

OFFICIAL REPORT

OF THE

DEBATES

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF THE

DOMINION OF CANADA

SIXTH SESSION—SEVENTH PARLIAMENT

59 VICTORIA, 1896

VOL. XLI.

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM THE SECOND DAY OF JANUARY TO THE
THIRTEENTH DAY OF MARCH INCLUSIVE.



OTTAWA

PRINTED BY S. E. DAWSON, PRINTER TO THE QU.
EXCELLENT MAJESTY

OSSE

1896

MEMBERS OF THE GOVERNMENT

OF THE

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

AT THE OPENING OF THE

SIXTH SESSION OF THE SEVENTH PARLIAMENT

1896

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

[The above formed the Cabinet.]

Solicitor General.....	
Controller of Customs.....	Hon. JOHN F. WOOD*.
Controller of Inland Revenue.....	Hon. EDWARD GAWLER PRIOR.

CABINET FORMED 15TH JANUARY, 1896.

President of the Council (Premier).....	Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL, K.C.M.G.
Secretary of State.....	Hon. Sir CHARLES TUPPER, Bart., G.C.M.G., C.B
Postmaster General.....	Hon. Sir ADOLPHE P. CARON, K.C.M.G.
Minister of Marine and Fisheries.....	Hon. JOHN COSTIGAN.
Without Portfolio.....	Hon. Sir FRANK SMITH, Kt.
Minister of Finance.....	Hon. GEORGE E. FOSTER.
Minister of Railways and Canals.....	Hon. JOHN HAGGART.
Minister of Public Works.....	Hon. J. A. OUIMET.
Minister of the Interior.....	Hon. T. MAYNE DALY.
Minister of Trade and Commerce.....	Hon. W. B. IVES.
Minister of Justice.....	Hon. A. R. DICKEY.
Minister of Agriculture.....	Hon. W. H. MONTAGUE.
Without Portfolio.....	Hon. DONALD FERGUSON.
Controller of Customs.....	Hon. JOHN F. WOOD.
Controller of Inland Revenue.....	Hon. EDWARD GAWLER PRIOR.
Minister of Militia and Defence.....	Hon. ALPHONSE DESJARDINS.

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

* Resigned Portfolios 5th January, 1893.

OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS :

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

OFFICIAL REPORTERS :

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

} *Reporters.*

ALPHABETICAL LIST

OF THE

CONSTITUENCIES AND MEMBERS

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

SIXTH SESSION OF THE SEVENTH PARLIAMENT OF THE DOMINION OF CANADA

1896

ADDINGTON—George W. W. Dawson.
ALBERT—Richard Chapman Weldon.
ALBERTA—Donald Watson Davis.
ALGOMA—George Hugh Macdonell.
ANNAPOLIS—John B. Mills.
ANTIGONISH—Colin F. McIsaac.
ARGENTEUIL—Thomas Christie.
ASSINIBOIA, East—William Walter McDonald.
ASSINIBOIA, West—Nicholas Flood Davin.
BAGOT—Flavien Dupont.
BEAUCE—Joseph Godbout.
BEAUHARNOIS—Joseph Gédéon Horace Bergeron.
BELLECHASSE—Guillaume Amyot.*
BERTHIER—Cléophas Beausoleil.
BONAVENTURE—William Le Boutillier Fauvel.
BOTHWELL—Hon. David Mills.
BRANT, N. Riding—James Somerville.
BRANT, S. Riding—William Paterson.
BROCKVILLE—Hon. John Fisher Wood.
BROME—Eugene A. Dyer.
BRUCE, E. Riding—Henry Cargill.
BRUCE, N. Riding—Alexander McNeill.
BRUCE, W. Riding—James Rowand.
CAPE BRETON—

{	Hector F. McDougall.
	David McKeen.†
	Sir Charles Tupper, Bart.‡

CARDWELL—William Stubbs.
CARLETON (N.B.)—Newton Ramsay Colter.
CARLETON (O.)—William T. Hodgins.
CARIBOO—Frank S. Barnard.
CHAMBLY—Raymond Préfontaine.
CHAMPLAIN—Onésime Carignan.
CHARLEVOIX—Charles Angers.‡
CHARLOTTE—Arthur Hill Gillmor.
CHATEAUGUAY—James Pollock Brown.

CHICOUTIMI AND SAGUENAY—Louis de Gonzagu Belley.
COLCHESTER—William A. Patterson.
COMPTON—Rufus Henry Pope.
CORNWALL AND STORMONT—Darby Bergin.
CUMBERLAND—Hon. Arthur R. Dickey.
DIGBY—Edward Charles Bowers.
DORCHESTER—Cyrille Emile Vaillancourt.
DRUMMOND AND ARTHABASKA—Joseph Lavergne.
DUNDAS—Hugo H. Ross.
DURHAM, E. Riding—Thomas Dixon Craig.
DURHAM, W. Riding—Robert Beith.
ELGIN, E. Riding—Andrew B. Ingram.
ELGIN, W. Riding—George Elliott Casey.
ESSEX, N. Riding—William McGregor.
ESSEX, S. Riding—Henry W. Allan.
FRONTENAC—Hiram A. Calvin.
GASPÉ—Louis Zéphirin Joncas.
GLENGARRY—Roderick R. McLennan.
GLOUCESTER—Théotigne Blanchard.
GRENVILLE, S. Riding—John Dowsley Reid.
GREY, E. Riding—Thomas S. Sproule.
GREY, N. Riding—James Masson.
GREY, S. Riding—George Landerkin.
GUYSBOROUGH—Duncan C. Fraser.
HALDIMAND—Hon. Walter H. Montague.
HALIFAX—

{	Thomas E. Kenny.
	John Fitz-William Stairs.

HALTON—David Henderson.
HAMILTON—

{	Alexander McKay.
	Samuel S. Ryckman.

HANTS—Alfred Putnam.
HASTINGS, E. Riding—William B. Northrup.
HASTINGS, N. Riding—A. W. Carscallen.
HASTINGS, W. Riding—Henry Corby.
HOHELAGA—Sévérin Lachapelle.
HUNTINGDON—Julius Scriver.

* Died on or about 30th March.

† Resigned; appointed to the Senate, 21st February

‡ Elected during session; took seat 11th February.

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

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

VANCOUVER ISLAND—Andrew Haslam.
 VAUDREUIL—Henry Stanislaus Harwood.
 VERCHÈRES—C. A. Geoffrion.

* Died on or about 15th April.

VICTORIA (B.C.)—{ Hon. Edward Gawler Prior.
 Thomas Earle.
 VICTORIA (N.B.)—Hon. John Costigan.
 VICTORIA (N.S.)—John Archibald McDonald.
 VICTORIA (O.) N. Riding—Samuel Hughes.
 VICTORIA (O.) S. Riding—Charles Fairbairn.

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

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

* Appointed to the Senate, 7th January.

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

BEAUSOLEIL, Mr. Cléophas (*Berthier*).
 BÉCHARD, Mr. François (*Iberville*).
 CAMERON, Mr. Hugh (*Inverness*).
 CHARLTON, Mr. John (*North Norfolk*).
 CRAIG, Mr. Thomas D. (*East Durham*).
 DAVIN, Mr. Nicholas Flood (*West Assiniboia*).
 EARLE, Mr. Thomas (*Victoria, B.C.*).
 HAZEN, Mr. J. Douglas (*St. John City and County*).

INNES, Mr. James (*South Wellington*).
 LARIVIÈRE, Mr. Alphonse A. C. (*Provencher*).
 LÉPINE, Mr. Alphonse Téléphore (*East Montreal*).
 SCRIVER, Mr. Julius (*Huntingdon*).
 SOMERVILLE, Mr. James (*North Brant*).
 TAYLOR, Mr. George (*South Leeds*).
 WELDON, Mr. R. Chapman (*Albert*).

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

LIST OF PAIRS DURING THE SESSION.

On Mr. LAURIER's proposed amendment (6 m. h.) to Sir CHARLES TUPPER's motion for Second Reading of Bill 58 (The Remedial Act, Man.) 20th March:—

<i>Ministerial.</i>	<i>Opposition.</i>
Sir DONALD SMITH,	Mr. ROWAND,
Mr. MONTAGUE,	Mr. DENISON.

On Mr. OUIMET's amendment to Sir CHARLES TUPPER's proposed motion (*re* Saturday Sittings of the House) 2nd April:—

Mr. HASLAM,	Mr. McSHANE,
Mr. DICKEY,	Mr. PRÉFONTAINE,
Sir DONALD SMITH,	Mr. GEOFFRION,
Mr. JONCAS,	Mr. McDONALD (Huron)

<i>Ministerial.</i>	<i>Opposition.</i>
Mr. CLEVELAND,	Mr. LAVERGNE,
Mr. CHESLEY,	Mr. FORBES.

On Mr. O'BRIEN's amendment to Sir CHARLES TUPPER's proposed motion (*re* Saturday Sittings of the House) 2nd April:—

Mr. HASLAM,	Mr. McSHANE,
Mr. DICKEY,	Mr. PRÉFONTAINE,
Sir DONALD SMITH,	Mr. GEOFFRION,
Mr. JONCAS,	Mr. McDONALD (Huron),
Mr. CLEVELAND,	Mr. LAVERGNE,
Mr. CHESLEY,	Mr. FORBES.

House of Commons Debates

SIXTH SESSION—SEVENTH PARLIAMENT

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 2nd January, 1896.

The Parliament, which had been prorogued from time to time, was now commanded to assemble on the 2nd day of January, 1896, for the despatch of business.

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

PRAYERS.

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

MR. SPEAKER.

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

Accordingly, the House went up to the Senate Chamber.

And the House being returned,

VACANCIES.

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

Of Josiah Wood, Esquire, Member for the Electoral District of Westmoreland, by being summoned to the Senate.

Of Robert S. White, Esquire, Member for the Electoral District of Cardwell, by resignation.

Of Frank Madill, Esquire, Member for the Electoral District of the North Riding of Ontario, by decease.

Of Hon. James Colebrooke Patterson, Member for the Electoral District of West Huron, by the acceptance of an office of emolument under the Crown, to wit : that of Lieutenant-Governor of the Province of Manitoba.

Of Désiré Girouard, Esquire, Member for the Electoral District of Jacques Cartier, by the acceptance of an office of emolument under the Crown, to wit : that of a Judge of the Supreme Court of Canada.

Of Hon. John Joseph Curran, Member for the Electoral District of Montreal Centre, by the acceptance of an office of emolument under the Crown, to wit : that of a Judge of the Superior Court of the Province of Quebec.

Of Henry Simard, Esquire, Member for the Electoral District of Charlevoix, by decease ; and

Of Edward Gawler Prior, Esquire, Member for the Electoral District of Victoria, B.C., by the acceptance of an office of emolument under the Crown.

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

NEW MEMBERS.

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

Of Henry A. Powell, for the Electoral District of Westmoreland ; and

Of John A. McGillivray, for the Electoral District of the North Riding of Ontario.

MEMBER INTRODUCED.

John A. McGillivray, Esquire, Member for the Electoral District of North Ontario, introduced by Hon. Mr. Montague and Mr. Hughes.

FIRST READING.

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

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE.

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

Honourable Gentlemen of the Senate :

Gentlemen of the House of Commons :

In accordance with the announcement made during the last Session, Parliament has been

summoned somewhat in advance of the usual period.

The bountiful harvest with which Canada has been blessed is a cause for the deepest thankfulness to the Giver of all good.

I congratulate you upon the evidence of increased activity in the various branches of commerce and industry.

Several such indications have come under my personal observation during a tour made recently in the North-west Territories and British Columbia. In particular, I noticed the extension of mining enterprise in British Columbia, where the vast mineral resources are in certain localities being now developed and utilized upon something like an adequate scale.

A special feature of the same tour consisted in the opportunities obtained for visiting a number of the Indian Reservations and also the Indian Industrial Schools. On the former I was received with hearty demonstrations of loyalty and good-will, while in connection with the latter the proofs of proficiency and intelligence on the part of the children are highly encouraging.

As to the work of the Indian Department as a whole, the manner in which it is directed and administered appears to be very satisfactory.

A reference to these topics would be incomplete without an allusion to the valuable services of the North-west Mounted Police, which may justly be regarded by Canadians generally as indispensable, under present conditions, to the well-being of those extensive and promising portions of the Dominion in which they are stationed.

Immediately after the prorogation of Parliament my Government communicated through the Lieutenant-Governor of Manitoba with the Government of that province, in order to ascertain upon what lines the local authorities of Manitoba would be prepared to promote amendments to the Acts respecting education in schools in that province, and whether any arrangement was possible with the Manitoba Government which would render action by the Federal Parliament in this connection unnecessary. I regret to say that the advisers of the Lieutenant-Governor have declined to entertain favourably these suggestions, thereby rendering it necessary for my Government in pursuance of its declared policy to introduce legislation in regard to this subject. The papers will be laid before you.

I am happy to inform you that the representations of my Government and the suggestions of the Ottawa Conference respecting steamship communication have resulted in an announcement by the Imperial authorities of their willingness to grant a substantial subvention towards the Atlantic portion of the scheme. This will, I trust, ensure the successful establishment of a line of steamers between the United Kingdom

Mr. SPEAKER.

and Canada, which, in point of speed and equipment, shall fully meet all requirements.

My Government have also learned with satisfaction that it is the intention of the Secretary of State for the Colonies to appoint a Committee to consider a proposed Pacific Cable to connect Canada with Australasia. You will, I am sure, share the gratification with which my advisers welcome these announcements as affording further evidence of the desire of Her Majesty's Government to draw closer to each other and to the motherland the outlying portions of the Queen's Dominions. The papers on these subjects will also be submitted to you.

Your attention will be asked to measures intended to provide for the better arming of our militia and the strengthening of Canadian defences.

The growth of population in the North-west Territories as disclosed by the last enumeration calls for additional representation in Parliament. A Bill for this purpose will be laid before you.

I am happy to be able to inform you that the Commissioners appointed by Great Britain and the United States for the purpose of delimiting the boundary between Alaska and Canada have concluded their labours and have signed a joint report for presentation to their respective Governments. This report will be laid before Parliament in due time.

At the request of the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for the Colonies a delegate of my Government visited England last summer to confer with the Imperial authorities upon the question of Copyright. His report will be laid before you, and I doubt not that this subject will again receive your earnest attention.

You will also be asked to consider measures for the extension and development of our trade in agricultural products with the United Kingdom, and other markets.

Gentlemen of the House of Commons :

The accounts of the past and the estimates for the ensuing year will be laid before you. The latter have been framed with every regard for economy consistent with the requirements of the public service.

You will be pleased to learn that the revenues of the country show a gradual and continuous increase, and that the promised equilibrium between income and expenditure on Consolidated Fund account for the current year bids fair to be realized.

Honourable Gentlemen of the Senate :

Gentlemen of the House of Commons :

I commend these subjects and others which may come before you to your earnest consideration, relying upon your wisdom and prudence

under the Divine guidance to discharge with dignity and effect the high trust committed to your care.

Mr. FOSTER moved :

That the Address with which His Excellency has been pleased to open the session be taken into consideration on Tuesday next, the 7th inst.

Motion agreed to.

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES.

Mr. FOSTER moved :

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

Motion agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. FOSTER moved :

That when the House adjourns this day it do stand adjourned until Tuesday next, the 7th inst., at 3 o'clock p.m.

Motion agreed to.

REPORT.

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

Mr. FOSTER moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 3.50 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 7th January, 1896.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

NEW MEMBERS.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to inform the House that the Clerk of the House had received from the Clerk of the Crown

1½

in Chancery, certificates of the Election and Return of the following Members, viz. :—

Of James McShane, for the Electoral District of Montreal Centre ; and

Of William Stubbs, for the Electoral District of Cardwell.

MEMBERS INTRODUCED.

Henry A. Powell, Esquire, Member for the Electoral District of Westmoreland, N.B., introduced by Hon. Mr. Costigan and Hon. Mr. Foster.

William Stubbs, Esquire, Member for the Electoral District of Cardwell, introduced by Mr. McCarthy and Mr. O'Brien.

James McShane, Esquire, Member for the Electoral District of Montreal Centre, introduced by Mr. Laurier and Mr. Devlin.

SAFETY OF RAILWAY EMPLOYEES AND PASSENGERS.

Mr. CASEY moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 2), further to secure the safety of railway employees and passengers. He said: This is, in substance, the Bill I introduced last year, and for which I was unable to get a second reading. If there happens to be a session this year, I hope to obtain full consideration for the Bill.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

DRAINAGE ON PROPERTY OF RAILWAY COMPANIES.

Mr. CASEY moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 3), concerning drainage on the property of railway companies. He said: This is a Bill similar to the Bill I introduced last year on the same subject.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

MINISTERIAL RESIGNATIONS.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I have an important statement to make to the House. Since the opening of Parliament, seven members of the Cabinet have tendered their resignations to the Prime Minister, which were submitted to the Governor General and accepted by His Excellency. The gentlemen whose resignations have been accepted are :—The Hon. George E. Foster, Minister of Finance ; the Hon. John Haggart, Minister of Railways and Canals ; the Hon. Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper, Minister of Justice ; the Hon. William Bullock Ives, Minister of Trade and Commerce ; the Hon. Arthur R. Dickey, Minister of Militia and Defence ; the Hon. Walter H. Montague, Minister of Agriculture ; the Hon. John F. Wood, Controller of Customs. At the next meeting of the House I hope to be in a position to state

definitely what course the Government has taken, or intends to take, under these circumstances. Considering the gravity of the situation, I have to ask that when the House adjourns to-day—of course, I am aware that without notice I can only move for an adjournment from day to day—it stands adjourned for ten days, or a fortnight, which would allow time to consider the gravity of the circumstances. This is the statement, Mr. Speaker, which I have the honour to lay before the House. Therefore, I move :

That when the House adjourns this day, it do stand adjourned until Tuesday, the 21st instant.

Mr. LAURIER. Mr. Speaker, I really believe that my hon. friend who now leads the House will not be surprised if I tell him at the outset that it will not be possible for me, nor for any of those who sit on this side of the House, to agree at this moment to the proposition that the House should adjourn at all, except in the ordinary way from day to day. I understand very well that the Government are in a very peculiar position, and that they are entitled, I must say, to some commiseration. I am not disposed to refuse that commiseration to them in any way. But on the other hand, we must have something like parliamentary government in this country, and it is time that we should put an end to the travesty, to the mockery, and to the sham which has been too long going on here under the name of parliamentary government. It is not at all surprising to me that there should be resignations of members of the Cabinet. I must say that I have rather expected it ever since we had the resignations on the 8th of July last. I expected then that the day would come when another wing of the Cabinet would do the same thing as had been done by the wing of the Cabinet which resigned on that occasion. On that point I have nothing to say further than this: The hon. gentleman (Sir Adolphe Caron) has told us that seven of the members of the Administration have resigned. Sir, the hon. gentleman should have told us what is the cause which has brought on these resignations. Not a word, not a syllable, not a scintilla of information has been given to the House upon this most important subject. We knew before the hon. gentleman (Sir Adolphe Caron) spoke—because the fact had gone abroad through the length and breadth of the land—that seven of his colleagues had resigned, but we were in the dark then and we are in the dark yet, as to what are the causes which led to this most extraordinary and important course. What are the causes? I must assume, Mr. Speaker, that some extraordinary event has taken place which has induced seven of the members of the Administration to take such a course. I cannot assume for a moment that the hon. gentlemen who have resigned, have tendered their resignations to the Premier for causes which existed when this Parliament

Sir ADOLPHE CARON.

met on the second of this month. To assume that, would be to assume that these hon. gentlemen had acted not only in a most unparliamentary manner, but that they had acted in a most treacherous manner to the Premier, and in a most unpardonable manner towards the dignity of the Crown. Why, Sir, what is the position we are in at this moment? The position is this: On the 8th of July last, when the Cabinet had been tossed to and fro, and undecided as to whether or not they would introduce a measure of remedial legislation with regard to the Manitoba school case, based upon the Order in Council of the 21st of March last, they came here with the announcement that they were to reopen negotiations with the government of Manitoba, and that in the event of Manitoba failing to give to the minority the redress which the minority was asking for, then they would summon Parliament not later than the 2nd of January and introduce remedial legislation and press it to a conclusion. Parliament was summoned to assemble on the 2nd of January, and Parliament met on the 2nd of January. The whole Cabinet has put in the mouth of His Excellency a statement of the policy which the Government intended to carry on this session, and of the measures which they proposed to introduce. This was assented to unanimously. All the colleagues of the Prime Minister, of course, pledged themselves to the support of that policy. Now, are we to suppose that after the whole of the Government have been committed to that policy, after they have taken their course, and after they have placed in the hands of the Crown the policy which the advisers of the Crown intended to carry on, are we to suppose that unless something unforeseen has taken place since then, these gentlemen would have resigned on account of causes which existed at the very time they put that language into the mouth of the representative of the Crown? We are indeed told by the ministerial press that no extraordinary event has taken place since that time, but that these gentlemen have tendered their resignations on account of reasons which existed long before Parliament was called. Again, I assume that some very extraordinary event must have taken place since the opening of Parliament. It is true that the ministerial press has given us an event extraordinary in its character, which, however, did not affect the whole Cabinet, but affected only two members of the Administration. It is true, as has been stated in the press, that a member of the Administration had charged one of his colleagues with having anonymously slandered him to His Excellency the Governor General, had carried on investigations behind his back, although they were sitting all the time at the same table in Council, and that under such circumstances there was something to be investigated against those two gentlemen. Well, this is an extraordinary

event, I must admit, but it is not an event I would imagine which would bring on such a crisis as we have at present. What is the true cause I ask? We are told in the organs of the Government that the Conservative party are dissatisfied with the leadership of Sir Mackenzie Bowell. As to that I have nothing to say. It is a purely family quarrel in which I would not at all venture to take any part. It is for the Conservatives themselves to settle that question. But, Sir, if that were the cause, if that is really the reason, and the only reason why we have the present crisis, then, met as we are here to-day to discuss the Speech of His Excellency, and asked as we are to adjourn the House, we had better know whether that is the cause or not. But, Sir, this cause existed long ago. Whether the Conservative party at large is or is not satisfied with the leadership of Sir Mackenzie Bowell, it is for gentlemen on the other side of the House and not for me to determine. I have to say that Parliament would be trifled with if that were given as the cause why we should not proceed with the business of the House. Parliament has been called to determine a certain policy, but to me it looks very much as if this were another of those expedients, of which we have had too many already, in order to afford the Government an opportunity to not carry out the pledges which they have given Parliament.

Mr. SPEAKER. Is the motion of the hon. gentleman (Sir Adolphe Caron) objected to?

Mr. LAURIER. Certainly; notice must be given.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I will give it as a notice of motion for to-morrow.

Mr. LAURIER. For the day after to-morrow.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I move that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, before the House adjourns, I rise to perform a duty which I conceive should be performed at once, and to say at the same time that I do not propose (as neither, I think, do my colleagues who are acting with me in this matter) to enter into any discussion of the subject. I will to-day simply make a statement for the information of the House and the country as to our position—I mean the position of those gentlemen who thought it their duty to retire from the Government—and I shall briefly state the reasons why they retired. I may say in the first place that there is no disagreement between ourselves and the Premier upon any question of public policy, trade or constitutional, with regard to which action has been already taken, or in respect to which an attitude has been assumed by the Government under

the present Premier. I beg also to say that we retain our firm belief in the principles and policy of the Liberal Conservative party, with which we are in entire accord, and of which, in common with others, we have been and will remain the exponents in so far as our ability admits. We have lost none of our confidence in the sound and healthy condition of the Liberal Conservative party of Canada, or of our belief that it embodies a policy which the majority of the electorate considers essential to the continued welfare and progress of the country, or of our faith that under firm and prudent leadership it will come back triumphant from the polls. Though with many misgivings we agreed to enter the Government under Mr. Bowell in succession to Sir John Thompson, we have nevertheless unitedly and loyally striven to the best of our ability to make it strong and efficient, and it has been with growing regret that we have seen our efforts result in a measure of success less than that for which we had hoped and striven. We are of the opinion that the Liberal Conservative party ought to be represented by the strongest Government possible to be secured from its ranks, that the necessity therefor was never greater than under existing circumstances, and we believe that such a Government can be formed without delay. This we have repeatedly urged upon the Premier with the result that we found ourselves face to face with Parliament having a Government with its numbers incomplete, and with no assurance that the present Premier could satisfactorily complete it. Under these circumstances we thought it our duty to retire, and in this manner to pave the way, if possible, for the formation of a Government whose Premier could command the confidence of all his colleagues, could satisfy the Liberal Conservative party, that its strongest elements were at its head and impress the country that it had a Government which was united and had power to govern. We affirm with the utmost sincerity that the action we have taken has sprung from no feeling of personal dislike or of personal ambition, but has been solely dictated by our wish to sink all minor considerations in the presence of our great desire that the best interests of our party and country should be duly conserved.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not know, Mr. Speaker, which is the more extraordinary—the request made by the present leader of the House or the statement to which we have just listened from the ex-leader of the House. Sir, I have had some parliamentary experience. It is three and thirty years since I first sat in the Parliament of the then two Canadas, and in all that time, although I have seen many crises and assisted at some, I can recall nothing in the faintest degree parallel with the present condition of things. Sir, I defy my hon.

friend the ex-Minister of Justice, who is learned in precedents, to point out to us, in the history of any British community, a case in which seven ministers of the Crown have resigned in the interval between the placing of a speech in the mouth of the Governor or Sovereign of the country and the debate that usually follows thereon. Sir, we have heard of sudden conversions and sudden convictions. We know, on the authority of an eminent English writer, that

“ Mercy was sought and mercy found
Between the saddle and the ground ;”

But that is not a circumstance to the speed with which these new convictions have dawned on the minds of hon. gentlemen opposite. Now, Mr. Speaker, it does appear to me that these hon. gentlemen, one and all, have offered a direct insult to the representative of the Sovereign, and a direct insult to the House. No matter what their grounds or their reasons may be, for a cabinet to place a speech in the mouth of His Excellency, and then, before the ink on the document is dry, to put a pistol to the head of their own colleague, the Premier of the country—to place him in the utterly humiliating and degrading position in which they have tried to place him, whether successful or not,—is, I am happy to say, utterly unparalleled in the history of any British community. Neither, Sir, is it a less insult to the House. We are, for the first time in Canadian history, summoned to hold a sixth session of Parliament for a most precise and special purpose; and the men who unanimously declared, speaking through the mouth of the hon. gentleman who has just addressed us, that it was necessary to the best interests of Canada that this extraordinary step should be taken, that this Parliament should be summoned on the 2nd day of January, 1896, to consult on a measure to which they declared themselves pledged, which they informed us it was their duty, their imperative duty to bring down, now present themselves before us as the very men who have—what shall I say?—combined together or conspired together to render its discussion impossible. More than that, Sir, I say it is a fraud on the country. If these seven gentlemen long entertained, as is perfectly evident from the statement we have just heard, such sentiments against the leader of the Government as have been expressed, each and every one of them have openly and shamefully perpetrated a fraud upon the electorate of the country. Sir, during the recent bye elections—during the election of my hon. friend who has just taken his seat for Montreal Centre (Mr. McShane), during the election in Jacques Cartier, during the election in North Ontario, during the election in Cardwell—I might almost say during the recent election in Victoria—have not these men, one and all, been declaring that the cabinet were in perfect unity, that they were a band of brothers

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

without any dissensions or disputes? Have they not, in tones of thunder—especially through the late Secretary of State—what is he now?—the ex-Minister of Agriculture—declared that these assertions about cabinet dissensions were the vilest slanders of an unscrupulous Grit press? Have they not over and over again declared that all these assertions which we have made so recklessly against men so notoriously at one as the late Minister of Railways and his colleague the Minister of Public Works, were pure inventions of the enemy, and not entitled to the slightest consideration? Now, Sir, it is no light thing at a crisis like this—it is no light thing when several constituencies are called upon to record their verdict—that Ministers of the Crown should come before the country with statements in their mouths which I cannot characterize in parliamentary language other than this, that they appear to have not the slightest foundation in fact, judging from the statement which the ex-Minister of Finance has just made. Then, Sir, over and above all this, the matter is complicated by another consideration. It appears to me that these gentlemen's own honour demands now a full statement of the reasons which impelled them to take that extraordinary course; and it is certain that two of these hon. gentlemen, in view of the most extraordinary statements which are being circulated broadcast from one end of this country to the other, ought, before this day closes, or before this House rises, to inform us what truth there is or what truth there is not in the statement that one hon. Minister or ex-Minister has been caught in the act of slandering anonymously the reputation of an honourable colleague. I offer no opinion on the subject beyond this, that it is due to both those gentlemen that if this statement be true the proofs be given, and that if it is false, it be contradicted on the spot. I shall not say much about the modus operandi of these anonymous letters, but will merely offer the suggestion that if it should again become necessary, in the discharge of a patriotic duty, for any gentleman in similar position to address an anonymous correspondence to His Excellency, the communication should, for the sake of decency, and for the sake of preventing future scandals, be typewritten, and the typewriter be broken up immediately, so that there may be no possibility of afterwards detecting it. What sort of opinion are we to suppose these hon. gentlemen entertain of each other, if they have been sitting in Council, devising schemes for the welfare of Canada from day to day, and entertaining the opinion which apparently they must have entertained of each other, if we are to place the smallest reliance on the statements which have been circulated broadcast through the newspaper press. I will say but this one thing in conclusion, before these hon. gentlemen

rise, as I trust they will, to give some sort of explanation to the House of their extraordinary conduct, and it is that for my part I am prepared to grant—and I hope and I believe my friends are prepared to grant—the fullest consideration to the present first Minister, Sir Mackenzie Bowell, who, whatever his faults and sins may be, appears, so far as we can see, to have acted straightforwardly under very difficult circumstances indeed.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 3.50 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 8th January, 1896.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

NEW MEMBER.

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

Of Napoléon Charbonneau, for the Electoral District of Jacques Cartier.

MEMBER INTRODUCED.

Napoléon Charbonneau, Esquire, Member for the Electoral District of Jacques Cartier, introduced by Mr. Laurier and Mr. Tarte.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 4) respecting the liability of Her Majesty and public companies for labour used in the construction of public works.—(Mr. McLennan.)

Bill (No. 5) to amend "The Dairy Products Act."—(Mr. McLennan.)

Bill (No. 6) respecting the sale of railway return-fare tickets.—(Mr. McLennan.)

Bill (No. 7) respecting the Senate and House of Commons.—(Mr. Mulock.)

Bill (No. 8) respecting interest.—(Mr. Mulock.)

MINISTERIAL RESIGNATIONS.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I take it that the House will expect some information in relation to the announcement which I made yesterday. I then had the

honour of asking the House to consent to an adjournment for ten days. It was refused, and I had to give notice of motion, and that motion will come up only on to-morrow. I am not in a position to-day to say anything more to the House than I said yesterday, except, that the Prime Minister is now with His Excellency the Governor General, and of course, I can make no further announcement. I would again ask the House if the motion which I made yesterday can be agreed to, and if not, it will of course come up in the regular order to-morrow. I move, Mr. Speaker, that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. LAURIER. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that my hon. friend (Sir Adolphe Caron) remembers that yesterday he stated that at the next sitting of the House (that is the way he put it) he expected to be in a position to declare to the House the course which the Government intended to take under existing circumstances.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. My expectations have been disappointed.

Mr. LAURIER. Yes, and in more ways than one, perhaps. Under such circumstances the hon. gentleman will not find it extraordinary, if again I cannot agree to an adjournment for ten days. The hon. gentleman will see that it is most reasonable that we should not separate, at all events for such a length of time, until we have been informed of the intentions of the Government in reference to the present state of affairs. The hon. gentleman tells us to-day that the Prime Minister is in consultation with His Excellency. That being the case we certainly cannot press for more information, but we will expect it to-morrow.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Mr. Speaker. I think, Sir, that before the motion is carried it is important that the House should give some consideration to the very extraordinary position in which it finds itself on the present occasion. The position, Sir, is certainly a very novel one. I think the hon. gentlemen who occupy the Treasury benches, whether they are in the Government, or outside of the Government, will find very great difficulty in placing before the House a precedent for the present position of affairs. Sir, we have been called together, as we supposed, for the transaction of the public business; but, after having been convened, we find that this is a mistake; we have been called here simply to be spectators of a ministerial crisis, and to see how certain hon. gentlemen who have been members of the Government can succeed in getting rid of their present Prime Minister and substituting another party leader in his place. There was submitted to the House yesterday by the late Minister of Finance, then leader of this House, a declaration setting forth certain

very important facts. The one piece of information which he gave us was that there is no difference between the members of the Government on questions of public policy, whether relating to ordinary questions or to matters of constitutional procedure, but that the division of the Cabinet has taken place wholly on the question of the intellectual capacity of the Prime Minister. The hon. gentleman has told us that that is the sole question of difference between those who have withdrawn from the Government and those who continue members of the Administration. After having given the Prime Minister a trial for a period of over twelve months, one-half of his colleagues have confidence in his capacity and fitness for the position he occupies, and the other half are of the contrary opinion. Sir, the time chosen by the hon. gentlemen who have withdrawn from the Government for making this declaration and for impeding the public business is, in my opinion, an extraordinary one. Before the House met, these hon. gentlemen deliberated upon the policy that was to be pursued by the Government this session. They determined what measures of public importance were to be submitted to this House, and advised His Excellency upon that subject; and they put in His Excellency's mouth the Speech from the Throne which has been delivered to Parliament. Now, Sir, after that Speech has been given, and before this House has had any opportunity of making a reply to it, seven of the hon. Prime Minister's colleagues have withdrawn from the Government, and have created a political crisis which, if it could be justified at all, ought to have arisen, looking at the causes assigned, before Parliament met, instead of after the meeting of Parliament. These hon. gentlemen, it may be, have considered their party interests: I am not a judge of that matter; but they have certainly not considered the public interests in bringing us here, after making known to His Excellency what measures the Government considered of public importance, and then impeding the public business and making it impossible to proceed with it in consequence of their party differences, which they have seen fit to discuss publicly on the floor of Parliament instead of confining them to the party caucus. They have charged incapacity against their leader—a leader whom they accepted, a leader who was not forced upon them, a leader whom they were not obliged to accept, because it was open to them at the very outset to inform His Excellency that they had not confidence in his capacity or ability, and did not consider him qualified for the position. But they did not do that. They chose to act under him—to undertake to carry on the affairs of the Government under him; and it is only now, at the opening of Parliament, that they attempt to justify the

course they are taking in impeding the public business by declaring that they have a leader characterized by imbecility and a want of capacity for the duties that devolve upon him. This, Sir, seems to me to be a very extraordinary position for these hon. gentlemen to take, and an unusual defence to offer for the course they have taken. Sir, the declaration made yesterday by the hon. member has rather the appearance—I do not say it is so in fact—of a conspiracy than a protest on the part of those who make it. Let us look at the facts. This House is the place where the business of the country is conducted; it is here that ministerial responsibility mainly rests; and who is responsible for the conduct of business in this House? Why, Sir, the hon. gentleman who read this statement on behalf of himself and his colleagues is responsible as leader of this House, far beyond the Prime Minister, for the conduct of the public business; and if there has been hesitation, if there has been delay, if there has been an exhibition of incapacity, it would rather rest upon the hon. gentlemen who represent the Government in this House than upon the First Minister who sits in the other Chamber. That, Sir, is the way in which this matter strikes me. The hon. gentleman read in this House yesterday a sentence of death against the Prime Minister under whom he served. The hon. gentleman has sat, I believe, for a period of eight years in the Government with the Prime Minister. Now, I have never expressed my confidence in the hon. gentleman who leads the Government. I do not agree with his views of public policy; I do not agree with the course which he and his friends have taken in this House; but, Sir, the hon. gentleman did agree and sat with him for a period of eight years, and knew what his capacity was before he was chosen as Prime Minister, and so did the six hon. gentlemen who have joined with him in this protest. Yet they come here and declare that they cannot get on with the public business because of the incapacity of their leader, although, as I say, that leader is in a less degree responsible for the conduct of public business than the hon. gentlemen who sit in this House. Sir, we have seen hesitation and delay in the conduct of public business. Who does not remember the manner in which the hon. gentleman who has lately led this House dealt with the banking system? Who does not remember the forbearance shown to him by his colleagues and by all the members of this House on that occasion? Who does not remember the promise to lop off the decaying branches in the matter of the fiscal policy of the Government, and the Bill which the hon. gentleman introduced, and the speech which he made in pursuance of that promise? And yet this hon. member, who has shown to what a

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell.)

large degree he rested upon the forbearance of the House and the good-will of the supporters of the Administration, has seen proper to attack the Prime Minister for incapacity in the discharge of public business, and to declare, in effect, that the failures of the Conservative party in the country have been due to that incapacity. Sir, under the constitution of ancient Abyssinia—

Mr. FOSTER. Oh, give us a rest.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Yes, I will interest the hon. gentleman. Under the constitution of ancient Abyssinia there was a council known as the Sacred Council, which claimed the right, when they were tired of the sovereign, to pass an order directing him to die, and he was supposed to obey that order. Ultimately, there was a sovereign in Abyssinia who refused to die, and who ordered his guards to execute the order of the Sacred Council upon that honourable body; and if the Prime Minister should adopt that policy towards these hon. gentlemen, perhaps there would not be a great deal of sympathy for them or a great deal of regret in consequence. There might have been a more effective way than the one which the hon. gentlemen have adopted. In the East there are more recent constitutions than that of Abyssinia. There is at Stamboul a practice, I believe, which the hon. gentlemen might have imitated here. There are surely bowstrings and bags in Ottawa as well as at Stamboul, and the waters behind Parliament Hill are as deep as those in the Bosphorous, so that the hon. gentlemen might perhaps have got rid of their Premier, if they wished to deal unfairly with him, without making the matter so notorious, not merely in this House, but in every part of the country. What is the defence that the late Minister of Finance has made of this attempt to take the life of the Premier? We took him, says the hon. gentleman, with a good deal of misgiving. We took him for better or for worse, and we find him worse than we took him for. That is the position which the hon. gentleman has taken, that is the defence he has made for the course which he and his six colleagues have adopted towards the Prime Minister. The hon. gentleman says: We have not lost confidence in the policy of the Conservative party. He says that policy is a healthy policy, one that commends itself to the Liberal-Conservative party, and that, under the leadership of a competent man, that party could return from the country triumphant. The hon. gentleman has great faith. Now, it was under the lead of the hon. gentleman himself, rather than under the lead of the Premier, that certain bye-elections were held. A number of constituencies represented by supporters of the Government in this House had become vacant. There was Antigonish, which was lost to the Administra-

tion. There is Centre Montreal which is lost to the Administration. There is the seat of Jacques Cartier which is lost to the Administration. And the hon. gentleman was afraid for some time to create a vacancy in Cardwell, although an office was promised to the former member for Cardwell some time ago. He was afraid that the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) would be tempted to tread on the tails of the Government's coat, and so Mr. White was not appointed to office and the seat did not become vacant until Mr. White forced the hands of the Government by resigning. The seat then did become vacant, and the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) did tread on the tails of the Government coat with a very great deal of success. The hon. gentleman who used to lead this House (Mr. Foster)—and not the Premier—went into that constituency and the other vacant constituencies and defended the course of the Government, and dilated on the ability of the Government, and waxed eloquent on the masterly manner in which the affairs of this country were being administered by the Government; but notwithstanding his representations in Cardwell, and in the other constituencies where seats held by the Government became vacant, these constituencies were lost to the Administration. Therefore, I say, it exhibits a great deal of faith on the part of the late Finance Minister for him to declare now to this House that the Liberal-Conservative party is quite sure of success in the country if it only had a competent man at its head. Why, the hon. gentleman's statement that the country is in a sound and healthy and contented condition is not justified by the results of the elections. He must see that these results point in a wholly different direction. I would like to know who is responsible for this discontent in the country. Has the late Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster), or the late Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Montague), or the late Minister of Railways (Mr. Haggart), or any of the other gentlemen who have retired from the Government, no responsibility in the discharge of the duties of governing? If there has been inefficiency on the part of the Government, if there is dissatisfaction in the country, whose inefficiency is it that has created that dissatisfaction? Is the Prime Minister alone responsible for the feeling which exists in the country? No, Sir. There is no one who has contributed more to create an unfavourable impression with regard to the conduct of public affairs than the late Finance Minister himself. These dead branches that were to be lopped off are still upon the Government tree. Those that were cut off have been grafted on again, and the country has not had that relief from the reforms which the hon. gentleman had promised. Let me read to the House a few of the paragraphs contained in this address which the hon. gentleman

read to us yesterday, as a justification for the course he and his friends have taken. He says :

We are of the opinion that the Liberal-Conservative party ought to be represented by the strongest Government possible to be secured from its ranks, that the necessity therefor was never greater than under existing circumstances, and we believe that such a Government can be formed without delay.

Is that the reason the hon. gentleman retired? Was it because he wanted to have a competent Government that he and his colleagues withdrew from the Administration? Has he want of confidence in his own colleagues who retired with him, or want of confidence, at all events, in their capacity? I do not think so. The hon. gentleman himself, by this address, wishes the country to understand that if such men as those, who have retired with him, had control of public affairs, then the Government would be competently conducted. They are able, they are competent men—so they say—and all they require is a competent head. But, say these hon. gentlemen, although we are excellent material, the Government was vacant in the upper story. Now, in another paragraph, he says :

This we have repeatedly urged upon the Premier with the result that we found ourselves face to face with Parliament, having a Government with its numbers incomplete, and with no assurance that the present Premier could satisfactorily complete it.

Well, what is the position of the Government? There are two seats, I believe, vacant—one in the Cabinet and one outside. The Solicitor-General's position was not filled; neither was that of the late Minister of Agriculture. Well, that was not an extraordinary thing, and certainly not extraordinary in a Government by the Conservative party in this country. I remember many instances when seats in the Administration were vacant for a good while; and so far as I remember, there were still over thirteen members left in the Cabinet, so that there was abundance of material, whether it was material of the right sort or not. Let me point out this irrelevant reason assigned for resignation. That reason was just as good two months ago as it is to-day. It was just as good before Parliament was called as after the proclamation. Why did the hon. gentleman wait until Parliament was called before he discovered that the Administration was incomplete. Why did he assist in framing the Speech from the Throne and marking out a policy for the Administration? Why did he come down to this House and invite the attention of the House to the contents of the Speech from the Throne if he were not prepared to go on—if he thought that because there was no Solicitor-General and because one office in the Cabinet was vacant, that was a reason for his not continuing in the Government?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell.)

Sir, let me call the hon. gentleman's attention to another matter of importance. Seats have been kept vacant in this House for some months. Writs, I believe, were issued, in some cases, some time ago, but the Government failed to appoint the returning officers, they failed to give the necessary instructions. They put impediments in the way of the election instead of discharging their duty. Thus the hon. gentlemen must have thought it was more important that an unnecessary office in the Administration should be filled than the people of a large constituency should be represented in this House. Then, look at the Senate. The hon. gentlemen know that there have been for a long period of time many seats vacant in that House. That is contrary to the spirit of the constitution. I suppose, from what the hon. gentleman has said, that he is in accord with the course taken with the authority of the Prime Minister in this regard. How is it that the hon. gentlemen assign as a reason a temporary vacancy in the Government, while these vacancies in the Senate and the House of Commons extending over a long period of time were not considered worthy of notice? Then, Sir, there are vacancies outside. The hon. gentleman will not pretend that offices have been created in this country producing charges upon the public revenue which he thinks altogether unnecessary. Why was the Collectorship of Customs of Montreal kept vacant? The hon. gentleman says: There is no Solicitor General, and I must retire from the Government. And yet, while there has been no Collector in Montreal for three years, the hon. gentleman did not think it worth while to retire on that account. Further, the hon. gentleman and his colleagues have withdrawn from the Government and the reasons for that withdrawal are all set out in the address which the hon. gentleman read to us yesterday. It was open to the hon. gentleman, if he was dissatisfied with the Prime Minister, to have informed him that they desired an interview with His Excellency and that they desired to inform His Excellency that they did not consider Sir Mackenzie Bowell qualified for the post of Prime Minister. This course was followed in the case of Lord Granville in the Pelham Administration, who was following a course in respect of foreign affairs with which his colleagues did not agree. Five of those colleagues waited upon the King and informed His Majesty that they entirely disapproved of the foreign policy of Lord Granville and asked his removal from office on that account; and, although that policy was one of which the King approved, and although Lord Granville was a personal friend of His Majesty, nevertheless His Majesty complied with the request of a majority of his advisers. And so, in this case, it was open to the hon. gentlemen who were dissatisfied with the Government here

to have assigned that as a reason for their withdrawal from the Government, that is if Sir Mackenzie Bowell had been sustained. Now, let me read another paragraph from his address :

Under these circumstances we thought it our duty to retire, and in this manner to pave the way, if possible, for the formation of a Government whose Premier could command the confidence of all his colleagues, could satisfy the Liberal-Conservative party that its strongest elements were at its head and impress the country that it had a Government which was united and had power to govern.

Now, Sir, the one astonishing thing in this statement is that there is here an assumption that the hon. gentlemen on the other side of this House had the right to choose a Prime Minister for His Excellency. I deny that altogether. It is the prerogative of the Crown to choose whom it pleases as Prime Minister. The House may or may not, the country may or may not, support the party so chosen. The hon. gentlemen assume that in this matter the Conservative party must have a caucus, that its representatives must determine who their leader shall be, and that they must inform His Excellency that the leader so chosen must be the Prime Minister. I deny any such pretension altogether. There are numerous precedents which would show that no such right can be maintained. The hon. gentleman, so we understand, has undertaken to invite across the Atlantic the High Commissioner to lead the Conservative party. The Conservative party are, no doubt, in desperate straits. But that is not due to the incapacity of the Prime Minister; it is due to the reckless and extravagant course which the Administration have taken for a period of years past. These hon. gentlemen have excited high expectations in the public mind which have not been realized, and the public are disappointed. The elections which have taken place show that the public have no confidence in the hon. gentlemen. These gentlemen have attempted to repair their fortunes. In their desperate extremity they have invited Sir Charles Tupper from his office of High Commissioner to this country, and when he arrives here, they undertake to create a crisis, and they do create it just at the most inconvenient time for the country, when Parliament is called for the discharge of its public duty. Now, the hon. gentlemen, I think, will find that Sir Charles Tupper cannot improve very much the position of the Conservative party. The public have not as much confidence in Sir Charles Tupper as have the hon. gentlemen who sit on the Treasury benches—I should say who sat on the Treasury benches—because the hon. gentlemen who are retiring from the Government are they who are the friends and defenders of the High Commissioner. In this House and on that side of it there are a large number of members, and if we look to the Senate we find that nearly the

whole of that body is filled up with men who have done service for the Conservative party. These hon. gentlemen who have retired from the Government in effect declare that none of those whom they have advised His Excellency to appoint to seats in the other Chamber are men of ability, are men competent to lead their party. They look over this House and they say to the hundred and odd members who support the Administration that there is not one amongst them competent to lead the Conservative party. And so they appeal to Sir Charles Tupper on the other side of the Atlantic and ask him to come over and help them in their extremity. Now, Sir, I am not going to judge of the gentleman as leader of the Conservative party, but I say that it is, to say the least, in extremely bad taste to ask him here under the circumstances and to create a crisis by attempting to force him into the Administration. The hon. gentleman who has submitted to this House the address which was read yesterday as a defence for the course of those who have retired from the Government, will find that the country will regard it, not so much an evidence of the incapacity of the man who led them, as an evidence of the desperate straits in which the leaders of the Conservative party are placed in this House, and the want of confidence in leaders of that party in the country.

Mr. WALLACE. Before that motion is declared carried I wish to make this statement. Yesterday, two hon. members of this House informed me that they had learned from the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague) that I was responsible for the anonymous letter alleged to have been written by the hon. gentleman himself. Mr. Speaker, I have to deny absolutely the truth of the charge of the hon. member for Haldimand, and to say that I did not write said anonymous letter or letters, or inspire the writing of those letters, and I did not know that any such letter or letters were in existence for many months after they were received.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I think, Sir, though this is a matter upon which my lips, as a recent member of the Privy Council, ought to be sealed in this House at the present moment, I cannot allow the statement made by the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) to pass without saying a few words to this House. In doing so I trust that I shall not break any rule of courtesy or decency which should be observed as between a member of the Privy Council of Canada and other members of that Privy Council, and the representative of the sovereign in this country. First, let me say that three days ago, I think, an insinuation was made to me that I was guilty, or that I was charged by an hon. gentleman who belonged to the Privy Council, with having written certain anonymous letters in rela-

tion to himself, either to the Premier of Canada, or to the Governor General of Canada. I need not say, Sir, that, being absolutely innocent of the charge, I demanded, at the very moment the insinuation was made, that that statement should be sent to His Excellency, to whom, as a member of his Privy Council, I was responsible for honourable, manly and above-board conduct. Those charges made by a member of the Privy Council had been concealed. I understand, in a drawer for two or three months, and then, at an important juncture, they were thrown at me without a moment's notice, and I acted as I have stated to you this afternoon. That matter, as it concerns my honour as a Privy Councillor of Canada, is now before His Excellency, and I do not intend, in accordance with the rules of decency and of courtesy to him, to discuss the subject this afternoon—more than to say this, that no baser lie was ever told of a public man in Canada, and it was part of a foul and dirty conspiracy to ruin an hon. member of this House, and a member of the Government of Canada. I am bound to say, however, that since the hon. gentleman has stated this afternoon that he did not write those letters, I am prepared to accept that statement. I never said that the member for West York wrote the letters. What I did say was that the Postmaster General consulted the member for West York, that the member for West York hawked those letters around the city of Toronto, to Mr. Beattie Nesbitt, to Mr. Richard Armstrong, and to men who had nothing to do with members of Parliament, or with members of the Government of Canada—

Mr. WALLACE. That is absolutely untrue.

Mr. MONTAGUE—and that he charged me with writing those letters. Sir, I have only to say this, that when the whole subject is investigated, as it will be investigated in a court of law, then the hon. member for West York will have an opportunity of proving his innocence of the charge which I then made. I am here to say to this House that the charges made against me, humiliating and annoying as they are, are as false as it is possible to make them; and I am here to say also, that with regard to any member of this Government, or with regard to any member of this House, since I have had the honour of a seat here, I have never yet committed an act that could not bear the light of day, or that would not do me honour.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The reason given by the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague) for not entering into a discussion of this subject at the present moment, seems to me absolutely conclusive. If, as is quite true, the matter is in the hands of His Excellency, it seems to me it would be unbecoming to enter into a discussion of the subject, and unless one can en-

Mr. MONTAGUE.

ter into the discussion of that subject, it is impossible to make any statement. I am, however, prepared to say this, that as soon as the matter came to my cognizance in the press, I stated then, as I now state to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the House, that, directly or indirectly, I had nothing whatever to do with authorizing the publication of a matter which I considered personal between the hon. gentleman and myself. Not only had I nothing to do with this publication, but when I saw the statement in the paper, I found that it was made by one who knew nothing about the case, or very little about the details. I found inaccuracies in that publication which, knowing the matter as I did, proved to me that it was based upon reports, and was not made with full possession of the facts. Now, Sir, I am prepared to say that in so far as the denial from the hon. gentleman goes, it is my duty, and I say so here before the House, to accept that denial. As to the statement that reports have been circulated, for one object or another, that those letters were hawked about Toronto, I can tell the hon. gentleman that those letters have always been in my possession, and have not left my possession unless I knew where they were going when I sent them, under my own positive instruction, by reliable persons, to reliable people who were investigating them. That is the only statement which I consider it proper to make at present.

Mr. SCRIVER. It is not my intention to take any general part in the discussion which has sprung up regarding the situation as it affects the Cabinet. That discussion, perhaps, from the point of view taken by this side of the House was carried on by the leader of the Opposition and the hon. knight who sits before me to a sufficient length to enable all members of the House to understand the true position. I will simply say that since I became a member of this House, a quarter of a century ago, my experience has never included anything approaching the present condition of things. I would not have said one word on the situation were it not for the fact that an old personal friend of mine, not a political friend, has been assailed in the house of his friends in a manner which constrains me to say a few words in his defence. I cannot but feel as an independent member of this House that the Premier of this country has been assailed in a manner which very few would have expected to witness. If he has not been stabbed in the back, he has been, in the words of a late Governor General of this country, struck below the belt, at least. It was my good fortune when I first became a member of this House, twenty-five years ago, or thereabouts, to find as one of its members the present Premier. Although we were not at one in regard to all of our political views, we saw alike in respect to

many of them. I received at his hands many personal kindnesses. I was indebted to him for obtaining a seat near himself, which relieved me from occupying a seat that, in the then construction of the Chamber would have proved very detrimental to my health. I did not forget his kindness because of that fact, and because it afforded me the opportunity of cultivating a friendship and personal relations which have continued to exist till this day. I was then led to form a high opinion, an opinion which I entertain still, of the force of character, of the clear-headedness, of the sound common sense possessed by the Premier. And the revelations which have been made to us this afternoon, and which were made to us yesterday, have constrained me to believe that he has displayed signal evidence of ability in one respect at least, in that he has succeeded, as head of the Administration, in preventing certain members of it from flying at each other's throats. What may be the outcome of the present embroglio, it is impossible for me to say. I do not know whether or not the Premier will be enabled to reorganize his Administration, and it may be, within a few days, in the power of those who have been instrumental in procuring his overthrow to exclaim with some men in the past: "Le roi est mort, vive le roi." They may, perhaps, become Ministers in a new Administration. But if that be the case, of this I am convinced, that if the hon. gentleman becomes again simply a private member of this House, I trust that years of usefulness will be spared to him. In those years of usefulness as a public man I have no doubt he will continue to display those qualities of head and heart which, during twenty-five years, or more, have distinguished him as a public man, whether as a private member of this House, as the head of an important department of the Government, or as First Minister of the Crown.

Mr. CASEY. Like the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, I do not intend to discuss at any length the issue which is now before the House. I, like himself, and like many others who have a sense of fair-play, feel inclined to express my opinion of the immediate events which have been the cause of the downfall of the hon. gentleman to whose Government we on this side of the House have been long honourably opposed. It would seem that the hon. member for King's, N.B. (Mr. Foster), who has been, till lately, Finance Minister, told the House yesterday in an incidental moment of frankness—my hon. friend beside me suggests in a moment of weakness, and it may prove a source of weakness to him—at all events, in a moment of intentional or unintentional frankness, the hon. gentleman appears to have told us the truth.

In the course of his remarks yesterday he referred to those Ministers who have acted with him, as his colleagues; he spoke of the other six of the seven bolters as colleagues who had acted with him. So we look upon that hon. gentleman as the head of the provisional cabinet of wreckers; and I can easily believe he was the head of the movement, the history of which he briefly outlined yesterday, for everything in the whole proceedings indicates that he was the master-spirit in the movement. I should be sorry to think that several of those hon. gentlemen whom he designates as his colleagues, and who acted with him, would of their own motion, have taken the course which he states they have pursued in this affair. The tortuous course of policy they followed is more proper for the hon. member for King's to pursue than it is for any of the others in that wrecking cabinet, so far as their natural dispositions are known to this House. That hon. gentleman has been the moving spirit in the revolt, the leader of the mutiny.

Not to go into the matter at length, I may say that that hon. gentleman confessed that he and those who acted with him had entered the Government feeling no respect for, or confidence in, the leader whom they had asked to lead them. Remember, Mr. Speaker, that Sir Mackenzie Bowell did not have to go around and solicit the support of the hon. member for King's (Mr. Foster) or that of the other bolters. Sir Mackenzie was chosen by all of them as the one man who could lead the Cabinet under the circumstances of the day. Those hon. gentlemen declared they would support him; they accepted office under him, and were pledged as men of honour, not less than by their oaths as Privy Councillors, to give him their most loyal and hearty support during the time they held office under him.

Now, what, in brief, is the statement which was made to the House yesterday by the hon. member for King's? That hon. gentleman said that they took office at that time not then believing what they pretended to believe, that Sir Mackenzie Bowell was the right man for the place, and not having that confidence in him which they were bound, as men of honour, to have before they took office under him. And further, that during the whole time they remained in office under him, they retained that lack of confidence in him, and while the member for King's (Mr. Foster), then Finance Minister, was thundering from the platform at Smith's Falls and elsewhere about the unanimity of the Government, he and six others of that Cabinet were plotting for the downfall of the Premier.

That is what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) confessed to us. Not only did he confess it, but he almost boasted of it to us across the floor of the House. These men sitting at the

Premier's right hand and at his left, professing friendship for him in private, professing confidence in him before the public, were conspiring to raise a mutiny against him whenever it should seem to them that the time had arrived when they could most surely kill him politically. It would seem that the hon. member for King's (Mr. Foster) is blest with instincts so peculiar and so abnormal, that they did not inform him beforehand of the effect that such a statement as he made would have upon the public feeling of the country. When he avowed his political treachery, he did not seem to know that it would bring upon him the contempt of people of both parties throughout the country, and that it would rally a strong feeling of sympathy to the support of the man whom he wished to politically assassinate.

On his own statement this was a conspiracy and a mutiny against the leader of the Government, and further proof of it is to be found in the time chosen for bringing it to a head. If the object of the consultation, or rather I should say, if the understanding, between these seven who are properly dubbed by the press as "wreckers" had been to reconstruct the Government with the purpose of securing a strong Ministry for the Conservative party in Canada, they would have worked out the question, as my friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) says, in a party caucus long before the House met. But they kept mum. They bided their time; they waited until the policy of the Government had been announced; they waited until an adjournment had been obtained, ostensibly because the House was called too soon after the holidays; they waited for what might be called the psychological moment to drive the blow home, to assassinate the man whom they were bound, in party fidelity and common decency, to defend against surprise and against all midnight attacks. It is therefore clear that their object was not to strengthen the Government but to drive out of power one man who stood in the way of their ambition.

I repeat that the hon. member for King's (Mr. Foster) was mistaken, if he thought he would gain anything by that announcement. I must say, as a Liberal and as an opponent of Sir Mackenzie Bowell for twenty-three years or more, that I myself felt stirred by a sympathy which I cannot refrain from expressing upon the floor of this House, a sympathy for that gentleman under the circumstances in which he is placed. He had been sitting for thirteen months or so with colleagues who were plotting against him. It is no wonder that he did not make a success of his Government, as we all know he did not. What Prime Minister could succeed with half of his Government plotting against him? It is no wonder that he could not fill up the vacancies in his

Mr. CASEY.

Cabinet, for who would choose to sit with such colleagues as these gentlemen have confessed themselves to be?

I think, Sir, I am speaking the sentiment of all Liberals. I know I am speaking my own, when I say that we have no sympathy with this kind of domestic treachery. We are anxious to beat Sir Mackenzie Bowell and his Cabinet and to beat them as completely as possible, but we desire to beat them openly in a fair field and without any personal disgrace to the man who is beaten. We do not sympathize with mutiny. I should be glad to see the captain subdue this mutiny. I should be glad to see him bring his ship into the fight in the open sea of the general elections, and there sustain as severe a defeat as possible at the hands of the leader of my own party.

Sir, there is another question that I think must be spoken of before we leave this subject. I refer to the intervention of a salaried officer of this Government in the Cabinet making transactions which have been, or are now going on. By whom was Sir Charles Tupper sent for? At whose suggestion was he sent for to come to Canada at this crisis? We are told that as a matter of form he was sent for by the Premier to discuss, as he says, the East Atlantic Service, the Pacific Cable, and perhaps the Chignecto Ship Canal. We do not know how much the Chignecto Ship affair had to do with it, but we do know that Sir Charles Tupper was to return to England at a fixed date. He did not go on that date. He is still here, and he is known to be in consultation with the members of one or other of the two existing Cabinets on the other side of the House. He is in fact intriguing with one side or the other, perhaps with both.

What has become of the self-respect of the leaders of the Conservative party, or of those who are claiming to be the new leaders of it, when they take into consultation a public servant in the intrigues which are going on as to who shall rule the country? Nay, Sir, it is suggested and proposed, as everybody knows, that Sir Charles Tupper himself should become the leader of the new Government. He has always been the "deus ex machina" of these gentlemen. He has always been the great medicine man to be sent for whenever the Government was sick, and now it appears that he is to be called upon to lead the mutineers, to lead the "wreckers" in the formation of a new Ministry.

We cannot say whether or not he may succeed in attaining that eminence; but we can say that it is a scandal to public propriety that a highly salaried servant of the people, supposed to be the non-partisan representative of Canada in the mother country should be here receiving public pay, while he is spending his time in assisting to wreck the Gov-

ernment of this country. I say that while Sir Charles Tupper poses here as the chief of the wrecking gang, it is a scandal that he should be receiving public pay which all the people of Canada irrespective of party have to contribute to.

Now, Sir, what would be a petty scandal if it were not in such a high place, between two Ministers, is that matter of the anonymous letters, which should have received further explanation than it has had. The fact that the question is now before His Excellency prevents further being said upon it at the present time. It is well that we have had to-day, at least, what we did not have yesterday, a sort of anonymous explanation of the anonymous charge. I hope, Sir, that to-morrow such an announcement will be made as will enable us to have a fuller discussion of all the issues of the case.

Mr. LAURIER. Before this motion is put, perhaps the hon. gentleman who leads the Government will permit me to ask him for some information as to the character of public business. I understand that at the present moment what is left of the Government is fast depleting this House by distributing amongst its members senatorships, collectorships, and other offices. I understand that since yesterday no less than four or five members of this House, perhaps more, have been appointed to divers offices. I would like to have some explanation as to that.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I cannot give the hon. gentleman the information he requires just now, but I think that by to-morrow I can give it to him.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Well, to hon. gentlemen opposite it may seem very funny, but it is very serious. Supposing those appointments have been made, the papers may not have returned yet from His Excellency, and I think I am right in saying that I will take the first opportunity that I can properly do so, to give my hon. friend the information he asks.

Mr. LAURIER. Then I understand that my hon. friend suggests that His Excellency may think it advisable not to carry out the wishes of his Council.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. LAURIER. That is quite proper, and I think a very good point for His Excellency to consider in his wisdom. Perhaps my hon. friend is right, because I understand there are a hundred or more offices to be distributed, and he cannot remember them all—he may have to refresh his memory on that point.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I wish to correct my hon. friend on one point. Supposing the Orders in Council making those appoint-

ments to have passed, they must go to the Governor General to be signed; and would it be proper for me to give any information until I know whether they have returned from Government House, and whether they have been signed or not signed? Now, with regard to the hundred appointments. I have no manner of doubt that my hon. friend is just speaking from rumours—

Mr. LAURIER. Nothing else.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Well, it is very unsafe to put a question upon rumours.

Mr. LAURIER. It is not safe to depend on rumours, and that is why I want a positive answer.

Mr. EDGAR. There is another rumour which the hon. leader of the House will answer or not as he thinks proper. The latest rumour is that the Prime Minister has ordered the High Commissioner to go back to London and attend to his own business.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 4.20 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 9th January, 1896.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

TRADE CONSPIRACIES AND COMBINATIONS.

Mr. SPROULE moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 12) to amend the law relating to conspiracies and combinations formed in restraint of trade.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Could not the hon. gentleman enlarge the bounds of this Bill so as to include Cabinets as well?

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 9) better to secure the Independence of Parliament.—(Mr. Mulock.)

Bill (No. 10) further to amend the Act respecting the Adulteration of Food, Drugs and Agricultural Fertilizers.—(Mr. Sproule.)

Bill (No. 11) respecting Detective Corporations and Mercantile Agencies.—(Mr. Sproule.)

Bill (No. 13) to determine the length of the working day for workmen and labourers employed on public works.—(Mr. Lépine.)

REPORTS.

Report, returns and statistics of the Inland Revenues of the Dominion of Canada, for the fiscal year ended 30th June, 1895; Part I. Excise, etc.—(Mr. Costigan.)

Part II. Inspection of Weights and Measures and Gas, for the fiscal year ended 30th June, 1895.—(Mr. Costigan.)

Part III. Adulteration of Food, for the fiscal year ended 30th June, 1895.—(Mr. Costigan.)

MINISTERIAL RESIGNATIONS.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Mr. Speaker, before I move the motion which appears in my name, I desire to make an announcement to the House. After several interviews between the Premier and the Governor General, the former waited upon His Excellency yesterday for the purpose of tendering his resignation. His Excellency, however, intimated that he was not at that moment prepared to receive it. The chief reason for this attitude on the part of His Excellency is that the Speech from the Throne, although presented to Parliament, has not yet been considered, nor an expression of opinion given by Parliament upon it. It is regarded by His Excellency as unfitting that the Premier, as head of the Administration responsible for that Speech, should not have a full opportunity of reviewing the situation and testing the feelings of Parliament thereon. Under these circumstances the Premier deems it his duty to endeavour, as far as in him lies, to reorganize the Government. I therefore move :

That when the House adjourns this day, it do stand adjourned until Tuesday, the 14th instant.

Hon. gentlemen will see that the period that the Premier desired me to ask an adjournment for is made shorter than in the original motion, which made it to the 21st.

Mr. LAURIER. The announcement which has just been made by the hon. gentleman who, at this moment leads the House (Sir Adolphe Caron) puts a new face upon the crisis, and will to some extent—to a large extent—modify the views which otherwise I would have felt it my duty to express upon this occasion. I may say, however, to my hon. friend at once that I do not think it would be parliamentary or consistent with usages and rules of parliamentary government, to grant an adjournment later than to-morrow. It is a well-known, a well-settled law of Parliament, which has come down to us by a series of precedents extending as far back as the last century—that whenever a ministerial crisis arises while Parliament is sitting, it is the first

Mr. LANDERKIN.

duty of Parliament to extend to the Administration not only all possible courtesy, but every facility for accomplishing the task they have in hand of reconstituting the Government. But, at the same time, it is also the undoubted right of Parliament to be here from day to day, in order to be informed, from day to day, exactly of what progress is made. Now, while the statement made by the hon. gentleman has put a new face upon the crisis and modified, to a large extent, the position I had intended to take, I must, at the same time, express my regret that the promises which were made, not later than last night, by the First Minister in another House, are not being implemented. I understood from the statement of the First Minister last evening that he would be in a position to-day to say what progress he had made in filling up the vacant portfolios. Instead, however, we are asked again to wait until Tuesday. I call, again, the attention of my hon. friend to the fact that an adjournment of more than a day is altogether contrary to the spirit of our constitution. Let me call the attention of the House to the authorities on the subject. I quote from the book of Dr. Bourinot, page 795 :

If Parliament should be sitting on the occasion of a ministerial crisis, it is usual to adjourn from day to day, and questions to be asked with respect to the progress made with the formation of a ministry. The motion to adjourn may be made, when necessary, by one of the ex-Ministers, at the request of the person who has been entrusted with the duty of forming a ministry. In case of a reconstruction, it is customary for members of the former Cabinet to make such explanations as have been given them by the new Premier, since they hold their old offices until arrangements are finally made.

Therefore, nothing can be clearer than that the right and the duty of Parliament to-day is to exact from the Government that the adjournment should be only for one day, and on the morrow to be informed of what progress, if any, has been made, and if the task of reconstruction be not then completed, then again to adjourn until the following day, and so on, until the Government is in a position to tell us that the crisis is at an end or is not curable. And I must express my astonishment that my hon. friend should depart from what undoubtedly is the law and the constitution. Hon. gentlemen opposite, not only those who are in, but those who are out—not only the orthodox, but the dissenters; not only the steady, but the kickers—have always been most profuse in their declarations that, under all and every circumstance, they would stand by the constitution. Well, Mr. Speaker, this is an occasion for the hon. gentleman to show that he abides by the constitution. Why should we have this delay of four additional days? It is evident that the delay is but for the purpose of allowing the plotting

and the conspiring of which we have been the witnesses—

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. LAURIER—the plotting and conspiring which has been going on among hon. gentlemen opposite, to continue. For my part, I stand by the constitution, as I have always done. I have no objection to give all the delay that these hon. gentlemen want—even a delay of fifteen days, or more—provided we adjourn from day to day. Though my hon. friend, the ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster), said some days ago that the crisis was only skin-deep, it is far deeper, I am afraid, than his words would convey. The hon. gentleman told us a few days ago that the cause of the crisis was simply this, that they, the stalwarts, the giants of the Administration, would no longer serve under a man who, in their estimation, while not altogether a pigmy, is still not their equal in stature and majestic proportions.

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose this is a paraphrase of the hon. gentleman?

Mr. LAURIER. I have no objection to take the words of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not recognize the words; it is a paraphrase.

Mr. LAURIER. In language, the expression was more modest, but the thought was just the same. Will the hon. gentleman permit me to say that I am bound to take his statement? That is the law and the constitution. But the law and the constitution do not prevent me—nor even parliamentary courtesy—while accepting the statement, from accepting it, not with a grain, but with a very large measure of salt, indeed. This is not the first time we have heard an expression of opinion from the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) as to his leader, and the expressions he used on the public platform on other occasions do not bear out the opinion he has given on the floor of this House. This is not the cause of the crisis; the cause is deeper. What is the cause? It is simply this, that when Parliament is called upon to implement the promises which were made by the hon. gentleman himself towards the close of last session—when Parliament is called to pass the legislation which was then promised, the Government find that their party is irretrievably divided upon this question. That is the cause of the crisis at present. Was the information not spread broadcast throughout the country, when seven of the more important members of the Administration sent in their resignations to the Premier, that an urgent whip had been sent out to all the Conservative members to assemble here and hold a general caucus? The caucus was called, but it never sat. They dare not have it sit, and that is the reason we have this crisis. There have been caucuses

of provinces, but there has been no general caucus; and I must say to my hon. friend who leads the House (Sir Adolphe Caron) that for my part I cannot agree to an adjournment of more than one day. It is true the Government has not made much progress in the formation of the Cabinet, but if what is left of the Government to-day had displayed in the work of reconstruction the energy they had displayed in depleting this House of its members, perhaps they would be more advanced in their task. The greater part of their energy has been consumed in making voids in the representation of this House. Where is the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. McKay) to-day? Gone to his rewards—appointed collector of customs. Where is the hon. member for Monck (Mr. Boyle)? Gone to his reward, also. Where is the hon. member for Soulanges (Mr. Bain)? Also gone to his reward. Where is the hon. member for Missisquoi (Mr. Baker)? Gone to a sphere above. And the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Adams)? Also gone to a higher sphere. It is true that we still have with us my hon. friend from North Bruce. Under such circumstances, for my part, I think that, while it would be quite proper to grant an adjournment until tomorrow, it would be altogether antagonistic to the law of Parliament to have the adjournment extended to the time now asked by the Administration.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Mr. Speaker, I think that on reflection my hon. friend will regret the expressions he has used in reference to the statement which I brought down. From the remarks which have fallen from him I take it that the hon. gentleman doubts the correctness or veracity of this statement.

Mr. LAURIER. No, no.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Then what could the hon. gentleman have meant when he stated that the cause of this demand which was made, the reason of this delay which was asked by the Government, was to allow organized conspiracies to be carried into effect? Now, I submit to both sides of the House that the statements which I have had the honour of laying before Parliament from the beginning of this crisis have been absolutely frank and have taken the House into the confidence of the Government to the fullest possible extent. The hon. gentleman says that the constitutional practice is that the adjournment should take place from day to day and not beyond. Well, Sir, I must say that, in so far as I have been able to look up precedents, I think that the practice is not limited to an adjournment from day to day; and I take it that in a contingency like the present one—and I think it would be very difficult indeed to find a precedent for this occasion—the duty of the House is to afford every possible facility to the head of the Government and

to help him in re-forming the Government if it can be re-formed. I think that the only question that is left for the House to consider is whether the delay I have asked from to-day until three o'clock on Tuesday is an unreasonable delay. If it is an unreasonable delay it should not be granted. But I claim that, under the circumstances the delay which I have asked is more for the convenience of the members, while at the same time it will facilitate the work of the Premier by not putting him to the necessity of attending his parliamentary duties, but will allow him to go to work and ascertain, as well as is possible in that short time, whether he can reconstruct the Government or not. These, Mr. Speaker, are really the reasons why the delay is asked. The hon. gentleman has criticised the conduct of the Government in filling the vacancies which have occurred. I think that the Government were acting within their constitutional rights in filling vacancies and in carrying on the public business. The hon. gentleman knows that last session the Premier pledged himself to the House that these vacancies should be filled at the very beginning of the next—that is the present—session. For this reason, and in any case, the strictly constitutional duty as well as the undoubted right of the Government was to fill these vacancies. The Government has not ceased to be an advisory and executive body; it has not abdicated any of the privileges which it possessed previous to the crisis which has taken place. The hon. gentleman has referred to the statement made by the Premier yesterday that he hoped to-day to be able to give information in reference to the filling of the vacant portfolios. I think he has lost no time, he has shown how much in earnest he was in the promise he made to Parliament; for, ever since yesterday he has been in communication with His Excellency, and the result of these communications has been the statement which I have laid before you.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I had the honour last night to attend a sitting of the Senate and to listen to the official statement made by the leader of the Government there, and I am somewhat disappointed that the promise he then made in most equivocal language has not been implemented. I would like to know if the same statement read by the hon. leader of the House has been read by the Premier in the Senate.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Yes, exactly the same.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I can hardly conceive, after the language the hon. Premier used last night—language used with great care and twice repeated—that he would positively make a statement with reference to filling up of the vacancies in the Government, how he could make a statement such as the hon. gentleman has read to this

Sir ADOLPHE CARON.

House. There is no denying that that statement as read to this House alters the course which probably the Opposition would see fit to take upon this occasion. But I challenge, just at this moment, the correctness of two observations made by my hon. friend opposite (Sir Adolphe Caron). One was with respect to the construction he put upon the language by my hon. leader. I did not understand my leader to say that the purpose of asking the House to adjourn was to enable a conspiracy to be entered into with respect to the formation of a Government, but that the result of such adjournment would be to enable conspirators to carry out their designs. There is no one on either side of the House who doubts that there is at the present moment a vast conspiracy on foot to oust the present leader from his position and to prevent this House meeting to give an answer to the speech with which His Excellency opened the session. I have met no one in the House or out of it who doubts that such is the case. The men can be named, their names are mentioned in the daily press; the means they are taking to conspire, the persons they are using to carry out the conspiracy and to attain the object they have in view are well known. Nothing could be further from the thoughts of the hon. leader of the Opposition than that His Excellency or any one connected with him was a party to this object of this conspiracy. But what the hon. gentleman did say—and I do not know how the leader of the House could have misunderstood it—was that the result of this extended adjournment would be to give aid and comfort to these conspirators and to enable them to complete their nefarious work.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Well, Sir, "nefarious work" is a very strong expression to use, but I think that the circumstances quite justify it. This is not an attempt made by an organized Opposition to defeat the existing Government in a proper way. Why, Sir, we all welcome that, there is not a man on either side of the House but likes a fair, open fight. What is despised, and what ought to be looked down upon, is the attempt of those within the family circle to conspire against and to defeat their own leader and their own friends. There is another remark which fell from the hon. gentleman—passing from that branch of the subject entirely—which I would challenge; and I wish to observe that I am confining my remarks merely to the length the adjournment should take, and not discussing the many subjects to which I had hoped to call the attention of the House to-day. There is another observation which he made, and which I think on reflection he will see has not been well considered, and that is that it is for the convenience of members that this adjournment should take

place. Now, the hon. gentleman must recollect that quite a large proportion of the members of this House are gentlemen who come from a very long distance. They cannot go home, they have got to remain here until Tuesday. I am speaking solely on the question of convenience which the hon. gentleman has advanced as one which ought to weigh the House in taking a course absolutely opposed to all former precedents. If I understand the hon. gentleman aright, the proposition laid down was this, that we were passing through a condition of affairs for which it was difficult to find a precedent. We acknowledge that, but there is no difficulty in our adopting the constitutional course, which I think I am right in saying has been almost invariable, that while a government is in process of construction and the House of Commons is sitting, adjournment should take place *de die in diem*. That is an almost absolute rule, and I think hon. gentlemen will find it exceedingly difficult to quote a precedent the other way. Now, we stand in that position, and the hon. gentleman advances the proposition that the adjournment is for the convenience of members. I challenge that proposition; I say it is not; I say it is distinctly for their inconvenience and disadvantage; and when you are asking us to violate a constitutional rule which has been most rigidly adhered to in Great Britain and her colonies, and to adopt a new, and I venture to say, a bad precedent, and when there is no other argument in support of it than the one which the hon. gentleman suggested, that it is for the convenience of members, I respectfully submit to him that it is not. I would urge upon him that since the leader of the Opposition has expressed his earnest desire to give every reasonable latitude to the Government in undertaking, in the peculiar circumstances in which they find themselves, to re-form the Government at the request of His Excellency, and while we are willing to do everything in our power reasonably to further those views, still the hon. gentleman ought not to ask us to join in setting a precedent which in itself is bad, and which will be quoted hereafter and have a bad effect on future occasions. The convenience of members is against it, parliamentary procedure is against it, the precedents are against it, and there is nothing I can see in favour of it at all. We can meet to-morrow, and the hon. gentleman, if he has made any progress then, can inform us; and the House will then be in a position, if called upon, to give advice to His Excellency from day to day. That is one of the rights of which this House is possessed, a right which we can exercise to-day, or can exercise to-morrow, that is, tendering respectfully to His Excellency any advice the House may see fit, or may be in a position to give. I am inclined to think that, if it were not for the message which has been read to-day, the

House might have done that. The House will not, under the circumstances, do it now; but I say that to ask the House to adjourn for four or five days, when it will not be in a position to give the advice which it ought to give, if called for, is a course to which I hope the hon. gentleman will not press the House to accede, and one which, if he does press the House to accede to, the House will refuse to do so.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. If I may be allowed one word in explanation—when I spoke of the convenience of members, I viewed it in this manner. First, most of the members leave town on Friday and return on Monday, and when I spoke of the convenience of members I thought that we were reducing the delay from the time which was mentioned in my motion that is now on the Order paper, to Tuesday instead of ten days, the delay which I originally asked for. Now, that is one of the reasons why I think that the delay we ask for now is the shortest possible delay that will meet the case. The hon. gentleman knows very well that we do not sit on Saturday, so that it is really only a delay of two sittings we ask for, in order to give the Premier an opportunity of re-forming his Government.

Mr. McCARTHY. For my part I do not quite understand the anxiety of the Government to obtain a delay or an adjournment of the House until next Tuesday. Speaking for myself, and echoing in that respect what has fallen from the opposite side of the House, I think the House is quite willing to give every indulgence and every facility to the Government in their difficult task, and in the very difficult position in which they have been placed. Then why should we depart from the well established constitutional rule? This is the great council of the nation. We are here to advise His Excellency, if necessary, and why we should be sent about our business in order that the Government may be filled up, or that the Government may fill up the vacant portfolios, is, under the circumstances, what I am unable to understand. I am quite free to admit that there are no precedents; and I quite agree with what has fallen from the hon. gentleman who is leading the House, that no precedent for the position can be found. We have a Government *de jure*; we have a Government, as I understand, *de facto*; and the only question that occurs to me is whether we will have a quorum of the House of Commons when we meet next Tuesday, if members are taken from the House to fill positions at the rate that has been going on for the last forty-eight hours. We have, therefore, a Government both *de jure* and *de facto*; and it is to be remembered that this is not a ministerial crisis in the ordinary sense, it is not the case of the resignation of a Minister, or the resignation of a Prime Minister,

or of a new Prime Minister being asked to assume the responsibility of a Government; but we have a Government, and I am unable, I may add, to conceive why this long delay should be asked for, the Government having every office filled, either by a Minister or an acting Minister, and being able to carry on the affairs of the country, I am bound to say, more efficiently than has been done during the last thirteen months. So far as I can understand there has been more done in the last two or three days than has been done in the last thirteen months; and the very delay and the very difficulty which, we are told, induced these seven gentlemen to withdraw their confidence in their leader, seems, so far as I can judge by the result, to be caused by their presence in the Administration. While they were in, the Government could not go on, they were evidently blocking the way, nothing could be accomplished. So I would suggest to my hon. friend that, as we meet to-morrow, he intimate to the gentleman who is to move the reply to the Address, that he go on with his speech. It has been bottled up now so long that possibly it will have to be recast. I do not see why we should not at once go on with our business, and let this House discharge the duties which it has been called upon to discharge. I can certainly see no necessity on the part of the Government asking for any prolonged adjournment. I am quite satisfied that there is no independent member of the House, there is no member on the opposite side, so far as I learned from the language of the leader and of the hon. gentleman who followed him, disposed to throw any obstacle in the way of the Government. So far as I know the feelings of the House, it is prepared to give to the Administration every possible facility; and how they can be hampered, or how they can be prejudiced in any way by allowing the constitutional rule to prevail, is what for my part I cannot conceive.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think that the request of the hon. leader of the House is an unreasonable request under the circumstances. This House is the great council of the nation, it is the most important body to advise His Excellency, known to our constitution. Under the circumstances it seems to me, when the Administration experiences a crisis such as that which has overtaken the present Government, it is of the first consequence that this House should sit from day to day. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman asks us not to meet to-morrow. Why not? If the Government are not prepared to go on with the public business because all the portfolios in the Government are not filled, that may be a reason for a further adjournment. I am sure that this House has no intention of interfering with the Government, or with the Prime Minister, in filling up the vacancies in the Adminis-

Mr. McCARTHY.

tration; but this House ought not to abdicate its functions. It has important functions to discharge. The events which have happened since Parliament has been called together, and since the Speech from the Throne has been delivered, are of such a character as to make the House suspicious. The House does not know what may transpire next, and as we can only advise His Excellency in our capacity as members of the House collectively, it is of first consequence that we should meet from day to day whenever the sittings of the House, under our rules, come about. That being so, I think the leader of the House ought not to press his motion. He should consent to the House meeting to-morrow, and if the Government then requires further time to fill up the various vacancies in the Cabinet, further time will no doubt be given by the House. No one would put obstacles in the way. But events have been transpiring every day since we have met which are of very great consequence. We have seen three or four members taken from this House and translated to the other Chamber. We have had the announcement made that several hon. members who have seats in this House have been appointed to fill positions in the public service. I do not know whether those appointments have been confirmed or not. We may have information on that subject within the next twenty-four hours, and if we do not obtain such information, I think what has taken place calls for an expression of opinion on the part of this House. We are, Mr. Speaker, we know not what—whether this House is composed of members representing the constituencies whose electors sent us here, or whether it is composed of place-men of the Administration, or of that part of the Administration that still continues in office. Under the circumstances the leader of the House should not ask us to adjourn beyond to-morrow, and if then the Government have made progress in filling the vacancies, perhaps we may be able to go on with public business and answer the Speech from the Throne. But if the hon. gentleman is not, it may be that Parliament will require to consider other matters. The hon. gentleman knows right well that if a member has been promised an office and has agreed to accept that office, his seat becomes vacant whether he has been actually appointed to the office or not. We know that an hon. member sitting in the House of Commons years ago was named as Chancellor of the Exchequer; that he agreed to accept the office; that before the acceptance actually took place, His Majesty was unable to make the appointment; but nevertheless it was held that by his agreement to accept office his seat had become vacant, and he was obliged to retire and be re-elected, although he was elected as nothing more than a private member. The

law is perfectly clear on this subject. I see hon. gentlemen sitting in the House to-day who, we have been informed, have been approached and promised offices under the Crown, and have agreed to accept those offices. In the face of events of this sort it is important that this House should meet from day to day. The liberties of the people, as well as the rights of the Prime Minister, are attacked in what is being done. This House has important duties to discharge, and if the House sits every day at the usual-hour it will be in a position to undertake the discharge of those duties if opportunity occurs. Under these circumstances I trust the leader of the House will not press his motion for an adjournment until Tuesday next.

Mr. WELDON. I hope the hon. gentleman now leading the Government will press the motion for adjournment, for the reason that the Prime Minister, who is responsible for the request made to the House, has declared that in his judgment it is necessary to ask for an adjournment over Friday, Saturday and Monday to enable him to reform the Administration. What possible good to any one, what possible protection to the public, what possible regard for public safety makes it necessary for hon. members to come here on Friday and again on Monday to meet and adjourn. I cannot understand. Time will be wasted. What we now desire is, that the crisis should be brought to an end at the earliest possible moment; and if the hands of the First Minister, who is now employed in the duty of reconstructing the Cabinet, would be more free and his attention be less distracted by the House adjourning two or three days—it being admitted that we are willing to give the hon. gentleman as many days as are asked, if the House meets from day to day—I see no good reason why the Minister who leads the House should consent to the request made by the leader of the Opposition. I think the adoption of the motion before the House would lead to the more rapid conclusion of the crisis, which all good Canadians must heartily desire.

Mr. EDGAR. With respect to the remarks made by the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, that no harm can happen by giving the Premier four days' delay, instead of the House meeting to-morrow, I would ask the hon. gentleman if any harm can arise by meeting to-morrow. The rules of the House say that the House shall do so under all ordinary circumstances. The members are all here; they have come to the capital to try and transact some business, or get some information for the country at all events, and not merely to knock their heels together around the hotels for four days. The balance of convenience is altogether against the contention of the hon. gentleman. If the leader of the House should come down at three o'clock to-mor-

row and state that no progress has been made, we want to know it, and the country wants to know it. On the other hand, if he is then able to say, as we all hope he will be able to say, that progress is being made, that satisfactory progress is being made, then the meeting of the House will stand over till Monday, and the Premier can go on with his work of reconstruction. Does the meeting of the House for a quarter of an hour to-morrow or for half an hour on Monday delay the Prime Minister in filling up vacancies in the Cabinet? Not one whit. It will accelerate the work; it will cause him to do his duty more rapidly and will hurry him up in discharging the duty of filling the Cabinet positions. I think the leader of the House should consider this matter, and not endeavour to take away the undoubted constitutional right of Parliament, that when a Ministry is being reconstructed or formed in the face of Parliament, members shall have the right to ask explanations as to the progress made from the representatives of the Government at the meeting of the House from day to day.

Mr. DAVIN. I hope the leader of the House will not press his motion. This Parliament is the Parliament that governs this country and not the Committee that we call the Government, which is a Committee of this Parliament. The reason I urge on my hon. friend who is leading the House not to press his motion is this: I must emphasize my opinion and enter my protest against the tendency that is noticeable in parliamentary life in Canada for Parliament to efface itself before the Government of the day. Any man who has observed the course of parliamentary institutions in this country for any length of time, and who has sat in the House for seven or eight years, as I have done, must have seen this—and it would be the same if parties crossed the floor, I have no doubt, it seems to be in the air and to belong to the country, and the sooner it is got rid of the better—that there is a constant tendency on the part of members of the dominant party to voluntarily efface themselves before the Government of the day. And we see a correlative impatience on the part of the Government of the day with the least assertion of the rights of Parliament on the part of their supporters. This Parliament is the Parliament concerned with the Government of Canada to-day, and we have a right, and it is our duty as well as our right, to know from day to day what progress is being made under the unhappy circumstances with which we are now face to face. And I say, Sir, that I am now not speaking more in the interests of parliamentary institutions, than—addressing my hon. friends who are around me—than in the interests of the Conservative party itself. If a proper regard had been had by the members of the Conservative party to their own

dignity as members of this House, and if a proper regard had been shown by the Government of the day towards the members of that party, we should never have been face to face with such an unhappy and such an unprecedented crisis as meets us to-day. Sir, the people of this country are deeply concerned in the crisis that we are now called upon to humiliate ourselves as members of Parliament by observing. My hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) has not been too strong in expressing his opinions on this subject, and the leader of the Opposition has, I think, very moderately requested the leader of the House to take the constitutional course. I will not discuss whether harm can come of it or not. I am quite sure of this, that it will be impossible for the leader of the House, or impossible even for my hon. and learned friend (Mr. Weldon, Albert), who is usually supposed to be an authority on constitutional questions; it will be impossible for him to show that any harm can come of it. What harm can come from the representatives of the people in this House, who are the source of power to which the Government must look, coming here from day to day, to know what progress has been made? I am not going to discuss, or to remark on the filling up of offices, further than to say that I regret to see these offices being filled up. I do not know whence the motive of the movement to fill up offices comes, but it is regrettable, and I do not think it is in the interest of the Government, or of the Parliament, or of the Conservative party. My desire is, that the party of which I am a humble member, the party that at this minute represents the people of Canada, the party that up to the present commands the confidence of the people, my desire is that it should guide the destinies of our people. I defy hon. gentlemen anywhere, in or out of this House, to show that the policy of the Conservative party at this moment is not a policy dear to the heart of Canada.

Mr. FORBES. You cannot vote for it yourself.

Mr. DAVIN. What is that? Speak up and let me hear.

Mr. FORBES. I say that the hon. gentleman dare not support the measure of the Government on remedial legislation.

Mr. DAVIN. Mr. Speaker, when the Government measure on remedial legislation, of which I know nothing—I have not seen it—when it is brought forward I will discuss it. I was speaking of the general policy of the Government. I did not expect to be challenged because I did not expect that anything of a party nature would be said here just now, but as I have been challenged, I will go further, and say that from a far larger point of view than

Mr. DAVIN.

the trade policy, from a point of view truly Imperial, it would be a disastrous thing if, at this minute, anything should occur that would place power in any other hands than in the hands of that party which has the instinct and tradition of Government, and has no undivided allegiance—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. DAVIN. The party which has no divided allegiance to the great Empire of which this Canada forms an important part. Now, Sir, I turn aside from these party amenities into which I have been unwillingly drawn. I hope that my hon. friend the leader of the House will not press the motion. I do not think that any leader of the House could object to the language or tone of the leader of the Opposition, and I entirely agree with the position that hon. gentleman (Mr. Laurier) has taken in this matter.

Mr. McNEILL. Mr. Speaker, I desire merely to say a few words. I heard with very great pleasure, indeed, the friendly and kindly remarks that have been made from the other side of the House on every occasion on which we have met here during this session, in reference to the leader of the Government. I would have appreciated those remarks still more highly had they been followed up to-day by deeds. All that is asked by the leader of the House is a very small matter, and I have not heard any argument whatever to show that the request made could do any harm to any interest in this country. It is asked that on Friday and on Monday this House should not sit. It is known that the House does not sit on Saturday or on Sunday, and when the suggestion is made by members on the other side that four days are asked for, that statement is a proof that their position in opposing the motion is a very weak one. Two days' adjournment is practically all that is asked. I am quite sure that my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition is wholly sincere in the kindly remarks he has made in reference to the hon. gentleman who leads the Government of this country to-day, under the very painful circumstances that exist. I would appeal to the leader of the Opposition to exercise his generosity in this matter, and to withdraw his objection to this very harmless and reasonable proposal. The hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) asked what harm can be done if the House does meet. I would answer him that the First Minister asks for this short adjournment in order that he may be better able to carry out the work he is engaged in, and unless some real danger can be shown, I do think that ordinary generosity might induce hon. gentlemen opposite to acquiesce in the request.

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) tells us that the First Minister has sent a message to this

House which asks that we stand adjourned for four days. The First Minister has not given us the reasons that moved him to make that request.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Yes, he has.

Mr. MULLOCK. He has stated that he desires to reorganize the Cabinet, but he has not shown how the meeting of the House will embarrass him in that important work. The leader of the House says that it will serve the convenience of members if we adjourn. But what are we assembled at Ottawa for? Does Parliament exist for the convenience of members, or for the discharge of public duty? I was under the impression that our public duty was the first obligation upon us until this new doctrine is now laid down for our guidance. The leader of the House tells us that the situation is unparalleled. I admit that. It is not the first strike that has happened within the last few months in this Cabinet. The striking was inaugurated a few months ago by the late Minister of Justice. He struck. He returned to his allegiance for a short time, and, on being taken back, when he gave the bad example, that three months afterwards three other members of the Ministry went on strike. Two of them returned. To-day seven of them have followed that example, and perhaps want to return also. Is it to the interest of the country that we should facilitate this work of rebellion in the Cabinet? Not a gentleman charged has arisen to dispute or deny the charge of conspiracy. If there is a conspiracy against the liberties of the people, on what institution can the people depend for the defence of their liberties? The House of Commons? The House of Commons is the only instrument now existing to guard the rights of the people. The constitution demands that the House of Commons shall, every moment of time from now till this crisis is over, be in session to guard, if needs be, a weak Premier. We saw the late Finance Minister forty-eight hours ago arise in his place in this House and read a carefully prepared document discrediting the ability of his First Minister.

Mr. LANDERKIN. And his own, too.

Mr. MULLOCK. And he told us that he had only made that discovery after the Address from the Throne had been presented to Parliament. Sir, the flimsy excuse offered for the crisis that now exists discredits, in my judgment, the honesty of purpose of the Administration. A year ago as Premier they selected Sir Mackenzie Bowell. Not a stranger. He had been in public life for a generation. He had been a colleague of these gentlemen for a dozen years. He had been working side by side with them in the councils of the country, on the public platform, in Parliament—in every position which would enable them to test his capacity to fill the high office of

Premier. When they took office under him thirteen months ago, did they not know as well as they know to-day his fitness for that office? How comes it that after thirteen months the late Finance Minister suddenly discovers that the First Minister lacked capacity for administering the affairs of the country? And what was the evidence the hon. gentleman furnished? That seven colleagues of the First Minister in the Cabinet were so rebellious that he could not keep them in order—that he could not extract from them that degree of usefulness to which the country was entitled; and their disobedience, their rebellious spirit, their treasonable conduct against the country, is the cause they assign. Instead of the First Minister being removed, these hon. gentlemen have overreached themselves and have removed themselves; and the highest interests of the country demand that these men, who have for the moment gone into the shade of a position they do not like, outside of the emoluments of office, shall be allowed to continue to enjoy that position. Mr. Speaker, we hear a great deal as to who is to succeed the First Minister if this conspiracy succeeds. They wish a change of allegiance, they wish to abandon King Log and serve under King Stork. However that may be, they feel for the moment that they are outside of the vineyard, and feeling that they have failed through the infirmity of their leader, they think, in the language of the blind poet, that they can wait in this outer place until some greater man restores them to the promised land. Such is their object in asking that Parliament shall now adjourn till Tuesday next. Sir, the circumstances of the case do not warrant us in allowing this conspiracy to succeed. It is a conspiracy most foul; no one has dared to stand up in this House and justify it. I ask the Finance Minister if he can tell us how these seven Ministers came to arrive at the conclusion, only forty-eight hours after Parliament assembled, that the First Minister was unfit for his place, and how came it that they did not find that out twelve months ago? Why did they not find it out nine months ago, when the ex-Minister of Justice struck? How comes it that in July last they did not find out his incapacity? How comes it that not until Parliament assembles and the Address from the Throne is delivered, and the affairs of the country are in a most critical state, have they decided almost to demand the surrender of the First Minister from his high office? Sir, the names of the men who have done that act will go down with dishonour to the history of our country. They have sought to destroy the usefulness of a public man who to that moment enjoyed the confidence of His Excellency. Sir, I ask in what position would the First Minister be were he to appeal to the country now, with the solemn written statement of his seven colleagues that he was unfit to take charge

of the Government of the country? Was ever such a treacherous act committed before in any British country? You will search in vain for an instance in the past, and I trust that this will not furnish a precedent for the future. Under the circumstances I regret that I am unable fittingly to express my abhorrence of what has taken place. I trust that hon. gentlemen will take the will for the deed and give me credit for the desire to use whatever language the vocabulary of this House will permit in order to express my abhorrence and disapproval of these hon. gentlemen's action. I trust, Mr. Speaker, that under the circumstances we shall be permitted to stand guard here from day to day, over the rights of Parliament and the liberties of the people, until we have formed a strong, stable and effective Government. Sir, when we see the great party which Sir John Macdonald led to victory in 1891, with an overwhelming majority, to-day shattered, torn, divided by dissensions, weak and paralyzed, we know that there is but one source from which that strong and effective Government can be formed, and that is by the hon. leader of Her Majesty's loyal Opposition. The hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) claims a monopoly for his friends of all the loyalty that is going. Sir, is it loyalty for the majority, the active part of a Government, when engaged in discharging Her Majesty's business, to rebel against Her Majesty? Talk of loyalty! Loyalty must begin at home. You must be loyal to the institutions under which you serve and to the country you belong to, otherwise your loyalty is, at the best, only lip-loyalty. Sir, Her Majesty's Opposition share in every sentiment of loyalty that may be in the breast of any good citizen of Canada; and I believe that Her Majesty's institutions would occupy a firmer position in Canada, were the administration of the Government now in the hands of the loyal Opposition led on by the first man in Canada to-day, the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier).

Mr. COCKBURN. It is to me a source of much gratification to find such exuberant declarations of overflowing loyalty coming from the lips of the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock). And I am sure that it must be a source of unfeigned pleasure to all of us to see on the part of Her Majesty's Opposition such an exhibition of loyalty as that to which they have just treated us and which has forced them to constitute themselves the special guardians of the liberties of this country and the guardians of the privileges of every citizen of the Dominion. I only regret that our country has been so unappreciative of their efforts as not to have understood apparently the depth of the feeling that moves them, and has not set sufficient value on their exuberant loyalty to send them here in larger numbers to protect the constitution. Their loyalty seems to-day, however, to be centred, to a very

Mr. MULOCK.

large extent, on the hon. gentleman who leads this Government. I must say that, for my part, hearing the member for North York (Mr. Mulock) dilate on the many noble qualities which characterize our Premier, hearing him declare that for the last thirty years our Premier has filled every office under the Crown, to the greatest satisfaction of the country and the benefit of the Dominion, I fail to understand how, in the name of common sense, he can ask us to refuse the request of our Premier for a two days' adjournment. If the First Minister has given us for thirty years the strongest assurances that he has the welfare of his country at heart, if he has risen superior to all temptations and stands before the country with an unblemished reputation, how can the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) ask us for one moment to believe that this same First Minister desires a two days' adjournment in order that he may give license to conspirators. The supposition is monstrous and absurd. If we will only bring a little common sense to bear on the question, we shall easily arrive at a reasonable conclusion. If it is so necessary that this House should be in session every day to watch what is being done by the Premier of this country, would it not be well that some self-sacrifice should be made by Her Majesty's loyal Opposition, and that the proposal should come from them that we should sit here, not only on Friday and on Monday, but on Saturday and on Sunday as well? It is surely a religious duty to watch the interests and the rights of our fellow citizens. We are sent here for that purpose; and if we cannot trust the Government for two short days, surely it becomes us not to leave them free on Saturday and Sunday to further the work of the supposed unhallowed conspiracy. I cannot but regard the action taken by the leader of the Opposition as a tactical blunder, for I can assure him that if he will press his resolution to a vote, he will rouse such a feeling on the part of the Conservative party, under the present circumstances, as will show the whole country that the confidence of this House still remains with the Conservative party.

Mr. LISTER. It seems to me that several of the gentlemen who have spoken misapprehend the position of the Opposition and do not appear to thoroughly understand the question which the House is now discussing. It is not a question of expediency; it is not a question of antagonism to the present leader of the Government or to the Government as it at present exists. It is a question of law. It may be that in future years such a good, noble and upright Government as we have to-day will not be in existence. It may be that such a Government will be here as we shall not be in a position to trust; and if you once change the law of Parliament by breaking the well established rule on this occasion, on some

future occasion, instead of an adjournment of four days, an adjournment of four weeks or even four months may be required. For wise reasons the law of Parliament is that when a crisis occurs while Parliament is in session, Parliament shall continue sitting from day to day in order to be informed by the Government as to what progress is being made in the reconstruction of the Cabinet. So it is out of no feeling of antagonism to the leader of the Government or any member of the Government that the Opposition take the stand they do, but it is as a matter of right and law settled by well established precedent. It is the right of the people's representatives to remain here until the Government has been re-formed, and it is the right of the people to be informed through Parliament, from day to day, of what progress is being made in reconstruction. We have no desire to throw any obstacle whatever in the way. On the contrary, we desire to assist the First Minister in every way possible. But what the Government wants to do is to take away from Parliament the right which our constitution gives us, of being informed from day to day as to what progress has been made in the re-formation of the Cabinet. It may be that no exigency will arise which will require Parliament to advise His Excellency. It is unlikely that it will. But if you disregard the plain law of Parliament you make that law of no value; and as the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) says, the Government have been practically ignoring Parliament. If we permit the Government to take this position, we will be practically condoning their course of assuming the power of Parliament instead of merely recording its wishes. Sir, the First Minister of this country is entitled to the sympathy of the members of this House and of the country at large. We find that he is to-day attempting to reorganize his Cabinet. We find that this man who was accepted by his colleagues as the one man fit to fill the place which the late Sir John Thompson vacated, whom the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague) and the late Finance Minister (Mr. Foster) said throughout the country, up to a few days ago, was eminently fit for the position he occupies, now attacked and called upon to resign by these men on the ground of incompetency. We find the members of the Crown sitting at the Council table and drafting the Address which has been presented to this House and read by His Excellency; we find measures introduced into this House indicated in that Address; we find Parliament meeting here; and yet in the face of all this and in the face of the statement of the Ministers of the Crown made throughout the country, at the last elections, over and over again, that the Government was a unit upon every public question and that every member of the Government had unbounded confidence in

the First Minister, we find that seven of these Ministers of the Crown, after Parliament has met, send in their resignations and withdraw from the Government on the ground that the First Minister is mentally incapable of governing this country. The evidence all points to the fact, beyond any question, that the First Minister has been made the victim of the blackest political conspiracy that Canadian or English history has ever known. Sir, we can read between the lines; we can draw the necessary deductions from a certain state of facts. We find that the High Commissioner is brought over here ostensibly for the purpose of advising the First Minister as to the fast line and cable schemes. These were mere devices. The plot had been hatched long before Sir Charles Tupper came to this country. The man who leads this Government was persuaded into the belief that it was necessary, for the purpose of ripening these schemes, that Sir Charles Tupper should come to this country, when, as a matter of fact he came here to carry out and give effect to the conspiracy. Sir, he came and the hands of the evil geni can be seen in what takes place from that moment forward. When was it that these men made up their minds that they would abandon their leader and destroy the Government? Sir Charles Tupper, it was announced, would sail for England again. He ought to be in England to-day discharging his public duties. He is a servant of this country as much as any civil servant employed in these buildings. He draws from the coffers of this country \$10,000 a year and expenses. We find him here, a public servant, paid by the public of Canada, plotting against the Administration of the day and seeking to become the First Minister of Canada—to carry out, it may be, the wild schemes that characterized him when he was a member of the Administration of this country? When Sir Charles Tupper comes, what do we find? Why, seven Ministers of the Crown send in their resignations to the old Prime Minister, and they insult him by telling him that he is mentally unfit to lead such intellectual giants as have been associated with him for a number of years past. Evidently, they reckoned without their host. The Prime Minister did not capitulate, he did not say: I am willing to degrade myself; I am willing to go out and let somebody else come in. He has clung to the helm of the ship of state—and that is the trouble. Now, the Prime Minister should have time to reorganize his Administration. No member on this side of the House desires that that time shall be denied him. But, Sir, what we do contend is that the law of Parliament is explicit that during a crisis of this kind Parliament should meet from day to day. What the Government propose is that the law of Parliament shall be disregarded and that the House shall be adjourned for a fixed

period. While there may be no danger to-day in breaking the law of Parliament, we must remember that if this precedent is once established and it is declared lawful to adjourn for four days, it can, without violation of the principle thus established, be declared lawful to adjourn for a week or for four weeks. The safe course to pursue is to follow the law as we have received it, particularly when no harm can be done, and no obstacle is thrown in the way of the First Minister, but every move is facilitated for doing what he wishes to do and what, in the interests of the country, he ought to do. There can be no sound reason for the Government asking for the adjournment which the leader of the House asks, and I think the hon. gentleman should yield to the request, made not only by those on this side of the House, but by some of his own followers, that the usual course should be pursued and this House should meet from day to day, accepting from the Government the fact, if it should be a fact, that they have not yet formed their Administration, and giving them from time to time such delay as they may require for the purpose of accomplishing that object. I think, Sir, the hon. gentleman is making a mistake in forcing the House to vote upon this question, seeing that the meeting of the House from day to day can do no harm and that it will be in accordance with the law of the land.

Mr. O'BRIEN. The practical difference between adjournment from day to day and adjournment from now till Tuesday is comparatively trifling, and because it is comparatively trifling, there is all the more reason why the constitutional rule should not be departed from. The hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) made a remark which this House would do well to bear in mind, to the effect that this House followed too much the custom of effacing itself and allowing the executive to govern without regard to parliamentary rule, and not only without regard to parliamentary rule, but in defiance of constitutional usage. I will not go into that subject now, otherwise it might be shown that this Government, which is so ready now to lay aside constitutional rule, only a little while ago was willing to carry out what they claimed to be a constitutional rule with regard to the legislation concerning Manitoba schools, in which case they falsely alleged that the constitution compelled them to do something which, even though against their own convictions, they had decided to do. It is for that reason that every opportunity should be taken by this House to assert its rights and powers and privileges. Especially as it causes no public inconvenience there is all the more reason why, on the present occasion, hon. members should not accede to the request of the hon. gentleman who now leads the House. But the hon. member for West Assiniboia made another remark with which I cannot so

entirely coincide. The hon. gentleman spoke of the devotion to Imperial interests shown by the gentlemen on this side of the House. He laid great stress upon the long tradition and long experience of the Conservative party in governing this country. I am not going to enter into this question so far as the traditions of the past and the history of the country are concerned; but, Sir, it was a very extraordinary thing, in view of such a remark, to find that at the very time when the Empire was threatened from every quarter, when danger was apparently near us, these hon. gentlemen, who are said to be so careful for the Imperial interests, should choose that particular moment to bring their cabal to a head. Sir, it is a comparatively unimportant matter to this House, and a comparatively unimportant matter to this country, whether these hon. gentlemen who are now engaged in what I think has been justly termed a conspiracy had the right to disagree with their leader or not. It is a trifling matter whether there were domestic circumstances which justified the break up of the Government. It may be that their contention is correct; it may be that they found from experience, though they showed it in a most extraordinary fashion, that their leader was incompetent to carry on the affairs of the country. But it is a most extraordinary state of affairs and discredits these gentlemen who pretend to be so careful on Imperial interests, that they should choose such a moment to break up the Government which, if it was capable of carrying on affairs before was capable of continuing still longer. Where do we find the Finance Minister at the time when it was of the utmost importance to the Empire that all its resources should be most readily available? Instead of attending to his duty we find him carrying on a conspiracy which, so long as his name remains upon the roll of Parliament, will be to him a disgrace. Where was the Minister of Militia at the time when the resources of the country might have been required for the maintenance of Imperial interests? Instead of devoting himself to the best husbanding and arrangement of our resources, unfortunately for his reputation, he was also a party to this cabal. Where was the Minister of Railways at the time when the means of communication throughout Canada were of the utmost importance in the Imperial interest? Instead of being at his post and attending to the duties of his department, which might, at any moment, have become most important, he, also, was carrying on this same conspiracy and this same cabal. Other members of the Government, of less note, whose duties were, perhaps, less important, also allowed themselves to be led into the same undertaking. Sir, it does not lie in the mouths of any hon. gentlemen who talk about their devotion to Imperial interests, to defend, or excuse, or palliate

in the slightest degree, the conduct of gentlemen who took this particular moment, one of the most critical in the history of Canada, to show their devotion to the Empire by breaking up a Government whose duty it was, regardless of all minor considerations, regardless of all personal considerations, regardless of all those disputes which may arise in a Government for the time being, at any rate, to carry on the affairs of the Government until a fitting time came to resign their positions. They should have settled their differences before Parliament met, but, having allowed Parliament to meet, they certainly showed how little regard they had for anything beyond their own petty personal interests, their own petty political ambitions, when they chose that particular moment to break up the Government and render it impossible for it to carry on the affairs of the country.

Mr. TARTE. The result of the elections in Montreal Centre and Jacques Cartier has brought on this ministerial crisis. The First Minister did not go to Montreal Centre, nor did he go to Jacques Cartier. Nearly all the other Ministers came down. The ex-Finance Minister came, and made several magnificent speeches. The ex-Minister of Justice came to Jacques Cartier, and he made a magnificent speech. My hon. friend the leader of the House also came down to Jacques Cartier and made a magnificent speech. My hon. friend the Minister of Public Works also came down and made a magnificent speech. My hon. friend the Secretary of State came also. I had the honour to meet him, and he also made a very good speech. All those members, past and present, of the Administration, came down and made magnificent speeches, but the Prime Minister did not come. They lost the battle. Sir, I rise from my seat as one who took a large share in those two elections, and I say that the electors did not vote against the Prime Minister, they voted against the whole Administration. I was surprised when I read, in more than one paper, I am sorry to say, that it was French Quebec which was rallying round the leader of the Opposition. Montreal Centre, as every one knows, is composed of many races. Take, for instance, the Board of Trade. Out of the whole Board of Trade, composed of English members almost exclusively, there were not twelve men who voted for my hon. friends. Sir, it was a square fight on our part, at any rate. Was it a square fight on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite? I listened to several of their speeches. They resorted to the worst possible appeals, to racial passions and prejudices.

Mr. DEVLIN. They charged us with doing so.

Mr. TARTE. They said to the Roman Catholic electors of Montreal Centre and

Jacques Cartier: If you do not vote for the Administration and their candidates, you won't get any remedial legislation. Ministers of the Crown spoke in that way; members of the House used that language. We used the language of toleration, we used the language of moderation. Now, what has taken place? Seven Ministers of the Crown, exactly the number of bolters to-day, came to Montreal Centre and to Jacques Cartier. They said they were taking their lives in their hands on behalf of the Roman Catholic minority. What is the result of those two elections? The day after the election, we read in the ministerial press that the Protestant members of the Administration had made up their minds that there would be no remedial legislation. That language of the "Mail" and of the Montreal "Gazette" was not disclaimed. But what have we seen since? Seven members of the Administration, seven Protestant members of the Administration, I am sorry to say, went out, dividing, thereby, the country into religious factions. Still they claim that they are the loyal party. The facts are there, Mr. Speaker; I wish I were wrong, but the facts are there. We are face to face with those facts. We do not know the whole truth—we know it, but it was not written in the document which was read by the ex-leader of the House. The real facts are—let us state them like men—that my hon. friend and his colleagues do not want to carry out the pledges they have solemnly made during the last session of Parliament. Instead of coming out like men, and saying: We cannot do what we have pledged ourselves to do, they knife their own Prime Minister. That is the position, as every one knows. Now, Sir, the name of the High Commissioner has been mentioned. I have been one of his followers in times past. I know him well. He is an able man, and I am only sorry for one thing, and that is that he happens to be in Canada when such a crisis has arisen. He should not be here, Sir, and every loyal man—I use the word in the best sense—and every Conservative, should be of my opinion. Here is a man occupying the dignified position of High Commissioner, and we hear him accused of conspiracy. One thing is perfectly sure, and that is, that the members who have gone out of the Administration are trying to put him at their head. I have been surprised at the new doctrine that has been propounded in this Parliament. Some hon. gentlemen have said that the Conservative party have a right to choose their own leader; that is to say, their own Prime Minister. Sir, if there is a well-established doctrine, it is that the sovereign is entirely and absolutely free in the choice of his Prime Minister. The ex-leader of the House has said in the paper which he read to the House, that the Conservative party are prepared to form a new Government. He has no

right to make such a statement. In the first place, he was not speaking in the name of the Conservative party. The Conservative party is not composed of seven men, or even ten or twelve. The Conservative party is composed of the members of the House now sitting here. Are the members of the Conservative party in the House in a position to give their opinion to-day? Are they prepared to stand up in their places, and to take a vote, and to advise His Excellency in the choice he should make? None of those hon. gentlemen would dare to do it. The ex-leader of the House has made an undignified statement, as it has been qualified by his leader, an unconstitutional statement. Sir, we are face to face with a grave crisis. What I have said is perfectly true. The members who have gone out of the Administration happen to be Protestants, and nearly all the members which have remained faithful to the Prime Minister are Roman Catholics. That fact cannot be ignored, and the members of the Administration who have gone out must bear in history the responsibility of having divided this country on religious lines. I hope their scheme will not succeed, and I do not say so for the sake of my party. We are prepared to defeat hon. gentlemen opposite in the open field. Montreal Centre and Jacques Cartier have given the keynote. Let hon. gentlemen opposite dissolve the House, and instead of knifing their friends let them come into the open field, and they will be defeated. But I beg of them, because I belong to the minority, not to divide this country on religious lines. When there was a crisis in this House last year three Roman Catholic members of the Cabinet went out of the Administration. Two of them subsequently returned; and what did they say? They told the House that during this session a remedial law would be introduced. The same pledge given either verbally or in writing has been circulated from one bishop's palace to another in the province of Quebec. I and my Liberal colleagues have been accused of being traitors to our race and our religion. Accused by whom? By Ministers of the Crown and by their organs. And now to-day we are face to face, I repeat, with a party divided on religious lines. I did not intend to take any part in this debate; but when I heard the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) speaking of the Conservative party, constituted as it is to-day, as the only party which could be loyal and which could govern Canada, I said to myself that it was time that in the name of my electors, I should rise and declare that the Conservative party as it is to-day is surely not the party to which some of us belonged not very long ago. Under Sir John A. Macdonald was there ever such a shameful crisis as the one with which we are now face to face? Under Sir John Thompson was

Mr. TARTE.

there anything like it? Under Sir George E. Cartier did anything of this kind occur? What do we see to-day? That party which believes itself to be the only one capable of governing Canada, is unable to find among its members in both Houses a man who can be placed at the head of affairs, and that party is trying to impose on His Excellency a man who is not supposed to be here. The High Commissioner is not supposed to be in this country, but he is supposed to be at his post. By what right is the leader of the Government or any member of the Conservative party entitled to impose upon His Excellency a man who is not even a member of either House. I resume my seat expressing the hope that the country will be taught a lesson by this crisis, and that the people will learn to watch their rulers with the greatest care. In this aspect of the case I quite agree with my hon. friend before me (Mr. Davin). Members of the Conservative party during the past years have forgotten that they were representing the people, and I know there are in the country thousands of Conservatives who are to-day rallying around the banner of my hon. friend because they did not find on the other side of the House that security which existed in past days.

Mr. DEVLIN. I do not rise for the purpose of taking any extensive part in the debate that has arisen on the motion for adjournment, but I desire simply to correct an impression which has been created by a recent discourse of the ex-Minister of Justice. I rise in view of the statement just made by the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte) in regard to appeals made to the feelings of race and of creed. It is true, I attended a meeting in the town of Lachine at which the ex-Minister of Justice was present. I had the pleasure of listening to his able discourse on that occasion, and I was led to reply to a few points made by him. But the ex-Minister of Justice will bear me out in this statement, that on that occasion I never said a single word against the present Premier of Canada because of his having been connected with the Orange order, nor a single word in favour of my leader in this House because of the fact that he is of Catholic allegiance and of French birth. I did not do so, and the ex-Minister of Justice knows it perfectly well. Nevertheless, if I am to believe what has appeared in the newspapers, on the very day following the Minister of Justice, speaking in a constituency in which the majority of the electors belong to a religion and race entirely different from the electors whom he addressed in Lachine, stated that Mr. Brodeur and Mr. Devlin made appeals when in the province of Quebec based on the racial origin and faith of their leader and declared against the Premier because of the fact that he was an Orangeman. I think it is only proper in view of the state-

ments made by the hon. member for L'Islet, that I should have the opportunity of denying that accusation. I never made such declarations, and if the ex-Minister of Justice made in Cardwell the statement attributed to him, he made an assertion that was entirely wrong and inaccurate. There was no necessity for making such an appeal on the occasion referred to. What were the facts? We witnessed a delightful scene in the town of Lachine on that memorable evening. We had with us the present ex-Minister of Justice, who was then Minister of Justice. We had also the present Minister of Public Works. The ex-Minister of Justice opened the meeting by stating the position of the Government in regard to its policy on the Manitoba school question. He said, come what might, no matter what might arise, the Government would adhere to its policy of remedial legislation. It mattered not what difficulties might arise. It mattered not what might transpire, the policy of remedial legislation would be brought before this House, and if necessary the Government would fall by it or triumph by it. I look to-night at the gentleman who was then Minister of Justice, and I have every reason to ask him, is it his intention to have remedial legislation passed? Mr. Speaker, not only during the late recess of Parliament, but during the last five years, we have made the charge that the Government never intended doing justice to the minority in Manitoba. What are the facts? Those representing the Catholic minority of Manitoba, when the legislation of 1890 had been passed asked this Government to disallow these Acts of which they complained. The Government of that time did nothing. It is true an election was coming along and the impression was circulated throughout the province of Quebec that the law would be disallowed, whereas in the province of Ontario an entirely different impression was created by the speeches delivered by the hon. gentlemen supporting the Administration. The elections passed and the Catholic people of Manitoba had been humbugged. They were advised to go from court to court until finally they obtained a verdict in their favour from the highest tribunal in the land. Then it was that this Government assured them that in obedience to the judgment there delivered, justice would be done. This session was called for the purpose of doing justice to the Catholic minority of Manitoba by the Government of the day. It was not called for the purpose of showing what conspiracies could exist and did exist within the ranks of the Government, but simply for the purpose of righting what they claimed, and what I claim to have been a great wrong. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, was there ever such a wrong perpetrated upon any people as that which has been perpetrated by the ex-Minister of Justice and his bolting colleagues upon the Catholic people of the

province of Quebec? Why was it that they put that speech in the mouth of His Excellency when they knew that they were about to bolt? Why is it that they advised His Excellency to call this Parliament together for the purpose of passing a great act of legislation when they knew perfectly well that they had not the slightest intention of passing that Act? Why is it that they called Parliament together, bringing members from every part of Canada, simply to trifle with them as they have been doing during the last four days? Why is it that they trifle as they have been doing with that large class of the community having business with the Parliament of Canada? Is Parliament simply to be a witness to the antagonism which exists among members of the Administration? We are here, representatives of the people, in response to the call of His Excellency, anxious to transact the business for which Parliament was called, and what do we find? We find that the gentlemen who advised His Excellency to call Parliament together know not what their own mind is, and know not for what purpose they did call Parliament together. This, Sir, is perhaps as sad a condition of affairs as can be found anywhere. I would like to ask the present Minister of Public Works, if he could stand upon the floor of Parliament to-day, as I saw him stand up at Lachine a few days ago, and thank the ex-Minister of Justice for his attitude on the question of remedial legislation? Only two weeks ago the Minister of Public Works stood before a large audience in the town of Lachine and gave his thanks in most profuse language to the ex-Minister of Justice for his noble stand, for his spirit of generosity to the Catholic minority, and for the fact that he was ready to sacrifice his political life to uphold the principles of the constitution. I ask the Minister of Public Works to stand up to-day in the Parliament of Canada and to repeat those thanks to his late colleague the ex-Minister of Justice. Can the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ouimet) to-day thank the ex-Minister of Justice for what he has done for the Catholic minority? This is the place and this is the time, if such thanks can be given with any degree of sincerity. I can understand what the confusion of the Minister of Public Works must be now. I believe in my heart that the Minister of Public Works thought that night, that the Minister of Justice was sincere, and I sympathize with him in the downfall of his hopes and of his aspirations. Mr. Speaker, I simply rose for the purpose of correcting the impression which had been created by the speech of the ex-Minister of Justice in Cardwell. No, Sir; not in Montreal Centre, and not in the county of Jacques Cartier did we make appeals to feelings of race and religion. Our opponents did that. Our opponents conducted in Montreal Centre the most despicable campaign which was ever

conducted in this country. We knew what they could do, but we placed our trust in the good sense and in the judgment of the people of Montreal, and, Sir, we have seen the most gratifying results. We appealed solely on the ground that no faith could be placed in the gentlemen who then composed the Administration, because of the fact that they were not sincere in the promises they made. And, Sir, as we view that decimated Administration, that weak and vacillating Administration, that Administration shorn of its strongest elements (that is if we are to believe the ex-Minister of Finance, because he claims all the intelligence of the late Government for the "bolters")—we are satisfied that the people understood what we told them. We claimed that no faith could be placed in them. Were we wrong when we claimed that it was not a capable Government? Were we wrong when we claimed it was not a strong Government? The other day we witnessed the Minister of Finance in this House stating: We have resigned because we have not strength, and because we are incapable to govern this country. That bore out the truth of our claims in Montreal Centre. We insisted that the Government were incapable of governing the country, because we pointed out the proportions of the national debt, we pointed out the immense amount of money which had gone into wrong channels; we pointed out the long list of scandals, and we added that the Government were unable to show a good record of administrative ability. We pointed out that the ex-Minister of Finance has a worse financial record than any man who ever had charge of the finances of this country. We affirmed that that gentleman in one short year built up a deficit of five million dollars, and if he touches a deficit at all it has got to be five millions. The people of Montreal Centre and Jacques Cartier understood the truth of these statements, and the answer they gave to them has smashed the Administration to-day. Mr. Speaker, we appealed to the electors of Montreal Centre on good honest grounds. We explained what the platform of the Liberal party was. They understood what it was. They appreciated the platform of the Liberal party. They understood that if this country is to be honestly governed, it must not be governed by men who are constantly boasting of their loyalty when there is treason in their hearts, even against their own leader; for men who have treason in their hearts against their own leader cannot be expected to be loyal to their country. More than that, I would point out this fact to the ex-Minister of Justice, that in that very election of Jacques Cartier, where he claims appeals were made by the Liberal party to Roman Catholics and French-Canadians, the majority of the English Protestants voted against the Administration. That is about as good an answer, I think, as he could wish to his statement in Cardwell.

Mr. DEVLIN.

No, Sir, we are quite satisfied that if we could only have the happiness of a dissolution of this Parliament to-morrow, there will not be here at the next session of this House any such men as the bolters, and much less the present Government.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, there is just one phase of this question which has not been thought about, that is, that if the time of the present leader of the Government is necessary for the reconstruction or the filling up of the Cabinet, much more time has been taken up in the discussion this afternoon than the next two sittings of the House would have taken. But, so far as that question is concerned, I am not going to discuss it further than this: I understand that it is unconstitutional to adjourn otherwise than from day to day; but on that question, I, individually, am perfectly content to throw the entire responsibility upon the Government. There is just one other word I desire to say, that is, that recently I had the pleasure of attending several meetings in company with the hon. leader of the Opposition, both in Roman Catholic and Protestant constituencies. As I have the pleasure of understanding the French language about as well as the English language, although, unfortunately, I cannot speak it as well, I can certify that on no occasion at any meeting did the hon. leader of the Opposition divert from the one course. He dealt with questions in exactly the same way before a Protestant community as he did before a Roman Catholic community. I was also a witness of the contest in Montreal Centre, and I can state, and verify the statement most fully, that so far as the Liberal party is concerned, questions of race, nationality or religion did not, in any sense, enter into the contest.

Motion to adjourn until the 14th inst. agreed to, on division.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 5.25 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 14th January, 1896.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

DOMINION ELECTIONS ACT.

Mr. McCARTHY moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 14) to amend the Dominion Elections Act. He said: This is the same

Bill that I introduced last session, and it is for the purpose of making it plain that railway companies shall not furnish passes to enable electors to attend the polls. Our law has been uncertain on this subject, while the provincial law has been settled. I think it is important, in view of the near approach of an election, that it should be perfectly clear that railway companies shall not have the right to furnish passes under these circumstances and that electors shall not have the right to accept passes from the railway companies when about to attend the polls. The Bill is also intended to prevent what is commonly known as "plugging," and to give facilities for the arrest of personators.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES ACT.

Mr. McCARTHY moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 15) to amend the North-west Territories Act. He said: The purpose of this Bill is to confer upon the Legislative Assembly of the North-west Territories full and complete power in the matter of education.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Mr. McCARTHY moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 16) to amend the Act respecting the House of Commons. He said: This is a Bill which I trust I shall have the opportunity to press through. The important provision of the Bill is that when a vacancy occurs in the House of Commons, the effect of the Speaker's warrant shall not be delayed or intercepted by the failure of the Government to name a day for the election and to appoint a returning officer. The Bill provides that if the Government do not appoint a day within a certain time after the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery receives your warrant, Mr. Speaker, the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery shall direct his writ to the sheriff, or, if there be more than one sheriff in the county, to one of the sheriffs, and that the election shall take place within a given time. The object, of course, is to prevent the abuse which, I am sorry to say, has prevailed under the present law. We have had elections fixed by the Government with reference only to their own interest, or what they supposed to be their interest, and without the slightest regard to the power of this Parliament. Above all things this Parliament ought to recognize the fact that it is the supreme body in the state, and this conduct on the part of the Government is an insult which we ought to take the earliest opportunity of resenting, and the power which the Government seeks to exercise of controlling this House is one of

which we ought to deprive them at the earliest moment.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

VOTING BY EMPLOYEES.

Mr. RIDER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 17) to facilitate voting by employees at the elections of members of the House of Commons.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

MINISTERIAL RESIGNATIONS.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I desire to express my regret that I am not in a position to-day to make a final announcement in reference to the reconstruction of the Cabinet. The negotiations are almost completed, and, to-morrow at three o'clock when the House meets, I have no doubt I shall be in a position to announce definitely that the Cabinet is reconstructed. I move that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. WALLACE. Before the House adjourns I wish to make a statement. An article appeared in the "Mail and Empire" on Saturday last in which reference was made to the anonymous letters attention to which has been called in this House. In that article it is stated that there is one man in this country who has particular reasons to feel uneasy. I have been told by several members of the House of Commons that it has been freely stated that I am the one man referred to in the article which has appeared in the "Mail and Empire." From the rumours that are industriously circulated and what has previously appeared in print I have come to the conclusion that there is no doubt that I am the person alluded to and aimed at in the statement which I have just read, and I have, further, no doubt from what I have heard, but I make the statement subject to contradiction, that these rumours and the statement in the Government organs have originated with the Minister of Railways and Canals. I allude to the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague), who, I understand, is Minister of Railways and Canals to-day. Under these circumstances I have deemed it right to add to the formal and explicit denial that I gave to the House respecting these anonymous letters on Thursday last a full statement of all the facts and circumstances in connection wherewith that have come to my knowledge.

Some time in the latter part of June or in the early part of the month of July last, as I was returning home from the House of Commons I was accosted by Sir Adolphe Caron, then Postmaster General. He told me that there was a conspiracy of the vilest kind against him for the purpose of driving

him out of the Government and ruining his character. He went on to explain that this conspiracy had been carried out by the writing of an anonymous letter to the Prime Minister which charged him with having received the bribe in connection with the Montreal Belt Line Railway of \$15,000 or \$20,000. In answer to my inquiries he stated that he suspected Haggart and Montague, to use his own words, of "being at the bottom of it." I asked him why Haggart or Montague should seek in this way to ruin him? To which he replied that some time previous to the receipt of the anonymous letter, he and the then Minister of Railways and Canals had had sharp differences as to the composition of the Cabinet. And Sir Adolphe Caron added that he was looking round to try and ascertain who it was that harboured such feelings against him as would make them resort to such means to ruin him, and he could think of no others than Haggart and Montague. He said that he had obtained affidavits and papers and had cleared himself from the imputations contained in the letter to the satisfaction of both His Excellency the Governor General and the Prime Minister, and he proposed to bring the anonymous letter to me and the letters and papers which had satisfied the Governor General and Sir Mackenzie Bowell that he was innocent of the charge made in it. I had not heard anything of this matter prior to this interview, nor had I, in fact, seen Sir Adolphe Caron, except casually, in connection with my departmental business.

A day or two afterwards he brought me to his room in the House and showed me the anonymous letter and also the other documents, which he read to me, and he asked me as to whether I had any opinion as to the writer of the anonymous letter. I saw the letter then for the first time, and I was impressed with the idea that the letter was in the handwriting of Dr. Montague. This opinion I mentioned to Sir Adolphe Caron, saying that I thought his suspicions were correct.

The next that took place in connection with the matter was Sir Adolphe Caron coming to my office with the letter and asking me to compare it with the letters which I had in my department from Dr. Montague. This I did and I became more firmly convinced than ever that the anonymous communication was in Dr. Montague's handwriting. He suggested that it would be better to have the letter submitted to an expert in handwriting and I, with his knowledge and at his request, showed the letter to gentlemen whose names I do not feel at liberty to mention without their consent, but who are perfectly well known to Sir Adolphe Caron, and they were of the opinion, without doubt, that the anonymous letter was written by Dr. Montague, and they came to this conclusion on the com-

Mr. WALLACE.

parison of Dr. Montague's letters which were then submitted to them.

Sir Adolphe Caron was not yet satisfied, and he suggested that it would be better to have the opinion of the best expert that could be procured. He ascertained that Mr. Ames, of New York, was an expert in the matter of handwriting, well known and much thought of, and a man of the highest reputation in his profession. Sir Adolphe Caron caused a photographic copy of the anonymous letter, and six letters which undoubtedly were written by Dr. Montague, to be sent to Mr. Ames for the purpose of ascertaining from him, whether in his opinion, the writer of the six letters was the writer of the anonymous letter. These six letters I have now in my hand and they are subject to the inspection of Dr. Montague or of any hon. member of the House who desires to see them, and if deemed proper they will be laid upon the Table of the House, but, as some of them are private in their nature, I do not feel at liberty to do that without the consent of the writer. The opinion of Mr. Ames is contained in the following communication, part of which I now read, omitting the comparisons made by him which are unnecessary to read, but which I am quite willing to do if any hon. member desires it; they deal with the comparison of the various letters and the style of writing and are somewhat technical in their nature. I will read a portion only of the report of Mr. Ames, who, I am since informed, stands at the very highest mark of his profession, and I have the words of one of the most eminent barristers in Canada that on Mr. Ames' opinion he would willingly take a brief and be quite positive. This is Mr. Ames' report:

New York, 11th July, 1895.

This is to certify that I have made careful examination of the writing upon a photograph of an anonymous writing, dated Montreal, 18th December, 1894, addressed "Dear Mr. Bowell," and marked by me for identification Aa. That I have made careful comparison of this writing with that upon six other sheets marked by me for identification, A1 to A6 inclusive, and that I reached a very clear conviction that all the said writings were written by one and the same person, writing Aa being disguised. I reached this conclusion from the very numerous coincident and highly personal and peculiar characteristics I find throughout the two sets of writings. Writing Aa is in what tends to be a back-hand, but of so vacillating a character as to make it apparent that the author was accustomed to write upon a direct slope. As an example I find the date line mostly in a back-hand.

And so it goes on. I will not read the whole of the report, but just a portion here and there. In another place, it says:

Letters identical in form and in their relation to other letters are in exhibits A2 line 12, A3 lines 4, 5, A4 line 3, A5 lines 2, 6 and 12. The final "r" of "dear," and "Mr." are exceptional in the writing of Aa, but are duplicated in A1 line 2 twice, in A3 line 6.

In another place it says :

Letters in form and relationship are almost identical in A1 lines 3, 14, 17 and 18. The small "b" is peculiar in that it is usually made with a short single stroke for a staff, example in Aa lines 4 and 7. * * * * Letters similar in character are in A2 lines 8, 11, 19, and in A3 line 8. A very peculiar and highly personal combination is in the words "of the" in Aa, the beginning of line 14. * * * * Examples are in lines 6, 9, 11, 13, 15 and 16 and others. Identically the same combination and relationship is in A1 lines 7, 8 and 10.

He winds up as follows :—

In the examination of the writings A1 to A6, I find an exceeding variety of writing to be written by one person, so different that from a casual examination, no two of them would be taken to be written by the same person. They differ in the forms of letters, in the slants of the writings, in the shade and in the movement. For instance, Exhibit A5 is an open running hand, while Exhibit A1 is a compact, formal, large hand, while Exhibit A2 differs from either of them and is more angular and written with less facility than either of the others, indicating that the writer has great versatility.

DANIEL T. AMES,
Examiner of disputed writing.

This letter was ultimately delivered to me by Sir Adolphe Caron and is the original opinion given by Mr. Ames himself. Sir Adolphe Caron, anxious to be perfectly certain of the matter, forwarded another batch of Dr. Montague's letters to Mr. Ames for the purpose of seeing whether this other lot of letters corroborated the view which Mr. Ames had already arrived at or affected his opinion in any way, and Mr. Ames's response by letter, which Sir Adolphe Caron has, was to the same effect as his first opinion—that the writer of the second batch of letters was also the writer of the anonymous letter. I heard nothing more about the matter until some time towards the end of November, or beginning of December, when Sir Adolphe Caron told me that another letter similar in character and purport to the one of December, 1894, had been sent to the Prime Minister, and he said it was in the same handwriting as the first letter, and in the second page the disguise was apparently thrown off. He showed me the second anonymous letter, and I was clearly of the opinion that it was also in the handwriting of Dr. Montague, and Sir Adolphe Caron told me he intended to submit it to Mr. Ames. I have only to add that when Sir Adolphe Caron told me that he had reason to suspect Messrs. Haggart and Montague of being the instigators or writers of the anonymous letters, it recalled to my recollection that somewhere about the time Sir Mackenzie Bowell's Government was formed, Mr. Haggart came to my office, quite an unusual thing for him to do, for there had been nothing more than official intercourse between us prior to that time, and expressed the greatest hostility towards Sir Adolphe Caron, using very violent language in regard

to him, and saying he ought to be driven out of the Government. I may conclude by saying that I felt bound, under all the circumstances, and the evident attempt that has been made by Dr. Montague and his friends to shift the odium of these anonymous communications to me, to make this statement, and I must positively assert that there is not a pretext for charging or insinuating that I had anything to do, directly or indirectly, with the writing of either of these communications.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I exceedingly regret that under present circumstances, and at this particular juncture, Parliament should be troubled by the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) dealing with this matter as he has thought fit to deal with it this afternoon; and more particularly do I regret it, since it appears to me that the attitude the hon. member for West York has assumed this afternoon, can be taken as nothing more or less than an insult to His Excellency the Governor General, before whom this matter has been placed in its entirety, and who has absolved me, and who has expressed his most perfect confidence in me; and no Governor General, much less Lord Aberdeen, would express confidence in any Privy Councillor against whom a taint of a suspicion such as this, could be found to exist. For my part, I stood before Parliament the moment this charge was made, as confident that, when the facts were known, I would be shown to be entirely absolved, as I am that I stand here to-day. I knew, Sir, from almost the very first, the hostility that had prompted the conspiracy to ruin me in the eyes of the citizens of this country. I knew that the attack upon me was not instigated by Sir Adolphe Caron, with whom, I am glad to say, I have always been on the most friendly terms; and did I possess the meanness within me to do such an act, there was not within me, nor within sight, the motive to say a word against Sir Adolphe Caron in his connection with the Government, or his place in this House. Sir, it is a serious thing to charge any man with a conspiracy in this regard, until you have the absolute facts under your fingers upon which to base the charge. I do not think now that there is any necessity whatever for me to make that charge. Am I the uncomfortable man to-day in this Parliament with regard to these anonymous letters? I think Parliament will say I am not. Am I the gentleman asking the privilege of raising this question for the purpose of casting off an insinuation? No, but another member of this House seeks the ear of the House. What for? For the purpose of attacking me, without making a direct attack, or for the purpose of throwing off as against himself insinuations which seem to hurt him, which seem to cut to the quick. Sir, what is the statement that has been made here to-day

by the member for West York? Is it not this: That when Sir Adolphe Caron went to the member for West York he called his attention to the fact that it was my handwriting? What motive did the member for West York have for this? Is it not the same motive which prompted the man who wrote that anonymous letter, and endeavoured to fasten the charge upon me, the motive of desiring to ruin a man who, whatever his faults may have been, has done his best upon the platform of this country for the party to which he belongs, and for the principles which he has held. I appeal to my hon. friends opposite. I have hit them as hard as I could in public debate, but there is not a man of them in this House to-day who will say that I have ever hit below the belt, either in this House or upon the platform, that I have ever yet done an act which should bring a blush of shame to the face of any man who is proud of his position as a Canadian in the public life of his country. Sir, after this matter had gone to His Excellency, after His Excellency had looked into the matter between Sir Adolphe Caron and myself, I think, in obedience to the rules of decency, in obedience to the respect in which we should hold the representative of Her Majesty, and in obedience to that respect which should guide one member of this House in his intercourse towards another, it might well have been let rest until the courts may deal with it, until the courts will deal with it. And men are afraid that the courts will deal with it, for when I came to engage a counsel in Toronto to deal with it, the best criminal counsel in the province of Ontario, I found that the member for West York had engaged him in advance. I have only to say this, that when this subject is dealt with in the courts, and when the photographs of these letters are distributed to members of this House, and are printed in the press of this country, there is not a man in Canada, expert or no expert, who will say that there is a trace of resemblance between my writing and the writing of those anonymous letters; and I wish to God, for the honour of this House, and for the honour of Canadian public life, that another man in this House could say the same thing.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I need hardly say how deeply I regret that the matter, which I considered from the very first a matter personal to Dr. Montague and myself, should have been brought up again this afternoon. I regret more especially that the hon. member who has made the statement which he has made, although coming up to my seat and telling me that he was going to make a statement, should not have considered it necessary, as he was using information which he supposed to have come from myself, to let me see the statement before he gave it to the House.

Mr. MONTAGUE. And had given me notice.

Mr. MONTAGUE.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. And had given notice of his intention to proceed in this matter. Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not consider that the statement made by the hon. gentleman changes in any way the position of the case as it stands before the House and before the country. I wish at this moment to express how deeply I regret that His Excellency's name should be brought up in connection with a matter of this kind. But I know that on both sides of the House it will be the feeling of every hon. gentleman that if he did consent to look into the matter, it was because of the fact that it concerned two hon. gentlemen who were his constitutional advisers, and who were sitting in the Cabinet with the Prime Minister whom he had charged with the responsibility of advising him. I wish to say now, without going into a discussion of the statement, that the declaration I made the other day to the House is the one which I am prepared to stand by. I received from Dr. Montague a denial of his connection with the anonymous letters. Beyond this, the circumstances under which he was supposed to be connected with the case were explained to me by the hon. gentleman. I stated openly and frankly to the House, as I did to the Governor General in a letter under my own signature, that I accepted his denial, and I repeat it to-day; and I think when a matter of this kind has been settled in the manner in which it has been settled between the two parties interested, it would have been better to have allowed it to remain as we left it, after the Governor General had given, not his sanction, but an expression of his opinion that it was satisfactorily settled, as I state again it was.

Mr. LAURIER. The House, I am sure, will readily understand that I have no intention whatever of even alluding to the little episode of which we have just been witnesses. I rise simply to address myself to the statement made just now by the hon. gentleman who leads the House with respect to the negotiations that are now going on between the Prime Minister and certain parties with a view with reconstructing the Cabinet. If I understood the hon. gentleman rightly, he told us that at the present time negotiations were going on with certain parties, that they have advanced to a certain stage but are not yet completed, but he hopes that by to-morrow he will be in a position to give to the House a full statement. Under such circumstances I certainly deem it my duty to put no obstacle in the way of the Prime Minister, and I shall not offer any objection to the hon. gentleman's motion. But perhaps the hon. gentleman might tell the House, if he can conveniently do so, if certain gentlemen who a week ago to-day he told us would not serve under the present Premier have thought better or worse—I will not say which—but have, at all events, thought differently and have now gone half over to the fold. That is all the

information I should like to obtain at the present moment.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. If I could give that information to-day, I would hardly ask the hon. gentleman to consent to an adjournment of the House until to-morrow. But I tell my hon. friend that I will not keep him without that information any longer than to-morrow at three o'clock, and I am sure the hon. gentleman would be disappointed, as he has agreed to the adjournment, if I were to give him any information until to-morrow, when I can give him the whole programme, which I have already promised to bring down.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 3.50 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 15th January, 1896.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

NEW MEMBER.

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

Of Edward Gawler Prior, for the Electoral District of Victoria, B.C.

MEMBER INTRODUCED.

Edward Gawler Prior, Esquire, member for the Electoral District of Victoria, B.C., introduced by Hon. Mr. Daly and Mr. Mara.

MINISTERIAL RESIGNATIONS.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I desire to make a statement to the House. And I wish to say that the statement I am about to make has been submitted to the Governor General by the Prime Minister, and I am authorized to say that, in its bearings on the position of the Crown in matters, of this nature, it has His Excellency's approval. Since reference was made, in this House, to the retirement from office of certain members of the Government the Prime Minister has had an opportunity of carefully reviewing the circumstances connected with these resignations, and has satisfied himself that the best interests of the country would be served, notwithstanding any differences of opinion that exist re-

specting the importance of filling the portfolio made vacant by the resignation of the Hon. Mr. Angers, by the return to their former positions in the Cabinet of those who deemed it their duty to retire on account of that vacancy. While it is true that this point was freely discussed between the Prime Minister and his colleagues, it is equally true that the Prime Minister did not regard that vacancy—the importance of filling which cannot be questioned—as a sufficient reason for the resignation of any member of the Government. This view, however, was not concurred in by some of his colleagues who urged that a meeting of Parliament with a Quebec portfolio vacant might seriously imperil certain important measures to be presented during this session. He had reasonable hopes of being able to fill that position up to the very day when Parliament met, and was disappointed when his efforts failed. After the opening of Parliament certain members of the Government sent their resignations to the Prime Minister, giving among other reasons, the fact, that “having failed to fill the portfolio” and, that he evidently “intended to go on with the transaction of public business with an incomplete Cabinet,” they thought this course so great “a departure from sound constitutional practice and so weak, as a matter of policy,” that they were “unwilling any longer to remain as members of an incomplete Government.”

Mr. MULOCK. And therefore to make it more incomplete.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I think the hon. gentleman will permit me to continue the statement. Since the receipt of the resignations referred to, the objections put forward by the Ministers who resigned have been removed by the acceptance of a seat in the Cabinet by the Hon. Alphonse Desjardins, a gentleman well known and esteemed in the province of Quebec for his ability and integrity of character, and by the acceptance to the Ministry of Sir Charles Tupper, Bart. Under these circumstances and with these objections removed, the Ministers who resigned have deemed it consistent with duty to their country to resume the positions they respectively held in the Government. It is gratifying, therefore, to be able to inform the House and the country that a Ministry has been formed which will command the support of the majority in Parliament and enable us to proceed with the measures foreshadowed in the Speech from the Throne. The Government, as reconstructed, is as follows:—President of the Council, Hon. Sir Mackenzie Bowell; Secretary of State, Hon. Sir Charles Tupper, Bart.; Postmaster General, Hon. Sir Adolphe Caron; Minister of Marine and Fisheries, Hon. John Costigan; Minister of Finance, Hon. George E. Foster; Minister of Rail-

ways and Canals, Hon. John Haggart ; Minister of Public Works, Hon. J. A. Ouimet ; Minister of the Interior, Hon. T. Mayne Daly ; Minister of Trade and Commerce, Hon. W. B. Ives ; Minister of Justice, Hon. A. R. Dickey ; Minister of Agriculture, Hon. W. H. Montague ; Minister of Militia and Defence, Hon. Alphonse Desjardins ; without portfolio, Hon. Frank Smith, Hon. Donald Ferguson ; Controller of Customs, Hon. J. F. Wood ; Controller of Inland Revenue, Hon. E. G. Prior.

An hon. MEMBER. And Solicitor General ?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. There is no Solicitor General at present. This is the statement I have the honour to lay before the House. I move that this House do now adjourn.

Mr. LAURIER. So, at last, Mr. Speaker, after these long days of waiting, after the public business has been blocked for almost two weeks, after the House has been subjected to the ignominy of dancing attendance upon the pleasure of weak and vacillating men—vacillating by their own admission as stated here to-day—at last the comedy is at an end ; and the end is what might have been expected from the experience we have had in the past under similar circumstances, just what everybody might have foretold ;—the stray sheep have gone back to the fold, the bolters have eaten their words, and they are expected to sit again under the man, who just a week ago yesterday, they declared was too small to be their leader. Sir, it is always the same thing, everybody might have expected it. These ministerial crises are becoming ludicrously monotonous in their regularity and in their sameness. It is always the same thing. A few days out in the cold and they return to the fold. A general kissing and embracing, an admission and confession of guilt, pardon from all sides, and everything serene and lovely on the surface ; though, I presume, still underneath there is a great deal of kicking, and swearing, and cursing, and vilifying each other. In the month of March last year my good friend, whom I am sorry not to see in his usual seat at the present time—he was at one time Minister of Justice ; he is now simply a member of Parliament, my hon. friend from Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper)—gave a bad example. One day, from the serene skies, came a bolt from the blue. We were told by the papers that he had withdrawn from the Government ; but after a few days he asked to be taken back again. One day we were told that Achilles had withdrawn into his tent, that he refused to come out. But, after sulking a few days in the cold, he came back repenting, subdued and tamed. Then, in the month of July, my hon. friend, the warrior of the party, the former Minister of Militia and Defence, the present Postmaster General, and my hon. friend the Minister of Pub-

Sir ADOLPHE CARON.

lic Works, did the like thing ; they also went out in the cold, and, after three days, they came back again, repentant, subdued, tamed. Now, Sir, on this occasion it was not only one or two, but even seven members of the Administration who went out—what shall I say ?—in a moment of weakness ? Yes, it is nothing else, by the confession of the hon. gentleman—in a moment of weakness, and they also came back to the fold. But I must give credit to whomsoever credit is due. They have exhibited upon this occasion a staying power which their colleagues on the former occasion did not exhibit. They remained out ten days in the cold, but they found the cold too much for them, and they also came back tamed, subdued, repentant. Well, Sir, now, in view of the result, it is not inappropriate for us to look at the causes which gave occasion to this crisis. In view of the results we have at the present time, it is not inappropriate to go back to the language which was used on the former occasion by the hon. Finance Minister, when he gave to the House the reasons which had induced him and his colleagues to take the very extraordinary course they have taken. He stated, that after the death of the late Sir John Thompson, when the present Prime Minister, Sir Mackenzie Bowell, was called upon to form a Government, they accepted indeed to serve under him, though with great misgivings, and the course of events more than justified those misgivings. The course of events has shown that, though they had supported the Government with their gigantic intellects, still the result had not been such as one would have expected. They did not obtain that measure of success which they had reason to believe should meet their efforts, and, therefore, tired and fatigued with struggling in vain for a Government which was weak, they had taken the course of resigning. True it is, that before they took that supreme course they had again and again hinted to the Prime Minister that it would be well for him to make way. But the Prime Minister was deaf on that score. He did not hear, at all events he did not accede to those hints, and he remained obdurate. Then they took the only course which was left to them to take, that was to resign in a body. They wished to have a strong Government,

A Government whose Premier could command the confidence of all his colleagues, could satisfy the Liberal-Conservative party that its strongest elements were at its head, and impress the country that it had a Government which was united and had power to govern.

This was the reason why they bolted, this was the reason why they resigned, in order that they might have the strongest Government possible, in order to satisfy the Liberal-Conservative party that the strongest elements were at its head ; and in order, last, though not least, “to impress the country that it had a Government which was united and had power to govern.” Such was the

object of the resignations. What is the result to-day? Why, Sir, the result shows this, for one thing, that, if there was weakness, the weakness was not in the leadership, but the weakness was in the following. The leadership remains the same as it was eight days ago, but the following has been strengthened. Six of the followers came back to the fold. Another, it is true, has remained outside, but the plums remain in the family, at all events, by the accession of Sir Charles Tupper. The following has been strengthened, strengthened by the accession of really a strong man in the person of Sir Charles Tupper. Then, perhaps, some vigour will be put in the vacillating Premier. Well, Sir, I ask in face of what has taken place, if all these scandalous proceedings have been justified by the result? Can the hon. gentleman who, I suppose, will now resume his position as leader of the House, declare that the Government has at its head at this time a Premier who can command the confidence of his colleagues? I doubt it very much. Is this a Government whose Premier can satisfy the Liberal-Conservative party "that its strongest elements are at its head," that "it has a government which is united, and has power to govern?" Why, Sir, if the country has been impressed in any way, it has been impressed with the conviction which now prevails, that the Government is composed of a band of plotters, and schemers, and conspirators, whose bond of union is the cement of office, and whose only aim and purpose is their own selfish and personal aggrandizement. The paramount conviction at this moment is that the hon. gentlemen opposite can sacrifice anything and everything, honour, friends, convictions, principles, so long as they can remain in the places which they have so long misused. Why, Sir, what have we to-day? We had eight days ago the announcement made on the floor of this House by an hon. gentleman who was supposed to speak with authority as to the causes which had led to these resignations, and to-day we learn that the true causes were not given to us on that occasion. I am sorry to use this language, Mr. Speaker, but we have the confession made here, in the hearing of the hon. gentleman who leads the House at the present time, that the reasons which were then assigned for the withdrawal of himself and his colleagues, were not the true reasons, but that the whole thing dated back to the month of July last, when the Hon. Mr. Angers resigned his seat in the Cabinet and did not return to the fold. This was the reason. We have known all along that such was the reason. We have known all along that the Cabinet was divided upon the same question at the present time. Sir, to-day have we a complete Government? No, Sir, we have still the rump of a Government, we have not yet a complete Government. Well, Sir, I leave the hon. gentlemen and their

colleagues, and their followers, to the reflections which must arise in their minds at this moment. Further than this I will not say. I remember on a certain occasion when there was a political commotion in England. Mr. Disraeli was then in his prime, but was not taking part in the affair; and when he was asked the question why, he answered that he was loth by word or deed to take anything away from the effect of the lamentable exhibition which the Government was making of itself in the eyes of the country. Sir, I would be loth myself, by word or deed, to say anything that would diminish from the result, or from the effects which must follow from the lamentable, from the humiliating, from the base exhibition which the Government have made of themselves during the last eight days in the eyes of the country at large.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. When I brought down the announcement which I made to the House, I realized the great disappointment which hon. gentlemen on your left, Mr. Speaker, would experience from the fact that a strong Government, one which we believe will control and command the confidence of the country, has been formed, no doubt to the regret of the supporters of the hon. gentleman who leads Her Majesty's loyal Opposition. I felt that the hon. gentleman and his friends must have seen that their chance of reaching the Treasury benches could only come to them through dissensions in or the breaking up of the Conservative party; and, Sir, I venture to state that the reasons which have been given in the statement that I laid before the House are reasons that must appeal to the country, and must prove satisfactory to the people. What is the reason which induces the hon. gentlemen to return to the portfolios which they had considered it their duty to vacate? It was because, as stated in this document, they felt that, in the interests of the country they should put aside any consideration except the one of public interest, and for that reason, and that alone, they have come back and form to-day the Government which I have announced to the House. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Laurier) has spoken of several crises which have taken place, and he has drawn the attention of the House to the fact that in April one hon. gentleman left the Government, and that in July two other hon. gentlemen resigned, and the last crisis, which has lasted, as he said, two weeks, but it has continued not quite that length of time, he has spoken of as indicating, on the part of the Government, a state of affairs in the constitution of the Cabinet which rendered it unfit to control and govern the destinies of the country. Sir, I venture to express the opinion that when troublesome questions arise it is not only possible, but it is natural to suppose that great difference of opinions must arise between mem-

bers composing the Cabinet; but when those differences disappear, when those men, sinking their personal views and opinions, band together for the general good, and determine to stay together to carry out the most important matters of public interest that have ever come before the country, I think the people of Canada, at least, whatever hon. gentlemen on your left, Mr. Speaker, may say, will find that the reasons which induced them to resume their portfolios were such as will receive the approbation of public opinion. I am, therefore, not in the least surprised at the manner in which the explanations have been received by the hon. leader of the Opposition. I felt that he would be disappointed, but this is one of those numerous disappointments which he has already experienced, and which he must put up with once more.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, it is not often I feel it to be my duty to differ from the hon. gentleman who sits besides me (Mr. Laurier), but few as those occasions may be, this, I am bound to confess, is one of them. My hon. friend will pardon me when I say that he takes the hon. gentlemen opposite quite too seriously. Sir, he assumes that he is dealing with responsible statesmen. Now, viewed from that standpoint, I must admit that my hon. friend has not said a word too much, and, in fact, a good deal more might justly be said than he has said. But I submit to this honourable body that that is not the true standpoint from which those hon. gentlemen's actions should be regarded. Sir, as I understand it, we are here in the presence of the Royal Ottawa Low Comedy Troupe, and we should be grateful to them for the great benefit they have done us as a party, and for the amusement they have afforded, not only to us, but to all Canada, during some time past. As I understand it, and I submit this to my hon. friend with all deference, what we have been listening to, after all, has really been a series of rehearsals. We had No. 1 rehearsal—because I can hardly count the little episode of the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) as one—a sort of undress rehearsal, as we may call it, in July, when three members of the Cabinet went out, and one of them, being a person of some honour and self-respect, stayed out. Then we have lately had what I may call a full dress rehearsal, when seven members went out, and practically seven came back, because the mere substitution of junior for senior, or senior for junior, really hardly affects the situation, as no one will more frankly admit than the hon. member for Pictou. Now these hon. gentlemen being pretty nearly letter perfect, we can have the real performance, which will not long be delayed, when all will go out and none come back. In the meantime, Mr. Speaker, allow me to congratulate those hon. gentlemen on the magnifi-

Sir ADOLPHE CARON.

cent spectacular effects which they have produced entirely regardless of expense. I think you, Mr. Speaker, will admit, and I think all constitutional authorities from the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) down, will admit it is of the highest moment that the Ministry of the day, under a form of government like ours, should command the respect of the great mass of the people of this country, and the confidence of their fellows. Sir, I think those hon. gentlemen stayed out too long, when they allowed the weekly issues of the Conservative press to be sent to the country, and if I am any judge of the effect produced, it is only too plain that they have utterly failed either to inspire respect in the country, or confidence among their own followers. Now, Sir, let us consider for a moment what this whole farce means. It means, in my judgment, nothing less and nothing more than this: that this whole business has been transacted for the purpose, and for no other purpose, than to make room for my ancient acquaintance, Sir Charles Tupper, Baronet of the United Kingdom. Sir, it is impossible that even such a crew as I see yonder—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is impossible that even such a crew could dream of returning except on a most distinct understanding, whether written or verbal, that within a very short space of time Sir Mackenzie Bowell must make way for Sir Charles Tupper, Bart.

Mr. POPE. You are right for once.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes, right for once and right always, and right all through. Not even their fronts of brass (and I give them credit for any imaginable quantity of that commodity)—not even their fronts of brass could endure—and I will do them that justice, and particularly to the Minister of Railways will I do that justice—could endure to sit very long under Sir Mackenzie Bowell in Council after what has passed between them. And now, Sir, as to Sir Mackenzie Bowell himself, and here I candidly confess that I feel some pity for that hon. gentleman. Up to the present time, Sir Mackenzie Bowell might have commanded the sympathy, not merely of a great number of his own followers, but of a large proportion of the people of this country irrespective of party. That was a sympathy which naturally went out to an old leader fighting for his life with his back to the wall against seven treacherous ministers. But, Sir, I am sorry to say for Sir Mackenzie Bowell that although I am ready to make large allowances for him, I must say that he cannot expect the same measure of our sympathy and respect when he sinks to play the part of a warming-pan to one of the most corrupt politicians our country has ever known. As I have said, Mr. Speaker, Sir Charles Tupper, Bart., is a

very ancient acquaintance of mine. Using the word "fame" in its scientific definition, I may say that the fame of Sir Charles Tupper, if not precisely well known in all the churches, is well known in all the provinces of this Dominion. It is well known that he graduated with very high honours in his own peculiar school in Nova Scotia many years ago. Nova Scotia—"arida nutrix leonum," which if my hon. friend from Picton (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) will permit me, I will freely translate—Nova Scotia, which has produced so many eminent men, but which has also been the dry-nurse, aye, and the wet-nurse too, of the most highly developed type of Tory boodlers this country has ever known. I say that with the most profound apology to those of my hon. friends from Nova Scotia who have helped us so well in driving that valuable class of individuals to the wall. Now, Sir, I am bound to say that knowing what tremendous pressure was exercised on Sir Mackenzie Bowell, I feel considerable pity for that hon. gentleman. I have no doubt whatever that his intentions originally were right, and I think some of those whom I know to have exercised this pressure upon him for the purpose of bringing together at all costs and at all hazards men who have no possible ground for respecting or trusting each other; I say, Sir, these men might very well have spared him that. But all the same, and I say it with regret, I have to say to Sir Mackenzie Bowell, that if there be anything on earth which could justify the conduct of these gentlemen, it is that he himself, by his own conduct in admitting them once more to his councils, has gone far to justify them. And now, Mr. Speaker, as to the statements which have been made, I have been given to understand—though I cannot imagine how the idea has got abroad—I have been given to understand that there have been some persons in this House who have insinuated in times past that I did not always attach the implicit credence which I ought to have done to the statements made by hon. gentlemen opposite. I have been told so. Permit me to say on this occasion, I am prepared to state here in my place in Parliament, that I attach implicit credence to the statement made—that is to the statements they have severally made about each other. As I understand the rulings which were frequently laid down by the Chair in this House, that is my duty as a member of Parliament, and I mean to do my duty. I believe also, and I am here open to correction, that it is my constitutional duty to extend to the other Chamber in the legislature, similar courtesy. If that be your ruling, and I presume it is, I feel that I am likewise bound to extend the same implicit credence to the statements which have been made by the hon. the Premier in his place in the other Chamber. It is in the recollection of some hon.

gentlemen here that the hon. the Premier, in the hearing of many gentlemen around me, described himself not many days ago—I do not think you were in the Chair at the time, Mr. Speaker—described himself on the floor of this House as having been living in a nest of traitors. Whether he did that or not, there is no doubt whatever that in his place in the Senate Chamber, speaking of this transaction, the Premier declared (I have got his words here) that the conduct of his colleagues to him had been unparalleled in British history. And he went on to remark, although not exactly in these words, that he feared they were a set of ruffians who had no reverence for gray hairs. This he said, together with many other remarks of a similar character, which will be found extended at considerable length on the pages of the senatorial "Hansard." I suppose I must believe the statements made by the Premier of this country in his place in the Senate, and I will endeavour to do my duty accordingly. Similarly, Sir, I feel that when the Minister of Finance, speaking for himself and friends, and speaking, mind you, not lightly, but speaking from a document carefully prepared and revised; when that gentleman, with exceedingly little circumspection, declared in the course of the document that the Premier of Canada was an old fool, and an obstinate one at that—

Mr. FOSTER. "Ipsissima verba."

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Well, I think that is an accurate if not a literal translation. I suppose, Mr. Speaker, I must believe the Finance Minister, too, when he made that declaration. I suppose it is my duty to believe him, and I will endeavour to do my duty on this occasion as always. Now, so far the case is plain sailing, because, Mr. Speaker, you will observe—and I call the attention of the House carefully to the fact—you will observe that the statements made by the Premier and the Minister of Finance are not at all necessarily irreconcilable. In point of fact, some people have said that they go far respectively each to prove the other. But, Sir, I am in a little dilemma. What am I to do if a case should arise in which two of these hon. gentlemen should contradict each other, and that is a possibility. Light may arise out of the darkness, even if it is from the lurid illumination which may be shed by certain threatened lawsuits on the subject, but as yet we are in darkness. However, one great difficulty has been taken out of my way. Sir, it has been my privilege, and I have no doubt it has been yours, to peruse certain affectionate letters—I might almost call them an amatory correspondence—which lately passed between my esteemed friend the Postmaster General and another eminent member of the late confraternity. Sir, I feel it my duty for purposes of illus-

tration to read these letters in order that they may not be lost to posterity. They are as follows:—and they are not anonymous, Mr. Speaker:—

“Ottawa, Jan. 13, 1896.

“Dear Sir Adolphe Caron.—Although I have already in my place in Parliament denied any complicity whatever in the matter of these anonymous letters, I wish to repeat in this personal manner my emphatic denial of having been in any way connected with their authorship. I wish at the same time to say that I entirely acquit you from the suspicion of having been the cause of communications to the press in regard to this matter.

“I remain, yours faithfully,
“W. H. MONTAGUE.”

The reply is worthy of the preceding:

“Dear Dr. Montague.—In reply to your letter I fully accept your repudiation of the anonymous letters, as, indeed, I have already stated in Parliament, and I regret the annoyance to which you have been subject in the publication of an allusion to the matter in the press. I wish to add that I am glad that you exonerate me from the suspicion of having been the source of any communication to the newspapers upon the subject.

“Yours truly,
“ADOLPHE CARON.”

Now, Sir, I think our fair friends, the hon. Postmaster General's fair friends, looking at all the surrounding circumstances, will agree with me in designating these letters as sweetly pretty. Here is the point, Sir, and the reason why I have introduced them; they illustrate in a most remarkable way the value of the ruling which I have been endeavouring to comply with, and the duty of all public men to believe as true all statements made in Parliament. Just think of it, Mr. Speaker. But for that excellent rule—I put it to the hon. Postmaster General—how could he and Dr. Montague have fallen on each other's necks and wept and gushed over each other as they have done just now? Verily, Mr. Speaker, wisdom is justified of her children, and so are your rulings. Now, Sir, I think that in many ways the explanation we have just heard, and in fact the whole performance from start to finish, forms a most fitting climax to the history of this present Parliament. This Parliament, Sir, is likely for many reasons to occupy a perfectly unique position in Canadian history. It has done several things which no Parliament ever did before, and which, if I may venture a prediction, no Parliament will ever do again. In the first place, Sir, this is a Parliament which is on the high road to get six years' indemnities for five years' work. In the next place, it is exceedingly likely to be the only Parliament in Canada to expire by effluxion of time. In the third place, it is the only Parliament I have ever heard, known or read of in any English-speaking community which deliberately re-

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

fused to investigate a charge against a Minister of the Crown preferred by a member in his place; and it is most assuredly the only Parliament that has ever sat in any community I have ever heard of in which, when a Minister of the Crown has been accused of high crimes and misdemeanours, that Minister has been allowed to choose his own judges and draw up the charges to suit himself.

Mr. FOSTER. Order.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think I am in perfect order. I am stating what is on record; I am stating what was drawn up and made the basis of a royal commission issued, the more shame to them, in the name of Her Majesty, by these gentlemen, for the purpose of giving effect to the identical thing to which I have alluded. Well, Sir, all I can say is that the parliamentary majority that would sanction such proceedings is a most fitting complement to the Cabinet we now see before us. The Parliament are worthy of the Cabinet; the Cabinet are worthy of the Parliament. Sir, I did think on Tuesday week that we had reached the lowest depth of degradation to which it was possible for a Canadian Parliament to sink; but I see that I was wrong. To-day's proceedings have convinced me that even in the lowest depths a lower deep can yet be found. I think it was Oliver Wendell Holmes, or some other gentleman equally eminent in psychology, who declared that the real way to get at the truth as to any man or thing was to apply the rule of triangulation to such person or thing. Sir, I propose to apply that rule to the Cabinet. I know pretty well what is the opinion of them held by the Liberal party, and I can form a pretty shrewd guess what is the opinion entertained of them by every true Conservative. But it is interesting to see these things in profile, and it is my happy privilege to be able to afford a side light as to how they strike our neighbours, the citizens of the great American Republic.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Was that remark made by an hon. gentleman who, if not a naturalized citizen, is a large property holder in some portions of the great American Republic? As it happened very recently, four of these hon. gentlemen were travelling either in the United States or in the immediate vicinity of the United States. They were, as I am informed, the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce, the hon. Minister of Agriculture, the hon. Minister of Finance and the hon. Minister of Railways. On this particular occasion, Sir, they were not screened from the vulgar gaze within the sacred precincts of the car “Jamaica;” but they were travelling in an ordinary Pullman car like com-

mon mortals such as you and me, Mr. Speaker. At any rate, they were identified, and a friend of mine pointed them out to an American gentleman travelling with him as distinguished Canadian luminaries.

An hon. MEMBER. Chestnut.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Well, the story will suit. I dare say some hon. gentlemen have heard it before, and it is just as well that they should hear it again. It so happened that the American gentleman had not seen these four pillars of the state before. He regarded them long and carefully, and when asked his opinion of them, delivered it in these few words: "Stranger, if them four fellers are Privy Councillors and Advisers of Her Majesty Queen Victoria, then, stranger, I never said it before and I never thought to say it all, but I do say now and say it from the very bottom of my heart. God Save the Queen." Now, Mr. Speaker, in sad and sober seriousness, one word more. As I said at the outset, if there be one thing which is more essential than another to the good working of representative government, it is that the men who are chosen from the representatives of the people to discharge the important functions of government in any country shall be men who command the respect and honour of the bulk of the community at least. Sir, I say—and in saying it I will have the concurrence of every true man in Canada,—that the honour and character of its public men are the most valuable possessions of any people. I say furthermore that anything which tends to lower and degrade the honour and character of public men in any country, tends to lower and degrade, in the very highest degree, the morality of that whole community; and I say that all the churches, colleges, clergymen and schools collected together can do will fail to undo in generations the evil which has been done by such exhibitions as those we have been compelled to witness within the last few days unless the people—and that speedily—purge and purify themselves from all connection with them by inflicting condign punishment on the men who are responsible for such scenes. We can well believe, knowing what I know, looking at the character of the patent combination now before us, that if they are left in office for a very short time indeed, they may plunge this country into entanglements which will cost at the very least \$100,000,000 to escape from.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. My hon. friends have not sat in Parliament as long as I have or they would know that the predecessors of these men, for the purpose of concealing their infamy, for the purpose of buying a ransom from the consequences of the first Canadian Pacific

scandal—and it was not worse than this—deliberately added more than \$100,000,000, or what if capitalized would have represented more than \$100,000,000 to the capital expenditure of Canada more than twenty years ago. These men are just as capable as their predecessors of adding \$100,000,000 to our debt and charges; but for my part, grave as that may be, I would rather see \$200,000,000 thrown into the sea than see Canada degraded as she has been by the exhibition of falsehood, of treachery, of meanness, of weakness and cowardice which this country has witnessed in the last few days.

Mr. DAVIN. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat has spoken of a comedy troupe. Well, Sir, if he pursued that figurative way of regarding the present situation, I think he would on seeing these galleries crowded and looking at this House, filled as they are to-day, have asked those who fill the galleries and the House: "What went you out for to see?" They came here to-day expecting to hear the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat and the hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition make such an attack on the Government of Canada as would ring throughout the length and breadth of the land. Well, what went they out for to see? A reed shaken by the wind? Why, a reed shaken by the wind would be respectable compared with the hon. gentleman and his leader. Sir, the hon. gentleman went on very well for a few minutes, with his carefully prepared jokes and his studied impromptus, conned day by day and by the midnight lamp, until he began to review the Government as reconstructed and pointed out one new element in that Government. And, Sir, Macbeth, at the famous feast, when the ghost of Banquo appeared to him, was never so unmanned as was the hon. gentleman by the spectre of Tupper that rose before him. From the moment that he uttered the name of Sir Charles Tupper, Baronet, the sinking of heart that came into his breast many and many a time, the chicken quivering beneath his frock coat, which he had often felt when the war-horse of Cumberland neighed, made itself again felt. Sir, the Right Hon. Sir John Macdonald was a keen observer of men; and I well remember his sitting where my hon. friend, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster) sits now, and looking over and remarking how much afraid the hon. gentleman who has taken his seat was of Sir Charles Tupper, Baronet. And, Sir, we have seen something of that here to-day. Why, as I once or twice pointed out here, if we are to canvass this Conservative Government with the view of changing it, we have to ask the question: What Government shall succeed? Sir, we have heard the two leaders of the Opposition to-day under circumstances that give to a leader of the Opposition a great

chance. I say that every member of the Conservative party who hears me is ready to acknowledge that the circumstances were peculiar, and gave any competent leader of men in this House an immense chance. And what has been made of it? My hon. friend who leads the House has not risen equal to the occasion.

Some hon. MEMBERS. You are right.

Mr. DAVIN. I should have said my hon. friend who leads the Opposition. If there is any comfort in the slip, the hon. gentlemen may have it. I say the hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition has not risen to the occasion to-day. There is no man in this House who likes the hon. leader of the Opposition better than I do. He is a scholar, and a gentleman and a man of great charm of manner; but, Sir, he is not a leader of men—he is an academic personage. He is altogether too nice for the high position he occupies; and I say that to-day he has not availed himself of the opportunity which the circumstances gave him. And as for the hon. gentleman who would be our Finance Minister, if we were to change sides, what has he done? Why, he has been simply telling us a story that belonged to the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen). A statesman of the standing of the ex-Finance Minister—what constituency does the hon. gentleman represent? He has been from constituency to constituency, and I do not recollect which one he represents now.

An hon. MEMBER. South Oxford.

Mr. DAVIN. From a gentleman occupying the position in this House which the hon. member for South Oxford does, we naturally expect something. But on this occasion he has simply been a political rag-picker in the McMullen heap. To-day, Sir, we not only get instruction in the newspapers from the pen but also from the pencil, and in the "World" newspaper there are appearing some very clever pictures of political thought by a man of real genius, Mr. Hunter. I hope that that gentleman will send down to posterity forever a picture of the hon. gentleman who had just taken his seat as the political rag-picker in the McMullen heap. Let me say this. These gentlemen have given us nothing but comedy, and low comedy degenerating into farce that ceases to be laughable and becomes painful. Let me say one word seriously of the situation. Sir, I consider that the situation was one that gave great anxiety to the country and great anxiety to the Conservative party. And one of the greatest anxieties to patriotic men was this, that it did afford a chance—a desperate chance—to the gentlemen on the Opposition side of getting into power. I say that the fear that was in the hearts of patriotic men was not that power and patronage might pass from us, but that

Mr. DAVIN.

at such a crisis as this in the history of the Empire and in the history of Canada, men such as we see before us should obtain portfolios. That was our fear. Now, Sir, the two hon. gentlemen who spoke have made no points against the Government as reconstituted. As a matter of fact the Government has been reconstituted. According to the statement of the Finance Minister these gentlemen went out because they wanted a stronger Government; and, although I am not here to undervalue any, though no man can value more highly than I do the administrative ability, the great talents of my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Justice, at the same time I am sure that he will agree with me, as the country agrees with me at this moment, that there cannot be the least doubt that the Government has been strengthened. The presence of Sir Charles Tupper, Bart., in that Government strengthens it. The announcement made by the Finance Minister is an important one. He said that the Conservative party ought to have the strongest possible Government. He said that was the aim we should have in view, and, in the course of two weeks they have given us a Government much stronger than the one that preceded it. And, Sir, the principle then enunciated is a principle that the people of Canada and the members of this House will hold the Government to; and on succeeding occasions, when that Government shall be reconstructed again or added to again, I hope that this principle will be followed, and that not merely will local considerations, geographical considerations, ethnological and theological considerations have weight, as is too often the case whatever party may be in power in Canada with our unfortunate mosaic politics—but that the question of ability to fill a ministerial position will also be taken into account. Whatever party may be in power here, the sooner we adopt and carry out the methods of the English constitution as carried out in England the better. We have a replica of the British constitution in this Canada of ours, but we have not its methods. The method in England is to take men into the Government because of their weight in Parliament; and the consequence is that, at each successive change, at each successive reconstruction of the Government in England, you have men in the Government capable of dealing with the vast and complex questions of an entire Empire. But here we see pressure brought to bear because a man is of this colour or that, of this stripe or that, irrespective of the important question, not whether he is fit to manage a department, for that is not enough, but fit to be one of the leaders of Canada, one of the pillars of the state. We should aim higher than we do, we should have not merely men fit to manage a department, but men of adequate knowledge, men of the highest ability we can find, and we should have those who can

fairly claim the high title of gentleman. Sir, I rose merely because of my disappointment. I came here for a treat; I came here expecting that the leader of the Opposition or his first lieutenant, or probably, my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills), or, it may be my hon. friend who can roar like a lion and coo like a sucking dove, the hon. member from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies) would afford us that treat. But the fact is that these gentlemen were not equal to the occasion, and we need never expect them to be equal to the occasion as it rises. Above all the point of importance is that the Government has been strengthened. The appearance of Sir Charles Tupper, Bart., in the Government has frightened the wits out of gentlemen opposite. The addition of my hon. friend, Hon. Mr. Desjardins, also greatly increases the strength of the Government, for Mr. Desjardins is not only a man of ability, but, as the hon. leader of the Opposition too well knows, he represents an element in Quebec that is of great force. Well, Sir, we have a stronger Government, and I think that the events of this day prove that we have a weaker Opposition.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that it must be a matter of poignant regret to my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition and my hon. friend to my left (Sir Richard Cartwright) that they were not able to make speeches upon this occasion sufficiently interesting to please the taste of the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin). That hon. gentleman has told us that there is nothing that he despises more than studied impromptus and carefully-prepared witticisms. I am not surprised at that, Sir, because the hon. gentleman has given the House a greater surfeit of these things than any other man I know. I think I remember that a few years ago, the hon. gentleman undertook a pilgrimage to Stratford, having prepared a very learned and brilliant extempore lecture to be delivered from the public platform in that city—production bristling with witticisms, and not only that but with interruptions from small boys and clever retorts with which the interrupters were instantly crushed. For one reason or another the hon. gentleman did not reach his destination. Nevertheless we had the speech with the carefully-prepared impromptus which were not even delivered all fully reported in the columns of the next morning's "Citizen." There were the interruptions from the small boys and the lecturer's brilliant retorts, the applause which greeted every brilliant impromptu and the thunderous cheers which marked one of the most magnificent perorations ever heard in the Dominion of Canada. The hon. gentleman, I may remark in passing, had reached only about half-way to his destination, and all this time was slumbering peacefully at a wayside town. Of course, whether a speech pleases or not is largely

a matter of taste. But I will venture to say that of the hundreds who are sitting in this Chamber, and who heard the attack made by the hon. leader of the Opposition and the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), few will leave this Chamber without feeling that that attack was as strong and as effective, and as true, as the English language could make it. If they did not please their opponents, they may be gratified to know that at least they pleased their friends and all independent men. It may be nothing to some men, it may be nothing to the hon. member for Assiniboia that dishonour and treachery and backbiting and meanness and untruth should be exposed in this House, but it matters much to the honest people of Canada. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) phrased the situation very neatly. I think, when he told us that these gentlemen were playing as the Royal Ottawa Low Comedy Troupe. I have known the hon. gentleman from Assiniboia too long to call him names, but I regret that he descended to playing the part of mountebank in that troupe. That is not his customary role, and I do not think that in it he came off with his customary applause. I would advise him, notwithstanding his great versatility, to drop the role he has played to-day. The hon. gentleman tells us that the practice is to take men into the Government on account of their weight, their intellectual weight, and their qualities as gentlemen. Why did the hon. gentleman not explain that, notwithstanding that he has sat here under Sir John Macdonald, Sir John Abbott, Sir John Thompson and Sir Mackenzie Bowell, not one of these gentlemen ever discovered these distinguished qualities in himself. Let me tell him that the situation is one which should not be passed by in silence, one which has, I think, been aptly designated by my hon. friend. You may search the annals of your country's history in vain to find a precedent or a situation such as we have had here. We have had seven men leaving the Government and openly proclaiming that they left it because the leader was incompetent and an imbecile. And you have the seven men coming back to the Government and ranging themselves under the banner of this incompetent and this imbecile, and asking the country to believe that we have got a strong Government which should be followed. Where, Sir, can you parallel that in the history of Canada, or in the history of any other country? The hon. gentleman who leads the House to-day told us that no reason but that of public interest prompted these gentlemen to resign, and no reason but the public interest prompted them to come back. But he was singularly forgetful of the fact that the reasons which prompted them to resign have all been embalmed in the statement read by the Finance Minister in this House as his own statement and the statement of his six

colleagues, and that those reasons are entirely different from the one he has given to-day. Sir, I am glad of the limitation which he put to the statement when he opened to-day, that the official statement he was reading had the imprimatur and sanction of His Excellency. I say I was glad of the qualification he put in, so far as that statement affected His Excellency's position; because the statement which he read, outside of that one qualification, was a statement contending that to be a fact which was untrue—unless he is prepared to accept the view that the ex-Finance Minister read a false statement the other day. One statement directly contradicts the other. In the statement read the other day we were told that notwithstanding the fact that they joined his Government with very many misgivings, because they doubted whether the Premier was equal to the occasion, although they had unitedly and loyally striven to make it strong, they found that the Premier was too weak a man, too incompetent a leader, to give courage to his followers and to form a strong Government, and they left him on that account. Sir, although clothed in diplomatic and euphemistic language, it meant this: The present leader of the Government was an incompetent and an imbecile, and that is the reason they left, and that is the reason that appears before the eyes of the country in language which anybody accustomed to read between the lines, can clearly understand. But to-day the hon. gentleman does not scruple to come down and ask this House to believe, with the echo of the language used by the Finance Minister still ringing in our ears, that his statement was false, and that the real reason they left was that it was a matter of public interest. Why, Sir, is it not time that this system of public deception should cease, and that this House, at least, should be treated with the respect due to the representatives of the people, and told the truth? Why, Sir, the ship of state—if I may be allowed to use a maritime expression, coming as I do from a maritime part of the Dominion—started out a year ago under this hon. gentleman, Sir Mackenzie Bowell, tight, staunch and strong, and reputed to be in every respect, seaworthy. What did we see? We saw the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) while she was rolling in the deep seas of remedial legislation, suddenly bolt, run away from the ship, desert her, and, as my hon. friend beside me said, sulk in his tent for two or three days, and was it public interest that drove the hon. gentleman out? Did he leave because he could not agree with the policy of the Government? No explanations have ever been vouchsafed to us here; but the hon. gentleman was led back by the ear two or three days afterwards, and told to be a good boy, and he came back whipped into line, looking very sheepish for several days here.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

not able to open his mouth, and never to this day has he had pluck to stand up and tell us why he left. But I will tell them what he had the pluck to do, and this I will give him credit for; he is about the only one of the English-speaking members of the Government who has had the pluck to say what the policy of the Government really is on the subject of remedial legislation. He said it on the floor of this House, and he said it in Antigonish, and I believe he repeated the same statement in Cardwell. But did anybody ever hear the Finance Minister say anything, that was not equivocal and capable of leaving a retreat open for him, as to what the object was? Never. I will do the hon. gentleman from Pictou that justice at least, that he had a policy, and he had the pluck to say what it was. But, Sir, after he ran away from the ship, signed articles and ran away, and was brought back by the ear, he remained here for some time in the Government until this big bolt came. But when the big ship was rolling, as I say, with its cargo of remedial legislation on board, then came what my hon. friend described as the great bolt of the three members. Well, Sir, I thought they were sincere. Everybody thought the Postmaster General must be sincere, because he was known to be a man who based his public life upon principle. There are other men who might be open to the accusation, there are other men in this House who might be open to the accusation, that other motives than public interest prompted them to take this extraordinary course; but did ever anybody hear that the hon. Postmaster General was accused of that? We all knew that when he went out, accompanied by that bold lion, who sits behind him, we all knew that the hon. gentleman meant business. He went out upon principle, he went out because he thought the interest of his compatriots was being—not lost, but sold, sacrificed; and he remained out two or three days with a very bold face on, and he came back as a cat to lick the milk again, humbled, tamed, subdued, if I may repeat the language of my leader. He has remained there ever since, whipped into line. One lesson was enough for him, and I do not think anybody will ever catch him going out of the Government again, no matter what is at stake. But to-day I call his attention to the fact that his colleague, who had the pluck and manliness to go out on principle—a view of the principle in which I myself do not agree with at all—but he who went out on that principle believing that he was right, to-day has the respect of all honest men, French and English; while those who went out professedly on principle and came back, sacrificing their principle, have earned the contempt of all honest men. I hope if he has respect for public life at all, if he has respect for the high models of public life which he says we ought to follow in England, he

knows that when a man sacrifices his place and power for principle, he has the respect of friends and foes alike. But when a political mountebank or time-server professedly goes out on principle, and eats the leek, and comes back and swallows the principle, he earns the contempt of those with whom he sits, and is despised by his opponents. Well, Sir, what did we see next? We find, Sir, this old ship of state I am talking about, staggering into the parliamentary harbour here the other day, dismasted, running under jury-mast, as my colleague from Queen's County (Mr. Welsh) phrased it the other day to me, and we find, Sir, that notwithstanding the wrecked condition in which she was, public proclamation was made by the Finance Minister that, all suspicions and declarations to the contrary, there was nothing but unity on board that ship, unity among the officers and unity amongst the crew. The hon. gentleman, a few weeks previously, had taken the trouble to go up to Smith's Falls and had proclaimed in the loudest tones he was capable of using that all stories to the effect that there was disaffection in the Cabinet, were untrue, that they were all united, each one to the other, and all to their chief; and he called upon the people to rally around them under the old National Policy because they were united, and because they were loyal, and because, in his opinion, that policy was good for the country. He came here to Parliament. He joined in the public proclamation that peace still continued, that there was unity. He joined in putting a Speech into the mouth of His Excellency. He came down to the House and had that Speech read. He put his name on the Order paper that he would move that the Speech be taken into consideration by this House, and, after having put His Excellency in the most awkward position he could possibly place him, he had the meanness at that particular juncture, and the treachery, I will say, too, to resign his position and throw affairs into a crisis where, except for an accident, the Speech never would have been answered at all. Well, Sir, he tells us that although he joined, as he stated in his explanation the other day, Sir Mackenzie Bowell's Cabinet with many misgivings, he and they had unitedly and loyally striven to maintain that Cabinet intact, and to carry out the principles upon which it was originally formed. What a strange commentary we have had on that official declaration made by the hon. gentleman. I call your attention, Mr. Speaker, and the attention of the House to the fact, that while the words used by the ex-Minister of Finance are still ringing in this Chamber, that they, as a Government, had unitedly and loyally striven to carry out the policy of the Government, within a few days we had the celebrated Caron-Montague letters read in this House, showing the statement was true that the members of the Cabinet

had been, for the past twelve months, flying at each others throats, fighting internally, and that fact was known to the hon. gentleman when he placed his name to the statement that they were loyally united. We have more than that. We had a statement made here by a late member of the Government that at the very time the ex-Finance Minister pledged his word to the statement that the Government were loyal and united, such statement was not true, because the Minister of Railways came to him and told him that "Caron," to use his expression, "should be kicked out of the Cabinet altogether." We have, Sir, the public rumours, which have never been denied, so far as I know, that the Minister of Railways and the Minister of Public Works carried their union and their loyalty to the extent of fighting across the Council Chamber Board. These particular evidences would not show that the Cabinet was united and loyal, but the hon. gentleman, who has made similar statements before, rose in this House and, speaking on behalf of himself and his friends, made that declaration of loyalty and unity which was contradicted so pointedly by one of his former colleagues, the late Controller of Customs, yesterday. One would naturally ask whether, under the circumstances, the old ship is worth saving. I think she is. I think, although the country has been torn by internal dissensions and discussions, she is worth saving, as well from foreign foes as domestic enemies. We have a policy to save her, and we have a leader who can save her. It is true she may have a dangerous cargo on board just now, but I think her timbers and hull are pretty sound yet, and, with a good captain, and an efficient crew, she may be threshed through this storm, and reach her port of destination. But she wants new masts, she needs a new captain, and, I think she must have a fresh crew, and the sooner hon. gentlemen opposite go back to the owners and give up the articles they have signed, and let new officers be elected, the better it will be for themselves and for the country.

Mr. DAVIN. Will you supply the fog horn?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I need not while you are on deck. I was calling attention, before the interruption, to the fact that the confidence of the public, on which we, as legislators, must depend, has been rudely shaken since Parliament met. My hon. friend referred to a session of Parliament a few years ago. It is within the recollection of hon. gentlemen that when the McGreevy-Connolly scandals were first exhumed and exhibited in this House we thought Canada had reached the point of degradation, below which there was no lower depth. But we had the Caron episode afterwards, and, at that time, the hon. gentleman boasted he would

like to repeat it if he had the opportunity, and we found then there was a depth a little lower than we had previously supposed. Then the want of confidence which spread and permeated the whole public, was confirmed by the Curran Bridge scandal, and the incapacity and mismanagement which was shown to have characterized the administration of the public departments. And to-day our humiliation is complete. A lower depth has been found when we learn that, in addition to incapacity and mismanagement, treachery and mutiny have been found to exist at the very foot of the vice-regal throne. Sir, one day we are told that hon. gentlemen opposite have a leader entitled to respect. One day the hon. gentleman, the Finance Minister, comes down and asks his followers to give their adhesion and their loyalty to a man who, I think, he, or, at all events, one of his colleagues, at the Bowell banquet in Belleville, declared was a man worthy of being selected by Her Majesty for the high position in which he was placed, and at that banquet the true and faithful were called upon to rally around this able man who had been selected to succeed Sir John Thompson. They came down to Parliament, and in the Speech from the Throne intimated that Sir Mackenzie Bowell was a fit and proper person to continue in the leadership; but two or three days afterwards, those hon. gentlemen came down and told us in euphemistic language that he was incapacitated for the post, and was a fool. We were further told that they could have no confidence in a Government so constituted. But we are now told that those mutineers have gone back, and to-day they are feeding at the public crib, as the Postmaster General says, from a sense of public duty, and, as their followers outside the House allege, from party allegiance. Party allegiance can excuse a good deal, but it is hateful and disgusting when it involves the loss of self-respect. I should like to know, Mr. Speaker, whether those hon. gentlemen, after the statement they made here that their leader was a man unfit to govern and to rule, and who went out because they thought the state was unsafe under his guidance, can possibly have any self-respect now they have gone back under the same man, without a single change in the composition of the Cabinet, except the introduction of Sir Charles Tupper, Bart. If they can have self-respect, can any of their followers have respect for them? I should like hon. gentlemen to ask, not those who place party loyalty and party allegiance in the fore-front, but men in the party who believe there is public honour, truth, and justice, what they think of the position which those hon. gentlemen have assumed, and of the respect which should be entertained for men acting as they have acted. Sir, the hon. gentlemen have fallen into the error of mistaking opportunism for states-

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

manship, and have to learn that self-seeking is not patriotism. If truth, honour and patriotism can all be sacrificed on the altar of self, then there is a poor future in store for this country. But I have no such low estimate of the better element in the Conservative party, because I know, myself, hundreds of them who are as good, or better, than I am.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I say, unhesitatingly, that I know there are hundreds of such, not in this city, but scattered throughout the Dominion, and the contempt with which we look upon these men is exceeded by the contempt with which these honest Conservatives look at them. Why, Sir, the party heeler may to-day shout with joy, and the hoodler may smile at the possible return of the good times when he can fleece the public treasury again. But the old-fashioned virtues of truth and honour which are still enshrined in the hearts of the tens of thousands of Conservatives in this Dominion impel them to look with loathing and contempt upon men who went out one day because their master was an imbecile, and not finding anything to do, went back again under the same master to the crib, at which they had been feeding. But, Sir, the verdict which Cardwell has pronounced, and the verdict which Montreal Centre has pronounced, and the verdict which Jacques Cartier has pronounced was repeated yesterday by West Huron, and, if I mistake not, it will be re-echoed in every district in Canada where truth is valued above deception, and where self-respect and honesty have not been bartered for falsehood and selfishness.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I do not rise this afternoon with the least idea in the world of following up the apologies, and substitutions for argument and logic, which have been so freely used by hon. gentlemen opposite. Neither do I intend to ask the members of this House, who have something much better to do, to give me one single moment of their time in listening to any attempt of mine to reply to the usual—no, I am not quite right in saying simply the usual—but the more than usual exaggerations and misrepresentations which these hon. gentlemen have made, of documents which have been placed before them, and are to-day in the public records to be read by them, and by all members of this House. What in the world, a gentleman thinks, before an intelligent House, and in an intelligent country, can be gained by a mere parody and utter misrepresentation of the documents submitted—and submitted in no haste—and put upon the records, I cannot, for the life of me, conceive. That these hon. gentlemen have done from the first one who spoke (Mr. Laurier) to the last one who has just sat down (Mr. Davies). I am here to be

judged, and every public man is to be judged, by his own statement, made from his heart, and uttered from his lips; but I am not here to be judged by any suspicion, and by any parody, and by any misrepresentation that an opponent may make of that statement. The very moment that gentlemen in a representative assembly go off from the solid ground of taking the statement that a man actually made, and believing it, as they are bound to do, that moment they leave gentlemanly and parliamentary discussion, and appeal to a plane which is far lower and far more unworthy. These hon. gentlemen opposite talk about kaleidoscopic changes. I think I can see a kaleidoscope change on the other side of the House. I think that a spirit has come over the dreams of these hon. gentlemen now, as compared with a few days ago. I read their faces to-day, as I read them before. They are not so pleasant-looking. Their smiles are not so seductively alluring, and their cast of countenance is in quite a different mould. You would think, Sir, that between that day and this a funeral had occurred. Perhaps it is the funeral of the ill-starred, and too quickly begotten hopes that hon. gentlemen opposite formed a few days ago; a repetition of hopes that they have formed again and again, and buried in a mantle of disappointment. That is the hope that maybe, the Conservative party some time or other would be so foolish as to go to pieces by internal dissensions, and let them come into power. Sir, contrasting that period of two or three days ago with the period of to-day, and contrasting the varying facial expressions of the hon. gentlemen, the truth of the whole matter can be easily seen. A day or two ago they were hopeful that they would get into power, because they could creep through a chink in the Conservative ranks, but to-day they see the Conservative ranks solidly opposing them, and displaying a united front. The other day, Sir, tears were not hot enough nor copious enough to properly represent their feelings of heartfelt sympathy for the Bowell Government. To-day, Sir, their indignation and hot words of contempt are not strong enough to show their hatred of that same Bowell Government which they declare has not been strengthened by the addition of a single element. Take the false sympathy of these hon. gentlemen, and their equally false expressions of contempt that they do not, in their hearts, feel, and you have an unerring barometer which tells you the state of their political temperature. Now, I put it to the members of the House, and I put it to the people of the country who will read these debates, because the country is interested enough to read them, I ask if these gentlemen opposite have, in their discussion of the subject this afternoon touched the germ of the question in dispute during this critical period of the last

week. They have uttered their words of contempt, they have had their expressions of deep loathing, they have had these hoarded up for the last week to be delivered to the House. They have given us the pleasure of listening to some very good comic rehearsals by my hon. friend (Sir Richard Cartwright), and some very good mock tragedy by my hon. friend (Mr. Davies). But, outside of that, where has there been a business-like or statesmanlike discussion of the issues involved so as to show where the members or the leaders of the Conservative party were wrong. My hon. friend (Mr. Laurier), who started the discussion, gave, unfortunately (and I think not altogether to his own credit), a wrong trend to the discussion, by making a complete parody of the statement which was read by myself in the House a few days ago. Others followed him, and they ended up with the declaration that the statement which had been submitted, after having been presented to His Excellency, and read in this and the other House to-day, was completely subversive of, and contradictory to, the statement which was read previously. Here are the two statements, and both of them will be on the records of the House. I challenge any honest and reasonable man to read the two of them and not see that they entirely agree as to the main question which has been the central point of the differences that existed between the members of the Government. Leave aside, for a moment, all the misinterpretations, the inferences, the imaginations which have been founded upon, and drawn from, the first statement, and when you boil it down it means exactly this: That seven members of the Government, bound by their oath of office as Privy Councillors to give their best consideration to the public questions which come before them, without personal considerations of any kind, that these seven gentlemen came to the conclusion that, upon a certain point, there existed a sufficient reason for them to insist upon the strengthening and completion of the Government. No man can deny that. To-day, Sir, the statement which has been read here by my hon. colleague who represents the Premier and the Government in this House makes that the very kernel and gist of its meaning. It says, as plainly as the English language can put it, that between members of the Government there was a difference often discussed, as to the constitutional propriety as well as on the policy, not simply of meeting this House, but of coming to the transaction of the business of this House with a Government that was incomplete and not, therefore, as strong as it should be. Has one of the gentlemen opposite discussed the constitutional question as to whether or not this was sufficient ground to cause a difference of opinion leading to the result reached? Let us look at the facts of the case. When this House was in session last

year, a vacancy occurred in the ranks of the Government arising out of an important question of policy which was discussed in this House. Owing to that difference a member of the Government handed in his resignation, and the office he held remained vacant during the remainder of last session. It was asked in this House when that office would be filled, and it was stated that it would be filled. That vacancy was more than an ordinary vacancy, from the fact that it arose out of a question that was more than an ordinary question; and the seven members of the former Government who resigned contended, and held to the contention, that any vacancy in the ranks of a Government held over from one session to another was not according to constitutional practice, and was not conducive to strength. In this case, they conceived, that contention had even more force because of the peculiar nature of the circumstance out of which the vacancy had occurred; and it was on that point, as stated both in the first statement made by the seven Ministers who resigned, and as stated by the Premier in another place this afternoon—it was upon that point that the differences existed, and upon that point that the resignations took place. Now, Sir, that vacancy has been filled, and consequently the Premier is able to present a completed Government; and that vacancy has been filled from the same province from which the vacancy was made, and by an adherent, and a favourable adherent, of the very same question out of which the vacancy arose last year. The Government has been completed, then, and it has been strengthened by the addition to it of the hon. gentleman whose name has been mentioned here to-day—Sir Charles Tupper, Baronet. Some gentlemen on the other side rose to the occasion, as they always do, and have tried to break the force of that addition to the Government by saying that one member of the family went out and another come in, but the plums remained in the family just the same. These gentlemen are inaccurate as usual. Sir Charles Tupper has been in the enjoyment of one of the highest offices in the gift of this country, where he has stood between this country and the Imperial authorities, where he has been of the utmost service to this country. Sir Charles Tupper, true as always to the call of his party and to the interests of his party, to-day resigned that high and honourable and distinguished office in order to come down among the rank and file of his fellow labourers in the old Conservative party to help to lead them to victory again, as he has often done in the past. And Sir Charles Tupper, the younger, my colleague—whose absence from the present Government I and all my colleagues deplore, whose services were of the best and whose abilities were of the highest in the Government—he

Mr. FOSTER.

is with us still, though he has voluntarily and for the good of the party been willing to return to the rank and file of ordinary membership, and battle strongly and loyally and effectively, as he did before, for the progress and prosperity of the party; but, Sir, he does it now without the salary that attaches to the Minister of the Crown, and therefore my hon. friend opposite was wrong. But what position is that for a man who aspires to be a statesman? What expression is that for a man who hopes some day himself to become a member of a Government in Canada—to taunt us on this side with not being gentlemen; to taunt us with lowering the type and the grade of public life in this country: to point to a man on this side, one of my colleagues or myself, as feeding at the public crib. Is that my hon. friend's idea of what governments or Ministeries mean? If so, all I have to say is that the moment his lips utter a sentence of that kind he pronounces his own condemnation. So I say there is no difference in the statement as handed down by myself on behalf of the gentlemen who retired from the Ministry a few days ago and the statement that has been authorized by the Premier to be read here to-day in so far as the main points of the question is concerned. Some men say to us, Why did you agree with the Speech and put it in the mouth of His Excellency, and then, before it was discussed and passed by this House, tender your resignations? The Premier himself, in his statement as read here to-day, has given the reason and the only reason. We often discussed that question of constitutional difference with him. In his statement to-day he says that up to the very time of the meeting of the House he had hoped to be able to fill that vacancy, and so present a united Government to carry on the business of the country, and that his own disappointment was equal to ours when he found that he was not able to do it. But, Sir, cannot six or seven gentlemen, who have gone in and out of this House of Commons and who have been before this country for some considerable time, say that in duty bound—and reading that duty in the only light in which they could read it—they were perfectly consistent having once insisted on the constitutional practice in handing in their resignations and not consenting to remain in the Government when that constitutional practice seemed to them not going to be carried out? Cannot they be considered as having some regard to the contention that was held as fundamental? Cannot they be considered as being honest in that? And is it wise—does it help to raise the tone of public life in Canada—is it true or honest—to say that when they have these convictions and carry them out, they are to be charged with treachery, with conspiracy, with everything that is dark and underhand and mean? I think if such had been the rule in past times, the history

of no Cabinet or government under the sun would have been free of the same charge; for in all cabinets and all governments differences of opinion will arise, which will be fought out to the end and will result in the resignations of those who feel that they cannot give in to the contentions that prevail in the Cabinet. Now, Sir, the great desire and the great aim, evinced the other day in this House by my hon. friend who leads the Opposition, persisted in to-day by some of his followers, spread throughout the country from one end to the other most sedulously, is to make it appear that there is a reason behind the reason; and that reason they read to be that there is a lack of unanimity in the Government on some vital questions of policy. I say again that the only basis you can have for argument amongst gentlemen and in a parliamentary assembly is to take the records and the statements and argue from them. And taking the records and the statements, can my hon. friend find warrant for an assertion of that kind? No, Sir, he cannot, but he is one of those gentlemen who will inquire in this way. If you make a statement that the sun rises at six o'clock in the morning and sets at six o'clock at night, he will take up that statement and read it, and then declare that although you said this, what you meant was that the sun rises at six at night and sets at six in the morning. In reply to that kind of misrepresentation you can have no argument. It may, however, be of some benefit to those in the country who hear of or read the hon. gentleman's statement, to place the truth just briefly before the House this afternoon. The hon. gentleman could find nothing better to do a moment ago than to rise and coolly assert that I had made no statement in this House or the country from which any intelligent man could find out my position on the Manitoba school question. He said that I had gone to Smith's Falls and said something there. So I did, and I will tell the hon. gentleman what I did say. But I will tell the hon. gentleman first what I said in this House last session, and if my hon. friend thinks himself unable to understand English, he may give other gentlemen credit for knowing what the English language means. I said this on July 8th of last year:

A session of the present Parliament will be called together to meet not later than the first Thursday of January next. If by that time, the Manitoba Government fails to make a satisfactory arrangement to remedy the grievances of the minority—

Does my honourable friend understand that?

—the Dominion Government will be prepared at the next session of Parliament, to be called as above stated—

To wit, as stated in the first line of the paragraph that I am reading—

--to introduce and press to a conclusion—

Is not that definite?

—such legislation as will afford an adequate relief to the said minority, based upon the lines of the judgment of the Privy Council and the remedial order of the 21st March, 1895.

It strikes me that that is tolerably plain, concise English. Mr. Foster was at Smith's Falls, said the hon. gentleman, and made a statement. Well, Mr. Speaker, I have a copy of the statement that I made there, and from which, the hon. gentleman said, no man could gather at all what position I took upon this question. This is what I said:

I tell you, as one having authority to say it, that on that question of policy, as stated definitely by me in the House and by Sir Mackenzie Bowell in the Senate, every member of the Government sees eye to eye. Our opponents get up their fanciful narrations as to who is not and who is going to approve it.

I think I must have had the hon. gentleman from Charlottetown, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies) in my eye.

It is all simple imagination. Every one of the Government is united upon that just as closely as upon the trade question—that is, altogether and unanimously.

Here you have our position as a whole, as a Government, and on both these questions. Now, I appeal to fair-play, to the sense of what is right in this House and out of it, to know whether that is a statement which is clear and definite. And if my hon. friend wants more, I will read him another bit of fairly terse English. That is in the statement read by me the other night:

I may say, in the first place, that there is no disagreement between ourselves and the Premier upon any question of public policy, trade or constitutional, with regard to which action has been already taken, or in respect to which an attitude has been already assumed by the Government under the present Premier.

And yet, in the face of those consecutive statements, first, my hon. friend who leads the Opposition, and then those who follow him, find nothing better to do than make the assertion that the real reason is something else than what I give as the reason, and that there is no unity in the Cabinet on this question. My hon. friend thinks he has stated the whole case when he says that Ministers went about the country from place to place and declared that the Government was united while all the time they were disunited. Again my hon. friend will not state the facts. Let him read those statements. We stated that the Government were thoroughly united upon all the essential lines of its policy. And so it was. But I suppose it will be many and many generations before you will find a Cabinet, all the members of which agree with each other on all the different questions that come before it for discussion and

decision. Now, I make these few remarks simply to draw back the attention of the House and country as well to what is really involved in the differences that have taken place, and which are simply and concisely set forth in both statements, and which consequently we may take to be true and to be the real reasons. We need not, therefore, go about looking for others that are not stated. These statements show that these differences were, in the opinion of the seven Ministers, as stated by the Premier in his statement read to-day, on the ground of the completion of the Government in accordance with constitutional practice and the strengthening of the Government, that on those points they were of sufficient weight to give us a basis for our action; that we thought so and took the action we did honourably and as men, and we stood by that action until the trouble was removed and the Government presented, as it does to-day, a united body, with its departments complete and most materially strengthened as well. I do not wish to sit down, even after making these few remarks—and I expected to make but a few—without stating this, that the attitude of the Liberal-Conservative party in this trying period of six or eight days has been an attitude which must strike the country, and strike it forcibly. Without panic, without passion, steady and true, the members of the Liberal-Conservative party, as represented here at Ottawa, stood firmly upon the principles of their party, with that solidity behind it which assured everybody, as leaders or otherwise, that come what would, a strong, steady, hopeful combination would emerge from it all, with differences healed, with dissension set aside, ever loyal and firm to their lifelong principles and determined to conduct them to a successful issue in the elections which are shortly to come. My hon. friend who spoke so slightly of Sir Charles Tupper, who has entered this Cabinet, might deem himself fortunate indeed if he had a record of such patriotism and ability.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, and of such sterling service to his country. My hon. friend before now has shown that he can be very brave in denunciation when his opponent is not before him. He seems to have feared that the public would forget his idiosyncrasy in that respect, and he wished to give another proof and exemplification of that trait in his character. Let me inform the hon. gentleman that Sir Charles Tupper will be in his seat before many days are over. My hon. friend can get ready all his vigorous Anglo-Saxon, and he will find, as he has always found, in Sir Charles Tupper a foeman worthy of his steel, one who before his denunciation will neither cower nor blench.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Mr. Speaker, I am sure that, notwithstanding all that the

Mr. FOSTER.

hon. Minister of Finance has said in defence of the reorganization of the Government, neither the House nor the country will be deceived with reference to the reasons assigned by the hon. member a few days ago for the retirement of himself and a number of his colleagues from the Administration and the reasons assigned to-day for their going back. In his speech to-day the hon. gentleman has endeavoured to impress the House with the view that the sole ground for difference of opinion in the Government was that he and the others who withdrew from the Government desired to see certain vacancies filled, and that the Prime Minister had failed to comply with their wishes. If we look at the changes that have taken place in the Government we can only come to the conclusion that these hon. gentlemen, when they told us that they desired that the Government should be strengthened, were very easily satisfied; for, excepting the retirement of the hon. ex-Minister of Justice, the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper), there has been, so far as this House is concerned, no practical change in the Administration. I am quite sure that when the hon. Minister told the House the other day that the retiring members desired to see the Government strengthened, and they wished to see the strongest men of the Conservative party introduced into it, he did not wish to have it inferred that the Minister of Justice was the one incapable man in the Administration, and that they retired along with him for the purpose of getting rid of him. That was not the impression made upon my mind, and I am quite sure that was not the impression made upon the mind of any hon. gentleman on either side of the House. When we look at the statement, the carefully prepared statement, made by the hon. gentleman on behalf of himself and those associated with him, we cannot but see that, if the whole is taken into consideration, there is much in it that is omitted from the paper read by the hon. Postmaster-General to-day. The hon. Minister of Finance told us on that occasion that he and his colleagues who had withdrawn from the Government of Sir Mackenzie Bowell entered it with a great deal of misgiving.

We have nevertheless unitedly and loyally striven to the best of our ability to make it strong and efficient, and it has been with growing regret that we have seen our efforts result in a measure of success less than that for which we had hoped and striven.

Does the hon. gentleman stand by that statement still? Does he say that they entered the Government with misgiving, that they consider the present Prime Minister an incapable man, that they suspected his incapacity at the time they consented to serve under him, and that after twelve months' experience they discovered his incapacity to be even greater than they had

feared? That, Sir, is the statement the hon. gentleman made to the House the other day as the chief reason for withdrawing from the Administration. Has that defect been corrected? Has the Prime Minister withdrawn from his position? Has another Premier been found? If not, then what reason have these hon. gentlemen for returning to the Administration now? The more this statement is examined the more it will be seen that it was a much more candid statement than the one read to the House by the Postmaster-General to-day. Does any hon. gentleman seriously entertain the opinion that these hon. gentlemen, with a majority of fifty behind them in this House, were afraid to meet this House and dreaded their inability to carry on the Government because a certain place in the Administration had not been filled up? The hon. gentleman says in effect: Mr. Angers retired from the Government some months ago; we pressed upon the Premier the propriety of filling that position; the Premier neglected to do so, and for that reason we withdrew from the Administration. Sir, that is not the statement these hon. gentlemen made a few days ago: that was not the reason they gave for their withdrawal from the Administration. They assigned wholly different reasons, and I say again that I have no doubt that the statement read by the hon. Minister of Finance was a more candid statement than the one that has been submitted to-day as a reason for the return of these hon. gentlemen to the Administration. The hon. gentleman spoke of misgivings as to the capacity of the Premier, which misgivings he found to be more than justified by a year's experience. Now, what has been done to strengthen the Government? What has transpired to induce the hon. gentleman to return to the office he held before or to induce his colleagues to join him? The hon. gentleman will not pretend to say that Sir Charles Tupper possesses ability so much superior to his son, the hon. gentleman's late colleague, that he is justified in going back again because one has gone out and the other has come in. The hon. gentleman did not point to the ex-Minister of Justice when he gave his reasons for returning. It was not by the withdrawal of the ex-Minister of Justice that he expected to strengthen the Administration. The defect in the Administration, according to his statement, was in its head; the Prime Minister was said to be incapable and must be got rid of. But these hon. gentlemen, without getting rid of the Prime Minister, fearing that their occupations might be gone, have returned and have consented to continue to serve under him. All the facts show that these hon. gentlemen sought to become tools in the hands of one man in order that they might be the destroyers of another. They have not succeeded. They may have got their friend into the Adminis-

tration, the man whom they hope will assist them in the elections; but they have not got rid of the man who they said was an incubus upon the Conservative party and the continuance of whose premiership would prove a disaster to the party. Sir, there was a time, I suppose, when the hon. gentlemen thought that when the brains were out of a Government, the Government would die; and the hon. gentleman retired, and his associates retired with him, and they thought the life of the Government would cease. But the Government did not die, and these hon. gentlemen have come back into the Administration again. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman has spoken of exaggeration, and misrepresentation, and parody of the statement he read the other day to the House, in the speeches that were made by the leader of the Opposition and by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). What did either hon. gentleman say with respect to the statement made by the hon. Minister of Finance, that is not borne out by the statement itself? Did he not say that the Prime Minister was incapable? Did he not say that he was utterly unfit for his post? Did he not say that unless he was got rid of it would be disastrous to the Conservative party in the coming elections? Is not all that set out in the statement which the hon. gentleman made? Are not those the reasons given by the hon. gentleman for retiring from the Administration? And the Prime Minister, this incapable man, this imbecile man, is still at the head of the Administration, and the hon. gentleman has come back to serve under him. That is the position which the hon. gentleman occupies at this moment. Why, Sir, the hon. Minister of Finance talks about standing for principle. The hon. gentleman talks platitudes, and they have not served him a good purpose on the present occasion. Some years ago, there was a church critic who said that his church was divided into three great schools—there were the platitudinarians, the latitudinarians, and the attitudinarians. Well, we have had in the speech made by the hon. gentleman on this occasion, the platitudinarians. The hon. gentleman has travelled over a great deal of ground, and has spoken of his devotion to principle. But he has said very little in defence of the reasons which he assigned the other day for retiring from the Government, and for returning, under circumstances which he led us to believe were such as to preclude his entering the Government again. Sir, let me say that the hon. gentleman in his speech spoke of his devotion to principle. What principle was he devoted to? He said, the constitutional principle of going out of a Government if the Prime Minister did not fill up at the moment a particular seat in the Administration. Now, Sir, I have pointed out before that the hon. Minister has entered the Govern-

ment again with still one seat vacant. Why did not the hon. gentleman insist upon the office of Solicitor General being filled before returning? He did not. The office is still vacant. The hon. gentleman does not think that it is of such a character as to lead to a revolution in the Government, and so he comes back again. Why, then, can any one believe that the hon. gentleman wishes us to take him seriously? He says that seven members retired from the Administration because one seat in the Administration was, for a time being, vacant. Has the hon. gentleman ever been member of a Government before when a seat was vacant in the Administration? Why, Sir, it is important that the seats in this House should be filled; it is important that the people of this country should be represented on the floor of this Parliament. What has the Government done, what is he responsible for having been done during the past ten days? Why, to denude this House of a number of its members and transfer them to the other Chamber. How then, could the hon. gentleman sit in the Government with a number of seats vacant in the Senate for years? The constitution provides that there shall be a certain representation for each province, and for each division in this Chamber. Has the hon. gentleman taken care that that clause of the constitution is complied with in that regard? Not at all. He has wholly disregarded this provision of the law, notwithstanding his devotion to principle on this one occasion. Now, Sir, let me say that the Prime Minister the other day declared that the statement made by the hon. gentleman on the floor of this House was uncalled for, that it was undignified, that it was unfair. Has the hon. gentleman apologized to the Prime Minister? Why is it that the hon. gentleman has not given to the House some explanation of the character of this document which he read? Upon what terms has he gone back into the Administration again? How is it that the man whose political life he undertook to take a few days ago, is the one under whom now he is ready to serve? What change has taken place in the circumstances? Sir, the hon. gentleman has acted very much like a kangaroo: driven to stand at bay, he has undertaken to disembowel the Government, and, failing in that, he has returned, and is ready to serve in it. Sir, the hon. gentleman says the Government is completed, they are all back in their places again. The hon. gentleman says the whole Conservative party is united. I suppose he counts the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) a nobody, he counts for nothing. I supposed the hon. member for West York was a member of the Conservative party. I did not know he had been read out, I did not know that the hon. gentleman had authority to excommunicate the hon. member for West York from the party. And yet the hon.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).

gentleman declares that the whole party are united in this House, and so stands before the country, and that we on this side of the House are greatly disconcerted because we see the Conservative party united. Well, Sir, it does not disconcert me, and I am quite sure it does not disconcert any of my hon. friends sitting beside me, or behind me, to see the Conservative party in this House united. We rather prefer to see them in that condition than making the exhibition which they did during the past week. We do not think it redounds to the honour of Parliament, or to the credit of the country, to have such an exhibition made on the floor of Parliament as the hon. gentlemen have made during the past ten days. Why, Sir, we had a Speech delivered by His Excellency, by the advice of these gentlemen, and before this House had any opportunity whatever of considering that Speech, seven of those gentlemen who had advised it, withdrew from the Administration. The hon. gentleman may think that he is devoted to constitutional principles, but it seems to me there was a very wide departure from one essential principle of our constitutional system when the hon. gentlemen, under these circumstances, withdrew from the Administration. Sir, the hon. gentleman admitted that he had misgivings as to the chances of the party with which he is associated, succeeding in the next election. His misgivings were so great that he retired under unusual circumstances, accompanied by six of his colleagues. He has strengthened the Administration, so he tells us, by bringing in one prominent gentleman of the Conservative party, and putting out another. Now, Sir, does the hon. gentleman, under these circumstances, expect to succeed? Within the last few months, five constituencies represented by supporters of the Government in this House have become vacant, and four of the five have returned opponents of the Administration. That is the prospect that the hon. gentleman has before him, and so it does not disturb us on this side of the House in the least to find the supporters of the Government standing by them. It does not disturb us in the least to find those who left the Administration returning to it again; it does not disturb us in the least to find them supported on their return by the late High Commissioner. We are perfectly willing when the time comes to meet those hon. gentlemen on the hustings, and we have no doubt that the verdict of the entire country will be what it has been in the constituencies in which elections have recently been held. The hon. gentleman will find that the exhibition which he has made and the humiliation and degradation to which Parliament has been subjected by the course which he and others have taken during the past ten days will, notwithstanding the aid of the late High Commissioner, prove disastrous to them when the day of trial comes.

Mr. HAZEN. Mr. Speaker, I would not rise this afternoon for the sake of protracting the discussion which has taken place on the motion of adjournment that has been made by the hon. gentleman who is leading the House, were it not that I desire to place on record my own personal regret that in the Cabinet changes which have taken place on the reconstruction of the new Ministry the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper), who until very recently has occupied with credit to himself and with satisfaction to the country the honourable position of Minister of Justice, has thought it necessary to retire from the Government. I feel, Sir, in giving expression to that feeling that I am not only voicing my own personal feelings, but voicing the feeling not only of hon. gentlemen who sit on this side of the Chamber where the hon. gentleman sits, but also of many hon. gentlemen who sit on the opposite side of this Chamber as well. During the first three or four years I had a seat in this Parliament, representing as I do a maritime constituency, and one largely interested in matters pertaining to the Department of Marine and Fisheries over which the hon. gentleman then presided, I came very much indeed in contact with that hon. gentleman in the administration of his department, and though, as he knows, there were times when I differed from him on matters regarding the administration of that department so far as my constituency was concerned, at the same time I always attributed to him, as I think the whole country has done, the most honest motives in all his actions, and I never received anything but the greatest personal kindness at the hands of my hon. friend. No man, I think I am safe in saying, of his age in Canadian politics has ever had so distinguished a career in the history of this country. He is regarded by friends and foe alike as honourable, competent and capable. And all those who desire to have competent and honourable men in the government of the country will trust that at some time in the future, in the not very far distant future we may see the hon. gentleman occupying a still more distinguished position in the Government of the country even than he has occupied up to the present time. My honourable and respected friend from Queen's (Mr. Davies) found fault with the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) because he criticised the speech which had been made by the leader of the Opposition and the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), and he said that if those speeches had been disappointing to members on this side of the House, he could assure hon. gentlemen opposite that there was no such feeling on the Opposition benches, and he considered that those speeches had been strong and had been bitter. No one, I think, for a moment will question one part of that statement, that those speeches were at least bitter. If that

is a merit in the speeches of public men, then I think hon. gentlemen on this side of the House concede at once not only that that merit was possessed, but that that merit was possessed in a very great degree, especially in the speech made by the hon. member for South Oxford. But, Sir, there was reason for the bitterness that possessed the souls of those hon. gentlemen. Only a few days have lapsed since a storm, to use the expression made use of very often in this debate, left the ship of state almost in the condition of that ship of state which my classical friend from South Oxford will remember was described by Horace, deprived of rowers and without sails. To-day, following the advice contained in that ode, they have bravely made the harbour, and the ship of state again sails on the sea of Canadian public life, furnished with all its oars and sails and crew, and capable of successfully buffeting the waves of opposition criticism. But the hon. member for South Oxford found fault in his usual manner. It is said that the ruling passion is strong in death, and whatever the reason may be I am unable to conceive, but whenever the hon. member feels especially bitter, he goes out of his way to insult the lower provinces, the maritime provinces of Canada. Just after the election of 1891, it is now historical that that hon. gentleman, then especially bitter at the verdict pronounced at the polls, especially by the overwhelming voice of the maritime provinces against the policy which he had advocated, wrote an article in which he said that the maritime provinces were things all shreds, patches and ragged remnants, that the people had no political convictions, but were simply influenced by promise or money in hand or subsidies for public works. To-day we find the same motives actuating the hon. gentleman. Sir, we find exactly the same vein of thought running through the hon. gentleman's mind, and again he assaults and insults in a manner that I think is without justification the sister province of Nova Scotia by saying that it is the cradle and birthplace of boodlers.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No. I must correct the hon. gentleman, for I did not make such a statement. What I said was, not that Nova Scotia was the birthplace of boodlers, but that Nova Scotia had succeeded in developing the most highly developed article.

Mr. HAZEN. I accept, as I am bound to do, any statement or correction which the hon. gentleman may be disposed to make. Now he has told the House that Nova Scotia has produced the highest type of boodlers in this country. There is the same idea running through the hon. gentleman's mind whenever he becomes especially bitter, for some reason which as I said I do not understand, and he deems it necessary to go out of his way to offer insults to

the lower provinces of this Dominion. I will say no more on this point. No doubt my hon. friends from my sister province of Nova Scotia—the hon. gentleman did not include my province in his remarks—will take him to task for the remarks he has made. I do not wish to protract the discussion. As a member of the Conservative party who believes in the party, in its history, traditions and policy, I think the Conservative party of this country has reason to congratulate itself on the strength of the Cabinet announced to-day. In the first place, we have as a member of that Cabinet an honourable representative of Montreal in the Senate, a gentleman of position in his province, a man who has occupied positions of the highest honour at the hands of the people, and who is a gentleman of the very highest character. In the second place I think it is an immense advantage to the Government and the party, and it will prove of advantage to the country, to have in the Cabinet a gentleman of the strong personality, the great ability and the thoroughly loyal Canadian patriotism of Sir Charles Tupper, who has consented to take a place in the Administration, and in a few days will occupy a seat on the floor of this House. I believe his appointment will be received with applause and approbation not only in the province of Nova Scotia where he is known and honoured as one of the greatest of our public men, not only in New Brunswick and in the great provinces of Ontario and Quebec, where his name is received with plaudits as a man who has done so much in the past to build up their industries, but also on the prairies of the west and in the province of British Columbia will his name be held in respect and prove a tower of strength, being that of a man who was one of the main instruments in building the Canadian Pacific Railway. And not only in Canada, and in every part of this Dominion, but in the great British Empire, in Great Britain itself, where there is no colonial statesman better known or more respected, his appointment to a seat in the Cabinet of Canada will be as heartily welcomed as in this country, and will have the greatest effect in helping to advance the welfare of this Dominion and strengthen its credit at the present time.

Mr. MULLOCK. As I understand, Mr. Speaker, the explanation that the Finance Minister has offered to the House and the country this afternoon of the unprecedented event that happened on 4th January inst., was that a vacancy occurred in the Cabinet in the month of July last and continued until the assembling of Parliament this month. That is the reason assigned in the paper read to-day, and that is the reason as endorsed by the speech of the Finance Minister. Now, if that is the case I venture to question the bona fides of that statement in the light of the evidence furnished in the House, and before the Finance Minister leaves

Mr. HAZEN.

the House I would like to ask him a question and will give him the floor for a brief moment if he wishes to reply. Will he explain to the House and to the country, why, that vacancy having existed from the 8th day of July, he and his colleagues did not resign sooner. I ask him why they postponed their resignations until the Address was prepared and placed in the hands of His Excellency; why they selected Saturday the 4th day of January, and I ask him further whether there was not a combination? Did he notify the First Minister at any time between the resignation of Mr. Angers and the assembling of Parliament, that he and his friends would take such a course if that vacancy were not filled? I pause for a reply. Mr. Speaker, the country is entitled to a fuller statement and a fuller explanation. The Finance Minister has heard my question but he remains silent. He cannot answer the question. I will take the hon. gentleman at his own word for a moment. He told us that they resigned on the 4th day of January because the Cabinet was incomplete. But the Cabinet had been incomplete since the previous July, and I ask, would it not have been his duty as an honourable man to have notified the Premier before the assembling of Parliament as to what he and the other six Ministers intended to do. Sir, we are told now that the whole cause of the strike has been removed by the filling of that one vacant portfolio. The country has not drawn that conclusion, nor has Parliament drawn such a conclusion. The press of the country has not drawn that conclusion, and I venture to say that when we go before the country, as I trust we shall in the near future, the electorate will not draw that conclusion. The question as to whether Ministers may embarrass a Cabinet is one thing, but it is a question now whether the conduct of Her Majesty's advisers will be condoned if it be established to the satisfaction of the public that one member of the Cabinet speaking for them all, has stated on the floor of Parliament for the information of the public a matter that is not true. Is the Cabinet bound to be frank and candid with the country, or is it to be allowed to adopt deception, concealment, and misrepresentation? What is the issue? It is contended that there was a deep laid plan to depose the First Minister and to appoint in his place Sir Charles Tupper, Sr. The Finance Minister tells us to-day that such is not a fact, and that the sole object of the strike was to cause a Cabinet vacancy to be filled in a constitutional way. The First Minister did not draw such a conclusion from the conduct of his confrères. He tells us, that he learned that their object was to strike at him. Speaking in the Upper Chamber last Thursday, the First Minister said in most unmistakable language, that the inference he drew from the paper read in the House, was that it was an attempt to strike at him,

and he proceeded to defend himself and to declare his fidelity to his party. He contended that he had efficiently governed the country. But the Finance Minister tells us to-day that the First Minister was in error, and that he had drawn a wrong conclusion. Did the Finance Minister do what an honourable man would have done and apologize for the vagueness of the language used by him, and which led the First Minister to draw that wrong conclusion? Let me say further, Mr. Speaker, that the action of the strikers since the strike is not in harmony with the statement made by the Finance Minister to-day. Did they assist in reorganizing the Cabinet by allowing the First Minister that free hand which they professed they were willing he should have in order to fill up the vacancies? Why, Sir, the newspapers of the country are full of statements as to the conduct of the strikers during the period of the strike. Instead of allowing the First Minister to fill up the Cabinet, like ordinary strikers they set out their pickets, and whenever the First Minister made progress they succeeded in intimidating any member who would be willing to take office under him. Let me quote a statement from the Hamilton "Spectator," which I believe is a newspaper enjoying the confidence of the Government; a paper the loyalty of which to the Conservative party no one will question. The Ottawa correspondent on the 13th of January writes as follows to the "Spectator":

The seceding Ministers are working methodically and energetically. You might suppose the headquarters of the party was the place they would avoid, but such is not the case. There is generally one, and sometimes two or three of them at a time among the members. Some of the Bowell men expressed the opinion with considerable energy that the men who smashed the Cabinet should carry on their canvassing outside the rooms of the followers of the Ministry. The canvass is becoming a good deal more earnest and serious as the time draws nearer for meeting on the floor of Parliament.

That is the conduct of gentlemen who now say that they desired to give the First Minister a free hand in filling up the vacancies. The Toronto "Telegram," referring to an informal caucus of the Conservatives from the maritime provinces, said:

Foster made a speech that had the effect of stiffening the backs of the seceders.

The Toronto "World" of the 11th January, says:

If Sir Mackenzie fails in his present task it will be because of the adverse influences at work against him.

And so numerous other papers point out that these gentlemen adopted every possible method to prevent the Prime Minister reorganizing his Cabinet. Let me give you the evidence of the Hamilton "Spectator" of the 7th January, which doubts very much the reasons assigned for the action of the strikers:

There is nothing in the explanations to show why the Ministers should bolt just now after giving Sir Mackenzie Bowell and his policy their support even down to the preparation of the Speech from the Throne. It is manifest that the alleged reasons given in Mr. Foster's statement are no reasons at all, and that the real reason for the bolt remains to be guessed at.

That is the statement of an organ of the Government and not of a Grit newspaper. Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. Postmaster General, who leads the Government in this House, stated that he thought the action of the seceders, or the bolters as they are undignifiedly called, in returning to office, would meet with the approval of the country. Let me show the House, so far as I can in a few moments, how far their action has met with the approval of the country, and the quotations with which I will trouble the House will be wholly from Conservative and Independent Conservative papers. The Hamilton "Herald," which, I believe, is an independent journal, said editorially on the 13th of January:

Politicians will learn from it that treachery of the rankest character is not regarded simply as smart politics.

The same paper, on the 11th of January, in its Ottawa correspondence, says:

Conservatives are in high feather. Down with the seven traitors.

The same journal, on the 9th of January, said:

It is just a question for Conservatives to consider, if the men who have proved traitors to one leader, are not quite as likely to prove traitors to another and to the party itself.

A paper published under the shadow of this building, the Aylmer "Sun," of the 9th of January, says:

Many are calling for Sir Charles Tupper to take the helm, as being the one strong man who can command the more unruly and ambitious men who have helped to bring on the crisis.

In this connection let me read a statement made by the First Minister in which he says that the embarrassments of the Government were, in his opinion, not attributable to his weakness, but to the misconduct of his supporters, who made government under him an impossibility, and who were determined to destroy his usefulness and to break up his Government, with a view to securing the succession of some one else. The First Minister's precise words, spoken in the Senate one week ago, are as follows:—

I say that, had I had that loyal support which every Premier ought to have in his endeavours to govern the country, the support that was given most loyally to my late chief, Sir John Macdonald, and to Sir John Thompson, I would have been just as successful in carrying on the affairs of the Government as my predecessors. * * * Had not that jealousy prevailed and the ambition to destroy the usefulness of the Government been so firmly rooted in the breasts of those

with whom I was associated, I flatter myself that we should have been as successful in carrying on the affairs of this country.

In proof of the suspicion that there were conspiracies against him, the First Minister in this same statement says that until the strike occurred, not one single intimation had been given to him that he was the man in the way.

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

After Recess.

Mr. MULOCK. Mr. Speaker, when the House rose at six o'clock, I was proceeding to say that the inference drawn by the public from the action of the gentlemen who withdrew from the Administration did not harmonize with the explanation given by the Ministry to-day: and I must apologize in advance for continuing that line of argument, which is instructive, though perhaps not interesting, and not altogether pleasurable to the gentlemen to whom the references are particularly made. Let me proceed with the evidence, to see whether the statement read to the House to-day, and endorsed by the speech of the Finance Minister, is entitled to credence or not: because, Sir, it is to be borne in mind that we are now testing a most important question in connection with constitutional government, whether or not a Government, or a section of a Government is entitled to represent Her Majesty in the Canadian Parliament who issue to the country statements which are, in themselves, misleading, which are intended to be misleading, and which, in another place, where strict parliamentary rules would not apply, would be characterized as absolutely false. Sir, the First Minister, speaking in another Chamber one week ago, after reading the explanation offered in this Chamber by the Finance Minister, of the reason for the strike of those seven gentlemen, used these words:

Can any of you conceive why, after the opening of the session, after the Speech from the Throne had been given, not only to Parliament, but to the whole country, you should find seven members of the Cabinet sending in their resignations—

Not, as they say to us to-day, because there was a vacancy in the Cabinet, but, as the Prime Minister says:

—simply because they did not like the gentleman with whom they had been so long associated?

I cite the First Minister as a witness against the statements of the strikers themselves. And, Sir, that the issue which I present is the true one, namely, that these strikers concocted a plan for the deposition of the First Minister and the elevation in his place of Sir Charles Tupper, is made abundantly clear in other ways. For ex-

Mr. MULOCK.

ample, there is published in Toronto a paper called the daily "World," which is well known to be under the control of, and, in fact, owned by the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean), and I have no doubt that the communications from Ottawa to this paper emanate from him, or are sanctioned by him; at all events, they are published with his responsibility. So that this extract which I am about to read bears, not only the weight of a Conservative journal, but that of a supporter of the Administration. I find, then, the Ottawa correspondent of that journal, on the 13th of January, writing as follows of the strike:

All this time, however, friends of the bolting Ministers were thoroughly organized, and played a game of checkmate. It is said they intimated to every member who consented or was disposed to join the Bowell Cabinet, that only failure would result.

And then, after alluding to some attempts at reconstruction, the writer goes on to say:

THE BOLTERS GOT IN THEIR WORK.

To-night the friends of the bolters are cock-a-hoop. It is hinted in some quarters that the dissentient Ministers have sent a statement to His Excellency charging the First Minister with misrepresenting their position to him. Report has it also that charges are to be preferred by the bolters against one of their late colleagues. This will take the shape of a statement by Mr. Foster in the House on Tuesday. From present appearances the outlook is a very gloomy one. Charges and counter-charges are being bandied about, with a freedom almost appalling. There is, moreover, lamentable lack of confidence, no one, seemingly, having confidence in his neighbour.

From present appearances, Sir Mackenzie will not be able to fill up the existing vacancies, and this being the case, there will be no alternative but for him to tender his resignation, when, it is expected, Sir Charles Tupper, sen., will be sent for.

There we have his organ giving to us, in advance, a culmination of this scheme. I shall now quote from an important paper, the Hamilton "Spectator," which, I think I am safe in saying, is the leading Conservative journal in Canada, west of Toronto, and a staunch supporter of the Conservative party. This paper, in its issue of the 13th inst., contained an editorial from which I extract the following:—

The unfortunate complications at the capital are due solely to the blunders and wrong-doings of Ministers.

Not to a desire to reconstruct the Cabinet in the way now professed—not in consequence of the Cabinet's being imperfect, as is now alleged, but in consequence of the blunders and wrong-doings of the Ministers. Wrong-doings. What wrong-doings? A conspiracy, a cowardly conspiracy, to depose the Premier in favour of another gentleman. That paper goes on to say:

If disunion and discord reign at Ottawa, if a feeling akin to dismay has consequently spread

throughout the country, it is solely because the men who have been honoured with the chief places of trust and emolument have betrayed the confidence reposed in them and have proved unequal to the task they assumed—so much is clear. Much stronger language might be employed to characterize their conduct.

After some further reference, the writer proceeds :

If they persist in thinking of themselves,—
Not of the constitution.

—and refuse to put principle, consistency, honour and duty before their own interests and their own inclinations, they will be held responsible. They may wreck the party, but, if they do, they will go down with the wreck, and never rise again. The party will survive defeat, and will regain power, but the men who lead it to temporary defeat will never be trusted again.

Here is the language of a staunch supporter of the Administration. Would such language as that be used by a journal supporting this Government, if the action of these gentlemen were as pure, disinterested and straightforward as alleged by the Finance Minister to-day? The Toronto "Telegram," an independent Conservative paper, in its issue of the 11th inst., thus alluded to the conduct of these gentlemen :

The seven mutineers—
Not the seven patriots—

—The seven mutineers forsook Sir Mackenzie Bowell. Their continuance in office under him might endanger their own interests.

That is the inference which that independent supporter of the Government drew from their conduct. The Ottawa "Journal," another independent Conservative paper, said

Mr. Foster's statement puts the ex-Ministers in the light that they have been more loyal to themselves than either to their Premier or their party.

Sir, there is a newspaper published in Belleville, which is said to be the Premier's own organ. I quote now from the Belleville "Intelligencer," in which the following editorial item appeared :—

Following the surprise and indignation which were aroused in the minds of the people, irrespective of party, by the desertion of seven members of the Bowell Administration on the field of battle, come feelings of sorrow to Conservatives that men whom we had delighted to honour could have so shattered our ideals, and disgust at their disregard of the dictates of honour and the feelings of gratitude by which they ought to have been actuated.

The organ of the First Minister in Belleville evidently did not draw the conclusion that these men were solely guided by their respect for the constitution, but drew the inference that they had degraded the honour and principle for selfish purposes. There is an independent journal published in the city of Toronto, known as the "Evening Star." What inference did the "Evening

Star" draw from the action of these gentlemen? Did it draw the conclusion that they had withdrawn from the Cabinet because of this vacancy? That they had been solicitous to have this vacancy filled up and had manifested their supreme respect for the constitution? On the contrary the "Evening Star" characterized their conduct as follows :—

The shadow of Sir Mackenzie Bowell, the Assassinated, will fall upon every caucus and secret council of the party for years. Faith, the sense of security, reliance upon each other, are gone for a generation. Tricks and treasons will be suspected where they do not exist, and will exist where they are not suspected. Haunted by the wraith of a strangled leader, the party house will permit no repose to the red-handed. Peaceful sleep will be impossible, and waking ease out of the question.

The hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), who quoted from Macbeth and conjured up the ghost of Banquo, might much more fitly have compared the bolters to Macbeth who had murdered sleep and peace in their party. The "Evening Star" goes on to say :

The souging of the wind will be ominous; the bellying curtain at the open window will suggest a hidden bravo; the word of a man will be held worthless, and his oath of small value. Before eating, every dish will be tested for poison with the finger-ring of Machiavelli; before sleeping, every couch will be probed with daggers, as in the palace of Henry VIII. Sir Charles Tupper is not the man to lay the ghost. It cannot be done in his generation, nor by one who was accessory before the fact. What is to be done to re-throne Faith and to re-establish Confidence? Shall the men who introduced treachery at the hearthstone be made the heads of the house or sent into exile? Can they be exalted without treachery becoming the whole habit of the ambitious?

Sir, that language was sufficiently clear. Certainly, the writer of that article drew no such inference as the leader of the House to-day desired should be drawn. Again, I quote from the Toronto "World" of the 11th inst. Perhaps the hon. member for East York will give us the name of the gentleman alluded to in the paragraph which I will read, or disavow the article if it was not authorized. The article says :

A Conservative member says—

Is the hon. member for East York at liberty to give us the name?

Mr. MACLEAN (York). I will have to ask our correspondent.

Mr. MULOCK. The Toronto "World" says :

A Conservative member says that they (the seven bolters) made their mistake in acting as if they owned the earth, at least the Conservative section. They overestimated themselves.

Is that the language which should be applied to men who sacrificed themselves on

the altar of their country in defence of the constitution? Perhaps the hon. gentleman can communicate with that correspondent and find out who is this traitor in the camp of the Conservative party. Or is this the true explanation? There is a journal published in the county of Grey, the Meaford "Mirror," a supporter of the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule). Here is a choice piece of reading from this Conservative journal. Where did the editor get his inspiration, can the hon. member for East Grey tell?

Mr. SPROULE. I don't know.

Mr. MULLOCK. No doubt, however, he has drawn it from reliable sources.

Of all the abominable intrigues, treachery is the worst, and Mr. Foster was the last man we would have suspected of playing the role of Judas Iscariot.

Now, as my hon. friend from L'Islet says, the writer of this article evidently did not know the Finance Minister, but he knows him now, and what he does not know of him now he will know hereafter when the conclusion of the drama is reached. The article goes on to say:

But he has put himself on record as a politician willing to sell his birthright for a mess of pottage.

Not willing to sacrifice a mess of pottage for the constitution, but willing to sell his birthright for that article.

Sir Charles Tupper came to this country, ostensibly for the purpose of consulting the Government with reference to the fast Atlantic steamship service. He disclaimed any desire to re-enter Canadian politics.

Then it goes on to intimate that he has been lying in wait, by his presence countenancing this conspiracy.

While we are ready to admit that Sir Charles Tupper is a talented man, still, we by no means think that he possesses the brains of the Conservative party.

I believe there is a considerable portion of the Conservative party of the same opinion.

If he came to this country on a certain mission, let him complete his negotiations with the Government and depart in peace, without seeking to undermine a patriotic leader who enjoys the respect and esteem of his fellow men.

We have never taken much stock in the utterances of Sir Richard Cartwright, but must confess that he voiced the true sentiments of the great Conservative party when he declared in his place in the House that the attempt to undermine Sir Mackenzie Bowell was a vile conspiracy, unprecedented in the annals of British history.

And in support of that statement he has the testimony of the First Minister himself, who repeated it in the Senate Chamber on Thursday last. The article proceeds:

Moreover, Sir Richard pointed out, that when Mr. Foster and his colleagues were telling the people that there were no dissensions in the Cab-

Mr. MULLOCK.

inet, that all was peace and brotherly love, they were deceiving the electorate. There is no getting over the fact that Sir Richard Cartwright is right in the conclusions he has formed. If not, Mr. Foster and Dr. Montague should rise and explain.

There is another leading Conservative journal published in the city of Kingston. I am only going to give a few of many extracts that I have. The Kingston "News" says:

Sir Mackenzie Bowell has more pluck and will power than the seven bolters put together. How they can reconcile their present attitude with their platform utterances during the recent bye-elections, certainly passes our comprehension. We cannot for a moment entertain the suggestion that they have been hypnotized by what the Opposition press is pleased to term "the Tupper dynasty." What then? They have either seen a new light on the Manitoba school question with amazing suddenness, or they are panic-stricken by the reverses in Quebec, and are ready to desert principle for power and pelf.

Not, you will observe, that they accept office and its emoluments only for the sake of the constitution. Again I quote from the independent Conservative paper, the Ottawa "Journal":

A leading Conservative with an intimate knowledge of the situation, makes the statement that the rupture between the Premier and his Cabinet was influenced by the tight hand which he kept on the finances and his repugnance to enter into nefarious contracts which would supply the Conservatives with funds to bring about their return to office. The party understand that their condition is anything but promising for another term, and that unless money can be raised by the granting of subsidies, their case is almost hopeless. It is generally and very naturally claimed that Sir Charles Tupper's fiscal policy would be the very opposite of that followed by the existing Administration, and that, in the language of the gentleman, "money would flow like water."

This paper is of the opinion that one of the objects of this conspiracy is to impose Sir Charles Tupper upon this country and through him to cause public money to "flow like water." There is a paper down in the city of Quebec known as the Quebec "Chronicle." I am sure the Postmaster-General will recognize this language. At the time this was written the Postmaster-General was one of the few who stood by the Administration. There were some of them who stood by the Treasury and the offices, and were anxious to do so. Now, I would ask the Postmaster-General how the editor of this paper came to publish such treason as this against the Administration. The hon. gentleman is not included in the charges here made, as these are directed against certain of his then ex-colleagues. Alluding to these seven patriots it says:

They resigned in a body, and left him—
that is the Premier—

—to find out why they deserted their seats, in the newspapers. They did not even favour him

with a copy of their reasons. They, who fawned upon him twelve months ago, left him without saying so much as good-bye. They do not say to his face that he was incompetent to lead them. They allowed him to find that out later. They told the House of Commons the story of their desertion, and a wretched story it was. No one sympathizes with them. No one can respect them. They are politically lost, and their treacherous conduct should keep them out of politics forever. If they are ruined politically and socially, as they ought to be, the lesson will not be lost.

What does the Postmaster-General think of his organ writing such treason about the seven colleagues he has embraced? There is another paper, published in West Bruce, and called the Kincardine "Review," a Conservative paper. This paper hardly draws the conclusion from the action of the bolters that the Finance Minister desires should be drawn. But, not to discount this choice morsel, I will quote it directly:

The crash that was inevitable has come, and now we must get to work to clear away the wreck. Premier Bowell is to-day the most picturesque figure in the whole Administration. In his hands he holds the key of the situation. The gang of cut-throats and rebels that he had in charge has gone out on strike, after having failed to get him to resign. * * * We are almost sorry now that Sir Mackenzie, having got rid of a section of the malcontents and mischief-breeders, cannot remain at the head of the Conservative party, but he cannot do it, pledged, as he is, to remedial legislation.

Seven of his Ministers have resigned, and the idea was to get Sir Charles Tupper to take his place, when the seven could come back under the new Premier. Now, we take time by the forelock, and protest against any Bowell Ministers being placed in any new Cabinet formed to evade the pledges given in favour of the Roman Catholic minority.

Then after some further reference to that subject the article proceeds:

We have had too much of the Tupperts, Haggarts, Ouimets, Carons, Montagues and the other peanut politicians who have risen to high places in the ranks of the Conservative party. Let us not deplore any extremity into which the Government can fall, if we can get rid of such men by it. We have had enough of them. Let us try some other material now. Surely, the womb of the Conservative party has given forth hundreds of men better fitted to command the fortunes of the most progressive political elements in Canada. Looking back at the past, we are constrained to remark, that we should not have expected anything else than what has happened. For the past ten years the petty politicians of the party have been crowding out the men who would have developed into statesmen. Until last week we had an aggregation of men who could run a circus all right, but not a country. The party stood by, and, with a self-complacency that was criminal, saw those fellows advance step by step to places of power and prestige. Since the party refused to get up and slay them can we not rejoice in secret that they have turned on each other after the example of the cats of Kilkenny?

You observe, Mr. Speaker, how frequently the feline race affords illustrations on an occasion of this kind. The article proceeds:

For the past year they have done nothing that we could honestly and sincerely applaud.

There have been some speeches as we sometimes hear in this House, but not honest and sincere. The article proceeds:

Now they have done something that challenges our admiration.

What do you think it was?

But our glee is tinged with regret that they did not kill themselves long ago. But we should not expect too much of them. They dilly-dallied in everything, even in their self-destruction.

The sentiment this writer gives expression to, is an echo of one that is attributed to certain enemies of a Prime Minister of England, Lord Castlereagh, on the occasion of his death. unkind enemies remarked that the only useful public act in his life was the cutting of his own throat by himself. The writer of the Kincardine "Review" will have reason to regret, I presume, that the victims have recovered from their only pretended attempt of self-destruction. I will not exhaust the patience of the House further.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Read the other letter over again.

Mr. MULOCK. Since the hon. gentleman wishes some more extracts, I will proceed. I will only trouble the House with a couple more. One is from the Toronto "World" of yesterday; and this, Mr. Speaker, is not what a Conservative member said, this is what the editor himself said yesterday. To-day he is applauding and endorsing the utterances of the Finance Minister when the Minister of Finance said that the sole and one reason for the withdrawal of the seven gentlemen from the Cabinet was because a portfolio remained vacant from the 8th July last until 4th January. They wish the public to believe that is not a true statement. Before this utterance of to-day by the leader of the House, this article was published. It is entitled "The Ottawa Crisis."

The most remarkable political crisis known to Canada reached a point of settlement last night. A movement was begun on January 2nd, the day Parliament met, to depose Sir Mackenzie Bowell from the Premiership of Canada.

The movement was begun to depose Sir Mackenzie Bowell from the Premiership of Canada. How did the editor of the "World" discover that fact?

An hon. MEMBER. By his wits.

Mr. MULOCK. That is a very good source of information, and I have no doubt his wits guided him correctly on this occasion. And if so, how does it harmonize with the statement of the Finance Minister? The article goes on to say:

Two days after, the movement came to a head, and seven of his Ministers sent in their resignations. Last night six of these Ministers agreed

to return to office and to continue under Sir Mackenzie; and with them came as a new colleague the man who, they intended, should succeed the man whom they had set out to depose.

And yet a Minister of the Crown to-day made the statement on the floor of this House which I wish parliamentary rules would allow me to characterize as the truth would warrant. Sir, this question has found its way into the pulpit. The ministers of the Gospel have drawn their conclusions as to what has taken place. Have they drawn the inference that these resignations were for the purpose stated to-day by the members of the Government? Not many have spoken yet, but I have one utterance in my hand now. The Rev. Dr. Campbell, of Montreal, is stated by this journal to have characterized their action as follows. I read from this extract:

In his sermon, on Sunday, in St. Gabriel Presbyterian church, of Montreal, the Rev. Dr. Campbell was very forcible in recommending his congregation to do their duty in the approaching civic elections, and deplored the position into which the city had been forced. He then turned his attention to the recent doings of the Cabinet, which he declared were humiliating to every citizen who loved his country and desired her advancement. "Every one of us," continued Dr. Campbell, with impressive solemnity, "should go upon our knees and confess our sins to God because of the shortcomings of the nation."

Well, Mr. Speaker, this afternoon we had the utterance of the leader of the House. Since then, one journal has spoken. The paper I am to read from now is the Ottawa "Journal," published under the shadows of this House, a journal in sympathy with the Conservative party, a high toned journal, a journal which I think is governed by a conscientious desire to promote the interests of the country, even if mistaken as to the party it supports. This paper, has, since the utterance of the Government to-day, given expression to its view of the situation, and though the article is somewhat lengthy, I would ask the permission of the House to read from it. Under the heading "The Reconciliation" that paper says in its issue of to-day, January 15th:

Prior to the public announcement of the split in the Conservative administration, the "Journal" voiced a feeling which was wide-spread, that the Administration had not since the death of Sir John Thompson done itself credit in the government of the country. The gravest count in the indictment made was that the members of the Administration had subordinated statesmanship and public interest to their personal rivalries and suspicions. The ink was hardly dry on the charge before a startling proof of its truth was furnished by the resignations of half the Cabinet on professed personal grounds.

The Ministers who resigned have returned to the fold, and the question is, How is the situation to be looked at now? If there was any truth in the indictment made prior to their resignations, that truth remains. More, it was accentuated by the resignations. The people, by the nature and time of the resignations, were given more reason than ever if they had any at all, to condemn the

Mr. MULOCK.

Conservative politics of the preceding year, and more reason to feel that men who had subordinated patriotism and statesmanship to the petty game of office could have little claim to public confidence.

Since that, on the back of that unpleasant culmination, has come the reconciliation. Ministers who alleged that a Premier was so incompetent that their patience was forced to an end at a most trying juncture for both country and party, take office under him again. Is that honesty or patriotism? To consent again to consign the weal of Canada to a man whom they a week ago pronounced unfit. True, a new and strong hand has joined the Government. That does help to excuse them to their party, but does it matter much to the country, which must judge the Government, not by one man, but by its collective personnel and record? On the other hand, we have a Premier who, so painfully attacked, retorts upon his former associates by counter depreciation; yet, within four days, reinstates them as his colleagues. They cannot retract what they said: that would show lying, either then or now—they have not had time to discover an honest mistake—yet the Premier replaces them in charge of the country's interests—these very men whom he four days ago stigmatized as conceited and treacherous. Is that justifiable as regards the nation?

The good of the party! What of that, if it be bad for character and honour? The good of the party! What of that, if it be bad for the people? Is it a wrong to the country that, from the bolters' point of view, we should have an incompetent Premier? Yet they accept him. Is it a wrong to the country that, from the Premier's point of view, we should have treacherous men in the Cabinet? He forces them on us. If either side is right, the country is wronged. If both are right, the wrong is worse. If neither be right, where are the brains the country pays for? We have cause to look to the mother country for standards of public honour, and is there any good reason why our standard should be lower? Is it possible to imagine a British Cabinet presenting the appearance the Canadian Cabinet does to-day, or British Ministers acting as our own are doing? We doubt whether a man in this city will say, yes. They would feel as keen a concern for party good, but, surely, their concern for their own honour would be their first consideration, and their country is the better for it.

Party good! A fine thing when it means public good. If a stout suspicion arises that to those who use the shibboleth, party good means chiefly office, and salaries, and patronage, and swelled heads, the people need to consider whether the time is ripe to give that party a trial in the fire and burn out some of the dross. Is the time ripe now? The answer is, of course, partly dependent on how far the country's general interests may be affected—the national ideal and the business welfare. As to business welfare, the Liberals argue very strenuously that their advent to power will not cause any violent upsetting of trade or manufacturing, and it is a matter for the people to think over. As to the national ideal, there is some reason to think that a change in office would accomplish national good. Since Confederation, now nearly thirty years ago, the Liberals have had four years of power. For eighteen years successively, up till now, they have been in opposition. They are Canadians, but they have had no Canadian responsibility. Possibly a term of responsibility would promote their virility as Canadians, their pride in

the Canadian heritage, their broad-mindedness and patriotism. If this be so, if the Dominion can be thus better solidified, the people would be well repaid indeed by chancing something as regards their business interests in an effort to purify the atmosphere of government and point the attention of parliamentarians to higher purposes and standards than seem to be fashionable among the Conservative leaders just now.

I will not utter my own sentiments—it is not necessary to do so. As I said at the beginning, I say now, at the conclusion of reading these extracts, I have quoted but from Conservative sources or independent Conservative sources. This is the testimony of the people, or a portion of it, as to the interpretation placed upon the action of the seven men who, on 4th January, rebelled against the Crown and the dignity of the country, the seven men who went on strike, as the public journals describe, like common millmen in the busy season, and put out pickets to prevent a reorganization of the Cabinet unless it should be reorganized on the lines of their conspiracy. And so I regard this question to-day as higher than any party question, greater than any party question, it is a question that strikes at the very root of constitutional government in Canada. Shall Governments be formed to-day of these elements, of men without confidence in each other, of men who have banded charges against each other, of men who are incapable honestly of trusting each other, and coming together and deliberating for the promotion of those common objects for which alone the Cabinet exists? Sir, the public have drawn their inferences. The public will criticize the utterances of the Minister to-day as the culmination of their disgrace. The general public will withdraw respect from the Administration, if they ever had any, for being, if I might use the word, pettifoggers where they should have been statesmen. I will not use that expression if it be not parliamentary, but that will be the impression of the public with respect to such action as we have seen, and which we see now. One more scene in the drama is to be enacted. Within a brief period, we are told, the Premier, the honoured Premier, who, with all faults, bears a spotless name, a name which certainly stands for high personal integrity, will be deposed, and the late High Commissioner put in his place. Does anybody in his senses believe Sir Charles Tupper was not brought out here as part and parcel of this conspiracy? Are Premiers picked up by accident in the streets of Ottawa? Was it an accident that he who is to become Premier of Canada was sitting here, giving counsel to this movement, receiving communications, and, at the same time, with uplifted hands, declaring that he would have no communication with those unworthy stewards? Was it an accident that he was here? Sir, so many accidents as these had an origin in a common design. Was it an accident that

seven of those gentlemen signed a document at the same time? Was it accident that those seven minds all came to the same conclusion on the same day, at the most critical period in the fate of a Government, after submitting the Address to the House, and before its adoption by this House? The public have drawn their conclusion, and if this conspiracy culminates, and if Sir Charles Tupper takes the place of Sir Mackenzie Bowell, these hon. gentlemen will have succeeded, for the moment, they will, by their intrigue, have usurped honour and virtue, and they will have, if they succeed in the country, have set an example which must operate to the injury of Canada. As the virtue of a few men has been the foundation of great nations, so the misconduct of men may be the occasion of the disintegration of the most powerful peoples.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, I only desire the attention of the House for a few moments while I discharge what I conceive to be a duty on my part in reference to the subject which is under discussion this afternoon. I do not propose, as you, Mr. Speaker, can well understand, to attempt to deal with many of the statements that have been made of an entirely personal character to-day, and not in a very good temper at that, but I do desire, so far as I can, briefly to put myself right with this House if possible, and as I feel confident I can do with the Conservative party in this country at large. Hon. gentlemen opposite who have to-day so unfairly pressed their criticisms by not accepting the two statements which have been read to this House in connection with the recent crisis, have taken that advantage which was of necessity open to them if they were so desperate as to stoop to it. By suggesting suspicions, and then assuming that these suspicions were founded on fact, they made serious charges which could only be satisfactorily and fully met if each of the seven Privy Councillors who deemed it his duty to retire from the Cabinet of Sir Mackenzie Bowell, was free to say all that happened at the Council Board. Those gentlemen in the front Opposition benches well know the disadvantage under which the seven gentlemen laboured, and they made the most of it, I fully admit. Every Privy Councillor opposite knows how difficult it is for any Minister, either in Canada or in England, to put himself fully and freely before his countrymen in regard to the particulars that may concern any event which has induced him to retire from the council of the nation. Be a man's object ever so high, be his principles ever so good, there is, we know, grave difficulty before him in the vindication of any step which he takes in that direction. But, Mr. Speaker, although our lips are, to a large extent, sealed, I think I am justified in referring to two features which prominently stand

out in this discussion. These features concern, first, the character of the gentlemen who left the Cabinet, and, second, their action as regards the Governor General, the representative of the Queen in this country. In regard to the last feature, and, perhaps, the most important one, it ought to be sufficient to fair-minded men to know, that after explanations have been exchanged between those gentlemen and the present Prime Minister, and submitted to His Excellency the Governor General, there has been found nothing inconsistent with, and nothing derogatory to, the dignity of the Crown, to prevent the Queen's representative taking back to the councils of the country, six of these gentlemen. As regards the other facts which immediately concern the action taken, I am justified in saying that it clearly appears, that whether the point was put before the Prime Minister at the proper time or not, or whether or not wise judgment was used by the seven as to the mode in which they took that important step; they were actuated by two strong reasons and two good reasons. First, the interests of the country, as they conceived. And what did the interests of the country demand? The interests of the country, in their opinion, demanded that remedial legislation, if necessary, should be put upon the Dominion statute-book this session. In their opinion, it was impossible to rely upon hon. gentlemen opposite to do this. In their opinion, the Conservative party alone could be expected to enact that legislation, and, in order to do that, the Conservative party must be strong in the Government, and the Government, in their opinion, never required greater strength than on the present occasion. The proposed legislation is admittedly unique, and it has evoked all kinds of opinions in the two parties. The Conservative party, it is known, was not united and did not speak as a whole upon that subject. No one ever pretended they did.

Mr. LAURIER. The Minister of Finance said the very reverse this afternoon.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Not at all. I am speaking of the Conservative party, but the Minister of Finance spoke of the Government, which has always been united on the question. The Cabinet of the Conservative party has been a unit on that question from the first moment down to the present, and only differed last spring in regard to the time when that legislation should be adopted. Regarding that principle of the Conservative party as the most important that was at stake this session, those seven gentlemen, under the circumstances which existed, believed that it was absolutely impossible to hope for success in the promotion of any measure of that kind, while such an extraordinary state of affairs should exist, as that a representative of the French Catholics of the pro-

vince of Quebec could not be found to join them in their efforts to obtain that legislation. At the time when the seven gentlemen left the Cabinet, it goes without contradiction that the Government had failed to obtain the services of a representative of the French Catholics of the province of Quebec, in place of the Hon. Mr. Angers, who retired over six months ago. More than that, the gentlemen who took that step believed, and I agree with them to the full, that the Government, as it stood, could not, for that, and other reasons, hope to command the support of their own party, be it ever so strong, numerically, in this House, and could not, with a difficult measure, hope to surmount the difficulties and obstacles that stood in their way. We may have been wrong, we may have been entirely without the necessary faith, and without the proper and fair confidence that we should have reposed in the members of this House. These points do stand out as the reasons which actuated these gentlemen in taking the important step they did. And if any doubt ever entered into my mind as to the wisdom of our course, seeing that we had for an object the success of the legislation to which we were pledged, and the success of the Conservative party at the next general elections, I, for one, would have all that doubt removed on account of the extraordinary spasms which have taken possession of hon. gentlemen opposite since that crisis occurred. Instead of letting loose their invective, instead of breaking through all parliamentary rules, instead of transforming this chamber into a veritable bear garden, these gentlemen should have been as happy as the day is long, and a crisis such as they have described should have brought them joy instead of sorrow. Hon. gentlemen opposite, instead of acting so as to resemble the hyena, which laughs when it is mad, and descending to the vile epithets and gross abuse, mingled with coarse jests and jokes, would have arisen to the dignity of the occasion; buoyed up with hope, they would have presented an entirely different front. But from the very beginning of this episode, they have confirmed me at any rate in the wisdom of the course I have taken. I believe remedial legislation is safe, I believe the Conservative party is safe, and I believe these gentlemen understand that just as well as I do. While they would have preferred things to remain as they were at the beginning of this session, while they hoped for success under that state of things, hope has been banished. Even the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), who last session had assumed an almost genial role, has so lost control of himself that he now in his rage and anger finds it impossible for any one on this side of the House at present to engross his attention, and travel outside of this chamber to abuse an old and absent opponent. Well, it is not for me to defend—thank God,

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.

it is not necessary for me to defend—the hon. gentleman to whom I refer against the assaults of the member for South Oxford. I comfort myself with the reflection that all the great Canadians, notably two who have passed away, who have won all the honours obtainable in Canada at the hands of their countrymen, and have seen their labours crowned with the approval of Her Majesty, have had the inveterate hate and abuse of the member for South Oxford. There was nothing too vile for him to say of Sir John Macdonald in season and out of season. In his rage and violent conduct towards that hon. gentleman, he lost the little hold he once had upon the people of this country. Indeed, on these topics, I think on both sides of the House, as well as in the country, he is regarded as a political madman, absolutely devoid of reason, absolutely without any ability to see any virtue whatever in the character of those hon. gentlemen. Sir John Thompson was the last to come under his lash, and I think a certain scene in this chamber is familiar to hon. gentlemen present, because the hon. member for South Oxford had then audacity enough to say those things before his opponent's face. The scene is familiar to this chamber when the late Sir John Thompson administered to that gentleman such a castigation that he was not only civil to Sir John Thompson for the remainder of his life, but acted with wonderful success the part of a gentleman in this chamber from that time down to the present day. So I think the hon. gentleman may do as a certain animal has done—gnaw at those files for a considerable time without hurting the files. The hon. leader of the Opposition even departed from his usual happy vein and disclosed the secret of his mortification at the changes which have taken place. He referred to purposes of selfish aggrandizement, and imputed sinister motives and the most unworthy objects. But against this suspicion or charge, I set in bold contrast the fact that there were gentlemen willing to risk their positions and even the good opinion of their fellow countrymen, in order to obtain the success of their party; and they have, I think, the gratification to-night to know that though that task was difficult and the trial hard, they have been afforded abundant and cogent proof that their action was wise and has resulted most happily for the Conservative party and for the interests which that party holds dear. The hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies) was not content to deal with the present so-called crisis alone; but he drew largely upon that fertile imagination of his for some facts in connection with myself. He went so far as to say—though I think one of his colleagues corrected him later—that I left the Cabinet last spring. I have to tell the hon. gentleman that there is no truth in that statement. I have to tell the hon. gentleman that the only time that I have resigned from the Cabinet of this

country I have remained out, and I am out to-day. I do not regret the step I have taken. I have parted from the Cabinet, as has been already explained, for the benefit of the Cabinet, and I am willing to admit it. I never assumed to be a strong man in that Cabinet; but I have proclaimed my belief in the principles of the Conservative party, and my ability faithfully and loyally to represent the interests of my county, and my willingness to do what I can to promote the principles of the Conservative party. I differed from my colleagues last spring, there is no doubt about that, and there is no dishonour in the fact. I had strong views as to the course that ought to be adopted; but finally, after the discussion of those views, I abandoned them and was willing to remain and did remain a member of the Cabinet. Do the hon. gentlemen opposite, who sat in the Cabinet for a few years, brief though the time was, pretend that no strong differences of opinion prevailed between them? Do they wish the people of this country to believe that in the discussion of matters pertaining to the interests of Canada, at the Council board, unanimity is ever to be found. Sir, we know that at that board the strongest differences exist, and have to be discussed and solved; we know that cabinets are continually occupied with the discussion of differences of opinion. But on the occasion to which I refer I can say that I played neither part of a skulker, to use the dignified language of the hon. member for Queen's, nor the part of a coward. I had the courage of my convictions then, I have the courage of my convictions now, and in that respect I differ from the hon. member for Queen's. I never ran away from this House, as the hon. member did last session when there was to come before it this important and vital question concerning the minority of the people of Manitoba.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman is fond of making false accusations. I tell him that the charge which he has made to-night is false.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I tell him that the charge that he has made is without any foundation. He said I ran away from this House. That is not correct.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I shall not bandy words with the hon. gentleman, but I shall tell him that he disappeared from the chamber of this House—that he was not present during the discussion which took place on the question of the policy of the Government as regards remedial legislation; and if there was a time when a man professing to be the coadjutor leader of the Liberal party for the maritime provinces ought to have been in this House, surely it was on the occasion of the discussion of a grave constitutional question of the kind to which I refer. Whether he ran

away, whether he walked away, whether he vanished into thin air, or what became of him, this we know, that his delightful presence was a thing of the past when that subject came to be discussed, and he never reappeared on the scene. So that, so far as that is concerned I think that the hon. gentleman had better not dwell upon the subject of cowardice or courage until we know a little more definitely what he is going to do on this question which he rolled around his tongue so gently to-day. I was more embarrassed by the very generous and kindly praise showered upon me from the lips of one of the representatives of St. John (Mr. Hazen) than I was by the personal and gross language used with regard to a gentleman very closely connected with me, and which fell from the opposite side of the House. Now, one word more and I have done. The hon. gentleman from St. John was good enough to speak of me in a way that I in no sense deserve. But this I do say to the House, that while I never claimed to have the qualities that could make me worthy to fill either of the high offices of state which I have held, I do submit with confidence to those gentlemen who have had anything to do with me in either of those departments, that no man ever struggled harder in either to do his duty and to serve his country: and it is only fair on my part to say that while no man in either department, perhaps, ever more required assistance, aid and co-operation from the officers under him, none ever had greater assistance, and none was ever more loyally supported than I was, both in the Department of Marine and Fisheries, and the Department of Justice. It gives me a great deal of pleasure, when cutting my connection with those departments, to say that the men in both of them deserve at the hands of Parliament the highest consideration. From the top to the bottom of the staffs in those departments I do not know where—and I say it seriously—you could find better men, and it has astonished me that Canada has been able to obtain as high and efficient a class of officials as I have had to do with for the paltry stipends that are paid to them yearly.

Mr. PATERSON. I shall not take up much of the time of the House in discussing the question we have before us, and I trust I shall say nothing very offensive to the gentleman who has just taken his seat. He knows the kindly feelings with which I regard him, and I should certainly be very unwilling to wound his sensitiveness in any measure. He seems, certainly, a little sensitive to-night, and I think a little unfair. He is, however, in rather a peculiar position, and, therefore, allowance must be made. I have read in the public press, and no doubt it is correct, an account of a personal interview with the hon. gentleman himself. In that interview, on being asked the question whether

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.

he supposed there was any possibility of Sir Mackenzie Bowell forming a Government which would exclude any of the dissentient Ministers, he replied:

It is inconceivable to suppose that any of the six Ministers would enter the Cabinet if the rest were left out, under circumstances which in the slightest degree reflected upon him.

And the hon. gentleman has told us that he was left out.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I was not one of the six, but one of the seven.

Mr. PATERSON. Yes, Mr. Speaker, but the hon. gentleman could not understand how it was possible for one of these to go back without all going back.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I think the hon. gentleman said one of the six.

Mr. PATERSON. Yes; the hon. gentleman might say, perhaps, that there was not room for him, but I think that sticklers, as they pretend to be, for a full and complete Cabinet, the position of Solicitor General is still open; and even if it were deemed that his paternal ancestor was an abler man than the hon. gentleman, the party certainly would have considered that he was able to fill the position of Solicitor General, and thus have completed the Cabinet, the completion of which they deemed to be of so much importance. Now, the hon. gentleman tells us that it is rather difficult to speak freely concerning matters which come before the Privy Council. Taking up the reason given the other day for the resignation of the seven gentlemen a few days ago, that reason differs in my judgment from that now given, namely, the necessity of the Cabinet being filled. That was the point dwelt upon by saying that there was a very important measure to which the Government and each individual member of the Government were solemnly pledged, and knowing that they were in honour bound to see it carried through, they found it absolutely necessary that the one vacant position should be filled; and the Prime Minister, having failed to fill that one position, these gentlemen, in order to implement the solemn pledges that they had given with reference to this matter, attempted to remedy this shortage of one individual by making the Cabinet shorter still by seven members. That was a very strange position to take. If the Cabinet were unable to deal with that question because there was one vacant portfolio, did these gentlemen, pledged in all honour, as they say they were, to carry through that measure, hope to strengthen the Government in carrying it by handing in their resignation before the measure was submitted. We are making history in this country, and I am afraid the history we have

been making in the last few days is history that will not redound to our credit. Sir, if it may be said that truth has fallen in our streets, it would be sad to know that it fell because it was slain by men in high places. But while I wish to use no language too strong, I ask you, Mr. Speaker, and the members of this House if they can reconcile the different statements which have been given to this House solemnly by hon. gentlemen opposite. To-day they tell us that they have the authority of His Excellency the Governor General for informing this House that the reason they resigned was because the Cabinet was not complete, inasmuch as one portfolio was not filled. Sir, that was not the reason which was given to this House in a carefully prepared and written document, in which all the gentlemen who had resigned, concurred. In that document, the reason assigned was because the Prime Minister was not strong enough to lead a Government and conduct the Government. What this country wants is that there shall be truth and honour in high places, and whether there has been honour in high places, let these gentlemen say who sent in their resignations to the Prime Minister, alleging as they did in this House, that the cause was his unfitness and incapacity to administer the Government of this country. These gentlemen who gave that as their reason should have adhered to it and not have come before us to-day with another and a totally different reason. The hon. Minister of Finance asked that the very words he had used should be given, and said it was not fair to paraphrase his statements. Well, in order to gratify him, let me read the reason he gave for these resignations :

We have lost none of our confidence in the sound and healthy condition of the Liberal-Conservative party of Canada, or of our belief that it embodies a policy which the majority of the electorate considers essential to the continued welfare and progress of the country, or of our faith that under firm and prudent leadership it will come back triumphant from the polls. Though with many misgivings we agreed to enter the Government under Mr. Bowell, in succession to Sir John Thompson, we have, nevertheless, unitedly and loyally striven to the best of our ability to make it strong and efficient, and it has been with growing regret that we have seen our efforts result in a measure of success less than that for which we had hoped and striven.

Going on, he says :

This we have repeatedly urged upon the Premier, with the result that we found ourselves face to face with Parliament having a Government with its numbers incomplete, and with no assurance that the present Premier could satisfactorily complete it. Under these circumstances we thought it our duty to retire, and in this manner to pave the way, if possible, for the formation of a Government whose Premier could command the confidence of all his colleagues, could satisfy the Liberal-Conservative party that its strongest elements were at its head, and im-

press the country that it had a Government which was united and had power to govern.

Now, Sir, I have read the very words, as desired by the Finance Minister, of the reasons given to this House, and I would ask if it is not there emphatically shown that the reason that these gentlemen resigned was that the Prime Minister was not strong enough in character, was not mentally fit to guide the affairs of the country and discharge the duties pertaining to government. To-day they come down and assign a totally different reason. They give as their main reason what at first was only given as a proof of the incapacity and weakness of the First Minister. They tell us now that it was because the Government was not full that they sent in their resignations. And the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, feeling the weakness of their position, seeks to strengthen it by alleging that a question was then pending before the Government which made it absolutely necessary that this one member who was lacking should be in his place. How is it that they have secured that one member now when they could not secure him before? The Prime Minister, in his speech in the other House, which I have in my hand, in dealing with this question, stated that it was not without precedent for the Government to carry on the affairs of the country without its membership being full. He cited two instances, and one of the instances the vacant portfolio had been held by Sir Charles Tupper, the great man of the Conservative party, the only man, apparently, in the Conservative party who has strength of character and ability to re-unite and lead forward the Conservative host. The Prime Minister said :—

The record shows that Sir Charles Tupper resigned the office of Minister of Railways and Canals on the 24th day of May, 1884. Parliament met the following January. The Hon. John Henry Pope was not appointed to succeed Sir Charles Tupper until the 28th September, 1885, so that through one long session of six months some of these very gentlemen sat in the House, while one of the portfolios was vacant—that, too, one of the most important in the Cabinet.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to interrupt him?

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Certainly.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I interrupt in order that the point that I alluded to may be understood, because the hon. gentleman does not understand it. I do not deny that there are precedents for vacancies in the Administration during the session, even running through the whole session. That was not my point. The difficulty I had, as I believe was the case with the other gentlemen who acted together was not that there was not a precedent for the vacancy, but that it was impossible for us to promote successfully legislation in re-

gard to the minority claims in Manitoba when it appeared we had not the confidence of so large a section of the party, that we could not as it appeared then obtain a representative of the French Catholics of Quebec in place of Mr. Angers. That is the frank statement I sought to make.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Is it not a strange thing, then, that two members from that province should be willing to assume the responsibility of not having a third Minister in the House of Commons? The Prime Minister had to have recourse to the other Chamber, where their seats are absolutely safe, and where so much patriotism prevails. Did the hon. gentleman, might I ask, make an honest effort to combine the seven bolters—if I may use that expression—in an effort to induce some Senator to accept the position?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The vacancy was in the Senate and the vacancy has been filled.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). That is not an answer to my question. Was an effort made by the seven bolting Ministers prior to their taking the final step of resignation, to induce some Senator—

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I cannot take that question seriously.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The reason they have assigned is one that will not bear consideration for one moment. Another instance was given by Sir Mackenzie Bowell of a portfolio being vacant during the whole session, when, I think, the hon. gentleman himself and many of his colleagues sat in the Cabinet without raising any protest against it. Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that when it was possible for a place held by the great Sir Charles Tupper to remain vacant during the whole session, it was dangerous, in fact fatal, to any measure proposed before this House, that one of the portfolios should remain vacant? Is Mr. Desjardins of the Senate a greater man, a more powerful man, than the great Sir Charles Tupper, whose praises we have heard so loudly sung to-day? Is the Cabinet saved, is the country saved, only through the patriotism and self-denial of Hon. A. Desjardins of the Senate? That would seem to be the position we are placed in at the present time. Well, Sir, it is a serious matter to trifle with Parliament. The honour and dignity of Parliament should not be trampled upon by men who hold the places of advisers to His Excellency the Governor General. I am sorry to say that the records are before us showing that this is not the only time that these gentlemen have come before us telling us tales irreconcilable in their nature. Both statements cannot be true, yet both are made by themselves. They went on the public platform in this country and made declarations that they were united as one man, that there

Mr. PATERSON (Brant.)

was not a shred of disunion among them—the very expression that was used—

Mr. MONTAGUE. Hear, hear.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). And now the hon. gentleman says "hear, hear." I ask him, then, if those who attended these public meetings will not say that the men who addressed them lied to them when they told them that? I ask him how these gentlemen are ever to face the public again and tell them that there is not a shred of disunion among them, when a late member of the Government told us no longer ago than yesterday that one of their number came to him and asked him to join him in driving another of their number from their midst. Sir, when they go before this people again and tell them anything, does the hon. gentleman suppose that their words will carry any weight? Not that I want to throw any opprobrium upon them, but, Sir, the country's welfare is concerned in this matter. The people of Canada do not want to have it recorded and go forth as a fact that the men who advise His Excellency in this country are men who, on public platforms, will state to the people what their own words give the lie to when Parliament meets in this House, as I claim has been done by these hon. gentlemen since this session opened. Well, Sir, let us see what these gentlemen said with reference to this very Prime Minister, whose weakness and incapacity they assigned as a reason in this House for sending in their resignations at the time they did. What do I find in reference to that matter? I read what the hon. Secretary of State said with reference to this same Prime Minister, Sir Mackenzie Bowell; I read from the "Mail-Empire" report of December 7th, 1895, at Orangeville:

He compared the present Premier with the leader of the Liberal party. For seventeen years Sir Mackenzie Bowell has been an honoured member of the Government who had successfully administered the affairs of his department. During all these seventeen years not one mark could be placed against Sir Mackenzie's honesty, either as a Minister or as a public man.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Hear, hear.

Mr. LANDERKIN. That is the reason you wanted to kick him out.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I do not accuse my hon. friend opposite of giving still another reason; that reason is assigned by my hon. friend:

Not only that, but the Premier has always favoured the broadest lines of policy, and had always supported plans for Canadian progress and development.

A broad man, a large man, the very man the country wants. He could not have given a description of a stronger intellect, and a more progressive statesman than he gives there:

In addition to that, first as Minister, and now as Premier, he had invariably supported the strengthening of the ties which bound them to the dear old motherland.

And that ought to have made his person almost sacred to those patriots who wave the flag on every occasion. Well, Sir, we read again from a speech of this same gentleman at another place. But I forgot to mention, Mr. Speaker, that this opinion entertained by the hon. Secretary of State in reference to the Prime Minister's capacity and ability, was entertained as late as December 7th, 1895. Well, about a month before that, namely, on November 15th, 1895, when at Smith's Falls, he had as much faith, for the "Mail-Empire" reports him as bestowing a warm eulogy upon Sir Mackenzie Bowell:

Whose character, after seventeen years of administration of one of the greatest departments of the Government, had not shown one trace of dishonesty or incapacity. He reiterated the statements of Mr. Foster and Mr. Haggart, ridiculing the assertions that the Cabinet was disunited.

He was not even content with saying, as they said, that the Cabinet were united, but according to this report, he ridiculed the statement the Cabinet were disunited. Sir, we read how his praises were sounded, how the hon. gentleman carried the audience with him, treating as the most preposterous thing it was possible to conceive of, the accusation that in that happy family there was anything but union and brotherly love existing in its fullest and most complete sense:

When the time came, they would show their opponents, that, far from this being the case, they were united as ever they were, and they would win, not only in constituencies where they had formerly been successful, but in constituencies where victory had not previously been with them.

Well, that is a prophecy. We have not had the general elections, but we have had some since then, and the prophecy has not been very well fulfilled. Then we had the hon. Mr. Foster, no longer ago than November 15th, speaking at Smith's Falls:

After stating that, from reading Grit literature lately, he had come to the conclusion that the grand old Conservative party outside of Ottawa was disunited, demoralized and on its last legs, it was a great relief to him to know that this was not the case, at least in Smith's Falls, and to find present the remnants of the grand old party, and to feel the old-time enthusiasm, and to know that he had been simply reading a concoction of lies.

Then he went on to say:

He had another reason for being glad to be present. They had, perhaps, learned also from the Grit press that their Government at Ottawa was disunited and demoralized. Having reassured him, as they had, that the Conservative party outside of Ottawa was in good health, he was there to demonstrate to them, with his two col-

leagues that were present, and also for those that were not present, that the Liberal-Conservative Government now as of old was a Government which was united on its different lines of policy, without one shred of disunion.

"Without one shred of disunion," "united now as of old." And that gentleman, when he made that statement to the public, and whose words ought to be taken anywhere, according to the revelations made in this House, was aware of the fact, I suppose must have been aware of the fact, that one of his colleagues in that Government believed that another colleague in the Government was base enough to write anonymous letters in order to do him harm. If he did not know it, we had it told here, that one of the colleagues in that Government endeavoured to secure another colleague to lend his influence to drive some member out of the Cabinet. But, Sir, we know more than that and we know it from the lips of the Prime Minister of this country whom, though they have charged with incapacity, they have not yet ventured to charge with uttering falsehoods. And what did he say? In his speech delivered in the Senate, commenting on a paragraph of the statement that was read in this House by the Finance Minister, the Premier said:

I shall not comment upon that statement.

That is, that they were loyal to him:

I could, however, characterize it in other language than that in which the sentence is couched, and more than that, with no less degree of truth. Then, they stated that they waited upon me repeatedly in order to insist upon the Government being strengthened in its personnel. That is quite true. But is there a single word in any of those sentences which would lead you or might lead others, after what has been whispered about the country, to conclude that it was the head of the Government they were striking at, instead of the other members of the Government.

This united family:

It is true, they waited upon me and pointed out the necessity of strengthening the Government, as all governments ought to be strengthened, and according to my own views, I should acquiesce in any proposition of that kind, and there were intimations at those interviews pointing to certain members of the Government who, in their opinion, ought to go out.

Yet these hon. gentlemen stated in the face of thousands of Canadians that all was harmony, peace and union in their ranks. The Premier continued:

Certainly they never meant themselves, because from their statement one would suppose that all the wisdom was concentrated in their craniums. But there were others of whom they had not such exalted opinions; had they intimated to me that I was one of them, I should have made way for them, but I heard nothing of that until two days after Parliament had met. I make these explanations in order that I may show the nature of their anxiety for the strengthening of the Government.

It will seem almost incredible, in view of past history, that the Government should be so lowered that public men having access to His Excellency and whose duty it is to give him advice, should stand upon public platforms in this country and make the declarations they did make, knowing all the facts that have been revealed to us in the statement made by the Prime Minister. Take, again, the document presented to-day, which gives the lie to the document those hon. gentlemen presented the other day, and what do we see? The reason assigned was that a constitutional point was involved—the necessity of filling a vacant portfolio. Do they believe that, do they wish the House to understand such to be the case? If they do, I only ask them how they came to frame a sentence like this:—

I may say, in the first place, that there is no disagreement between ourselves and the Premier on any question of public policy, trade or constitutional.

There was no disagreement, they say in the carefully prepared document, on any constitutional point; and yet to-day it is a constitutional point, because a portfolio was not filled. Sir, there is to-day proof against those men, their statements have been contradicted by the words of the same men who uttered them. I choose to put it in that way. What do they say further? In the document that Mr. Foster submitted to Parliament, they said:—

Though with many misgivings we agreed to enter the Government under Mr. Bowell in succession to Sir John Thompson, we have, nevertheless, unitedly and loyally striven to the best of our ability to make it strong and efficient, and it has been with growing regret that we have seen our efforts in a measure of success less than that for which we had hoped and striven.

This is the solemn statement made in this House by one of His Excellency's Ministers, that they had unitedly and loyally striven to make the Government strong. That is the statement of one of the Ministers, who said he spoke for the seven who went out. I put against the statement made by Mr. Foster in the House of Commons the statement made by the Prime Minister, the head of the Government of which Mr. Foster was a member, and I leave hon. gentlemen, if they can do so, to reconcile these two statements; and if they cannot be reconciled, what is the inevitable inference, what is the conclusion to which we must be driven? It is a conclusion the character of which must appear shameful in the eyes of any man who loves his country. I now submit the Prime Minister's statement, as follows:—

Even in the present trying circumstances, I hesitate not to say, and to say it boldly,—I would not have stated it had not such reasons been given to the House as the cause which induced these gentlemen to leave the Government—that had I that loyal support which every Premier ought to receive in the arduous duties

Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

incident to the governing of a country, such support as was given most loyally to my late chiefs, Sir John Macdonald and Sir John Thompson, we would have been just as successful in carrying on the affairs of the Government as my predecessors, though not possessed of their measure of ability or political tact.

What more follows a few lines further down:—

Had not jealousy and a determination to destroy the usefulness of the head of the Government been firmly rooted in the breasts of those with whom I was associated, I flatter myself that we should have been successful in carrying on the affairs of this country.

Were ever such words printed? The Premier stated that if they had only been loyal to him he could have carried on successfully the public affairs; but instead of that, they were disloyal to him, they were endeavouring to undermine him, and they added to the excuses put forward that this course was taken because the Premier was mentally unfit to carry on the affairs of this country. The Premier said, "had not jealousy and a determination." It was not an idea sprung upon them all at once, but it is a determination. What did the First Minister say further? He said it was "firmly rooted." That means that it had been growing for some time and was not a sudden impulse. This is the Cabinet in regard to which the Secretary of State, the Minister of Finance, and other men who are called Ministers of the Crown, knowing these facts, have nevertheless gone on public platforms and told the people that all was peace and harmony, and everything was going on well. I do not wish to continue the discussion further. I simply wish to emphasize these facts, not that I wish to bring discredit on the Government, for I wish in the interest of this country it might not be possible to read such extracts from the speeches of Ministers as I have read, but the hope of this country now lies in the future, and we want the people to know the exact truth that has come out so far, if we cannot know the whole truth, with respect to the manner in which the affairs of the country have been conducted, so that it may be possible for the people to say that the men who are selected by the Crown to give advice to the Crown, the men who occupy the highest positions in this Canada of ours shall be men who will have at least common honour, common decency and common regard for the truth.

Mr. CASEY. It is alleged, now, Mr. Speaker, that all the brains have gone back into the Cabinet, and I am not sure that the occurrences of this evening do not give some colour to the assertion. The brains of the Minister of Finance have been taxed to some extent in making it appear that what he said some time ago, as the mouthpiece of himself and his six colleagues did not mean what it meant to the natural ear, but that it meant something quite different from what

he intended it to mean at that time. That was not much of a task for the Finance Minister to perform. It is no new duty for him to have to explain away and change the meaning of words he has used across the floor of this House. It is so much his habitual attitude that his brain cannot have been severely taxed in undertaking it.

But the late Minister of Justice, Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper, who has staid out of the Cabinet, felt bound, with that constitutional distension of the cranium which he legitimately inherits from his distinguished parent, to give further explanations, and further proofs that the bulk of the brains has gone back into the Cabinet. He gives us a totally new version of the reasons why the wreckers wished to wreck the Bowell government. The Minister of Finance told us that they wished to wreck it merely because it was weak, and that it was weak because the Premier was not fit to be a leader. But the Minister of Justice gives another and a most startling reason. He says that the bolters went out of the Cabinet, because they did not believe it was honest in its desire to carry out remedial legislation, and because they were afraid that the Liberal party were not to be trusted to pass such legislation if they came in.

Whatever may be the truth of that remark with regard to the intentions of the Liberal party, it is certainly news to the people of Quebec, to learn that the bolters comprised that particular section of the Cabinet which was especially anxious to carry out remedial legislation. We are asked to believe that the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Haggart), the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Montague), the Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster), and the other four who went out, comprised the section of the Government especially anxious to pass a remedial law. Well, I am sure that nobody with a quicker perception of the ludicrous than the late Minister of Justice would have asked us to believe anything of the kind. It is a strain upon the credulity of the country which amounts to the ridiculous.

He further said that the Cabinet was not united on this subject and never had been. We have had the proof read by my hon. friend (Mr. Paterson); we have had the proof in the papers every day and we have had the proof across the floor of this House, that it was pretended that the Cabinet was united upon this and every other subject. But now, this bolter who did not come back, feels himself free to tell us that there were constant dissensions in the Cabinet about remedial legislation. We fully believe him in that statement, but we must not be asked to believe him when he says that it was the anxiety of the bolters to carry a remedial law which induced them to burst up the Cabinet.

Again, the late Minister of Justice tells us that the Government as it stood could not

hope to get the support of its own party in this House upon that question. What section of the Conservative members was it in danger of losing? Was it the French-Canadian section? The hon. Minister insinuates that the Government could not count upon that, because they could not fill the vacancy in the Cabinet from the province of Quebec, and that they wanted another leader to do so. If he had not, to use his own classical phrase, run away from this discussion, by leaving the House, I would like to ask him: which was the more likely to secure a Minister from the province of Quebec, a Cabinet with Sir Mackenzie Bowell at its head, or a Cabinet with Sir Charles Tupper at its head? Every one knows that Sir Mackenzie Bowell has the confidence of the people of the province of Quebec to a greater degree than Sir Charles Tupper, to a greater degree than the Minister of Finance, to a greater degree than the Minister of Railways and to a greater degree than the Minister of Agriculture. It is insulting to the intelligence of this House to tell us that the bolters wished a change such as has taken place, in order to obtain greater strength in the province of Quebec. And, as if to show how absurd it is, it turns out that, immediately it was known Sir Mackenzie Bowell was in undisputed control of the Cabinet after the bolters left, he got a Minister from the province of Quebec. It was no thanks to the bolters, and no thanks to Sir Charles Tupper, that Mr. Desjardins entered the Cabinet, for his entry was decided upon during the days that the bolters were out, and when it was believed to be impossible that they could ever return.

The ex-Minister of Justice attacked the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) and other members on this side of the House for their conduct in this debate. He accuses us of turning the Chamber into a bear garden, and says that we used foul epithets towards gentlemen on the other side. I deny those charges entirely. I say that it is the members of the Cabinet themselves who have used foul epithets against each other. It is the Council Chamber that has been turned into a bear garden, and not the House of Commons. It is the members of their own household who have defiled the domestic hearth. It is they who have told the people of this country how little they think of each other.

Did any member on this side of the House declare that he believed the Minister of Agriculture was mean enough and scoundrelly enough to write an anonymous libel against the Postmaster General? No, it was a member of the Government though not of the Cabinet (Mr. Wallace) who made that statement. Did any member on this side of the House charge the member for West York (Mr. Wallace) with the somewhat Irish intention of trying to forge an anonymous letter in his name? No, it was

the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Montague) who said that he believed the member for West York (Mr. Wallace) had himself written the anonymous libel and was trying to put the blame on him.

These are charges made against each other by men who know each other intimately; who have sat together around the council board, or were consulted outside the council room on Government matters, and who ought know each other's character well. These men had better take care lest the people of the country at large should believe both sides, and come to the conclusion that what Ministers say about each other in this Billingsgate style, is true all around. It matters little whether these charges be true or false, or whether the Minister of Agriculture, or the member for West York (Mr. Wallace) be capable of the scoundrelly conduct with which each charges the other. What remains absolutely certain and positive is that those men who claim to be united, who claim to be sitting in unity around the council board, sworn advisers of the Queen, sworn brethren to each other, entertain such opinions of each other as to make that kind of suspicion of each other possible.

It is certain, Mr. Speaker, that these gentlemen have opinions of each other which would prevent them from associating as gentlemen, in any ordinary capacity, outside of the Council Chamber. If they believed such things, the one about the other, they could not meet in peace and harmony—on a board of directors, in a club, in a drawing room, anywhere where gentlemen congregate or have business to transact; and it is they who have blackened each others' characters in this House, not we on this side. That is where the bear garden is, where the violent hates exist.

Then, Sir, the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) told us one bit of truth when he said he believed he had helped the Government by going out. That is quite possible. It is natural for him, also, to believe that he helped the Government and the country by securing the entrance of his father into the Cabinet. It is quite proper for him to believe that, and quite natural; but he must not expect the country to take everything he says on that subject without a grain of salt, without, perhaps, a barrel of salt.

The people of this country knew Sir Charles Tupper, senior, when this young gentleman was too young to have much appreciation of the older gentleman's position in public life. They have not forgotten what they had learned to know about him at such great expense, and his son in this House must not be too thin-skinned. It is not his fault that he was born the son of Sir Charles Tupper, senior; it is not his fault that he and his father are both in public life; and he must take it for

Mr. CASEY.

granted that he and his father will be discussed individually and collectively, as if they did not belong to the reigning dynasty of Canada. They will be treated exactly as other politicians are; they will be discussed with the same severity, and will have to put up with the same criticism.

I was referring to the hon. gentleman's belief that his father would be a source of strength to the newly reorganized Government. It must be noted that the entrance of that gentleman is the only new source of strength that has been secured to the Government by the return of the bolters. Now, what reason have we for believing that that gentleman's entrance will be a source of strength to the Government, and a benefit to the country?

As to Sir Charles Tupper's past record, the House would not bear with me in going into much detail just now, but whatever it be, we know that for the last nine years he has been out of Canadian politics, with the exception of one ill-advised, indecent, irruption into our politics as a paid Government servant during the elections of 1891. He has been living in England in luxury at the expense of the taxpayers of this country, associating with the aristocrats of England, forgetting his connection with what to him may seem the local politics of Canada. He has evidently not been taking treatment to reduce the measure of his hatband while there—I use this phrase about the hatband, merely to describe that state of self-appreciation which is supposed to extend the measure of a man's head. For we know that he granted an interview to a reporter of the "Mail and Empire" a few days ago, in which he displayed a most exalted opinion of himself and his importance to Canada and the Conservative party.

It is worth while to place on record this utterance of this man who was then the most-highly-paid public servant of Canada, and with the least to do for the money he received. After explaining how he had been called in to consult Sir Mackenzie Bowell, he says:

I assured Sir Mackenzie that I had approached the consideration of this question wholly from the standpoint of altogether subordinating every personal and private consideration to the exigency of what I believed the party and the best interests of the country required; that if I were prepared under those circumstances to enter his Government, I thought he, animated by the same considerations, ought not to allow his personal feelings towards any gentleman to influence him. The only thing, I said, that could induce me to re-enter parliamentary life at all was the belief that an overwhelming proportion of the Liberal-Conservative party in Canada believed that I could be of great service to the country in the present emergency by taking the leadership; that I assumed he would be animated by the same feelings, that of considering alone what the interests of the party demanded, and that the only inducement I could possibly have to enter his

Government, even temporarily, would be to reunite and consolidate the great body to which we belonged, and which had accomplished so much for Canada.

Now, Sir, here we have this public servant, who had been awaiting developments here, ever since the business for which he had been summoned to Canada was done, to see what would turn up—a veritable Micawber looking for an opportunity to reinvest his talents in Canadian politics—an investment which, in the past, has borne for him the most tremendous and undue financial profits. We have, I say, a gentleman in that situation, talking as if he were a little tin Jupiter, the only resource, the only saviour of the Conservative party—who would only condescend to take a place as Premier of the Canadian Government under the belief that he could save Canada by so doing, and that he could bring back all the mutineers in his new crew.

Witness the condescending tone he adopts towards Sir Mackenzie Bowell, towards the chief whose servant he was, as High Commissioner in London. He told Sir Mackenzie Bowell, speaking as one away up to one down below, that he would condescend, on certain terms, to come in. He thought that with the mutineers at his back he would be able to enforce these terms; and, Sir, the circumstances have proved that he has been able to enforce them.

He gave his chief distinctly to understand that he would only go into the Government on condition that after the Address was passed he would become Premier, and leader of the party. That is a point on which we have not received proper explanation from the Government to-day—a point on which we should have explanation.

Is it understood that Sir Mackenzie Bowell or Sir Charles Tupper is to be the actual leader of the party, when we come to the elections? We want to know whether a conspiracy between a public servant and a set of Ministers whom their own leader denounced as treasonable, and unreasonably jealous of himself, has been a full success or not. We want to know that, and it is very hard to make it out from all the changing incidents that have characterized this crisis.

It has been a great series of events: First, resignation; then, recrimination; then, reconciliation; then, reorganization. But, oh, Mr. Speaker, there is one thing there has not been, there has not been renunciation, on the part of anybody in connection with the whole affair. The Minister of Finance would have us believe that there was renunciation—that the bolters were giving up something great and grand, when they gave up their key of the streets and took refuge again in the comfortable old lodgings which had housed them so long.

But unfortunately for them they have an organ in this city which must have drawn the inspiration for the article I am about

to read from some member of the bolting party and which has given away the whole secret to the public. It says:

Sir Mackenzie Bowell, so far from having given up in despair the task of recruiting the depleted ranks of his Cabinet—a denouement which most of the political wiseacres have been predicting since Friday last—is believed to have provided himself with a pretty fair outfit of fighting men. These gentlemen who have been offered portfolios during the late unpleasantness will be pleased to hear how they are designated by the party organ:

Such at least was the report about the House of Commons, a report which certainly intensified anxiety as to the outcome.

They were anxious because they heard that the Premier had succeeded in forming a Cabinet? That was a strange cause for anxiety amongst patriotic Conservatives, I should think!

So long as the prospect of Sir Mackenzie's failure held out, many of the party seemed to be satisfied that all would come out right in the end, on the principle, probably, that all's well that ends well.

Here we have the Government organ telling us that the Conservative party regarded Sir Mackenzie Bowell's failure to form a Cabinet as a good ending that would make up for any sort of failure in the way by which that end was attained. All would be well if only he could fail to form a Government. But here comes the gem of this statement by the Ministerial organ:

But the possibility of a successful attempt to reconstruct the Cabinet, although minus some of the party's strongest element, was regarded with grave apprehension.

Evidently the formation of a successful Cabinet would disrupt the party!

And it is possibly on that account, that simultaneously with the announcement of Sir Mackenzie Bowell's success in getting a new Cabinet together, there was noticed a very general and decided disposition among the party leaders to bring about a speedy reconciliation of existing differences.

Compare this naive, and, I believe, true explanation, with the cooked explanation of the Finance Minister across the floor. He says it was done to save the party, but the "Citizen," the inspired Government organ, says it was done to save the bolters. They got in out of the cold, as quickly as they could, because they were afraid Sir Mackenzie was going to form a Cabinet without them. That is probably the exact situation of the case. Then the "Citizen" continues with a sub-heading:

THE HUSTLE BEGINS.

The work of mediation was readily undertaken by men who on Saturday were content to allow matters to drift towards what they considered to be the inevitable and perhaps undesirable result of the disruption. A regular hustle of stalwarts

set in, and in an hour or so the habitues of Parliament were enjoying communion with the common secret that a reapproachment had been effected and that the crisis was at an end.

I am not a good enough English scholar to know exactly what it may be to enjoy communion with a secret, but, at all events, the point is that everybody was glad and happy to find that the hustling stalwarts had succeeded, and had managed to hustle in again out of the cold. The Minister of Finance and the still more stalwart Minister of Railways, and the passably stalwart Minister of Agriculture, hustled for all they were worth, and did get back again before the door was finally shut in their faces.

Mr. Speaker, a kaleidoscope is a very pretty toy, which shows many remarkable things to him who uses it. There is a lot of broken scraps and rubbish in the interior of this toy, but by a combination of crooked reflections in mirrors, an appearance of solidity is given to this broken mass of atoms when you shake the tube. The political kaleidoscope has been shaken up again, and the mass of incongruous atoms within it has been made to seem to adhere in a solid and cohesive mass. But it is nothing but an optical illusion.

There is no real cohesion between the members of the Cabinet, and the very next jar that occurs will separate the atoms and leave nothing but a disorganized mass of rubbish again.

How can there be union amongst men who, on their own solemn declaration, read in this House and printed in the "Hansard," have no respect for each other? How can there be union among Ministers who, on their own statement, have no respect for their leader? How can there be union between a Premier and his Cabinet who, he says, have a firmly rooted jealousy of himself? How can there be union among men who have proven that they have no respect for themselves?

The action of the bolters in going back to that Premier whom they first betrayed and then insulted—their action in begging to be taken back into his Cabinet—shows that they have lost all respect for themselves as they did for him. There can be no union, no solid reconstruction, in such a Cabinet as that.

I expressed, on a previous occasion, across this floor, my regret, for the sake of Canada, that such things had been possible in the Cabinet, as were stated by the Minister of Finance on behalf of the wreckers. I expressed my sympathy for the chief who had been betrayed, and who now, with the pistol at his head, has been induced to sign a statement of the causes for taking back the bolters, which we know to be contrary to the truth. I have now to express my regret that this mutiny has been successful. Like my hon. friend from South Brant (Mr. Paterson) I cannot feel any pride in the political institutions of Canada when it is possible for such schemes to succeed for

Mr. CASEY.

the time being; but I have yet an abiding faith that when this scheme comes to be tried in the furnace of a general election; when this Cabinet, got together by such improper means, has to face the electors of Canada, the whole construction will come to ruin, and those who have been the authors of the disruption will go down to posterity branded with the accusation that they have ruined the Conservative party of Canada, and disgraced the politics of this country.

The only good which is likely to spring from the series of political crimes that have taken place is this, that all those who have taken part in this mutiny, this wrecking scheme, have committed political suicide and erased their names from the list of those who will be remembered as benefactors of Canada, and to that extent the political atmosphere of the country will be cleared and its political health greatly improved.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 10.15 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 16th January, 1896.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

VACANCY.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to inform the House that I have received notification of a vacancy having occurred in the representation of the electoral district of Cape Breton by the resignation of David McKeen, Esq. I have accordingly issued my warrant to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to make out a new writ of election for the said electoral district.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. FOSTER. I move, with the consent of my hon. friend's opposite:

That questions and notices of motion be deferred until after the consideration of His Excellency's speech at the opening of this session.

Motion agreed to.

ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HIS EXCELLENCY'S SPEECH.

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

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, in rising to move that a humble address be presented

to His Excellency the Governor General, I must crave the indulgence of the House on account of the physical incapacity under which I am suffering this afternoon. This duty devolves upon me under peculiar circumstances. I presume this is the most important occasion on which Parliament has been convened. The constitution, which has been sufficient for all the purposes of ordinary government in this country, is now put to its most severe test. It would have been much more satisfactory had the most important matter which had called this Parliament together, been settled amicably by the Government of Manitoba. Such has not been the case, and there now devolves upon this Parliament the duty of exercising as a Parliament of final resort, the corrective jurisdiction which is vested in it by the constitution of the country. In approaching the discussion of this subject, I cannot do better than refer in the briefest terms to the historical facts of the question. In the first place, Sir, as is well known, in the territory which is now the province of Manitoba, and which was then a portion of the Hudson Bay Territory, there were existing denominational schools, schools of Protestant type and schools of Catholic type; and at the time this constitutional compact was made and the province of Manitoba was formed, it was agreed between the people of that country and the Government, of the day, that a certain Act should be passed by Parliament and certain provisions should be incorporated in that Act, guaranteeing these denominational schools. It turns out, Sir, that since that Act has been passed it has been found that the intentions of the parties were not fully embodied in the agreement. According to the statement of the Lord Chancellor of England, the constitutional compact does not embrace the intentions of the contracting parties. Not only was that intention clearly understood at the time, but immediately after the constitution of Manitoba was framed and that district was formed into a separate province, its legislature, as one of its first acts, embodied that agreement in a statute whose spirit, for a period of about 20 years, was universally adopted and acted upon. In 1890 that legislative agreement was cast to the winds; and now this Parliament, after the necessary preliminaries have been taken, in the exercise of our corrective jurisdiction, will be called upon to remedy the injury that has been done to the minority in that province. I say, Sir, that it was regrettable that the legislature of Manitoba did not of itself, acting upon generous principles, remedy these evils. It has not seen fit to do so. When this matter was first brought to the notice of this Government in 1894 by petitions from that province to this Government—and I refer to this to rebut the contention that has been made throughout the country that this Government has acted in an arbi-

trary manner, that it has been inspired by a coercive spirit—on that occasion, Sir, the declaration that was made to Manitoba was a most pacific one. It appeals entirely to the good sense of its Government and to their patriotism, and it is very much to be regretted that it was not received in the spirit in which it was made. The last clause of the Order in Council then passed by this Government runs as follows:—

The committee beg to observe to Your Excellency, that the statements which are contained in this memorial are matters of deep concern and solicitude in the interest of the Dominion at large, and that it is a matter of the utmost importance to the people of Canada that the laws which prevail in any portion of the Dominion should not be such as to occasion complaint of oppression or injustice to any class or portion of the people, but should be recognized as establishing perfect freedom and equality, especially in all matters relating to religion and religious belief and practice; and the committee, therefore, humbly advise that Your Excellency may join with them in expressing the most earnest hope that the legislatures of Manitoba and the North-west Territories respectively may take into consideration at the earliest possible moment the complaints which are set forth in this petition, and which are said to create dissatisfaction among Roman Catholics, not only in Manitoba and the North-west Territories, but likewise throughout Canada, and may take speedy measures to give redress in all the matters in relation to which any well-founded complaint of grievance may be ascertained to exist.

That, Sir, was a moderate course to pursue. There is nothing there that savors of coercion in the exercise of the constitutional rights of this Government; and I find no fault with the Government of Manitoba, either, for having planted themselves particularly upon the plea of provincial autonomy. The document containing Manitoba's answer is an able one. It is not, I contend, in harmony, however, with the spirit of the constitution. Again, when forced to act, the Government of this country, in the exercise of the function as a quasi-judicial body, heard the complaints, made another Order in Council, expressing their opinion, and directing what was necessary to be done in the interest of the minority in that province. This was also refused to be complied with by the Government of Manitoba. Still desiring the difficulty to be settled by that province, the Government again invited the province of Manitoba to make concessions. The reply to that invitation is one of which I do complain. It is an evasive reply; it does not grapple with the difficulty. It declares, notwithstanding the constitution has invested in this Parliament remedial power, the Manitoba Government have expressed their determination that they will not allow the Federal flag to float within the province of Manitoba in respect to this matter. They have opened their guns upon every portion of the Federal fortress, with this result, that we are called upon to undertake, during this session, a very unpleasant

office indeed. With this brief statement of the facts, I shall proceed to discuss what to me are the salient features of the question. In the first place, I deny the constitutional contention of the Government of Manitoba, and I affirm broadly and positively the doctrine that there is in this constitution of ours no such thing, no such constitutional principle, as provincial autonomy. The principle of provincial autonomy is a principle of unquestionably wise policy. It has to be adopted, no doubt, as a matter of legislative policy, but as a question of constitutional policy and principle, it does not exist. In making this statement, I know I am taking strong, and, it may be thought, novel ground. Let us look into the history of the constitution and see whether that history supports it. At the time the Confederation was formed there was a grand purpose in view. That purpose was what? It was to collect and bind together a series of scattered and detached provinces, and to make them an organized whole. In order to do so, the provinces had to sacrifice what they had, they had to sacrifice provincial autonomy; and when the framers of the constitution were looking about for precedents, they looked first to the British constitution. In the preamble of the British North America Act, it is said that the provinces desired to be confederated under a constitution similar in principle to that of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland. If this statutory declaration is true, what do we find? There is no such thing as local autonomy, there is no such principle as local autonomy in the British constitution. Englishmen, Irishmen, Scotchmen and Welshmen in all things are absolutely under the control of the Imperial Parliament. We may therefore regard this statutory statement as being rather the prompting of patriotism than of truth. The real prototype of our constitution is that of the republic to the south of us. If the founders of our constitution had determined to preserve the principle of provincial autonomy they might have adopted, not the constitution of the United States of to-day, but of the old federation which preceded it. That constitution was one of the most abortive which history records. It provided for no strong national government and ended in failure. The present constitution of the United States had shown its power; it had power to triumph over sectarian animosities, race antipathies and diverse territorial interests. It had also shown its weakness. That weakness consisted in the inadequate control of the central Government over the states which composed the union. The fathers of our constitution seeing its strength, determined to adopt its strong features and to avoid its weak ones, and therefore in moulding our constitution they did away entirely with the principle of absolute provincial autonomy. In the first place, in regard to the constitution of the local legislatures; an integral part of the

law-making power of the province is a lieutenant-governor appointed by the federal government, to which he is responsible. In the next place, each and every Act of the local legislature can be disallowed by the federal authority, the federal government being in each case responsible to this Parliament. These two features standing there contain a declaration of the supremacy of the federal government, a declaration that the dominant power in this country is the federal power, and that the genius of our constitution is the federal genius. Particularly in regard to the subject of education, what do we find? It is treated as an exceptional subject. Generally it is relegated to the local body, subject to the federal power of disallowance, but in respect to denominational rights and privileges subject to the exercise of a corrective power that is vested in the federal government. This power which is vested in the federal government, in the case of Manitoba, whose constitution in that respect is on the lines of the general constitution of the Dominion, goes with the power to legislate given to her. The very Act which gives her power to legislate controls that legislative power in this respect, and the government of Manitoba has as much right to deny the power to this Parliament to legislate with respect to the criminal law, or to legislate with respect to promissory notes, or in regard to any one of the subjects of jurisdiction which the constitution confers on the federal power, as it has to deny to this Parliament its right to exercise its jurisdiction in regard to the matter of schools. This departure from the American constitution was made by men of no ordinary calibre. I question whether there ever sat as a board, charged with the duty of framing the constitution of a country, a more able, experienced and patriotic body of men than those who gathered in the Council Chamber of the old Parliament Building in Quebec. They were men selected without respect to party; they represented all parties, all religions, and both nationalities in Canada, and what those men in their calm deliberations determined on is the basal rule of our national life. It cannot on any particular occasion be departed from without resorting to the principles of revolution itself. But while it is conceded that this constitution does confer upon the federal parliament the powers I have mentioned, it is denied that there is any occasion for their exercise. I will point out this fact, that the School Act of the province of Manitoba affords the only possible ground for this Parliament's interference. The legislature of Manitoba has gone from one extreme to the other. They have swept away every vestige of denominational right or privilege. The power must be vested in this Parliament for some purpose, and no human ingenuity is equal to suggesting a case in which it is right and proper for this Parliament to intervene.

if that case is not now before us. But it is said that there is no grievance in that country; that there is nothing imposed on the Catholic conscience which is a violation of the principles of religious liberty. Now, Sir, there may be an infringement of the rights of conscience which is negative, as well as an infringement which is positive, and if you say in respect to religious matters a man shall not do so and so, in principle the infringement of the rights of conscience is as great as if you say he shall do so and so. The infringements are but different phases of the one objectionable principle. Now, Sir, look for one moment at the legislation which we have there. In the first place, the legislature of Manitoba lays down in the portion of the law of 1890 which relates to religion, that it shall be the duty of the teacher to teach with the consent of the trustees, religion of a certain type. It is true that this religious teaching is in its positive aspect colourless,—that it is an abstraction. But the Catholic conscience is not satisfied with that. The Catholics want something beyond it. In juxtaposition to this clause they have, strange to say, inserted a clause prescribing that the Act shall be entirely undenominational. The legislature has invited the Catholics to feast. That feast is one which satisfies the Protestant palate, and it says to the Catholics: If you are not satisfied with that feast you may leave the banquet hall. Not only on that ground is there an interference with the rights of the Catholics of Manitoba, but there is the main interference which I have mentioned, in relating the history of the case. There was understood to be guaranteed to the Catholics by the solemnity of the constitutional contract certain rights and privileges with respect to denominational schools that existed at the time of the union; and although the Privy Council of England have said that there were no such rights and privileges known to the law; yet, as I have pointed out, the Chancellor of England in the argument of the school case declared it is evident from reading the document itself that there was something which was not incorporated in it by which rights and privileges supposed to be guaranteed were not guaranteed. That was an error of the draughtsman. Now, Sir, I ask this House if it has come to this: if we are to plant ourselves behind an error, and to say that inasmuch as a certain privilege was not properly embodied in the constitution, that we will tolerate sharp practice, and standing firmly by the letter of the law refuse the minority their rights. I say that if we should do that we would be committing a great breach of faith with the people of this country. We would be committing a breach of faith which this country cannot afford to be guilty of. We have a standing to maintain. We must be revered at home, we must be respected abroad; and if that respect is to be merited, and if that reverence

is to be maintained, then there is but one principle to live by: that each and every man or set of men in this country shall be true to the other in respect to those matters that lie at the basis of the national compact, and which by the solemn terms of allegiance they are pledged each to the other to stand to, and to abide by. I have great faith, Sir, in the people of this country. I believe that when they rightly understand this question there will be no difficulty in the way of our doing justice. I anticipate that when Manitoba thoroughly understands the action of this Parliament she will abide by the constitution most reverently, and that this troublous question will then, soon be happily solved. How can it be otherwise? Why, Sir, in order that the other portions of Canada should be true and loyal to Manitoba what have they done for her? In order to work out the grand principle of nationalism in this country, the older provinces of Canada have poured from their treasury into that western province. All that we ask of Manitoba now is, that she should respect this feeling of nationalism, be loyal to the principle of federalism in the constitution, and do nothing that will outrage the religious sentiments of the minority in Manitoba, and of their fellow citizens in every province of this Dominion. I have very much pleasure, Sir, in referring to another article in the Speech from the Throne, that, in relation to the favourable condition of our trade and commerce. It is a pleasure to know that during the last six months ending in December, that while the increase in revenue has been about a million and a quarter dollars, the decrease in our expenditure has been about six hundred thousand dollars, giving a difference for these six months alone of about \$1,800,000. It is also a pleasure for us to know that the imports and exports of this country, so far as the statistics are to hand, afford evidence that the trade of the country, and that the fiscal policy of the country have been such, that notwithstanding the peculiarly unfavourable condition of trade throughout the world, our trade and finances are in a healthy condition in Canada. Both our imports and our exports are increasing. That is a highly satisfactory state of affairs. I would refer, Sir, for a moment to that paragraph in the Address which speaks of the delimitation of the boundary between Alaska and Canada. It will be a pleasure to this House to know that the matter is almost satisfactorily consummated. It is a subject for congratulation to the world that the two great nations upon this continent, bound to each other by ties of race and political institutions, should be willing to calmly submit to a mutually selected commission, those difficulties which agitating other nations are unfortunately generally settled by a recourse to arms. It is a remarkable thing indeed that we, lying to the north of the

United States, and notwithstanding the numerous disputes which have arisen concerning our boundary, have invariably settled them, not by the sword, but by that more philosophical, Christian and civilized method of arbitration. It is to be hoped that in other controversies between Great Britain and the United States the same kindly feeling which has prevailed in respect to our boundary questions, will display itself, and that never shall the good feeling and harmony existing between the two nationalities be impaired or sacrificed. Now, Sir, in closing I desire to say that this great question for which this session has been specially called together, is one that I trust every member of this House will approach in the largest spirit of Christian charity, and that our decision on this question will be received by Manitoba in the same spirit as that in which the legislation will be instituted by us. There is one great principle that must underlie this young country, if we are to attain national eminence, and that principle is, that each and every man in every portion of Canada shall feel, that although he may be a resident of New Brunswick, or a resident of Nova Scotia, or a resident of Manitoba, or a resident of Quebec, he is a citizen of Canada and of Canada alone. This country has no sympathy, humanity at large has no sympathy with a man who stands up for his parish, or his county, or his province, and who does not allow his patriotism to embrace the whole extent of the national territory. The history of the Republic to the south of us comprises the history of seventy or eighty years of constitutional struggle for federal amplitude. During that time great men clung to the principle of state autonomy; but, Sir, of the long list of illustrious names which that great country has produced there is not one of those who held to the doctrine of state autonomy—notwithstanding the greatness of their intellectual endowments—there is not one of them who to-day lives in the hearts of the American people. These men met with the plaudits of the party claquers of the day. They were lights that shot out like meteors for a moment and then expired; but the names which are deeply entrenched in the affections of the American people—Washington, Hamilton, Madison, Jefferson, Marshall and Webster—are names that are imperishable. These are lights set in the political firmament, eternal as the stars; and I trust that this country will ever be guided by the spirit of such men—

Such men and men like these can ne'er expire;
They shall withstand the empire of decay
When time is o'er and worlds have passed away;
Cold in the dust their perished hearts may lie,
But that which warmed them once can never die.

Sir, I feel proud in being a supporter of a Government who on this question have the boldness to come out and take their political lives in their hands, the true and manly

Mr. POWELL

course to take, and lay aside all considerations of office or party vantage, in view of the solemn duty before them; who although defeat may be staring them in the face, are not afraid to be patriotic, honest and honourable—to plant themselves firmly on the constitution of the country, and carry out its provisions at all hazards trusting that posterity may justify them, if the present generation does not. No state can afford to deal unjustly with itself; no state can afford to deal unjustly with any portion of itself. For party purposes we may act differently; but these evils may ultimately, if persisted in, destroy the national existence itself. All along the banks of the stream of time we may see empires shipwrecked—why? Because rulers followed the blind impulses for the time of the majority. Statesmen may think they are acquiring popularity; they may hope to acquire or cling to office by such a course; they may even deceive themselves and imagine they are doing a service to their country.

But the destinies think not so;

To their judgment chamber lone
Comes no voice of popular clamor—

There Fame's trumpet is not blown.

That you grant; but then you say,

That you differ from them somewhat;

Which is stronger, you or they?

Patient are they as the insects

Which build islands in the deep:

They heed not the bolted thunder,

But their silent way they keep;

Where they have been that we know;

Where empires towered that were not just,

Lo! the skulking wild fox scratches

In a little heap of dust.

I thank the House for the attention they have given me. I am sorry indeed that I am physically incapacitated for the task that has been imposed upon me; but with these few remarks I have much pleasure in moving that this humble Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to the Speech from the Throne.

Mr. MCGILLIVRAY. Mr. Speaker, in rising to perform an important function of public duty and personal pleasure, I must follow in the wake of the hon. gentleman who has just addressed you, and ask for that indulgence that is gladly and willingly extended by the members of the House of Commons to all new members. Ere I proceed to speak in detail upon the questions upon which I am expected to speak, I am reminded at the moment that lately within your hearing it has been said that this Parliament has been remarkable for several things. Those things were specified. Sir, I think this Parliament has been remarkable for other things besides. We are here in its dying days; and if I be not familiar with parliamentary practice, and not familiar, perhaps, with the proper language to use here, it is evidently not going to be my lot, at least in this Parliament, to learn very much thereof. But, Sir, carrying my

mind back to its beginning, and, remembering that then we had with us a man who has since gone to his reward as the leader of the Liberal-Conservative party, of whom we all were proud—followed soon by another leader of whom every Canadian, whether he belonged to the professions or to the laity, felt proud—followed closely by yet another leader who lived in the affections of the people of this country more than most others, and who died at the very foot of the Throne—I think, Mr. Speaker, that this Parliament is remarkable in that it has furnished an example of a political party being able to withstand such great reverses. No wonder, Sir, it can come out unscathed from a political crisis. This Parliament is remarkable also in high measure in another respect, inasmuch as it is affording a welcome back to the shores of our beloved country of one whom, during forty years past, we have learned to admire—one who has been highly honoured in his native province and who sat in that great council in the old hall at Quebec which has been spoken of to-day, and joined in the endeavour, the successful endeavour, to build up a great empire on this side of the Atlantic under the same old flag that floats on the other.

Mr. Speaker, I do not purpose speaking in detail of the many triumphs of this Parliament of Canada. My one regret in connection therewith is that my entry into Parliament had to be heralded by the death of one who in his native country, and particularly in North Ontario where he was best known, was best beloved. I am sorry, indeed, that in order that I should have a place in the Parliament of Canada, he had to step down and out from the councils of the nation. But there is this satisfaction to us of his country, who have always known him, that he left the Parliament of Canada in possession of the fond affections of its members on both sides of the House. This Parliament is remarkable yet again in that it welcomed to our shores a year or two back one who has a name not only in the vice-regal service of the Empire, but throughout the length and breadth of all countries in which the English tongue is spoken. I have reference to His Excellency, who has shown his opinion of our country and his belief in its future by investing his means in our broad acres. I think it was a happy day when His Excellency came to our shores, and I believe that the Home Government will in the future, as it has in the past, give us, in the vice-regal chair, men of whom Canadians can be proud.

Now, coming down to that paragraph which speaks of the Mounted Police—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. MCGILLIVRAY. Hon. gentlemen laugh, but I know something of the efficiency of the Mounted Police, for I once got into their clutches. Well might His Excellency speak in kindly and eulogistic terms of that noble body of men. When General

Miles and General Terry can speak of them as a body of men of which any country might be proud, surely Canadians can well afford to be proud of them. We hear of little incipient rebellions on the other side of the line; we hear rumours of little wars over there; we hear of thefts and murders in their territories; but we do not hear of such on our side of the line. Our Indian population are quiet and contented, and our Mounted Police are the men who go among the Indians and the Half-breeds and the Whites in our North-west and keep order. It is they who gather in our revenue and maintain peace and order, and they do this at a comparatively very small expense to the people of the country.

Agriculture is spoken of as likely to be stimulated by this Government and by our people. Speaking as an agriculturist, I think there is no body of men who deserve better at the hands of the Government than those who till the soil; and permit me to add that I do not think any body of men are better treated by the Government of Canada than the farmers of Canada. We have a great North-west, the possibilities of that country are beyond the comprehension of any mind in this House. A short time ago we purchased it at an expense of \$1,400,000. It cost us as much more to organize it, and a further sum of \$3,668,904 to put the land of that country in a position for proper sale. In other words, we have expended upon that country, in these respects, \$6,468,904, and have got back into the treasury in golden dollars since then, through the sale of those lands, \$4,275,526, leaving a balance against the treasury of \$2,192,378. Well, Sir, during these last twelve months, ending the 31st of December last, we find that the farmers of Manitoba alone have been able to reap from their lands:—

	Bushels.
Wheat	31,775,038
Barley	5,645,036
Oats	22,555,733
Flax	1,281,354
Rye	81,082
Peas	28,229
	61,366,472

not taking into account upwards of six million bushels of potatoes, turnips, and mangolds which that country has yielded; and if the yield of the territories were added, the grain crop, instead of totalling up to 61,366,472 bushels, would be upwards of one hundred million bushels. Compute the value of that grain at, say 30 cents a bushel, on an average—and I think the average is a low one—and you have a yield in a single year to the farmers of Manitoba alone worth the enormous sum of \$18,000,000, or nine times as much as the balance still owing to the national treasury from the sale of Manitoba lands. If that be true of Manitoba, what of the North-west Territories? What of the provinces down by the sea? What of our great Ontario, and great

Quebec? Why, the possibilities of the future are incalculable if the Government of Canada be true to its duty, and render to the farmers of the country even in greater measure than in the past that assistance to which they have proved themselves entitled. We are told by hon. gentlemen opposite sometimes that there is an exodus, or that there has been an exodus in the past. But if we go through the counties of Manitoba, and the lands of the North-west, we find them settled, not by the English and the German, and the foreigner, so much as by the sons and daughters of Ontario, Quebec, New Brunswick, and Nova Scotia. We have had an exodus from the older settled portions of the country to that newer portion, and we may be thankful for this further fact, that in the seventeen years during which the National Policy has been in force in Canada, there has been no exodus of any considerable proportion from this great country of ours. Hon. gentlemen opposite, judging from their remarks, appear to join issue with me upon that statement, but let them go to the Canadian settlements on the other side of the line, let them go to Michigan, if they will, and while they will find there half of its entire population Canadians or descendants of Canadians, they will also learn that these people went yonder long before the Government of Sir John Macdonald took office. If they go to Northern Dakota and there meet three out of every four in the northernmost part of the state, Canadians, they may have the satisfaction of knowing that these people left Canada before the National Policy came into operation. Let them go to the settlement in Kansas if they will, and they will discover that our fellow Canadians went in there before the National Policy was heard or dreamt of. Go where they will, they will find that the Canadian settlements over yonder are not the results of the National Policy. Then again these people are coming back in large numbers. This paternal Government of ours has had its agents in Dakota and Michigan and elsewhere, bringing back these children of Canada to our country from which they have been long separated, and settling them in the North-west Territories. Now, Mr. Speaker, is there reason for the further existence of the National Policy? Take an illustration from the experience of the people of Scotland. When I first had the pleasure of going to the land of my fathers some sixteen or eighteen years ago, I found the tenant farmer of Scotland a gentleman indeed, in the sense that he had gloved hands and spent his time in sporting and hunting as did the laird himself. But if we go to Scotland to-day we will find the tenant farmer working as hard with his ungloved hands as the farmer of Canada is doing. And so, too, in the south of England, in that portion of the country where the sheep industry flourishes. Throughout the United Kingdom, we find farm after

Mr. MCGILLIVRAY.

farm thrown upon the hands of the landlord, not to be let again, simply because the farmer can no longer raise wheat—even though his crops still yield thirty to forty bushels to the acre as heretofore—in competition with the farmer of the United States and Canada and other portions of the new world. The English farmer to-day is a protectionist: he is crying out for duties upon his products in order that he may have the very same protection, the farmers of Canada are now enjoying. And they have a body of eighty men in the British House of Commons acting in the interest of the farmers of the country and clamouring for protection to native industry. It is not my purpose to dwell long upon this subject, but I cannot leave it, without according the thanks of the farmers of this country to one who has still a seat in this House. Years ago little interest was taken in the agricultural industry of this country. True, certain returns and tabulated statistics were submitted every year, but only to be filed away in order that they might be referred to now and again. Not until the Government of John Sandfield Macdonald came into power in Ontario was any particular interest taken in the farmers of Canada. Then we find an experimental farm purchased in that province at the instance and upon the suggestion of the hon. member for London (Sir John Carling). And when he left the local political sphere to take his part in national affairs, we find him again, ever considerate of the interests of the farmers, establishing experimental farms in the province of Ontario, in the North-west Territories, and other portions of this great Dominion. The Department of Agriculture had an efficient head in the person of the hon. member for London, and if there is one man who, more than another, lives in the affection of the farmers of this country, he is that hon. member.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That is the reason he is now out of the Government.

Mr. MCGILLIVRAY. The hon. gentleman was succeeded in that office by another gentleman, who was alleged by the friends of gentlemen opposite to be incompetent because he had been trained in a noble profession to which many of us in this House are proud to belong, and because he had not been brought up to the sheepfold or the plough. Nevertheless, Sir, the hon. senator then at the head of that department made a good Minister of Agriculture. And now, within the last few weeks, there has been welcomed by the yeomanry of Canada as the head of that department one who gives promise of becoming a stalwart agriculturist. He tells the farmers that his policy is to be an aggressive policy. He has told them already that he is going to have a sheep expert upon the Experimental Farm here.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. To take care of stray sheep?

Mr. MCGILLIVRAY. Well, I am not the stray sheep. If there is one branch of agriculture that has been more neglected than another in this country of ours it is the sheep industry. I say that without fear of successful contradiction. You may say to me: Look at the Columbian Exposition, where the Canadian farmers carried away nine-tenths of the awards given. That is a subject of perhaps pardonable pride to me, coming as I do from the old banner county of Ontario. The hon. member for South Ontario (Mr. Smith), and the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) must share my pride in the fact that a large majority of those prizes came to our county. But if we have had successes of that kind, it has been because of the individual effort of the individual owner, except that the Government transported our sheep to Chicago and kept them while they were there. But, if we turn our eyes to Australia or to England, we find that our sheep industry is a drop in the bucket as compared with theirs. We have gained success in the old world with our cheese, and to-day we supply 50 per cent of the English consumption. We have gained occasional successes with our fruit, although it is true, occasional failures have befallen us as well in that respect. But what is there to prevent us, if we stimulate this industry as we ought to do, from making our mutton the favourite mutton of the London market? Let the Minister of Agriculture purchase his sheep and engage his experts, and, after a while, the farmers of Canada will know what class of sheep it is best for them to raise. Other industries have been stimulated by this paternal Government of ours. When, through no fault of our own, we lost a market we formerly had—a market which we do not really now require—our eyes were turned to the British market, and our cheese men sold their product there, until they now supply one-half of the cheese required and used over there, but notwithstanding such is the fact, this Government of ours noticed that our butter found no place in the British market, although Denmark and France and Australia were selling their butter in that country, and they, therefore, copied the example of the Australian governments which gave a bonus on a sliding scale for the production of that class of butter likely to find a place in the British market, with the result that they increased our sales in Great Britain from one to two per cent of the total consumption in a single year. What they have done in the matter of butter they can do in respect of other industries; and we the farmers of Canada claim they should do so, if farming is to retain the position it has had in the past, and reasonably hopes to attain in the future. In the last three years we have trebled our sales of horses going from Montreal to the old country, and I am glad to notice that the Minister of Agriculture has assured us that he is going to try to stimulate

the production of the class of horses most likely to find purchasers in Britain. It is well known that horses are in great demand there now, and if we Canadians can produce the class of horses required there, we will find a ready sale for them. Now, another thing. This Government has already established the principle of cold storage. A prohibition has been put upon the sale of our live cattle in the old land, and it is now the purpose of the Government to establish the cold storage system on such a basis that our cattle can be killed here, transported to the old land, and sold to the English consumer from warehouses established in various parts of the Empire. That scheme is worthy of support. Now, if they have been doing that, why can they not also stimulate the bee industry, as has been promised—an object well worthy of their consideration. I may suggest to the Minister of Agriculture that he also endeavour to stimulate the fruit industry, and let the farmers of this country know what classes of fruit will find the best market in England. Then, Sir, I may be permitted to speak of another subject, that of fall wheat. I believe nothing has been done at the Central Experimental Farm in respect to fall wheat. The soil does not permit of it, I am told. But, Mr. Speaker, there are counties in Ontario, and counties in every province of this great Dominion, where fall wheat might be tried and tested; and I would invite the Minister of Agriculture once again to look at North Ontario. I would not complain a great deal if the Minister, in his researches, were to visit my hon. friend from South Ontario (Mr. Smith), nor yet the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Hughes), or South Victoria (Mr. Fairbairn), or, indeed, my hon. friend for West Durham (Mr. Beith), or my hon. friend for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar). We can give the Minister of Agriculture soil in which he can test that question in a way that he cannot test it here, and I think in the interest of the people of Canada that ought to be done. Now, one word more before leaving this subject. We have to-day the satisfaction of knowing that the lumbermen of the Ottawa valley, operating in our great north country, can no longer go to Chicago and buy their oats at 12 cents a bushel, and bring them here to be consumed. We have the satisfaction of knowing, as producers of meat, that Mr. Armour can no longer sell his meat here. We have the satisfaction of knowing that American horses that come away from the interior of the United States and are sold at Buffalo at ten dollars a head, as was reported a few days ago, cannot come into this country any longer to be sold at those prices in the face of the Canadian farmer. Sir, I am satisfied, speaking for the farmers of this country, that if the Government were to do their full duty towards the agricultural interests, we have before us a future of unknown greatness. Now, this brings me to the last mat-

ter I wish to touch upon, and that is the militia of Canada.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. MCGILLIVRAY. Perhaps hon. gentlemen opposite who seem to endorse the very word "militia," are militiamen like myself. Perhaps they have had the experience of a quarter of a century with the active militia of Canada, as I have had, and as many hon. gentlemen around me have had. We who have had that experience know full well that this present Government, and all other Canadian Governments, have been unkind to the militia of Canada, unkind in the sense that they have not given us the annual drill we ought to have had. Why do we require it? Mr. Speaker, the men upon the field require to know one another, as the men in this House require to know one another; and if we meet but once in two years, and, as happened on the last occasion, once in three years, we can never hope to know one another as we ought in order that we may stand by one another in cases of emergency. Sir, I believe that the militia of Canada is deserving of the very best thought of Canada. The militia of Canada have done great things in the past. Sometimes it is said of us that we are not the brave men that our fathers were. Give us a chance, Mr. Speaker. We have not had a chance in our generation. We want a better rifle than the old Snider, and we have been promised it by this Government. We are promised that the militia is to be encouraged, and our defences are to be strengthened. I believe that the best way to strengthen the defences of this country is by strengthening the individual members of the militia. Let us have proper arms, let us have free ammunition as far as possible; and then, Sir, instead of having but one Queen's prize winner in this great Dominion of ours, we will have prize winner after prize winner in years to come. We are proud as Canadians to think that one of our sons went to the old land and captured that valuable prize from the sharpshooters and marksmen there assembled from all parts of the Empire. One word more on this topic. We have furnished for the British service, already two regiments of men. Only a few years ago, we found the 100th regiment raised here in old Canada for the Imperial service, and the 104th, in New Brunswick. We have had individual Canadians making famous names for themselves, not only in the Crimean war, but in the wars in the east as well. Only a few short years ago we put down a rebellion in Canada, unaided by British forces, and with the loss of but little Canadian blood. In the first North-west rebellion we suppressed the disturbance with the aid of a few British forces, and our Canadian volunteers distinguished themselves so well in those troubles that General Wolseley, when he went to Egypt, sent for Canadians to surround him and assist him in the great work he had to do there. Mr. Speaker, we have done grent

Mr. MCGILLIVRAY.

things in the past. In 1866 and in 1868, when a horde of misguided men thought to do their country a service by striking at us, we repelled them with but little loss. In 1812 our grandsires showed that they were worthy descendants of Britons. The raw militia of Canada then won for us the battles of Stony Creek, Chrysler's Farm, Chateauguay, Lundy's Lane, and Queenston Heights. These were Canadian battles, fought by the sons of Canadians. Sir, I ask this House to consider the subject of the militia of Canada with the idea that they are worthy of greater attention on the part of this Government. Although we are now happily at peace, we know that possibly, though I hope not probably, a quarrel might arise with our neighbours across the line, and when we find England in her present isolated condition, it is possible, I say, though not probable, that the Empire may require the services of Canada; therefore, we who have the protection of her flag ought to be ready, at any moment, not only to defend our own homes, but to rush to the rescue wherever and whenever danger threatens. It gives me pleasure not a little to have the high privilege of seconding the Address in response to the Speech from the Throne, so ably moved by the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Powell), and I do so in the fullest confidence that the Parliament of Canada, inspired by the very best influences of the democracy of the old world and the new intermingled with abiding traditions and sustained by the everlasting principles of the British people in the past, who have shown to the world that the monarchical form of government as it is exemplified in England and in the colonies is, after all, the best—so sustained and so supported will act always in the very best interest of our people and our beloved country.

Mr. LAURIER. Mr. Speaker, the House, I am sure, will regret, and, perhaps, will somewhat resent the loss of time which, through the action of vacillating men, has prevented it, up to this moment, addressing itself to the task which it has in hand, and the duties which it is incumbent upon it to discharge. Among those statements which were made by the hon. member for Westmoreland in which I can at all agree, I admit, is the statement that this is a special and most important session. This is not only an important session, but it is an unprecedented and extraordinary session. It is unprecedented and extraordinary for more reasons than one. It is unprecedented and extraordinary not only for the crisis of which we have been the witnesses, and of which, perhaps, after having heard the two speeches we will think we have not seen the last, but it is important, extraordinary and unprecedented for this cause especially, that Parliament is here summoned to determine one of the gravest questions which Parliament has ever had come before it, the gravest perhaps which has engaged, up to this moment, the attention of the confederation,

and a question which, in its bearings, and in the manner in which it shall be settled, may, perhaps, permanently affect the future of this Canadian confederation. Sir, for my part, I thought that it would be well that every facility should be given to the Government to bring forward at the earliest possible moment the measure for the consideration of which this session has been called; but, before so doing there are certain duties which have to be attended to, and first and foremost is the duty in which we are now engaged of offering an answer to the Speech with which His Excellency was pleased to open this Parliament just two weeks ago to-day. In the first place, Mr. Speaker, it affords me much pleasure, in accordance with parliamentary usage and traditions, to offer to the mover and seconder of this Address the congratulations of the House on the manner in which they have performed an always difficult duty. I had, myself, when I first came to this House, the honour of seconding the Address, and I know from personal experience that it is always a most ungrateful task to perform. I may say to the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Powell) that his advent to this House had been preceded by a reputation earned in another sphere, on the floor of the legislature of his native province, and I am very glad to tell the hon. gentleman candidly that it was a reputation well earned, and well deserved. I say it was fame well earned, and well deserved as an orator, though the hon. gentleman will pardon me if I say that I could not take him as a guide in constitutional matters. My hon. friend has uttered views which I do not propose to discuss at any length at this moment, views which he suggested amounting to actual heresy in regard to the form of this Government, views which we may all have the opportunity of discussing on a future occasion. But, again, I repeat that the hon. gentleman has proved that he will turn out to be quite a success in the House, and quite an honour to the party to which he belongs. My hon. friend from North Ontario (Mr. McGillivray) has also done very well, and if he will permit me I will at once pay him the compliment that he excelled in stretches of imagination, though I must say, if he will pardon me for saying it, that his memory is not as good as his imagination is vast. My hon. friend is ignorant of the fact that there has been an exodus since we have had the National Policy in force. He knows there has been an exodus at some time, but he does not appear to know, and he would not admit, that an exodus has taken place since the introduction of the National Policy. I will not enter into figures with him, but if my memory of the censuses of 1881 and 1891 is correct, the rate of increase in population for the decade previous to 1881 was something like 90 per cent, whilst for the decade following (under the National Policy) the rate of increase fell to 12 per

cent. But the hon. gentleman, while admitting there had been an exodus at some time, stated that if some of our people had gone to Michigan, Dakota, and the Western States at some time in our history, still to-day we might console ourselves with the fact that they were coming back to this country. Well, if it takes them nineteen years, odd, to come back, I must say they are not possessed of the same rapidity of locomotion we have seen exhibited on the floor of this House within the past few days. I may also say to my hon. friend the member for North Ontario (Mr. McGillivray) that I was rather anxious and curious when listening to his remarks to-day.—I was anxious and curious to listen to him, because in common with many others I was in doubt as to whether in the election that took place a few weeks ago in the good riding of North Ontario, the Government had actually won a victory or suffered a defeat. It is true, Sir, I do not deny it, it is in the memory of all the members of this House, that the election of my hon. friend (Mr. McGillivray) was heralded throughout the length and breadth of this land as a great and substantial victory for the Government. It is true that the elation was such that my hon. friend from Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper), who was then a leading member of the Government, and who happened to be at that moment in the city of New York, proclaimed to the American people at large in an interview published in the New York papers, that the victory of North Ontario was an endorsement by the people of Canada of the policy of the Government upon the school question. But, Sir, though this may be true, it is equally true that only a few days afterwards, if the papers do not lie to us, the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace), who had just left the Government upon that very same school question because as we understand he could not agree with that policy, stated somewhere in the province of Ontario, that when the proper time came the hon. member for North Ontario (Mr. McGillivray) would vote with him upon that question. I understand that statement has been disputed, but I imagine that if there has been a victory in North Ontario for the Government it was at best a victory which may at some time or another turn into a defeat. But, whatever may be the result in North Ontario, whether it was an approbation or a condemnation of the policy of the Government upon the school question, there was no uncertain sound in the election for Cardwell, there was no uncertain sound, for I was present myself, in the election for Montreal Centre, there was a still less uncertain sound in the election of Jacques Cartier, and there was no uncertain sound in the West Huron election. The Government may console themselves with the victory in Victoria, B.C., but my hon. friend (Mr. Prior) knows very well that there has been a landslide in the city of Victoria which almost buried the Controller of In-

land Revenue, and if a few more boulders should come down, my hon. friend (Mr. Prior) would be crushed under a heap of earth and ashes next time. Now, Sir, there is something very peculiar in the debate so far as it has gone up to the present moment. We have had already two speeches, and it seems to me that there is echoing in my ears yet, what took place last session upon a similar occasion. To-day we have had the speech of the hon. the mover of the resolution (Mr. Powell) which was almost altogether devoted to the Manitoba school question. We have had the speech of my hon. friend from North Ontario (Mr. McGillivray), but not a word did he say about the Manitoba school question. These dualities are not new to this House. We had them last session when the Address in answer to the Speech from the Throne was moved by my hon. friend from East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett), and seconded by my hon. friend from Chicoutimi (Mr. Belley). The first of those hon. gentlemen (Mr. Bennett) declared that the remedial order which had just been passed by the Government was simply a reference of the question to the Government of Manitoba, while my hon. friend from Chicoutimi (Mr. Belley) declared in no uncertain tone that the Government had pinned its faith to the policy of interference, and interference there would be. Upon the present occasion we have one sound coming from one province and we have another sound coming from another province. We shall know by and by which is singing in tune with the policy of the Government. Sir, there are many things in the Speech from the Throne which have been neglected by the mover and seconder of the Address, and which, therefore, I presume I may also neglect. For instance, the first paragraph of the Speech declares this :

The bountiful harvest with which Canada has been blessed is a cause for the deepest thankfulness to the Giver of all good.

Well, that is a sentiment which I can certainly re-echo. But there is something a little new in this paragraph. A bountiful harvest, I am sorry to say, has not been of late very, very frequent. But we have had bountiful harvests before, although this is the first time, since the National Policy has been in existence, that Providence has been thanked for a bountiful harvest. Generally, the thanks were given to the National Policy. We were told that the National Policy was responsible for the good harvest, just as at one time the National Policy was the cause of the hens laying bigger eggs than usual. I do not want to decry the glories of the National Policy, but there is one thing further that should be told in this Speech, and it is not fair that hon. gentlemen opposite should decline to give the National Policy due praise for the good prices which the Canadian farmer is getting for the fruits of the bountiful harvest in the Canadian market which has been built by the National Policy. The Speech also says :

Mr. LAURIER.

I congratulate you upon the evidence of increased activity in the various branches of commerce and industry.

"I congratulate you." This is an expression which I have often heard used in derision in this House, and I did not know that at the moment the advisers of His Excellency put these words in the mouth of His Excellency, they were at that time incubating a great political crisis. I would suppose that they were speaking in a jocose manner and using the words in an ironical sense. Reference is made in the Speech to the loyalty of the Indians. Well, loyalty is a very big word when you speak of the Indians. The Indian is not generally supposed to be loyal except for good cause. Loyalty implies a sentiment, an idea. I have this to say : Since the Department of the Interior has been brought here the experience is that so long as the Indian is treated well and rations distributed to him, and so long as his reservation is not invaded, he will be loyal. I agree with the sentiment expressed in the Speech that the Indian industrial schools in the North-west are quite a boon to that country. I have heard the usefulness of these schools discussed, but for my part, after having visited the North-west and seen these industrial schools, I believe, although they cost dear, that they do a great deal of good to the population there. I may reiterate also everything that has been said by both the mover and the seconder of the Address with regard to the North-west Mounted Police. The mounted police is certainly a body of which Canada has every reason to be proud. Sometimes in the east, the usefulness of that force has been discussed, but for my part, after having visited the North-west, I came back with the conclusion deeply seated in my mind that the North-west Mounted Police force is worth all the money that it costs the country. So long as the population is sparsely settled, so long as the population is not sufficiently numerous to allow of the different groups to be in touch with each other, I consider that the services of the mounted police are absolutely requisite to the good government and peace of the country at large. Now, Sir, I pass to another subject which has been touched upon by my hon. friend the seconder of the Address (Mr. McGillivray). It is a subject on which I listened to him with a great deal of attention. The paragraph in the Speech is this :

Your attention will be asked to measures intended to provide for the better arming of our militia and the strengthening of Canadian defences.

Sir, I confess that when I read that statement in the speech my curiosity was aroused and I listened attentively to the seconder of this address when he referred to it in order to find out (since he is in the confidence of the Government) what was really intended

by the Government, what were their motives, and why the words were used. The dry utterances of the speech are tantalizing in this respect, that they inform us that the Government have some design in their minds, but what that design actually is we do not know. I am curious, for my part, to have some information on this subject. With regard to the better arming of the militia, I have only this to say at this moment, that it seems to me that the subject is not one that should call for such a solemn announcement as that made in the Speech. To my mind, this is simply a departmental affair and nothing else. I quite agree with every word on this subject that has been uttered by my hon. friend from North Ontario (Mr. McGillivray). If we are to spend money on our militia and our volunteer force, and we must do so, common sense requires that this money, to be effectively spent, should be spent in such a manner as to provide them with the best armament that can be obtained, according to the progress of the age. What is the object of our militia force? Why, Sir, the thing is obvious. The object of arming the militia or the volunteer force is this, that should we, in the grave contingency of war, be called upon at any moment to defend our country, we may have a force ready to meet the enemy or to repel invasion; and if our militia or volunteers are to meet the enemy at any moment, which God forbid, then it would be simply sending them to butchery if we forced them to go without equipping them with an arm equal to that in the hands of the enemy. I quite agree with the hon. member for North Ontario that the best armament, the best defence for Canada, is to put good and sound weapons into the hands of the soldiers of Canada. I do not understand what is meant by the remark in the Speech from the Throne with reference to strengthening the defences of Canada. What is the meaning of that expression? Sir, I hope it does not mean any jingo policy. We are at peace with our neighbours. It is true, there was a few days ago a little ripple between Great Britain and the United States; but I am glad to say that the best people in the United States to-day would regard a war between England and the United States as fratricidal, almost as much so as the war which a few years ago drenched the soil of the republic with torrents of blood. It is to be regretted that in many quarters in the United States there is a deep feeling of hostility against Great Britain. The war of emancipation has left in the hearts of some classes there a feeling of irritation against England; but knowing as I do something of the feelings of the American people, I venture to say that among the mass of the nation, among the educated classes, among the better classes there, there is nothing but a feeling of love towards the old land, the motherland of the United States as well as the motherland

of Canada. I was proud and touched to read a few days ago two lines from perhaps the most American of all the American poets. Whittier addressed these lines to the English people:

We bow the heart, if not the knee
To England's Queen; God bless her.

When these words were uttered, I am sure from what I know of the American people, that they did not fall upon dull ears. Let me, Sir, pass from the language of a poet to the language of a statesman—to the language used only a few days ago by Governor Morton of the State of New York. In his annual message to the legislature of that state, Mr. Morton used the following language:

Any disturbance of the existing friendly relations between the United States and Great Britain cannot fail to have a serious effect. Because of the possible baleful consequences of such disturbances, I feel myself justified in making this reference to the larger affairs of the nation in which we feel such a peculiar and vital interest.

I cannot believe that the relations between our country and Great Britain will be ruptured or seriously impaired by the misunderstanding now existing between that country and Venezuela concerning the proper location of the boundary line of their possessions in South America. Arbitration affords a simple, humane and honourable method of determining national disputes; and it is scarcely conceivable at this period of the world's history that any great nation is willing to take the responsibility of the needless sacrifice of human life and the wanton destruction of property which would be the inevitable result of an armed conflict.

These are the words of one of the most important men living to-day in the United States of America; they are the words of the American nation; and I trust and hope that this Government will do nothing to suggest even the possibility that we indulge a thought of war with our American neighbours. Now, Sir, there is another paragraph in the speech which I fail to understand, and to which—though it has not been referred to by my hon. friends the mover and the seconder of the Address—I wish to call the attention of the House. Let me read it to the House:

The growth of population in the North-west Territories, as disclosed by the last enumeration, calls for additional representation in Parliament. A Bill for this purpose will be laid before you.

Sir, what is the meaning of this paragraph, I want to know? The last enumeration that took place in the North-west Territories, so far as my memory goes, was the general census of 1891. In the following year the Parliament of Canada undertook to redistribute the representation of Canada in this House, at the instance of Sir John Thompson. On that occasion, the representation of the Territories was left just as it then was. Are we to understand, Mr. Speaker, that this moribund Parliament, in its last days, is to go back upon that legislation, and

create a new disturbance in this respect? Sir, I have nothing to say at present as to the advisability or not of increasing the representation from the North-west Territories. That is a subject which can be better discussed at another time; but at present I have only this to say, that it is not within the duty of this moribund Parliament to take up such a large subject. There is, it seems to me, a smell of gerrymander in this paragraph and of an unfair advantage to be taken by the majority in this House over their opponents. If I be mistaken, I shall be only too glad to retract every word I said. But I repeat that so important a paragraph should have been heralded and announced beforehand in some more open manner. Now, my hon. friend has also alluded to another paragraph in the Speech, which is this:

You will also be asked to consider measures for the extension and development of our trade in agricultural products with the United Kingdom and other markets.

What is the meaning of this? The Government last year went into the butter trade. Are we to understand from the hon. member for North Ontario that they propose going this year into the sheep trade? We have a doctor now at the head of the Department of Agriculture. He is a stalwart, my hon. friend says, and a strong agriculturist. But I very much fear that the hon. gentleman is about to turn his lancet from the human patient to the treasury of the country. I do not object that the hon. gentleman should do everything to promote the trade of Canada, especially in farm products, but if that is to be done according to the policy cheered by hon. gentlemen opposite, I doubt very much the success of the attempt. Why should we endeavour to increase our trade with Great Britain? Have we not been told by the hon. gentleman, amidst the cheers of his friends beside him, that Great Britain is going back to protection—that England is to be for the English as Canada is for the Canadians. Why, if the eighty men in the English House of Commons who are in favour of protection can impose their will on that House, England will be a protectionist country such as Canada is now. And in such event, what kind of a market will England be for our products, if our products are treated there as British products are treated in this country? What kind of a market will that be for us where the products of Canadian farmers are met by a wall in England just as the products of English manufacturers are met by a wall in Canada? This is the policy which is cheered by hon. gentlemen opposite—a policy which, if adopted by Great Britain, they would for ever deplore, the unfortunate day when it was adopted for ever rue. But by far the most important part of the

Mr. LAURIER.

Speech is that which relates to the Manitoba school question. My hon. friend, the mover of the Address, devoted a great deal of attention to that part of the Speech. I do not intend at this moment following all the arguments he advanced. I do not intend, for instance, to discuss his proposition that provincial autonomy is a pure fallacy and that we have been living in a world of illusion in this respect since confederation. But, I take the Speech as it is. We are told that the negotiations entered into between Canada and Manitoba for the consideration of some measure of justice to the Catholic minority have not been productive of those results for which we might have looked. What these negotiations were, we do not know, and the Speech does not inform us. I do not know myself. I only know one thing in common with the people of Canada, and that it is that some time in the month of July last, shortly after prorogation, an Order in Council was passed by this Government amending the Order in Council of March previous, and telling the people of Manitoba that, in dealing with the school question, they were not bound to deal with it on the strict lines of the Remedial Order of March last. That is the only thing that passed, as far as I know. This order, I presume, was sent to the Government of Manitoba. Whether any other negotiations took place, I do not know. We know, from the manifesto which Mr. Greenway issued a few days ago to the people of Manitoba, at the opening of the campaign, that he refused to comply with the terms of the Order in Council even as amended, though at the same time he intimated his readiness to investigate the whole subject jointly with the Government of Canada. That is all I know. But as far as indications go, we know something more. We know that the people of Manitoba feel very strongly on that subject. We know that from the elections which took place yesterday and from the issues which were brought up before the people of that province, Mr. Greenway's government has been sustained at the polls by an overwhelming majority. But we must remember this, that the issue between the Liberal Government of Mr. Greenway and the Conservative opposition was not at all as to whether the School Act should be modified or not modified, but the issue raised against Mr. Greenway by the Conservative opposition was that if the people of Manitoba wanted to keep their school system intact, they should not trust him because he might make concessions to the minority, but they should remove him from power and elect his opponents? In order to show the character of the conflict which was decided yesterday in Manitoba, let me quote a manifesto which has been standing in the columns of the "Daily Nor-Wester," the organ of the Conservative party of Winnipeg, during the whole of the campaign:

" DECEPTION ! "

Electors of Manitoba.

" The Greenway Government is Deceiving You. "

" Mr. Laurier said at Montreal, in the late contest there, speaking as to the Manitoba school question :

' I have no hesitation in telling you that I want to have the minority in Manitoba restored to the same privileges which are freely granted in Quebec to the Protestant minority, and to the Catholic minority in Ontario.'

The Brandon " Sun " (the organ of the Greenway party), in its issue of 26th December last, said :

' Let it be shown that the Manitoba School Act attacks the conscientious convictions of Catholics, and we will join in demanding its amendment or correction.'

The Hon. Mr. Sifton, in his speech at Douglas, on the 31st December last, as reported by the Winnipeg " Daily Tribune " (the Government organ), said :

' We are prepared to consider any changes in method that will make it acceptable to the Roman Catholics. We will do anything in reason, anything that will not compromise principle ;' and again, ' Anything in reason, if we can settle this matter without compromising principle, then we will do it, but not otherwise. If there is any change that can be made in the religious exercises that will make them acceptable to all parties, if any change can be made in the time they are held, or other like changes, we are prepared to consider them.'

" What does all this mean ? Is the present School Act going to be modified to meet the grievances of the Roman Catholics, by the Greenway party, if returned to power ? Why are these doubtful and qualified expressions uttered and published at the present time if no understanding has been come to ? The evidence is clear, and the inference is clear. The Greenway party are coming before you on a false issue. They are deceiving you on this school question, and hope by means of it to cover the numerous shortcomings of their administration."

" You may depend upon it that, if returned to power, they will so change and amend the present School Act that the conscientious convictions of the Roman Catholics will no longer be attacked by it, and, though they will not have separate schools in name, they will have them in fact."

" Remember Greenway's withholding of Maximum letter as to freight rates."

" Remember Sifton's concealment of Dalton McCarthy's opinion re Ryan & Heney claim."

" Remember Greenway's deception towards the Roman Catholics in passing the School Act, and he will deceive the whole province."

" ELECTORS, DON'T TRUST THEM ! ! ! "

The Conservative party asked the electors of Manitoba not to support the Greenway Government because the Greenway Government would be prepared to extend to the Roman Catholic minority a measure of relief, whereas, the other party, if returned to power, would keep the law as it is inviolate. I am glad to say that the result was in favour of the party which, by the mouth of the Attorney General, and through

its principal organ declared itself ready to consider the claims of the minority, and if a grievance was found to exist, to give them such measure of relief as would be adequate. Such is the position to-day in the province of Manitoba. There is no issue, therefore, between the two parties upon this point. All agree upon this, that the system of public schools is to be maintained intact, and inviolate. Sir, if such be the public opinion of Manitoba to-day, what is the course to be followed by the Canadian Government upon this great question ? The difficulties of the constitution are very great, I admit. The hon. gentleman who moved the Address now in your hands stated that the principle of provincial autonomy did not exist. Such a doctrine cannot be accepted for a moment : it would be giving the lie to the whole history of confederation to tell us, in this year 1896, that the principle of provincial autonomy does not exist. Though it is recognized that the power of interference with provincial legislation exists under the constitution, yet the united will of the people, declared again and again, has been that this power of interference, if it is to be used at all, is to be used only for cause, and when a substantial injustice has been shown to exist. That is the only principle upon which we can go with safety. The hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Powell) told us that it was the imperative duty of the Government to interfere in this matter. Let me say, Sir, that I have never gone back on the words I uttered in the city of Montreal. I deeply sympathize with my co-religionists in the province of Manitoba. I would wish to see them restored to their privileges, and there is not a man, whether he be in favour of public schools or of separate schools, who would not be glad to see the Roman Catholics of Manitoba restored to their full privileges if that were done by the legislature of Manitoba. But in the mind of everybody in this House, and out of it, there is a repugnance to substituting the will of the superior body, the federal legislature, for the will of the people of Manitoba, or of any other province, as expressed by their legislature. Now, how does this question come before us to-day ? Two judgments have been rendered by the judicial committee of the Privy Council upon this question. The first of these judgments was to this effect : That the legislature in Manitoba, in passing the Act of 1890, was acting within the sphere of its authority, and that the Act was, therefore, valid. The second judgment was to this effect : That as against this very Act, which the legislature of Manitoba had the power to pass, and did pass, there was an appeal to the Government and to the Parliament of Canada. Now, some men take the view that, because there is such an appeal, that appeal must be granted in all cases : other men take the view that, though such an

appeal is allowed, the appeal is to be denied in all cases. I take issue with both these extremists, with those who say that the appeal must be granted, *ex officio*, as well as with those who say that it is to be denied, *ex officio*. There is but one way to approach this question; we must approach it in the very terms of the Act itself, and apply the remedy in every case as the circumstances of the case shall warrant and justify. That is the position I have taken all along. This question came twice before this House for discussion—once in 1893 and once in 1895. I maintained the same position on those occasions; I have maintained it in Ontario and Quebec; I have maintained it with friend and foe; I maintain it now. And, Mr. Speaker, I go further. Whatever may be the course taken by the Government upon this question, the day will come, sooner or later, when the position I now take must be taken by the Government of Canada, no matter who may be at the head of affairs. Gentlemen opposite have taken a different course. I know. This is not the time to discuss the course they have taken. When the Bill they are to propose comes before us, the matter can be discussed as a practical issue. I simply for the present, lay down the salient principles which must govern our dealing with this subject. The hon. gentlemen tell us, as they have told us all along, that they are bound by the terms of the constitution to take an extreme course in this matter. Bound by the terms of the constitution! That is a subject we shall have to discuss on a future occasion. Let me, however, tell the hon. gentlemen who have spoken to-day that we know what value is to be attached to these words of theirs, "bound by the terms of the constitution." We know by their conduct that the constitution is in their hands simply to be used or not used as party exigencies may require. We know by their conduct in the past that if party exigencies demand it, they will take refuge behind the constitution, but if party exigencies require it, they will trample under foot its most cardinal principles. I challenge these sticklers for the constitution to say if there is a principle of the constitution better known or more necessary to the proper working of representative institutions than this—that every elector shall be represented here, and shall be given his due share of weight in the affairs of the country. But, notwithstanding this, we find that to-day two constituencies are disfranchised by these sticklers for the constitution. Some forty thousand of Her Majesty's subjects have not a voice upon the floor of Parliament in deciding this great question, and others that are to come before us. Why is not the hon. member for West Huron in his seat to-day? What is the reason that the election for West Huron did not take place at the same time as the others? And what is the reason that the people of Charlevoix are not re-

Mr. LAURIER.

presented on the floor of Parliament? Upon what ground have these sticklers for the constitution denied the right of representation to some forty thousand of Her Majesty's subjects? There is not a reason except that of party expediency. For this expediency is sacrificed not only the statute of the land, but also the most sacred right of the people guaranteed under that constitution which these gentlemen, forsooth, tell us it is their abundant desire to carry out. Sir, these words are empty words, words which will deceive no one. What is the reason? We have not here a member for West Huron and a member for Charlevoix. It is because these hon. gentlemen, these sticklers for the constitution, have been delinquent in the performance of the duties which they owe to the people and to the representative of the Crown as well. Sir, you know the law upon this subject as well as, and even better than, I do. The law requires that whenever a vacancy arises in any constituency represented on the floor of the House of Commons, the Speaker shall forthwith issue his warrant to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery for a new election. Sir, I am proud to say that upon this, as upon all occasions, you have discharged your duty as fully as might be expected; I am proud to say it. I must also say of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery that he has never been dilatory in carrying out his duties, when he had an opportunity to do so. But, unfortunately, though you are the Speaker, and you may issue your warrant, your warrant is not honoured by the hon. gentlemen sitting opposite, who pose as defenders of the constitution. Your warrant is not honoured, though it may be lying in the dust of a pigeon-hole for weeks and months. On the very first day of the opening of this Parliament you informed the House that you had issued your warrants for elections in Westmoreland, in Cardwell, in North Ontario, in West Huron, in Jacques Cartier, in Montreal Centre, and in Charlevoix. Sir, have these hon. gentlemen, these sticklers for the constitution, honoured the warrant of the Speaker? They should have issued the writ: they did not do so. They have it in their power to block the warrant of the Speaker, to block the constitution of the country, to deprive the people of their rights, because there is in the Act an unfortunate paragraph whereby the nomination of the returning officer belongs to them, the fixing of the date of the election belongs to them, and, until they fix a date for the election, until they have appointed a returning officer, the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery is altogether powerless to act. Well, then, what is the reason we have not had those elections all at once? The Government thought they knew better. Last year they had experience with several elections on the same day, those of Antigonish, Verchères, Haldimand and Quebec West, and in two of those elections they were defeated. This

year they thought they would do better, they would have the elections one after another. They would first select their own ground, the county where they thought they would be the strongest, and they would move therein their boodle brigade, they would then take their boodle brigade from place to place, in order to have the same result in every one. They tried first in Westmoreland. Sir, the parchment that called the Hon. Mr. Wood to the Senate was hardly dry before they issued a writ for Westmoreland. Brave men they were, indeed. There were 2,000 majority for Mr. Wood in the last election, though in this one that was reduced to 500. Then they went to North Ontario; their success was only partial. Then they went to Cardwell; no success there whatever. They could not recall the writs for Montreal Centre and Jacques Cartier, but they postponed as far as they could the date for the other elections. And these, Sir, are sticklers for the constitution. Mr. Speaker, I have no right, perhaps, to address myself to the majority of this House, to those hon. gentlemen who sit behind the Treasury benches, who keep the Government in power. But though I may have no right, perhaps, to address myself to them, I appeal upon this occasion to their patriotism, I appeal to their honour, nay, I appeal to their own manhood. They are party men; for this, certainly, I do not reproach them, I am a party man myself. They are Conservatives; for this I do not reproach them, all convictions are respected. They want to win; for this I do not reproach them. It is a fair and legitimate ambition. Very well, they are welcome to all means, to all tactics which can be defended under the law; but I submit to them that these tactics are base, are cowardly, are criminal. These tactics are base, are cowardly, are criminal, which violate systematically, wickedly and designedly the very letter of the statute and the most sacred rights of the people. They pretend to be strong in the confidence of the people. Sir, the Liberal party make no boasts, but we believe we are strong. We believe that we are strong in our record, in our principles, in our past; and the Liberal party will never fight with such weapons, and will never win by such methods. The Liberal party will fight with fair weapons, and will win with its head erect, and no shame upon its brow.

Mr. FOSTER. I join, in the first place, most heartily and sincerely with my hon. friend who has just taken his seat, in giving my congratulations to the mover and seconder of the reply to the Address, for the distinguished manner in which they have acquitted themselves in what is, to every newcomer to Parliament, a peculiarly trying task. I think my hon. friend has not stinted, nor yet has he exaggerated his congratulations to them, although he endeavoured to break the force of his congratulations by some faults which his critical eye

discerned, and which his critical mind perforce must make note of. That is all right, and, I suppose, is one of those things in common with dispensations of Providence which prevent men from being too much praised and growing too proud over compliments that are given to them. I well remember when my hon. friend, the late member of this House and the predecessor of the hon. gentleman who to-day represents Westmoreland, made his first speech in this House, and how strongly he impressed upon the House and the country his great ability, the remarkable purity and terseness of his diction, and the fine and cultured force of mind which he possessed as a business man and as a public man. Many members of this House, without doubt, felt that when he went to another place, and an honourable place in the Parliament of the country, this House might stand to lose something here in force, and in ability, and in power. But, Sir, the hon. gentleman who has spoken this afternoon so well and so ably, has shown to this House that, on the whole, parliamentary public life has experienced a very great gain. Our former member and associate has his place to fill, and will fill it worthily, in the other House; but he is succeeded here by one who, I believe, by his efforts to-day, has convinced the House that he is no unworthy successor even to such a predecessor. Now, Sir, as to my hon. friend who seconded the Address, too much cannot be said in praise of his sentiments and the manner in which he expressed them. But my hon. friend (Mr. Laurier) had some few criticisms to make, and some information to ask for. My hon. friend is a great seeker after information. Among other things he wanted to know who gained the victory in North Ontario, and he wanted to know what were the sentiments of my hon. friend on the school question. Well, Sir, the hon. gentleman opposite knows full well that his party did not get the victory. He knows full well that the representative of the great Liberal party, now eighteen years out, having formulated all its politics, and laid all its plans, and gathered all its strong men in that contest in North Ontario, fell to the rank of third party, and came within about eighty votes of losing its deposit. So one question is settled for the hon. gentleman and his confrères, viz., that who ever got the victory, it was not the Liberal party or the nominee of that party in North Ontario. As to his laudable desire for information respecting the sentiments on the school question of the hon. gentleman who seconded the reply to the Address, my hon. friend (Mr. McGillivray) is perfectly entitled to rise in his place in the House, as the hon. gentleman leading Her Majesty's Opposition is versed more or less on this difficult matter, the Manitoba school question, in all its constitutional and other diversifications, and especially after this

last and most earnest speech of the hon. gentleman, full of the finest sentiments, full of the strongest declarations, full of the most logical deductions and ask him : Please what is your opinion about the Manitoba school question ? And I venture to say that the answer will be just as barren as regards an affirmative as it was in the case of the hon. gentleman who did not try to instruct this House, and therefore made no failure. If the hon. gentleman does not know who gained the victory in North Ontario, perhaps he does know the result of the contest in Cardwell. He certainly knows that his party did not gain the victory, for the nominee of the hon. gentleman lost his deposit, became the third party in a diminishing ratio, and the result gave rise to the very general conclusion, which was taken up by independent newspapers in this country and newspapers in other countries, that the Liberal party, whatever may be said as regards other parties had collapsed in the province of Ontario. The hon. gentleman agrees with most of the Speech. I am happy to know that. I do not recollect any Speech presented to the consideration of this House which has met with so hearty an acquiescence as this Speech has at the hands of my hon. friend. He agreed with almost every section. There are eighteen sections, I think, in the Speech, and he did not criticise adversely more than one or two of them, and he heartily agreed with most of them. There is that much then we can congratulate ourselves upon, that in framing a Speech and presenting it to this House. His Excellency has the approval, in the main, of Her Majesty's loyal Opposition, as voiced by its leader in this House. There is one section, however, on which he did make a little objection. The harvest, he said, was bountiful : he almost stuck at what interpretation he should give to the latter part of the clause, as to whom was the giver of all good. At first he was inclined to think it was the Deity himself, afterwards he rather qualified the expression by wanting to know whether or not it was not meant to be the Liberal-Conservative party. Well, Sir, the nearest benefactor is often the one that is first looked to, and I think the phrase itself may be interpreted in this way : that for the bountiful harvest and for all blessings we enjoy in this country conjointly we may be thankful to the Giver of all Good, and one of the items which enters into the basis of that thankfulness is that the Liberal-Conservative policy and the Liberal-Conservative party is in power in this country. The harvest was bounteous, the hon. gentleman said, but prices were not good. At all events, by virtue of the Liberal-Conservative party and its policy the prices in Canada for the cereals of the country have been kept higher than they would have been if the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite had been in force. A bountiful harvest in this country side by side with an overflowing

Mr. FOSTER.

harvest on the southern side of the line that separates us from the United States made it possible that if the surplus of that country could have been sent over to Canada, it would have materially diminished the prices that the farmers received for their cereals and agricultural products. The only thing that saved prices was the fact that there was the barrier of a protective tariff against the farmers on this side of the line and the abundant crops on the other.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. I am glad the hon. gentleman opposite agrees in that sentiment. My hon. friend also drew attention to the section in the Address which refers to the arming and the strengthening of the militia and defences of Canada. He spoke words none too hearty, he spoke none too approvingly of the militia of this country, and he voiced what is the general sentiment of this House and the country, that its militia deserves well at its hands, and it is the duty of the country to put the best and the newest arms in the hands of the militia, and see that they are well taken care of and equipped in this respect. But he had to qualify that by saying, that he could perceive in it the flavour of a jingo policy. Well, Sir, I leave it to the hon. gentleman and all reasonable men to say if, taking up that paragraph in reply to the Speech, they can see anything in it which savours of defiance or in the least approaches to a jingo policy. It is a modest and straightforward expression, meaning exactly what he says and nothing more, and my hon. friend, I think, will agree that it does not in the least show a tendency in the direction suggested. No person in Canada who loves his country and desires its peace and prosperity, can, in the present juncture of circumstances, whatever may be said at other times, think of breathing a spirit of defiance and jingoism. This would be furthest remove possible from that sensible and well developed sentiment of Canada, which while it honours love of country, feels the evidence of strength in its arms, and cherishes in its heart the full purpose to defend that country and stand by it whenever it is threatened, yet relying on its own calmness, force and strength, does not ask for declamation, and does not flaunt itself in defiance. But he would read the signs of the times not aright in these somewhat troublesome days, when the great mother Empire stands splendidly isolated in Europe, with interests stretching over the wide world, with a commerce the greatest of any nation of the world has ever possessed and vulnerable on every quarter of the sea, who did not feel as Britain feels to-day, and is showing it, that the country's weal, the country's progress, the country's stability, all of the country's pride and glory must base itself upon the strong arms and willing

loyal hearts of the citizenship of that Empire from one end of it to the other. It is the right and duty of Britain herself and of every dependency that belongs to her to be ready, aye, ready as well as steady in its sentiments of loyalty and devotion for the Empire as a whole. It is in that spirit and not in any spirit that asks for war or trouble that that modest reference was placed in the Queen's Speech. And in pursuance of that it is the determination of this Government to put the militia, and the defences of this country, so far as can possibly be done by Canada, into a state which is adequate to the feelings, the interests, and the security of this country in itself, and as a portion of the Empire. Now, Sir, my hon. friend (Mr. Laurier) has referred to the developments of foreign markets. I would not speak of that for a single moment except that he introduced a specious fallacy which is often thrown at the Liberal-Conservative party. It is this: You tell me that the farmer of Great Britain is seeking for protection, that to-day the weight of competition is being felt by the English farmer who when raising his wheat 100 miles from London is at a disadvantage in competition with the man who raises his wheat 3,000 miles away under other and freer conditions; and that therefore the British farmer is looking for protection to aid him in the unequal competition. But, says my hon. friend, if the British farmer gets the protection that he needs, it is a death-blow to you as a protectionist in Canada. That I think, Sir, is not a view that takes in the whole of the situation. We shall have time to discuss that by and by, but there is just one great question to-day which is pressing itself to the front, which is becoming every day more and more considered by the best statesmen of Great Britain and the Colonies, and that is, as to whether these forces and outside circumstances conjoining together, the time is not approaching when it shall not become a question simply as to whether Great Britain shall give protection to her farmers, but when the greater problem will appear for solution as to whether the needs of the Empire can not be best met within the Empire itself, as to whether the Empire's markets can not be supplied by the Empire's producers, and practical independence of foreign countries in food supplies be secured, so that in time of trial and war the Empire's producers may be rid of that great danger of the present time, in this, that the Empire itself shall be sufficient to feed and to produce for the needs of the Empire itself. Now, my hon. friend (Mr. Laurier) approached another question, and that was what he called the gravest question which could possibly be approached by Parliament. He declared that this session of Parliament was remarkable because it was called to approach and settle that question. No one

doubts that it is a grave question. I am not going to discuss it at this time broadly. The time will come, and come before long in this House, when the House must settle down to a discussion of this question, and then, I hope that the House, as I believe it will, will settle down to that discussion with a full understanding of its gravity and its bearings, not only upon the small minority of people in Manitoba who feel that certain rights which they have had and enjoyed and that they thought were guaranteed to them were taken away; but that the House will discuss it also in its bearings upon the country as a whole, as doing even-handed justice to every minority, to every class, and to every condition of people that live under our constitution and who have the benefits and perform the duties of citizenship in our common country. But, Sir, I want to draw the attention of hon. gentlemen to a most remarkable exhibition, one which I am sorry to say is not unusual even in this House. You saw the fire flashing from the eye of my hon. friend (Mr. Laurier) as he approached this question filled with a noble purpose to plant himself squarely upon definite facts and to take this House and this country into his confidence as to his exact position upon that great question. You saw him flagellate, and lacerate the weakness, and delay, and vacillation of the Government on the position it had taken. You heard him utter brave sentiments as to Manitoba, as to the constitution, as to provincial autonomy and what not; but, Sir, he still remains within the lines of Torres Vedras. He still remains within these lines, for whilst he said that he deeply sympathized with the Manitoba minority, whilst he said he wished to have their schools and their privileges restored to them, whilst he went over the question as to whether it could be effectual at all if Manitoba did not do it, and expressed an invincible repugnance naturally to forcing anything upon people who did not want it; whilst he argued finically about appeals in general, that if there is now an appeal some people say it ought to be granted and some people deny it should be granted; he himself takes the definite and clear position: that it must be granted or denied as the circumstances of the case warrant it. And then, Sir, rising to the full height of clear and definite statement, he says: This I maintain, who will say the opposite. But what is the "this" that he maintains? After five years, he has got so far outside the lines of Torres Vedras as to say that there is an appeal and there is a right to interfere, some men say it ought to be granted, some men say it ought to be denied, but I take my stand upon the definite and well understood ground, that it must be denied or granted as the circumstances warrant. So much for the hon. gentleman's position. I saw a very comic picture in a daily paper, illustrating what I suppose were the

long line of Torres Vedras, and two heels sticking out from under a rampart with the name of the leader of the Opposition printed upon them. To-day I do not even see the boot heels. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Laurier) has worked himself entirely within the lines. He has planted himself upon an airy nothing done up in verbiage to which no man living can give a definite meaning. And, Sir, having planted no defences, having trained no guns, having deployed no army, having shown no line of battle; he cannonades the Liberal-Conservatives for sticking to the constitution only when it is to the interests of their party to do so. He makes a show of cannonading the enemy's position and then gently and quietly retires under a burst of applause for the attack he has made upon the Government. They may be his tactics, but they are childish tactics. Sir, there is not a suspicion of statesmanship in tactics like that. But my hon. friend (Mr. Laurier) will have this much to comfort him. The time is coming, Sir, when the lines of Torres Vedras will not be able to shelter him. He must come to the question sooner or later. Whatever be the result of it one thing will happen; that after a long six years of tergiversations and wanderings, and meanderings, my hon. friend will have to plant one vote that will have the power of a direct answer as to his convictions on this question. Oh, he says, you stand upon the constitution and say you are bound by it; but you are not bound by the constitution when it suits your party interests not to be bound by it? How can you show it? Two constituencies are at present not represented in this House; for not having them represented when this House met, he declares we are base, cowardly, criminal.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. Those words form a bond of connection, a tie thicker than of blood, between the hon. leader of the Opposition and the member for South Oxford; because, if there is anything that will make a family connection with the member for South Oxford, it is a flow of strong and sturdy expletives, which have much of sound but little significance, because they are based simply upon the spirit of invective. Well, Sir, what has happened? Why are we criminal, may I ask my hon. friend? He himself stated—he was bound to state it—that the law as it is did not compel us. A man is a criminal if he violates the law; if he has not violated the law, he is not a criminal. Will my hon. friend wipe that word out from his list of his expletives? My hon. friend has a poor memory. He pounds and lacerates the Liberal-Conservative party because two constituencies are not represented—in one the election being now over, and in the other the election being in progress; but his mind

Mr. FOSTER.

does not go back to a short time ago—no, quite a long time ago—when he was a member of the Liberal Government in this country, and when his party—that party of principle, that party of constitutional right, that party of open and manly fair-play—pursued the very same tactics, and in the province of Nova Scotia—that 'arida nutrix leonum' of which my hon. friend spoke last night, and then denied the very words he used—

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No.

Mr. FOSTER. Denied that he called that province the 'arida nutrix leonum,' which he freely translated as the dry-nurse, and the wet-nurse, too, of the most gigantic pack of boodlers this country has ever known. If my hon. friend will read a little of his own party history, he will find an instance in Nova Scotia in 1878 in which the very same tactics which he has denounced to-day were the tactics of his own party, and if I may have the benefit of such a suggestion, I say that if his party were in power and not in opposition to-day, and the law did not prevent, they would pursue the very same policy.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Give the facts and the dates.

Mr. FOSTER. The facts and the dates are here. Mr. Vail, who was Minister of Militia, and Mr. Jones, went to Nova Scotia. They were disqualified from sitting in this House, they went to Nova Scotia, and their elections were held consecutively and not simultaneously.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. FOSTER. One of the noblest sentiments which ever came from the lips of my hon. friend was uttered in the city of Montreal or the city of Toronto, I am not sure which, not long since. That sentiment was this, that in the United States of America, when a public man had been declared guilty of corrupt practices, he was driven out of public life entirely by the force of public sentiment. "I am sorry to say," he added, "that public spirit in Canada does not rise to that height."

Mr. LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend himself has foregathered over and again with men who have been unseated and disqualified for corrupt practices in the Dominion of Canada. My hon. friend's memory is short in this respect too. There was a man in this House of the name of German, who represented a constituency in the Niagara peninsula, and who was disqualified for seven years. Not many months afterwards my hon. friend stood on a platform with this same disqualified gentleman, and sang a paean of praise in honour of the sterling qualities of Mr. German.

Mr. LAURIER. Will my hon. friend permit me? There was a man disqualified in the

province of Quebec under precisely the same circumstances as Mr. German, and he was raised to the Senate by the hon. gentleman.

Mr. FOSTER. And so my hon. friend, feeling the prickings of conscience, feeling that he has been found out as a poser of magnificent proportions in the distance, when the fact has been brought home to him that he herds with disqualified men who have been driven out of public life by the courts, says, granted, but of some of you the same may be said. Where was his candidate in Montreal Centre in the last by-election that he talks so much about?

Mr. LAURIER. I ask the hon. gentleman's pardon. He will have to apologize to the hon. member for Montreal Centre (Mr. McShane).

Mr. FOSTER. Will he? What for?

Mr. LAURIER. Yes, because the sentence given against Mr. McShane was reversed by the court of appeal.

Mr. McMULLEN. Take it back.

Mr. FOSTER. I will proceed, if my hon. friends on the other side will be quiet. I was proceeding to say, where was the candidate for Montreal Centre at this last by-election?

Mr. CASEY. At the head of the polls.

Mr. FOSTER. At the head of the polls, and a candidate with a record which is written in the evidence and the decisions of the courts—such a record and such evidence that the staunchest Liberal paper in the English language in the city of Montreal wished and prayed, and put its wish in its columns almost daily, that the Liberal candidate might be defeated for the credit of the Liberal party. Yet my hon. friend, having done the same when he was formerly in power as he has charged against us, in this matter of keeping constituency after constituency open, and taking them in their time, finds fault with the Liberal-Conservative party and Government to-night. I cite to him the election of Westmoreland if he pleases. The contest there came on early after the appointment of Mr. Wood to the Senate, and that campaign drew into the ranks of the Liberal party as fighters all the prominent public men they had in the maritime provinces against but few on the other side. They had a full opportunity of deploying their whole strength for that struggle, and they were ignominiously defeated.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Six o'clock.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not care to ask the House to listen to me after 8 o'clock. If they will give me two minutes now I will finish my remarks and leave the floor to some one else. I do not think, looking over my notes, that there is any other remark that I wish to criticise at this particular

time. Before closing, I wish to draw the attention of my hon. friends on both sides of this House, to the impotency of the conclusion to which my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, as representing his party, has come to-night on the Manitoba school question. He had the goodness to taunt some gentlemen on this side with not speaking their opinion. I reply to that simply by asking him to name a prominent supporter of himself and party on that side of the House, who, within the last three years, since this question has been discussed, has ventured to give his opinion with reference to the Manitoba school question, and how it ought to be settled. Until my hon. friend has courage himself, and until he can infuse courage into the hearts of those gentlemen who support him, it would be better for him to cease taunting gentlemen on this side with not having the courage of their opinions and with failing to express them.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I rise to express my hope that the hon. gentleman will not fail to be here to-night. He is rather apt to avoid attendance.

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

After Recess.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I propose, on the present occasion, to reply, first of all, to the last question which was put by the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster). That hon. gentleman desired to know why it was that the leaders of the Opposition were so exceedingly reticent in dealing with the question of the Manitoba schools. Sir, it is a strange question for a leader of the Government to put, why it is that gentlemen in the Opposition, in no wise responsible to the country or to Parliament for dealing with this question—men who understand, if he does not, how grave a question it is, how deep its issues go, and what the consequences of a mistake may be in dealing with it—should be somewhat cautious and somewhat reticent in expressing an opinion until, at least, they have the measure which the Government have proposed to lay before us for a year back, and which they have not, up to this time, found courage to submit to the House—which, peradventure, they have not yet found courage to submit to that remarkably united and harmonious body which constitutes the present Government of Canada. Sir, I will tell the hon. gentleman briefly—it is true, and it is a good old respectable proverb, that fools rush in where angels fear to tread, and I do not propose, and my hon. friends here do not propose to be dragged into a discussion of this question until, at least, we know what the Government proposes to do. I am sorry that the ex-Minister of Justice (Sir Charles Hib-

bert Tupper) is not in his place, because I remember that a few months ago he addressed a somewhat similar question to me. Were he in his place I would tell him that statesmen may well pause and hesitate to deal with this question, and it would have been well for him and his colleagues, too, if they had paused and thought a little while before they issued the remedial order which they were obliged, very shortly afterwards, practically to cancel. Sir, allow me to say this, with respect to my own attitude on all questions of this kind. I have had occasion, I know, to excite to a considerable degree, the animosity of hon. gentlemen opposite, and it may have been that in my career I have not sufficiently respected the delicate feelings and fine susceptibilities of those hon. gentlemen, and it may well be that I have occasionally called a spade a spade, and then when I have caught men with their arms up to their elbows in the public treasury, I have designated their acts as they deserved to be designated, and I propose to do so still. But my record, on one point, at any rate, will bear investigation. In the thirty and three years I have sat in one Parliament and another—and I may say my record has been pretty minutely scrutinized—I challenge the hon. gentleman, I challenge his friends and his followers, I challenge his hireling press, I challenge any and everybody on that side of the House to point to one instance where I have attempted to make political capital by stirring up strife on questions of race and religion. Sir, I am a Canadian, and not of yesterday. I am a Canadian, the son of a Canadian, the grandson of a Canadian, the great-grandson of a man who was an Englishman, and who forfeited everything that men hold dear for the purpose of maintaining and supporting the English flag. Under those circumstances, I am not likely, under any temptation, to be the man to set one class of my fellow-countrymen, on any such grounds, against another. But, as I have said, it is a strange question for hon. gentlemen to put, who, at present, are supposed to be the Government of Canada, who are supposed to be the men charged by the country with the express duty of dealing with this question, who are the men to whom we pay \$100,000 a year—very badly earned, I fear—for the express purpose of dealing with this question and similar questions. They turn to us, they turn to my hon. friend (Mr. Laurier), and they say: Tell us what to do; tell us, for heaven's sake what to do; do not conceal your views on this important subject; help us poor sinners in this dilemma, we do not know what to do; for heaven's sake come to our rescue. The hon. gentleman might well have spared his very inconsiderate and very foolish taunt at my hon. friend. I will take it upon me to say, once for all, that if there be one man in Canada who deserves less than another the

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

reproach of undue reticence, much less the reproach of inconsistency in dealing with this question, that man is Wilfred Laurier. More, I say that if ever any public man took his life in his hands, under circumstances of peculiar difficulty, and if any public man has, for years back, been more straight or consistent in dealing with the question than my friend beside me, I should like to know his name, for he is assuredly not to be found in this Chamber. From the very start, Sir, my hon. friend has declared that this is a question of fact as well as of law, that this is a question which it is imperatively necessary you should investigate, in which it is imperatively necessary you should ascertain the true and exact conditions and circumstances, and having done that, that you should, not pass a remedial order taking the province of Manitoba by the throat as these hon. gentlemen did, but negotiate calmly and prudently with the province and, in that way, endeavour to obtain, as it only can be obtained, a proper and amicable settlement of a most important and most complicated question. Sir, there are none so blind as those who will not see; and I am in the judgment of this House, to quote a distinguished gentleman who, we hear, is shortly to be a member of this House, whether, except the Minister of Finance and others like him who cannot afford to see and cannot afford to admit the fact, there is one man on either side who does not understand distinctly what my hon. friend meant, or one man who does not know that my hon. friend, whether in this House or in the province of Quebec or in the province of Ontario from end to end has, for the several years steadily and persistently advised the self-same course. These paltry jeers might well be spared. They do not do any credit to hon. gentlemen, and they simply invite a comparison with their conduct in this matter. Does the hon. gentleman suppose that we do not know why that same precious remedial order was passed? Does the hon. gentleman think we do not know that, nearly nine months ago they were prepared to go to the elections with a lie in their right hand? Does the hon. gentleman not know that when the order was passed—and we have proof of this in the declaration of his own colleagues—they meant to take the remedial order to Quebec, or to the gentlemen who, they thought, controlled the people of Quebec and say: There is our remedial order and that is the legislation we will pass? And do they not know that lodge pledges were being given at the self-same time in Haldimand and other places to the effect that they would have no remedial legislation at all, and that the remedial order was not worth the paper it was written on?—and they spoke the truth there, whoever made the assertion. Why was it, let me ask, that that excellent plot was not carried out to a successful termination? It is the

misfortune of some men to be better known than trusted. It was the misfortune of these gentlemen that the men whom they sought to impose upon would not take their promissory note. No, Sir, nothing short of an Act of Parliament, signed, sealed and delivered would be sufficient to fill the bill, and therefore we had a fifth session of this Parliament—

An hon. MEMBER. Sixth session.

SIR RICHARD CARTWRIGHT—and therefore we have also a sixth session of this Parliament. No, Sir, we had the fifth session because the remedial order was not accepted as satisfactory by the parties for whose benefit it was passed. Are not gentlemen present in this House who know, and know right well, that when the Minister of Public Works, who I am sorry not to see in his place, was contesting the election in Verchères, he took his Maker to witness that during the approaching session an Act would be passed exactly and precisely in the terms and words of the remedial order? Does not the hon. gentleman know that? Or will his colleague the Minister of Public Works dare to deny that he made that assertion? He will have plenty of time before this debate closes, and there are friends of mine who will recall it to his attention. I do not see my hon. friend from Verchères (Mr. Geoffrion) in his place at the moment. That hon. gentleman knows that the Minister of Public Works made the statement, and I challenge the Minister of Public Works to deny it when he comes to his place. As to what passed in the lodges in Haldimand, perhaps my hon. friend from North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) can give some information. We have not heard him, but we should like to hear him on that question. As I have said, these gentlemen's conduct might have warned them not to stir up reproach on this subject. Their policy, forsooth, is first to bully and then to cringe. Our policy, on the contrary, is first to investigate and then to negotiate, and then to do justice between the two classes of our countrymen. What has their policy done? Let the result of yesterday answer. Sir, I tell them that I fully expected that Mr. Greenway would have sent a telegram to the ex-Minister of Justice to inform him that thanks to his remedial order and thanks to that alone, the Greenway Government to-day is returned with 32, if not 33 supporters out of 40, the remainder being composed of 4 Conservatives and 3 Patrons. There is Manitoba's answer to your remedial order. What is the Dominion's answer? The hon. gentleman was good enough to say that the Liberal party had not much to boast of in the late elections. I read the record rather differently. The Liberal party can point to Antigonish, the Liberal party can point to Verchères, it can point to Montreal Centre, to Jacques Cartier, and to West Huron. I

think all these are reasonably conclusive answers as to what the Dominion at large thinks of this policy of bully and cringe. I may have something more to say on that subject before I close; but, in the meantime, although I am trespassing on my hon. friend's prerogative, I do want to say a word or two about this constitutional question. My hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) need not be afraid, however. The authority I am going to quote is one which, although he is well acquainted with it, he does not frequently quote. The authority I am going to quote is no less than Hosea Biglow:

Here we stan' on the Constitution, by thunder,
It's a fact o' which ther's bushels o' proofs;
Fer how could we trample on't so, I wonder,
Ef't worn't thet it's ollers under our hoofs?

For the particular edification of the hon. gentleman's supporters, I may remark that this is a quotation from the works of an ex-Minister to the Court of St. James. There are other very valuable suggestions in this work, and perhaps the hon. gentleman would like to peruse it. The hon. gentleman was good enough to allude to the action of my hon. friend in consorting with publicans and sinners who had happened to get into trouble in the courts. I think it can be shown that he is not without example in that respect. I beg leave to say, and with some knowledge of the facts, that when I perused the evidence on which my friend Mr. German was disqualified, I came to the conclusion that, whatever were the grounds on which the courts of justice acted, very great hardship was inflicted upon that gentleman, even if very grave injustice was not done him, when he was disqualified upon the evidence presented in his case. As to my hon. friends in Nova Scotia who, the hon. gentleman declared, had been disqualified—and here let me ask them how it came that if, they were disqualified, they again ran for seats in Parliament—

MR. FOSTER. I must say that that word "disqualified" should not have been used. The memorandum was put in my hands hurriedly, and I scarcely read it.

SIR RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman was not good enough to give us the dates on which these seats were vacated and the writs of election given. Had he done so, he would have shown and the House would have seen that under the Mackenzie Government there was no parallel for the cowardly trickery my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition most properly denounced. I will say just a word or two about the cases of Messrs. Jones and Vail, honourable men both. It is true that, at great cost to themselves, at enormous loss to themselves, these gentlemen and four or five others did run a Liberal journal in Halifax which did receive some trifle of Dominion patronage. It is true that by a

strict construction of the law, they were obliged to vacate their seats as being part owners in that newspaper.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) They resigned.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. They resigned, owing to the doubt. Now, what they ought to have done was this, as a good many gentlemen opposite did and they ought to have profited by experience. They ought to have formed a joint stock company of five, as Mr. White, of the Montreal "Gazette," and other ingenious gentlemen did, and thereafter drew hundreds of thousands of dollars at various times out of the Dominion treasury. Or they might have done as my hon. friend suggests certain proprietors of the Regina "Leader" have done, who also figure very conspicuously in our Auditor General's account. Sir, I am not here to defend or excuse the mistakes which Mr. Vail and Mr. Jones made. They suffered for it, they had to resign their seats rather than stand an action at law, and thereafter Mr. Jones was elected for the very constituency, my hon. friend opposite represents. But I do protest against any rational man contending that there was any moral criminality on the part of Mr. Jones or Mr. Vail. Why, Sir, their losses on that transaction might be measured by thousands. They never made a penny, or hoped to make a penny, from any two-penny ha'penny patronage which they obtained from the Dominion Government. Sir, I now come to something where the hon. gentleman ought to be more at home. The hon. gentleman tells us that although prices were low in Canada, they were better than in the United States. Now, I would like the hon. gentleman to explain to me, or explain to this House, and would like him to explain to this country, what, in the majority of cases, fixes the prices of cereals in Canada or in the United States. Does he not know that the prices of cereals in Canada and in the United States are fixed by the European markets? It may possibly be true—I leave that question to be dealt with by my hon. friend from Huron (Mr. McMillan)—it may possibly be true that in a few isolated cases, for a very short time, under very exceptional circumstances, and when it was no benefit whatever to the farmers of Canada, prices in one or two isolated points in Canada, may have ruled higher than they did in the United States; but on the average, and taking the whole country through, I say that the statement is wholly incorrect, and that as a rule, and taking the thing from year's end to year's end, prices were, as a matter of fact, higher in the United States than in Canada, the hon. gentleman's tariff wall to the contrary notwithstanding. Sir, the hon. gentleman poses as an authority on agricultural matters. Must I remind him of the lesson which was read to him by my hon. friend behind me when, in his

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

budget speech, he made this most extraordinary statement, and mind you, this was not lightly made, this was made in a document which is a state paper, a document which I think was typewritten, a document which was, at any rate, carefully thought over and prepared. Here was what the hon. gentleman said:

I wish to adduce some figures to show what has been done for the agricultural interests of this country. In 1877 the people of this country consumed, in agricultural products, animals and their products, from Great Britain, \$56,000 worth; from the United States, \$16,000,000 worth; from other countries, \$7,000 worth, making a total of \$16,131,000 worth. In 1878 these imports for home consumption amounted to \$15,000,000, and in 1879 to \$16,420,000. The National Policy did its work, and the result was that the importation of these products fell to \$4,240,000, in 1891; to \$3,000,000, in 1892; to \$2,741,000, in 1893; in other words, in the three years, 1877-78-79, there was an average annual import of those products for consumption of \$13,867,000, whereas in the last three years, there was an average annual import of the same materials for home consumption, of \$3,358,000.

There is a statement made in his place by a Finance Minister of six years' standing, by the hon. gentleman. Sir, the fact was this, that hon. gentleman was utterly ignorant of what he was talking about. The hon. gentleman did not know the first a, b, c of these identical Trade and Navigation Returns I hold in my hand. Had he turned over the second page, he would have seen the facts to which my hon. friend here directed his attention, and he would have seen that in 1877 he had made an error of \$4,000,000, in 1878 he had made an error of \$9,000,000, in 1879 he had made an error of \$6,700,000; and in the three years he had made a total error of \$20,000,000. Sir, my hon. friend, I am sure, will be very happy to give him a much needed lesson in political economy, which will teach him what was the real effect of the National Policy in the matter of promoting the market for agricultural products, and after he has done that, I would advise him to consult on the question that other financial sage whom I do not see here, the present Minister of Agriculture. Why, Sir, the youngest clerk in my department, when I had a department, would have risked his head if he had brought a statement to me, when I had sent him instructions to prepare a document of that kind, and he had committed a mistake of that kind. It is not so much the mistake itself, as the character of the mistake. I have never denied that the hon. gentleman is an excellent talking machine, a first-class talking machine, a magnificent talking machine; but I have denied, and do deny, that the hon. gentleman possesses any real, genuine, thorough knowledge of the questions which he attempts to deal.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh. oh.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Perhaps my hon friends who cry "oh" will under-

take to back up that statement; they will have an opportunity as soon as I sit down, and let them do so. Let them take the statement of my hon. friend from King's (Dr. Borden), let them read it to the House, let them point out the errors my hon. friend has made, as he has pointed out the errors the Finance Minister has made; and when they have done that I will withdraw most humbly the aspersions I have thrown out against the hon. gentleman. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman comes to another matter, a question I desire to approach with all possible care, under the present circumstances. The hon. gentleman twitted my hon. friend because he ventured to suggest a doubt whether, under present circumstances, it was altogether prudent to call attention in the Speech from the Throne, to the necessity of increasing the armament of Canada. Now, he will not find, and he has not found in the past, that this side of the House was disposed to throw any impediment in the way of any well-considered scheme for increasing the efficiency of our militia, or even for improving our defences, in reason. I have this to tell him, however. The hon. gentleman declared—he is welcome to correct—I took down his words, that England to-day "stands splendidly isolated." Sir, England does stand isolated, but I think true statesmen would have said that England stands dangerously isolated, and not splendidly isolated. And that I know is the opinion of English statesmen of very high rank whose opinion on such a subject is worth much more than that of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. FOSTER. Still, I suppose, I have a right to express it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. You have the right to use the word "splendidly" and I have the right to point out that it was grandiloquent nonsense. Now, Sir, I have a word or two to say on this same subject of "splendid isolation." For many a year, not alone in my place here, but in the Cabinets of English ministers, I have steadfastly pointed out—I, a descendant of men who quitted the United States rather than see the English flag pulled down—that the true interest of England, the real interest of England, the thing of all others which English and Canadian statesmen should apply themselves to, is to provide England with a true ally and the only true ally worthy of her that she can find, are her own descendants in the United States. That, Sir, is the true policy; that is the policy which true friends of Canada most anxiously desired to see after the heat of battle had passed away. That is the policy which Canada can help to promote, if Canada is guided by statesmen who understand her interests and the real interests of the Empire. I repeat, that it is not of yesterday I have made these statements. I can well

remember, two and twenty years ago, discussing this subject with Lord Carnarvon, then Minister of the Colonies, and I told Lord Carnarvon that this was one of the things which British statesmen would do well to lay to heart, and were I Minister of the Colonies, the first thing I would do would be to paint above the door of my office "In 1900 there will be 80,000,000 English-speaking people on the continent of America." These are the men whom England should secure as allies, and after all these passing war scares and clouds have disappeared, I do hope and trust it will yet be found to be in the power of English statesmen and of Canadian statesmen worthy of the name, to bring about a true defensive alliance with the only nation which can really imperil the supremacy of England on the sea. Sir, it may be that the mischievous policy and language of hon. gentlemen and their press have put numerous difficulties in the way of my hon. friend beside me and his colleagues when he comes to deal with that question, as he will shortly do. But here I take the opportunity, as I have been accused of being unjust to Sir Charles Tupper, the elder, of saying that he possesses one merit which I recognize fully. Sir, when in this House in 1888 I proposed a scheme for obtaining an honourable reciprocity with the United States, with the consent and approval of my hon. friends behind me, to the credit of Sir Charles Tupper, the elder, he it said that even a pair of horses could not drag him into the House to oppose the proposition.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does the hon. gentleman deny it; let him look at the records. Sir Charles Tupper preserved a discreet silence on the subject, quite equal to that maintained by any hon. gentleman on the Manitoba School question by any hon. gentleman on this side of the House. More than that, to Sir Charles Tupper's credit be it said—and it atones, in my eyes, for many sins, and he has a great many to atone for—and the speech is on record, he took occasion very shortly afterwards to proclaim aloud his extreme dislike to any other policy, and by and by he reproved in pretty strong terms some of his colleagues for the way they conducted negotiations at Washington by which they brought this country almost to within an hour or day of a commercial war with the United States, which he truly said—and his words will be found recorded in "Hansard"—would have been preliminary to actual war, than which said Sir Charles Tupper, and I for once agreed with him, no greater misfortune could befall civilization than war between England and the United States. Sir, the hon. gentleman was good enough to talk as to what they have done for the development of the markets, and he insinuated, and his friends have insinu-

ated for a long time, that in all this National Policy of theirs they have a single eye to the unity of the Empire and the promotion of trade with Great Britain. Well, Sir, their intentions may have been as good as those which pave the High Street in Hades, or any other avenue in that locality, but their performances have been miserably inadequate. I take first from the hon. gentleman's own return, the aggregate trade of the Dominion by countries. In 1874, when the renegade Grits were carrying on the Government of Canada, our trade with Great Britain, Canada's population being 3,750,000, was \$108,000,000. In 1895, with a population of 5,000,000, our aggregate trade was \$92,000,000, or \$16,000,000 less than it was under Mr. Mackenzie's regime. Sir, the hon. gentleman talks of the wonderful progress we have made. In 1874, with a population of 3,750,000, our aggregate trade was \$217,801,000, being a per capita aggregate of \$.58 per head.

Mr. WELDON. Read the figures for 1879.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I have nothing to do with 1879; but I will explain the point to the hon. member before I am done. In 1895, our aggregate trade, with a population of 5,000,000, was of the value of \$224,000,000. Our trade had fallen from \$58 per head to \$44 per head. It is quite true that our trade had fallen considerably in 1878; and why? Let the hon. gentleman opposite explain to his followers the reason why. There had been a tremendous commercial depression during four or five years extending over the whole world, but chiefly affecting our greatest customers, Great Britain and the United States. There had been a huge shrinkage in the values of imported goods. Probably we imported nearly as much, but the values had shrunken largely, and hon. gentlemen opposite made a disingenuous use of the fact in their attack on Mr. Mackenzie with respect to steel rails; and although the quantities of goods imported remained about the same, the values were considerably less in 1878 than in 1874. These were the grounds on which the Minister of Finance lately justified the shrinkage in the returns, and the deficit of \$4,153,000, which is one of the many signs of prosperity accruing under our present policy.

Mr. WELDON. The hon. gentleman has not yet given us the figures.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The amount is \$175,000,000, and if the hon. gentleman will divide that sum by 3,800,000 people, he will find that after five years of depression and shrinkage of values, we did as well in our worst year as hon. gentlemen opposite are doing now, if not better. Now, I will take the value of exports. In 1894, (and be it remembered that hon. gentlemen opposite are increasing our trade with Great Britain by leaps and bounds) we ex-

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

ported to Great Britain the value of \$68,000,000. This year we exported the value of \$61,000,000, a loss of \$7,000,000. Per contra, in 1894, we exported to the United States the value of \$35,000,000; last year we exported the value of \$41,000,000, being a gain of \$6,800,000; in other words our export trade with the United States increased by \$7,000,000, while our export trade with Great Britain decreased \$7,000,000. By way of showing in what fashion the National Policy has increased our trade with Britain, I now take the value of goods entered for consumption, which is also a useful test. I take the year 1874, to suit the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon). We imported in that year from Great Britain, goods to the value of \$63,000,000; in 1895, we imported goods to the value of \$31,000,000, rather less than half. And here is a remarkable instance of the way in which the National Policy gets in its fine work, as the hon. gentleman opposite is fond of saying. I have here a table—and I am obliged to him for it, as it saves some calculation—of the duties collected. The duties collected on goods to the value of \$31,000,000, which we imported from Great Britain amounted to \$7,000,000. We imported, during the same year, goods to the value of \$54,000,000 from the United States, and we charged them \$6,897,000 duty. Coming to the percentage, which the hon. gentleman is so fond of quoting, I am sorry to say that whereas in 1874 the percentage of duty on the total value of goods imported, dutiable and free, amounted to 11¼ per cent, the total percentage now amounts to 16¼; and it is a very curious fact that the duty on the goods imported from Great Britain under the hon. gentleman's tariff is as nearly as possible, 100 per cent more than the duty levied on American goods. The average duty on English goods is 22½ per cent, the average duty on American goods is 12½ per cent, so that you charge on English goods just about double what you charge on goods imported from the United States.

Mr. FOSTER. The same quality of goods?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Of course not, but the hon. gentleman will understand that I am following Solomon's rule, and I am answering these foolish people according to their folly. As for the great comfort and advantage which our Canadian protectionists are going to obtain from the growth of the protection sentiment in Great Britain, let my friend from Huron (Mr. McMillan), and let the farmers from Canada whose cattle and whose sheep have been excluded from the English markets testify at their pleasure. It may be that that heresy will spread in England. Will it not be a most glorious thing for the Canadian farmer that after having been tariff-barred from the United States market, he is to be scheduled out of the English market, and

won't it greatly tend to increase his resignation and patience under the high burdens the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) and his friends have been inflicting on him. And now, Mr. Speaker, I have a word or two to say myself on a question to which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) challenged my attention. With respect to this said Manitoba school question, I think it is rather unfair for the men who are charged with the government of the country to come to us to teach them how to deal with a matter which is in their special province, and which they have specially muddled. Now, I will give the hon. gentleman, as he wants to know, my own view on this matter. I say here—and I am a Protestant, and I represent perhaps an ultra-Protestant constituency—I say here, that I have great sympathy with the Catholic minority in the province of Manitoba. I say more; I am disposed to do all I can in order to have their views met. I wish to be just to them: I wish likewise to be just to the majority in Manitoba, and I have great confidence, for my part, that if properly dealt with and properly appealed to, the majority in Manitoba, strong in their victory, will deal generously with the Catholic minority, and that if it be found on examination and investigation that there is a real grievance, they will be ready to redress it. Let those of our friends who object to any interference with Manitoba remember that when I am saying this I am merely re-echoing the sentiments expressed by the present Premier of Manitoba, who has been so triumphantly returned yesterday. But, Sir, I refuse at present to discuss that question on its merits. I am not going into any disquisition on provincial autonomy. I would like to hear the opinions of some of the constitutional authorities opposite as to the statements and views that were promulgated this afternoon with respect to the right of the provinces to manage their own affairs. I do not think we would find a united and happy family, particularly from the province of Quebec, on that question on the other side of the House. Sir, I waive the technical legal question. I am not going to enter into a disquisition as to whether this Parliament has the legal right to deal with the matter. For argument's sake we will admit that; but I have this to say: every man in this country who knows anything of the composition of this House knows that at best and under the most favourable circumstances the House of Commons is a bad tribunal before which to bring a question of education. It is a question which to be properly dealt with requires special knowledge, which most of us have not. It requires special local knowledge which very few of us can possibly possess, and for these reasons, and under any circumstances, except as a matter of extreme necessity, I deprecate bringing that question from its proper arena of the local legislature into Dominion politics.

Every man of any experience in Canadian politics will, I think, most heartily re-echo that sentiment of mine. Apart from that, I desire to say to my hon. friends on both sides this: there are, it appears to me, the very strongest imaginable reasons, looking at the matter from a moral, from an equitable, from a constitutional point of view, why this House at this particular moment, and under these conditions, should not be called upon to discuss this question at all. First of all, as a matter of physical fact, this House, which was elected on a registration roll made in 1888, seven or eight years ago, has long since ceased to represent the existing electorate of Canada. An enormous proportion of the electors who were on the roll of 1888 have since died; an enormous proportion have left this country, and an enormous proportion have grown to manhood since then. I believe in many constituencies you will not find on the roll to-day fifty per cent of those who were on the roll in 1888. I am certain that, taking the country all through, you will not find that more than two-thirds of the existing electorate were represented in 1888. Therefore, as a mere matter of physical fact, this House cannot pretend to represent the people of Canada to-day. More than that, since this House met a census was held, and the proportions of the representation in no less than four provinces has been altered. The maritime provinces have now 10 per cent more than their population entitles them to, and Manitoba has scarcely two-thirds of the representation its population entitles it to. Now, Mr. Speaker, constitutionally speaking, you know, and every constitutional student knows, that after a census which has disturbed the representation, an appeal to the people ought to have followed, and it is not creditable to the Government that an appeal to the people did not follow within a reasonable measure of time after the census of 1891. Then, Sir, I have a third reason which ought to weigh with those hon. gentlemen. It is extremely inexpedient to introduce a question of this kind, stirring up race and religious prejudices in what is not merely a moribund Parliament, but a Parliament actually in the throes of dissolution. Must I remind those hon. gentlemen who were members of the Government of Sir John Macdonald of the plea on which they anticipated the proper time for the dissolution of Parliament in 1891. We were told by Sir John Macdonald, on his authority as a constitutional lawyer, that it was not proper to deal with a great question involving our commercial relations with the United States in a moribund Parliament, and therefore he anticipated the dissolution of that moribund Parliament by rather more than one year, and justified his action in asking for a dissolution on that score. Sir, is the Minister of Finance going to give Sir John Macdonald points on constitutional law, or is the ex-Minister of Justice going to

teach Sir John Macdonald constitutional law? If it were right and proper to refuse to deal with the question of a commercial treaty in 1891, until we had an appeal to the people, because forsooth the Parliament was moribund and did not therefore represent the people of Canada, what are we to say of men who propose to deal with a question of this gravity in a Parliament which at the best has scarcely a few weeks to live. Sir, I say, in brief, if those hon. gentlemen opposite want my advice: repeal your hasty and ill-considered remedial order, do as Mr. Greenway and the Government of Manitoba have done; appeal to the country. Learn what the opinion of the electorate is on the subject (they have never been consulted yet), and when you have done that, accept the reasonable proposition of Manitoba, issue a proper commission, as my hon. friend (Mr. Laurier) has advised, have the question investigated, negotiate with Manitoba, and I pledge my word in this House that I have every reason to believe that a settlement perfectly satisfactory to all honest men of both parties will be arrived at. Sir, the hour has come, the man is here, and in the seat of my hon. friend Wilfrid Laurier sits the man to whom Canada looks, and not in vain, for the settlement of this question.

Mr. DICKEY. Mr. Speaker, I am afraid nothing I can say would add anything to the weight of the compliment that has already been paid to the mover and seconder of the resolution this afternoon. They have already been told by high authority on both sides of the House with what gratification we have witnessed their admirable performance of the duty assigned to them, a duty that is always a most difficult and trying one to perform, and one which, in my short experience in this House, I have never heard performed in better style, both on the part of the mover and the seconder. I am sure every hon. member of this House on either side must feel that persons who acquit themselves as these hon. gentlemen have done this afternoon, cannot fail to prove with experience most valuable members of this body. I do not propose, Sir, to follow the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) through the whole course of his address; and I suppose, in order that we may get along as fast as possible, it is well that I should begin with the subject on which I can agree with him. I may tell the hon. gentleman that I agree with him in his deprecation of anything like jingo talk on the present occasion. I think it would be most unwise in responsible men, speaking from their places in Parliament, to say anything that would stir the susceptibilities of the most sensitive nation that one could imagine. When the late excitement arose in the neighbouring republic, I had the honour to be the Minister of Militia, and I took the very first opportunity in my power to state, so far as

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

my utterances in that office had any weight, that so far as Canada was concerned, she looked to the common sense of the American people as her best defence. That attitude, Sir, I still maintain. But admitting all that and speaking here with the grave responsibility of office, I have to say this, that I am quite sure that no self-respecting American would think the slightest bit less of any Canadian because in the Speech from the Throne we have dared to say, what is perfectly true, that the Government intend to improve the condition of the militia and to strengthen the defences of the country. Sir, what insult is that to any peaceable neighbour? The most susceptible person could not take the slightest offence from that. I am quite sure that no thoughtful person in Canada took offence because the United States Congress proposed to vote \$100,000,000 for the improvement of the defences of their seaboard. No person questioned their right to do so or felt the least aggrieved at that proposition; and I am sure that the hon. gentleman is more tender for the United States than the United States itself would be, when he says that the mere statement in the official Speech from the Throne that we intend to improve our reserve forces, would excite any offence there. There is one statement of the hon. gentleman in that connection with which I find fault. He speaks of the mischievous language of the Conservative press in connection with that trouble.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman will excuse me. That was not what I said. I referred not to what they said on that occasion, which I think has been fairly considered, but to the language used by them against the Liberal party in 1891, when charges of treason against the half of Canada formed the staple of their campaign sheets.

Mr. DICKEY. I am extremely glad to learn that the hon. gentleman agrees with me—and I think it should be acknowledged here publicly—that the attitude of the press throughout Canada, Liberal and Conservative, during that trying crisis, was eminently creditable to them and eminently creditable to the self-respect and self-restraint of the Canadian people. They held, so far as I could see, a most dignified attitude, and while firm in their language, were most careful not to offend the susceptibilities of our neighbours on the other side of the line. As to the conduct of the Conservative press in 1891, though I can scarcely expect that the hon. gentleman will agree with me, I think I could commend it equally on that occasion. Now, Sir, with respect to the incident which has been mentioned regarding Messrs. Vail and Jones, the hon. gentleman has, I think, misunderstood the charge which was made. The hon. leader of the Opposition charged the Conservative party with high crimes and misdemeanours

because they did not hold the elections for the vacant seats during the recess simultaneously—because they chose their own political pleasure, as he put it—because they chose the days of the several elections so as to benefit their own party. Now, Sir, it is admitted that that was a legal course; it is admitted that that is a course contemplated by the statute.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No.

Mr. DICKEY. I am not here to defend that course in its abstract morality—not at all. I am here to say that that represents the course which the Parliament of Canada, in framing its Election Act thought was the best for this country. Now, the hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition is not considered on this side of the House to be entirely immaculate politically. If the hon. gentleman would condescend to admit some of the weaknesses of humanity, perhaps we would not be so severe with him; but when he stands up and sets his own standard for his own conduct, and throws around himself a mantle of purity, and denounces this Government from a high standpoint, he must take the measure that he has set for himself. Now, the hon. gentleman has declared to this House that it was cowardly, base and criminal to arrange in succession the elections for the vacancies that had occurred. That is the hon. gentleman's own statement. If that statement is correct, the hon. gentleman in his practice was cowardly, was base, and was criminal. I do not say he was, because I have regard to public exigencies and to party exigencies. But I take the hon. gentleman on his own statement. Mr. Vail and Mr. Jones were both disqualified to sit in this House by reason of contracts. No person on the Conservative side that I ever heard imputed any moral blame to either of those gentlemen on that account. Certainly nobody did to-day. The gravamen of the charge was this, that when the seats which those gentlemen had vacated were to be filled, hon. gentlemen opposite dated the election writs on the same day, the 31st day of December, and set one election for one date, and the other election far enough ahead to change their policy in case the first election did not go right. Was that cowardly? Was that base? Was that criminal? If it was, the hon. leader of the Opposition stands convicted of all these things. The then Government made Mr. Vail its Minister of Militia and ran him in Digby, where he was beaten. It immediately appointed Mr. Jones Minister of Militia, and ran him in the county of Halifax, and elected him. Now, Sir, it is not for me to complain of that at all; I admit that frankly. But I say that when a gentleman stands up and assumes a high standard of morality, it is well that he should realize that he is to be judged by the standard of morality which he applies to others.

So much for the Vail and Jones episode. I am quite certain of this, that the hon. the leader of the Opposition will always be moral, that he will always hold his elections together, that he will always do everything which is politically right, so long as he stays where he is. The hon. gentleman has been politically virtuous, so far as holding elections is concerned, for the last seventeen years, and he will have the opportunity of being so for another considerable term. But the only record we have of the hon. gentleman in office is one short year, and during that year the transaction I complain of occurred, which, he says, was base, cowardly and criminal. A good deal has been said with reference to consorting with criminals. I do not propose to follow up that line. I do not think it is a very fruitful subject to discuss, but I must say this. Where a member of this House has been unfortunate enough—and it may be misfortune—to have been convicted of personal corruption by the courts, I do not think it tends to the dignity of debate for a member of this House to get up and attack the judiciary who condemned that man and say he was wrongfully condemned. We may have our private opinions, but I ask the hon. gentleman from South Oxford if, strong, bitter, partisan as he is, he considers himself a fair judge of the evidence on which his own colleague was convicted?

The hon. gentleman was good enough to say that the Finance Minister (Mr. Foster) possessed no knowledge whatever of finance or trade, and in fact I think he went so far as to say that he possessed no knowledge of any kind.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No, I did not say that.

Mr. DICKEY. I am not here to defend the Minister of Finance. Where that hon. gentleman is not known, perhaps he needs some defence, but in this House, which has listened so often to his able speeches, he needs none. We who have listened to the Minister of Finance meeting the hon. knight from South Oxford and downing him, from time to time, can only feel surprise that the hon. gentleman from South Oxford should rate his own powers so low as to admit before this House that he has been beaten so often by a gentleman who knows nothing about finance or anything else. I wish to say a few words with reference to what the hon. gentleman said concerning the Manitoba school question. He began by stating that the course of the leader of the Opposition was straightforward, clear and consistent throughout—that his view had been that the question was one of fact and not of law, and that his advice had been to investigate the facts and to negotiate from start to finish. I admit frankly, as a member of the Administration, that if the hon. leader of the Opposition could make out a case of that kind, he would stand in

a strong position before the House and country ; and it is only because I feel that the leader of the Opposition is open to the charge that he has made a party football of this question, that I consider he stands in a weak position before this House and country with regard to it. I do not propose to discuss the Manitoba school question in many of its bearings.

Mr. McMULLEN. No.

Mr. DICKEY. I am glad to see that the hon. member for Wellington agrees with me that it should not be done. I wish, however, to say something concerning the course of the leader of the Opposition upon that point. My hon. friend, the Minister of Finance, has touched upon it to some degree. I wish to recall to your memory, Mr. Speaker, and to the recollection of members of this House, that the Manitoba school question began in 1891 ; that Sir John Abbott, who then led the Government, refused to disallow the first act ; that when the appeal came up, Sir John Thompson took this ground and said to the appellants, we will only get you into trouble if we hear this appeal, unless our jurisdiction to hear it has been settled by the courts—it will have to go to the courts anyway, and it is far better we should refer it, under the statute, and get a decided opinion. Sir John Thompson and the Government took that course and Parliament endorsed it. That was in the direction of negotiation ; that was in the direction of caution and delay. Did that meet the approval of the leader of the Opposition ? Not at all. In 1893 he supported a motion on the Manitoba school question. What sort of a motion was it ? The hon. gentleman has said in this House, and in Toronto and elsewhere, that he does not wish to get into power on the Manitoba school question, that he does not wish to make political capital out of it ; and yet, what sort of a motion was made in this House by the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte) with the knowledge and connivance of the hon. the leader of the Opposition ? Not a square motion, not a manly motion, not a straightforward motion, but a motion so framed as to catch all the extreme votes upon either side—the extreme Protestant vote and the extreme Catholic vote. I would not complain of that course, if the question were an ordinary political question. I would not complain of it upon a tariff matter, but when the hon. the leader of the Opposition stands up in this House and poses as a man who is going to treat the question as above politics, and when we find him resorting to the most tricky tactics—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. DICKEY. I withdraw the word "tricky." When we find him resorting to tactics which are only justifiable by the ex-

Mr. DICKEY.

treme laws of warfare in connection with party matters, he must give up his claim of being non-partisan and non-political in this matter. That is the first move which the hon. gentleman made. What was the hon. gentleman's cry at that time, that we were moving too fast ? No, that we were not moving fast enough. The hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte) made one of his characteristically fiery speeches. His voice was then for war. I do not know what it is for now. I think the hon. gentleman has been dragooned into silence ; I think the hon. gentleman will now turn up on the other side of the question, driven thither by the party whip. However, this is what he said on that occasion :

Our petitions were there ; they were not taken into consideration. And why ? Because, as usual, the Government was inspired by the desire to cause no commotion. We, therefore, had to wait. The courts of justice decided legal questions.

The hon. gentleman then complained that the Government did not cause commotion ; that was the gravamen of his charge. The hon. gentleman further said :

We are now discussing one of the most momentous questions public men in our country had ever to discuss for the last forty years. After a solemn compact, after arrangements were accepted by the majority, guaranteeing the rights of the minority, without any notice being given, without any regard for the negotiations which took place, these guarantees are thrown aside which protected the rights of the minority. And they would have us believe that Parliament is powerless to do justice to those who suffer !

That was nearly three years ago. The hon. gentleman was burning then to have action taken in this matter. He said again :

Separate schools were abolished ; they had no right to abolish them. And they screen themselves behind mean legal subtleties so as not to do justice to us.

The hon. leader of the Opposition voted and spoke in favour of that motion. That was a motion in favour of haste ; it was against deliberation and care. And it is for that reason I say that the hon. gentleman to-day stands on exactly the same platform from that on which he stood two or three years ago. Now, when we have taken action, he says : You have acted too hastily ; when we did not act, he said : You are not acting fast enough. On that occasion he said :

The question, after all, is a simple one. In 1890 the legislature of Manitoba passed a law which the Roman Catholic minority deemed oppressive ; that minority appealed to the Government against that law ; their prayer has to be denied or has to be granted ; this is the simple issue ; and yet, Sir, one year, two years, three years have elapsed, and during those three years the Government have never dared yet to come to a decisive action—nay, to express a simple opinion. And, Sir, what is the reason ? The reason is well known. The reason is not new ; it is as old as the constitution itself. The reason is, that upon this occasion, as upon similar occa-

sions, there is not in this Government the courage equal to the duty of the hour.

In those days the hon. gentleman said we had not courage enough. He said: You have spent three years without coming to a decision; all these people want is for you to admit their petition or to deny it. We have admitted their petition, and now the hon. gentleman says we have acted too fast and are imperilling the safety of the country by going too rapidly. The hon. gentleman says we should investigate the facts. I do not propose to go at length into that question, for it will come up in another form, probably, later on. In the year 1893, when the hon. gentleman had studied this question for three years, he informed this House, that there was only one fact to investigate, and that was whether the schools in Manitoba were Protestant schools or not. Does the hon. gentleman want that fact investigated now? He has spoken recently on platforms throughout Ontario and Quebec; he has taken the trouble to enumerate to his audiences the questions of fact that he wanted investigated; and I have never yet read a report of one of these speeches in which this fact is mentioned as one of the facts requiring to be investigated. And this is the hon. gentleman who has always been consistent upon this issue. The hon. gentleman has been making speeches throughout the country similar to the speeches he made in Montreal. And I must admit that they are speeches which do him infinite credit. I have not the experience and the boldness of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), and, therefore, I would not for a moment think of saying that the hon. leader of the Opposition was a good talking machine. But the hon. gentleman has had considerable practice in saying a good deal without meaning very much. The hon. gentleman, in Montreal, actually succeeded in making a speech which was so frank, which so exposed his position to the public, as he said, that the Winnipeg "Tribune" quoted it to show that he was dead against interference with Manitoba in any event, while the Rouge papers in Quebec quoted it to show that he was for interference no matter what happened. The hon. gentleman has been clear, he has been consistent in his course. His consistency has been the consistency of a man who wanted power and was prepared to get it at any price, of a man who was willing, on such a delicate question as this, to run the risk of plunging his country into any sort of religious strife, of a man who says: Let anything happen, so long as I can cross the floor and administer from the Treasury benches. Does the hon. gentleman remember the motions he made last session? This Government, as we have heard recently, has been a government distinguished for strikers. Last July three members of the Cabinet went out on this question, because, as they

alleged, they had not at that date confidence that the Government would carry out its pledges. What course did the hon. leader of the Opposition take on that occasion? I leave it to the House, I leave it to the country, to say if the hon. gentleman on that occasion pursued a straightforward, manly course, a course calculated to allay strife and stop religious agitation. Did he take a position one way or the other? On two occasions he moved colourless motions to adjourn the House, so as to avoid expressing any opinion himself, so as, he hoped, to defeat the Government and attain power. So I think the hon. gentleman has not much to say with reference to his patriotic course upon this question. I would like to know from the hon. leader of the Opposition, whether he endorses his statement of policy on the Manitoba school question made by the second leader of the Opposition, the hon. member for South Oxford. A short time ago a statement was made by another parliamentary leader of the Liberal party. A few days ago the leader of the Liberal party in Parliament made a statement on this question. He stated that remedial legislation was perfectly useless. Does the hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition agree wholly in that? The hon. gentleman for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) says to-night that his first step would be to repeal the remedial orders. Does the hon. leader of the Opposition approve of that policy? Does the leader of the Opposition want us to understand that he would adopt that policy, that he and the member for South Oxford have concocted in their conferences together? He says the first thing they would do is to unwind all that has been done, and start this matter again from the beginning, that they would wipe out what this House has already done, and begin de novo. Is that the policy? That is the policy the hon. member for South Oxford advocates. However, that hon. gentleman is not entirely without comfort for the minority in Manitoba. The hon. gentleman generously extends to the Catholic minority of Manitoba his sympathy, and we know that the hon. gentleman's sympathy is so scarce that the Manitoba people ought to value it very highly.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The sympathy is large, but the object of it is small.

Mr. DICKEY. I think the hon. gentleman's sympathetic faculties are all exhausted in sympathizing with himself, so that he has nothing to give to other people. But, Sir, he thinks the Manitoba Government will right this wrong. He points out, and points out with great justice, that the legislature of Manitoba is the proper place for this to be righted. No one disputes that; no one doubts it. Is the hon. gentleman prepared to go a step further? He was very bold in stating his policy, and I will do him the credit to say that cowardice is

not one of his traits. The hon. gentleman said he had sympathy with the Catholics, and that he thought the Manitoba Government would give them relief if they were properly approached. Will the hon. gentleman tell me what his policy is on the principle of remedial legislation, supposing it to be impossible to get relief from the province of Manitoba; supposing it should turn out in the last resort that the neck of Mr. Greenway was too stiff, and that he utterly refuse to bow it under the yoke? Is the hon. gentleman prepared, in that event, to stand up for the constitution and for the rights of minorities in this country?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am ready to prescribe when we are called in.

Mr. DICKEY. The hon. gentleman says he is ready to prescribe when he is called in. That is what I like. This non-political question, this question upon which parties are not divided, this question on which hon. gentlemen opposite would not come to power if they could. And yet upon that question, that non-political question, they will not give us the slightest aid in carrying on the Queen's Government. I am quite aware that every hon. gentleman upon your left is in the same position. If he could get there by any hook or crook, whether on the Manitoba school question or any other, he would be glad to get here. I do not blame the hon. gentlemen opposite, providing the question is an ordinary political question. Everything is fair in war and politics. But, Sir, when the leader of the Opposition, whose word they ought to take, tells them that this is not a political question in the sense of being one on which he would like to get into power, I suppose the hon. gentleman is actuated by high and patriotic motives. The hon. gentleman said that in 1891 Sir John A. Macdonald would not allow Parliament to meet because he wished to negotiate a reciprocity treaty. Well, I suppose this House remembers the reason why. There was a party in the country at that time who were going up and down the land, preaching what Sir John Macdonald thought to be the doctrine of treason. They claimed to have the support of the majority in this country. Mr. Speaker, does anybody suppose that a Government could go to Washington and negotiate a moderate reciprocity treaty when a large party in the state who claimed that they would control the Government in a year or two, was willing to give them everything for nothing? For that reason Sir John A. Macdonald stated, and stated properly, that in the interest of this country this question between the parties must be settled once for all. He wanted to know whether the people of this country wished to control their own affairs and to make a reciprocity treaty to suit themselves, or to give away everything.

Mr. DICKEY.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). He said he was going to Washington to secure a treaty.

Mr. DICKEY. Now, Sir, there is just one more question which I would like to recall to the attention of the House. The hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition is an integral part of the constitution of this country. He has a right to a title, the leader of Her Majesty's loyal Opposition. Now, I must say that I did hope that the leader of Her Majesty's loyal Opposition, when speaking on the Speech that was made by His Excellency the other day, would have confessed to this House his sentiments and those of the hon. gentlemen who sat behind him, in gratification that the British Government had decided to assist us in the fast steamship line. I hoped that on the occasion of this, the first step, which may be everything to the British Empire, the hon. gentleman would have, at least, said some word of commendation, not of us—I never expected him to commend us—but of the British Government, some word of congratulation that this country and the Home Government had joined hands on this matter. I believe, Sir, important as I regard the other clauses of the Speech, that they will sink into insignificance compared with that clause which states that:

In pursuance of the resolutions of the Ottawa Conference, the Imperial authorities have decided to give a subvention to a fast line of steamships across the Atlantic.

Mr. LAURIER. Neither the mover nor the seconder of the Address said a word about it.

Mr. DICKEY. Very well, then the hon. gentleman required to be reminded of his duty by the youngest members of the House. If that had been in the hon. gentleman's heart, it would have come out, but, not being forthcoming in his mind, not attaching very much importance to this subject, he missed it altogether. Sir, I think this House should realize that this is a most important statement, and I firmly believe that it foreshadows very much greater things to come. The hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) some years ago, spoke in this House, almost the first time that it was mentioned, about a little cloud, which he described as no bigger than a man's hand, which was rising in favour of preferential trade. The hon. member for South Oxford and the hon. leader of the Opposition have made merry to-night on the subject of protection in England. They say if they adopt protection in England it will be a nice lookout for our protectionists in Canada. Well, Sir, all I can say is that if those hon. gentlemen read the speeches and reports on protection in England, they will find that the whole direction of protectionist opinion there is in favour of including Canada with the rest of the British Empire, that the whole force of protec-

tion in England, the backbone and strength of protectionist opinion is united to the national and Imperial feeling in England, and that it draws its strength from that feeling of Empire which I am glad to say is developing in England and in the colonies as well. If protection does come to pass in England—although I pretend to know nothing whatever about the state of political matters in England—but if protection does come to pass in England, it will be in the shape of a protection against the rest of the world outside of the British Empire, and in favour of the products of the colonies of Great Britain.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that protection will be a good thing for the English farmer, and that the English Government ought to confer it?

Mr. DICKEY. I do not pretend to know very much about trade, but I try to guard against being drawn aside by theories and supposing that they fit every possible case. I know nothing, practically, about the situation in England, and, therefore, I do not pretend to express any opinion. I have no doubt that those who are on the spot are quite able to look after her interests.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What does the hon. gentleman wish the House to understand by his special reference to protection in England?

Mr. DICKEY. I made that reference because the leader of the Opposition and the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) pointed out that if there was protection in England, if those theories we were advocating prevailed in England, it would shut us out of the English market.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Do you believe that?

Mr. DICKEY. No, because if protection prevails in England it would be a protection against the rest of the world.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Could you prove that?

Mr. McNEILL. When England had protection before, the colonies enjoyed preferential trade with England.

Mr. DICKEY. I do not propose to dogmatize to the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies). I tell him this, and I believe I am supported in this opinion by a majority of the House, that the trend of protection sentiment, which it is admitted is growing more or less in England, is not for absolute protection against the whole world, but in favour of the colonies as against the rest of the world.

Mr. LAURIER. What would Canada do then?

Mr. DICKEY. I am not talking theories, I am simply stating facts. I have already

occupied the time of the House longer than I intended. It is scarcely time yet to discuss the Manitoba school question, but I hope at some later date we shall have the pleasure of doing so and placing on record the leader of the Opposition and the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte), and I hope they will vote together.

Mr. McMULLEN. We have listened to an address from the Minister of Justice in which he has attempted to give the House some information on the Manitoba school question. I have listened to most of the Ministers, I have heard some of them on the stump, and I have read the speeches of others on this very important question. But I have never yet heard one hon. gentleman clearly and distinctly outline what course they intend to take in dealing with this question. Even with their own candidates in the field, in Cardwell and in North Ontario, each man was asked to shut his eyes, open his mouth and swallow the pill without knowing what was being administered to him. The Minister of Finance visited both these constituencies, on neither occasion on which he delivered an address, did he let the audience understand what the Government intended to do. They have shot all round the mark, and although they have been politically shooting at the Manitoba school question for three or four years, not one of them has made a bull's eye. The Minister of Justice shot around the mark, but he never came near it. The hon. gentleman found fault with the leader of the Opposition because he had not clearly and distinctly told them what he would do if he came into power. It is most singular that although we have thirteen or fifteen Ministers of the Crown, and I am sure they consider they are political Solomons, and that all wisdom would die if they were to drop out, they have not been able yet to come to a decision as to their action, nor have they yet told a single candidate whom the party has placed in the field what is the character of the School Bill they intend to propose or what are any of its provisions. They have endeavoured in some sections to make political capital out of the question. When the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague) went back to his constituency for re-election, he stated that they had only sent forward the verdict of the highest court in the realm, and had passed it from the hands of the Governor General to that of the Lieutenant-Governor of Manitoba, and it remained with the Government of that province to deal with it. In other sections of the Dominion, however, different statements were made. It is to be hoped that the long promised Bill will soon be presented to the House in order that we may be able to scrutinize its provisions. The Minister of Justice, while finding fault with the leader of the Opposition on the ground that the Liberal party were not in unison with him in his view, forgot to state the

dissensions on the other side of the House. The Minister of Justice had better induce the Minister of Militia to call out the volunteers and have the galleries of this House crowded with men with guns charged, ready to fire and destroy the first member opposite who does not rise to vote for the Bill, because there are a number of members on the other side of the House who will require something perhaps stronger than such a threat to lead them to vote for the Government Bill. I challenge the Minister of Justice to point to a single row on the other side of the Chamber in which every man will support remedial legislation. The hon. gentleman does not know where his followers are; it is stated right and left that members are not going to vote for remedial legislation. We know what has been stated by the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace), and there are other members disposed to follow the course he has taken. The Government has not yet had even a caucus of its followers, they have not dared to call their members together, but I hope ere long the promised Bill will make its appearance and hon. members will be able to form some idea of its provisions. The Minister of Justice made some remarks with respect to the statement made by the hon. member for Oxford in regard to the action of the Minister of Finance. That hon. gentleman evidently repeats parrot-like, figures submitted to him by officials, and no doubt he was thus led into the very serious error pointed out by the hon. member for Oxford, an error of several millions in his statement submitted to the House. It is a very common thing with the Finance Minister to make errors of that kind in the House. The other evening in trying to explain how the difficulties in the Cabinet had been healed, he told us that it was the funeral of the Reform party, who expected to get into power on account of the dissensions. Well, Sir, from the exhibitions we have had in this House from the hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches, we can honestly say that they are willing to swallow anything and everything rather than leave office. The Minister of Finance was rather disposed to challenge the statements made on this side of the House, and he thought the Cabinet Ministers were not fully remunerated for the services they rendered to the country. Well, looking at the gentlemen occupying seats on the Treasury benches, for my part I fail to recognize a man who was ever able to earn \$7,000 a year until he was made a Minister of the Crown. The best evidence that they were not able to earn such a salary is to be found in the hurried manner in which they ran back to their portfolios, least they might be taken by somebody else. Sir, with regard to the position taken by my esteemed leader on the Manitoba school question, I have a few words to say. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Laur-

Mr. McMULLEN.

ier) has desired that a commission should be appointed to thoroughly investigate the whole difficulty, and thus throw the onus on Mr. Greenway. Had the Government taken that course last session the report of that commission would now be before the House, and the members could deal intelligently with the question. But the hon. gentlemen opposite did not want to accept any suggestion from Mr. Greenway. They did not want to do anything which might tone down the differences that existed between the Government of Manitoba and the Dominion Government on that question. They had taken the bull by the horns themselves, and they were bound to rush it with all the strength and power which they considered was vested in them under the provisions of the constitution. They evidently do not want a peaceful settlement of this difficult question. As far as I am personally concerned, I would rejoice to see the matter quietly and satisfactorily settled in the best interests of the country. I have no desire to see it kept in the political arena, and I believe if the Government had taken the proper course, a settlement could have been obtained long ago. But, Sir, the Government saw that the National Policy was losing its grip upon the people, and that they dare not again face the country with it, and so, they dragged in the Manitoba school question for political purposes. We are quite well aware, Mr. Speaker, that in 1891, the Government promised to secure a reciprocity treaty between this country and the United States. Sir Charles Tupper, sr., came from England, and he declared from place to place that the Canadian Government had an invitation to send delegates to Washington after the 4th March for the purpose of discussing a reciprocity treaty. He and the members of the Cabinet told the people throughout Canada: Gentlemen, for the first time in the history of this country for years you are now offered the golden opportunity of having reciprocity with the States, the only thing that is wanted is a mandate from the people, send members of Parliament to support the Conservative party, and we will send delegates to Washington to arrange for a treaty. They deceived the people then as they have often done since and before. The statements they made to the people were soon discovered to be untrue, and Sir Charles Tupper, sr., who is now in Canada and expects to be installed as First Minister, went before the people of this country five years ago with an untruth in his mouth, preached it from stump to stump, and when the elections were over, he was compelled to go on his knees to Mr. Blaine, in Washington, and confess that what he had stated was not true. He had the brass, after misleading the people of this country, to write back to the First Minister over his own signature, that he lost no time in seeing Mr. Blaine and telling him that Mr. Blaine's interpretation of the correspondence was

correct, and that the interpretation he (Sir Charles Tupper) put on it was incorrect. That is the kind of man who is going to be the Prime Minister of Canada in a short time. That was not the first time that the late High Commissioner misled the members of this House and the people of this country. We very well know that when he occupied a seat in Parliament he was designated as one of the greatest stretchers this country had ever seen. We well remember in what glowing terms he pointed out what would be the result of the completion of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and the opening up of the North-west. He told us that when a certain specified year had arrived there would be so many farmers in the North-west, every farmer would cultivate so much land, and that land would bring forth so much wheat that in a few years we would have an export of 640,000,000 bushels. That year has passed long since, but where are the 640,000,000 bushels of wheat? We remember that in 1887 in what glowing terms he referred to the result of his legislation to increase the duty on iron. He told us that men were standing on our borders ready to invest millions, that our iron mountains would be honeycombed with mining tunnels, that 200,000 people were to be added to our population and that the benefits to Canada would be grand, glorious and great. He got the Bill passed, but where are the iron furnaces?

Mr. WALLACE. In Hamilton.

Mr. McMULLEN. My hon. friend (Mr. Wallace) says there is one in Hamilton, but that is the first one that has been built, and it is hard to tell when we will get any more. That was prophesy No. 2 of Sir Charles Tupper. Then we had many other prophesies from him with regard to the outcome of appropriations that he secured from this House as to the construction of railroads and other schemes. We will be able to point out to him that all his glowing prophesies remain unrealized.

We earnestly hope that if he does come back, he will not be the Balaam in the future that he has been in the past, but that he will be more moderate and discreet in his prophetic utterances. Now, Sir, the retired Minister of Justice undertook last evening to size up the hon. member for South Oxford, and, after considering his ability, he decided that there was nothing in him and that he was no statesman. Well, Sir, that is an amusing thing to come from a man of his limited years and experience. If he were possessed of that intelligence and courtesy which we might well hope to find in him, he would not dare to express such opinions. I am quite sure that the members of this House, as well as the public throughout this Dominion have learned to respect the hon. member for South Oxford as one of the best and ablest men in Canada; and it ill be-

comes a young man whose beard is hardly grown to undertake to size up and pronounce as brainless and as having no ability, a man who has sat in Parliament for over thirty years, and has been elected by an intelligent constituency. I dare say that the late Minister of Justice fancies that when his hat is on, the best brains of this House are covered, that he is one of the Solomons of the present age, and that it will be a sad loss to this country and to the world when we have to lose such ability as his head contains. Now, Sir, hon. gentlemen opposite, the Minister of Finance particularly, made some very discourteous allusions to the hon. gentleman who has been sent to this House as the representative of Montreal Centre (Mr. McShane). The Minister of Finance, without any reason whatever, and in a very discourteous and rude way, drew attention to the fact that that hon. gentleman had been at one time, under certain circumstances, disqualified. He forgot that the disqualification had been removed. You would fancy, to hear hon. gentlemen opposite, that all the corruption that ever existed in Canada belonged to the Reform party—that there was none in the other party at all. Well, Sir, we can say this, that, commencing with the Pacific Scandal, of which Sir Charles Tupper was one of the chief promoters, for he was in the Cabinet at the time, down to the present day, there has never been a session of Parliament when the utmost efforts of their opponents have not been used to get at the bottom of the political corruption and the stealing of public money that has characterized the whole history of that party. Year after year we have been called upon to take part in investigations that have been a disgrace to this country and to the party concerned in them. Well, we are to have Sir Charles Tupper back, and I would like to know why we should not have the hon. member for Three Rivers (Sir Hector Langevin) installed in office with the High Commissioner. He has as good a right to be taken back. In order to complete the bill and grant an absolute and entire pardon to all offenders, I would suggest that the hon. member for Quebec West (Mr. McGreevy) should be taken back, also, and put into the Cabinet. We had better have the whole of them, because I am quite sure that when we take back the High Commissioner, we may just as well take back the whole lot, and be done with it at once. Then, hon. gentlemen opposite have pointed out that the hon. leader of the Opposition has been seen on a platform with a gentleman who was disqualified on a technicality—disqualified, perhaps, by the evidence of a character who certainly does not stand very high in the estimation of the section where he lives, and whose word very few would be disposed to believe. We know perfectly well that other men have been disqualified. We know that men who have been not only

preven guilty of the most abominable corruption, but who have been compelled to pay the penalty of the law, have been introduced into this House by the whips of the party opposite, and have been received into their bosom again. It ill-becomes hon. gentlemen opposite to try to fasten on members on this side, crimes of which they themselves have been guilty: and they have always been doing that. We had an admission from one of the hon. gentlemen who spoke with regard to the revenues we have received from the sale of lands in the North-west, and the amount we have expended in connection with surveys. He said we had spent some \$6,000,000, and had got back only \$4,000,000. That is true. But if we go back to one more of the prophetic utterances of Sir Charles Tupper, we will find that when he was introducing his resolution for granting a loan of \$30,000,000 to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, he said he had not the slightest doubt that by the year 1891, Canada would have received money enough from the sale of lands to recoup her for every dollar she had spent on the Canadian Pacific Railway. Well, here is the statement of the hon. gentleman who moved the Address to-day, which gives the lie to that prophetic utterance, and proves that in place of having received any money towards the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway or the expenses connected with the development of that country, we are yet over \$2,000,000 short of the amount spent in carrying on surveys. Then, Sir, the hon. gentleman who moved the Address pointed to the magnificent crop which had been gathered in Manitoba and the North-west this year. We are very glad, indeed, that the people of Manitoba have had a fairly good yield for their labour, and we earnestly hope that the success which has attended their efforts this year may be realized year after year in the future. We shall be glad to see that country developed and grow in population and wealth, and increase its exports of produce. But hon. gentlemen opposite must remember that the National Policy is not to be thanked for the exports of the products of Manitoba, such as oats, barley, and pease, which the hon. gentleman pointed out as likely to be exported this year. The National Policy, instead of encouraging, has positively restricted the export of produce from that country. I see, on looking over the returns of last year, that these people paid between seven thousand dollars and eight thousand dollars for duty on binders which they had to buy in the United States; and calculating the duty on each binder, I find it amounted to about \$32 on each machine. This certainly cannot be looked upon as an assistance to those people in prosecuting their industry, so that instead of the National Policy doing any good to the people of that country, it positively militates against them in every

Mr. McMULLEN.

possible way. They are overcharged for everything they buy and have to use, while, on the other hand, they are excluded from markets which would be unquestionably profitable. We are told, however, that we have now a Minister of Agriculture who is going to do wonderful things in the interests of the farming community. He tried his hand last year at buying dairy butter and exporting it, and he made a very considerable loss on the speculation. However, I am quite satisfied, if the farmers of the country are to reap the advantage, that he should repeat the operation if he likes. He talks now of establishing a dead meat export business. Well, I do not know what he may be able to accomplish in that line, but I should not be at all surprised if he and those associated with him politically were to become dead ducks before they got the dead meat project set on all fours. However, we will be glad if he does establish an export dead meat business in this country or do anything for the farmers. I can say that although the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Montague) has taken every opportunity on the stump to declare that our farmers are prosperous, he must know that, at this moment our farmers are driven to their wit's ends, as they never were before at any period in our history, to make both ends meet and do not know what way to turn financially. If the Minister of Agriculture would take the trouble to look over the files which are furnished every day of chattel mortgages, he would find that never has the volume of chattel mortgages filed in any period been so great as during the last six months. And this, above anything else, is positive evidence of the straightened condition of our farming community, as it shows that they have to chattel mortgage their stock and their valuables in order to meet their debts. The hon. gentleman also said that he was going to relieve the farmers by showing them how to raise horses for export. Well, if our farmers have to wait four or five years to get rid of the extra stock of horses which they now have, and if they have to wait until such time as the Minister of Agriculture will have produced a model horse such as he thinks our farmers ought to raise for export, I doubt whether he is going to accomplish very much. It will be the old story: Live old horse and you will get grass. I may say for the benefit of the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), and in reply to the statement made by an hon. gentleman here that horses were being sold in the United States, in Chicago, for \$10 apiece, that I am credibly informed that a buyer went to a station in North Grey and bought a carload of horses, eighteen in all, at the magnificent price of \$1 a head and brought them to Toronto.

Mr. SPROULE. They were ready to die and of no use.

Mr. McMULLEN. If they are selling at \$1 a head in East Grey, that is still worse than \$10 a head in Chicago.

Mr. McSHANE. Horses are selling in Chicago at from \$80 to \$100 per head all the time.

Mr. McMULLEN. If we can get a proper price for our horses in Chicago we will not challenge what use they make of them. They may use them for any purpose they like so long as we get the money. Hon. gentlemen opposite say that we do not want the American market. I do not think that is the voice of the people of this Dominion. I do not think it is the opinion of the farmers of this Dominion. If you will consult our farming community, you will find that they do want the American market. If there is one thing that they want more than another, it is a liberal and fancy market for a great many of the things they can produce; and if the American market were open to them, they would get better prices than in England or Canada. The hon. Minister of Justice spoke about bettering our trade relations with the United Kingdom. He expressed the hope that all the dependencies of the Empire were going to be brought closer together and that we would be enabled to enjoy better facilities in the direction of sending to them and receiving from them many commodities, the trade in which is now restricted by tariffs. If I understood him rightly, this is what is going to take place. In all probability, England, if she makes any change in her policy, will do so, of course, in her own interests, and will treat Canada just as Canada treats her. We know that when Sir Charles Tupper introduced his resolutions into this House regarding iron, the iron-mongers in England, the different boards of trade and commercial organizations, passed resolutions strongly condemning and clearly pointing out the inevitable results to the English iron industry of the passage of that Bill. Sir Charles Tupper, however, took no notice of these resolutions. He treated these remonstrances from England just as Sir John Macdonald treated similar remonstrances when he introduced the National Policy. Sir John Macdonald then made this memorable statement: If the National Policy is going to endanger our imperial connection, so much the worse for our imperial connection. We were going, he said, to look after ourselves, and England might look after herself. This, Mr. Speaker, we have been doing for the last eighteen or twenty years. We have struck the mother country in the face every time, as has been pointed out here to-day. We are now receiving a volume of goods from the United States at a lower tariff than that at which we are receiving the same goods from Great Britain. We are virtually discriminating against Great Britain, and it is surprising that hon. gentlemen opposite

should look forward so hopefully to England receiving suggestions at our hands in the way of shaping her trade tariff so as to increase the trade between us and her and give us advantages over the outside world. I question very much if England will not have a very vivid recollection of the many slaps she has got in the face from Canada on the trade question during the last twenty years, and treat Canada with that measure of consideration which Canada justly deserves at the mother's hands. Something has been said with regard to the farmers of England agitating in favour of protection. The farmers of England possibly might be benefited by putting a duty upon the food supply which goes to England's shores, simply because they do not grow enough to feed their own population for two months out of the twelve. England is not an exporting country of agricultural products, but is, on the contrary, a very large importer. Consequently, if she put a tax upon the grains imported, she would increase the price of the grain. But, apply the same principle to Canada. This is an exporting country, and what we export regulates the price of what is consumed at home. We know that perfectly well from past experience. And so, while protection in Britain might mean an incidental advantage to the farmers there, it cannot possibly accomplish the same in Canada, for what the farmer exports fixes the price of what he sells in the home market. Gentlemen opposite are very fond of pointing out the advantage that our farmers have in the home consumption of their products. We are glad to know that our population is increasing; but I would like some gentlemen opposite to give us the name of the man who pays more for a barrel of flour or a bag of potatoes than its actual value simply because it is the product of Canada. We know perfectly well that every man buys at the lowest possible price, and that price is regulated by the price in the foreign market. No man pays a brass farthing more than the article is worth abroad less the export charges. I do not wish to prolong this debate too late, for I presume we have plenty of time to discuss the items in the Speech from the Throne, and no doubt there are others who wish to speak. Moreover, I dare say the Government are considerably behind in the preparation of the papers that they intend to lay before the House, and we do not wish to hurry them too much. The hon. gentleman made some reference to cold storage. They told us that they were going to provide cold storage for the exports of the farmers of this country. Well, they ought to know what cold storage is—they were in it for ten days themselves. But they suffered so much in the cold that they were glad to come back. They have all been reinstated, their salaries have been set running again, and they are comfortable

and easy. They now fancy that every man in the country should be satisfied, that all should be deeply grateful that the country has not been deprived of the admirable services of these hon. gentlemen, and rejoiced to know that their towering ability is to be at the service of the country for a little while longer. It certainly must be humiliating to the Conservative party that of all its membership in Parliament, young and old, men of large brain and great eloquence, there is not one fit to take the position of leader, but they must bring in a man of seventy-two years of age and set him at the head of the party. All these gentlemen seem to have a certain suspicion of one another. All summer, when the Reform press of this country was pointing out that there were nothing but rows and quarrels going on in the Privy Council Chamber, the Conservative papers, including the "Mail and Empire," declared that it was all a Grit canard, and without any truth. But now we have an outburst. At last the pot has boiled over, and we have had an exhibition that must be simply sickening to the best people of this country. There is not a man in this Dominion who respects his country and desires to see its affairs properly handled but feels disgusted and realizes that the dignity of the country has been lowered by the actions of Ministers of the Crown during the last five or six weeks. The Finance Minister drew attention to the apparent difficulties that were gathering around Great Britain at this hour. But, at the very time when the hearty co-operation of all her colonies was most needful to Britain, the Ministers here into whose charge the affairs of Canada had been committed, were on strike. The reason of that strike, as now explained, is that no gentleman had been appointed to fill the position of Minister of Agriculture. They were so weak that even the absence of one man might prove a very serious disadvantage. We hope that the change made may prove beneficial, but we question very much that the strength they have brought in to the Cabinet will help them much. I think the people are ready to say to them that their course in the past has been such as to justify the country in spewing them out of its mouth and committing the care of public affairs to men who will administer them honestly and prudently. The gentleman who is to take the lead in a few days, Sir Charles Tupper, has said on one occasion by the gentleman who is now at the head of affairs, Sir Mackenzie Bowell, in my hearing, would rather undertake to justify an increased expenditure of \$100, than to defend a decrease of \$5. Sir, if ever there was a period in the history of this country when we wanted a man in charge of our affairs who was a pronounced and determined economist, that time is the present.

We don't want a man whose whole career has been outlined by the state-

Mr. McMULLEN.

ment that he would rather defend the expenditure of a hundred dollars than attempt to justify a reduction of five. Well, that is the man we are to have now at the head of affairs, and the people of this country may look forward, if he gets a grip upon the affairs of this country, with a solid following, to the prospect that at least another hundred millions will be added to the debt, and another very large increase added to the annual expenditure. I do not think that the people of this country are in a temper or tone to encourage anything of that kind, and I think they will be prepared to speak their mind very plainly and very frankly, when they get an opportunity. Mr. Speaker, as the hour is late, I will move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend had better finish his speech.

Mr. LAURIER. My hon. friend is tired.

Mr. FOSTER. I must say that he has given indications of being somewhat tired for the last half hour. On that consideration I will not object.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

Mr. FOSTER moved the adjournment of the House.

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 17th January, 1896.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 18) to amend the Trade Mark and Design Act.—(Mr. Coatsworth.)

Bill (No. 19) to abolish the superannuation system as applied to the Civil Service of Canada.—(Mr. McMullen.)

Bill (No. 20) to amend the North-west Territories Representation Act.—(Mr. Davin.)

ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HIS EXCELLENCY'S SPEECH.

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

Mr. McMULLEN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to add a few words to the observations I presented to the House last night on the Speech from the Throne. I then endeavoured to answer some of the remarks that had dropped from the Minister of Justice, and I also took occasion to reply to some remarks made by the Minister of Finance. I shall now confine myself to the several clauses of the Address, and in doing so I shall be as brief as possible in closing my remarks on this occasion. In one clause of the Address the Governor General refers to the harvest as a cause of thankfulness on the part of the people, and especially for the bounteous return that the farmers have realized in that regard. While the farmers are undoubtedly thankful to a kind Providence for giving a bounteous harvest and a fairly good yield, they have no cause for thankfulness towards the Government for having in the slightest degree assisted them in securing advantageous markets for the disposal of that bounteous harvest. Never in the history of this country since it became a confederacy have the farmers been called upon to accept such exceedingly low prices for their products as during the past year, and at the present time prices are far below those which they have been accustomed to realize. We know very well that at the inception of the National Policy one of the advantages that advocates of protection declared would result from the introduction of that system was, that the farmers would get a home market and a better market for everything they had to sell. At the time the Mackenzie Government was in power, from 1874 to 1878, hon. gentlemen opposite declared that in the matter of securing fair prices for the commodities the people had to sell, the Government were veritable "flies on the wheel." We have had an exhibition of flies on the wheel during the last year. Hon. gentlemen opposite have made no effort whatever to secure a better return to the farmers for their products, save and except in the article of butter. It is, of course, now their desire to show some little interest in the poor agriculturist. Always when elections are at hand the cause of the farmer is taken up and advocated, but just as soon as elections are over and hon. gentlemen opposite have secured the confidence of the country for a few more years, the interests of the farmers are neglected until elections again come round. That has been the experience in the past, it is the experience to-day and it will be the experience so long as hon. gentlemen opposite occupy their present positions. Another point to which the Governor General referred in the Speech was the vast mineral resources of this Dominion. We are indeed proud to be able to say that the mineral resources of Canada are valuable and immense. We rejoice to know that we have within our borders a mineral wealth unsurpassed by

any other nation in the world. But that mineral wealth needs development, and no policy could be better calculated to cripple the development of our mineral resources than the National Policy. It is well known to every one that had we free access for our minerals to the markets of the United States it would be of vast advantage to us. But, because the manufacturers of this country wanted to monopolize the home market, the National Policy was introduced to please that class, and so the development of our mineral resources was neglected. There is no doubt that years ago a treaty could have been secured with the United States to give us an outlet for our minerals, had not hon. gentlemen opposite strongly opposed and discountenanced the making of such a treaty. His Excellency the Governor General, in the course of the Address referred to the kindly reception he met with on the different Indian reserves, and he congratulates the people of this country on the efforts they are making to educate the Indians. Well, Sir, we are all willing to do anything we possibly can for the unfortunate Red man who has come absolutely under our care. There is not a man in this country who would not readily contribute his mite to place them, the Indians, in a position of comfort, but we do not want that money should be squandered in taking care of them. We know well that a very large sum of money, vastly beyond what was necessary, has been expended on the industrial schools. Last year, in company with another hon. gentleman, we had the privilege in the Public Accounts Committee of examining the expenditure on these training schools and reserves, and we can honestly say that extravagance reigns in connection with every reserve. The prices paid for supplies are largely beyond the intrinsic value of the commodities, and the schools are conducted on a scale altogether beyond the ability of the taxpayers of this country to bear. Some of the schools with an attendance of fifty or sixty cost from \$18,000 to \$20,000, and some cost as high as \$25,000, which expenditure is altogether on an extravagant basis. The people of the country are willing to train the Indians in industrial habits so as to fit them for civilization, but they are not willing to sanction an extravagant expenditure of money for that purpose. His Excellency also referred to the Indian Department, and I presume that the Ministers of the Crown put those words in his mouth in order to try and hide the extravagance of that department. We are spending over \$1,000,000 a year on the Indians in Manitoba and the North-west Territories. We claim, Sir, that not one-half of that money reaches the pockets, the mouth or the back of the Indians. About half of it is pocketed by instructors, by reserve superintendents, by doctors, and by others who press their

services upon the Government, and who, when no other place is found for them, are foisted over as a charge on the Indian Department. We raise no objection to the proper expenditure of money for relieving the distress of the Indians, but we object to paying unnecessary officials, many of whom receive a salary far in excess of what their education or ability would entitle them to in other walks of life.

Mr. DAVIN. Would the hon. gentleman cite some instances of excessive expenditure?

Mr. McMULLEN. If the hon. gentleman will quietly take his seat, I will be willing to hear him after a little while. Now, with regard to the North-west Mounted Police. Nobody challenges their efficiency, nor denies the fact that they have rendered desirable services in that new country. I remember, however, that the late Sir John Macdonald, when he had charge of that corps, as Minister, declared in this House that the day was not far distant when we would be able to reduce that corps by a considerable number. Although originally the force was 1,000 strong, it was then about 900, and the right hon. gentleman stated that from year to year, as the time of the members expired, the force would be reduced by refraining from filling up the vacancies. I quite admit that along the frontier there is reasonable ground for having a fairly efficient force, particularly to prevent smuggling, which very often comprises commodities which it is well should be kept out of the territory, and especially out of the hands of the Indians. We are quite willing that the force should perform that particular duty, but to maintain so many men at such expense as at present is, I maintain, against the wishes of the people who have to contribute to this heavy expenditure. If the wishes of the people of Canada are to be carried out, there must be a reduction of expenditure along the whole line. If hon. gentlemen opposite fancy that by eulogizing the Mounted Police, or the industrial schools, they can shield themselves from the consequence of their extravagance, I warn them that they will very soon find out their mistake. Reference is also made in the Speech from the Throne in regard to arming the militia. I am quite prepared to say that, in my humble opinion, it is the duty of Canada to improve our militia service. Our militia force, with our volunteers, have always been a credit to this country. They are highly respected by the people of this Dominion, and I do not think that any reasonable amount properly and economically expended for the purpose of keeping the force in a state of efficiency for any service that they may be called upon to perform will be grudged by the taxpayers of the country. But I hope that this expenditure will not be made a means of spending money unnecessarily and foolishly. Our fortifica-

Mr. McMULLEN.

tions may possibly require some little repairs, and I am sure that our friends to the south will not find any fault with us for maintaining them in a fairly good condition. At the same time, I quite agree with what has been said to the effect that an efficient militia force well equipped is the most important kind of defence we can have, and I do not think our people will raise any serious objection to the expenditure of money for that purpose if it is kept within proper limits. We also have, as the principal feature of the Speech from the Throne, the announcement of this remedial Bill which is to be introduced. I drew the attention of the House last night to some features of the attitude of hon. gentlemen opposite on that question. I have been struck with this fact: the gentlemen who left the Cabinet assigned as a reason why they did so was because the Cabinet was weak, and they wanted to strengthen it in view of the introduction of this measure. It is a very peculiar thing, Sir, that all the bolters were Protestants. Not a single Catholic member of the Cabinet was so afraid of the measure that he felt it his duty to bolt. Another very peculiar circumstance, which has happened since this House met, is that hon. gentlemen opposite have appointed from among themselves a certain number of members to the Senate. I have looked over the list of names of those who have been transferred from this House to the other House, and I would naturally conclude that every one of those men would have voted for remedial legislation. But, Sir, while the Government are expressing their anxious and earnest desire to strengthen themselves by additions to the Cabinet so as to secure the success of remedial legislation, on the other hand, they have weakened their vote in this House by picking out men who would undoubtedly vote for remedial legislation, and sending them to the other Chamber. I am sure the country will wonder why the Government on the one hand, express such anxiety for the success of remedial legislation, and on the other hand weaken the possibility of their being able to carry it out. The Governor General, in the next place, promises a Bill for extending our trade in agricultural products. That promise was, no doubt, put into his mouth for the purpose of catching the agriculturists of this country, with whom hon. gentlemen opposite are very anxious, for the moment, to cultivate the most kindly and considerate relations. I wonder where we are going to be able to find a market to which to export our agricultural products that will be equal to what we could find just across the border if our people were disposed to take advantage of it. But some new scheme must be got up to please the farmers and to capture the rural vote, now that the general elections are at hand; and so the Government put this promise into the mouth of the

Governor General in order to show that they are anxious and willing to accomplish something in the interests of the agriculturists of the country. Well, Sir, we shall be glad to see their Bill, and we will give its provisions our best consideration. I am sure we earnestly hope that its provisions will be such as will help that class out of the financial difficulties they are now in, and place them on the high road to prosperity. It is quite evident that the National Policy has failed to do its duty in this respect. The promise of this Bill is a plain admission that while the National Policy was going to accomplish a great deal, especially for the farmers, it has utterly and absolutely failed, for the Bill is presumably not to be along the lines of the National Policy. For my part, if it is such a Bill as will assist the farmers of this country, it shall have my support, I care not who introduces it or whence it originates. My sympathy for that class is such that I am anxious and willing to give every fair and reasonable consideration to a Bill that is likely to accomplish anything to promote their interests. Sir, I am afraid that after all this Bill will not help them out of the financial difficulties they are now suffering from, and put them on the high road of prosperity. A promise was also put into the Governor General's mouth that the equilibrium between income and expenditure is at last to be realized. Well, we have had that promise for years. The Finance Minister years ago, in the course of his Budget speech to this House, declared that the period when Canada had of necessity to borrow money was drawing very rapidly to a close, that the debt of this country had virtually reached the highest point, and he predicted that in the future there was a very strong probability—nay, almost a certainty—that the debt would begin to recede from year to year. We had that promise; it has never been realized. Every year we have been adding to the debt. Hon. gentlemen opposite used to point to the history of the Mackenzie Government as the days of deficits—the dark days when my esteemed friend the hon. member for South Oxford had to come before this House and announce a deficit as the result of each year's operations. But, Sir, during the time of the Mackenzie Government the deficits amounted to something like \$4,000,000 altogether, while hon. gentlemen opposite, by their admirable management of the affairs of this Dominion have rolled up in the last four years an aggregate deficit of over sixteen millions.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). Eighteen millions.

Mr. McMULLEN. One hon. gentleman says eighteen million dollars and I have no doubt he is correct. Well, the expenditure of the country, in place of decreasing in the face of these deficits, in the fact of the restricted and hampered condition of the

people, in the face of the failures that have taken place, in the face of all the evidences of the absence of that measure of prosperity which we would be glad to see prevail from one end of this country to the other, has been largely increasing. But we have another promise. We are to reach the equilibrium this year. The receipts and expenditure this year are about to balance. I shall be glad if that be the result, and I hope that the Finance Minister's prophetic utterances with regard to the days of Canada for borrowing having reached their limit, will be fulfilled before very long. When we come to realize the enormous addition to our debt, the enormous drain upon the resources of the people—a point to which I shall endeavour to give some personal attention when we reach the Budget debate—we must hope earnestly that this period of extravagance will soon end and that a different condition of things will prevail. I was rather amused, and in some measure pleased, to hear my hon. friend from West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) rise in his place, and at a very critical moment endeavour to defend the Government. He is always willing, always ready. He appears to be always willing whether he is ready or not, always ready to jump to their support, and I suppose his willingness is largely regulated by the advantages which he enjoys of being kept so comfortably under the wing and protection of the Government opposite. He is grateful for small things, he is grateful for large things—he is grateful anyhow.

Mr. DAVIN. I rise to order. The hon. gentleman says I am kept comfortably by the Government and kept under their shadow and wing. I call on him to explain.

Mr. McMULLEN. I was going on to explain, and I would have satisfied the hon. gentleman if he had only kept his seat. I am sorry that he got disturbed so soon. If he had just quietly kept his seat and cultivated a little silence, he would have learned before long and I would have satisfied him upon that point.

Mr. DAVIN. Satisfy me now.

Mr. McMULLEN. I will draw his attention before doing that—if he will cultivate a little patience—to what his opinions were of the Government a few years ago.

Mr. DAVIN. I rise to order. I will not cultivate patience. The hon. gentleman has made the statement that the Government is supporting me and that I am under its shadow and protection, and he is bound to explain these words.

Mr. McMULLEN. I am going to explain. I stated that the hon. gentleman no doubt was grateful for the kindness and the mercies and the assistance which had been extended him by hon. gentlemen oppo-

site, that he had no doubt lived under the shadow of their wing. I should like to know why he challenges that remark. I think he is certainly a good Tory. I am sure everybody in this House believes he is. He is ready at all times to jump up and defend the party of which, I admit, he is a very shining light.

Mr. DAVIN. Is that all ?

Mr. McMULLEN. I have no doubt he is always ready to defend them. If he is prepared to challenge what I am going to say, he will, when I am through, have the opportunity of doing so, and I am sure, Mr. Speaker, you will grant him the privilege of entering into an extended explanation. With regard to his opinion of the Government at one time, he said, not many years ago—

Mr. DAVIN. I rise to order, Mr. Speaker, and will have your ruling. The hon. gentleman has not used exactly the words he used previously. He has tried to wriggle out of what he said. He speaks now about assistance, and so on. But the language he used implied that I had received some protection or favours personally, either directly or indirectly, from the Government, for which I had reason to be grateful. I say here that a single favour of any kind or assistance of any kind, apparent or real, I have never had from any Government or Minister.

Mr. SPEAKER. If the hon. gentleman said that the hon. member for Assiniboia had received favours from the Government in return for which he gave them his support, I think that would be out of order.

Mr. McMULLEN. I did not say so—not at all. I said that he had a right to be grateful to the Government for kindness. The hon. gentleman says he never received any favours, and I am willing to accept his statement for the moment. I have been,—and I admit it now—misled by the Auditor General's Report. It certainly must be incorrect. The hon. gentleman may be right and the Auditor General may be wrong, and if he chooses to take that position, I am willing, for the moment, to let him out on that ground.

Mr. DAVIN. I rise to order. That is trifling with this House and with my rights in this House. The hon. gentleman must withdraw his charge.

Mr. McMULLEN. I presume that in the course of the debates which will necessarily take place in this House on the items that will be submitted for the consideration of Parliament, we may have a better and more favourable opportunity for threshing out this little difficulty between my hon. friend from Assiniboia and myself, and I am willing, in the meantime, to free him from any charge of personally having been bribed or bought. I am quite willing to do that, and I hope he will rest quietly in that condition

Mr. McMULLEN.

until we reach a more favourable opportunity for discussing the items.

Mr. DAVIN. I still rise to order. I am not going to rest quietly when the hon. gentleman disgraces this House by making the matter worse.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order ; take it back.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman ought not to use an expression of that kind.

Mr. DAVIN. I withdraw the expression, and now I beg to submit and ask that you, Sir, rule the hon. gentleman out of order, and that he went on to aggravate the offence, and has never withdrawn the charge or atoned for the offence he was guilty of. I shall insist on the hon. gentleman putting himself in order with the same readiness that I have shown in submitting to the Chair.

Mr. SPEAKER. I listened, after my attention was called to the observations of the hon. member for Wellington, more carefully. I did not discover that subsequent to the time when my attention was called to his remarks he had made any observations that were contrary to the rules of Parliament. If the hon. gentleman did state, before my attention was called to his observation—and while I was not listening very carefully, I confess, to them—that the hon. member for Assiniboia had been purchased by the Government or has received from the Government any consideration, in return for which he had given them his support, then, as I have ruled already, that would be an improper and unparliamentary expression, and the hon. gentleman should withdraw it.

Mr. McMULLEN. I did not say so, Mr. Speaker. I would not think for a moment of making even an insinuation of that kind, because I am quite sure that hon. gentlemen opposite, with all the wealth they boast, have not sufficient means to buy my hon. friend. I was going on to point out that certain opinions had been expressed by the hon. member for Assiniboia respecting some of the members of the present Cabinet. At one time, in his sober moments, or non-sober, I do not know which, he declared that they were a Cabinet of antiques. On another occasion he declared that he was not going to peddle brains for the Government. He has very considerably changed his views with regard to the Government since that time. I was pleased indeed to notice that the hon. gentleman had got so completely into line that he was ready to rise and, with his usual eloquence, attempt to protect the undefended heads of the members of the Cabinet from the attack that was made upon them.

I desire to call attention to just one matter more. I refer to an interview that took place between the correspondent of the

"Globe" and a very eminent divine, Principal Grant of Queen's College, with regard to the differences that have recently existed and which seem to have been patched up, as the hon. gentlemen are all back in their comfortable quarters again:

Kingston, Jan. 15.—(Special).—A representative of the "Globe" waited on Principal Grant this afternoon to ask an expression of opinion in regard to the Ottawa crisis. He answered that, as the Government is not yet reconstructed, it would be premature to express an opinion on it or its proposed action. "I see in the press," he continued, "that Sir Charles Tupper stated that the Premier told him plainly that he would not have Messrs. Foster, Montague and Haggart again in his Cabinet, and that Sir Charles had replied that, in that event, neither would he accept a position. Is not the question, then, simply this at present: Will Sir Mackenzie stick to his determination or not? I hear that these three Ministers have just been sworn into his Cabinet. I am sorry to hear it, for his sake, for their sakes, and for the sake of public morality and the decencies of public life, which have been violated recently to such an extent that there must be an overpowering feeling of shame, amounting to disgust, in the minds of Canadians, no matter to what party they may belong. The Premier described the seven who deserted him on the ground of his incompetency as a leader, as a nest of traitors, and, according to Sir Charles Tupper, he charged the three of them in particular with a bad pre-eminence in the work of treachery, and now for him to take these back, and for them to go back, gives one a shock of so many volts that it can be described only by the algebra system, X or N. However, Sir Mackenzie has not yet given his explanation, and it is only due to his position and the spirit he has recently manifested to wait for that."

Now, Sir, that is the opinion of a man occupying a very distinguished position in this country. He was also, some years ago, as he declared himself, a supporter of hon. gentlemen opposite. But he has become so disgusted with the evidence of weakness and treachery and discourtesy among them that he feels called upon to give expression to the opinions I have just quoted. I have no doubt that he voices the vast majority of the citizens of this Dominion, including a great many in the ranks of the Conservatives. I shall not continue further my remarks in connection with the Address. I shall have another opportunity, I presume, of discussing some points that in my opinion, might well have been dealt with. But I shall seek an opportunity at a later stage of the session to point out, where, in my opinion, hon. gentlemen have failed to put in the mouth of the Governor General any announcement with regard to matters that should have been touched upon if we are to deal during this session with the questions of vital interest to the people of Canada.

Mr. WELDON. I shall not follow at very great length the hon. gentleman who has just addressed the House, but I desire to call attention for a moment or two to some of the points he has made in this afternoon's

portion of his speech. He complained of the Conservative party that they discover an exceptional fondness for the farmer in the days just preceding a general election. He did not prove that statement, nor did he give any grounds for it. But I think it is clear that the statement is not very well founded, having regard to the most salient facts of our recent history in connection with this matter. We in the eastern provinces know and appreciate highly the work that has been done by this Administration—largely through the agency of Prof. Robertson, and with, I am glad to say, the hearty co-operation of our local governments—in the way of stimulating dairy farming and the manufacture of dairy products. This has not been going on only for the few months before an election; it has been going on continuously and steadily for a considerable number of years. Our farmers, furthermore, have felt the very great advantage that has come to them through the work of the Experimental Farm. In many ways this has been found to be of great benefit to them, and, year by year, they are learning more generally to watch for the farm bulletins, to follow them carefully. Our intelligent farmers eagerly watch for these bulletins, study them carefully and file them away for reference, showing that they regard as most valuable the expert testimony, and advice they convey. I heartily endorse the cordial words that were spoken yesterday by the gentleman who seconded the Address when he commended in high terms the services rendered by Sir John Carling to the agricultural industry of Canada and which, I think, the farmers are beginning to recognize as of very great and permanent value. But I wish to be a little more plain with the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen), I wish to know a little more directly what the hon. member's views are on this question of tariff for the farmer. Is the hon. member for North Wellington a free trader in that part of the tariff which touches the farmers? We wish to understand the hon. gentleman. It is but a few weeks before he and I and all the rest of us must face our own constituencies, and I addressing the farmers of Albert shall tell them frankly that I am in favour of the present tariff upon our coarse grains, in favour of the present tariff upon oats and wheat, in favour of the present duty upon horses, in favour of the present duty upon beef, in favour of the present duty upon pork, in favour of the present duty upon butter and other agricultural products. Is the hon. member opposed to it, and if he had his way, and if he can only influence his financial leader, the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), will he bring it about that the duty on farm products shall be struck off and that there should be free trade in those articles? I think that is a fair question. I pause for a reply. The hon. gentleman will not answer.

I think we have a right to have an understanding, as I shall take occasion to put this question as plainly as I can before the farmers of my own constituency and point out to them that the hon. gentlemen opposite will not deal with us fairly and openly in this House in this matter.

Mr. McMULLEN. I say to the hon. gentleman that the debate on the Budget will be the proper time to discuss this question, and I will answer him then.

Mr. WELDON. I accept the hon. gentleman's answer, which I think is a fair enough answer. On the question of the Mounted Police we have the opinion of the hon. member for North Wellington; we also had the much wider opinion and more carefully considered opinion, and to my mind an opinion more to be regarded, that of his leader, and I put the opinion of the leader of that party against his opinion. I heartily commend the patriotism, sagacity, fairness of the utterances that were given by the leader of the Opposition yesterday in respect to the Mounted Police. I know little of them, we live so far away in the east that we know little of that force, though many of us have warm and intimate friends in the North-west, and when these friends come east to see us and write letters to us, they speak almost precisely in the line the leader of the Opposition spoke yesterday. I heartily agree with what the hon. member himself said with reference to the militia, and I endorse his view. I think those views are shared by every member of this House, and it does seem to speak well for the credit of Canada that her press and her public men without exception have spoken with such prudence, with such courage, with such firmness, with such notable moderation on the question of defence. Mr. Speaker, as to remedial legislation, now is not the time for me to deal with that question.

Mr. FORBES. Oh, oh.

Mr. WELDON. The hon. member laughs. Everything in its place. The hon. member for Queen's heard me speak last year, and I have nothing to alter in the statements I then made in the House and in the former and more elaborate statement I made; though as I pass from the subject I shall only express the hope that when this matter comes up for discussion during the approaching weeks of this session the House will preserve the same excellent temper, the same calmness, the same capacity for reasoning quietly that it showed last session. That certainly will be a good example for the country. But I must say to the Administration and their friends who have entered upon this policy, and I must point out what was pointed out yesterday by the hon. member for South Oxford, that their difficulties are deepening by reason of this consideration. This Parliament is six years old, we who sit here were chosen by people whose

Mr. WELDON.

names were put on the list eight or nine years ago, and so far as I know, we came from the eastern provinces without any mandate from the people with regard to this question. I never heard the question discussed in Albert County, I never heard it mentioned by the candidates on either side. We knew of no such question; therefore, if it be a question of much magnitude I must, among other things, shelter myself behind the constitutional defence, that I have no mandate from the people of Albert to speak for them in this regard. My view of the law, and which I expressed with much modesty, is that action once taken by this Parliament is unalterable by this Parliament. You see, therefore, how much stronger is the view I take of the position in this regard, and how much deeper are the difficulties of the Government in forcing this measure through, even in the view of many who are in favour of separate schools.

The hon. member for North Wellington said that the National Policy had failed to do its duty. I cannot share that view; I differ in toto from that view. I do not worship the National Policy as a fetish. Like many other of the younger members of this House I was trained in the old school of free trade, brought up on Adam Smith and Ricardo, on Henry Fawcett, on Stuart Mill and the rest of them. It was with singular pleasure that I read three or four weeks ago in the weekly edition of the London "Times" a notice by an old friend of Mill of a fact which I had never seen before, and which confirmed the truth of that famous saying of his so much in controversy between his admirers who are protectionists and the orthodox free traders, as to the advantages and necessity of a protective tariff in a new country. It was stated in the London "Times" of about 11th December in an extract from Mills private correspondence that he had expressed in private conversation to his friends that view much more strongly, and that he could easily understand how, if he had been in the United States he would have been a protectionist. But, Sir, we have seen Canada and her course and her success in the last three or four years, we have seen the country beside us and her course and her success in the last years. Do we not know what has been said with so much power and very frequently in this House within two years that the National Policy did act as a bulwark to break the force of that storm blowing upon us from the south, and did give us a degree of protection, a degree of safety that we could not have enjoyed under a low tariff. Of course I do not conceal that we owe something to our sound currency on a gold basis; I do not conceal that we owe something to our excellent banking system with a perfect secure circulation, with a very elastic currency; but mainly do I attribute our exceptional immunity from the world-wide storm to the

industrial protection of this tariff wall that was thrown up on our southern border. On the question of the debt it was true that within the last year or two we have struck down the sugar duties, and if we had left them on and if we had left the sugar duty where it was two or three years ago, for the last three years we would have had no deficit. The thing has given us no anxiety and has not in any way influenced our credit in London, and all these cries of alarm are, in my opinion, not much better than clap-trap.

I now turn away from the hon. member for North Wellington. He will not think me lacking in courtesy if I now turn to the financial leader, the stronger parliamentarian, the hon. member for South Oxford—though I by no means underrate the experience or strength of the hon. member for North Wellington. I have sat too long in this Chamber and followed him too closely to undertake to minimize or underrate or depreciate his very great services and his very great industry and his parliamentary ability. I would not have spoken in this debate had it not been for the shocking misstatement that drew me to my feet last night to interrupt the hon. member for South Oxford. I do not believe the hon. member has many gentlemen in this House who are more cordial admirers of him, his courage, his ability, his extraordinary gifts of speech with its wealth of literary allusion, with its parliamentary strength and dignity, than myself. That I am free to say. But when I heard him make these old-time charges to the discredit of this Government and to the discredit of the National Policy, taking four years before the National Policy began, for the first term of his comparison, I thought it was a trick of a political—I am not allowed by the rules of Parliament to use the proper word to characterize his device. And this is not the first time he has committed that offence. You will pardon me for reminding the House that you yourself a year or two before you were taken from the storms of this floor to the dignity of that Chair, that you yourself in an unanswerable argument met that very misstatement and battered it to pieces. I will borrow the quotation used by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills):

“Time was, the brains were out, the man would die.”

The brains are out of the wretched comparison that the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) has made for five or six years past between what happened in 1874 and the current year. We care nothing about what happened in 1874, when we are testing the effect of the National Policy as regards the decrease or increase in English trade. The National Policy did not begin in 1874. To institute such a comparison is a disreputable fallacy, unworthy of a man of the high learning and strength in this House

possessed by that hon. gentleman. It is absurd to take 1874 for the purpose of any such comparison. Who was in power then? Why, the hon. gentleman was, and the next year he was, and the next year, and still the following year. The first year with which a comparison could be made, if you wish to test the effect of the National Policy upon our trade with England, is 1879. That is a fair year with which to commence. And I have the figures here in my hands. Between 1879 and the year 1894 the total trade, exports and imports, between Canada and Great Britain, increased at a much more rapid rate than the population. In 1879 our total trade with England was \$67,000,000 in round figures; last year, according to these returns, it was \$107,000,000. That return is for 1894.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I gave the figures for the following year, the value of volume of the trade for 1895.

Mr. WELDON. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will give me the book from which he read.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Certainly I will.

Mr. WELDON. I will then correct my figures, because I was unable to get that return.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The volume of trade, \$92,900,000.

Mr. WELDON. The hon. gentleman would not read the figures for 1879 to me when I asked for them.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I have nothing to do with 1879.

Mr. WELDON. I have been fairer than was the hon. gentleman.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Read them now.

Mr. WELDON. The figures I have for 1879 show the total import and exports between Canada and Great Britain as \$67,250,000.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The year of the very great depression.

Mr. WELDON. In 1894 the trade aggregated \$107,250,000 in round figures, or a clear increase of \$40,000,000. Our population is not growing so rapidly as that. I therefore say the hon. gentleman's statement is a fallacy—a falsehood I will not call it, but I would so call it on the stump, for I like to call a spade a spade. I do not know a more immoral act than to make a comparison that is deliberately false. It is the trick of a cheap, two-penny-half-penny petty advocate. On the stump I would treat such a man with contempt and refuse seriously to argue with him—I would not do him the courtesy to argue with him.

Mr. CASEY. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will read the figures for 1895.

Mr. WELDON. I am astonished that a man of the parliamentary experience, general intelligence—I will not say fairness, but observing usual regard for the decencies of debate—of the hon. member for South Oxford, after the matter had been fully explained on several occasions, should continue to repeat the same disreputable and discreditable fallacy. There was an enormous decline in trade after 1874, I grant you. It fell from \$112,000,000 to \$67,000,000. Who were the Ministers at that time? The Premier was Mr. Mackenzie; Sir Richard Cartwright was Finance Minister. I do not undertake to say that the decline from \$107,000,000 to \$67,000,000 was entirely the fault of the hon. gentleman opposite. I do not think so. I have already stated, and I am fair enough to say that the years between 1874 and 1879 were years of phenomenal depression of trade, when the volume declined and the prices went down, as the hon. gentleman has explained. I am not unfair enough to attribute the large decline entirely to him; but in some degree it was owing to an absolute lack of faith in themselves, owing to a political atheism, and an absolute lack of capacity, their actions tended to intensify it. It was Sir John Macdonald with his sagacity, it was Sir Charles Tupper with his Titanic energy, and I would not forget a representative from the Eastern Townships, Hon. Mr. Colby, who made a magnificent presentation of the case of this protective tariff; these were the men who brought hope and heart to the great mass of the people, brought in a protective policy, and put an end to that condition of affairs.

The second statement made by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) I cannot characterize in the same strong terms, because it requires to be dealt with in a more temperate manner.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I have been trying to follow the hon. gentleman's argument, and, although I can generally do so, I fail to comprehend it at the present time. Does the hon. gentleman intend the House to understand that the decrease in exports from 1873-74 to 1879 was caused by the then existing tariff or was attributable in any sense to it?

Mr. WELDON. I have already answered that point. I said that the depression which struck Canada was part of a world-wide depression, but in their later years, whatever power remained in the Government, they failed to exercise it, for they had lost all faith in themselves. The hon. member for South Oxford addressed to the House a second argument, of which I am not speaking too strongly when I say that it was not a candid argument, namely, that the tariff operated against Great Britain. I have heard that argument on hundreds of platforms, I have read it in hundreds of newspapers, and

Mr. WELDON.

I have heard it twenty times in this House. Let us look at the facts of the case and see how far and in what sense that statement is true. The hon. gentleman has the rough-and-ready method of the schoolboy in making calculations. He takes up the trade returns, and he finds, as any of us will find, in looking over them, that we bought from England last year goods to the value of about \$39,000,000, that we bought goods from the United States to the value of \$53,000,000 odd, and then he says the duty we paid on the American goods was so many millions, and the duty levied on the English goods was so many millions. He then divided the duty by the value. It is a clumsy method.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is a mighty awkward one for you to meet on the stump.

Mr. WELDON. Let the hon. gentleman call it what he pleases, but I will show it is a trick. He is merely attacking that feature of the National Policy which says that raw materials and food products are to be free.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No, I was answering a fool according to his folly.

Mr. WELDON. It will be exposed, before I have done, to a degree which the hon. gentleman himself will not enjoy. It is true that we bought from England in 1894 goods to the value of \$39,000,000. It is true also that we bought in that year from the United States goods to the value of \$53,000,000. But let us see what kinds of goods they were. These imports included about six and a half millions of anthracite coal, almost three millions worth of raw cotton, two and a quarter millions worth of bullion and coin, two and two-third millions in value of settlers' effects; I point to that item with a special emphasis, as showing that some people are coming back to Canada from the United States. Then, there were one and two-thirds million in value of hides, one and two-thirds million value in tobacco, considerably more than half a million in value of raw wool, about two hundred thousand dollars in value of raw silk, rather more than a million dollars worth of rubber, gutta percha and unmanufactured goods; under the heading of fruit, there were bananas to the value of \$471,000, and there was lumber, largely Georgia pine, to the value of \$1,200,000. These are the items, with some minor ones, which aggregate \$23,500,000. Let the hon. gentleman subtract \$23,500,000 from \$53,000,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Not at all.

Mr. WELDON. Then he will find the goods dutiable, and he may divide the duty by that figure. Let the hon. gentleman make the same correction in regard to English trade.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does the hon. gentleman want to know what I was trying to establish ?

Mr. WELDON. I know perfectly well. The hon. member was trying to create the impression upon the electorate. He knew he could not befool the House, but he was trying to befool the electorate by saying that the tariff was levelled against English manufacturers.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. As every protective tariff must be.

Mr. WELDON. We know better. I have here a list of goods that we import from England, such as furs, hides, wool, soda, jute, and the coarser forms of metals, and so on, which aggregate \$9,000,000. A fair comparison is to subtract from the English imports \$9,000,000, and from the American imports, \$23,500,000, and then reckon the ad valorem duties.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Not at all.

Mr. WELDON. Yes. If you do that you will find there is not very much difference. The reason a tariff on the ad valorem basis does show a little heavier against England than against the United States, is because the bulk of English imports are more highly manufactured. The hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) has some regard for the intelligence of the House. Will he not show some little regard for the great democracy, his masters in this House, and forbear to impose on us, and through us, on them, any more of such unadulterated rubbish. Now, Mr. Speaker, for a plain word or two. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) used an expression which, as we all quickly saw, caused unspeakable pain to the hon. member for King's (Mr. Borden) behind him, when he referred to the character of Nova Scotia's public men. He called them a rascally pack of boodlers. I have heard the hon. member (Sir Richard Cartwright) speak at Halifax long ago, when he went to the drill shed in that city with Mr. Mackenzie. He has not been long enough in Nova Scotia to understand Nova Scotia, and her people, and he will not establish any entente cordiale with that province by the use of such ill-considered language. Nova Scotia has her faults, but she has one enormous vanity. That little peninsula, walled in from the sea by its iron-bound rocks all along the coast, has been proud of one thing. It is a small province, it has not many people, but it has been singularly proud of its public men. It has a suspicion which it never whispers—and I think I am the first Nova Scotian who ever, in this House, whispered it in the capital of the Dominion—that no province with double the population has ever had a group of public men of such singular ability, such remarkable probity, and such genuine devotion to

the public service. And, when I heard the hon. member (Sir Richard Cartwright) speak of this pack of boodlers, my memory brought me back to days of which I know better than he. I bethought myself of the Nova Scotians that were held in honour. I speak of our statesmen dead; I will not speak of the living. Was Herbert Huntington, of Yarmouth, a boodler? He has a name of honour in Nova Scotia. Was James Boyle Uniacke a boodler? That is a name of honour in Nova Scotia. Was Robert John Uniacke a boodler? That is a name of honour in Nova Scotia. Were the Stewarts, James and Andrew, boodlers? They are names of power and honour in Nova Scotia, although the Stewarts are long dead. Was Lawrence O'Connor Doyle a boodler? He was a man who, in many respects, reminds us of our friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Davin). Lawrence O'Connor Doyle, that witty Irishman, did he ever dream that he could be called a boodler? Was John Young a boodler, or were his distinguished sons? Did any foe in the bitterest and hottest fight in Nova Scotia ever charge John, George or William Young that he was a boodler. Take James W. Johnston, a man who had, perhaps, as strong an intellect as any I have named, and a man of unimpeachable character, beginning life poor, giving magnificent abilities and life to the public service of Nova Scotia, and dying beloved by the people of Nova Scotia: was he a boodler? Was any man ever foolish enough to charge that that man who is enshrined in the hearts of the people of Nova Scotia was a boodler? Sir, I come to the last, and, perhaps, the greatest of them all, Joseph Howe, for whom we are now striving to erect a monument by the provincial building of Halifax. "Old Joe Howe," as the people affectionately call him, whom they loved with an affection still strong, although he is now twenty-two years dead, whom they love with an affection such as boys have for their own father. Was Joseph Howe a boodler? No man in the province, taking him all in all, had the abilities he had. Nay, I will go further, and I will risk my reputation for historic perspective by saying that no man born in British North America, and no man born abroad, who has served the Queen in North America, taking him all in all, his gifts of mind, his nobleness of character, his large aims, his remarkable gifts of eloquence, his permanent achievements for the colonies, and the Empire, not one of them was the equal of Joseph Howe. Who ever dreamed of calling Joseph Howe a boodler? Money, he never cared for. These are the names—I am speaking of the dead—these are the names which the people of Nova Scotia have put in the niches in our temple of fame. These are the names of the men we honour. I agree with the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) in the magnificent statement he made, that

not all the sermons in your pulpits, not all the lectures of your university professors, not all the teachings of your schoolmasters, not all the writings in your press can undo the immorality of putting in a position of power and preferment, an unworthy public man. I agree with that statement. He touched my heart when he made it, and it is in the spirit of that statement that I refer to these able, unselfish, blameless public men, whom Nova Scotia has given to Canada. I should have remembered the Archibalds, the old Master of the Rolls, D. T. W. Archibald, and he who died only a few years ago. I need not speak of one who recently passed from our midst. Were the Archibalds and John Thompson boodlers? The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) knew Sir John Thompson, and I need not tell him now how unfortunate was his remark. He (Sir Richard Cartwright) does not know how deeply he wounded the hearts of many men in this House. I am not a Nova Scotia boy, I am a New Brunswicker, born in New Brunswick, but the last half of my life I have lived in Nova Scotia, and I can tell my hon. friend that we are an extremely sensitive people there. We are proud of our public men. No other province in Canada is so proud of her public men as we are, and we are especially proud of their high character. The remarks of the hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) were unfortunate. I leave it at this.

Now, Mr. Speaker, with reference to one or two questions of the hour. My friend the Minister of Justice (Mr. Dickey) last night, in a kindly reference to me, took my own mind back to a discussion in this House some four or five years ago. And when I mention the name of the Minister of Justice, I may say that one of the happy results, that gave pleasure to many members of this House as coming from that embroglio which gave us all pain, was the preferment of my old friend the Minister of Justice. When he made reference to myself and to my advocacy in this House some years ago, of the idea that the Empire should strive to develop and perfect trade relations within our own colonies, and make herself independent of food supplies from foreign powers, who might be hostile powers, it brought me back to a canvass made by myself in this House, and in the country and with much greater ability by others in a good many counties in Canada. As the hon. gentleman said, then it was a cloud the size of a man's hand. We thought then that we saw that the one danger that in times of war threatened that magnificent Imperial power, centred in the British Isles, was that our people were not quite sure of their food supply. We saw that they were buying more than two-thirds of their wheat from abroad, and not raising quite one-third at home. Once again, we see this question coming to the

front, and I hope, Sir, that those remarks cabled yesterday from London are the expression of a deep movement that is on foot, and that the Imperial authorities will answer back the call which went from this Parliament in 1892. I must refer to the efforts, in this connection, of my hon. friend from North Bruce (Mr. McNeill), who has advocated it, in season and out of season, with a fixity of purpose and with a devotion to Imperial interests, and with that strength of Imperial feeling that he has shown in this House and out of it, in this country, or in the British isles. I do not forget the magnificent advocacy of the Imperial idea made by the hon. gentleman in the towns of little England, three summers ago. I had the opportunity of reading in the English papers powerful editorials endorsing his position, and seeing the full report of his speeches in town after town, and before board of trade after board of trade. It is only fair to give honour to whom honour is due, and had the Minister of Justice (Mr. Dickey) known what I know, when he spoke he would have mentioned, not my name, but the name of that distinguished member (Mr. McNeill) in this connection. To that hon. gentleman I looked eight years ago as my master in this matter. It was he who first put in my hands the documents—the famous Hofmeyer scheme—the scheme of that distinguished statesman from South Africa who honoured Ottawa by his presence last summer; and it is with great pleasure that I see that sound Imperial idea, which, if it ever bears fruit, promises much for the development of Canada, taking this step in advance. The growl of menace which was uttered the other day by the German Kaiser, and the attitude of defiance by England assumed in face of all the possible complications that might follow, accentuated the danger of the mother country depending upon foreign nations for her food supply. It may be hoped that hereafter English statesmen will see, what colonial statesmen saw long ago, that there must come from this prolific English race which breeds so fast in the British islands, an overflow into our own colonies—Canada, Australia and South Africa. If we can hold that overflow, which has gone to other countries in the past, how soon will the prairies of Canada, the fertile lands of South Africa, and the plains of Australia, be filled with a teeming people. Therefore I hope—if this Government be reconstructed, as I am sure it must radically be if it is to go to the country with any hope of success—that the best capable man will be placed at the head of the Department of the Interior, in order to join hands with the Imperial authorities, with the Canadian Pacific Railway, with the Grand Trunk Railway, with all the steamship lines—the Allan Line, the Dominion Line, the Beaver Line, and all the other lines carrying people to this country—to make a heroic and magnificent effort

Mr. WELDON.

to direct the overflow of the people of the British islands—such as are fit for farming life and will stay on the farm—to make a strong and heroic effort to settle our prairie country;—not so rapidly as to cause congestion, but as rapidly as possible; taking care that when they go to the prairie they will remain; and thus bring about a swift and healthy development of our western territories. That is a part of the scheme to which I look with great interest as being of immense value to Canada.

We had, Mr. Speaker, one remarkable—what shall I say?—statement, confession, declaration, by the hon. member for South Oxford. He told us last night that he was a great-grandson of a United Empire loyalist. Why, in the name of conscience, did a gentleman of his pride make such a declaration? Why does he come retailing his pedigree in this Chamber? A gentleman of his pride, why does he deem it necessary to accredit his loyalty by a communication so unheard-of and unprecedented? I leave him to answer. It excited in my mind a strong suspicion that he was like the soldier in the play whom the old Welsh doctor caught hugging the servant girl in the cupboard. The soldier comes out and says: "I am an honest man." "Yes," says the Welsh doctor, "but what is an honest man doing in my closet?" Well, I say, what was that descendant of a United Empire loyalist doing in Boston—he and Erastus Wiman, as thick as two thieves? What was he doing in the company of that crew of the Glens and the Farrers, whom the Toronto "Globe" found it necessary some years ago to drum out of Canada, and who has gone to his proper home—

Some hon. MEMBERS. To the "Mail."

Mr. WELDON. He has gone to make his home in New York, has he not?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No, he is in Toronto.

Mr. WELDON. Is Farrer on the "Mail"? My information is that he is on the New York "Sun" with Mr. Dana, the most inveterate enemy of England on the North American continent. I am not speaking of the dead; it is not necessary to speak of them. But where to-day are the Farrers, the Glens, the Wimans? Where is Congressman Hitt? In these days we hear no more of him. I was about to point to the series of dramatic performances between the hon. member for South Oxford and Congressman Hitt in 1890. They were like two ships signalling to each other at sea. Congressman Hitt would spring a motion in Congress on Monday, and Sir Richard would answer by another here on Wednesday; and so these two adroit statesmen were constantly signalling to each other, from Washington to Ottawa and from Ottawa to Washington—a motion here, an answer there.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Hear, hear.

Mr. WELDON. I think the hon. gentleman must see arising these phantoms of the Farrers, the Wimans and the Hitts marching before his vision in procession like the ghost at the banquet in Macbeth. The hon. member for South Oxford for the moment forgot his prime duty to his Queen and his country so far as to allow himself to be spoken of as a prospective Senator from Ontario. The hon. gentleman knows his Shakespeare very well. I wonder if he heard then the witches calling: Hail, thane of Cawdor! Hail, Glamis! By the good-will of the Canadian electorate he is a member of Parliament; by the favour of our good Queen he is a Knight Commander of St. Michael and St. George; but Senator from Ontario, please God, he shall never be. Glamis thou art, and Cawdor; but king thou shalt not be. He told us last night of his statesmanlike views. He referred to a conversation with Lord Carnarvon twenty-one years ago. I do not think nobler words or more fit could have come from a public man. But I remember also that my hon. leader performed deeds when the hon. gentleman uttered words. In that great crisis between the North and South, when the conduct of England, especially in letting the "Alabama" slip from her ways, gave so much offence to the North, I remember that while the North complained, and had reason to complain, of the breach of neutral duty on the part of England, our old leader—Sir John Macdonald—who was acquainted with international law as well as with everything else necessary to the successful conduct of public life in Canada—kept a firm hand on the rudder of the ship of state, and maintained Canada faithful to the duties of neutrality—so much so that the United States Secretary of State, William H. Seward, said that he would to God that England had acted as well as Canada had done. I put the wise deeds of our old leader against the wise words of this leader, and I am willing that the country should judge between them. But I admit that the words of the hon. gentleman are the words of a statesman; I do not think that he could have uttered any sounder or wiser words. And in my own province of New Brunswick, it is true, too, that the Administration of that day, under Sir Leonard Tilley, was well advised in its international law and did take care to observe strict neutrality and to follow strictly the rules of international law, as between the North and the South, even after the belligerency of the Southern States had been recognized by the powers of Europe. So that the Liberal-Conservative party is not open to the taunt contained in the innuendo of the hon. gentleman that we Liberal-Conservatives are not sisterly, that we are unneighbourly and forgetful of the debt we owe to the Empire

in the way of keeping peace between her daughter here still under the old roof-tree and that other daughter who is house-keeping for herself. I think he is the best friend of Canada and of the United States and of England who pursues the policy outlined in that conversation with Lord Carnarvon in 1874. There is a book written by a young and gifted public man in Toronto, called the "New Empire," which gives the very fullest expression to that idea, an idea I heartily share. There is no duty which should be more carefully regarded by every member of this House than that of avoiding words of taunt or insult or reproach to that proud, irritable people to the south. Especially in these dark days, threatening to the old Empire across the sea, it is still more incumbent on us to do all in our power to avoid exciting the slightest hostile irritation. If by outspokenness we can promote a better feeling, let us be outspoken; if reticence will do it, better let us be silent or reticent, all the while doing in our judgment what is the best, taking care to do nothing to provoke or offend so that England may not have this enemy in her rear, should the day come, which may come shortly, when she will have to fight and grapple with her great rivals in the old world. It seems that these nations are possessed to-day by a spirit of envy at her success. It seems as if old England which, since the treaty of Utrecht, some two hundred years ago, has had the supremacy of the world, will have to fight for that supremacy once more as she has twice before fought for it. She fought for it in the Marlborough campaigns and won; she fought again in the Napoleon wars, that desperate fight, and again won. And it looks to-day—I hope I am reading the signs wrong—as if once again she would have to repeat the struggle. All the fertile, unsettled parts of the earth are under the English flag. There are no fertile lands of any considerable extent unsettled under any other flag except the northern part of Russia in Asia. All the rest are under the English flag; and if we have but thirty or forty years of peace, Canada, Australia, South Africa will be filled up; and with these places filled up with powerful nations, she could pursue her policy of peace and defy the whole world. We only pray God, that she may have peace, and have that growth of population in her Empire which her destiny requires, and realize that beautiful prayer of the noblest of Englishmen in the seventeenth century, which may not irreverently be repeated in this House:

Oh Thou, who by thy free Spirit didst build up the Britannic Empire to its present glorious and enviable height, with all her daughter lands about her, stay us in this felicity.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would like to have a few words of personal explanation.

Mr. WELDON.

Mr. LANGELIER moved the adjournment of the House.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would like to say a word to my hon. friend (Mr. Weldon) whose susceptibilities were touched by my innocent reference to Nova Scotia as a nurse of lions. Possibly there was a little envy on his part that I had not referred to the sister province of New Brunswick which he represents, and by-the-by it was rather a curious circumstance that among the galaxy of talent so free from boodling in Nova Scotia I did not hear him mention the name of the illustrious baronet to whom I had reference. Possibly that was an omission on his part which he may supply later. Now, Sir, with respect to what I did at Washington, Boston and New York, I ask the hon. gentleman to read what I said there. Every word I stand to. Every word I am prepared to repeat here or elsewhere—in England, Canada or the United States. Every word that I said to the Chamber of Trade of New York, every word that I said to the Chamber of Transportation at Boston, every word I said to Senator Sherman, Senator Carlisle and Mr. Blaine, I am ready to repeat here, and I defy any one to find fault with it, who will repeat truly and honestly what I said. I want to call the attention of the House to what I did say about Nova Scotia. I never have denied that that little province by the sea has produced many eminent men. I said that she has, and said so often, and among those men whom the hon. gentleman has enumerated are men I respect and admire. But I said likewise that it produced about the most extravagant type of boodlers this country has ever seen, and I gave illustrations. I am going to quote from a distinguished Nova Scotian, erstwhile Minister of Finance in this House, erstwhile colleague of the Minister of Justice, erstwhile colleague of Sir Charles Tupper, who is not yet a member of this House. I am going to quote what he said, and when I have done, I will ask the hon. gentleman and the House what Nova Scotia thought of each other and the type of boodlers they produced before they became a part of the Dominion. What Mr. McLellan had to say was this:

But the picture, dark as it is, has something blacker still. I see there, standing in the background, the Provincial Secretary of Nova Scotia privately handing over to this same engineer a contract for the whole work.

I believe the Provincial Secretary for Nova Scotia bore the honoured name of Charles Tupper.

I see him shrouded in darkness and bearing it for months in the grave of secrecy. Another provincial secretary comes forward and tells us it was so hidden to serve the public interest; to enable Sandford Fleming, after he had taken the contract, to make better terms with the old contractors, to grind a few more dollars out of

them. Public interests, indeed! Mr. Sandford Fleming's interest alone. Sir, I know not what term to apply to such conduct in a government. I know not what to call it—I shall not venture an opinion; but in private life it is called extorting money under false pretenses, and our laws make it indictable knavery.

They have heard of men riding in public conveyances with a loose mantle about them and a pair of false hands folded in front to lull suspicion, while the real hands were finding their way into their fellow travellers' pockets, and they now think that when the hon. gentleman—

Mind, this was the Provincial Secretary, whose name was Charles Tupper—perhaps no relative whatever—

—when the hon. gentleman put on the mantle of Herbert Huntington and the old Reformers, the hands he put to the plough were not real—that the real hands were hidden, that they might the better get deep to the arm-pits in the public chest, and they wait, they long, for the opportunity to sweep him from his position. Therefore, Sir, there was no necessity to bring this case here to excite public opinion. But, Mr. Speaker, if, having brought it here for investigation in the discharge of a public duty, what if the people should, on examination of it, decide that the public interests have been bartered away and betrayed—that the man whom they once believed in as the apostle of retrenchment has become the great high priest of jobbery and corruption? Who then shall restrain limits to their just indignation, as they take him, loaded down though he may be with the share of the offerings that fall to the priest, and impale him upon the horns of the altar at which he ministers?

That was the opinion of Mr. McLelan, former Minister of Finance in the Government which these hon. gentlemen supported and of which they were colleagues. I called the attention of Mr. McLelan to the statement he had made relative to Sir Charles Tupper, and I wanted to know then whether he had repented or whether Sir Charles Tupper had repented, and Mr. McLelan took exceeding good care not to deny or withdraw a single solitary word, so that if charges of boodling had been made against prominent Nova Scotians, they were not made by me in the first instance, but by a gentleman who was highly honoured by hon. gentlemen opposite, and who died, I think, a Lieutenant-Governor of Nova Scotia. Now, I do not intend to prolong this discussion further than this. I say that I never impugned the honour of the people of Nova Scotia nor the honour of the public men of Nova Scotia. What I said was this, that while Nova Scotia has produced many eminent men, it has likewise produced a type of the most discreditable boodlers that Canada has ever known. As to the argument—if I can call it so—of the hon. gentleman, I leave that in the hands of my friends who are well able to reply. If the hon. gentleman wants further information of what Nova Scotians think of the gentleman I have alluded to, let him peruse the "Hansard" of 1878. Let him read the speech of one Alfred Gilpin Jones, former member for Halifax, and I think he will get all the

information he wants as to the capacity of Nova Scotia to produce boodlers of the highest order and most pronounced type.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I intend to adhere to the principle which I long ago laid down, of refraining from discussing a subject which it would be delicate for me to discuss. But it is impossible for me to-day to remain absolutely silent while the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) hastens with his usual delight, to offend the most delicate feelings that a brother member can possess. The hon. gentleman, in referring to an extract from a speech of Mr. McLelan, has not, it is significant for me to observe, had the manliness or the honour to refer to Mr. McLelan's explanation and apology for these utterances—

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. He made no apology.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER—made in this House. I pass by this incident by simply stating that nearly all of the prominent public men to whom so eloquent and just reference was made to-day by the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) died the political and personal friends of Sir Charles Tupper, though they had opposed him, and hotly opposed him, for years. But, if the hon. gentleman desires that family records shall be exposed in this Chamber, I will give him something to study while this debate proceeds. He has referred to heated references to Sir Charles Tupper made by his political opponents. I will refer to the archives of Canada as they relate the experiences of a certain gentleman who, we are informed, and I believe was the grandfather of the hon. member for South Oxford. Who was this grandfather and what did he do politically? I know nothing about him except for the few references to him that are on record. I find, for instance, that

A warrant was sent in 1778 by J. Van Rensselaer, Isaac de Fonda, and M. Visscher, commissioners appointed for detecting and defeating all conspiracies in this State (New York) against the liberties of America. All persons described of as neutral and equivocal characters, are to be removed within the enemy's lines. John Stevenson, Richard Cartwright, John Van Allen, and Isaac Mann, are, in accordance with the Act, to be arrested for refusal and to be sent into the enemy's lines.

I would not be very proud of a United Empire Loyalist if he became one of these Loyalists only because at a trying time of his country he was of "neutral and equivocal character." The unfortunate gentleman came to Canada perforce, but he obtained a record which I think his grandson has fully justified in his own lifetime as applicable to him. Continuing this interesting family history, I find that on the 10th September, 1793, Governor Simcoe wrote to Mr. Dundas:

Mr. Hamilton is an avowed republican in his sentiments, and though the merchants are justly

obnoxious to the settlers of this province, and he is particularly so, yet the ascendancy he and his friend Mr. Cartwright must acquire by being agents for the contract which supplies the King's troops with provisions, is of that nature that there is nothing to prevent them from exercising it to the detriment of Government, if they have any particular object to promote that may gratify their avarice, ambition or vanity.

On the 16th March, 1794, Mr. Dundas wrote to Governor Simcoe :

The conduct of Mr. Hamilton and Mr. Cartwright appears to be such as to by no means entitle them to the favour or attention of His Majesty's Government. Nothing is more destructive, both in example and in effect than that influence flowing from the executive authority should be excited against that authority.

On the 23rd December, 1794, Governor Simcoe writes :

I conceive Mr. Cartwright's opposition to have been principally directed to the establishment of a court of justice, which deprived him of the seat of judge, a station of some trifling emolument, but of greater power and to display his own talents, which are respectable.

And, in that particular, I will be fair enough to say that there is a remarkable resemblance between the grandson and the grandfather.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. May I be permitted—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Would you like another adjournment of the debate ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No, but may I be permitted to state that in 1778, the time referred to, my grandfather was serving in Butler's corps at the risk of his life, being then of the age of 18 years. If at 18 years he was important enough to be specially singled out, it must be pretty clear that he had made himself tolerably effective under the officer whom he served. In 1793 and 1794, to which years the hon. gentleman has made allusion, my grandfather was a member of the Legislative Council of the province of Ontario, and was leading the Opposition to a very unjust Governor.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I wish to say—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I wish to say nothing more than this—that the hon. gentleman has proved exactly what I would like to say, and that is that charges were made against both our relatives which they could probably refute if they were here.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. KENNY. I am quite sure, Mr. Speaker, that the insulting reference which the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.

Cartwright) made on Wednesday last to the province from which I come, will be accepted by the House as my excuse for taking part in this very unexpected debate. It is well within the recollection of the members of this Parliament that the hon. member for South Oxford has seized upon every possible occasion to offer insult and contumely to the maritime provinces generally, especially to the province of Nova Scotia, and more particularly to the representatives of that province in this chamber. The studied insult which the hon. gentleman has heaped upon the representatives of those provinces, and the unprovoked manner in which he has gone out of his way to speak disparagingly of those who represent the maritime provinces here is a matter of notoriety in this assembly, and must be my excuse for taking up the time of the House this afternoon. The hon. gentleman stated, referring to the province of Nova Scotia, that it was the "arida nutrix leonum," or, to give his own free translation, it was the dry nurse and the wet nurse too of the most highly developed type of boodlers this country has ever known. These are the words that appear in "Hansard," and they are words that will live in the memory of the people of Nova Scotia as long as the hon. gentleman remains a member of this House. But, Sir, this is not the first occasion on which that gentleman sought an occasion to insult the people of the province of Nova Scotia. Some years ago he told this House, and it is recorded on the pages of "Hansard," that the people of Nova Scotia were so corrupt that they offered to sell themselves to Mr. Blake for railway subsidies; but Mr. Blake was too honest to buy them. Now, Sir, the circumstances under which that statement was made will be within the recollection of many hon. gentlemen. It was not made in the heat of debate, it was not provoked by any discussion, it was said almost in a conversational tone across the floor of this House. Subsequently, after the election of 1891, that gentleman again, not on the floor of Parliament, it is true, but in the quiet of his own study, humiliated as he was at the defeat of his party, at the failure of the disloyal policy which he had been advocating for four years in Canada—the policy of commercial union, of continental union, of unrestricted reciprocity, or whatever he chose to call it—when he was smarting under that defeat, and the rebuff which was given him by the people of the maritime provinces, and Manitoba and the Northwest Territories and British Columbia—then, Sir, in the calm of his own study, he wrote that the majority which the Liberal-Conservatives held in this chamber was a majority from the shreds and patches of the Dominion, that the men who represented it came here to boodle for themselves or their constituents, Sir, the men from the province of Nova Scotia who sit behind the hon. gentleman, and for whom

I have a personal regard and respect, in their own homes in their own province, will not stand up and say that man for man they pose as being any better than the men who represent here the Conservative party of that province. I am quite sure there is not a man amongst them who did not feel that all Nova Scotia was insulted when that offensive statement was made. Sir, my hon. friend from Albert (Mr. Weldon), with his usual eloquence and his usual force of language, has spoken of the statement made by the hon. member for South Oxford at the famous banquet in the city of Boston, and that hon. member tells us again that he abides by that statement, that he is proud of it, and that such are now his sentiments. I desire to say to hon. gentlemen opposite who come from the province of Nova Scotia that I believe that the language which the hon. member for South Oxford has applied to the people of the maritime provinces and to the people of the smaller provinces of the Dominion, was as objectionable to them as to the hon. gentlemen who sit on this side of the House. I come to what was said by the hon. gentleman in the city of Boston. On that occasion the hon. gentleman was advocating in the Dominion of Canada, the commercial union of Canada and the United States.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No.

Mr. KENNY. He was advocating continental free trade.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No.

Mr. KENNY. He was advocating unrestricted reciprocity—in fact, he did not understand what he was advocating; and it was so impossible for him to make his policy known to the men who occupied seats in this assembly, that when he was asked here, in this British legislature for an explanation of his policy, he referred us to a measure that was introduced by Mr. Hitt in a foreign legislature—the Congress of the United States of America. And thus it was, as my hon. friend from Albert has pointed out, that this conspiracy was entered into, which meant that on one side of the border one man was advocating, in this assembly a measure which was calculated, if it was not intended, to destroy the independence of Canada, another man was advocating a like measure in Washington. Mr. Blake warned his old party that it would have that result. It appeared to us so disloyal a measure that the only conclusion we could come to was that these gentlemen were not looking to Ottawa, they were looking to Washington, and that the only logical sequence of their conduct must be the annexation of Canada. This was the measure, this was the policy, these were the views, which the hon. gentleman was expressing in Canada when he was invited to a public banquet in the city of

Boston. Sir, I have never had the honour of attending a public banquet in the city of Boston. I can readily understand that the hon. gentleman might, in a moment of weakness, and, being desirous of saying something that was pleasant and agreeable to the audience that he was addressing, a Yankee audience—he might have forgotten that loyalty which should enshroud a man who has been honoured by his Queen.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Read what I said.

Mr. KENNY. The hon. gentleman may have given away, in a moment of weakness, and in order to say something agreeable to his American audience, just as his leader did in 1891, in Boston, when he made a speech which every Canadian who read it, must have read it with pity and shame.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Read it.

Mr. KENNY. Hon. gentlemen do not wish me to tell them the Irish story of one at a time. They have heard it before.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Read it.

Mr. KENNY. It is the hon. member for South Oxford who has provoked all this interruption.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Read the shameful statement you said he made.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I rise to a point of order. A year ago, I was going to read the same thing, but I was ruled out of order.

Mr. FOSTER. That is no point of order.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I appeal to you, Mr. Speaker, if it is proper for hon. gentlemen opposite to have a privilege which was denied to this side.

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not understand that the hon. member for Halifax proposes to read anything.

Mr. LAURIER. I heard the hon. gentleman make a statement that I had said things of which any Canadian should be ashamed.

Mr. FOSTER. Order, order.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I am speaking to the point of order.

Mr. FOSTER. There is no point raised.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Yes, there is.

Mr. FOSTER. What point is raised?

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman stated a moment ago—

Mr. FOSTER. Order, order.

Mr. LAURIER. I am speaking to the point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. FOSTER. There is no point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member for Grey (Mr. Landerkin), to my mind, certainly did not raise any point of order.

Mr. LAURIER. You have just stated that you had understood the hon. member intended to read nothing. The hon. member, a moment ago, within your hearing, stated that at Boston I said things of which every Canadian should be ashamed. Is it in order to make such a statement if he does not intend to read it? If the hon. gentleman has anything to say about it, let him say it now.

Mr. KENNY. I have much pleasure in complying with the hon. gentleman's request. I was going to say that these hon. gentlemen had a fashion of going down to Boston and making speeches there which were very derogatory to Canada, and that the hon. gentleman, the leader of the Opposition, occupying a position of responsibility in Canada, the representative of a party in whose ranks there are many loyal men, the majority of whom are loyal, the vast majority of whom are loyal—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. FOSTER. Do not rise to another point of order.

Mr. KENNY. The hon. gentleman on that occasion said, *inter alia*, that England and Canada must separate.

Mr. LAURIER. Mr. Speaker, I deny the accusation in toto.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Take it back, and apologize.

Mr. LAURIER. No; order. The hon. gentleman brought this matter up last year and I referred him to the 'ipsissima verba' which I uttered in Boston that day; and it is all the more shameful on his part to again bring it up to-day. Why should the hon. gentleman repeat that accusation which I denied on the spot? Let him take my speech in Boston, which was reported in toto, and I defy him to find anything of the kind. I will not be responsible for any garbled report of my speeches, especially garbled by the Tory press; but the speech I made in Boston was reported in full, and by that speech I will abide.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Withdraw.

Mr. KENNY. The hon. gentleman may be in a difficulty, but his friends behind him will not improve his position by endeavouring to prevent me going on with my speech.

Mr. LANDERKIN. You are in the difficulty.

Mr. KENNY. The hon. gentleman stated last year that he would only be responsible for the report of his speech which appeared in the Toronto "Globe." Now, we all know the facility which the hon. gentleman possesses of protecting himself by subterfuges.

Mr. KENNY.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. That word is out of order.

Mr. FOSTER. It means to lie under.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Withdraw.

Mr. KENNY. I understand, Mr. Speaker, that the word is unparliamentary, and I apologize for using it. I was going on to say—and I consider it my duty to refer to it here as a Canadian in view of the responsible position which the hon. gentleman holds in the public life of Canada—that the hon. gentleman went to Boston and his speech was reported in the Boston newspapers by men who took down his words as they fell from his lips, and yet that report, which appeared in the newspapers of the following day, is not to be accepted. What possible object could reporters in Boston have in misrepresenting the hon. gentleman? I am quite aware that the speech the hon. gentleman delivered at that time was of such a character, that it was offensive to the public sentiment of Canada, was so offensive to his own party, that the loyal men of that party told him that it was a very bad policy, at least, and as a consequence he had a rehash of the speech published in the Toronto "Globe."

Some hon. MEMBERS. Shame.

Mr. KENNY. I have just had the report placed in my hands which appeared in the Toronto "Globe," and it is only fair to the hon. gentleman, and I desire to be fair, that I should read it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. KENNY. Hon. gentlemen opposite may not give me credit for that sentiment, but I not only desire to be fair, but to be just to the hon. gentleman, and I will therefore read it, assuming it to be what it is now represented to be, the report of the hon. gentleman's speech which appeared in his own organ the Toronto "Globe." The hon. gentleman went on to say:

The tie which now binds Canada to the motherland is Canada's own will; and, it is with pride that I say it, though still a colony, yet Canada is free (applause). Of course the tie is that of a dependency, and it cannot last forever.

What does that mean? The hon. gentleman says the relations between England and Canada cannot last for ever.

Mr. LANDERKIN. We will be a nation larger than England in a few years, if we govern the country.

Mr. KENNY. The hon. gentleman continued:

Even at this stage Canada and England have interests totally apart.

Why do not hon. gentlemen opposite shout for that sentiment? Is that a nice loyal Canadian sentiment? He said further:

And the time will come when in the very nature of things separation will take place.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have stated that I desire to be not only fair, but I desire to be just to the hon. gentleman. If I were disposed to accept the statements of the Boston newspapers, I would be obliged to go on and tell you that the hon. gentleman when he made that statement about the separation of England and Canada went further, and addressing an American audience, said: "the interests of my country are identical with the interests of the United States." It is true that these words do not find a place, that this sentence does not appear in the report published in the Toronto "Globe," and therefore I do not use them to-day.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Why do you quote them?

Mr. KENNY. I do not use them, because the hon. gentleman has denied them. He has said he will abide solely by his corrected and revised speech as it appeared in the Toronto "Globe," and therefore I do not use them. So much for the point of order. I really do not know at this moment, I have been interrupted so often, whether I am speaking to the point of order or to the motion for adjournment. Assuming I have the floor, I shall with your permission, Mr. Speaker, now deal with the speech made in the same city by the hon. member for South Oxford.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Be good enough to read it, then.

Mr. KENNY. When hon. gentlemen opposite ask us to read reports, will they be kind enough to indicate what they want us to read,—what they said in Boston, or the report as revised by them when they got back.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman will find my speech reported perfectly correct in the transactions of the Boston Society which invited me, and the members of which honoured me with their presence at that time, and by that I stand, every word of it.

Mr. MONTAGUE. In what year was it?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Let the hon. gentleman take his seat.

Mr. KENNY. Mr. Speaker, a request has just been made by my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Montague) for the date on which the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) made that speech. With every desire to inform the House as to that, I regret that I do not remember the exact date. I do, however, remember that the almost more important speech of the leader of the Opposition was made in November, 1891, after the general elections, after the people of Canada had told the hon. gentlemen that they did not want to have anything to do with him, and just before the by-elections which resulted

in doubling the majority which the Conservative party had in this House. I regret that I am not at the present moment able to comply with the wish of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) to read him the exact words which he used at the Boston dinner party. I will quote them in substance to the best of my recollection, and I am quite sure that if I cannot give the exact words I can convey to the House the meaning of what the hon. gentleman said. On that occasion, at a time when he was advocating in the Dominion of Canada a policy which his former leader has pronounced to be a disloyal one, he went to the city of Boston and at a dinner given by some commercial association, I think the very people with whom Mr. Wiman had been associated, he made some interesting remarks. I think it was on that occasion that the announcement was made that Laurier in Quebec, Davies in Prince Edward Island, and Cartwright in Ontario, looked to them, the people of the United States, for the sign by which they should conquer. It would be interesting to the House if we had the details of that dinner and all the speeches which were made there. The only thing which was absent on that occasion was the British flag, for I have never heard that the Union Jack was seen in the room. The hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) there intimated that if his policy were accepted, if the American people would only do what he wanted them to do, the result would be the establishment in Canada of a northern tier of states, of which Boston was to be the entrepot, and that the trade being once secured to Boston no man living could take it from them. Hon. gentlemen will at once see that that would have meant the destruction of the export and import commerce of Montreal, of Quebec, of St. John, of Halifax, and of every maritime city in Canada. The hon. gentleman tells us now that such language is commendable, that he is proud of it, and that he sticks by it yet.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Not by what you say but by what I said.

Mr. KENNY. It is impossible for me to quote from memory the exact words, but I believe I have given their correct meaning. The hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) tells us now that he adheres to those statements. We are satisfied. They helped us in the last elections in Nova Scotia and they will help us in the next elections. Sir, complimentary and well-earned references have been made in this House to the services of distinguished men who have been leaders of the Conservative party, but I say that there has not been one of them, from Sir John Macdonald down, who has done so much to keep the Conservative party in power as has the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright).

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How ungrateful a lot you must be.

Mr. KENNY. Gratitude finds a place in my breast, and I am grateful to the hon. member for South Oxford. An hon. friend of mine has just handed me the "Hansard," in which appear the exact words of the hon. member (Sir Richard Cartwright) at the Boston dinner, and in order that there may be no misunderstanding, and that this debate may be conducted in perfect fairness, I shall quote those remarks in accordance with the hon. gentleman's request. After I have read them I will leave it to hon. members of this House if I did not give a correct interpretation of them, before. I quote the words of the hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) from the "Hansard" of 1891, page 1155 :

In one word, given free trade with Canada, and you are within one stride from the position, in some respects, of a frontier city, with no great extent of trade territory secured to you, to that of a central entrepôt, with the practical monopoly of a great region behind you, whose commerce no man can take away from you.

This is the language used by the hon. gentleman. The hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) says he is proud of that language, and that he abides by it. Let me tell him that in the maritime provinces at least, these sentiments have never found a defender on the platform or in the press. The hon. gentleman tells us now that he never advocated commercial union, and never advocated continental free trade.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No, I did not say that. I said I never advocated commercial union.

Mr. COCHRANE. You supported a man in my riding whose platform was commercial union.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. By some of your lighthouse-keepers, I suppose.

Mr. COCHRANE. No.

Mr. KENNY. The hon. member (Sir Richard Cartwright) will have great difficulty in proving to the House what difference there is between free trade between Canada and the United States and the entire obliteration of customs ; and commercial union or continental free trade. At all events, the policy of the hon. gentleman was of such a character that it was pronounced by his late leader to be disloyal. Now that I have given the hon. gentleman his exact words, and now that he persists in them and says that these are still his views, I think, Mr. Speaker, that it is not to be regretted that this discussion took place. It is seldom, Sir, that on a motion to adjourn the House we learn so much as we have learned this afternoon. Here, the hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright), who poses as the financial guide of hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House,

Mr. KENNY.

tells us that he still thinks that the best thing for Canada is to have free trade with the United States and to make Boston the entrepot for the commerce of Canada. Only yesterday the hon. gentleman drew, by inference at least, a comparison between himself as a financial guide and my hon. friend the present Finance Minister, and endeavoured to convey the impression to this House that he was so much better an authority that it was unwise and inexpedient for us forming the majority to follow any longer my hon. friend the Minister of Finance. Sir, with all due deference to the hon. gentleman—and I am a man of commerce—he will pardon me for saying that, although we recognize his great ability and his great usefulness in this House—and I listen to him even when he abuses me, for he is never more amusing than when he is abusing—I say, following out that comparison, which I did not originate, but which he himself introduced, he must permit me to say, as a member of this House and as a merchant of Canada, that in all matters of detail, connected with the trade and commerce of this country, my hon. friend the Minister of Finance is much better informed than the hon. member for South Oxford. And that is not to be wondered at. It is due to the fact that the hon. member for South Oxford has not the time—it is not his metier, his avocation ; whereas my hon. friend the Finance Minister is constantly dealing with such questions. But, Sir, I should have had some hesitation in intruding my individual opinion in this matter if I did not know that the merchants of Canada, the men who deal in finance in Canada, and the people of Canada, have more confidence in the hon. Finance Minister than in the hon. member for South Oxford, and they have shown it by their votes at the polls.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. They have shown it in Montreal Centre, for instance.

Mr. KENNY. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that nothing that I could say, or that could be said in this House or in this country, could disabuse the mind of the hon. member for South Oxford of the idea that he knows more than all the other members of the House of Commons together. But as he has instituted a comparison with only one of us, I carry it no further. That the comparison made by the hon. member for South Oxford is disposed of, I desire to refer to the appeal recently made to this side of the House by the hon. leader of the Opposition.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The leader of the country.

Mr. KENNY. Well, it will be a long time before he is that. It will be a long time before the people of Canada forget that Boston speech.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What guarantees have you taken from the bolters that they will not go out again ?

Mr. FOSTER. The bolters will answer for themselves.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. They have been very slow to do it.

Mr. SPEAKER. I must appeal to hon. members on both sides of the House to assist me in keeping order.

Mr. LAURIER. Make the appeal to that side.

Mr. KENNY. No one will accuse me of causing disorder in debate. My desire is that discussion should be carried on in the most charitable way possible; but it is necessary to instruct the people in the language of truth, and no amount of interruption which hon. gentlemen opposite can offer will deter me from doing so. I was going to refer to the appeal which the hon. leader of the Opposition made to the patriotism and the honour of the men who sit on this side of the House when he told us that as patriots and as honourable men we should support the party with which he is associated. Now, Sir, let us review the patriotism of the hon. gentleman. In the year 1886 the hon. gentleman encouraged, aided and abetted the very dishonest and very disloyal repeal agitation which was started by Mr. Fielding in the province of Nova Scotia. Sir, the hon. gentleman may think that it is a wise thing to disintegrate this Dominion. That is not the sentiment of the people of Canada. But one way of doing it would have been to have succeeded in the purpose of that very dishonest and disloyal agitation; so I termed it in Nova Scotia, and so I term it here. Sir, I do say that an hon. gentleman occupying a position of responsibility in this House and in this country who appeals to my patriotism and my devotion to Canada must first of all show me that he is entitled to be called a patriot himself. There is almost immediately before the House a question which is supposed to bristle with evidences of the hon. gentleman's patriotism. For some years past no question has so disturbed the people of Canada as the one which is before us—that known as the Manitoba school question. Sir, the action which has led to the introduction of this very unpleasant subject into our political arena was the action of Mr. Greenway, as leader of the Liberal party in the province of Manitoba. That gentleman being then in opposition, and the party at Ottawa feeling that they had not much chance of success in federal politics, and being anxious to obtain power in the different provincial legislatures, Mr. Greenway co-mingling with the leaders of the Opposition here—so it is said, for I do not speak from original knowledge—together they inaugurated this move-

ment which resulted in depriving the Roman Catholic minority in Manitoba of schools which they always possessed and such as has always been enjoyed by the minority in Ontario.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Why did you not disallow the Bill? That is the point.

Mr. KENNY. Was the hon. gentleman in favour of disallowance?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Answer the question.

Mr. KENNY. The hon. gentleman has put to me a question.

Mr. LANDERKIN. And you have not answered it.

Mr. KENNY. I answer it by asking another. The whole career of this hon. gentleman, the hon. leader of the Opposition, who appeals to us on patriotic grounds to support him, is one which, I regret to say, I cannot as a Canadian admire. We know that immediately after the Manitoba School Act was passed by the legislature of Manitoba, an agitation arose in that province on the part of the Roman Catholic minority for the restoration to them of rights which they had enjoyed up to the time the Liberal party came into power in Manitoba. What happened? Mr. Greenway, I believe, came down to Ottawa after he had received the information from the Government of Canada that the matter had gone through the courts, and that the final court of appeal had decided that it was the duty of the Government of Canada and the Parliament of Canada to remedy the grievance which existed. Now, Sir, Mr. Greenway came to Ottawa at the invitation of His Excellency the Governor General, who, being a wise ruler, was anxious that this vexed question should be settled as a matter of compromise and arrangement. He came down here, it is reported, in a spirit of conciliation. I am told that his desire was to have the matter disposed of, but it will be remembered that he arrived here very shortly after hon. gentlemen opposite last year first introduced into this Parliament their free trade as-in-England-policy—and we know what an arrant failure that was. We know that its advocacy was met by their own friends in the country with the statement that on such a platform they could never carry the approaching general elections. The Grit party was in a difficulty, and it was necessary to apply some remedy. And what happened? Mr. Greenway put himself in communication with the hon. gentlemen opposite, and, so the story runs, it was decided that it would never do, in the interests of the Liberal party of the Dominion to allow the question to be settled, but that it must be kept open.

Mr. LAURIER. Does the hon. gentleman affirm that?

Mr. KENNY. It is impossible for me to say what took place at a private interview.

Mr. LAURIER. It suits the hon. gentleman not to affirm, but to insinuate. That is his style.

Mr. KENNY. I say that was the impression in the public mind, well founded, well based, but the matter was too well managed to make it possible for me to prove it. But it was the generally accepted opinion of the country that this question was to be kept open in order to help—a remote possibility and a desperate one—these hon. gentlemen opposite to get into power by the disintegration of the Conservative party, which they could never do on their trade policy.

Mr. LAURIER. I beg to say here to the hon. gentleman that when Mr. Greenway was here, I did not speak to him—never!

Some hon. MEMBERS. Take it back.

Mr. SPEAKER. I must again appeal to the hon. members on both sides to aid me in putting a stop to these unseemly interruptions. The hon. member for Quebec East having stated positively that he had no communication with Mr. Greenway when he was here, the hon. member for Halifax should accept that statement.

Mr. LAURIER. I think I can appeal to you, Sir, that in the discharge of the duties which I have to discharge in this House, I have always endeavoured to carry out my part with consideration to friends and foes, but I cannot submit to hear in silence the most—I will not characterize it otherwise—unparliamentary language which the hon. gentleman has used towards me this afternoon on two different occasions.

Mr. KENNY. I unreservedly accept what the hon. gentleman has said. I never insinuated for a moment that he had any special interview with Mr. Greenway, and, after all, the hon. gentleman must not be so sensitive. He is in the habit of applying epithets, which are anything but seemly, to the men who sit opposite him, and he has used language, during this session, to the men who sit on the right of the Chair, the independent supporters of the Government, which we cannot be expected not to resent. The two references which I made to the hon. gentleman's conduct were regarding what he said in Boston, and I proved that I was correct by reading his own speech; and now, when I refer to the belief which prevails in the country—

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It does not prevail.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Never heard it before.

Mr. KENNY. When I refer to this belief, and when I draw a fair inference, at all events, from the course of public events,
Mr. KENNY.

the hon. gentleman finds fault with me for having done so. I accept, unreservedly, his statement when he tells me that he did not meet Mr. Greenway in Ottawa. I suppose that the other day in Montreal, on that Sunday afternoon when the Hon. Mr. Sifton was there, he did not meet the Hon. Mr. Sifton.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. He does not say that.

Mr. KENNY. At all events, we do know this, that when the Hon. Mr. Sifton got back to Manitoba—I do not say it was the result of his interview with the hon. gentleman; I cannot say that, for I was not present—but I do say that what happened was that the Manitoba school question was not settled, no attempt was made to settle it, the sore was to be kept open, there was to be a general election. That is what happened. As I do not believe that England and Canada should separate, as it is in the interests of Manitoba and this Dominion that this question of the Manitoba schools and remedial legislation should be kept no longer in our public life than is absolutely necessary, I must decline to accept the hon. gentleman's appeal to my honour or my patriotism.

An hon. MEMBER. You have not got any.

Mr. KENNY. I would not like to have much of it, if it is of the character of some that is on the other side of the House. The debate which the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) has provoked in this House has, I am sorry to say, taken a very extensive range. But I do say to the hon. gentlemen opposite, that when they make use of language, characterizing men who sit here as thieves and robbers because they happen to be identified with some manufacturing industry, which, in many cases, is not very profitable to them, financially, or when they call them hoodlums because they come from a certain province, or when references of a similar character are made to our political leaders whom we are very glad to serve, it is not possible for us to sit here quietly and not take cognizance of such abusive statements. The hon. member for South Oxford went out of his way to insult a gentleman who has just joined the Government, the Hon. Sir Charles Tupper, in his absence. Let me say this, that if there is one trait or one characteristic of the Hon. Sir Charles Tupper, if there is one point in his public career which makes his return to public life at this moment particularly acceptable to the people of the Dominion, and especially to the people of his own province, it is this: He arrives at a moment when there is a religious excitement in Canada, and we who know him best, we of his own province, know that the happy relations which exist there between the people of all denomina-

tions are largely due to the salutary influence which Sir Charles Tupper has exercised during his whole career. And, Mr. Speaker, I do believe that it is a fortunate thing for Canada that Sir Charles Tupper is coming into the Government of the country at the time when we are dealing with such a vexed question. Referring to the attack made upon the absent Sir Charles Tupper, I desire to read the retraction made by the Hon. Mr. McLelan, which the hon. member for South Oxford, in a moment of forgetfulness, said Mr. McLelan had not made. At page 26 of the Debates of 1882 I find the following statement made by Mr. McLelan :—

Whatever I may have said on that occasion, I say now, namely, that when that contract was complete, and that when the whole history of the railway was made known to the people of Nova Scotia, no man will pretend to say that, whoever may have benefited, the hon. Minister of Railways—

Sir Charles Tupper was then Minister of Railways—

—ever personally benefited by that contract. Therefore, all the insinuations that have been made against him by the hon. gentlemen opposite are unworthy of repetition on the floor of this House.

Could the English language be made to convey a statement more positive and explicit than that? The hon. member for South Oxford was, I do not like to say unfair, but was so unjust as actually to tell this House—and very few of us were here in 1882—that the Hon. Mr. McLelan had never retracted or explained his words. I say, Sir, that nothing, as regards Sir Charles Tupper's connection with this matter, could be more satisfactory to his friends than this explicit statement of the late Hon. Mr. McLelan.

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

After Recess.

Mr. MARTIN. I have always noticed that when hon. gentlemen opposite and their friends throughout the country find themselves in trouble, find it hard to justify the acts of their party, they invariably have recourse to laudations of their own loyalty and denunciations of the disloyalty of their opponents. Thus, a subject that should be held sacred is continually used by gentlemen opposite as a means of covering up their own iniquity. I think that there has never been an occasion in the long history of their party when some ruse of that kind was more necessary than it is now. Gentlemen opposite must find it extremely difficult to say anything in their own defence, or even to feel any degree of loyalty to their leaders, who have been in charge of the fortunes of their party. It must have been

for this reason that the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) introduced into this discussion stale charges of disloyalty, chestnuts of the worst kind, the same that have been heard in every part of Canada for the past five or six years, the same that did full duty in the campaign of 1891, and answers to which have been forthcoming on every possible occasion. But to-day, in order, if possible, to distract public attention from the extraordinary position of the Conservative party, the hon. gentleman brings forward these charges again. The hon. member for Albert rather poses as a man of independent character, as one who is above his party, as one who regards public questions from an independent standpoint and does not take part in ordinary partisan discussions. That is the estimate of the hon. gentleman that I have read before I became a member of this House. But I must say that since coming here I have wholly failed to discern any difference between the hon. gentleman and his fellow-members on the score of partisanship. There has never been, so far as I know, since I came here, any question on which the hon. gentleman has given an independent vote or expressed an independent opinion. When shady transactions have come before the House, the hon. member is often put up by the Government to defend them, with the view possibly of trading upon the reputation which he seems to have acquired in some quarters. One of the worst things this Parliament has done since I became a member of it, in my opinion, was the whitewashing of the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Turcotte), against whom a charge was made that he was a contractor with the Government while a member of this House. We found that this independent gentleman, the hon. member for Albert was prepared to support the Government in that matter. The reason given among members of the party for whitewashing the hon. member, as I understand, was that the hon. member for East Northumberland (Mr. Cochrane) had been whitewashed, though the charge against him was even a worse one, and that, as he was an Englishman, it was only fair that the same leniency should be extended to a French member. The Government endeavoured to stifle public inquiry by refusing to put the oath to witnesses in the investigation in the Committee on Public Accounts, and it was the hon. member for Albert who took the most active part on the floor of the House in defending that most outrageous proceeding. I understood that the hon. member for Albert was led to bring up these old charges of disloyalty by the reference made by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) to the new member of the Government, Sir Charles Tupper. The hon. member for South Oxford has shown to-day, in the words of one of the former leaders of the Conservative party, the opinion that

was held of Sir Charles Tupper. The attempt has been made by hon. members on the other side to show that Mr. McLelan, on a subsequent occasion, apologized for words he had used. But the extract from "Hansard" which has been given does not fairly bear that construction. In the speech quoted, Mr. McLelan did not apologize to Sir Charles Tupper for the charges he had made against him. I understand that Mr. McLelan's reference to Sir Charles Tupper in the Nova Scotia legislature was a charge against him upon his record, and applying that record to propositions which were then before the legislature with regard to a certain railway corporation, Mr. McLelan denominated him the high priest of corruption, and I find nothing in "Hansard" to show that Mr. McLelan at any time withdrew those words. And certainly, Sir Charles Tupper's record after he left the legislature of Nova Scotia and entered Dominion politics affords every reason to warrant any member of this House in applying that epithet to him. I believe that it is the opinion of the country generally that if there is a man in Canada who deserves the epithet used by Mr. McLelan—a high priest of corruption—that man is Sir Charles Tupper. Now, the hon. ex-Minister of Justice, taking this as an attack upon himself, made a counter-charge against the hon. member for South Oxford. It will seem very strange if the public men of this country are to be justified or condemned, not for their own actions, but for the actions of their grandfathers. Had the hon. member for South Oxford or any other member made a charge against the ex-Minister of Justice on account of something Sir Charles Tupper, his father, had done, then there would have been some kind of reason for his striking back in this way. But no charges made regarding Sir Charles Tupper the elder are made to affect the political standing or conduct of his son, the ex-Minister of Justice. I think the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) made it very plain the other night when he said that if the Government undertake to bring into their ranks the late High Commissioner, that gentleman becomes a fair subject for comment, and the comments must be taken as directed against himself and not against his son. It seems to me, therefore, that the ex-Minister of Justice was ill-advised in bringing up in this House the record of the grandfather of an hon. member on this side. Even if it be granted that a member of this House is bound to account for and be responsible not only for his own actions, but those of his father, and not only those of his father but those of his grandfather, still, so far as anything appears from the discussion to-day it seems to me that the hon. member for South Oxford has nothing to excuse but much to be proud of. The first charge read was in the form of an extract from the archives of Canada, and from it it appeared that the authorities of the State

Mr. MARTIN.

of New York were not satisfied with Mr. Richard Cartwright, the grandfather of the hon. member. I have always understood that the United Empire Loyalists left New York and other states because they were not prepared to live loyally under republican institutions that had been adopted there. The ex-Minister of Justice seems to think it a crime on the part of Mr. Cartwright that the Americans charged him with being neutral and unsatisfactory; in other words, not loyal to their institutions. Such a charge must lie against every United Empire Loyalist who came to Canada. While many would not agree with the course taken by the United Empire Loyalists, but would rather approve the course of those British subjects who resisted the tyranny which was practised upon them at that time by the English Government, still we must all admire the courage and devotion to their cause that these men displayed. Not being able to live loyally under the institutions of the country they took the manly course of breaking up their homes and coming to what was to them a foreign country. That is the charge made by the ex-Minister of Justice, and it is a charge that can be made on the same ground against every United Empire Loyalist who came to Canada. The ex-Minister of Justice, not satisfied with proclaiming that this man was a United Empire Loyalist, because that covers the definition of the phrase, which means that he was a man whom the authorities of the United States were not prepared to have live among them, and who was driven from the new union because his allegiance to the British Empire was so strong that he was prepared to give up his home and make for himself a new home in a foreign country, as Canada then was, he went on and stated that when this man, Richard Cartwright, came into Canada his actions were reflected upon by Governor Simcoe.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. He was at that time a member of the Legislative Council.

Mr. MARTIN. His conduct was reflected upon, so far as we can judge, because he was not prepared to knuckle under to Governor Simcoe, who was a despotic Tory Governor of Upper Canada. I have always understood that the ancestors of the hon. member for South Oxford were of the Tory party. I have always had a trifle of feeling against the hon. gentleman, if that were possible, on that account. But it would appear, from what was brought forward by the ex-Minister of Justice, that Richard Cartwright, the grandfather of my hon. friend, was not prepared to submit to the Tory Governor, Governor Simcoe, that he was, in other words, a Reformer at that time, and was not prepared to bow the knee to the Family Compact. If it be a crime to have opposed that Family Com-

pact, if Richard Cartwright was a man upon whose name aspersions might be cast on account of his conduct during that period of Canadian history, he is in good company. I have no doubt that the ex-Minister of Justice, if he had pursued his inquiries a little further, would have found in the archives of Canada even more serious reflections cast against such men as Baldwin, Lafontaine, William Lyon Mackenzie and Louis Joseph Papineau. That Richard Cartwright should be classed with men of that kind, that he should have been a man opposed to the Family Compact, and not prepared to submit to them in every particular, may be in the eye of the ex-Minister of Justice, and of hon. gentlemen opposite, a reflection on that gentleman's patriotism and loyalty, but with the great Liberal party of Canada it will be an added ornament to the hon. member for South Oxford, that he should have had a grandfather prepared to stand up with Baldwin and Lafontaine, and William Lyon Mackenzie and Papineau, as against the Family Compact. I have had to listen to-day, for the first time since I entered this House, to an hon. member who, up to the present time, I had considered was an honourable gentleman, a member of this House with honourable instinct, make the most futile attack ever made since I have been a member of this House. The attack made by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny) on the leader of the Opposition was most unwarranted and most uncalled for. That hon. gentleman refused to accept the word of the leader of the Opposition as to what he had said in a speech delivered in Boston. I found great difficulty in understanding exactly what complaint was brought against the hon. member for South Oxford, and the leader of the Opposition, with respect to their speeches on the other side. It would almost appear that from the standpoint of hon. gentlemen opposite, it is a crime and misdemeanour for a Canadian statesman to address an American audience. I do not take that view, and, as the leader of the Opposition and the hon. member for South Oxford said, if there is anything to condemn let it be shown by what they said there. It is suggested that the remarks of the hon. member for South Oxford were so acceptable to the audience addressed in Boston that they applauded him, and one gentleman more enthusiastic than the rest addressed him as the future senator for Ontario. I understand that is a compliment to my hon. friend, because the Senate of the United States, differing in that respect from the Senate of Canada, is the most important legislative body there, and it is the greatest honour which can come to an American politician to become a member of that House. How can my hon. friend be blamed in any degree for any suggestions coming from the audience he addressed, except so far as he was able

to make himself acceptable and his speech pleasing to them, I cannot see. During the course of the remarks made by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny) the hon. gentleman referred to something which he said he had heard. He could not tell where he had heard it, who had said it, or give any responsible person as authority for it; but there was in the country, he said, a very definite impression that there had been an agreement entered into between the Premier of Manitoba and the leader of the Opposition in this House, by which the Premier of Manitoba had purposely refrained from carrying out an intention which, up to that time, he entertained of settling the Manitoba school difficulty. The hon. gentleman did, upon pressure, I must admit, withdraw his statement with regard to the leader of the Opposition; but perhaps it may be as well, since the matter has been broached here, and since the hon. member for Halifax has stated that there was a very well-defined impression throughout the country that this was the case, to allude, briefly, to the matter. The leader of the Opposition said that he had had no communication whatever with respect to that matter. I may say, however, that the charge which has been made against Mr. Greenway and his government in the elections which have just taken place in Manitoba is just the opposite of that which the hon. member for Halifax has made against Mr. Greenway and the leader of the Opposition to-night, because it was charged during the campaign just closed that Mr. Greenway and the leader of the Opposition here were in a conspiracy, and that as soon as the elections were fairly over in Manitoba, and Mr. Greenway had been returned to power on his stand on the school question, he, Mr. Greenway, would, at the next session of the legislature, called for the 27th instant, introduce a School Bill, restoring to the Roman Catholics of Manitoba the privileges which they possessed under the Acts prior to 1890. That is the charge which has been made. That charge has been denied most explicitly by the Premier of Manitoba and his government. He has taken the position that so far as the Manitoba school question is concerned, it is his duty, and the duty of his government to act in that matter in the interests of Manitoba alone, without any regard to questions of Dominion politics, I am satisfied, Mr. Speaker, that that is the course which will be adopted in Manitoba. I am satisfied that in dealing with this matter the government of Manitoba will in the future, as they have in the past, deal with it from a Manitoba standpoint. The reason offered by the Opposition for this charge against the Government arose from statements that have been made by different members of the Manitoba government, and by the "Tribune" newspaper which is the leading Liberal paper of Manitoba, as to

the attitude of the Manitoba government upon this school question. These statements were to the effect: That the government had been in the past and would be in the future prepared to do justice where any injustice was shown to exist either to the Roman Catholic minority or to any one else. I wish to show that that is still the attitude of the government there, because since the election which occurred on the 15th of the present month the following appeared in the "Winnipeg Tribune," which is, as I say, the leading Liberal paper of that province. It is not the organ of the government, because a Liberal paper cannot be the organ of a government; it is an independent newspaper which represents the opinions of the government probably to a large extent, but which specially represents the constituency to which it appeals. The "Tribune" says:

All friends of interprovincial harmony will still hope that some gleam of statesmanlike sense will now influence the actions of the Dominion Cabinet. It is not to be understood from the present attitude of Manitoba that the majority of her people have any hatred of Roman Catholics, or that, having them down, their wish is to keep them down. There is a good deal of misunderstanding on this point, and a good deal of nonsense has been talked. The real intention of Manitoba has no foundation in ill-will to any part of her population, but these intentions have so far had no opportunity to be manifested. The province has practically been on her defence for the last five years, and until the struggle to maintain what she deems her rights is ended, a dispassionate consideration of the grievances of the minority can hardly be expected. When, however, the threat of coercion is removed, as ultimately it must be, the sense of justice of Manitobans will be found as active as it is in any part of the Dominion, and a readiness will be shown to remove all just cause of complaint against our school laws.

Mr. Speaker, that is the attitude of the Government, and that is the attitude of the people of Manitoba. The statement that there is any conspiracy or any understanding between the Manitoba government and the leader of the Opposition here, to use the school question as a foot ball in Dominion politics is utterly unfounded. The charge that the leader of the Opposition and the government of Manitoba are arranging to keep the question in active politics for their own purposes, as well as the charge that there is pending an arrangement with the leader of the Opposition since the election, to produce an Act for the purpose of settling this question, are charges that are utterly false and untrue. The Manitoba government do not propose to lend themselves to any arrangement of that kind, and I am certain the leader of the Opposition here has never directly nor indirectly suggested that they should lend themselves to any such arrangement. The stand taken by the Manitoba government is not a stand taken by the Liberals of that province alone, but it is a stand taken by the Liberals and Conser-

Mr. MARTIN.

vatives of Manitoba alike, as was proven by the result of the elections which took place on Wednesday last. Their stand is this: they insist that the subject of education is one over which the province should have control. They intend to insist upon that principle and to fight for it in every legitimate constitutional way, but at the same time they insist that they are prepared to do justice if any injustice is shown. From the time that this question first came up, the Manitoba government have always manifested a disposition of that kind. When the remedial order was sent to them commanding them to restore the schools as they existed prior to 1890, in every particular, they took the only course possible to them. They refused to restore those schools as they existed prior to 1890, but at the same time they have coupled that refusal with the suggestion that they were prepared to join in any investigation into the real facts of the case that might be thought desirable by the Dominion Government, and that if any injustice were shown, they were ready to right it. That answer was sent some time in June last. It was then suggested in this House that the Manitoba government were prepared to compromise this question. I say, Sir, that the Dominion Government never had the slightest reason to suppose that the Manitoba government had any intention whatever to depart from, in the slightest degree, their answer to the remedial order. The suggestion that there was any likelihood of the Manitoba government making any compromise was a mere excuse put forward by the Dominion Government in order to gain delay for their own purposes. They knew perfectly well that the only possible way of approaching anything like the discussion of a compromise, was the withdrawal of the remedial order, and until the remedial order couched in such terms was withdrawn, it was quite impossible to consider the question of compromise, or to consider the making right of any injustice that might have been done. That being the case, it seems to me most important that this question should be approached from the standpoint of conciliation rather than coercion. That has been very well said by the leader of the Opposition. Until the Government of Canada are prepared to deal with the question from that standpoint, and to go into all the facts, as they did not do when they passed the remedial order, there can be no settlement of the question. The remedial order was passed before any investigation was made and without any knowledge on the part of the Government of Canada as to how things were up in Manitoba. The Government now propose to introduce legislation for the purpose of giving effect to that remedial order. At the present time I will not say anything with regard to that remedial legislation. My purpose in rising was only to refer to the story suggested by the member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny) and

to the other stories suggested with regard to combination and conspiracy between the leader of the Opposition here and the Government of Manitoba. It does seem to me, however, that it would be a great advantage in the settlement of this question if it could be arranged between two friendly governments. So far as the present Government are concerned, they have shown no special desire, in dealing with the province, to enter into any negotiations on a basis of compromise. They have taken the other course. They have taken the plan of deciding from the outset, without even hearing the case of Manitoba, that the province is entirely wrong, and that the only possible solution of the difficulty is to restore the old school system of 1871 as it existed when the statutes of 1890 were passed. Mr. Speaker, the province of Manitoba will never consent to that. If the old system is to be restored as it was before, it will have to be done by force; it will have to be done in such a way that the province cannot resist it constitutionally. I do not mean to say that the province will use force. They will be prepared to yield, if the constitution compels them to do so. But the question will never be solved in that way by the people of Manitoba. They do not believe that the old system was a proper system, either as the Catholic board or the Protestant board were constituted. They believe they had a perfect right to legislate on the question in the way they did; but, as the honourable Attorney General has said in public speeches, they do not by any means stand on the Act of 1890 as being an Act that cannot be altered or changed. They are prepared, on a proper case being shown, to make every wrong right, and to deal with the question in a spirit that will be proper and fair to the minority.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, might we not dispose of the question as to the adjournment of the House at this time.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Mr. Speaker, I will not detain the House for more than a very few moments; but I cannot allow that question to be put without saying a word or two with reference to the rather discreditable exhibition which this House saw this afternoon. It was a discreditable exhibition of personal feeling and rancour which, I am happy to say for Parliament, is seldom witnessed here. I refer to the language and the tone—I was going to use an unparliamentary expression, and say the insolence—used by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny), who I am sorry to see is not in his place. The hon. gentleman knew very well that he had made references to hon. members in this House and to their friends outside of the House, which references could not be permitted to go unchallenged; and I regret to say that, knowing as he did that they were to be taken up, he had not the manliness to take his seat in the House and

listen to the reply. Sir, that hon. gentleman, not on one occasion, but on almost all occasions, with an arrogant insolence which vulgarly assumes a monopoly of loyalty—

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I shall withdraw the expression if it is not parliamentary. With an arrogance, then, which vulgarly assumes a monopoly of patriotism, he tells this House time and again that one-half of our people, the Liberal party of Canada, led by my hon. friend, are not loyal to the Crown; and he keeps repeating this year after year, and attempting to prove it by what, Sir? By a quotation or an alleged quotation from a speech which he heard the hon. leader of the Opposition tell him four years ago and repeat a year ago, was a false quotation. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, what can be thought of the conduct of a member of this House who, having been assured that a quotation which he professes to make from a speech of one of his opponents is incorrect and untrue, goes on year after year refusing to accept the explanation and repeating the quotation? Hon. gentlemen who live in the western part of Canada may not be aware of the fact that that hon. gentleman has made that speech—that false quotation—his stock-in-trade at every petty meeting held in Halifax, and generally in Nova Scotia, which he has attended. He trots out this alleged quotation on every occasion, although knowing that its correctness has been challenged and denied by my hon. leader. What is to be done with a gentleman of that kind? He comes here proclaiming his personal loyalty. Well, Sir, I have never heard it challenged. If a lady goes around from drawing-room to drawing-room protesting her virtue, or if a business man goes from board of exchange to board of exchange protesting his honesty, they simply give rise to suspicion; and so when a politician, in season and out of season, protests and proclaims his loyalty to the Crown, he leads people to suspect that there is some other motive animating him than loyalty. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman never replies to an argument upon the true issues which divide the parties in this country without taking refuge in this eternal patter and cry of loyalty—that which Dr. Johnson described to be the last refuge of a scoundrel. Now, Sir, I call the attention of hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House to the spectacle presented on this particular occasion. I ask my hon. friends, is this the time, here and now, when the Government of this country are calling upon all Canadians to sink for the moment their party differences in order to vote the necessary money to increase the militia and the defences of this country, and to stand shoulder to shoulder in the possible event of an invasion of the country—is this the time for a member of Parliament to proclaim to the

world that one-half of the Canadian people are traitors? Sir, his lies and his slanders—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Or those lies and those slanders—I am not referring to any individual.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman said "his lies," referring to the hon. member for Halifax.

Mr. SPEAKER. I understood the hon. gentleman to say "his lies and his slanders." If those words were made use of, they must be withdrawn.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I believe they slipped from my tongue unintentionally. I meant to say, and I do say, those lies and those misrepresentations—because they were not the lies and misrepresentations of one man only, as will be seen when I finish my sentence—were used in the last election to carry the election for the Conservative party. The interests of the country were sacrificed then, as those gentlemen are frequently ready to sacrifice them, for party exigencies. There are many who, if they can gain a party triumph, will not scruple to sacrifice and ruin their country. At that time, when everything was in peace and quietness, party interests might induce some men who know the contrary to take such a dishonest and unjustifiable course. But I should think that now of all times it were desirable, whatever our party differences may be, that our loyalty to the Crown and to the country should be unquestioned; and I should have thought there was not a man in this Canadian Parliament who would have the meanness and the audacity to stand up and challenge the loyalty of one-half of the Canadian people. I repudiate the slander, Sir, with scorn and indignation. When the volunteers were called upon a few years ago to quell a rebellion in the North-west Territories, was there any difference in the loyalty of those who responded, whether they were Conservatives or Reformers? When our young men sprang to take their places in the ranks, did anybody stop to ask whether they came from the Liberal or the Tory ranks? No, they came because they were loyal to the country, and I tell the hon. gentleman who to-day slanders his country and its young men, that if this country were attacked from abroad by any foreigner, whoever he may be, he would find as much unquestioned loyalty in the Liberal party, as much stern determination to defend their hearths and homes, as much fierce desire and determination to live under and fight for the flag which we have lived under so long, as could be found in the party to which he belongs. Sir, the hon. gentleman not only attacked my hon. friend here, but with a lack of courtesy, which I was ashamed of, coming as I do from the maritime provinces, he refused to accept his

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

explanation. Is there another hon. gentleman on that side of the House, who, when my hon. friend offered an explanation of an alleged statement made by him, would refuse to accept it? I say that he owes an apology to my hon. friend, and it would be becoming in him now to make it, and make it in a humble manner.

Mr. KENNY. Do you mean me?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Yes, I am alluding to the hon. member for Halifax. He did not scruple also to attack a prominent Nova Scotian behind his back. Why did he deem it his duty to drag in the name of Mr. Fielding into the debate and pronounce his policy disloyal and dishonest?

Mr. KENNY. I rise to a point of order. The statement which I made was that the repeal agitation in 1886 was a dishonest and, to my mind, a disloyal policy. I said so in my own province and I repeat it here.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman put no qualification upon it at all.

Mr. KENNY. Yes, I did.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) With the policy which was advocated then I have no concern. It may have been a prudent policy, or it may not. I was not a Nova Scotian, but I know this, that ever since Confederation, with the exception of a short disastrous period, the people of that province have kept at their head, fortunately for themselves, such men as Mr. Fielding and his colleagues. I know this, that ever since that province was sold into Confederation by the hon. gentleman's party friends, there has rankled a deep feeling of disappointment, and I know that if there is a suspicion of want of loyalty to the Confederation, that suspicion is entirely owing to the treachery which sold the constitution of Nova Scotia over the people's heads. In the province from which I come and in the other maritime provinces the people were consulted. They went in willingly, and there never has been, in town, hamlet or village, the suspicion of a cry asking that Confederation be dissolved. They are loyal to Confederation because their opinion was taken. But in the province from which the hon. gentleman comes the people were bought and sold without their leave being asked, and they would not be the descendants of the men they are if they did not resist and resent a treachery which took away from them their own constitution. But where was the disloyalty? Nova Scotia was a part of the British Empire before ever Confederation was thought of, its loyalty to the Crown was not changed because it merged its local independence in the Dominion of Canada. It remains a part and parcel of the Empire now as before, and if the political union which binds it to the other provinces were severed, as Mr. Fielding wished it to be severed, it would still

remain part of the Empire, and where would be the disloyalty? I desire that Nova Scotia should remain a part and parcel of Confederation, the policy of repeal is not one I advocate, but where is the disloyalty? I say it is a most offensive and a most uncalled-for aspersion. The hon. gentleman took care to make the attack on Mr. Fielding behind his back. Sir, we have eulogies passed to-day on great and distinguished Nova Scotians who have gone to their long home. Mr. Fielding is not held up by his friends to have the versatility, genius, or brilliancy of a Howe or the oratorical qualities of a Huntington, or a Uniacke, but I say that in solid commonsense, in political foresight and sagacity, in business capacity, he is a peer of them all. I say more than that on behalf of a man whom I am proud to value as my personal friend, who has been my personal friend for years, whose loyalty, if such a thing has to be discussed here, is unquestioned in the minds of all the people who comprise Nova Scotia outside the hon. gentlemen opposite. I say that for the last twenty years in the capacity of First Minister, he has carried on the affairs of his province with a prudence and wisdom and sagacity which has hardly any parallel in provincial politics, and certainly has none in Dominion politics.

Mr. FOSTER. And he trebled the debt.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) If the hon. gentleman wants to enter into a discussion about the debt, he had better confine himself to the debt with which he has saddled the country, and he will have all he can do to defend himself. I just rise for the purpose of saying a word on behalf of an absent man whom, if he had been present, the hon. gentleman would not have had the pluck to attack as he did. There is one distinguishing characteristic which Mr. Fielding has, and that is pluck, his political foes recognize it as well as his friends, and those who have met him as opponents on the public platform have reason to dread discussion with him either on Dominion or local politics. I may say to the hon. gentleman, who stands here a thousand miles behind Mr. Fielding's back and charges him with disloyalty, that I would like to see him down on a Halifax platform before a Halifax audience making the same charge. He dare not do it, because Mr. Fielding has a hold on the hearts and the affections of his people which few public men in this country can boast of.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. After the able speech of my hon. friend, the member for Queen's, P.E.I., I have but a few words to say with regard to the matter before the House. I deeply regret, as a member of this House and a Canadian, the turn which the debate to-day has taken. It is one that is disgraceful to this House and country. It would not be necessary for me to refer to it, were it not that I wish

to point out the object of hon. gentlemen opposite in bringing up this discussion as it has been brought up to-day. My hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Kenny) was, I think, most unfair to the leader of the Opposition. I wish to keep within bounds because I have always held that gentleman in the highest respect, but I must say, that after to-night I do not think anybody more than himself will regret the line he has taken. Was it fair to make by insinuation charges against hon. members of this House? Now, then, the plan of campaign laid down by my hon. friend and those who agree with him, and those who cheer him, in certain sections of the country, is that the leader of the Liberal party and his friends supporting him are favourable to annexation, and disloyal to the British crown. Sir, cutting it short, and putting it plainly before the country, any sensible man can see the object they have in view. Now, I want to ask my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Kenny) and those associated with him, whether they agree with the line of campaign that is taken against my hon. friend the leader of the Liberal party in the province of Ontario. He knows right well, for he is a thinking man and a reading man, and he has listened to the speeches of his friends, and he knows that because the leader of the Opposition and his friends dare to criticise the Administration of the present Government, dared to differ with their policy, the answer is that they are unfit to be trusted with power; and in the province of Ontario he cannot pick up a leading Conservative newspaper, published from day to day, or any of the smaller weekly sheets published throughout the province, but he will find that they are calling the attention of the people to the fact that the leader of the Liberal party is a Roman Catholic, and, therefore, unfit to be entrusted with power. I ask the hon. gentleman whether he is prepared to say that he supports that policy? Is it not just as unfair and just as dishonest to support the attacks that are made upon the hon. leader of the Opposition in the province of Ontario, as it is for him if only by insinuation to question his loyalty, as my hon. friend has pointed out. There can be no other result but to make it appear to our neighbours across the line that one-half, if not more than one-half, of the people of his own province are disloyal to the British crown; because the men whom he denounced to-day are the leaders, and have the confidence of the majority of the people of his own province of Nova Scotia, as have the leaders of the Liberal party in the province of Ontario in confidence of the great majority of the people of that province. The hon. gentleman referred to the province of Manitoba and the school question, and I wish to take up that matter, because my name has been associated with my hon. friend the leader

of the Opposition with regard to this so-called story. I think I can appeal to the hon. gentleman's sense of decency, in order to show that it was most unfair to say that a certain story was in circulation which was got up to injure the leader of the Liberal party and those who follow him. Now, Sir, I say here upon my responsibility, without the slightest fear of denial from any person, and having been in close relations with my leader, I know it to be a fact, that he had no communication, directly or indirectly, with the Premier of Manitoba in relation to this matter, except on one occasion, and the result of that communication, I am not ashamed to own, to this House or to the country. He urged upon him, in the eloquent manner which is peculiar to him, the desirability, if possible, of removing the grievance that existed in that province, and keeping this matter out of Dominion politics. As a prominent Conservative said to me when he read a story in the "Mail Empire," published about the meeting in Montreal, that it was lacking so much in the appearance of truth that it could not possibly deceive any person, still the member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny) went on to point out that the action of that government in bringing on the elections and taking the position they did, was caused by some arrangement between the government of Manitoba and the leader of the Opposition. Well, Mr. Speaker, I say here without even a chance of an insinuation of a denial, that there is not one word of truth in that story. It was only got up for the purpose of trying, if possible, to raise a prejudice amongst the people in this country against the hon. leader of the Opposition. Now, then, my hon. friend perhaps, knows that I have not given the whole line of campaign taken up by the Conservative press. Yes, he does know it, because he knows that in the province in which my leader lives, and is honoured and respected, the same plan has been adopted, in order, if possible, to raise a feeling against him because he was received with so much honour and enthusiasm in the English and Protestant province of Ontario, and, consequently, he could not be loyal even to his own people and to his own church. My hon. friends on both sides of the House, know that almost daily fierce attacks are being made upon him in the province of Quebec in order to mislead the people. Mr. Speaker, I think if I were to recite a little of the history of the Manitoba school question before this House and the country, that almost every sensible man, irrespective of party politics, would come to the conclusion that if my hon. friend has a right to charge any person or party in this country with bringing this question into Dominion politics and keeping it before the country at the present time, it would be his own leaders in this House,

Mr. SUTHERLAND.

and his leader in the Government. If this is not true, it is strange the Government did not enter into negotiations years ago, with a view of settlement, in order to keep this question out of Dominion politics. My hon. friend, the leader of the Opposition, whose sympathies would naturally be with his co-religionists in the province of Manitoba, who have laid their grievance before Parliament stood up on the floor of Parliament long ago, and pointed out to them a reasonable, fair and business-like way in which this question should be dealt with, but they neglected to take the advice, not only from him, but from some of their own friends supporting him. I would refer the hon. gentleman to some of the newspapers to-day on both sides of politics, especially those who are most ultra Tory, to show what they have to say with regard to the present Government and to their policy on this question. It is known to this House and to the country that I was associated with my leader when he dealt with this question in every province in this Dominion from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and was present at almost every important statement that he made; therefore I can speak with knowledge of what he said. I was not surprised to find sometimes extreme party papers taking up a cry for the purpose of injuring him personally, and, through him, his party, by making statements that were false and untrue with regard to his speeches in the other provinces. But this seems to be a part of the policy of the Conservative party. I was more than surprised to find hon. gentlemen in this House, if not directly, by insinuation, trying to make it appear that the leader of the Opposition had one set of opinions for one province and another set for another province. Sir, I can say that, having been associated with him and heard his speeches in almost every part of this Dominion, he never at any time could be accused of such dishonourable and improper conduct. I am proud to say, also, Mr. Speaker, that I do not believe that those hon. gentlemen who are opposed to him in this House, really believe in their hearts that the hon. leader of the Opposition, in fighting political battles and in discussing questions of policy and administration, has ever been, to use a common expression, guilty of striking below the belt. Every man in this House and outside of it, irrespective of party politics, irrespective of creed and province, have always acknowledged and accorded to the leader of the Opposition the honour to which he is justly entitled. He would not hold the position that he does if he did not use vigorous language in his speeches; but I think no one, for a moment, either in the House or out of it, would ever accuse him of striking below the belt. I feel, Sir, that this policy, this line of conduct that has been adopted, and is being carried on by the

press representing the party in power, and has even made its appearance on the floor of this House, will entirely fail to humbug the intelligent mass of the Canadian people. Sir, as one having hope in my country, and believing in our people, I feel that I have a right here to take my stand according to my own views of questions of politics, and to support what I may consider to be in the best interest of my country, without being accused of disloyalty, I think that my hon. friends in this House, and out of it, have a perfect right to be respected, no matter at what altar they worship, no matter what creed they profess. I say, Sir, that I believe this thing is having the contrary effect to that intended, and that the Protestants in Ontario are coming to look upon the hon. leader of the Liberal party as a high-minded statesman, as a man who places before them honestly and frankly the policy that he believes to be in the interest of the country, and that he condemns what he believes to be wrong in the policy and the administration of the present Government. And as to the success of their line of campaign in the province of Quebec, we have only to look to the results of the elections a few days ago. Even in the constituency of my hon. friend from Victoria, B.C. (Mr. Prior) we see the same indications of the favour in which the Liberal party is held. Sir, I will say that there is no public man sitting in the House of Commons who has taken more pains than the leader of the Opposition to acquaint himself with the people in every section of this Dominion, to acquaint himself with the resources of every part of the country. I say to his credit and to his honour, that he has, at great personal sacrifice, endeavoured to make himself acquainted with the conditions prevailing in every part of the Dominion. No other public man has taken so much pains to address the people frankly and boldly with regard to the public questions before us to-day. Sir, I believe that the appeals to prejudice that are being made in some sections of the country against the Liberal party and its leader, will be entirely without effect. I have not the slightest doubt that the people of this country look upon him as a man worthy of the position he holds, as a man who would not be guilty of any dishonourable act, a man who holds firmly and vigorously to the views that he considers to be in the best interests of the country; and never, either on the floor of Parliament, or outside, does he condescend to misrepresent those who may be opposed to him. I believe that the people of the various provinces will feel that the time has come when this policy of humbug and misrepresentation should be condemned, and that they will show that they look upon the leader of the Opposition as a man worthy to be the Premier of this country.

Mr. McNEILL. I do not intend to make a speech on the present occasion, and will

only take up the time of the House for a moment or two. I must say that I was very much impressed with the remark that fell from my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies), when he said that this was no time to accuse one-half of the people of Canada of being disloyal. I wish to say for myself, and I am quite sure I may say it of many of those who sit around me, that no thought could be further from our minds than that of accusing one-half of the people of Canada of disloyalty. I certainly did not understand, when my hon. friend from Halifax addressed this House, that he for one moment meant to insinuate, much less to state, any such thing.

Mr. KENNY. I said the contrary.

Mr. McNEILL. We would repudiate that statement with just as much warmth as any gentleman on the other side of the House. But we cannot forget, unhappily it is too true, that the leaders of the party opposite, only a few years ago, did support and press upon the people of this country a policy which, as my hon. friend has said, was described by the late leader of their party, the Hon. Edward Blake, as a policy of annexation in disguise and which, he said, moreover, was a policy of annexation under very disadvantageous terms for Canada. That is unhappily the case, and it is also unhappily true that the two gentlemen referred to, both of whom I respect very much, and the ability of both of whom I very much admire, nevertheless did make use of expressions on the other side of the line among our friends in the American Republic, which, to say the least of it, were most unfortunate. That the policy that these gentlemen pursued was such as I have said, cannot be gainsaid. That one-half of the people of Canada are not disloyal is proved by the fact that when the by-elections came on, and when the people came to understand the matter, it having been explained to them by Mr. Blake, when they came to understand what the real issue before the country was, they declared in trumpet tones that one-half of the people of this country were not disloyal, for they refused to follow the leaders of their party in the policy they were advocating at that time. Having said so much with reference to that matter, I just wish to say one word, as I am on my feet, so that I may not be obliged to rise again, in reference to my position as to one of the paragraphs of the Speech which has been placed in the mouth of His Excellency. I do not wish at all to precipitate a discussion on that question, but I think it right that I should take this opportunity, this very first opportunity, of defining what my position is in regard to that matter. So far as my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition is concerned, I can for once, to some extent, at all events, agree with his views. I cannot, however, go so far as my hon. friend from South Oxford went yesterday, when he de-

clared that his course in this respect had been altogether consistent, and that it had been most clear, emphatic and explicit. The extent to which he laid down his policy, I think, is in the memory of us all. The words seem now to be ringing in my ears, in which the hon. gentleman told this House that he was not to be called upon to define his policy, that he was "not the adviser of the advisers of His Excellency." If he had defined his policy in a manner so clear and definite, why should he make use of such an expression as this? Mr. Speaker, it has been notorious throughout the constituencies of this country that the hon. gentleman had refused to define his policy; it has been notorious that he has not given the people that light and leading which every public man occupying the position he occupies, is, I think, in duty bound to give to the people in such an emergency as this. I think the people of Canada have just as much right to expect from the leader of the Opposition in Canada a definite declaration of his policy in reference to separate schools for Manitoba as the people of the United Kingdom had a right to expect from the leader of the Opposition there a definite declaration of his policy as to Home Rule for Ireland. If the Marquis of Salisbury had acted as the leader of the Opposition has done, if he had gone beating about the bush and refused to declare what his policy was on such a leading question for as many years as the leader of the Opposition did, I do not think he would to-day have been in power in England as the leader of one of the most powerful governments known for half a century in that country. But, on the contrary, he would have been the leader of a party which was humiliated and was in disgrace. I have said, however, that, while I to this degree differ from the course which the hon. gentleman has pursued, in some respects I agree with him. I think my hon. friend has to-day at last announced the right policy in respect to this matter. I believe that the proper course to pursue in respect to this question, which is straining this Dominion at the present time, is the statesmanlike British policy of conciliation and compromise, and not the anti-British policy of coercion and compulsion, as, I fear, we must describe the policy which has been enunciated on more than one occasion from these benches in this House. The government of Manitoba has, I understand, invited investigation and by doing so, it seems to me, it has opened wide the door for a friendly arrangement of the differences which, unhappily, divide the federal power from the province of Manitoba. I believe that if we meet the government of Manitoba in a friendly conciliatory, kindly spirit, we will find that the people there will go a long way to meet us in a similar spirit. But I believe, on the other hand, that if we attempt coercion, if we attempt to force wholesale down

Mr. McNEILL.

the throats of the people of Manitoba legislation which they utterly disapprove, we will land ourselves in difficulties the result of which no man can foretell. I believe it will be found that the descendants of those who successfully opposed the Spanish Armada and many another attempted encroachment on their liberties, will to-day, within the lines of the constitution, be found lawfully, patiently, quietly, but with a steady determination, fighting for what they deem to be their rights. And this is no time, a time when we want to marshal all the forces of the Empire together to defend the heart of the Empire, to strain the relations of the provinces of this Dominion with the central power. Moreover, as it has been said with such great force, by the hon. member for South Oxford, it is especially undesirable to attempt to do so in this dying Parliament, which no longer represents and cannot at all be supposed to have any mandate from the people. On the contrary, so far as my province is concerned, I am satisfied that the mandate is in the very opposite direction from that to which I have referred. It seems to me, also, a most weighty consideration that, in the view of many of the ablest lawyers in this country, we may now adopt a course in regard to this question which is irrevocable. And I say that to adopt a course in respect to this matter which by many of the best legal minds in this country is believed to be one that, if wrong, cannot be put right again, to adopt such a course in a dying Parliament and thus to deprive the people of their right to pronounce their opinion upon it before action is taken, is a most improper course; and I say here, from my place, that it is a course which, so far as I am concerned, I will most assuredly oppose with all the force and energy I possess, and by every means which the rules of this House enable me to pursue.

Mr. BORDEN. I suppose we should be very thankful to the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. McNeill) for having condescended to give a certificate of character to one-half the people of the Dominion of Canada. But that hon. gentleman could not bring himself, fair-minded as I believe he tries to be, and is in everything which does not affect his party, to extend that certificate of character to the leaders of half the people of this Dominion, and more than half the people, as they will very soon find out. Does any one suppose that the hon. gentleman believes that there is one word of truth in the statement which, I am sorry to say, he and many of his friends put forth to the people, to the effect that the leaders of the Liberal party are disloyal men? Why should he not go the full length of admitting that what he says to be true as regards the hon. members who follow those leaders is true in regard to the leaders themselves, and admit at once that they are as loyal as the people who follow them, and even as loyal

as the hon. gentleman himself? No, that does not suit the political necessities of the hon. gentleman at this moment. It is one of the strongest proofs of the disastrous straits in which the Conservative party of this country finds itself to-day, that we should have been compelled to listen in this House to such a speech as came from the hon. member for Halifax.

Mr. McNEILL. I rise for a moment to make a personal explanation. I do not think I have said that the leaders of the hon. gentleman's party were disloyal.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Yes.

Mr. BORDEN. You did not say they were not.

Mr. McNEILL. That is for the hon. gentleman to say. I think I said they advocated a policy, and pressed it on the people, which by the late leader of the party was described as annexation in disguise. I think I also added, that among our friends and kindred on the other side of the line they had made use of certain expressions which were, to say the least, unfortunate and unhappy. I do not think I have said they are disloyal. If the hon. gentleman chooses to say that these facts prove them to be disloyal, I am not responsible for the facts.

Mr. BORDEN. Then, the leaders of the Liberal party, in the estimation of my hon. friend, were disloyal before because of their policy of reciprocity with the United States.

Mr. McNEILL. I have not said so.

Mr. BORDEN. Then, I do not understand the English language. The hon. gentleman said that our policy was annexation in disguise. I took down the words.

Mr. McNEILL. I said the hon. gentleman's late leader, Hon. Edward Blake, had said so.

Mr. BORDEN. The hon. gentleman differs from my late leader.

Mr. McNEILL. Not at all.

Mr. BORDEN. He approves, then. Therefore, we get back to the point at which I started, that the hon. gentleman, using the words of Mr. Blake, said that our policy was a policy of annexation in disguise. He might as well admit at the outset that what I said was true. Diverting my attention for a moment from my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Kenny), to whom I will return presently, I wish to say with reference to that: the hon. gentleman (Mr. McNeill) told us that Mr. Blake stated that the Liberal policy is a policy of annexation in disguise. What is the policy of the hon. gentleman (Mr. McNeill) in 1891? He and his party, for the time being, forgot their National Policy, and they appealed to the country on a policy of reciprocity pure and simple; and the only distinguishing mark between the policy of the Liberal party and the policy

of the Conservative party at that time was: that the Liberal party went a step further and was willing to include in a treaty between Canada and the United States manufactured articles in addition to natural products. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, how it comes that it is perfectly loyal to bring into this country the cheap agricultural products of the United States to undersell the products of the farmers of Canada, and how it is disloyal to bring in a cheap mowing machine to enable the Canadian farmer to produce his crop cheaply. Will hon. gentlemen opposite explain wherein the disloyalty lies. According to them it is perfectly loyal and perfectly proper to bring in commodities to compete with the Canadian farmer in his industry, but when it comes to bringing in an article to interfere with the profits of the pets of this Government, the combiners, and the protected manufacturers, then, forsooth, we who advocate such a course, are a disloyal party. I desire, further, to call the attention of my hon. friend (Mr. McNeill) to one difference between the appeal made to the people by the Liberal party and the appeal made to them by the Tory party in 1891. There was this essential difference: that while the Liberal party went to the country with a straightforward policy fully explained and based upon facts and truth, the Tory party appealed to the people of this country with a lie in their mouths, falsely informing the people that they had been invited by the Government of the United States to negotiate a treaty, and that it was desirable to elect a new Parliament to consider that question. I have here the letter of Mr. Blaine to Sir Julian Pauncefote, and the letter of Sir Charles Tupper, sr., to Mr. Blaine, in which Sir Charles admits that the statement made to the people of Canada by the Government of Sir John Macdonald in 1891, that the United States had asked this Government to negotiate a treaty of reciprocity, was utterly and absolutely without foundation. These gentlemen opposite are the loyal men; these are the men who abuse the prerogative of the Crown, and who abuse the privileges which they hold as servants of the people in order to snatch a victory and defeat their opponents. Now, Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Kenny) was very much concerned this afternoon as to how the Liberals in this House would take certain observations which he said—and he had to misrepresent them as usual—had been made by my hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). I tell my hon. friend (Mr. Kenny) that I am vastly more concerned for the humiliation which has been thrown upon my province by the speech which he made in the House this afternoon, and I tell him that he has lowered himself, he has lowered his province, and he has lowered this House by such utterances. The desperate straits to which the Tory party are driven are well illustrated by that speech.

That hon. gentleman we had all supposed to be a kind-hearted, honourable man, accustomed to the amenities of life and of Parliament, but we find him this afternoon deliberately putting words into the mouth of the hon. leader of the Opposition in order to make a case against him, in order to prefer a charge of disloyalty against him; and we further find him repeating the same tactics with reference to my hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). And, although my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition again and again denied the truth of the quotation which the hon. member from Halifax (Mr. Kenny) read, that hon. gentleman persisted in reading it again, and reiterating it, and absolutely refusing to withdraw it. My hon. friend (Mr. Laurier) stood upon the floor of Parliament and stated that the words which were read by the hon. member (Mr. Kenny) were words which were put in his mouth and which he did not utter.

Mr. KENNY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden) has unintentionally misrepresented what I stated. I said that the hon. leader of the Opposition, when he was in Boston on a memorable occasion, made use of certain language, and that he (Mr. Laurier) had stated that he refused to accept any interpretation of his speech except that which appeared in the Toronto "Globe." And Sir, in order to place myself right before the House, I read an extract from the speech, as it was handed to me hurriedly, which I understood to be that which appeared in the Toronto "Globe." The circumstances under which this debate arose were such as did not permit me time to gather that information myself, but I say that when I quoted the language of the hon. leader of the Opposition, I quoted from the Toronto "Globe," as I understood it, and from the only version of the speech by which the hon. gentleman said he would be bound.

Mr. LAURIER. Mr. Speaker, if you will pardon me, I will recall the facts to the hon. gentleman, which are not in the way he now recites them, because his memory is failing him, but in the way which they occurred to-day, and I leave him afterwards, and I leave the House to draw its own conclusions. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Kenny) commenced by quoting a supposed speech of mine, delivered in Boston, from the report of an American newspaper. I told him that I would not be bound by that report, but that I would be bound by the report in the Toronto "Globe." Now, before I go further, I leave it to any man in this House, and especially to the leaders of the other side of the House, as to whether they will consent to be bound by the report of a speech which is condensed in a column or a half a column, when the full report of which extends over six columns. Is it fair, when there is a condensed report of one-half

Mr. BORDEN.

column and also a full verbatim report, to quote against an opponent the condensed and garbled report and not the full report? I pointed that out to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Kenny). Then, Sir, I must say for the hon. gentleman that he said: Very well, I will leave the report of the American paper, but I will take the rehash which was afterwards published in the Toronto "Globe." Sir, this is the basest insinuation that ever was made against an honourable man. That is what I called the attention of the hon. gentleman to, when he insinuated that after I had delivered my speech in Boston, I had deliberately gone further and made a rehash of it for the Canadian public. This is the insinuation which I resent as an insult that is intolerable in parliamentary life.

Mr. KENNY. Mr. Speaker, I ask from you and from both sides of the House the indulgence to follow the hon. gentleman for a minute. The hon. gentleman has put in my mouth a word I have never used since I entered Parliament.

Mr. LAURIER. The word "rehash" is there.

Mr. KENNY. "Rehash" is not there.

Mr. LAURIER. It is there—I heard it.

Mr. KENNY. I said distinctly, that is my recollection of it, a "revised" copy of the speech.

Mr. LAURIER. No such word. We will see "Hansard."

Mr. KENNY. Well, we will see "Hansard": but at all events, I say most positively that I never used the word "rehash," and that I used the word "revised," which I think is the ordinary parliamentary term applied in this House. In the quotation which I gave, as my memory serves me, I gave two or three or four sentences from what I understand to be, and understood to be when I used it, the "Globe" report of the hon. gentleman's speech.

Mr. BORDEN. Well, Mr. Speaker, it does not matter very much whether the report was in the "Globe" or not. We have this fact, that the hon. leader of the Opposition has stated upon the floor of this House that the words read by the hon. gentleman and attributed to him as having been contained in a speech which he delivered, were not contained in any speech of his, and that he never used them. We have the fact, moreover, that, after that statement was made by the hon. leader of the Opposition, the hon. gentleman still persists in going on and insinuating that the hon. leader of the Opposition is disloyal and unworthy of the respect of the people of this country.

Mr. KENNY. In all fairness, Mr. Speaker—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Sit down.

Mr. KENNY. I can only speak with the consent of the House. What I was going to say was that the hon. gentleman is not fair in saying that I used language which the hon. leader of the Opposition did not use, because I read from the revised version of the speech in the Toronto "Globe," which the hon. gentleman said he accepted.

Mr. BORDEN. Now, Sir, what is the meaning of all this? Do hon. gentlemen suppose that the hon. member for Halifax is seriously exercised in his heart about the disloyalty of my hon. friend? Is that what is the matter? If the hon. gentleman would tell us what he honestly believes—a thing which I think he perhaps does not always do—

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. BORDEN. Then, I take that back—which he always does. If the hon. gentleman would tell us that fully—because he does not always tell the whole of it—I suppose that is not unparliamentary—if the hon. gentleman would tell us what he believes about this subject, he would admit that he believes that the hon. leader of the Opposition is as loyal as he is himself. And surely nothing could be more loyal than that—than he thinks he is himself. Well, Mr. Speaker, what is the trouble? Whence these tears from hon. gentlemen opposite? What is the matter with them? I will tell you. Not that they are afraid that the Empire is going to suffer owing to the less loyalty or the want of loyalty of the leaders of the Liberal party—because the rank and file, it seems, are all loyal. It is not that: it is because the hon. gentleman sees that the hon. leader of the Opposition is getting deep into the affections of this country, and he wants, if possible, to discredit that hon. gentleman and the whole Liberal party thereby. But he will find his mistake. He will find, when the hour comes, and we hope it will come soon—the sooner the better—the people of this country from one end to the other, in spite of the slanders of his opponents, rallying around the banner of Wilfred Laurier, and putting him in the foremost place in the leadership of the Government of this country. Now, Mr. Speaker, I might suggest to my hon. friend from Halifax that supposing this kind of warfare is to be carried on, what may be the result if epithets and charges of this kind are to be hurled across the floor of the House?

Mr. KENNY. Well, you must not call us boodlers.

Mr. BORDEN. I never did. If any one were to say in this House that my hon. friend, who does really seem to be getting more and more loyal every hour of his life—if any man were to insinuate that his loyalty was in the slightest degree affected by the fact that he had a relative occupying a position of emolument in which he has

\$10,000 a year for a second term—I would be the last to make such an insinuation—or if any man were to stand on the floor of this House and say that the hon. gentleman is connected with an institution in the city of Halifax which, at a critical moment a year or so ago, by its good fortune in buying a large quantity of sugar just before the duties were increased, made one or two hundred thousand dollars, and to insinuate that the hon. gentleman's loyalty has been stimulated thereby, would it not be baseness itself? And yet, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentleman persists in his course, some day somebody may do that. Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Halifax devoted considerable attention, as he usually does, to my hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). He said that hon. gentleman had done a terrible thing; he had delivered a speech in the city of Boston. Now, Sir, it happens that I have here under my hand the report of the speech delivered by the hon. member for South Oxford in the city of Boston as it was published by the board of trade before whom it was delivered; and I suppose there cannot be any question of garbling or rehash here, because this is the authentic document put forth by that society. I find that among other things the hon. member for South Oxford made this statement:

Man for man you will gain quite as much as we will, and Canada does not come as a beggar, asking for the crumbs which fall from the rich man's table. Canada offers and Canada desires only a fair exchange and no robbery, and I for one am as anxious as yourselves that in such exchange you make dollar for dollar, because I know well that thus, and thus only, can any lasting and permanent arrangement be secured. Moreover, I believe, indeed I know, that free trade with us would be of great value to the entire northern portion of the United States, and trebly so to the people of New England and to the good city of Boston.

Now, I understand my hon. friend from Halifax to say that it would be a terrible calamity if we had reciprocity, although he was prepared to vote for it and was elected to support it in 1891. It would be a terrible thing, according to him, to have the trade of Boston increased although our own trade might, at the same time, be increased. He said the city of Halifax would suffer.

Mr. KENNY. By unrestricted reciprocity.

Mr. BORDEN. He said that Charlottetown would suffer. Does not the hon. gentleman remember that, under the old treaty of 1854, the cities of Halifax, St. John and Charlottetown prospered as they never prospered before and as they have never prospered since. Yet the hon. gentleman will stand up here and tell us that if we had freer trade relations with the United States by which the city of Boston might

benefit, the cities of Halifax and St. John and Charlottetown would suffer.

Mr. KENNY. Is the hon. gentleman in favour of unrestricted reciprocity?

Mr. BORDEN. The report continues:

Even as it is, your trade with Canada is not to be despised. Per head you sell more goods to Canada than to any other country. Absolutely we buy as much from you as France does, and more than any other country except Great Britain and Germany. I think, in fact, we stand third on the list of countries to which you export your productions, and we alone, 5,000,000, as we are, buy from you as much as 50,000,000 of Mexicans and South Americans do all put together. Surely, if we do this in the teeth of two hostile tariffs, it is no idle word of mine to say that you cannot measure or bound the possibilities which lie before both countries if only these artificial walls were thrown low.

And now, Sir, a few words as to our political future. I would despise myself, and you as true men would have a right to despise me, too, if I were to tell you that it was my purpose to advise my countrymen to offer themselves for sale to the best bidder or to barter their independence for trade privileges. But I will tell you frankly where we Canadians stand and what it is many of us do desire very sincerely. Ours is a very peculiar position. We are free to do as we see fit, and no British statesmen at this time of day would ever dream of attempting to coerce us. Now, we have our past history, as you have yours. We stand, in a fashion, midway between the two great English nations; we admire and respect the United States, and we also admire and respect the mother country of both of us as well. There are many among us who have long thought that the time has well-nigh come to heal completely the great breach which took place 120 years ago between England and her greatest offspring. We entertain no idle visions of political re-union or of a vast Anglo-Saxon empire, but we do think that, on certain conditions and for certain common objects, a firm and cordial alliance might well be created between the several nations which speak the English tongue, which should, humanly speaking, make it impossible that they should ever again come into hostile conflict; and we have further ventured to hope that the peculiar position of Canada, especially if close trade relations were established between her and you, might enable her to play some part in bringing about this consummation. Now, all this may prove only a devout imagination, but it surely is no unworthy one, and I do not hesitate to tell you that it is one which I greatly desire to see brought about.

Now, Sir, those are the words criticised by the hon. member for Halifax. Is there in them one word of disloyalty, one word at which the most loyal man of the British Empire could take alarm? Those are the words of a Canadian statesman uttered in Boston in 1891. I have under hand words uttered by a British statesman, the well-nigh leader of the British Government, the second in command. Mr. Balfour, in a recent speech, made use of this significant language:

War with the United States of America appeared to himself, and, doubtless, to his hearers, also, to be enveloped with the unnatural horror

Mr. BORDEN.

of a civil war, which, with any nation, is a terror to be avoided at all costs except dishonour. Beyond their common ancestry, language and civilization, he believed, he said, that the British people had a pride of race which embraced every English-speaking community in the world and an Anglo-Saxon patriotism.

It seems to me that in spirit this utterance of Mr. Balfour does not differ very much from the words uttered by the hon. Sir Richard Cartwright in Boston in 1891. Now, there was one point which I omitted to state with reference to these superloyal gentlemen who were so much alarmed that our policy of 1891 was disloyal. Have they forgotten that their leader in 1871 was prepared to carry out with the United States an arrangement for absolute and full commercial union with that country. And yet who would think of charging the Tory party with disloyalty, although they were prepared to go to the extent of adopting the United States tariff in 1871. Those hon. gentlemen prate of their loyalty. Is it possible that they are the gentlemen whose organ in Toronto, a few years ago, when the assertion was ventured by the Liberal party that the inauguration of the National Policy, with its high taxes, worked injury to the British connection, said: "If the 'National Policy injured British connection, 'so much the worse for British connection.'" The hon. gentleman from Halifax city referred to my hon. friend, Mr. Fielding, in connection with the repeal movement, but I need only barely refer to his attack because my hon. friend for Queen's (P.E.I.) has dealt with it pretty effectively. But it is only fair that I, coming from Nova Scotia and having taken some part in that fight should have a word to say. The hon. member for Halifax characterized the repeal movement in Nova Scotia in 1886 as dishonest and disloyal. Is it possible that he who thus characterized the movement in favour of repeal is the gentleman who stood on the platform in Halifax and said that he was bound to admit that Confederation had been a bitter disappointment and a dismal failure.

Mr. KENNY. The hon. gentleman is right. I said it had been a bitter disappointment, but I did not say that it was a dismal failure.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It was not sweetened at that time.

Mr. BORDEN. Several things have happened since then, and we have not heard the hon. gentleman talk of it as a bitter disappointment since some time ago. Is it to be wondered if this hon. gentleman, wealthy, occupying a high social position, having inherited a large fortune, with everything round him calculated to make him happy and comfortable all his life long—and who supported the Government which carried Confederation without sub-

mitting it to the people of Nova Scotia—is it to be wondered at if this hon. gentleman thought that Confederation was a bitter disappointment, that the hundreds of thousands of people of Nova Scotia who hated it for itself and hated it because, although supposed to be a free people, they were allowed no opportunity to say whether they wanted it or not, should feel keen disappointment? Is it any wonder that this thing should have rankled in the breasts of the people of my province and that this feeling of unrest and bitter disappointment, to use the words of the hon. gentleman, culminated in what is known as the repeal movement of 1836? The hon. gentleman talks about dishonesty, talks about disloyalty. Sir, he is the last man who should impute motives of dishonesty or disloyalty, after the exhibition we have had from him to-day. Dishonest How is it dishonest? Are the people of Nova Scotia dishonest because they object to having their constitution legislated away from them without so much as a “by-your-leave”? And when the man who is mainly responsible for that is being brought back from England to take charge of the Government of this country, is it any wonder that the old feeling is aroused, and has the hon. gentleman any right to apply the word “dishonesty” to that movement because that feeling manifests itself? We thought that we had representative institutions in this country. The Liberal leaders, years ago, fought hard for those institutions, and we supposed, until the moment Confederation was carried without asking us whether we wanted it or not, that we had responsible government in this country—that is, government according to the well-understood wishes of the people. Is it disloyal for the Government in a province to submit to the people of that province whether or not they are satisfied with the constitution under which they live? Anybody would suppose, from the language of the hon. gentleman that companies were being organized, that men were being armed to seek our freedom by force, and that disloyalty to Great Britain was involved. Sir, it was proposed to go to the foot of the throne and lay our grievances before Her Majesty the Queen and to proceed entirely upon the lines of constitutional precedent in such matters. Consequently, I say it is wrong, it is unjust, it is untrue—and if parliamentary usages allowed I would characterize it in stronger language—this imputation that the hon. gentleman casts upon the vast majority of the people of his own province. Now, it is not my intention, at this moment, to enter into a discussion of matters specially pertaining to the Address. This is a debate, as I understand, which has arisen upon the motion to adjourn the House, and I felt, coming as I do from the province of Nova Scotia, that it was my duty not to allow this incident to pass without expressing my

opinions concerning the matters referred to by my hon. friend.

Mr. CASEY. The tactics pursued on this occasion by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny) who is practically the subject of the present debate, remind one of the trick often practised by street boys when they are having a faction fight. When one party is getting a little the better of the other, a boy of the weaker faction picks up a gob of mud and throws it in the face of one of his opponents. Then the whole party scuttles round the corner while the bespattered urchin is clawing his face clear of the mud. The hon. gentleman is imitating the tactics of the street gamin; he has scooped up the largest gob of the dirtiest mud he could find, and has slung it at these benches. And he has succeeded in securing the retreat of his party for this afternoon and evening, at least, from the subject of discussion.

But he has succeeded in something else which I regret even more than that. He has succeeded in giving the House a new conception of himself. We have never supposed that a gentleman so polished, of such high social connections, of such suave manner in his intercourse outside this House, would have such a contemptibly low idea of the duties of a member of Parliament as to pursue such a policy as he has pursued this afternoon. The hon. gentleman has taken to mud-slinging. He has lowered himself in the opinion of this House and of his constituents, but the only mud that will stick is that which will stick to himself.

So far as this talk about loyalty is concerned, no harm will be done by it to any body in Canada except to the hon. member from Halifax. We know what this is all about. We know, as the hon. member for King's (Mr. Borden) has said, that the hon. gentleman is not worried about the loyalty of the Opposition or the maintenance of the connection between Britain and Canada. We all know that the hon. gentleman was partly talking through his hat, and partly for the pending election in Cape Breton. We know that the object of these tactics is simply a little electioneering dodge, if dodge is not an unparliamentary—

Mr. SPEAKER. It is unparliamentary.

Mr. CASEY. Electioneering plan then, to influence the electors of Cape Breton in favour of the great man who, though so strong in the sympathies of his fellow-citizens of Nova Scotia, seems to require assistance of this mud-slinging kind. That is the object of the whole rumpus, if “rumpus” is not an irregular word—

Mr. FOSTER. That is a compound word.

Mr. CASEY. Yes, “rum” and “puss.” We have heard a good deal about “pussies” lately, and no doubt the idea remained in the mind of my hon. friend the

Minister of Finance. Where the "rum" comes in the hon. gentleman can explain better than I!

I say this sort of tactics can do no harm in Canada, for we know it is only a "diversion" of the enemy. But, Sir, there is an audience that will absorb the hon. gentleman's muddy eloquence with avidity. There is an audience whom, if it is not addressed to them intentionally, it will, at least, reach as a matter of fact—I mean the hoodlums of Yankeedom, the mob of the cities in the United States, those who for one reason or another have a spite against England, and those who wish to plunder the hen-roosts of Canada. These form the sympathetic audience for such talk. These are the people who will greedily read the utterances of my hon. friend from Halifax; these are the people to whom the charge of disloyalty against the majority of the people of Canada—and I say majority advisedly—will be most welcome. He has made a speech to-day, he has made allegations—and those who have picked up those allegations and continued the debate on that side of the House are equally responsible with him—I say that he and they have made speeches and allegations which will be greedily devoured by that element in the United States which wishes to see the humiliation of England and the plunder of Canada.

For this reason these tactics, which would otherwise be merely contemptible and childish, have become markedly dangerous. In the present condition of the mind of the people of the United States, a firebrand thrown by the hands of a man assumedly loyal, a firebrand like this, may kindle feelings on the other side of the line that may lead to serious difficulties between the two countries. In the present crisis such tactics are disloyal to Canada, disloyal to Britain, are a treacherous undermining of the interests of Canada, and ought to be denounced, and will be denounced in the strongest terms by every man in this House and in this country who is a lover of Canada. I say, Sir, that language too strong cannot be applied to that sort of tactics, because nothing could more markedly injure Canada in the eyes of the world.

I am not going to recriminate. There is plenty of material for recrimination, there is mud lying as ready to our hands as it did to the hands of the hon. member for Halifax. Mud could be slung from our side also in regard to disloyalty. But I would not be guilty of such treason to my country as to insinuate that hon. gentlemen opposite are disloyal. I know they are not, however they may be misled for the time being into language of this kind, which in its results, has all the effect of disloyalty. I know that the men themselves do not mean to be disloyal to Canada, and, therefore, I will not recriminate.

Mr. CASEY.

But, Sir, this incident should be marked by such general condemnation, that never again, when the monopolists of this country, the combinesters of this country, the refinesters of this country, feel their craft in danger, shall they feel inclined to raise the cry of loyalty, and to declare that those who object to being oppressed by them are disloyal to Canada or to Britain. I think, perhaps, they have had a lesson on the subject this afternoon and to-night that will teach them to be more guarded in their expressions in the future; if they have not had it now, they will have it when they stand before a jury of their fellow-countrymen and are tried and convicted at the polls.

Mr. KENNY. The hon. leader of the Opposition has drawn my attention to the fact that I may have used the word "rehash." I was under the impression I used the word "revision." If I have used the word "rehash," I entirely withdraw it. I understood from the hon. gentleman last year or the year before, when this matter of the report of his Boston speech came up, that he was only bound by the report of his speech which appeared in the Toronto "Globe." That was satisfactory to me, and in order to put myself right with the House I desire to say, I find that in 1895 I quoted the hon. gentleman's speech directly from the Toronto "Globe." I had it not by me to-day, as I had not the slightest expectation that any such debate was coming up; but I rise simply for the purpose of withdrawing entirely and unreservedly the word "rehash." If used in the hurry of debate, I regret it.

Motion to adjourn (Mr. Langelier) negatived.

Mr. MASSON moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT—INTERNAL ECONOMY COMMISSION.

Mr. FOSTER moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. LAURIER. I desire to call the attention of the hon. gentleman to the fact that a commission to assist the Speaker in the business of the House, the Commission on Internal Economy, has not yet been appointed.

Mr. FOSTER. No; I think it must have escaped attention. It should have been done the first week, but it will be attended to at the next sitting of the House.

RETURN ON SUPERANNUATION.

Mr. McMULLEN. In connection with the return the Minister has laid on the Table of the House regarding superannuation, he

will remember that last year there was an order of this House for a return giving receipts and expenditures under the head of superannuation, from the inception of the Act down to the present time. The hon. Minister amended the resolution I presented to the House to meet some views he held himself with regard to the form in which it should be presented. That return has never been presented to the House, so far as I can learn it has not been brought down, and I would like to know from the Finance Minister if it is his intention to bring down at an early period in this session the return that the House has ordered last session in regard to superannuation.

Mr. FOSTER. It is my intention to bring it down at an early period. I shall charter a conveyance and have it brought very early next week.

GRAIN IMPORTED BY DISTILLERS.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would like to ask the hon. gentleman whether he can, from the returns made to date, lay before the House a statement of the amount of grain imported by each of the distillers of Canada.

Mr. FOSTER. I think that can be done.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would like very much to get this return at an early date, if it can be got without being moved for.

Mr. FOSTER. Properly it ought to be moved for, but I will see the Controller of Customs and have it facilitated. In the meantime, the hon. gentleman will just send a note of what he requires.

AUDITOR GENERAL'S REPORT.

Mr. RIDER. Can the Finance Minister inform us when we may look for the Auditor General's Report?

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend may look for it now, it is under way. I do not think he will have to keep long looking before it will be down. I think the Auditor General is arranging it in sections this year, so that it can be fired off more quickly. I think we may have some sections of it next week, if you hurry up this debate on the Address.

REPORTS.

The Public Accounts of Canada, for the fiscal year ended 30th June, 1895.—(Mr. Foster.)

The Civil Service List of Canada, 1895.—(Mr. Ouimet.)

Report of the Commissioner, Dominion Police Force, for the year 1895, under Revised Statutes of Canada, Chapter 184, section 5.—(Mr. Daly.)

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 10.25 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 20th January, 1896.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HIS EXCELLENCY'S SPEECH.

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

Mr. MASSON. Mr. Speaker, I have much pleasure, indeed, in supporting the motion now in your hands, and the Address to which it refers. Although considerable time has been occupied in the debate on this Address, I claim the indulgence of the House for the privilege of saying a few words in respect to the main clauses contained in it. I would not pass over those references in the Speech which has so far received but little attention, but, at the same time, I shall not attempt to occupy the time of the House in speaking at any length on those clauses which do not appear to be of specially great importance at this particular session. I believe, Sir, that the country may very well be congratulated upon the evidences of increased activity in the various branches of commerce and industries. I was surprised to hear the leader of the Opposition receive this announcement in the Address with sneers and with doubts. While it must be admitted that, during the last few years, Canada, in common with the rest of the world, suffered to a certain extent from the wave of depression that commenced in our sister colonies of Australia and spread over the civilized world, doing greatest havoc, perhaps, in the United States and in the mother land, yet we must remember that Canada experienced but a small share of that disaster, although, indeed, her industries and commerce were, to a certain extent, checked. Hon. gentlemen opposite seem to close their eyes to the fact that, within the last few months, within the last year specially, there has been a marked increase in our commerce, as denoted by our exports and imports. There has also been a marked improvement in our industries as shown by the employment of more labour, by our workmen making extra time, and by the increased orders received in our factories. All these signs of improvement, hon. gentlemen opposite choose to close their eyes to. To them it is no reason for congratulation. Their hopes seem to have rested upon the fact that Canada was suffering from hard times, that depression had at last reached her shores, and, on this wave

of depression, hon. gentlemen opposite hoped, sincerely hoped, to ride into power. It is, therefore, with no feeling of congratulation that they notice these evidences of increased prosperity. But, surely hon. gentlemen opposite should have received with feelings of joy, the statement in the Address that His Excellency had met in the Northwest demonstrations of loyalty and good-will from the Indian population. Not only at the present time, but in times past, Canada has been able to congratulate herself that the Indian population has been loyal. However, the leader of the Opposition received the word loyalty, as applied to the Indians, with sneers, as if such a thing as loyalty was foreign to the Indian breast. Such has not been the record of Canadian history with regard to our Indians. We have been able to congratulate ourselves upon Indian loyalty, in contradistinction, be it remembered, with the experience of our neighbours to the south. I was, however, pleased to hear the leader of the Opposition admit that the North-west Mounted Police were a fine body of men, and were indispensable, and were doing good service. He agreed with that particular reference in the Address, but he did not leave the subject until he threw out a cue to his followers, which was readily taken up by the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), by condemning the expense of that indispensable and efficient force. The announcement that the Imperial authorities have expressed a willingness to grant a substantial subvention towards a fast Atlantic service is also a matter for congratulation to the country, although it surprised me to see that hon. gentlemen opposite received it with feelings the reverse of grateful. This question has long been before the people of Canada, and in every part of this Dominion it has, from the outset, received a unanimous support. The good that such a fast line of steamers between Canada and the mother land would do to Canadian commerce, and would do towards filling up with population the vacant lands of Canada and bringing here a worthy class of immigrants, is so well known that it does not require to be commented upon at all. Still, hon. gentlemen opposite seem to look upon that scheme as impossible of accomplishment. The reference to the cable service with our sister colonies of Australia is also received by hon. gentlemen opposite with the same sneer. That such a cable service would be of great advantage, not only to Canada, but to the Empire at large, is an admitted fact. It seems to me, Sir, that those hon. gentlemen opposite, who, in times past, have shown no faith in their country, still cling to that want of faith, and declare, if not in words, by their actions and inferences, that such a thing is impossible for Canada to achieve. But the measures suggested to be taken this session for the extension and development

Mr. MASSON.

of our trade in agricultural products with the United Kingdom are such as one would suppose, from the resolution on this subject which hon. gentlemen opposite voted for only last session, would surely be received with applause. Not so, however. On the contrary, any attempt by the Government to aid agriculture seems to them to be foolishness. A sneer is made at the aid given to the butter trade. It is not to be supposed that the Government are going into the greengrocery business in competition with the private trader. But what has been done in the way of developing the trade in cheese and butter in Great Britain, and protecting it from inroads from without, by branding our products in such a way that they will be recognized as Canadian wherever they go, and that our neighbours to the south will be prevented from gaining an unfair advantage from our good name, has accrued to the benefit of the agriculturists of Canada, and the agriculturists of Canada are, I believe, in favour of the Government going on with that good work. But, Sir, the one clause in this Address which has occupied so much time in this House and has called for so much debate—and it is not to be wondered at—is that which refers to the reason why some six months ago this session was promised, which is probably the main cause for calling Parliament together so early in the year. I refer to the Manitoba school question. That that question is a serious one—serious in more ways than one—must be admitted on all hands. It is true, some very learned individuals have written of that question as a very trifling thing, which any man outside of the range of politics could very easily settle. That may be, but it happens that people outside of the range of politics are not called upon to settle it. It may be said, and it may be said truly, that it would be well if Manitoba should settle this question itself. I echo that sentiment, and I say that the Greenway Government missed an opportunity of placing themselves on record as statesmen, when after the delivery of the judgment of the Privy Council, they did not at once readily set themselves to work to remedy the grievance. They had entered, honestly we will assume, upon what they called a reform. They had passed an Act, honestly we may say, which they considered for the benefit of the province of Manitoba. That Act had passed through the courts and had received from the highest tribunal in the Empire its interpretation, to the effect that it had caused a grievance to the minority, which grievance might be made the subject of an appeal to this Parliament. The law having been thus declared, it was certainly the duty of the Premier of Manitoba, at once, without waiting for any application to be made to the federal government or for any further proceedings whatever, to take the judgment of the Privy Council as his cue, and set himself to redress the grievance. Had he done

that, even in a half-hearted way, in all probability, considering the difficulties surrounding the question, his remedy, no matter how trifling, might have been accepted on all hands. But instead of doing that, which any patriot, any law-abiding subject of the realm would naturally suppose to be the proper course for a man entrusted with the destinies of a new and growing province, he put the judgment of the Privy Council at defiance, and declared that Manitoba would have her own way. Now, so often has this matter been discussed that it seems almost useless to repeat the various stages through which it has passed. I will, therefore, content myself with barely repeating them, without dwelling on them at any length. Shortly after the establishment of the province of Manitoba, the School Act was passed allowing denominational schools. That Act was taken advantage of by more than one denomination, but especially by the Roman Catholics, who established separate schools under it, and these schools flourished for twenty years. The work that was being done in these schools, whether it was efficient or inefficient, was not the result of the Act, but the result of the administration of education in the province. The provincial government had power to interfere and refuse to grant public money to schools which were not doing efficient work. They had a right to make such regulations with that object; and no person, Catholic or Protestant, French or English, would for one moment have blamed any government for saying: Our public money is for efficient schools, not for inefficient schools. Therefore, whether the schools were efficient or inefficient matters not to the principle involved, for it is just as possible to administer two branches as one. But for some reason, which we may assume to be well-founded and honestly acted upon, the Manitoba government, by one stroke of the pen as it were, struck out all this legislation. Not only did they destroy the system, but they practically confiscated the property of the separate schools. That such an Act would create trouble in the province and cause the minority to consider themselves aggrieved, could not be disputed; and the highest court in the realm has declared that it has caused a grievance and such a grievance as is worthy of a remedy. After the passage of the Act, those dissatisfied with it took what to their minds was the speediest way of having it rendered ineffective: they applied to the federal government for a veto. The Act being considered by those in authority here as within the jurisdiction, or at least debatably so, of the provincial legislature, they refused to veto it. In so doing I think everybody at the present day will agree that they acted wisely at that stage; for the question was worthy of greater consideration than could be given to it simply on the question of applying the veto. One

and perhaps the main reason for the Government here not vetoing the Act was that the people who were dissatisfied with it, immediately started proceedings in the courts. As that was the right course to take to have the question of jurisdiction thoroughly tested, the cases entered were allowed to proceed. They went on step by step until they reached the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council of England. The decision of that body, solemnly given, was that the legislation was within the jurisdiction of the provincial legislature; that is, that by the section which corresponds with the second subsection of section 93 of our British North America Act, the provincial legislature had power to pass such a law. They then sought relief under the section which corresponds with the third subsection in the British North America Act, which provides that where these separate schools existed at the union or shall be established after the union, although the provincial legislature has power to interfere with them, there is the right of appeal against such legislation. Now, though that is an exceptional case in legislation, it is by no means an exceptional thing. For instance, the courts of our country have jurisdiction to try many cases in which, after they have tried them, their judgments are the subject of appeal. But, with reference to legislation, with reference to the dealings between the provinces and the federal government, this exceptional clause is the only case in which the right of appeal, as a right of appeal upon the merits, lies to the federal government and this Parliament. While it was decided that the right to legislate was conceded, as decided by the first Privy Council judgment, the right of appeal was still there and was taken advantage of. A petition to appeal was laid before the federal government, and a day fixed for its hearing. The Manitoba government was notified. How did the Manitoba government treat the notice? It stood strong on its rights; it had obtained one judgment upon one question, and would have had nothing to do with any further questions. It treated the notice with indifference and refused to attend, refused to take any part in the proceedings at all, so that the petition came to be heard before the Privy Council of Canada without any opposition from the Manitoba government. But so careful was the Government, under the direction of the late Sir John Thompson, that a reference was made to the Supreme Court to test every possible legal question that could be raised, and have an answer from that court before taking any action. A reply having been given against the minority, the minority asked leave to appeal to the Privy Council of England. There the Manitoba government was represented, and its case was argued by the best counsel obtainable—one who knew more of the history and details of this trouble, probably,

than any other person in the world, and who went from Canada to take part in that argument. Judgment was given in favour of the minority, and the judgment not only declared that the case was a subject of appeal, but that there was a grievance, and that the minority were entitled to remedy. It was clearly the duty of the Manitoba government to immediately act upon that statement. What use was there in having the matter brought before the federal parliament when the Manitoba government knew exactly what the law was, knew what interpretation the highest court in the realm had placed upon it, and what remedy it had suggested—a remedy which would not interfere with the public schools of the majority, but would give the small minority of Manitoba the right to deal with their own affairs as they had done in the past. The Privy Council having decided that an appeal did lie, an appeal was then made to this Government. A great cry has been raised by hon. gentlemen opposite, and even the leader of the Opposition has thrown out the hint that the matter was hurried through without sufficient time being given. I do not see in the records that the time given or asked for was objected to or insufficient. What was time required for? Was it to produce facts? Certainly not, because the official returns were there as evidence of the facts. Everything was there to show the position of these schools as they were in 1890. All the evidence necessary had been laid on the Table before the committee. It was not for the purpose of obtaining evidence as to the facts that the counsel asked for and was granted an adjournment. It was simply to prepare his argument—not to hunt up evidence, not to give additional facts or make additional inquiries. Therefore, the matter was fairly treated, and it is too late in the day for anyone on behalf of Manitoba to come forward and say that the case was hurried through and that further time was required to look up evidence and investigate. The case was heard before the Government of the Dominion, and then, during last session, we heard the complaint that the order given by the Government was arbitrary, that it was at least open to the charge of being arbitrary, that Manitoba was justified in applying that interpretation to it, and in decidedly refusing to do anything whatever under that order. A defiant answer was given by the Manitoba government. Upon the plea of harshness advanced in their behalf, this Government granted a further delay, and a new Order in Council was passed inviting proposals for a negotiation, and stating in plain language what would be satisfactory. There is no room to doubt what the reply of the Manitoba government was to this new Order in Council of July. We have listened to the very ingenious argument of the hon. leader of the Opposition as to what the issues were between the local Opposition and gov-

Mr. MASSON.

ernment in Manitoba and what position the people of Manitoba had taken. But I think we have far better authority in the statements made by the members of the Manitoba government themselves when they appealed to the people. In the opening of the campaign, a speech delivered by Mr. Sifton, and reported in the "Tribune" on the 2nd and again on the 3rd of January last contains the following language:

The school question has been before the people in various phases for six or seven years, but it is only within the last few weeks that it has been clear that there was to be a conflict. The Dominion Government has taken the position of forcing separate schools upon us, and we are determined that they shall not. This is our stand, and it is to ascertain the mind of the people on the question that we are now before you. Of course, everybody says that Manitoba is a unit on the question, but the way to ascertain this properly and constitutionally is to do what we have done, and apply to the electorate.

That statement, in which the declaration is made that the Manitoba government absolutely declined the proposition of this Government, was made by Mr. Sifton, a member of the Manitoba government, in the presence of his leader, Mr. Greenway. But if we wish to have Mr. Greenway's statement, we have it in his address over his own signature, published in the same paper. After reciting the Order in Council, which, he said, asked for the re-establishment of Catholic schools, and with reading which I shall not trouble the House, he goes on to speak of the Order in Council of the 27th of July:

As to the communication forwarded in pursuance of the announcement by the Dominion Government of the 27th of July last, inviting the Manitoba government to take such action as would remedy the alleged grievances of the minority, we did reply, definitely and positively rejecting the proposition to establish separate schools in any way, and expressed our intention to uphold our present uniform non-sectarian system.

Now, nothing can be plainer than that. But what is the question he says the electors are to vote on:

I ask you, in conclusion, to remember that the main issue upon which you are to pronounce is the only important one. Shall the people of Manitoba submit without protest to unjust and overbearing treatment? Shall provincial autonomy be practically abandoned? Shall our national system be destroyed? These are the questions, gentlemen, which you are required to answer by the exercise of your franchise.

Now, whatever may be the interpretation of the issue by the hon. leader of the Opposition, there is only one interpretation placed before the people by the members of that government. They admit that the order of 27th July invited them to remedy the evil, and they emphatically said they would not. The order of 27th July being received in that way, there was nothing left for the Government but to call this session of Parliament and carry out the promise they

had made. I have traced the action of the Government but without dwelling at length upon the point, and have shown that step after step was taken with judicial care—care to ascertain what the legal position was, care to ascertain what the rights and privileges infringed upon were, and what remedy should be applied. But, while approached by this Government—in fact by successive governments—with all this judicial care, what has been the position of the Opposition? In such a unique question as this, a question outside the ordinary range of politics, a question of nobody's seeking, coming here neither at the bidding of the Government nor at the bidding of the Opposition, but arising under the constitution, the duty of hon. gentlemen opposite, their clear duty as citizens of this land, was to give their aid and assistance in finding a solution of the problem. But such has not been their course, no assistance has been given by them from first to last. They have assumed, or have pretended to occupy the position of disinterested lookers-on, but during the whole time, by their actions and their words, not as much in this House as in the country and through their press, they have been aiding those who were taking a stand against remedying the evil that has been declared by the highest courts in the realm to exist. The hon. gentleman says it was not for him to commit himself to any particular line of action, that he stood within the charmed circle of the Opposition and it was not for him to assist the Government. In ordinary political questions, perhaps it is not the bounden duty of the Opposition to assist the Government: but in national and constitutional questions of this kind, it is certainly the duty of every citizen to assist in keeping them out of party lines. But while hon. gentlemen opposite have been saying that they were not taking any part in this matter but merely disinterested lookers-on, several of their leaders have been able to talk on both sides of the question at the same time. They have been able in the most surprising manner, not only to make the attempt which many stump speakers might make of speaking on both sides, but the leader of the Opposition especially has been very fortunate in succeeding in the attempt. As the hon. gentleman has already taken exception to statements that have appeared in the newspapers as being correct reports of his speeches, I shall not charge the hon. gentleman with using any particular set of words. If I quote any words as being attributed to the hon. gentleman I quote them simply as appearing in newspapers not unfriendly to him, and I shall quote them not as his words, but as the words of the reporter who heard him. If I make any charge against the hon. gentleman it will not be for uttering these particular words or even for uttering any words that would justify the reporter in attributing to him these expressions, but for having stood quietly by

while these words were published and commented upon day after day, week after week and month after month without contradicting them in the quarter where a contradiction would not meet with applause, but where the publication of them did meet with applause. Now, it may be stated that the hon. gentleman has contradicted in a more or less definite manner the statement which I am going to read. I find the best and strongest contradiction in the Toronto "Globe" of 30th September, where, commenting upon a letter received by Mr. Alexander Smith, Secretary of the Ontario Liberal Association of Toronto in answer to a letter that gentleman had written to the leader of the Opposition, the "Globe" gives this as a quotation from the hon. gentleman's letter, and I suppose he will admit that it is a correct one:

With regard to these offensive statements which are attributed to me by the Conservative press, I need not tell you that they are absolutely false. Those who know me, friends or foes, know very well that they are absolutely out of keeping with the language I have always made use of ever since I have been in public life.

Now, I do not intend to quote from or refer to any of the Tory newspapers. I have in my hand the file of "L'Electeur," which I understand to be the organ of the hon. leader of the Opposition. It is a paper published in the city of Quebec and circulating largely through some twenty constituencies, claiming to have a daily issue of 20,000 and to be the only organ of the Liberal party in these twenty constituencies. In "L'Electeur" of 3rd September, we find a report—no, I will not call it a report, because the hon. gentleman objects to his speeches being quoted unless the whole six columns of the speech are read—it is only a notice of a speech delivered by the hon. gentleman at Chicoutimi on 1st September. It has the black letter head of ordinary political news "Laurier at Chicoutimi. Cheered by four thousand people. Special despatch to L'Electeur:"

Chicoutimi, September 2.

Saturday was the greatest day ever seen in Chicoutimi. Our little town presented a charming aspect. Nothing but flags and banners everywhere floating in the breeze. Our streets were crowded with people. The whole country seemed to be here to welcome our eloquent fellow-countryman, whose name has filled the political world of recent years. Yesterday, four thousand persons were present on the arrival of the boat that carried the Liberal leader. The meeting began at 11 o'clock. It was opened by Mr. Savard, advocate and M.P., who read the address of welcome. Mr. Laurier replied in a two-hours speech,—

Quite sufficient to fill six columns, I have no doubt.

—reviewing all the questions now occupying the public mind: the fiscal policy, the wasting of the public moneys, and lastly the school question. The Liberal leader reiterated, amidst indescribable enthusiasm, his solemn engagement to

re-establish Catholic schools on attaining power. The Conservatives were equally enthusiastic with the Liberals, and applauded frantically. "I know," says Mr. Laurier, "that I shall be called upon to carry out this undertaking, for the present Government cannot settle the question. How could you expect men who have taken an oath to stifle Catholic influence, to re-establish Catholic schools, which are the very source of that influence? Thank God, there are no Orangemen among us Liberals, and whensoever the people entrust to me the control of public affairs, I shall only need to appeal to the Christian sentiments of my supporters to induce them to render justice where justice is due."

Mr. LANDERKIN. Might I ask the hon. gentleman if the Government have not kicked the Orangemen out of their Cabinet?

Mr. MASSON. If the hon. gentleman will only give notice of his question, we will give him an answer. Now, as I said before, I do not charge that these are the words of the hon. gentleman; but what I do say is that they appear in a report printed in his own journal, appearing under his own eye, and remaining there to this day, uncontradicted, being the text of editorial after editorial up to the present day, relying upon the statement that the Liberal leader had entered into a solemn engagement to re-establish Catholic schools. The changes upon that text have been rung day in and day out for the last four months. Taking that speech as the morning lesson, they have preached on it in season and out of season, and proclaimed that the Liberal leader had entered into a solemn engagement to re-establish separate schools. They have also put forth quite a number of articles upon these words as their text:

How could you expect men who have taken an oath to stifle Catholic influence, to re-establish separate schools?

That has been read over and over again by the 20,000 subscribers of *L'Electeur*; that has been kept prominently before their minds, and has been done with the sanction and consent of the leader of the Opposition. Now it appears, Mr. Speaker, that these statements and these editorials were based upon the speech made upon that occasion to the admiring 4,000 people of Chicoutimi. The hon. gentleman used words that justified the reporter in sending forth that special despatch, and though he may not have used those exact words, he used words that meant the same thing. He used words, perhaps, far finer and grander and more embellished with flowery rhetoric, but they meant the same thing. It was not possible to send forth a six-column article, but the reporter sent forth the kernel of that speech, and the kernel is contained in that extract of which the two main features are, first, that the leader of the Opposition is under an engagement to re-establish separate schools; and, secondly, the question, how can the French-Canadians of Quebec expect men who have sworn to stifle Catho-

Mr. MASSON.

lic influence, to re-establish separate schools? Who does the hon. gentleman refer to? Who is referred to by his organ as the men who have sworn to stifle Catholic influence? As a Protestant from Ontario I know of no such men. Where are the men who are sworn to stifle Catholic influence? What does the hon. gentleman mean by allowing such a statement as that to be put forth before the French-Canadian electors? What does he mean when he allows that same statement to be copied by the Tory press of Quebec, and objects when it appears in the province of Ontario? What does he mean when he speaks with regard to this "offensive statement." What is the offensive statement? Is it that these men have sworn to stifle Catholic influence? Is that what he calls an offensive statement? Is the offensive statement he alludes to the statement that he thanks God that there are no Orangemen among the Liberals? That is his denial, take it for what it is worth. I give him credit for the denial, and give him credit for publishing it in the Protestant province of Ontario. I also give him credit for the motive that tempted him to publish it, when I tell you that it is in a letter received by the secretary of the Liberal Association in reply to one sent to him. But it was not the fact that the hon. gentleman had made that statement, and had kept it before the electors for so long, that I was specially intending to deal with. I wished more especially to bring before the House the hon. gentleman's great ability in speaking both ways at the same meeting. Now, Sir, that same speech is elsewhere reported, at least noticed, by a friendly reporter of the Liberal organ in Manitoba, in the special despatches of the day. We find the same speech is specially despatched to Winnipeg and is there reported in the Liberal organ, in which Mr. Laurier, the leader of the Opposition, is referred to in these words:

He will stand upon the broad principle of provincial rights, and decline to interfere with this province beyond making a request for what he may deem the fairest of fair treatment of the minority under the circumstances. Mr. Laurier does not believe in separate schools; he is too advanced and liberal a thinker to endorse them.

There, the hon. gentleman who had spoken before the admiring 4,000 in Chicoutimi, was able to impress upon the minds of those who wished to see separate schools re-established, that he was under a solemn engagement to re-establish them; and he also had the ability to impress upon a friendly reporter who was there reporting for his friends in Manitoba, that he was not in favour of separate schools at all, that he was too advanced a Liberal thinker to endorse any such ancient affair as that. Such then is the ability of the hon. gentleman. It seems surprising to the ordinary mind that an hon. gentleman is able in the same speech, without even taking the trou-

ble to deliver one speech in one province and another in a different province, to have such absolutely different reports. Such reports were issued in Manitoba, and the Winnipeg "Tribune" has harped on the line that the Liberal leader is not in favour of separate schools and will not re-establish them, while at the same time other journals claim he is pledged to re-establish them. However, this ability possessed by the hon. gentleman has been noticed before. I did intend to refer to some speeches delivered by the hon. leader of the Opposition in 1891-93 and 1895, but this House had such an excellent sample the other day that I need not go further back than the hon. gentleman's speech in this debate. Hon. members will recollect that the hon. gentleman endeavoured to convince the House that the issue between the Opposition and the Government of Manitoba was whether there should be modifications or should not, that the Liberals were in favour of moderation—which is the word used by the hon. gentleman—and the Opposition were not. Why the hon. gentleman should endeavour to establish such an issue in the face of the speeches of the ministers and the Opposition in the west is incomprehensible. However, the hon. gentleman has done so; he established the position to his own satisfaction, and no doubt persons hearing the matter discussed for the first time would be satisfied that the issue in Manitoba was, whether the Government should remain in power to remedy the evil, or whether the Opposition should come in and prevent a remedy being applied. I will quote a few of the words uttered by the hon. gentleman. He said:

The issue raised against Mr. Greenway by the Conservative Opposition was, that if the people of Manitoba wanted to keep their school system intact, they should not trust him (Mr. Greenway), because he might make concessions to the minority, but they should remove him from power, and elect his opponents to power.

Then, in order to prove that position, he took up speeches made by his opponents and quoted from them—and if any other hon. gentleman had selected two or three lines from speeches and a few lines from a newspaper article and had woven these together into a piece of fancy crazy work, the hon. gentleman would have denounced the result as a garbled report; however, such was given by him as positive proof that that was the issue before the elections. In order to show the great versatility of the hon. gentleman in argument, I will quote a statement made by the hon. gentleman when dealing with another phase of the same issue:

There was no issue between the two parties on this point; all agreed upon this, that the system of public schools should be maintained intact and inviolate.

There is a sample of the hon. gentleman's ability to make statements in the same

speech that were of an entirely contradictory character. In the course of the hon. gentleman's speech he declared there was an issue—an issue that never did exist, an issue that cannot be proved by any record, an issue that the statements, both of Ministers and members of the Opposition, emphatically deny—and then the hon. gentleman wound up by stating there was no issue whatever, that all parties agreed on the point that the public schools should remain intact and inviolate. The hon. gentleman came here with a solution lately dreamt of, a solution without a detail. He came to the House with a reference, no matter to what, with something to cause delay, something to stave off the approaching day, something to keep this matter dangling before the people at the next election, something no matter what, a reference or a commission. It is not so long ago, in 1893, that the hon. gentleman said that there was only one point to inquire into—were schools of Manitoba Protestant or were they not? In 1895 the hon. gentleman asked himself the same question, for during the two intervening years he had not succeeded in finding out whether the public schools of Manitoba were Protestant or were not. But the inference he drew on both occasions was that if they were Protestant, then the minority were entitled to relief. Now, there is no question about the Manitoba schools being Protestant. They are Protestant in the minds of the Catholic population, they are Protestant in the minds of Protestant clergymen, and they are Protestant in the opinion of no less an authority than Principal Grant of Queen's College. Those schools were not made non-religious, as the author of the Bill intended them to be; but the influence of the Protestant majority and the Protestant ministers who assembled in Winnipeg at the time had an effect on the Act as it passed through its different stages, and it did not come out of the House as it went in, a measure for purely secular schools. That being the case, what else is there into which the hon. gentleman seeks to inquire? He apparently now seeks to inquire as to whether they are well conducted, as to whether they are satisfactory and efficient. Does any reasonable man ask whether separate schools established in sparsely populated districts come up to the requirements of schools in the more thickly settled districts? Everyone in Ontario knows well that in our rural districts those schools are not what town or city men would call efficient, unless it happens that the school in question is situated in a solid block where the residents are of one religion. There we have some good and efficient schools; but where the population is mixed, the alternate farms being occupied by Protestants and Catholics, the distance necessary to travel is too long to allow a sufficient number of supporters to establish satisfactory schools.

The result has been in Ontario that school after school has been established which within a few years has been closed. Some time ago certain amendments were made to the Ontario Separate School Act which gave a boom to separate schools and quite a number were established. But, notwithstanding the advantages given them, empowering them to collect taxes from parties who were not sufficiently anxious to support separate schools to take any action to put their names upon the roll, these schools have fallen away. It goes without saying, that except where the Catholic population is en masse separate Catholic schools cannot be efficient in the Manitoba rural districts. The farms in Manitoba would be larger in proportion than the average farms in Ontario, the population is more scattered there, and a child is not able to walk any further, so that consequently, in a given circle six miles in diameter, if the population is mixed, a separate and a public school cannot be supported. The Hon. Mr. Sifton raised another objection which I also wish to refer to. He said that nearly three times as much per head of the public money was paid to the separate schools as was paid to the public schools. I shall not quote his figures to the House, but the statement was that three times as much for each child was given to the separate schools, per head, as was given to the public schools. Was that the fault of the system or was that the fault of the administration? I certainly say that if they allowed such an inequality to exist in the distribution of the public money, it was the fault of the administration, because if the system can exist at all it should exist upon a fair ratio of distribution. That is also one of the objections taken by Principal Grant, who has written so many letters upon this question, and hon. gentlemen opposite have quoted portions of those letters which bear upon their side of the case. Principal Grant gives cases where the attendance at the Manitoba schools he visited amounted only to two, or three, or four or nine children. I must say that the worthy Principal cannot have travelled through many of the rural districts, especially in the back townships of Ontario, or he would have found exactly the same condition of things at the same time of the year. Even our public schools in Ontario in comparatively well-settled portions have a very small attendance, and that only of the little children, during the summer months. I myself recollect that last summer, passing along one of our best roads not over six miles from my own town, in a well-settled country with well-to-do farmers, I noticed that the children coming out of a school numbered only five. I asked the teacher was that the full attendance at the school and she replied: Oh yes, just now. This is berrying time and all the children are berrying. The fact that Principal Grant found only a few children attending

Mr. MASSON.

school in some parts of Manitoba at that time of the year, actually proves nothing. The question arises, not only what the Government is to inquire into but what they have to propose. The hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) has challenged us that the Government have been uncertain on this question, that they have not defined their position. Well, when the hon. the leader of this House (Mr. Foster) declared in July last that if Manitoba did not remedy the grievance, this Government would introduce and press to a conclusion legislation on the lines of the judgment of the Privy Council and the remedial order; I think that was definite enough. And, when at the by-elections the members of the Government proclaimed their adhesion to that statement, and when the Speech from the Throne reiterates the same statement, surely that pronouncement is definite enough. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. McMullen) asks for the details of the Act he will have to wait until the Bill comes down. I have no doubt that he, like other members from the province of Ontario, will see that inefficiency in the schools is properly guarded against. One of the great causes of inefficiency in the separate schools in Ontario arises from the ease with which separate schools can be established. The small number of five heads of families can establish a separate school. They have not to apply for its establishment, nor have they to show good cause to some authority for its establishment, but they can establish it themselves. It will readily suggest itself to any intelligent mind that five is too small a number to have the power to establish these schools. It would be better in my mind if they had to apply to some responsible body and to show that they were in a position to maintain in an efficient manner a school of that kind. These five heads of families can establish a separate school, perhaps forcing those who may be unwilling to come into their scheme, and thus it occurs sometimes that these schools are poorly supported and inefficiently conducted. In our Protestant separate schools which can be established under certain circumstances, twelve heads of families have to apply to the municipal authorities, but they cannot themselves establish a school. So it is with the coloured people, twelve heads of families have power to apply to the municipality for a separate school but they cannot themselves establish it. That is in my mind a far better system than the other. The hon. the leader of the Opposition waxed rather indignant at the suggestion that he was in collusion with Mr. Greenway of the Manitoba government. Some of his followers did the same thing, and the Liberal newspapers throughout the country have apparently been carried away by the storm of indignation. In face of the denial of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Laurier), I do not for a

moment wish to insinuate that there is any collusion between him and the Manitoba government; but the fact remains that on two occasions, shortly before important action was taken by the Manitoba government, a member of that government came east and had an interview with the leader of the Opposition. Perhaps it was only a friendly chat, but it nevertheless establishes that if there be no collusion there is at least a great friendship between them. Now, Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to occupy so much time when I began, and I will certainly not occupy much more. There are, however, a few points, especially in the speech of the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), which I think it well to refer to before closing. That hon. gentleman made the astonishing statement, the like of which we have never heard before, that the National Policy had not made the country or the farmers rich. There was never anything like that published in the "Globe" newspaper; and the hon. gentleman imparted a pleasant little variety to this debate on the Address by interlarding in it that astonishing statement. The hon. gentleman went further and said that the National Policy had made the farmers poor—that it had reduced the price of grain. Now, did the hon. gentleman give any proof of that? Has he any fact to support such a statement?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The National Policy did not prevent it.

Mr. MASSON. He said that the price of land had decreased since the National Policy was introduced. Has the National Policy anything to do with that? If it has, how is it that the same thing has happened, only to a greater degree, in the motherland, where there is no such National Policy? Is it our difficulty in getting into the great market of sixty millions to the south of us that has caused the decrease in the price of land? If so, why is it that the price of land has decreased in the United States in a far greater proportion than in Canada? Now, the decrease in the price of farm land is because farm produce has fallen in price in consequence of the great increase of production, owing to the large quantity of arable land brought under cultivation. A statistical writer, only two years ago, stated that the area of wheat-growing land had quadrupled in the last fifteen years, causing such an increase in production as to bring about, naturally, a decrease in price, the world over. Hon. gentlemen say that our markets have to fall or rise with the fall or rise of the world's markets. Why then charge the National Policy? The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) says the National Policy has not prevented these things in Canada. I tell the hon. gentleman that, comparatively and relatively speaking, the National Policy has prevented them. The National Policy has done what

its promoters promised, it has relatively increased the prices of farm products. The prices in Canada to-day, compared with the prices in the markets of the world, are higher than they were before the National Policy was introduced. Take any class of farm produce you like, and compare the markets of Toronto with the markets of New York prior to the introduction of the National Policy, and what do you find? That the prices were about 20 per cent higher in New York than in Toronto. How are they to-day? During the selling months of the year—October, November, December and January—they are higher in Toronto, on the average than in New York. How has that come about? Prior to the introduction of the National Policy, American produce coming into the market long before ours, glutted our market to such an extent that our farmers, first and last, had to sell in a glutted market. Compare the markets of Toronto with the markets of Chicago, and you will find the same thing. On the very day when the hon. member for North Wellington spoke—although I do not base the comparison on one day only, for the same is true of all the selling months of the year—what did his party organ give as the prices of farm products in the open market? The highest price paid for wheat in New York was from 67 cents to 68 cents, and in Chicago from 59 cents to 60 cents, whereas the highest price paid in Toronto was 76 cents, and the price paid at the farmers' wagons was from 70 cents to 74 cents, showing that in each case, whether in bulk at the car or at the farmers' wagons, the price paid was higher almost to the amount of the duty, at Toronto than at Chicago. What is the case with oats, in which the province of Quebec especially is so much interested? The highest price in New York was 23 cents, and in Chicago 19 cents, while in Toronto, at the farmers' wagons, the highest price was from 28 cents to 29 cents. Now, the National Policy has prevented the falling of these prices; it has done what its promoters promised—relatively increased them. The National Policy cannot make farm products dear when they are cheap the world over; but, relatively, it has increased, and is to-day increasing the prices of them. The hon. gentleman also complains that the National Policy does no good to the farmers. Does the hon. gentleman want the protection on farm products to be taken off? Does he want the 20 per cent on live animals to be taken off, and the herds of the United States to come into Canada to glut our market? Does he want the 1½ cent a pound on live hogs removed? Does he want the 3 cents a pound on fresh meat, or the 25 per cent on canned meats removed? Does he want the 4 cents a pound on butter, or the 3 cents a pound on cheese removed? Does he want the 10 cents a bushel on oats or the 15 cents a bushel on wheat, or the 40 cents a barrel on apples

removed? Will the hon. gentleman tell the House and the country, or will he tell the farmers of his constituency, if he wishes to have those duties removed? Does he want free trade as they have it in England? Does he want a duty put on the articles which the farmers are forced to use? Does he want a duty put on uncompounded fertilizers? Does he want tea, coffee and sugar taxed in order to raise a revenue, as they do it in England? But, Sir, there is another subject not mentioned in the Speech that hon. gentlemen opposite wax very wrathful over. Where they bring it into the subject of this debate, I know not; but they have brought it in, and the very word sets them wild—they lose their heads at the sound of the name of Sir Charles Tupper. It is strange to see why all this furore should be made because Sir Charles Tupper has taken a portfolio in this Cabinet. He is blamed for a great many things, it would appear; but, boiling them all down, what do they amount to? He is blamed for having had too much faith in his country; he is blamed for having prophesied too great things of this country; he is blamed for having too much faith in its resources and in its rapid development. These are sins of which hon. gentlemen opposite have never been guilty. It is not too much faith in their country that they appear to have, but too little. Would to heaven they had more faith in their country, more faith in its resources, and more faith in its ultimate destiny. This, however, is summed down, nearly the sum and substance of his defects. The hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) said he was a false prophet. Wherein did his false prophecies lie? He prophesied that the Canadian Pacific Railway would be built in ten years, and it was built in seven. Was he a false prophet in that respect? He prophesied that the building of that road would develop our trade with India. It has not only developed our trade with India, but with Australia. Was that a false prophesy? But regarding that same railway, hon. gentlemen opposite made prophecies as well. They prophesied that the Canadian Pacific Railway never could be built. Nevertheless, it was built. They prophesied that when it was built, it would cripple the resources of the country, and so injure our financial condition that we would practically become bankrupt. Well, the road was built, the resources of the country have not been crippled, and we have never been able to borrow money so cheaply. Even when there was financial crises in other countries, our Finance Minister was able to float a loan at the best rate ever obtained. They further prophesied that if the Pacific Railway were ever built, it would not earn its axle-grease. Well, it has been built and has made a better showing in earnings than any other road in Canada.

Mr. MASSON.

The hon. gentleman also put forth another astounding announcement—that the National Policy was not responsible for the good crops in Manitoba this year. I have no doubt that that surprised a number of his friends and supporters, and I have no doubt it will surprise his constituency to learn that he has been, after full and due consideration, led to make the announcement that the National Policy had nothing to do with the good crops in Manitoba. But I will tell the hon. gentleman what the National Policy has to do with. It has to do with the farmers of Manitoba getting better prices for their grain than farmers on the other side of the line similarly situated are getting. From the time they began to sell their grain in October until the present, the prices have been better on the Canadian side than on the other side of the line. The National Policy has helped in that respect. It has helped to develop the resources of the country and its trade. The building of the Canadian Pacific Railway has given to farmers the means of exporting their produce and of obtaining much higher prices than they otherwise would. I must apologize for having occupied so much time on a matter that has been so thoroughly discussed before, and shall not detain you any longer, but simply again express my pleasure at being able to support this motion and the Address.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I do not think that, with the time at my disposal, I will be able to follow the hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Masson) through the speech he has just delivered. There are a few points in it, however, to which I may direct the attention of the House for a few moments, and then I propose to go to the root of the question before us to-day.

In speaking of agriculture and the Agriculture Department, the hon. gentleman gave the Government credit for what they did last session regarding the butter trade. This is a very important matter, viewed as the hon. gentleman viewed it. Now, what did the Government do? They taxed the people, raised the money from the people, bought the butter, sold the butter, lost on the sale of the butter, and then taxed the people again to make up the loss. Is that good agriculture? Is that good business? Is that what the hon. member for North Grey desires to cultivate in relation to agriculture? From whom did they buy their butter? Did they buy it from the farmers of North Grey? Did they buy it from the producers of butter in the rural districts? No, they bought it from the traders. As far as I can understand, they bought it from a few sore-headed Tories in order to butter their heads and heal their wounds, and thereby they could afford, as it were, to carry on this trade, because they did not carry it on out of their own pockets. It is very nice to speculate with other people's money. The Govern-

ment know that ; they have been doing that for a considerable number of years, and it is about time they should stop. I hope the hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Masson) will give me his assistance in putting a stop to this thing. I hope he will give me his assistance in putting a stop to further taxation on the people he represents, because his county adjoins mine, it is a portion of the great county of Grey, and we do not want to see any more burdens put upon the people of that county after those they have borne all through their history for the building up of enterprises in other portions of the country without receiving themselves any consideration from the Government.

Now, I believe the Minister of Agriculture is going to start a green groceries department. That will be another very important department. I hope he will carry that on better than his predecessor carried on the butter business. If he does not, it will result in further loss and taxation upon the people.

The Minister of Agriculture is about to take a wider range. He has told us that he is going into the wheat business, and is going to establish sheep experts. That is an important announcement, and I am surprised it is not made known in the Speech from the Throne. The Minister of Agriculture, backed up and aided by the members of the Government—not in any anonymous way at all, but openly and fairly—has announced to this House that he is going to appoint sheep experts. He intends to shear the flock entirely. I presume, when he gets these experts. He will not be satisfied with the tariff he has or the money he has spent, but will go on further spending the people's money and imposing further burdens.

What do the farmers want? Sir, they want the Government to let them alone. Give the farmers a chance. When the farmers, in competition with the world at the Chicago Exposition, carried off the prizes from all the world, what did that prove? It proved that our farmers, in an open market, can hold their own against the world, and they want the Government to give them that market if they can.

The hon. gentleman spoke about the Government keeping up the price of grain. Well, with the present prices of grain, I do not wish him much joy in his boast, because if ever there was a time when the products of the farm were low, it is the present, and has been the last seven years. The land of the farmer has decreased in value because his products have decreased in value. One is certain to follow the other. The Minister of Agriculture is here, and I am glad of it, as I wish to refer to what the hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Masson) said about the great things the duty had done for pork. There was a meeting in the town of Peterborough and the Minister of Agriculture was there. He was making

one of the speeches for which he has become so renowned. A young man in the audience asked the hon. Minister if he would tell him why pork was higher in Buffalo than in Toronto. And what do you think was the answer given by this Minister of Agriculture, who is so deeply imbued with love for the farmers and proposes to do so much for them? His answer was: "Are you a Grit?" Of course it makes a great deal of difference to the farmers of Canada whether he was a Grit or a Tory. If the young man had said he was a Grit, no doubt the Minister would have tried to give an answer which would turn the laughter of the audience upon the young farmer. But the question nonplussed the Minister. He had not studied that branch of agriculture and was not able to tell why it was that pork was higher in Buffalo than in Toronto. Had he been asked almost any other question, he could have answered it, no doubt. Had he been asked about sheep, for instance, the Minister could have told him, for has he not his sheep experts at his elbow? Having said so much in reference to the speech of the hon. member for North Grey, I proceed to review what I consider the most important matter in connection with the Speech from the Throne, and that is the Government that produced it. The conduct and character of the Government are of vital importance. The Government is but a committee of Parliament chosen by us to do our work. We pay them fair salaries, and we want to see that they do their work well. When Parliament sits we have a right to review their public conduct and to say whether they are carrying on the affairs of the country in an efficient manner or not. When they bolt, if you will, or desert if you will, or become traitors—as the Premier said they did—if you will, we have the right to inquire into their conduct upon public ground, but upon public grounds alone. His Excellency's Address was read in the Senate on the 2nd January. I think it was the 16th of January before we reached the consideration of that Address. I do not know how to characterize the act of a government that is eternally preaching its loyalty when they mete out such treatment as this to His Excellency, the representative of Her Glorious Majesty, The Queen. They solemnly declared that they were united by their strong official oath to stand together as brothers, all for the good of Canada. They united upon the Address and His Excellency read it to the House at the opening of Parliament—and then they told His Excellency to wait until their differences were adjusted. What a spectacle! Seven of them took off their coats and asked His Excellency to hold them while they fought it out. This was the dignified position in which they placed His Excellency. His Excellency knew the capacity of their pockets, but he did not dare to search those

pockets. No doubt he was afraid that he might find some more anonymous letters. Well, they fought it out. I tell you what it is, there is nothing to humble pride like poverty. An empty bag cannot stand upright. I knew that the deserters and bolters would capitulate. I was convinced of that from the first. Their emoluments being cut off, I knew their pride would soon be humbled. These men went out because Sir Mackenzie Bowell was not fit to lead them; and then they went in again although he was as unfit to lead them as he was before they went out. They appeared on many platforms last fall. The Minister of Finance, the Minister of Agriculture, and the Minister of Railways were at Smith's Falls and each of this glorious trinity proclaimed that the Conservative Government was being maligned by the Grits and the Grit press and by the independent press, in statements that there was disunion in the Cabinet. They declared there was not a vestige of disunion, but that the Cabinet was perfectly united. The Minister of Finance made that statement, if the "Mail and Empire" is to be trusted, and I do not suppose that he will contradict what it says. The Minister of Railways said the same thing, then the Minister of Agriculture came up and corroborated what the others had said.

Mr. CASEY. Anonymously?

Mr. LANDERKIN. No, not anonymously. They went to London and told the same story of the unanimity of the great Conservative Government and how the Ministers loved one another. They came back to the House and presented the statement to the House that they had bolted. I remember seeing the Minister of Finance. I think it was the morning after he and his six colleagues had left Sir Mackenzie Bowell, notwithstanding that an important measure was to be presented to the House, one upon which Sir Mackenzie had staked his political life, one that the Minister of Justice of that time had said he was prepared to die for. I saw the Minister of Finance coming up the walk and looking wistfully at his old department. He had his hands in his pockets as though he were trying to find out how much salary he had lost.

Mr. FOSTER. I was looking for car tickets.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I have found that these gentlemen have seven principles, namely, five loaves and two small fishes. I thought the hon. Finance Minister that morning felt that he must go back to his wheel again. He had a wheel last summer and gave us a practical illustration of the old political saying about a fly on the wheel. Well, why did these gentlemen go out? And if there was good reason for them to go out, why did they go back? If

Mr. LANDERKIN.

they told the truth when they went out, what did they tell when they went back? Was it the retort courteous, or the lie circumstantial, or the lie direct? These are questions the people will ask, because if there is anything the people of this country look for in their public men it is that they shall stand upon the principle of truth, that they should be bound by that principle in their public utterances. If a member of the Government makes an untruthful statement, he should be compelled to forfeit his place. Now we will take and examine the members of the Government on their record, and we will see how they agree. The hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Masson) has been telling about my leader having one speech for one section of the country, and another speech for another section. My leader is not responsible for what all the papers say, he is responsible for what he says himself. The Minister of Finance is responsible for what he says himself, and the Prime Minister is also responsible for what he says himself. Now, what does the Prime Minister say in reference to the buccaneers who left his Cabinet? He says:

Even in the present trying circumstances, I hesitate not to say, and to say it boldly—I would not have stated it had not such reasons been given to the House as to the cause which induced these gentlemen to leave the Government—that had I had that loyal support which every Premier ought to receive in the arduous duties incident to the governing of a country, such support as was given most loyally to my late chief, Sir John Macdonald, and Sir John Thompson, we would have been just as successful in carrying on the affairs of the Government as my predecessors, though not possessed of their measure of ability or political tact.

Now, again, in another place, we find that the First Minister stated in a speech a day or two ago:

The action of the seven bolters constitute the blackest piece of political treachery on record.

Then what does the Finance Minister say in his statement, read for himself and his colleagues:

Though with many misgivings, we agreed to enter the Government under Mr. Bowell, in succession to Sir John Thompson, we have, nevertheless, unitedly and loyally striven to the best of our ability to make it strong and efficient, and it has been with growing regret that we have seen our efforts result in a measure of success less than that for which we had hoped and striven.

They say they had misgivings. Now, I would like to know what the Minister of Finance meant when he said they had misgivings. I believe the Minister of Finance in his day has been a professor. He may have different meanings, he may have concealed by his statement what he really meant. I have an authority here on the meaning of the word, which I will read to him, and I invite him to give me his atten-

tion, and to tell me which of these meanings he wishes to give to the word "misgivings." I find by this authority that misgiving means "fear, timidity, diffidence." Was it that? "Want of confidence, fearfulness, solicitude, anxiety, care, apprehension, misgiving, mistrust, distrust, suspicion, qualm." Did he ever have one? "Hesitation, nervousness, restlessness, indisquietude, flutter, trepidation, fear and trembling, perturbation, tremor, quivering, shaking, trembling, throbbing heart, palpitation, ague fit, cold sweat, abject fear, mortal funk, heart sinking, despair, despondency, fright, affright, alarm, dread, awe, terror, horror, dismay, consternation, panic, scare, stampede, intimidation." Oh, he stampeded. And the object of these misgivings. It was "a bugbear, a bugaboo, a scarecrow, a hobgoblin, a nightmare, rawhide and bloody bones, fee-faw-fum." Now, will the hon. Finance Minister tell me about which of these he had the most misgivings? That would be a very proper thing to do. It is well for the House to know, well for the followers behind the hon. gentleman to know, and for the country to know, what was really the misgivings that he had in Sir Mackenzie Bowell's Government. Well, he entered that Government. He did not give his loyal support to the Premier. What would he do if he had another Premier? A man who has been a rebel once, will he ever be loyal again?

Mr. FOSTER. That is a conundrum.

Mr. LANDERKIN. That is a conundrum. There is a newspaper here which will perhaps answer that conundrum, and I might as well read it to the hon. gentleman just now. It is a Conservative newspaper, published in my riding. It is opposed to me, and, I think, without reason. It is called the "Flesherton Advance." It heads its article "The Ottawa Fiasco," and says:

It was with feelings of relief that Conservatives read on Tuesday that a compromise had been arranged at Ottawa, and that six of the seven bolting Ministers had returned to their allegiance, thus raising the blockade which has been in progress for a week past. Yet it is with a sense of chagrin to many, as it is felt that men who have been guilty of the act that these men have, should be relegated to oblivion, and not allowed to resume the important functions they had previous to the difficulty. Had they remained at their posts in the hour of danger, and fallen like heroes, if need be, under the rock they have poised over their heads, their names would have at least been honoured; but to play the part of craven at the political moment, and invent so paltry an excuse as was put forth, is to draw ignominy upon themselves. Sir Mackenzie Bowell has acted the part of a hero, and is honoured for it both by friend and foe. His dogged resistance in the face of such difficulties as were placed in his path during the past week, will be gratefully remembered by his party, even should he sink back into senatorial oblivion. This whole trouble has been caused by personal ambitions running wild; and, while these "ambitious scions of a noble race" have been plotting personal gain, the country has been

reading them, and all true Conservatives and honest men must have come to the conclusion that some who have held the highest places are not to be relied upon when patriotism is demanded; that some of these men are little better than mountebanks, and do not know what loyalty to principle means. Whatever the immediate outcome of the present condition of affairs may be, the time is nigh at hand when these individuals can be singled out and quietly retired into the list of discredited politicians who have dropped to the rear the few past years, and something better and nobler can be brought forth from the chaos of corruption and bickerings which has been too plainly apparent of late. We look to the Conservative party, too, to effect this purification, because it is a duty incumbent upon it to perform. It is, we hope, capable at least of something more noble and edifying than the distressing exhibition it has given us during the past week; if it is not, the editor of this paper, for one, is not proud of being called a Conservative.

That is the opinion entertained by a very able editor, who conducts a very nice paper, the tone of which might be improved, politically, if it would only change a little, although it has had a very fair tone lately. I know it has struck the right keynote, and has come down to hard rock. I noticed the other day in the speech delivered by the hon. Minister of Finance on the Address that he said all governments had their troubles, that it was incidental to governments that they should have men who would go out and preach to the people that they were all united when there was nothing but discord in their ranks, and they were practically seizing each other by the throat. I believe in the days of Pharaoh they had trouble. Two of his officers came under his displeasure—I presume they must have had deficits in their departments. They bolted; but Pharaoh soon bolted them up in jail. On a festive occasion they were taken out of jail. One was restored to his office but the other was hanged. Pharaoh had no Governor General. If he had had such an officer, his chief baker would have probably received a letter from the Governor General and have saved his office and his baking; but there was no Governor General in Egypt, and, consequently, he had to lose his head and his office at the same time. Now, there is a circumstance in connection with that incident that gives hope even to people now. The people of Canada, out of the events of recent days, out of the treason and out of the treachery on the part of the Government, have been looking around for a leader, one to lead the people of this country out of the slough of despond into which they have been placed by this Administration, and they have found a Joseph in the person of Wilfrid Laurier. It would have been better for the people if the leader had come sooner, because he might have stopped the ruin and the destruction that has prevailed, and he might have preserved the name of Canada, which, as a Canadian, I feel has been dishonour-

ed by the events of the past few days. I think the record of this Government is not one that will commend itself to the Canadian people. The policy of the Government is not Canadian, it is a narrow, restricted policy, a policy which has a tendency to cripple the resources of Canada, and not allow the energies of the people, who are the best people on earth, to have full play and secure that success which they have a right to expect they should achieve. But Sir Charles Tupper, hon. gentlemen opposite say, has great faith in this country. I think that is what the hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Masson) said. Sir Charles is High Commissioner at London, with a salary of \$10,000 a year and pickings. He stated in Montreal recently that he would not resign the office—and so his salary goes on. He is also President of the Council, with a salary of \$8,000 a year, and I presume his salary goes on. You would not catch a Tupper lose his salary if he could help it. I remember some few years ago Sir Charles occupied two offices, and was paid for both. He has come back now. He returned, first to break up the Government, and, after having broken it up, to galvanize the Government into life. But there is a somewhat serious phase to it. I saw Sir Charles the other day, but he inspired me with the thought that time is passing, and I was grieved to see the tottering form of the once robust Sir Charles scarcely able to wend his way around the streets, and I felt grieved that a person who had reached his time of life should come here to galvanize life into a party, and unite a party, one-half of which terms the other traitors, and the other half turns round and calls their colleagues incapables. To unite that party is a task more than Sir Charles Tupper is capable of performing. What is wanted is a Government that believes in this country, has faith in this country, and has faith in one another. What can be expected of such a Government, as the Minister of Finance said in his statement the other day. The hon. gentleman said the present Government had not had that measure of success they expected. That was, perhaps, the most truthful statement I ever heard the Finance Minister make. In every other speech made by the hon. gentleman he considered they had had more success than they expected. Reverting again to Sir Charles Tupper, I may say that there was published in the Toronto "Mail" some time ago an outline of Sir Charles Tupper's career, and, as it is in the "Mail," it will prove good reading for this House. It was published on June 9, 1891. I will not read all the article, because it is lengthy, but I will read portions of it, as follows:—

Mr. Edward Blake told us that the policy pursued of late years had done "worse, far worse," than injure our national prosperity. "It had left us," he said, "with lowered standards of public virtue, and a death-like apathy of public

Mr. LANDERKIN.

opinion, with a subservient Parliament, an autocratic executive, debauched constituencies, and corrupting and corrupted classes." Of the system which Mr. Blake deplures, Sir Charles Tupper has notoriously been the chief agent; all that is worst in it and has tended most to debase the national character is familiarly connected with his name, which may be said to be a household word of corruption. Nor has he, like his late chief, succeeded in convincing the people that, except when he is doing the dirty work of a political party, his hands are clean; or that, if he governed the nation, its honour, while it might be in danger from such exposures as that of the Pacific Railway scandal, would be secure against a deeper stain. His name is at this moment unpleasantly connected with a suspicious commercial affair in England, and, if the sentence of the arbitrators in the Onderdonk contract case next month should be against the Dominion, another sinister transaction will be recalled to mind. He will protest his innocence, of course, but his word, unhappily, is that of a man whose veracity is much impugned, and who does not scruple to use stolen letters. It is too evident what sort of scene would be opened by his accession to power. He is the prince of political cracksmen, no doubt, but we cannot afford to purchase ability, even of so rare a kind, at such a price as that of continued and increased demoralization. Of the members of the House of Commons who, the other night voted, under the party lash, that Sir Charles Tupper had done right in leaving his diplomatic post and violating the most sacred rule of the Civil Service, to play a most offensive part in an election, we will venture to say, that there were very few who did not feel in their hearts that he had done wrong. The manner in which he conducted the contest, by trying to fix upon half the community a charge of treason, and thus putting deadly enmity between them and the other half, showed that genuine patriotism could have no hold upon his mind. Nor was his course more sagacious than it was patriotic. The use of violent language against the Americans, which he in vain afterwards attempted to deny, ruined his chances as a negotiator at Washington, where, if he is received at all, it will be on the ground of international courtesy, and with a determination, which nobody can blame, not to play into his hands. His attack on the Grand Trunk was as gratuitous an act of folly as ever insolence, drunk with success, committed. It was doubly insensate, since he must have known that the Grand Trunk had the means of exposing his attempt to bribe its management. His subsequent performances—oratorical and literary—are of a piece with his attack on the Grand Trunk. After ostentatiously assuming the character of an impartial representative of the whole Canadian people and their common ambassador to Washington, he proceeds to show his impartiality by a most violent and slanderous attack on the party in Canada opposed to him, first in an American and then in an English magazine. His article in the "Contemporary," impudently accusing Canadian Liberals to the British public of conspiracy to subvert British institutions and annex Canada to the United States, considering his position and the nature of his duties, may safely be said to be unique in the history of the public service. The appointment of such a man as the head of the state would be not merely the inauguration of violence and corruption, unredeemed by any true wisdom or statesmanship; it would be the signal for a disruption of the community and for a moral civil war.

That is the opinion of the "Mail," the organ of the Conservative party at present, of the man whom they are now crowing so much about having come back to the country. Sir Charles Tupper is still at it. I understand that he promises again to build a bridge at Quebec. He promised that, I understand, in 1891. It does appear to me as rather singular how much reliance the Conservative Government places upon bridges. They built the Curran Bridge, and that was a very important matter for them. I believe they built some bridges in East Northumberland also, and now Sir Charles is promising to build this bridge at Quebec, in order to bridge themselves across the chasm they are likely to fall into. By the way, I forgot to mention the Minister of Finance's own bridge in York. I am told that, in connection with the late revolution in the Government, if I may so term a little insurrection of that kind; that, when the seven Ministers went out, there was great joy among the party, because some of them said that the country must be purged of these men and that new blood would be infused into the Government. The member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) went up to Toronto, looking for a leader. He went to the bench, I believe,—the story is not denied—looking for a leader, and he said: For God's sake, come and help us. We have no man in our party fit to lead us, so come down and help us in this crisis in our country's affairs. The member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) is a loyal man, as everybody knows. He is scarcely a constitutional authority in the House, although he is a professor, too, but it is a singular thing that I never saw a professor in Parliament who knew anything about the constitution. Some time ago the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) interviewed His Excellency the Governor General. He had no faith in the Government then, and it would appear that his faith has not increased since. He went to see the Governor General because he was afraid the Government had not statesmanship and foresight enough to look after the coal mines in Nova Scotia, and he was afraid some one would come along and fill them full of water. As the Ministers were not capable of distinguishing water from coal oil, he thought the Governor himself would have to come to his rescue. Well, on this occasion he went to Toronto, looking for a leader. I understand, that, when those members of the House who were willing to be sacrificed on the altars of their country went in to see the Premier, the bolters, or the traitors—but I will call them deserters—organized a bodyguard of their own near the Premier's door, and they waylaid every man who came out, and took him in charge, so that there was an exciting time for ten days. There was a judge sent for from New Brunswick. He came up, and, when the seven deserters knew he was coming, every one of them crept into their holes. Every single one of them, except one, went

back, but then his father got into the Cabinet, and so he stayed out. Both salaries are secured to the father, so that it will be continued in the family all the same. Of course, you are aware, Mr. Speaker, that Sir Charles Tupper, sen., still retains the High Commissionership, while he is also Secretary of State. That, I am sure, is cheering and gratifying news to the family, and it will not be a surprise to the people who know the family. I do not know whether or not the New Brunswick judge is here but he was waylaid and kept over night in Montreal. The seven deserters had their pickets there, they had reinforcements stationed at every point. There is not a more loyal party in the world than this party, and so they guarded every entrance to the Council Chamber to prevent the Premier filling up his Cabinet. Then, the gallant major from Glengarry (Mr. McLennan); he approached the door, and they knew if he got in, he would soon throw them all out. Therefore, they organized to keep him out of the Cabinet, and they prevented him from getting a portfolio. The member for South Ontario (Mr. Smith) was, I believe, willing to sacrifice himself. I do not know but that the member for North Grey (Mr. Masson) might have been prevailed upon, and the member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) was quite well qualified, and was in the swim. But in all the party arrangements, and in all the Cabinet reconstruction, it is a singular thing that it never occurred to anybody to take in the member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin). His name was never mentioned in all the negotiations. It is a most singular thing that, with the talents which he enjoys, and which he knows he enjoys, and nobody knows better than he, it is a wonder that nobody ever pointed to him for this position of trust. Some time ago he had not so much faith in the Government as he has now. He did not believe in their policy, and he did not believe in their personnel. They had not what he calls the instinct of government about them. The other day, he told us that the Conservative party was a party with the instincts of government, and we know that he thinks that he himself has the instincts of government. I have an idea, judging from what they have done in patching up their Cabinet, that the only instinct about them is that of sticking together. It is true that they do not stick together on principle, for, if they went out because the leader was unfit or incompetent, then they must have gone back when the Premier was just as unfit and incompetent as when they went out. I think the late Minister of Justice is more to be justified for staying out than those who went back, because, if he held the view that Sir Mackenzie Bowell was not fit to lead, he was somewhat consistent in staying out. But then how he can consistently support that Government is something I cannot understand. I noticed the other night that he got quite violent. I did not know, when

his portfolio was taken from him, that he would show violence so soon. I know that Tories out of office are apt to get violent, and sometimes disloyal. But I was surprised the other night to hear the violent statements the hon. gentleman made. He looked into the pedigree of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). He searched among the archives, and he found that the great-grandfather of the hon. member for South Oxford was a loyalist and a true Briton, and that when the United States, where he was then living, rose in rebellion in order to secede from Great Britain, they found out that the great-grandfather of the hon. member for South Oxford was too loyal for them, and he left the country and came to Canada. I think it is well for the hon. gentleman to delve into the archives to find the antecedents of hon. gentlemen on this side of the House; but I do not know that it would be well for him to search into the pedigrees of hon. gentlemen on the other side for three or four centuries. There are dangers to be apprehended in doing that. But it was a most signal triumph for the hon. member for South Oxford, when pursued by an opponent out of office and out of salary, to find his loyalty vindicated in such a remarkable way. I wonder why the ex-Minister of Justice brought forward that memorandum. He has perhaps patched the matter up with Sir Richard since; perhaps they are harmonized; because, if he had searched all last year, he could not have found a better tribute to the worth of the family from which Sir Richard has descended than that which he produced in the House the other night. Well, Mr. Speaker, I have detained the House probably as long as I should on this occasion. There are many things that ought to be discussed and that will have to be discussed this session; but this Cabinet reconstruction I consider is the most important. I think it should not be allowed to remain undiscussed. If the members of this House are true to themselves, if they are loyal to Canada, they will not support any Government which, upon the words of its own members, is shown to be united under false colours and false pretenses, whose members have been shown to be untrue to the truth, untrue to one another, and untrue to their country, and hence unfit to govern. It is the duty of every honest man in this House, whether he is a Conservative or a Liberal, to see to it that we have a Government so formed that its members will cordially agree upon the matters that come before them, and will have honour among themselves at least to be true to one another. I do not see the point of improving a Government that has a leader of seventy-three by proposing to replace him with another who is seventy-six. It seems a strange and startling thing to find a political party finding fault with one leader who has been straight so far as I know, and true to his

Mr. LANDERKIN.

party so far as I know, and proposing to supplant him because of his age, and then putting an older man in his place. It may be good politics for the Conservative party; but the Conservative party has to face the people and answer the statement which the Minister of Finance read to this House. They have also to face the statements made by the Premier to Parliament; and when the people of the country see the conflict between these statements, they will be convinced that one or other faction of this Government has lied to the people of this country; and I believe the people of this country will express their opinion that no member of this House, on either side, should give his support to a Government of which truth is not the foundation.

Mr. FOSTER. Question.

Mr. SPEAKER. Is the House ready for the question?

Mr. CASEY. I should have supposed, Sir, that in a discussion of this kind, involving such important issues personal to members of the Government, there would have been a reply from the other side of the House to all that is said on this side. To be sure, those gentlemen whom we have been designating as bolters or wreckers have observed a policy—I might almost call it a conspiracy—of silence for a long time. But how it is possible for men with any vestige of self-respect left about them, with any knowledge, even, of what people expect still under the taunts which are hurled at them from this side of the House, is more than I can understand.

And it is not as if these taunts were the mere voice of party ill-feeling. They are not that at all. Not one of the hard things said from this side of the House, not one of the insinuations made against the character of these hon. gentlemen as Privy Councillors, as Ministers, as gentlemen, but is based upon something that has been said, either by their leader about them, or by one of them about the other. We have no need to manufacture or imagine hard things to say of them. Out of their own mouths they stand convicted. Under these circumstances I cannot imagine how they endure to be reminded of the things which their leader has said about them, or the things which they have said about each other, without attempting to wipe off a little of the dirt which they have thrown upon each other, even thus early in the session.

But whether they are afraid to speak, whether they think their case is so utterly bad that there is no use in saying anything about it, or not, it is the duty of the House to give some discussion to the important issues before it. We have to discuss at present, not only the subjects laid before us in the Speech from the Throne, but events which have occurred subsequent to the de-

livery of that Speech, and the general situation of the country.

As for the Speech itself, the most important question mentioned in it is that referring to remedial legislation. That is indeed the only subject that should have been brought before the House, this session, in the Speech from the Throne. This session was called for a special purpose, and is not one of the regular sessions which we constitutionally and ordinarily have. It was called as the result of a bargain, the result of a compromise, announced as such, across the floor of the House, between the English-speaking, and certain French-speaking, members of the Cabinet, on the subject of separate schools. The promise had been given that legislation on that subject would be presented and carried through last session, but that was found impossible, from the fact that the Cabinet were not able then, any more than they had been able since, to agree on the terms of the legislation which they were to propose. A crisis occurred, some of the Ministers withdrew; and in order to repair the breach temporarily, a compromise was made by which an extra session was agreed to be specially called, to discuss that question, and, as we supposed, and had the right to suppose, that question alone.

We have no right to discuss any other question this session because we are a moribund Parliament. We know that on the 25th of April next we shall be extinguished as a Parliament, and extinguished individually as members of this House, and we know that we ought not, in a sixth session, attempt to do any general or ordinary business pertaining to the duties of the Parliament of Canada. We were called for this one thing, and this one thing alone we should do.

We should not be called upon—as it seems it is intended to call upon us—to vote the supplies for a year which properly belongs to a new Parliament. We should not be called upon to endorse any new schemes, the effects of which may last through several succeeding years, when a new Parliament will be in existence. We have been called here to do this one thing; it should have been ready for us to do; the Bill should have been presented to us; our decision should be taken upon it; and then we should have the elections, in order that the people may judge between the Government and the Opposition as to what was done.

However, it appears to be the intention of the wise heads who planned the Speech from the Throne—and we do not know to what division of the Cabinet these wise heads belong—that it would be very well to take a snap vote of supplies this extra session, which might carry the Government on for another year without calling Parliament together again after the

elections. The plan may have originated in the tortuous brain of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster) himself. It may have seemed to him that it would be very convenient not to have to call Parliament together again after the elections, even should the result of the elections be unfavourable to the Ministry. He might have thought it would be very comfortable, notwithstanding a majority of a score or two returned against him in the country, to go on for twelve months without taking the sense of the House. That may be the plan, and developments may arise in regard to it, later.

But apart from these two things which have been mentioned in the Speech from the Throne,—one of which should not have been mentioned at all, and the other of which should be discussed in its proper place, when the Government have succeeded in deciding what they are willing to propose to the House about it—there are other important matters before us. I believe the most important things before us are those which are not mentioned in the Speech from the Throne. That Speech did not tell us for example, what sort of people the Government of the day is composed of. It did not tell us what those people thought of each other, and yet those are very important matters for the people of this country to know.

That oversight in the construction of the Speech has been made up, however, too some extent by the hon. gentlemen themselves. They have confessed, later than the Speech, with regard to these points to which I have referred. They stand convicted out of their own mouths of having—seven of them—plotting for thirteen months against the man they were bound to support. They have been capable of thinking each other guilty of very atrocious crimes. They are, in a word, on their own statement, whether as regards their dealings with their leader, or as regards the opinions which individual members of the Cabinet seem to hold of each other, truly unfit, not only for positions in the Cabinet but for any position of trust. It is a very usual sort of recommendation to any young man who asks for a letter to enable him to obtain employment on a railway or in a merchant's office, to say that he is "fit for any position of trust." I am afraid that nobody who heard the statements made by these hon. gentlemen about each other could give any of them any such certificate as this.

As my hon. friend from Grey (Mr. Landerkin) has pointed out, it is highly likely that these men will receive their punishment from their own party. That party is not fairly represented, when led by men such as these have confessed themselves to be. The bulk of the Conservative party throughout the country is composed of honest, upright men, who have confidence in each other, who have confidence in their neighbours, who do not call

each other blackguards, or traitors, and whose conduct in their individual capacities will bear the light of day in every respect. Such men will not be content to be represented much longer by a Cabinet such as this.

I believe that they will punish them at the polls, and possibly the result may be that their party will have to go into opposition, and the longer those Cabinet Ministers are now kept in office, the longer will be the term of their opposition when the people have had a chance to pronounce on their conduct. The Conservatives themselves are well aware that the only chance of purifying their party and obtaining leaders who are fit to lead, men who can be respected, is to defeat their present leaders at the polls and send them into the cold shades of opposition. Then, whoever is able enough, and clean enough, to lead them back to power, will be their leader. The party has no leaders now. It is so poverty-stricken in respect to talent or character that it has to employ a public servant to rally together its broken remnants.

They have had to call in the hired man. I do not see how even these Ministers, who have put up with the other degradations they have suffered lately, can accept this. Let us take it for granted that the Premier was disposed of, that the knifing of Sir Mackenzie Bowell made him impossible as a leader. Was it impossible, even then, to find a leader in Canada? Why was not the Finance Minister chosen to be leader? We cannot think that it was on account of any "misgivings" on his part as to his fitness for the position. We do not believe it was for want of ambition on his part. His whole conduct for the last thirteen months goes to show that he was working to obtain the leadership himself. Why, then, did he allow it to fall into the hands of another? Was it impossible for him to command the confidence of his colleagues? It is for him to explain why he was passed over. Why was the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Montague) not chosen? Perhaps he must be left nameless in this discussion. But we know that his ambition in the line of leadership has been echoed in various newspapers throughout the country. Why was the Minister of Railways (Mr. Haggart) passed over? I ask that very seriously, because a great many people throughout the country regard him as one who would most naturally, under the circumstances, be chosen to lead. Why was the present Minister of Justice (Mr. Dickey) passed over? Would he not have been acceptable as leader? I know no reason why he should not be so; it remains for his colleagues to answer. A controller, perhaps, was out of the question.

But, failing all these gentlemen, why should Sir Charles Tupper be chosen, of all persons in the world? It would take too long to review that gentleman's history in the pub-

Mr. CASEY.

lic life of Canada. In fact, it is hardly necessary to do so, for his record is fresh in the memory of those who have been in active politics for ten or fifteen years, though it may not be known to the men who have come of voting age within that time. He cannot have been chosen because of any great confidence in his personal character as leader of a great party. Was he chosen because it was supposed that his judgment and temper were especially trustworthy? Hardly, I think, Mr. Speaker. Those who have sat with him in this House know that, so far as judgment and temper are concerned, he is certainly no improvement upon some of the Ministers whom he now oversteps.

The reason why he has been called upon has been made clear by the Conservative press all over the country. He was called upon because the Government are pinched for money. They know they will need a large sum, in order to stand the least chance of carrying the next election. They know they will require a lot of money to keep their own party solid in these elections, and they know that, even if they got the vote of every man who nominally belongs to their party, they could not win. They want a great deal of money—they want a "bar'l"—and expect to fill it.

Sir Mackenzie Bowell has not proved himself an adept in that part of the tactics to which this Government finds it so necessary to resort; he has not shown himself very skilful in sweating contractors and manufacturers. Sir Charles has been called upon, as an expert, the doctor has been called in to sweat the patient. The patient will be sweated; the money will be put up; the Government will stake their last cent on this election, with a result which there is no use boasting about beforehand, but I hope will be in the interests of the country at large, and not of the hoodling class.

Of course, it would not do for this gentleman, coming in as the virtual head of the party, to give this as the reason for his leadership or as the policy of the party. What line, then, is he taking? The line we have had quoted here to-day, as having been taken by him previously, that of accusing his opponents of disloyalty and treason, and boasting of the superior loyalty of himself and his party. That has been gone into already, but it cannot be made too clear. Such a cry as this comes with the worst grace from the mouths of men, who have confessed that they cannot be loyal for a few months to their own leader, or to the Government of which they form a part. But this is the class of people who raise the cry. Men who have been loyal only to their own salaries, accuse others of being disloyal to their country, and thereby feed the flames of foreign disaffection against Canada and against Great Britain.

But, as I said on a former occasion, I will not recriminate. I believe even the Ministers are loyal. That is quite a stretch of belief, but among the eighty or so of us on this side of the House, we can manage to believe even that. I have no trouble in believing it of the rank and file of the Conservative members in this House, and the Conservative party at large. Those Canadians who are of British descent are loyal to Britain by instinct and race. Those of French descent are loyal from conviction, and from the loyalty of their own nature, and their true-heartedness—loyal above all things to that Canada of which they were the first inhabitants, and of whose prosperity they laid the foundations. They showed their loyalty in the years when they were the vast majority of the people of this country, and when the defence of Canada rested chiefly upon their shoulders. No man can impugn the loyalty of the French race who knows the history of Canada.

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

After Recess.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, when you left the Chair to allow us to refresh the inner man, I was referring to the accusations of disloyalty so freely made upon the other side of the House. I was referring more particularly to one of the races which inhabit the Dominion of Canada, that race which traces its origin to France. In continuation of these remarks, I may say that it is an insult to the whole French-Canadian race, an insult of the bitterest and most unpardonable kind, that our leader, one of the most distinguished French-Canadians who ever appeared in public life in Canada, one of the most distinguished Canadians of any race, should be subjected to the insults heaped upon him by my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Kenny) and others on that side of the House.

I say it is an insult which the French-Canadian race will resent, because, in the person of the leader of this side of the House, many of the best qualities of that race are typified and exemplified. I do not believe that there is one French-Canadian who will not feel, that these attacks upon the leader of the Opposition are an insult to every man of that race in the country. Sir, those French-Canadians, those original Canadians, proved their mettle long before the British flag waved over the heights of Quebec. They could defend their homes and their country then against the Yankees, and against Indians, and when the flag of England was hoisted, they were as loyal to that as they had been to the flag of France.

He would be a poor coward, indeed, who would not fight to protect his home, and to

protect those in it dearer to him than his own life. There is no ground to imagine that there is anywhere in Canada a coward of that kind. There are no copperheads, Sir, on this side of the House, no copperheads. I verily believe, when the day of need comes, on the other side of the House. Why, then, should these hon. gentlemen find pleasure in creating the impression abroad that there are copperheads in this country, that half the people in this country are disloyal and are traitors? What good can it do them? Ah, Mr. Speaker, they forget the harm they are doing their country, they forget the risk they are running of encouraging hostile feelings, and hostile action against Canada, for the sake of what they consider would be a little temporary advantage to their party. I believe even in that object they will be mistaken. I believe all this slinging of mud will befool those who sling it more than those at whom it is thrown.

Some hon. gentlemen opposite even go so far as to charge the leader of the Opposition with being opposed to arming the volunteers, and strengthening the defences of the country. You must remember, Sir, and the House will remember, that when he spoke with reference to this matter, which was mentioned in the Speech from the Throne, he gave no uncertain sound with regard to it. The leader of the Opposition declared himself frankly and freely in favour of the best armament that could be secured for the volunteers of the country. There is no reason why he should do so. A very large proportion of those volunteers, I do not know but I would be right in saying a majority of them, are good supporters of his own, and of the principles we advocate on this side of the House. Whenever there has been need for volunteers, Liberals and Conservatives have sprung equally to arms.

But the Government would like to produce the impression upon the country that they are the only ones who care for the volunteer, and who wish to see him properly armed. Sir, in my own humble capacity, I have for many years urged upon the present Government the necessity of arming our volunteers with a modern and useful weapon. In his far higher capacity, the general commanding the forces in Canada, has for many years been urging the same thing upon the Government. And it is only now, at a moment when an election is imminent, when the votes of the volunteers will count, that we have a bluster and a blow about the needs of the volunteer, and the propriety of arming him with a good weapon.

How was it when we had an actual war on hand, during the rebellion in the North-west in 1885? Sir, the Government were as unprepared then as they are now. The troops were not armed with improved weapons; the troops were not supplied with good cartridges; the troops were not supplied with

the ordinary comforts of camp life. These had to be, in many cases, provided for out of the pockets of friends, and out of the treasuries of different municipalities, which passed votes for their local companies or battalions. The Government was then, is now, and ever will be, unready, and unprepared to put a force in the field in efficient shape, until actual necessity comes upon them, and for some time after that necessity has come upon them.

We all remember how the gun carriages broke down. We all remember when complaints were made of the nature of the ammunition served to the volunteers there. When I made that complaint myself across the floor of the House, the then Minister of Militia (Sir Adolphe Caron) now the Postmaster General, had the coolness to tell me that he was quite aware that the ammunition was not good enough for practice at a target, but he believed it was quite good enough for shooting in the field? Why, Sir, in 1885, during the war in the North-west, we had a Minister of Militia who thought anything that would make a noise would do for shooting in the field, though good cartridges were required for accurate shooting at the butts. I sincerely hope, Sir, that the Hon. Mr. Desjardins, who has taken charge of the militia for the present, will prove himself a somewhat more practical Minister of Militia than the gentleman who preceded him some time ago in the same department.

Now, Sir, while we do not recriminate upon hon. gentlemen opposite on the subject of loyalty, while we admit that they are good citizens, we do say and maintain, and we have facts to prove, that hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House are fond of adopting Yankee politics, Yankee methods of procedure: their sympathies are Yankee in everything that is connected with the administration of this country. I do not say that they would like to join the Yankees, or anything of that kind; but they have, in a spirit of imitation, a spirit of weak, childish imitation, to put it at its best, adopted all that is worst in the practices and in the policy of our neighbours to the south.

When they believed, or professed to believe that a change of policy was required in 1878 to restore prosperity to this country, where did they seek for inspiration? Did they seek it in the old motherland, of whom they talk so proudly now? Did they seek for it in Imperial federation, of which Sir Charles Tupper is to be the Mahomet, the prophet, the only interpreter? Did they seek it in the writings of the greatest English authorities? Did they seek it in the practice of the British legislature? No, Sir, they went straight to Washington for their policy; and so foreign was this protective policy to everything that was British or Canadian, that they had to import a live Yankee from

Mr. CASEY.

Washington, bottle him up, and make him a member of the Canadian Civil Service for the time being, and set him down here in Ottawa to compile that policy for them. They imported a man belonging to the civil service in Washington, and set him with Mr. Fraser, secretary of the Manufacturers' Association, to frame an imitation of the Yankee policy of protection.

Where is the loyalty, the Britishness, if I may coin a word, of such proceeding? They talk of love and friendship for England; but acts speak louder than words. They sought their inspiration and their models for a new policy under a foreign flag.

Let me come down to a latter day, when this new Yankee policy had been in force for a dozen years or more, and see how they treated the resolution offered in this House for the purpose of bringing about better trade relations with the mother country. On 25th April, 1892, the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) moved a resolution, beginning with an "if" and a "when," and declaring that, "if and when," England gave us preferential advantages in her markets over foreign countries, we would be prepared to make reductions in duties on the main articles imported from that country. That motion was discussed at considerable length, and our dear friend from Halifax (Mr. Kenny) vented his usual torrent of abuse on the leader of the Opposition for his Boston speech and other remarks, and he spoke of our connection with the mother country as a "tie which binds us in a love knot."

That was very fine and eloquent in the mouth of the hon. member for Halifax; but when the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) proposed an amendment, to which I will refer in a moment, we had an opportunity of seeing how far the practice of that hon. gentleman agreed with his words. The hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) moved:

That inasmuch as Great Britain admits the products of Canada into her ports free of duty, this House is of the opinion that the present scale of duties upon goods mainly imported from Great Britain should be reduced.

How did the hon. member for Halifax vote? He voted nay; as did the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper), and his father, if he had been here, would have voted in the same way; and so also did the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) and every one of the loyalists on the other side of the House who was present in his seat.

Did the hon. member for Queen's ask that we should give preferential treatment to Great Britain? No; but he said that the present National Policy was unfair to her export trade, and that, as Great Britain admitted our goods free, we should reduce the duties on such articles as are mainly imported from the mother country. But the

loyal member for Halifax, my imperial friend from North Bruce, and my royal friend from Pictou, would not go a quarter of an inch in the direction of giving any privilege to the mother country. That is their practice as compared with their profession in the way of loyalty.

It is very regrettable that this Yankee system should have been introduced among us, a policy that was begotten by the makers of wooden nutmegs and nursed into its present condition of maturity by the Minister of Finance. Whether there is any relationship between the parent and foster father, I do not know. But it is worth while to consider what the effects of that policy have been on the United States itself. Let it not be forgotten that when protection is discussed in Canada we are usually told to look to the results in the United States and see how that country has prospered, and act accordingly.

I have before me the words of the United States ambassador to London (Mr. Bayard), uttered in a speech delivered in Edinburgh, on November 7th, 1895, in which he gives his impression of the effects of protection in the United States. Let it not be forgotten that these are not the utterances of a Canadian or of an English free trader, but of the representative of the most strongly protected country in the world, and the one held up as our model. That gentleman was addressing the members of the Philosophical Institution of Edinburgh, and his subject was "Individual Freedom, the Germ of National Progress and Permanence." After other remarks, he said :

In his own country he had witnessed the insatiable growth of that form of "state socialism" called 'protection,' which, he believed, had done more to foster class legislation, and create inequality of fortune ; to corrupt public life ; to banish men of independent mind and character from the public councils ; to lower the tone of national representation ; to blunt public conscience, and create false standards in the popular mind ; to familiarize it with reliance upon state aid and guardianship in private affairs ; to divorce ethics from politics, and place politics upon the low level of a mercenary scramble than any other single cause.

This is a notable condemnation by the official ambassador of a protectionist country. We have seen many of these results springing up among ourselves. We have divorced ethics from politics, we have blunted public conscience and created a false standard in the popular mind, and in proof of these assertions I need only refer to the events of the last fortnight. Mr. Bayard continued :

Step by step, and largely owing to the confusion of civil strife, it had succeeded in obtaining control of the sovereign power of taxation, never hesitating at any alliance, or the resort to any combination, that promised to assist its purpose of perverting public taxation from its only true justification and function—that of creating revenue for the support of the government of the whole people—into an engine for the

selfish and private profit of allied beneficiaries and combinations called "trusts."

Have not trusts arisen in Canada ? Have we not seen the Government here making all sorts of alliances, resulting in all sorts of combinations, to secure the support of one interest or another ? Have we not seen taxation diverted from its proper purposes ? What did our Finance Minister say in 1894 when introducing his Budget ? He said :

The principal aspect in which the tariff is to be viewed is in respect of its effects upon the trade development of this country.

We find the same results followed in Canada as in the United States. But I must quote further from Mr. Bayard. He said :

Under its dictation individual enterprise and independence have been oppressed, and the energy of discovery and invention debilitated and discouraged. It had unhesitatingly allied itself with every policy which tended to commercial isolation, dangerously depleted the treasury, and sapped the popular conscience by schemes of corrupting favour and largesse to special classes, whose support was thereby attracted.

Did we not have in 1894 clear proof of the truth of this last statement in regard to protection, when the manufacturers in Canada furnished a brief to the Finance Minister, a brief of what he should do in regard to the tariff in order to foster to the greatest extent their individual interests as manufacturers, a brief which he accepted, and gratefully acknowledged, and carried out ; a brief which those manufacturers boasted of having furnished him, and which they published throughout the country as a creditable action. Did not that show not only the debasement of public morality, but the sapping of the public conscience by schemes of favouritism to a special class ? Mr. Bayard went on to say :

This it had done so much to throw legislation into the political market, where jobbers and chaffers took the place of statesmen. Gradually the commercial marine of the United States had disappeared from the high seas, with the loss of the carrying trade and the dispersion of the class of trained seamen and skilled navigators.

Does not that sound very familiar to us, Mr. Speaker ? Has not the commercial marine of Canada declined since we adopted protection ? Let those gentlemen who represent seaport towns in the maritime provinces answer whether or not the commercial marine has declined ? Let them tell us whether the shipyards are not closed, and let them tell us whether our seamen do not have to seek employment in the ships of other countries ; men who used to be employed in vessels built and owned in Canada ?

They cannot deny it, Sir. If they throw the blame of this upon the introduction of iron instead, with wood as the material for ship-building, ask them why Sir Charles Tupper's grand scheme for the protection of

iron, and the utilization of the coal and iron ore of Cape Breton, in smelting furnaces for the production of material to be used in Canadian ships, did not succeed? If there is any country in the world adapted for iron ship-building it is Cape Breton, where the iron and the coal and the flux for smelting are in juxtaposition. Sir Charles Tupper promised in 1887, that by reason of the duties he was then imposing, the ore would be smelted and the iron used in Canada for ship-building and all sorts of iron work. The result has been a total failure, and his promises have been belied in that respect, as much as they have been in regard to the lands of the North-west. Mr. Bayard continues, in reference to the decline of ship-building:

The exceptions which only prove the rule, were the few vessels lately built, and these only by making a breach by special contract in the general tariff and navigation laws, a reluctant confession of the impolicy and unwisdom of both, but an object lesson from which valuable instruction might be drawn.

Speaking of the special contract, he refers, as I understand it, to special provisions made for the admission of material for the construction of vessels in the United States, and for the admission to free registry of a certain number of steamships bought abroad. Said Mr. Bayard, continuing:

It was incorrect to speak of "protection" as a national policy,—

That, Mr. Speaker, is a very familiar word in Canada!

—for that it could never be, because it could never be other than the fostering of special interests at the expense of the rest,—

Why, Sir, you would almost think there was a Finance Minister of the same name as our own in the United States, one who fosters their interests as carefully and wonderfully as our interests are fostered in this country!

—and this overthrew the great principle of equality before the law, and the resultant sense of justice and equity in the administration of sovereign powers, which was the true cause of domestic tranquillity and human contentment. The value of "protective" taxation to its beneficiaries consisted in its inequality; for, without discrimination in favour of some one, there was no advantage to any one, and, if the tax were equally laid on all, all would be kept upon the relative levels from which they started; and that simply meant a high scale of living to all, high cost of production of everything, and consequent inability to compete anywhere, outside of the orbit of such restrictive laws.

Mr. Speaker, do not we find all that borne out by our own experience? Where do our manufacturers compete except where they have the advantage of our tariff—with the exception of one or two natural industries which did not require any protection in the first place? In reference to this point of Mr. Bayard's, that protection, to be of any

Mr. CASEY.

use, must be unfair to some one. I refer the House to the language of our own Finance Minister, who, in 1894, said with regard to a protective tariff, that, as a matter of course, protective taxes did raise the price of similar articles produced in the country—and that if such taxes did not raise the price of these articles they were of no use to any one. Mr. Bayard proceeds:

But the enfeeblement of individual energies and the impairment of manly self-reliance were necessarily involved, and the belief in the mysterious powers of the state and a reliance upon them to take the place of individual exertion fostered the growth of state socialism, and personal liberty ceased to be the great end of government.

Now, Sir, that is a terrible indictment against protection by one who knew the inmost secrets of its working in the United States, by one who represented at a foreign court that country which had made such an awful failure of its attempts to foster, as it is called, its native industries. I do not believe that anything I could add to these remarks of Mr. Bayard's would increase their force.

Before closing my remarks, I must make one more reference to the general subject of remedial legislation, a reference which I think is required in justice and in equity. I wish to point out the patriotic, and sound, British, common sense action of the Roman Catholic population of this country in regard to that question. It was assumed on all hands a year ago, that the promise of remedial legislation by the Government of the day would secure for them the solid Catholic vote throughout Canada no matter what sins the Government might be responsible for in other directions. Events have shown since that time that the Catholics of Canada, be they French-speaking or English-speaking, refuse to have it believed that theirs is a "solid vote," which can be bought by any promise made by any Government. They refuse to let it be understood that they are what is commonly called "priest-ridden." They refuse to act otherwise than as good citizens of this community.

If they had been open to any influences of that kind to which I refer, the by-elections which have taken place since the issue of the remedial order would not have taken the course they did. I do not say that the policy of one party or the other in regard to the remedial order has caused the effect which has taken place in Montreal Centre, Jacques Cartier, Verchères, Antigonish, or anywhere else. But I do say that the result in these elections shows that our Catholic fellow-citizens are taking into consideration the whole conduct of the Government, uninfluenced by appeals to their religious feelings. They are taking it all of a piece. Here is a body, the great majority of whom are prepared to pronounce want of confidence in that Government, no matter what illus-

ory promises they may make to them in this or any other respect. They do not believe in the honesty of purpose of the Government; they do not believe in the capacity of the Government to carry out what it promises.

They do believe in the common sense, the tact, and the good management of the gentleman who leads this side of the House, and whom alone they believe capable of settling this vexed question in a patriotic way. I am sure, Sir, that they have done themselves infinite credit by their action. I would go further than that. I believe they have not only done infinite credit to their own good sense, and self-restraint and patriotic intention, but I believe that their action in those by-elections, and the action they will probably take in the by-elections yet to come, will be the salvation of this country. It will save the country from the farce of such government as we have had for the last year or two, at any rate. It will save the country from the awful consequences described by Mr. Bayard as arising from protection in the United States which have not yet reached full maturity in Canada, but would, in few years, if that system were to continue.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, before this debate closes I would like to say a few words. In looking over the Speech from the Throne I find that we are congratulated "upon the evidence of increased activity in the various branches of commerce and industry." There is one important branch of industry in Canada which is in a very depressed condition to-day; I mean the agricultural industry. I have lived for the last fifty-two years as a farmer in Canada, and I have never seen that industry so depressed as it is to-day. Let me read a short statement to show how the income of the farmer has been reduced since 1882, the first year in which the report of the Ontario Bureau of Industries was published. In that year, 19,622,429 acres of land were occupied in the province, making 196,225 farms of 100 acres each. The value of all the field crops in the province in that year was \$155,000,000, giving to each farmer with 100 acres an income of \$789. When I take an average of the years from 1882 to 1892, I find that there were 207,815 farmers, with a total annual average value of field crops of \$114,533,844, giving to each farmer during that time an average annual income of \$551. In 1893 there were 219,407 farmers in the province of Ontario, and the value of all the field crops was \$101,886,557, or \$464 to each farmer. In 1894 there were 220,327 farmers with 100 acres each, and the value of all the field crops amounted to only \$94,055,000, giving to each farmer only \$426, or a reduction from 1882 to 1894 of \$363. This is a very small remuneration, indeed. Then, most of the farmers with 100 acres of land to-day are compelled to have a certain amount of hired help dur-

ing the summer, as it is impossible for a farmer in this climate of ours, with the rapidity with which the harvest comes on, to do the work of such a farm without hired help. Therefore, when we deduct \$80 or \$90 from this amount for a hired man during the summer, the farmer has very little left for himself. Now, I will offer another piece of evidence to show that the condition of the farmer in the province of Ontario is gradually becoming worse. In 1887 the mortgages on real estate in Ontario amounted to \$74,954,076. At that time there was not a single farmer's chattel mortgage recorded. In 1894, the real estate mortgages amounted to \$115,558,027, an increase of \$40,000,000 in the seven years, or an increase of \$6,000,000 annually. Now, this is a bad condition of things, but it does not show in reality how depressed the condition of the farmer is in the way the amount of chattel mortgages does. In 1894 the chattel mortgages in the province of Ontario amounted to \$11,220,000, and more than half of this amount was recorded against farmers. We all know that as long as a farmer can increase the mortgage on his farm he is unwilling to mortgage his chattels; when he does that, it is his last resort; and within the last two years the chattel mortgages have increased more than they have ever done in the same length of time in the history of Canada. These facts and figures show that the farmer of this country is in very straitened circumstances indeed. Now, we have been told time and again that this is not the case. I have been told during the last twelve months that a bushel of wheat had just as much purchasing power in 1895 as it had in 1881 or 1882. In looking over my own accounts at home, I find that in 1882, on a certain piece of property I paid \$93.12 of taxes. I find that during that year I was getting \$1.25 per bushel for my wheat, so that 74½ bushels paid the taxes of that property. In the year 1895 the taxes on the same property amounted to \$93.90, and with wheat at 62 cents a bushel, it took 155½ bushels to pay the taxes, or more than double the amount required in 1882. And yet we are told that wheat to-day has as much purchasing power as it had then. In 1882 I purchased a pair of boots, for which I paid \$5, and 4 bushels of wheat paid for those boots. In 1895 I also purchased a pair of boots for which I paid \$5, so that, with wheat at 62 cents a bushel it took 8 bushels and 8 pounds to pay for them. In 1882 I purchased a suit of clothes for which I paid \$24, and, with wheat at \$1.25 a bushel, it took just 19 1-5 bushels to pay for it. In 1895 I also purchased a suit of clothes, nearly the same quality, for which I paid \$20, but I only got 62 cents a bushel for wheat, so that it took 32½ bushels of wheat to purchase that suit of clothes. And yet we are told that a bushel of wheat to-day has just as much pur-

chasing power as it ever had before. Well, the dollar may have as much purchasing power, but it takes a very great deal more wheat to enable the farmers to get the dollar than in days gone by. There is no class in Canada on whom the National Policy has borne so hardly as the farmers.

With respect to the North-west Mounted Police, concerning which there is a paragraph in the Speech, I have been in the North-west and I believe that force is a necessity. It is necessary that we should have a certain number of Mounted Police there. We have not as many now as we had formerly, and as the country settles up the number may be further reduced, but that will have to be done very cautiously. The force ought to be kept in a very efficient condition because it has rendered good service.

I was amused in reading this paragraph :

I regret to say that the advisers of the Lieutenant-Governor have declined to entertain favourably these suggestions, thereby rendering it necessary for my Government, in pursuance of its declared policy, to introduce legislation with regard to this subject.

This paragraph refers to the answer of the Manitoba Government to the Order in Council of July last. What is the declared policy of this Government with respect to the Manitoba school question? I understand that there have been disagreements in the Cabinet. We were told the other night by the ex-Minister of Justice (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) that there are differences of opinion on that question, and I really wonder if the Government have yet any settled policy or if that policy has yet to be formulated.

We have been taunted by members of the Government and other hon. gentlemen opposite with the usual charge of disloyalty. I would ask whether these hon. gentlemen could not much better apply that charge to themselves. Is there any virtue in being loyal so long as everything is going along peaceably and quietly in the state, so long as there are no difficulties to grapple with? No, the time to test the loyalty of individuals is when any particular crisis takes place. If the Government of Canada be tested by that measure, it must be admitted that no more disloyal set of men ever held the reins of power in any country. We know that during the last session of Parliament three of them went out, we know that there was a disagreement then, and we were led to believe that it was with respect to the remedial order. Two of these bolters came back, and we never have been told anything in explanation of this whole business, but have merely had the report that one of the Ministers said he would not come back unless with the promise that a certain Bill should pass through the House at a certain time. That information we got from an interview with the Minister in question which was

Mr. McMILLAN.

published in the Montreal "Star." Whether he ever got that promise we have never been informed, but he came back. We know that later on, since this Parliament has met, a further outbreak of disloyalty took place in the Cabinet. And I say that if disloyalty was ever shown amongst the members of the Government of any country, it is shown in a Cabinet which, after agreeing to submit a Speech from the Throne to the House, bolted and deserted their leader before that Speech could be discussed. For what reason they deserted him we have not been told, but it evidently was because they wanted to get rid of him as a leader. If they think that they have strengthened themselves in the country by the course of conduct that they have pursued, they will find that they were never more mistaken. I believe that Sir Mackenzie Bowell has drawn a very large amount of sympathy from the country for the manner in which he asserted his position. I am not posted in constitutional law, and as I am ignorant of what the real policy of the Government is, I shall leave this question to be discussed by others more competent.

There is another paragraph in the Speech :

Your attention will be asked to measures intended to provide for the better arming of the militia and the strengthening of Canadian defences.

The Opposition are satisfied with regard to that. If we are to have a militia at all it ought to be properly armed and equipped and made as efficient as possible, while having a due regard to economy.

We are asked to consider measures for the extension and developing of our trade and agricultural products with the United Kingdom and other markets. In this connection I shall take up what the seconder of the Speech from the Throne said on this point. He said that no body of men deserved better treatment at the hands of the Government than those who tilled the soil and that no body of men had got better treatment. That hon. gentleman is certainly not a farmer. Certainly he has not examined very closely the conduct of the Government with respect to the farmers. He does not apparently know that when the tariff suffered its last revision, the tariff committee of the manufacturers sent to the Government their own tariff resolutions, and the Government Bill was largely drafted in accordance with these resolutions. Not only the suggestions of the manufacturers but their very language was embodied in the Government Bill. And further, the manufacturers told us that what surplus funds they had they handed over to the Government in return for the very kind treatment they had received in the past and they hoped to dedicate that surplus in the future also to assist the Government. But can any one show what the farmers have got in the way of special legislation at the

hands of the Government? We have been told, time and again, of a large number of articles of raw material from which the duty has been removed in favour of the manufacturers. Is there one article from which the Government have removed the duty in favour of the farmers? For a number of years, I and others urged upon the Government to allow us to get free corn in order that we might be enabled to feed our cattle cheaply; and finally the Government did remove the duty from the small quantity of sweet corn which we bring in for ensilage purposes. They also reduced the duty on a few of the agricultural implements only from 35 to 20 per cent. I believe, however, that that reduction is more illusory than real. I asked the Finance Minister at the time whether or not the Government intended to continue in the future the system they had followed in the past of having revaluation of agricultural implements made on their being imported from other countries. His answer was that they intended to continue the same system, and, therefore, the revaluation often annuls any benefits the farmer gets from this reduction.

What injury have we received on account of the failure of the Government to properly inspect cattle coming into the North-west? The scheduling of our cattle in the British markets has certainly done a great deal of injury to our trade with Great Britain. If the Government had had the inspection of cattle carried out rigidly, the probability is that the scheduling would never have taken place. Our sheep have also been scheduled. No longer ago than last session the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Featherston) brought in a resolution with respect to the inspection of sheep, and showed the Government conclusively that there was a necessity to have a rigid inspection. I stated then that unless the Government appointed an expert, one who understood all the diseases of sheep, I had not the slightest doubt that our sheep would also be scheduled before long. I stated that while we might have good inspectors, it did not follow that these men were competent to inspect sheep, because those acquainted with cattle very often knew very little about sheep, and we required an expert to make a proper examination. The Government, however, did not pay attention to our suggestions to have sheep coming from the United States more closely inspected and prevent the shipping of any diseased animals to the British markets. Then we find that the farmer is at a disadvantage compared with almost every other class of the community. What is the reason that the manufacturers get a rebate of 99 per cent of the duties paid for raw material on all the agricultural implements that are exported? Where do these agricultural implements go to? They go to Britain, Australia, British Africa, the British West Indies, Newfoundland, Argentina, Central America, Chili, Denmark,

France, Germany, Holland and Russia. The farmers of all these countries can get these Canadian implements cheaper than can the Canadian farmers. And yet we are told by the seconder of the Address that no class of the community receive greater consideration at the hands of this Government than the farmers. The fact is that no class have been as hardly dealt with as the farmers have been. If they wish to deal with the farmers as they ought to do, why do they not accept the offer that has been held out to us by the United States government ever since the McKinley Bill came into force? Under the McKinley Bill certain class of implements is allowed to enter the United States free as soon as similar implements are allowed to enter free into Canada. Under the Wilson Bill that offer to the Canadian Government is continued. Looking back we find there was a time when the Canadian tariff statute had in it a reciprocity clause. This was the case with the tariff Bill passed in 1879. Under that Bill a large list of articles was given and it was declared that when the United States removed in whole or in part the duty upon any or all of these articles, the Canadian Government would reciprocate. Did they reciprocate? Not at all. They did nothing until 1888 and then, under pressure they took certain duties off. But this was allowed to continue only until 1890. Mr. McKinley himself stated in the house of representatives that, while the McKinley Bill was not a retaliatory measure, he could not forget the action of the Canadian Government in restoring to the dutiable list in 1890 certain articles which they had taken off that list under pressure two years before. In 1888 Sir Charles Tupper made the statement to the House that the Canadian Government were going to remove the duties on the goods which the American government had made free five years ago and said the Canadian Government had passed an Order in Council in which were these words:

—and the Canadian Government await the further action of the American government in the same direction.

Now, the American government have taken the duty off a large number of agricultural implements offering to allow those goods to come in free from any country that allows them a like privilege. Why does not the Government reciprocate and take the duties off these goods? The manufacturers could send their goods to the United States and compete in that market but for the American duties. We have nothing to thank the Government for in the small reduction in agricultural implements. They reduced the duty on binding twine from 25 per cent to 12½ per cent. But they would not have done that but for the action of the Patrons of Industry in establishing a twine manufactory at Brantford and the action of the Ontario government in manu-

facturing binding twine at the central prison. The Government is always ready to listen to the complaints of the manufacturers. In fact the manufacturers have come out with the plain statement that there never was a time when they had a greater influence with the Canadian Government than they had when the tariff was being revised in 1893. Further, they have stated plainly that it was at their instigation that the rebate of duty upon raw materials was given on goods sent out of the country. It is a gross injustice to the agricultural community that agricultural implements can be manufactured in Canada and sent to Australia and Argentina and other countries and purchased there cheaper than the Canadian farmers can buy them. And not only that, but, so far as the export of these implements to Australia is concerned, the Government has given a bounty of \$125,000 to a line of steamships plying between Vancouver and the Australian colonies, enabling them to carry these goods cheaply, and the Canadian farmer has to assist through the taxation of the country, in sending these goods to Australia. And we have been told that the Government is going to engage a sheep expert at the Experimental Farm and to adopt a policy of encouraging the sheep industry. If they would cease to discourage the sheep industry it would be better than to give it a little encouragement while doing so much to keep it down. I was never so much astonished in my life as when I found by the report of the Intercolonial conference that the Minister of Finance had told the commissioners that the Canadian farmers were utterly unable—those were the very words—to furnish the meat consumed upon the Pacific slope, and that the Australian farmers could do a very large trade in bringing frozen mutton to the coast and British Columbia and could do a little in butter also. He admitted that this would displace the little butter that had gone from the province of Ontario. That has taken place. Butter is brought in from Australia to British Columbia and it is even brought into Ontario, and is competing with our butter in our own market. Think of the folly of a government telling the producers of foreign countries that they could bring in the products of which we have a surplus in this country, and then instructing the Dairy Commissioner to offer the farmers 20 cents a pound for butter to be exported to the British market. I am sorry that the Minister of Agriculture is not in his place that he might hear what I am saying. The hon. gentleman stated that the Government had made money out of the transaction. The only detailed information we have had does not indicate anything of the kind. The Dairy Commissioner told the committee on agriculture and colonization that the last sale reported realized only 63 shillings per hundred

Mr. McMILLAN.

weight. That is equal to 13½ cents a pound. Later we were told by the Secretary of State, now Minister of Agriculture that 175 packages had been sold in Manchester and brought 16 4-10 cents per pound, and 79 packages had been sold in Liverpool and brought 16 3-10 cents. Now, Mr. Speaker, let me say that the range between the highest and lowest prices that that butter brought when put upon the English market, at the same time and almost under the same conditions, shows that a judicious selection of that butter has not been made. The fact that some of it was sold in the market within a few weeks or a few days of the other sales, and that one sale was 63 shillings and the other sales were from 85 to 90, shows conclusively that the experiment could not have the effect of giving the butter a good standing upon the British market. If you are going to place any line of goods upon the British market and wish to give that line of goods a good standing there, you must select an article of a uniform quality and an article that suits the market. The difference in price brought by this butter shows conclusively that it was not an article of a uniform quality, otherwise the difference in price would not have ranged all the way from 63 shillings per hundred weight up to 90 shillings. That is conclusive evidence, I think, that they did not make a wise selection of butter to be sent to that market. Now, we were also told that the farmers of Scotland to-day are working just as hard as the Canadian farmer. I do not see, Mr. Speaker, why the farmers of Scotland or of any other country should not work just as hard as the Canadian farmers. The farmers of Scotland are upon rented farms, and we know that in Canada to-day, while farming is very much depressed, the farmers of this country on rented farms have to work even a little harder than those who work their own farms. Let me say that the English farmer to-day is not usually a protectionist. I have seen seven or eight reports made by commissioners in different counties in Great Britain, and I find that while there is a considerable feeling with respect to protection amongst the farmers, yet a very large number of them declare that protection would not benefit them, that it would only benefit them for a short time, if at all, until their lease expired, and once their lease expired, the benefit would accrue entirely to the landlord and not to the farmer. One of the commissioners state that there are three different places in one county in England where they brought up and discussed the question of protection to their industry, and he says that the question was only brought up to be set aside. One farmer stated clearly that he would consider it childish to discuss the question of protection, that it was something they would never get. Another farmer stated plainly that he believed that protection in cattle and horses would benefit

the British farmer, but protection in grains would not, and that the salvation of the grazer and the dairyman had been in the cheap grains that they had got from foreign countries during the last year or two. There is one commodity upon which I believe almost all the British farmers agree that there should be a protective duty, and that is the article of flour. While they were willing that wheat should come into the British market duty free, they are almost a unit in saying that there should be a duty upon flour, for the reason, among others, that the milling of the flour would afford employment to a large amount of labour. Now, we have been told that the Minister of Agriculture is going to enter upon a new experiment upon the model farm here, or upon some of the other farms, and that he is going into the production of horses of the proper class suitable for breeding and exportation to the British market. Mr. Speaker, if there is one thing above another that this Government should steer clear of it is the breeding of horses. We all know that within the last five years we have spent \$30,000 for the purpose of encouraging the breeding of horses of a proper class in Canada; and I am convinced to-day that among all the animals bred from horses at the experimental station at Ottawa they cannot show one animal of special merit that has been bred there, and some of them are five years old at the present time and should be showing their good qualities if they have any. This \$30,000 might just as well have been thrown into the fire as spent in the manner I have described, because I contend that even if the farmers did get these animals at a very cheap rate, they would be injured by the class of stock that would be raised. I hold that private enterprise in this country is doing everything that can be done in producing the best class of horses that can be raised in this country. We were told also that the English market for horses was increasing rapidly, that it had increased three-fold within the last three years. Now, let me say that the United States are certainly our best market for horses. In 1889, we sent 17,277 horses to the American market, and we sent 164 to the British market. In 1890, we sent 16,118 horses to the American market, and 125 horses to the British market. In 1893, we sent 10,660 horses to the United States, and 1,946 to Great Britain. In 1895, we sent 6,312 horses to the United States, and 7,123 to Great Britain. Mr. Speaker, upon these 6,312 horses that went to the United States market there was a duty of 20 per cent paid, whereas those we sent to Great Britain entered the market free. Will any hon. gentleman have the hardihood to stand up and say that if the duty was taken off horses going into the United States nearly the whole of the horses exported would not have gone to the American market? Therefore, I contend that is our best market for

good horses. I may mention that a few days before I left home one of my sons sold a working team of horses to go to the United States for \$280, and before they could cross the boundary line the purchaser had to pay 20 per cent duty.

Mr. DAVIN. Will the hon. gentleman explain how we are going to get into the American market?

Mr. McMILLAN. We can get into the American market by paying 20 per cent upon the value of every animal that goes across, and it is found that it is only our best horses that are taken across, and that bring good prices, and upon these the duty has to be paid. Is the hon. gentleman so very ignorant of the conditions of trade between the two countries as to ask such a question? I thought he was better posted with respect to the tariff between the two countries. Now, we are told that our Government are going to stimulate the production of the class of horses that will take in the British market. Let me say that the class of horses that takes in the British market cannot be produced from such animals as we find at the experimental station here, and I believe that these animals are changed from year to year, so that we saw a fair sample. I would say to the Government: leave the breeding of horses alone, we have private individuals in this country who are stimulating that industry and bringing in a class of animals that will do credit to our farmers, and will be of great benefit to the country, such as blood horses, coach horses, hackneys, shires and Clydesdales: As for Percherons, they have gone out of date in the west; I do not know how it is in the east; but we have been supplied with some of those at the experimental farm. Now, so far as sheep are concerned, let me say that sheep raisers in the province of Ontario have brought that industry to a high pitch. We are told also that this Government are going into the business of raising sheep at the experimental farm in order to drive our own out of the market. I find that at the Intercolonial Conference the Minister of Finance stated that wool and frozen mutton would be brought in from Australia. If this should be done, the Australians would be taking away our natural market on the Pacific slope. And yet the Government tell us they intend to appoint an expert on the breeding of sheep for the experimental farm. This is an act of the greatest folly. They bought, for the purpose of the experimental farm, animals at very high prices, and yet, when certain diseases sprang up among them there was no officer on the farm who was able to discover their nature. Ontario farmers can understand they will never receive any benefit from experiments with animals conducted on this farm. The Minister of Finance told the House that, except for the tariff under the National Policy, our grains

would be much cheaper than they are to-day. I have here a statement which I obtained last week from reports issued in the United States, and it shows the prices of oats, rye and wheat from 1882 to 1892. I have also obtained from the Bureau of Industry a statement of the prices in Canada for the same cereals from 1882 to 1890. The statement shows that the average price of barley from 1882 to 1892 in the United States was 34½ cents per bushel; in Ontario, from 1882 to 1890, the average price was 35 cents. The price of oats in the United States was 35 7-10; in Ontario it was 35 9-10. It must be remembered that a bushel of oats in the United States is only 32 pounds, as against 34 pounds in Canada. So the price of oats ruled higher in the United States than in this country. Rye, in the United States, averaged 38 cents; in Ontario it averaged 39 cents. Wheat was a little higher in Canada than the States; but let me say that the prices taken for Canada are those of Ontario, which do not give the basis of a fair comparison, when at the same we take prices in both the eastern and western portions of the United States. If we make a comparison of prices paid for agricultural produce all over Canada, I am convinced there will be very little difference in the rates as compared with the United States. The House was told by the hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Masson) that while the National Policy had not put up the prices of grain it had kept them relatively higher than would otherwise have prevailed, the hon. gentleman adding that before the National Policy Americans sent in grain to the Canadian market. I have here a statement of the prices in Buffalo and Montreal for a series of years, as follows:—

PRICES OF WHEAT.

	Montreal.	U.S.
1881	\$1 33	\$1 11
1882	1 30	1 18
1883	1 14	1 12
1884	1 05	1 06
1885	0 92	0 86
1886	0 85	0 87

The price in 1881 was that for the year after the National Policy went into operation. Thus it will be seen that while wheat in Canada was 22 cents higher before the National Policy went into force, it was absolutely lower than the United States after the policy had been in operation for five years. Where, then, is the benefit which our farmers are supposed to derive from the National Policy; where are the higher prices they were going to obtain for their grains? Let it be also remembered that these figures are taken from a report which has been prepared by our Government statistician, and no doubt they are correct. That our National Policy did not benefit farmers in other lines is shown by the following statement:

Mr. McMILLAN.

FARM PRODUCTS IN BUFFALO AND TORONTO, FEB. 26, 1895.

	Buffalo.	Toronto.
Cattle	\$5 30	\$2 80 highest.
do	4 00	2 00 lowest.
Hogs	4 40	4 30
Lambs	5 75	4 50
Sheep	4 50	3 50 best.
Barley (No. 1).....	0 63	0 50½
do (No. 2).....	0 61	0 47
Oats (No. 2).....	0 32½	0 32 to 34
do (No. 3).....	0 35
Rye	0 56½	0 43

In the United States a bushel of oats is only 32 pounds, and 34 pounds in Canada. I do not deny that there are times when grains may be higher in Canada than in the United States, this being especially true of Ontario. We can remember last year when we had oversold in Canada, that wheat rose to a high price. But was not the National Policy to a great extent, to blame for the shortage in Canada? If it had not been for this policy, wheat would not have been sent out of the country in such large quantities, for it is claimed by the Government that the carrying trade is stimulated as well as other branches of industry by the National Policy. The people of the West found they are able to ship wheat at lower rates on American than on Canadian bottoms, and they took advantage of the opportunity, although afterwards we had to import wheat and pay a duty of 15 cents per bushel to bring our own wheat back into Canada. I should like hon. gentlemen opposite to take a lesson from some leading political economist, and I wish they would study the question as to what market it is that regulates the price of grain. The Americans fully understand this question. They admit that the price of American wheat is regulated by that prevailing in the British market, and it cannot be supposed that the Canadian Government is able to do that which the American Government fails to accomplish. It is thus evident that it is sheer folly for hon. gentlemen opposite to endeavour to impress on the farmers of Canada that they are realizing great benefits as regards the prices of grain from the operation of the National Policy. I can remember well, before the National Policy, that the price of our wheat was much higher in Canada than it was in the United States, and it is a little higher to-day, but a very little indeed. Mr. Speaker, I have been informed by Americans, and I have seen the report on the subject, that a great deal of our grain, wheat, oats, and barley also, would go from this country to the United States as seed, because the generating power of our wheat is 15 or 20 per cent stronger than is the wheat of the United States. Any farmer who knows anything about his business, knows that, when a farmer can get grain that makes first-class seed, it will always command a very high price. Let us go back to the year 1890, when there was 20 cents per bushel duty on Canadian wheat

going into the United States, and we find that the export that year amounted to 1,200,000 bushels to Britain. We sent 770,000 bushels that year to the United States, and on that was paid a duty of 20 cents per bushel. Will any gentleman say that, if the whole of our wheat could have gone into the United States markets free of duty, they would not have taken it all? I am perfectly convinced they would. Any one who has studied that question must know full well that it is sheer nonsense to talk about the National Policy increasing the farmer's profits. There is another argument generally used by the Government and their friends, to the effect that goods are cheaper under the National Policy than they ever were in the history of the world. There is an attempt made by them to attribute the cheapness of many articles to the National Policy, but that is all nonsense. I have a statement here, taken from the "Contemporary Review," which quotes English official statistics to show that in 1874 a spindle in spinning cotton made four thousand revolutions a minute, and in 1888 the same spindle made ten thousand revolutions. In 1874, one man could attend only one spindle, while in 1888 one man and two children could attend 2,500 spindles. On the old hand-loom one man could weave only from 42 to 48 yards per day, while in 1888 a skilled workman could tend six looms and weave 1,500 yards per day. Cotton goods which could be purchased from 1865 to 1869 at 3·41 pence per yard, in 1885 could be purchased for 2¼ pence per yard, a reduction of about one-third. Worsted stuffs, which from 1865 to 1869 could be produced for 13·41 pence per yard, in 1885 to 1889 could be produced for 8·99 pence per yard. The improvements in making iron have displaced 39,000 workingmen and reduced the cost of steel from £12 1s. 1d. per ton in 1874 to £4 per ton in 1887. A ship in 1883 that would cost £120,000 sterling, could be bought in 1888 for £70,000, and yet the hon. gentlemen tell us that it is because of the National Policy that we get goods cheaper than before. There is no market in which Canadians can sell to so much advantage as in the markets of the United States. During the last year, under the Wilson Bill, we increased our sales to the United States from \$35,000,000 to \$41,000,000, while our sales to Great Britain were reduced from \$68,000,000 to \$61,000,000. That same year our purchases from the United States increased from \$53,000,000 to \$54,000,000, and our purchases from Great Britain were reduced from \$38,000,000 to \$31,000,000. This shows conclusively that, if we had anything at all like a low duty, the United States is our best market. If hon. gentlemen opposite would examine the records within their reach, they would know that the statement I got last week proves that oats, taking the same weight, for the last ten years have been higher in the United States than in Canada. This

shows that the arguments of hon. gentlemen opposite with regard to the effect of the National Policy on the farmers are very fallacious indeed.

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

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

Mr. DICKEY moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 9.45 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 21st January, 1896.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

VACANCY.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to inform the House that I have received a notification of a vacancy having occurred in the representation of the electoral district of Northumberland, N.B., by the appointment of Michael Adams, Esquire, to the Senate of the Dominion. I accordingly issued my warrant to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to make out a new writ of election for the said electoral district.

MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY--
INTERNAL ECONOMY.

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

Mr. SPEAKER read the Message, as follows:—

ABERDEEN.

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

Government House,

Ottawa, 20th January, 1896.

DEATH OF MR. BRYSON.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, it

becomes my duty to say a very few words with reference to an event more than usually sad which has taken place within the last few days: I refer to the death of our colleague and co-member of this House, Mr. Bryson, who was the representative of the electoral district of Pontiac. The suddenness with which this bereavement has taken place makes it all the more sad for us who were his fellow-members, as well as for his family. It only seems a day or two since we saw him with us in this Chamber, occupying the seat yonder on which to-day lies the loving tribute of his fellow-members to what is now but his memory. Mr. Bryson was a young man, born, I believe, in 1849, and so had measured not nearly one-half of the usual span of mature and active life which falls to men. He was born in a family which had political associations and large business interests; and out of these he speedily grew into those diligent, careful and capable business habits, which made him particularly a man of affairs, and by which he conducted his business in a most prosperous and fortunate way. These also, I suppose, gave him a taste for public life, which found its fruition, so far as the arena of Dominion politics is concerned, in 1882, when he entered this House—the same year in which I myself and many of my colleagues who sit about me first became members of this House. It has always struck me that Mr. Bryson was a man of a particularly kindly and genial disposition. He did not seem to care for those sharp and quick encounters in which the asperities of political life are found, but always assumed a milder and calmer tone. He did not, however, lack in ability, and all of us who have heard him speak here in his unpretentious conversational way, know that his ideas and expressions, and the general trend and tenor of his sentiments in relation to political matters, were those of an able and reasonable-minded man. I am sure that I only voice what the hon. members of this House on both sides will endorse when I say that we desire to convey to his family an expression of our deepest regret and our sincerest sympathy. Events like this, happening as they do so suddenly, show us that there are things of far more importance, and truths much greater and more far-reaching than those which in the hurly-burly of political and business life claim so much of our attention. They make us think how little indeed is that span of human life which commences as it were but yesterday on the shoreless sea of an irrevocable past, and ends as it were to-morrow on the equally shoreless sea of a relentless future.

Mr. LAURIER. Mr. Speaker, I also, on behalf of those who sit on this side of the House, beg to add my tribute to the memory of our departed friend. My hon. friend has said nothing too strong or too loving of him. Mr. Bryson was certainly one of the most

Mr. FOSTER.

respected members of this House. He had opponents, but he had no enemies. Indeed, I may say that in every opponent he had a friend. It adds certainly to the poignancy of death that a man whom we knew in such young, healthy and vigorous life should have been so near the fatal day. It is almost impossible to believe that one with a step so alert and with so much buoyancy of life should have been already under the shadow of death. Mr. Bryson was above all things a manly man, courageous, courteous, and conscientious. As my hon. friend has said, he seldom took part in the debates of this House, but whenever he gave expression to his views upon any question that arose, he always did it in a straightforward, manly, kind and gentle manner. His death is a great loss to his party; it is also a loss to those associated with him in other ways; and his political opponents feel the loss as keenly as the members of the party with which he was connected.

ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HIS EXCELLENCY'S SPEECH.

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

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Mr. Speaker, one would suppose, from the appearance the other side of the House presented during the past week, that our constitution had been radically changed, and that Ministers of the Crown were no longer members of Parliament. We have had a discussion upon the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne, and I think that during the two or three hours that that Address was being discussed yesterday evening, no Minister, except the Minister of Justice, was in his place on that side of the House. I do not know whether hon. gentlemen think that the observations addressed to the House and to the country from this side are not worthy of serious consideration. I do not know whether that is the reason for the course which they have recently adopted or not; or whether, in consequence of their retirement from the Government a few days ago, they also acquired the habit of leaving their seats in this House vacant, and that that habit has so far grown upon them that up to this moment they have been unable to overcome it. Sir, the hon. gentleman who moved the Address on behalf of the Administration gave to the House a speech of very considerable consequence, and which derives additional importance from the fact that the constitutional utterances to be found in that speech received the sanction and approval of the hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Dickey). Sir, the hon. gentleman who moved the Address informed us that we had, under our present constitution, no longer any provincial

autonomy : that, while it is true the provinces were endowed with the rights of self-government prior to the union, since the union those rights of self-government were merged into the authority of this Parliament, that because we had a constitution similar in principle to that of the United Kingdom, there were no powers held by the provinces which were not held by them upon sufferance : and that because of this the House had an undoubted right to deal with one important question which was mentioned in the Speech from the Throne, and which was referred to in the answer. Sir, I do not know how far the Minister of Justice (Mr. Dickey) is prepared to subscribe to those doctrines, but I do know that the hon. Minister, in the speech which he addressed to this House, commended the observations of the hon. mover of the Address, which observations consisted largely in the peculiar constitutional views I have mentioned. Sir, I do not understand our constitutional system to be as propounded by the hon. gentleman. We are, under the provisions of the British North America Act, federally united ; but if the hon. gentleman's views be correct, we have not a federal act but an incorporate union, and all provincial autonomy ceased the moment that union was accomplished. If I rightly understand our constitution, it is against the views put forward by the mover of the Address. It is a federal union that is established, and the provisions of the constitution relate mainly to the creation of a government and a Parliament which had no existence under the previous order of things. The declaration in the British North America Act is :

Whereas the provinces of Canada, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, have expressed their desire to be federally united into one Dominion, under the Crown of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, with a constitution similar in principle to that of the United Kingdom.

That is their express desire. It was for a federal union. The provinces were to be united, but they were to be federally united. Their individual existence was not interfered with or destroyed by the creation of the union. And it is said, too, that it is to be a union similar in principle to that of the United Kingdom. Now, it is not the old government of the provinces that is declared by this Act or that provision to be similar in principle with that of the United Kingdom. It is this new government ; it is this federal constitution, the creation, this government, which had no existence before. So far as the provinces are concerned, they already had governments ; they already had a parliamentary existence ; they already had constitutions in principle similar to that of the United Kingdom. And therefore it was not necessary to make any provision for them. In so far as any provisions exist for the provinces, those provisions relate to certain things required in consequence of the character of

the union. There were three provinces before the union ; there were to be four after the union. And because of the dissolution of the union between Ontario and Quebec, which previously existed, certain provisions were necessary in their provincial constitutions which were not necessary in the case of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. Now, if we look at the words of this statute, we see it states that the constitution of the executive authority in each of the provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, so subjected to the provisions of this Act, continue as they existed at the union. The legislature that existed in New Brunswick was continued after the union. The legislature that was actually in existence in the province of New Brunswick, its time not having expired, was authorized to continue to sit as the legislature of that province after the union. And so far as the provinces are concerned, there was no attempt or intention, by the provisions of this Act, to alter their constitutions or give them a different system of government from that which existed before. It is true that they were shorn of a portion of the powers they previously possessed. If that had not been the case, the federal creation could not have been called into existence. But when you look at the preamble, you will see that it is absolutely silent about the constitutions of the provinces, and relates solely to the constitution of the new government which was to exercise a jurisdiction over all the provinces as a unit. Now, it is also stated in this Act :

And whereas, on the establishment of the union by authority of Parliament, it is expedient, not only that the constitution of the legislative authority in the Dominion should be provided for, but also that the nature of the executive government therein be declared.

There are two things here stated as important to do which this Act sets out to accomplish. The one is that a legislature shall be provided for. You state how it shall be constituted and you state also what functions shall be entrusted to it ; but when you come to the Executive Government, there is nothing of the sort. The Executive Government is admitted to exist. It is assumed that it already possesses the powers which the Executive Government of Canada is to exercise. It is not called into existence by this Act, but it is declared by the Act that the Queen is the executive head, in whom is vested the executive authority of the Empire. Her Majesty exercises that authority in the United Kingdom upon the advice of her Ministers there. She exercises that authority in the various portions of the Empire, where no governments are called into existence, where no parliamentary institutions exist upon their advice, under the regulative authority of some statute or under the common law of the United Kingdom. But when you come to a province or a dependency in which parliamentary institu-

tions exist. Her Majesty is still executive head. She is never divested of that authority, but the persons who accompany her and upon whose advice she acts, lay down their authority. It comes to an end when certain boundaries are reached, and a new class of advisers under the law or the local constitution are given to Her Majesty. Her Majesty's Imperial advisers assist her in exercising the executive authority and the prerogatives of the Crown within the United Kingdom. But when Her Majesty comes to any one of the provinces having parliamentary government, her advisers are not those who advise her at Westminster, but those within the province. And so when a new government was called into existence under the authority of this statute, Her Majesty was not given power that she did not previously possess, for executive authority was already vested in her; but when a new government was called into existence, it became necessary to declare the executive authority, and so we find that under the provisions of this statute it is declared that:

The Executive Government and authority of and over Canada is hereby declared—

What?

—to continue and be vested in the Queen.

It was in Her Majesty before and it continues in Her Majesty still, but is exercised upon the responsibility of a new body of advisers. And so with regard to the provinces, the parliamentary government which they possessed was not altered in its character. The responsibility of Ministers to the Crown in the various provinces remains since the union as it existed before. The relation between the Crown and these Ministers after the union was precisely what it was before, and Her Majesty was the executive head of every province after the union as she was before. Look at the provisions of the statute. In whose name is the local legislature called? In the name of Her Majesty. Why in the name of Her Majesty? Because the two houses of the local legislature, or the one house, as the case may be, are the advisers of the Crown. If they were called to advise an executive officer created by statute as the head of the government, the legislature would be called in his name. And so with regard to appointments. If you look at the provisions respecting the legislature of Quebec, where the legislative council is continued, the members of that council are appointed in the name of the sovereign. Why in the name of the sovereign? Because they are the council of the sovereign, and not of an executive officer of the local government. And so they possess all the dignity and independence and authority within their own particular sphere, that belong even to members of the Parliament of the United Kingdom. There are cases

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell.)

which show the character of the provincial establishment. Let me refer you to a few of these—the Queen vs. Burah. Their lordships in that case say that the Indian legislature, which is certainly inferior to the representative assemblies of these provinces,

Has powers expressly limited by the Act of the Imperial Parliament, which created it, and it can, of course, do nothing beyond the limits which circumscribe these powers. But, when acting within those limits, it is not in any sense an agent or delegate of the Imperial Parliament, but has, or was intended to have, plenary powers of legislation as large and of the same nature as those possessed by the Imperial Parliament.

And so in the case of Hodge vs. The Queen, which arose in the province of Ontario since the union, their lordships say that:

It appears to their lordships that the objection raised by the appellants is founded upon an entire misconception of the true character and position of the provincial legislatures. They are in no sense delegates or acting under any mandate from the Imperial Parliament.

And further on in the same judgment, their lordships say that:

The British North America Act conferred powers, not in any sense to be exercised by delegation from or as agents of the Imperial Parliament, but authority as plenary, as ample, within the limits prescribed by section 92, as the Imperial Parliament, in the plenitude of its powers, possessed and could bestow.

That, Sir, I think, shows that the powers of any one of our legislatures under our federal constitution, acting within the limits of its authority, does not differ from the powers of any dependency of the Empire where parliamentary institutions are introduced. The character of the authority possessed by any one of the provinces of the Dominion has not been altered by the fact that they have been federally united. As they were at the union, or prior to the union, so they continue to be, their authority differing from what it was only in the extent of the power with which they are entrusted, but not at all in the character of the government or the legislature that exists under the constitution. It was often a subject of discussion prior to the American revolution, and, indeed, long after, whence the provinces of the Empire derived their authority. This question was incidentally dealt with from what may be regarded as the colonial point of view in the case of Keilly vs. Carson. But in a later case, Philips vs. Eyre, the Court of Exchequer Chamber fully recognized the plenary right and authority of the legislatures of the dependencies, both with regard to the nature of the authority, and with regard to its origin. Now, that judgment, which was delivered by Mr. Justice Wills on behalf of the entire court, after very full argument, sets out this proposition—that the Crown has, as a matter of common law right, the prerogative to issue writs and to

call into existence in new colonies legislative assemblies. That the Crown had this power to create new constituencies and to issue writs for the election of members by those constituencies prior to the union of England with Scotland, is an undoubted fact. This power which the Crown possessed then in England, was a power which it continued to possess in the colonies. It issues writs, calls into existence legislative assemblies, and these assemblies derive their authority from the common laws, not as a matter of grace bestowed upon them by the Crown, but as a matter of right inherent in British subjects, who carry with them the common law wherever they may go. Let me read an extract from that judgment :

There is even greater reason for holding sacred the prerogative of the Crown to constitute a local legislature in the case of a settled colony, where the inhabitants are entitled to be governed by the English law, than in that of a conquered colony, where it is only by grace of the Crown that the privilege of self-government is allowed, though, where once allowed, it cannot be recalled. In colonies distant from the mother country to which writs to return members to the Imperial Parliament do not run, it is essential, both for the due government of the country in dealing with matters best understood upon the spot, and with emergencies which do not admit of delay, and also for giving subjects there resident the benefit of a voice by their representatives in the councils by which they are taxed and governed, that the Crown should have the power of creating a local parliament.

Showing that so far as local parliaments in all the dependencies settled by British subjects, are concerned, they owe their existence to the same law, and to the same authority, and by the exercise of the same prerogatives of the Crown, that called into existence the Parliament of the United Kingdom. Now, Sir, that rule applies to every colony that has representative institutions in the Empire. That rule applies to the provinces of this Dominion, and I shall be indeed surprised if the Minister of Justice undertakes to uphold and to defend the novel doctrines put forward by the hon. gentleman who moved this Address, and for a purpose that it seems to me that they do not effectually serve. Then the hon. gentleman made another observation with regard to the difference between our system and the American system. The hon. gentleman speaks as though those who undertook to uphold provincial rights are simply followers and disciples of those American statesmen who adopted the doctrine of what was called state rights. Now, Mr. Speaker, as this is a matter of some little importance, let me say that there is no similarity or analogy between them. The men who held to the doctrine of state rights were men who held that the federal government of the United States was simply a congress of ambassadors representing independent and sovereign states, entrusted by

the voluntary act of those states with certain powers; that any one of the states might withdraw from the others, by withdrawing those representatives from that united assembly. Why, Sir, there is no person in this country who maintains such a doctrine. We on this side of the House have always been federalists. We maintain that the province has rights, undoubted rights, which Parliament ought not to invade; but we also maintain that Parliament has rights which are as independent of the provinces as those of the provinces are independent of us. Now, let me say another thing. The hon. gentleman has in his statement referred to what he calls the historical fact, that the men who advocated state rights are forgotten, and that the men who advocated the national character of the union on the other side of the boundary, are the only men whose names stand out prominently to-day; and the hon. gentleman mentioned amongst those, Mr. Jefferson and Mr. Madison. Now, Sir, these are the two gentlemen who founded the school of state rights. Mr. Jefferson declared that the constitution of the United States was simply an international department, or a foreign department for the administration of international affairs, that that was the strict interpretation of the constitution as to the power that was conferred upon Congress. Mr. Madison himself was the author of those celebrated state rights resolutions that were passed in the Virginia convention. Now, let me say a word or two here, and I think this is not inappropriate in this discussion, especially as the hon. gentleman who moved the Address referred to the matter. I think there is a mistaken notion abroad with regard to the constitution of our neighbours. It is assumed that the states were sovereign, and that the power of congress, the power vested in the central or federal government, is a power that arose from the surrender on the part of the states of a portion of the sovereign power vested in them. I say there is no warrant for such a doctrine. Look at the origin of the American federation. The various provinces that formed afterwards the states of the union, had a dispute with Great Britain, first, with regard to their exclusive right to domestic legislation, and second, with regard to their exclusive right to domestic taxes. They denied the power of the Imperial Parliament to tax. They maintained that the Imperial Parliament was in its nature a federal government so far as they were concerned, and ought not to interfere with their local and internal affairs. That dispute led to war. The colonies formed a voluntary organization unknown to the law, representing the people in the various states of the union. These men declared war against Great Britain. They carried on that war, they exercised the power of a sovereign state, they issued letters of marque, they established prize courts, they entered into

treaties with foreign states, and they were ultimately recognized as an independent and sovereign government by the King and Parliament of Great Britain. Well, Sir, whence did they get their power? From the states? Not at all. By the success of their arms, and by the treaty made with the government of the United Kingdom, they had transferred to them the powers which belonged previously to the King and Parliament of Great Britain, and were never claimed by any one of the provinces which became states of the union. The war was a war declared by them on behalf of the colonists at that time, and they declared that the sovereign authority which was before vested in the King and Parliament of Great Britain passed to the people, not of each of the states separately, but of the people of the United States. And so the constitution did no more than this, it drew the boundary line between those powers which had been previously exercised by the states of the union when they were British colonies, and that power which was admittedly vested in the King and Parliament of the United Kingdom. That was what the constitution did. And by whom was that constitution framed? There was a government existing before, created by the articles of federation. There was a union formed years before the articles of federation were called into existence, created by the force of arms, and the constitution begins by declaring that We, the people of the United States, in order to establish a more perfect union, do so and so. And when we look at the 10th article of the constitution we find these words:

The powers not delegated to the United States by the constitution, nor prohibited by it to the states, are reserved to the states respectively or to the people.

That is, there was a residue of power neither vested in the state nor vested in congress, but remained in the people at large, and which no government was authorized to exercise on behalf of the nation. Look at these words: "The powers not delegated to the United States by the constitution." Who framed the constitution? We, the people of the United States. The whole nation framed the constitution, and they say that the powers which are not prohibited to the states, or not conferred upon Congress, remain either to the state or the people, remain to the states where they are local in their character and were exercised previously by the colonies; remain to the people at large if they were powers previously vested in the King and Parliament of the United Kingdom. Here are powers delegated—by whom? By the people of the United States. And so no more preposterous contention was ever put forward than to say that the different states conferred on Congress the powers it possesses. Sir, I pass away from the ob-

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).

servations addressed to the House by the mover of the Address, and I come to allude to the speech of the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny). The hon. gentleman made a somewhat violent personal attack upon the leader of the Opposition and upon the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). It seems to me that was a very ill-judged and ill-timed attack, that it was unpatriotic, ungenerous, and the charges which it formulated were altogether unfounded. Sir, I say it was an unpatriotic attack. Let us look for a moment at the position of Great Britain in her relations to the United States at this moment. We, Sir, are a portion of the British Empire, we maintain, and it is vital to us that we should maintain, that Great Britain is an American power. We are upon this continent to stay. We intend to exercise, under the aegis of the Imperial authority, the rights of self-government. We are growing not in the direction of maturing and of falling off from the United Kingdom, but growing in the direction of equality, and we propose to enter into permanent partnership in some form or other, determined by growth rather than by the fanciful opinions of statesmen or politicians, as to what the character of that partnership shall be. We are every day becoming in a larger and larger degree a sovereign power. We are exercising upon this continent international relations so far as they concern ourselves. We did so in the abortive treaty relating to our Atlantic fisheries; we did so in the treaty relating to the Behring Sea; and I have no doubt whatever, in a larger degree, and, perhaps, under well settled regulations in time as regards those matters which specially concern ourselves, the Imperial Government will be disposed to trust us as we are disposed to trust Great Britain, and she will permit us to judge with a larger measure of responsibility as to what our interests are in this regard. When you look at the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, you see that the United States have recognized Great Britain as an American power. They have recognized the British Empire as having on this continent an equal voice with themselves in the settlement of the erection and use of those great commercial highways in which the Empire, as well as the neighbouring republic is interested. And then when you look at South America you find that England is a South American power, but the United States is not; and it would be an extraordinary thing, indeed, if our neighbours were to assume to exercise supreme jurisdiction over this continent in disregard of those provisions of international law which regulate our relations. I say, then, that while we are devoted to the Empire, and I trust we fully appreciate our own interests in the matter, and our rights as an American power, and do so with courtesy towards our neighbours, it was an

exceedingly inopportune time for the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny) to attack the hon. leader of the Opposition and the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) under the pretense that those hon. gentlemen were not just as loyal as he, or any hon. gentleman on the other side of the House. It is important to us that we should present to the world our unity in this regard. We are one people so far as the maintenance of relations with the United Kingdom are concerned, and, that being so, it was in the last degree improper, it was ungenerous for the hon. gentleman to undertake to make the charges which he did. Sir, the hon. gentleman must remember this, that when he made those attacks he was injuring the country, he was not simply injuring the Liberal party. The Liberal party is too well established in this country, its interests in the country are too well known, its devotion to the public interests in the country are too well understood for the people to place any value upon such attacks as those made by the hon. member for Halifax; but we must consider the impression made abroad, made upon our neighbours, the fact that they expect to gain something by assuming that by using an arrogant tone, they will drive a certain portion of our population into the union sooner than take any risk. That is a danger which presents itself, and that is a danger which the hon. gentleman, by his speech, has undertaken to aggravate. The hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) also spoke upon this subject, and declared that the policy which the Liberal party adopted some time ago, and which so far as I know, the Liberal party has never abandoned—we believe in more intimate relations with our neighbours, and we still believe that a liberal measure of reciprocity would be a good thing and would not promote political union with our neighbours across the border. The hon. gentleman quoted from an address published by the late leader of the Opposition, to show that the policy of a large measure of reciprocity would necessarily lead to annexation, and the hon. gentleman thought that the opinion of the late leader of the Opposition upon a question of that sort ought to be taken as conclusive. If the opinion of the late leader of the Opposition is good against his friends, it is equally good against his opponents, and the hon. member for North Bruce seems to have altogether forgotten what Mr. Blake said in regard to the policy which the hon. gentleman himself, up to a very recent period, so zealously supported. Mr. Blake said :

The Canadian Conservative policy has failed to accomplish the predictions of its promoters.

That statement, I suppose, the hon. gentleman will not question. He continued :

Its real tendency has been, as foretold twelve years ago, towards disintegration and annexation, instead of consolidation and that maintenance of British connections—

12½

The hon. gentleman will surely accept that assertion.

—of which they claimed to be the special guardians.

Further on, Mr. Blake said :

It has left us with a small population, a scanty immigration, and a North-west empty still.

All three statements are true to-day, as they were when Mr. Blake penned them, and the hon. member, I am sure, will not question their accuracy. Mr. Blake continued :

With enormous additions to our public debt and yearly charge, an extravagant system of expenditure, and an unjust and oppressive tariff; with restricted markets for our needs, whether to buy or to sell, and all the hosts of evils (greatly intensified by our special conditions) thence arising; with trade diverted from its natural into forced and therefore less profitable channels; and with unfriendly relations and frowning tariff walls ever more and more estranging us from the mighty English-speaking nation to the south, our neighbours and relations, with whom it ought to be, and it was promised that we should be, living in generous amity and liberal intercourse.

Worse; far worse! it has left us with lowered standards of public virtue, and a death-like apathy in public opinion; with racial, religious and provincial animosities rather inflamed than soothed; with a subservient parliament, an autocratic executive, debauched constituencies, and corrupted and corrupting classes; with lessened self-reliance and increased dependence on the public chest and on legislative aids; and possessed, withal, by a boastful jingo spirit, far enough removed from true manliness, loudly proclaiming unreal conditions and exaggerated sentiments, while actual facts and genuine opinions are suppressed.

It has left us with our hands tied; our future compromised; and in such a plight that, whether we stand or move, we must run some risks which else we might have either declined, or encountered with greater promise of success.

That is the testimony which Mr. Blake gives in respect to the policy of my hon. friend (Mr. McNeill). I hope that the hon. gentleman (Mr. McNeill) will not discredit his own witness. I hope, as he has appealed to Caesar that he will by the judgment of Caesar abide.

Mr. McNEILL. Will the hon. gentleman forgive me for a moment. I do not think that the evidence of Mr. Blake against his life-long political opponents, carries so much weight as it does against his political friends.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The testimony is with regard to principles and not with regard to men. It is a testimony with regard to the tendency and effect of those principles, and it is just as valuable and just as weighty in the one case as in the other. Now, Sir, the hon. Finance Minister undertook to show that the course taken by his Government in respect to the by-elections was justified because of the elections of Mr. Jores and Mr. Vail many years ago when

the Mackenzie Government was in power. Why, in order that the hon. gentleman's testimony or illustration might have any value, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) ought to have looked at the writs. The hon. gentleman ought to have seen whether they were not issued upon the same day. The hon. gentleman forgets that he names the returning officer now, and, of course, there can be no election until a returning officer is appointed. When Mr. Jones and Mr. Vail were elected, there were returning officers appointed by the law. The writs were sent on the same day to the sheriffs, and under that law as in England, the sheriffs had power to name the day on which the elections should be held, and the day on which the nominations should be made. And, if they were not held on the same day it was because there was no concerted action between the returning officers. That is not the position the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) is now in. My hon. friend beside me (Mr. Laurier), I think, gave Mr. Speaker notice of four vacancies at the same time, and I understand that Mr. Speaker issued his warrants for those four vacancies at the same time. But the Government had it in their power to give effect to these warrants. Before the writs were issued they had to name returning officers to whom these writs could be addressed, and if there was not simultaneousness in the elections, or if the elections did not take place at the same time or about the same time, it was because the hon. gentlemen opposite interfered. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) say that Mr. Mackenzie's Government interfered in the matter of the Vail and Jones elections? Not at all. They stood upon a different footing; the law was different. Then, the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery issued his writ and the law operated independent of the Government; but in this case the Government interfered. They exercised authority over the returning officer. He is an officer of their naming and the hon. gentlemen took care to arrange the elections, as they thought, in the interests of their party. Now, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) made some observations which I do not understand, and perhaps he will explain them when he comes to address the House again. He said of the hon. gentleman the leader of the Opposition:

You saw him flagellate and lacerate the weakness, and the delay, and the vacillation of the Government.

I tell the hon. gentleman frankly that I do not understand what he means by "flagellating and lacerating the weakness, and the delay, and the vacillation of the Government." I could understand what would be meant, if the flagellation and laceration were of the Government, but how my hon. friend (Mr. Laurier) could "flagellate and lacerate the weakness, delay and vacillation of the Government" I confess I do not understand and the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) will,

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).

no doubt, in time tell us. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) said further:

If there is anything that will make a family connection with the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), it is the use of strong expletives which have much of sound but little of significance, because they are based upon the spirit of invective.

Neither do I quite understand the meaning of this expression. I would have supposed, Sir, that if an expletive were a strong expression it would have something more than sound; it would have some real significance, and I do not know precisely what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) means by "making a family connection with the hon. member for South Oxford" (Sir Richard Cartwright). Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) pretend to say that we are going to enter into some martial relations with the hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) because of his strong language, or what does he mean? I confess I do not know. Then the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) attacked Mr. German. Now, I am not here to defend Mr. German. If Mr. German was guilty of bribery or corruption, or if his agents were guilty with his knowledge, he was justly punished. But the complaint made by Mr. German was: That the witness who gave testimony against him was a perjured witness, and Mr. German entered an action against that person for perjury. If I remember rightly, that man did not remain in the constituency to stand his trial, and Mr. German has since by a very large majority in that constituency, been returned to the local legislature, a fact which I hardly think would have taken place if the constituency believed the witness and did not believe Mr. German. Now, Mr. Speaker, I was rather bewildered. I must say, by the observations addressed to the House by the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon). That hon. gentleman made a somewhat violent attack upon the hon. member for Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) in reference to the use he made of the information contained in the Trade and Navigation Returns in respect to our exports and imports. He thought my hon. friend from South Oxford had acted most dishonestly in undertaking to institute a comparison between the periods existing before 1879 and those which followed. Sir, I am totally unable to follow the hon. gentleman in that respect. I think it is very important to institute comparisons between the imports and exports during different periods under different tariffs in order to form some opinion as to what influence the changes in the tariff have had on the exports and imports. The hon. member for Albert vigorously dissented; but what his objections were to the comparison I was totally unable to ascertain. The hon. member's speech reminded me a little of an observation I once heard Mr. Beck address to a gentleman in

the Senate of the United States who corrected him for a false quantity. Mr. Beck said that he had not had the advantages of early culture that were enjoyed by the hon. Senator who had corrected him; but he had never listened to the hon. Senator without being reminded of an observation once made by Mr. Randolph of Virginia on a former occasion in reference to certain lands in Virginia, which he said were poor by nature and had been still further impoverished by cultivation. I give the hon. member for Albert credit for ability; but in the speech which he addressed to the House on this question, his criticisms of the figures given by the hon. member for South Oxford, it does seem to me, were wanting in logical force and accuracy. Now, Sir, let me say a word or two with regard to a paragraph in the Speech which so far no member of the Government has explained. It says:

The growth of population in the North-west Territories, as disclosed by the last enumeration, calls for additional representation in Parliament. A Bill for this purpose will be laid before you.

Now, Sir, I find that in the last distribution, that of 1892, based on the census of 1891, the number of people represented by each member is, on the average, 23,000. There are four representatives of the North-west Territories. The last census, I apprehend, is that of 1894. I do not know whether the Government are prepared to contend that they have a right to use that in the distribution of seats or not; but that census shows a population there of 73,506. According to the ordinary average, four representatives would be an adequate representation for something over 90,000 people; so that in the North-west Territories, according to that census of 1894, the population is short of the representation by 16,500. I am totally unable to understand how, with that fact before them, the Administration can seriously argue that the North-west Territories are entitled to additional representation. In British Columbia, in Manitoba and in the North-west Territories, a representation was given in excess of what the population would warrant, and in the case of British Columbia and Manitoba, and later in the case of the North-west Territories, the extra representation was confirmed by Imperial authority. There was also a provision that that representation should not be increased in the first two cases without an increase of population warranting it; and, as the Government state in this Address that the population does warrant it, we will require some further information on that subject. Now, Sir, I wish to call attention—for this seems an appropriate time to do so—to the commutation of the sentence of Shortis. Under the present instructions, which were determined after a good deal of controversy with the Colonial Office, it became the settled

policy of this country, that, where Imperial interests were not concerned, in the commutation of a sentence or the pardon of an offender, the Governor should act upon the advice of his Administration. The rule prior to the adoption of that contained in the instructions first issued to Lord Lorne, was somewhat different, and I have taken the trouble to look at some of the cases in which this subject was discussed in the House of Lords. There was a case in which Sir Hercules Robinson had exercised the power of pardon. One Gardiner had been guilty of robbery—had, in fact, been a cattle lifter and had caused great annoyance to the population of a large district for a long time; and he was sentenced to the penitentiary for thirty-two years. Sir Hercules Robinson commuted his sentence on condition that he would banish himself from the colony, and that commutation was made the subject of discussion in the House of Lords. The conduct of Sir Hercules Robinson in that case was justified, nearly all those who spoke in the debate maintaining that it was a matter upon which the Governor should be entrusted personally with the exercise of the royal prerogative; that for certain purposes, in fact in all cases, he ought to take the advice of his ministers, but that in such cases, if he dissented from their views, he could act on his own responsibility. There was a double responsibility, said the Colonial Secretary—a responsibility to the Crown and Imperial Government, on the part of the Governor, and a responsibility on the part of the ministers to the country in which the trial took place. In the papers moved for, on the 4th of October, 1869, Lord Granville, who was Colonial Secretary, addressed a letter to the Governor of New South Wales, in which he said:

But, unless an Imperial interest or policy is involved, as might be the case in a matter of treason or slave trading, or in matters in which foreigners might be concerned, the Governor would be bound to allow great weight to the recommendation of his ministry.

And in 1871, the Earl of Kimberley, then Colonial Secretary, said:

The governor, as invested with the Queen's prerogative, is bound to examine personally each case in which he is called upon to exercise the power entrusted to him, although in a colony under responsible government he will, of course, have a due regard to the advice of his ministers, who are responsible to the colony for the proper administration of justice and the prevention of crime, and will not grant any pardon without receiving their advice.

Although he was not at that time, in every case, bound to follow the advice, he was, in every case, bound to take the advice. Lord Carnarvon, in a despatch addressed to Sir Hercules Robinson, said:

You will, I apprehend, have no difficulty in conforming to the clear rule laid down in your instructions, which are based on this principle,

namely, that, on the one hand, the Governor to whom the Queen personally delegates a very high prerogative, cannot in any way be released from the duty of judging for himself in every case in which that prerogative is proposed to be expressed, while, on the other hand, he is bound, before deciding, to pay the most careful attention to the advice of his ministers, or that one of them who, in the matter under consideration, may be selected to represent his colleagues.

He further says :

On the one hand, the Governor will not be relieved of his responsibility to the Crown, and, on the other hand, the local government will not be relieved of its responsibility to its own Parliament.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have seen in some of the Government organs reference made to the case of Lepine, as justifying the course which the Government have taken in this matter. That was a wholly different case. The circumstances were different, the rules and regulations, the responsibilities of the Ministers at that time were different from what they are to-day. The crime with which Lepine was charged, although tried in Canada, was a crime which was not committed in Canada. The crime of murder, with which he was charged, was committed in the territories outside of Canada, which, subsequent to the murder, became included in Canada. That being the case, the question was properly a question for Imperial consideration. It was a question with which the Imperial authorities had to do rather than the Canadian Government. The views of the Canadian Government were expressed and were well known. They were stated by Lord Carnarvon, in the discussion of this subject in the House of Lords. But the Governor General, as an Imperial officer, charged with the duty of exercising the royal prerogative, under those rules and regulations which I have read to the House, in respect to an offence which was committed under Imperial authority, and not under Canadian, did, as an Imperial officer, exercise the prerogative of mercy. Shortly after this whole subject was made the subject of discussion, and a new rule was agreed upon, so far as Canada was concerned. It was admitted that, with the exception of those cases I have named, the exercise of the power of pardon or commutation, the exercise of the prerogative of mercy, was to be upon the advice of the Ministers of the Crown in this country. Now, I am not saying that the pardon or the commutation of Shortis's sentence was an improper act. I am expressing no opinion whatever upon that subject ; but I am pointing out to the House, that so far as the Government of this country is concerned, it had imposed upon it the duty of saying whether the law should be carried into execution or whether the prerogative of mercy should be exercised. That was its constitutional duty. But it was reported—and these hon. gentlemen can say what foundation there is for

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).

that report—that the First Minister went to His Excellency and informed him not what the advice of the Government was upon the subject, but that the Government could not give any advice, because the Ministers were divided in opinion and could not agree. That was a statement he had no right whatever to make. Hon. members will recollect that that subject is discussed by Mr. Gladstone in his article on "Our Kin Beyond the Sea." Baron Stockmar maintains that the sovereign ought to be present in Council to hear the deliberations of Council, to take part in those deliberations, and to assist in coming to a conclusion, and Mr. Gladstone points out that the sovereign ought not to be present, ought not to know what the views of the Ministers were when the subject was under deliberation, that the duty of the Ministers was to advise the sovereign, and that they cannot give a discordant or divided advice. Their advice must be one, they must agree in opinion, they must state what their conclusion is ; and unless they do come to some conclusion, and do state what their opinion is, they have no advice to give. It is not their business, it is a total abnegation of their functions to go to the sovereign and say : We are divided in our opinion and cannot advise you. I say you are bound to advise the sovereign or retire from your places. You are confessing your incompetency, you are admitting that you are unable to discharge the ordinary administrative duties devolving upon you. That is what you do when you say you cannot agree upon an opinion. I am speaking now of what is reported, and I am speaking of this fact, that the hon. gentlemen, because of their differences, imposed upon the Governor duties that were outside of his instructions, and for which special instructions were given him by telegram. I am not denying that the Imperial Government could alter those instructions ; but I call the hon. gentleman's attention to this, that we are in a large degree governed by conventions, that one of the conventions of our constitution is that the exercise of the power of pardon in this country shall be upon the advice of the Ministers in this country, except where Imperial interests are concerned ; and the Government, by the course it has taken, has confessed itself unable to discharge that duty and incapable of giving that advice. That is the position these hon. gentlemen have taken. I suppose the Minister of Justice had that question before him. I suppose he discussed that question and reported to the Council upon it ; and if his advice were not acted upon, I do not understand, looking at his responsibility as a Minister of the Crown, he continued in the office after his report was disregarded. My hon. friend says that he went out, but whether on this subject or not, I do not know. My impression is that the hon. Minister of Justice remained after the discordant voices were heard in the Cabinet upon this subject.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I certainly did not go out on the Shortis question.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman made some report and that report was not acted upon. Effect was not given to it. I repeat again that it seems to me a matter of surprise that the hon. gentleman should have been overruled on a question specially concerning his own department and his own duties by his own colleagues. It is admitted that he was so overruled in a matter where a life was in issue, and where the administration of justice might be, by the conclusion reached, seriously affected. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have said all I intend to say with regard to this Speech from the Throne. It is not very extensive, but it is very intensive; and I have no doubt that it gives hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches as much anxiety as any Address that was ever submitted by the Government to Parliament. I hope the hon. gentlemen will explain this proposition for increased representation, and I hope they will explain how it was that they abdicated their functions and shirked their responsibilities in the Shortis case, and imposed an ungracious duty upon the representative of the sovereign in this country.

Mr. DALY. Mr. Speaker, in the opening of his remarks the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) called the attention of the House to the fact that there were not many Ministers present last night during the debate, and rather took exception to that fact. I may say that it was owing, unfortunately, to indisposition on the part of some of the Ministers that they were not present. And I wish to say to the hon. gentleman and to the House that it is not through any discourtesy to him that the benches on this side are so empty to-day. It is due to the fact that a number of the colleagues of the late lamented member whose death has been so gracefully referred to, have gone to attend the last sad rites over his body. I do not intend to follow the hon. member from Bothwell in the long dissertation he gave us upon the constitutional question of provincial autonomy raised by the mover of the Address in the speech he gave us a few days ago. I congratulate the mover of the Address upon the speech he made, and the manner in which he made it, and I think he is still further to be congratulated upon the fact that he has raised a point that has given the hon. member for Bothwell a good deal of thought and has occasioned that hon. gentleman taking up the time of the House in trying to refute the position taken by the mover of the Address upon the subject of provincial autonomy. I do not intend to follow the hon. gentleman who has just sat down, in the discussion of that subject, for the hon. gentleman is a Radical by nature, and has exceedingly radical ideas upon the

constitutional law of this country. I have noticed that, in listening to his address, a number of constitutional authorities in this House have been overcome, and no doubt they will await the reading of his speech, as I shall before undertaking to deal with the points he has raised. But, in reference to the last matter the hon. gentleman spoke of, I think that when he admitted that he was dealing with the question upon public report only, it would have been in better taste if he had left the matter until the papers were upon the Table, when, with all the facts before him, he could have dealt with it in a more becoming way. I wish to touch upon what the hon. gentleman said concerning what he called the violent attack made by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny) upon the hon. member for South Oxford, and the leader of the Opposition. I would ask the hon. gentleman, who was present on that occasion, whether the hon. member for Halifax manifested any violence that would call for the scathing criticisms administered by the hon. member for Bothwell. We all remember that the remarks of the hon. member for Halifax were called forth by statements made by the hon. member for South Oxford. The hon. member for Halifax and the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) were naturally incensed, as no doubt were the members for Nova Scotia and the people of Nova Scotia at large, at the charge made by the hon. member for South Oxford that that province was the dry-nurse and the wet-nurse of the worst type of boodlers we had ever known in Canada. And the whole difficulty that arose between the hon. member for Halifax and the leader of the Opposition was as to the words that were used by the leader of the Opposition in the speech he made at Boston some years ago. The hon. member for Halifax had not the report of the speech at hand, but he quoted from memory what he understood was what the hon. gentleman had said. I notice that the hon. gentleman for Bothwell is far apart in his ideas as to our future connection with Great Britain from the leader of the Opposition, or, at least, as the leader of the Opposition expressed himself at Boston. If I remember rightly, the member for Bothwell said a few moments ago that Canada and the Empire were growing together, and that there was a permanent attachment between them. But we find that his leader, a few short years ago, as reported, not in the Boston papers, but in the Toronto "Globe," said:

Britain and Canada were, however, drifting further and further apart, and the time was coming when they must separate; but he was a British subject, and, as such, he hoped that, when the final separation came about, it would come in friendship, as a son leaves the house of his father to become the father of a family.

If those were the views of the leader of

the Opposition then, what are his views to-day? If he believes that Great Britain and Canada are drifting further and further apart, he does not agree with the hon. member for Bothwell, because that hon. gentleman, along with the members on this side of the House, and the vast majority of the people, hold that the attachment between Canada and Great Britain is growing stronger, that they are growing closer and closer together, and not drifting further and further apart. The hon. gentleman referred to the fact that the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) had quoted the speech of Mr. Blake and had used the admission of Mr. Blake against Mr. Blake himself, and against the hon. member for Bothwell and other members of the party. No doubt the statement may be taken to be true in part and not true in the whole, and we take it that it was true in part.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). We take it that it was true the other way.

Mr. DALY. That is where we differ. Leaving the remarks of the hon. member for Bothwell, I come to consider the Speech from the Throne. I congratulate the mover and the seconder of the Address upon the able manner in which they fulfilled their duty. There was a clause of the Speech which I thought the hon. member for Bothwell would have referred to, in view of the discussion last session when he and I were pitted against each other in debating the Government's Indian policy. It is gratifying to myself, as head of the department, as well as to the officers of the department generally, that His Excellency has seen fit to say a good word for us:

As to the work of the Indian Department, as a whole, the manner in which it is directed and administered appears to be very satisfactory.

That is the speech of His Excellency in the Speech from the Throne.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). He prepared that Speech on the advice of his Ministers.

Mr. DALY. Undoubtedly; but we have to acknowledge the fact that His Excellency has been travelling in the North-west, that he met the Indians upon their reserves and visited the industrial schools; and no doubt the words used by His Excellency in the Speech can be found to be expressive of the views of His Excellency himself.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. DALY. And whatever the present views of the hon. member for Bothwell, no doubt if he would take the same trouble of inspecting these schools and visiting these reserves he would share the views expressed in the Speech. I do not for one moment say that these words are the words of His Excellency, I do not wish to be so understood. They are the words used by His Excellency upon the advice of his responsible advisers. But no doubt if you were to ask His Ex-

Mr. DALY.

cellency's private opinion it would be found to be the same as that expressed by every gentleman who has taken the trouble to visit the North-west and ascertain the facts.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Including the hon. leader of the Opposition himself.

Mr. DALY. I was coming to that.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Is it right to quote His Excellency?

Mr. DALY. I am not quoting His Excellency. I do not seek to do so. But I say that any private person knowing the circumstances as His Excellency does, would speak as His Excellency did in the Speech from the Throne. We have the leader of the Opposition, the leader of the Opposition in the Senate, and a number of other Senators in opposition expressing the same views as His Excellency does here.

I have not the slightest doubt that if the hon. gentlemen from the other side of the House would take the opportunity of visiting our industrial schools they would come to the conclusion that the policy that has been adopted by this Government is the correct one. Sir, I do not see why we should view this Indian question from a political standpoint at all. It seems to me that our policy in the administration of our Indian affairs should be non-political, and on this ground we shall find that the policy this Government has adopted has been a successful one. I guarantee that if the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) should be called upon to administer that department, he will make very few changes in the present mode of conducting its affairs, and I doubt if he would change the policy of the Government in that direction. I am also glad to see reference made to the Mounted Police. We have had discussions in this House last session, and previous sessions, and hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, with little knowledge of what they were talking about, have seen fit to attack that body, have seen fit to say that the Government are expending more money in the administration of the Mounted Police, or the conduct of that body, than was necessary. But I am glad to find, from testimony adduced in the Senate, and from testimony adduced by hon. gentlemen upon either side of the House who have had occasion to come in contact with that body of men, and who have had an opportunity of knowing what they are doing, that they have highly complimented the Mounted Police and the officers who command them. But, Sir, this session was called by His Excellency in pursuance of a promise that was made upon this side of the House last session, to take into consideration the question as to whether we should introduce remedial legislation in accordance with the action of the Government upon the judgment of the Privy

Council, and, as I have just said, in accordance with the promise that was made by the leader of this House, and by the leader of the Government. Sir, that is a question that, I presume, will occupy most of the attention of the members of this House during the days that we shall sit here, and I am called upon to discuss this question now in view of certain statements that were made by the leader of the Opposition the other day, and by the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin). Now, the hon. leader of the Opposition referred the other night, I thought, in rather congratulatory terms to the supposed fact that Mr. Greenway had carried the country upon the school question, that the people of Manitoba were a unit upon that question. Now, Sir, I take exception to that statement. I do not admit that because Mr. Greenway has been able, as he undoubtedly has, to increase his majority in that House, the result was a declaration by the people of Manitoba upon the school question. It may be a declaration of the people of Manitoba upon one branch, or one feature, of that question; but I know the result does not indicate their minds, because, Sir, I am satisfied that the true issue was not generally discussed during the recent election. But advantage was taken by Mr. Greenway of the machinery that was at hand to get a snap verdict from the people, without giving them an opportunity to exercise their franchise, or giving them an opportunity of properly discussing this question. Why, Sir, if Mr. Greenway were in earnest upon this matter, if Mr. Greenway were the advocate of the rights of the people of Manitoba, as he contends that he is, why was it necessary for him to call the elections there so suddenly? Why did Mr. Greenway make up his mind to call the elections some months before it was necessary for him to go before the people again? More than that, Sir, was it necessary for Mr. Greenway and the members of his government, through their partisan enumerators and partisan officers, to disfranchise the people by wholesale as they did in the different constituencies of Manitoba? Why, Sir, I find by recent papers that I have received from Manitoba, that no less than thirty-nine names, all of which are published in the "Nor'-Wester," a newspaper published in Winnipeg, were handed to the registrar and to the officials in North Winnipeg, but not one of those names appear upon the list. Out of fifty-six names that were put in by Ogilvie & Co., of men employed in their mill, twenty-four were left off the list. Mr. T. W. Taylor, the Conservative candidate in North Winnipeg, resident over twenty years in North Winnipeg, a large employer of labour there, and a well known man—his name was left off the list. Mr. F. W. Thompson, manager for Ogilvie & Co.—his name was left off the list. In fact, out of 2,500 names of voters that appear upon the Dominion list

and the local municipal list in North Winnipeg, 400 names were left off by the partisan enumerators. Now, Sir, it seems to me that such conduct as that does not indicate that Mr. Greenway and his followers were anxious to meet the people of Manitoba upon the school question, or upon any other question. He was anxious to snap a verdict from the people, and to get another lease of power for four years. In addition to those gentlemen I have mentioned, we find that a Conservative went to the clerk to see if another name was duly registered, and, at the same time, asked after his own registration. He found his name on the list, saw it there, but when the list was printed, his name was not on it, and he was, consequently, disfranchised. Another party went to the office twice with witnesses, and was told his name was on the list, but it did not appear. Four men went together to the registrar, two were put on and two were left off. The latter were Tories, of course. This same paper says:

In a terrace, containing four houses, in which lived two Grits and two Tories, the Grits were registered and the Tories were left. One old gentleman, owning his home, who has lived and voted in North Winnipeg for years—a good consistent Conservative—is left off the list, while his tenant, living in the other end of the same house—a Grit, of course—is registered.

Sir, these gentlemen and their officers have not done this kind of work in North Winnipeg alone. You will find it in Brandon, you will find it in North Brandon, you will find it in every constituency in the province of Manitoba. You find instances of it in Oak River, a rural constituency where the enumerators got in their work, and where I find that eighty-four names were left off that list. Some of those men had been residents for ten or twelve years, are large property owners and prosperous farmers, growing ten to twelve thousand bushels of wheat annually. This paper goes on to say:

Many of them, notwithstanding the fact that their names were on the old list, took the pains and trouble to see the registration clerk, and were told by him that their names were properly recorded, but, when the lists appeared, they found themselves disfranchised. A young man, who came up some few months ago on the harvesting expedition and stayed, has been duly registered. He owns no property, has never paid any taxes in Manitoba, is only here while a job is to be had, but he is a Grit, and that settles it.

And so, Sir, I might quote you, 'ad libitum,' cases that have been reported to me by our friends in Manitoba where Mr. Greenway's officers left names off the list, or cooked those lists, in order that they might succeed in getting their candidate elected. Now, Sir, the haste in calling the elections, and the ignoble way in which those lists were prepared, do not indicate that Mr. Greenway, and Mr. Sifton, and the other members of his government, felt safe or quite sure that the people of Manitoba were with

them upon this school question or upon others.

Mr. McGREGOR. How about the acclamations ?

Mr. DALY. Now, Sir, I come to another feature of the case. We find that the Reform papers up there, as well as the Reform papers in the east, declare that our people were united upon this Manitoba school question, and that was the question at issue. I know it to be a fact, Sir, that in several constituencies the school question was not the issue, and I know, as a fact, that where it was the issue, the opponents of the Greenway government were elected. If you take Portage la Prairie, where an hon. gentleman who at one time occupied a seat in this House, no less a person than the present Minister of Public Works in Manitoba, the Hon. Robert Watson, was running against Mr. Cooper, mayor of Portage la Prairie. Mr. Cooper took a stand upon the school question identical with the stand taken by this Government, and we find that Mr. Watson was only elected by the narrow majority of eleven. And, Sir, you can take Lorne, take Woodlands, where Mr. O'Malley and Mr. Roblin, the leader of the Opposition were elected, you will find that the school question was discussed in those constituencies upon its merits, and Mr. Roblin was elected by a majority of 400. These facts indicate that wherever the question was properly threshed out and discussed, and the people knew what the true issue was before them, they gave their verdict accordingly. Now, what is the position that has been taken by our friends on the other side of the House, or rather by their press, and by Mr. Greenway and his party in Manitoba ? Their cry is, you must not coerce Manitoba. Hands off Manitoba. Well, Sir, it seems to me that in order to ascertain whether these men have a right to say that this Government is about to coerce Manitoba, or that any person desires to put hands upon Manitoba, we should have a thorough understanding of the question. Now it occurs to me that the school question is this : The highest court in the Empire has decided that the minority of Manitoba have been deprived of certain constitutional rights, and, this being the case, these rights should be restored, independent of any party or political considerations. Has this question been viewed from anything other than party or political considerations ? It seems to me it has not. I think I can prove to this House and to those who are listening to me that in the course of this trouble, from 1890 up to the present time, members, particularly those of the Liberal party, have been acting more from political motives than a desire to restore to the minority the rights that were said to be theirs by the judgment of the Privy Council. I take it that when the judgment came from the Judicial Committee of the Privy Coun-

Mr. DALY.

cil, the highest court in the land, it was the bounden duty of the government of Manitoba, to accept that decision, to act magnanimously and restore those rights to the minority. For there is nothing in that judgment that impresses me for a single moment with the view that the schools should be restored as they existed prior to 1890 ; but, on the contrary, the judgment says that the grievance should be remedied by supplementary legislation, passed by the legislature of Manitoba, and if those men were desirous, as we find them now to be, judging by the expressions used by Mr. Sifton, for example, whose remarks were quoted by the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin) the other night, to do what was right by the minority, it was their duty a year ago to have passed supplementary legislation and remedied the grievance complained of by the minority, and not to have allowed the matter to have gone as far as it has gone. They should have acted before it became necessary for the minority to come here and appeal to the Privy Council of Canada under the law. What has been the position of the Dominion Government in this matter ? We find the Acts complained of were passed by the Manitoba legislature in 1890. The hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte) insisted on disallowance. I give him credit for having taken the only consistent course pursued by hon. gentlemen opposite on this question. He then insisted on the disallowance of the Acts, and I presume he insists on disallowance still. But we find that the hon. gentleman, in addition to the motion moved by him in this House, condemning the Government for not having disallowed those Acts, declared through the press and outside of this House that disallowance was the proper course which the Government have pursued. Now we find that hon. gentleman stating :

Had the Manitoba school question been settled four years ago, everybody would have been pleased. But the Ministers had not the courage to act.

The hon. gentleman also stated that he had read that the Government were going to send to the Manitoba government a communication containing the various judgments rendered by the courts. He added :

He had read that the Government were going to send to the Manitoba government a communication containing the various judgments rendered by the courts.

If the Government does that, the government of Manitoba will reply that they are a lot of impertinent people. I would do the same thing, were I in their place.

What has been the position of the Government so condemned in the past by the hon. member for L'Islet ? The Government did not disallow the Act ; on the contrary, the Government decided that this was a mixed question of fact and law and it should be determined by a legal decision,

and they would not assume the responsibility. The first petition sent in by Archbishop Taché was in August, 1890, and upon that petition the Minister of Justice made a report on March 21, 1891, and in that report he recites the fact that the matter is now before the courts for adjudication. At that time, I think, the case had been argued in the Supreme Court and was awaiting judgment. The position the Government then took was the correct one, because if the Government had acted in accordance with the advice of the hon. member for L'Islet and disallowed the Act of the Manitoba legislature, the Manitoba government would have taken the position that they would have re-enacted it, and as often as it was disallowed it would have been re-enacted. What would have been the effect? We are even now charged with dangling the Manitoba school question before the eyes of the people for years. Would it not have been better that the question should be before the people all these years on a constitutional decision given by the courts rather than on the ipse dixit of the Dominion Government by disallowing the Act? It would have been wrong if the Government had disallowed the Act, as the people of Manitoba had stated they would have it re-enacted, and then the accusation would have been made against the Dominion Government that we had kept the question all these years before the public. The leader of the Opposition in his speech the other day quoted from a newspaper published in Manitoba to show that the Opposition in that province had changed their position, and that they were now charging the Greenway government with insincerity. The position of the Conservative party in Manitoba, or rather the Conservative Opposition in the local House, was very well defined at the sitting of that House in June, 1895. At that time—you may recollect, Mr. Speaker, the local House had reassembled—upon the reading of the resolution containing the reply to the remedial order, an amendment was moved by Mr. O'Malley, then leader of the Opposition. It was a very long resolution, and I am not going to read the whole of it, but what I will read will indicate to this House and the people of the country the feeling of the Opposition in the local House of Manitoba on this question, and after I have read it the House will come to the conclusion that the hon. gentleman who introduced the resolution and supported it took proper ground upon this question, and if the local government had seen fit to act in accordance with its terms we should not have had the question before us to discuss to-day. After reciting the clauses of the judgment, the resolution goes on to say:

Holding the views thus indicated, and reaffirming our decision that we cannot accept the responsibility of re-enacting the provisions of the old law, we have to consider what provisions in

the way of supplementing or modifying the existing law could be adopted that will, while securing the efficiency of our system of education in all schools and requiring all sections of the community to bear their full share of the burden of maintaining it, give reasonable relief to the minority.

In endeavouring to arrive at a solution of this question, we would respectfully submit that, inasmuch as the remedial order in itself, as we ventured to point out, is wide enough in terms to justify the minority in seeking practically a restoration of the old system as regards separate schools, it would be futile to pass a measure of relief unless the minority were prepared to accept it. It will be apparent to you that the minority might still apply to Parliament for the large measure of relief. We, therefore, submit that it is desirable that any action to be taken should be with the approval of Your Excellency in Council, as well as of the Catholic minority.

In this view of the matter, we venture to suggest that the system of education that prevails in Ontario may be looked to as furnishing to some degree, a basis for a system that might be adopted here. The provisions of that system in regard to the schools of the Roman Catholic minority are, of course, well known to you, but we may be allowed to indicate certain reasons why in our judgment, they may be taken as effecting a solution of the question here. It is well known that the system in that province has given general satisfaction, both to the Catholic minority and to the Protestant majority. As evidence of this, we would quote the language of the Hon. David Mills in the Commons in 1892, when discussing the Ontario system in connection with the establishment of a system of education in the North-west Territories.

Mr. Mills said at that time—and then they quote what the hon. member for Bothwell said.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What are you reading from?

Mr. DALY. I am reading a report of the proceedings of the local assembly in June, 1895, as reported in the "Nor-Wester." It says:

We also quote the following from the Toronto "Globe":—

"We advocate the Ontario system," says the "Globe," not because it is fixed by the constitution, but because we consider it to be a good system, embodying a satisfactory settlement of a vexed question. If this province were making a fresh start to-day, absolutely untrammelled by constitutional restrictions, we do not know that it could do better than to continue that arrangement without material change. We think the public schools are satisfactory, not only to the Protestant majority, but to every large body of Catholics who prefer that system of education."

The resolution goes on:

In submitting this view for the consideration of Your Excellency in Council, we beg to express our earnest desire to bring about a satisfactory settlement of the difficulty, and beg to assure you that we are prepared to make an earnest effort to bring about this settlement by supplementary provisions to the School Act of 1890, which will remove the grievance upon which said appeal was founded, and will modify the law so far, and so far only, as may be necessary to give effect to these provisions. Such legislation should

provide for an equal standard of education in all schools and of taxation of all property of Protestants and Roman Catholics, so as to ensure taxation of all properties within each school district for the support of the school of that district, and, generally, to secure the efficiency of the school system of the province.

Now, Sir, I commend to this House and to every member of it, as to whether the position taken by the Opposition was not the true position, and as to whether it does not stand out in bold relief as against the position taken by the government of that province. We find that even before the appeal had come before the Privy Council and was discussed there, and as soon as it was known to the people of Canada that the decision of the Judicial Committee had been given, certain members of the local government had been interviewed and had given their views upon the subject. But, before I come to that, I would like to call the attention of the House to the fact that during that same sitting of the legislature, Mr. Fisher, one of the members of that House also introduced a resolution. I will not weary the House by reading any more than the fifth and concluding clause of that resolution.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What year was that?

Mr. DALY. February, 1895; last year. This resolution I may say was moved by Mr. Fisher prior to the remedial order, and prior to the legislature having received that remedial order, and prior to its having adjourned, as you will remember it did.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) After the Privy Council judgment?

Mr. DALY. After the Privy Council judgment was known, but before the Privy Council of Canada had heard the appeal and before the remedial order had been made. Mr. Fisher's resolution concludes as follows:—

And, having regard to the suggestions of the tribunal referred to, that "all legitimate" ground of complaint would be removed if the present system were supplemented by provisions which would remove the grievances upon which the appeal is founded, and were modified so far as might be necessary to give effect to those provisions, without a repeal of the present law, this House is ready to consider the grievances referred to, with a view to providing reasonable relief, while maintaining, as far as possible consistent with that object, the principles of the present Act in their general application.

Now, Sir, was that resolution agreed to by Mr. Greenway or his followers? Not at all. At that time apparently Mr. Greenway and Mr. Sifton had made up their minds that they would not recede one iota from their position on this question. They were not going to regard the judgment of the Privy Council in any degree whatever, and not only were they content with saying that, but Mr. Sifton moved an amendment

Mr. DALY.

to the motion of Mr. Fisher which reads as follows:—

That all the words after the word "While," in the original motion, be struck out, and the following substituted therefor:—"this House loyally submits itself to the provisions of the constitution, as interpreted by the Judicial Committee of Her Majesty's Privy Council, it is hereby resolved that the exercise of appellate jurisdiction by the Governor General in Council in such a way as to lead hereafter to the alteration of the principles upon which the public school system of Manitoba is founded, will be viewed with grave apprehension. That an interference by the federal authority with the educational policy of the province is contrary to the recognized principles of provincial autonomy. That this House will, by all constitutional means, and to the utmost extent of its power, resist any steps which may be taken to attack the school system established by the Public Schools Act of 1890, which is believed to be conceived and administered in the highest and best interests of the whole population of Manitoba.

This, Mr. Speaker, was before the Privy Council of Canada had even heard the appeal and after the Judicial Committee had given their decision. Now, Sir, I think these gentlemen assumed a tremendous responsibility when they committed themselves and their followers to the doctrine laid down here, namely: that although they were aware of the judgment of the Privy Council, and that that judgment did not ask them to restore the schools of the minority as they existed prior to 1890, and before even the appeal had been heard by the Privy Council of Canada, and before the remedial order had been made; these gentlemen came to the conclusion that they have grave apprehension of this matter being heard by the Governor General in Council. It seems to me, Sir, that if they were as desirous as they have since expressed of relieving the minority of the grievances complained of, these gentlemen instead of taking that ground, would have taken the higher ground laid down by Mr. Fisher in the resolution of which I have read a portion. But they bade defiance, not only to the judgment of the highest court of the realm, but they bade defiance to the law as interpreted by that Judicial Committee.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What date was that resolution?

Mr. DALY. February 27th, 1895.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Was Fisher's resolution put to the House?

Mr. DALY. Fisher's resolution was put to the House and defeated.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What was the division—have you got it there?

Mr. DALY. Yes, I think I have.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Or was Mr. Sifton's resolution put to the House?

Mr. DALY. If I recollect there was Mr. Fisher's motion, and then the amendment

by Mr. Pendergast to the effect that the schools should be restored as they were prior to 1890, and then the amendment of Mr. Sifton which I have read.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Then the amendment from Mr. Sifton was an amendment to Mr. Pendergast's resolution that the schools should be restored.

Mr. DALY. No. Mr. Sifton moved "that all the words after 'while' in the original motion be left out."

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Was that an amendment to Mr. Fisher's motion or to Mr. Pendergast's motion?

Mr. DALY. To Mr. Fisher's.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I thought you stated just now it was to Mr. Pendergast's?

Mr. DALY. No; what I said was that Mr. Fisher's motion was first. Mr. Pendergast moved an amendment, and this is an amendment to the original motion.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) An amendment to the amendment?

Mr. DALY. No; it reads: "That all the words after 'while' in the original motion be struck out."

Mr. LAURIER. What is the vote?

Mr. DALY. The vote stood 22 to 10, the usual opposition. The nays were: Fisher, Frame, Lyons, Pare, Hartney, Martin, O'Malley, Jerome, Armstrong, McFadden, and I think the majority of the English-speaking men who appear there have been returned at the late election. That was the position taken by the provincial government prior to their hearing before the Privy Council and prior to the remedial order. Sir, we find that the member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin) quoted the other night from the "Tribune" newspaper to show what the disposition of Mr. Greenway and his followers is in Manitoba to-day. He tried to show that Mr. Greenway and Mr. Sifton, the gentlemen who refused to receive the proposition of Mr. Fisher as indicated in the resolution I have read, now assume a different position towards the minority in Manitoba. The member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin) prefaced the quotation from the Winnipeg "Tribune" by telling this House that it was not an organ. Of course that would bring a smile to the face of any one who knows anything about Manitoba politics, because if there is an organ in this country which belongs to any government, it is the Winnipeg "Tribune," which belongs body and soul to the Hon. Mr. Greenway. Here is what the "Tribune" says, defending the present ideas of Mr. Greenway and Mr. Sifton, according to the statement of the hon. member for Winnipeg the other night:

All friends of interprovincial harmony will still hope that some gleam of statesmanlike sense will now influence the actions of the Do-

minion Cabinet. It is not to be understood from the present attitude of Manitoba that the majority of her people have any hatred of Roman Catholics, or that, having them down, their wish is to keep them down. There is a good deal of misunderstanding on this point, and a good deal of nonsense has been talked. The real intention of Manitoba has no foundation in ill-will to any part of her population, but these intentions have so far had no opportunity to be manifested. The province has practically been on her defence for the last five years, and until the struggle to maintain what she deems her rights is ended, a dispassionate consideration of the grievances of the minority can hardly be expected. When, however, the threat of coercion is removed, as ultimately it must be, the sense of justice of Manitobans will be found as active as it is in any part of the Dominion, and a readiness will be shown to remove all just cause of complaint against our school laws.

That is a complete change of position on the part of the Winnipeg "Tribune," and on the part of Mr. Greenway and his followers: because we find that this same Winnipeg "Tribune" on the 27th March, 1895, published a long article in a contrary strain. When I read some extracts from that article, hon. gentlemen can compare them with what I have just now read as quoted by the hon. member for Winnipeg, and judge whether the people of Manitoba have any desire (according to the "Tribune"), to put the Roman Catholics down and keep them down. Here is what the Winnipeg "Tribune" of the 27th March said:

The remedial order has been read in the legislature. We are asked to restore the school system that was in operation previous to 1890. Let Quebec and Ottawa rest assured that the restoration will never be made. Manitoba has too keen a sense of justice, too much regard for truth and equity, to recognize as a religious aristocracy an element of its population by no means the most worthy. As a civilized people attempting to realize in a measure the ideals of the nineteenth century, Manitoba will not silently submit to the preposterous demand that they should turn back the wheels of progress three hundred years. They will stubbornly refuse to supplant modern civilization by mediaevalism. This whole question is not a quarrel between Manitoba and the Dominion; it is not even a quarrel between races and creeds; it is a struggle as to whether the ideals of the nineteenth century or the ideals of the dark ages shall prevail.

* * * * *
Why does not the Roman Catholic Church out with the truth at once? Why not advance the real reason for discontent? Rome is not in accord with the spirit of the age. It is wedded to a dead past. Mediaevalism cannot, or will not, coalesce with modern thought. In place of the Act of 1890 what substitute is offered? We are asked to set creed against creed, and race against race, to break up the unity that should exist, to mutually support each other in wrong-doing, to make the state the teacher of religious truth, for, when Romanists and non-Romanists combine their wealth, and then draw from the joint fund, it is clear as day that each is a partner in the work of the other. How can any Romanist, believing the Protestant schools are teaching errors, conscientiously support them, and how can any Protestant, believing that the religious teaching

of the Catholic Church is false, agree that a portion of his taxes should be devoted towards the support of such teaching? No. Any one who has the least sense of justice, any one who is patriotic even in the slightest degree, any one who believes that all citizens are equal in the sight of the law, and that what is good enough for one is good enough for all, must stand by the Act of 1890. And this is our answer to Quebec. We shall not allow the state to support religion; we shall not allow the church to control the state; we shall not return to the civilization of the dark ages; we shall not recognize Rome as better or in any way different from others; we shall hold to the principle of equal rights for all, and that principle shall be dearer to us than confederation itself.

This same paper, the Winnipeg "Tribune," said of the hon. leader of the Opposition:

He stands upon the broad principle of provincial rights.

—and that—

He does not believe in separate schools; he is too advanced a Liberal and a thinker to endorse them.

And this is the paper, the organ of the Greenway government, quoted by the hon. member for Winnipeg. I ask hon. gentlemen who have listened to these quotations, whether these people have been sincere in this matter, from the time of the judgment of the Privy Council was rendered up to the present moment. Now, we find that a change has not only come over the dream of the "Tribune," but a change has come over the dream of Mr. Sifton, the Attorney General. Here is what Mr. Sifton said in a speech during the recent campaign:

We are prepared to consider any changes in method that will make it acceptable to the Roman Catholics. We will do anything in reason, anything that will not compromise principle.

Again, he said:

Anything in reason, if we can settle this matter without compromising principle, then we will do it, but not otherwise. If there is any change that can be made in the religious exercises that will make them acceptable to all parties, if any change can be made in the time they are held, or other like changes, we are prepared to consider them.

The Brandon "Sun," a Liberal organ, also says:

Let it be shown that the Manitoba School Act attacks the conscientious convictions of Catholics, and we will join in demanding its amendment or correction.

These people sing a different tune now from what they did in the days when they were talking in the strain of that quotation from the "Tribune," from which I have read. But, Sir, we find that this statement of Mr. Sifton is made in the face of a declaration made by his leader in his address to the electors of the electoral division of Mountain. In that address Mr. Greenway declared:

Mr. DALY.

A similar statement was made about the same time in the Senate by Sir Mackenzie Bowell, the Premier of the Dominion. From the utterances of the members of the Dominion Cabinet, and from the facts known to all who have watched the controversy, it is clear that nothing short of a separate denominational system of schools will be accepted as an adequate measure of relief.

To the communication forwarded in pursuance of the above announcements by the Dominion Government of the 27th of July last, inviting the Manitoba government to take such action as would remedy the alleged grievances of the minority, we have replied, definitely and positively rejecting the proposal to re-establish separate schools in any form, and expressing the intention to uphold the present uniform, non-sectarian system. As the federal parliament is about to be asked to legislate upon this subject, it is of the utmost importance that the views of the electors of the province should be clearly and unmistakably expressed.

Thus, we find, from the statement of Mr. Greenway, that there was a determination on the part of his government not to re-establish separate schools in any form, and to uphold the present uniform non-sectarian system. It seems to me that that is not in accord with the spirit of the declaration made by Mr. Sifton and that made by the "Tribune," but is, on the contrary, on a par with the position taken by Mr. Greenway, Mr. Sifton, and the other members of his government from the beginning. Now, I want to quote to members of this House, not the statements of the leader of the Opposition, not the statements of politicians or of the Roman Catholic hierarchy; but I want to go outside of this House and take the views of men and newspapers who view the question from an independent standpoint. I take it that it was the duty of the local legislature to be guided and influenced by the government at its head, and if that government had guided and influenced that legislature in the way that all right-minded people thought it should have done, we would not to-day be called upon to consider the question of remedial legislation. Before any action was taken by the Dominion Government on this question, a local independent paper called the "North-west Baptist," gave utterance to the following sentiments:

The Privy Council, without determining what rights of the Roman Catholics have been invaded, clearly indicates that there is a case for intervention on the part of the Dominion. Let Manitoba recognize this decision. We are a part of the Empire. We cannot antagonize Great Britain or even the Dominion, when the Dominion's authority in such a matter is established by the highest court in Great Britain. There ought to be a readiness on the part of Manitoba—we mean the provincial government—to be a party in discovering where our legislation has wronged our Roman Catholic fellow-citizens, and, upon discovering, willingly make every endeavour to do them justice.

But have the Manitoba government ever sought by their actions to discover where this legislation is wrong to the minority?

Not in the slightest degree. On the contrary, they took the firm stand from the beginning that they were determined not to alter their course, come what might. In addition to that independent opinion I will quote from a very able article in the Toronto "Globe" on the 4th March, 1895. This is what the "Globe" says

Our conclusion, then, is, that the question will be best decided, not by the Government or the Parliament or the people of the Dominion, but by the people of Manitoba, in the light of justice and of the best interests of the province. In the endeavour to arrive at a wise and just decision, we believe that they can derive material aid from the judgments of the Privy Council, not, we repeat, as infallible oracles, but as the honest efforts of able men to settle a question of right and wrong. We deprecate outside interference in confidence that the majority of the people of Manitoba will be just, will regard so their very strength as an obligation to be scrupulously just, will be generous rather than be in peril of falling short of complete justice; and in confidence that they understand the conditions and requirements of their young and growing community better than we outsiders can possibly do.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Do you agree with that?

Mr. DALY. I agree with every word of that. I say that none could better understand the position, of the minority or what is required to remedy their grievances than could the legislature of Manitoba, and if the legislature of Manitoba had been guided by the Government to conduct this matter on the lines indicated by the "Globe" and laid down by the North-west Baptists, the question would have been decided months, even years ago, and would not have been thrown into the political arena for the purpose of exciting political passion and securing party advantage. I will show further, by other quotations which I am about to make, that from the moment the judgment of the Privy Council was given, Mr. Greenway and his Ministers decided not to recede from the position they had taken. Our hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, also made an effort to get these gentlemen to come to a proper sense of their duty. He said at Morrisburg:

I would approach this man Greenway with the sunny ways of patriotism, asking him to be just and to be fair, asking him to be generous to the minority, in order that we may have peace amongst all the creeds and races which it has pleased God to bring upon this corner of our common country. Do you not believe there is more to be gained by appealing to the hearts and souls of men, rather than by trying to compel them to do a thing?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. DALY. Hon. gentlemen say "hear, hear." Did Mr. Greenway—the gentleman whom our hon. friend asked us to approach in the sunny ways of peace—did Mr. Sifton or Mr. Cameron, or any member of the Manitoba government, show any disposition to

respond to an appeal of that kind, in the amendment which they moved and carried to the resolution of Mr. Fisher that I read a short time ago. No, Mr. Speaker, they did not. Approach these gentlemen in the sunny ways of peace—whom are we to approach? Men who gave a decided opinion on this subject before they were ever called upon to give one? There can be no question as to their desire to show how obstinate they clung to the position they had taken. On the 30th January, 1895, both Messrs, McMillan and Sifton were in Toronto, when the substance of the judgment had been given in the press, and these gentlemen were interviewed. Here is what these gentlemen said, whom we are asked to approach in "the sunny ways of patriotism." The Provincial Secretary, Mr. McMillan, said:

The decision is not unexpected. Our counsel advised us that the remarks of their lordships during the argument indicated that the appeal would be allowed. The decision does not affect us in the least. The people of Manitoba know what kind of school system they want, and any attempt on behalf of the Dominion to override their wishes in the matter of remedial legislation would be so much time thrown away.

There is a declaration before these gentlemen were ever called upon by this Government for an opinion, even before we had received the full text of the judgment of the Privy Council. Mr. McMillan declared that any action upon our part would be simply thrown away. Mr. Sifton, the Attorney General of Manitoba, said:

The decision makes no difference to us. We have established a common school system for all, and we will maintain it. The Manitoba government was bound to have one efficient school system for all, and would treat all alike, and cared little whether the Dominion passed remedial legislation or not, as they had taken their stand, and it was a constitutional one, and they were perfectly satisfied.

These are the gentlemen we are invited to approach on the "sunny ways of patriotism." The effort would be as futile as the attempt to extract sunbeams from a cucumber. Mr. Sifton was again interviewed in January, 1895. He said:

"If such right of appeal be granted by the decision of the Privy Council, then, practically, the immediate effect of the decision will be that the Dominion Government has legal power to restore the educational privileges which the Catholics of Manitoba enjoy under the provisions of the former School Act."

"And how will the provincial government take that?"

"The provincial government will not take it at all."

"There will be a deadlock, then, between the Dominion and provincial governments, if the former decides to interfere with our existing school Act?"

"If they undertake to interfere with the legislation in any way, shape or form, there will be a deadlock, certainly. The province will resent any interference with provincial rights."

"What form will the resenting of such interference probably take?"

"Can't tell. We don't know yet that there will be any interference. I don't think the Dominion Government will trouble us. It is a difficult nut for them to crack, but I do not think they will undertake to make any change in our provincial laws. Practically, this is on similar lines to the old system of disallowance. We said that we had a right then to build railways with our own money on our own land, without the consent of people who dwelt in the other provinces. It was a purely local matter, and I consider that the question of religious education is equally a local matter, and that the people of Manitoba know what kind of schools they want, and will see to it that they get them."

Such expressions of opinion coming from these gentlemen indicate clearly that they were determined from the outset not to budge in the slightest degree from the position they had taken, notwithstanding the decision of the Privy Council.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Is the hon. gentleman giving the dates of these respective quotations?

Mr. DALY. Yes.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It might be desirable to have them.

Mr. DALY. I am very desirous they should get on "Hansard," and I have given you the dates. The "Empire" correspondent in Winnipeg called on Mr. Greenway who was ill, on the 29th of January, 1895, and Mr. Greenway sent out this message:

I don't believe the Dominion Government will dare to interfere with Manitoba school law. If it does, there certainly will be trouble. The Manitoba government will strenuously resist any interference. We shall stand by our school law.

That statement was given out when the telegram came announcing that the Judicial Committee had decided in favour of the minority. Mr. J. D. Cameron, at the same time, who was also notified of the decision and who is the Provincial Secretary, replied:

The attitude of the government is pretty well known, and will not be modified. Any interference on the part of the Dominion Government will be resisted to the utmost within constitutional limits. The decision is to be regretted, because it reopens the question which it was generally supposed was finally settled. In any event, the decision is nothing more than a hollow victory for the appellants.

In this way Mr. Cameron and Mr. Sifton and Mr. Greenway spoke of the decision of the highest court of the realm. Why, it seems to me that any person reading that decision can come to no other conclusion than that his lordship who gave the decision and their lordships who concurred in it never supposed, for one moment, that they were dealing with men who would declare themselves on the lines taken by Messrs. Sifton and Greenway. Their lordships supposed that when they laid down certain rules and lines, these men would act in

Mr. DALY.

accordance with the judgment of the court. They did not suppose that the matter would ever come to appeal under section 22 of the Manitoba Act. They did not suppose that these men, as soon as they were in receipt of the judgment, would move the amendments they did in the local House, would not express themselves as they did, but on the contrary would have passed the legislation supplementary to the legislation of 1890 that would remove the grievances of these people. But we find that not only were these the statements made by members of the government, but they actually put words of defiance into the mouth of the Lieutenant-Governor. We find in the Speech that was read from the Throne by the Lieutenant-Governor, before the appeal came on before the Privy Council, these words:

Whether or not the demand will be made by the federal government that the Act shall be modified, it is not the intention of my government in any way to recede from our determination to uphold the present system.

Now, what did this Government do when this matter was brought before it? We have been told that we intend to "coerce Manitoba." We have been told that we intended to "take Manitoba by the throat." We have been told that our remedial order was couched in drastic terms. But we fail to find that in the discussions in the local House or in the press these gentlemen have seen fit to refer to the Order in Council accompanying the remedial order, nor have they seen fit at any time to refer to the memorandum sent by this Government in 1895 to the local government. I think that, if we read this thing dispassionately with the desire to be fair, we shall come to the conclusion that this Government had no desire to coerce Manitoba, but simply desired to carry out the law as it appears in the statute-book and interpreted by the highest court in the land. What the Government said in this Order in Council of 19th March, 1895, was as follows:—

And the committee also recommends that Your Excellency in Council do further declare and decide that for the due execution of the provisions of section 22 of "The Manitoba Act," it seems requisite that the system of education embodied in the two Acts of 1890 aforesaid should be supplemented by a provincial Act or Acts which would restore to the Roman Catholic minority the said rights and privileges of which such minority has been so deprived as aforesaid, and which would modify the said Acts of 1890 so far, and so far only, as may be necessary to give effect to the provisions restoring the rights and privileges in paragraphs (a), (b) and (c) hereinbefore mentioned.

And later on in this same Order in Council we find the following:—

In the opinion of the committee, "The Manitoba Act," as construed with regard to the present case by the Judicial Committee of Her Majesty's Privy Council, so clearly points to a duty devolving upon Your Excellency in Council that no

course is open, consistent with both the letter and the spirit of the constitution, other than that recommended. To dismiss this appeal would be not only to deny to the Roman Catholic minority rights substantially guaranteed to them under the constitution of Canada, but, in truth, such a course might involve the declaration on the part of Your Excellency in Council that this provision of the constitution for the protection of the rights of certain of Her Majesty's subjects in Manitoba should not in any case be acted upon; and further, the committee do not perceive upon what principle, consistently with a declaration that effect is not to be given to this appeal, the Protestant or Roman Catholic minority in Quebec or Ontario could invoke the corresponding provision of section 93 of "The British North America Act," in case of any provincial Act or decision affecting their rights or privileges.

If Your Excellency should see fit to approve of the foregoing recommendation, the committee desire to state that it follows that refusal or neglect on the part of the legislature of Manitoba to enact remedial legislation which to Your Excellency in Council seems requisite, will confer upon Parliament authority to enact such a law. In this connection, it was urged by counsel on behalf of the province, that, should Parliament legislate under these circumstances, its enactment would be absolute and irrevocable so far as both Parliament and the provincial legislature are concerned.

The committee, without necessarily adopting this view, observe that section 22 of "The Manitoba Act" may admit of that construction. The committee, therefore, recommend that the provincial legislature be requested to consider whether its action upon the decision of Your Excellency in Council should be permitted to be such as, while refusing to redress a grievance which the highest court in the Empire has declared to exist, may compel Parliament to give the relief of which, under the constitution, the provincial legislature is the proper and primary source, thereby, according to this view, permanently divesting itself in a very large measure of its authority, and so establishing in the province an educational system which, no matter what changes may take place in the circumstances of the country or the views of the people, cannot be altered or repealed by any legislative body in Canada.

These are the important portions of that Order in Council. They showed upon the face of them what the duty of the Manitoba legislature was. But, with the full responsibility resting upon that legislature, these men refused to entertain the order in the slightest degree. If you look at former portions of it you will find quotations from the judgment, of which I have given a summary, and one of which I may now give in full:

It is certainly not essential that the statutes repealed by the Act of 1890 should be re-enacted, or that the precise provisions of these statutes should again be made law. The system of education embodied in the Acts of 1890 no doubt commends itself to, and adequately supplies the wants of the great majority of the inhabitants of the province. All legitimate grounds of complaint would be removed if that system were supplemented by provisions which would remove the grievance upon which the appeal is founded,

and were modified so far as might be necessary to give effect to these provisions.

Now, Sir, reading that, as they must have done, any one in the legislature who was desirous of doing what was right, who was desirous of settling the question could say to himself: The highest court in the land has decided that these people have a grievance. We have appeared before the Privy Council of Canada, and have argued our case, and the Privy Council has decided that they are obliged to require us to carry out the conditions of that judgment. Although these were not our views, and although we have combatted them up to this time and have taken our present position, yet, as Canadians, in the interest of peace and good government, with the desire to carry out what we are directed to do by the highest court in the land, we will sacrifice any ideas of our own that we had upon this question, we will sink self interest in this matter and we will advise our friends in the local legislature to adopt the lines of the judgment and, by legislation supplementary to that of 1890, we will remove the grievances of these people. But we find that in the discussion that has taken place on public platforms and in the press a great deal has been made of the alleged inefficiency of the Roman Catholic schools prior to 1890. That is the ground taken by the local government. They say it would be wrong to the people themselves to restore these schools as they existed. Now, if the local government had ascertained in 1890 that these schools were inefficient, it was their duty to make them efficient, and if they had not sufficient power to do so they could have got the power from the legislature. But do I find that in the discussion that took place on the introduction of the Bill by the present member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin) in March, 1890, the question of efficiency was mentioned? I have read the reported account of the speeches of the hon. gentlemen who introduced the Bill, the Hon. Mr. Smart and the Hon. Mr. Sifton, and I find no reference whatever to the inefficiency of the schools. On the contrary I find this in the speech of the present hon. member for Winnipeg, who introduced the Bill, as reported in the "Free Press" on March 5th, 1890:

The Government's action had not been determined because they were dissatisfied with the manner in which the affairs of the department are conducted under the system, but because they were dissatisfied with the system itself.

It was the system they wanted to get rid of and not its inefficiency, and we do not need to go further than the same debate to find a further explanation, and I commend this to the attention of the leader of the Opposition and that of his friend the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte). Mr. Martin said:

"It is proposed to imitate the example of New Brunswick and do away with the monstrous evil of separate schools." He anticipated that, if they once dealt with this evil, they would not be called upon to deal with it again. They would be able to say to the people of all nationalities: If you want a home where religious liberty is fully recognized, come to Manitoba.

So, it was to wipe out the monstrous evil of separate schools, it was because they were dissatisfied with the system itself that the Acts of 1890 were introduced and passed, and not because these schools were inefficient. But, Sir, we find that the leader of the Opposition had also given his views upon this question. But before I come to that I may say that we are aware of the fact that the member for Winnipeg who sought to do away with this monstrous evil of separate schools, coolly and quietly declared to the people of the country, with the Acts of 1890, which he passed to wipe out this monstrous evil, standing on the statute-book from 1890 to 1894, when he wrote his celebrated letter, that the action the Government committed at that time inflicted rank tyranny upon the minority against whom those Acts were directed. This, Sir, is the hon. gentleman with whom the leader of the Opposition delights to consort, this is the gentleman to whom the leader of the Opposition, no doubt, looks for his chief support from the province of Manitoba. I ask him to define his position upon this question of separate schools, as from his utterances on this question it is not easy to know where he stands. Does he look upon separate schools as a monstrous evil? I do not think so, because we find the hon. gentleman has made several statements on this question, and we know that he does not look upon separate schools as a monstrous evil. Now, Sir, we find that the leader of the Opposition, in 1893, I think it was, spoke as follows in the House of Commons:

If the statement is founded on fact which is made by His Grace Archbishop Taché, and which is repeated in all the petitions coming from the Roman Catholics of Manitoba, that under the guise of public schools, Protestant schools are being continued, and that Roman Catholic children are forced under that law to attend what in reality are Protestant schools, I say that the strongest case has been made for interference by this Government.

Now, we have not ascertained since whether the hon. gentleman has made it his business to find out whether these schools are Protestant or Catholic, or whether the strongest case has been made out for interference by the Government. We do not know exactly what the hon. gentleman's conclusions are in that matter. We find, however, that the hon. gentleman visited the city of Winnipeg, and there met a large number of his co-religionists; he met a great number of people who were interested on behalf of the minority. He was interviewed by these gentlemen, and he got certain light from them, he got certain knowledge from them, but

Mr. DALY.

whether the facts or the knowledge that he got from them have changed his position, I have failed so far to learn.

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

After Recess.

Mr. DALY. Just previously to your leaving the Chair, Mr. Speaker, at six o'clock, I had quoted from a speech made by the leader of the Opposition in this House in 1893, in which he declared in terms that after reading the petition of His Grace Archbishop Taché, he had come to the conclusion that the schools that had been inflicted upon the minority in Manitoba, were Protestant schools, and if that was the case, he would use his best endeavours to have the wrong remedied. Now, Sir, we find that in September, 1894, the hon. leader of the Opposition visited the province of Manitoba, but we have not yet ascertained whether during that visit, although he was waited upon by a deputation of his co-religionists, he received any additional light or any additional facts in relation to this question. Sir, hon. gentlemen upon this side of the House have complained that the leader of the Opposition has been very indefinite in all his public utterances on this question ever since its inception; and I must say, without at all desiring to reflect upon that hon. gentleman, that I have read a great many of his speeches, a great many of his utterances on this question, and I have failed up to the present time to ascertain where the hon. gentleman stands. But, Sir, it will not be long, it will not be many days, before we will have an opportunity of placing that hon. gentleman where he will have to say what his true position is on this matter.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How many days?

Mr. DALY. I would not like to anticipate the hon. gentleman's pleasure, but it won't be many days. Well, Sir, we find that at the first appearance of the leader of the Opposition in Winnipeg, he made a speech upon this Manitoba school question, and I think, after reading his speech, from which I will quote, that the House will come to the conclusion that the hon. gentleman's statements on that occasion were as indefinite and void of meaning as they have been on other occasions. He said there:

And as soon as I came here a letter was handed to me asking me to express my views upon the Manitoba school question. Sir, I do not need to be reminded of that subject. (Applause.) I would not be worthy of the name of man if I were not able to speak my own mind to my countrymen. Whether I speak in the province of Ontario, the province of Quebec, or the province of Manitoba, I am a Canadian. (Loud applause.) I believe in the principles of the Liberal party, and by these principles I will abide. In Winnipeg I will speak upon that

question also ; but, Sir, can we say as much of the Canadian Government which is at Ottawa to-day ? The legislature of Manitoba passed an Act in 1890, the Catholic minority refused to abide by that Act, and they appealed to the Government at Ottawa. What answer to that appeal have they received since 1891 ? The Government at Ottawa dilly-dallied with that question, they gave promises on every side, but except these they never gave anything to anybody. Well, Sir, I believe it is the duty of every man to express his opinion as a man upon these subjects. In a country like our own, where there are men of different religions, it is impossible to speak language which would please everybody. It is impossible, if you speak your honest mind, the honest opinion of your heart, to please everybody, but I believe it is possible to use language which will appeal to the honest opinion of every man. Instead of appealing to passions and prejudice, you must appeal to those great principles of liberty which have made the Liberal party the party of reform, of progress and freedom. It is upon this principle that I stand. (Cheers.) I am a firm believer in provincial rights. (Renewed cheers.) In the Dominion House of Commons I have stood up for the authority of the provinces. When I took up the petition of my fellow-religionists of Manitoba, complaining of the legislation of the Government of Manitoba, I asked myself. What is the complaint ? I took the petition of the late Archbishop Taché, a man who, I believe, was revered in this province by friend or foe. I took up the petition of the Archbishop and those who signed it with him, and the complaint which was made was that the Government of Manitoba—I speak here in the presence of the members of the Government—had adopted legislation which, instead of imposing public schools upon the minority, imposed upon them Protestant schools, and that they were bound to send their children to Protestant schools. On the other hand, the Government of Manitoba denied the statement in toto. They did not admit that the legislation had that effect. They did not admit that the legislation was to have the effect of sending Roman Catholic children to Protestant schools. I said to the Government : Here is a simple question of fact. You have to determine whether the statements are true or not ; but instead of doing that, they went on appealing to the courts and evading the question. I did more. I said then—I say it here now—if the complaint of the Catholics were true, that Catholic children had been forced to attend Protestant schools, if that were true it would be such an outrage upon the rights of conscience that no community would permit it. I said upon the floor of the House of Commons : Prove to me that the complaint of the Roman Catholic minority is true, that their rights are outraged to this extent, that, instead of sending their children to schools where there is no religious teaching, they are forced to send their children to schools where there is religious teaching, and I will be prepared to go before the people of Manitoba and tell them that such legislation should not stand. I have nothing else to say in Winnipeg that I have not said on the floor of Parliament, in Quebec and elsewhere.

Now, I ask any hon. gentleman who understands the English language, to take that extract I have read from the speech of the leader of the Opposition in Winnipeg, and to take out of it one single definite state-

ment, one idea that could convey to the ordinary mind what that hon. gentleman's position was upon the school question. He surrounds the statements he makes in this House with so much verbiage that it is impossible for any one to obtain the slightest communication as to what position the hon. gentleman occupies. On the occasion in question, he was waited upon by a deputation of co-religionists, and, according to the report published in the "North-western Review," September 12, 1894, the following occurred :—

Mr. Powell then handed the written statement just read to the Hon. Mr. Laurier, who, resuming his seat, asked if any of the members present were desirous of supplementing by their remarks any of the facts alleged.

Mr. J. J. Golden at once arose and said that there might be a possibility of Mr. Laurier's being misinformed on this question. He said that Mr. Laurier might be led to believe that the schools are Protestant only where the majority are Protestants, and, as for instance in St. Boniface, that the schools could be favourable to Catholics. Mr. Golden went on to show that even in constituencies where Catholics were in a majority the schools were bound by the same rules and regulations as the schools of Winnipeg, the same text books were used, &c. Mr. Golden dwelt at length upon many other features of the School Act.

Mr. Laurier then said : " Many of those things on this topic are new to me. Don't you think you ought to lay your complaint before the present Government, and not before me ? "

Mr. Golden.—" We don't think so. "

Mr. Laurier.—" You honour me much. "

Mr. Golden.—" You, as leader of the Opposition, hold the key to this matter. "

Finally, after a brief discussion, Mr. Laurier said : " That is bringing me to where I will not follow you. This would be carrying us into politics, which I want to avoid. Your policy is to acquaint the Government of your state of the case. This I would advise you. I have but one policy ; it is the same in Manitoba as in Quebec, and I have expressed myself openly upon it. Your case is as strong a one as can be given. This is my only answer. "

The hon. gentleman stated that he had one policy in Quebec and the same policy in Manitoba. I have been trying to ascertain what that policy is ; other hon. members to whom I have applied have been trying to find out, but they have not found out yet. We cannot ascertain his policy in any statement made by the hon. gentleman. He makes general statements ; but when he came face to face with gentlemen who could give him the facts, he said, " This would be carrying us into politics, which I want to avoid. " The report continues :

Mr. N. Bawlf next addressed the Liberal leader and said that, when this present School Act went into force, the Catholic schools were wiped out, both the Catholic and Protestant schools ; Catholics should have got a proportionate representation on the board.

" When our schools were wiped out, " Mr. Bawlf said, " we had no debts whatever, and yet we were turned over to the Protestant school board and forced to share in their debt, amount-

ing to \$200,000. In order to break the camel's back, they have passed an Act whereby our very schools are taxed. And we are compelled to keep up the collegiate institute. If the law is what they say, if the state of their schools is such as they would lead us to believe, why do they insist on having a collegiate institute?"

Mr. Laurier.—"These are new facts to me upon this question. Were I in power, and you were to present me with such grievances as those, in my official capacity, I would ask an answer from the Manitoba Government. There are two sides to every question. You have stated your side. At present I am not in power, and have no authority to deal with your grievances. The only thing I can do is to give the facts as I know them to be, whenever an opportunity should arise. At present I am powerless to alter an iota."

Mr. T. D. Deegan.—"In the event of the present Government showing any inclination to deal favourably with us on this question, would Mr. Laurier aid the Government in that alternative?"

Mr. Laurier.—"If, after investigating the facts, I have found them to be as stated, I would act as I said yesterday. On all occasions I would be glad to impart the knowledge which I possess on this question. It is a question of facts, not one of law."

The hon. gentleman remained some days in Winnipeg, and had the opportunity to ascertain the facts. Has the hon. gentleman made a statement on any platform, or told the people anywhere that he has investigated the facts, or is in a better position to give more definite opinion on the question than he has given in the past? I trow not. We find in the present debate, the hon. gentleman has made utterances which are equally indefinite, and show that he is as much at sea on this question now as he was when he delivered addresses in Winnipeg in September, 1894. The hon. gentleman said the other night:

There is but one way to approach this question: we must approach it in the very terms of the Act itself, and apply the remedy in every case as the circumstances of the case shall warrant and justify. That is the position I have taken all along. This question came twice before this House for discussion—once in 1893 and once in 1895. I maintained the same position on those occasions.

The hon. gentleman is correct; he maintained the same indefinite position he has always maintained. The hon. gentleman further said:

I have maintained it in Ontario and Quebec; I have maintained it with friend and foe; I maintain it now. And, Mr. Speaker, I go further. Whatever may be the course taken by the Government upon this question, the day will come, sooner or later, when the position I now take must be taken by the Government of Canada, no matter who may be at the head of affairs.

That would be a very fine explanation of the hon. gentleman's present position if we only knew what position he occupied in the matter, if we could get the hon. gentleman to announce something definite, if we could find any definite statement made by him on the question, even if we could find

Mr. DALY.

it with a small-tooth comb. I should like the hon. gentleman to assist us to find such a statement. In addition to the hon. gentleman's speeches at Winnipeg, we find that he made other utterances equally indefinite. The hon. gentleman spoke in Montreal, and, according to a report published in the "Globe" of February 19, he said:

I am glad to leave for a moment the domain of political economy and to discuss the subject which interests particularly the people of Montreal, the Manitoba school question. I have spoken already many times on this question in the House of Commons, in Toronto, in Winnipeg, in Victoria. Let me tell you that I would have much more pleasure in discussing this matter in Winnipeg or Toronto than at Montreal, because while here I feel the sympathy of public sentiment, there I experienced the pleasure that one feels in fighting for a good cause. I have spoken frequently on the Manitoba schools, but have not yet succeeded in satisfying the Conservatives. The more I discuss it, the less satisfied they are. It is because I have taken the stand of a statesman and a patriot that I have not succeeded in pleasing them, and I do not expect to please them this evening.

I wish the hon. member for Grey would again refer to the little book from which he read yesterday in regard to synonyms, and would look up the word patriot, and would give us an idea as to its meaning, in order to throw light on the position taken by the leader of the Opposition at the time he made this statement. The hon. gentleman further said:

This question is not a new one. It came up in 1893 before Parliament, when the Government, after having made a first reference of it to the courts, found themselves obliged to confront it. They sought again to refer it to the courts, and they succeeded. I then declared in the House that the question was not one of right, but of fact. I took up the petition addressed to the Government by the Bishop of St. Boniface, the much regretted Monseigneur Taché, in which he declared that, under the pretext of introducing public schools into Manitoba, Protestant schools were in reality established. I asked the Government: Why refer this question to the courts? If these are Protestant schools, never in a free country should such an outrage be allowed. That declaration I repeated, I have repeated, not once, but five or six different times, in Ontario. I repeated it only fifteen days ago in Toronto; but the Conservative newspapers asked, Why does not Mr. Laurier go further?

The hon. gentleman has repeated that statement, and he will doubtless continue to repeat it; but what sense is there in continually repeating the declaration that he learned, after reading the petition of the late Archbishop Taché, that the schools were Protestant schools, and the hon. gentleman never took the opportunity, when in Winnipeg to ascertain whether such was the fact or not. The hon. gentleman has taken since 1893, when he made his first statement to the House, up to the present time to ascertain whether, as a matter of fact, these are Protestant or Catholic schools. An hon. gentleman across the floor said

"hear, hear," when I quoted the words of his leader that the question was not one of law, but of facts. There is no doubt that it is a question of law and of fact, and that was the reason that the questions were referred to the Supreme Court under the Blake Act, in order to get a decision from the court as to the facts in dispute, and as to what the law was, and it was not until that Act was passed, based on the resolution introduced by Mr. Blake, that the Government could obtain a legal decision on the facts and the law. If hon. gentlemen will read the judgment of the Privy Council, they will find the facts ascertained and the law laid down. In addition to the speech made by the hon. leader of the Opposition at Montreal and Winnipeg, we find that during his tour through Ontario, the hon. gentleman made other speeches, for instance, at Merrickville, on which occasion he declared his policy in more definite terms than he had done previously. The report says :

"There is not a man in the audience," exclaimed Mr. Laurier, in an outburst of eloquence, "but who would be glad to see the Catholic schools restored by the legislature of Manitoba." This was said at the Merrickville meeting, which, according to the "Globe's" report, was a specially enthusiastic demonstration, where "cheers went up for Mr. Laurier from a thousand throats," and where "there was not a dissentient voice amongst the shouts of approbation with which the Liberal leader's declaration of policy was received."

Now, Sir, is there any difference between the position taken by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Laurier) and by gentlemen on this side of the House, as defined by the hon. gentleman at Merrickville? The hon. gentleman there said for the first time in any of his public utterances, that he would be glad to see the Catholic schools restored by the legislature of Manitoba. What has the Dominion Government been seeking to do? Has it not been striving to get the rights of the minority restored by the legislature of Manitoba? Yes, Mr. Speaker, in every movement made by this Government from the inception of the case up to the present time there has been an effort on our part to have the rights of the minority restored by the Manitoba government, and it is because that government, friends and allies of the hon. gentlemen opposite, have refused to grant the necessary legislation to remove the grievances of the minority that this House is placed in the position it is to-day and will have to grapple with the question here. At Renfrew the hon. gentleman (Mr. Laurier) said :

I choose conciliation as my motto. We must have peace in this country. We must have harmony. We are, above everything, Canadians, whatever may be our religious beliefs, whatever be our opinions. If we want to build up this nation, we can do it only by every one of us individually making a sacrifice, upon the altar of our common country, of something of our own

opinions and prejudices. If the question is approached in this way, I think it is easy of solution, but, if it is approached in any other way, I see nothing but strife and discord for the future in this land of ours.

My object in making that quotation is, that I trust it will be read by his Liberal friends in the province of Manitoba and that it will sink deep into their hearts. If they had taken the advice uttered by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Laurier) at Renfrew, and the advice given by others equally prominent in the affairs of this country, we would not be dealing with this question in this Parliament as we are. In addition to this statement the hon. gentleman's organ "L'Electeur" of Quebec writes :

Mr. Laurier has pronounced himself boldly and has vigorously reproached the Government for not having interfered more promptly.

Now, I fail to find in any utterance made by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Laurier) in this House that he has attacked the Government for not having interfered more promptly. On the contrary, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Laurier) has taken three or four years to ascertain certain facts which he could ascertain in a few hours at Winnipeg; facts which indeed were given him by the deputation. And yet we find that the hon. gentleman is as indefinite upon the question now as he was at any time previously. Mr. Speaker, there is another feature of the case I would like to address myself to. We are charged with coercing Manitoba, and we are told that we are endeavouring to force separate schools upon Manitoba against its will. Now, Sir, I think I have shown from the quotations I have made from the Order in Council covering the remedial order, and from the quotations from other documents I have read, that there has been no attempt, or no thought, or no idea, upon the part of this Government to coerce Manitoba or to force separate schools upon it. But we find from the statements I have quoted that the government of Manitoba have been unwilling to listen, not only to the representations made by this Government, but unwilling also to listen to the declaration made by the judges of the highest court in the land. I had read in some newspapers that Mr. Greenway, or some of his colleagues, have said that they have never been approached on this question by those most deeply interested, namely, the minority in Manitoba. Let me point out that on the 12th September, 1894, a short time after the visit of the leader of the Opposition to Winnipeg, a deputation waited upon Mr. Greenway and presented a petition to him. Here is the report taken from the North-west "Review:"

Yesterday, the Catholics of the province assembled at St. Mary's church, and at 3.30 in the afternoon marched, two by two, up St. Mary's Street, then up Kennedy Street, and to the government buildings. Nearly 1,000 people were in line. Having arrived at the parliament house, all entered the legislative chambers.

Mr. Greenway did not keep the people waiting very long, for at four o'clock, sharp, he came in with Messrs. McMillan, Cameron and Watson. Mr. N. Bawlf, on behalf of the Catholics of the province, read the petition, which is as follows:—

“To the Honourable the Premier and Members of the Government of Manitoba.

“We, the undersigned Catholics of the province of Manitoba, do respectfully present :

“1. That we are unable, from motives of conscientious convictions, to participate in, or derive any benefit from a system of education as now carried on, under the Public School Act of 1890 and amendments thereto.

“2. That the heavy pecuniary sacrifices with which Catholics throughout the province have been burdened, in consequence of said laws, for the last four years, even through the financial stringency of the present time, must remove any doubt as to the earnestness of their feelings, and convince your government of the gravity of their grievances.

“3. That, without sharing your petitioners' religious convictions that the taxation of Catholics for schools, acceptable only to Protestants, is most oppressive and unfair, your government must feel that they can no longer, in their own conscience, carry on the system the result of which is injustice and oppression.

“4. Therefore, your petitioners, as free-born British subjects, do enter their formal and solemn protest against this unfair treatment at your hands ; and do respectfully and earnestly pray, that your government take into their serious consideration the grievances of the Catholics of this province, and do pass such legislation as may be necessary to remedy such grievances to their full extent, and to assure to the said population the full respect of their rights and conscientious feelings, the use of their school taxes, of their legitimate share of the public money voted for educational purposes in this province ; and your petitioners, as in duty bound, will ever pray.”

The petition was signed by nearly 4,000 people.

Mr. Greenway replied as follows :—

“Mr. Bawlf, and gentlemen of the delegation, on an important matter of this kind, involving the question of the government policy, in order to avoid misapprehension, it is better to give an answer in writing. At an early meeting of the government we will lay this matter before them, and as soon as possible we will give our reply.”

Here was an effort made by the people themselves, without the assistance of the courts, who waited upon the Premier in September, 1894, and respectfully asked him to remedy the grievances under which they laboured. But we find that a deaf ear was then turned to their representations. In addition to this, upon the charge that we have endeavoured to coerce this government and that we have not approached them in the sunny ways of patriotism mentioned by the leader of the Opposition, I have only to call the attention of the House to the fact that in 1894 a petition was signed by Cardinal Taschereau and by all the Archbishops and Bishops of the Roman Catholic Church in Canada, addressed to His Excellency the Governor General in Council, asking that the grievances under which the Roman Catholic minority in Manitoba and

Mr. DALY.

the North-west laboured, should be removed. We find that this Government, by a report of His Excellency in Council dated the 26th July, 1894, which was transmitted to the Lieutenant-Governor of the province of Manitoba, to be laid by him before the legislature, concluded as follows :—

The committee beg to observe to Your Excellency, that the statements which are contained in this memorial are matters of deep concern and solicitude in the interests of the Dominion at large, and that it is a matter of the utmost importance to the people of Canada that the laws which prevail in any portion of the Dominion should not be such as to occasion complaint of oppression or injustice to any class or portion of the people, but should be recognized as establishing perfect freedom and equality, especially in all matters relating to religion and religious belief and practice ; and the committee, therefore, humbly advise that Your Excellency may join with them in expressing the most earnest hope that the legislatures of Manitoba and of the North-west Territories, respectively, may take into consideration at the earliest possible moment the complaints which are set forth in this petition, and which are said to create dissatisfaction among Roman Catholics, not only in Manitoba and the North-west Territories, but likewise throughout Canada, and may take speedy measures to give redress in all the matters in relation to which any well-founded complaint or grievance be ascertained to exist.

I would ask even the gentleman who uttered these memorable words, whether that was not appealing to those gentlemen in the “sunny ways of patriotism ?” But do we find that those gentlemen are willing to be approached in that way ? No, Sir. Remember, it was in July, 1894, before the judgment of the Privy Council and before the issue of the remedial order, that this appeal was made by the Dominion Government to Mr. Greenway and the legislature of Manitoba asking them, in these kind and conciliatory words, to take into consideration at the earliest possible moment the complaints set forth in the petition, and if possible, to give satisfaction, and to lay this request before the legislature. Sir, from that day to this that memorandum has never been laid before the legislature of Manitoba, and that body is still ignorant of its existence except from its publication in the blue-books of this House and the newspapers of the country. The government of Mr. Greenway did not consult their masters ; but those gentlemen, whom we are asked to approach in the sunny ways of patriotism, made their reply, which was to the effect that they had no desire or intention to recede from the position they had taken in this matter. They say :

The questions which are raised by the report now under consideration have been the subject of most voluminous discussion in the legislature of Manitoba during the last four years. All the statements made in the memorial addressed to His Excellency the Governor General and many others, have been repeatedly made to and considered by the legislature. That body

has advisedly enacted educational legislation which gives to every citizen equal rights and equal privileges, and makes no distinction respecting nationality and religion. After a harassing legal contest, the highest court in the British dominions has decided that the legislature, in enacting the law of 1890, was within its constitutional powers, and that the subject of education is one committed to the charge of the provincial legislature. Under these circumstances, the executive of the province see no reason for recommending the legislature to alter the principles of the legislation complained of. It has been made clear that there is no grievance, except that it be a grievance that the legislature refuses to subsidize particular creeds out of the public funds, and the legislature can hardly be held to be responsible for the fact that their refusal to violate what seems to be a sound and just principle of government, creates, in the words of the report, dissatisfaction amongst Roman Catholics, not only in Manitoba and the North-west Territories, but likewise throughout Canada.

The government and legislative assembly would unitedly resist by every constitutional means any such attempt to interfere with their provincial autonomy.

So that these gentlemen, by the solemn declaration of an Order in Council, dated, Executive Council Chamber, 20th October, 1894, when there were present the Hon. Mr. Greenway, Mr. McMillan, Mr. Sifton, Mr. Watson and Mr. Cameron, declare, almost seven months before the decision of the Privy Council of England was rendered, that the government and legislative assembly would unitedly resist by every constitutional means any such attempt to interfere with their provincial autonomy; and we find that they are as good as their word. They say in their declaration that there is no grievance, while the highest court in the realm says there are grievances; and in spite of that they refuse to carry out the request made to them. Now, I have made the statement before, and I make it again without any fear of contradiction, that this whole movement on the part of Mr. Greenway and his followers, has been from its inception a political movement; it has been used for political purposes, and no other. Their position on the question is indefensible, when you look at it from the standpoint either of the constitution or of common sense, or from the standpoint of men having the responsibilities of government on their shoulders. Men removed from the sphere of politics altogether have given their views upon this question. We had it declared in this House not over two years ago by the hon. member for Winnipeg at that time, Mr. Hugh John Macdonald, that the legislation which was introduced in 1890 was brutal and butcherly. The Rev. Dr. King, in a very able review of the case delivered before the Presbyterian Synod of the North-west, maintained:

There has been great absence of wisdom and conciliatoriness, a degree perhaps even of injustice and harshness wholly unnecessary, in the way in which the change had been introduced.

Principal Grant on the same subject, said:

The government of Manitoba made a great mistake, and the onus lies on them to make concessions.

Then, we find the Rev. Peter Wright, of Portage la Prairie, formerly an Ontario teacher, speaking as follows:

Let us make it as easy as possible for our representatives to be not only fair and just, but noble and generous. Encourage them to look into the alleged grievance. If it exists let them see about the remedy in a spirit as broad and generous as is compatible with the cardinal principles of our institutions—equal rights and privileges to all.

And after a reference to the manner of settlement that some propose—the abolition of all religious exercises from the schools—he proceeds:

Will the Catholics then call our schools godless? Well, let them have the privilege of preparing religious exercises after their own ideas, as distinctly Catholic as they please, so long as the teaching is not subversive of civil obligation—and let these be used in every school where the trustees so determine, in lieu of the present religious exercises, and with the same limitations as to time and attendance.

Here are three statements made by learned divines of the Presbyterian Church. I could supplement them with similar statements made by the divines of other churches, calling on the government of Manitoba to meet this question manfully and rightfully and try to restore the rights of the minority and remedy their grievances. But, Sir, we find that every appeal made to them fell upon deaf ears; and they stand to-day as firmly as they did in 1890 when the Bill was introduced by the member for Winnipeg. In politics, Sir, we find very strange bed-fellows; but I cannot for the life of me understand how the hon. leader of the Opposition can take to his bosom the member for Winnipeg as one of his chief supporters, remembering the part he has played in this matter of the Manitoba schools. Why, Sir, I picture in my mind a meeting on the celebrated Champ de Mars in Montreal, with the hon. leader of the Opposition present as the central figure, and upon the platform with him the member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin), the member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte) and the member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar). While the audience are gathering the member for West Ontario in his dulcet tones sings that noble song which was so dear to the hearts of all Reformers in 1891:

Ontario, Ontario!
The tyrant's heel is on thy neck,
Ontario, Ontario!

And while that song is being sung by the hon. member for West Ontario, the member for L'Islet is going about among the audience distributing oranges—Bowling oranges. Then the hon. leader of the Opposition, with mighty mien, approaches the audience,

and, lifting in his hand a glass of sparkling St. Lawrence water, says: "Monsieur Martin, mon cher ami, salut"; or as they used to say in old days, "here is to our merry meeting." "Yes, compatriots, on this historic spot I desire to introduce to you my friend, Mr. Joseph Martin, the member for Winnipeg, a gentleman who is one of my strongest lieutenants. It is true, gentlemen, or ladies and gentlemen, that Mr. Martin has made certain declarations on the school question; it is true that he is the author of the School Act of 1890, about which we have had so much trouble and discussion; it is true that when introducing that Act in the Manitoba legislature he made a speech in which he said that he wished to wipe out the monstrous evil of separate schools." Now, we may have our own ideas on separate schools, but my friend Mr. Martin says they are a monstrous evil, and it was under that conviction, that he introduced his legislation. He desired to wipe them out, but none the less do I now commend Mr. Martin to you. And this same member for Winnipeg is the gentleman, who, after he had subjected yours and my compatriots and co-religionists in Manitoba to all the troubles and trials caused them by the Act of 1890, has come to the conclusion that this same Act which he placed on the statute-book has subjected them to rank tyranny." Of course it will be pretty hard for the leader of the Opposition to explain the fact of Mr. Martin being on the same platform with him. But I will leave that task to him and his supporters in Quebec. It is a most extraordinary position we find to-day. We find the leader of the Opposition and the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin) standing shoulder to shoulder in the hope and expectation which has filled their breasts for years that they may come at last across to the Treasury benches; and in this hope and expectation the leader of the Opposition is willing to ally himself to a gentleman who has declared that the separate schools are a monstrous evil, and that he trusts they will never be restored to the minority of Manitoba. And yet we are told that these gentlemen are statesmen. And we are told, forsooth, that our Government is coercing Manitoba. Sir, it is not we who are coercing Manitoba. I have proved that from the very inception of the school legislation in Manitoba, the gentlemen who introduced it, who followed it up, and who resist any attempt to have it interfered with, have but one idea, and that is to keep that Act intact upon the statute-book just so long as it will suit their political prospects. If these men had acted as British statesmen, as patriots, as Canadians, we would not be in the position in which we are to-day? We are charged with coercing Manitoba. Who has coerced it? I have shown that long before the remedial

Mr DALY.

order was made, when the resolution was introduced into the Manitoba legislature by Mr. Fisher, calling upon the legislature to meet the views laid down in the judgment of the Privy Council, that resolution was met by an amendment moved by the Attorney General, and seconded by the Provincial Secretary, and was defeated by a large majority. By that amendment, the legislature of Manitoba declared that they would not recede from the position they had taken. Even after that, I showed by interviews with these gentlemen, which I quoted—interviews with the Provincial Treasurer, the Provincial Secretary, the Attorney General, the Premier himself—and by quotations from the speeches of these gentlemen, that these men stood firm on the one ground alone and would not recede one iota. Why, if they had listened to the judgment of the Privy Council, if they had listened to the utterances of the Toronto "Globe," which I read to-day, if they had listened to the advice of the North-west Baptists, if they had listened to the Rev. Dr. Grant and the Rev. Dr. King, and to the opinion and views of other men who are not in politics—if they had listened to the views of those men, patriots and Canadians—they would have met the condition of things by at once yielding to the judgment of the courts and not have obstinately clung to their irreconcilable position. We find that those men, instead of being open to conciliation, have refused all along, from the very inception of this difficulty to the present time, despite all the efforts of this Government to conduct the matter on strictly constitutional lines and make the slightest concession. After the government of Manitoba had been called upon, from time to time, to have itself represented by counsel before the Privy Council and the tribunals, they refused. They were quite willing to let the thing go as it might without their being properly represented. In addition, we find that the counsel who conducted the case on their behalf, said before the Privy Council of Canada that no matter what order was made by the Privy Council, the Manitoba government would not obey it. They put on record before that Council their spirit of defiance, and continued to show the same defiance in reply to every appeal made for justice to the minority. They showed it in answer to the appeal which the four thousand made to the Premier of Manitoba in 1894; they showed it in answer to the appeals of the different gentlemen whose utterances I quoted; and they were no less obdurate when appealed to by this Government through its Orders in Council in July, 1894. In the same spirit of defiance with which they met those appeals, they answered the remedial order. This question is one that was thrust upon this Government. It is a question which was forced into the arena of Dominion politics through no fault of

ours. Well, Mr. Speaker, we have the courage of our convictions. We have taken a stand on this question and will carry out our pledges and promises. Instead of being charged with coercing Manitoba, I say that Manitoba is being coerced by the very men whose defiant utterances I have quoted here to-day. If a condition should arise, through any legislation that may be passed by this House, which would place this country in an unfortunate position, I blame those men, and history will endorse my opinion. On my responsibility, as a Minister of the Crown, standing here as a Canadian and a British subject, I say that it was never contemplated by the court which delivered the judgment that the government of Manitoba would not, as soon as it read that judgment, put itself in accord with the spirit and the principles of our constitution, and take the course which should be expected of British subjects and Canadians. In a few days this House will be called upon to discuss the Bill, and hon. gentlemen in this House and the people of the country will hold the provincial government of Manitoba responsible for the necessity which exists for passing this legislation.

Mr. FORBES. In view of the importance which this question has assumed, it would be unbecoming for me to be silent, and, therefore, I will beg the indulgence of the House for a short time while I touch several of the points referred to in the Speech from the Throne. I do not propose at this stage to enter upon an extensive discussion of the Manitoba school matter. I am gratified to learn that the Government intends to bring down its Bill, when we shall have a fair field to discuss the whole thing on its merits. I shall, therefore, not dwell very largely on that matter, but merely refer to it briefly when I reach it in its place in the Speech from the Throne. This debate has assumed considerable importance, and, I think, rightly so by virtue of the fact that the very sentiments expressed in the Speech from the Throne are, to a large extent, contradictory of the facts, as revealed to us by the records of the Government. We find that after His Excellency had addressed the hon. gentlemen in the Senate and the House of Commons, he announced that this special session was called for a particular purpose, and started out by saying that he "congratulates us upon the increased activity in the various departments of commerce and industry." I would like to be able to concur entirely in the views thus expressed, but, having in my mind the records of the Government, brought down and laid upon the Table of the House, it is impossible for me to do so. In saying this, I do not imply any reflection on the position held by His Excellency, who is in no way responsible for the Speech, but for which, primarily and lastly, his advisers, the Government of the day,

are directly responsible. If we turn to the first and only reference to commerce, we will find that the position of Canada to-day, as regards her commerce is far from being one of any great prosperity compared with former years, and compared with the great resources she enjoys. The returns brought down show that, as compared with other countries having less natural resources, Canada does not do herself justice. In the last returns, which are for the year ending 30th June, 1895, we find that the aggregate trade for the year, on the basis of goods for consumption alone, amounted to \$218,891,000. In the previous year, the total was \$230,618,000, so that there was a decrease in 1895 of about \$12,000,000. Again, take the total trade on the basis of total imports and exports, and we find that the total in 1895 was \$224,420,000, as against \$241,000,000 in 1894, a decrease of about \$16,000,000. As compared with the year 1893, the decrease was about \$23,000,000. I fail to understand, therefore, upon what ground the Government formulated that section of the Speech from the Throne. Let us examine the returns of imports and exports to ascertain our position as regards the question whether the trade of the country is in our favour or against us. I assert boldly that all sound economic writers uphold the principle that the trade of a country is in favour of a country when the imports are in excess of the exports. When the reverse of this is the case, the country must be exporting goods and getting no return. In 1893 the balance of trade, on the principle I have stated, was in favour of our country to the extent of \$9,000,000. In 1894 it was in our favour to the extent of \$6,000,000. But in 1895, the last year of which we have the records, we find that the exports were \$113,638,000, and the imports \$110,781,000. There was a balance of trade against Canada of almost \$3,000,000. We are forced to the conclusion that something or other, whatever we may choose to call it, is operating against the industries and against the progress of Canada. Without any hesitation, I would attribute the result to one cause alone, and that is our fiscal policy. Let us look at still other returns which afford us a fair means of judging whether the statement is justified that there is "evidence of increased activity in the various branches of commerce and industry." Let us turn to the shipping interest. In this we find the true reflex of the condition of the commerce of the country. I regret to say, Mr. Speaker, that the evidence furnished by the official returns is conclusive proof that this great industry of Canada, and particularly of the maritime provinces, is gradually but steadily decreasing. In 1873 the three maritime provinces, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island—I confine myself to these because the shipping interest is of more importance to them than

to the other provinces—the total tonnage was 716,469 tons. In 1878 it had increased to 943,783 tons, an increase of 237,314 tons. At a valuation of \$30 per ton, this would mean an increase in the wealth of Canada of \$7,113,420. At that time we had a low tariff, a tariff imposed for the purpose of raising revenue and giving only such incidental protection as might happen to the interests affected, but not in any way intended to restrict trade, particularly the export and import trade. Therefore, between those dates the shipping, the most important industry in the country, possibly excepting agriculture, grew and developed as I have shown. In 1893 the tonnage of the maritime provinces had fallen from 943,783 tons to 573,319 tons, a decrease of 370,264 tons, which, at the same valuation of \$30 per ton, would mean a loss of \$11,108,220 to the Dominion. From 1878 to 1893, we had a high tariff, the very object of which is to restrict exports and imports as well. Such a tariff must operate most injuriously upon the great shipping industry of the country. In 1894 the province of Nova Scotia lost, in addition, in that one year alone, 41,868 tons of shipping, equal to \$1,206,040, and in 1895 she suffered a further loss of 36,308 tons, equal to \$1,089,240. When that retrograde movement has been going on for a number of years past, and when, in addition, we find from returns laid upon the Table that we have lost, during the last decade over 1,250,000 of our population, taking into consideration the natural increase and the immigration which has cost us so much, and when you find these evidences of the unsatisfactory state of our industries corroborated by the reduced exports and imports, we cannot but conclude that something is wrong in the management of our affairs, and that Canada's prosperity is not what we have a right to look for. It is not too much to say that the condition of affairs in Canada to-day is one of absolute stagnation and decay, calling for the careful attention of our statesmen. In view of the facts I have quoted, I condemn that part of His Excellency's speech concerning "increased activity in the various branches of commerce and industry." I say it is a shame, in view of the condition of affairs, that these gentlemen not only seek to mislead the people by their own words, but they actually use the official position of His Excellency to give authority to their statements, and publish them throughout the length and breadth of the land. Sir, I ask the condemnation of all good thinking people upon that. Now, let us proceed a little further and see how they have made matters better, if they possibly could do so. But, in fact, I think we will find, as we proceed, that while they started out on the dangerous edge of a bog, they have only sunk themselves deeper into it as they progressed. The next clause refers to the North-west Territories and British Columbia.

Mr. FORBES.

In particular I notice the mining enterprise in British Columbia.

Now, Sir, if the Government ever promised anything to the people of Canada, it was that their policy which is in force to-day would tend to increase and develop the mining industries of this country. What do we find? We find a bare reference to the mining enterprises in British Columbia, a new colony, a new province, a province blessed by nature with some of the greatest resources the world has ever known, a province which we welcomed to the Dominion of Canada, a province which is a beauty spot within the limits of our nation. But because enterprising foreign capitalists have come in and uncovered the earth, and shown the great resources there are in that province, we are told, forsooth, that the mineral resources of the whole country are showing signs of progress and increased activity. As a matter of fact, the mining enterprises in eastern Canada have not shown that activity which they should have shown. We have in the province of Nova Scotia the finest deposits of gold, coal and iron in the world to-day, equalled only by those which you will find in British Columbia, superior to these you will find in the United States; and I say that they ought to be fostered by a judicious system of legislation that will develop them and make them a source of revenue, to a large extent, to the governments of this country, as well as a source of profit to the citizens of Canada. But what do we find? A clause is put into our tariff, and I believe it was inserted when the Act was supposed to be revised in 1894, for the purpose, among other things, of encouraging mining operations in Canada. It reads as follows:

Machinery, mining, and smelting, imported prior to May 16th, 1896, which is at the time of its importation of a class or kind not manufactured in Canada, free.

Now, Sir, the Government have violated in principle and in letter that section of the tariff. There is a large and well-developed industry in iron, coal and gold in Nova Scotia, and special machinery of various kinds, is used and is necessary. The manufacturing industries of Canada have not yet reached that perfect state where they can produce the best class of mining machinery, hence that clause is put in there for the purpose of letting in mining machinery free, to aid and assist the mining enterprises of Canada. But we find the Government of Canada, in league again with the hidden foes of the great interests of Canada, the manufacturing industry, the combines and monopolists—we find the Government of Canada in league with them; and when a piece of mining machinery is necessarily bought abroad because it cannot be obtained in Canada equal in quality to that which the mine owners would like to use, and which is absolutely necessary for the devel-

opment of our mines, we find the Government exacting an excessive duty upon that imported article; it deliberately imposes a serious tax upon the mining industries of the Dominion for the purpose, not of getting a revenue which might be derived therefrom, but for the ostensible purpose, and for the real purpose, too, of aiding and assisting the combines and monopolists of Canada, although it has been represented to them over and over again that machinery equal to that which can be got abroad, is not and cannot be made in Canada. Petitions have been presented by the mining societies in Nova Scotia, as I am aware, and representations have been made to the Government, delegations have waited upon them, but without avail. No satisfaction can be obtained, the only and the invariable answer is: We will take it into advisement. That means that they will consult with the manufacturers of similar articles in Canada, and if it can be shown by these manufacturers that their interests are affected in any way, then, forsooth, taxes are imposed upon the imported article, and the mining industry must bear the burden. Sir, the coal industry of Nova Scotia did not reach that pitch of development last year which we fondly hoped it would, and I dare say the vicious taxing system of this Government had considerable to do with it. Yet, in spite of all that, we find the Government asking His Excellency the Governor General to express the thanks of the Government to the Houses of Parliament for the increased activity in the mining resources of the country. Again, I must take exception to that clause, and say that the facts as deduced from the blue-books and the returns laid upon the Table of this House, do not warrant that statement at all. Now, we come to another clause, number four in the Speech, where we find reference is made to the industrial schools on the Indian reservations in the North-west. Sir, I have nothing to say but approval of those industrial schools, and approval of the way in which the Indian question is handled in Canada. I cordially approve of the generous way in which the North-west Mounted Police handle the Indians out there. The industrial schools which have been started for the benefits of those wards of the Government, are wise in their inception, and are doing a good work. If they are only operated in the best interests of those poor Indians, they shall have my support, and they should have the support of every true Canadian. Clause five refers to the North-west Mounted Police. Clause six refers to the special cause for which this special session of Parliament has been called, namely, the Manitoba school question. It points out that:

Immediately after the prorogation of Parliament, my Government communicated through the Lieutenant-Governor of Manitoba with the Government of that province, in order to ascer-

tain upon what lines the local authorities of Manitoba would be prepared to promote amendments to the Acts respecting education in schools in that province, and whether any arrangement was possible with the Manitoba Government which would render action by the Federal Parliament in this connection unnecessary. I regret to say that the advisers of the Lieutenant-Governor have declined to entertain favourably these suggestions, thereby rendering it necessary for my Government, in pursuance of its declared policy, to introduce legislation in regard to the subject.

That, Sir, is the great bone of contention between parties in this country. It is the great subject upon which this Government has got to exercise all its brains and all its power. It is the shoal, it is the quicksand, upon which they are going to fall to pieces. They will fall purely and simply because they started out wrong. They started out with a braggadocio which one would expect to see only in a highway robber when he is fully armed and equipped with all the modern instruments of warfare. Sir, the Government are going to fall simply because they have not the confidence of the people of the country, and they do not know how to get the confidence of the people of the country on that question. If they had started out where they are to-day by asking Manitoba what she would do by expressing their wish that a spirit of investigation and conciliation might govern their legislation on this subject, the question might not have assumed the strained condition in which we find it to-day. But the Government of Canada started out most hastily when they found they had obtained a verdict from the Privy Council in England in their favour. They started with a loaded blunderbuss to blow off the head of the Manitoba government, to crush provincial autonomy to the wall; they proceeded to act on the old antiquated theory of the Conservatives since federation, that they would attempt, and would succeed if they held power long enough, to deprive the provinces of their provincial rights and centralize those powers in the Federal Parliament and Government of Canada. The Liberal party has always opposed the usurpation of the rights of the provinces. I was astonished at the remarks made by the mover of the Address. No doubt he had received the suggestion from the Government before he proceeded to show that there was no such thing as provincial autonomy, that the proper way to govern this country was to wipe out the provincial governments, and particularly to sweep away those questions over which, according to the constitution, the provinces have jurisdiction, and centralize all powers in the central government. It is with that desire in their hearts and minds that the present Government has drifted into the position which we find them occupying to-day on the Manitoba school question. If it had been the acknowledged policy of the Government to have allowed

Parliament to run its full life and to have gone to the people only when the term of Parliament had expired, I do not think we would have ever had the remedial order of March last placed on the records of this country. The ex-Minister of Justice never would have drafted and carried through Council that celebrated order. At the time he got the order accepted by his colleagues in the Cabinet it was intended to hold the general elections at once, and before holding a session. It was intended to go to the Catholics with the declaration that the remedial order spoke in plain language for separate schools; and at the same time it was the intention to appeal to the people in Protestant sections with the plea that the order meant nothing but the transmission of the judicial decision from the Privy Council to the government of Manitoba. Undoubtedly that was the intention of this Government when the order was passed. But the first indication of disloyalty to the Premier was exhibited on that occasion. The majority of the members of the Cabinet took the ex-Minister of Justice by the throat and compelled him to withdraw his resignation; they compelled him to do so although he had forced the order through the Privy Council; of course, I do not know the details, but it is well known in one part of Canada. In Antigonish and Verchères the matter was explained in one way by himself, and his colleagues in the Cabinet explained it another way in Haldimand. We find that the Government, through its Protestant members there, are afraid to go to the country on the policy formulated. It was decided to hold another session of Parliament before appealing to the people, but they did not possess the nerve to bring down a Bill on the lines of the remedial order, and they misled the people for political gain. They announced that they would drive through Parliament during the present session a Bill on the lines of the remedial order. They adjourned Parliament last year with the solemn promise given to this House by the leader of the Government and by the Premier in the Upper Chamber that when the next session was called the chief and only business before Parliament would be to pass remedial legislation. Yet, forsooth, where is the Government Bill to-day? We are practically in the dark as to what the Government intend to do on this subject; they are hoping and trusting and praying that another bolt will occur in the Cabinet, or that some person may die, or that something may happen so that the Government will not be called upon to pass a remedial Act, and not be compelled to go to the country on this issue. During two hours and a half this afternoon the Minister of the Interior debated the remedial legislation proposed to be brought down to this House, but he discussed it from an abstract point of view and not on details. He endeavoured to prove

Mr. FORBES.

to this House and to the country in one breath that there are no facts which require investigation, and in the next breath that all the facts have been investigated; in the third place, that the Government of Canada to-day does not intend to coerce Manitoba; and in the fourth place, that if Manitoba does not do what is required, she will be coerced. These are the whole points of the speech delivered by the Minister of the Interior on the subject this afternoon. I could gather nothing further from it—it was first he would and then he would not; and as I listened to the speech I was convinced that the policy of the Government on this question is absolutely one of wrongdoing, that they intend to violate one of the most sacred principles of our constitution, and deprive the provinces of rights which were given to them in letters indelible at the time they came into the confederacy; I was satisfied of this when I heard the Minister read newspaper clippings and express his own opinions that it was safe and safe only for the confederation to adopt the legislation proposed by this Government. I do not hesitate to say that if it were established upon evidence before us that a wrong has been done, there is not a citizen in Canada who would not be prepared to give fair and equal justice to his comrades of any faith or creed in this country. No speech has been made on this question, nor is there a single record among the records laid on the Table of the House to convince me that there is a sufficient injury and wrong done to the Catholic minority in Manitoba to override the constitution and to warrant us in driving out of the constitution of this country the great principle of provincial autonomy. We only require to look at the condition of affairs in Manitoba and the history of this question from its inception to see that the policy of the leader of the Opposition, as laid down in this House some years ago is the correct one, and the only one which any free citizen and patriot in Canada should adopt. The statement was made by the Minister of the Interior, that the petition of the Archbishop of Manitoba submitted to the Privy Council of Canada, established the fact that the Roman Catholic children of Manitoba are compelled to attend Protestant schools, and to accept Protestant teaching against their conscientious convictions; but we find that this statement is denied by the records of the Manitoba government, and how can it be said that the facts are settled and determined so that we can come to a fair decision on the case. That alone, which I take as an excerpt from the statement of the Minister this afternoon, is enough to convince hon. members that it would redound with fatal effect to the Catholics generally in Canada if we allowed such an Act as the Government propose to pass through this House. It is stated by the Minister of the Interior

that Manitoba has never shown a spirit of conciliation in this matter, and has never attempted to meet the federal government in any degree, not even half way, in order to have this question settled. The facts, as set forth by the hon. gentleman's colleagues and friends do not concur with this statement. We have in the "Nor'-Wester," newspaper published by the Conservatives and supporting the Opposition to Mr. Greenway's government, this statement :

The Hon. Mr. Sifton in his speech at Douglas on 31st December last, as reported by the Winnipeg "Daily Tribune," said :

We (the government of Manitoba) are prepared to consider any changes in method that will make it acceptable to the Roman Catholics. We will do anything in reason, anything that will not compromise principle ; and again, anything in reason if we can settle this matter without compromising principle, then we will do it, but not otherwise. If there is any change that can be made in the religious exercises that will make them acceptable to all parties, if any change can be made in the time they are held, or other like changes, we are prepared to consider them.

Well, Sir, if it is the conscientious scruples of the minority, that the Greenway party and the Liberal party—or we will say the Greenway party alone—are attempting to trample upon in the province of Manitoba surely that can be settled without coercing Manitoba ; surely that can be settled without passing an Act of this Parliament compelling the people of Manitoba, at the point of the bayonet, to give separate schools, to divide public lands and public moneys, and to upset the whole system of education in that province, which is yet a young province, and which may be forced out of confederation or compelled to take up arms. Since the general elections they have returned the Greenway government by 33 majority, in a House of 40 members. Surely some men can be found on the Government side of the House able to grapple with this question. I know there is none of them on the other side able to grapple with it as the leader of the Opposition can, but surely some of their Conservative friends can throw some ray of light on the darkness in which they have involved themselves. Why do they not attempt to conciliate Manitoba. Why do they not submit a draft of the Bill they propose, and ask Manitoba if she will consent to it, if she will accept it, before laying it on the Table of this House ? There is no evidence of any attempt at conciliating Manitoba on the part of the Dominion Government. They met Manitoba with a gun loaded to the muzzle. They were compelled by public opinion to withdraw the charge in that gun, but they hold it ready to fire again at the provincial autonomy of that province. Sir, if they trample upon that great sacred right of a province of this Dominion a wave of indignation will go westward to British Columbia and back again to the province of Nova Scotia. If there is a province in

this Dominion which would seriously protest against the action of this Government in trampling upon provincial autonomy, it is the province of Nova Scotia. That province has its birthright stolen from it without the consent of the people, and the subject is tender to them. Within the limits of Nova Scotia all classes and creeds are treated in the same generous and fair spirit on the question of education. But let it not be said to them that this Parliament of Canada will coerce the people of Manitoba or the people of any other province. Sir, if they do, it will never be forgotten to the last generation of the Tory party in Canada, should it live a hundred or a thousand years. This is a matter which in my opinion should be thoroughly investigated. Upon the evidence which may be adduced I am prepared to lend myself as an unbiassed juror, and if any facts be found in favour of the Roman Catholic minority or against their best interest to-day, I am ready to decide upon these facts. I am not in a position at the present time to decide fully and conscientiously on the limited facts which we have before us. I cannot come to any honest conclusion upon the question in the absence of such facts as might be gained by an investigation. It is mere child's play for hon. gentlemen opposite to talk about the question as they do. Imagine a Minister of the Crown, the Minister of the Interior, reading newspaper extracts extending over the last three or four years, as to what newspaper editors have said, as to what biased persons have written, and as to views on the question expressed by enthusiastic people in favour of this party or that party. Why should Manitoba be coerced on such statements as that ? Not one of these statements, can the hon. Minister attempt to say, have been established as absolutely correct and true. They are the mere "ipsi dixit" and "obiter dicta" of persons who are not versed in the facts of this important case. This question should be approached in the sunny ways of patriotism. I repeat that it can only be settled by an investigation, and after that, by conciliation. I have faith in the people of Manitoba, and particularly in the patriotism of the minority of that province and their numerous friends in other parts of Canada. We have it upon record to-day that the province is a unit as against coercion and against the proposed legislation by this Parliament. The Conservatives of Manitoba who opposed the Greenway government at the last election proclaimed from every hustings that Greenway, the Liberal Premier of that province, was selling Manitoba to the French Catholics, to the Roman Catholics, and to the Hierarchy of Manitoba. The organ of the Conservative government in Manitoba has on the other hand said that the Greenway party stand upon the principle that the British Privy Council laid

down in the judicial decision which they gave upon the Act of 1890, namely, that the Act of 1890 was within the jurisdiction of the province of Manitoba. With that fact found by the highest legal tribunal in the British Empire, why should it be said that Manitoba, at the dictation of the Government of Canada, should recede from the rights which the constitution of the province entitled it to. It is quite true, and I admit as a lawyer, that we should as a nation and as a Parliament, be bound by the decision of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council on any legal point. But, Sir, when it is found that the Privy Council distinctly laid down that Parliament is not legally bound, and is not constitutionally bound to give that full measure of relief which the remedial order of the present Government says the Roman Catholic minority is entitled to; what are we to say? With that fact before me, and with the fact that the decision given a year before holds the Act to be thoroughly constitutional, I scout the contention of this Government that they are acting constitutionally in forcing this Act upon Manitoba. There is no evidence whatever to entitle them to come to that conclusion. They have purely a judicial power. They have no perfunctory act to perform. They have not the right to say to Manitoba: if you do not accept the judicial opinion of the English Privy Council we will force it upon you. They have the right simply to say: It has been laid down by the highest court in the Empire that we have the power to hear both parties on this question, now let them come before us, let them come with counsel as they have done, let them come before us in Parliament by their representatives as they propose to do this session, let them further than that say: If it is absolutely necessary in the interest of justice or in the interest of the minority that we should appoint a commission to investigate, let us appoint that commission. Even if it should take one, two or five months for that commission to investigate, and even if necessary dissolve this moribund parliament and appeal to the people of Canada. I contend that the necessity of the occasion and the importance of the matter, command that the Government of Canada should hesitate before it shall pass an Act without obtaining that information which would enable this Parliament to come to a righteous and well matured conclusion. I judge from the remarks of the Minister of the Interior that the Government does not know where it stands upon this question to-day. That hon. gentleman started out against coercion and he wound up by advocating coercion if necessary; he started out by declaring that he had all the facts, and wound up with the statement that we did not have the facts we ought to have. Mr. Speaker, there are a few more clauses of the Address to

Mr. FORBES.

which I would like to make a few references. One is the clause in reference to a Fast Atlantic steamship line:

I am happy to inform you that the representatives of my Government, and the suggestions of the Ottawa conference respecting steamship communication, have resulted in an announcement by the Imperial authorities of their willingness to grant a substantial subvention towards the Atlantic portion of the scheme.

Sir, I take that to mean that a fast Atlantic steam service is to be established between England and some port in Canada, and that from the extreme western portion of Canada in British Columbia a submarine cable is to be laid across the Pacific to Australia. I admire the boldness of the Government in bringing forward the project for a fast Atlantic line. I heartily approve of anything that tends to develop and increase the trade and commerce of this country. All that is required is that this be done in a proper and judicial manner, and that we exercise our privilege of voting money to aid these great undertakings in the true national spirit of developing our nation and natural industries only—not in the jingo spirit, merely for the sake of capturing votes. The only Atlantic service from which Canada has derived a benefit in the past is that which has been given by the Liberal party. The hon. members who represent Halifax in this House have done nothing during this Parliament to stop the delivery of passengers and freight at an American seaport. It is to be hoped that a part of the policy indicated in the Speech from the Throne will be to bring this fast Atlantic line to some Canadian port. Of course, I think that there is no port superior to our Nova Scotia ports. Those ports are the nearest to the mother country, and our ports are open at all seasons of the year, so that it would not be necessary to change the port at any season. On this subject I reserve further discussion until the Government's proposition with regard to the proposed subsidy is definitely before Parliament. With regard to the proposed cable across the Pacific Ocean, it would be well for Canada to have it; but I think that is a matter entirely for the consideration of the Imperial Government, and Canada should not be asked to spend one cent upon it; and I trust that if the Government have made any provision for that in their Estimates, they will strike it out. Then, we are told in the Speech that our attention will be asked to "measures intended to provide for the better arming of our militia and the strengthening of Canadian defences." This is a peculiar clause, and when we find attempts being made by Canadian statesmen to set up a sort of jingo policy based upon it, I for my part must deprecate it. I find that Sir Charles Tupper, the new Secretary of State, on his way east, when asked as to the Conservative platform, said that "it was going to be enlarged so as to include

closer trade relations with the mother country and the betterment of the defences along the Canadian border." You will see, Mr. Speaker, that that differs from the statement in the Speech from the Throne. Why the Secretary of State should have said this, unless he was authorized to do so by his Government, I fail to see, unless to make it appear that Canada was anxious, and publicly anxious, to insult the American nation. If the hon. gentleman intended to say that Canada was hostile to the American people, that Canada intended to cut off all communication with them and to arm herself against possible inroads from them, it is of a piece with the jingo spirit which animates hon. gentlemen opposite when they parade their loyalty, carry it on their coat-sleeves, and constantly talk about it on the floor of the Canadian Parliament. It may be that the clause put in here is for the purpose of catching votes for the Conservative party. For my part, I say it would be absolutely ridiculous to establish a line of fortifications along the Canadian border. If the clause means simply that we are to be asked to provide a sum of money to furnish superior arms for our militia, I agree most fully with that statement. I believe, in the words of my honoured leader, that it would be little short of butchery to send the Canadian militia out to do duty armed with an antiquated weapon; and if such is the condition of the force to-day, it is a reflection upon the Government of Canada that it should have allowed such a condition of affairs to remain so long. I believe the proposal to properly arm our militia will meet with the approval of both sides of the House. There are some other sections in the Speech to which I would like to make reference, but time is pressing. There is one, however, to which I wish in particular to take exception:

You will also be asked to consider measures for the extension and development of our trade in agricultural products with the United Kingdom, and other markets.

This does not harmonize with the clause referring to the strengthening of Canadian defences, if that refers to a series of defences along the frontier of Canada. It is quite right that we should make efforts for "the extension of our trade with the United Kingdom and other markets." We have always been desirous of extending our trade with other countries, and we are to-day willing and anxious to develop our trade with the other portions of the British Empire, and particularly with England; but whether or not Great Britain will adopt the principle of preferential trade with the colonies, we can never secure by any act of this Parliament. But if we intend to adopt such a policy towards England, there is only one way in which we can show our sympathy with the sentiment expressed by His Excellency, that is, by

throwing down the barriers which tend to restrict our trade with England. Yesterday, I believe, the Secretary of State (Sir Charles Tupper) addressed the Board of Trade in Montreal. I am informed by the newspapers that he touched upon this great question of preferential trade within the Empire, and, as an evidence of Canada's willingness to participate in that policy, quoted a resolution which he said had passed the Canadian Parliament. That resolution was as follows:—

Inasmuch as Great Britain admits the products of Canada free of duty into her ports, this House is of opinion that the present scale of duties exacted on goods mainly imported from Great Britain, should be reduced.

I am surprised to learn that the Secretary of State quoted that resolution to the Board of Trade in Montreal, and said that it expressed the opinion of Parliament to-day on the question, and was an evidence of Canada's good-will to meet the British Empire half way upon the principle of preferential trade. Sir, it is a fact that the hon. member for Queen's (P.E.I.) (Mr. Davies) in 1892 submitted that resolution to Parliament. But the Government, the National Policy party, the party of restrictionists, voted down that resolution, and it failed to pass. Yet, if we are intending to do all which lies in our power to facilitate and carry out the great principle of preferential trade, or of increasing our trade with the mother country, why could we not have done the least in our power in that direction by passing this resolution which the hon. Secretary of State thought we had passed. It was wrong for us, then, to refuse that resolution, and wrong for us to-day to speak of adopting a policy of preferential trade in the Empire while, at the same time, carrying out no policy and doing nothing on our part to aid the scheme. I find, on looking over the reports further, a report of the Executive Council of Upper and Lower Canada, passed in 1865, at which board the late Sir John Macdonald sat as a member. The following minute was passed:

They (i.e., the Committee in Council) cannot err in directing the attention of the enlightened statesmen of the great Empire, of which it is the proudest boast of Canadians, to form a part, to the connection between material prosperity and political contentment, feeling that they appealed to the highest motives of patriotic statesmen, viz., the desire to perpetuate a Dominion founded on the affectionate alliance of a prosperous and contented people.

We have in that minute of council, this principle enunciated that material prosperity and political contentment go together. But that principle is at variance with the policy of the Government to-day, as exhibited in their policy of antagonism to the United States. It is a serious thing for us to consider as a commercial people, whether material prosperity and political contentment cannot and should not go side by side to-day as it was said they should go in

1865. If we are to develop our trade with the mother country, and with our sister colonies by a system of preferential treatment within the Empire, is it not equally important for us to foster a condition of political contentment with our great neighbours to the south? While the proposed policy of preferential trade within the Empire should go on and progress towards a conclusion satisfactory to all the colonies, including ourselves, I say that Canada must not make the mistake of acting against the interests of Great Britain and her sister colonies, or the also fatal mistake of throwing herself against her own interests and antagonizing our commercial friends and interests in the United States.

Sir, before I sit down I would like to make a reference to the statements which were made by the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) with reference to the public men of Nova Scotia. I do most thoroughly agree with him that Nova Scotia has produced bright and shining lights in her public life. The Howes, the Uniackes, the Johnsons, the Huntingtons and the Youngs are men of whom Nova Scotia may be proud. But, Sir, I know of no more complete vindication of the statement made by the hon. member for South Oxford in his caustic references to the hon. Secretary of State (Sir Charles Tupper, Bart.) than the speech of the hon. member for Albert, when, in referring to the many public men of note which Nova Scotia had produced, he (Mr. Weldon) deliberately omitted the name of Sir Charles Tupper, Bart. It was to him alone that the hon. member for South Oxford referred. He cast no slur, in the language I heard him use, on the public men of Nova Scotia. His reference to Nova Scotia producing the highest type of a boodler was confined to the Secretary of State (Sir Charles Tupper), and was backed up by evidence which he produced, from statements of A. W. McLellan, Tupper's colleague, and from the Government paper, the "Mail and Empire." I shall not prolong this debate further. I would not have risen to take up the time of the House except for two purposes. First, that, in my humble opinion, the statements made by His Excellency in opening Parliament are not based upon facts and are contradicted by the reports brought down to Parliament which I have examined. The statement in particular concerning trade and commerce is not correct, and I feel it my duty to call the attention of the House to it. *Secondly*, I desired to make a few remarks and put myself on record as early as possible with regard to the great question of the Manitoba schools. I shall reserve any further remarks on that subject until the Bill is laid before the House, and I trust that the Address which the hon. member for Westmoreland has moved in reply to the Address with which His Excellency opened Parliament will pass the House;

Mr. FORBES.

and while I do not agree with the sentiments expressed by the mover, I join with the mover and seconder in thanking His Excellency for having opened Parliament and advised us in the way he did.

Mr. NORTHROP. The debate which has followed on the motion of the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Powell) has taken so wide a range that there is hardly any topic within the range of Parliamentary inquiry, to which one could possibly refer, that one might not very well say was urged in reply to some of the observations of hon. gentlemen opposite. Yet it seemed to me, with all due respect for those who have already spoken, that in one of the first sentences which fell from the lips of the hon. leader of the Opposition in opening the discussion, the keynote was struck which better expressed the relative position of the two parties with regard to the questions now before the House and country, than whole volumes of discussion could do. In referring to the Speech from the Throne, the first clause of which was a natural and proper clause, expressing gratitude for the bounteous harvest with which Canada has been blessed, the leader of the Opposition expressed his surprise in a sarcastic, almost sneering way, that the Address contained no reference to the National Policy. There is the key-note to show the distinction between the two sides of the House. We on this side, bend to no one on the other side in frank and grateful acknowledgment that all good gifts around us come from heaven above. We are ready to acknowledge our gratitude for these good gifts and to confess, that without the blessing of the Giver of all good, the labours of the husbandman would be in vain. But, at the same time we know that the old adage is true which says that Heaven helps those who help themselves; and, while we are thankful, as has been so well said, for the bounteous harvest with which the country has been blessed, we know, and gentlemen opposite know as well, that the harvest would have been thirty millions of bushels less but for Manitoba and the North-west. And we know also that if gentlemen opposite had their way and had carried out the amphibious policy that they advocated when in power and had constructed a line whereby, partly by rail and partly by water in the summer and partly by sleds and generally not at all in the winter, the products of that far country would have been brought to the sea, the harvest would have been thirty millions bushels less than it was. And we know that when the Conservative party restored to power had made arrangements for a railway and the railway company had exhausted the means they had been able to raise, in the construction of the road and found it necessary to return to Parliament and ask for a further loan, the Conservative party took its life in its hands, and, though

fought with bitterness by gentlemen opposite, decided to grant that loan. Gentlemen opposite declared that that loan would never be repaid, but, in fact it was faithfully, honestly and promptly repaid, and the Canadian Pacific Railway constructed to that far land is one of the means which has brought about that bounteous harvest for which we return thanks to Heaven. When we listen to gentlemen opposite discussing political questions, I confess that the impression on my mind—and I say it with all frankness—is that they are trying hard to keep up their own courage by the arguments they use. The other night we heard the hon. member for King's, N.S. (Mr. Borden) learnedly discussing limited reciprocity as against unlimited reciprocity; and to save his life he could not see why a person favouring limited reciprocity should not be quite enthusiastic about unrestricted reciprocity. There again we have a singular suggestion of the lines dividing the two parties. Gentlemen on the other side are wedded to the idea of reciprocity. There seems to be some charm about the very name, so that they are ready at all times and under any circumstances to fall down and worship reciprocity. Now we are not in favour of reciprocity nor are we opposed to it. We flatter ourselves that we know enough about it to know that no person can judge of the effect of reciprocity unless he takes the articles to which it is to be applied one by one or class by class. We know that there are some articles in which, beyond all peradventure, it would be better to have reciprocity. Let me quote the case of barley as an instance. I suppose there is not a man in Canada but would hold up both hands in favour of reciprocity in barley. We have other articles, such as some of our manufactures, in respect of which it is perfectly certain a large portion of the people would think our trade would be injured by reciprocity. Then we have another class of articles, such as corn and coal as to which, in one part of the country reciprocity would be considered desirable while in another part it would be considered undesirable. And so we see that the Government that wishes to justify itself to intelligent men must consider all these articles and the various circumstances of every case with which they are called upon to deal. They must not fall down and worship an idol, even though it be called reciprocity, but must sit down and consider as business men in which articles reciprocity would pay and in which it would not pay, and even if we must lose on some to try to make a gain on others, and so try to have a balance in our own favour and secure such a bargain as would be fair, reasonable and profitable. Hon. gentlemen opposite have a peculiar way of expressing their views in this House. I was surprised to hear one of the leaders of the Opposition refer to the theory of protection in England and sneeringly turn to this side of the House and inquire

whether that would be a good thing for us in Canada. It seems utterly impossible for these hon. gentlemen to fix their eyes on the country they are asked to legislate for. They have been so accustomed to cast their eyes on another country that they cannot fix their eyes upon the country really interested in any particular case. There is not a man in the Conservative party who would advocate protection in England for the benefit of Canada. It would be a different thing if the members of this party were in England and were called upon to consider it from the standpoint of England. We might then prefer to see it introduced there. Yet hon. gentlemen opposite, who, one would think, must be aware of this distinction, quietly discuss this question as if the only question was for us to say what would be the effect upon Canada if protection were adopted in England. In fact, one cannot help thinking the gentlemen opposite are somewhat like the hon. member for South Oxford, an ex-Finance Minister of this country who so touchily denied that he had ever supported commercial union. I am bound, of course, to accept his statement, but I think I am at liberty to say that, if he never advocated commercial union, he disguised his thoughts so successfully that everybody in this country and the people in the old country and the United States thought he supported commercial union, and that he even went so far that he thought he supported it himself. I am sorry, the hon. gentleman who has been here during the evening, has just left the Chamber, because I think that evidence can be given to satisfy even him that though, as I admit, he never did advocate commercial union, other people were justified in believing, however mistakenly, that he did. I have here a touching little work entitled "The Commercial Union Hand Book," published in 1888 by the Commercial Union Club established in the city of Toronto. This book contains the constitution of the Commercial Union Club of Toronto. It says:

This association shall be designated the Commercial Union Club—

And it gives the objects of the association, one of which is:

—to improve the trade relations and develop the industries of Canada by securing unrestricted reciprocity of trade between this country and the United States.

So this commercial union club, founded in Toronto and publishing a pamphlet or series of pamphlets to promulgate their doctrines, though calling themselves the commercial union club declare in their constitution that they are in favour of unrestricted reciprocity. Looking into this work I find that that which was thought best calculated to set forth the views of the club, because they give it the place of prominence at the very

first of the book, is a speech by the Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright, K.C.M.G., in the House of Commons on the 14th March, 1888. In looking through the speech I find that the hon. gentleman has again and again laid down his views as to what the true policy of this country should be. I find on page 15, for example, that he advocates the attaining of perfect free trade with the people of the United States. I find that on page 17 he says :

It is scarcely necessary for me to insist on the enormous advantage which unrestricted trade with the United States would be for us.

And so on through his speech again and again he is appealing for perfect free trade or unrestricted reciprocity with the United States. But when I look further in this work, I find a speech delivered by John Charlton, not he of Michigan, of whom we have heard so much even in this House, but John Charlton, M.P. for Norfolk. Looking at his speech on page 131 of this precious work, we find that he first proceeded to explain the meaning of the term commercial union, and he then went on with his argument and proceeded to show that Canada would derive from unrestricted reciprocity certain advantages, showing that the terms commercial union and unrestricted reciprocity were synonymous. I then find this gentleman appealing to the farmers' institute, and they seem to have captured the farmers' institute, so far as one could judge. On page 165 I see that the executive committee of the farmers' institute of Ontario issued a circular in the following words :

That this executive committee do now proceed to take steps to form an organization in each electoral district or county in which farmers' institutes have declared by vote in favour of unrestricted reciprocity or commercial union, with a view of promoting the same between Canada and the United States.

In the advice which accompanies this circular, they urge their friends to take immediate action, and to form commercial union clubs, not only in every electoral district, but in every township if possible. I find a special declaration which the farmers are asked to sign :

We, whose names are hereunto subscribed, are of the opinion that it is necessary for the agricultural community and those directly interested in agriculture, to unite firmly and cordially to promote their interests, and by so doing to help every other legitimate interest in the country, since successful agriculture is the principal basis of true Canadian prosperity. Unrestricted free trade with the United States would be the greatest attainable boon for the farmers of Canada at the present time. We are further of the opinion that the necessity is so urgent that men should sink minor differences and agree upon united action to obtain the desired unrestricted reciprocity or commercial union.

I find in going through this work—I will not occupy your time in quoting—but again

Mr. NORTHROP.

and again the terms are used synonymously, continental free trade, unrestricted reciprocity and commercial union. Now, Sir, I find a singular thing. In looking at an article on page 115, I find that Mr. Longley, Attorney General, I believe, of Nova Scotia, very strongly, of course, advocated this policy, and in advocating the policy, he had occasion to answer some objections urged to it, and the first was that it would lead to annexation. His answer was :

This must be considered from two standpoints—that of those who are rigidly opposed to political union with the United States, and those who are not. Belonging to the latter class—

Those who are not opposed to union with the United States—

And believing firmly that the interests of the Dominion of Canada are more identified with the continent of America than with any other portion of the world, this bugbear has no terrors for me.

Further on, at page 120, the same Mr. Longley says, in discussing this objection that it will tend to separate Canada from the British Empire :

I wish, above all things, to be frank in the discussion of this vital question, and, therefore, I am compelled to admit that there is a large basis to this objection.

I find, too, that Mr. Goldwin Smith, who was one of the principal movers in this club, and who, I believe, was a president of the club, he too in this same work, page 199, avows that he was in favour of union between this country and the republic to the south. He says :

I wish to be perfectly frank upon this, as upon other points, and not to leave it to be said hereafter that anything has been held back. It is my avowed conviction that the union of the English-speaking race upon this continent will some day come to pass.

Then he goes on to show why. Now, Sir, I think it is a little extraordinary that a gentleman who poses before this House as a descendant of the noble United Empire Loyalists, and rather claims credit for it, should be found in such company as we have found him, and that his speeches should be of such a character as have been quoted. We cannot blame him for having his speeches published, but we can blame him for making speeches of such a character that they would be published in such a handbook as this, in which the principal leaders of the movement openly avow that this policy is in the interest of Canada, and they think the interest of Canada is annexation to the United States. The leader of the Opposition, in some speeches delivered by him through the country, which are gathered together in an interesting little volume I hold in my hand, a volume which I am sure will meet with the approval of the hon. leader of the Opposition, edited, no doubt, by a friend, Mr. Ulric Barthe, and dedicated

to Ernest Pacaud. There is every evidence of its genuineness, and every reason to believe that the ideas set forth here are those of the leaders of the Liberal party. In this little work I find the leader of the Opposition defining, according to his idea, what the policy of the Liberal party was, and he told us it was continental free trade, pages 563 and 564. I will not occupy the time of the House in reading all the quotations. The hon. gentleman pointed out why we could not have a commercial alliance with Great Britain. At that time he did not think of having free trade as it is in Great Britain. He pointed out why we could not have it, and he says :

If there is any man who believes that any such alliance between Canada and Great Britain can be formed upon any other basis than that of free trade, which prevails in England, that man is a "Rip Van Winkle," who has been sleeping, not only for the last seven years, but for the last forty-four years. Why, Mr. Chairman, the British people will not to-day go back on the policy of free trade which they have adopted, and Canada is not in a position at this moment, with the large revenue which she has to collect, to adopt any other tariff than a revenue tariff, at best.

So he goes on to say that continental free trade is the proper policy for this country. But I find this gentleman, Mr. Goldwin Smith, who, whatever faults he may have, is at least a scholar, at page 245 of this little work, sums up the meaning of these three terms, "commercial union," "unrestricted reciprocity," and "continental free trade," in this sentence :

"Commercial union," "unrestricted reciprocity," "continental free trade" are three different names for the same or nearly the same thing. For my own part, I preferred "continental free trade," but this was discarded because it seemed to threaten protectionists with the adoption of free trade as a general principle. "Unrestricted reciprocity" as a watchword was somewhat cumbersome. Thus we slid into "commercial union," which is, perhaps, more accurate, in this respect that it includes community of fisheries and of the coasting trade, which forms part of the scheme.

Now, Sir, those having been the views advocated by the hon. member for South Oxford, it is not surprising that he was invited to the famous banquet in the city of Boston in 1891, of which we have heard so much, and as to his utterances at which there appears to be such a difference of opinion. The other evening the hon. gentleman, in this House, refused to be bound by the newspaper reports, but said he would stand by the report of the Boston Merchants' Association. This book was obtained from Boston, so that we have authority for the statements the hon. gentleman made that night. Before referring to his statement, perhaps, one should, in justice, say that the hon. gentleman may have been a little flurried that evening, although he is somewhat accustomed to public speaking, for he was received with such encomiums

as, I venture to say, no Canadian, no British subject, from the earliest times to that unfortunate night, ever received in any foreign land. He was introduced by Mr. President Lane. After reference had been made to the excellent policy which these gentlemen were advocating, which was commercial union or unrestricted reciprocity, the president went on to say :

Our Liberal friends, Fielding and Longley, of Nova Scotia,—

Mr. Longley is the annexation friend whose utterances I quoted a moment ago :

Our Liberal friends, Fielding and Longley, of Nova Scotia ; Davies, of Prince Edward Island ; Mercier and Laurier, of Quebec ; Cartwright, of Ontario, and hosts besides look to us, the people of the United States, for "the sign by which they shall conquer. "Shall we deny them?"

No wonder the hon. gentleman was probably a little flurried and excited when he arose to address this enthusiastic and friendly gathering. After he had described in glowing terms the advantages to the United States to be gained by the adoption of the policy he was advocating, he used these words, which are practically the same as quoted by the hon. member for Halifax the other night, and which I only give now since the hon. member for South Oxford himself appealed to this little work as the authority on the subject, so that after quoting from it, there can in future, I presume, be no manner of doubt as to the language actually used by the hon. gentleman that night. He said :

As to who on your side would profit most, I cannot speak as to the future. But in the present I take it the immediate gainers would be first, the whole northern belt of states which adjoin the Dominion of Canada, and, second, and especially, the group of north-eastern states, of which your good city of Boston may fairly be called the commercial capital. The advantages of your position for securing a very large part of our trade are great. You own, as I have said, much of our mineral wealth.

Many of our chief trade routes centre here. You are the natural shipping ports, especially in winter, for very large sections of our territory. You lie within easy distances of our chief cities, and of the most populous portion of our Dominion. In one word, given free trade with Canada, and you rise at one stride from the position in some respect of a frontier city, with no great extent of trade territory secured to you, to that of a central entrepôt with the practical monopoly of a great region behind you, whose commerce no man can take away from you.

It is hardly any wonder that when the feelings of our American friends had been excited, and naturally they must have been by this speech, utterance should have been given to this feeling in the legislature. In this little book there is the speech of the hon. member for South Oxford, delivered in 1888, in which he refers to :

The two distinguished members of Congress, Mr. Butterworth and Mr. Hitt, both Republicans,

both opposed to the party of Mr. Bayard and President Cleveland, introducing Bills, one of which is almost substantially on the lines of the resolution I have placed in your hands, Mr. Speaker, the other of which goes further than I think it would be judicious or wise to go.

This is not very severe condemnation; one is substantially on the proper line, and the other goes further than it would be wise or proper to go.

But both in the direction of free trade and unrestricted reciprocity with Canada.

I have here the resolutions; but I am embarrassed in selecting the motion to which the hon. gentleman refers. Mr. Butterworth unfortunately introduced two resolutions, Mr. Hitt introduced one, to be found at page 29 of "Reciprocity Reports, Bills and Resolutions, 1888-91." On that page we find Mr. Hitt's resolution, and it is a strong commercial union resolution. There is no fencing on unrestricted reciprocity—it is introduced as "the following resolution to promote commercial union with Canada." If that is not the other, it is a resolution approved by my hon. friend, for it is one introduced by Mr. Butterworth. If the hon. gentleman chooses to take Mr. Hitt's resolution, I am willing to leave it there, and the resolution is to promote commercial union. If the hon. gentleman takes Mr. Butterworth's resolution, I must point out that there are two resolutions under Mr. Butterworth's name, one of which is found at page 39, and the other at page 175. At page 39 Mr. Butterworth, I observe, introduced a "Bill to extend the trade and commerce of the United States and to provide for full reciprocity between the United States and the Dominion of Canada," and at page 175 he introduced another resolution—this friend of Canada, admired so much by the hon. member for South Oxford—and I should like to take the time of the House for a few moments to call attention to this resolution or Bill. I venture to say that never in any civilized assembly was such an act of discourtesy, such a shamelessly impudent act proposed as this Bill by the friend of the hon. gentleman, Mr. Butterworth. It is a Bill authorizing the President to negotiate with respect to the unity and assimilation of the United States and Canada, or one or more provinces thereof. Perhaps Mr. Butterworth went a little further than the hon. gentleman would have gone; but I think even stronger language might have been used under parliamentary or any other etiquette. The Bill recites:

Whereas, the resources of the two countries supplement each other, and the arteries of commerce, both natural and artificial, are so interlocked and mutually dependent upon each other that they ought to constitute a single system, to be one and inseparable; and

Whereas, the commercial relations between the United States and the Dominion of Canada are and have been strained and unnaturally

Mr. NORTHRUP.

cramped, and in a measure paralyzed, owing to the inability of the two governments to establish such a system of international trade and commerce between them as is essential to meet the requirements of the situation (and so on);

Resolved, That the President be, and he is hereby authorized and empowered to invite negotiations looking to the assimilation and unity of the people of the Dominion of Canada and the United States under one government, such unity and assimilation to be based upon the admission of the several provinces of the Dominion, or any of them, into the union of the states upon the same terms and equality with the several states now composing the Union,—

Great Heavens, here is generosity!

—and the assumption by the United States of the indebtedness of the Dominion of Canada, or a just proportion thereof, and such equitable terms and conditions as justice to the high contracting parties may demand.

I venture to say in the face of this reception in the United States of the policy which the hon. gentleman and his friends have been advocating for so many years it is not curious that Hon. Edward Blake, late leader of the party, published his famous Durham letter, to which reference has been made so frequently during the last few days. I do not intend to occupy the time of the House any longer in discussing the trade position of hon. gentlemen opposite, but since I have mentioned the name of Mr. Blake I will call attention to an argument used this afternoon with respect to his letter. From this side of the House an hon. gentleman called attention to the most damaging admissions affecting hon. gentlemen opposite contained in that letter, and I was surprised that an hon. gentleman occupying the high position of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), whose legal attainments and constitutional lore we all respect and admire, should have been led this afternoon to gravely discuss this question in the manner in which he did discuss it. He is a lawyer—had he been a layman there might have been some excuse—and he must have known in his own practice, as it is known in the practice of every lawyer of experience, the great difference between admissions coming from your own witness in the box or admissions made by a witness on the other side. Every one knows that tenfold weight is attached to the admissions of a hostile witness. Yet here is the late leader of the party opposite, who was heralded as the saviour of this country, a gentleman whom I agree possesses one of the brightest minds ever born in Canada, occupying the position he did as the leader of the party opposite, declaring in a most touching letter, in which you could almost see his heart break, because deprived of the goal of his life and driven from the life he esteems so much, that as an honest patriot he could not take part in the advocacy of the policy that he believed meant amalgamation with the United States. Yet the hon. gentlemen opposite see no difference

between the force of evidence given by a member of their party or by a member of our party. They say : You believe what Mr. Blake said about us, why should you not believe what he said about yourselves ? Let me reverse the position. Hon. gentlemen opposite as a party expressed pride in the Hon. Edward Blake and believed what he said. We never asked the country to believe Mr. Blake's statements ; but they have asked the country again and again to believe his statements, and they themselves have professed to believe everything he said, with this one exception to which I have referred. If they believed for years what he said, why did they refuse to believe what he said in regard to this particular policy adopted by the party ? Let me read a portion of Mr. Blake's letter, because we cannot fail to see how Mr. Blake's heart was wrung when he sent in his resignation to the electors of Durham. He wrote :

There is much to be done and much to be prevented at Ottawa ; and, while deeply sensible of many shortcomings, it yet seems reasonable to suppose that the experience of all these years has made me less unfit than formerly for your service.

This is the sphere which offers the best prospect of usefulness to my country during that short remainder of life in which I would fain labour for her, as remembering that the night cometh when no man can work.

I have been anxious, then, to retain the seat with which the habits and interests of my life are interwoven, and to the duties of which I had arranged to devote the bulk of my time.

A renomination for West Durham would be my greatest prize ; the severance of our connection will inflict a bitter pang.

And so this hon. gentleman resigning the seat which to him was the prize of his life, abandoning all future political ambition rather than be forced to support the policy proposed, could say to hon. gentlemen opposite : Surely if you love your country as you profess to do, surely if the sole object of your policy is to promote the interest of the country and its welfare, when you not only find the Conservative party, but gentlemen on the south of the line entertaining the same idea, as well as the people in England, and even your own late leader declaring that such a policy would lead to annexation ; how was it that even if the party opposite believed the policy they advocated would not have such a result, they were willing to run such a risk as to pursue a policy that might result in annexation. A question was mentioned in the Speech from the Throne which it is advisable and necessary that any one attempting to discuss the Address should refer to—the Manitoba school question. I fully recognize that no question has come before this House which is more embarrassing to hon. members, which is more interesting to the community and which is more momentous to this country than this same question

of the Manitoba school law. I must confess, Sir, I felt pained and humiliated this afternoon when the speaker who preceded me (Mr. Forbes), after describing the braggadocio way in which the Government had approached Manitoba, after describing the sunny way that should have been adopted, after referring to the attempt to interfere with provincial rights, after telling us that the Government last year had not the nerve to bring down the Bill which they wanted to bring down, after telling us that the Government should have made a proposition to Manitoba, and if they did so all would have been well, after he had so clearly shown in which way his bias ran, entirely on the side of Manitoba and thoroughly against this Dominion Government ; then the hon. gentleman (Mr. Forbes) very gravely suggested that he would offer himself as an unbiased juror to take evidence to investigate the facts of this case. He went further : so generous was he that he was willing to allow even four or five years, for this bright intellectual commission, of which I have no doubt he would be a shining ornament, to report. Well, Sir, I cannot help thinking that if he gained information in days to come at about the same rate and with the same accuracy he has gained information within the last four or five years, that commission would require not five years, but four or five hundred years before it could make up its mind to give an intelligent report. Sir, it is rather humiliating,—and at the same time it shows the difficulties of this question—that a gentleman, by profession a lawyer, should discuss this question in a deliberative body such as the House of Commons of Canada in the manner he has done. Some of his remarks were such as to lead one to think it impossible that he ever had even read the judgment of the Privy Council. He told us for example—he was a generous man, he was willing to do what was right between the parties—he told us, that if it were established that a wrong had been done there is not a single Canadian throughout the length or breadth of the land who would not be ready to right that wrong. It may be a question of opinion whether a wrong has been done, but I would like to ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Forbes), if there is a difference of opinion as to whether or not a wrong has been done, where is the tribunal which is to decide it ? We have the decision of the Privy Council, and let me ask the gentleman who so confidently suggested a commission, does he expect that this House could select a commission which would be more able to deal with this question than was the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. Now, Sir, I venture to say that this question, although a very embarrassing and perplexing one, can be put in a nutshell as to its main facts. There are certain facts which cannot be disputed,

and these facts being granted, there is very little room left for difference of opinion as to what should be done. I was rather pleased to find from certain remarks made by the hon. the leader of the Opposition that he is practically in accord with the Government in the line that they propose to take in regard to this question. It may be in the memory of hon. gentlemen of this House that in the year 1891, this matter was referred to the courts. At that time the hon. member for East Durham (Mr. Craig) supported the Government in this reference to the courts, and it evidently seemed to the leader of the Opposition that the member for East Durham should have opposed any such reference, and therefore speaking in regard to the question then before the House, giving his own views of the situation, he described the attitude of the member for East Durham as a very unwise one, and I take the liberty to give to the House his reasons for so thinking. In the "Hansard" of 1893, page 1981, the hon. the leader of the Opposition spoke as follows:—

Sir, what is the question that is referred to the Supreme Court? The hon. gentleman (Mr. Craig) tells us that he approves of that reference. If he approves the reference to the Supreme Court, does he forget that that reference is to decide whether or not the Government have the power to interfere with the legislation of Manitoba?

There is no doubt at all, Sir, that that was the question:

If, in his opinion, the Government should not interfere with the legislation of Manitoba, why, in the name of common sense, should there be a reference to the Supreme Court at all?

And I agree with the leader of the Opposition. If the Government were satisfied that under no circumstances should they interfere with Manitoba, I say not only was there no necessity to refer the case to the Supreme Court, but I say it would have been a most exasperating contempt of this House, and it would have been a most impudent proceeding on the part of the Government to put this country to the expense, and to put the people of this country to the anxiety of this long and weary suspense, if they, from the beginning had made up their minds that no matter what was the result there would be no interference. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Laurier) continued:

Not only should there not be a reference to the Supreme Court under such circumstances, but I say—

That is "I the leader of the Opposition" say:

—that the reference to the Supreme Court under any circumstances is most dangerous, because, if the Supreme Court should decide that the Government have the power to interfere with the legislation of Manitoba, and the Government should not obey the legal mandate which they themselves have sought, there would be a power-

Mr. NORTHRUP.

ful and a rightful agitation in some parts of the country against the Government.

So Sir, I say I am pleased to find that we have the leader of the Opposition on record in support of the attitude of the Government. The Privy Council having decided that the Government have power to deal with this appeal, and the Act stating clearly, as the judgment of the Privy Council showed, that the Government only had power to hear the appeal if this wrong had been done; I say, Sir, that the leader of the Opposition is thoroughly in accord with the Government as to the principle—although of course as we expected, he lags a little way behind because all the facts have not yet caught up to him. Suppose we would for a moment consider the contention of the leader of the Opposition that this matter should be referred to a commission; what in the name of common sense would the commission have to do. This case has been threshed out before the courts for four years, and with the exception of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Forbes) who last spoke, I would be inclined to think there was not a man in the whole Dominion who did not know what the facts of the case were.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Hear, hear.

Mr. NORTHRUP. I am glad to see one gentleman respond with a "hear, hear," who does understand the question?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Perhaps you could tell the House, because no one on that side has told us yet, what the issue between you and Manitoba is?

Mr. NORTHRUP. When the time comes and when the Bill is before the House, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davies) can rest assured that we will be then in a position to discuss details which we need not discuss tonight. Then for the first time he will find light dawning on him. I am surprised that during all these weary years the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davies) was so blindfolded—and there is none so blind as he who will not see,—that not a single ray of light entered upon him. Now, Sir, supposing a commission were appointed, as asked by the leader of the Opposition, that commission would be nominated to investigate something. Is not his opinion about that the same as was his opinion about the reference to the Supreme Court? If it were found that there was anything wrong, would he be willing to right it? Would it not be an extraordinary thing for members of this House to vote for a commission to ascertain if there was anything wrong, when they had already made up their minds that they would not right that wrong if it did exist? Surely the leader of the Opposition, being in favour of a commission, believes that if there are wrongs he is prepared to right them. It seems to me, Sir, that when hon. gentlemen opposite appeal to this House and appeal to the coun-

try in the strains which we have heard to-night, we on this side have ample reason to complain of the unfair way in which the case has been presented by them. The last speaker (Mr. Forbes) referred in dulcet tones—no I do not think he ever referred to anything in that way—to the cry of provincial rights and the coercing of Manitoba. I wonder if the hon. gentleman ever took the trouble to read the Manitoba Act at all. I wonder if he ever noticed that while there are certain rights given to the legislature of that province in regard to which they can adjudicate, as well as certain other rights are given to this Parliament with regard to which it can adjudicate, and while each of those parliamentary bodies is supreme in dealing with matters within its own sphere, there is one single peculiar subject which stands on a different footing from any other subject. And while I would have thought that the mere reading of the statute would have been amply sufficient for a legal gentleman like my friend, it convinces me that he did not read the judgment of the Privy Council, for they very fully and exhaustively go into this matter to show, as they say, that this cry that it interferes with provincial rights, is, to use their own term, fallacious. The judgment shows there can be no interference with the rights of Manitoba if this House acts within its allotted sphere, and if this House goes beyond the sphere allotted to us, then the legislation is ultra vires and it can very soon be annulled by the courts. Whatever disposition is made of this matter by this House, I claim, that those who say we are acting in contravention of provincial rights are not doing their duty by the people of this country, and not doing their duty by the minority of Manitoba who appeal to them for relief. Sir, there is one matter which I might ask your pardon for referring to, because I would have thought it so simple that every member here would be in accord with regard to it, and yet there does seem to be differences of opinion as to the position we occupy in this House in dealing with this or any other matter. We hear members continually speaking of their position here as if this member was the member for South Oxford, and that one the member for North Grey, and as if they represented only those ridings, and were to be governed only by the feelings of the people in them. I venture to say—and I think the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) will bear me out in this—that there is no warrant whatever for such a theory of parliamentary government. The real truth is that to the constituencies is left the trust of selecting the representatives, but, once these are selected, they take their seats as representatives of the people of Canada. So that every member of this House sits here representing the minority in Manitoba as fully as the man elected by their

suffrages, and is as much bound to do his duty to them and to all the people of Canada, irrespective of what part of the country he comes from or what particular electors send him here. It is well laid down that the reason a man is elected by a particular constituency is that he is supposed to be better acquainted with their needs, and can look better after them; but, at the same time, in regard to all legislative matters coming before this House, he represents every man in this country. Therefore, I say that in dealing with this important question, dangerous as it may be, we are bound, every one of us, to be true to ourselves, true to our country, and true to those who send us here; we are bound to bring to bear upon it the best judgment and intellect we can command, and honestly and fairly do what seems to us right, in the interest of our country, be the consequences to ourselves what they may. I know that in dealing with this question, different gentlemen will look at it from different points of view; but I lay it down broadly that the real ground from which we are to view it is that we are here to act in the interests of our country. So acting, we are to bear in mind certain principles that are to be applied. There is an old saying, which was true many years ago, and which I have no doubt is equally true to-day—that righteousness exalts a nation. A nation no more than an individual can afford to be guilty of a breach of faith, or guilty of dishonesty in its dealings between parties. If it is, it will have to pay the penalty, and a heavy penalty. We can approach the solution of this question from one of two sides. If we 215 members of this House come to its consideration, each one trying to secure simply such a solution of the difficulty as will leave him safe in his seat, regardless of other considerations, I venture to say that endless trouble will come to this country. But, on the other hand, I believe the people of this country respect the man who tries to do what is right. I believe they would rather see a man go wrong, while endeavouring, according to his best lights, to do right because it is right, than to see a man trying to do right in a feeble, halting way, because he thought his action would pay. Looking at the question in that light, how does it arise in the first instance? People discuss it as if this House had passed the Manitoba Act in the same way as we pass Acts of Parliament day by day. No greater mistake could be made. The judgment of the Privy Council settles that point. Their lordships say:

The terms on which Manitoba was to become a province of the Dominion, were matters of negotiations between representatives of the inhabitants of Manitoba and of the Dominion Government. The terms agreed upon, so far as education was concerned, must be taken to be embodied in the 22nd section of the Act of 1870.

So that at that time Manitoba was not part

of this Dominion, and we could not make it so. That is a point which cannot be too much impressed upon the people of this country. We have heard a great deal of the rebellion of Manitoba against the Dominion of Canada in 1869. There was no rebellion against the Dominion. The Dominion at that time had no right to take possession of that country, and the troops were not sent there to make it a part of the Dominion. They were sent there to preserve law and order in that portion of Her Majesty's dominions. The Dominion of Canada could not and did not obtain possession of that country until it sent representatives here, until the Dominion mutually agreed with them upon the terms of union. Having done that, we can do what the Privy Council, by their judgment, could not do. They could only look at the intent of parties to the union as that intent is expressed in the pages of the Act: they could go no further. We can go further; we can go behind the Act and consider the circumstances and conditions under which it was passed; and we have only to look at the debates of that day to find that separate schools existed and were intended to continue. Now, personally, I am not in favour of separate schools; I do not like them. I think it would be better if all the children of this country could be brought up together in one kind of schools. But in the same way I think it would be better if all people went to one church; but the difficulty is in deciding which church it will be. There have been many people in different ages of the world who had that same idea, and some of them tried to carry it into effect; but a dismal failure they made of it in every instance. While I am not here to defend separate schools, I think there is a question before us far and away beyond the question of separate schools. I think the greater question by far is whether the honour of Canada is to be maintained. While I do not believe in separate schools, I would sooner see a separate school in every township of this Dominion than to see the plighted faith of my country broken and her honour tarnished. The hon. gentleman from Queen's (Mr. Davies) stands up in this House and asks how this Government can pretend to interfere with Manitoba when the Privy Council held the Act of 1890 to be *intra vires*. One might well suppose the case of the minority to be hopeless when a legal gentleman would dare—and I use the word advisedly—to address this House in terms like that. Did he not know—if he did not, he could not have read the judgment—that the single point decided in the Barrett case was whether the Public Schools Act of 1890 prejudicially affected any right or privilege which the Roman Catholics by law or practice had in the province at the union. It was held that it did not affect any such right or privilege, and, therefore, the Act

Mr. NORTHRUP.

was valid. But the appeal which we are called upon to consider could not have arisen if the Act had been invalid, for then it would have been upset by the courts. This appeal arose from the subsequent proceeding founded on the validity of the Act; and when the minority asked for a remedial order from the Dominion Government, the government of Manitoba protested and declared that if the Dominion Government presumed to act in accordance with the petition of the minority, their act would be *ultra vires*. The Dominion Government accordingly said: We will send the question to the Privy Council first. So it was that the case went to the Privy Council, for that body to decide whether or not this Government had power to act; and I submit that under the decision of the Privy Council the Dominion Government had power only if the rights and privileges had been infringed upon. An argument was used last session in this House, and it has been repeated again this session, that we are not bound by the decision of the Privy Council to act. One word as to that. I think discussions frequently arise in regard to a word which is used in two senses. The hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) last year made a clear and incisive legal argument to show that this Parliament was not bound by the judgment of the Privy Council, and I must say that I agree with him in the sense in which he used the word "bound." He used the word legally in the same way as it would be used in the case of a man bound to pay a note; that is in the sense that the courts have power to make him pay whether he will or no. But there is no power which can compel this House to do what is right. We can do what is wrong if we see fit; and in that sense we are not legally bound by the judgment of the Privy Council. Let me submit a parallel case which will illustrate my idea of the way we are bound. If the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies) were in my part of the country, and if a client was to come to my office and say to me: this hon. gentleman came into my store with a friend, who wished to buy a suit of clothes, but whom I was unwilling to trust, and the hon. member for Queen's said: Give him the clothes, and if he will not pay, I will—merely making a verbal promise. If my client asked me whether the hon. member for Queen's was bound, I would say most certainly he was. Not that I was ignorant of the provision that no man can be held to a verbal promise of that kind; but knowing the hon. gentleman from Queen's, and knowing that he would not take advantage of a quirk such as that, and that even if the case were brought into court, he would defend himself on some reasonable ground and not raise such an objection as that, fatal though it was, I would feel perfectly warranted in

assuring my client that the hon. member for Queen's was bound and that he was perfectly safe. So, in this case, we are not legally bound in the way that we can be forced to legislate on any particular line, but we are morally bound, we are bound in honour, and that, in my humble judgment, should be a far higher and more invincible bond in such a Chamber as this than the mere legal liability to have the judgment enforced. I must apologize to the House for the time I have taken. I had no intention of taking so long a time, but this is a subject on which I feel very strongly, for it does seem to me there has never been such a subject in this country on which people will talk apparently very learnedly without knowing anything under the sun about the matter in question. I have full confidence that when the people come to understand the true question submitted to them, they will rise to the question, and will say that it is the duty of this House to keep its plighted faith, no matter what the consequences may be. It would be an unworthy and humiliating argument to address to the House, and I do not address it in the hope or desire of its having any influence here, but merely to show one of the results that might follow through a body such as ours failing to do its duty in such a case as this, assuming for a moment that our duty is to grant a measure for remedial legislation. I am not committing myself to any particular piece of legislation. I would be false to my constituency if I pledged myself to support any Bill that might be introduced, and I shall wait until the measure is laid on the Table before pronouncing myself with regard to it; but I am simply giving expression to the general principle that where there are wrongs they ought to be righted. But in such a question as this the people of the country are interested in this way. Assuming that we refuse to deal with it, and supposing, as is quite possible, and as was pointed out by the hon. leader of the Opposition in a speech which presented the circumstances under which the original clause crept into the Confederation Act—a speech I would advise every member of this House to read, a speech made by the hon. leader of the Opposition in 1891, which will repay perusal by any one, in which he pointed out what action the people of Quebec might take—supposing they were to abolish the Protestant Board of Education. They have, beyond question, the legal power to do that, and if they did to-morrow, all the Protestant dissentient schools in Quebec would be under the control of the hierarchy. Everybody would admit that that would be contrary to the faith plighted at Confederation. Every one would admit that of all men in this country the most deceived and betrayed would be the Protest-

ants of Quebec, and if they came to this House asking to have the rights granted to them by the British North America Act restored. Imagine the position we would be in if we were obliged to say to them: you are right, the rights guaranteed to you by the constitution have been taken away, we ought to be in a position to right these wrongs, but unfortunately last year we laid down the principle that we would not interfere with any province, and therefore, admitting that our duty is to right these wrongs, we have so tied our hands that we cannot do so. What would be the effect to this country if such a thing should happen? We have a country which we are trying to build up, and every one knows it can never attain the future it is evidently destined for except by promoting harmony and union among the various classes and creeds which compose it. I do not wish to enter upon such a vexed question as that, but the House being small to-night, it seems to me we are speaking as if in a small family party. We very often hear the cry that this is a Protestant country and all that sort of thing. Well, the census shows that 5-12 of our population are Roman Catholics, and 7-12 Protestants, including atheists, Jews, Gentiles, and all outside Roman Catholics. Looking at the question, practically, not as Protestants or Catholics, not as French or English-speaking Canadians, but from the proper standpoint of Canadians, how are we ever going to build up a country such as this if we are to have 5-12 on the one hand, and 7-12 on the other hand eager to grasp each other by the throat? We might as well give up the task at once and realize that we cannot become a nation but must be swallowed up inevitably and absorbed by some other people. We might as well destroy ourselves and make the best bargain we can with Mexico, or Guatemala, or Venezuela, or some other more civilized country rather than have the five-twelfths and seven-twelfths of our people ready to get at each other's throats. Because I feel this is the one great question that has arisen since Confederation which is likely to bring about this terrible result, and because we cannot accomplish our destiny unless this animosity be made to disappear. I have kept the House much longer than I had any intention of doing.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron) moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

Mr. FOSTER moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.15 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 22nd January, 1896.

The **SPEAKER** took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

NEW MEMBER.

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

Of Malcolm Colin Cameron, for the Electoral District of West Huron, Ontario.

MEMBER INTRODUCED.

Malcolm Colin Cameron, Esquire, Member for the Electoral District of West Huron, Ontario, introduced by the Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright and Mr. McMillan (of Huron.)

THE BANKING ACT.

Mr. **JEANNOTTE** (Translation) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 12) further to amend the Act respecting Banks and Banking. He said: The title of the Bill is very short and self-explanatory. The object of this Bill is to amend the Bank Act, to the effect that henceforward no director of any bank shall borrow from the bank a higher sum than that of the paid up shares of the capital subscribed by him. Such is, in substance, the whole Bill.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HIS EXCELLENCY'S SPEECH.

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

Mr. **MACDONALD** (Huron). Mr. Speaker, I intend confining my remarks almost exclusively to the subjects referred to by His Excellency the Governor General in his Speech from the Throne. One of these was his congratulations to the country that the commissioners who had been appointed to delimit the boundary of Alaska had already reported to their respective governments, and that in a short time action would be taken by these governments on the report, when I hope this vexed question will be finally settled harmoniously between the respective governments. Another question referred to is the abundant harvest we have had during the last year, and for which the Government express their gratitude to God. I think we have great reason to be grateful for the great number of blessings

Mr. **MACDONALD** (Huron).

we are receiving every year outside of the harvest as well. We have great reason to be grateful that we have such a grand country of which we are so proud. We have reason to be grateful more particularly that the people in Manitoba and the North-west Territories have had their efforts so abundantly blessed by Divine Providence and are rejoicing in abundant crops. Reference is made in the Speech from the Throne to the development of the mining interests of British Columbia and to the visit of His Excellency the Governor General to that province, I think we should be grateful to His Excellency for taking so deep an interest in this country and more particularly for the interest he takes in British Columbia, where he has invested a large amount of money for the purpose of testing the cultivation of fruit, thus stimulating that industry. I had an opportunity last fall of visiting the Coldstream estate belonging to His Excellency, and was highly gratified with what I saw there. Several hundreds of acres are under various fruit trees, such as apples, pears, apricots and various small fruits, giving employment to a large number of men in the section in which the estate is situate; and I must say that these people all bore the highest testimony and spoke with the highest respect of the efforts which His Excellency was putting forth for the advantage of that province. One thing which struck me more particularly in British Columbia was that it is a province containing a vast amount of wealth, that it had vast storehouses of wealth which only required a key to open them. One of these storehouses is its mineral deposits, another is the vast wealth contained in its forests, and a third its teeming fisheries. While admiring that province on account of its enormous wealth, I could not but think that this Government had adopted a very bad policy for the development of those interests. When we consider means for increasing the wealth of the country we are forced to the conclusion that the efforts of the Government should be directed to the development of the country along the lines of its greatest natural productiveness. If we followed this policy we should seek to develop the mineral interests, the fishing interests and the lumbering interests of British Columbia. In order to accomplish this we must have two things especially—cheap capital and cheap labour. Dear labour is one of the drawbacks of which they complain in British Columbia. Many large employers of labour find it necessary, in order to hold the market in which they sell, to employ a large number of Chinese. The reason is that white labour is so dear, and the reason why white labour is dear is that living is dear in that province. And it is just here that we see the application of the National Policy. Our Government has been pleased to impose very high duties upon the abso-

lute necessities of life, so that, before these necessities reach the consumer, they are very high in price. Then the labourer must be recouped with higher wages than he would otherwise require. If it were possible for each of these labouring men in the mines, in the lumber woods or in the fisheries to save \$50 a year by reason of the cheapening of the necessities of life, the working capital of the province would be increased by a very large amount and more men could be engaged in developing the resources of the province than can be employed under present conditions. Let me point out what the people of that province pay in duties upon the actual necessities of life. I have a few figures here, compiled from the Trade and Navigation Returns, and if I am wrong in any point and if a British Columbia member should succeed me in this debate, I trust he will point out to the House my mistakes. I find that the people of that province pay \$149,000 in duties on breadstuffs alone. On meats of all kinds they pay \$29,000; on butter and cheese, \$12,400; on vegetables, \$13,000; on fruits, \$40,200; on furniture, \$4,000; on coal oil, \$29,000; on woollen clothing, \$19,600; on cotton clothing, \$14,700; on rubber clothing, \$3,000; on boots and shoes, \$7,300; and on rubber boots and shoes, \$4,400. Every hon. gentleman will see that the articles here enumerated are absolute necessities of life. On these twelve classes of goods, the British Columbia taxpayers paid into the Dominion treasury no less than \$325,600 last year. And, Mr. Speaker, you must bear in mind that the duty is only one part of the expense. The people of British Columbia consume far more than they import from abroad. The increased price upon the articles either imported from Eastern Canada, or produced in British Columbia, which increase is caused by the high duties, if added to this \$325,000, would make a sum of nearly a million dollars, to be paid by the eighty or ninety thousand people in British Columbia upon the necessities of life. According to my way of thinking, it would be well if all these duties, or at least as large a proportion of them as is consistent with the raising the necessary revenues of the country, were reduced so as to place at the disposal of the workingmen of British Columbia cheaper goods. If this were done they would be able to compete to better advantage with Chinese labour. It is impossible to bring the white man down to the standard of living of the Chinaman. But the cheaper you make means of living which the white man needs and must have, the better he is able to compete in the market with the Chinaman. We very well know that the National Policy in no way benefits the great industries of British Columbia. It cannot protect the mining interests, because the product of the mine are exported to other countries. The National Policy can in no way protect the fishing industry, because the fish are exported to foreign mar-

kets to compete with fish from other countries, probably produced under more favourable conditions. The lumber interests cannot be protected because no lumber comes in to compete with the British Columbia product. But what would be the effect of cheap labour? Cheap labour means cheap production, and cheap production means more trade, and more trade means more development and more development means greater prosperity, which prosperity would diffuse itself throughout the whole population. Now, the hon. members from British Columbia know very well that when they sell the products of their mines, especially coal, they have to send that coal into other markets. They must overcome the embargo which is imposed upon our coal in the country to which, mainly, it is exported. And though we are not to blame for the duty the other country imposes, it is wise for us to afford such facilities as will enable our coal producers as far as possible, to overcome the difficulties imposed upon them. Out of 650,000 tons of coal exported from British Columbia to other countries, about 20,000 went to other countries than the United States. In competing with the coal of California, Oregon and Washington, it would be a great boon to the coal producers in British Columbia if the labour were cheapened. The same thing is true of lumber. British Columbia is a great producer of lumber, for the province is blest with magnificent forests. I understand that they export lumber to many foreign countries; they send it all the way to Australia, to China and Japan, and even to Africa. Is it not important, if the lumbermen of that province are to compete in these far-off markets that they should be afforded every facility to produce as cheaply as possible. A large proportion of the fish taken in British Columbia are sent to the English market, there to come into competition with fish produced under more advantageous conditions—labour being cheaper and the place of production nearer the market. I do not think that any member from British Columbia will take exception to the principles I have laid down. Of course, I met farmers in British Columbia, and they are protectionists, just as are the farmers in England. The farmers in British Columbia do not produce enough to feed the people there, and the higher the duty and the greater the impediments in the way of producing breadstuffs, the higher price the people of the valleys are able to realize. They call that in British Columbia a "valley policy," but when you speak to these gentlemen with regard to the interests of the whole country, they say that what is wanted is freer intercourse with other nations. I have no doubt but that the two hon. gentlemen who are looking at me so intently will agree with me in every statement I make in this respect. Now, Mr.

Speaker, passing from British Columbia, I come to another question which has been mentioned in the Speech from the Throne, namely, the reception which His Excellency received when he visited the Indian reservations. I was very much gratified and pleased to learn that the Indians are loyal. I suppose, from the Conservative standpoint, they are even more loyal than the Liberals of this country. But I am pleased that the Indians are loyal, and why should they not be loyal? The great Queen whom His Excellency represents here, has always taken a deep interest in the Indians in all parts of her dominion; our noble Governor-General here takes a deep interest in them also, and, as being a representative of that noble lady who sits upon the throne of England, we could not but expect that they should treat him loyally and heartily; and I am glad to hear that they are in that spirit. Then there was a reference made to the condition of the Indians, to their schools, and to their attainments. Now, I am very much gratified that the Indians have been attended to by the Government. The Government must bear this fact in mind, a fact which they do not always acknowledge, and I hope that I may have the ear of the Minister of the Interior just at this point. He has sought to make this country believe that if the Liberal party were in power, the Indians would not be attended to as well as they are attended to now. He said yesterday that if the Liberals came into power they would not change the present policy. Well, it may be so. I do not find fault so much with the policy of the Government in connection with the administration of that department as I do with their extravagance, and with the cost which their administration has entailed upon the country. Now, Mr. Speaker, you know, I think, that I have brought this question before the House on previous occasions, and I have pointed out that the objection of the Liberal party to the administration of the Department of Indian Affairs is, that in the past, at least, they have expended more money than was necessary to accomplish the ends which they have accomplished; and we gave this fact, that for every 46 cents of money expended upon the Indians, 54 cents are spent among the officials; in other words, out of every 100 cents spent by the Government in the Department of Indian Affairs, 46 cents go to the Indians, and 54 cents are expended among the officials. Now, this is wholly and entirely different from the expenditure of the Liberals when they were in power. Of course, we had not to deal with these Indians at that time, but we dealt with the Indians of British Columbia; and out of an average of \$25,000 expended every year during the regime of the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie, all went to the Indians, with the exception of \$6,000, showing that 75 cents out of every 100 went to the

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron).

Indians then, instead of, at present, 46 cents going to the Indians out of every 100. It is with the administration of the department that we are finding fault, it is with the extravagance of the department rather than with the policy of the department, because we are all anxious that this country should deal fairly by the Indians, because all they had has been taken from them by this country. Now, leaving that matter, I come to another question which has been mentioned in the Speech from the Throne, and that is the Mounted Police. I met a number of the Mounted Police when I passed through that country, and I must say they are a noble looking body of men. They appeared to be well equipped and well dressed, and were neat and cleanly in their appearance. But we do not find any fault with that, of course. We have said in the past, and we still say, that the Government has been too extravagant, has spent too large a sum, that the officials in connection with that department receive too much, that a large proportion of the money that is paid by the people of this country does not go so much to the benefit of the Police as to fill the pockets of the officials. You will remember, Sir, that when the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie was at the head of the Government, there was probably more need of a Mounted Police than there is today. The people were more scattered, they were not grouped together as they are today, and therefore, they were not able to protect themselves as well as they are in 1896. But, during that time, all these difficulties were overcome, and Mr. Mackenzie administered the police force of the Northwest Territories efficiently, with about one-half the money now expended. Let me give you the figures exactly. Last year there was expended \$646,000; and the Hon. Mr. Mackenzie, during the last year of his ministry, spent \$335,000. So you will see that this Government spends about double the money, and the efficiency and the greater number do not counterbalance the increased expenditure over 1878. Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to say a few words upon another subject mentioned in the Speech from the Throne; I shall endeavour to speak, weighing well the words I use, upon the Manitoba school question. It is, in my opinion, one of the most important questions that have come before the Canadian Parliament for settlement since Confederation. I think that if ever there was a question in regard to which men required to study well their words, and to study well their actions, this question requires the exhibition of those qualities. If this question is not settled right, it will continue to be a cause of irritation throughout the length and breadth of this country for a great many years; therefore, we should consider, apart from political leanings, apart from prejudice, apart from the support of any party, what is best to be done, in order to settle this question properly and amicably.

ably. The state of this question, at the present time, as I understand it, is as follows:—In 1871 the local legislature of Manitoba, in its first session, passed a law establishing schools for the different denominations in that country. Among those denominations, as I understand, were the Roman Catholics on the one side, and the Episcopalians, the Methodists and the Presbyterians on the other side. It was deemed wise by the legislature of 1871 that special privileges in regard to education should be extended to all those classes. Those privileges were continued to be extended to them until the year 1890, when the same legislature deemed it its duty to withdraw those special privileges that had been granted to all denominations alike, and to establish, as they say they have established, a national system of education, which they say is just and equitable to all classes of the community. Now, the Minister of the Interior said last night that those privileges were conferred upon the minority by the constitution. I think he made a slip when he said so. In 1871, as he will remember—and if I do not construe his words aright, he is in my presence and he can put me right—it was the local legislature that gave these special privileges to the various denominations. The constitution of 1870 is entirely silent in regard to what kind of schools there should be; and so you see, Mr. Speaker, that the privileges were extended, not by the constitution, but by a legislative enactment of the first legislature of Manitoba. But the constitution made this provision, that if the privileges enjoyed by any party or any class under the local legislature, in regard to education, were taken away from them, they had a right to appeal to the Governor General in Council for redress of grievances. You know, Sir, that this last point was contested in the courts, and was finally settled by the Lords of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in their judgment, in which they set forth that the minority had the right to appeal, and that if the Governor General in Council felt disposed to interfere in the matter, they had jurisdiction to interfere and to remove the alleged grievance. That is the position in which the question stands now. It is held by some parties to the controversy that the judgment of the Privy Council determined the action of this Government, and that the constitution made it imperative upon this Government to interfere. I think they have given up that contention. If not, I think it will be well for me to read a statement made by Lord Watson when the question came before the court, in order to show that the whole matter as to interference or non-interference, is at the discretion of the Government. If the Government wish to interfere, the Privy Council said, you have power to do so; and if you do not wish, you need not do so, for action

is entirely at your discretion. Let me read the statement made by Lord Watson when the question was before the court. I hold in my hand a copy of the Manitoba school case, the proceedings of the court in England, and I find on page 193 Lord Watson is reported as having spoken as follows:—

I apprehend that an appeal to the governor is an appeal to the governor's discretion. It is a political and administrative appeal, and not a judicial appeal in any proper sense of the term; and in the same way, after he has decided, the same latitude of discretion is given to the Dominion Parliament. They may legislate or not, as they think fit.

That is the opinion of one of the Lords of the Privy Council, and it shows that there is a discretionary power with the Government; or in other words, it is entirely a matter of policy, and it is claimed on the part of Manitoba that every scintilla of evidence procurable in the case, both with regards to facts and law, should be obtained before any step is taken by Parliament. One of the hon. members said last night that all the facts were brought before the Privy Council in England. Everybody knows as well as I do that all the facts were not brought before the Privy Council. All the facts bearing on the legal side of the issue were brought before the court in England, but there are a hundred and one facts on which hon. members on both sides of the House are speaking every day, upon which no one member possesses fuller knowledge than another. One party makes one statement and another makes a statement exactly the opposite, and what we want to know in Parliament, which is the jury in the case, is an official statement of the facts, and not what one party or the other simply asserts. Let me show the House that hon. members do not at all agree as to the facts. One party to the case makes the following statement: the separate schools were inefficient. How can we know that they were inefficient? I have no personal knowledge of the condition of the schools there. Has any hon. member opposite more personal knowledge than I possess? Another contention made is: the teachers were improperly educated. Again, it is contended: the schools were not properly inspected. Again: the schools were not kept open a reasonable time each week, month or year. Again: the education of the children in the schools was greatly neglected. Again: the national schools are fair and just to all parties. Again: the school property has been justly settled. These are the contentions put forward by one party to the controversy. Is there any hon. member who can testify from personal knowledge that these statements are true or false? Well, then, if hon. members cannot testify whether those statements are true or false, is it not plain that it is necessary to institute some proceedings whereby

we may place on record testimony on the points, so that the people when called upon to adjudge this case, or, in other words, to act as the jury to settle the matter, will be in possession of the evidence. What argument is based on these contentions? Manitoba submits this argument, and it is a plausible one: special privileges were granted to the minority in 1871; they have so abused those privileges that it is right and just and in the interest of the country and in the interest of education to withdraw those special privileges. Of course if the contentions are false, the argument falls to the ground; if the premises are wrong an argument cannot be built upon them. The other party to the controversy declares that they can prove that all those contentions are wrong, and, therefore, the argument has no effect. What does the other party say? This is the other side of the question: the separate schools were well-equipped and conducted. An hon. gentleman, speaking in this House last year and representing the minority, said that the separate schools in that province were as well conducted as the Protestant schools. Is there any person who can give personal testimony as to which of the two parties is right? Then, again, another contention is that the curriculum of the separate schools is as high, and the teachers are as well qualified as Protestant teachers. The hon. member for Provencher (Mr. LaRivière), speaking last year, made the statement that the separate school curriculum was higher and that a greater number of subjects were required than in the Protestant schools. I again ask whether there is any hon. member from Quebec or Ontario who can rise and state from personal knowledge which of the two contentions is the correct one? Again, a further contention of the minority is this: the schools were kept open as required by law, and the education of the children was not neglected. Last year the hon. member for Provencher declared that the separate schools were kept open according to law, and during as many days on the average as the Protestant schools. A further contention of the minority is: the property of the separate schools was confiscated by the legislature, and a great injustice done to the minority. Who can testify from personal knowledge as to this point? It was asserted that the arrangement in regard to the school lands was just and equitable to all the parties. The other party to the controversy states directly the opposite; and are we going to be called upon to decide upon this question when we have not sufficient information or personal knowledge as to which of the parties is correct. The minority further contends: the schools are Protestant, and, therefore, it is unjust and unfair to ask the children of the minority to attend them. If that be a fact, then there is an injustice done to the minority and it should be corrected. But the other

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron).

party asserts; they are not Protestant schools, they are non-sectarian, and have been acknowledged as such. The late Archbishop Taché wrote a pamphlet containing nearly fifty pages in which he sought to establish that they were Protestant schools. I ask any hon. gentleman on the other side of the House, can he testify from his own personal experience that he has the knowledge upon which he can decide that one party is right and the other party wrong. Why should we be called upon at this juncture to decide this important case in the absence of so many facts and points of testimony? Sir, what do the Manitoba people ask us to do in the face of these contradictory statements? We are told in Mr. Greenway's answer to the first remedial order. He said, that he believed the Government were not in possession of all the facts, and I doubt very much if they are in possession of all the facts. He told them further, that if they were not in possession of all the facts, they had not the basis upon which to come to a proper conclusion, and he suggested the following mode of procedure. Mr. Greenway writes:

We believe that, when the remedial order was made, there was not available then to Your Excellency in Council full and accurate information as to the working of our former system of schools. We also believe that there was lacking the means of forming a correct judgment as to the effect upon the province of changes in the direction indicated in the order. Being impressed with this view, we respectfully submit that it is not yet too late to make a full and deliberate investigation of the whole subject. Should such a course be adopted, we shall cheerfully assist in affording the most complete information available. An investigation of such a kind would furnish a substantial basis of fact upon which conclusions could be formed with a reasonable degree of certainty.

Now, Sir, could there be anything more just than that? Could there be anything more reasonable than to ask this Government who are attacking the institutions of Manitoba and charging that the local government dealt unfairly with the minority; to ask them to appoint a commission of their own choice, send the commission out to get the entire facts which the Manitoba government are ready to lay before them, and to take testimony under oath so that the people of this country may be able to judge properly from it. In the face of that fair and honest request, this Government have refused to grant that commission, and we hear them every day in this House say that they are in possession of all the facts, when the truth is they have no personal knowledge of these facts at all. Again, Mr. Greenway said: That the facts thus gathered by the commission would form a foundation upon which in all probability a reconciliation would be brought about and a final settlement made. Notwithstanding that invitation, we have yet to hear that the Government of Canada are willing to give

the people of Manitoba who are on trial, an opportunity of clearing themselves. Suppose, Sir, I was charged with a crime and that I was placed at the bar and a jury empanelled to hear my case. If I claimed from that court and jury an opportunity to place before them all the evidence bearing upon the alleged offence with which I was charged, in order that I might show there were surrounding circumstances and conditions which would justify my action; is there any court or jury in the world that would refuse to allow me to put myself in the best position before them? It is just the same with Manitoba in the present instance. They claim that certain charges have been made against them, and they are prepared to submit the whole matter to an impartial commission which will gather evidence and place it before the Parliament of Canada. Now, Mr. Speaker, there is another reason why we should not interfere at this particular time. This Parliament, as was pointed out a day or two ago, does not represent the electors of this country to-day. We were elected on lists prepared in the year 1888. Those lists are now nearly seven years old, and hundreds and thousands of electors who were on them then are not on them now, and hundreds and thousands who were not on the lists at that time, are on the lists at the present time. Therefore, in deciding an important question like this which bears so heavily upon one of our provinces, which assails the autonomy of that province and attacks its educational system, does not every gentleman here honestly think that it would be well to submit the whole case to the electors of this country and to ask their judgment upon the facts, when the facts were before them. If that were done there would be a decision on this question which would be far more just than can be given by this moribund Parliament during the present session. I would advise the Government—although I do not think for a moment that my advice will be taken—to appoint a commission to investigate the whole matter, to place the evidence upon record before the people, and ask them to decide whether it is in the best interests of the whole country to interfere or not to interfere. I venture to say that if this Government and its supporters coerce Manitoba without a full investigation of all the facts, the time is not far distant when the Government will regret the day; when the minority will regret the day, and when the whole country will regret the day that remedial legislation was passed in this House to coerce Manitoba under the present conditions. Sir, if a remedial law is passed in this House it will be the final settlement of the whole matter. In a few years that law will become inapplicable to the new conditions of a new country, but there is no power on earth that can modify or change it. This being a final settlement, the Federal Government cannot amend it, and

the local legislature has no power to amend a federal law. As a large number of the people of Manitoba are opposed to the operations of remedial legislation of that kind, the condition of the Roman Catholics in Manitoba will be far worse than if they threw themselves upon the generosity, and the justice, and the magnanimity of the majority in that province, as they do in the provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island. If there has been any injustice done to the minority, they had better press their claims upon the Manitoba legislature. Sir, in the present condition of our knowledge of the facts I am not in a position to give my ipse dixit upon this question. My anxiety is that the whole matter should be fully and completely elucidated and the evidence placed before the Parliament of Canada. Mr. Speaker, I think probably I have said enough on the Manitoba school question. You, Sir, know my opinion and my intention. I trust that every member of this House—although I can hardly hope so,—will vote against remedial legislation, at least this session, until all the facts are known and until every scintilla of evidence is obtained. Then in the future, after all the evidence is before the people, and after the people have an opportunity of expressing themselves upon this great political question—because it is a political question,—we will be in a position, not to take the ex parte statement of this one or that one, but to look to the evidence and ascertain the true facts. We will then be in the same position as a jury would be, to bring in a verdict of guilty or not guilty as the evidence may warrant. Now I come to another question to which reference is made in the Speech—that is, the condition of the militia of this country. We are told that it is the intention of the Government to make provision for the better arming of the militia and to strengthen the defences of the country. Well, I am sure that there is no man more willing than I am to do all that is possible to place the militia on a war basis if necessary. I am perfectly willing to vote money enough to place them in an efficient condition, and I think there is not a single member on either side of the House who will refuse to do that. But we have been granting large sums of money for many years towards the maintenance of our militia, and I ask, has that money been properly expended? Have the Ministers of Militia adopted any special reform with a view of putting the force on a proper basis? I think not. There were some severe charges made against the department some years ago by men in a position to speak with high authority on this question—men who had nothing to say against the Government as a Government. I do not know whether they were Reformers or Conservatives—but men who spoke on behalf of the militia and with a full knowledge of its

condition. Now, I would like to know something about this. I do not see the Minister of Militia here. I think he is in the other House. And just here let me say that the Government have been changing the Minister of Militia too frequently. How is it possible for a man to enter the Militia Department, introduce reforms for the purpose of making the militia efficient, and carry out those reforms, if several months afterwards he is replaced by some other man who knows nothing at all about the militia? About the time the present Postmaster General left the office of Minister of Militia, the militia was described as being in a very wretched condition. The chief commanding officer, from England, who had no object other than to point out to Parliament that the militia required their direct and instant attention, made a report on the state of the militia in 1891; and what did he say? Now, it is worth while listening to this, because I am addressing a good many militiamen, and I am not giving any personal information of my own. I have no personal information on the matter at all; but when I find such statements as those made in the report of Major General Herbert, I am constrained to come to the conclusion that the militia has been mismanaged, and that a great deal of the money expended on it has been wasted. Here is what he says in his official report of 1891:

The rural corps are very deficient in instruction; but their organization is still more defective. Money is spent for instruction by officers incapable of imparting it. The arms and equipments are, for the most part, obsolete.

I have no personal knowledge of the matter, and I ask, is that true? Will any of the Ministers present who have more knowledge than I have, say whether that is true or false? If it be false, the Major General should have been condemned for putting such a paragraph in his report. If it be true, the Government are to be condemned for not bringing the militia to a higher state of efficiency. If they had not money enough to do so, they should have come before this House and asked for money to give the force a proper equipment. Was it proper to appoint officers not capable of imparting instruction, and to spend upon such offices the money of the taxpayers of this country? It was not. That state of things went on for four years. During that time we had one or two more Ministers of Militia. The present Lieutenant-Governor of Manitoba then became the head of the department. I suppose he went to work to introduce reforms, but he was only in the department a very short time when he was removed. Then we had as Minister of Militia the present Minister of Justice, and I believe he was the right man in the right place. I believe that last year he went through the whole militia department from one end of this Dominion to the other, and consulted different militia authorities in

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron).

order to ascertain the needs of the force. But now, at the end of a year, he is removed from that position and placed in another, and at present we have a man at the head of the department who knows no more about the militia than I do, and I was never in a militia corps in my life. More than that, instead of being in this House to answer any questions that may be put concerning his department, he is sitting easily in another House on a red-cushioned chair. Now, there were some charges made by a man who I am sure did not desire to throw any obstacles in the way of the Government improving the militia, who had experience in the force for many years, and who wrote a paper on the subject; and you know, Mr. Speaker, that when a man writes a paper to be read before an institute, he weighs every word he uses and every opinion he expresses. Here is what Colonel R. H. Davis stated in a paper which he read before the Militia Institute in the city of Toronto in 1895, four years after Major General Herbert had made his report:

We have no corps fit to take the field, nor organization for a campaign, nor stores to supply it. The Militia Department knows nothing about the rural militia, and cares less. Then, darkness and ignorance, or worse, have prevailed for years. The country well knows, and the department should know, that the militia is not only disorganized, but demoralized.

Is that true? I do not know whether it is true or not; and I ask, in the absence of the Minister of Militia, if any of the Ministers who have the facts at their disposal will get up and say whether it is true or not. If they do not, we will expect an answer from them at some future time, when the Estimates are under discussion. That is not all. I have a statement here from another high authority. The Militia has an organ called the "Military Gazette," which discusses questions relating to his department, and is the mouthpiece through which the militia officers of Canada speak to the country and to the Government. In the issue of that paper of January, 1895, the following is found:—

The militia has never been in a worse condition than it is to-day. Ignorance, incapacity and systematic neglect are the prominent characteristics of the present militia system.

Is that true? If all these statements, made before the country by high authorities are true, how can the Government come to this Parliament and ask for more money to place the militia upon an efficient basis? If they are not true, it is the duty of the Government to deny them, and to deny them upon authority. If they are true, it is the duty of the Government to acknowledge them and to see that they do better in the future than they have done in the past. Now, the militia, instead of improving, is getting worse. In 1891 the following were the charges made by Major General Herbert:—First, deficiency of instruction;

second, defective organization ; third, incapable officers ; fourth, obsolete equipment. You will suppose that these faults would have been corrected, but at the end of four years the following charges are formulated against the militia :—First, that it is demoralized ; second, that it is disorganized ; third, that it never was in a worse condition ; fourth, that darkness and ignorance have prevailed for years ; fifth, that the Militia Department knows nothing about the rural militia and cares less ; sixth, that there is no corps fit to take the field ; seventh, ignorance, incapacity and systematic neglect characterize the department. Now, if these hon. gentlemen were loyal, our militia would not have been left in that inefficient condition, but would have been placed on the highest level of efficiency on which we could afford to place it. If sufficient moneys were not voted by Parliament, hon. gentlemen opposite should come to Parliament and say so. But you will notice, in all these charges brought against the efficiency of the militia, not a word is said about too little money being voted. All the fault found is with the ignorance, incapacity and systematic neglect of those having control. I hope that the hon. gentleman who has this department to manage will endeavour to give satisfactory reasons to the country for its inefficiency, and show, if possible, that that inefficiency is a thing of the past, and that the spending of money among officers incapable to impart instructions is a thing of the past. If it be shown that there is not sufficient money voted to make the militia effective, there is not a gentleman on this side of the House who will refuse to vote what is necessary. Now I come to another question to which reference is made in the Address. It is a very important question. I do not know whether I shall express the sentiments of my own friends on this question, but I have strong convictions upon it, and intend giving expression to those convictions this afternoon. I refer to the fast line of steamers. In the Speech from the Throne mention is made of England's contribution to the enterprise. I am still of the opinion that this proposed enterprise is a waste of public money, without a reasonable expectation of an adequate return to the taxpayers. We have at present a fairly equipped steamship line crossing from this side to the old country. That line has given satisfaction to the people for many years, and there has been no particular fault found with it. The present lines are more than capable of doing the business across the Atlantic. The average number of passengers who cross every year is only one-third the capacity of the steamers that carry them. Therefore, it is not to supply sufficient accommodation that the fast line of steamers is sought to be established. Even if the fast line were established, nine out of ten passengers would go on the slower lines. A large number of people who go to England are not able to go on the most ex-

pensive line, and would rather go over as cabin passengers on a slow line than as steerage on the fast line. We also know that the majority of passengers who leave Canada to visit England during the season are not particular about getting to Liverpool twenty or twenty-four hours before they would on a slower line, and, therefore, you will find that a large portion will still patronize the slower lines. Canadians who wish to go to England during the winter will certainly not take a long railway ride to Halifax in order to get on a steamer there, simply because it belongs to a Canadian line, but they will go by rail to New York in twelve or eighteen hours, and then take a steamer equal, if not superior, to the one at Halifax. I have no doubt that if I were going to England in the winter time and went by New York, I would find a good many Liberal-Conservatives on the same train with me, leaving their own fast line behind, and taking the line most convenient. But we are told that this fast line is going to be of great service in carrying freight to the old country. If we only look into that statement for a moment, we will see its fallacy. True, it will carry some freight. But we are told that it will carry immigrants. This we were told by the hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Masson). Does the hon. gentleman think that immigrants are going to choose the most expensive line to travel by, one that will charge double the fares of inferior boats ? Then, we are told that our butter, eggs, cheese and other articles will go on these steamers. What great difference will that line make ? The other steamers have cold storage accommodation just as the fast line will have, and the only difference will be that the fast line steamer will probably reach the English market twenty-four hours sooner. But, in that case, the slow vessel might strike the high market, and the fast vessel the low market. Where is the advantage ? I hope that those who reply will point out what their opinions are on this particular point. Again, those who ship by the fast steamship line will have to pay more freight. The average cost of a trip of one of these swift boats to England and back is estimated from fifty thousand dollars to sixty thousand dollars. Therefore, you must understand that the cost of a slower boat, going three or four knots an hour less would not be more than one-half. And it is reasonable to suppose that it would carry freight, passengers and make the same provisions for their accommodation as the fast line does, at one-half the rates charged. So that I do not see any advantage that can accrue to the exporters of farm products by the establishment of this line. Are we supposed to make provisions for the few passengers that come from the United States or from Australia, or from this country, and who want to go by the fast line ? Are we to make contribution for those from the

taxpayers of the country? If they want a special line of steamers, let them pay for it out of their own pockets, and not out of subsidies voted by the Canadian Parliament. We are told, again, that our business interests require this line. Well, we have carried on business for many years and, I think, very successfully. I think we have the reputation all over the world of being as sharp in business as other people. It has never been shown that we have lost any money by not having swifter steamers. If we have business requiring particular despatch, we have the cable at our disposal. When we require goods from the old country, we very frequently order them months before they are required, so that for these there is no necessity for this fast line. Again, Mr. Speaker, we have more ships upon the ocean than we have traffic for. I hope you will pay particular attention to some figures I have taken from the Trade and Navigation Returns indicating that our vessels even now, are not fully employed. The number of vessels entered in ballast in the port of St. John last year was 743—that is, that many ships came into the port of St. John in one year without any cargo; and there were 332 that left the port of St. John without any cargo. In the port of Halifax there were 51 ships entered from abroad without cargo, and 18 ships left the port in ballast. In Quebec, 115 ships entered the port without cargo, and 63 had to leave in the same condition. Even in the city of Montreal, that great port occupying the most advantageous position in our country for the trade of the west, the commercial metropolis for this Canada of ours, no less than 39 ships came in from various countries without cargo, and 3 ships left the port without cargo. Let me give you the figures for the whole Dominion. Entered inwards in ballast at all the ports of the Dominion in 1895, 7,040 ships; outwards, 7,118. Does not that indicate a terrible condition of our trade and commerce? And yet it is proposed that we shall pay \$750,000 a year for ten years, and \$500,000 a year for the next ten years to establish a line of steamers to compete with these vessels that are not getting sufficient cargo to pay a reasonable profit, either on the inward voyage or on the outward voyage. Because of these facts, and many others that I could give you, I intend to oppose that proposition when it comes up. The next point in the Speech to which I draw attention is that referring to the condition of our trade and commerce. The country is congratulated upon the "evidence of increasing activity"; not upon the increased activity, but upon the evidence of it. I am very glad to learn that there is that evidence. I am glad to know that there are a few rifts in the clouds of adversity through which come some rays of light. It is yet too early in the year for us to prophesy. The rifts may

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron).

close up, but I hope that they will widen, and that we may have more light at the end of the year than we have at the present time. But we know what the commerce of last year was, and the figures show that it has fallen off very largely. Let me give a few figures of our trade with the various countries with which we dealt. I would like to know if the Ministers are satisfied with the condition of things these figures indicate. Is it not enough to prophesy in glowing terms that we are going to be rich. We can better consider the trade of the current year when the year is finished. In 1894 we had an aggregate trade with Great Britain of \$107,000,000. In 1895 that trade fell to \$92,000,000, a decrease of 32 per cent. I would ask some of these gentlemen who have been striving to make Great Britain our market to say what has been the cause of this falling off. I suppose they will say that it is because of the failure of the crops in Canada. No doubt that is the cause, to a large extent. But what, then, have they to give as the reason why our trade with the United States has increased from \$84,844,000 in 1894 to \$95,932,000 in 1895, an increase of 8 per cent? Does not that completely answer the argument so frequently used that the United States is no market for Canada, that that country produces so many articles of the same kind as are produced here that the American market can never be worth anything to us? But the figures show that, notwithstanding the high tariff wall between this country and the United States, notwithstanding that our trade is decreasing with almost every other country with which we deal, our trade with the United States is increasing. Will any of these gentlemen who went into North Ontario and made speeches with regard to the United States not being the market for Canada explain that, here where they can be answered? I emphasize this point in order to give an opportunity to hon. gentlemen who may succeed me to answer the question, why it is that our trade with the United States is increasing, while there is such a decrease in our trade with England, into whose markets we can send everything we produce free of duty. Then take the case of France. In 1894 we had a trade with that country of \$3,082,000. In 1895 that trade fell to \$2,921,000, a decrease of 5 per cent, and this notwithstanding the French treaty. But I suppose the French treaty had not come into full operation in 1895, and the figures may be partly explained upon that ground. Our trade with Germany in 1894 amounted to \$7,888,000, but in 1895 that trade amounted to only \$5,421,000, a decrease of 31 per cent. Our trade with Spain showed a reduction of 2 per cent; that with Portugal, a reduction of 8 per cent; that with Italy, a reduction of 18½ per cent; that with Holland, a reduction of 38 per cent; that with Belgium, a reduction of 44 per cent. Even our trade with Newfoundland, one of our sister col-

onies, a colony with which we should trade very largely, showed a reduction of 15 per cent. Our trade with the West Indies increased. The hon. Minister of Finance went to the West Indies a few years ago and spent a good deal of money and a good deal of time on the trip. We have established between these islands and the ports of St. John and Halifax two lines of steamships which are largely subsidized by this Dominion. If there is any part of the world our trade with which ought to increase, it is the West India Islands, for they produce many things that we require, and we produce many articles, the necessaries or comforts of life, which are much in demand there. Our trade with the West Indies increased 22 per cent last year. Our trade with South America fell off 29 per cent. Now consider our trade with China and Japan. We remember the predictions that were made a few years ago of the large increase in our trade with these countries, particularly when the Canadian Pacific Railway was completed and two beautiful steamers were placed upon the route between Vancouver and Yokohama. We were told then that this trade would go forward with leaps and bounds. Has that prediction been fulfilled? Not at all. We find this last year that our trade with that far-off country has been reduced by 5 per cent, and with Switzerland, by 6 per cent; while our whole trade has been reduced from \$230,619,000 to \$218,819,000. Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to draw attention to this fact. These figures do not prove anything against the National Policy, nor do they support it. But hon. gentlemen last year, and among them the Finance Minister maintained that increase of trade between this country and other countries indicated the stimulus which the National Policy gave to the various industries of this country. Now, if the National Policy accomplished that last year, why has it been a failure this year? You see, Sir, how many false arguments are used, how many unfair opportunities are taken to make everything tell in favour of the National Policy. One hon. gentleman speaking last night—and he spoke very well, but his arguments were not very conclusive to my mind—actually maintained that the exceedingly large crop, the magnificent crop, the abundant crop of Manitoba, was indirectly owing to the influence of the National Policy; and while the Government expressed gratitude to God for the abundance He had sent to the people of Manitoba, this hon. gentleman tried to steal away from the gratitude that God was getting, and give a part of it to the National Policy. Now, Sir, it is a fact that the trade of this country has increased largely over the trade in 1875-76-77. But why has it increased? Is it because of the National Policy? We have half a continent now peopled that was unsettled in 1874-75-76. We have now produced in Manitoba 30 million bushels of wheat, 30

million bushels of oats, barley and pease, and other cereals, by people who were not in that country in the former period; and that volume of trade, that volume of production, has been thrown into the great stream of exports that has been flowing from this country to other countries. Yet there are hon. gentlemen who stand upon the public platform and say that this is all owing to the National Policy. Would they come down to details, and show us wherein the National Policy has stimulated our exports? No, Sir; on the other hand, I say the National Policy has been a drawback. It has been a stumbling block, it has been a high fence against the interests of Manitoba. If the people of that province had less taxes to pay and a fairer opportunity, with the beautiful climate they possess, with the wonderfully fertile land that they own, and with the energy and pluck and skill which distinguish them, the province of Manitoba would be far more prosperous than it is to-day. Sir, there is no denying that fact. What we want to do, Mr. Speaker, is to lessen the burden of taxes upon those western people, to give them a chance, to give them as good an outlet as possible by which they may take their products into the markets of the world; and if that is done, it will be a speech on immigration which will far exceed in results the speeches and the literature that are sent to England in various forms. But if we continue the application of the National Policy to these new provinces, rest assured that the development of British Columbia, and the development of the North-west Territories, and the development of Manitoba, will be retarded. Therefore, I am opposed to the National Policy as applied to those provinces, and I maintain that it has produced results the opposite of those which its framers promised us. There is no country, in my opinion, so great as this country. We Liberals sometimes are accused of defaming our country. Sir, I challenge any man to put his finger upon one paragraph, one line, one sentence, in which any member of the Liberal party decried this country. We say that British Columbia is a great province, we say that all the provinces are great, but what we complain of is that in the endeavour to develop those great interests and open up those great store-houses of wealth, the Government have used a key that does not fit the lock, and consequently they have not been able to open up those storehouses of wealth. If the Liberal party were in power they would adopt a policy of developing those resources of wealth, of increasing our trade. Now, Sir, I want to refer briefly to the promise which has been made by my hon. friend who is looking at me, the Minister of Agriculture. He says that he is going to introduce a policy by which the farmers of this country will be largely benefited. I hope he will have every aid and every help that every man in this country can give him, but I hope at the same time, that the farmers will

not again be deceived. They have been deceived, and badly deceived. For the last seventeen years the farmers of this country have been waiting for what has been promised them, they have been waiting for some of the advantages of the National Policy. But I have never yet met a farmer who would, speaking apart from political leanings, speaking upon the broad principles of what he believed to be right, stand up in an audience and say that the National Policy had put one dollar into his pocket. I hope, however, they will be able to say so, after my hon. friend has formulated his policy, after he has crystallized it into practical shape, and placed it upon the statute-book. But don't let it remain there, Mr. Minister of Agriculture. Let its practical effects be felt, let the farmers feel it in their pockets and in their everyday operations, let them realize that the policy is bringing to them increased prosperity and increased prices over and above what they would receive had this policy never been inaugurated. If you inaugurate a policy that will in any way benefit the farmers of this country, no class of the people will be more grateful than the farmers. Now, Sir, I want to say in conclusion, that the farmers of this country have been waiting, and waiting and waiting, and now they have come to the conclusion that they will not wait any longer. They are tired of waiting, and they are going to put gentlemen into power who will give them something more quickly than after a period of seventeen years. In a few months, when my hon. friends opposite will go before the electorate of this country, and particularly before the farmers of this country, the farmers will ask them this question: How is it that, according to your own figures contained in the census of 1891, the manufacturers of this country have made 25 per cent profits upon their invested capital, whereas the farmers, under the influence of this so-called National Policy, have not made one farthing, not one farthing. Take the manufacturers of Ontario; allow them 10 per cent on the wear and tear of their capital, and they made 25 per cent net. From the milliner who conducts her business in a little town to the large manufacturer in the city, every one of them, from low to high, made 25 per cent net upon their capital. Do you believe it? Let somebody say whether they believe it or not.

An hon. MEMBER. Yes.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). Well, then, if you believe it, is it not a wrong principle to exact high taxes from the farmers who have not made one solitary cent upon their capital, and make them pay high prices for all they consume, in order that you may give the advantage to parties who have made 25 per cent upon their capital? Then, there is another side to that question. If they did not make 25 per cent, then all the figures of the census lie. The Government must take

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron).

one horn of the dilemma or the other. If the figures in the census are correct on this point, then each manufacturer, from the milliner up, has made 25 per cent upon their invested capital. The other alternative is that the figures are false, and if the figures are false, then what satisfaction is it to hear the Minister of Agriculture, or the Minister of Finance, or any other gentleman, stand upon a public platform and quote from the census to show the wondrous development that has taken place in the country, when you acknowledge that your own figures are not applicable to the very parties to which they are intended to apply? I conclude my remarks by thanking hon. members for the courtesy they have shown to me while I have addressed them.

Sir JAMES GRANT. Mr. Speaker, at this stage of the debate on the Address the subjects under consideration have already been frequently gone over. However, there are some points that I wish to touch upon briefly, although I am thoroughly aware of the fact that at no time has a more comprehensive, instructive or promising Speech been presented to this House than that which has been brought down on the present occasion. Its first important sentence is with respect to the bountiful harvest. We are very much gratified indeed to learn that throughout the length and breadth of Canada this year we have had a remarkable harvest. That is largely owing to our climatic conditions, to the fertility of our soil, to the improved implements and machinery. Our agricultural colleges and agricultural schools, and emissaries that the Canadian Government are now sending to every part of the Dominion are instructing our agriculturists in the practical principles to be carried out in farming, and they have proved to be largely the means of securing a bountiful harvest. We in Ontario fancy we have all the best agricultural lands, we also believe that the province of Manitoba has magnificent areas, but I find here a very striking fact, and it is one which is worthy of recognition, and it is this, that even in British Columbia there is a very fine area of farming lands. Touching on the Kootenay region, Capt. Hamilton, who is now in that country, speaking of its capabilities, says:

I was talking of Kootenay, and he told me of the capabilities of small farms even in that district of rocky, mountainous character. He ranches and mines, but he is staying in Victoria for a little change just now with his wife. Three millions of dollars, said he, is a low estimate of the output of the West Kootenay district during the past year. The district comprises the mining camps of Slocan, Trail Creek, and Nelson, and this amount will probably be more than trebled next year, for last year but one smelter was in operation, and two more are nearly completed.

It is extremely gratifying to think that this great region, formerly described as a "sea of mountains," has any area of agricultural

land in it at all. When we look at other paragraphs in the Address we find, in speaking of British Columbia, the next sentence adverts to the mineral products of that country. I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that at no time in the history of Canada has more remarkable development taken place in that province than during the past twelve months. I think it must be a source of gratification to the people living on the Pacific slope to be aware of the fact that the Government has taken steps in the right direction by appointing a representative from that province to guard over their interests in this Dominion of Canada. I am glad beyond measure that the hon. gentleman has arrived here, and we are perfectly satisfied from the knowledge he possesses of that country, its capabilities and requirements, and his thorough acquaintance with the people, that he will do everything in his power to advance the best interests not only of British Columbia but of the Dominion as a whole. I find with respect to the Kootenay region a statement in a recent English journal of a most remarkable development which has taken place, and it has been placed on record in no less a journal than the "Canada Gazette" in London. It states:

A West Kootenay newspaper gives the following as a list of companies incorporated since January 1st, 1891, to carry on mining enterprises in West Kootenay. It is difficult, if not almost impossible, at present to make a complete list, but the one given will give some idea of recent activities. The list includes forty-four companies, with total capital of \$32,000,000 odd, the capital of the companies ranging from \$100,000 to \$25,500,000.

And still, Mr. Speaker, we are told that the people of Canada are leaving this country and are going to the neighbouring republic. Only a few days ago the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) said the country was retrograding, in fact was going to the dogs. Is that an evidence of it? Very far from it. We know perfectly well, on looking into the history of the country, that it is really making remarkable development. The leader of the Opposition paid a visit a short time ago to the Pacific slope, and when there he did not fail, with the great erudition he possesses and the power of eloquence he is known to inherit, to describe very graphically the resources of the province and to congratulate the people of the country on their progress and development. But at the same time, did the hon. gentleman say a word about the Conservative party, that they were largely instrumental in bringing about this result, that they constructed the Canadian Pacific Railway, and that when that company was attacked on the floor of the House the Government came forward in a manly way with public assistance, and gave an extra grant when the company was in trouble and might have become almost bankrupt. And if this had not been done, where would

have been the Canadian Pacific Railway to-day? May I ask you, Mr. Speaker, who opposed that grant to the road? Did not hon. gentlemen opposite? When I had occasion to introduce a Canadian Pacific Railway Bill twenty-two or twenty-three years ago I was criticised and looked upon as not being in possession of the right ideas with respect to the development of the country. But has not the road accomplished great results, has it not built up a great country, has it not developed remarkable resources, and has it not convinced the civilized world that there are not five millions of people to be found in any portion of the universe who have done more during the past seventeen years than the people of Canada, led by the Conservative party? Did the leader of the Opposition, when visiting the Pacific slope, and speaking about the Dominion, say anything about the line of steamers the Government have established, with the assistance of a grant from the Government of New South Wales? No; he had not a word of encouragement to give to the people or to those in charge of public affairs. He knows, however, as well as I do what the Liberal party has done. I am not here to convince him on that point. He is thoroughly impressed with the fact, and if he does not recognize it and acknowledge it, he mentally admits that the Liberal-Conservative party of Canada has done more for the development of the country than ever was accomplished by any body of men on the floor of this House. I wish to make one or two observations in regard to British Columbia. We have there a magnificent country. We have there fisheries unsurpassed. We know perfectly well the late Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the hon. member for Pictou, when in charge of the fisheries of the Dominion, conserved the public interests more than any other man has done. He guided and directed the people with a view to the protection of the fisheries. We know from the history of the past that even in tributaries flowing into Lake Ontario there was an ample supply of salmon. Where are those fisheries to-day? The supply is fished out. How is it with the salmon fisheries in Scotland? Rivers that abounded with salmon fifty or a hundred years ago have as large a supply to-day as then. And why? Because the laws of Great Britain have been carried out in their entirety. If the late Minister made enemies in British Columbia, if any man engaged in the salmon fisheries felt so disposed towards him, what was the reason? It was because he thoroughly and fully intended to guard those fisheries and preserve them to the people of British Columbia as well as to the Dominion; and forsooth, notwithstanding that fact, the leader of the Opposition, I heard it stated, led the people there to infer that if the Liberal party came into power, they would regulate the law so that the fishermen might fish out the Fraser or

Skeena or other tributaries, whose fisheries to-day give a large revenue not only to British Columbia but the Dominion at large. With respect to Indian industrial schools, I am very much pleased to find, from the statements contained in the Speech, they are making gratifying progress. There is nothing that tends to elevate and improve a community as much as education does, and Canada is not backward in this respect. We find that our Dominion spends annually about \$12,000,000 for the education of 1,000,000 children, fitting them for citizenship. We have built 16,150 public schools, we have 14 universities, 41 colleges, 300 high schools; we have over 3,000,000 volumes of books in our libraries for the improvement of our intellectual power and about \$1,208,000 are annually expended on books and stationery. In view of this, it is very desirable that the copyright laws should be looked after and put into operation at once. In connection with this question of education there is one very important point I wish to dwell upon. It is my opinion that those who have charge of education in the various provinces of this country, where we have a large agricultural population, should take care that the education is of that character which will not drive our people away from the farms, but will tend to keep them there. This is an age in which we require education to be of a thoroughly practical character. It is an age of specialism. It is an age in which a man can never know too much of the subject in which he is directly concerned. But, when our young people in the rural districts became educated in everything that does not pertain to the cultivation of the soil, or the raising of cattle, the young men and young women leave the farm, take to some of the learned professions, come into our cities and towns, and becoming dissatisfied with their lot make their way to the United States or somewhere else. Education should be of a thoroughly practical character and should be confined as much as possible to those subjects in which the young are directly interested. There is nothing more injurious than educating the common sense out of the people, instead of educating common sense into them. Look at this House and look at this country, and see who are the men who made this great Dominion. They were self-made men, men who educated themselves, men who commenced with very little, men who did not desire to occupy their father's shoes until they fitted them, but who were willing to grow up with the country in proportion to the development of the country. If we educate our young people to cultivate the soil, we will be educating them in an honest industry calculated to forward the material interests and prosperity of the Dominion as a whole. Mr. Speaker, I wish for a moment or two, to refer to the fast lines of steamships. When this subject was brought before the House

Sir JAMES GRANT.

some time ago, on a resolution introduced by the Finance Minister, we know that notwithstanding the character of this great project it was opposed by our friends of the Liberal party. They said: Oh, forsooth, the idea of bringing a fast line of steamers up the St. Lawrence, why they would run aground; they could not run fast enough, and the navigation is not equal to the occasion. But the late Minister of Marine (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) pointed out that the report of Commodore Bayfield, and the report of Capt. Gordon who had spent many years in investigating this subject proved beyond a doubt that fast steamers could navigate the St. Lawrence as well as they could the Atlantic, and that there could be no impediment in that direction. Sir, I approve very highly of the remarks addressed to the House by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny), when he said that a steam service to be efficient, must come from a non-tidal port to a non-tidal port. This fast Atlantic service is attracting very great attention at the present time. In the motherland they are thoroughly alive to the vast advantage England has derived from the improvement in her mercantile marine. I find in a recent work by Henry Fry, the following very remarkable statement:—

Fifty years ago, England controlled one-third of the carrying trade of the high seas; but now it controls more than one-half, or literally possesses 56 per cent of the carrying power of the world. Its tonnage of vessels increased from 3,310,000 tons in 1840 to 10,330,000 tons in 1892, or 210 per cent. The increase, as naturally would be expected, is mostly in favour of England. Taking the world's cargoes, according to port entries, to be, in 1892, 230,190,000 tons, England carried 115,020,000 tons, or 461 tons per seaman.

England has advanced in the most remarkable manner through not being afraid of development in that direction. Do you suppose that England would have the magnificent connection she has to-day with the outside world in commerce, if it were not for her mercantile marine? She never was afraid to undertake an enterprise of the character now proposed by Canada, and for that reason the Right Hon. Mr. Chamberlain, one of the most progressive statesmen of the present age, when the subject came before the Imperial Parliament offered to give us half the amount contributed by Canada, that is, half of \$750,000 annually. That is because the people of England know that Canada must have a fast line of steamers on the Atlantic. Canadians are not going to be retrogressive instead of progressive. The hon. gentleman from Huron (Mr. Macdonald) has got hold of the wrong idea. We have a fast Pacific steamship service now; we have a railroad service from the Pacific to the Atlantic, but what we want in addition is a fast Atlantic service with England to complete the circuit. When this last link is completed the communication

between India, China, Japan, Australia and South Africa will eventually pass through Canada to England instead of going via the Suez Canal. Do you suppose for one moment that people are not alive to the importance of passing through this Dominion with its advantages from a climatic point of view, instead of passing through that hot and arid and dry atmosphere of the Suez Canal which is enough to stifle the energies of any individual? I would ask our farming community if they are not in favour of this fast steamship service? Do they not wish to have their products delivered in the English markets as rapidly as possible? The more rapidly you can bring your canned and frozen products and agricultural products of every kind into the markets of England, the more perfect will be their state of preservation and the greater will be the demand for them. Rely upon it, the day is not far distant when we will have that fast Atlantic service to build that great oceanic and interprovincial trade of this country which will make Canada the centre of the trade of the world, and advance the prosperity of the labourer who earns his bread by the sweat of his brow. If our trade is developed in that way, the entire material interests of our country must be advanced. Again, we know that by carrying out this project we will show that we are a progressive people. When any great scheme for the advancement of Canada is propounded in this House by the Liberal-Conservative party, no matter how good it may be, no matter how well it may tend towards the advancement of the country, it is quite enough for the Conservative party to propound it, in order to have antagonism raised against it so as to try and thwart the idea of the Canadian people that the Conservative party is the progressive party in this country. In connection with this fast service, let me speak of the Pacific cable. That cable is going to be an accomplished fact at no very distant time. Was ever a public more excited than were the English capitalists within the last few days, and why? Because the Aden-Zanzibar cable was fractured, and those who have invested millions of dollars in South Africa could not receive any intelligence from that country, and even the British Government could not get its messages sent over. Rely upon it, Mr. Speaker, the time has now arrived when the people of England are aware of the important fact that to centralize British power, and to protect the Empire, both at home and abroad, lines of communication must be constructed across British territory, and deep in the great seas where they cannot be attacked by an enemy. Our fellow-townsmen here, Mr. Sandford Fleming, has been one of the most energetic individuals in Canada in agitating for the construction of the Pacific cable. The subject was brought before the people of England by the Right Hon. Mr. Stanhope, in

1887, and when the conference took place at Ottawa a few years ago, the whole subject was formulated and placed before the country in a tangible shape. The Pacific cable is a matter of vast importance, and I am sure that in a short time we shall have it in operation, as well as our Atlantic steam service. These two great links in the chain of communication between the various parts of the empire the Liberal-Conservative party will have been successful, not only in propounding, but in carrying out. With reference to the improvement of the militia and the defences of Canada, I am very much pleased that a paragraph has been introduced into the Address on this subject. For the last few years there has been, I think, too great a disposition towards economy in dealing with our militia; but I think that now those who have charge of the finances of the country are waking up to the importance of placing the militia in a thoroughly efficient condition. In the ordinary affairs of life, we cannot get on without life insurance. The militia service is our national life insurance, protecting individuals and the country, and it should be placed in such a condition of efficiency as to be ready for any emergency that may arise. I do not for a moment anticipate that any difficulties are likely to arise in this country. We live alongside of a great neighbour; we admire its people, and their great prosperity; there is no antagonism between Canada and the United States, and I do not believe there will be in the future. At the same time, this country ought to provide for its own protection. We have been talking for years about improving our militia, and now that the revenue is increasing, it is high time that the militia of Canada should be placed upon a foundation of perfect efficiency. I believe the Lee-Metford rifle is to be introduced. That is not because there is any special necessity for it just now. That idea was propounded many years ago, and it is only now being carried out. Before closing my remarks on this subject, I desire to say a word or two about a great officer who has been connected with the militia force the most of his life, and who has just retired. I refer to Deputy Adjutant General Powell, a gentleman who has grown gray in the service of the country, and who, during the many years that he has discharged the duties of his responsible office, has given entire satisfaction to the department, I believe, as well as to all the people of Canada. When a great officer whom we have known so intimately, and who has taken so active a part in maintaining our militia force, is retiring on his laurels, it is only right and proper that his great services should be publicly acknowledged. A word now with reference to the North-west Mounted Police. That is a very fine organization; I had the pleasure of seeing it on more than one occasion, and I must say

that it has accomplished a great work, and is now doing a great deal of good. At the same time, we know that the population of the North-west is increasing, and the time cannot be very far distant when a militia organization will be introduced there similar to what exists in other parts of Canada. We know, also, that the Indians are being educated; they have their industrial schools, and they are engaging in agricultural pursuits. At the exhibition which recently took place at Regina, it was amazing to see the evidences there displayed of the advances made by the Indians in agriculture, and in civilization. Considering these facts, the time cannot be far distant when the North-west Mounted Police may be safely reduced in number, and the principle of economy applied to it. I am glad to find that the revenue of Canada is increasing; if we look at the returns, we will find that such is the case. As one of the leading financial journals says:

The public finances are in a satisfactory state. In the five months ending with November, the revenue exceeded the expenditure by \$3,335,642, whereas, in the corresponding period of the previous fiscal year the surplus was only \$1,555,017. The same ratio of improvement, continued down to June next, will cause the deficit of 1894-95 to disappear. The improvement in the finances, moreover, has been accomplished as well by a reduction in expenditure as by an increase in revenue.

If the hon. Finance Minister has one fault at all, people say he is too economical. Although he is doing his best to save the people's money, we sometimes think he is going a little too far in that direction, and that is why I spoke out last year in regard to expending more money on our militia service. But I am glad to see that this paragraph has this year been introduced into the Speech from the Throne, which must have been done with his consent, otherwise it would not be there. As each man grows older his intellect widens. I have no doubt that this step towards improving our militia force will receive the encouragement of the force and the endorsement of the people of Canada generally. The population of Canada is said not to be increasing. Now, that is a great mistake. We know perfectly well that the population of Canada is increasing, even in the North-west. The population of our country has made as good progress as could reasonably be expected. A hundred years ago, there were not more than 200,000 people in Canada, while there were 3,600,000 people in the United States. How is it that they have made such progress, and we have not? Because we occupied a mere strip of territory, and were cut off from our great North-west until the Canadian Pacific Railway was built, while they had their fertile plains open to them, without any insurmountable barrier to get over. If we look back upon the history of our country, we shall find that the people of Canada have

Sir JAMES GRANT.

made as much progress by their skill, their energy and their indefatigable industry as any people in the world. Look at the financial condition of our people—the deposits in the banks, the success of our insurance companies, and the railways we have built—16,000 miles of railway by five millions of people. We have built, in Canada, more railways, according to our population, in the same length of time than they have built in the United States. We have no reason for discouragement whatever. We know perfectly well that our population is only about one and a half individuals to the square mile, whereas in Ontario it is about ten to the square mile, and in the United States twenty-one. If we go on in the same ratio as we have been, we will, before the end of the century, have thirty millions of people in this country thriving, comfortable and happy. What more could we possibly expect? Rely upon it that when we have coming in here a combination and infusion of elements from the various nationalities in the world—and it is this combination of elements and nationalities that makes a country great; this it is what made Great Britain great and enabled her to attain the position she has attained—our future will be greater than we can possibly have any idea of at present. I find in the "Canada Gazette" of London, an article by no less a person than the Hon. Senator Perley, which must be very encouraging. Speaking of mixed farming, he says:

The first principle to adopt is to raise on the farm all the food that is required by the family that the soil of the farm and the climate of the district will produce. That done, there is little to buy in the grocery line, as in any of the thirteen years I have been in the country a farmer could raise his bread, meat—the best of all kinds—butter, milk, cream, poultry, eggs, together with almost every vegetable—nearly all his living.

Practical observations such as these from a Canadian agriculturist, a gentleman sent by Canada to represent it at the great Chicago Fair, are worthy of being carefully noted. And that great fair itself was particularly encouraging to this Dominion through the magnificent exhibit which our country made and the many prizes which our people carried off and which adorn the firesides of many of our agriculturists. Hon. gentlemen opposite tell us that Canada is going back. Why, Mr. Speaker, if we look back thirty or forty years and make a comparison, we find that our advancement has been very great indeed. We are to-day a united people joined together by railways, by steam communication and telegraphic communication and everything required to promote the advancement of our country, whereas thirty or forty years ago we were separated, we knew scarcely anything of each other, and had not the understanding and the conception of each other's require-

ments which we now have. It has taken many centuries for European Kingdoms to have attained to arrive at the degree of progress which we have, although we have only been a Dominion for half a century. If we cannot boast of great advancement in science, literature and art, still we have men in Canada who have achieved world-wide reputation in these lines. If we cannot boast of great ancestry in this country, if we cannot go back hundreds of years as the English people can, still every man in this Dominion stands on his own merits, and is proud to stand by his country and promote everything that will tend to build up the material interests of this Dominion of ours. Hon. gentlemen opposite claim that we are retarded in our progress by the National Policy. Could any policy have done more for the country than the National Policy has done? I do not intend to expatiate on this subject as that would take up too much of your time. All that I need do is to point to our high chimney stacks, to our factories in every direction, to our agricultural products, which are being seized upon by the leading countries in the world, to our manufactured products, to our cloth which is now finding its way into Germany and even competing with the best products of England, to the various materials which we are now exporting to Australia and New Zealand. In every line the National Policy is advancing the best interests of the country, and I defy any one to say anything to the contrary. In conclusion, I wish merely to advert very briefly to the Manitoba school question. No subject has occupied more the attention of the House during the last two or three sessions than this intricate question. That question has been submitted to the high court of England. It is rather singular that the hon. leader of the Opposition, who expects to be First Minister—but whose prospects of attaining that office are still very remote—should have, as his warmest friend in this House, the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin), who introduced the legislation establishing separate schools in Manitoba. That hon. gentleman wants to procrastinate; he wants a commission. Why? Is it because he does not understand the subject, or that those to whom is entrusted the legislation of this country do not understand it? Not at all. He merely wants to put the matter off a little longer; he wants to be able to tell his French compatriots: you do not know anything about the separate school question, it is not right for you to do anything about it, the hon. member for Winnipeg is against taking any action, he is my political friend and supporter; and when he introduced the Bill to do away with separate schools, do you imagine for a moment that I am going to legislate to restore them? Now, we know that our constitution requires the protection of minorities in Manitoba as well as in

Quebec. It is based on protection through and through, and it is our duty to carry out the principles of our constitution. If a vote be taken, I am satisfied that those who are opposing the proposition will find, when they have thoroughly considered it, that something will have to be done. They will find that our French compatriots are not going to submit to this question being put off any longer and will insist upon what they are entitled to. We know that the French nationality is a great nationality. We know that it has contributed to the prosperity of Canada from the days when the aborigines paddled their own canoes up the majestic St. Lawrence. We know that it has worked shoulder to shoulder with the Anglo-Saxon in building up this country; and if to-day we are a happy, contented, and prosperous people, it is because we are all working together as one, no matter what our nationality or creed. We ask for nothing but equal justice to all classes of the community. We do not want any procrastination in the matter. When this question came up some years ago in this House, the leader of the Opposition taunted the Government with procrastination on this subject: You will not push it forward, you are doing nothing with regard to it; you are not according to my French compatriots the justice to which they are entitled. And, forsooth, when the Government takes the responsibility of formulating a policy and trying to settle this great question which it is so necessary to settle, they are told that they are moving too fast. They have declared that the Manitoba government should settle the matter and have afforded them every opportunity to do so. But that government would not touch it, because they think that it is only the legislation that has been introduced and carried through by the hon. member for Winnipeg, (Mr. Martin) the right-hand man of the leader of the Opposition, that should stand as the law in this matter. When this question comes before them in a tangible form, the people will declare whether the policy of procrastination is right and proper when we have a matter of law to deal with. And when we place on the statute-book the law which should be carried out in its entirety, and when this great question is settled and when the people come to understand it, they must not have occasion to say that we were behind-hand in extending equal rights and equal privileges to all classes of the community. This is the great aim and object that the Conservative party of Canada has in view and is determined to see carried out in its entirety. One more point I wish to advert to—the changes that have recently taken place in our Administration. The little thunderstorm has passed over, and the air is clear again. The change had common-sense behind it. What the Government wanted was more power to their elbow—and they have got it. At no

time in the history of the country have the Opposition felt more agueish than they have done since the advent of Sir Charles Tupper to the Cabinet. The history of that gentleman is thoroughly understood. He has taken an active part for many years in the affairs of this country and has been instrumental in moulding the legislation not only of his own province but of the Dominion. No man has accomplished more in promoting progressive legislation than the hon. the Secretary of State. In England, for years past, he has taken an active part in affairs as High Commissioner, and it is well known that no great project has been placed before the people of England with reference to Canada that he has not advocated in the most strenuous manner. So much has he done that the power and ability of the man are recognized not only in Canada and in England but throughout the civilized world. His co-operation in great movements has frequently been asked. Consider, for example, the address delivered by him a few days ago on the subject of preferential trade before one of the finest assemblies ever gathered in the commercial metropolis, the great city of Montreal. It is true that we lost Montreal Centre, but let me tell gentlemen opposite that if that election were to take place to-morrow, the Conservative party would carry the constituency by a majority of hundreds of votes. And why? Because the people there know that never was a more impressive or instructive address placed before this country than that recently delivered upon the subject of preferential trade by the Secretary of State. Its arguments were sound and impressive; in all its details it was practical, not theoretical, and it tended directly to the development of all our industries. Not only the merchants and manufacturers but the farmers who have so much to sell abroad will endorse that address, and they will say that the little cloud that came over the Conservative party has completely passed away and that there is as great a future in store for us now as there ever was. I am satisfied that when the next general elections take place the people of Canada will not record their votes against their own interests. Canada never was so progressive as she is to-day. Look in any direction and where will you find a people enjoying the comforts and privileges we enjoy, where will you find a people making the progress we are making in education, science, literature and industry? There is no country that has a greater future before it than Canada. At no time in my life have I felt greater pleasure than I have felt at the addition of strength to the Government. That Government will receive the endorsement of the Dominion and will continue its commendable work of developing and building up this great country.

Mr. McSHANE. Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to say a word upon the subject

Sir JAMES GRANT.

before the House. But, a few evenings ago, when I was absent from my seat for a few minutes, the hon. Minister of Finance saw fit to say something about the hon. member for Montreal Centre. Let me read from "Hansard" the words of that hon. gentleman. Speaking in reply to Mr. Laurier, he said:

Mr. FOSTER. And so my hon. friend, feeling the prickings of conscience, feeling that he has been found out as a poser of magnificent proportions in the distance, when the fact has been brought home to him that he herds with disqualified men who have been driven out of public life by the courts, says, granted, but of some of you the same may be said. Where was his candidate in Montreal Centre in the last by-election that he talks so much about.

Mr. LAURIER. I ask the hon. gentleman's pardon. He will have to apologize to the hon. member for Montreal Centre (Mr. McShane).

Mr. FOSTER. Will he? What for?

Mr. LAURIER. Yes, because the sentence given against Mr. McShane was reversed by the court of appeal.

Mr. McMULLEN. Take it back.

Mr. FOSTER. I will proceed, if my hon. friends on the other side will be quiet. I was proceeding to say, where was the candidate for Montreal Centre at this last by-election?

Mr. CASEY. At the head of the polls.

Mr. FOSTER. At the head of the polls, and a candidate with a record which is written in the evidence and the decisions of the courts—such a record and such evidence that the staunchest Liberal paper in the English language in the city of Montreal—

And so on and so on. Mr. Speaker, I came here to listen to the distinguished gentlemen who represent the people of this Dominion on both sides of the House. I thought I would bide my time as a humble individual, and did not suppose for a moment that an hon. gentleman who had been for such a long time a member of the House and who occupied the high and honourable position of Minister of Finance of this Dominion would go so far out of his way and would, in an uncalled-for and an unwarrantable manner, insult me and the people of Montreal Centre who have sent me here. He has said, in effect, that I was disqualified. I desire to tell him that I was not disqualified; and I wish to tell him this, that though, in my life, I may have violated some provisions of our strict electoral Act, let me ask, Sir, how many hon. gentlemen are there in this House who can say that at some time or other, when working hard for a friend, they have not stepped beyond the line, and done something which that Act condemns? I desire to say also that I was acquitted by the Court of Appeal of the province of Quebec, presided over by one of the most distinguished men who ever sat on a bench in our country. I mean the late Chief Justice Dorion, and with him, Mr. Speaker, there were sitting these distinguished judges, whose names I may mention, Judge Church, Judge Cross—these

three judges have passed away, and I hope to a better place—Judge Bossé and Judge Doherty. These distinguished judges unanimsly acquitted me of any charge ; and yet, Sir, I am told by the hon. Minister of Finance that I am disqualified, in a sense, and unworthy to sit in this House. Mr. Speaker, does he suppose that the people of Montreal Centre, a people amongst whom I was born and I have lived since my boyhood, do not know me far better than he does ? I have occupied positions of honour in my city. I have been an alderman for twenty long years, I have been a representative in the Quebec legislature for fourteen long years, and I have been elected to that position unanimously two or three times. I have also been mayor of my city, and not only have I received the largest majority that has ever been given to any man, but on one occasion I was elected mayor of Montreal by acclamation. And yet, Sir, the people of Montreal Centre are now told that they have sent a man to Parliament who is disqualified, and unworthy to fill that high and honourable position. Let me tell the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fester) that in the last election I had to resist the combined efforts of two Governments. Seven Ministers of this Cabinet were in the city of Montreal speaking almost every day and night. What they said against me politically, I care not, for I carried the election. In carrying on the election I said not one word against the distinguished gentleman, Sir Wm. Hingston, who opposed me ; neither did I speak an unkind word of any one who worked against me. But I cannot say the same thing of the Ministers of this Government who came down and remained in Montreal day after day. We had the hon. Minister of Public Works, a gentleman whose name will always stand high in the history of this country as the commander of the 65th regiment in the North-west rebellion. We also had another distinguished gentleman, the Postmaster General, who, along with his supporters, did everything they could to crush and defeat me. That hon. gentleman visited every railway company, every manufacturing company, every office and every other place where he thought he could get a vote, and where he could use any influence against me. Not only that, Mr. Speaker, but even religion came over the spirit of his dream, and one Sunday he came to St. Patrick's Church. I am glad he came there, I do not think he goes to church a great deal, but there he heard a beautiful and most eloquent sermon, and the people wondered who was the gentleman with the eye-glass. The following Sunday he went down to good old Griffintown, and to good Father Strubbe's church. He sat there in the pew, and heard another beautiful and eloquent sermon. I hope these sermons will long live in the memory of the hon. gentleman, and that he will become a better man politically.

Let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, that the efforts these Ministers made to defeat me in the city of Montreal were the most desperate ever made against any one. Not only did they use the wealth, the power and the influence of two Governments to defeat me, but they enlisted the aid of the monopolists, and on the day of election, they had an organized band of telegraphers at almost every poll to swear through every dead man and every absent man they could hear of to vote against me. Sir, I stood upon the platform of the people, and I had with me the distinguished gentleman in whose ranks I serve as an humble soldier, the high-spirited Laurier, the man who, according to the hon. gentleman who just spoke, will one day be Premier of this country, a gentleman whose every act is above-board, whose record is pure. We hope, as the hon. gentleman who just sat down (Sir James Grant) says, that he will one day lead this country, that he will direct its legislation in ways that are pure and honest. Mr. Speaker, we are told by the Minister of Finance that I am a man unworthy to represent the people of Montreal Centre in the House of Commons ; but the people of Montreal think differently. Montreal is a great city, the greatest in the Dominion. I was supported by a large number of the members of the Board of Trade. The members of the Corn Exchange, the best doctors in the city, the leading lawyers, the leading notaries, and greatest and grandest of all, the solid workingmen, the bone and sinew of the city, all voted for me. Sir, I did not intend to say so much, but let me add that while I hold a seat in this House, I hope I shall never utter one word that will hurt the feelings of anybody. I sat in the Quebec legislature for 14 years, and I left it with the respect of every member of that House ; and I hope that when I leave this Parliament, I shall leave it with the respect, not only of my friends, but of my political foes. It will be my endeavour always to act in a straightforward and honourable manner, as befitting the representative of one of the divisions of that great city. I desire to say to the hon. gentleman before I sit down, that I have always been faithful to my friends. I have stood up for them when I knew I would be knocked down. I have always been true and faithful to my political friends. I have never been called a renegade or a traitor, and I say it ill-becomes that hon. gentleman who thought fit to go out of his way to attack me, to use the language he did. I tell him that the people of Montreal Centre will remember him ; and I call upon every friend of mine—and I hope that the "Hansard" and the press of this country will take note of it—I call upon every friend of mine to remember that a man who has been a renegade to his party, a man who

has been called a traitor by his Premier, has thought fit, because he believes there were very few of my race in this House, to charge me wrongfully with being disqualified. Sir, I tell him that these words will never do him any good. I hope that every friend I have throughout this Dominion will remember the words used by the hon. gentleman in reference to one who came into this House with the intention of faithfully performing his duty to his constituents and to this country. I repeat, Sir, that he will one day regret having used those words against the member for Montreal Centre.

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

After Recess

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Mr. Speaker, I am sure we were all very much pleased this afternoon to listen to the manly and honest vindication of himself by the hon. member for Montreal Centre (Mr. McShane) against the charge which had been preferred against him by the leader of the House. Those explanations and that defence were very satisfactory to my mind. They completely disproved the charge the hon. gentleman preferred.

Mr. FOSTER. What was the charge, please?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I regret that the charge was made. It was that he had been disqualified by the courts, and that he was a boodler.

Mr. FOSTER. Quote the charge. It was misquoted this afternoon, and the hon. gentleman is proceeding on a misquotation to-day. If the hon. gentleman will take the "Hansard" and read what I said, he will have a basis on which to proceed.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I have read the "Hansard." The hon. gentleman said the member was a boodler and had been disqualified by the courts.

Mr. FOSTER. I said no such a thing. I do not think it is fair to put words in my mouth which I did not use, when not a few feet from his mouth the hon. gentleman has the very words I used.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The words reported to have been said by the hon. gentleman were, that the member had been disqualified by the courts.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman cannot read that statement.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I can read it. The hon. gentleman cannot deny it.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. McSHANE.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I am not stating what the hon. gentleman said, but what he is reported to have said.

Mr. SPEAKER. If the leader of the House disclaims having used the words, the House must accept his statement.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman does not disclaim having used the words. But what I want particularly to call the attention of the House to is, that whether he used this expression or that expression, what he attempted to do was to leave the impression on the minds of hon. members that the hon. member for Montreal Centre had been guilty of offences which had induced the courts to disqualify him, and that it was an act discreditable on the part of Mr. Laurier, leader of the Opposition, to associate with that hon. gentleman.

Mr. FOSTER. If the hon. gentleman will allow me, I should like to put the matter straight as to what I did say. I did not deny the statement made this afternoon, for I did not think it necessary; but as the hon. gentleman has taken the matter up, I do think it necessary. I made no charge against the hon. member for Montreal Centre (Mr. McShane). I did make a charge against the leader of the Opposition, and I was proceeding to prove it, and what I said with respect to the hon. member for Montreal Centre was this:

I will proceed, if my hon. friends on the other side will be quiet.

Probably before I read that part of the statement, I should read what I said previously. In speaking of the hon. leader of the Opposition, I said:

—he has been found out as a poser of magnificent proportions in the distance, when the fact has been brought home to him that he herds with disqualified men, who have been driven out of public life by the courts, says, granted, but of some of you the same may be said.

Then I go on, after having instanced the case of Mr. German, and say:

Where was his candidate in Montreal Centre in the last by-election that he talks so much about?

Then there was some interruption. After that I go on and say:

I will proceed, if my hon. friends from the other side will be quiet. I was proceeding to say, where was the candidate for Montreal Centre at this last by-election.

Mr. Casey, interrupting, replied, at the head of the poll. I then continued:

At the head of the polls, and a candidate with a record which is written in the evidence and the decisions of the courts—such a record and such evidence that the staunchest Liberal paper in the English language in the city wished, and prayed, and put its wish in its columns almost daily, that the Liberal candidate might be defeated for the credit of the Liberal party.

If there is any quarrel, it is with your own Liberal papers, not myself. I simply spoke of this hon. gentleman's record as a record and evidence which was in the courts, and to which exception was taken, and to which prominence was given by several papers, among them being the Montreal "Witness."

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It is perfectly evident the hon. gentleman wants to explain away what he said. It is perfectly plain to any one who reads the report that if it does not bear out the obvious meaning which an independent party will put on it, he should withdraw it and put other language in its stead. What the hon. gentleman said, after referring to a sentiment which the leader of the Opposition had uttered, was :

That in the United States of America, when a man had been declared guilty of corrupt practices, he was driven out of public life entirely by the force of public sentiment.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman continued :

My hon. friend has foregathered over and over again with men who have been unseated and disqualified for corrupt practices.

Mr. FOSTER. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) He proceeded :

My hon. friend's memory is short in this respect, too. There was a man in this House of the name of German, who represented a constituency in the Niagara peninsula, and who was disqualified for seven years. Not many months afterwards, my hon. friend stood on a platform with this same disqualified gentleman, and sang a paean of praise in reference to the sterling qualities of Mr. German.

Mr. LAURIER. Will my hon. friend permit me ? There was a man disqualified in the province of Quebec under precisely the same circumstances as Mr. German, and he was raised to the Senate by the hon. gentleman.

Mr. FOSTER. And so my hon. friend, feeling the prickings of conscience, feeling that he has been found out as a poser of magnificent proportions in the distance, when the fact has been brought home to him that he herds with disqualified men who have been driven out of public life by the courts,—

Mr. FOSTER. Which I proved a moment before.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)—

—says, granted, but of some of you the same may be said. Where was his candidate in Montreal Centre in the last by-election that he talks so much about ?

Mr. FOSTER. Certainly. Then I go on and speak of the candidate.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman spoke of a man disqualified by the courts, and asked where was the candidate from Montreal Centre. The report proceeds :

Mr. LAURIER. I ask the hon. gentleman's pardon. He will have to apologize to the hon. member for Montreal Centre (Mr. McShane).

Mr. FOSTER. Will he ? What for ?

The hon. gentleman was able to make the charge in an indirect way, for he had not the manliness to make it direct.

Mr. FOSTER. I made it direct, and I proved it.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) If so, there was no occasion to interrupt me just now.

Mr. FOSTER. That is unfair. I did so by citing the case of Mr. German.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Did the hon. gentleman not mean to refer to the hon. member for Montreal Centre ? If not, I ask him two questions : When interrupted in the course of his speech by the leader of the Opposition, who called attention to the fact that he would have to apologize to the hon. member for Montreal Centre, why did not the hon. gentleman say that he did not refer to the hon. member for Montreal Centre ?

Mr. FOSTER. I will give the hon. gentleman an answer. It was because I did not propose to say what I did not mean. After it had been said in the first instance, I decided to dispose of it ; I intended to say what I did say in regard to the member for Montreal Centre, and I said it.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman cannot escape. The hon. gentleman was not speaking of a man—he spoke of two individuals, and he spoke of them by name, and he spoke of disqualified men whom the leader of the Opposition should be ashamed to associate with, and the only two names he gave were Mr. German and the hon. member for Montreal Centre.

Mr. FOSTER. Allow me to correct the hon. gentleman again. The hon. gentleman said that before I used the word in regard to the member for Montreal Centre that I spoke of disqualified men by name. I deny it, and it cannot be found on the record.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I said the hon. gentleman spoke of disqualified members, after he had spoken of the member for Montreal Centre.

Mr. FOSTER. Did I, and by name ?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) You spoke of the member for Montreal Centre.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman's misrepresentation just now was, that he said that before I spoke of the member for Montreal Centre I spoke of disqualified men by name. I did not—I spoke of Mr. German.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Well, Sir, if he can crawl out of that hole, if he says that in naming an hon. member by the county he represents and not by his Christian and surname he did not refer to him ; if he wishes to escape by saying that, it is a miserable and contemptible hole to crawl out of.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not want to escape. I did not mention the member from Montreal Centre (Mr. McShane).

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) has distinctly stated that the Hon. Mr. Laurier had stood on the platform with this same disqualified gentleman, referring to Mr. German.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, I did.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) And he went on distinctly to say that Mr. Laurier had associated with disqualified men.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, I did.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Distinguishing between a gentleman who singly was disqualified, and others who were disqualified, and the only other name he referred to was the member for Montreal Centre (Mr. McShane).

Mr. FOSTER. That is not so.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) was told by the hon. leader of the Opposition that he would have to apologize, and he did not apologize.

Mr. FOSTER. No.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The member for Montreal Centre came here to-day, and in a manly and straightforward manner, called attention to the fact, that while a single judge in the Superior Court disqualified him, that no sooner was the case brought before the Court of Appeals, than that court, composed of five judges, representing all classes of politics, unanimously determined that there was not a vestige of ground for maintaining the charge, and reversed the judgment of the court below.

Mr. FOSTER. If my hon. friend will allow me.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. FOSTER. Order; we want the truth. If that statement is correct, as made by the member for Montreal Centre (Mr. McShane), he has put his position right, a position which was asserted in the public press for many weeks, but which was not asserted directly, although indirectly it was, by me here, in quoting the position taken by the Montreal "Witness." I made no positive statement with reference to the hon. gentleman from Montreal Centre. If his statement is correct, he has set himself right.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) adopted the substance of the charge. He now says that Mr. McShane has cleared himself, or, if he has he ought to be satisfied. But, if Mr. McShane has cleared himself that is not the point I am addressing myself to. The leader of the House has not cleared himself.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, he has.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The point I am leading up to is this, Sir. The Finance Minister, more than any other gentleman, because of the official position he occupies as leader of the House, if, in the heat of argument he stumbles into a false position and is guilty of slandering one of his fellow members, he should be the first man in this House to make a respectable apology. That apology is due yet from the hon. gentleman, and unless he does rise up and apologize to the hon. member for Montreal Centre (Mr. McShane) he will be held, in the minds of a great number of men, to be a slanderer of the worst kind.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman should not use the word "slanderer" as applied to an hon. member of this House.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) If Mr. Speaker tells me that I must not use the word slanderer, I shall, of course, withdraw it. I was speaking of the esteem and repute in which any hon. gentleman would be held in this House who makes a charge against a fellow member, and not only fails to substantiate it, but has the disproof placed in his hands by the member himself, and then fails to make the "amende honorable."

Mr. FOSTER. If my hon. friend (Mr. Davies) will allow me; I say that I did not make any charge.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. FOSTER. Hon. gentlemen will please allow me to say what I wish to say. I made no charge. I quoted that which was current report, which was quoted in different papers all through that election contest, and which was one of the foremost charges and arguments in the press in the contest which took place in Montreal Centre. I quoted that here. I gave my authority for it as the Montreal "Daily Witness." I made no direct charge against the hon. gentleman (Mr. McShane) at all, nor did not intend to. That hon. gentleman has to-day made a statement, and, after he had made it I said: That statement, so far as the hon. gentleman is concerned, must clear him if that statement be a correct one, and the hon. gentleman says it is. If I had made a direct charge I would be the first to take it back, after the statement was made, but I did not do it, and I am not going to allow myself to be put in a false position.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman can take his own course.

Mr. FOSTER. I intend to.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Of course he intends to. I may tell him that it is generally understood amongst gentlemen that there is no more shameful and no more shameless way of attacking your adver-

sary, than, instead of making a charge against him directly, to say: I have seen you called a thief and a robber in the public press of this country. Sir, if I made a charge against one of my opponents in the heat of argument, and I found out afterwards that that charge was without the shadow of foundation, if I found out that the Appeal Court of the country had declared it to be without a shadow of foundation, if the person against whom I made the charge met me face to face and complained bitterly that this charge, coming from my lips was doing him damage, I should be the first one to apologize, and the first one to withdraw.

Mr. FOSTER. So should I if I had ever made the charge.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) does not see fit to apologize; he does not see fit to withdraw. If he did not adopt the language he quoted, let me ask him, what motive prompted him to quote it in this House? Why did he quote a slander in this House if he did not quote it with the intention of adopting it? Why did he appeal to his followers behind him, and point the finger of scorn at my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition who, he said, associated with gentlemen of that character? To-day he intensifies the evil of the wrong which he has done to an hon. gentleman who sits in the same House with him, an hon. gentleman who has made a full, frank and complete explanation, and he refuses to make a public apology or withdrawal. I leave the hon. gentleman to his own reflections, and I undertake to say that if he polls the gentlemen of the House who sit behind him, they will tell him he has but one course to take, and that is to apologize. Now, Sir, permit me to turn away from this subject which I did not suppose would occupy more than a moment or two. The hon. gentleman from Ottawa (Sir James Grant) who addressed the House to-night congratulated the country on the recent changes in the Cabinet, and referred to the little disturbances which proceeded those changes. He rather congratulated the country upon these disturbances, too, because they had given us a strong Government, practically led by a man who is going to lead the Conservative party to victory. The hon. gentleman (Sir James Grant) is well satisfied with the explanations made to this House by its present leader, and by the gentleman whom he has supplanted, the hon. Postmaster General. I have had an opportunity of expressing my personal opinion as to the character and truthfulness of these representations, and as to the view which the country held respecting the representations themselves, and respecting the men who made them. I do not propose to go over the same ground. I do not propose, either, to trouble the House with the opinions of anybody outside who might

be called a party man, because we all know that, more or less, our party prejudices and feelings lead us sometimes to form extreme and partisan opinions. But, Sir, if you will permit me, I will read the opinion of one of the most independent papers in Canada, a paper which, I believe, boasts that it does not belong to either party, and a paper whose record for some time past gives good ground for the boast which it makes. The Montreal "Star," of the 16th of January, referring to the recent Cabinet disturbance on which the hon. member for Ottawa (Sir James Grant) congratulated the House this afternoon, speaks as follows:—

MAGNA EST VERITAS ET PREVALEBIT.

Ananias is dead. Saphira is dead. Munchausen (if he ever existed) is dead. But the Government at Ottawa still lives, and the breed is in no immediate danger of extinction.

These melancholy reminiscences are suggested by the official explanations made in the House of Commons yesterday by Sir Adolphe Caron, with reference to the recent ministerial strike, lock-out and resumption of work.

There are features about that explanation which compel public admiration. Upon that utterance alone Sir Adolphe might be elected president of any fish and game club.

It was colossal! Magnificent! Heroic! Superb!

The people of Canada expected to be taken into the confidence of the Government.

They were taken in!

There is an island in Cumberland county, Nova Scotia, known as Jerry Island, and which it is the fashion for the bluenoses to offer as a prize to the biggest liar in the province. The Government ought to declare that island for the general advantage of Canada and take it.

Nobody has a better claim just now.

The Ministers have been setting a good example by accepting each other's explanations on various subjects lately, and we are bound to accept their explanation.

We are required to believe that the seven retired but repentant Ministers resigned their portfolios because they had conscientious scruples about violating the constitution by leaving Mr. Angers's chair at the Council table empty, and that the Premier has taken them back again because, after reconstruction, he has come to the conclusion that this cause was not sufficient to justify the resignations.

We repeat, we are bound to accept the explanation—otherwise we might have some lingering doubts.

And if we accept it (as we are bound to do), we cannot very well hereafter refuse to accept any statement bearing the ministerial brand.

The explanation thus frankly accepted effectually disposes of the theory that the Ministers resigned because they found it impossible to carry on the Government without a Solicitor-General.

Unfortunately, there are difficulties about reconciling this explanation with the explanation of the Hon. George Eulas Foster to the effect that the seven bolters resigned because they found that their venerable leader suffered from moments of weakness for about twenty-four hours a day.

Are we equally bound to accept that statement?

In view of the evident fact that the old man has come out of the scrimmage most conspicuously on top, we think not.

Oh, fie, George Eulas Foster!

Beware, George, of the exceeding fibfulness of little fibs.

To think that you should represent yourself and your associates as actuated by disloyalty to your chief, when you were all actuated by jealousy for the purity of the constitution.

No, George! We must accept the explanation made by Sir Adolphus.

That was no petty fib.

There was nothing petty about it.

I thought, Mr. Speaker, that that explanation of the "Star" was so excellent that it ought to be embalmed as an answer to the congratulations which the hon. member for Ottawa offered to the House this afternoon.

Passing away from that, I wish to say a few words on the Address, and my remarks to-night shall be very short. We have had some observations made on those paragraphs in the Address which relate to the militia and the Mounted Police. In that connection references were made by my hon. leader to the recent war-scare, and the language he used has been challenged in this House. But I venture to say, Sir, that there has not been a sentiment uttered on either side of the House which commanded more general assent than that uttered by my honoured leader—that if we were to have a militia at all, and he greatly hoped we were, we should not send them out with old weapons such as they are now armed with, to be murdered in case of war, but that we should arm them with the best arm that money could secure. That sentiment was received, I think, with general approval on both sides of the House. I will not dwell on this military aspect of the case at any length. I do not feel myself qualified to advise the Government as to the manner in which the militia should be organized. We had read us to-day by the hon. member for East Huron (Mr. Macdonald) the report of the late Major General Herbert upon the present condition of our militia, and I must say frankly that that condition is not one which can give satisfaction to any one. I am pleased to see that there is a universal feeling on both sides of the House that these defects and evils should be remedied. We are prepared on both sides of the House to grant the necessary money for that purpose. We have been voting money, for years past, and voting it reluctantly, because of the general impression prevailing, not only in military circles, but outside of them, that the money has been wasted. But we are willing to vote the same amount, and double it if necessary, for our militia service, provided the Government are prepared to come down with a fairly well-considered scheme and to show us that our money is going to be put to good use. Sir, the recent war scare will have one good effect at least: it will show the world that while we have our own internal troubles and feuds and dis-

sensions, when it comes to a matter affecting Canada's external relations, her people are one. On national questions we can close up our ranks and stand shoulder to shoulder. We in this country desire peace above all things. The horrors of a war between Canada, Great Britain and the United States are simply unspeakable. One cannot dwell upon such an idea for a moment without horror, and I am pleased that the evidences of the existence of a war cloud are rapidly passing away. But while we are prepared to do everything that is honourable to avoid the horrors of a fratricidal war, I do not think there is a man in Canada who is prepared to yield to dishonour to avoid that trouble. We are a part, and an integral part of the British Empire; we are proud to be a part of the Empire, and we propose to remain a part of the Empire; and if the passing trouble does nothing more than satisfy our neighbours to the south, and any doubters elsewhere, that the heart of the Canadian people, from British Columbia to Nova Scotia, beats in unison with that sentiment, then, Sir, it will not have been in vain. If attacked, we would show in a practical way that we value our political institutions, that we value our country, and that we value our homes. At the same time, I believe that one united prayer will go up from the minds and hearts of all Canadians that the horrors of this anticipated war may be avoided, and that the two great countries which heretofore have worked in unison for the promotion of peace and civilization will continue to do so in the near future. I believe myself, although I do not go so far as my honoured leader, that there is a very widespread feeling of love and affection among many classes of people in the United States for Canada and for the British and Canadian people. I admit there is a class, and a large class, who entertain other feelings, and I think perhaps they are the noisiest class; but we know that when the first flush of passion and anger had exhausted itself, there welled up from the hearts and bosoms of the better class of American people the feeling that blood after all was thicker than water, that England had done nothing to merit the extreme language which had been used by America's chief magistrate towards her, that her course on this, as on other questions, was a dignified and manly one, and that, so far as Canada was concerned, she at least was perfectly free from the expression even of a sentiment which could cause anger on the part of our American neighbours. We hope and trust that this war cloud will pass away; but if it should not, and if the horrors of an invasion ever should be thrown upon us, I believe there would not be any appreciable section of the people who would not willingly rise and cheerfully sacrifice health, strength, and property in defence of their homes and hearths.

I wish to say a few words on a question which is paramount in the minds of most people in this country. I refer to the question of education in Manitoba. That question has, I think, wisely been relegated by the constitution to the several provinces themselves for legislation and settlement. There are provisions in our constitutional Act limiting the extent of the powers of the several provinces, particularly Ontario and Quebec, guaranteeing to the minorities in those provinces certain rights and privileges, and I am pleased to know that now as heretofore, and I hope always hereafter, there is not and never will be any question arising as to the absolute integrity of those limitations and the absolute right of the minorities in these provinces to the privileges which have been granted them by the constitution. But I say it is a happy thing that this question, which is peculiarly a local one, has been left by the constitution to the people of the several provinces themselves, and I say so speaking from the practical experience of a good many years. Sir, we have gone through this agitation in the maritime provinces. It is now nearly thirty years since our Free School Act was introduced in Nova Scotia, and very nearly twenty years since similar Acts were introduced in Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick. At the time of their introduction, they gave rise to acrimonies and bitter quarrels, they gave rise to many fears, doubts and qualms, the minority thought there was a disposition on the part of the majority to trample on their rights and privileges; and I recall these facts to-day for the one purpose of drawing attention to the fact that while there have been a few hitches here and there, a few disputes on minor points here and there, speaking generally, the system of education which has been adopted in those three provinces, has, after the lapse of twenty years in the one case and thirty years in the other, given general satisfaction. I do not mean to say that there might not be a few little points here and there which may be improved. I do not say that there may not be a few minor matters on which there may be small points of complaint, but I do say most unhesitatingly that in the three provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island to-day, the practical manner in which the school question has been worked out by the people themselves leaves no room for complaint on the part of any minority. I am pleased to know to-day that in neither of those three provinces can any appreciable section of the people be found to lay a complaint, here or elsewhere, that their rights in this matter are not fully recognized and allowed. That is an object-lesson which should not be lost sight of, because you must remember, Sir, that when those provinces began to legislate on this subject, the greatest fears were expressed by the minority that in the then near future their

rights would be trampled upon. We know that so strong was that feeling in the minds even of members of this House that application was made, time and again, to this House to interfere for the protection of those rights and privileges. Parliament was called upon to exercise the power which, it was alleged, our constitution gave it of overriding the local Acts of education, in the province at least of New Brunswick. I venture to-day to appeal even to those gentlemen who some years ago asked Parliament to interfere, to bear me out in saying that no greater a calamity could have happened to the maritime provinces than would have happened if their counsel had been listened to. Sir, the broad common-sense and generous feeling of the majority of these provinces enabled them to work out this question and to solve the difficulties in a manner which commands our admiration of to-day, and I hope and trust that in approaching the similar question of the administration of the education laws in Manitoba, Parliament will show as strong common-sense, as much shrewdness and stern determination to keep within the lines of the constitution, as it did twenty years ago in reference to education in the maritime provinces. Now, how do we stand with reference to this Manitoba school question? My hon. friend who spoke on the other side last night, (Mr. Northrup) made—I do not use the term offensively,—a pleasant but rather sophistical speech. He complained of the gross ignorance which seemed to exist in the minds of individuals who ought to be informed as to the real merits of the case. From his standpoint, he may think that gross ignorance exists, but I think, after all is said and done, that the salient points are few and very simple. I do not think I will go beyond the bounds when I say that each of the judgments of the Privy Council, the highest court in the Empire, was received with unbounded surprise by the majority of the legal profession in the Dominion. For my own part, I have no hesitation in saying that previous to each judgment of the Privy Council I personally had formed a different opinion. But we are not going to discuss what the law ought to be, because we are bound by the judgments. And what do they successively prove? They prove in the first place, that the Act of 1890, which was believed by so very large a majority of the people of the Dominion to be unconstitutional, is constitutional, strictly constitutional, offends in no respect against the constitution, and that the system of education which it brought into vogue is legally and constitutionally proper. So far so good. I venture to repeat again that that judgment was a surprise. Well, when that judgment was delivered, everybody supposed, rightly or wrongly, that the question was settled, and I will venture to say that there are few lawyers in this Dominion who ever believed that the appeal which was

taken from the Supreme Court of the Dominion to the Privy Council would have the result that it did. Sir, there is no use in talking of what might happen. We have got to deal with facts as they are. The Privy Council has decided that while the Act was constitutional, still the questions put to it by the Privy Council of Canada must be answered in this sense and this sense only, that if the allegations contained in the petitions alleging grievances on the part of the minority, were true, then there was a right of appeal to the Parliament of Canada. That is the substance, the totality of the judgment that they delivered. They did not determine that any fact was true, they heard no evidence upon any fact. They were not—

Mr. AMYOT. They had the admissions of the parties all the time.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) My hon. friend will pardon me, but I think I am stating the case correctly. I desire to state the facts and the law, as I understand them, with complete accuracy. Their lordships had before them certain petitions which had been, in the first place, presented to the Privy Council of Canada, alleging that under the second subsection of section 22 of the Manitoba Act rights and privileges that had been accorded to them by the legislature of Manitoba after Manitoba became part of the union, had been prejudicially affected by the legislation of Manitoba in 1890. The Privy Council of Canada, under the Blake Act, asked the court to determine whether, assuming the allegations in these petitions to be true, there was a right of appeal to the Privy Council of Canada. That was the question. The Supreme Court of Canada determined that, assuming these allegations to be true, there was no right of appeal. The Judicial Committee of the Privy Council of Great Britain decided that, assuming these allegations to be true, there was a right of appeal. And that was the only question decided by the Privy Council. Now, when people talk about the reasons which the Privy Council gave for reaching that conclusion, and when they begin to quote this opinion and that opinion, this dictum, and that of the Privy Council upon matters which the Privy Council were not called upon to decide, they are going wide of the mark. I admit that the opinion of such a learned body, if only a dictum, is entitled to very great respect; and, as a lawyer, I, for one, am prepared to accord a large modicum of respect to the opinion of such a distinguished judicial body. But I wish to bring home to the House the fact that the question put before the Privy Council was this single, simple question: Has the Privy Council of Canada the right to hear the appeal, assuming the facts to be as stated in the petition? They decided in the affirmative; they said: You have the right to hear the appeal. That being determined

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

and conceded, what was left? Did that in any way bind the Privy Council of Canada? Did that in any way offer an indication to the Privy Council of Canada how they should decide? My hon. friend the leader of the House waxed very merry the other day over the position which he alleged the leader of the Opposition took on this question. The position taken by the leader of this side—I say it with respect—seems to me a constitutional, solid, sound position. He said that there was one class of men who held that, though the Privy Council had the right to hear the appeal, in no case should that appeal be granted; there were others who held that the Privy Council, having the right to hear the appeal, should grant the appeal, as a matter of course, in every case; but there was a third body who held that the granting or withholding of a favourable decision to the appellants should be determined by the peculiar circumstances of each case. Well, Sir, to my mind, as a layman, and as a lawyer, too, that seemed to me a very plain, simple, frank, straightforward, common-sense view. But my hon. friend the leader of the House waxed very merry over it and said: This is the hon. gentleman's policy. Now, if he had read a little deeper, if he had consulted the Manitoba Act itself, he would have found that the policy which the leader of the Opposition was laying down was in the identical words of the statute itself. What power have you in this Parliament? Have you power to grant all that is asked, or have you power to refuse all that is asked, or what is your duty in the matter? Your duty is neither to grant all nor to refuse all. Your duty, as the leader of the Opposition has said here and elsewhere, is to grant or to withhold as far only as the circumstances of each case require. If my hon. friend will turn to the statute he will see that these are the very words of the statute itself—"and in every such case, and so far only as the circumstances of each case require, the Parliament of Canada may make remedial laws." So you will see, Mr. Speaker, that the policy laid down by the leader of the Opposition was laid down in language so carefully chosen that he took the words of the statute itself. But though he exercised such extreme care and caution, and framed his policy in the language of the statute, my hon. friend the leader of the House waxed merry and asked the House to look upon this man with contempt. What have we to say, he asked, to such a policy as that? Sir, it is the only policy that will work out a satisfactory solution of the question. Now, what course did the Government take when that appeal came before them? I have not said a word in fault-finding with the Government up to the time they commenced to hear that appeal. But I have my complaint to make. I am not sure whether that complaint has been made before. I say they did not

treat the matter fairly or liberally, or with a sincere desire to reach the solution without plunging this country into a racial and religious war. And upon what do I base that opinion? I say that any ordinary body of men who were called upon to hear an appeal of that kind, depending upon whether or not certain statements made were true, the first duty which devolved upon them was to ascertain whether those statements were true in whole or in part. How, in the name of common sense, could they come to a conclusion as to whether the appeal should be granted or not unless they were satisfied that these statements were true in whole or in part when the granting of the appeal must depend upon the extent of which they found the statements to be true? If they found them to be wholly true, they might grant the whole appeal; if they found them to be true in part, they might grant the appeal in part. But even though they found the statements to be true, it did not follow that they were bound to grant the appeal, as has been alleged again and again by gentlemen on the other side of the House. Not at all. The question is much greater than one coming before an ordinary judicial tribunal. If there is one fact that has been settled by the decision of the Privy Council more clearly than another it is that the appeal the Privy Council of Canada were to hear was a politico-administrative appeal, an appeal to be determined by them as the political officers of His Excellency and in no sense as a judicial court. Therefore, I say that when these gentlemen came to hear the appeal, if they wished to hear it and decide it upon principles which would command the favour of the people of Manitoba and the people of the Dominion at large, they were bound to take measures to ascertain the correctness of the statements made in the petition. I arraign these gentlemen because they made no attempt whatever to ascertain the truth of these statements. I re-read only this morning the arguments before the Privy Council of Canada on hearing that appeal. What took place? The petitions were read, affidavits were put in in support of the allegations contained in the petition. Counsel for the petitioners made his statement. A gentleman whose name, I think, was O'Donohoe, appeared on behalf of some of the inhabitants of Manitoba and himself to represent that he did not agree to the truthfulness of the statements made. He then made his statements. The gentleman who appeared for Manitoba claimed the right to reply to the affidavits Manitoba had put in. And for fear that the time required to obtain the affidavits to make the reply, would delay the hearing too much, the gentlemen who put in the affidavits withdrew them from the court altogether; and, notwithstanding their withdrawal from the court, I find them printed in full in the official document which was put before the

country. Although the counsel for Manitoba was not permitted to reply to the affidavits made, and although the affidavits were absolutely withdrawn from the court by Mr. Ewart, who presented them, still, Sir, they are published to the world as the evidence upon which this Privy Council proceeded when they gave their judgment in this matter. Well, we have the judgment they gave, and I am not going to question for a moment, whether it is legal or not, whether it is right or whether it is wrong. I am calling attention to one fact only, and that is that while these gentlemen were engaged on one of the most solemn and momentous occasions of their political lives, and when they were called upon to take, with prudence and care, every step which led up to the final conclusion they reached, they took no step whatever to ascertain the truth of any of the statements on which they claim to base their decision, but decided solely and alone upon the legal aspect of the statutes which were repealed by the Act of 1890. Now, Sir, that is not right. I say if it was not possible to bring down evidence from Manitoba and hear it before the Privy Council, it was quite possible to send a commission up to take evidence there. I say that for them to attempt to decide the case without hearing the facts, was, it seems to me, an evidence of a desire, or an intention, to come to a foregone conclusion. I cannot justify it, I cannot excuse it, I cannot understand it; and I have never been able to justify, or excuse, or understand it, from that day to this. Now mind you, Mr. Speaker, the judgment which these gentlemen were coming to was a judgment on which the future action of Parliament was to be based. Nobody will contend that this Parliament can act in the dark. Nobody who understands this question will pretend for a moment that we would dare to legislate without knowing what the facts are. And still we are told by this Government that although they made no inquiry at all, either by sending a commission to the spot, or by hearing evidence down here by affidavit, or orally, or otherwise, they are going to recommend to Parliament to take the matter out of the hands of Manitoba, and pass a law here which will be the law of Manitoba for all time to come. Well, Sir, I charge against the government that they were guilty of conduct which is indefensible in that regard; I charge upon them that they acted hastily; I charge upon them that they came to a conclusion which is unjustifiable, because they had no evidence upon which to base it. What took place, then? Sir, when they came to the conclusion that, on the evidence of the statutes, on the face of them, there was a grievance so great that there could be no doubt about it, and that there should be a remedy in the manner which was suggested by clauses "a," "b" and "c" of the

remedial order, what course should they have taken then? Why, Sir, it seems to me that there was but one honest course to take; they should have gone to the people and placed before them their conclusion, and asked for a mandate from the people to carry it out by legislation. Why, Sir, when we were elected in 1891, was there a man in this House, on either side, who had a mandate from his constituents to give a vote upon this question, one way or the other? Not one. Yet I say this appeal was heard in the dying hours of a dying Parliament, it was heard at a time when, ordinarily, Parliament was about to be dissolved; and when the Privy Council came to a conclusion, as they did, involving a radical change in the educational laws of a province, and involving their asking Parliament to assume a responsibility which Parliament never assumed before, and to force upon the province of Manitoba a new educational law different from the one they had themselves adopted, then, I say, there was but one course, and one only, open to them, and that was to go back to the people from whom they obtained their powers, and lay the matter before them, and let a new Parliament be elected to carry out the remedial law. Sir, I believe, rumour has it, at least, that the late Minister of Justice advised that course, and went so far as, if not to resign, to threaten his resignation, if they would not adopt that course. But he thought better of it afterwards, and went back to the Cabinet. I say he missed a great opportunity on that occasion; he missed the opportunity of showing that he was animated and controlled by a statesmanlike idea; he missed the opportunity of showing that he was determined that in a matter of this kind, vitally affecting the interest of a great province, the people at large, as well as the people of Manitoba, should be consulted. Well, Sir, we have now been called here to legislate. We have Manitoba resenting the conclusion, we have Manitoba up in arms against the remedial order. We have Manitoba holding out the olive branch to this House in this sense. The hon. gentleman smiles.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I smile because the hon. gentleman says the people of Manitoba were at the same time in a state of war, and holding out the olive branch.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Yes, they were. They have held out the olive branch, and you have rejected it. The hon. gentleman himself believed they held out the olive branch, because he asked Parliament to postpone the passing of remedial legislation inasmuch as he detected in the answer from Manitoba the desire to come to a conciliatory conclusion. Well, Sir, what did the Manitoba government do? The Manitoba government said: You have made

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

your remedial order without full knowledge of the facts. If you had had the full knowledge of the facts, you would not have made this remedial order, and we ask you to appoint a commission to examine the facts. The only conclusion an outsider could derive from such a request on the part of the Manitoba government, was this, that if a commission was appointed, it would offer a means, a happy means, a means which would be received with joy by a large majority of the people of this country, of settling this question on an amicable and friendly basis. I approve, my whole heart goes out to the proposition that a commission of some kind should be issued to take evidence upon this momentous question, and that for two reasons: First, because I deem it impossible for any legislation to emanate from this House which will be good in itself, or effective in itself, unless a commission to give us possession of the facts is first issued, because, otherwise, we will legislate in ignorance; and secondly, and above all, because I believe the issue of such a commission would open the way for a settlement on amicable and conciliatory lines between the Dominion and the province of Manitoba. I say there is no man who desires peace, order and good government in Canada, but would approve of such a policy of conciliation, if such a policy of conciliation can be reached. But, Sir, what are we to do now? The hon. gentleman complains of me saying that Manitoba at one moment was at variance with this Dominion, and the next moment that she held out the olive branch. They are not at all inconsistent. The olive branch is contained in the statement made by them that the remedial order must have been made in ignorance of the facts, and asking that a commission should issue; the variance is contained in the statement that until a commission does issue, and until we get possession of the facts, we need not hope that they will legislate in the way the remedial order desires. Now, Sir, I think the time has come when, instead of taking the people of Manitoba by the throat, we should try conciliatory measures. An hon. gentleman who spoke last night on the other side of the House talked about our being bound in honour to legislate now. Why are we bound in honour to legislate now? Bound in honour, if I understand him aright, not only to legislate now, but to legislate on the lines of the remedial order, up to the remedial order, up to the full extent of the remedial order. Where did he get his authority for that? We are bound, as the Act says, to legislate "in every such case, and so far only, as the circumstances of each case require." We are bound, in determining how far the circumstances require, to know the circumstances; and I stand here to-day to challenge the fact that there is any man on either side of this House who knows the circumstances of this case so fully as to justify him in im-

posing a mandatory, a compulsory, law upon Manitoba. Sir, you ask me to legislate, coming as I do from the maritime provinces, with reference to a state of facts existing in Manitoba. How can I do it? I hear the Attorney General and the Premier of Manitoba alleging one thing to be true; I hear those who petitioned this Parliament, alleging the contrary to be true. How am I to judge between them? How am I to legislate between them? Mark you, Mr. Speaker, when we legislate, in the opinion of very many men of the highest attainments, we are legislating irrevocably. Our legislation is not, as it very often is in legislatures and in Parliament, merely tentative. We cannot wait to see how it will operate for a year or two, and then amend it, or withdraw it, or repeal it altogether. If we legislate now, that legislation may be for weal or for woe, irrevocable. Sir, I ask hon. members, with that terrible responsibility upon them, when the law tells you that you shall never legislate except so far only as the circumstance of each case require, and no further, am I right in saying that you are assuming an unfair and a cruel responsibility if you legislate upon circumstances of which you know nothing. Sir, I do not know—I am here to confess ignorance—I know what the law of Manitoba was, and I know what the law of Manitoba is now; but the thousand and one points as to how that law at present bears upon the different classes of the community there, as to whether the communities are grouped together or mixed up, whether they desire themselves the legislation you are going to force upon them or not, whether it will be for the well-being of the country or not, whether it is for the peace, order and good government of Canada or not—all these things I do not know, and cannot know unless evidence is taken from the people who know about the facts. If hon. members had the evidence before them, if such evidence had been taken before the remedial order was made it would be something on which to proceed. But such evidence has not yet been submitted to this House, and if legislation is to be introduced, as we are informed it is about to be, then, in ignorance of the facts, I am asked to do that which I will feel the full responsibility of their act will also decline to do. The hon. gentleman says he is bound in honour to adopt this course. Where did he find his honour involved or that he was bound in any way? In every sense are the representatives of the people bound in honour to legislate for the peace, order and good government of Canada. The hon. gentleman is bound, when he assumes to exercise this extraordinary power, this unique power, this irreversible power which this second subsection vests in us, to make himself acquainted with the facts and circum-

stances of the case and the opinions of the people upon whom he is about to impose that law. We have never yet dreamed, under the most trying circumstances, of exercising the power which undoubtedly is vested in this Parliament, after a remedial order has been passed, of remedying a grievance of the minority in the matter of education. I am not here to say that we do not possess that power, or that we should not exercise it. I am not here to say that full and ample justice should not be done. Very far from it. I hope that full and ample justice will be done; but before I am asked to pledge myself to an irrevocable and irreversible law and impose on the people of a province an educational scheme which they themselves have declined to accept, I must be absolutely certain that I am doing right to the people I represent, and to the people upon whom I am imposing that law. Sir, justice must be done, and I trust there is no man on either side of the House who, if convinced that a wrong has been done—I care not whether he believes in separate schools or not, for that is not the point—that rights guaranteed under the constitution have been taken away, and it is for the order, peace and good government of Canada and in its general interest that they should be reimposed, would not scruple to take the responsibility to so act. But there are many considerations that must be weighed before that is done. In the first place, particularly and above all things, we must possess a knowledge of the facts; and in the second place, action must be taken by a Parliament fresh with the mandate of the people. Sir, I stand here before a moribund Parliament, which should have been sent to the people long since, before a dying Parliament, in its dying hours, and I am asked to pass a law which cannot be reversed, and in which if a mistake is made, it cannot be rectified. If we were passing a mere tentative measure, if we were passing, as we do every year, a law which we could amend in the following year or in subsequent years, as the circumstances require, it might not require so much care, prudence and time for its consideration; but when we are called upon to exercise a unique power, a power in regard to the educational system which is opposed by the people on whom it is intended to impose it, when we are asked to pass it in a dying Parliament and in its dying hours, without having made an investigation into the facts, do not let the hon. gentleman tell me that this action is proposed from a sense of honour, because there is no honour, no justice and no fair-play which could justify such conduct. I say that this is an arbitrary, unique and irresponsible power. I believe in an honest attempt to settle this question by conciliation. God knows there are enough racial and religious difficulties in this country already. I do not think any

man on either side of the House wants this question dragged forward on the hustings at the next elections. We want to settle it, if we can, by conciliation. If this could be done, it would be settled as the maritime province education question was settled, for all time and to the general satisfaction of the whole people. But if it is settled by force, it must be remembered that force is no remedy, the case of Ireland has proved that a long time ago. If it is settled by force, and if you impose on the people of Manitoba your view as to what you consider to be the law, and do so without accepting their offer to have an investigation, in God's name do it, but do not do it under the false idea or claim that you are complying with any demand of honour, for there is no honour in it, but there is simply dishonour and injustice. I have gone into this matter more fully than I intended to do, for I rose hurriedly without intending to go into it at length, but I have of course thought out the question pretty thoroughly from time to time and thought out the course which I should take. I may say, I commit myself to no decision one way or the other.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Oh.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) won't laugh when he hears me.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Excuse me.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I commit myself to no decision one way or the other as to whether there is a grievance or not, until I ascertain the facts by a properly constituted commission of inquiry. There may be a legal grievance; I do not deny that. But I do not admit by any manner of means that because there is a legal grievance I am called upon in this Parliament to rectify it. I believe that if there is a legal grievance it ought to be rectified by the legislature which created the grievance. I believe it can be rectified by the legislature which created the grievance. I have evidence that it will be rectified by the legislature that created the grievance.

Mr. FOSTER. Give us the proof.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Yes, if you give them the opportunity which they have asked from you. If you give them the opportunity they have asked from you of giving evidence upon the facts which you say constitute the grievance. I do not believe there is a man who doubts, that if a fair, honest commission were chosen to-day, not of party men, but a fair, honest commission, and sent out to Manitoba, and they heard the evidence of the Manitoba government upon this alleged grievance and the evidence of those who say they are suffering under it, and made a report upon it; I do not believe

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

there is a man who doubts that the Manitoba government would do justice in the premises. Why should they not, Sir? Are they different men from us? We in the maritime provinces do justice there. They, in Manitoba are our brothers, our relations sprung from the same stock, animated by the same ideas, saturated with the same literature, worshipping at the same altars, reading the same papers and books, and controlled by the same feelings and passions. Why should they not do justice as we do? Is there anything peculiar to Manitoba? Give them a chance.

Mr. DALY. We have given them a chance for five years.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I charge the hon. gentleman to-day, and those who act with him, that if evil passions are aroused, if racial and religious passions are aroused, he and his friends are the men who aroused them.

Mr. DALY. They will be aroused by just such speeches as you are making.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) My speeches are not calculated nor do I desire to raise the slightest amount of passion or feeling at all.

Mr. DALY. You seem to be very passionate yourself.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I am not passionate about it. I am dealing with this question, Sir, more in sorrow than in anger. I can tell the hon. gentleman I do not wish it in the arena of politics at all; but I want those men who by the constitution primarily have charge and control of the question, to be allowed to deal with it. I say that when you took them by the throat with that remedial order without hearing a scintilla of evidence, and said to them you must amend your education law by enacting therein clauses a, b and c, you turned your back upon conciliation and you embraced coercion and made it your friend and brother. I say that even now it is not too late. No advantage will be taken upon this side of the House, now—I think I am able to speak for my hon. friends—if you consent even at this late hour to issue a commission, and after the facts are before us then let us go into an inquiry as to how far we should legislate.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Will the hon. gentleman say that the Opposition are a unit as to that offer?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I have not consulted every one of the Opposition.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I do not ask that in an unfriendly way. I simply wish to know.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I believe I am speaking the minds of the Opposition when I say, that they desire above all things that

this matter should be settled by the province of Manitoba, that it should be settled in a conciliatory manner, and that a commission should issue in response to the invitation of Manitoba as the first step to obtain that settlement. God forbid that a word which I should utter would invoke racial or religious feeling on this matter. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Daly) is mistaken. The thought is furthest from me. I say we will not take any advantage of it if they will come down at this late hour and propose a commission. I believe I speak for my hon. leader when I say, it will have its hearty and unanimous support. We will go for it one and all.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. An hon. gentleman behind you shakes his head.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Well, there may be one or two. I do not know how the Opposition is to speak except through its chief, any more than the Government. I can speak for myself and I can on this occasion speak for a great many others with whom I am accustomed to vote and act, and I say our one and earnest desire is that some steps should be taken by which this question would be settled in a conciliatory manner without resorting to force. How are the Government acting to-day? Are you going to legislate in the interest of those people who complain they have a grievance? Are you going to remedy the grievance by passing a compulsory law in this House? You know that when you pass your law, it will be waste paper if it is passed against the wishes of the people. Pass your law if you will, force it by a majority on the statute-books, and it will not be worth the paper on which it is written unless it be endorsed by the wishes of the people. You may pretend that you are acting in the interests of the minority of Manitoba, and you may pretend that you are trying to remedy the grievance under which they labour, but I tell you, if you try to remedy it by forcing at the point of the bayonet a law through this Parliament and endeavour to carry it out afterwards in Manitoba against the will of the people, you are defeating your own object, and hon. gentlemen opposite know it. You may obtain a paltry party triumph. You may go to the polls and gain a wretched party victory; but the object you have in view—if it is the object—of giving to those people rights they have been deprived of, will be frustrated by your own acts, and you cannot help but know it. The people rule in this Dominion and any law which has not their fiat can never be carried into effect. You have the greatest opportunity now of uniting political parties of both sides on one general policy; a policy the object of which is to ascertain the real facts in dispute, with the object in the first place of inducing Manitoba to remedy the grievance if there is one, and if they refuse, then we will have men who have returned from the

people with their mandate upon this subject and let the House then do justice in the premises though the Heavens should fall.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, before dealing particularly with the observations which have fallen from the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) I would ask the indulgence of the House while I refer to a subject touched upon by several hon. gentlemen in this debate, and introduced to some extent by the leader of the Opposition. That hon. gentleman spoke with reference to the relations existing between England and the United States of America, and this is a subject which, perhaps after all, is uppermost in the minds of the people of this country at the present moment. I desire to join those in this House and those out side of it who express the wish that there should be a happy and peaceful solution found of the difficulties which have arisen between these two great English-speaking nationalities, and in that solution there are none more directly interested than are the people of Canada. I desire at the same time to join with those who say, that there is not in Canada to-day any difference of opinion as to where the best interests of Canada lie in this dispute. Whatever may have been the political actions of individuals, or the expressions of opinion in time past, regarding the connection that exists between this country and the mother country, I have no doubt that of leading individuals who favoured views dangerously approximating to those of annexation, or political union, there are very few in this country who would to-day dare to use the arguments that were used on behalf of the Liberal party in 1891.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Let there be no mistake, Mr. Speaker. I do not mean to say, any more now than I did then, that the Liberal party of this country are a disloyal party. No individuals have spread that idea more industriously than Liberals themselves—the idea that they had been so charged. But it is an extraordinary fact, so far as I have been able to follow public discussion, that no one has been able to give the statement of any leading public man in Canada, in this House or out of it, to the effect that the Liberal party as a party were disloyal. Our boast on this side of the House, and the legitimate boast of the majority on the other side, has always been that Canada is firmly and ardently attached, not only to British institutions, but to British connection; and it was because of the value that is placed upon that bond, and upon all that it implies, that, including Mr. Blake, the Conservative party in 1891 endeavoured to point out the dangerous tendency of the arguments used in favour of commercial union or unrestricted reciprocity or continental free trade. They endeavoured to impress upon the minds of

the people, and they did it successfully, that a policy that involved discrimination, a stiff and hard discrimination, against the mother country on the part of Canada, could not be adopted in this country without threatening the connection between Canada and the Empire. Now, Sir, the hon. leader of the Opposition spoke of the feeling in the United States as being friendly to England. I have no doubt that among certain classes, perhaps the best informed classes, in the United States, there is that feeling; and that is fortunate for England, fortunate for the United States and fortunate for Canada. But the hon. gentlemen knows—and it is not rash for me even at the present moment to refer to the fact—that in that country there is an element that is decidedly hostile both to England and to Canada. That it has not been able to make itself actively felt so as to produce a state of war is a fortunate and grand thing on which we can congratulate ourselves and every one concerned. But, Sir, it becomes my duty at this moment to point out that in that dangerous and misleading campaign of 1891, so desperate were the efforts of some hon. gentlemen opposite that they did encourage, as I conceive, the idea in the United States that there were a large number of people in Canada tired of British connection, and ready to throw that connection to the winds; and if any one in this House or in this country ever did anything to stir up an unfriendly or unkind feeling in the United States, both towards Canada and towards the mother country, it was the hon. leader of the Opposition, whom I see in his place to-night. I want to remind that hon. gentleman, and I want to do it as calmly as I can, of the dangerous part which he, occupying an important position in this country, played at a particular time. He not only did what was injurious to the good feeling that should obtain between the countries concerned, but he misrepresented, as I am ready to show, his own immediate country, Canada, and the Empire of which Canada is a part. In proof of that I will refer to a speech which the hon. gentleman made at St. Thomas in 1888, at a time when there was not that friendly feeling existing in the United States towards Canada which we would desire.—when, in fact, we were threatened with dire penalties and severe punishment because we did not feel ready to yield our rights for the benefit of the people of the United States. When I read a portion of that speech, I think the hon. gentleman will see that it was not only calculated to place Canada in a very unenviable position in the eyes of the people of the United States, but if it was likely to produce any effect on the councils of the United States, that effect would have been most injurious to this country. The hon. gentleman said:

The President only asks to retaliate. Why retaliate? Why, Sir, because, in his judgment,
SIR CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.

he would be compelled to do so by the unfriendly action of the Canadian Government. If we are met with this state of things with which we are threatened, it is due to the vicious policy of the Canadian Government in the administration of the rights secured to us by the treaty of 1818.

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

SIR CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. What hon. gentleman says "hear, hear?" I would like to know what hon. gentleman now supports that statement.

Mr. LAURIER. Everybody.

SIR CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Nobody except the leader of the Opposition seems anxious to make himself notorious as to that.

Mr. LAURIER. Even Sir Charles Tupper had to take backwater for what your Government had done.

SIR CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. We may perhaps leave Sir Charles Tupper out of the discussion at the moment. I would be curious to hear the name of some hon. gentleman who would applaud the statement which I have read from the hon. gentleman's speech. He goes on:

If the Canadian Government had followed a more friendly course, there would not have been an unfriendly feeling to-day.

SIR RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Hear, hear.

SIR CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. We have the hon. member for South Oxford nailed.

The United States would never have contested those rights, if the rights had been asserted in a friendly manner. It was not so. Those rights had been asserted in a harsh manner. Time and again, in the year 1885, American fishermen were arrested for trivial offences. Nothing, Sir, could be more offensive to those people, when they came to the British port and found themselves arrested, their vessels detained for the simple violation of Customs laws, which, in all probability they did not know. It is no wonder that their hearts were bitter, and that they made complaint at Washington. If, on the contrary, the Canadian Government had administered our laws, as they conceived them under the treaty, in a friendly manner, there could not have taken place what has taken place.

Then, later on in the speech he said this—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Better read it all.

SIR CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I am reading a considerable portion of it:

Sir, I say this—and this is a fact to which I call the attention of my fellow-countrymen to-day—it is high time we should reverse the policy we have been following towards the United States for the past twenty-five years.

That, mark you, under a threat from the United States—

For the past twenty-five years it has not been altogether hostile to the United States, but it has never been altogether friendly. It has not

been such as to bind us to those on the other side of the line, who speak the same language and have the same ability with us.

When they were in the great struggle which they had to undergo some twenty years ago, to preserve the unity of the nation, when they were engaged in that most expensive war, which lasted four years and which taxed all their energies and courage, and which cost them millions of lives, what sympathy did they receive from their brothers in England or in Canada? Not the slightest. I shall give the authority of the statement.

I shall give you the authority of a statesman equally as important as that of the hon. gentleman opposite, in a short time, to the contrary, and will then ask you which opinion you approve.

I am ashamed to say for my country, for the civilized world, when the Americans were engaged in such a struggle, the civilized world did not rise to sustain them with the hand of friendship. Of those who favoured the cause of the North and championed that of freedom, of those who favoured the cause in England, the names of John Bright and Richard Cobden were about the only names in that day, ever in the foremost ranks of civilization and freedom, openly to declare for freedom; and in this country, among the public men of that day there was one man, and only one man, who was always foremost in the ranks of freedom, who openly declared his sympathy with the North—George Brown.

One short extract further and I will show the hon. gentleman why I have ventured to read so much to this House.

We had disputes with them on that treaty of 1818 with regard to the fisheries. Instead of adopting a friendly attitude, the Government did everything to annoy them. Is it any wonder, then, that they have been refusing to maintain those friendly relations which would be to their interests and our interests? Again, I say that it is high time we reversed our policy towards the United States. After all, blood is thicker than water. Those who live on the other side of the line come from the British Isles, as most of us do. We have the same literature and the same language. The time has come when there should be closer relations. Let us remain as we are, politically, but let us agree that it would be for their benefit and for our benefit that there should be no Customs laws, but that we should exchange our produce from one side of the line to the other.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Surely hon. gentlemen opposite do not applaud that sentiment? They threw over that policy no later than June, 1893. Mr. Laurier continued: "This is the policy of the Liberal party." Now, hon. gentlemen opposite have short memories. They applaud that sentiment. But I will say this that while they are applauding to-night—this is in 1896—at that time when there was excitement from one end of Canada to the other, when no one knew what would follow that message of the President of the United States, there was not one gentleman opposite who, if my memory

serves me right, dared to repeat or re-echo one single sentiment of the speech I have just read. But the Liberal organ read a lecture to the hon. leader of the Opposition which he took so much to heart that he himself remained silent the rest of that campaign and never repeated the sentiments he had expressed at St. Thomas and which, after a long lapse, he ventures to-night to again agree to. This was the argument of the "Globe" which, I think, commended itself to the people at large in this country at that critical time. Said the "Globe," in a leading article on the 29th of August of that year:

Till Mr. Laurier disposes of the arguments by which we yesterday maintained this opinion, we must, with all deference and good will to him, maintain that he is wrong in alleging that the fisheries policy of Canada has been unfriendly to the United States.

Again, "Globe" says:

What could Ministers do but stand on the Convention of 1818? There was no other guide for them after the Americans had denounced the fisheries clauses of the Treaty of Washington and had refused to negotiate.

And in article after article during that month that paper most ably vindicated the position of the Canadian Government, and said it was the duty of Canadians, one and all, to back up that Government while it stood for Canadian rights. But that St. Thomas speech was made in Canada. That speech was made by the hon. gentleman in the face of his fellow-countrymen. I desire, however, to call particular attention to the utterances made by the hon. gentleman in the United States, and my point is that these sentiments which he expressed were not calculated to promote a friendly feeling on the part of the people of the United States either towards Canada or the mother country. I am not at the moment able to put my hand on the "Globe" report of the hon. gentleman's speech, and I desired, as the hon. gentleman has been so very sensitive about that speech delivered in Boston, to obtain an authentic copy. The speech was to this effect at any rate, and the hon. gentleman will correct me if my recollection be wrong. It was on the lines of part of the St. Thomas speech in which he attacked both England and Canada, no doubt, amid the plaudits of the gentlemen who were at this banquet, for their conduct towards the United States during that terrible war; and I want to bring out, in strong contrast, the patriotic stand taken by Joseph Howe at a time—not when the memories of either the people of the United States or the people of Canada had faded—but at a time when there was very hard feeling indeed against Canada altogether unjustifiable. Now, the reference of the leader of the Opposition, I have. After all, I find under my hand, and I recollect well that in 1888 the hon. gentleman in this House said:

Let the tongue cleave to the roof of my mouth, if I ever say an unkind word of England.

Now, in 1891, I do not know what condition the hon. gentleman's mouth was in, but this is what he said :

In my opinion, the conduct of England, of Canada, toward the United States during the war was a disgrace to the civilization of England, of Canada. The American people could fight their own battles ; they required no help ; but when they were engaged in the supreme struggle for the life or death of this great nation ; when they were fighting for a cause as great, as holy, as ever engaged the devotion of men ; when they had reason to expect the outspoken sympathy of those nearest to them, it was galling that Southern privateers could be built, manned and equipped in England with the tacit connivance of the British Government, to destroy American commerce on the high seas ; it was galling that rebel refugees could find shelter in Canada, and there, with impunity and without provoking condemnation, plot abominable crimes to help secession.

That is the "Globe" report of the speech the hon. gentleman made to foreigners in Boston in 1891. I ask him does he think that these utterances aid in the cultivation of a friendly feeling on the part of the United States towards Canada. I ask him if these facts are historically true.

Mr. LAURIER. Do you deny them.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I deny them absolutely. I am able to deny them on the authority of a man who knew more about the condition of affairs in the United States, in England and in Canada at that particular time than either the hon. gentleman or I do. Joseph Howe was a man who, whether in Canada or in the United States was always British, British through and through. He did not seek to win cheap applause by abuse of his country in a foreign land, but in 1865, at Detroit, when meeting hundreds, if not thousands, of the leading citizens of the United States, enraged with England and with Canada because of the false statements made regarding these countries during the war, he told them the truth with regard to the actions of Great Britain and Canada. This was the manner in which at that time he refuted these libels, these slanders upon his country and upon the British North American provinces. Said that great man in his own eloquent and inimitable way :

Everything of which complaint could be made has been the act of your own rebellious people, in violation of the hospitality and right of asylum everywhere extended to them on the soil of Great Britain and her dependencies. I make these remarks in no spirit of anger or of excitement, but to show how unfair it is to hold any government or people responsible for the actions of a few evil-disposed individuals, as well as how natural it was for sympathy to be aroused in the minds of people on one side or another.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.

And again :

It is something to be able to say that, during the four long, disastrous years of war just ended,—

I call the hon. gentleman's attention especially to this—

—not a single act of which complaint could be made has been committed by a Canadian. Notwithstanding the false reports that were circulated, I do not believe there was a single intelligent citizen, of my province at least, who did not believe that the capture of the 'Chesapeake' off the coast of Maine, by rebellious citizens of the United States, was nothing less or more than an act of piracy. And so of the St. Albans raid. The Government of Canada acted most promptly and nobly in connection with that affair, and has repaid the money which rebellious citizens of the United States had carried into their territory from the states banks. As to their harbouring the rebels and extending to them the right of asylum, is there a single American here who would have his government surrender that right ? There was not an Englishman, nor an Irishman, nor a Scotchman, nor an American, who would not fight three wars rather than give up that sacred right.

These were the words of that eminent man, spoken at a time when the facts were within the recollection of the people who heard and read them. His words were spoken in defence of his country. For what purpose was the hon. gentleman's statement made in Boston in 1891 ? But, while Canada has been misrepresented by such speeches as have been made by many Liberals, I again say that if the hon. gentleman thought that he was voicing the feelings of an appreciable portion of the people of Canada he was reckoning without his host. The people of Canada have at all times, as a people, been most loyal to the British Empire. I do not suppose there is a part of the Empire so firmly attached to it or determined to maintain the connection as the portion in which I stand. Now, what service did Sir Oliver Mowat render to his party ? What was it that induced Sir Oliver Mowat to come to Ottawa to attend the convention, the famous convention of 1893. I have my reason for believing, having read the hon. gentleman's speech, that he came here to stamp out the pernicious doctrine of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). Not only do I believe that he came here to do it, but I believe that he did it, for from that day down to this we have not heard the hon. gentleman speak of unrestricted reciprocity, except to explain it as something of the past.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am afraid the hon. gentleman has not read my speeches as carefully as he ought to have done, especially my speech at Sarnia.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. If the hon. gentleman finds me dropping into unparliamentary language, he will change his opinion. I intend to read some choice extracts from his speeches. Sir Oliver

Mowat came to strike down a policy that was absolute ruin to the Liberal party, a policy that was described by Mr. Blake in his famous letter as having the tendency towards political union with the United States. But, Mr. Speaker, I wish to give the hon. member for South Oxford proof that I do read his speeches. Whenever I desire to know what would be good policy to advocate in this contry, what would be a benefit for my fellow-countrymen, I endeavour to find out what the hon. gentleman for South Oxford has had to say on the given subject, and then I form a conclusion exactly the opposite of his. Let us see what this descendant of the Loyalists said of his countrymen before Sir Oliver Mowat taught him a lesson which he finds it exceedingly difficult to learn. In 1888 the hon. member for South Oxford, addressing this House, used the following language :

To tell you a profound secret, Mr. Speaker, which I trust will not go outside the walls of this House, I have never been able exactly to understand the very deep obligation under which the people of Canada lay to England.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Hear, hear ; the obligation is quite the other way.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER—

In point of fact, I rather think that the obligation is the other way.

This evidently was a carefully prepared speech.

I do not think, Sir, that, although we have cherished, I hope we will continue to cherish, the most friendly feeling towards the parent state, I do not think, for my part, that we are under any deep debt of gratitude to English statesmen, that we owe them much, unless, perchance, it may be the duty, as Christian men, to forgive them for the atrocious blunders which have marked every treaty, or transaction, or negotiation that they have ever had with the United States, where the interests of Canada were concerned, from the days of Benjamin Franklin to this hour, not excepting the first and second Treaty of Washington. I say there is no man here who does not know, that from the very first hour the United Empire Loyalists took possession of Ontario and held it for the British Crown, down to this year 1888, there never has been a time, except, perhaps, during the short paroxysm of the American civil war, when the people could not have greatly benefited their material interests by throwing in their lot with the people on the other side.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Hear, hear.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Now, the hon. gentleman approves that statement.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes ; every word of it.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I say that Sir Oliver Mowat proved to the satisfaction of the Liberal convention that that was a heresy ; he proved to the mem-

bers of the Liberal convention, and I think largely controlled the minds there, that all along the lines, from the day when the United States obtained their independence, Canada had made relatively as much progress as the people to the south of the line. He came there, he used those arguments, and, from that moment, as I say, the policy of the hon. gentlemen opposite has changed. Let me, however, give one more reference to the hon. gentleman from South Oxford, showing what the hon. gentleman offered Canada in 1891. He said :

Instead, for instance, of the National Policy, we offer a clear-cut, rational policy, we offer a clear-cut, rational, plain and distinct policy. We say, the only way you can redress the mischief you have done, the only way you can give our people a chance, the only way to increase our population, the only way in which you can make atonement to the farmers for the over-taxation you have wrung from them for these many years, is by obtaining reciprocity with the United States.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Hear, hear.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. And the hon. gentleman now applauds that sentence.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Certainly I do.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. But that is not the doctrine of the Liberal party to-day, that is not the doctrine that any hon. gentleman opposite proclaims to-day, but it is the very doctrine which that hon. gentleman at Halifax and Charlottetown said was the best way to prevent reciprocity ever being obtained. Mr. Speaker, I submit that the hon. gentleman's argument and language to the effect that this country is dependent upon the United States, has not tended to create that friendly or respectful feeling towards Canada on the part of the people of the United States, that is so much to be desired. Those are misrepresentations, I believe, of the spirit of the Canadian people, of the facts of the industrial position of Canada. Those are sentiments that hon. gentlemen opposite wish had never been uttered ; those are sentiments, I am glad to say, and I congratulate them upon it, that they seldom utter to-day. Now, then, I will give a little further attention to the hon. member for South Oxford. The hon. gentleman has been an amusing and an interesting study to many other gentlemen besides myself ; I do not know, however, if much profit has ever come out of a study of that kind. But I desire to call his attention to the extraordinary position he has ventured to adopt towards the province to which I am so proud to belong. That province needs no vindication at my hands. I would insult the pride of that province were I to defend it from the fruitless attacks of the hon. gentleman from South Oxford. He sought recently to induce the House to believe that

an attack which he made this session, was not so much upon a province as upon an individual. The hon. gentleman has a hard task before him. The hon. gentleman, indeed, will have, not only to explain his utterances this session, but he will have to explain several other references in the same direction. I wish to put these choice and unadulterated slanders of my native province in a group, if I can. I wish to put them so that the hon. gentleman may, in his own time and in his own fashion, give such an explanation as he may be able to give. The hon. gentleman, in 1888, was guilty of using certain language which I will quote, in respect to the province of Nova Scotia. He may have forgotten it, but the people of that province have not. The hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) was speaking at the moment, and he was accounting for the beating which the Liberal party had received in the maritime provinces, and he spoke of Sir Charles Tupper as follows:—

His own personal qualities and long public life might possibly have induced his return, but I doubt that he would have had a corporal's guard at the back of him.

The hon. gentleman was referring to corrupt means which he charged had been used to obtain the support of those provinces. Sir John Macdonald said: "What a corrupt lot to be bought in that way." The hon. member for Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) interpellated: "Well, our public records show it. Why, they offered themselves to us, but Mr. Blake was too honest to buy them." Was he referring there to an individual or to the people of the maritime provinces? Then, again, who has forgotten that hon. gentleman's reference to those provinces after another general election, after the general election when the Liberal forces were so completely routed. In a letter, indicating thought and deliberation, not in a speech made in the heat of passion, in which the hon. gentleman often indulges, he wrote as follows:—

Our opponents are a thing of shreds and patches, ragged remnants of half-a-dozen minor provinces, the great majority of whom do not even act on any principle, save and except a good share of boodle for themselves and the sections or the constituencies they respectively represent.

Again he writes:

And who knows the popular feeling in those very provinces is opposed to our policy, but we know that railway subsidies approve too much for the virtue of the majority in many instances.

Again, acting on this, I am told the sum of \$50,000 has been sent down into a constituency now open in that province.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am very glad to know the figure which it is expected to cost.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman expressed, as I have said, the greatest contempt for the people of Nova Scotia. Later on the hon. gentleman visited Almonte. Sir John Thompson and I had spoken there the night before, and in December, 1891, as reported in the Toronto "Globe," this is the manner in which the hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) referred to my province:

It was fortunate for us that the demands of Quebec, great as they were, have not been one-quarter in proportion to their population of the demands of Nova Scotia. Probably \$60,000,000 of our debt was due to the necessity of incorporating and pacifying Nova Scotia. Sir Richard then told them what an expensive luxury the Intercolonial Railway was, with its heavy annual deficit. He challenged the competency of these Nova Scotia gentlemen to teach Ontario what her needs were, trade and otherwise.

Again, the hon. gentleman is reported to have said:

Coming to deal with the loyalty cry, Sir Richard reminded the audience that the two Ministers who had addressed them last night came from a province which had petitioned the Crown for permission to separate from the union, and yet they undertook, forsooth, to lecture others on loyalty.

These statements would not amount to anything, and no one would pay the slightest attention to them except for the prominence which has been given to the hon. gentleman by the leader of the Opposition. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) knows, whatever his opinion of Nova Scotia may be, the opinion in Ontario as to the difficulty which he has met in obtaining a seat at various times in this Chamber. Why, the hon. gentleman was a burden to any party that had to carry him. He has told us that he has twice bought one of the finest counties in the province of Ontario. But notwithstanding that fact, the people apparently would not stay bought, if they had the honour of being represented by the hon. member for South Oxford. Finally the only place his feet could obtain a resting place was one of the hived constituencies, so-called, of the province, the electoral district of South Oxford. And now he has run amuck with the large majority there, as each succeeding election comes on, as is well known, and the overwhelming Liberal vote is vanishing under the weight of the hon. gentleman. Instead of abusing hon. members on the Treasury benches for treachery and treason and all sorts of horrible things, I expect the hon. gentleman to keep the promise which he made in the county of Oxford not long ago. The air, he said, was to ring with the names of the traitors in the Reform party who were endeavouring to stab him in the back. I venture to think that the abuse which the hon. member for South Oxford has poured on the heads of present and absent opponents on this side of the House shows

that he is endeavouring to atone for that fearful blunder which he committed in exposing the position of the Liberal party, and indicating that treachery and treason could find a place in its ranks. At last in the struggle between Patrons and Liberals the hon. member for South Oxford cried out in his agony to the leader of the Opposition, and that genial leader came forward to heal all the troubles and sores in the party and unite them together, and beg them to take the hon. gentleman. And how did the leader of the Opposition do it. He did it in such a way as to render the remarks of the hon. member for South Oxford important. Those insults to my province for the first time require to be noticed, because the leader of the Opposition, endorsing him as he did, has to a large extent become responsible for the unfailing hostility of the hon. gentleman to the maritime provinces. What do hon. members think the leader of the Opposition said about the hon. gentleman? It is almost impossible to credit his remarks. Yet it is reported in the "Globe" that the leader of the Opposition, while he did not refer to anything done by the hon. gentleman for the country, told the people that the hon. gentleman was to be his Finance Minister when he came into power. That was the inducement held out to the people of South Oxford; but the leader of the Opposition went so far in his endorsement of that hon. gentleman as to say, "we, his colleagues, all love him." Even the hon. member for South Oxford smiles at that expression. I believe there is as much love for the hon. gentleman on this side of the House as on the other, and in the maritime provinces, of course, he is idolized. So much for small affairs.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman had better continue to speak of small things.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I have no Latin quotation for the hon. gentleman, but I will not leave the hon. gentleman alone. He spoke of lions—he called them something else; at all events, he referred to lions, and I wish to refer to the lion he had in mind:

"Methought he bore him in the thickest troop
As doth a lion in a herd of neat;
Or as a bear, encompass'd round with dogs;
Who, having pinch'd a few, and made them cry,
The rest stand all aloof, and bark at him."

The leader of the Opposition, in his contribution to this debate, referred to a statement which he said I made to the representatives of the New York press. I do not think I made a statement to the representatives of the New York press—I do not discuss Canadian politics with reporters in the United States. But I told a representative of the Montreal "Star" what I considered the victory in North Ontario meant. I am told by the leader of the Opposition, or it is suggested, that I counted without my host

in thinking that the triumph of the hon. member meant the triumph of toleration over bigotry. I am not of his opinion: I have seen nothing on the part of the representative of the hon. member for North Ontario (Mr. McGillivray) to lead me to change the view I entertain of the significance of his splendid victory. But if I wanted authority for believing that the gentleman was prepared to vote this session for justice to the oppressed minority of the province of Manitoba, my authority sits behind the leader of the Opposition. The member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) was in that riding. His speeches were reported in the "Globe," and time and again he said to the electors there that in voting for the present member they voted for the policy of this Government on the Manitoba school question, and he read the statement of the leader of this House delivered in this Chamber. So if there has been a mistake, let the hon. gentleman deal with his supporters in regard to it. I listened with some surprise to the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) to-night on the subject of the Manitoba schools. I was interested to a great extent, because I do not know that the hon. gentleman has ever since 1890 given vent to so many opinions on this subject as he has done to-night.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I spoke on nearly every hustings in the maritime provinces.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Yes, but I am speaking of the hon. gentleman's utterances in the House. The hon. gentleman is the maritime province leader of the Liberal party, and is therefore one of those to whom we specially look for opinions on public questions in order that we may deal with them. It is significant that while the remedial order was adopted last session, and while the policy of this Government was propounded last session, and while there was abundant opportunity for the consideration of the attitude of the Government, that hon. gentleman did not attack the position of the Government and did not suggest what he says now is the only sensible and rational way to deal with that important question. I do not think the hon. gentleman did himself justice to-night in his treatment of that subject. He talked, for instance, as to the great regret he feels that it is a political question, and the desire he entertains that it should be removed from the political arena. What has he done? What has any one of the gentlemen behind him done to assist the Government in a calm and dispassionate treatment of that question or to remove it from the political arena? The hon. gentleman (Mr. Davies) knows that his leader has occupied many and different positions upon this subject. The hon. gentleman knows that this idea of a commission is the last refuge of the leader of the Opposition in regard to a question which he thinks is so disturbing. Has the hon. gentleman

(Mr. Davies) forgotten that from the first hour this question came before Parliament, that, contrasted with the varied and changing attitude on the opposite side of the House, there has been one consistent line of action on the part of the Government of the day. Whether under the present Prime Minister or the late Prime Minister, that hon. gentleman (Mr. Davies) knows that every effort that reasonable men could make to deal calmly with this question has been made. He knows too, that every effort has been made in the line of the pledges and the promises of the late Sir John Thompson. In the year 1893—I take it no one in this House will dispute this fact,—every one believed that the decision on the last appeal to England would be adverse to the Catholics, because many eminent men at the bar were of the opinion, and some are now, that the first judgment of the Privy Council in Barrett's case, made it impossible for the Privy Council to sustain the appeal in the second case. But whether that be so or not let us be fair and let us meet the facts squarely in the face. Speaking in the year 1893 in Toronto in the presence of nearly the whole of his Cabinet, Sir John Thompson, on being asked what would be his policy on this difficult question, with great courage, stated clearly the course he intended to follow and he took all the risks that might attach to it. Will the House allow me to refresh their memory by referring to Sir John Thompson's address at that time. He was speaking in Toronto, in the most important Protestant centre of Protestant Ontario; and I do not think that even the leading organs of the reform or Conservative party quarrelled with the attitude he then assumed. This is what he said:

I want simply to impress upon you this: that, candidly and honestly, we intend to be guided in that matter simply by the constitution, as it will be expounded by the highest authorities that can be got to expound it.

And in this House during the session of 1893, Sir John Thompson said:

When the questions which surround her (referring to Manitoba) case have been decided by the courts, there will be no suspicion on the part of the province, that, either from religious or political antipathy or sympathy her legislation has been interfered with or her rights invaded; and, when the hon. member for L'Islet challenges me, as he surely had no right to challenge me, to state in advance what the policy of the Government would be, if such and so should happen, I tell him that the answer I can give him now, and the answer I shall be able to give him if that event should happen, would be this: that the province of Manitoba is a constitutional province, and that, whether it be in the hands of legislators opposed to us, or in the hands of legislators in sympathy with us, we have every reason to believe and to rest assured that she will obey the dictates of the highest tribunals in this Empire as to what the constitution is, regardless of consequences, regardless even of the displeasure of the majority, if the decision

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.

should be against the majority; and that, so far as the disposal of this appeal is concerned at any rate, the minority must bow to that decision, and the Federal Executive will advise His Excellency accordingly.

There was the policy clearly defined. Whether that decision of the Privy Council was to be mandatory or advisory, whether its legal effect might be considered to be by lawyers; there was the statement of the leader of the Conservative party of 1893: that whether it was in favour of the Catholics or the Protestants it would be the guiding star of his Government, and that has been our position from 1893 down to this very day. And how have we been met by the Liberal party of Canada? Why, this advice which is now said to come from a desire to eliminate this question from the political arena, this advice which is supposed to be for the benefit of the Government, comes to us for the first time in the year 1896—although the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davies) says that in the maritime provinces during recess he gave vent to that idea, and so did his leader. But his leader has condemned in advance that very policy which he now enunciates. The leader of the Opposition is no believer in commissions. Only a short time ago, the leader of the Opposition said in Toronto, that commissions were but a subterfuge to shelve difficult questions, that commissions were attended with great expense upon this country and simply enabled a political party to shunt and defer awkward and delicate public questions. Now, with that introduction to the policy of commissions generally, how can we accept this advice of the leader of the Opposition? It is tendered to us not only at the eleventh hour, but tendered to us—and mark this I pray—when our position has been so taken and defined, that if we desired to accept the suggestion it is impossible for us honourably to do so. Before we were committed up to the hilt we obtained no such advice. Before we had taken a position from which we dare not retreat if we would, we were offered no such friendly assistance from the Liberal party. Now, the suggestion of a moribund Parliament, the suggestion of a commission, and the suggestion of ultimate justice by the legislature of Manitoba, are very freely and generously offered by hon. gentlemen opposite. From what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davies) said to-night, it occurs to me that not only has he forgotten the discussions which have taken place in this Chamber, but that he has not read very carefully the report to which he referred, because he says that the decision of the Privy Council only established a right of appeal on the part of the minority in Manitoba. What is the hon. gentleman's position in regard to that decision generally? Is it mandatory or advisory? If it is only advisory, according to these gentlemen who argue that way he will see that it established nothing in the sense in which he referred to it. But

whichever way you take it, it establishes more than that there was a right of appeal. The hon. gentleman surely must know that it establishes that grievances did exist, and that the minority in Manitoba were suffering from the grievances contemplated by the Act which gives them the appeal. Surely he knows that the opinions of these eminent members of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council went further than that; and that they not only said that these grievances had been established, and that the right of appeal had been established, but that they pointed out how the grievances should be redressed. And with the pledge from our leader, with the statement in advance as to why we sought the court, with the object of the Act under which the appeal was prepared and the case heard, hon. gentlemen will quite understand that if any part of it is valuable the whole is valuable. For instance, if it be advisory none of it is binding. I have given my opinion long ago in this House that it was advisory—the whole of it, every bit of it—and that if you want to take no action upon it, technically you may. If you want to throw it into the waste paper basket, so to speak, you may do so. This Parliament is free to legislate or not to legislate; but when you speak of the value of that decision and refer to it, as every one seems to refer with respect to that part of it which establishes the right of appeal, then I say: Why halt there? Having consulted those men on a question which was clearly legal in all its important bearings, why pick out only one part of the decision? We go for the whole of it, for every line of it; and it is a fortunate thing for the people of this country that this important and difficult question has been so well and satisfactorily solved, as it has been in England, outside of our own political arena. But the hon. gentleman went on to say that the statute referring to our powers of legislation indicated that we should legislate only so far as the circumstances of the question required. But, again, I refer to the decision, and I call his attention to the fact that the circumstances have been solemnly and effectively put before that tribunal. Looking at those circumstances, and recounting them all in terms, the law lords given their opinion—to put it as favourably to the hon. gentleman's view as possible—as to the manner in which we could legislate so as to remove the grievances which they decided existed. The hon. gentleman said he had no fault to find with the Government up to the time of the appeal. Well, I again call his attention to the position of the Government when that appeal was made. At that time the position of the Government was defined. The appeal was made on a pledge given that we would be guided by the judgment of the Privy Council, and the hon. gentleman said he had no fault to find with our posi-

tion. Now, the hon. leader of the Opposition is on record, for in that same year he said that if the Government were appealing to the courts, and if they should not act as the courts decided, then a rightful and powerful agitation would arise in this country.

Mr. LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman agrees that I am quoting him correctly. Then I ask him in all fairness if there is any other course that we can honourably take? If we are following the judgment of the Privy Council, how is it that to-day he ventures to offer us another policy—a commission—when after telling us in 1893 that if we did not do as the courts directed, a rightful and powerful agitation would arise against us? Now, the hon. gentleman says that the counsel for Manitoba claimed the right to reply to certain affidavits. I do not agree with the hon. gentleman in his references to that incident, which took place before the Privy Council for Canada. I will give him the exact account as reported, because it is an important statement, and under the circumstances it is necessary that it should be put correctly before the House and the country. But I am glad the hon. gentleman referred to that investigation, because it offers a complete and absolute answer to the position which hon. gentlemen opposite are now assuming, that further inquiry is necessary in regard to this subject. Let me explain myself before the hon. gentleman smiles, because I say this in all seriousness, and I am submitting it to the judgment of the House. He must recollect that two of the parties in this House are satisfied as to the inquiries—the third party and the Government. The Opposition want further inquiry; they desire delay; they desire, as I believe, to shove this question over the general election. But the hon. gentleman who argued this case for the Government of Manitoba does not ask for further inquiry. He does not think it necessary to press for further facts or an opportunity to adduce further facts; and any one who will read his arguments as counsel for Manitoba before the Privy Council of Canada will find that he not only put before them all that was necessary for the purposes of his case, but he never suggested that there should be a commission or any other form of further investigation.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). He is satisfied with things as they are, I suppose.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Not at all. He says that under the facts as they stand, no action should be taken by Parliament; and in Cardwell he opposed most hotly the position of gentleman opposite of seeking a commission on this question, as entirely unnecessary. There are facts in his judgment sufficient to drive the question

out of Parliament altogether. But, Mr. Speaker, I want to mark this important fact, that the Manitoba government were given repeated opportunities of being heard, and yet never sought directly or indirectly, as I believe, any opportunity of investigation except for one purpose. They told us that unmistakably. First, they said, before the decision of the Privy Council was given, that there were no grievances on the part of the minority—there was no room for inquiry on that subject. Secondly, after the decision they gave us two answers, in both of which they say unmistakably that the only purpose for which they would join in a commission of inquiry was to convince us that they were right. But they have said, in every statement that has come to this Government or that has been published, that under no circumstances will they change the school law of the province of Manitoba. Now, I do not quarrel with them for taking that position; they have the absolute right to take any position they please—

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Will the hon. gentleman excuse me? I understood him to say that the counsel for Manitoba, for whom, of course, I am not concerned, made no application for an inquiry into the facts. I call the hon. gentleman's attention to page 3 of the report where the counsel for Manitoba says:

Although it is plain enough that the province does not intend to obey any remedial order that may be made, at the same time it is desirable there should be no conflict, and, consequently, in order that I may show to this Council, if possible, that the Council ought not to interfere, I require to have a minuter knowledge of the old school system and of the practical working of the present system, than I am able to afford now, and it was impossible for me, with the time at my disposal, to have mastered the subject. I am not going to answer the personal observations of my learned friend; I hope personalities will be kept out of the contest. I appear here as counsel for the Manitoba government, I do not appear as a public man; and I desire to present the case without regard to any other considerations than those affecting the province. It is a matter affecting the province only, and I have not been able to acquaint myself sufficiently with the practical working of the late system as contrasted with the working of the present system.

He asked for delay.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman must treat me a little more fairly. I do not mean to intimate that he desires to treat me unfairly; but I had not forgotten that, and I was coming to it. But I was pressing on the attention of the House the position of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) in his political capacity as well as his position as counsel for Manitoba, and I am confident that I am right—that before the people of this country, particularly in Cardwell, his position

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.

was that no commission was necessary, that the people had the facts and were ready to pass their judgment one way or the other. I do not wish to misrepresent him or any other hon. gentleman. But with reference to that hearing, remember the attitude of Manitoba. Manitoba, acting as, no doubt, she felt herself justified in doing, refused to enter into any arrangement or have this matter investigated by the courts. She declined to be represented at the first hearing, declined to be represented in the Supreme Court of Canada when the question was referred to that court, and sent a counsel to the Privy Council of Canada—we certainly have some rights, not as a party but as one of the institutions of the country, to be treated fairly and to form opinions upon what is solemnly said before us—sent counsel there to tell us that while they were prepared to press upon us that we should not pass a remedial order, the Manitoba government would not obey any order that we might make. That was the position they took, and I do not think they shrink from it now. But it does not lie in the mouths of those who sympathize and act with the Manitoba government, to upbraid us for not going more thoroughly into the matter. We gave the Manitoba government every opportunity of being heard. Delay was sought, as the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) has shown, by their counsel, and delay was granted, as the hon. gentleman did not explain. Their counsel was heard. The inspector of schools was present at the hearing, every one who desired to address us was heard, and the counsel for the Manitoba government thanked the Privy Council committee for the patience with which it had listened to all he had to say on the subject. What was the line of his argument. It showed that he held the same opinion then as he holds in his political capacity. It showed that the facts were all plain and beyond question, that all the necessary and essential facts were before the people and the Government of Canada, and that the case of the government of Manitoba stood upon facts which were well known and understood. When the hon. gentleman for Queen's (Mr. Davies) says there is such a necessity for inquiry, so many things to understand—the position of the various races and the different religious bodies, and so forth—I refer him to his leader. His leader had not that opinion, at any rate, at one time. His leader was not of the opinion at one time that there were so many things to investigate. In 1893, the leader of the Opposition told this House that the only fact to investigate was whether the schools are in reality Protestant schools; and in Victoria, B.C., in Sept., 1894, he told the electors that the only question to be considered was whether the Roman Catholic minority in Manitoba were forced to send their children to Protestant schools. That was the only question. Does

the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) want a commission to investigate that fact, if it be the only one? The hon. gentleman will not do me the favour of answering, and he has the right to decline, but I ask him the question, though I will not press for a reply, because, no doubt, he has come to the conclusion which his leader reached in 1895. In 1893 there was only one fact to investigate, but in 1895, when this idea of a commission was entertained by the leader of the Opposition, he ran the facts out in order to make a commission appear necessary. Instead of saying there was only one fact to be investigated, as he said at Victoria, B.C., he said in Morrisburg, in 1895, that there were many things to investigate. These things he summed up under four heads. First, the position of affairs; second the relative strength of the population; third, the distribution of the population; fourth, how far the pretensions of the minority may be met without encroaching on the rights of the majority. Those are the facts as expanded; but why is it the hon. gentleman advocates a commission? I have suggested—perhaps I am not doing the hon. gentleman justice, but it is the idea which I seriously entertain—that it is simply a policy to throw this question over the general election.

Mr. LAURIER. Oh, no.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. This statement of the hon. gentleman, as reported, somewhat confirms that idea. At Victoria, B.C., in September, 1894, the hon. gentleman was not anxious to give his views. He entrenched himself further within the lines of Torres Vedras. He said:

The desire to get him to express an opinion was but a trick to get him to commit himself; in which event, if he sided with the Catholics, he would antagonize the Ontario Protestants, and, if he upheld the Protestants, he would be antagonized by the Catholics. But he was too old a bird to be drawn into the trap.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) That was before the appeal was heard at all.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That was in September, 1894. I do not see the difference in regard to the attitude. It is clear that the leader of the Opposition did not wish, at any time, to antagonize the Protestants or the Catholics, and I am giving that statement of his as accounting for the attitude he now takes, when he can call to his side, not only such gentlemen as the representative from Winnipeg (Mr. Martin), but the member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte), who are both as far apart as the poles, on the merits of this question. But as Liberals they will all go for the commission, and they will not, in that way, they hope, antagonize the Catholics or the Protestants. I promised to refer to the statement which the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) made, which I think, is an erroneous statement regarding the

affidavits. These affidavits were put in by Mr. Ewart, and were read. Mr. McCarthy, who represented the province of Manitoba on that occasion, objected to these affidavits unless he were given the right to reply; and Mr. Ewart, seeing that this would involve delay, agreed to withdraw the affidavits entirely from the consideration of the court. But the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) is too old and able a counsel to pretend that because that incident was so considered and so dealt with it should form no part of the records. The minutes, the transactions before us, required that all that took place in that Chamber should be brought to the attention of this House.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Does the hon. gentleman mean the House to understand that in any court of record in the world, when an affidavit is offered in evidence and afterwards withdrawn, it appears as part of the records?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman did not do me the favour of listening until I had finished. I say that every one knows that the hearing which took place before the Privy Council of Canada was of such a character that it was but preliminary to the hearing before the great council of the nation, and that this House was entitled to be seized of all information that we were seized of, and, in fact, to have a correct and accurate statement of all that took place.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What I complained of was that Mr. McCarthy made a specific application for leave to answer the affidavit, Mr. Ewart objected that such a course would cause delay, and then asked to be allowed to withdraw the affidavits, and Sir Charles Tupper then said: We will consider them withdrawn. They were then withdrawn. Mr. McCarthy had no opportunity of putting in, as he said he would do, affidavits in reply, and yet you are bringing down that record for our information with these affidavits that were withdrawn.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman is hardly fair to me, because I am interrupted constantly in the middle of my argument. I do not altogether complain of it, but I merely mention to the hon. gentleman that I put that view to the House, and am endeavouring to meet him. The hon. gentleman surely does not think that anything material can hang upon the fact that these documents which came to us have also been permitted to come to the knowledge of the House? The hon. gentleman knows that if these documents were material the House would very speedily be put in possession of any answers there might be to them. But the point I wish to press upon the House is that these documents became absolutely immaterial to the merits of the case; they

form no part of the judgment. What took place shows that they were not considered important by the counsel on either side. Mr. McCarthy, for instance, said :

The conclusion of my argument is, that I want an opportunity of answering these affidavits. That is my application. My learned friend made nine arguments, four of these are based partly upon affidavits, three of them altogether upon affidavits. Now, it never entered into my head that this matter could be determined upon affidavits.

The counsel for Manitoba takes a different position from that taken by the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies). He scouts the idea that affidavits were required on one side or the other.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I think you ought to do him the justice to finish that sentence.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.

If it is to be determined upon affidavits, they cannot be produced upon one side only, and, of course, an opportunity must be afforded me of answering these affidavits by others.

That is the view the court took, as you will see by what was said a little later on. Mr. McCarthy says :

I certainly do not think I had any right to do more than to point out, as I did, that it was irregular. I do not know anything about what this Council will do. It seems to me, if the matter was to be discussed upon public grounds, as provided by Mr. Blake's Act, to which reference was made, in any question of fact to be tried, the reference should have been made under that Act.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I do not think that it is fair for the hon. gentleman to stop there.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I must ask permission to make my argument as I see fit. The hon. gentleman knows that the House has already indulged me by allowing me to read copious extracts from these documents, and I do not like to ask too much liberty.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) But the hon. gentleman—

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Very well, let the hon. gentleman read what he desires.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman read the whole paragraph except this line :

Without reading the affidavits, I do not know how anybody can determine the matter.

That is what the hon. gentleman left out.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That is absolutely immaterial in my opinion. The hon. gentleman thinks it material, and he has had the opportunity of putting it before the House. The matter was settled in this manner. Sir Mackenzie Bowell said :

The Council has decided to request Mr. McCarthy to proceed with his argument upon points of law, and upon such points of historical inter-

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.

est as he may desire to submit ; but they will give reasonable time afterwards to produce affidavits in reply to those produced by Mr. Ewart. But no affidavits of any new matter can be produced. Mr. Ewart can be heard upon them upon a subsequent day, to be fixed at the end of the argument.

Then Mr. Ewart said :

Allow me to say, that that would throw the matter over so late that it would be impossible that anything could be done this year ; and rather than that should happen, I would withdraw the affidavits and rest the case upon the other material.

Mr. McCarthy.—I can not object to that course.

So that all the grievance that remains in regard to the question is that these papers form part of this record. But, in view of the serious questions that remain to be discussed, surely that is a very trifling offence. No member of this House will be misled by what he sees in the affidavits which, counsel say, form no material part of the case presented. There has been ample opportunity since that argument—

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) How ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. There has been ample opportunity to have answers laid before this House through any hon. gentleman, and no hon. gentleman would refuse to present them if asked by any one interested to do so. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have already stated that Mr. McCarthy did not ask to put in evidence upon the merits of the case, and the facts before the Privy Council in the record were never challenged. This case went to the Supreme Court of Canada and from the Supreme Court to the Privy Council in England with the material facts relating to the subject in dispute. These facts were not challenged by counsel on either side, and from their opinion, and it is for that reason that that opinion has become so valuable to us in the solution of the question at the hands of the Privy Council. Now, the hon. gentleman has spoken about going to the people. He has said that we have not a mandate to deal with the subject and that this is a moribund Parliament. Well, Mr. Speaker, there was a time, and not very long ago, when I myself would have preferred that that course should be adopted. But I did not hear, last session, any suggestion in that direction from the hon. member for Queen's.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I was not consulted.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman was not consulted. But probably certain facts will influence him as they influenced me to change his opinion. The hon. gentleman and I agree that this Parliament has complete jurisdiction in the subject matter of remedial legislation, that we have the constitutional right to deal with the matter and to deal with it before dissolution. But the reason

he suggests that there should be an appeal to the people, and the reason I once thought that that would be the better course was that the question was of so peculiar a character that the solution of it at the hands of the people might be more satisfactory than by Parliament passing an Act and then the Government responsible for it putting their case before the electorate. But our course, in such a matter, must depend upon the condition of the public mind. The hon. gentleman knows as well as I do that, shortly after the remedial order was adopted and when there seemed to be an exhibition of a dangerous sentiment in various parts of Canada in regard to it, a remarkable change came over the minds of the people of this country as the result of at least four by-elections that took place. The hon. gentleman knows that there were elections in Ontario, Quebec and Nova Scotia—three different provinces. And, whether the Liberals were returned or whether the Conservatives were returned every man came to Parliament approving of remedial legislation and of the remedial order adopted by this Government. The leader of the Opposition was throwing up the lines of Torres Vedras; he was busily engaged in hiding his opinion from the public. In the county where I was busy, the hon. gentleman who succeeded in winning his election claimed that the Government at Ottawa had done nothing more or less than their duty in adopting that remedial order and that they were not entitled to credit for such an act; that, in fact, it was disgraceful on their part to claim support because of it. And no one will contradict me when I say that the position taken in the province of Quebec was the same, and that my genial friend who succeeded in Verchères (Mr. Geoffrion) took that position. At that time there was an extraordinary sentiment in the country in favour of doing justice to the minority and in favour of this remedial order. The question having been before the country practically since 1890—that is previous to the general elections of 1891—all the arguments that the hon. gentleman would now conjure up have been greatly weakened, and there is no doubt that there is a question not only that we ought to settle but, one which if not settled, I fear, will create in Canada and in England a feeling that the Canadian people are not strong enough or have not sufficient sense of justice and fair-play to do their duty and do it at the proper time. The hon. gentleman used two expressions, I think, most unfortunate in his argument to-night, when he spoke of taking the people of Manitoba by the throat, and suggested that instead of doing that, we should resort to conciliatory measures. Now, why use language more violent than the people or the members of the legislature of Manitoba, use? They have not resorted to those expressions. They have, in the strongest

way, indicated their objections to legislation in this Parliament in the direction of the judgment of the Privy Council of England, and they have intimated to us that under no circumstances will they change their school law. But they have not gone into a frenzy over the matter, nor have they talked about our exercising towards them a policy, so far as I understand it, of coercion, or of taking them by the throat. Is it fair, no matter what view you may take of this question, so to characterize the action of gentlemen who are endeavouring to exercise the proper jurisdiction of the federal parliament? We have as much right to legislate on the lines of that remedial order as the people of Manitoba have to deal with any question relating to schools, and that proposition the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) will not deny. No lawyer in this House who approves, as he does himself, of the remedial order, as I understand him, will deny that we are seized of a complete jurisdiction over the subjects within the terms of that order, as the Manitoba legislature is seized of jurisdiction over any question pertaining to the interests of the people of that province. Therefore, the hon. gentleman is unfair, and it is a weak political argument, in my opinion, to press upon us that we are attempting to coerce any one. What we are attempting to do, Mr. Speaker, is what we think to be our duty; what we are attempting to do is to carry out the advice of the Judicial Committee of the Queen's Privy Council; and under those circumstances, if we go no further than we are advised we ought to go in the direction they have pointed out to us, I think we are fairly defended from such a charge as has been brought against us. The hon. gentleman wants to know also how he, coming from the maritime provinces, is to know how to legislate for Manitoba. Well, let him speak for himself. There are other subjects with which we have to deal every session, there are other subjects in the British North America Act that by no means indicate plain sailing all along the line. This is a subject practically added on to the powers, or to the list of subjects, in the British North America Act that are given to this legislature to deal with it. If an hon. gentleman in this House has no information that will enable him to deal with it satisfactorily, of course he must do the best he can in order to obtain that information before the time comes. But what did he indicate in this House to be the information that he requires? The hon. gentleman is well versed in connection with the subject of school laws. The hon. gentleman occupied a high and honourable position in the legislature of his native province, and had much to do with a school Bill there. I venture to say that he has carefully considered every conceivable question that has anything to do with this sub-

ject, years ago ; and I will do him the compliment to say that I believe he is well equipped to deal with this question, or any other question concerning schools. But at any rate, he has not indicated to-night the particular difficulty under which he labours, he has not indicated any important facts that could be obtained by the commission which he has proposed. If hon. gentlemen be really serious about this commission, why have they allowed this long time to elapse without giving us a more concise and clearer idea of the important facts that we ought to be in possession of ? The hon. gentleman would not be able to satisfy this House that the points he mentioned are not accessible and easily obtainable before the Bill to be introduced here, is considered or discussed. I have no doubt myself that the Government will be thoroughly able to give all the important information that is required in order to an understanding of the facts, and the application to Manitoba of any clause in the Bill it may introduce, otherwise it will be impossible for the Government to pass a Bill through this House. Let hon. gentlemen who are in favour of remedial legislation tender us their good efforts to make complete such remedial legislation, and instead of moving amendments of embarrassing the Government in the introduction of that legislation, let them facilitate the introduction of the Bill, and then we will be only too glad to scan carefully every line and every clause of the Bill. If the Government is not able to satisfy the House that that legislation is practicable, that that legislation will redress the substantial grievance that has been asserted to exist, and has been proved before the Judicial Committee, I certainly will not vote for the measure. But the principle of remedial legislation commends itself to me, and I think, from what the hon. gentleman has said, it ought to commend itself even to him. Now, he gave us for a time some hope in regard to his attitude when he spoke of justice for the minority. He admitted that we had jurisdiction to deal with the subject, and he hoped that full and ample justice would be done, and then all the hopes of the advocates of remedial legislation were dashed to the ground because he said there were very many things to be considered before justice ought to be done. How long are these people to wait in Manitoba ? How long can you fairly expect them to be patient ? The minority, the small minority, if you like, has shown extraordinary patience through the long and serious trial to them. How many years will the hon. gentleman suggest should now intervene before he is willing that justice should be done to these people ?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Who is responsible for the delay ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Let us not look at the past. We are talking of

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.

action this session, and hon. gentlemen opposite say they are prepared for further delay. It does not lie in their mouths to talk of past delay when they propose now that the delay should continue. Our position is a difficult one, I grant you, and it has been embarrassed by the delay since last session. But it was for a good purpose, it was to sound to the very bottom every hope or expectation that some people had, that if Manitoba were given a few months more delay, the Manitoba government and legislature would settle the question. That time was irksome, no doubt, to the minority. That delay injured the Government, no doubt, and gave birth to suspicions that the Government were not sincere. Nevertheless, the Government lived through it all, and I believe they will do their duty this session, and see that justice is done, and well done. But the hon. gentleman, in speaking to-night reminded me of his leader's utterance at Renfrew. I think it was at Renfrew where the hon. gentleman suggested that after all every minority had a grievance, and that the place to redress these grievances was in the legislature of the province, and his suggestion was then that the minority must look to Manitoba for redress. I rather think that was the idea the hon. member for Queen's had in his mind when he said, after all these statements, that he was in favour of full and ample justice, but that we were to bear in mind he was not committing himself to-night to an admission that a grievance had been established. Do I do him any injustice ? Because it was a most extraordinary statement, if I heard him correctly, towards the end of his speech, after admitting that we had jurisdiction.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) You heard me say that I thought a legal grievance had been established, but I drew a broad distinction between a legal grievance and a grievance which this Parliament must necessarily remedy.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Well, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman corrected me, and the reason why I called attention particularly to the matter was that I did not wish to misrepresent him. But when the hon. gentleman says there is a legal grievance, but that he does not wish to be committed to the fact that there is a real grievance, I find it difficult to distinguish between one and the other. Can the hon. gentleman tell the difference, for I plead ignorance ? If a legal difference has been established, in what way is there not a real grievance established ?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I said a legal grievance was established. Does it necessarily follow that this Parliament must at once intervene and remedy it, or must the local parliament do it ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That is another question, and is not the one with which I was dealing. If, however, I have understood the remarks of the hon. gentleman, I am glad, because I noted at the time that he was guarding himself against what I thought was an admission that any grievance had been established. The hon. gentleman, however, admits that there is a legal grievance.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Which gave the right of appeal.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. What did the law lords say? The hon. gentleman will save time if he states that the Lord Chancellor has gone further than he is willing to go. But what does the judgment of the Privy Council say? The hon. gentleman has referred a great deal to their having said the right of appeal is established. They said a great deal more than that. The law lords stated in their decision :

The sole question to be determined is, whether a right or privilege which the Roman Catholic minority previously enjoyed has been affected by the legislation of 1890. Their lordships are unable to see how this question can receive any but an affirmative answer. Contrast the position of the Roman Catholics prior and subsequent to the Acts from which they appeal. Before these passed into law there existed denominational schools, of which the control and management were in the hands of Roman Catholics, who could select the books to be used and determine the character of the religious teaching. These schools received their proportionate share of the money contributed for school purposes out of the general taxation of the province, and the money raised for these purposes by local assessment was, so far as it fell upon Catholics, applied only toward the support of Catholic schools. What is the position of the Roman Catholic minority under the Acts of 1890? Schools of their own denomination, conducted according to their views, will receive no aid from the state. They must depend entirely for their support upon the contributions of the Roman Catholic community, while the taxes out of which state aid is granted to the schools provided for by the statute fall alike on Catholics and Protestants. Moreover, while the Catholic inhabitants remain liable to local assessment for school purposes, the proceeds of that assessment are no longer destined to any extent for the support of Catholic schools, but afford the means of maintaining schools which they regard as no more suitable for the education of Catholic children than if they were distinctly Protestant in their character.

Could the Lord Chancellor go further in order to show that not merely in the opinion of the Privy Council had a right to appeal as indicated, but that a grievance of the most serious character had been established to their satisfaction. Again :

The appeal is given if the rights are, in fact, affected.

Again :

It is notorious that there were acute differences of opinion between Catholics and Protest-

ants on the education question prior to 1870. This is recognized and emphasized in almost every line of these enactments. There is no doubt, either, what the points of difference were, and it is in the light of these that the 22nd section of the Manitoba Act of 1870, which was, in truth, a parliamentary compact, must be read.

Does the hon. gentleman want a commission to inquire into that further? There is a compact, and there is a compact broken, according to the decision of the Privy Council. Are we to talk of a legal grievance as distinguished from any other grievance? Is it not a grievance when we are told by the highest judicial authority in the Empire that a parliamentary compact requires the restoration of the position occupied before 1890? Yet the hon. gentleman says he has hope that full and ample justice will be done. What justice could the minority expect from the hands of the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies), I venture to ask? Then the hon. gentleman has great faith in the local legislature of Manitoba doing justice. The leader of the Opposition will admit with me that in the last election the Manitoba government took its stand upon resisting the suggestion of this Government that they should legislate in order to remedy any of the grievances of the Catholic minority of Manitoba. We have had their message through their Council, that they will not act. We have had references in the Speech from the Throne to the effect that they will not change or abate their position. What does the Minute of Council, dated 20th October, 1894, inform us? Does the hon. member for Queen's hope that the Manitoba legislature can and will remedy the grievance of the minority? This is the conclusion of that minute :

The questions which are raised by the report now under consideration have been the subject of most voluminous discussion in the legislature of Manitoba during the past four years. All of the statements made in the memorial addressed to His Excellency the Governor General, and many others, have been repeatedly made to and considered by the legislature. That body has advisedly enacted educational legislation which gives to every citizen equal rights and equal privileges, and makes no distinction respecting nationality and religion. After a harassing legal contest, the highest court in the British dominions has decided that the legislature, in enacting the law of 1890, was within its constitutional powers, and that the subject of education is one committed to the charge of the provincial legislature. Under these circumstances, the executive of the province see no reason for recommending the legislature to alter the principles of the legislation complained of. It has been made clear that there is no grievance, except it be a grievance that the legislature refuses to subsidize particular creeds out of the public funds, and the legislature can hardly be held to be responsible for the fact that their refusal to violate what seems to be a sound and just principle of government creates, in the words of the report, dissatisfaction amongst Roman Catholics, not only in Manitoba and the North-west Territories, but likewise throughout Canada.

The minute concludes :

The government and legislative assembly would unitedly resist by every constitutional means any such attempt to interfere with their provincial autonomy.

Some will say that that was before the last decision of the Privy Council in England. But we had their answer to the remedial order. Then, in order to exhaust all hope, another communication was sent. The olive branch was held out, and some persons have very severely criticised our action in again approaching the Manitoba government, feeling that, perhaps, we had not yet exhausted every reasonable hope in seeking a satisfactory solution of the question at the hands of the legislature in Manitoba. We communicated to them by the despatch of last July, asking them if they would do anything short of the terms of the remedial order, and their answer has come back, and there is no uncertain sound about that answer. Their answer is frankly, that their decision is not changed, that their decision is, that they will resist by every constitutional means any action in regard to education taken outside of the floors of the parliament of Manitoba. Mr. Speaker, I would suppose—indeed I would like to suppose the contrary—but it does seem to me idle to suppose that a remedy for the grievances is possible at the hands of the legislature of the province of Manitoba, and that therefore, unless we act, no action will ever be taken, and these grievances will go unredressed. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Davies) will agree with me, I think, on one thing, although we differed on many things to-night. He will agree that when he ventured to say that his party was united in reference to a policy for further delay, or in other words, in advocating a commission to further inquire, that negative answer to that was not long in coming. He was cheered and applauded in certain periods of his speech, but there was a very significant silence when the hon. gentleman ventured to speak on this particular question for the members of his party behind him. One hon. gentleman, in my own sight, gave so significant a contradiction to that sentiment that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davies) will discover later on, if he has not already discovered it since his speech this evening, that his party and those who usually act and vote with him are not by any means united on the policy of further delay. And, Mr. Speaker, prophetic utterances are perhaps worth very little, but I at this moment believe, as I have before said, that even the leader of the Opposition will yet this session find it right, find it manly, and find it in the interest of Canada as a whole, to support the Government of the day, if that Government bring down to this House a Bill that will remove the grievances of the minority in Manitoba; grievances which have been established to the satisfaction of the highest tribunal in this Empire.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER

Mr. O'BRIEN moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

Mr. FOSTER moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.30 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 23rd January, 1896.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

PRIVATE BILLS.

Mr. FOSTER. I desire to present a motion to which, I suppose, there will be no objection :

That the time for receiving petitions for Private Bills be extended to Friday, 7th February next, and for presenting Private Bills to Friday, 14th February next.

This is made necessary by the length of the debate on the Address, the committees to deal with private Bills not having been organized. I hope the hon. leader of the Opposition will find it convenient to bring this debate to a close soon.

Motion agreed to.

NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES REPRESENTATION.

Mr. MARTIN moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 22) further to amend chapter seven of the Revised Statutes of Canada, being the "North-west Territories Representation Act." He said: In introducing this Bill I desire to make a few remarks, as the subject is one of very great importance indeed to the Liberals of the North-west Territories. The Bill proposes to undo the legislation enacted by the House in 1894, which altered the North-west Territories Representation Act—that is, to undo it so far as it effects a change in regard to the voters' lists. It will be remembered that in 1894 the hon. Minister of the Interior introduced a Bill for the purpose of establishing vote by ballot in the North-west Territories in the coming general election. These provisions were, of course, supported on this side of the House. There had been a good deal of agitation in the North-west Territories in favour of the ballot, and, of course, the Liberals were very strongly in favour of extending to the North-west Ter-

ritories the law that was in force in other parts of Canada. During the discussion of that Bill the question of the voters' lists came up in this chamber and the condition of affairs in the North-west Territories was thoroughly explained. The Bill did not seek to alter matters at all with regard to the voters' lists. The Bill was passed by this House and sent to the Senate, and the Senate did a very unusual thing, it undertook to make a most material change in the law with regard to elections for this House. I suppose that never before since Confederation did the Senate assume to do such a thing as change the law with regard to elections for members of the House of Commons. But in this case they made a most vital change, a change which simply means that, at the coming general elections the Government of the day have the power to nominate and elect representatives of the four constituencies in the North-west Territories. That is to say, this amendment makes it impossible for any opponent of the Government to get his name upon the voters' lists unless the officer appointed by the Government is willing that his name should be there. There is no opportunity for the voter to learn whether his name is upon the list or not unless it appears upon the first preliminary list that is made up. The amendments came back to the House of Commons and were passed in this House without any discussion or any explanation whatever; they were passed through in such a silent and secret way that even the "Hansard" reporters did not discover that they had been before the House for consideration. I find that, according to the journals, the Senate amendments to this Bill came up for consideration on the 26th June, 1894, and were agreed to without any amendment. In the "Hansard" of 26th June, 1894, there is no reference whatever to the North-west Territories Representation Act, and while, no doubt, the hon. Minister of the Interior must have moved that the House go into committee on these amendments, there is no record of it whatever. As I say, the thing was done in such a way that there was not a single member of the House, unless he had some notice of it from the Government, who knew anything of this most vital, this most momentous change having been made. I must say that I was entirely ignorant of it, and I fancy that no members of the House were aware of it, apart from those coming from the Territories who had inspired this, and who had taken this means of having it done, of having the amendments made in the Senate, in a body that had nothing to do with this question, taking good care that no explanation should be made of the matter in this House, taking good care that no opportunity should be given to members of this House to show how outrageous the change was. They no doubt knew that this was going through the House, but I fancy, apart from

those few interested ones, and apart from the members of the Government, no member of this House had any idea that any such change had been made. I myself heard of it during the dying hours of last session. It appeared that in making the changes, the hon. Minister of the Interior had overlooked some minor matters which also required to be changed, and in 1895 he brought in a Bill to correct those minor defects, and it was upon the discussion of that Bill, and in fact only after that Bill had passed its second reading, had gone through committee, and was ready for the third reading, that some members on this side of the House discovered, upon looking into the matter, that this vital change had been made. A very strong appeal was made to the Minister of the Interior not to force the amendments through, but he paid no attention to that appeal, and he placed on the statute-book the most outrageous piece of legislation, Mr. Speaker, that has ever been enacted by this House of Commons, and I think in saying that I am saying a good deal. However, I intend to prove every word of it, because I say that the legislation is not any clearer or more definite than if the House had passed a section and added it to the North-west Territories Representation Act, providing that the Government of the day should have the power to nominate and elect for the four constituencies in the Territories, such men as they thought proper to represent those four constituencies. Now, in order to justify that statement it will be necessary for me to show, and I shall do so as briefly as I can, just what the law was prior to 1894, and what the law is to-day in regard to this matter. Prior to 1894 there was a voters' list in the Territories. But that voters' list was really of no account, because on election day it was possible for any person otherwise entitled to vote, to get his name added to the voters' list by the deputy returning officer; and the only object, as explained by the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) when we were discussing that Bill in 1894, of having a voters' list at all, was to save time, by preventing the necessity of swearing every one that came up, and to make it possible to poll all the votes at a particular polling division. Apart from that, the voters' list was of no use whatever. I myself believed at that time that it did not matter at that time particularly, because there was always the right for a voter whose name had been omitted from that list, to have his name added to the list by the deputy returning officer. Now, that list is prepared in this way: Section 28 of the North-west Territories Representation Act, as amended by chapter 10 of the Statutes of 1888, provides that the Governor General in Council may appoint enumerators for each polling division, and if he does not do so, the returning officer, with the assistance of any

justice of the peace, or notary public, and two electors, is obliged to appoint these enumerators. That is, instead of having, as we have in the Dominion Franchise Act, a revising officer for the whole constituency, an enumerator is appointed for each polling division when an election comes on. These enumerators, of course, are only appointed in case of an election, and they proceed to their duties as soon as the proclamation is issued for the election. Section 29 provides that the enumerator, as soon as he is appointed, shall take an oath of office and proceed to make the list. The enumerator is appointed by the Government, and in default of an appointment by the Government, the returning officer is obliged, with the assistance of a justice of the peace and two electors, to make the appointment, so that there must be an enumerator for every polling division. It may be that an enumerator may act for more than one polling division. Then he goes on, by section 29, as amended in 1888, and compiles the list. Then by section 30 :

Each enumerator shall complete, date at his place of residence, and sign the copies of the voters' list, or lists, as aforesaid, eight days before the polling day ; two of the said copies for each polling division he shall forthwith post up in two of the most public places within such polling division, and the other he retains for revision.

Now, that section remains as it was. He completes the list eight days before polling day, and posts up two of these lists in two of the most public places. Then section 31 is the section which provides for revision, and I shall read that section to the House, and ask what protection there is to any one in a revision conducted under the provision of this section :

If any enumerator, at any time after posting up any voters' list, and before the polling day, is fully satisfied, from representations made to him by any credible person, that the name of any qualified voter has been omitted from the voters' list of the polling division to which such voter belongs, he shall add such name to the copy of the list in his possession, below his own signature, and shall attest such addition by his initials ; if the enumerator in like manner is fully satisfied that there is on the list the name of any person who is not qualified as a voter in such polling division, he may draw erasing lines through such name and write his own initials opposite thereto in the column for remarks.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in this voters' list, that is all the protection there is. Eight days before the election day this man completes a list, he posts it up in two places, and then, by the Senate amendment, if at any time up to within two days of the polling day, that is six days after it is posted up, and during those six days, he gets any credible person to tell him that there is a name that ought to be on the list, he may put it on ; and if any credible person informs him that there is some name on the list that ought to be struck off, he may

Mr. MARTIN.

strike it off. That, Mr. Speaker, is all the protection there is to the opponents of the Government in these four constituencies, in the case of an election. Eight days before the election day the list is made, made by a man appointed by the Government. Anybody, Tom, Dick and Harry, the most disreputable man in the community, if they like, they can appoint. There is no restriction as to whom they may appoint. They may send in non-residents, the hon. Minister of the Interior may take some of the characters that the party keep down here—I do not know that they have got so many up there—they may send them into the Territories, one for each polling division, and ask them to make a list eight days before election. That list may have four names on it, it may have one name on it, possibly he may not find a single voter in the constituency, or it may have twenty names on it ; there is no limit. He is obliged to take no application. No elector has the right to go and make a statutory declaration and have his name put upon the list. The agent of the Government may conduct himself without the slightest restriction or limitation. He can put on every Conservative. This man goes into the polling division, and he can go to the candidate and ask him : Do you think you have any supporters in polling division No. 5 ? If so, give me the names of those supporters. And having got the names of those supporters, he puts them upon the list. Then he posts it up eight days before election day, and during six days an elector, if he could not find out where the list was posted up, because there was no means of telling where it was posted, for all the Act says is that it must be posted in two of the most prominent places—and in many of the polling divisions of the Territories there is no polling place, except possibly a post office, and in some cases there is no place that you could call the most public place except at the corner of a fence, according to the meaning of the Act—the elector could go and ask to have his name put on the list. But the official can laugh, and say, "I will put your name on the list," but he need not do it. There is no means of finding out whether the name has been put on the list or not until the man goes to vote on election day, and if the name is not on the list, there is no possible remedy, because after the list is completed two days before polling day, it is absolutely final. Section 46 of the Act provides that every voter shall be entitled to vote whose name is on the voters' list, and if a man is not on the list he cannot vote. I should like to ask politicians whom I see around me on both sides of the House if they would want anything better—if they were prepared to use it, but I do not suppose any hon. member of this House would do so, although candidates to the next House might take advantage of it—to use than a snap of that

kind with which to carry an election. It simply means that the Government has the power to nominate and elect those four members.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). That is taking a leaf out of the practice of the local government in Nova Scotia, by which they disfranchised electors.

Mr. MARTIN. On this side of the House the Franchise Act of the Dominion has been very much opposed. It has been opposed for this reason, that we do not believe it is right for the Government to appoint an officer of their own to make up the voters' list. But let me refer to the protection there is under the Franchise Act so far as getting names on the list is concerned. Section 15 of the Act provides that the revising officer shall on 1st August prepare to commence to make his list. He continues to make up that list up to 1st October. I am taking the Act as it is at present; it has been changed in regard to time, but there has always been an opportunity to add names during the two months of September and October, when the revising officer is supposed to be in his office ready to take applications, and in fact he is bound to take them if they are properly sworn to and placed before him. Every elector in the constituency has the opportunity of knowing that, according to the law, on 1st August—it was in 1894 when the general list was made up—the revising officer in each constituency commences to prepare the list. On 1st October the list is closed. It is immediately printed. It is then posted in various places; copies are sent to the defeated candidate, to the sitting member, to the different officials throughout the constituency, and every man can see, if he will take the trouble to go over the list and examine it, whether his name is on the list. If he finds that his name is not on that list, a reasonable delay is granted in order that he may get his name placed there, because after the list has been posted the revising officer holds the court of revision, which must be held at least five weeks after the closing of the list. Note the difference in time. Weeks and months in the one case; days, hours and minutes in the other. Then any person whose name is not there may put in his appeal, if he gets it in within two weeks before the day of revision. He goes there and gives his evidence and after all these proceedings have taken place the judge gives notice that he will make up the list finally, and both parties have a right to be present. So far as time is concerned, an opportunity is given, under the Dominion Franchise Act, for both sides to be present, and to find out what is going on. These are not the objections made by the Liberals; the main objection taken is to the great power exercised by these revising officers and their appointment by the Government. But in

the Territories there is no protection of the kind afforded by the Dominion Franchise Act. There is nothing done until the election almost comes on, and the first the electors know what is going on is eight days before the day they are called on to vote. Many of them may be away, you can never count on having all the electors in the constituency during the eight days preceding an election. But that is the only chance given them. If they can find those two public places where the lists are posted—because there is no provision for sending the lists to any one, even to the defeated candidate, and the people have no means of finding out anything in regard to it, for the enumerator has no office and there is no means of finding him—names may perhaps be added. But the list may be made up in Toronto, so far as the law is concerned, and indeed there is nothing in the law to prevent the preparation of the whole list for the Territories in an office in this building. All that is necessary, so far as the Act is concerned, is to get some one to put up the lists in two places in each polling division in the Territories. But if that is not done, there is no penalty for failing to do it. Eight days before the election the lists are stuck up, and then for six days an elector (and the House will remember that polling divisions in the North-west are frequently larger than a county in Ontario), if by some chance he learns that the list has been posted in some place, may travel fifteen or twenty miles, and he may find that the list has been torn down in the meantime. In fact, the enumerator himself may tear it down immediately after he has put it up, for there is nothing in the law to prevent it. The list having been printed and published throughout the constituency, there is no possibility of the elector being able to get his name placed there. In this case what is the provision? The provision is that he could go and ask the enumerator to have his name on; that is all. The enumerator is not bound to put his name on, and if he does not put his name on the unfortunate elector has no means whatever of finding out that it has been left off; except that he goes on polling day, and after having driven again fifteen or twenty miles he finds that this enumerator has obeyed the instructions he received from those who appointed him and has not put his name on the list. Mr. Speaker, can it be imagined that a Government boasting of their strength as this Government has done during all these years, deriding the Opposition for their ill-success at the election, with a majority in the House at the time they passed this Act of 55 or 60; can you imagine this Government being reduced to the extremity of passing an Act of Parliament for the purpose of stealing from us four seats in the North-west Territories, in a part of Canada which has never yet returned a Liberal to Parliament? The Minister of the Interior had been up in that country and

he had driven through it. He found that the prestige of the Government had gone, and that the people there were only waiting the opportunity of voting against the Government representatives, and so he came to the conclusion that unless he passed some Act of this kind, every member from the North-west Territories would be a supporter of the leader of the Opposition. But even then you would have thought that the Government would have some honour and some decency in the matter, and that if they were prepared to pass an Act of this outrageous character they would have had at least the decency to explain in the House in a manly, straightforward way, that they did intend to steal these constituencies and give us an opportunity of discussing and objecting to it. But, no; the Minister introduces the Bill without a word. He puts it through the House and then he gets somebody in the Senate, a body which has nothing to do with the matter, to sneak in these amendments so vital and so important, and he brings it back here and puts it through without the slightest word of explanation. The hon. gentleman referred in another debate to the Manitoba Act in regard to the elections. Let us look at the Manitoba Act and see if there is anything in it like this: That Act provides that the voters' lists shall be made up from time to time when the Government sees fit, and that when the voters' lists are to be revised a general proclamation is to issue appointing a registration clerk for each electoral district in the province. That proclamation fixes the day for the closing of the lists, which day shall be not less than four weeks from the date of the proclamation. During these four weeks every elector has an opportunity of sending to that registration clerk, a sworn declaration showing that he is entitled to vote, and if the registration clerk does not put upon the list every one of those persons who furnishes him with a proper declaration, he is subject to a heavy penalty. After the lists are closed they are printed and circulated. Copies are sent to defeated candidates at the previous election, to the sitting members, to every mayor, councillor, alderman and reeve in the constituency and to every postmaster. They are put up in every school house, and every post office, and every municipal office, and then there is a revision. A revising officer is appointed who must be either a judge or a barrister of at least three years standing. These lists must be published and posted up at least thirty days before the day appointed for the final court revision. Then, every one has an opportunity, just as they have under the Dominion Franchise Act, of putting in their appeals, as long as they get them in five days before the day for the final revision. Then an open court is held, and after that the list is completed and is published. Twenty-five copies are sent to the defeated candidate, twenty-five

Mr. MARTIN.

copies to the sitting member, and two copies to every municipal officer in the province. These are also posted up in the most public way all over the province. Therefore, under the Dominion Act and under the Manitoba Act, which the hon. gentleman criticized in another connection, there is the most ample opportunity for every man to get his name upon the list, unless some of the officers commit a fraud. But, in the North-west Territories, I say that there is no opportunity, there is no possible chance of a man getting his name upon the list unless the enumerator is willing to put him upon the list. Now, Mr. Speaker, it is well known by the Government, and also, I think, generally in this House, that the North-west Assembly is composed very largely of Conservatives. I shall, with your permission, Sir, read a resolution which that body passed upon this very subject; a subject, it is true, that was not particularly within their jurisdiction, but a subject in which each one of them was interested as a citizen of the Dominion, and one in which they felt there was such a strong public interest in the Territories that they were justified in passing this very forcible resolution in regard to the matter. The following resolution was moved by Mr. Insinger, and passed unanimously:—

Whereas under the "North-west Territories Representation Act" the requirements for electors in the territories to be allowed to vote at Dominion elections differ from the requirements for electors in the provinces, inasmuch as they are not based on the provisions of the "Electoral Franchise Act";

And whereas, though immediately before Dominion elections in the Territories lists of voters are to be made by enumerators appointed either by the Governor in Council or by the returning officer, conjointly with any two justices of the peace, or with one justice of the peace and a notary public, or with any one of them and two electors of the electoral district, yet, till the passing of the Acts to amend the North-west Representation Act in the years 1894 and 1895, all electors having the qualifications of such were allowed to vote independently of the fact, if they were on such list of voters or not; And whereas in all elections in the Territories, both territorial and Dominion, the principle of allowing a voter's name to be put on the list up to the moment of voting prevailed up to 1894;

And whereas such principle was reaffirmed by the legislative assembly of the North-west Territories in their "Territories Elections Ordinance" of 1894, in which, moreover, the assembly did not think it advisable to make provisions for either voters' lists or lists of voters; And whereas experience at the general election for the assembly held in the year 1894 showed such system to be admirably adapted to the needs of these sparsely-settled territories;

And whereas by the Acts to amend the North-west Representation Act, passed in the 57-58 year and 58-59 year, Victoria, the list of voters made by enumerators will have the same force as a voters' list prepared under the provisions of the Electoral Franchise Act, and all such persons as are not on such list of voters will

be excluded from the right to exercise the franchise ;

And whereas such lists of voters do not offer the same safeguards to the rights of electors as do the voters' lists in the provinces, inasmuch as

- (1) They are necessarily hurriedly prepared by enumerators between the time of the receipt of the writ for election and a week before the day of polling ;
- (2) The time allowed to electors or their agents to ascertain if their names are on such list is, taken in connection with the distances generally to be travelled in the territories, and with the fact that no fixed residences are appointed for such enumerators, insufficient for the purpose ;
- (3) The enumerator is the absolute judge of the right of an elector to be on such list, and he can put on or strike off names till within two days of the polling day without notice from or to such electors ;
- (4) There is no appeal from the decision of the enumerator either to a revising officer or to a judge :

Therefore, in the opinion of this assembly, it is desirable that the "North-west Territories Representation Act" be further amended so as to either adopt the system provided for in the "Territories Election Ordinances," or to bring into effect the provisions regarding voters' lists of the "Electoral Franchise Act."

Among the members of the assembly who supported that resolution, which recapitulates very well the different points which I have alleged against this outrage, is Mr. Haultain, who is the Premier of the Territories, and the nominated candidate on the Government side for the constituency of Alberta at the present time. In fact, it was at his suggestion that it was proposed that the law should be re-enacted as it was before. What the assembly ask for is one of three things—first, that the law should be re-enacted as it was before ; second, that the Territories Franchise Act should be adopted ; third, that the Electoral Franchise Act of the Dominion should be brought into force in the Territories. Of course, it is quite out of the question to attempt, at this late day to bring into force the Dominion Franchise Act for the coming elections ; so that the recommendations of the assembly narrow themselves down to the others—either to have their own Franchise Act, or to have the old Act as it was. I understand that it is suggested as an objection to the Act as it was passed that it afforded more or less opportunity for fraudulent voting. Now, whether there was opportunity for it, or not, I can say truthfully—and I think the members from the Territories will agree with me—that there has not been, to any appreciable extent, any fraud in elections there. There has been no complaint on the floor of this House, so far as I have heard, from members representing constituencies in the Territories, of the law working in that direction. There is no doubt that it is a very crude law. It is certainly not a law that should be allowed to stand ; but the law that has been sub-

stituted for it will bear no comparison with it whatever. If the Government came to the conclusion that there was too much opportunity for persons swearing falsely that they were entitled to vote, they should, in 1894, have applied the Dominion Franchise Act to the Territories. Not having been prepared to do that, they cannot be allowed to use this flimsy pretext for the outrage they committed. I am glad to notice that the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) apparently takes the same view of the Government's conduct as I do, because he has also introduced a Bill into this House, which has received its first reading, in exactly the same direction as mine. My Bill proposes to put the law back as it was before, that is, to re-enact section 44 of chapter 7 of the Revised Statutes, which reads as follows :—

The deputy returning officer shall, while the poll is open, if required by any elector whose name is not on the voters' list, administer to such elector oath number one in the said form P ; and such oath having been taken, the deputy returning officer shall at once cause such elector's name to be added to the voters' list, with the word "sworn" written thereafter.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to know from the hon. Minister of the Interior whether the Government committed this outrage of their own accord, or whether they were asked to do so by any member from the Territories in the House at the present time. We may take it for granted, that the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) did not request or advise the Government to do so, because he comes here and asks to have the same changes made that I am asking for. I do not suppose that the hon. member for East Assiniboia (Mr. McDonald) would request the Government to make a change in this direction, because he has been discarded by his party in his constituency, and another man substituted for him as the candidate for the coming election. So far as the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Davis) is concerned, I am sure I am quite safe in saying that hon. gentleman would never be a party to such a disgraceful attempt to steal constituencies. Then, the hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Macdowall) is the only member left representing a North-west constituency. I do not know—I should imagine that hon. gentleman would scarcely be guilty of forwarding or asking for legislation the effect of which must be to give him a most unfair advantage over his opponent. The Government have always expressed themselves as being confident of the result of the elections in the Territories, and I would ask hon. members supporting the Government from other provinces what they think of their expression of confidence when they are reduced to extremities such as this. Will any one believe that they have any confidence whatever in having the slightest particle of a

chance in any one of these constituencies, if they are obliged to put through this House in such a secret way, without any discussion or explanation, without any chance of their opponents knowing what they were doing, a Bill of this kind—an Act which allows men nominated by themselves to go into a polling division and make up once for all a list from which they may exclude every likely opponent from being a candidate, and from which list there is no possible appeal. Why, Mr. Speaker, I fancy that, outside of the Government, and outside of any member from the Territories, if such can be found, who has urged and supported legislation of this kind, there is not on the other side of the House a single member who will justify and support the Government in keeping upon the statute-book such an outrage as this. This is the last session of this House; it can only last a certain time; and, so far as I am concerned, if my voice does not give out, I will certainly, so long as I am able to speak, stand up here day after day and protest against this iniquitous outrage, and prevent, so far as my efforts can, the Government getting on with any business whatever until—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. You are perfectly correct.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman is not in order; he is threatening the House with opposition.

Mr. MARTIN. I withdraw my threat.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Allow me for one moment on a question of order—it is always the rule that the redress of grievances should precede supplies.

Mr. SPEAKER. I did not understand the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin) to take that position. I understood him to threaten that he would not allow the business of the House to go on unless this particular statute to which he referred was amended.

Mr. MARTIN. You certainly, Sir, understood me quite correctly, and as I find I am out of order, I withdraw the threat; but I shall take every parliamentary means in my power to compel the Government—there is no use appealing to this Government, I have lost any idea of that kind; I do not think there is any use appealing to their honour or patriotism or fairness—but I say that I will use my right as a representative here of taking every parliamentary and legitimate opportunity of insisting that this wrong shall be made right before this session is over. And I would like to hear from the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Daly) any justification of this amendment which he put through this House without the slightest explanation. I have been in the Territories since last session,

Mr. MARTIN.

after the people had learnt of this amendment. They had no knowledge of it before last session. I have conversed with gentlemen there on both sides of politics, and was requested by them to ask for this change in the law, and I am satisfied that the hon. Minister of the Interior has few, if any, supporters in the Territories who will justify him in this attempt to take away from the people their right to vote. If the hon. gentleman's policy is acceptable to the people there, let him depend upon that alone. Let him go before the people with his policy; let him give us the opportunity of getting our names on the list; let him give us the right to vote—and then if he is supported by the people, all right; if he is condemned, let him take his condemnation. But let him not attempt to get away from the votes of the people; let him not attempt to hide his iniquity in a parliamentary election of members for those four constituencies. It is an outrage which has never been perpetrated even in this House of Commons, and I am satisfied it could not have been perpetrated here, if the members had known what was suggested to them, and what was being enacted.

Mr. DALY. In answer to the very furious attack made by the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin), it seems to me that it is well for the House and you, Mr. Speaker, to be put in possession of the facts, and not take for gospel what the hon. gentleman has said. He has seen fit to impugn the honour and patriotism of this Government, and my own personal honour in this matter, not only as a member of the Government, but as a member of the House, because he declared that I had sneaked through this House a clause in the Bill which came from the Senate. What are the facts? They are that in 1894 I introduced into this House a Bill to amend the North-west Territories Representation Act. That Bill went through this House and had its third reading. I ask if the hon. gentleman will find upon record that he took any part in the discussion of that Bill, during its three readings. He will find that he did not. He will find that he did not give any attention to it.

Mr. MARTIN. It had not this clause in it.

Mr. DALY. Did you, or did you not read the Bill?

Mr. MARTIN. I did.

Mr. DALY. So we have the hon. gentleman on record that he did look at the Bill and knew what it was when it went through the Senate. The hon. gentleman has accused me of going to the Senate and getting the members of that chamber to put in this clause, and conniving with them in doing a wrong to the North-west Territories. I tell the hon. gentleman and this House that I never spoke to a Senator, or any-

body else, with reference to this Bill after it left this House and went to the Senate; and I was just as ignorant as the hon. gentleman is that the clause was put in the Bill by the Senate repealing clause 44 until the Bill came back to this House. When the Bill came back here, I pointed out to members of the North-west Territories the changes made by the Senate, because there was more than one change, and I was told by these gentlemen that the changes had been made at their solicitation.

Mr. MARTIN. Will the hon. gentleman give the names?

Mr. DALY. The hon. member for East Assiniboia (Mr. McDonald) was the gentleman who informed me, and he told me the reason was that in the last elections held in the North-west Territories this clause 44 gave rise to the committal of perjury by a number of people, who had their names put on the list without any right. What does clause 44 say:

The deputy returning officer shall, while the poll is open, if required by any elector whose name is not on the voters' list, administer to such elector oath number one in the said form P; and such oath having been taken, the deputy returning officer shall at once cause such elector's name to be added to the voters' list, with the word "sworn" written thereafter.

I should like to know if that provision does not admit of the statement made by the hon. member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Macdonald) to me that it opened the door for wrong-doing? The hon. gentleman told me that in his own electoral division, there were 150 names put on the list under the provision of that clause, which would not have been there if the men whose names were on had not perjured themselves by taking the oath. The hon. gentleman went further. He did not only charge me with having connived with some one in the Senate in order to have the clause added to the Bill, but he said that the Bill was not discussed in this House, and that it went through silently and in an irregular manner.

Mr. MARTIN. I said as to the amendments.

Mr. DALY. I am talking about them. The hon. gentleman said that there is nothing in the "Hansard" about this particular amendment. He will not find in the "Hansard" anything about the amendments to the Bill, but he will find them in the Journals of the House. Look at the Journals of the 26th June, 1894.

Mr. MARTIN. I said they were in the Journal, but that there was no mention in the "Hansard" about any discussion.

Mr. DALY. On page 349 of the Journals of the House you will find, by a division that took place in the afternoon, that the hon. member for Winnipeg was present when the

amendments went through, or that, if not present, he ought to have been. He was in the precincts of the House.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Does the hon. gentleman say that on the page 349 of the Journals of 1894 the particular amendment to which my hon. friend objects is found?

Mr. DALY. Yes; and I call the attention of the House to the proceedings that took place on that day, so that we may ascertain whether or not these amendments were sneaked through or whether there was anything irregular in the manner in which these amendments that came from the Senate were put through this House. We find that four petitions were presented; we find that a Bill from the Senate, intituled "An Act respecting the Speaker of the Senate," was, according to the Orders, read a third time, &c., and then we find that the House, according to order, proceeded to take into consideration the amendments made by the Senate to the Bill intituled "An Act further to amend the North-west Territories Representation Act," and that the same were read as follows. There was not one amendment only, but half a dozen, and these were read to the House in the usual way, and they were passed through in the usual way. I want to call the hon. gentleman's particular attention to the fact that they went through in the afternoon, so that there was no excuse for his not knowing all about them. He may be frequently absent during the evening, but these were read in the afternoon, and, besides, they were on the Order paper, so that the hon. gentleman has no excuse for not knowing about them. And they were on the Orders of the Day, so that the hon. gentleman's attention was called to the matter. Moreover, those amendments were all spread out upon the Journals of the House, as follows:—

Clause A.

Section eighteen of the said Act is hereby amended by adding thereto the following subsection:—

"3. The returning officer shall not receive the nomination paper of any member of the legislative assembly of the North-west Territories.

Page 1, line 15.—After "Council" insert clauses B, C and D.

Clause B.

Section thirty-one of the said Act is hereby amended by adding after the word "and" in the second line thereof the words "two days."

Clause C.

Section thirty-two of the said Act is hereby amended by striking out the words "on the day" in the fifth line thereof and replacing the same by the words "two days."

Clause D.

Section thirty-three of the said Act is hereby amended by leaving out all after the word "division" in the sixth line thereof.

Page 2, line 6.—After "twenty" insert "section twenty-eight."

Page 2, line 11.—After "twenty" insert "two."

Page 2, line 22.—After "application" insert "for a recount or final addition."

Page 2, line 23.—Leave out from "Act" to "shall" in line 24.

Page 2, line 26.—After "Territories" insert "and the application provided for by the subsection added to the said section by section eleven of chapter nineteen of the Statutes of 1891, shall be made to the said court in banco."

Page 2, line 28.—After "forty-one" insert "forty-four."

This is the amendment the hon. gentleman objects to. These amendments were agreed to by this House. Now, Mr. Speaker, this was done in broad daylight when, I presume, the hon. gentleman was in his seat in the House. The Votes and Proceedings show that during that afternoon or evening a division took place, and the hon. gentleman's name is recorded in the division. So the hon. gentleman was in the House or within the precincts of the House when these proceedings took place. Had the hon. gentleman paid the attention to his legislative duties that he ought to have paid, he would have known of these amendments, for he had the same notice of the amendments that I had. When these amendments were made I went into them to ascertain the effect of them, because, as I said before, they were made without my knowledge. When my attention was called to the fact that section 44 was amended, I went to the hon. member for East Assiniboia (Mr. McDonald), who, I think, was the only representative from the North-west Territories about at the time, to ascertain what the facts were, and he explained to me why the amendment was made in the Senate. So the hon. gentleman's charge that I was responsible for that amendment falls to the ground. That amendment was made by the hon. gentleman in charge of the Bill in the Senate on the advice of the representatives in that chamber from the North-west Territories. I would be quite willing to leave the matter there but the hon. gentleman goes further. He seems to wish to make a little cheap popularity by frequent clap-trap discussions of this matter. The hon. gentleman would give the members of this House to understand that by that simple amendment we have changed the position of voters in the North-west Territories and that the provisions he has read were new. He seeks to impress the people with the same idea, for in an interview with the hon. gentleman in the Winnipeg "Tribune," which was sent to me, the impression is conveyed that there is something new about it. Why, Sir, the Act the hon. gentleman has quoted is one of the Acts of 49 Victoria. Ten years ago that Act was passed in this House. So if any injustice was inflicted upon the people of the North-west Territories, it was inflicted upon them by the

Mr. DALY.

House of Parliament of which many hon. gentlemen still in the House were members.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). And opposed it.

Mr. DALY. I do not know; I have not looked up the debates of the House of that time. At all events this is the law. Since then two elections have been held, and I fail to find that any of the charges made by the hon. gentleman have been borne out. I fail to find that either the newspapers or candidates in the elections have complained about the way the enumerations were made up. I was through that country in an election campaign in 1887. I saw those lists there, prepared, as they were, under the statute and I never heard any complaints, and we were associated day after day with gentlemen representing the Opposition. No discussion at all took place in reference to the way the lists were being made up.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). They were made up to the day of the election, which cannot be done now.

Mr. DALY. The hon. gentleman is mistaken. The hon. member for Winnipeg says that under the amendment, if names are not on the list two days before the election they cannot be got on at all. Under the old law persons could swear in their names on the day of the election. That is the real charge. If he rested the charge there, I would be satisfied. But he goes further and makes the charge against the Government that we are seeking to disfranchise the electors of the North-west Territories by a law that he would give us to understand was passed in 1894 or 1895. But the enumeration lists are made up under a law passed ten years ago. What are its provisions? They were made to suit the peculiar conditions and requirements of the North-west Territories. It was well understood by Parliament that it would not do to apply the provisions of the Franchise Act to the North-west Territories. The most suitable law under the circumstances was passed. In discussing the provisions of the Act the hon. gentleman sneers at the idea of the Governor General appointing the enumerators, and says that disreputable men might be appointed, that disreputable men might be sent up from here. I think the hon. gentleman reflects severely upon the people of the North-west Territories. Does the hon. gentleman give us to understand by the charge he makes that disreputable men prepared the lists for the late local elections in Manitoba, I do not think that the hon. gentleman would like to admit that the men who prepared the lists in North Winnipeg and Brandon City and North Brandon were disreputable men. Yet I produced evidence the other day to show that hundreds of men were disfranchised by their names being left off the lists. In this case the Governor General will do just as he has done in the past—he will appoint men fit for the position.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). He will appoint men whom he is advised to appoint.

Mr. DALY. Who advises the Attorney General at Winnipeg to appoint the enumerators under the Manitoba Franchise Act? Do they appoint any person opposed to the Government or do they appoint their own friends? I do not wish the House to understand that we are going to appoint Grit enumerators; I do not think the hon. gentleman expects us to do so. But we will appoint men capable of performing the duties assigned to them. I wish to call attention to the fact that these enumerators have to take an oath, and have to prepare their lists under the sanction of that oath. If the hon. gentleman could produce evidence that, in the elections of 1887 and 1891 enumerators were appointed who proved derelict in their duty, if he could show that people were disfranchised as he has given the House to understand, there might be something in his argument. But I defy him to produce the slightest proof that any person has complained, directly or indirectly, of the preparation of the lists in 1887 and 1891. The hon. gentleman does not give the same credit that I do to his political allies in the North-west Territories. He has had no experience of those gentlemen. I want him to understand that they are alive and that they have their organizations. I speak of what I know.

Mr. MARTIN. It did not make the slightest difference in 1887 and 1891, because they could get their names on the lists on election day.

Mr. DALY. Why, Sir, I have been engaged in contests up there, and I do not think the hon. gentleman took part in them, and it seems to me that no man ever fought harder to get their names upon the list and to elect their candidate than did our Grit friends in Eastern and Western Assiniboia, and the other constituencies. This Act, as it is now amended, does not give any advantage to the supporters of the Government as against those who are opposed to the Government, because the enumerator is bound to take their names. The only conclusion I can arrive at, when hon. gentlemen say, "Oh, oh," is that they have a different experience in preparing the lists to what I have. Are we to understand that those gentlemen know about how those lists are prepared, and that they do not do the square thing when they prepare the lists?—because that is the inference I draw from the remarks made by the hon. gentleman. I take it that a man who is sworn to do his duty, will do it, and any opponent of this Government, has, under the provisions of the Act, the very same chance of getting his name upon the list as does any person who is a supporter of this Government. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman sneered at the enumerators that would be appointed by the Governor General in Council, and shortly after-

wards he came round and said that of course he could not object to the Governor General appointing the friends of the Government. Well, all that the Act presumes is that the Governor General shall appoint men who are fit to make up those lists. Now, what does all this amount to? It amounts simply to this, as I said before, that the conditions of that country are not such as to admit of our extending to it the provisions of the Franchise Act. In 1894 I introduced a Bill into this House for the purpose of extending the ballot to the North-west Territories, and in that Bill certain changes had to be made in the North-west Territories Representation Act, but those changes did not affect materially the mode of the preparation of those lists, other than the amendment which was made in the Senate in repealing clause 44. I think the hon. gentleman will have to make out a considerably stronger case than he has made to-day to prove to this House that any electors in that country will be affected in the slightest degree by the changes that have been made in the Act, because so far as the appointment of enumerators is concerned, and so far as the preparation of the lists is concerned, they will be prepared as they were in 1887, and as they were in 1891, and prepared under legislation that was passed in this House some ten years ago. So how could the hon. gentleman, or how can the legislative assembly, in the petition the hon. gentleman read, say that by the Act that was passed last session or the session before, we seek to disfranchise by wholesale the electors of the North-west Territories? Sir, the hon. gentleman threatened, but he had to withdraw the threat, that he was going to keep this House here until such time as he accomplished his purpose. I want to say to the hon. gentleman that we do not fear his threats. We are just as desirous of giving to the people of the North-west Territories a full franchise as he is. The hon. gentleman says that I went through that country and saw the people, and in consequence of my visit I came to the conclusion that if the provisions of the law remained as they were we could not expect to get the same representation. I want to tell the hon. gentleman that I do not fear the verdict of the electors of the North-west Territories.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) You do not show any signs of it.

Mr. DALY. I do not show any signs of it in the slightest degree. I want to say to the hon. gentleman that remarks such as his are very stale. We heard in 1887 that the whole North-west representation was going to be opposed to this Government; we heard in 1891 that the whole North-west representation would go against this Government. But as the North-west people did in 1887, and as they did in 1891, the North-west people will do in 1896, and the hon.

gentleman will find that we will have a solid representation here supporting the policy of this Government the same as we had in 1891 and 1887.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. For "this Government," substitute "the Government," and you will be right.

Mr. DALY. Well, for the Government of the grand old Conservative party, not a Government of the hon. gentlemen opposite, because I am sure the hon. gentleman will be a considerable number of years older before he sits upon the Treasury benches, notwithstanding his own inclination to get there. Now, Sir, I say to the hon. gentleman that the charge he made against me that this amendment was made by my conniving with the Senate, I have proved to be untrue. More than that, I had no thought or idea, when agreeing to the amendment that was made in the Senate, that it would affect in the slightest degree the franchise of the electors of the North-west Territories; more than that, the thought never occurred to me, and has never occurred to me, nor will it ever occur to me, until the last ballot is cast, that the North-west Territories will give any different verdict from the one they gave in the elections in 1887 and 1891.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). My hon. friend from Winnipeg (Mr. Martin) has pointed out, in the speech which he addressed to the House, the very serious objections that lie against the law as it stands at this moment. He has also pointed out the possibility of disfranchising a very large number of the electors of the North-west Territories under the provisions of the law as it is. What defence or answer has the Minister made to that? Why, the hon. Minister says that the law as it stood before these objectionable amendments were made, worked satisfactorily, and he gives that statement as an answer to the argument of my hon. friend that the law was changed for the worse.

Mr. DALY. I said with the one exception.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Well, the hon. gentleman did not say that he was prepared to take away that exception, the hon. gentleman did not say that he was prepared to remove any of the objections which the hon. member for Winnipeg made to the law as it at present stands. The hon. gentleman did not say one word that can be regarded as an argument in defence of the amendments that were made in 1894 in the Senate, and which were allowed to stand in his measure of last session. Sir, if he looks at the facts as they are stated, what do they disclose? In the first place, the very objectionable condition of things exists, which the hon. gentleman says is to continue, that the Government, who stand as one of the parties on trial at an election, are to be the persons who are to appoint all the officers, who are to create the machinery under which their trial is to take place. Sir,

Mr. DALY.

there is no analogy between the condition of things that exists in Ontario and the condition of things that exists in the North-west Territories. The hon. gentleman said that we appointed Grits to office where an opportunity occurs. Why, Sir, has the Government of Ontario—and I take that as an illustration—provided for the appointment of their own friends under the Franchise Act for the preparation of the voters' list? Has the Government of Ontario provided for the appointment of the returning officers who are to hold the elections, when those elections take place in that province? No, Sir, the Government of Ontario provided by statute that certain officers, some of whom may be their friends and some of whom may be their opponents, are the persons under whose authority and responsibility the elections are to be held; but they also provided that the preparation of the voters' lists shall be in the hands of the municipality, the members of which are elected by the people who represent both parties, and the final appeal is to the county judge, that is, when a new appointment takes place, by the Government who sit here. Now, look at the condition of things in the North-west. The hon. gentleman says that they take care to appoint no Grits, and he says His Excellency makes the appointments, and therefore they will be proper appointments. Sir, the hon. gentleman might as well refer to the Lieutenant-Governor as a conclusive answer to the character of appointments everywhere. His Excellency, it is true, makes those appointments, but he does not choose the men. The men are chosen by the hon. gentlemen; they are named by the hon. gentlemen, and it is upon their responsibility that the appointments are made. The hon. gentleman may appoint in the North-west, as he or his friends have done elsewhere, bankrupts to office in elections, where it is known that if improper conduct takes place, no prosecution can be successfully had against them. That is the position which the hon. gentleman and his friends have practically taken, and he has referred us to His Excellency, whose name ought never to have been dragged into a discussion in this House, as a guarantee that the appointments will be all right and proper.

Mr. DALY. I rise to an explanation. I do not see why the hon. gentleman should state that I brought His Excellency's name into this discussion. I mentioned the name of the Governor General as given in the Act, and a child understands that it means the Governor General in Council. I never mentioned the name of His Excellency.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman will see, when he reads the report of his speech, that I am not misrepresenting him, and that I am not stating what he did not say on this occasion. What is the objection made by my hon. friend? It is,

that by the alteration of the law it placed in the hands of the enumerator or revising officer, where there is one, power to disfranchise a portion of the population. Under the law, as cited, if a man's name is excised improperly, he could go before the enumerator on the day of polling, he could swear that he was entitled to have his name on the list, he could have it placed on the list by the enumerator, and he could thereafter record his vote. Can he do that to-day? If his name is left off the list, or struck off the list, can he go and vote? Everybody knows that he cannot do so. And the hon. gentlemen, by changes made by the Senate in a law affecting this House, know the position of the matter is this: that the party stands in a wholly different position from that which he occupied before. Why, an unscrupulous enumerator or an unscrupulous revising officer would not undertake to excise a name from the list, or leave it out after promising to place it there, if he thought that the party on the day of election would find a fraud had been practised, and he could still have his name placed on the list and still record his vote. There would be no motive under that provision of the Act for improper and fraudulent conduct. But does it stand so to-day; is that the position of the question at this moment? No. If a revising officer or an enumerator leaves a name off the list, and tells the party that he is entitled to vote, and that he will place his name on the list, and the man goes to the poll and finds his name not there, is he entitled to have his name on the list and have it then and there recorded? No. He will be told that he should have come and had his name added two days before. The opportunity is taken away; the temptation to fraud is created for the first time, and the list will be not only improperly made but it will be full of defects, and errors, and omissions, which cannot be corrected. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Daly) has said the position of the North-west is peculiar, and that he cannot apply there the law as it exists in the older provinces of the Dominion. I do not dispute that such may be the case. It may be necessary to make special provision for the conditions existing in the Territories; but those should be rational conditions, and they should be such as to secure the rights and privileges of the electors, and not be framed for the purpose of taking them away. That is the condition of things now existing. Men will lose their right to vote—the number of voters will be diminished. On whose representation are enumerators or revising officers appointed? Upon the representation of the candidates which support the Administration, upon the representation of gentlemen who for the time being are sitting in this House, in so far as they become candidates again. Is not every officer so appointed friendly to them, and though the emolument may be small, nevertheless in

that country it may be important, and be sufficient to place those officers under obligations to these men. Will they not undertake to promote their interest? Will they not feel that in looking after friends of the candidates and neglecting applications made by opponents, they are not doing an improper act? They may feel it is none of their business to see that names of persons hostile to the Administration are placed on the list. Was the condition of things such that the list would be full and fair, and the election an honest and free expression of public opinion? At all events, the evil has been enormously aggravated. Under the pretense of having an innocent provision added to the law, serious injustice has been done to a large section of the population, and power is given to effect serious frauds against which no remedy can be applied. You may prosecute a man elsewhere, if he has property which you can seize or reach, for the misconduct, but where you require no security of any kind, where you attach no penalties of any sort, the House should be specially careful to guard the interests, rights and privileges of the electors of the North-west; but you destroy every guard, you throw down every barrier that stands as an obstacle to fraud and wrong-doing, and the result is that hon. gentlemen opposite have created a state of things under the law that will prevent a free and full expression of the opinion of the electors in that country. That is a condition that should not exist. It is not creditable to this House if it permits it to stand; and it was an indignity to this House, that such matters which specially concerned its own rights and privileges and the representation of the people there should have been dealt with primarily in the Senate and not in this House of Commons. It is clear to any one who takes the trouble to look at the law that the law is seriously defective, that the amendment suggested by the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin) should be made, and that full opportunity should be given to have as full and complete a voters' list in that country as can be prepared under the circumstances, and that an honest and fair opportunity should be given to the people to elect those candidates whom they prefer.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I think the importance of the subject is such as to justify me in calling the attention of the House to it for a few moments longer, although I am free to admit that the hon. gentleman who has just preceded me (Mr. Mills) has presented it quite as forcibly as I can hope to do, and I only plead as an excuse for my observations the great importance and serious character of the Bill before the House. I am absolutely certain in my own mind that if hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House would give time and attention to the question before it for a few moments, they

would all agree that injustice has been done. I am not going to discuss the ancillary point, as to whether the Minister of the Interior was or was not responsible for the change made. He said he was not, and we accept his denial. We start out with the fact that an Act was passed ten years ago for the preparation of voters' lists in the North-west Territories. The circumstances of the country are exceptional, and every hon. member will at once recognize that it was rather a crude scheme which was proposed and suggested, but still it was one which practically worked pretty well. The Minister of the Interior pledges his own experience in the House and his responsibility as a Minister, that the Act passed ten years ago worked passably well in two elections and that he for one never heard any complaint about it.

Mr. DALY. About the preparation of the lists.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The House will understand that my hon. friend (Mr. Martin) is simply seeking to put the Act in the same position as it was when the Minister of the Interior said it worked so well. The Act vests arbitrary and extraordinary powers in the enumerators. An opportunity is given to those persons whose names are omitted, or to those who think names are improperly on, to go to that enumerator and to have the omitted names put on or the wrong names taken off. There is large room even there for arbitrary and improper conduct on the part of the enumerator. There is large room for partiality and bias and prejudices to exhibit themselves. There is room there to make a list which may favour one side much more than the other. But, there was a clause inserted in the Act as it existed before the amendment which was intended to prevent, if possible, and to overcome that evil. That clause was, that if anybody was improperly struck off the list who was a duly qualified voter he could on election day take the oath that he was qualified, and be entitled to vote, even if a partisan enumerator left him off.

Mr. SPROULE. You cannot do that in any part of Canada.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) My hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) is right, but the hon. gentleman will see that the Electoral Franchise Act of the rest of Canada was not applied to the Territories, that a special law was made for these Territories alone, and that that law as it formerly existed, while vesting extraordinary powers in the enumerator, had one security to the qualified voter, namely, that if his name was by accident or design omitted he could on election day vote on taking the oath. Now, why was that provision struck out? The Government did not advise that it should be struck out; nor did the Government bring a Bill to this House and ask that it should be struck out.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

It was not discussed in the House of Commons, but an amendment—not setting out what the object of the amendment was—but simply mentioning among the clauses that were to be repealed “clause 4” was inserted by the Senate. No human being unless he followed the legislation of this House most closely, would ever discover what the object of that was. He would have to get the original North-west Territories Representation Act, and the amendment, and read over section 44 to see what the clause was, which they were seeking to eliminate from the Act. Who asked the Senate to do that? Was there a petition from any one in the North-west Territories; there was none presented to this House. What right has the Senate—legal and technical right it may have had—to amend Bills passed by this House providing for the representation of members here? I submit it is not fair that Bills which pass this House providing for representation in this House, should be amended in the Senate; unless it is on occasions where some important omissions have been made and they are solicited to do so by the Government or by some person promoting the Bill. This amendment was slid in and no one knew anything about it. But we need not discuss by-gones here to-day. The question is: That a great evil having been committed are we prepared to remedy it? The hon. gentleman (Mr. Daly) asks us to assume that all the enumerators will do even-handed justice. He knows well, and every member of this House knows, that of the two or three hundred revisers appointed to revise the lists throughout Canada, with all the security given by the fact that many of them are judges and lawyers, it takes an immense deal of time and money to make even an approximately accurate list. In the North-west Territories you have no revision at all, but suddenly, after the writ is out the enumerator is asked to make a list. He posts that list. One of his friends goes to him and asks that his name should be put on, and he can arbitrarily refuse to do it if he likes, or he may tell the man he will do it and when the man turns his back, he does not do it. There is no security to the voter. There is no court held, no means of compelling the enumerator to put it on. The one and only safeguard the electors had was, that if their names were omitted by the enumerator, they could go to the polls on election day and by pledging their oaths exercise their right to vote. The Minister of the Interior says that that provision worked admirably well, and he challenges criticism upon the practical working of that Act. I am willing to accept his statement that the Act as it did stand worked practically fairly well, but what we are seeking to do now is to put back that safeguard and put the Act where it was before the Senate foolishly amended it, we propose to restore the security to the electors which they

formerly had, and which they are now deprived of. If hon. gentlemen find that the Bill proposed by my hon. friend (Mr. Martin) has the unanimous endorsement of the North-west Assembly, then I say the last vestige of opposition to the proposal should vanish. Why, Sir, I hold in my hands a resolution which was moved in the North-west Assembly by Mr. Insinger, which after reciting all the circumstances calls attention to the fact that this Act, passed in 1894, practically made the voters' lists final as fixed by the enumerators and excluded from the right of the franchise every man whose name was not on that list two days before the election. The resolution gives the following reasons why the Act as it now stands does not offer the same safeguard to the rights of electors, as the voters' lists in the provinces do. It says:

And whereas such lists of voters do not offer the same safeguards to the rights of electors as do the voters' lists in the provinces, inasmuch as,—

- (1) They are necessarily hurriedly prepared by enumerators between the time of the receipt of the writ for election and a week before the day of polling;
- (2) The time allowed to electors or their agents to ascertain if their names are on such list is, taken in connection with the distances generally to be travelled in the Territories, and with the fact that no fixed residences are appointed for such enumerators, insufficient for the purpose;
- (3) The enumerator is absolute judge of the right of an elector to be on such list, and he can put on or strike off names till within two days of the polling day, without notice from or to such electors;
- (4) There is no appeal from the decision of the enumerator, either to a revising officer or to a judge.

After giving these cogent and to my mind unanswerable reasons why the amendment made by the Senate is an unfortunate amendment which should be rectified at the earliest possible moment, the resolution winds up with the following:—

Therefore, in the opinion of this assembly it is desirable that the "North-west Territories Representation Act" be further amended so as to either adopt the system provided for in the "Territories Election Ordinances," or to bring into effect the provisions regarding voters' lists in the "Electoral Franchise Act."

That system of enabling a man to vote on election day by pledging his oath when his right to vote is challenged prevails in other provinces outside of the North-west Territory. In the province from which I come, in all the local elections, if the right to vote of any duly qualified elector is challenged, he can, by taking the necessary oath, poll his vote, and it has been found to work practically very well. The neighbours all around know whether the man is qualified or not and if he perjures himself he can be punished. In this case, Sir, you have the whole North-west Assembly, irrespective of

politics, invoking the aid of this House to restore to the electors of the North-west the rights and privileges which they possessed before the Senate amendments took them away. My hon. friend (Mr. Martin) has proposed a Bill to carry out that wish. I was glad to hear from the remarks of the Minister of the Interior, that he has not yet made up his mind to oppose the Bill of my hon. friend (Mr. Martin), that he has not made up his mind yet, that he will not restore to the electors the privileges and rights which they possessed before. It boots not, Sir, to cite the fact that in Manitoba, as the hon. gentleman said, or in Nova Scotia, as another hon. gentleman said, there are evils existing in the electoral laws. We have nothing to do with that. If wrong was done elsewhere, it does not justify wrong being done here; two wrongs do not make a right. We are dealing with the fact that a grievous wrong has been committed—a wrong capable of being used by improper officers to such an extent as to almost disfranchise a majority of the electors in any one district. It is a wrong that would not be tolerated in any part of Canada outside of the North-west Territories, and, if I know the men there, from what I have seen of them, they are not the men to tolerate it, either; and when we have the whole North-west Assembly entering a public protest against that wrong, and asking Parliament to remedy it, I say that it is time that we should rise to the occasion, irrespective of party feeling or party affiliation, and determine that the wrong shall be rectified at the first opportunity. My hon. friend from Winnipeg (Mr. Martin) was called to order for threatening to obstruct the business of this House unless this were done. His words were stronger than the rules of the House justified, but nobody doubts that the action he proposed to take would have been justified by the facts. Is it not absolutely intolerable that four districts which send members to this House should be absolutely and entirely in the hands of the nominees of the Government? Why, Sir, the fact only needs to be mentioned to excite horror, surprise and indignation; and I am satisfied that hon. members, if they calmly and coolly consider the matter, will repeal the ill-advised action of the Senate, and place the electors of the North-west in exactly the same position they were in before the Act of 1894 was passed.

Mr. DAVIN. Mr. Speaker, some days before the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin) arrived here, and before I had any knowledge that he intended to move in this matter, I went to the Clerk and gave him a sketch of a Bill dealing with this matter; and as soon as he told me that the Bill was prepared, I gave notice that I would move for leave to introduce it. I think, Sir, that a great deal more has been made of this than there was any reason for.

Mr. MULOCK. What direction does your Bill move in?

Mr. DAVIN. It moves in the direction of repealing the legislation of 1894 and 1895, and reviving the legislation of 1886. My hon. friend from Winnipeg was most unjust in the strong attack, as it seems to me it may be called, which he made on my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior. If ever a man was innocent, my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior was innocent of introducing this clause. After I have calmly laid before the House what the law was, and how the change came about, I rather think the House will see that a great deal more has been made of this matter than was necessary. My hon. friend the Minister of the Interior was quite right in saying that in 1887 and in 1891, the law, as it was passed in 1886, worked well. In my own constituency I did not hear a single complaint against the working of that law. But that was not the case in some other constituencies. In the constituency of my hon. friend from Eastern Assiniboia (Mr. McDonald), I have been told by him and by others, 107 names were sworn on the list improperly. In 1894 certain gentlemen from the North-west who took an interest in politics, and were strongly impressed that a wrong had been done by those unscrupulous persons swearing themselves on the list, urged that a change should be made in the direction which the reform of the law took in 1894; and an amendment to that effect was placed in my hands when the Bill of 1894 was passing through the House. I read the amendment at that time, and while I did not take such a strong view of it as is taken by hon. gentlemen who have spoken to-day, I came to the conclusion that it was undesirable to make such a change, and I did not move in the matter. I know I never brought it to the attention of the Minister of the Interior. That is all I know about it. When the Bill came down, it appeared that those gentlemen who were interested in the matter had moved in it in the Senate, and the change had been made there. Now, Sir, the change that was made is simply this—that instead of a man having the power to go on the day of election and make an affidavit that he has the qualification entitling him to vote, he can have his name put on that list up to two days before the election, by appealing to the enumerator, should it prove not to be there.

Mr. MARTIN. I beg pardon. There is no such provision. It is quite impossible to get his name on the list unless the enumerator is willing to put it there.

Mr. DAVIN. I think my hon. friend is wrong. Up to two days before the election he can appeal to the enumerator, and have his name put on the list.

Mr. MARTIN. Suppose the enumerator refuses?

Mr. DAVIN.

Mr. DAVIN. My hon. friend does not understand the men in the North-west Territories. No enumerator there would behave in that manner. I quite agree that a critic, looking at the legislation as it is, might very properly see ground for alarm; but, knowing as I do the districts and the people, and the public criticism under which the enumerators would act, I do not apprehend any such dangers as the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) and the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) anticipate; if I did, I would have moved in this matter before. But, Sir, there are persons in the Territories who do think there is some danger, and I grant you that a check on the enumerator has been taken away. Under the circumstances, I am inclined to think that it is not worth debating in this House for five minutes. I do not believe that the change which my Bill and that of the hon. member for Winnipeg contemplate will affect a single vote in any constituency. But if there is any feeling on the eve of election amongst any portion of the community—I do not care what side of politics they belong to—that a check on the enumerator had been taken away and that somehow the elector was put in a worse position than he was in before, it is not a matter we should quarrel about in this House, and the best way is to get rid of all cause for alarm.

Mr. MULOCK. I congratulate the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) on the tone of his remarks, and I only rise now to supplement something that fell from the lips of the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies), and I would ask the attention of the hon. Minister of the Interior for one minute. It appears that the Bill complained of was passed through this House without much, if any, publicity. I think we may admit that its conditions were not known to the public intended to be affected.

Mr. DALY. Is the hon. gentleman referring to the Bill or to the Senate amendments?

Mr. MULOCK. I am speaking of what became of the Senate amendments.

Mr. DALY. They came down in the day time and were discussed in the day time.

Mr. MULOCK. I am not referring to anything which occurred in the House. What I say is that the people of the North-west Territories learned nothing of this proposition until it was incorporated in the statutes, and we have evidence now that the people of the Territories are in favour of a return to the old law, or, at all events, against the continuance of the present law. The opinion in the North-west Territories is against the law of 1895. That is proved by the unanimous resolution of the North-west Territories legislature, and also by the remarks of my hon. friend from

West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin). It is probable also that if other hon. gentlemen representing the Territories were to give the results of their knowledge of public opinion, they would corroborate what has been said by the hon. member for Winnipeg. My hon. friend from Queen's has suggested that, under the circumstances, it is the duty of the Minister of the Interior to place no opposition in the way of the measure proposed by the hon. member for Winnipeg. I go further. I think it is his positive duty—not a merely negative one—to make this a Government Bill. It was through the Bill which the Minister of the Interior introduced that the law got tangled up as it is, and it is his duty, as a member of the Government, to adopt this proposed legislation with the view of having the law framed so as to meet public opinion in the North-west Territories. We all know that a private member can scarcely expect to get a public Bill through this House, and I would venture to say that despite all a member can do, there is not the slightest chance of a public measure introduced by the hon. member for Winnipeg, or, for the matter of that, by the hon. member for West Assiniboia, becoming law. The only way by which this wrong can be redressed is by action on the part of the Government, and I therefore rise to suggest to the Minister of the Interior that it is the duty of the Government to undo their mistake by seeing that the proper safeguards are secured to the electorate before the election of 1896 comes on. If they do less than that, they will fail to do an imperative duty devolving on them. This discussion, this waste of public time, occasioned by hasty legislation, is an illustration of the manner in which, of late years, important measures affecting Parliament and affecting the public has been allowed to go through this House. We have seen, every session, important legislation put through at the last days of the session when there was scarcely a quorum present. We have seen millions of dollars voted away on bonuses. We have seen most important pieces of legislation put on the statute-book when but a small percentage of the people's representatives were here in Parliament.

Mr. McLENNAN. They should be here.

Mr. MULLOCK. I admit that, but the circumstances are such that many hon. gentlemen find it impossible to remain there. I was not one of the absent, because I took exception, in 1895, to the very clause which has been the subject of discussion to-day.

Mr. DALY. I want to relieve the hon. gentleman from any responsibility on his part, and other hon. gentlemen on that side from any responsibility on their part, through absence from the House. These amendments were agreed to one month before the session closed. The session did not close until the latter portion of July,

and these amendments were agreed to in June, one month before the session expired, and, according to the records of the House, every member of the Opposition must have been present, because they all voted on a division. There was, therefore, no snap division by the House.

Mr. DAVIES. How is it, it was not known?

Mr. DALY. I do not know. It is for you to explain that.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman never explained.

Mr. DALY. I had not the opportunity. I do not know that I was in the House when the Bill went through.

Mr. DAVIN. I spoke to Sir John Thompson on the subject, who had charge of the Bill.

Mr. DALY. I was absent from the House at the time.

Mr. MULLOCK. No; the hon. gentleman was in the House and took part in putting through the amendments from the Senate. This House prorogued on the 22nd July, and the Bill was put through on the 26th June, that is twenty-three days before prorogation. The hon. gentleman will remember that the session of last year was called at probably the most inconvenient period that could have been selected. It was called at a time when we should have been proroguing instead of convening. In the month of June, the attendance was slim, and the early part of July there were many days when scarcely a quorum was present. Towards the close, there were times when there were not over twenty members present out of the two hundred. While there was not such a limited attendance when these amendments were passed, still, the attendance was very small, indeed, and the law which got embodied on the statute-book had not the sanction of the majority of the people's representatives in Parliament. It was unknown to the people who were to be affected, and certainly a most irresistible case has been made out for the repeal of this measure.

Mr. MARTIN. I desire to say a few words in reply to what has fallen from the hon. Minister of the Interior, because he resents the suggestion which I made that he is to blame for the law as it now stands. If only such matters as occurred in 1894 were in issue, I would be quite prepared to accept his statement; but my charges against him were not based on what happened in 1894 alone, but upon the fact that this amendment was brought to his attention last session, in 1895, when he was asked to make this wrong right. He himself was then obliged to introduce a second Bill to this House in order to correct some trifling errors in his Bill of 1894, because,

strange to say, the Bill of 1894, while providing that no one could get his name upon the list on election day, provided that notices should be stuck up in the polling division notifying the electors that they could apply to have their names put upon the voters' lists, even on the last day, so that the hon. gentleman was obliged, on account of this inconsistency and error in his 1894 Act, to come again in 1895 and ask to have the change made. It was only when the Bill came up for discussion, and only upon the third reading of it, that members on this side learned of the change that was made in 1894. And a very strong appeal was then made by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) to the Minister of the Interior to right the outrage that had been perpetrated. More than that, I went to the hon. Minister in his seat and discussed the matter with him and urged him very strongly, as a matter of fair-play to the Liberals in the Territories, not to insist upon this change in the old law. But he took a firm stand, and said it was the policy of the Government to insist upon the Act as it had been amended. So I think the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) was not justified in finding fault with me for putting the case against the hon. Minister as I did. The hon. Minister assumed the responsibility of the change at that time, and he defends it to-day. And for what purpose? What other purpose can there be than that I suggest? It is admitted, it must be admitted by everybody who considers the matter, that, under the law as it is at present, it is possible for the most gigantic frauds to be perpetrated in these elections. As I have said, it is possible for the Government to elect every member for the North-west Territories in the next general election, through the operation of this changed law. The hon. Minister, of course, repudiates the suggestion that he intends to do any such thing. If he has no such intention, why, then, does he take the power to do it? He offers only one reason, and that is that, in 1891, under the old law, certain frauds were perpetrated. If that is all, let him make some change which will right the wrong he speaks of, without taking the power to inflict this great wrong upon us. Surely, he can remedy one without causing the other. Let the hon. Minister take any course he likes, but I am going to protest, as I said before, against the Government taking into their hands the power they have under this Act. And I hold the hon. Minister of the Interior wholly responsible for it. I think I was quite justified, after the stand he took in 1895, in assuming, as I did, that his action in 1894 was taken advisedly, so that the House would not understand the change proposed. He says that the amendments were made in the Senate without his knowledge. I accept his word upon that point. But, when those amendments came before the House, surely, as a

Mr. MARTIN.

matter of fair-play, he should have explained to the House what the changes were. He stated that he had explained the changes to members from the North-west Territories, but, when I pressed him for the name of any hon. member to whom he had explained these changes, the only name he could give was that of the hon. member for East Assiniboia (Mr. McDonald), who has not had a word to say in defence of the changes then made. I could not believe that the hon. member for East Assiniboia would suggest this change. For what interest could he have in the elections? As I said before, he has been discarded by his party, he is of no further use to them. He made a very vigorous fight for the nomination, but he failed. Now, if it be true that, before these changes, outrages in the way of men falsely swearing their names upon the lists, is it not an astonishing fact to find that the legislative assembly of the North-west Territories, in their local elections adhere to the system we have abandoned? Under the law of the Territories any person can get his name on the list by going on election day and swearing that he is a British subject and is otherwise entitled to vote, just as, prior to 1894, a person could do in Dominion elections. It is hardly necessary for me to refer again to the absurd and childish argument of the Minister of the Interior in support of his plea that this change would do no harm. His argument was that the old law worked well, and, therefore, the new law would work well. The hon. gentleman must surely think there is neither sense nor reason in this House. In effect, he says that there is no difference between a list that means nothing and a list that is final and binding. When a list is made up which binds nobody, who cares what becomes of it or how it is made up. But if, in the meantime, you change the law so that the list, instead of being, as the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) says, a mere list for convenience, to save time on election day, and make that list final and binding, surely you effect a complete change. You could perpetrate any fraud you liked in 1887 or 1891 in keeping men's names off the prepared lists, and we did not need to care, because we had privileges under the Act which countervailed all that wrong. But, if you attempt to perpetrate a fraud in 1896 which the Act gives you the power to perpetrate, we have no protection. The only course of safety is to have this vile iniquity purged from the statute-book. The hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) says this Bill cannot pass. Well, Mr. Speaker, I hope it will pass. The hon. member for North York appeals to the Government in favour of the Bill. We tried that in 1895. But in 1895, unfortunately, when we first learned of this wrong, the Government business was done, and we had no chance of emphasizing our appeal effectually. We are in a different position at this time, Mr.

Speaker. I do not care whether my hon. friend's (Mr. Davin's) Bill passes or whether my Bill passes; but I ask and demand of the Government of the day the righting of this wrong. As I have already said, if they have no intention of doing us this wrong, let them relinquish the power to do it. I make the demand at the instance of the people of the North-west Territories. They are alarmed about this matter, and they have shown their alarm in the clearest possible way by a resolution passed by an assembly which, as I said before, is composed largely of Conservatives. The hon. member for West Assiniboia will agree with me in that. It is true that, among the members of that assembly, are the Liberal candidate for Alberta and some other Liberals. But I know a great many of them, and I think I am quite correct in saying that there is a considerable majority who are supporters of the present Government. Mr. Haultain, as I said before, the Premier, is the Government candidate in Alberta; and these gentlemen with one voice have condemned this outrage in language as strong and as clear as any that I have used to-day. They have pointed out the possibility of great wrong being done, and they have asked to have the law changed back into its old form, or else into their local Franchise Act, but it makes no difference for the purpose of the people which is done. I may say that I got a letter this day from a member of the legislative assembly urging me not to overlook this matter, to be sure and bring it up, and endeavour if possible to have the wrong made right. I again say that if this House does not at this session change that law, the prediction of the hon. Minister of the Interior will, no doubt, be fulfilled in the elections which will take place in 1896, and there will, no doubt, be four members returned supporting the Conservative party in the North-west Territories. I have no doubt about it, it is too clear for argument. I do not think that the Liberals would put up candidates, I do not think we will be able to find four men foolish enough to risk \$200 under circumstances such as these. The Conservatives will get every seat, and possibly by acclamation. But, Mr. Speaker, if they will give us a fair chance up there, if they will repeal this iniquity and give us an equal chance with them in the election, I think the issue will be different. I may be right in my prediction that we will get the four seats, or the Minister of the Interior may be right in his. But there will be some equal chance for us, there will be some opportunity for a fight; whereas under this Act we have no chance and no opportunity. As I said before, it will be entirely useless for us to attempt to fight under the circumstances. Therefore, it is my duty, as the only representative of Liberal opinions, or the nearest representative to the Territories of Liberal opinions, to demand in this House

that a change be made. While the hon. Minister of the Interior may take the stand, and his colleagues may support him in it, that he is going to take into his hands this enormous power for fraud, I doubt very much whether the members in this House supporting the Government on their general policy, will support them in any such outrageous proceeding as this. If there is any possibility, under the rules of the House, of bringing the matter to a vote, I shall certainly obtain a vote of the members upon this question. I hope when the occasion comes hon. members will see that the people of these four constituencies in the Territories have a fair chance to go to the polls and deposit their ballots, whether they happen to be in favour of or against the Government of the day.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am not going to prolong the discussion which my hon. friend from Winnipeg (Mr. Martin) has initiated, although I feel bound to say that I have failed to hear one single argument from the other side of the House in the slightest degree justifying the assumption of the monstrous power—and I use the word advisedly—which the Government have, without the real knowledge of the House, taken to themselves. The thing smacks of fraud of the grossest possible description. But what I want chiefly to call the attention of the House to, is this: As I understand it, this confusion has arisen, or the ignorance of the House has been caused, in no small degree, by the very mischievous practice which prevails in our legislation of repealing a clause by number, without giving full details of the clause that is repealed. I have over and over again protested against that practice in this House. I hold that it is the most slovenly possible legislation, when we are dealing with important subjects like this, to say you repeal such and such a clause, number so and so, of such and such an Act. Not one man out of fifty in the House knows anything about the matter in general when it is introduced in that fashion, still less, when it is introduced in the shape of an amendment from the Senate. Such a practice ought to be prohibited, I think, by a rule of this House; at any rate, the Government in particular ought to be exceedingly cautious not to allow any legislation which passes through their hands, to be conducted in such an exceedingly slipshod fashion. I hope and trust that my hon. friends will get an opportunity of testing the sense of the House on this question, because I myself am of the opinion that if this thing had been fairly presented to the House, the members on both sides would have refused to accord to the nominees of the Government any such power as that which appears to be given to them; and I trust that my hon. friend will take exceedingly good care that a test vote be

obtained on this subject before we are much older.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HIS EXCELLENCY'S SPEECH.

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

Mr. O'BRIEN. Whatever results may follow as to the political future of this country from the events which have recently taken place in this House and in this city, I think it will hardly be denied that this result will, at any rate, be clear, that a very serious blow has been dealt, and a very disastrous effect has been produced upon the political morality of the people of this country, as well as upon the condition of things existing in this House. I do not think that at any time, within my knowledge of parliamentary affairs, at any rate, have we had the standard of propriety by which we are supposed to be governed, so entirely lost sight of as it has been lost sight of during the time that has elapsed since the 9th of this month. But be that as it may, we have now arrived at a condition of things, in which, I think, it is possible to adopt a different method of action. We have at last a Government, a Government such as it is, a Government composed of gentlemen who are not only entirely at variance with each other, whose only bond of union is a mixture of personal motives and party interests—it is hard to say which predominates—who profess allegiance to a chief, who certainly presides but does not govern, and whose term of office, even in the precarious position which he now occupies, is entirely dependent upon the convenience of those gentlemen, who, I think, at some loss to his own reputation, after their conspiracy against him, he was weak enough to take back into his councils. I say we have a Government, although it is not after all constitutionally constituted, according to the theory of the Minister of Finance, because it still lacks that important functionary, a Solicitor General. But I suppose the advent to its councils of the gentleman who was last admitted to it, must be taken as sufficient to countervail all the other defects. Now, Sir, I am not anxious to throw any discouragement upon the hon. gentlemen who seem to imagine that they have gained a great deal in the change that has been affected; but I think they will find the results will be far other than they expect. Sir, the Conservative party in this country—I speak rather for a very considerable proportion of that party which includes in it some of the best men of that party—have come to the conclusion that the policy which

has been in power for so many years, is one which they can no longer support, and one which they will no longer support. The very fact that the man who is most responsible for the condition of things to which they object is the man who is brought in to strengthen it, is a reason why they will not give it the support which, under other circumstances, they might give it. Sir, I say we have a Government, and having a Government which has, I believe, a numerical majority in this House—although, I think, that numerical majority, if it were measured by the degree of confidence which they have in the hon. gentlemen who occupy the Treasury benches, would be exceedingly small—but having that Government, perhaps, it would be as well for us now to undertake the business for which we were called together. Especially when we consider that the period of time during which this Parliament can last, is short, and that the people of this country will shortly have an opportunity to pronounce upon the policy of those who now occupy the Treasury benches, and as the position of things, I think, is now pretty well understood throughout the country—perhaps, I say, it would be just as well if we were now to undertake the business for which we were called together. If we were to allow the bones of our grandfathers and great-grandfathers to rest quietly in their graves, and if we were to shut up our scrap books and abstain for a time from the delectable enjoyment of one side proving the other to be entirely disloyal and the other side proving their opponents to be entirely dishonest—if we were to abandon that entertaining process for a time, we might get down to the business for discussion. When we come to consider the Address we find in it a great deal of what may be termed padding. I do not think there is anything in the condition of the North-west Police or in the condition of the Indians to call to special reference in the Address, except for one or two reasons; either, in order to make what I call padding, or else to adopt the extraordinary hypothesis of the Minister of the Interior, and announce to the House that these were the personal opinions of His Excellency, and it was the right and proper thing to put them in the Address. One would be surprised at that, were it not for the fact that we have had so many extraordinary specimens of the hon. gentleman's ideas of ministerial responsibility, it is hardly possible to tell what next they might suggest. Those hon. gentlemen could not make up their minds with respect to the great question to which reference was made by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) the other day. If they could not make up their minds on a matter of that kind, where not only great constitutional questions were involved, but where the life or death of a man was in issue, we could hardly expect that they would be able to decide anything

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

more important than the condition of the Indians and the North-west Mounted Police. I was exceedingly pleased to hear the leader of the Opposition speak as he did in regard to the North-west Mounted Police. I have taken a good deal of trouble at different times to follow the actions of that body and to ascertain their condition and how far any changes were required, and also how far it was possible for the country to dispense with their services. But I am quite convinced of this, that what is so often considered as a reason why the North-west Mounted Police should be reduced in number and the expense of the force thereby diminished, namely, that this reduction might be achieved because there is an increase in the population of the country, is no reason why the force should not be maintained, at all events, at its present strength. The very fact that there is a more numerous body of white settlers, constantly brought into intercourse with the Indians, is a strong reason why the police should be maintained at their present satisfactory state of efficiency. There are roaming over the prairies immense herds of cattle. These are constantly encroaching on the Indian reserves, and were it not for the watchfulness of the police, who are constantly patrolling the country, we should have conflicts between cowboys and Indians over the slaughter of cattle which actually takes place and which would inevitably result in very serious disaster. If a white man's family were in a state of starvation we would not think it a very serious offence if he took a steer or a calf to feed them, and if we are prepared to make that excuse for a white man, surely we must judge still more leniently the Indian, who having been deprived of his source of food supply by the destruction of the buffalo naturally looks upon cattle roaming over the prairies as the most convenient substitute for that food supply which he has lost. The presence of these cattle on the plains has undoubtedly introduced another and important element of danger. The hon. gentleman for Wellington (Mr. McMullen) in the course of his remarks said something respecting the industrial schools, intimating that there had been a great deal of extravagance. Perhaps there may have been. I think if the secret history of the transactions in the North-west from the time of its first settlement was printed and published, it would be found that many things have transpired that would bring the blush of shame to the cheek of every one who has had anything to do with such transactions, and it would make many members of the Conservative party regret what has been done. However that may be, I think at the present time the affairs of the North-west, especially with respect to the Indians and the police, are fairly and honestly administered, and so far from there being a surplus of money or extravagance practiced with respect to the industrial

schools, I consider, having had the pleasure of visiting some of them last season, that the only difficulty was not that they had too much money to spend but that they had too little. There may have been extravagance in some sections of the department, but I am not speaking of that matter; at all events so far as the schools are concerned and anything connected with the children and their teaching and anything connected with the direct administration of the schools themselves, want of money rather than too much money has been the trouble in those cases. Another paragraph of the Address which I was exceedingly pleased to see was that relating to the militia. The leader of the Opposition seems to think that there was a lingering taint of jingoism in that very modest and innocent paragraph. So far from that being the case, I hold that His Excellency the Governor General might have very properly, acting fully in accord with the sentiments of the people of this country, have expressed in positive terms, and not merely by implication, the wish, the desire and the determination of the people of this country to stand by the Empire under existing circumstances and under all dangers that might possibly arise. The arming and re-equipping of the militia is a matter that must have been undertaken under any circumstances. It was just as necessary a year ago as now; it has been necessary any time during the last ten years. So far as that is concerned, it is doing what any nation under the same circumstances would do. Something was said to indicate the idea that the extremely delicate susceptibility of our American neighbours might be offended if we adopted measures for self-defence. It has been suggested that such action might be looked upon as a menace and threat. But we must consider the classes with which we have to do in that country. The leader of the Opposition said, and I hope he said truly, that the educated classes, the poets and historians, and I think he might have added the bankers and moneyed men, were opposed to war. But unfortunately we know from experience those are not the classes that govern the republic of the United States, and the mere fact that President Cleveland thought it worth while to endanger his European reputation, to bring his country to the very verge of war in order that he might accomplish a political or party purpose, shows how great and imminent the danger was. If there was no great population to be influenced by such considerations, it would not have been worth while to issue the measure. View the matter as you will, either as a serious attack on his part on Great Britain, or view it merely as a political operation, the result remains the same—the fact of having done so proves that a large and important element can be influenced by such considerations, and that fact in itself is one of great danger to this country. If we have to take into consider-

ation the feelings of those men to whom the leader of the Opposition referred, we would be perfectly safe in making reasonable preparations for defence, because we would be doing what they would approve and what they themselves would do under similar circumstances. So far as the other element, what we may call for the sake of distinction the jingo element, is concerned, I think people of that class are as likely to be discouraged by the fact that we are prepared to meet invasion, as encouraged by allowing them to entertain the idea that they can have a holiday excursion into Canada without danger to themselves and without loss. Dealing with this class of people, whose opinions, I think, only were concerned in this matter, I say it is far better, and far safer, and far more wise, and far more prudent, to let them understand that any machinations on their part will be met, not only by determination, but also by preparation and by resolute and determined action. It is far better to do this than to lead them to suppose that we are either so indifferent or so careless, or so cowardly, that they can walk over the frontier at any time it pleases them. As regards that view of the case we are perfectly justified in what the Government proposes, and we need not be at all uneasy about making all reasonable and necessary preparations. The hon. member for South Huron (Mr. Macdonald) said a good deal about the condition of the militia, and he quoted as his authorities the report of General Herbert some four years ago, and the address delivered by Col. Davis a few months ago. Well, Sir, I think the report of the General was rather severe, and I think the remarks of Col. Davis altogether unwarranted. The General undoubtedly was in the main correct. He was correct so far as our arms and accoutrements and equipments are concerned; but I think he spoke too strongly altogether so far as our organization is concerned. And as regards my friend Col. Davis, he is one of those gentlemen who always take a pessimistic view of everything. He is exactly the opposite of my hon. friend from Ottawa (Sir James Grant), who views everything through the most roseate spectacles. Col. Davis is a man who has always taken the greatest possible interest in the active force of which he is a distinguished officer, but I venture to say that if any one applied to Col. Davis's own regiment the remarks which he has applied to the force in general, he would resent it most bitterly. I say further, that if you were to tell Col. Davis he could not put his regiment in the field fully fit for service in the course of three days, he would think very badly of himself and his men. His remarks must be taken with a great deal of allowance as being a view of the case which I do not think the condition of things justifies. But, after all, it just comes down to a question of expense, and this House must be pre-

Mr. O'BRIEN.

pared to expect a very large demand from the Government. I am only afraid that the Government will not ask as much as is necessary to accomplish the object, and as much as I believe the people of this country are willing to pay. The arms and equipments of the active force will alone cost a very considerable sum, but what will be a still greater expense, if the country is to be defended, will be the necessary outlay upon field artillery and heavy guns. If the work is to be done effectively, done, I hope, once for all, at any rate during the lifetime of the present generation, it can only be done at a very considerable expense, and one which this country must be prepared to bear. I am glad to learn from gentlemen on the Opposition side of the House that any reasonable and necessary expenditure in that direction will be heartily supported by them. I may say, Sir, that so far as the expenditure of the Militia Department is concerned, so far as it has recently been concerned, so far as it was concerned under the gentleman whom I am sorry to see is leaving that department just as he was beginning to learn something about it and showing an ability to deal with it: so far as the expenditure is concerned under his regime, there has been no expenditure of which this country need complain. I do trust that in the expenditure of the large amount which will be necessary there will be exercised the prudence which we have a right to expect. It is rather a matter of congratulation to us that in dealing with this matter we shall be dealing with the Imperial authorities, and there can hardly any question arise as to whether we are paying the right amount for anything we purchase from them because all these things are regulated by order, the price of everything is known, and it is scarcely possible that anything improper can be done in carrying out such arrangements. Now, Mr. Speaker, with regard to the question which has occupied so much the attention of this House and for which we are specially summoned to meet, I have also a word to say. Sir, I am not oppressed by these difficulties and perplexities that seem to weigh so heavily upon the minds of certain hon. gentlemen. Viewing the matter as I do, my course is perfectly clear. I do not want a commission to tell me how to act, for I have quite determined that I will not act. My ground is this: I say that we are not called upon to settle this question. I say the question has been settled: settled by the authority which has the right to settle it, and I say it is our duty to leave it in the hands of those to whom it properly appertains. And when I hear so much about the rights of minorities, I meet that by saying that minorities have no rights except such as they enjoy in common with the rest of the fellow-subjects of Her Majesty. It is this theory about the rights of minorities which gets us into a great deal of our troubles and difficulties.

What justification is there, in dealing with the people of this country, for treating them and legislating for them as though they were divided into two hostile camps or into two different communities? What right have we, by our legislation, to recognize either a Roman Catholic population, or a Protestant population, or a population of any denomination whatever. I say that the minority, either in Manitoba or Quebec, have no rights except such as they enjoy in common with all the rest of the Queen's subjects. Speaking of the province of Quebec, we have thrown in our teeth the old worn-out argument which has been refuted a dozen times over: that the Protestant minority in the province of Quebec, as regards the subject of education, stands upon the same footing as the Roman Catholic minority in the province of Ontario. Well, Sir, it is hardly necessary to again refute that statement, because every one who has taken the trouble to investigate the subject knows that the so-called separate schools in the province of Quebec are not sectarian schools, and there would be no hardship were every Roman Catholic in Quebec compelled to attend these schools. But it would be a totally different thing if that Protestant minority were compelled to attend what are called the public schools in Quebec, because then they would be compelled to accept sectarian teaching, which, of course, they would not be willing to do. It is just as well to dismiss from our minds that argument which has been so often made use of. I deny that there is any sort of analogy between the Protestant minority in the province of Quebec as regards education, and the Catholic minority in the province of Ontario. Taking my own argument that minorities have no rights other than those I have referred to, I say it would be a gross violation of their rights as British subjects to compel the minority of Quebec to attend the public schools there. It is simply as a matter of justice that they are allowed to have schools in which the dogmas of the Roman Catholic Church are not taught. There is no privilege about that. But when you ask us to give the people of Manitoba, or of any other province, the right to have sectarian education apart from that of the rest of the population, then you at once violate the rule, and you do not give a right but a privilege. There is no question of rights concerned in it. You establish a privilege. The trouble that lies at the bottom of our difficulties is this granting privileges under the name of rights. There is no right about it. We all stand here on the same footing as regards the law, and the constitution, which declares that there shall be no state church, and no interference with the religion of any one. Then the last resource is, that they fall back upon the constitution. Well, Sir, to use a slang expression of modern times, it makes me tired to hear the Minister of Finance talk about the

constitution. Why, there is not a single principle involved in the constitution which that gentleman and his colleagues have not violated over and over again, when it suited them to do so. I should like to know how they could more signally have violated the constitution in regard to the constituency of Cardwell? They kept, for three years, a man sitting in this House who had the promise of an appointment in his pocket, and the vacancy kept open for him. Was not that a most direct violation of the Independence of Parliament Act? Why, if the man had held the office, and at the same time sat in the House and enjoyed the salary, it would be merely extending the thing a little further, because the principle in both cases was virtually the same. They talk about the constitution. They can regard the constitution when they have a political object to serve, but otherwise the constitution weighs very lightly upon their consciences. Holding these views, Sir, I have no difficulty in dealing with this question. I have no difficulty in saying that I will oppose remedial legislation. I do not agree with my hon. friend on my right (Mr. McNeill) that a commission is necessary, because I say I am not going to act; and if I am not going to act, I do not want a commission to tell me how I ought to act. I am relieved from that perplexity. I say this question belongs to the people of Manitoba, and I am not going to take it out of their hands. But I do agree with that hon. gentleman in opposing any attempt on the part of the majority in this House—if it proves to be a majority—to force on the people of Manitoba legislation which they say they will not accept. On this question there will be ample opportunity for further discussion when the Bill comes down, if it ever does come down, as I suppose it will. There seems to be considerable difficulty about that Bill. We know enough about it to know that it is not yet settled. Here we have been sitting since the opening of the House on the 2nd of January, and yet we are told, on semi-official authority, that the Bill is not yet settled—that the details are not settled. Why, Sir, the whole value and interest of the Bill depends on the details, and if the details are not settled, you might as well say that there is no Bill. Whether we shall have another ministerial revolution before it is brought down, we cannot say; it is hardly worth while to speculate on what may happen in the future. As the hour for adjournment is approaching, I do not propose to deal any further with this question. What I say is simply this, that, being perfectly free as to my course with regard to the question, and my resolution being to oppose any measure of legislation on the subject, I am not troubled with perplexities about commissions or anything else. I see no difficulties in my way. I shall simply oppose any attempt on the part of this Government

to interfere with Manitoba in the exercise of its constitutional rights. Holding this view, I shall oppose to the uttermost, as fully and as strongly as the rules of Parliament will permit, any attempt on the part of this House to force legislation upon Manitoba.

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

After Recess.

Mr. TARTE. Mr. Speaker, the first ministerial crisis of the season, being at an end, we are now invited to answer the Speech from the Throne. I beg to assure my hon. friends opposite that they are under a great misapprehension when they state that we are disappointed at the result of the skin-deep troubles that have taken place recently between the Ministers. The Government, as it is to-day, is, from an electoral standpoint, the best Government that could be desired. We like to have them as they are. The country will not suffer long at their hands. They claim that they have been greatly strengthened by the last crisis. The hon. member for St. John (Mr. Hazen) used the words "immensely strengthened." Well, Sir, I hope that, at any rate, they have been strengthened to such an extent as to be able to go on with the affairs of Canada. We have not been convened as a Parliament to witness the quarrels and wrangles of the Ministers. Two new Ministers have been added to the Administration—Sir Charles Tupper and Mr. Alphonse Desjardins. They are not new men; they are known. Sir Charles Tupper is an old parliamentary hand. It was rumoured that he would do us the honour to test the feeling of the city of Montreal. We heard that we were going to lose the services of the eminent gentleman who now represents Montreal West (Sir Donald Smith), and that Sir Charles Tupper would run as a candidate in that division. I am sorry to say that he has changed his mind. Montreal West would have been a fair ground on which to test public opinion. It is a great division, inhabited by bankers, business men, and labouring men. He has changed his mind; or rather his friends, I suppose, have decided that it was not safe for him to test the feeling of the city of Montreal; and they have been prudent, because I venture to assert that Sir Charles Tupper would have been defeated just as badly as Sir William Hingston was defeated. He has gone to another province, his native province—to Cape Breton. He has gone where, if I may be allowed to say so, his friends hope that coercion may be used. Coercion seems to-day to be the first plank in the platform of our ministerial friends. In Cape Breton there is a strong element of workmen employed in the mines, and our hon. friends rely on coercing those men. I

Mr. O'BRIEN.

hope that their object will be defeated. Mr. Alphonse Desjardins, as I have said, is not a new man; he was for years a member of this House. My hon. friend from Pictou, the ex-Minister of Justice (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) said the other day that Mr. Desjardins had been chosen because he was a member of the Senate. My hon. friend has a short memory. Mr. Angers' portfolio was vacant since the 8th of July last, and during the intervening six months it was offered to at least half a dozen of people. It was offered to Mr. Chapleau repeatedly by the First Minister himself, and even by the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Haggart) who, in former days, did not think so much as he seems to think now of Mr. Chapleau. The portfolio of Mr. Angers, having been declined repeatedly by Mr. Chapleau, was offered to Mr. Flynn, a member of the Quebec Administration, who also declined. It was then offered to Mr. Pelletier. Those three gentlemen are not members of the Senate. Mr. Pelletier declined, under circumstances of which we are all aware. And if the county of Charlevoix is not represented to-day in this House, it is because it was left vacant in order to supply a constituency in which Mr. Pelletier might run as a Minister. But the results of the election in Montreal Centre and Jacques Cartier upset all his calculations, and so he, too, declined that portfolio. I venture to assert—and I do not think I will be contradicted by any one of my hon. friends in the Conservative ranks—that in the whole province of Quebec there is not a single county in which a member of this Administration could be elected; and that is the reason why a member of the Senate has been chosen to take the vacant portfolio. But we have been told by the ex-Minister of Justice (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) that the recent troubles had been productive of this good at least, that remedial legislation was now safe. I must admit that when I heard the statement I was a little surprised. I had heard it stated so many times by Ministers of the Crown, members of Parliament, I had seen it stated so many times in the ministerial press that remedial legislation was safe, that I was surprised to hear it had become safe only since the return of the seven members of the Administration who had gone out on strike. Is it because remedial legislation has become so safe that they returned? Is it because Mr. Desjardins was tricked into entering the Government? Because I hear, and I would like to be told that I am wrongly informed, that when Mr. Desjardins accepted the portfolio, the seven members—six of whom have since returned—were then out. He was tricked into entering the Cabinet, and being in it when the six bolters came back, he stayed in. Is it on account of that fact that remedial legislation is safe? Nobody will believe it. Outside those walls there is nobody who believes the statement which was read to

the House the other day. Outside this House people say : It is not because the portfolio of Mr. Angers was vacant that the seven Ministers went out. Certainly public opinion says : It is not because Senator Desjardins entered the Cabinet that the six bolters came in after him. What is believed outside these walls is this : We know what took place. A great crisis, a great danger, came on the Government. The Ministers had made up their minds that the First Minister was not a fit man to lead them, and they had arranged among themselves that Sir Charles Tupper was to be their Premier. A caucus was to be held, the whole thing was arranged ; but there appeared in the Toronto "Mail" one day the warning that nobody could tell what might happen ; and the bolters and their friends read up their parliamentary law and discovered that perhaps His Excellency might feel constrained to send for the leader of the Opposition. Then they made up their minds to swallow everything they did not like before ; they made up their minds to take back just as much water as was necessary—and then they are back again. Previous to that crisis they had lost the confidence of their friends. That confidence they have not yet recovered. I shall not trouble the House with reading many newspaper extracts, but I cannot resist the temptation to read an extract from a newspaper of Montreal, which is known as the most important French paper in the province of Quebec, and it is a Conservative paper called "La Presse." After having expressed its satisfaction that foreign countries do not pay more attention to our internal affairs, because, if they did, they would look upon us as a lot of savages, that newspaper goes on to say :

Sir Richard Cartwright made a speech, or rather, he made a lecture on parliamentary law, which places in its true light the conduct of the strikers in the Cabinet. Sir Richard pointed out the base conduct of those politicians who, after preparing the Speech from the Throne, went back on it, and gave up their positions, at the very moment when that Speech and the measures it propounded were about to be discussed by Parliament. This matter, however astonishing it may be, has caused no astonishment to "La Presse." We have always expected some coup of this kind from Hon. Mr. Foster since the matter of the French Treaty. The Hon. Mr. Foster has gone back on the Speech from the Throne that was prepared with his co-operation, precisely as he went back on the French Treaty prepared by his Government. He has gone back on Sir Mackenzie Bowell just as he went back on Lord Dufferin and Sir Charles Tupper. In these two matters Hon. Mr. Foster has shown himself as he is, and what he is is not either agreeable or pleasant.

"Rejouissant" is the French word.

Those who have followed him and conspired with him are no better than he, and have no more claim upon public confidence.

The "Catholic Register" also published an

article on the subject, from which I will extract only a few words :

Will Sir Charles Tupper—for he is now virtually Premier of Canada—attempt to pass a Remedial Bill ? Will he stake his success upon that issue after what has taken place within the Government ? With the intentions of the Government henceforward honest men can have little concern. They are discredited, in a ridiculous position before the country. It would be absurd to expect anything definite from them. This is the view we expressed last week, and all that has occurred since has helped to confirm us in our opinion. They have lost every claim to confidence, every right to public trust. They have lost all the instincts of statesmen, even of average politicians. The only characteristic that still clings to them is their dogged pertinacity to retain the fruits of office. We do not apply these remarks to all the members of the Government, for we know not for how long or how short it may be until another crisis arises as important as the one now announced over. But the deserters of last week are, for the moment, in control of the policy of the Conservative party, and, as they are men unworthy of confidence, and equal to any species of political villany it is they who must now be judged and condemned.

Is it possible that we may have another ministerial crisis in a short time ? We know nothing about it ; but I hope, for the sake of the country, that these forebodings may not be realized. I hope that in a few days we shall have before us the ministerial measure which has been the cause of so much trouble, I mean the School Bill. Before entering upon the discussion of the school question, I wish to say a few words as to the position in which we are placed, politically. We are a confederation, composed of seven provinces. Under the Confederation Act there was a division of powers. The Dominion was allowed certain rights and powers, while certain rights and powers were given to the provinces. The provinces received the exclusive right to deal with educational matters, with the proviso that, under certain circumstances, where the minority were dealt with in an unjust manner, the central power might interfere. Sir, I hold it to be a dangerous heresy to say, as the ex-Minister of Justice (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) has said, that on the Manitoba school question the Dominion Parliament has as much right as the Manitoba legislature had. I say again that that is a dangerous heresy, and, in the name of the province of Quebec from which I come, I protest against that doctrine. It would be a most dangerous doctrine to assent to here. The Dominion Parliament have rights in the matter—there is no doubt about that—but those rights are limited, as they are conditional. Applying these principles to the Manitoba school question, I shall proceed to an examination of the question itself. From 1870 to 1890 there existed in Manitoba a separate school system. I am not here to say that that system had given entire satisfaction. But that does not affect

the case as it is before us to-day. In 1890 the legislature of Manitoba, by a nearly unanimous vote, abolished the then existing system and adopted certain school laws. The minority protested. There was an immediate request for the disallowance of the Bill. My hon. friend from Provencher (Mr. LaRivière), Archbishop Taché, and Mr. Bernier, who was then superintendent of education, signed a petition for the disallowance of the Bill. Complaints were made. That petition was not entertained, those complaints were not listened to; and, on the 19th March, 1891, the then Minister of Justice made a report concluding with the recommendation that the school laws should be allowed to go into operation. In 1892 the legislature of the North-west Territories adopted ordinances which, as a matter of fact, practically disposed of the separate school system. The minority, especially the religious leaders of the minority, protested and asked for the disallowance of the Bill. The whole episcopacy of Canada joined with them and asked for the disallowance of these ordinances. Complaints were made, petitions were sent in. These complaints and petitions were not entertained, and again the then Minister of Justice made a report concluding with the recommendation that the ordinances should be allowed to go into operation. In 1894 the legislature of Manitoba enacted other school laws, or rather, amended its school laws of 1890 to give them greater strength. Again, Sir, there were petitions for the disallowance of those laws. Petitions were sent by the Roman Catholic Episcopacy throughout Canada. They were unanimously signed. I must immediately state, speaking for myself, that I did not sign them. I had previously signed another petition asking for disallowance, but there was something in these petitions with which I could not agree. Then we had a report from the Minister of Justice deciding that those enactments should be allowed to go into force and operation. The Government took upon themselves to consent that these laws should come into force. I do not say that they are responsible for the entire policy followed by the local legislature of Manitoba, but they are to a certain extent responsible for the laws that are to-day on the statute-book of that province. They had full power to disallow those laws, but they did not do so. If the Government had any desire to use that right of disallowance, they could have availed themselves of the advice of the Supreme Court. When Mr. Blake, in 1890, offered to the House the resolution that was acted upon in 1891, he explained in the House that he did not intend to apply his resolution only to the right of appeal, but the object was that the law which might be enacted later on, could also be used so as to allow the executive Government at Ottawa to apply to the Supreme Court for advice in case of dis-

Mr. TARTE.

allowance. The resolution read as follows:—

It is expedient to provide means whereby, on solemn occasions touching the power of disallowance, or of the appellate powers as to educational legislation,—

The words "touching the exercise of the power of disallowance" are in the resolution, and the law which was enacted in 1891 is based on that very resolution, and covers the very same ground. The Government, then, if it had any desire to exercise the right of veto, could have availed themselves of the law which they themselves had placed on the statute-book. They thought that it was better to allow these laws to go into operation, and the right of veto was not exercised. And yet, Sir, on how many occasions of less importance has that right of veto been exercised. I am always surprised when I hear members of this Parliament express their disgust, if I may so speak, at the exercise of the right of veto. Not very long ago, even the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) called for the exercise of the right of veto in the matter of the Jesuit Estates Act, and he was supported by a certain number of members of this House, and by a large body of public opinion. Yet that Jesuit Estates Act was altogether a provincial matter. The rights of nobody had been taken away. The province of Quebec had simply disposed of moneys which were its own, as it thought proper to do. But now we are told that the exercise of the right of veto would have been a radical remedy. That is true, but I want to know if what we are asked to do to-day, is a less radical remedy. Suppose that the School Act of Manitoba had been disallowed, we are told that it would have been enacted again. That may be true, but the people of Manitoba, the majority and the minority, would have had time to think over the matter. The laws might have been enacted again, they might have been amended, probably they would have been amended. But by not disallowing those laws, this Government consented that they should come into operation, and they have been in operation for the last six years. We have allowed the province of Manitoba to establish within its own territory a school system. We have not disallowed their laws, and they are now in full force and operation. We have done more than that, we have referred the question to the courts of justice, and what has been the result? The result is that the laws enacted in 1890 have been declared constitutional by the highest court of the Empire. Therefore, we are face to face with that combination of things, a condition that we cannot ignore. The laws have not been disallowed, but they have been declared constitutional, within the province of Manitoba, by the highest court in the Empire. Sir, I cannot help thinking, I cannot help saying, referring

again to the right of veto, that if the legislature of the province of Quebec had taken away the rights of the English minority in that province in the same way, that law would have been disallowed. But I do not wish to recriminate, I only wish to state the facts as I believe them to be true. Sir, the position, as I have described it, does not alter the main fact that the minority has a grievance. The Privy Council, the highest tribunal of the Empire, has admitted and declared that the minority has a grievance. That court has left with us, as it was bound to do, the responsibility of dealing with the matter, and applying a remedy. What has the Government done to remedy that grievance? Immediately after the judgment of the Privy Council was received, they issued their first remedial order, on 19th March, 1895; and a month after that order was issued, there was a ministerial crisis. What more did they do? They issued on the 27th of July a second remedial order, and it was so inexplicable to the public that when the Postmaster General visited the good old city of Quebec and was interviewed by a newspaper reporter, and asked if there was any truth in the rumour that a new remedial order had been issued, he denied positively that he had knowledge of any remedial order. Nevertheless, the remedial order had been issued. Parliament was called on the 2nd of January. The Speech from the Throne was read by His Excellency. In that Speech it is pointed out that a Bill for remedial legislation would be submitted. A second ministerial crisis followed that announcement. I have stated these facts because I have come to a conclusion, which I am sure is shared by all persons who have carefully thought over the position. All these crises, all these vacillations on the part of the Government have led the people and the government of Manitoba to believe that they had with them the majority of the Ministers of the Crown. There has been crisis after crisis, there has been difference after difference between Ministers of the Crown. What did these hon. gentlemen say outside of Parliament? We all remember the celebrated speech which the ex-Controller of Customs, whom I am glad to see in his seat, delivered on 12th July last. He stated to a newspaper not very long ago that before delivering his speech he showed it to the Prime Minister.

Mr. WALLACE. I deny that statement.

Mr. TARTE. I read it in the papers.

Mr. WALLACE. I never saw such a statement in the newspapers.

Mr. TARTE. I read it myself; nearly every member of the House read it. It was published in the Toronto "World," I think, and not contradicted until to-day. At all events I am very glad, indeed, for the sake of the

Prime Minister to know that the Controller did not show the speech to him. But the speech was made, and the hon. gentleman remained a member of the Administration, as Controller of Customs. The hon. gentleman visited Halifax and attended a large Orange convention, and there also he made a speech. At that time he was Controller of Customs, and the speech was to the same effect as that which he delivered on 12th July. The hon. member remained a member of the Administration. What took place during the recent elections? The hon. member for North Ontario (Mr. McGillivray) made a speech at Cannington on 19th November last, at which the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Agriculture were present. The present member was asked what course he would take on the school question. His answer was:

All I ask is to let me first see the measure before I am asked to support it, before I am asked to say whether I will support it or not. Let me know first what the Government proposes. I do not believe they have yet agreed as to what their policy is going to be.

His colleagues were present, and they did not say a word. What did the hon. gentleman say at another meeting held while the Ministers were in the riding? He was present at a meeting on 26th November, at Longford Mills, at which Mr. Edgar was present. I read from the report:

"You are the Government candidate. Will you support the Government Bill?"

Mr. McGillivray.—"I will not be pledged, and the Government is not pledged."

The people and government of Manitoba were led to believe, as I have said, that they were receiving support and co-operation at the hands of the Dominion Government. Sir, what was the campaign conducted by the "Mail" during the last six months? The leader of the Opposition and myself have been every day accused of wishing to coerce Manitoba. The Manitoba government, thinking they were supported by members of the Administration, and encouraged by them, made up their minds to appeal to the electorate. I was surprised to hear the Minister of the Interior make light of the elections in that province. It seems to me that a responsible member of the House should not, on such an important occasion, make light of the verdict just rendered. We are face to face with a grave crisis. The people of Manitoba have practically pronounced themselves a unit on this question. Certainly, I do not agree with the verdict which has been rendered, but whether we agree with it or not, the verdict is there. In what position are we placed to-day? The laws of 1890 and 1894 have not been disallowed, and they have been declared constitutional. The majority of the people of Manitoba are in arms against interference from this Parliament; the

minority are clamouring for redress and for justice, and the public opinion in this Parliament and in Canada is deeply divided. This is the result of six years of vacillation and unsound policy. What are we going to do? The Government has announced a policy. The hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) has said what is true, that the Government have not yet agreed on the Bill they are going to propose to this House. They know it, and their friends know it. The Parliament of Canada has rights, but those rights are limited and conditional. We have no precedent to guide us in this important action; the only precedent we possess is one by which we cannot be guided, but one by which we can be, to a certain extent, enlightened, and that is the New Brunswick school case. I will recite in a few words some of the circumstances of that case. In 1871 the New Brunswick legislature adopted certain school laws. In the session of 1872, Mr. Renaud first brought the question before the House of Commons on a motion for documents, and several speeches were made. Among the speakers were Sir John Macdonald and Sir George Etienne Cartier. As I said: we cannot be guided by this case altogether, but certain opinions which were expressed then may be of great use to us now. Sir John Macdonald was asked at the time to disallow the law, and he said:

As the officer primarily responsible on such subjects, he could only say that he had taken uniform care to interfere in no way whatever with any Act passed by any of the provincial legislatures, if they were within the scope of their jurisdiction. There were only two cases, in his opinion, in which the Government of the Dominion was justified in advising the disallowance of a local Act: First, if the Act was unconstitutional, and there had been an excess of jurisdiction, and second, if it was injurious to the interests of the whole Dominion. In the case of measures not coming within either of these categories, the Government would be unwarranted in interfering with local legislation. In the present case there was not a doubt that the New Brunswick legislature had acted within its jurisdiction, and that the Act was constitutionally legal and could not be impugned on that ground.

And further on he said:

If the legislation was bad, if it bore on them unjustly, that injustice pressed at the polls would force the legislature to do justice. They had, in his opinion, a just cause, for it was for the interest of education that, if a large body like the Catholics of New Brunswick desired a separate school system, they should have it, but it could only be obtained by working for it. An important body like that, holding the balance of power, could force upon the legislature a separate school system. They might not do it this session, but they could afford to wait, as the Catholics of Ontario waited, and the moment a law was secured, then they were protected by the provisions of the Confederation Act, and no power of the local legislature could ever deprive them of it. It would be a wonderful mistake in the Catholics of New

Mr. TARTE.

Brunswick, and they would be throwing away their case, if they upheld the Act lately repealed as being sufficient for their purposes, but it was a matter for them to decide, and it was not for Canada to dictate what the legislature of New Brunswick should do. The Government of the Dominion could not act, and they would have been guilty of a violent wrench of the constitution if, because they might hold a different opinion, they should set up their own judgment against the solemn decision of a province in a matter entirely within the control of that province. The constitution, which had hitherto worked so easily and so well, could not survive the wrench that would be given if the Dominion Government assumed to dictate the policy or question the action of the legislatures of the different provinces on subjects reserved by the British North America Act to those legislatures. Sir, I do not intend to be bound by the doctrine laid down in the speech I have just quoted, but in view of the great importance of the question we have to decide now, I thought it well to put the opinions of such high authorities before this Parliament. Well, the New Brunswick school question continued on. My hon. friend the Minister of Marine (Mr. Costigan) brought up a motion for the disallowance of the Bill and there was a vote upon it, but the first time his motion was not acceded to. The Government of the day headed by Sir John Macdonald and Sir George Cartier accepted the motion made by Mr. Colby, asking the legislature of New Brunswick to remedy the evil themselves. Time passed on and the legislature of that province declined to act. What took place then? In the session of 1873, my hon. friend the Minister of Marine (Mr. Costigan) brought up the question again and asked for the disallowance of certain enactments which had been made by the legislature of New Brunswick in 1872. His motion carried by a majority of 35 in the House, in spite of all the efforts of Sir John Macdonald against it. Although the Government had been ordered by the House to act, it refused to advise His Excellency that the law should be disallowed, and the whole question was referred to England. It is very interesting to-day to read the answer that was given at the time by Lord Kimberley in the name of the Imperial Government. The Imperial Government took a view which is scarcely credible at the present time. I will only read part of the answer which is dated "Downing St., June 30th, 1873." After having recited what took place in the House of Commons his lordship goes on to say:

That these Acts of the New Brunswick legislature are, like the Acts of 1871, within the powers of that legislature. That the Canadian House of Commons cannot constitutionally interfere with their operation by passing a resolution such as that of the 14th of May last. If such a resolution were allowed to have effect, it would amount to a virtual repeal of the section of the British North America Act, 1867, which gives the exclusive right of legislation in these matters to the provincial legislatures. That this is a matter

on which you must act in your own individual discretion, and on which you cannot be guided by the advice of your responsible Ministers of the Dominion.

Well, Sir, that is a pretty strong view of the powers of a provincial legislature, and it is the reason why I am surprised to see a man in the position of the Minister of the Interior making light of the verdict which has just been rendered by the people of Manitoba. As a French-Canadian, as one of the minority, I say that that verdict, and that the appeal to the courts of justice by which the laws have been declared constitutional, are the worst blows we have received. But, in spite of all that, the minority have a grievance, a great grievance, and we have to deal with it. Again, I ask, what are we going to do? The Government have told us that they are going to bring down remedial legislation. We do not know yet what that legislation is going to be. Nobody knows it; the Ministers themselves do not know it. What system of education are they going to give to the province of Manitoba? We in Quebec are having a great fight these days on educational matters; and, speaking with a full sense of my responsibility, and with a knowledge that my words will be reported, I say for one that I do not wish for the establishment in Manitoba of the Quebec system. Men of the stamp of Senator Masson and others, men of large experience, are trying, day by day, with the greatest efforts, and in the face of the greatest difficulty, to improve a system which has worked disastrously to our detriment. There is something good in our system—there is no doubt about that; but there is a great deal of bad also; and I appeal to any liberal-minded man, let him be a Conservative or a Liberal, to be a witness with me that our educational system in Quebec needs a great deal of improvement.

Mr. DAVIN. Explain.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Order. Go on.

Mr. TARTE. I am prepared to explain. I am just going to explain. I have no objections to questions being put to me either.

Mr. DAVIN. I did not say that hostilely.

Mr. TARTE. I am sure of that. We are here to discuss a most important question; we are here to discuss it freely; and, so far as I am concerned, I will not be coerced by any power under the sun of God to vote for anything of which I do not approve. We are going to legislate on a provincial question in this Dominion Parliament. We have an undoubted right to pass legislation. My hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, knowing the difficulties of this question, knowing the great interests at stake in Manitoba, knowing the great interests at stake in the whole Dominion, has asked for an inquiry.

He has been answered in a hostile spirit. He has been told that no inquiry is necessary—that all the members of this Parliament know everything about Manitoba. Mr. Speaker, I am in communication with the French population of Manitoba as much as any other Frenchman in this House. I have been a newspaper man for the last twenty years, and my paper has had and has today a large circulation among the French people; and I tell you one thing: give an inquiry, appoint a commission of this House; bring down before us the real representatives of the minority, and you will receive advice that will surprise you. The legislature of Manitoba has deprived them of their rights—there is no doubt about that. They had the right to separate schools and the right to the official use of the French language, and the legislature has deprived them of these rights. But, Sir, as I have said, we have been to a certain extent a party to that deprivation. You have allowed the laws for that purpose to go into force. By your own action, your own fault, those laws have been declared constitutional; and now we are called upon to make laws. This is the position; this is the real state of affairs. I ask any hon. gentleman who does not want to make of this question a vote-catching question: Is he prepared to say that he is fully equipped and fully informed to make a law for the legislature of Manitoba? Even if we were ready, even if we were fully informed, what have we to lose if we get a committee of the House? Have we anything to lose if on Monday next we appoint a committee of the House to inquire into this question? This Parliament has been convened to deal with the school question. By our appointing a committee of the House, the minority will not renounce any right which they have. The judgment of the Privy Council will still stand as it is. Have we anything to lose if we go on too quickly? I ask my hon. friends from the province of Quebec to think of the question? What is the position today? The people of Manitoba have expressed their determination to resist us; they have declared that they will fight to the bitter end any legislation we might enact. I think they have been wrong in doing so, but they have done so. My hon. friend the ex-Minister of Justice said the other day what is true; he said, the minority have waited very long, and you should not ask them to wait any longer. He is right in that; I quite agree with him. But I want to know if it is not just as sure as the sun shines, that if we pass a remedial law today, Manitoba will fight that law for years and years. For the last five years we have been litigating; we have been before the courts of justice. Now, suppose that a committee of this House, composed of members of both political parties, is appointed to avoid that dangerous conflict. This is the point which I desire to make. Suppose that all

parties are brought here before us to discuss their differences, what harm can be done? The work of that committee could be done in a month. In 1874 there was a committee of the House on the amnesty question. If I remember right, it lasted a month, and it gave satisfaction to all. Well, I call the attention of the House to the suggestion that I am now about to throw out. I do not intend to renounce any right that we now possess; the nomination of a committee of the House cannot injure anybody; and in my estimation it can greatly serve our own purpose, speaking from a Roman Catholic and a French-Canadian point of view. The Government are well aware—and I call the attention of my hon. friends from the province of Quebec to the fact—that they are going to be abandoned by twenty-five or thirty of their English-speaking supporters. A newspaper, which is in the secrets of the Ministerial party, said so a few days ago, and I am very much afraid that it said truly. Then suppose the Government brings down a measure, it will expect to have that measure carried by the vote of the French Liberals in this House. The Government is throwing upon our French-speaking population, and members of the House, a tremendous responsibility. The Government is dividing again this country on religious lines. What would be said the day after the remedial law was carried by the support of the French-speaking members of both political parties? The province of Quebec would be branded as desiring French domination. We would be accused of dominating Canada.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, no.

Mr. DUPONT. Do not be afraid of it.

Mr. TARTE. There are men who are not afraid of anything. I know that my hon. friend is a courageous man. I, too, am not afraid of it; but when it can be averted, let us endeavour to avert it. My hon. friend who has been in the political arena for years and who reads the newspapers of the other provinces must know very well that it has been for the last ten years, the war cry in the province of Ontario, especially that the province of Quebec is endeavouring to direct and dominate everything. The "Mail" especially has used its best efforts during the past ten years to prove that our province is seeking to rule all the others. I say again, if we can avert any such issue as that, is it not better to do so? If we can avert years and years of litigation, is it not better that we should do so? I would not say what I am saying to-day if, by the appointment of a committee of the House during this session, I thought that I was injuring any right of the minority, but, again, I ask my hon. friends from both political parties: What harm can be done? This Parliament has been convened to deal with the Manitoba school question. Why should we not take next month to deal manfully and courageously with it once and for all? What

Mr. TARTE.

harm could be done by bringing here together, under our eyes, the members of the Manitoba government and the representatives of the minority? We are after all in this case their judges of last resort. What harm could be done by having them here and trying to adjust all their differences? This question cannot be postponed. I am not one of those who ask to postpone it. On the contrary, I want to deal with it; I want this Parliament to deal with it, and we can deal with it during this very session. Let those who think that I am wrong consider the proposition that I am now making, before they decide. All the wisdom in the country cannot be on the one side. The ablest men sometimes make mistakes, and it seems to me that the proposition I am now offering is a good one. Some of my hon. friends may be tempted to make light of it. I beg them to reflect. The Government, deserted as they are, by a great number of their supporters in Parliament and abandoned by a large portion of their ordinary supporters out of Parliament, are unquestionably in a difficult position. I think that they brought the difficulty on themselves, but none the less they are in great embarrassment. They cannot bring down to the House a Bill which will satisfy the minority. Let my hon. friends in the province of Quebec ask themselves this question. The minority in Manitoba cannot do much if they have no money. Is this Government going to ask for money from the federal exchequer in order to equip and maintain schools in Manitoba? They will not do it. Is it in a position to oblige the Manitoba government to give money for the same purpose? Has it the power to do so? It has not. There are certain things our Government can do. It can pass a law which would not be enforced for years; it can pass a law dispensing Roman Catholics from the obligation of paying the school tax; it can pass some kind of a law. But would it not be better to bring the parties together and try to obtain from the Manitoba government the pledge that it will give to the minority the grant which the minority is entitled to receive, the money which it is necessary it should have. If the minority have no money, what can they do? We cannot oblige the province of Manitoba to give them a grant of money, and without a grant they cannot have schools. I may have spoken longer than I expected.

Mr. FOSTER. In the interests of clearness, may I ask my hon. friend a question?

Mr. TARTE. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. What does he propose that that committee of the House shall do? There are three things that it might do. To that committee might be referred a Bill. Or the committee might be instructed to prepare such legislation as the hon. gentleman thinks necessary. Or the com-

mittee might be appointed to investigate the matter and report to this House. I would like to know what is the hon. gentleman's thought, because he has not expressed it so clearly that we have understood what it is that he really means.

Mr. TARTE. I am quite prepared to give my opinion. Of course, I speak for myself alone. My own opinion is that a committee of the House should be appointed, composed of those furthest apart. They should not investigate the right to redress on the part of the minority, because that right cannot be questioned, in my opinion; it is absolutely certain that there is a grievance and that there is the right to redress that grievance. These points I would not ask any committee of the House to consider, for they have been already adjudicated upon. But the government and the legislature of Manitoba have adopted certain laws, and the Roman Catholics of Manitoba have complained of those laws, saying that those laws deprive them of such and such rights; they say that they cannot send their children to the schools because they are sectarian schools. This question is to be investigated. Let us bring the government of Manitoba, by its members, here.

An hon. MEMBER. Suppose they won't come.

Mr. TARTE. If they will not come, we will deal with them.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). Coerce them.

Mr. TARTE. It is useless to speak of coercion. It is a nasty word, and a nasty policy. The time has not come to use it, and I hope it will never come. I do not consent to believe that if this Parliament, which is the master of the position after all, invites these gentlemen, who have differences, to come before us, saying: Now, gentlemen, you have not been able to agree so far, what are the differences between you that the differences will not be arranged? The minority will state, officially, if I may say so, what they want; the Government will state, officially, what they can give, and what they cannot give. And if they cannot agree, we must judge, and then we can draft a Bill. There are important facts in this case, facts that although a Roman Catholic and in communication with representatives of the minority, I do not know all about. For I know, Sir—and I make the assertion upon my responsibility and upon my honour—that the minority are not united upon what the school law should be. My hon. friend the leader of the House knows that he cannot undo the school law which exists. He does not wish to do so, I think. The Government could not be permitted to do it, for the law was not disallowed in time, and it has been declared constitutional. If we

pass a law to-morrow for the minority of Manitoba, who can tell that a great number of people in Canada will not immediately address themselves to the Imperial Parliament and ask that that law be vetoed. My friends from the province of Quebec should think over the question before declining the proposition I am now making. Let them understand me well: I have the same interest as they have, I have the same feeling as they have, and I think that I may fairly claim that I have carefully and conscientiously thought over the question. A month of inquiry, not on the right of the minority for the redress of their grievances, but to get a just view of the facts and to bring those who differ together before the Bill is drafted, can surely do no harm. For, after the Government have come down with a Bill, it might be too late. What has the Government itself to lose by this proposal. They will have the hearty co-operation of this side of the House. We do not wish to make political capital out of this question. No political party has anything to gain by it, but Canada has a great deal at stake. We know that public opinion is profoundly divided; are we going to divide it more profoundly? Whatever may have been our opinions in the past, whatever I may have said or whatever my hon. friend the leader of the House may have said, the question is there confronting us. We are called upon to make a law, to make a law for a province upon a question of education, a question that belongs exclusively—as a cardinal principle—to the provincial legislatures. Who can say that in a short time the English minority in Quebec will not come here and ask that laws affecting education in that province be made by this Parliament. Sir, George Etienne Cartier, in 1872—I have not time to read his speech—warned the people of Quebec against the danger of causing this Parliament to interfere in a dangerous way with the school laws passed by the legislature. Mr. Speaker, I have expressed my views to the best of my ability. I do not know whether I have answered fully the questions put to me by the leader of the House, and if I have made myself thoroughly understood. I want an inquiry before a committee of the House during this session, and legislation during this session.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I had not intended to address the House upon this subject during the present discussion. The discussion has taken a pretty wide range, and, so far as the Manitoba school question is concerned, I thought that I could best express my opinion in the debate on the measure itself. But I feel forced to say a few words in this House to-night, owing to the peculiar circumstances of the case, owing to the peculiar features of the discussion, and the turn it has taken. I asked myself, while the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, was speaking,

is it true that he and his party, from the leader down to the youngest member thereof, and the organs of that party, have been creating, so far as they could create, and I am sorry to say with some measure of success, a feeling of doubt in the country as to the sincerity of the Government in the pledges they made to this Parliament and to the country? There is no longer any reason to doubt it. The hon. gentleman's whole speech is an assertion, that everything they have said was to mislead the public, and now he is face to face with a remedial measure, and he feels uncomfortable on that account. I do not under-rate that sentiment which he expressed, and the fear, if it be well founded, to which he gave expression, that it would be a misfortune from his point of view, if remedial legislation being introduced into this Parliament, it should only be carried by a French vote, and the cry would go up that there was French domination in this country. Sir, I hope there will be no reason for any such cry. Is that the fear of the hon. gentleman, or is it a fear that there is a crisis between him and his Ontario friends?

Mr. TARTE. Do not be afraid about that.

Mr. COSTIGAN. No, I am not afraid; nor am I afraid of the other result either, for the simple reason that we have given the best proofs of our sincerity. We have the hon. gentleman himself on record that he will not give his vote in such a way as that it may be construed into French domination, and that when that remedial measure comes up, he will be true to the ground he has taken in his paper, that this Parliament has no power to legislate. Sir, through his whole speech to-night can you point to any one thing, is there anything that you can gather from the remarks of the hon. gentleman to-night, to show you exactly where he stands on this question? Hon. gentlemen opposite now speak of a commission, or an inquiry, of summoning the local government and the minority there to come down here and give evidence before a committee. Very well. The point is that he thinks these gentlemen ought to be brought here in order to give us information. Surely he does not want any more information. He has had them running backwards and forwards for the past year in connection with his party. Those gentlemen have all the information they can need on that subject. Then he says, is this Parliament prepared to pass an educational measure for the province of Manitoba? They cannot do away with the school law. Whoever talked in this Parliament or in the country of doing away with the Manitoba school law? Not a member of the Government, not a member supporting the Government in this House, not a newspaper supporting the Government in this country ever spoke of doing away with or injuring the principle

Mr. COSTIGAN.

of the school law. Look at the judgment itself. Look at the means pointed out by the Privy Council by which to remedy that grievance. It says that the law need not be interfered with, that it is a good law, adopted to the requirements of that country, so far as its general principle is concerned, but that certain amendment might be made by the legislature itself, just sufficient to restore the rights of the minority in regard to separate schools, and that the measure itself would be as perfect as ever in its application to the majority. Therefore, on this point I think that the hon. gentleman has expressed a fear that is unfounded. Sir, I trust that we shall not divide on this question in such a manner as that it may be said that it has been decided by the province of Quebec, or by the province of Ontario, or by any other province; but I hope, if there is to be a division at all, that we shall divide as representative men, giving our votes conscientiously, in the best interest of our country, in the interest of peace, in the interest of the maintenance of the honour and dignity of our country under the constitution under which we live. If we divide upon it from that point of view, there will be no danger for the peace of the country, but it will be assured thence forward. The hon. gentleman quoted the New Brunswick school case. I would like to know from any hon. gentleman in this House, what parallel there is between the two cases. I would like to know what it has to do with the Manitoba case at all. Why, Sir, if I wished to quote the New Brunswick case at all, I would quote every word that was said upon it to strengthen my argument, and the ground I take now in the Manitoba case. The difference in the two cases is simply this, that in New Brunswick, the minority had enjoyed separate schools up to 1871, the schools were then taken away from them, and a system of common schools was established by the law passed that year. The minority who had enjoyed, for, I do not know how long a period before that, the privilege of maintaining their separate schools all through the province, felt they had been unfairly dealt with; they felt so because they believed their rights were guaranteed to them under the constitution. They thought the privileges they enjoyed at the time of Confederation would be continued to them, and when those privileges were taken away, they came to this Parliament. The hon. gentleman has quoted the Rt. Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald. He says that he might have quoted Sir George E. Cartier, and so he might. What did they say. They said they believed that the law was constitutional within the jurisdiction of that legislature, and that we had no right to interfere with it upon that ground. Their contention was supported by the Supreme Court of this country, and was confirmed by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, the highest tribunal to which they

could go. And that being so, we were thrown out of court, we had no case. That is not the case with Manitoba. The hon. gentleman quoted Sir John A. Macdonald on that question, and I dare say he quoted him a little further than he intended; but he went on to read where Sir John pointed out on that occasion that a minority might, as in New Brunswick, for instance, if such a case arose, exercise their patience, being a third of the population, and the time might come when the legislature there would give them their rights, and these once being given—and the hon. gentleman quoted those words, but he stopped very suddenly—these once being given, no Parliament could take them away again. It is because that very case did arise, as shown in the quotation which the hon. gentleman read to this House, that very circumstance did arise in Manitoba. In confirmation of the pledges given before 1870, the legislature of Manitoba, of its own free will, not by the coercion of the Dominion Parliament, not by outside pressure, but freely exercising its powers under the constitution, passed a law giving rights to Protestants and Catholics, in respect to religious instruction in schools, to a greater extent than they had in any other province. Those rights they enjoyed for 20 years until, unfortunately, men came into power who thought more of votes than they did of principle. They undertook to do, what? To do as they did in New Brunswick, establish a non-sectarian system of schools? Yes, if we are to believe the statement of the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin) they did undertake that, that was their policy. They believed that they could unite the whole province upon that policy. But in order to point out the bad faith of these hon. gentlemen carrying out their programme, let me call your attention to the facts. They did not establish a system of non-sectarian schools. They departed from that system. They began by declaring that the separate schools should disappear, and that they should be replaced by non-sectarian schools, giving no religious instructions whatever. But, Sir, when the strong Protestant sentiment—which I believe in this country is largely in favour of the recognition of God in the schools—when representatives of that sentiment came to Mr. Greenway and his government, he counted noses and said, I can tread upon the Catholic minority and deprive them of their rights, but I must give religious teaching in the schools of the Protestant majority, and he gave it. Sir, there is the difference between the two cases. The claim of the Catholic minority in Manitoba is based upon the rights secured to them under the constitution as interpreted by the judgment of the highest court in the realm. In New Brunswick the courts decided they had not those rights; and there is the difference. We have heard a good deal, too, about the commission which is talked of by the

leader of the Opposition. When that ground was first taken by the Liberal party I was surprised, because I believed that at that time the hon. gentleman was looking forward to final action, if necessary, by this Parliament in case of refusal by the Manitoba government, recognizing that this Parliament has the power and it is its duty to exercise that power for the relief of the minority. If not, why should there be any clause there? The clause was put there for a purpose. It was put there to satisfy the minority in every part of the country, a Protestant minority it was at that time, it has been changed to a Catholic minority now, but that makes no difference. I only wish to God it was a Protestant minority to-day that I might speak more forcibly and claim in thunder tones that justice be done, which I feel more delicate in asking for a Catholic minority. I say I thought when the hon. gentleman first enunciated that policy involving the appointment of a commission of inquiry, it was because he was not satisfied that a grievance existed and he wanted fuller information; but I soon found, that his party at least abandoned that position. I hope I will not be offensive to any hon. gentleman, but I will as a matter of duty state clearly what my convictions are, not from a desire to attack any hon. gentleman, but to state the matter as I understand it, and my observations are of course subject to correction. At that time, to speak of a commission was to throw the question overboard so far as the minority was concerned, it was to rely upon the legislature of Manitoba to redress the grievance and do justice to the minority. If the leader of the Opposition had a guarantee in his pocket and could produce it before this House, from the government of Manitoba, stating that in twenty-four hours from this time they would amend their law and re-establish separate schools, not acquiescing in the remedial order, I say that would be no remedy, that it would be no settlement of the case, that they could kick it aside three months afterwards, if they thought it had not worked well. There is only one way under the constitution to settle the question. I admit the gravity of it, and I admit that a great deal of ill-feeling has been created in this Dominion on this question, but the hon. gentleman himself must know that he and his party share a large amount of responsibility for that ill-feeling. The hon. gentleman states that even in Manitoba the minority do not know their position, they have not been represented here, they have had no one to speak for them, and the hon. gentleman added, that he is in communication with them. Now I can understand his position in regard to the people there. We can now better understand the hon. gentleman's action in his own province. The tactics followed by hon. gentlemen opposite were pursued because they saw not only on their own side of

the House a party split in two on this question, but they saw there was some difference of opinion between members of the Conservative members on this side of the House.

Mr. CASEY. Hear, hear.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The hon. gentleman says "hear, hear." No one ever disputed it. It is not likely in a large, strong and old party, such as the Conservative party, that on every measure we can agree unanimously to a man, but the party, as a party, the Government as a Government, has taken its ground on the constitutional question, and intends to stand or fall by it. That is plain enough.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Then the hon. gentlemen opposite do not want the Manitoba legislature to remedy this grievance?

Mr. COSTIGAN. We have expressed over and over again how anxious we are that the Manitoba legislature should remedy it.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman said it would be no use, that they would kick it over in three months.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Yes, in view of the answer we got. I will tell the House why we got that answer, why Mr. Greenway and his government are so strong in refusing to abide by the judgment of the Privy Council. It is because they find in the Parliament of Canada a party of men who will rise and say that the rights of this Parliament should be sacrificed. Is there any Canadian representative man who will stand up and say that the rights and constitutional powers of this Parliament should be second to those of any other Parliament in the country?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It will depend on the subject.

Mr. COSTIGAN. It will depend upon votes—and that matter is unfortunately being too much considered in this question.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) All the votes in the House could not give you jurisdiction.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I will not take up much of the time of the House, but when I am interrupted I will take my time, and when the interruption ceases I will proceed. I do not want to be personal, I do not want to be cruel to hon. gentlemen opposite. I do not want to go back and give a full statement of the history of the New Brunswick school question. I will, however, ask the hon. gentleman who sat down (Mr. Tarte) why he did not give the full facts, because at that time he was working with us, if I remember rightly? At that time he was a Conservative, he was one of the men from Quebec.

Mr. TARTE. I supported Sir George Cartier.

Mr. COSTIGAN.

Mr. COSTIGAN. At that time the hon. gentleman did not belong to the Liberal party; but he found in 1875 the policy had been reversed, and we got kicked out from this Parliament by the Liberal party. He was, however, fighting side by side with me on that question.

Mr. TARTE. With Sir George Cartier.

Mr. COSTIGAN. But the hon. gentleman did not choose to give all the facts. This is not a question of legislation upon separate schools for Manitoba, and from the first day I have repudiated that argument. The hon. gentleman asks, how are you going to deal with this question, how are you going to establish separate schools there? The hon. gentleman says that certain conditions existed before 1890 when the Act was repealed, and he was not going to say they were satisfactory. I agree with him on that point, because we have nothing to do with it, and it has no bearing on this question. It is not a question of re-establishing separate schools in Manitoba; it is not a question as to whether separate schools should be re-established there, or whether separate schools are best for this Dominion, or as to how far the hon. member represents the ideas of the people of the province of Quebec on education. I think he will find that he does not represent the majority of the people of Quebec so far as educational institutions are concerned, because I was present myself in Chicago when the highest compliments were paid to the educational system in Quebec by men of authority. But that is aside from the issue. The hon. gentleman need not have gone into that at all. This is simply a question of right. In this instance it may be separate schools or the giving of religious instruction. Whatever it was, that was taken away, and that which was taken away must be given back. Call it separate schools, religious teaching or whatever you like; it is a right given to the people of that province under the constitution, no more and no less. I trust in any case that the minority will not demand its pound of flesh, that their demands will be within the lines of the judgment and will not exact the last farthing. What this Parliament can do and what the country will expect hon. gentlemen on both sides to do is, not to appoint a commission or to bring down people from Manitoba here. The hon. gentleman and his party have already indicated that the session is limited in time, they have already indicated to us that we will have to fight for supplies necessary for the country's business, and if there is a commission of inquiry, then a remedial Bill cannot be introduced. No doubt the hon. gentleman (Mr. Tarte) wants to go to the people of Quebec and make good his promise that no remedial measure would be carried this session. I am sure, even if he were able to make good that promise, given perhaps in good faith, but evidently

given as it now appears without full knowledge of the facts, he should admit that his judgment of the Conservative party and the Conservative Government was too severe, and that the Conservative Government is made of different materials from those of which he thought it was composed. To-day he finds the Government in this House standing on the pledges they made to the country. Hon. gentlemen opposite may be able to defeat us and change from that side of the House to this, but let them defeat us like straightforward men. Let them defeat us fairly on the policy we have introduced, but do not let them use a two-edged sword as they have been doing. Do not let them have their friends hunting in pairs throughout this country. Do not let their Catholic friends go to a Catholic district and tell the Catholic people: "Don't trust that Tory Government, which is under the influence of the Orange lodges, for they will never give you remedial legislation." Do not let their Protestant friends, as they are doing down in the east now, go to the Protestant people and say: "Are you going to stand up and see the Tory Government coerce that little province of Manitoba? Rise in your might and come to the rescue of Manitoba." That is the kind of attack the Conservative Government have had to meet when they ventured to stand by the constitution. Well, Sir, the Conservative Government will fight the battle out, and the country will judge—not to-day, perhaps, but before long of their policy. Before long the verdict of the people of the country will pronounce that the Conservative Government are doing their duty in the best interests of the country, and in the best interests of peace and harmony between the provinces and the Dominion. Sir, if you establish the fact that the constitution is not going to be recognized, if you establish that the majority in a province has a perfect right to rule within its limits whether it be constitutional or not, if you establish the right of a majority in any province to override a clause of the constitution that is there to prevent injustice being done, then, Sir, you destroy all sense of security in this country, all sense of security on the part of the humblest as well as the highest individual in the land. There is one safe course for the Government and for this Parliament to pursue. That is: stand by the constitution whether you be Liberals or whether you be Conservatives, stand by the constitution and keep faith with the people to whom these pledges were given, whether these people be Protestant or Catholic. That is the best way to accomplish the highest needs of the country. That is the best way to restore peace, and that is the best way to bring about the most desirable and lasting results. Mr. Speaker, just before I sit down I want to say that on this school question there are a large number of the people of Canada who are easily mis-

led. They are people who have the highest desire to cast their vote and to give their support in favour of what is right, but they have been misled by the false cries which have been raised throughout the Dominion. One cry is that we are taking Manitoba by the throat. Well, Sir, it is not dignified, nor do I think it is in the interests of the peace of this country that hon. gentleman should—even if they don't care for the Bill which shall be brought down, or even though they oppose that measure—it is not, I say, in the interest of the peace of the country that they should raise such a cry. No good can be done by the utterance of such sentiments by any hon. gentleman in this House. Their effect is to fan the feeling of opposition and antagonism that we know exists in Manitoba, but which, I believe, is limited even in that province. Sir, I have as much confidence in the people of Manitoba complying with a reasonable measure that will be passed here, as I have that the Liberals in this House will themselves acknowledge that the pledges given to the people by the Government were given in good faith and will be carried out.

Mr. LAURIER. Mr. Speaker, although I have already spoken in this debate, I will claim the indulgence of the House to be allowed to give a few words of answer or explanation.

Mr. SPEAKER. I am afraid the rules of the House do not permit the hon. gentleman to speak again.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I move that the House adjourn.

Mr. LAURIER. Sir, I never concealed from myself the difficulties which were in the way of the Government in arriving at a settlement of this question which now lies in their hands. On more than one occasion I have tendered my humble advice to the Government that for the purpose of carrying on the great duty that was in their hands, they should issue—I will not say a commission of inquiry—but that they should have an inquiry into the facts, whether by commission, or by a committee of this House, is not material. Sir, I am sure there is no man in this House, whatever may be his proclivities in favour of separate, or common schools, who does not desire to approach this question so as to give substantial justice to whom justice is due, so as to preserve the constitution of our country; and above all things so as to maintain peace and harmony among all the races that live in this Dominion.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. LAURIER. Very well, we are all agreed upon this. Sir, what is the situation at the present time? We have a most peculiar constitution. We have, you may say, a most arbitrary constitution in one way. Upon an important question, upon the ques-

tion of education, the sovereignty of the province is abridged and there is an appeal to the Government at Ottawa given to the minority which feels aggrieved. This is an exceptional disposition in the constitution. I do not know that in all the federal constitutions in the world you will find such a provision as that. I was, I believe, among the first to point out that this provision had been introduced at the instance of a gentleman who at that time represented the Protestant minority in the province of Quebec, Sir A. T. Galt. Of course the provision was not introduced for the province of Quebec alone but for all the provinces. The minority in the province of Manitoba has taken advantage of that provision in the constitution and has made an appeal. It is now settled by the judgment of the Privy Council, the highest judicial authority in the realm, that the minority has a grievance which gives them the right of an appeal, which gives them the right to come to this Parliament and to put their grievance before it and have it decided. This is what has been decided by the judgment of the Privy Council. Now, Sir, when this judgment was rendered, I am free to say as my hon. friend (Mr. Davies) said yesterday, that it was a surprise to the majority of lawyers in Canada. I must say that on that point I differ from my hon. friend. The judgment of the Judicial Committee did not surprise me, because coming from the province of Quebec myself, and being more familiar perhaps than other persons in other provinces upon this question, it seemed to me that there could be no decision given other than rendered by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council on that occasion. This disposition was placed in the law for a certain purpose, that is to say, that if in matters of education the minority feel oppressed by the legislation of the majority, they can come to this Parliament to seek redress. Now, Sir, that is the law and that is the present position of affairs. What, therefore, is the Government to do? What is the position which they have to take? That is the question at issue. I say to my friends opposite—they know it as well as I do—that the one thing which they have to overcome in the way of remedial legislation is the great aversion which in this country, after some twenty-five years experience of our constitution, exists against having local legislation reversed or annulled by the supreme power of the federal parliament. That is the feeling which exists upon that side of the House and upon this. It is not so much a question of separate schools, it is not so much a question of public schools; but it is the great aversion that exists on the part of the people, that the Parliament of Canada should override the will of the majority of the people in a province. Because, Sir, there is not a man in this House whether he be a Conservative or a Liberal, whether he be a Pro-

Mr. LAURIER.

testant or a Catholic, whether he be in favour of separate or public schools; there is not a man in this House who would for one instant imagine that the legislation passed in Manitoba in 1890 which deprived the minority of their schools, was so imposed with a view of doing a substantial injustice to the minority. The majority had different views from the minority, and I venture to say that there was not a man in that majority who imagined that by passing that law he was doing a substantial injustice to the minority. You have, therefore, this question before you at the present time. You propose to legislate. Well, you must first of all overcome the feeling of repugnance which exists in the minds of the electors of this country; how are you going to overcome it? There is only one way: it is by bringing the facts before the people and showing them that there has been a substantial injustice done—such an injustice as would shock the sense of right of every man in this House. If this can be done, a great step will be taken towards effecting a peaceful solution of this question. I ask the hon. gentlemen who have determined to interfere, who have admitted the principle of interference, do they not see that they would have strengthened their hands immensely if they had had a preliminary investigation as to the character of the legislation which has been imposed upon the minority in Manitoba?

Mr. FOSTER. Is not the law on the statute-book?

Mr. LAURIER. The law is on the statute-book; but what is the answer to this? Let me give to the hon. gentleman one of the answers given by the people of Manitoba in the contest which took place in that province a few days ago. One of the papers supporting the Greenway government stated this:

Let it be shown that the Manitoba School Act attacks the conscientious convictions of Catholics, and we will join in demanding its amendment or correction.

Here is a reason why an inquiry would have been useful. There is an immense difference, my hon. friend knows, between the conscience of those who are in favour of separate schools and the conscience of those who are in favour of public schools. The man who upholds the system of public schools does not conceive the extent of the injustice which is inflicted on the conscience of Roman Catholics when they are deprived of their schools.

Mr. FOSTER. Would the hon. gentleman cure that by a commission?

Mr. LAURIER. Certainly.

Mr. FOSTER. The only way to cure that is by missionary work, prolonged for a thousand years, probably.

Mr. LAURIER. I have a better and a wider faith in the conscience of my fellow-countrymen than that. What is the argument which you hear from the majority, as any man who has been in Manitoba knows? You are told this: Why should the Roman Catholic minority find fault with our school system? We do not impose upon them any different schools from those which we impose upon ourselves. We do not want Godless schools; we want to have religious education in our schools. We have schools which Baptists, Methodists, Presbyterians and Anglicans can accept; why should not the Roman Catholics go to those schools as well? The answer of the Roman Catholic to that is this—and it is an answer which a commission would have brought out—that the Roman Catholic Church attaches just as much importance to doctrinal tuition as to moral tuition. If these views had been brought before a commission, it would have gone a long way towards solving this difficulty in the minds of the people at large. These are some of the reasons why an inquiry would have been useful. There are other considerations also—I cannot, at this moment point to them all, but I have pointed them out on different occasions. The inquiry would have shown the distribution of the population.

Mr. FOSTER. The census shows that.

Mr. LAURIER. No; the census does not show that. It shows the population, but it does not show how the population is grouped. For instance, in the county of Provencher, the population is compact; the census does not show that. Then, the inquiry would have afforded an opportunity to meet argument with argument. Does not my hon. friend admit that with such an inquiry it would have been far more easy to bring the question to a solution than it is by the method which the Government are adopting? I know very well that the Government are not bound to have a commission. They can go on with their legislation, I admit; but my hon. friend knows that he and his colleagues have been struggling for more than a year to prepare a Bill which would be acceptable even to the different members of the Cabinet, and I do not know that they have succeeded even yet. But if they have succeeded in framing a Bill to the satisfaction of the fourteen or fifteen men who sit in the Cabinet, he knows that they had to struggle a long time before they completed it. Well, Sir, the same difficulty which existed in the Cabinet exists in the whole population of the country. I repeat what my hon. friend said a few moments ago: I do not, for my part, care to make any political capital out of this question; and I tell the hon. gentleman opposite—who, I am sure, wants to settle it in a way to maintain peace and harmony in this country—if the commission served no other purpose

than to maintain peace and harmony in the country, does he not think that it would be worth while, at least, to try it, rather than to have the discord which has already existed too long on this question? This is one of the many reasons which I should think should have compelled the Government to take that course. They are not bound to do it. They may, perhaps, solve the question without an investigation, simply by placing a law upon the statute-book; but if they do, they know very well that the feeling of injustice would not be solved, as it might be solved, otherwise. At the present time, all the sympathies of the public are with the minority in Manitoba. My hon. friend knows that; I know it as well as he does; but he knows very well that if a Bill is passed in this House granting to the minority in Manitoba a system of schools which might not be repugnant to them, but which would be so to the majority, then it will be the majority that will have the sympathies of the public. For my part, I do not want to see such a state of things. I want to have, as far as possible peace and harmony between all the races and creeds of this country. Well, Sir, the legislation which is to be introduced is to be upon lines which are altogether new in this country, and not only in this country, but in every country; and though my heart is strongly with the minority—and I have never disguised my sentiments on this matter—though I see no reason whatever why the minority in Manitoba should not be as well favoured as the minority in Ontario or Quebec—I have said that on the public platform everywhere, and I say it here also—though I recognize this, and feel that it would be the duty of the Government as well as of the Opposition to give justice to the minority; yet I want to have that done on terms that will satisfy the public conscience as far as it can be satisfied; and the more light there is thrown upon the question the better it will satisfy the public conscience as far as it can be satisfied; and the more light there is thrown upon the question the better it will be for all parties concerned. These are the reasons why I venture to suggest once more that it would be better for all parties concerned to take the course I have proposed than any other course.

Mr. LARIVIERE. Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to take any part in this debate. All my hon. friends will admit that during the five years that the school question has been before the House, I have very seldom risen to speak upon it, trusting all the time that the good sense and liberality of the members of this House would induce them to deal fairly, honestly and judicially with the rights of the minority in Manitoba. I do not want to arouse any feeling and would have preferred to wait until the House was about to deal with the question in a fair and just way. However, after

listening to the speeches made by the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte) and the hon. leader of the Opposition. I deem it my duty to rise and offer some remarks on what those gentlemen have said. I shall not go into the history of the school question, but I shall look back some four years, and remind this House that after going through the courts of Manitoba and the Supreme Court of Canada, the school case was taken to the Privy Council in England, and that tribunal, although the Supreme Court of Canada had decided unanimously in favour of the contention of the minority, reversed that judgment. As a representative of the minority, at least as one of them, I made it a point to study our constitution and find out the best means of protecting the rights which I was entrusted to protect as their representative. At that time, it was suggested that the appeal which was before the Privy Council of Canada by the minority, should be submitted to the Supreme Court in order to find out whether we had the right to put in our appeal or whether the Privy Council had the right to hear that appeal; and knowing that whatever might be the decision of the Supreme Court, that question would be taken again to the Privy Council in England, I had serious doubts, after the decision which had been already given in the first instance in the same case, as to what the result would be, and therefore I would not be a party to asking that that case should be again submitted to the courts. And I myself, in 1892, suggested that as the Supreme Court had unanimously decided in favour of our contention and as we had against that the judgment of the Privy Council reversing that first decision, there was a conflict of opinion between the two highest tribunals before which the case should be tried, and therefore it was reasonable to some to express doubt as to what the real case was. On the one hand, the judges of the Supreme Court were supposed to be better posted on our constitution and our laws than the Privy Council in England. On the other hand, the Privy Council in England, with their knowledge and with the case as it was put before them decided in a different way, so that it left to this Parliament the duty of interpreting the law which was contested. It rested with this Parliament to decide whether, in framing the Manitoba Act, our intention was to grant separate schools for all time to come to the province of Manitoba or not. It was a question, as I said at the time, of interpretation of the constitution; and as each of the tribunals, which so far had the case before them, had given a directly opposite interpretation, it rested with this Parliament to decide what the constitution meant. In the month of October, 1892, I happened to be in the city of Ottawa, and speaking to a number of my friends on our school question, I was induced to allow myself to be interviewed

Mr. LaRIVIERE.

by the correspondent of the Toronto "Mail" and to express my opinion as to what should be done in order to arrive at a solution. I will now read to you this interview which took place four years ago, and which was sent as special correspondence to the "Mail" from Ottawa, dated October 18th:

Mr. LaRivière, M.P., for Provencher, who is the only French-Canadian representative of Manitoba in the House of Commons, has been in the city for several days. He says that he is here on no political mission, and that he has not talked with any of the Ministers on the Manitoba school question. Speaking for himself, however, and, in doing so, speaking for the French-Canadians in Manitoba, Mr. LaRivière gave your correspondent his views of that question and the proposed reference to the Supreme Court, which, as foreshadowed by the Government organs, will be recommended by the Cabinet committee which has in charge the consideration of Archbishop Taché's appeal, to obtain a decision upon the question whether or not, according to the terms of the Manitoba Act, the Federal Government can interpose with remedial legislation for the relief of the Roman Catholics of Manitoba.

"That reference to the Supreme Court, which the Montreal 'Gazette' talks of," he said, "can do no good whatever. Not the slightest effective progress towards solving the problem can be made in that way. I will tell you why. The proposed reference to the Supreme Court will only be in avoidance of the real difficulty. It is true that subsections 2 and 3 of the Manitoba Act provide for an appeal to the Governor General in Council by the minority of the people of the province, whose rights have been taken from them, but, if the decision of the Privy Council in England is a true and just judgment, then I do not see how we can appeal to the Governor General in Council, because the Privy Council declared that there was no right taken from us. Going to the Supreme Court now can do no good at all. The Privy Council in England has decided that we have no rights which were invaded, then what could the Supreme Court judges do but repeat their former judgments, and, if they do decide that there was room for remedial legislation, the Roman Catholics of Manitoba will not accept anything in the form of a grant as compensation."

"Do you mean," Mr. LaRivière was asked, "that they would refuse to be benefited by the setting aside for their use of a portion of the school lands?"

"Yes, emphatically," he said. "We are not begging. We will not sacrifice a principle for a mere pecuniary consideration. We will not barter our vested rights for a temporary indemnity. I know of no remedial legislation which can do any good except an Interpretation Act. Anything else is only a subterfuge to gain time."

Mr. LaRivière then explained himself as follows:—"It is not true, as I see it reported in some papers, that I want any change in the British North America Act or the Manitoba Act. These two, which must be taken together to explain each other, are our inviolable safeguard, our Magna Charta. Now, the British North America Act expressly provides that separate schools existing in any province prior to Confederation or established after Confederation, shall remain for ever thereafter. That is the spirit and the letter too. The Act, while it does not impose the separate school system where it

does not exist, protects it where it does, in Ontario and Quebec, and provides for its permanency if existent at Confederation or established afterwards in any province, with no exception. The delegates from Manitoba who assisted at the arrangement of terms of union, made it a clause in their bill of rights that the new province of Manitoba should have Roman Catholic separate schools. This was a fundamental principle, a cardinal condition of Manitoba's entrance into the Confederation. Before the annexation of Manitoba the Roman Catholics, the Presbyterians and the Anglicans each had their separate schools in the old colony of Assiniboia, or the Red River settlement, as it was called, and to these schools the government of the colony granted public money. We contend, then, that, under the British North America Act and the Manitoba Act, the separate schools we had prior to Confederation cannot be abolished by the legislature; and if such an interpretation of the Manitoba Act, as that we have now, can be given by the Privy Council in England, it only proves that the wording of the Act is faulty. Its spirit is all right, and we should have an Interpretation Act passed by the Federal Parliament setting the wording right; an Act similar to that which the Federal Parliament passed in 1872 with reference to the powers of the Lieutenant-Governor, when it was found that the clause defining those powers was not clearly worded. An Act was passed here in Ottawa, explaining the clause, was confirmed by the Imperial Parliament. Why should Manitoba be standing in an exceptional position among the provinces on this school question. If it was not the intention of the framers of the Manitoba Act to secure separate schools to Manitoba, what was their intention? Why should the clause about the schools be there at all, if it meant nothing? It was plainly intended that separate schools should be safe in Manitoba, and that being so, the Roman Catholics of Manitoba cannot consent to be satisfied by any such solution of the difficulty as the setting aside of a portion of the school lands to indemnify them for their losses under the regime of Mr. Martin, which deprives the Catholic section of the Board of Public Instruction of \$14,000 in the bank, of its further share of money voted for school purposes, and of all school property formerly under its control. The only way out of the difficulty is by an Interpretation Act. There is no use in going to the Supreme Court again. Further reference to the Supreme Court, or even remedial legislation, short of an Interpretation Act, will be no better than the disallowance of the Martin Act would have been in the beginning, for, after the exercise of the federal veto, the provincial legislature would have gone on re-enacting its law. We know the spirit of the two Acts. If the wording of this one clause does not satisfy these gentlemen of the Imperial Privy Council's Judicial Committee, we must make it right."

Mr. LaRivière was asked how he thought that should be done. "A committee of the House," he replied, "made up of members from both sides, should be appointed to investigate the setting of the terms of union, to look into the records, and use all other possible means to ascertain what was promised, what was asked, and what was understood to be granted. Then, when the facts are known, how the question is to be settled will be plain; and it is a question which all good citizens want to settle in accordance with justice. Why," Mr. LaRivière exclaimed, in a final outburst, "protection of separate schools

is a cardinal principle of Confederation. If a majority had the right to do away with them, then the Protestant majority in Ontario, or the Catholics in Quebec, could abolish the separate schools in those provinces; but they cannot. Then, Manitoba, it would seem, is the sole exception in this respect out of all the provinces, and why? Where is the clause in the British North America Act, or in the Manitoba Act, making her an exception?"

During the conversation, it may be added, Mr. LaRivière, who was for six years a member of Mr. Norquay's government, in which he was Provincial Treasurer, said that Mr. Norquay and his colleagues deliberated together upon the question whether they had the power to establish public schools such as are established by the Martin Act, and they decided that the only interpretation they could give to the constitution was, that they had not the power to so interfere with the existing school system.

Well, Mr. Speaker, of course the circumstances are changed. When I had that interview, the position was such that we did not know what would be the outcome. After having been taken from court to court without any success, I took upon myself the responsibility of suggesting the appointment of a committee to investigate the case and arrive at some solution. But to-day the position is quite different. In spite of our apprehensions, when the case was taken to the courts the result was far different from what it was in the first instance. Nevertheless in order to show the consistence of some of those who have taken part in this debate, I wish to read to this House an article which appeared in one of the Montreal papers a few days after the interview I had with the correspondent of the "Mail." This is dated the 2nd November, 1892, it is from "Le Canadien," a newspaper then published in Montreal, and this article is signed by a party whose name I will give later on. It is headed:

Away with subterfuge.

I translate it:

It seems certain that the Dominion Government have resolved to "take into consideration" the appeal of the Manitoba Catholics—pursuant to their promise, as embodied in the report of the Minister of Justice to the Governor General. Sir John Thompson is to be congratulated on such a step. It was high time to know whether public affairs in this country should be managed in the future according to the constitution and the law of the land. That there are to be found in our midst ignorant, fanatical people numerous enough to make a fuss and stir up bad feelings, I am quite willing to grant. Still, on a close inspection of our ranks, it will be found that there are in Canada a majority of citizens regardful of the rights, creeds and liberties of their fellow-citizens. Such a majority would not be long in coming forward, in standing to their opinions and rallying around the political men having the moral courage to take the solid position of equal rights for all.

The Ontario Tories, for some time past, have been attempting to frighten the Government. Sir John Thompson has no occasion for dreading them. Should they provoke a crisis, they will have to pay for it. Let us not lose sight of the

fact that the party led by Mr. Mowat has successfully fought against them on the separate school question.

Away, therefore, with such subterfuges as those proposed by Mr. LaRivière, whose political course has proved so fatal to the French interests in Manitoba.

To appoint a committee of the House in order to inquire into the circumstances which have accompanied the passing of the Manitoba Act: such is the suggestion offered by the member for Provencher. Who is there that is not aware of those circumstances?

Do not the official papers contain as clear a statement as possible of the history of the case?

Instead of demanding justice, Mr. LaRivière lends a hand to the Ontario fanatics in taking the means of "shelving" the question. Let it be well understood that he is doing that job on his own account. We are most positive in making that statement. In Manitoba wherever he has made known his scheme, it has been condemned with one voice. We feel it our duty to caution the friends of the French cause against his manoeuvres.

The constitution is explicit: it is the province of the Governor General in Council to take the initiative, to give a decision, to pass on his decision to the Manitoba government and ask them to do justice. Should the latter decline to do justice, then, and then only, begins the right of interference and action by the Canadian Parliament.

The reference to the Supreme Court, which has been alluded to in some newspapers, is another scheme concocted to shelve the school question and the rights of the Catholic minority. From the Supreme Court the matter will be carried up to the Privy Council.

Do not Parliaments, which are the supreme authority, possess the incontrovertible power to make laws to redress the decisions of the courts?

In this case, no decision was reached on the appeal of the Catholics to the Privy Council, an appeal which has been held in suspense for some time.

Besides, what is the good of all this scheming and intriguing? Who would dare deny the fact that the intention of the Act of 1870 was to constitute in the province of Manitoba a school system modelled after the Ontario and Quebec systems?

The statute in question was enacted by the Parliament of Canada. For twenty years past the Manitoba legislature submitted to the law.

In 1890 they unrighteously repealed the law, to the detriment of a portion of the population.

And yet, we see writers who set up for wise men, we see members of Parliament, politicians, who gravely tell us: "We keep on this question the very same stand we took on the Jesuits' Estates Bill: we will no more interfere with the Manitoba affairs than we did interfere with the Quebec matters." These words betray either ignorance or absolute insincerity.

When drawing from the provincial cash-box money wherewithal to settle the Jesuits' estates claim, the province of Quebec evidently remained within the strict limits of its right and jurisdiction; and the Canadian Parliament had no business to interfere here; while, in this case, the constitution specifically invests the Governor in Council and Parliament with the power to protect minorities, should their rights and privileges in educational matters have been infringed upon by the provincial legislatures.

Mr. LARIVIERE.

This is signed by J. Israel Tarte, member for L'Islet, who says, as you have heard, that the reference of the school question to a committee of this House, would be shelving it in order to avoid arriving at a solution of the question. That was in 1892, only two years after the passing of the school Act; and to-day, four years afterwards, the very same gentleman who has accused me of making that suggestion of a reference to a special committee with the object of shelving the question, comes before this House and suggests the very same committee I suggested four years ago, but under very different circumstances. It is to be remembered that at the time we had lost our case, and it was reasonable to expect that we might lose it again. But, Sir, after having been dragged from court to court, after having spent a large sum of money to defend our rights and privileges, after having secured a judgment granting us our request, acknowledging that we have been deprived of our rights, and intimating to the legislature of Manitoba and to the Parliament of Canada that those rights must be restored to us: what do we find? We find these very gentlemen who, four years ago, condemned what I then suggested, now, when this question is on the eve of being closed, now, after we have gone through all the proceedings that are indicated in that article signed by the member for L'Islet, we find these gentlemen, who dare not vote on the merits of the case, who are afraid to cast their vote either for or against the cause of separate schools, trying to shelve the question, resorting indeed to a subterfuge in order to avoid giving an honest opinion on this question. The member for L'Islet is unauthorized to say that the minority in Manitoba are not a unit as to what the school law should be. The minority in Manitoba are a unit as to what the school law should be, that is, they are a unit in demanding that their rights should be restored. We are willing that all the necessary provisions may be embodied in that remedial Bill, within our powers, of course, and that provisions should be made that our schools should be good schools, even better than the schools we had before if possible. We are willing that our schools should be subject to inspection: we are willing to accept any reasonable clause in that school Act that will give us the schools we have always claimed to have, and give us even better schools, if those we had can be improved.

Motion (Mr. Sutherland) to adjourn, negatived.

Motion (Mr. Powell) for an Address to His Excellency, agreed to.

Mr. OUMET moved:

That said Address be engrossed.

Motion agreed to.

SUPPLY.

Mr. FOSTER moved :

That this House will on Tuesday next resolve itself into committee to consider of the supplies to be granted to Her Majesty.

Motion agreed to.

WAYS AND MEANS.

Mr. FOSTER moved :

That this House will on Tuesday next resolve itself into committee to consider of the ways and means for raising a supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

Motion agreed to.

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES.

Mr. FOSTER moved :

That a special committee of seven members be appointed to prepare and report, with all convenient speed, a list of members to compose the select standing committees ordered by the House, to be composed of Mr. Foster, Sir Adolphe Caron, Sir Richard Cartwright, and Messrs. Costigan, Haggart, Laurier and Mills (Bothwell).

Motion agreed to.

OFFICIAL REPORT OF THE DEBATES.

Mr. FOSTER moved :

That a select committee be appointed to supervise the Official Reports of the Debates of this House during the present session, with power to report from time to time ; to be composed of Messrs. Beausoleil, Bechard, Cameron (Inverness), Chariton, Craig, Davin, Earle, Hazen, Innes, LaRivière, Lepine, Sriver, Somerville, Taylor and Welden.

Motion agreed to.

DEATH OF PRINCE HENRY OF BATTENBERG—ADDRESS TO HER MAJESTY.

Mr. FOSTER. I desire to present a resolution to the House to-night, and I do it to-night because the event which calls this action forth is one which happened a day or so ago, and it is well that what action is taken by this House should be taken promptly. It has reference to the death of Prince Henry of Battenberg, son-in-law of the Queen. What I propose to do is to move an address to Her Majesty with respect to the sudden and lamented death of the Prince. I do not propose to make any extended remarks at this time ; I do not think it is necessary to do so. The address and the unanimous action of this House will be sufficient testimony of the sincerity of the regret we feel that our beloved Queen in her advanced years has to suffer another added to the many bereavements which in her long life she has sustained. Without further remarks, I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Laurier :

To the Queen's Most Excellent Majesty :
Most Gracious Sovereign,

We, Your Majesty's dutiful and loyal subjects, the Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled, humbly approach Your Majesty with renewed assurances of our attachment to Your Majesty's Person and Crown.

The intelligence of the death of His Royal Highness Prince Henry of Battenberg has deeply touched the hearts of the people of Canada : We speak in their name, as well as in our own, when we humbly tender you the expression of our earnest sympathy in the affliction which has deprived Her Royal Highness the Princess Beatrice of a Consort, and Your Majesty of a son-in-law, a young Prince enjoying the happiest prospect of a long and useful career.

We pray that the God of consolation may comfort Your Majesty and long preserve You to Your people.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. FOSTER moved :

That said Address be engrossed.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. FOSTER moved :

That a humble Address be presented to His Excellency, in the following terms :—

To His Excellency the Right Honourable Sir John Campbell Hamilton-Gordon, Earl of Aberdeen ; Viscount Formartine, Baron Haddo, Methlic, Tarves and Kellie, in the Peerage of Scotland ; Viscount Gordon of Aberdeen, County of Aberdeen, in the Peerage of the United Kingdom ; Baronet of Nova Scotia, &c., &c., Governor General of Canada, and Vice-Admiral of the same.

May it please Your Excellency :—

We, Her Majesty's dutiful and loyal subjects, the Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled, have resolved to send an Address of condolence to Her Majesty :

To express the profound sorrow of the people of Canada on the occasion of the death of His Royal Highness Prince Henry of Battenberg, and to tender Her Majesty on their behalf the expression of the earnest sympathy in the affliction which has deprived Her Majesty of a son-in-law, a young Prince enjoying the happiest prospect of a long and useful career.

We beg to approach Your Excellency with our respectful request that you will be pleased to transmit the said Address to Her Majesty in such a way as Your Excellency may see fit.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. FOSTER moved :

That said Address be engrossed.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. FOSTER moved :

That the said Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General by such members of the House as are of the Privy Council.

Motion agreed to.

MESSAGE OF CONDOLENCE TO H. R. H. PRINCESS BEATRICE.

Mr. FOSTER. I beg leave to move, seconded by Mr. Laurier :

That a Message of condolence be presented by this House to Her Royal Highness Princess Bea-

trice to express the sorrow of the people of Canada on the occasion of the death of His Royal Highness Prince Henry of Battenburg, and to tender the expression of their earnest sympathy in the affliction which has deprived Her Royal Highness of a loving husband.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. FOSTER. I beg leave to move, seconded by Mr. Laurier :

That it be resolved that an humble Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General in the following words :—

To His Excellency the Right Honourable Sir John Campbell Hamilton-Gordon, Earl of Aberdeen ; Viscount Formartine, Baron Haddo, Methlic Tarves and Kellie, in the Peerage of Scotland ; Viscount Gordon of Aberdeen, County of Aberdeen, in the Peerage of the United Kingdom ; Baronet of Nova Scotia, &c., &c., Governor General of Canada, and Vice-Admiral of the same. May it please Your Excellency :—

We, Her Majesty's dutiful and loyal subjects, the Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled, have resolved to send a message of condolence to Her Royal Highness the Princess Beatrice :

To express the sorrow of the people of Canada on the occasion of the death of His Royal Highness Prince Henry of Battenburg, and to tender the expression of their earnest sympathy in the affliction which has deprived Her Royal Highness of a loving husband.

We beg leave to approach Your Excellency with our respectful request that you will be pleased to transmit the said message to Her Royal Highness the Princess Beatrice, in such a way as Your Excellency may see fit.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. FOSTER moved :

That said Address be engrossed.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. FOSTER moved :

That the said Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General by such members of the House as are of the Honourable the Privy Council.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. FOSTER moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 24th January, 1896.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

REPORT.

Trade and Navigation Returns for the year ending 30th June, 1895.—(Mr. Wood.)

Mr. FOSTER.

AUDITOR GENERAL'S REPORT.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I want to call the attention of the Government to a matter of some consequence to the House, and I may observe, in order to prevent any doubt about the matter, that I will probably conclude with a motion. I desire to call the attention of the House to the fact that we have now been in session for something very nearly a month, and we have not got the Auditor General's Report yet. I am quite aware that the statute does not require that that should be brought down imperatively until the 31st January, or thereabouts ; but I do contend that it was the special duty of the Government to have taken special care that when they summoned the House for the 2nd January, every reasonable exertion should have been made to bring down the Auditor General's Report at the same time. I want to call the attention of the House to the fact that if this has not been done, it is probably largely due to the very absurd parsimony which induced the Minister of Finance, in opposition to our remonstrances, to refuse the requisite clerical aid to the Auditor General last year. Anyhow, as I say, we have been here a month, and we have not got the Auditor General's Report. Now, Sir, this document which we have before us, the Public Accounts, is practically of no sort of use to us for the purpose of ascertaining how the public money has been spent. We can make no progress, either in preparing ourselves for a proper discussion of the Estimates, or of the Budget, until we have the Auditor General's Report ; and I must say that it seems to me to be trifling with the House that the Government have not had that report prepared and brought down on the 2nd January. However, Sir, this is one of those cases in which the sin is apt to bring its own punishment, and if it be true, as I hear, that my hon. friend from Wellington (Mr. McMullen) for the purpose of impressing the Government of the day with the importance of attending to the Auditor General's Report, has serious thoughts of reading that document to the House when it appears. I think that the hon. Minister of Finance will see cause to regret that he did not give my friend the Auditor General those \$500 we asked for. Now, I have made a little calculation as to which I am open to correction. I rather think that the report contains about 5,000 pages, more or less, being rather more than less. My hon. friend from Wellington is a zealous and persevering man, but I do not think that he can get through with more than ten pages, with appropriate comments, in an hour, and if he has to read the report to the Minister of Finance, it will take 500 hours which, at ten hours per day, would equal 50 days. Surely, if the Minister of Finance is anxious to expedite business, I advise that he cause that report to be brought down at once so

that my hon. friend may be quick about getting through with his task. Whether my hon. friend will hold it to be his duty likewise to have it read in French, I cannot say, but I hope not.

Mr. FOSTER. The leader of the third party can have it read in French.

Mr. DAVIN. We will order a coffin for him.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. You had better order coffins for yourselves, I think. Now, Sir, I know that the Ministers, in a general way, are only flies on the wheel, and but ordinary flies at that, and we do not expect much from them. But, Sir, we have been lately going into matters of pedigree in this House, as my hon. friend from Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) knows, and my attention has been called, by a valued correspondent in the maritime provinces, to the fact that there has been a material change in the flies on the wheel, and that we have lately been visited by a Hessian fly on the wheel in the person of the Secretary of State, in point of fact, something like the true, real and original Hessian fly. Sir, we have always known, as the Minister of Agriculture will find out when he has been a little longer in his place, that the Hessian fly has been quite an important factor in the agriculture of this country. There are some who contend that the Hessian fly was really a blessing in disguise to the agriculturists, that it made the farmers sit up, that it cured them of their lazy fashion of growing wheat year after year on the same plot of ground. There are other eminent authorities who say that the Hessian fly is rather a proof that the system of cultivation pursued was vicious and demoralizing in the extreme. Now, I won't decide, the Minister of Agriculture may, between these differing authorities; but I will say this, that both these authorities are agreed that the appearance of the Hessian fly is a sign that a radical change of system is required. Now, under these circumstances, I really think that I ought to conclude, though I will not insist on it, with a motion that the House do adjourn until the Auditor General's Report is brought down, and we can apply ourselves intelligently to the discussion of the business before us.

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose my hon. friend does not mean that motion seriously?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I mean that we must get the Auditor General's Report.

Mr. FOSTER. Do you mean to adjourn if you do not get it to-day?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Well, I do not know that I would press that.

Mr. FOSTER. Then the hon. gentleman had better withdraw his motion. The hon. gentleman, I think, has earned the thanks of the House for this valu-

able rehearsal which he has given us. I would suggest that he reserve the *Te Deum*. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) is quite mistaken in saying that the delay in the Auditor General's Report was due to ill-timed parsimony of the Government in not granting the Auditor General additional clerks. If the hon. gentleman's memory was as good as his invective he would know that the point of difference between the Government and the Auditor General, or rather between the hon. member for Bothwell, representing the Auditor General in this House, and the Government, was in regard to the promotion of three clerks, and not as to the addition of three clerks. So parsimony hardly enters into it as a sufficient reason for delay. The hon. gentleman let the Government out completely when he said it was their duty to use all possible diligence in having the Auditor General's Report brought down. The Auditor General is an officer of Parliament; he gets up his own report in his own fashion. He prepares a very voluminous report, and I have asked him very frequently to push its completion forward as rapidly as possible. His report is not yet ready, although, I believe the major part of it is in print, and I think the Auditor General told me that it will be ready next week. I asked the Queen's Printer the reason of the delay, because I thought it might be delayed in the printing office. The answer given by the Queen's Printer is as follows:—

With respect to the Printing Bureau, re Auditor General's Report: no delay can possibly be charged on it with respect to this report. On 13th January every line of copy in the Bureau was set, and no further copy was received until four days afterwards, namely 17th. During all that time the equivalent of 357 pages were standing as proofs uncorrected. The copy began again to come in on the 17th, and it is being advanced with all possible despatch. There are, at this moment, standing in type the equivalent of 330 pages. It is not possible for us to say when this report will be published, as that depends entirely on the officers of the Auditor General, as to when they will read the proofs and sign them for printing, and when they will send the rest of the copy.

That is the statement given to me by the Queen's Printer. The hon. gentleman's remark about the Government simply trifling with the House in relation to this report was uncalled for, and is not based on facts, as the short statement I have made shows. I hope the hon. gentleman will receive the report early next week, and I am sure he will use his good offices to prevent the House from entering upon that dreary and almost interminable period of listening to the reading of it by the hon. member for North Wellington. We generally get a good deal of the report in the course of his comments, and I am not sure that the reading of long pages from the report would not be as interesting as are sometimes the hon. gentleman's comments; but, at the

same time, I think it would be very hard and wearing on the hon. gentleman.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Five hundred dollars were refused the Auditor General, or, at all events, that sum was deducted from his contingencies.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, but I have yet to learn that the loss of \$500 caused the delay.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Certainly it helped to do so.

Mr. McMULLEN. I think hon. members of the House, particularly those on this side of it who take an interest in discussing public expenditure will at once admit that the Auditor General's Report is the most valuable production laid on the Table of Parliament annually. I quite admit that in past years I have made very extensive use of that particular book in criticising public expenditure. The Minister of Finance had occasion more than once to note the fact that I largely use it, and I suppose he would prefer that I should not use it so frequently.

Mr. FOSTER. Oh, no.

Mr. McMULLEN. The public expenditure is a very important matter. The people realize this, and I contend it is impossible for any member of the House intelligently to criticise expenditure without having under his eyes the Auditor General's Report. No doubt the Finance Minister hopes to deliver his Budget speech in a short time, and then he will ask the House to go into Committee of Supply; but, in order to do so, I contend that it is necessary that members should be supplied with copies of this report, and have been in possession of copies for a few days, so as to make themselves familiar with its contents. The Minister of Finance has stated that the Auditor General has prepared a very voluminous report during recent years. That is quite true, but I do not think it has been too voluminous; I think every page has deserved the attention of hon. members who examine and criticise public expenditure. If I could make a favourable impression on hon. gentlemen opposite as to the necessity of curtailing expenditure, I would be prepared to spend fifty days in reading over the items in the report, for it would be time well spent. When the Auditor General last year asked for a small additional vote in order to be able to conduct the duties of his office efficiently, it was a mistake on the part of the Government to refuse that application. If the amount had been granted, the probability is that the Auditor General's Report would have been on the Table of the House to-day. If this had been done, more money would have been saved than by the parsimonious treatment extended to the Auditor General in refusing to grant that assistance. I hope the report will not be delayed as long as the Finance Minister has indicated. If it is not brought down until

Mr. FOSTER.

the end of next week, the discussion of public accounts cannot be properly proceeded with until fifteen or twenty days from now. The Opposition have important duties to discharge, and the country is looking to hon. members on this side of the House for a close criticism of public expenditure, and if the Government throw difficulties in the way and delay the presentation of the Auditor General's Report we shall assuredly let the people know with whom the responsibility lies. I hope the report will be brought down as quickly as possible, and that a statement promised with respect to superannuation system will also be laid on the Table.

Mr. FOSTER. The statement with respect to superannuation will be ready on Monday, and no doubt that will give the hon. gentleman occupation for a few days.

THE EXHIBITION IN THE NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES.

Mr. DAVIN. From remarks which I have read as having been delivered in another place, I gather that no arrangement has been made for placing in the Estimates a sum of money to meet claims in respect to the exhibition that was held in the Territories. There are a number of my constituents who are owed money for work done, and I hope that the member of the Government in charge will press on the Finance Minister this matter so that he may see that the necessary provision is made. The Lieutenant-Governor, I learn from the highest authority, is an official of the Government of Canada, and he occupies an exceptional position as Governor, and the Territories are in an exceptional position. I am sure neither the Government or Parliament would wish to see men who have done work for that exhibition, poor men who have comparatively large sums due them, out of pocket. I do not think it would be creditable, and I hope the Minister of Finance will make provision in the Estimates for paying these people.

Mr. FOSTER. I may say in answer to my hon. friend (Mr. Davin), that as he quite knows—and if it has escaped his memory he can refresh it by looking at the wording of the item—all that the Government proposed to the House to be responsible for was the sum of \$25,000 towards assisting in carrying on that exhibition. It did not suppose and did not intend, that anything more should go from the Dominion Treasury than simply that assistance of \$25,000. It appears from reports that more has been expended, or if more has not been expended, that there are liabilities outstanding for which the claimants are pressing for payment from some source. It is quite admissible, I admit at once that men who performed services or gave supplies or the like of that should not be kept out of their money. The first thing, however, to do is to

see that these accounts are very thoroughly investigated, and they are now being thoroughly investigated. Whilst the Dominion Government does not admit any responsibility for over-expenditure, after the accounts have been thoroughly investigated we will have an opportunity of talking about it again.

Mr. LAURIER. I understood that this money which was voted last year was to be spent under the authority of the Government of the North-west Territories, and not under the authority of this Government at all. I understood that the sum of \$25,000 was placed at the disposal of the government of the Territories.

Mr. DALY. No.

Mr. LAURIER. Well, under whose authority was the money spent?

Mr. FOSTER. The vote was really in the nature of a subsidy. It was \$25,000 which was given by this Parliament in aid of carrying out the exhibition in the North-west Territories. If I remember right, the expenditure of that money was, by Order in Council, put in the hands of the Lieutenant-Governor of the North-west Territories under certain checks as to the signing of drafts and the like of that. It was divided into two parts, one part to be used for the payment of prizes and the other for the expenses of the exhibition. It was not put in the hands of the North-west Government, as a government, but it was expended under the authority of the Lieutenant-Governor with the proper precautions for the signing and counter-signing of cheques.

Mr. LAURIER. As an officer of this Government.

Mr. FOSTER. No doubt the Lieutenant-Governor is an officer of this Government.

Mr. LAURIER. He has rendered the accounts, I suppose.

Mr. FOSTER. They are now being investigated.

Mr. LAURIER. Are we to understand that he actually expended more than was put into his hands?

Mr. FOSTER. What is understood is that there are claims over and above the amount of money which was made up by this \$25,000 and by other sources of revenue; claims still unpaid and for which the amount of money made up of the \$25,000 and the other sources of revenue is not sufficient. That is the claim.

Mr. LAURIER. I understand that the Lieutenant-Governor Mr. Mackintosh has accounted for the expenditure of the \$25,000, and that much more money has been expended.

Mr. FOSTER. There are claims for more than that.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The statement of the hon. gentleman is not so full as it ought to be. The House last session appropriated \$25,000 for this purpose. There exists a government in the North-west Territories who are the advisers of the Lieutenant-Governor. If I rightly understand the statement of the hon. gentleman, this sum was not placed at the disposal of the government at all, but was placed at the personal disposal of the Lieutenant-Governor. Then, what were the checks on the Lieutenant-Governor in that regard? I cannot understand that the exhibition in the North-west Territories was wholly under his management or that he controlled it. I suppose that the government who were his advisers had something to say in regard to that matter; but if they had not, then the matter is wholly under the jurisdiction of this Government, and for which this Government are responsible. The Lieutenant-Governor is simply their officer for the discharge of certain duties on their behalf, and the government of the Territories who were capable of forming an opinion as to what ought to be done, have been given no voice in the matter at all.

Mr. FOSTER. The whole matter will be more clear for discussion when the papers are brought down. My hon. friend (Mr. Laurier) is not quite right. The government of the North-west Territories is not the same for instance as the government of Manitoba or any one of the provinces, and as I understand it, the exhibition was carried on by what you might call a voluntary association. There were certain sources of revenue, amongst others, a grant of the North-west legislature and one from the town of Regina, and the entrance fees and all the like of that, which made up the general revenue. This association carried on the exhibition and paid the expenses and became responsible, I suppose, for the liability. The amount of \$25,000 was voted as an aid by this Government, and the expenditure of that was placed under the Lieutenant-Governor, with proper checks for countersigning.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Was he more than the cashier for the voluntary association?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not know. I suppose he was the president of it.

Mr. MARTIN. I would like to say a word with regard to this matter. I have moved for the papers and when the motion comes up I shall go more fully into the matter.

Mr. FOSTER. I would suggest that this matter can better be discussed when the papers are brought down.

Mr. MARTIN. I wish to say a few words to show what a gigantic affair this has been. The Dominion Government gave \$25,000, the local assembly gave \$5,000, the

city of Regina gave \$10,000, and after that the local assembly gave an additional grant of \$5,000, making a total of \$45,000, which is all gone. In addition to that, there was the admission money, entrance fees and everything of that kind. This association, as I understand, consisted entirely of one man, namely the Lieutenant-Governor of the North-west Territories. He was the association, he was in absolute control of everything, and they are still in debt to an amount which at any rate is \$8,000, and I do not know how much more. I may say that there is a great deal of feeling in the Territories with regard to the manner in which this exhibition has been conducted and with regard to the condition the affairs are in at the present time.

Mr. MACDOWALL. In reply to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Martin) I would state in a few words, that the exhibition was most successful. It was very large. I believe the list of exhibits was about four or five times the number at the provincial exhibition at Winnipeg in Manitoba. It was the first exhibition held in the North-west Territories. All the buildings had to be erected, everything had to be initiated, and if the association, however it might have been composed, did get a little behind in funds, I think it would be a generous act on the part of this House to overlook that, seeing the very great success of the exhibition and the advantages which the Territories have derived from it.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I would like to ask if the investigated claims are for expenses incurred by the direct order of the Lieutenant-Governor himself, or for expenses incurred by the committee of management, if there was such a committee?

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend's question exemplifies the difficulty we are under in discussing this question at the present time. These accounts are just now being gathered and investigated, and the claims as they come in are being tabulated. So that we are not in a position to discuss the claims or answer that question until the investigation is concluded.

Mr. MARTIN. Then I understand that the Government would like any person who has an account against the exhibition to send it in to them in order that they may check it over.

Mr. FOSTER. The Government does not ask any one to send in any account.

Mr. MARTIN. If you have not the accounts, how can you investigate them?

Mr. SPEAKER. Order. The whole of this discussion is entirely out of order. I frankly confess that a part of the discussion arose from my allowing an hon. member to ask a question; but I had not the slightest idea that it would lead to such a discussion as has arisen, particularly in view of the fact

Mr. MARTIN.

that the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin) has a motion on the paper for a return in reference to this subject. The discussion on that motion cannot be anticipated.

Mr. CASEY. Referring then to the original subject of discussion, the delay in the Auditor General's Report, I think it ought to be pointed out that, although the delay in the printing may be due to the delay in sending in copy from the Auditor General's Department, it does not follow that the fault of this latter delay lies with that department. The Auditor General has to work with material sent to him by the Finance Department. He must get vouchers and all sorts of papers from that department before he can complete his report, correct proof, and sign it for printing. It is very much more likely, according to our experience, that the delay has arisen from the slackness of the Minister of Finance in furnishing the Auditor General with the necessary material, than from any slackness on his part in dealing with it.

My hon. friend the Finance Minister cannot mention this matter without showing the feeling of soreness which he always gives evidence of when the Auditor General is mentioned. He takes pains to assure us that the Auditor General is an officer of Parliament, and not an officer of his department, and he says it always in a tone of voice that indicates his regret that such is the case. It would be much more pleasant for the Minister of Finance if the Auditor General were under his orders instead of being an independent officer of Parliament, not subject to any control by the Ministry of the day.

But I am not at all sure that my hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) need have been worried about the lateness of the presentation of this report. For one reason, it is scarcely within the limits of possibility that the Government can contemplate asking us for a supply for some considerable time to come. We must not forget that we are called for a special purpose. We must not forget that the Government asked for five months' delay for the purpose of introducing a certain Bill. We cannot forget, either, that the Government press throughout the country has been attacking the Opposition for continuing the debate on the Address at such length. They have been telling us that that debate should have been finished long ago, in order that the Government might have a chance to introduce the remedial Bill. I do not, for my part, see why they could not have introduced the Bill at an earlier stage. But, at all events, their press has been attacking us for obstructing the introduction of that Bill. We have been given to understand, especially by the French newspapers supporting hon. gentlemen opposite, that the Government

were aching for the opportunity of introducing the Remedial Bill; and, when that is introduced, it will probably furnish sufficient occupation to this House for a considerable time before we can touch the question of supplies at all.

Still further, it seems to me impossible that this Government can think of asking the House for supplies, until they have ascertained that they possess the confidence of a majority of this House on that Bill, which is the especial policy of the Government for this extra session. We cannot think that they will be so recreant to all constitutional principle and practice, to all the theories of responsible government, as to ask us to vote money until we know whether they possess the confidence of this House or not; and we cannot know that, until the Remedial Bill is introduced and goes to a second reading. I read to-day in "L'Evenement," the organ of the hon. member for Gaspé (Mr. Joncas), that the divisions amongst the Conservatives at Ottawa are increasing all the time—that a new party has been formed, with the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean), the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon), and the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) at its head, to oppose remedial legislation. Another Conservative paper stated that at least fifteen or twenty supporters of the Government, and probably more, were certain to vote against that Bill, while the Government majority in the House only amounted to 38 or 40. It is quite impossible that a Government so situated, which has made one particular Bill the sole ground of its appeal to this House and to the country, should have the effrontery to ask us to vote it millions of dollars, when we do not know whether or not it has the confidence of its own supporters, even, in regard to it. I am sure that before the Remedial Bill is introduced—and we are told that it will not be introduced until after Sir Charles Tupper is elected in Cape Breton, whenever that may be—and before its second reading is carried in this House, we shall have ample time to consider the Auditor General's accounts.

Motion withdrawn.

DRAINAGE ON RAILWAY PROPERTY.

Mr. CASEY moved second reading of Bill (No. 3) concerning drainage on the property of railway companies. He said: This Bill, Mr. Speaker, is very simple in its provisions, which are as follows:—

Whereas it is expedient that municipalities and land owners should have ample facilities for drainage on and across the lands of railway companies within the legislative authority of the Parliament of Canada; and whereas legislation concerning watercourses and drainage is within the jurisdiction of the legislatures of the provinces; and whereas doubts have arisen as to whether railway companies within the legislative

authority of the Parliament of Canada are subject to such provincial legislation: Therefore Her Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and House of Commons of Canada, declares and enacts as follows:—

1. Notwithstanding anything in any Act of the Parliament of Canada contained, every railway company within the legislative authority of the said Parliament is hereby declared to be subject, with respect to all lands, whether covered by road-bed or not, owned, occupied or used by it in any province, to all Acts of such province concerning drainage and watercourses as applied to railways.

The reason why I introduced this Bill is that in carrying out schemes of township drainage, and in carrying out drainage by individuals holding lands contiguous to railways, great opposition has been met with from the different railway companies, to the passage of the necessary drains across their lands or under their road-beds. This has been more especially the case, perhaps, in western Ontario, where the country is comparatively level, and where the necessary drainage for farms has to pass across the different railways in order to get an outlet. Some of the railways have raised very great difficulties in the way of such drainage. I may say that the Grand Trunk Railway in particular, in the county I have the honour to represent, has been in the habit of charging a rental for the right of drainage across their lands. I am told that that company is receiving thousands of dollars of rent annually on that portion of its road west of St. Thomas, for the mere right of drainage across its property—a right which the farmers in the townships concerned would have enjoyed, free, if that property had been in the hands of anybody else but a railway company—and a right for the enjoyment of which they would not have to pay rent, if these railways had been under the jurisdiction of the provinces, instead of this Parliament.

The legislature of Ontario has passed a very elaborate Act, dealing entirely with the question of drainage and watercourses, crossing the property of railway companies. I shall not go into its provisions in detail for they do not affect the principle of this Bill; but I may say that the Act provides the greatest security against any damage being done to the permanent road-beds of the railway companies. It provides for arbitration, on which the railways will be represented by their engineer, and on which the other party will be also represented. It provides for an easy and cheap means of deciding what the party who wishes to drain his land should pay for the privilege, or the expense, of cutting a drain across the railway's property, and how much, if anything, the railway company should pay towards the cost of such drain.

Now, while these railways were under provincial control, they were subject to any laws made by the provincial legisla-

tures. They would be subject to this drainage law among others ; but when this Parliament saw fit to declare that these were "railways for the benefit of Canada" and assumed legislative control over them, the railways set up the defence, in all cases where parties sought to drain across their property, that they were not subject to the provincial Drainage Act. I am informed that cases in connection with such drainage have gone into the courts, that the court of first instance has held, in some of the cases, that the companies, being Dominion railways, were not subject to the provincial Act, and appeals, I believe, are pending in some of these instances. But I have not heard that any case has been appealed to the Supreme Court or to the Privy Council in England ; so that the point has not been definitely settled whether these companies can claim exemption from their ordinary obligations as property owners, in consequence of their being Dominion railways.

This Bill simply proposes to remove those doubts, and to provide that, so far as drainage is concerned, all railways in Canada shall be subject to the laws of the provinces through which their lines extend. Whether they be Dominion railways or not, they shall be put on the same basis as other property owners in that respect. I have said that the province of Ontario has enacted special legislation with regard to drainage across railway lines, saving all proper rights to the railways. I am not aware that any other province has similar legislation ; but under this proposed Act, in a province where there is no such legislation, these railways would remain subject to Dominion legislation with regard to drainage. The Bill only provides that the railway companies shall be subject to provincial laws, where such exist, respecting drainage and watercourses as applied to railways, and not to general drainage acts.

I am sure that this Bill will recommend itself to the common sense of the House. I do not think it was ever intended, when this House assumed authority over these railways, that the people who owned lands adjoining should be put in any worse position than they were in before, or than they would be in now, if the railways had not been taken charge of by this House. I think the proposition will commend itself to every one, that the provincial legislatures know better what sort of legislation in regard to drainage is suited to their peculiar circumstances than this House. I think it will be admitted that there should be no distinction, as regards that point, between a railway company and any other owner of property, and I have great hopes that the House will adopt the Bill.

Last year, when I made a motion with regard to the inspection of locomotive boilers, the Minister of Railways objected to our taking any action, on the ground of lack of jurisdiction. He claimed that the inspection

of locomotive boilers rested particularly with the provincial Parliaments. I was glad to hear him make that statement, because it affects the case now before the House. If legislation with regard to the inspection of locomotive boilers is particularly within the jurisdiction of the provincial legislatures, surely legislation with regard to drainage, which is especially given to the provinces by our constitution, should be held to be within their power, in regard to railways as well as everybody else. I hope the Government will either see fit to adopt this Bill, or at all events, not to oppose it, and take the sense of the House fairly and squarely upon it. And, if that is done, I am sure that all who represent farming constituencies, at all events, will find it their duty to support the proposed legislation. This is, above all things, a farmer's Bill, because it is farmers, either in their individual capacity, or as ratepayers of municipalities, who are almost entirely concerned in this question. I hope that that great class of the community will receive due consideration from this House.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not know whether this Bill, if it becomes law, will remedy the grievance complained of by the farmers or not. But I do know that it is most desirable that some law should be enacted that will enable us to understand whether the authority in regard to this question rests with the province or with the Dominion. There seems to be a conflict of opinion upon that subject to-day. If it lies with the Dominion, it is utterly impossible, judging from past experience for either municipalities or private individuals to enforce their rights and to compel the railway company to allow lands to be drained across its road without paying a consideration, or signing some private agreement with the railway company which would be very onerous to the individual or the municipality signing it. This subject is frequently discussed in municipalities ; I know I have from time to time heard it raised in my own district. But no solution of the difficulty has ever been proposed in these discussions. You are practically unable to drain land to-day when the drain must cross the property of a railway company, for the railway company will not allow it. The question as to the authority in the matter is the first difficulty. Some say : Appeal to the Railway Committee of the Privy Council. But if you appeal to that body you will appeal in vain, because the railway companies are always too powerful to allow of an individual or municipal corporation getting redress. If the matter were placed under provincial law we should know better what to do, because we know the law as regards drainage and watercourses. It would be much easier then for municipal councils and those engaged in the execution of the law to know how to remedy the grievance and prosecute an appeal in case of the refusal of the railway company

Mr. CASEY.

to consent. We give these companies great power. We make extensive corporations and give them great franchises, including the power to take away the rights of the municipal corporations or individuals. And having given away these franchises, we are unable to do anything with the companies we have created. Even if the municipality wishes to cross a track with a highway it is met with the objection that this is private property and permission to cross it is withheld. In such a case, appeal must be made to the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, and there every objection is raised by the railway company, and so many difficulties thrown in the way that it is practically impossible for a private individual or weak corporation to gain what the public interests require. For these reasons, the plainer we make the law in the interest of the private individual, the better for all concerned, for without that, we can get no redress. In my part of the country, this question has been raised many times. There are extensive tracts of land requiring to be drained, but if the railway companies are applied to, they refuse to allow drains to cross their property. If you apply to the municipality, their answer is: We do not know where the authority lies, whether in the province or in the Dominion, and we do not want to go to the expense and trouble of prosecuting a lawsuit to establish our rights; therefore, we rest under the grievance. We should make the law plain, so that private individuals and municipal corporations could be secured in their rights. If this Bill is not considered strong enough or plain enough, I think it is the duty of the Government to introduce some legislation that will give the municipal corporations greater control and enable them to prosecute cases under the provincial law so that they may be able to provide the drains which are so necessary in the interests of the people in the various municipalities.

Mr. DICKEY. I think that both hon. gentlemen who have spoken are quite right in saying that this is a subject that is attended with a great deal of difficulty. You have on one hand a railway company incorporated by this Parliament and having a great trunk railway running through the country and doing a very valuable work, and, as a rule, making very little money out of its franchise. On the other hand, you have the private owners and municipalities deeply interested in the question of drainage across the railway company's property. The problem of reconciling these two rights—for both are rights demanding consideration—is one of very great difficulty. Now the hon. mover of the Bill proposes that this Parliament shall renounce all jurisdiction in the matter, and leave it to the local legislature. For my part, I would not, at present, feel justified in accepting that as a solution of the difficulty. The hon.

gentleman who introduced the Bill has referred to the legislation in the province of Ontario. That legislation may be, and probably is, of a very high class. But the hon. gentleman must remember that there are various provinces in the Dominion and that you will have to face not one only, but a number of sets of laws on the subject. So you will have railways in different parts of the country subject to different requirements.

Mr. MULOCK. They are now subject to different laws in some respects.

Mr. DICKEY. Not as to this subject.

Mr. MULOCK. Not as to drainage, but as to other matters.

Mr. DICKEY. Then, very likely, the provinces will find it convenient to delegate this power, if it is given to them, to the various municipalities; and, while there may be something in what has been said that the railway companies have a very high standing before the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, I think all will admit that they do not stand very well with the municipalities, and there would be a good deal of difficulty in getting impartial justice there. Again, where drainage is required across a railway track, each case must stand upon a different footing, for each has different degrees of merit, and it is practically impossible to deal with them under any general rule. A great deal must depend upon the opportunities of getting drainage in another direction, the facilities for providing the drainage through railway property, and other considerations that will readily suggest themselves. And so each case will require special consideration, and it should be expert consideration, it seems to me, that is, the matter should be decided upon the advice of engineers. I do not see how it is practicable for municipalities to offer the services of engineers to investigate matters of this kind. It must not be forgotten, either, that when a railway is located, part of the damages which it causes to proprietors of land severed by the railway, is a compensation for this very question of drainage.

Mr. CASEY. Oh, no.

Mr. DICKEY. I think so. Then there is another consideration, and that is the consideration of safety with regard to the railway itself. The Railway Committee of the Privy Council which deals with this matter, deals with it from the standpoint of the joint interest, on the one hand, the interest of the railway to preserve its franchise without undue interference, and on the other hand, to allow reasonable facilities for drainage. Their order in each case is accompanied by precautions as to the manner in which drains shall cross the railway, and in that way secures the safety of the public in travelling over the railway. Of course, it is quite proper to say that it is in the

interest of the railway to make a drain safe, and that no doubt is the case ; but the municipalities as such have no knowledge whatever of what is required in order to provide for the safe construction of a drain.

Mr. CASEY. If the hon. gentleman will allow me to interrupt him—I must ask him not to wander away from the municipalities. It is not proposed by anybody to leave it to the municipalities, but to make these railways subject to such laws as exist in the different provinces specially referring to this matter, and making provision for drainage across the railway.

Mr. HAGGART. The province of Ontario gives that right to the municipalities.

Mr. CASEY. No, it does not.

Mr. DICKEY. I do not think it is necessary for us to discuss that right, because it is quite evident that they could depute this power to the municipalities, and they probably would, as a very evident way of disposing of the question. Now, there is another consideration, and that is whether it is wise for this House to renounce a jurisdiction of this kind which will form a precedent. Take, for instance, the question of fencing. Nothing could be more purely local in its character than the question of fencing, and yet the railway legislation of the Dominion Parliament deals with that, and the Railway Committee of the Privy Council deals with it. The crossing of highways, the speed with which trains are to run through towns, and all local matters like that, which could very well be said to come within local jurisdiction, are regulated by the legislation of this Parliament. So that looking the whole subject over, and considering that the Railway Committee of the Privy Council has facilities for investigating cases of this kind which municipalities could not have, and considering that on any application, we would be quite ready to send an officer to any point in Canada to investigate a prima facie case of damage of this kind, it seems to me that the machinery there is better than anything likely to be provided by a municipality. I am not saying at all that the legislation of the Dominion as it stands now is all that it should be, I do not at all express that opinion. I admit that my hon. friend from Grey (Mr. Sproule) may be quite correct in saying that proper facilities are not given in that direction, but that is not the question at issue here. The question at issue here is not whether those facilities cannot be improved, but the question is whether we shall refrain from improving our own legislation, and hand the jurisdiction over to another power over whom we have no control whatever, and whose action in the matter no person can foresee.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). If we have jurisdiction here at all.

Mr. DICKEY.

Mr. DICKEY. I think there is no doubt about our jurisdiction. I am not at all denying the local jurisdiction, I do not propose to say that the local legislatures have not jurisdiction. I think, however, there is no doubt about our jurisdiction, and with deference I should say that the proper course for this House to pursue, and the most consistent with its own dignity, is to keep the power within ourselves, to make such changes in the legislation as we may deem proper.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I wish to call the attention of the House for a moment to a question which was raised by the Minister of Justice. There is no doubt that in granting the franchise to a railway company we may attach any conditions we think proper. It is perfectly true, too, that we may attach conditions with regard to drainage, if we see proper, there is no doubt about that. But apart from that altogether, if a railway company acquires property or land in running through a province, I do not know under what principle of law it could be argued that that railway company holds its lands free from any of the burdens or obligations which the law of the province imposes upon any other proprietor. The railway company goes into a province under the jurisdiction of the laws of the province, and it comes within the boundary of those laws, assuming the province to keep within its sphere of legislation,—as much as any other individual. Now, take the Parson's case, where insurance companies were incorporated by this House : I think that was the class of cases referred to. It was there held by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council that those companies going into a province and acquiring property or doing anything else, must conform to the laws of the province. For instance, we might authorize a railway company, because we are authorized to incorporate railway companies, to acquire real estate, but we could not say that they shall hold that estate under a title different from what the law of the province may require from any other individual. Here is a natural watercourse—and all these are under the jurisdiction of the province—crossed by a railway ; this House could not, in creating a railway corporation, say that the railway company shall have a right to close the watercourses along its own line ; it would have no right to say that. There are cases decided in the province of Ontario where it has been held that a railway company is liable when it interferes with a natural watercourse and damages have been obtained against it, if it interferes with the facilities for drainage where there is no natural watercourse. I think in many of the cases it has been held, that in giving compensation for the land, that matter must have been taken into consideration. But if a province says that, in the case of every land holder, the law which provides for the

drainage of a territory can apply to such, I do not know any jurisdiction or any authority on the part of this House to say that a railway company shall be an exception to that rule. I do not see how you could maintain provincial authority if you could set up a right of that sort, because you might, in granting a franchise to a railway company, flood tens of thousands of acres, and interfere with the possibility of cultivation altogether. I do not say what this House might do if it were a proprietor of the railway itself, or if the country were proprietor. I am not going to discuss that, though it is my impression that even in that case the power could not exist. But in the case of a railway corporation, you incorporate it to conform to the law of the province through which it runs, that is, so far as that law is within the purview and jurisdiction of that province. I do not at all dispute that we might attach any conditions in the franchise to a railway company that we might see proper, and that we could release it from those burdens which we here impose, because we can do so in the case of any other company we might incorporate, but we can't release it, from the duty of rendering obedience to the authority of the laws of each particular province through which the line may pass.

Mr. HAGGART. If there is anything in the hon. gentleman's argument, there is no necessity for this Bill. In that respect, I agree perfectly with the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills). I believe when a railway company acquires a franchise it is liable for all damages it may cause to a municipality or individual. If it erects a bridge, and, owing to the piers, adjacent lands are flooded, the company is liable for damages. This Bill appears to be intended to apply to some purposes that were not contemplated in building railways. It is intended to apply to a general system of drainage which it may be found necessary to carry across railway tracks. Every facility is, however, offered by the Dominion Government at the present time to secure the object which the hon. mover of the Bill has in view. Application may be made to the Railway Committee of the Privy Council. This may be done even without any expense to the individuals or attendance at Ottawa, because an application may be forwarded, and if a prima facie case is made out an officer of the department is sent to the place to ascertain if it is necessary the drainage should be made, and if it is necessary, he reports what proportion of the expenditure should be borne by the railway company and what part by the municipalities. I should like the hon. gentleman to suggest any easier mode of accomplishing the object he has in view. The objection to the Bill is that it gives provincial authorities the right of legislating on a matter that is within the jurisdiction of the Dominion Parliament. Perhaps there would not be much

harm if the local government legislated in regard to the matter in question. But if they were given the right, the provincial government might transfer it to the municipal authorities, and a reeve and council might act to please farmers along the line of railway. It might drive drains across the railway every hundred feet apart, for which, of course, there would be no necessity: they might, indeed, make such arrangements as would injure the rights of the railway company. This is a power which should not be given to the provincial authorities, which might limit franchises for undertakings granted with the sanction of this Government and within its powers.

Mr. SPROULE. Can you get a drain across a railway company's property now?

Mr. HAGGART. Yes. If necessary, an application can be made under the amendment of 1888.

Mr. MULLOCK. It provides only in case of municipalities. How about the case of individuals?

Mr. HAGGART. The municipality acts in cases of individuals who seek to cross a railroad.

Mr. CASEY. No.

Mr. HAGGART. If it is desired to cross a railway, the municipality acts. If it becomes necessary that an individual's property should be drained, he makes application to the municipality.

Mr. MULLOCK. There is no provision requiring a municipality to act for an individual.

Mr. HAGGART. If it was in the interest of the municipality that drainage should be carried in that direction, the municipality would have power to make application to the Privy Council. If the municipality did not think the building of the drain was of sufficient importance of course they would not make application. The hon. gentleman does not suppose that we could legislate for every individual, or give means for passing across or under railways if such was in the interest solely of an individual. It is carrying the principle far enough if we allow a municipality to make application, as it would do in all cases when more than an individual's benefit was at issue.

Mr. MULLOCK. I think the Minister has somewhat misunderstood my interruption. The Act to which he refers is only with respect to a municipality applying to the Railway Committee. Is there anything in the Act which enables an individual to secure drainage for his own private property; where no highway or public easement is affected? I am not aware that there is. If I am correct, then the Minister's argument does not meet the grievance referred to in the Bill, although I am not saying that the remedy proposed is the proper one.

Mr. HAGGART. The Act goes further and allows an individual to make application to the Railway Committee. The Act says :

The Railway Committee shall have power to inquire and determine any application, complaint or dispute respecting any highway or street, ditch or sewer, water, gas or other pipes or mains over and through lands owned or occupied by the company.

Mr. MULOCK. The point I made on a former occasion I renew now. Taking the contention of the Government that an individual sufferer is obliged to get relief through the tribunal provided by the Railway Act, he is obliged, either in person or by some one else, to make his grievance known at Ottawa. This law extends from ocean to ocean, over 3,000 or 4,000 miles of railway, with ramifications running from a short distance to hundreds of miles in a northerly direction. If every citizen was perfectly familiar with the railway law and with the step he has to take, namely, to write a letter, to get his grievance remedied, well and good. We know that theoretically every citizen is supposed to know the law, but as a Parliament we can hardly bind farmers and small property owners by any such law, if we can adopt one less cumbersome. What is involved in the case of an individual having his property injured? Parenthetically, I would say that I do not agree with the Minister of Justice that damages paid for land on expropriation include any possible damages to property by flooding of water or otherwise. The argument of the Minister of Justice was that the money given at the time of the purchase embraced damages at that moment unknown.

Mr. DALY. That was what the member for Bothwell said.

Mr. MULOCK. The Minister of Justice raised that point and I am answering him. Take the average land owner who is selling land to the railway company before the railway is constructed and his mind does not look into the future or anticipate the flooding of his property. I extremely doubt if, as a rule, the question of damages enters into the consideration of the parties when the purchase money is being fixed. If it does enter into consideration then, of course, the landed proprietor has no right whatever to drainage. I wish to address my remarks more particularly to the Minister of Railways. I say that the present system by which each individual is obliged to apply for redress to the Railway Committee of the Privy Council at Ottawa, is an insufficient remedy. It is cumbersome, expensive and unsatisfactory, and it often results in an individual bearing the evil he suffers rather than fly to others he knows not of. I would suggest that some more simple scheme should be devised. I do not say at this moment what that scheme should be, but I will submit for the consideration of the Government whether it would not be possible to select a local tribunal: for ex-

Mr. MULOCK.

ample, the county court judge of the county in which the land is situated. He could hear the matter, and either dispose of it or receive communications and transmit them. With a railway system extending three or four thousand miles in length it is unreasonable that the citizens should be compelled to communicate with the Privy Council and suffer all the delays, and perhaps expense, involved. The simple rural inhabitant, not knowing perhaps that the Minister of Railways will treat the matter in the off-hand way he intimates, and which, no doubt, he does, will shrink from making the application. If he employs counsel, the expense will perhaps override the advantage he derives, and so he suffers without getting redress. The present system is unjust and demands a remedy.

Mr. TISDALE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock) seems to forget one very important thing which is done at the inception of a railway. No one will gainsay that at the inception of a railway all properties through which it passes must be properly drained at the expense of the company, or damages must be paid for not draining. The remedy, if a remedy is needed, will simply be necessary for additional drainage that was not contemplated at the time. No hon. gentleman can successfully controvert that contention. All railway companies under the law of this Parliament are compelled to properly and effectually and thoroughly drain every part of the land over which they go, or they must pay the compensation necessary at the time.

Mr. CASEY. Will the hon. gentleman give me the reference to that in the Act?

Mr. TISDALE. It is under the different provisions of the General Railway Act, and any one who has looked into that Act will see it. We all know that the general franchise is clothed with that responsibility.

Mr. CASEY. Could the hon. gentleman refer me to any particular section of the Act where that is expressed?

Mr. TISDALE. It is in the General Act. I think almost every hon. gentleman has been in a locality where a railway has gone through, and he knows that the railway company is liable for the damages. There are liabilities of that sort imposed at the very inception of every railway company.

Mr. CASEY. I know they do not do it.

Mr. TISDALE. If they do not it is the fault of individuals. There might be some improvement in the law, no doubt, but this state of facts lessens the arguments against the present law. Hon. gentlemen seem to forget that the Railway Act of 1888 was the combined wisdom of this House, and of the Railway Department, and the Royal Commission which had been appointed to inquire into railway matters. That royal commission after the best consideration and

after hearing evidence, recommended that this, among other things, should be left to the Railway Committee. I am inclined to agree with the royal commission that the present procedure was the wisest and fairest and cheapest. I have been a practising lawyer for a good many years, although I am not now, and my experience was, that when it was left to the local tribunals, and a farmer went into the question of drainage he never knew where it was going to end. The lawyers took it from court to court and in trying to enforce his views, he often loaded himself with lawsuits which cost him half as much as his farm was worth.

Mr. MULOCK. They drain the farmer instead of the land.

Mr. TISDALE. The present tribunal is a cheap tribunal and the system has worked successfully. I am satisfied it will be a fair tribunal whichever party is in power. It leaves the responsibility with those who for the time being have the confidence of the nation and are charged with the responsibility of seeing that the rights of individuals are properly attended to. The only objections to it comes from one or two men who are actuated by personal considerations and personal disappointments in not being able to enforce their alleged rights in certain neighbourhoods. The question has been before Parliament a number of times before. The very subject which the hon. gentleman from Elgin (Mr. Casey) brings forward here, was twice thrown out last year by the Railway Committee. A similar Bill was passed in the Senate, and afterwards referred to the Railway Committee of this House, and was thrown out almost unanimously by that committee. This is a very strong point in favour of leaving the matter as it is at present. It would ill-become either the dignity or the legislative capacity of this House to concede that in granting franchises we will not maintain our rights. We should not blindly say that for all time to come, any legislation passed by any province in this Dominion will bind us in a matter within our jurisdiction, and with reference to a franchise which we took the responsibility of granting.

This is an unanswerable point. I am not saying that there may not be some improvements in the drainage; but if that is true, then let us have a Bill on the proper lines, and I for my part shall be most happy to consider anything of that sort on its merits. But I think that hon. members, when seized of the importance of the matter, will agree that it would be improper and unbecoming to the dignity and common sense and good judgment of this House to pass a law giving franchises to the extent to which we have a right to do, and at the same time to say that for all time to come the railways holding those franchises shall be liable to local interference from all the legislatures of this Dominion extending from the Atlantic to the Pacific.

Mr. CAMPBELL. There seems to be no doubt that on this matter this Parliament possesses jurisdiction; but whether the matter is under the exclusive jurisdiction of this Parliament or that of the local legislature, is admittedly a disputed point. As to that I have nothing to say. The object of this Bill is simply to remove that doubt, and to bring the matter of drainage under and through railways within the jurisdiction of the local legislature. Now, it seems to me that this is a Bill which ought to pass this House. No one can settle questions of this kind so well as those who are on the ground; and the local legislature in each province is certainly more competent to decide them properly than the Railway Committee of the Privy Council. With all due respect to what the hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) has said about the decisions of that committee, I maintain that they are very expensive, and in a great many instances most absurd. They are very expensive, for this reason, that if you want to carry your appeal before that committee, it is absolutely necessary for you to engage able counsel. The railways are, of course, represented by the ablest counsel in the land, and unless you are also represented by able counsel to rebut the arguments of those men, you simply have no show at all. I know of cases that have been very improperly decided by the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, resulting in heavy burdens being thrown upon municipalities which should never have been put on them. Through the western part of Ontario this matter is a very serious one. When railways were first built there, the lands through which they ran were comparatively unsettled and undrained. The lands have since improved, settlers have gone in, and now it is necessary that the lands should be drained. Yet it is almost impossible in the western part of Ontario—I speak with a knowledge of the facts—to get drains under the railway lands. You may appeal to the Railway Committee; but who is going to bear the expenses of that, which is a large expense? The hon. Minister of Railways (Mr. Haggart) says it does not cost a cent. It does not cost anything to appear before the committee; but the expense of sending witnesses and counsel and preparing maps and plans is a large expense—in many cases so large that the municipality would rather suffer the grievance than apply for a remedy. This matter, it seems to me, can be adjusted by leaving it to the local legislature. I do not see why a railway company that owns land in a municipality should have different rights from those of others who own lands there. My lands are subject to the laws of the local legislature, and why should not the lands of the railways be so too. I admit that the railway companies require protection as well as anybody else; but their rights would not be prejudicially affected at all by leaving this matter to the local legis-

lature. That body has a deep interest in the development of this country and in the welfare and progress of the railways throughout the country; and surely it would be as much interested in seeing that justice was done to all parties as the Railway Committee of the Privy Council. Besides, it would have this advantage, that it would have a knowledge of the facts obtained on the ground which could not be obtained by men who come from all parts of the Dominion. I therefore think that this Bill should become law, and I do not see why the Government should object to it. Surely it will relieve them of a great deal of responsibility, trouble, and no doubt unpleasant work, while at the same time it will meet the views of all who are interested much better than the present system.

Mr. OUIMET. It seems to me that, in looking at this Bill, we should bear in mind two very different interests that may be affected by it. The first interest is what I would call the private interest; that is, the right of property in the lands owned by the railway companies. I cannot see very great inconvenience in allowing the province to interfere with that right of property, which to a certain extent may be considered as private or civil property. But this would imply interference with the roadbed of every railway which I would call public property. We must remember that every railway is a great highway used for transportation what I would call accelerate and dangerous transportation. The interference with the roadbed may produce very grave results, if made without the supervision of the proper authorities. This is the reason why any interference with the Dominion highways must be looked after, and why these highways must be subject to the responsible authority of the Railway Department. No interference with these roads should be allowed except by the authority of the Railway Department and the Railway Committee of the Privy Council. This interference alone renders impossible the passage of this Bill. It would decentralize the authority responsible for the safety of the travelling public. For that reason, if no other, this Bill should be rejected. As has been said, every facility is given individuals, as well as municipalities, to have drains pass under the road-beds of the different railway companies, by applying to the Railway Department. No expense is incurred except the expense of writing to the secretary of the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, and in no case that I know of has the Government ever refused to consider an application of that kind, even when not supported by counsel. No good results can come from the adoption of this Bill, and the greatest evil may follow from it. Under the circumstances, I do not see how this House could approve of a measure which would be certainly a permanent danger to the security of the travelling public.

Mr. CAMPBELL.

Mr. McMULLEN. I must express my surprise at the views just stated by the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Ouimet). Does he pretend to say that the lives of the travelling public will not be as carefully looked after, under the supervision of a local legislature as of that of the Dominion Government? Does he pretend that the Dominion Government are the only safe guardians of the public?

Mr. OUIMET. I say that the safety of the public lies in having only one responsibility, and the danger lies in the division of that responsibility.

Mr. CASEY. This Bill proposes to remove that division.

Mr. McMULLEN. In every province the local government would be responsible for the proper and prudent use of the powers conferred on it by this Bill. Surely the hon. gentleman does not mean to insinuate that the Executive of each province would be incapable, and that to give them this responsibility would endanger public safety. Surely he does not mean that it would not be safe to allow the local governments to deal with the railway companies in this matter of drainage, and that the only safety for the public lies in this subject being dealt with exclusively by the central authority in Ottawa. I contend that the hon. Minister's argument is fallacious, and not at all just to the local governments of this Dominion. This is an exceedingly important Bill, deserving of the serious consideration of this House. The Minister of Railways has said that any one desiring the construction of a drain across railway property may apply to the Privy Council. My esteemed friend behind me has pointed out pretty clearly the expense and inconvenience of such an application. The Minister of Justice (Mr. Dickey) says he can apply by letter. But that letter would have to be accompanied by some additional proof that the drain was required, and the railway companies always have their counsel present to oppose the application.

Mr. HAGGART. Would not that be the case, anyhow?

Mr. McMULLEN. Would it not be more convenient for a person in my riding to present his case in the city of Toronto than the city of Ottawa? Is it not more trouble and expense to come all the way to Ottawa, when personal appearance must be made either by counsel or by the property owner himself, than it would be to go to the city of Toronto. The Minister of Railways (Mr. Haggart) appears desirous to keep the entire railway system of the country under the control of the central authority. I do not know whether the railway companies have earnestly solicited the Dominion Government to be their guardians and protectors from the expenses which might be put

upon them through the local governments passing drainage Acts under which they might be compelled to allow drains to cross their lines in greater numbers than at present. This is a question of growing importance. During the time that the country was being cleared, and before the people began to turn their attention to drainage, the question was not so important as it is now, and it is becoming more important every day. I submit that the greatest facilities should be given to the municipalities and to the farmers and property owners to secure drainage for their lands where it can be secured with the greatest convenience and cheapness. By this Bill we will give the local governments the power to deal with this as with all other Bills. Under the present law, when a man is going to construct a drain, he has to comply with two sets of laws—first the Drainage Act of Ontario, which applies to every portion of a drain which does not go on the property of the railway company, and then with the Dominion law the moment he touches the property of any railway whose charter is under the control of the Dominion Government—the Dominion Government has to be satisfied before he will be allowed to build that drain across the railway. Would it not be better that the entire drainage of lands, both across railways and elsewhere, should be relegated to the provincial authorities? In this way the question of drainage would be under the one control, and the drainage of lands would be much facilitated. I heard the hon. member for Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) say that railway companies are compelled to drain lands when they construct their railways. Well, Sir, they are simply compelled to drain land immediately adjacent to the line they are building. They are compelled to provide an outlet so as not to accumulate water that will become an inconvenience in the construction of the road-bed or to those who are immediately on the right or left of the road. If another man has a property at a distance requiring to be drained and there is not convenient outlet that can be made use of cheaply, it will enable him to cross the railway company's lands. Many cases are now arising in which it is necessary that the drains should cross the railway tracks. But the moment the drain reaches the railway company's property, the municipal system and the drainage laws of the province are superseded, and the person requiring the drain must come to Ottawa and make application for the privilege of making a drain across the railway company's tracks. It would be much better if the whole matter of drainage were relegated to the provinces, and let the province laws control the railways in such cases as well as the municipality. This is becoming a matter of more and more importance every day. In the district where I live, and in the dis-

trict of the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule)—to whose remarks I listened carefully—and throughout the whole of western Ontario it has become of the greatest importance that facilities should be given for the drainage of lands. Farmers should not be hampered and hindered by an expensive modus operandi that will postpone and frustrate the completion of drains that may be of the greatest benefit to large numbers in the community. The Bill proposed should be given effect to at once. The local governments and municipalities should be left to deal with this question.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). After an experience of twelve years in municipal life in Ontario, I have the best reasons for knowing that there is great difficulty in many cases in getting land drained on account of the railroads. I was astonished to hear the Minister say that the purchasing of the right of way included any damages that the land might sustain. Such is not the case. You can come on them for that afterwards. There is great need of a law to simplify the procedure in such matters. At present the farmer must bring an engineer to have a survey made of the locality, and then he must have plans and profiles made before he can go before the Railway Committee of the Privy Council; and, moreover, he must have counsel. A Bill should be passed allowing the whole matter to be dealt with in some such manner as is now done in Ontario in the case of property under provincial jurisdiction. The Minister of Railways and Canals said that a private individual could not carry a drain across a public highway in Ontario. That is quite true. It is also true that an individual cannot take a drain across his neighbour's property. The procedure in such cases is this: The person who requires the drain notifies the owners of the land he proposes to cross that he requires an outlet. They meet and consult upon matters, and if they cannot come to an arrangement the person requiring the drain notifies the township council. Each township council has its engineer. In our locality we have a regularly licensed provincial engineer for every municipality. The engineer examines the locality and apporitions the expense to be borne by each. The work is then done under the engineer. I do not know that exactly this system would work in the case of carrying drainage under railways, but I am sure that some simpler system is required than that which makes it necessary for a farmer to come before the Railway Committee of the Privy Council. I know localities where they have attempted time and again to make drains under railways, but have not been able to succeed down to the present time on account of the large cost required under the present procedure. Where but one farmer is interested, the expense is altogether too great. There is no use in saying that a

farmer can go before the Railway Committee of the Privy Council without incurring considerable expense in preparing plans and profiles, and even assessments of the different properties affected. A Bill such as that before the House would be of great benefit to the rural districts, not only of Ontario, but every other province.

Mr. FOSTER. After having listened to this discussion, it strikes me that the subject is one which seems to involve differences in treatment in different provinces. I have a suggestion to make. I think we should read the Bill a second time 'pro forma,' and refer it to the Committee on Railways. That committee, it seems to me, can discuss the matter more profitably than we can.

Mr. CASEY. I accept the suggestion with this counter-suggestion: that the Railway Committee will have its hands full in dealing with private Bills, and, as this is not a private Bill, it should rather, I think, be sent to a select committee of five or seven members.

Mr. FOSTER. I think the Railway Committee has not so much work to do this session as it sometimes has. If that committee wishes, it can have the Bill considered by a small sub-committee.

Mr. LAURIER. If my hon. friend (Mr. Casey) will take my advice, he will accept the suggestion of the hon. Minister of Finance, which, I think, is a very reasonable one. The Railway Committee is composed of experts in these matters, and will be able to give the Bill better treatment than a special committee could.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

Mr. CASEY moved:

That the said Bill be referred to the Select Standing Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines.

Motion agreed to.

LEGAL RATE OF INTEREST.

Mr. MULLOCK moved the second reading of Bill (No. 8) respecting interest. He said: The principle of this Bill is a very simple one, and I am sure the measure will commend itself to the judgment of the House. Many years ago, in 1859, I think, Parliament fixed the legal rate of interest at 6 per cent. At that time the current rate of interest was considerably in excess of 6 per cent—perhaps 9 per cent. The rate fixed by Parliament was, therefore, about one-third less than the current rate. Since that time a change has taken place in the value of money, and to-day, I think, I am quite within the facts in saying 6 per cent is the average current rate. Money is pro-

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron.)

curable at much less than 6 per cent, and I doubt if, in ordinary dealings between man and man, a higher rate than 6 per cent is now given as a matter of agreement, except in rare cases. I have suggested 4, because it is about a third under the current rate of 6 per cent, and 6 per cent was years ago about a third under the then current rate, so 4 per cent is about a third under the current rate of to-day. The only doubt in my mind is as to whether, instead of its being fixed at 4 per cent, we should not fix it at 3 per cent to-day. However, I am prepared to hear suggestions in that direction, but not wishing to be unreasonable, I have endeavoured as nearly as possible to adopt a scale in harmony with the scale adopted in 1859. It seems to me in the public interest that the legal rate, that is, the rate provided by law in the absence of an agreement, should not at least be in excess of, or even equal to, the highest going rate between parties. Six per cent to-day, the legal rate, is an excessive rate for the law to impose in the way of damages or fine upon a debtor. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I move the second reading of this Bill.

Mr. FOSTER. As it would be impossible to finish the discussion of this Bill before six o'clock, and I am going to propose that the House adjourn at six. I would suggest to my hon. friend that the debate on this Bill be adjourned. The discussion will certainly take longer than the time between now and six o'clock. I move that the debate be adjourned.

Mr. MULLOCK. Of course, I will accede to the hon. gentleman's request. I suppose that we will have plenty of time to discuss all these Bills.

Mr. FOSTER. Lots of time.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think the House should make that suggestion compulsory, that is, make a legal rate beyond which a contract should not extend.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

ROYAL COMMISSION ON PROHIBITION.

Mr. FLINT (for Mr. Casey) asked:

What has been the cost to date of the Royal Commission on Prohibition, specifying the amounts for expenses and salaries of commissioners, reporting and printing?

Is the amount so stated final?

Mr. FOSTER. The expense of the Royal Commission on Prohibition up to date has been \$82,813.41; the expenses of the commissioners, \$6,724.36; salaries of commissioners, \$13,775; reporting, including expenses of reporters, \$8,914.09; printing, \$29,846.05. The amount as stated above is, I believe, final.

CANADIAN SHEEP IN GREAT BRITAIN.

Mr. CASEY asked :

What steps have been taken by the Government to prevent the scheduling of Canadian sheep in Great Britain ?

Mr. MONTAGUE. When information was cabled by the High Commissioner to the effect that cases of scab had been found in sheep carried by Canadian steamers to England, the Minister of Agriculture caused instructions to be conveyed to the veterinary surgeons of the department to make an inspection of each animal before embarkation as quickly as possible. Such instructions were carried out, and none but healthy animals were allowed to go forward.

IMPORTATION OF SPIRITUOUS LIQUORS.

Mr. RIDER asked :

Whether there has been admitted into Canada, free of duty during the year 1895, any alcohol, or spirituous liquors of any kind, of American manufacture ? If so, under what statute or regulations ? For what purpose, and in what quantity, has it been imported during the period named ?

Mr. WOOD. There have been no spirituous liquors imported free of duty.

WHARF AT MAGOG, P.Q.

Mr. RIDER asked :

1. Whether the Government has acquired by purchase or otherwise any property at Magog, province of Quebec, for a public wharf ?

2. Of what does the property consist, and what are its specifications and dimensions ?

3. Where is it situated, and from whom was it purchased ?

4. Does it connect with a highway or street ?

5. When was the purchase completed ? What was the price paid ? How was the payment made ? If by cheque, to whom was it made payable ?

6. In what state of repair is the wharf, and have any repairs been made thereto by the Government ?

Mr. OUIMET. 1. Yes. 2. The property consists of a wharf 420 feet in length by 24 feet in width, for a distance of 322 feet from the shore, the remainder or outer end being 40 feet in width, with a storehouse situated on the outer end of the wharf. 3. The wharf is situated in the bed of Lake Memphremagog, and along the shore thereof in the town of Magog. The wharf was purchased from Messrs. C. C. Smith & Co. 4. The wharf connects with a street immediately west of the Canadian Pacific Railway station, which street leads to Main Street. 5. The purchase was completed on 7th August, 1895, and the price paid was \$2,500. The payment was made by cheque from the Department of Finance, payable to E. B. Longtinton, the agent of the Minister of Justice, and C. C. Smith & Co. 6. The wharf is in a fair state

of repair, and no work has been done on it since the purchase. It is reported that \$250 would place the wharf in a complete state of efficiency.

CHARLES CHAMBERLAIN.

Mr. MULOCK asked :

1. Did the Government commute the sentence of one Charles Chamberlain, convicted of perjury, personation, or both, and sentenced to serve a term of imprisonment in the Manitoba penitentiary ? If so, why ?

2. What was the length of such term of imprisonment ? How much was served ? When did the prisoner begin to serve it, and when was he set at large ?

Mr. DICKEY. Yes. Charles Chamberlain had been convicted of perjury. The sentence was reduced on account of special services rendered by Chamberlain to the penitentiary, whereby a large sum of money was saved. The sentence was three years, and two years were served. The sentence dates from March 14, 1894. He was discharged December 21st last.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that two years had been served ?

Mr. DICKEY. Yes.

Mr. MULOCK. And the sentence was dated 14th March, 1894 ?

Mr. DICKEY. There are reductions allowed.

Mr. MULOCK. Will the hon. gentleman add this ?

Mr. DICKEY. That is included, of course. It means that a year of his sentence is taken off. He was set at large on 21st December.

Mr. MULOCK. I think it would be convenient to add the nature of the services. I would like to add that question.

Mr. DICKEY. I will give you that.

TIGNISH BREAKWATER.

Mr. PERRY asked :

Has the Department of Public Works caused a survey to be made of the breakwater at Tignish, Prince Edward Island, during the season of 1895, as promised by the Minister of Public Works in the sessions of 1894 and 1895 ; and, if so, has a report been made ?

Mr. OUIMET. An examination of the breakwater at Tignish, P.E.I., was made during the session of 1895, and a report has been submitted.

Mr. PERRY asked :

Is the Department of Public Works aware of the fact that the Tignish Breakwater, Prince Edward Island, is in a dilapidated condition and liable to be carried away at any moment by storm, &c. ? Has the department taken steps for the immediate repair of said breakwater ?

Mr. OUIMET. The department is aware of the fact that the breakwater at Tignish, P.E.I., is in need of repair. The department has not taken steps for immediate repairs to the breakwater, owing to lack of funds.

KILDARE STATION POST OFFICE.

Mr. PERRY asked :

Has a postmaster been appointed at Kildare Station, Prince Edward Island, in the place of Avit Perry, deceased? If so, who is he, and, if not, how are the duties of that office managed?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Avit Perry does not appear to have been postmaster at Kildare Station at any time. The postmastership of Kildare became vacant in August, 1895, by the resignation of Marguerite Poirier, who was then postmistress. John B. Gaudet was appointed postmaster in her place.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS AT PETERBOROUGH.

Mr. LANDERKIN asked :

1. Has the collector of customs at Peterborough resigned or has he been removed from office?

2. Is there a deficit in his accounts? If so, what is the amount of such deficit? Is the Government secured by bondsmen? If so, what are their names, and are they responsible persons for the amount of their respective bonds? When was the last audit made of the accounts of the collector of customs at the port of Peterborough?

3. Did the collector receive permission from the Government or department before leaving for Chicago, where he is now said to be domesticated?

4. If there is a vacancy, has an appointment been made, and, if so, who is the present incumbent?

5. Has the late collector been paid the full amount of his salary each month during his term of office?

6. When does the Government or department expect a report of the investigation at present being made?

7. How long has the Government or department known that the affairs of the custom-house at Peterborough have been conducted practically without a responsible head?

Mr. WOOD. 1. Mr. Clementi has been removed from the office of collector of customs at Peterborough. 2. There is a deficit in his accounts; the inspector telegraphs me that it will be in the neighbourhood of \$3,000. The Government is fully secured. The bondsmen are Mr. James Stevenson and Mr. Robert Rowe. The port of Peterborough was last inspected on the 14th September, 1894. 3. The collector was not granted leave of absence before leaving for Chicago. 4. Mr. Rufus Stevenson has been appointed collector. 5. The late collector has been paid his salary up to the 31st December last. 6. The inspector wired me that he would not be able to make his full report before next week. 7. The Government were not aware that the affairs of the custom-house at Peterborough have

Mr. PERRY.

been conducted without a responsible head. As soon as information was received of the incompetency of the collector, a man was appointed as acting collector in charge of the port.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Is that Mr. Stephenson who is Collector at Chatham?

Mr. WOOD. No.

PIERS AND BREAKWATERS AT PASPEBIAC.

Mr. BERGERON (for Mr. Joncas) asked :

Whether petitions have been presented to the Government asking for the construction of piers and breakwaters at Paspébiac, in the County of Bonaventure, with a view to making at that point a harbour of refuge? If so, by whom were the said petitions signed?

Mr. OUIMET. Two petitions have been received by the Department, one in February, 1882, through Mr. Beauchesne, then M.P., signed by Rev. Cyprien Larrivee, Messrs. Charles Robin & Co., LeBoutillier Bros., the Mayor and Councillors of Paspébiac, and 184 others, asking for the construction of a public wharf at Paspébiac. Another petition was transmitted by Mr. Georges Romeril, agent for Messrs. Charles Robin & Co., on the 1st of June, 1891, asking that necessary works be constructed at Paspébiac to make it a harbour of refuge. This petition was signed by Messrs. LeBoutillier Bros., Georges Romeril, Rev. Mr. Larrivee, and 113 others. Letters were subsequently received to the same effect from Mr. Romeril on the 8th of January, 28th of November and 26th December, 1894, and from Messrs. Robin, Colas & Co., on the 28th March, 1894.

BAIE DES CHALEURS RAILWAY.

Mr. BERGERON (for Mr. Joncas) asked :

Whether letters or petitions have been forwarded to the Government, urging them to take the necessary steps to secure the ownership of the Baie des Chaleurs Railway, with a view to making it a branch of the Intercolonial?

Mr. HAGGART. The Gaspé Board of Trade have asked the Government if any application had been received from the Baie des Chaleurs Railway Company or the Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway Company for an extension of time for the completion of the Baie des Chaleurs Railway, and they further ask that the charter be cancelled, and that the road be taken possession of by the Government, and made a feeder of the Intercolonial Railway. I understand eighty miles out of the 100 miles from Metapédia to Paspébiac have been constructed, in aid of which the Government has granted a cash subsidy of \$620,000, which has been paid, the Government holding as security for the completion of the balance of the 100 miles contracted for,

Baie des Chaleurs Railway Company bonds to the face value of \$200,000.

CAPE BRETON RAILWAY CONTRACTS.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness) asked :

What quantity of "hard-pan," so called, was removed by D. McDonnell and Cameron, sub-contractors under Sims and Slater, on the Cape Breton Railway, east of Grand Narrows :—

- (1) On section from station 1 to 106 ?
- (2) On section from station 210 to 250 ?

Mr. HAGGART. I have not the information asked for, just in the form desired, but the records show that whilst Messrs Sims & Slater and their sureties conducted the work on section No. 2 of the Cape Breton Railway, the following quantities of what has been termed hard-pan was excavated: From station 1 to station 106, 19,273 cubic yards; from station 210 to station 250, 5,460 cubic yards.

SUPREME COURT REPORTS.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT (for Mr. Davies, P.E.I.) asked :

Has the Government taken any, and what, steps to have the reports of the Supreme Court published with less delay than they have been in the past, and to ensure that the reports, when published, will contain the judgments of the court up to the time of publication ?

Mr. DICKEY. Yes. The Minister of Justice has given the following directions to the reporter :—1. Cases in which judgments are pronounced should be immediately reported with the written opinions of the judges which are handed down at the time. No report is to be delayed by reason of any opinion not having been handed down at the time judgment was pronounced. 2. When a case is in type the reporter should send to each judge, if so desired, a fair proof in galley of his opinion, but no delay exceeding eight days can be authorized for the perusal or correction of such proof by the judge. 3. Where it is announced at the rendering of judgment that no written opinion will be furnished by the court or any member thereof, a synopsis of the case should be reported. 4. Cases already decided, but which stand unreported awaiting the delivery of written opinions, should be immediately reported with the material available unless within ten days the opinions are handed down, in which case, of course, the opinions will be reported.

TOBACCO IMPORTATIONS.

Mr. JEANNOTTE asked :

1. How many pounds of foreign tobacco entered Canada in 1895 ?
2. What was the amount of excise duty levied on the said tobacco ?
3. On how many pounds of Canadian tobacco did the Government collect duty ?
4. The amount of the said duties ?

5. How many officers of excise are employed in collecting the said duties ?

6. What is the amount of salary paid these officers for the year 1895 ?

7. What is the amount of money expended by the Government in the way of salaries to secure the collection of such duties for the year 1895 ?

Mr. PRIOR. 1. Raw leaf, 12,422,326 lbs.; manufactured tobacco, 178,167 lbs., which includes cigars, cigarettes, snuff, and 359 lbs. of raw leaf samples which paid duty. 2. The amount of excise duty levied and collected on tobacco manufactured in Canada from foreign leaf during the fiscal year 1894-95 was \$2,974,025.59, the duty being collectable on the manufactured product and not upon the raw leaf. 3. 544,244 lbs. 4. \$28,896.10. 5, 6 and 7. This information cannot be given with any degree of accuracy, as officers have different classes of surveys under their charge, and even a reasonably fair approximate estimate of the salaries and expenditures in connection with the collection of duties on a specific article is impossible.

QUARANTINE REGULATIONS.

Mr. BENNETT (for Mr. Smith, Ontario) asked :

Is it the intention of the Government to remove the quarantine regulations between Canada and the United States ?

Mr. MONTAGUE. Correspondence is going on in connection with the cattle quarantine, but that correspondence has not reached the stage when it would be wise to make any announcement in this House. Speaking generally, I may say that the Government are fully aware of the importance of the subject, and no time will be lost in taking such steps as we believe will be in the best interests of the Canadian cattle trade and of Canadian trade generally.

CABINET RESIGNATIONS.

Mr. RINFRET (for Mr. Fauvel) asked :

To how many gentlemen was the vacant portfolio in the Cabinet, caused by the resignation of Hon. A. R. Angers, offered, and by whom was it refused ?

Mr. FOSTER. The vacant portfolio in the Cabinet caused by the resignation of Hon. Mr. Angers was not offered to any person except and until it was offered and accepted by the present Minister.

LIEUTENANT-GOVERNOR DEWDNEY.

Mr. SUTHERLAND (for Mr. Martin) asked :

Whether it is true that Lieutenant-Governor Dewdney, of British Columbia, interfered in the recent election in Victoria by wiring the Premier as to Col. Prior's position in the Cabinet ?

Mr. FOSTER. It is not true that Lieutenant-Governor Dewdney, of British Col-

umbia, interfered in the recent election in Victoria by wiring the Premier as to Col. Prior's position in the Cabinet.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Did he wire ?

Mr. FOSTER. He did wire.

PASPEBIAC WINTER PORT.

Mr. BERGERON (for Mr. Joncas) asked :

Whether the Government have sent to Paspébiac, in the county of Bonaventure, an engineer, with instructions to ascertain the possibility of making a harbour of refuge, or a winter port at that place ?

If so, at whose request was he sent, and what instructions did he receive ?

Mr. OUMET. The department has sent an engineer to Paspébiac, in the county of Bonaventure, with instructions to ascertain whether that harbour could or not be used as a winter port. This engineer was sent at the request of the Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway Company. His instructions are to map out the formation of the bord ice, its thickness, keep record of maximum and minimum temperature, and all other details which will enable a conclusion to be arrived at. He is also instructed, while in the locality, to visit several other ports on the Baie des Chaleurs with the same object in view.

GASPE BASIN AND GRAND GREVE MAIL SERVICE.

Mr. BERGERON (for Mr. Joncas) asked :

Whether it is the intention of the Government to establish a daily mail service between Gaspé Basin and Grand Grève, in the county of Gaspé ?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. An application for a daily mail service between Gaspé Basin and Grand Grève was made by L. Z. Joncas, Esq., M.P., on the 20th inst., and it was referred to the inspector for report on the same day.

STE. ANNE DES MONTS MAIL SERVICE.

Mr. BERGERON (for Mr. Joncas) asked :

Whether it is the intention of the Government to establish a daily mail service between Ste. Anne des Monts, in the county of Gaspé, and Matane, in the county of Rimouski ?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. An application for a daily mail service between Ste. Anne des Monts and Matane was made by L. Z. Joncas, M.P., on the 20th inst., and it was referred to the inspector for report on the same day.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER, BART., HIGH COMMISSIONER.

Mr. CASEY asked :

1. At what different dates has Sir Charles Tupper been appointed to the office of High Commis-

Mr. FOSTER:

sioner at London, and how long did he hold that office under each appointment ?

2. For what period, or periods, since his first appointment as High Commissioner, has he held office as a Minister of the Crown, and for what departments, giving date of beginning and end of each such period ?

3. What leave of absence was granted to him from his duties in London, and for what purpose, when he last came to Canada ?

4. Has he resigned his office as High Commissioner in the employ of the Government of Canada, and if so, when ?

5. If not, is he still in receipt of a salary or other emolument or allowance as such High Commissioner ?

6. If he has resigned, has any one else been appointed High Commissioner, and if so, who ?

7. Is any business now pending, or are any Canadian interests at stake which require the presence of a High Commissioner in London ?

8. Has the attention of the Government been called to statements in the press to the effect that Sir Charles Tupper is to hold the double offices of Secretary of State and High Commissioner ?

9. Is their intention that he shall continue to be High Commissioner while a member of the Cabinet ?

Mr. FOSTER. 1. (a.) Appointed High Commissioner, without salary, 30th May, 1883 ; (b.) Appointed High Commissioner, with pay, &c., 24th May, 1884 ; (c.) Resigned office as High Commissioner, January, 1887 ; (d.) Appointed Acting High Commissioner, without pay, 7th March, 1887. (e.) Resigned Acting High Commissioner, 6th July, 1887 ; (f.) Appointed High Commissioner, with pay, 23rd May, 1888 ; (g.) Resigned High Commissioner, 15th January, 1896 ; (h.) Appointed Acting High Commissioner, without pay, 15th January, 1896. 2. (a.) Appointed Minister of Finance, 27th January, 1887 ; (b.) Resigned as Minister of Finance, 23rd May, 1888 ; (c.) Appointed Secretary of State, 15th January, 1896. 3. Summoned to Canada by Premier's cablegram, 2nd December, 1895. 4. Resigned as High Commissioner, 15th January, 1896. 5. No. 6. Appointed Acting High Commissioner, without salary. 7. All business is regularly attended to by the officials in London, with approval from here. 8. No. 9. Is Acting High Commissioner for the present.

REORGANIZATION OF THE CABINET.

Mr. DAWSON asked :

Whether the seven Ministers who recently resigned and who have (all save one) returned to the Cabinet, are now satisfied—

(1) That they have secured the formation of a Government whose Premier commands the confidence of all his colleagues ?

(2) That they can satisfy the Liberal-Conservative party that its strongest elements are now at its head ?

(3) That they are now able to impress the country that it has a Government which is united and has power to govern ?

Mr. FOSTER. I am afraid this question is dictated rather by curiosity than by a

desire for real information, and that I cannot answer it to the hon. gentleman's satisfaction. And, to prevent waste of time, I think I may say that the same remark applies to the next question.

Mr. DAWSON. I am very anxious the Government should answer this question, therefore, I will inquire :

Whether, at the time they re-entered the Government, the following members of the Cabinet :—

The Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster),

The Minister of Justice (Mr. Dickey),

The Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Haggart),

The Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Ives),

The Minister of Agriculture (Dr. Montague), and

The Controller of Customs (Mr. Wood), informed Sir Mackenzie Bowell that they re-entered his Government with many misgivings, but that they will nevertheless continue their loyal and united efforts to make it strong and efficient ?

Mr. FOSTER. I must give the same answer to that as to the preceding question.

THREE RIVERS HARBOUR.

Mr. RINFRET (for Mr. Langelier) asked :

1. What disposition has been made of the Three Rivers Harbour debentures authorized by chapter 10 of the Statutes of 1892 ? Have the said debentures been sold, and if so, at what price ?

2. Have the Three Rivers Harbour Commissioners paid to the Government the sum of fifteen thousand dollars, as required by the Act of last session ?

Mr. FOSTER. We have been advised that \$40,500 of the debentures referred to have been sold at 94. The Three Rivers Harbour Commissioners have paid to the Government the sum of \$15,000, as required by the Act of last session.

INSPECTOR OF WEIGHTS AND MEASURES FOR THREE RIVERS.

Mr. RIDER (for Mr. Leduc) asked :

Is the Government aware that the position of inspector of weights and measures for the district of Three Rivers has been already a long time vacant, by the death of Mr. Olivier, who held that post ? If so, is it the intention of the Government to appoint an inspector for that division, during the present session ?

Mr. PRIOR. The matter is under consideration.

THREE RIVERS HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS.

Mr. RINFRET (Translation) (for Mr. Langelier) asked :

1. What has been the total cost, up to 31st December, 1895, of the Three Rivers Harbour Commissioners' operations ?

2. Whether there are claims outstanding for work performed or for properties purchased, and if so, what are those claims ?

3. What is the annual revenue, and what are the annual expenses of said Harbour Commissioners ?

4. Whether the Three Rivers Harbour Commissioners are in debt to the Government ? If so, for what amount, and what steps have been taken to obtain payment of such debt ?

Mr. OUMET. (Translation.) The total expenditure of the Three Rivers Harbour Commissioners, up to 30th June, 1895, was \$150,164.77. There is no such outstanding claims as those mentioned in the second paragraph of the question. The annual revenue of the Three Rivers Harbour Commission of 1894, reached up to \$7,164.02, and the expenses, \$2,367.84. From the 1st January to the 30th June, 1895, the revenue was \$1,872.34, the expenditure being \$1,222.40.

Mr. FOSTER. As to the fourth part of the question, I beg to say that on the 31st of December last, the commission, after paying \$15,000 on account of interest, owed the Government for loan, \$81,760.97 ; arrears of interest, \$17,589.25 ; arrears and interest thereon on account of sinking fund, \$9,335.65 ; and there is a sum of \$800.22 at the credit of the sinking fund.

MARSH NEAR WALPOLE ISLAND.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell) asked :

Whether the marsh, or any portion of it adjoining Walpole Island has been leased or sold to parties in Windsor or in Detroit, or to any other parties, and if so, at what price ?

Mr. DALY. 1. No sale of any portion of the marsh adjoining Walpole Island has been sold by the Dominion Government. 2. It has been leased. 3. Part of it has been leased to the Walpole Fishing and Shooting Company, of Toronto, at a rental of \$250 per annum ; part to John S. Hendrie of Hamilton and Charles H. Nelson of Toronto, in trust for the St. Clair Flats Shooting Company, at a rental of \$700 per annum for the first half of term, and \$800 per annum for the remaining half ; and part to John Maughan, Z. A. Lash and E. R. C. Clarkson, of Toronto, in trust for the St. Anne's Island Shooting and Fishing Club, at a rental of \$650 per annum. All these leases were made some years ago.

ADJOURNMENT—TRANSIT OF AMERICAN CATTLE.

Mr. FOSTER moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. MULOCK. Before the House adjourns I desire to ask a question. In this morning's "Citizen" it is stated that the Government, having despaired of being able to remove the scheduling of Canadian cattle seeking to enter Great Britain, had

arranged for the admission to St. John of American cattle in transit to Great Britain. If any such permission has been given, I would ask the Government to lay upon the Table at the earliest moment the Order in Council and all other papers bearing on the subject.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The Government will be very pleased to lay on the Table, perhaps on Monday, the papers in connection with the matter which the hon. gentleman has referred to.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Might I inquire of the Minister whether the Order in Council giving his permission has been passed?

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. gentleman will see on Monday exactly what has been done.

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 27th January, 1896.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

CUSTOMS ACT, 1894.

Mr. McMULLEN moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 23) in further amendment of the Customs Tariff, 1894.

Mr. FOSTER. Explain.

Mr. McMULLEN. The intention of the proposed amendment to the Act is simply to erase the word "human." Of course, corn is used for human as well as for animal food. I will give full explanations when the Bill comes up for second reading.

TIGNISH BREAKWATER, P.E.I.

Mr. PERRY asked :

What is the amount collected for wharfage dues at the Tignish Breakwater, Prince Edward Island, during the season of 1895?

Mr. OUIMET. The total collections for the past year amounted to \$73.96; the commission thereon amounted to \$18.50, and there was remitted to the department the sum of \$54.46.

NORTHUMBERLAND STRAITS—BORINGS FOR TUNNEL.

Mr. PERRY asked :

Have any borings across the Straits of Northumberland, from Cape Traverse, Prince Edward

Mr. MULOCK.

Island, to Cape Tormentine, New Brunswick, been made during the season 1895? How many borings have been made since Engineer Palmer gave up the work? Have sufficient borings been made to enable the Government to decide intelligently on the feasibility and the cost of building a tunnel across the Straits? What amount has been paid for borings across the Straits up to date, giving the separate amounts for each year?

Mr. FOSTER. The amount expended in 1891 was \$1,650.28; in 1892, \$25; in 1895, \$6,248.16, giving a total of \$7,923.44. Several borings were made across the straits during 1895. I have not here the exact number made since Mr. Palmer left the business of boring at the straits, but I will get that information. With respect to the next question, I propose to have a map placed on the Table which will give information as to the course of the borings so far.

STEAMER "ALERT."

Mr. LANGELIER asked :

Whether the steamer "Alert" has been sold? If so, when, to whom, and at what price; has the purchase money been paid, and, if so, when?

Mr. COSTIGAN. 1. The "Alert" was sold on 2nd July, 1895. 2. The purchaser was J. B. Lantelum, of St. John, N.B. 3. The price for which the vessel was sold was \$4,155. 4. The purchase money was paid on the 4th July, 1895, and the proceeds of the sale, after payment of expenses, has been forwarded through the usual channel to the Admiralty for the credit of the Imperial Navy Fund. The amount remitted to the Admiralty was £814 4s. 7d. sterling.

FISHING BOUNTIES IN DIGBY, N.S.

Mr. BOWERS asked :

1. How many cheques issued to fishermen in Digby County in 1894, endorsed by the late fishery officer and used by himself, have come to the notice of the Government?
2. Have the Government taken any steps to ascertain whether the claims put forth of parties not receiving their cheques were correct?
3. If so, what conclusion was reached?
4. Has the Government re-issued new cheques to those parties who were thus defrauded by one of their officials?
5. If not, why not?
6. Is it the intention of the Government to see that no loss shall be incurred by these parties who have not received their bounties?
7. If so, when will the fishermen thus defrauded receive new cheques?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Eighteen bounty cheques issued to fishermen in Digby County in 1894, bearing the initials of the late fishery officer as witness to the mark of the payee, and also bearing that officer's usual signature, have come to the notice of the Government, but as the department has not full evidence that the amount of these cheques was appropriated by the officer, the case requires and is receiving further investigation, pending the result of which definite replies to ques-

tion from 2 to 7 inclusive would be premature. There is, however, sufficient evidence to justify legal proceedings against the officer in question and his sureties, and they have been ordered through the Department of Justice.

REFUND OF LICENSE MONEYS—NEW-FOUNDLAND.

Mr. FLINT asked :

Has the Government of Newfoundland settled the claim of the Dominion for refund of license moneys collected from Canadian fishermen in 1890-91 or 1891-92 ? If so, how much money has been paid over to the Dominion Government in pursuance of such settlement ? When does the Government expect to pay the same over to the claimants in Canada ?

Mr. COSTIGAN. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries undertook to recover back from the Newfoundland Government fees collected in 1890 from the Canadian fishing vessels under the Bait Act. Legal proceedings were instituted through the Department of Justice, by a local law firm. The net amount received by the Dominion Government up to date is \$3,970.04, and is made up as follows :—

License fees paid by 32 vessels....	\$ 4,327 50
Interest allowed by court on above.	501 09
	\$4,828 59
Deducted by Government solicitors for legal expenses	\$1,246 62
Less amount already advanced	398 00
	848 62
	\$3,979 97
Less exchange at ¼ p.c.....	9 93
	\$3,970 04

The Government has under consideration the question of assuming the payment of the law costs, and if it is decided to do so, it will be necessary to ask Parliament to provide the requisite amount, which will be slightly in excess of the sum of \$848.62, stated above, as there are still a few unrecovered license fees in respect of which action is proceeding and further expenses will accrue. The net amount has been placed to the credit of the Receiver General in special account, and as the payment of the legal expenses is now under the consideration of the Government, it is not deemed advisable to make any distribution until that question is decided, which will be at an early date.

BUTTER AND CHEESE MANUFACTURE.

Mr. GRIEVE asked :

How many pounds of butter and cheese were manufactured in each province of the Dominion of Canada during the years 1881 and 1891, respectively ?

21½

Mr. MONTAGUE :

CHEESE.

	1891. Pounds.	1881. Pounds.
British Columbia.....	39,595	88,800
Manitoba	743,746	19,613
New Brunswick	341,405	301,188
Nova Scotia.....	1,096,752	953,400
Ontario	81,834,904	53,569,254
Prince Edward Island.....	217,574	196,273
Quebec	30,511,997	8,771,556
Territories	195,541	1,060
	114,981,514	63,901,152

BUTTER.

British Columbia.....	393,089	364,887
Manitoba	5,067,318	957,152
New Brunswick.....	7,808,268	6,527,176
Nova Scotia.....	9,021,158	7,465,285
Ontario	57,065,061	55,924,765
Prince Edward Island.....	1,969,213	1,688,690
Quebec	32,892,836	31,253,887
Territories	1,928,162	70,717
	116,145,165	104,252,550

This includes home-made and factory-made cheese and butter.

PICTON POST OFFICE.

Mr. DAWSON asked :

1. Have the Government purchased land in the town of Picton, in the county of Prince Edward, upon which to erect a public building to be used as a post office and custom-house ?
2. From whom and when was the said land purchased, and at what price ?
3. What amount has been paid ?
4. Were there any buildings on said land at the time of purchase, and are they still there ?
5. Are the buildings occupied, and if so, by whom ?
6. Do the occupants pay rent, and if so, what amount ?
7. Who collects said rent ?
8. Do the Government intend to erect the said public building upon the said land ?
9. Has the contract been let yet, and if so, to whom and what is the amount ?
10. If let, has work been commenced by the contractor ? If not, when is he to begin ?

Mr. OUIMET. 1. Yes. 2. From Mr. J. N. Carter, in February, 1894, for \$3,500. 3. \$3,500. 4. Yes. 5. The buildings are occupied by the following parties : Messrs. Alcorn & Young, lawyers ; Mr. Richard Hubbs, lawyer ; Mr. Hodgins, storehouse for agricultural implements ; Messrs. Sixsmith & Baker and J. N. Carter. 6. Yes, \$500 per year. 7. The Collector of Revenue for the department. 8. Matter not yet settled. 9. No. 10. No.

MINISTERIAL RESIGNATIONS.

Mr. GRIEVE asked :

Is it the intention of the Government to lay on the Table of the House copies of all papers, telegrams and correspondence that have passed between Sir Mackenzie Bowell and the seven Ministers of his Cabinet, Hon. John Graham Hag-

gart, Hon. George Eulas Foster, Hon. Arthur Rupert Dickey, Hon. Walter Humphries Montague, Hon. John Fisher Wood, Hon. Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper and Hon. William Bullock Ives, regarding the resignation of these gentlemen from his Cabinet?

Mr. FOSTER. In answer, I will say to my hon. friend that the Government will bring down such correspondence as is usual on such occasions.

THE HON. CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE.

Mr. DAVIS (Alberta) asked :

Whether the Controller of Inland Revenue is a member of the Cabinet? If so, what is his position in the Cabinet?

Mr. FOSTER. In answer to that, I beg to say that the Controller of Inland Revenue is a member of the Cabinet and his position is exactly the same as that of any other Privy Councillor being a member of the Cabinet.

THE HIGH COMMISSIONER.

Mr. CASEY moved for :

Copies of all correspondence by letter or telegram between the Government and Sir Charles Tupper, Bart., concerning his present visit to Canada.

He said : In regard to the late High Commissioner's visit to Canada, we have been left considerably in the dark. It was stated in the press in general terms, that he had come here in connection with the fast Atlantic scheme, and the scheme for a Pacific cable, or what I might call the intercolonial cable system. I asked the Government on Friday what leave of absence was granted to Sir Charles Tupper from his duties in London, and for what purpose, when he last came to Canada. I received only the following answer from the hon. Finance Minister :

Summoned to Canada by Premier's cablegram, 2nd December, 1895.

Well, Sir, that is far from being an answer to the question I asked, but it is such an answer as the Finance Minister generally gives to an inconvenient question. He either refuses to answer at all, or he gives an answer which is utterly meaningless. In this case we are entitled to a fuller and more courteous answer than was given to that question. The House requires, and the country requires to know by whom its public servant was summoned from his office in London, where he was supposed to be attending to the country's business; why he was brought to Canada; whether he received leave of absence for any specified period; if so, what that period was; and a lot of other particulars which the hon. gentleman carefully refrained from giving.

In answer to another question which I asked on that day, as to when Sir Charles Tupper

Mr. GRIEVE.

had resigned the High Commissioner-ship, I was informed that he had resigned it on the 15th January, 1896. So that up to that time Sir Charles Tupper was a public servant, receiving the pay and allowances due to that office; and we have a right to know why he was called from London, and what he was called to do here. We need not ask the hon. member what he did after he came here, because that has been patent to all the world. He fell in with the mutineers in their attempt to wreck the Government, which has been his employer, in which they have been successful to an extent which we shall only be able to appreciate later on, when the full effects of that plot are matured. In the meantime, I move for this correspondence, which of course includes anything as to the objects of the visit, either suggested by the Government to Sir Charles Tupper, or by him to them.

Motion agreed to.

THE NORTH-WEST EXHIBITION.

Mr. MARTIN moved for :

Copies of all correspondence in connection with the Territorial Exhibition held last summer at Regina, and all papers showing the connection of the Lieutenant-Governor of the Territories with the same, and detailed accounts of receipts and expenditures of said exhibition; also the amount still owing on account of same.

He said : Mr. Speaker, in making this motion I desire to call attention to the exhibition which was held at Regina last summer, which was discussed slightly in the House the other day. The House will remember that a grant of \$25,000 was voted by Parliament as a bonus towards this exhibition. In addition, \$10,000 was granted by the city of Regina, and \$5,000 by the North-west Assembly, supplemented later on by another grant of \$5,000; making total grants amounting to \$45,000 of public money. The exhibition seems to have been conducted without any responsibility on the part of any particular body or particular person, so far as any one can learn, and no statement of receipts and expenditure has been laid before the public. So that the amount received for entrance fees, both for exhibits and for visiting the fair, is not known. In some quarters it is estimated as high as fifteen thousand or twenty thousand dollars, because there were a great many entries and a very considerable attendance. However, I have no knowledge myself whatever as to what the receipts amounted to. They did, however, amount to very considerable sums, so that in addition to the grants of \$45,000 there was this amount received, whatever it may be. It appears now that the whole amount of that money which was received, amounting to over fifty thousand dollars, has been spent, and there are heavy debts outstanding due by

I know not whom. It is stated out there that they are due by the Government, because the exhibition was looked upon as a Government exhibition, conducted, so far as it appears to have had any head at all, by His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor, who seems to have run the whole thing himself. He appears to have been the head and the committee and everything else connected with it. He appears to have had full charge of the management, and as he is an officer of the Dominion, the exhibition was looked upon by the creditors as an institution carried on by Lieutenant-Governor Mackintosh for and on behalf of the Dominion Government. I understood the other day that the Government were investigating his accounts sent in for debts due by this institution. I do not know myself exactly what investigations the Government are making of these accounts except to check the amounts. The first step they should take, with the view of knowing what the real indebtedness is, would be to advertise in the Territories at Regina for all claims. The Government, it appears, have not so far made up their minds whether to pay these debts or not; but certainly before coming to a conclusion, it would be well to know exactly what amount they are obligating themselves for. I would suggest that they should ascertain what the unpaid claims are before coming to any conclusion. And I may say myself that I think the claims ought to be paid by the Government, although it is certainly a great outrage that we should be called upon to pay these claims, after having already paid a grant of \$25,000. But the Government, by the position in which they have placed themselves, it seems to me, have given authority to their officer, the Lieutenant-Governor, to incur these expenses. He certainly has incurred them, and there is no other source than the Government from which they can be paid. The city of Regina has certainly given more than its share in giving the sum of \$10,000, and the legislative assembly has no money to give for purposes of this kind. It was more for the purpose of drawing the attention of the House to the manner in which this exhibition was conducted that I make my motion, and I shall not attempt to make any comments myself upon the exhibition because I was not present at it. I shall confine myself to reading the opinions of newspapers published in the Territories, most of which are very strong supporters of hon. gentlemen opposite. The first one I shall read from is not a Government paper but an Opposition organ published by Mr. J. K. McGinnis, who is the Patron candidate against my hon. friend from West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin). This is what he has to say regarding this matter. The article is dated Regina, 15th August, 1895, and headed "After the Fair:"

It was with deep reluctance that the "Standard," months ago, objected to the policy of mak-

ing the Territorial Fair a one-man show. As we then stated, we would much prefer that every act of the Lieutenant-Governor was such that we could heartily endorse. We were quite satisfied that His Honour should be the official head of the fair, but we felt that to shoulder all responsibility, even to the locating of booths and fixing the price on meals, was unfair to himself, and sure to lead to confusion and dissatisfaction. Experience has amply proven that we were right. No amount of congratulation, presentation or flabellation can obliterate the facts that confusion and consequent dissatisfaction reigned from beginning to end. There was no organization, no system, no discipline. All this could and should have been avoided. The complainings of some of our contemporaries who lent their columns to fulsome flatteries before the fair, are a source of amusement.

After referring to the comments of other papers, the writer goes on to say:

The "Standard" has no desire to prolong the agony. We have many glaring tales of mismanagement at hand, but will not go into them unless further discussion of the matter is forced upon us. The course we took in advocating thorough organization and subdivision of responsibility has been fully justified by the results.

Now, strange to say, that is by far the most moderate article which I have come across amongst the territorial newspapers in commenting upon this exhibition, and that is the only paper which I shall read, which is not a strong supporter of the Government. The next article to which I shall refer is from the Alberta "Tribune," which is a strong Government paper, published in the city of Calgary. The following is a portion of an article which appeared in that paper on the 28th Sept. last:—

Let the farmers, whose schools, roads and bridges are being neglected, bear in mind what that extravagant orgie has already cost—\$25,000 Federal vote, \$10,000 given by the people of Regina, \$5,000 voted last year by the assembly, in all \$40,000; much more than the legitimate expenses of a fair twice as important. And now another \$5,000 is wanted from the farmers to pay for the revellings of the governor and his cronies. Surely, the assembly will never consent to this wanton extravagance. Let the members rather insist on a detailed and audited account of the money already spent. The executive cannot constitutionally evade responsibility for the expenditure of the \$25,000 granted by the Federal Government to the assembly for this purpose. But even should it be contended it can, surely no one will urge that it can evade responsibility for the expenditure of the \$5,000 voted last year directly by the assembly in this connection.

The next article is one which appeared in a paper which was founded in the city of Regina by the hon. member for West Assiniboia. I understand that the hon. gentleman has parted with this newspaper, which we have often heard of in this House, the Regina "Leader." I understand that he has sold that paper, but I notice that it still continues to support that gentleman very urgently and also the Government very strongly. This is what the Regina "Leader" said with regard to this exhibition on the

7th of November last. It is headed: "He should be Recalled:"

The conduct of business by the present chief magistrate of the Territories is bringing scandal and contempt upon the honourable office which he holds. When the incumbent is spoken of with jeers, respect for the office itself cannot long be maintained. The name of the one who in the North-west at this moment occupies the place of honour, but two seats below the Throne of Great Britain, is a bye-word and reproach. The situation is bringing discredit upon the Dominion Government, whose appointee he is.

The Hon. C. H. Mackintosh is not playing the part of a man. This refers to the Territorial Exhibition matter. He was manager extraordinary of the exhibition. The affair is in debt. In that there is nothing disgraceful or contemptible. But those to whom money is due want to get it. They cannot get it. They cannot even see or hear from the one by whom the debt was contracted. They telephone him—he is not at his office. They write him—he does not reply. They go to his house—he is shooting. The part a man would play in a case like this would be to meet the creditors, explain to them the circumstances of the deficiency, tell them how it was to be met, or how it was hoped it would be met. The manly thing is to meet a difficulty face to face and thresh it or take a threshing.

For an humble individual to skulk around a little difficulty would be contemptible; for a ruler—a sovereign—it is unpardonable. In their anxiety to get a glimpse of the Lieutenant-Governor in the past few weeks, people have been led to study his record and his proceedings. Of the former the Government know more than we can know; of the latter the people know more than the Government can know. When the people read the frequent "interviewer's" accounts of His Honour's overwork, his prodigious devotion to duty, and "only a constitution of adamant could stand the pressure of his unceasing toil," those of them who can afford it, laugh; the others curse. They have watched, and know that he has not been in his office half a dozen times in half as many months. "Out shooting." When he tells the interviewer, "Candidly, had I the power, my first design would be to keep out the demagogue"—the politician—"and bring in the worker," the people wink the other eye.

When we read, as appears in a report of a meeting of the town council, in another column, a remark by a councillor, that "His Honour cannot return from the East until Sunday," it forcibly reminds us of that historical member for Galway, whose only safe conveyance from London to his home after dissolution of Parliament was a coffin.

For the honour of an honourable and picturesque institution, and for the preservation of its own prestige, the Government cannot too quickly recall the Lieutenant-Governor of the Territories.

I shall read another article from a newspaper, which is also a strong supporter of hon. gentlemen opposite. In the Alberta "Tribune," of the 16th November, a week later than the date of the article in the Regina "Leader," I find the following:—

TIME'S REVENGES.

Time brings its revenges. The day was when the Alberta "Tribune" was the only paper in the Territories that dare criticise Charles Herbert Mackintosh. Some remained silent; others

Mr. MARTIN.

denounced the "Tribune" for its crime of lese majeste. The "Tribune" was content to wait for a justification of its words. Of all the grovelling sheets which six months ago inserted the Lieutenant-Governor's puffings of himself, and endeavoured in their own weak way to emulate those inimitable specimens of sickening adulation, there is now "none so poor to do him reverence." The columns of almost every paper in the Territories have recently been filled with letters complaining of the unpaid prizes and accounts in connection with the Territorial Fair, whose gross mismanagement by the Governor the "Tribune" was assailed for denouncing. The fair has proved an even greater financial failure than the "Tribune" predicted; and the lick-spittle journals which failed to support the "Tribune's" criticism when such action would have been serviceable, are now joining in a chorus of abuse against the man they were formerly lauding with the extravagance of Herodian flatterers. The man's charlatanry, which disgusted the "Tribune," and which should have disgusted every decent journal, as soon as it began to be practiced, they now find abominably nauseating. His shallowness and incapacity, which any one of discernment might long since have discovered, they now find patently observable. A cry goes up for his deposition from the governorship. Never since confederation has a representative of royalty in Canada been the subject of so much execration. A sample article is republished elsewhere from the Regina "Leader." Its strictures are warranted, its contumelies are deserved, its demand is pertinent. The pity is, they did not appear sooner. Yes, if the "Tribune's" justification at the hands of its contemporaries has been deferred, it has certainly been ample, now it has come.

Then, the hon. gentleman in question, finding all these criticisms directed against him, determined to offset them, if possible, and he got up a banquet to himself at the town of Moosomin, some weeks ago. This is the manner in which the organ of my hon. friend from West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) referred to that banquet. I quote from the Regina "Leader" of the 26th December, 1895:

On the eve of his departure from the Northwest for Ottawa, to spend an indefinite term of absence, Lieutenant-Governor Mackintosh was banquetted at Moosomin. The enthusiasm over the event was not so spontaneous as His Honour must have wished. The tables were set for fifty, but only thirty-five, or thereabouts, sat down. We do not regret that we have not space to produce the speech made by His Honour on the occasion, for a more unseemly hotch-potch of recrimination, self-adulation and stale jokes it would be impossible for one occupying His Honour's high position to deliver. If only our Lieutenant-Governor would repress himself and attend diligently to the amount of business which pertains to his office, the people of the Northwest, even after his scandalous conduct in connection with the closing of the exhibition affairs, might learn to tolerate them; but, if he will persist in making himself obnoxious, the "Leader" may find it necessary to repeat in more urgent manner a request we made to the Government a few weeks ago.

The Regina "Leader," as I say, is the organ of my hon. friend from Western As-

siniboia—at any rate, it is a very strong supporter of his, and formerly was conducted by him. Now, the Alberta "Tribune," referring to these remarks I have just quoted, speaks as follows in its issue of 28th December last:—

The Regina "Leader's" comments on the Lieutenant-Governor's Moosomin speech are entirely deserved. His Honour has no conception of dignity, and very little of decency. The speech was a farrago of vulgar stories, coarse abuse of his critics and gross self-laudation. It was the rant of a pot-house politician in his cups, rather than the utterance of a representative of Her Majesty.

I am afraid, Mr. Speaker, I ought to apologize, on the score of loyalty, for the extreme language which, in the discharge of my duty, I have been compelled to read from these Conservative organs published in the Territories. On my own behalf, I would like to say, that, from what I have heard from others, I am led to believe that these comments, although expressed in such strong language, are perfectly justified so far as the management of the exhibition is concerned. The very first thing that was done by His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor in relation to this exhibition was to appoint as manager, a man named J. K. Strachan, who has just been practically dismissed by the Winnipeg Exhibition Association, for two reasons—first, for drunkenness, and, second, for being behind in his accounts. He had retired from his position to avoid dismissal, and Lieutenant-Governor Mackintosh picked him up and took him to Regina and put him in charge of this exhibition which was to spend \$50,000. That was the first mistake that was made, and I do not see even how it can be excused as a mistake, because Mr. Strachan's conduct as manager of Winnipeg's exhibition was just then the subject of a good deal of newspaper criticism. Then I have heard of a great many complaints, indeed, from exhibitors and persons who had business in connection with the fair, stories of the grossest mismanagement. In fact, I have been told by different persons who sent exhibits out to Regina fair, the railway company carrying exhibits there and back, free, that these exhibits came back to them just exactly as they went, never having been opened at all. I have heard a great many complaints of that kind. I may say that I regret very much that the representative of Her Majesty in the Territories has behaved as this gentleman has done, because I believe that the criticism directed against him by these newspapers is entirely deserved. I notice that that gentleman spends very little time at home, although he is paid the sum of \$7,000 a year, and travelling expenses, for attending to such duties as the office has attached to it in the Territories. We find that every two or three weeks, I might almost say, he is down in Winnipeg, pretend-

ing to be on public business. Now, I think it would be very much better, indeed, for Mr. Mackintosh, if he finds the time a little dreary out in the city of the plains, and desires to come down to Winnipeg for purposes of his own, that he should do so and say nothing about public business. He talks about making arrangements for the blind, and the deaf and dumb, in the Territories, making excuses of this kind, and he brings a retinue with him, the expense of which all comes out of the country. Then, again, we find that every session he is here at Ottawa during the whole session. I find from what has occurred in another place, that this session his leave of absence lasted only from 20th December to 20th January; but, from what has at present occurred, he certainly intended to remain in Ottawa all winter. His family left Regina and took a house in New Edinburgh, a suburb of this city. I think the House will agree with me that conduct of that kind is not such as should be expected from a man who is paid such a large salary as Lieutenant-Governor Mackintosh is paid for doing certain duties. If it is necessary to have a Lieutenant-Governor of the Northwest, it surely must be necessary that he should remain all his time, practically, in Regina, the capital of the Territories. But, as I have said, we find that he is continually absent from his post, not in travelling through the country as other Governors do, but in going down to Winnipeg, and coming here to Ottawa, really for the purpose of relaxation on his own part. Under these circumstances, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that we should have a very full and complete statement of all financial affairs of this exhibition, because it does appear that, unfair as it may be to the people of Canada generally, the Government will have, under the circumstances, to assume the very considerable debt which Mr. Mackintosh has incurred, in addition to these large sums which were voted by the different bodies to which I have alluded.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. gentleman who has just addressed the House, and has put a motion into your hands, seems to be under somewhat of a misapprehension. The tenor of the remarks which he made, as well as the wording of the motion, go to show that the hon. gentleman seems to be under the impression that the exhibition was held under the auspices of the Dominion Government. The remarks which he made to the House would indicate that that is the impression on his mind, and the wording of the motion in which he asks for a detailed account of the expenses of that exhibition, go to bear out the fact I have stated. I need scarcely remind the House that the hon. gentleman is quite mistaken, if that impression does rest upon his mind. It is true that the sum of \$25,000 was recommended by the Government, and voted in the Estimates for purposes in connection

with the exhibition, but though I have not directly before me the language of the vote, I had the Order in Council before me only this morning, I am convinced that the wording of that order is simply "to aid in the holding of an exhibition in the North-west Territories," just the same as the vote is given towards aiding agricultural societies of the North-west Territories in connection with the annual exhibitions that they hold in various portions of those Territories. So far as the investigation of the accounts is concerned, it is true that the Government have certain accounts before them. They have the accounts and vouchers for the money which this Parliament voted, namely, the \$25,000; they have the accounts and vouchers as sent by the Lieutenant-Governor of the North-west Territories to the Department of Agriculture for that sum. We have no hesitation in placing before the House these accounts and vouchers, together with the other papers, so far as we have them, which show the connection of His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor of the North-west Territories with this exhibition. I make this explanation to the hon. gentleman because the papers may fall quite short of what he moves for in his motion, by reason of the fact that we have not got them.

Sir JAMES GRANT. I have listened with a considerable degree of interest to the observations that have fallen from the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin) with reference to the North-west exhibition. It is a well-known fact that an exhibition of that character in a new country cannot be inaugurated at once. There have been great difficulties in the way. It is also well known that the Lieutenant-Governor of the North-west Territories did everything in his power to place before the Government and people of this country the desirability of holding an exhibition there; and if he accomplished it, it was only by the utmost exertion on his part, aided by the co-operation of the Government. We know perfectly well that in a new country like that, there are great difficulties to contend with in organizing an exhibition of that kind, and it cannot be done without considerable expense. It is also well known that in a large undertaking of that character you cannot ascertain before hand the exact sum necessary. If a few dollars extra have been expended, they were probably well expended in developing the resources of that country. Let me say that at no time in the history of the North-west Territories has any project been pushed forward that tended more towards the development of that country, and gave the public in eastern Canada and in Great Britain a better idea of its vast resources. This exhibition has been a credit to the North-west, and if some difficulties have sprung up, necessitating an extra expenditure, on the right hand or on the left, in

Mr. MONTAGUE.

carrying out that exhibition, are we going to find great fault with the gentleman who had the manliness of character and the independence of position to undertake the responsibility of inaugurating and carrying to completion a project such as this—not for his own purposes, not for his own personal aggrandizement, but merely for the purpose of showing to the world what remarkable progress and advancement that country has made along every line. Under these circumstances it is wrong for an individual to come to this House and attempt to lash the Government over the shoulders of the Lieutenant-Governor, because hon. gentlemen have been trying to accomplish that work. I hope and trust the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin), being a gentleman who no doubt has an interest in the country and its development, will change his view, and when associated with a high official in promoting the development of the North-west, he will exercise his full powers to assist him in carrying forward the general interests of that great country. I was surprised to find that the hon. gentleman in his criticisms to-day was prepared to throw discredit on a section of country like the North-west and on the great people who live there, and who are receiving that encouragement to which they are entitled in developing the resources of that country.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The statement of the hon. member for Ottawa (Sir James Grant) and the statement of the Minister of Agriculture do not harmonize. The member for Ottawa has informed the House to-day that this was a Government project, that it was carried through with remarkable success, that it attained gigantic proportions, that it developed the resources of the North-west, and that the Government and Lieutenant-Governor of the North-west Territories are entitled to the greatest credit for such enterprise. The statement of the Minister of Agriculture was a very different statement. The statement of the Minister was, that the Government had no responsibility in the matter, that they had not undertaken to forward the enterprise at all and had nothing to do with it beyond contributing \$25,000 voted by this House for the purpose of aiding the exhibition. If the parties who conducted the exhibition undertook to spend a very large sum, they had no more right to come here than they had to go to any other contributor to the exhibition funds and ask to have the difference made good. The gentlemen who are managing the enterprise were bound to consider that point while the exhibition was in progress; they knew the sum of money at their disposal and they should have cut their garments according to the exhibit of cloth. That is not what was done, and the complaint of my hon. friend against the Lieutenant-Governor is as to the manner in which he under-

took to manage the exhibition and the responsibilities which he assumed in connection with it. There is only one observation I wish to make in regard to the statement of the Minister of Agriculture. The Minister stated that the accounts sent in were being audited.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I did not say that, and the hon. gentleman must have misunderstood me.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Then, what has been done?

Mr. MONTAGUE. I thought I made my statement perfectly clear. I said that all the accounts sent to the Government, or at least all the accounts in my department, were accounts and vouchers for the \$25,000 which this House voted.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). If the accounts and vouchers are here and the Government are seeing whether they correspond, whether the vouchers are satisfactory and account for the money, then this amounts to an auditing of the accounts. What I propose to ask the attention of the Minister and the House to is this: If you have a contribution made by the Government, and that sum of money was paid over by the Lieutenant-Governor to the board which was to manage the exhibition, that would be all that would be required in his behalf so far; but the House will see that if you have this Government's contribution with certain other contributions, it is impossible to distinguish whether the vouchers are given for the money contributed by the Government or for money contributed by somebody else. It seems to me, therefore, that in order to have a proper audit, and account fairly for the expenditure of \$25,000, it is requisite to have an audit of the entire accounts. I cannot see how the one sum can be separated from the other sums. I think the Minister will see this point, and that the Auditor or any other competent accountant will tell him that this is the case; and it seems to me that if the Government are to make a satisfactory statement to the House with respect to this money they will require to know what has been done with all the moneys that were received by the managers of the exhibition. That is a necessary incident in order to ascertain all the facts with respect to this special matter.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Further discussion on this subject will be useless, I think, until all the papers are before us. The Government are perfectly willing to bring all the papers down, and the House when seized of the subject will be able to discuss it more intelligently.

Mr. MARTIN. But the attitude of the Government, I may point out, is rather different from the attitude assumed at the

informal discussion inaugurated by the hon. member for Assiniboia. He and I then desired to know whether the Government intend to pay these debts. I understood to-day from the Minister of Agriculture that the accounts which the Government were investigating—and for this reason they desired to delay answering the question put by the hon. gentleman—were not accounts for debts amounting in the aggregate to \$10,000, \$20,000 or \$30,000 (for the amount will be found, no doubt, much more than \$8,000), but they were accounts and vouchers for the amount of \$25,000 contributed by the Dominion Government. The people of Regina do not care a snap of the receipts affecting payment of that sum of \$25,000; it was already eaten up, but they are interested in accounts amounting to \$8,000 or \$10,000 which have not yet been paid. The hon. member for Ottawa (Sir James Grant) has talked about a few dollars spent over and above the amount granted for that exhibition. The hon. gentleman apparently does not see the point, that a large amount has been expended but has not yet been paid, and that is what the people are inquiring about. In addition to the sum of \$25,000 voted by this Parliament, a large sum was received from entries and from visitors to the exhibition, and Mr. Mackintosh has spent all that money, in addition to which he has incurred debts for an unknown amount. The Government disclaim all responsibility for the exhibition when it comes down to the question of paying this additional amount, and the Government claim they are not responsible. In view of the circumstances under which the Government entered upon that exhibition, it seems to me they are responsible, especially when they contributed \$25,000 for the purpose of carrying out an exhibition at Regina, and instead of giving that sum to an agricultural society or to the local assembly as a bonus or grant, the Government allowed their officer, the Lieutenant-Governor of the Territories, to take charge of the exhibition, to become responsible for it, to take full control of it, and to manage it in all its details; thus the Government are responsible for it, and are in the position that the hon. member for Ottawa (Sir James Grant) desired to place them in, namely, of having aided and abetted and backed up this exhibition. Of course, Mr. Speaker, if the Government is in that position it will not do for the credit of Canada that there should be \$5 or \$10 here and \$100 there, of debts floating around through the Territories, and incurred—not by Mr. Mackintosh, for no one looks to him in the matter—but by the Lieutenant-Governor of the Territories on behalf of the Dominion Government. That is the position that the people up there take, and I must say there will be a great deal of disappointment indeed, because the other day when this discussion came up irregularly at the instance of my hon. friend from

Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) the hon. Minister of Finance suggested that the time to discuss this matter in all its bearings was when my motion came up. My motion is now before the House, and the only thing the Government are prepared to say in regard to it is that they gave \$25,000 in aid of the exhibition, assumed no liability in connection with it, and that the accounts which they are investigating are the vouchers in connection with that sum of \$25,000. That will not be satisfactory to the people up there. I hope the Government will reconsider their position, and will look upon it as an unfortunate matter; for it is a most unfortunate matter that Mr. Mackintosh has been so foolish, has been so reckless, and has been so extravagant as he has been. It does seem to me that it will be a blot upon the honour and the dignity of the Government itself if it allows these small debts, distributed as they are all over the Territories and Manitoba, to go unpaid. I for one, as a member of Parliament—not interested directly, but coming from the adjoining province—will be very glad to support the Government in placing an item in the Estimates to wipe off these debts, and so let us hear the last of this very disgraceful and discreditable business.

Mr. DALY. Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to make any remarks on the motion of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Martin), except to clear away certain impressions which, no doubt, his remarks have left on the minds of hon. gentlemen. In the first place, my recollection is that the Lieutenant-Governor of the Territories, having been for some time in his gubernatorial office, considered that it would be a good thing for the Territories and for the people there to bring the people together at Regina at a territorial exhibition. This exhibition would advertise the country itself, and would bring the people together. Up to the date of the holding of this exhibition at Regina the people had been living there for eight or ten years, removed at long distances from each other, and they had not the opportunity of associating together. In the meantime, many enterprising men had brought in splendid bands of cattle, and some portions of the Territories produced better wheat and crops than others. The idea of the Lieutenant-Governor was to show the products of different localities, and was, in my opinion, a very good one. In carrying out this idea, he associated with himself the officers of all the agricultural societies which exist in the Territories. He met them in their associations, and they appointed committees, and, as I understand, these committees made up the Central Fair Association. The fair was held at Regina in due course, and was inaugurated by His Excellency the Governor General. It was a great success in every particular. The entries were far and away much larger than at the Winnipeg fair, and notwithstanding

Mr. MARTIN.

two or three days of wet weather, the territorial fair was a success in every particular. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Martin) would give the House to understand that there are debts owing by this exhibition association all over the Territories and all over Manitoba. As I understand it, every prize taken at the exhibition has been paid.

Mr. MARTIN. Those newspapers do not say so.

Mr. DALY. As I am advised, the only debts outstanding are certain debts incurred by the exhibition association to dealers in Winnipeg and other places. It was thought the accommodation at Regina would not be sufficient to meet the crowds of people who would come there, and numbers of tents were procured from Winnipeg and elsewhere. In addition to that, windmills and other facilities were obtained for procuring water, and large supplies of lumber were furnished for the purpose of giving shelter to the cattle at the show. As I understand it, it is sums in connection with these matters that remain unpaid. So far as the Government is concerned, its position is simply this: after the announcement had been made that the Lieutenant-Governor, in conjunction with the several agricultural societies throughout the Territories, would organize this exhibition, the Lieutenant-Governor came here to ask if this Government would contribute a sum of money towards the exhibition. The Dominion Government contributed \$25,000, and, as I understand from the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Montague), vouchers are at hand for every dollar of that \$25,000. The only question now is, as to whether this Government is responsible for any of the outstanding debts the association owes. I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Martin) has one word to say for the people of the North-west and fourteen or fifteen words against the Lieutenant-Governor, and that the object, and the sole object, of the hon. gentleman in bringing the matter up here, is to make an attack on the Hon. C. H. Mackintosh, Lieutenant-Governor. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Martin) has quoted several newspaper articles, but it is known that the proprietors of those newspapers had a personal enmity with the Lieutenant-Governor.

Mr. MARTIN. Why?

Mr. DALY. I do not know, but I do not think it has anything to do with this exhibition. Possibly it may have. They may be men of disappointed ambition. They may be men who have not had as much to do with this exhibition as they would like. But at all events, of one thing I am perfectly satisfied, and that is, that so far as the Lieutenant-Governor is concerned, no matter whether the exhibition has been extravagantly conducted or not, it was a first-class show, a splendid advertisement for the

North-west Territories, and it will last for years as a monument to the enterprise of the Lieutenant-Governor and those who took part in it. If there are any outstanding accounts, I have no doubt that these accounts will, or should be, paid. As to the position this Government occupies, it was a contributor, the same as the North-west Assembly or any of those associations. According to the statement of the Minister of Agriculture, the Government are prepared to show that every dollar that was voted by them has been accounted for by the managers of the fair.

Mr. DAVIN. My hon. friend (Mr. Martin) who brought this matter before the House referred frequently to the Regina "Leader," and looked across the floor at me. He read articles from the "Leader" and laughed, if it was a laugh, as though to suggest, though he did not say so, that I wrote the articles. He referred to the fact that at one time I controlled, and in the main owned the Regina "Leader." Well, Sir, I regret to say that all that about my owning the paper has to be put in the historic tense. I regret greatly to say that before these articles appeared, I had alienated every farthing of interest I had in the "Leader," and nobody can possibly regret more than I do to say what I say here: that I have not the least interest in that paper at present. Now, Sir, when I was editor and, in the main, proprietor of that paper, articles frequently appeared in it that I had nothing whatever to do with. A man cannot be away on the continent, or down here at Ottawa attending to his political duties and writing articles for a paper in Regina, and taking care that nothing gets into that paper that he would disapprove of. But so long as I was proprietor, so long as I was manager and technically responsible, I never repudiated any of these suggestions. I saw that one of the Ottawa papers quoted the article and said: "From Davin's paper"; and other papers had it, "Davin on Mackintosh," and so on. I tell my hon. friend (Mr. Martin) that I never suggested and I never inspired such an article, and I was not aware that such an article was to appear in the "Leader." That is enough. I may tell the hon. gentleman (Mr. Martin) further, if he wishes: that I was away at that time visiting my constituents, and that I came home one morning and saw the article. Now, with reference to what has fallen from the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Daly). Living here as he does in his place at Ottawa, and although he keeps, I think, more in touch with the Territories than any Minister of the Interior that we have ever had, still he cannot be supposed to be as well acquainted with the opinion of the Territories as one of the members from there. The object of sending members here is that they will be able to let the Government and Parliament know what each locality, represented by the individual member, feels. My hon.

friend, in accounting for those articles. I think, made a mistake. He said they were inspired by personal animus towards Mr. Mackintosh.

Mr. DALY. I said disappointed ambition.

Mr. DAVIN. What kind of disappointed ambition, would my hon. friend explain?

Mr. DALY. In connection with the exhibition, of course.

Mr. MARTIN. I would like to explain, if my hon. friend will allow me, that though I read from the "Leader" and the "Standard" and the Alberta "Tribune," I might have read similar articles from every Conservative paper in the Territories.

Mr. DAVIN. I may say that when I first saw that article headed, "He ought to be Recalled," my first feeling was one of great annoyance, and I will tell you why. I have been for years on terms of close intimacy with Mr. Mackintosh, and if I had full power over a paper, I would do what every man who controls a paper sometimes does: I would put a strain on myself, and sometimes allow my personal feeling to override my public duty as an editor. Every man does that sometimes: I do not say he ought to do it; but I must say this in justice to Mr. Walter Scott, who is my successor: It has been said that he could not write that article—that it was too clever an article for him to write. The man who has succeeded me as owner of that paper, is a very young man; he was trained in great part in my office; and some persons said to me, as one man did: "There were sentences in that article which I do not think a man in Canada could write but yourself." Well, it would be surprising if a man who had been trained in my office and had read every one of my articles, and I suppose every speech I made for ten years—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. DAVIN. Happy man—

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Has he survived them?

Mr. DAVIN. Yes, and it would be good for the compression of your style if you had done the same. Well, Sir, my friend, Mr. Scott, who owns the paper now, told me himself that he was the author of the article. He is not only capable of writing such an article, but he is the makings of one of the first journalists on the continent of America. He is a man incapable of writing such an article from mere personal pique. But, Sir, I was not surprised when I saw the article, and I will tell you why. Deputations came to me, as I have no doubt they did to him, as the editor of the paper, composed of men having claims against the exhibition, complaining that they could not get satisfaction. And now, let me say of my friend Mr. Mackintosh, that the strongest charge that

can be made against him is what seems to me to be foolish carelessness. All he had to do, in my opinion, the moment he found that he had not money enough to pay all persons to whom he was indebted, was to call a meeting of them, and say: "The money is run out, but I will do my best for you; I will speak to the members of Parliament, and also write to the Government, and do my best to get money put into the Estimates, so that you shall be paid." What angered them, was this, that, as that article correctly states, they could not get speech with him, and they felt as if they were going to be done out of the money. This was their feeling when they came formally to me. I said to them, "What on earth have I to do with this? It is none of my funeral. I have never been consulted on the matter at all. What have I to do with it?" They said, "You are our Dominion member, and a supporter of the Government of the day"—

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). And you will make it your funeral.

Mr. DAVIN. Ah, Mr. Speaker, the grass will be growing and flourishing over the political grave of the hon. member for Bothwell when I shall be sitting in this House—and I shall be on the Government side, too, as I am now. They said to me, "You are the Dominion member, and a supporter of the Government, and we support you. We would not have given any private individual credit; but, seeing that this man was the Lieutenant-Governor, we gave him credit." And I hope that the matter will be considered by the Government, as the Minister of Finance intimated that it would be considered, from that point of view. But let me ask the attention of the Government for a moment to the view I take of this matter myself. Whatever way you regard the position of my friend, Mr. Mackintosh, the Government have to enter into this matter. If you regard him as the agent of the Government, then the Government is debtor to those creditors in Regina and elsewhere. If he be not the agent of the Government in this matter—and, mind you, the language of the Minister of Agriculture is well borne out by the item, for it says, "\$25,000, contribution towards an exhibition in the North-west Territories," he is the Lieutenant-Governor of the North-west Territories; and the North-west Territories, and surely Canada, too, are concerned, to some extent, in the honour of this gentleman. You cannot allow a man wearing the Windsor uniform, and representing Her Majesty, to go up there and incur debts in a quasi official matter, and then allow the creditors to go unpaid. Then, let me say, in regard to the audit which the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Montague) says has taken place, that I do not think it is a satisfactory audit, either from a financial or an official point of view. The vouchers may show

Mr. DAVIN.

that every penny of the \$25,000 may have been expended, and that there are receipts for every penny of it; but if the audit of the two sums of \$5,000 from the Territories, and the audit of the \$10,000, are conducted separately, there is no guarantee to the public, who are concerned with the honour of this man, that everything has been fair and square; and, as I must feel confident that everything is fair and square, and that the honourable gentleman who occupies that high position will be found to have done everything fair and square, it is a puzzle to myself why he himself has not seen fit to lay before his Minister all the accounts connected with the exhibition, showing what the exhibition cost, what money he got from the Dominion Government, what he got from the local government, and what he got from Regina. And when they saw those accounts, I do not think this Government would have any difficulty in getting \$8,000 or \$10,000 from this House to supplement what was given. Now, I can agree entirely with my hon. friend from Ottawa (Sir James Grant) and with the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Daly) as well. This exhibition was a great success and could not fail to do good; and if we could send broadcast pictures of the live stock exhibit and the grain and of all the great potentialities of the Territories which were at that fair, the result could not fail to be very effective.

Mr. MARTIN. I understand that these exhibits were not from the Territories alone.

Mr. DAVIN. The live stock, the grain, the roots, the minerals were all from the Territories, but the horticultural exhibit, in great part, came from Winnipeg. But in any case there was a large number of exhibits, and the exhibition was a success. But there were irritating features to account for a certain feeling in the Territory that expressed itself, no doubt, in much criticism. There were some things none of us could understand. We could not understand, for instance, why the Lieutenant-Governor should send outside the Territories for the great majority of those he employed. We could not understand why people should be brought from Winnipeg to do work that could very well have been done by people living in the Territories—and you must remember, Sir, it was a North-west exhibition. My hon. friend from Ottawa talks about the difficulties of doing things in that country. That kind of talk again led to some irritation—trying to make out that, in some way or other, the clever people, coming from Ottawa or Toronto or anywhere else, came as great civilizers; that in the midst of all sorts of difficulties, they have only to wave the wand of the magician, and at once all is order and all is "hunky dory." That is the sort of talk, no doubt, which has challenged a great deal of criticism. You may call it

what you like, fake talk or buncombe, but talk based on the rock-bottom of fact it was not. My hon. friend from Ottawa is quite wrong. I cannot as a representative of the Territories, where, man to man, we are as good as any men in Canada, acquiesce by my silence in the supposition that Lieutenant-Governor Mackintosh or anybody else, from any part of the Dominion, could come to us as a missionary of civilization and of social amenities and of progress and of the Lord knows what else. We had a great deal of that kind of talk, and it was hard to keep silent when met by statements that were more like the egotistical dreams of a madman than anything else, as to what was being done and as to the fearful difficulties that had to be overcome. All that sort of thing was so much worse than froth and led to this criticism. But the bottom of fact remains that the exhibition was a success. To my knowledge, the Lieutenant-Governor worked hard to make it a success and was deeply interested in it. If he and his friends had been content to regard one of the largest cabbages that was ever grown as a cabbage, it would have been well, and it might have been made the theme for a paean by a Pindar of the North-west or Ottawa or anywhere else; but to try to make out that the cabbage was such a thing as was never before seen on the face of the earth, and that, examined under a microscope, it was found to contain potentialities of diamond dust was simply the height of flabbergashed nonsense. The North-west Territories are neither to be humbugged nor abused; and my hon. friend from Ottawa will find that not until the exhibition had got into certain difficulties was the wisdom of the North-west Territories called to help it out. It was the managing power, the practical experience of the North-west Territories that ultimately made that exhibition a success; and if the brains which had been used for some weeks in carrying it on had continued in its direction, instead of being the success it was, the exhibition would have been a great failure. But when it had fallen into the rut and the mud hole, then the common sense of leading men, practical men in the North-west Territories was called in, and they took the ship off the sandbank and guided her to success. I repeat that the most serious charge which can be brought against Lieutenant-Governor Mackintosh, so far as I know, is rather that of carelessness and foolishness than anything positively grave. To my knowledge, he was full of enthusiasm about this exhibition. He worked hard at it, and whatever little mistakes were made, it was a success and did great good to the North-west.

Mr. McMULLEN. I did not intend to interfere in this discussion at all, but I must say that I am exceedingly sorry that a muddle has been made of this exhibition held in the North-west, owing to the men who had charge, and who, no doubt, were anx-

icus and earnest to accomplish something to the advantage of the North-west, overstepping the bounds of prudence in the expenditure connected with it. If I understand properly, there was a grant of \$25,000 made by this Government to aid that exhibition. No one could possibly have formed the idea that that grant was to be supplemented by any additional sum to meet any extravagance in the carrying out of that exhibition. For my part, I will not consent to grant a dollar more in any shape or form. The country has sufficient to bear without being held responsible for the extravagance of the board which controlled that exhibition. They ought to have acted—whether the Lieutenant-Governor or any body else—within the limits of the money granted and the anticipated receipts and not have put themselves in the position of having to ask us to supplement our grant of \$25,000 by still another grant. For my part I shall unquestionably use all parliamentary means to prevent the granting of one dollar in addition to what we have already given.

Motion agreed to.

AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENTS.

Mr. McMILLAN moved:

That whereas the United States Government offers to admit free of duty ploughs, tooth and disk harrows, harvesters, reapers, agricultural drills and planters, mowers, horse rakes, cultivators, threshing machines and cotton gins, from any country which admits free of duty like articles imported from the United States, it would be greatly in the interests of both the Canadian agriculturists and the Canadian manufacturers that Canada should accept that offer by admitting those articles into Canada free of duty and at the same time so relieving the Canadian manufacturers of their taxation on their raw material as to enable them to take advantage of the markets of the United States.

He said: When the Government last revised the tariff, the duty was reduced from 35 to 20 per cent on a certain number of agricultural implements. I have learned since from the American tariff that the same list of implements, or nearly the same, is included in the United States reciprocity clause and has been so included for a length of time. Allow me to say, Mr. Speaker, that the Government, for a length of time, has been spending large sums of money under the pretense that it was going to be of great benefit to the agriculturists of this country. None of this expenditure, has so far given much benefit or relief, in any shape, to our Canadian farmers. Here is an offer from the government of the United States to allow a number of different kinds of agricultural implements to enter the United States free of duty from any country that will allow similar implements from the United States to enter its ports free of duty. At the present time the Government are giving a rebate of 99 per cent of the duty upon the raw material

entering into agricultural implements manufactured in this country and exported to foreign countries. So, in reality there would be very little loss of revenue to the Government through the acceptance of this reciprocity which the United States offers us. In the last Trade and Navigation Returns only \$70,000 of duty appears to have been paid upon agricultural implements coming into this country, and in this list are included a large number of agricultural implements to which this offer of the United States would not apply. If the Government of the day are really anxious to benefit the farmers of Canada, if they are anxious to take one step in the direction of encouraging immigrants to go to the North-west and Manitoba, let them accept this offer. It will not deplete the treasury of any considerable sum of money, and if it is true, as the Finance Minister has stated, that Canada can manufacture agricultural implements as cheaply as any country in the world, what can be the reason for refusing to accept this reciprocity clause and allowing the free admission of these goods into Canada. It is the plain duty of the Government at this time to give this slight advantage to the farmer. Time and again I have been asked what the government of Alexander Mackenzie ever did for the farmers of Canada. Let me say that in the tariff schedule under that government there was a clause allowing agricultural implements brought in by agricultural societies for the purpose of encouraging agriculture in Canada to enter free. That was a great benefit to the farmers of that day and it would be a great advantage to the farmers to-day if it were in force. It would be one of the greatest inducements to immigrants to go to the North-west and Manitoba to be assured that they would get their implements as cheaply as the people across the line. I have frequently come in contact with settlers that have gone from Ontario to the American North-west, and that was one of the inducements—that they found they could get their implements, as they could at that time, 35 per cent cheaper in Dakota and some of the other states than they could in any part of Manitoba or the North-west. I would urge the Government to take this step and so do something to prove to the farmers of this country that they are earnest when they say that they are doing much to advance the farmers' interests. However, I am afraid, Sir, that the Government of the day will be influenced in the other direction. It is true we have in Canada a number of agricultural implement manufacturers, who are ready, under the conditions of the motion I am about to make and with free raw material, to manufacture in competition with the manufacturers of agricultural implements of any country in the world. And if it is true, as stated by the Finance Minister, that agricultural implements can be manufactured in Canada

Mr. McMILLAN.

as cheaply as anywhere, they are perfectly justified in concluding that, with free raw material, Canada has nothing to fear in competition with the world. According to the Trade and Navigation Returns, agricultural implements to the value of \$635,000, the product of Canada, were exported from this country last year, while the imports amounted to only \$292,000. If we can manufacture as cheaply as any country in the world, we have nothing to fear from the competition of the United States.

Mr. WALLACE. Before the resolution is put, I desire to say a few words. It seems to me there are very strong objections to the passage of this resolution. The mover of it has stated that the changes he proposes would be to the advantage of the manufacturers in Canada. I think it would be a serious disadvantage to our manufacturers of agricultural implements, and no real advantage to our farmers, except, perhaps those in Manitoba and the North-west. Throughout the older provinces it would be no advantage, because agricultural implements to-day are sold cheaper in Canada than in any other country in the world.

Mr. MCGREGOR. How would our manufacturers be hurt, then? Would the American manufacturers send their higher-priced goods into a cheaper market?

Mr. WALLACE. I will inform the hon. gentleman. In the first place, the American manufacturers are protected by patents, which would prevent implements manufactured in Canada from being sold in the United States. Thus it would be a jug-handle business from the start; there would be no real reciprocity. Besides that, in the United States, as we know, there are immense manufacturing establishments with millions of dollars of capital. Do we not know, from our knowledge of human nature and our experience of the past, that, if our market were thrown open to the American manufacturers they would, for one or two seasons, put down their prices to so low a point as to kill our manufacturers, many of whom are struggling for an existence? And after that, having the whole Canadian market to themselves, they would raise the prices higher even than those ruling in the United States, which I contend, are higher than those ruling in Canada to-day.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Surely they are shut out now by 20 per cent.

Mr. WALLACE. Twenty per cent is sufficient to shut them out. That is a substantial protection, although it was stated last year that 20 per cent was no protection, inasmuch as they paid a larger percentage on some of their raw material. Well, Sir,

I went into a calculation last year. I got the figures from the Noxon Manufacturing Company, of Ingersoll, and this is the result: A machine is brought in from the United States, say a binder, and entered for duty at \$100, that being the figure given by the manufacturers themselves as their wholesale price in the United States, and is much larger than their retail price. That was the wholesale price given by McCormick Bros., of Chicago, to the Department of Customs, that meant \$20 duty. All the raw material has not to be imported, much of it is made here, and purchased here by the manufacturers, because it can be purchased cheaper here than it can be imported. But suppose it were all imported, the duty on the raw material would not be more than \$7, leaving a clear protection to the Canadian manufacturer of \$13. That protection, as I stated before, does not increase the price. On the contrary, you can buy an excellent binder in Canada for \$100 or \$105, and no farmer in the United States can buy one for the same money.

Mr. SPROULE. The Canadian farmer can buy them this summer for \$90, as many as they choose.

Mr. GRIEVE. Where?

Mr. SPROULE. In the counties of Grey, Peel, and York, manufactured in Orangeville.

Mr. GRIEVE. Would the hon. gentleman name the manufacturer?

Mr. WALLACE. I can inform the hon. gentleman that when the present Controller of Customs and myself were meeting the farmers, we also met a number of manufacturers, and the manufacturers in Orangeville, in Alliston, and in Shelburne told us that they were selling binders for \$100 cash.

Mr. SPROULE. Ninety dollars cash, last summer.

Mr. WALLACE. The price may have gone down last summer, that was the price they were asking then, and that was a lower price than a similar article could be bought for in the United States. I say, for these reasons, it would be ruinous to the Canadian manufacturer, and it would be no benefit to the Canadian farmer, to adopt the resolution proposed by the hon. member for Huron (Mr. McMillan).

Mr. McMULLEN. I wish to say a few words in reply to the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat. He says that the wholesale price last year of the McCormick Bros., Chicago, for binders, was \$100. I have letters in my possession from the McCormick Bros., of Chicago, in which they

state that they have proved to the agent of the Customs Department of Canada, at that time controlled by my hon. friend, that their highest wholesale price for binders was \$80; but the hon. gentleman refused to fix the price at \$80 for export duty, and he fixed it at \$100, so as to give an additional protection, no doubt, to the Canadian manufacturer. They wanted to export binders to the North-west, and the Controller of Customs refused to take the duty at the wholesale price of \$80, and he ruled that the value of the binder was \$100, and would not take anything less than \$20 duty.

Mr. WALLACE. What is the customs law?

Mr. McMULLEN. If my hon. friend will just sit down and wait a moment—

Mr. WALLACE. Permit me to make an explanation; I am sure the hon. gentleman wants to get the truth. The duties are not reckoned on the export price, but the Customs Act holds—the laws of the United States and Canada are similar in this respect—that the price for duty shall be the price for home consumption, not the price for export. The price for home consumption was fixed by McCormick Bros. themselves, and I verified it by sending an agent there to examine their books, and found the price to be as stated, and that was the price fixed for customs duties, as the law requires.

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. gentleman wished the House to understand a few moments ago that the wholesale price of McCormick Bros. for binders, was \$100; that is what he said.

Mr. WALLACE. Yes, for home consumption.

Mr. McMULLEN. No, he said the wholesale price was \$100. Now, I tell the hon. gentleman that the wholesale price is not \$100.

Mr. PRIOR. Yes, it is.

Mr. McMULLEN. Well, I have the signature of the firm, and I am prepared to produce their statement over their own signature, that they proved to the agent sent by the Controller of Customs to Chicago to examine into the facts, proved by their own sales, that their wholesale price was \$80 in Chicago. But he refused to fix the duty at \$80, and fixed it at \$100, and in that way made the Canadian user of the American implement pay an increased duty.

Mr. PRIOR. There is no dealer in the United States from whom you can buy them for \$80.

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. gentleman had better not be too positive in his assertion.

Mr. PRIOR. I am positive.

Mr. McMULLEN. I would like to inform my hon. friend that he is quite mistaken, because I took every opportunity, not only by writing, but I sent a party there for the purpose of entering into a contract for binders, and they offered, and tendered to supply him with a carload of binders at the rate of \$80. Now, will the hon. gentleman challenge that statement too?

Mr. PRIOR. Were they for Canada?

Mr. WALLACE. For export?

Mr. McMULLEN. They offered to supply him with a carload of binders for \$80.

Mr. PRIOR. They were not coming into Canada.

Mr. McMULLEN. How does the hon. gentleman know that? The party who applied for them did not say a single word about it. There may be certain sections in which they would not sell them at that price, because, I admit, they have a combination in binders in the United States. They did not inquire what direction the binders were going, but they agreed to sell a carload of binders for that money. But my hon. friend will not give the American binder to the Canadian user at the price of \$80 for export duty, but he fixes it at \$100, and the user pays \$20 extra. Now, I cannot understand the argument of my hon. friend when he says that if you open our ports to the importation of American agricultural implements, the Americans will run the price down, and the result would be that they would shut up our Canadian manufacturing. I would like to know whether the Canadian manufacturers could not try a dodge of that kind. Could they not combine and sell their binders at a low price for export and make money in them? What would be the result? If the American manufacturers, or any person else, were to sell their binders in Canada for \$60 in order to crush out the Canadian manufacturer, why could not the Canadian importer buy large numbers of those binders and re-export them again to the United States?

Mr. IVES. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman what would they be doing with their capital, their shops, their machinery, their plant, and their employees, while they were dealing in foreign-made binders?

Mr. McMULLEN. I will explain to the hon. gentleman. No difficulty would arise on that point with the American binders, because they would come in here free of duty and go back as an American product without any difficulty, and the result would be that the very game they would try to play would rebound upon themselves in that case.

Mr. PRIOR.

Now, I cannot see why that could not be done. More than that, I contend that the statement made by my hon. friend is quite true. I believe agricultural implements can be produced in Canada as cheaply as in the United States even more cheaply, and if such is the fact, we should allow our agriculturists the chance to get machines which are necessities for the cultivation of the soil, at the very lowest possible price; and as the Americans have offered very reasonable and equitable terms it is the duty of Parliament, in the interests of our farmers, to allow them to obtain the articles they require at the lowest price at which they can be procured. We know perfectly well, and the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) does not deny it, that the manufacturers of agricultural implements reap very considerable profit, no less than from \$13 to \$15 on the intrinsic value of a machine. I understand that the Harris-Massey Manufacturing Company turned out 20,000 binders last year; suppose the number was only 20,000, the profit being \$13 odd, as I have said, would give about \$30,000 profit on an output of 20,000 binders. So the Canadian manufacturers of agricultural implements have considerable advantage over American manufacturers. It will be remembered that the Government some time ago offered to adopt reciprocal terms on certain manufactured articles, and we should be willing to adopt reciprocity in agricultural implements, which represent 20 per cent. So on a binder of the value of \$80, \$16 would represent the duty, but by placing the value at \$100 the duty is increased to \$20.

Mr. SPROULE. According to the hon. gentleman's own argument and the statement of prices he has given, binders can be bought as cheaply in Canada as in the United States. Even if we take the price at \$80, the hon. gentleman, if he will visit Orangeville, through which he passes every time he visits his home, will find that the small steel binder is sold there by the single machine at \$90 each, and could be bought, no doubt, by a carload for \$80 cash. It has been sold for two years at this figure, and it is as low as any good American binder can be bought either in the United States or in Canada. But the hon. gentleman, in his desire to give the Americans control of our market, seems to be only actuated by a desire to kill the National Policy. I take it that the main object of this motion and discussion is to attack the National Policy piecemeal, because this is a subject which is interesting to farmers, and upon which some impression can be created by hon. gentlemen opposite for use at the coming elections. The hon. gentleman asks, would the American manufacturers reduce the prices to get control of the Canadian market? Such has been the history of manufacturers all over the world, and it

has been found necessary to afford protection to home manufacturers. This was done by England towards the United States for years, it is done to-day in the United States against Canada, and it would be done to-morrow by the Americans if they had the chance to destroy the manufacturers of Canada. There is another strong reason why it is not to the advantage of Canadian farmers to allow free importation of American implements. One of the great troubles experienced by farmers using implements is as regards the matter of supplies when repairs are needed, and their inability sometimes to obtain them rapidly and cheaply. If they use Canadian-made implements, and avail themselves of the telegraph, they are able within a few hours to reach headquarters for supplies and get them sent forward either that day or the day following. Therefore, they are not compelled to remain idle any great length of time owing to necessity for supplies to complete repairs. So long as our farmers use Canadian implements, and they can be purchased, as is the case to-day, as low as any other implements, it is most desirable that our farmers should be supplied at home instead of from abroad. But there is another very important reason which should be stated, and it is that the largest part of the wood that goes into Canadian-made implements is purchased from our farmers. To every small saw-mill the farmers bring their wood, perhaps they may not have large quantities of timber, but they have enough to enable them to bring maple, elm and birch, and other hardwood, to the mills, where they find a ready sale, and the mills again can sell this timber to manufacturers established throughout the country for the manufacture of implements. If you supply the Canadian market with a foreign product, you destroy the market for the sale of this class of lumber, and it must be sold in the United States, in which case the transportation will take off a large portion of the profits, and great injury will thus be done to farmers who take out the logs and have them converted into this class of lumber which goes into the manufacture of implements. At the present time many of our farmers are relying almost as largely on operations in the woods during the winter as on the crops from their farms during the summer. So long as low prices prevail for implements, we should endeavour to keep the manufacturing of them at home. It has been denied that the Americans have an advantage over the Canadian manufacturers on account of patent rights held by them. If, however, our manufacturers took their machines to New York, Ohio or the western states for sale, where the patent rights are held as regards those respective states, our manufacturers would not be allowed to sell the machines, or at least they would be handicapped with regard to their price. There-

fore, while the Americans might say that they have taken off the duty, yet in view of this position they could take in regard to the patent right, of what use would be the American market? To-day our manufacturers cannot take advantage of it, and the American manufacturers would at the same time, if the proposed arrangement were carried, would control our market. The Canadian manufacturers want the home market. Our manufacturers of implements use the raw materials which the Canadian farmers are supplying every year, and our manufacturers are able to turn the manufactured products at the lowest possible prices. No evidence has been adduced that our neighbours, even in the past or at the present time, are manufacturing and selling implements to American farmers on lower terms than Canadian manufacturers are selling them to Canadian farmers, and so long as there is no evidence that Canadian farmers are paying more than the implements are really worth, or for which they can be honestly produced, there is no valid reason why American implements should be admitted here. The assertion made in regard to American prices has never yet been proved; every test made has shown that American implements cannot be purchased at lower prices than those for which Canadian implements are sold. At my hotel I am sitting at the same table with a farmer from Ohio, who has been comparing prices. He declares that Canadian farmers are paying for their implements here, in many instances, less than they are sold by manufacturers in the United States, and he thinks our farmers have no reason to complain as to price or quality, as in every respect our implements compare favourably with those manufactured on the other side of the line. So long as that is the case, there is no reason why we should remove the duty, because it gives our manufacturers the Canadian market, and enables them to employ a full force, and at the same time a larger market is provided for the products of the Canadian farmers. One interest is working into the hands of the other, and so long as that continues and the farmers are not paying more for implements than they should pay, there is no possible reason why we should not maintain this protection in Canada.

Mr. DALY. Mr. Speaker, the hon. the mover of this resolution (Mr. McMillan) said that it was in the interests of the North-west farmer that the Government should agree to this resolution. Both he and the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen) seem to take considerable interest in the North-west farmer, and when they are discussing this question of duty upon agricultural implements they use it as an argument that they are speaking on behalf of those unfortunate people. If it true, I admit, that some years ago the North-west farmer laboured under disadvantages with regard to

the prices of agricultural implements. That was in the days before we had direct communication with eastern Canada via the Canadian Pacific Railway. Prior to 1886 when Canadian implements had to be exported either by way of Lake Superior and Duluth or by all-rail through to the United States, the price of binders in the North-west was high. In those days you paid from \$300 to \$325 for a binder for which you now only require to pay from \$140 to \$150. You can get no better evidence as to what the National Policy has done for the farmers of the North-west Territories, than to compare the prices of implements to-day, with the prices in that country before the completion of the Canadian Pacific Railway. We take it that the National Policy did not simply contemplate putting duties upon certain articles, but that it also meant the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway and the opening up and developing of our country. The hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen) contends that he has indisputable evidence in his possession that the McCormicks will sell either one implement or a carload of implements for \$80 each. Well, Sir, if that be the case, they are imposing greatly upon the farmers of North Dakota, because the retail price of their implements there is from \$130 to \$140 each, and the all-rail freight from Chicago to Neche cannot make up the difference between \$80 and \$130 or \$140, even adding a reasonable profit. If it were not for our National Policy which caused this competition amongst the manufacturers of agricultural implements, the farmer of Manitoba to-day would be at the mercy of the American implement manufacturer, and, as they are paying from \$130 to \$140 in Dakota, for an implement which the hon. gentleman says is wholesaled at \$80, our people would be paying a far higher price in the province of Manitoba. The fact is, as the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) established some time ago, the duty is only \$7. We find that the prices paid by our farmers in the North-west at the present time for Canadian implements are not greater than are paid by the farmers of Dakota and Minnesota, when you compare the distances from the point of manufacture. I have a statement here which I will give to the House furnished me by an implement dealer at Gretna, in Manitoba. He says that the Massey-Harris binder sells at from \$140 to \$150 at Gretna upon time, and at Neche, across the line, binders sell at from \$130 to \$140. But there is a difference in favour of the Manitoba farmer, and that is that when the Dakota farmer buys on time he has to give a mortgage not only upon the binder which he buys, but upon all his other implements in order to get credit. The farmer in the Canadian North-west who purchases a binder simply gives a lien upon that article, and gets it on time for two or three years. I will give to the House a further comparison of the

Mr. DALY.

prices of agricultural implements at Gretna, Man., as compared with the prices at Neche in the United States. This statement is also from the gentleman I have referred to before :

GRETNA.

Binders	\$140 to \$150
Massey-Harris mowers.....	50 55
Farmers' wagons.....	60
Sleighs (bob).....	22
Seed-drills (16 shoe).....	*75
Gang ploughs.....	50 to \$60
Walking ploughs.....	20

AT NECHE.

Binders	\$130 to \$140
Mowers	45 55
Wagons (farmers').....	60
Seed-drills (16 shoe).....	75
Gang ploughs.....	50 to \$60
Walking ploughs.....	18 to \$20

*Price varies according to size.

Low grades of carriages and buggies are very much cheaper on the other side. The better grades are about the same price. Fancy sleighs and cutters are very much better value on this side—so much so that the dealers across the lines are getting theirs from Winnipeg this winter.

Therefore, with the exception of binders, the prices paid in Canada and the United States are identical, and the Manitoba and North-west farmers have the advantage of getting better terms for their purchase. As the member for Grey (Mr. Sproule) said, there is a great deal of difference between buying an implement from a Canadian manufacturer and buying it from the American manufacturer, because the Canadian manufacturers have agencies everywhere in the North-west, and the farmer is enabled to get his "repairs" immediately. Any man who has anything to do with a binder, and hon. gentlemen in this House who are agents for machines, know how necessary it is for the farmer to be able to get his "repairs" cheaply and immediately. If a farmer be living outside some of the large centres, such as Brandon, Prince Albert, Regina, Winnipeg, and so on, in order to get an American implement "repairs" he has to telegraph or go down to town to get "repairs"; whereas the Canadian manufacturer has an agent in every centre who can furnish the "repairs" at once. Mr. Speaker, I have established by the figures I have given, that instead of the North-west farmer having to pay a larger price than the American farmer for his implements, he is exactly on the same plane in that respect as is the farmer across the line. There is another feature in it. If the Manitoba farmer wants an American implement to-day he pays almost the same price for it as he does for the Canadian implement, but if the duty were off we would find that the American implement would be sold at a considerably higher price than the Canadian implement is sold for to-day. The member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen) controverted the statement of the member for West York

as to the value at which the American implements come in. If the hon. gentleman will look at page 112 of the Trade and Navigation Returns, he will find that there were 685 binders brought into Manitoba last year from the United States, and that they were valued at \$65,000, upon which a duty of \$13,000 was paid. If the hon. gentleman makes a calculation he will find that these binders were valued at \$95 for import, and not \$100 as the hon. gentleman said. They were valued, as I say, at \$95, and if you add the 20 per cent duty to that you find that the profit that is made by the American dealer upon these agricultural implements is much in excess of the profit made by the Canadian dealer. The idea of our North-west farmers being oppressed by the prices they pay for agricultural implements is a thing of the past. It is exploded. No hon. gentleman can stand on the platform in the North-west or in Manitoba and get applause from any audience by making such a statement. As I said, Sir, in my opening remarks, it was a question with the farmers in Manitoba and the North-west some years ago. Our farmers now find that the Canadian article is equally as good and equally as cheap as the American article, and they can obtain it on better terms so far as credit is concerned. There is now as good material in the Canadian implement as in the American implement, which was not the case some years ago. I remember when the prices were higher than they are to-day, that the Canadian manufacturer did not make as good an article as the American manufacturer did, and the preference was given by our farmers to the American article. The Massey-Harris binder to-day is made from the latest American patents, from the very best steel, and from the very best dry material, and it is now in every respect as good an article as either the McCormick or the Deering binder. I venture to say that so far as the value to the farmer is concerned, he gets better value from the Massey machine than he does from the Deering, or the McCormack.

Mr. McMULLEN. I would like to correct the hon. Minister. He will notice that in the report, mention is made of harvesters, with binders and without binders. The number given as imported is 685, which would make an average cost of \$95 each. Will he say how many had binders attached, and how many were without binders? He will find, if he refers to the rulings of the Department of Customs, that they have ruled that \$100 is the value of a binder for the purpose of duty.

Mr. DALY. The hon. gentleman will see, on reference to page 111, that the number of binding attachments imported into Manitoba from the United States is placed at one, of the value of \$48, on which the duty was \$9.60.

Mr. McMILLAN. I have been very much interested in the turn this debate has taken.

It amuses me to hear the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Daly) state that if the duty were taken off agricultural implements, the farmer would have to pay more for them than he does to-day. I heard a similar argument from hon. gentlemen opposite with respect to binder-twine at the time we had to pay 14 or 15 cents a pound for it, and when we stated that it could be sold in the province of Ontario for 8 or 9 cents a pound, we were told it could not. I am convinced that the farmers of the North-west would also get their implements cheaper if the duty were taken off. I am also astonished at the statement that we have not a single patented article in Canada which would be allowed to go into the United States. Most of our implements are patented, and the right to manufacture them in the United States could be purchased, just as the Americans purchase the right to manufacture in Canada. This debate proves to me that I was right at the time the duty on agricultural implements was reduced from 35 per cent to 20 per cent, when I asked whether the Government were going to retain the right to revalue those implements when they came in, and when I said that the reduction in duty was more apparent than real, so far as the farmer was concerned. With regard to the statement of the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) that the farmers supply a very large amount of the wood-work that enters into these implements, very little wood-work enters into them except in threshers. What wood-work enters into a harrow, a plough, or a reaper? Very little; so that the argument of the hon. gentleman is really fallacious.

Mr. SPROULE. The men who sell it do not think so.

Mr. McMILLAN. Now, hon. gentlemen say that our manufacturers can manufacture agricultural implements as cheaply as any others, and that those implements are sold cheaper in Canada than in any other country in the world. If that is the case, and the manufacturers are able to export their implements and to meet the competition of other manufacturers, I want to know what harm will be done to our manufacturers if this duty is removed. Some of our manufacturers have said to me within the last twelve months, that if they could get their raw materials free, they would be prepared to compete with foreign manufacturers in any part of the world. The farmers of Canada understand all these arguments on this subject, and the day will shortly come when they will show that they understand them. They will show that no farmer or class of farmers is deriving any benefit from the policy of this Government. I once saw the statement that there were 123 different articles from which the duty was removed in favour of the manufacturers; but hon. gentlemen cannot show half a dozen articles from which the duty

was removed for the benefit of the farmers; and when it is proposed to allow agricultural implements to come in free, all possible obstacles are thrown in the way.

Mr. DAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. gentleman who has just sat down failed to seize the argument of my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior, and of another hon. gentleman on that side. Their argument is that if there had been no National Policy, instead of having implements at the price at which they are sold in the country at present, and instead of having manufacturers in Canada to supply those implements, you would be without the manufacturers, and, consequently, you would be supplied by manufacturers in the United States. My hon. friend from South Huron (Mr. McMillan) missed that argument by saying if the manufacturers in Canada are producing implements so cheap, why could you not take off the duty? That has no cogency, and is no reply to the argument of the hon. Minister of the Interior. Having developed manufactures by reason of the National Policy, which gives us implements at enormously lower prices than we were paying before the National Policy came, the only question we should now consider is this: Whether some regulation of the tariff may not be necessary, not as against the National Policy, but in the carrying out the principles of the National Policy. I have been a good deal assailed out west for using the phrase "scientific protection." Well, perhaps from a pedantic standpoint, the term is assailable. Political economy is a science, and a tariff is an application of that science. A tariff may be called an artificial application of the science of political economy. As a pictorial phrase, I think "scientific protection" serves my purpose; and, for the sake of scientific protection, I think you might well consider whether some change might not be made in the tariff which, while doing no harm to the manufacturer, and not impairing the National Policy, would yet benefit the people. Now, my hon. friend the ex-Controller of Customs (Mr. Wallace) said, and said truly, that under no circumstances could the motion of my hon. friend benefit the farmers in Ontario, though it might benefit the farmers of Manitoba and the North-west. My hon. friend the Minister of the Interior was right in the figures he quoted, so far as they go. So far as my inquiries go, the prices at which implements are sold in the North-west Territories are as low as, if not lower than, the prices at which they are sold in Dakota. But there is this to be considered. My hon. friend is not quite right in supposing that the farmers in the North-west get better terms from the one company with which they have mainly to do, the Massey-Harris Company. Cases have come before my notice where this company had

Mr. McMILLAN.

not only a lien on the implements but had a mortgage even on the crop.

Mr. DALY. That is after the payment is overdue.

Mr. DAVIN. And we passed an ordinance last year in order to protect those farmers from themselves, making it impossible for them to hypothecate their growing crops. But the way I look at it myself is this. The Massey-Harris Company now have, so far as the North-west Territories is concerned, a monopoly; and the moment you have a monopoly, you have to regard it with suspicion. I say you have to regard it with suspicion from the point of view of the National Policy. I hold, as a strong protectionist, that protection, like every other good thing, requires to be constantly watched and regulated in order that it shall be in accordance with the needs of the community. And it is a matter for consideration now whether some action might not be profitably taken, quite on the lines of the National Policy, with regard to the Massey-Harris Company, who do business in the North-west Territories, and who seem to me to have exceptional advantages. However, we shall have an opportunity of dealing with this matter later when I propose my own motion, but I thought I would rise to point out the fallacies to which my plausible friend, the hon. member for Huron (Mr. McMillan) has given expression. I have heard him on the platform as well as in this House, and I must say that he is one of the most plausible and, at the same time, one of the most fallacious of men.

Mr. GRIEVE. It appears to me that the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat is troubled with a very short memory. It was only in the beginning of this session—I think the first day the House met—when the hon. gentleman placed a motion on the Order paper asking that the duty on agricultural implements be abolished.

Mr. DAVIN. And I have just said that I will have an opportunity of moving it.

Mr. GRIEVE. If that was the opinion the hon. gentleman then had, while knowing, as he apparently appears to know, that agricultural implements are being sold in Manitoba and the North-west as cheap, and cheaper perhaps, than in Dakota and the other western states, what, in the name of common sense, was the reason he placed this motion on the Order paper?

Mr. DAVIN. I have just indicated my reason, and will explain further when I move my motion.

Mr. GRIEVE. The hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule) referred to the fact that binders were sold in different parts of Canada for \$90. It would be interesting for the farmers, who have been placing their orders this season with the Massey Manufacturing Company, Noxon Bros., Frost & Wood and

others, for \$115 to \$120 cash, to know what manufacturing firm in Canada is making a first-class machine and placing it on the market at \$90.

Mr. SPROULE. The Orangeville firm, and the hon. gentleman lived near enough to that firm to know.

Mr. GRIEVE. For my part I am satisfied the hon. gentleman's statement is not correct.

Mr. SPROULE. I saw the implements sold right in my presence and the money paid over not longer ago than this summer.

Mr. GRIEVE. I don't think the hon. gentleman knows the difference between a self binder and a self rake reaper, and no doubt it was a self rake reaper which he saw sold. However, let that be as it will, the statement has been made that if the duty on agricultural implements were removed, Canadian manufacturers would be swamped and driven out of the market. But how is it that the large implement manufacturers on the other side do not swamp the smaller firms? How is it that the smaller manufacturers in the United States are still able to go on manufacturing, as they have been doing for years, in competition with those large manufacturers? How is it that the small manufacturers of Canada are not being swamped by the large ones? We know that the Massey-Harris Company manufacture very largely, and we know that other firms can manufacture only on a smaller scale. How is it that the large firms are not able to drive the smaller ones to the wall? On the contrary, we see the latter going on manufacturing in greater numbers than in former years, although they have to compete with the larger firms. I am not prepared to say whether the farmers of Canada are paying more for their machines than the farmers of the United States. But this much I say, that the Canadian manufacturers would have no reason, if they had free entry for their machines into the American market, to fear the competition of the American firms, when we have free entry into a market of sixty million people, and in return the American manufacturers would only have the entry into a market of five million people. Who would benefit—the manufacturers of Canada or of the United States? I believe that the manufacturers of Canada are able and willing to compete with those of the United States or any other country. We know that to-day they are placing their goods side by side with American goods and English manufactures in Australia and New Zealand, where they have no favours, and also in England and Germany they are able to hold their own. I do not think for a moment that they are placing their goods in these countries for the mere honour of the trade. They are doing it for the money that is in it. And if they are able to com-

pete with those large manufacturers upon foreign soil, why, in the name of common sense, can they not compete with them at home? I have no doubt that our Canadian farmers would rather buy machines of Canadian than of foreign manufacture.

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

After Recess.

Mr. GRIEVE. Before the House rose at six o'clock, Mr. Speaker, I was attempting to show the relative positions of the manufacturers in Canada and the manufacturers in the United States. I was attempting to answer the arguments of some gentlemen on the opposite side of the House who tried to make it appear that, if we had reciprocity in agricultural implements, the manufacturers in the United States would be able to swamp what those hon. gentlemen call the smaller manufacturers of Canada. I was able to show, I think conclusively, that the manufacturers of Canada were able to compete with all comers in foreign markets, that they were able to send their products to Australia, New Zealand and other distant countries and compete successfully with foreign manufacturers there. I tried to show, further, that if they could compete in foreign markets, they certainly should be able to compete at home. The Canadian farmers would much sooner use implements manufactured in Canada. They believe, and I think rightly, that the machines manufactured in Canada are as good, if not better than those manufactured in any other country in the world. Our farmers believe in supporting home manufactures; they would rather pay more for goods manufactured in Canada than for goods manufactured in any other country. Is there anything in this resolution unjust to the manufacturers of Canada? If so, it has not yet been pointed out. It has been said that the Canadian manufacturers would not be able to send their products into the American markets because the manufacturers there are protected by letters patent, and under the patent laws of the United States, machines manufactured in Canada would be excluded. I do not believe that, generally speaking, that is correct. It may be true in the case of one or two machines, but I believe that it is not true as to the majority of the machines covered by the resolution. I am satisfied that there is no patent covering ploughs, tooth and disc harrows, harvesters, reapers, agricultural drills and planters, mowers, horse rakes, cultivators and threshing machines. It may be that one or two manufacturers in Canada are making self-binders upon which or upon certain parts of which letters patent have been issued to inventors in the United States. The hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Daly) stated that the farmers of Manitoba were perfectly

satisfied with the existing tariff. Representing, as he does a Manitoba constituency, he should know better than I do the wants and wishes of the farmers of that country. But, within the last few years, I have gone through Manitoba and the North-west Territories and, in addition, I have met many farmers from Manitoba and have had frequent opportunity of speaking with agricultural labourers who have gone from my own part of Ontario to help in taking in the immense harvests that they have had in Manitoba and the North-west for the last two years. They have all told me that one of the great difficulties the farmers of Manitoba and the North-west labour under at the present time is the excessive tariff upon their agricultural implements. These men tell me, I have no doubt truly, that if the farmers there were allowed to buy their implements from the American manufacturers or wherever they could buy them best, they could harvest their crops much more cheaply than they do at the present time. I do not know that I would favour this resolution in its entirety. It might place our manufacturers at a disadvantage in this way: They are now obliged to pay a heavy duty upon their coal, their steel, their iron and many other articles of raw material that go into the manufacture of their machines. I think this resolution ought to go further and place the raw products of the manufacturers of this country upon the free list as well.

Mr. McMILLAN. It does.

Mr. GRIEVE. On re-reading it I see that the hon. gentleman is right. That being the case, I contend that there is no reason why any man in this House, whether looking to the interests of the farmer, or looking to the interest of the manufacturer should feel it desirable to vote down this resolution. Sir, I have confidence in the manufacturers of this country; I believe they are able to compete successfully with the manufacturers of any country in the civilized world. I believe that the great institution established in Toronto, the Massey-Harris Company, who have competed so successfully in foreign lands, could send their goods into the centres of the United States and compete with the manufacturers of that country. I believe they can turn out as good an article and do it as cheaply as the manufacturers of the United States. Within the last few years I have met in conversation many of the manufacturers of this country, and I have failed to find one but told me that if the duty was taken off the raw material of his manufacture, he would hold up both hands for reciprocity with the United States. If our manufacturers are satisfied that they can compete with the manufacturers of the United States, surely those of us who are not engaged in manufacturing pursuits could find no fault with this proposal. I might deal with this matter at considerably great-

Mr. GRIEVE.

er length but I do not know that it is necessary to do so at the present time. This subject will come up for discussion later in the session. I simply rose in the first place, to point out the absurd position occupied by the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) in placing the resolution he did upon the Order paper at the beginning of the session and then speaking as he has done, upon a resolution worded almost the same as his own. I hope that if this resolution is pressed to a vote, the members of this House will be found placing themselves on record in favour of lessening the burdens resting upon the farming community. I know that this duty is a grievous burden to the western farmers, perhaps not so much to the farmers of Ontario, because, undoubtedly, competition has, in a measure, reduced the price of the manufactured goods. When gentlemen say, as they do, that the smaller manufacturers have been driven to the wall by the larger ones, I contend that this is due not so much to over-competition and consequent reduction in prices—because I believe there is a fair margin of profit in the prices of nearly all classes of goods—as to over-production. We have in Canada a limited market. If we had reciprocity in manufactured goods, the opening up of a market of 65,000,000 people would be a boon that would stimulate our manufacturing industries as nothing has stimulated them for many years past. Having these views, I feel that it is my duty to support the resolution that is at present before the House.

Mr. STAIRS. In the remarks made by the hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Grieve) there is one thing that needs a little consideration by this House. There is one fact connected with the manufacture of agricultural implements in Canada and in the United States that the hon. gentleman has not taken into consideration. Before six o'clock, and I think since, he referred to the advantages which the Canadian manufacturers of those implements would have in securing a market of fifty millions of people, whereas the American manufacturers would only secure a market of five millions of people. Now, it can easily be seen that if the production in each country were just equal to the consumption, neither the manufacturers in the United States nor those in Canada would be either injured or benefited by this reciprocity. I will illustrate my point by assuming that the consumption of agricultural implements in Canada in one year, of binders, we will say for example, is 20,000 a year. The hon. gentleman shakes his head, but it does not make any difference to my argument what the real number be. I will assume that the consumption of implements in the United States is about 12 times as many, the population of the United States being about 12 times that of Canada, in round numbers. Now, it will easily be seen that if the production of implements in each

country were 10 per cent less than the consumption, the argument of the hon. member for Perth would have a great deal of weight, and the manufacturer in Canada would be largely benefited by the reciprocity in machines. While the manufacturer in the United States would only have a market in this country to fill up a shortage, so to speak, in our production to the extent of 2,000 machines, our manufacturers would have a shortage to fill up in the United States to the extent of 24,000 machines. That is how the thing would stand if there were a shortage of production of about 10 per cent. As I said before, if the production and the consumption in each country were equal, if the Canadian manufacturers to-day, and the United States manufacturers to-day, were making exactly the quantity of machines that each country required to use in any year, then, neither in the United States nor in Canada would the manufacturers be benefited by reciprocity. The hon. gentleman will see that a fact comes in here which must be taken into consideration by the Canadian manufacturers, at least. Not only in Canada is there a much larger power of production than the country requires for consumption, but in the United States also there is to-day a very much larger power of production, on the part of the agricultural implement makers, than the consumption of that country requires. It is very much greater than 10 per cent. I am confident, but for the sake of the argument I will assume that it is 10 per cent, and that the agricultural implement makers of the United States are able to make 10 per cent more machines than are used in that country, and the agricultural implement makers in Canada are also able to make 10 per cent more machines than are used here. Now, under these circumstances, the hon. gentleman will see that to have reciprocity in agricultural implements to-day, would work to the great disadvantage of Canadian manufacturers. They would only have, so to speak, a surplus which they want to get rid of, of 2,000 machines that they could send into the United States, whereas the manufacturers in the United States would have a surplus production of 24,000 that they would be able to sell in Canada. I have only thought this matter out within the last minute, but I think I have largely underestimated the surplus power of production on the part of the United States manufacturers to-day, and that if they had a free market in Canada, they would have a surplus production that they could turn out of their factories each year that would far more than supply all the demand of Canada for that year. Even allowing that they could make to-day about 10 per cent more machines than their consumption, this would be the case. Then there is another factor that has to be taken into consideration, one that should be considered very seri-

ously by the manufacturers of Canada, and that is the geographical position. Even if it be true, and I hope it is true, that the manufacturers of Canada, under the same conditions, can manufacture as cheaply as they can in the United States, these conditions would result in many of the manufacturers in Canada transporting their enterprises into the United States. I think this result would naturally follow. The bulk of the free raw material, the iron and the steel which enters into the manufacture of these agricultural implements, comes from the iron districts of the United States. Now, the resolution asks that iron should be free, and under these circumstances, I hold, that to manufacture for Canada, the geographical position of the Canadian manufacturer is as favourable as the geographical position of the United States manufacturer; but to manufacture for the United States, hon. gentlemen will see that the geographical position of our manufacturers is not as favourable, because the Canadian manufacturer must pay freight from the American iron districts to points such as Toronto and Brantford, and then pay freight back again on the agricultural implements into the United States, many of which would have to go far south of Chicago to find a market. Now, how would any large manufacturer in Canada reason under these circumstances? He would say: I can manufacture for Canada just as cheaply in Chicago, or in some other American centre, and just as favourably, using American raw material, as I can in Canada, say in Toronto; and if I move my works there I am in a far better position to manufacture for the United States; and the result would be that in a few years, under the conditions proposed by the resolution of the hon. gentleman, these works would be moved to the United States, and our Canadian farmers and our Canadian labour would lose the advantages they now possess in these operations being conducted in Canada. But I did not intend to take up the time of the House at any length in discussing the details of the question. I only wish to say, however, in closing, that I believe this question must be considered on still broader principles than those I have enunciated. I hold that the National Policy has to stand or fall as one complete policy. The Conservative party, at least, are not going to pick out any one individual item, or any one class of manufactures, and put it upon the free list, and maintain their protective duties on other articles. It is the policy of the Conservative party to protect the farmer, to protect the manufacturer, to protect the artisan, and all the different classes of labour in this country, so far as they can. If the farmer, under the present tariff, has not protection enough, let us try and give him more protection on the lines of the National Policy,

but let us not give it to him by striking a blow at some other industry which we are at present protecting.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. For what reason was it that agriculture was singled out for special reductions?

Mr. FOSTER. It was only a moderate reduction.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It comes to about half the protection given it.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Do you object to that?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I object to any one industry being discriminated against.

Motion negatived.

MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY— THE ESTIMATES.

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

Mr. SPEAKER read the Message, as follows:—

ABERDEEN.

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons, Estimates of sums required for the service of the Dominion for the year ending 30th June, 1897, and in accordance with the provisions of "The British North America Act, 1867," the Governor General recommends these Estimates to the House of Commons.

Government House,

Ottawa, January, 1896.

Mr. FOSTER moved:

That the Message and Estimates be referred to Committee of Supply.

Motion agreed to.

THE HIGH COMMISSIONER.

Mr. CASEY moved for:

Copies of all Orders in Council, instructions from the Government or any department, and other documents, relating to the appointment of a High Commissioner in London, or the nature of his duties, or his discharge of those duties, which have not already been laid before this House.

He said: This motion raises a rather grave question, the question whether the course which is being followed in respect to the position of Sir Charles Tupper is one which is consistent with truly constitutional practice, and is decorous and convenient, so far as regards the business of the Government of the country. The Finance Minister gave me the following answer to a question on Friday. I had asked:

Has the attention of the Government been called to a statement in the press as to Sir Charles Tupper holding the double office of Secretary of State and High Commissioner? Is it their intention that he shall continue to be High Commissioner while a member of the Cabinet?

Mr. GRIEVE.

To the first of these questions, the Finance Minister replied, no. To the second question, he replied:

He is acting High Commissioner for the present.

It appears he resigned the office of High Commissioner on 15th January, and on the same day was reappointed Acting High Commissioner.

It will be within the memory of hon. members that this is not the first time Sir Charles Tupper has filled the dual position of Minister of the Crown in Canada, and High Commissioner in London, whether in the body or out of the body, during most of the time it would be very hard for any one to tell. I was told on Friday by the leader of the House, that Sir Charles Tupper had been appointed Acting High Commissioner on 30th May, 1883, and acted as such until 24th May, 1884. I had asked during what period Sir Charles Tupper had been Minister of the Crown since his first appointment as Acting High Commissioner in 1883. The Minister of Finance said Sir Charles had acted as Minister of Finance from 27th January, 1887, to 22nd May, 1888. But the hon. gentleman forgot to tell us what is equally the fact, that Sir Charles Tupper was Minister of Railways at the time he was appointed High Commissioner at London, in 1883, and continued for a year or more afterwards to act as Minister of Railways and High Commissioner jointly. I have no means of knowing the exact period, but have put a question on the paper on that point, and I hope the Minister of Finance will furnish information which will be more accurate than that which he gave on Friday.

At all events, in June, 1884, Sir Charles Tupper was Minister of Railways, and was what was called Acting High Commissioner in London at the same time. Mr. Blake called attention to this matter, and moved a motion similar in terms to the resolution I submit. I will quote from remarks offered by the hon. gentleman at that time, because he put the case more strongly than I could do it on the spur of the moment. After referring to the announcement of the condition of things in question, Mr. Blake said:

Now, I think when an arrangement of this kind was made, it was not an unreasonable thing to expect that the earliest opportunity would be taken to make an explanation to the House of the reasons for the change, if it was a change, and the arrangement substituted for the original one, for, no doubt, it was an important substitution.

The change the hon. gentleman referred to was from the intention of having Sir Charles Tupper reside in London permanently as High Commissioner, to the plan of his holding that office while acting as Minister of Railways. Mr. Blake proceeded to say:

We may differ as to the constitutional propriety, as to the convenience of that arrange-

ment; but, whether we differ or not, it is an innovation on our practice, and one of sufficient importance to entitle us to explanation upon it.

Mr. Blake proceeded to point out the peculiar relations that might arise between the High Commissioner in his capacity as such, and the High Commissioner as a Minister. He said:

In the first place, there is the question of the relation of the High Commissioner of Canada to the particular members of the Administration. He is agent of the Administration at large, but he is also agent of the various Ministers to whom individually he has been in the habit in the past of referring. We have before us instructions given to Sir Alexander Galt as High Commissioner. It will be remembered that, in respect to the negotiations with France,—I rather think, with Spain also—he received instructions from the Minister of Finance. The Minister of Finance wrote the Commissioner a letter, which was published, instructing him what to do. The Commissioner proceeded, and did not do it, but, I suppose, the failure was not his fault—he tried to do it. He reported to the Minister of Finance what he had done under his instructions. He reported to the Minister of Agriculture what he had done in regard to emigration, and, I dare say, to other hon. Ministers also with respect to matters in which, under their direction, he had acted for their different departments.

Sir, those same complications will arise now. We shall have Sir Charles Tupper the Secretary of State, instructing Sir Charles Tupper, the High Commissioner at London, to take certain action there. We shall have Sir Charles Tupper, the High Commissioner, hurrying off to London to carry out these instructions given by Sir Charles Tupper, the Secretary of State. We shall have Sir Charles Tupper, the High Commissioner, reporting to Sir Charles Tupper, the Secretary of State, what he has done in connection with this business; and we shall have such a perfect tangle of Sir Charles Tupper, that we shall not be able to distinguish which of these is the head of the reigning dynasty, which is the Prince Imperial, and which is merely the Lord High Commissioner.

Mr. Blake pointed out at greater length how such complications might arise. He referred to the responsibilities of Ministers. He said that in this country Ministers were held individually responsible for the business of their departments, as well as collectively responsible as a Cabinet for the general conduct of the Government. Mr. Blake further said that he did not see how a Minister who was at the same time High Commissioner, could be held individually responsible for the action of the High Commissioner, who was himself, or for his directions to himself, to do certain things and to report to himself. He also pointed out the grave difficulties that might arise from the absence of the High Commissioner from London, when business needed to be transacted here which should be done by the same person when a Minister of the

Crown. He pointed out that such difficulties had arisen, and that while Sir Charles Tupper, the High Commissioner, was in London the business of Sir Charles Tupper, the Minister of Railways, had been neglected, and had passed into the hands of the then Minister of Agriculture, as acting Minister of Railways, with the result that a great many matters had been carelessly treated. For example, he cited:

Questions of the route through the Rocky Mountains; the settlement of the passes, of the financial standing of the company, of the guarantee—the papers in regard to which, we hope, will be brought down in a few moments—and other questions of great importance, all of which we have not fully before us at this time.

He goes on to point out that it is a very awkward, unconstitutional and inconvenient thing for a member of the Cabinet to be away for any length of time, his duties being performed by an acting Minister; and, on the other hand, that it is perfectly absurd to have a man appointed as High Commissioner in London, unless he is in London attending to his duties as such. "Unless," says Mr. Blake, "he was an Irishman or a bird, he could not be in both places at the same time."

Now, it was argued at that time by Sir John Macdonald, in reply to Mr. Blake, that there were English precedents for a similar course. The then Premier spoke as follows:—

The hon. gentleman knows that it is a matter of practice in England. There was no inconsistency in Lord Beaconsfield, or the Marquis of Salisbury, going to Berlin, or in Lord John Russell, a member of the Administration in England, taking part in the Treaty of Vienna, after the Crimean war, when he was Prime Minister and Minister of Foreign Affairs.

Sir John Macdonald also instanced the case of Lord Castlereagh, a member of the Government of the day, who, in 1814, had been for a year in Vienna arranging about a treaty. Mr. Mackenzie called attention to the fact that none of these precedents bore on the case, for none of the gentlemen referred to had been permanent resident ambassadors at a foreign court, but envoys extraordinary sent to perform special duties, and for a limited time. As Mr. Blake also pointed out: they had not been sent as subordinates, they had not been sent out as civil servants subject to orders of the Government or of any department of Government; but they were sent with full powers to negotiate a certain treaty, which were specified before they left home.

The argument of Sir John Macdonald, and the precedents he quoted on that occasion, appear to have come to naught. So fully was it admitted that they had come to naught, that it was felt that the position of Sir Charles Tupper was indefensible without special action being taken, and special action was taken later in the session. On

March 4th, 1884, Sir John Macdonald moved to introduce a Bill respecting the Independence of Parliament, which provided that the existing Act, that of 1878, should be amended by declaring :

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

You will probably remember, Mr. Speaker, as I do, and as many others do, that until that Act was passed Sir Charles Tupper used to sit in the House, make a speech upon a measure advocating a certain line of policy, and then walk out and sit in the gallery while a vote was being taken, for fear he would be subject to the penalties consequent upon illegally sitting and voting in this House. After that Bill was passed he was enabled, not only to speak, but to vote in his capacity as a Minister.

I would call your attention, Sir, further, to the fact that even the conditions of this whitewashing Act were not carried out. It provided that a man holding a position such as Sir Charles Tupper held should be eligible for Parliament only if he received no fees, wages, allowance, and so on. Yet we find, from a return brought down in obedience to the motion proposed by Mr. Blake, that during the year 1883-84 Sir Charles Tupper, when acting as Minister of Railways and also as High Commissioner, was paid no less than \$4,729.33 for expenses, etc., in his capacity of High Commissioner. He was allowed for removal expenses \$836, and "Bank of Montreal, London, L.C., cheque of High Commissioner (£800), \$3,893.33," or a total of \$4,729.33. We find from the same return, Sir Charles Tupper reporting to the Minister of Agriculture on various occasions in regard to the cattle trade and immigration, and so on. We find him acting as a subordinate to his own colleagues, and reporting to them, practically, as a member of the Civil Service of Canada.

Now, Sir, the House and the country want to know whether this farce is to be played over again; whether we are going to have the Premier—for it appears to be taken for granted that he will be Premier, if Sir Mackenzie Bowell takes the line which my hon. friend the Minister of Finance would wish him to take—the House and the country want to know whether we are going to have, at all events, a leading member of the Cabinet, perhaps the Premier of that Cabinet, acting as High Commissioner in London, receiving allowance for rent of house, income tax, and other things, as High Commissioner, and, at the same time acting as a member of the

Government, or perhaps as the Premier. We want to know what other precedents for such an extraordinary action, an action so contrary to the spirit of the constitution and the independence of Parliament Act, the Government may be able to find now, which they were not able to find in 1883-84, when Sir John Macdonald made an attempt to find precedents for a similar action. I have no doubt the hon. Minister of Finance can give us some further facts in continuation of his little game of cross-questions and crooked answers. He may be able also to find some weighty precedents for this case.

Let me, in closing, briefly tabulate the imperfect and incorrect information which the hon. Minister gave me on Friday. In the first place he stated that Sir Charles Tupper was for about one year Acting High Commissioner, from the 30th May, 1883, to the 24th May, 1884, when he became full High Commissioner, and remained so until January, 1887, about two years and seven months. The hon. Minister forgot to tell us that during 1883-84 Sir Charles Tupper was also Minister of Railways. Then there was an interregnum of about a month and a half, from 27th January, 1887, to 7th March, 1887, during which nobody appears to have been High Commissioner or Acting High Commissioner. From 7th March, 1887, to 6th July, 1887, about four months, Sir Charles Tupper was again Acting High Commissioner without pay. This was the time when he was Finance Minister in Canada, and carried out that wonderful scheme of protection and bounties on iron, which has done so very much to develop the smelting trade of Canada, and to make Canada one of the foremost iron manufacturing countries in the world—that is, according to the statements of hon. gentlemen opposite. We have never been able to find any results from it, except in their speeches.

Then, there appears to have been an interregnum of about ten months again, during which nobody was High Commissioner or Acting High Commissioner. This continued so long as to lead us to suspect that matters would go on very well if no one was acting as High Commissioner in England at all. In 1888 Sir Charles Tupper again put on the mantle, and remained High Commissioner until 15th January, 1896, when he again resigned as High Commissioner, to become Acting High Commissioner without salary.

Now, Sir, during this last period a remarkable interlude occurred. Sir Charles Tupper, who was a public servant of Canada, in the pay of the country, who was the representative of the whole country at the Court of Great Britain, came out to Canada and assumed, not exactly the leadership, but the generalship, of the party of hon. gentlemen opposite during an election campaign. Throughout the whole campaign of 1891, while he was receiving pay at the high rate we allowed him to keep up his establishment in London, he

was rushing about from one end of Canada to the other at the public expense, doing what? Trying to defeat one of the parties struggling for political ascendancy in this country—trying to keep his party friends in power. Sir, I do not think the conduct of a public servant who could do that can be spoken of in terms of too high or too bitter condemnation. I think the scandal was such as could not possibly have occurred under any government but that of which the remains still occupy the Treasury benches. If it had not been a thoroughly Tupperized Government at that time, no such scandal could have been permitted; but it was permitted, for we have the statement of the Minister of Finance that during that whole period Sir Charles Tupper was full High Commissioner, and, therefore, doubtless, in receipt of the full salary and allowances belonging to that position.

On the 15th of this month he resigns again, and the farce of calling him an Acting High Commissioner re-begins. How is he to do his duties in London while he is out here? Or who is to do them for him if he cannot do them? Will he transact all his business by cable? My question on this point, on Friday, was as follows:—

Is any business now pending, or are any Canadian interests at stake, which require the presence of a High Commissioner in London?

To that the hon. Finance Minister replied:

All business is regularly attended to by the officials in London, with approval from here.

In other words, the leader of the House tells us that the business in London is all done by the clerks in the office, with approval from here—after it is done! Is that what we pay a commissioner twelve or fifteen thousand dollars a year for? If so, we want to know it. If not, and if there is need of a High Commissioner in London, it is a perfect scandal that the man who is needed there to look after our interests, should be kept here for a large part of the year to transact the duties of Secretary of State, purely partisan duties, with which he should not be allowed to mix at all.

The position is one which it seems a little hard to characterize as it should be characterized. It seems hard to realize that the Government should now, in the days of their weakness, as they did then, in the days of their strength, have the effrontery to keep a man in two positions at once, either of which would require the whole time of a good and competent man to fill. That appears to be what they intend to do, and it is perhaps the most abject confession of their own incapacity and weakness they could give to the country. They confess that they have not got a leader, or any one fit to be a leader, in Canada. They confess that they have to call home a civil servant from England to lead them; and yet they propose to continue him in authority and in part pay, notwithstanding anything said in the Order

in Council; because his allowances appear to be going on as in the past, and he has full authority as High Commissioner. I ask the Government to bring down these papers as soon as they can, and I will leave the House to form its judgment upon the constitutionality of the Government's action in this connection. I have worded my motion so as to include all papers that were not brought down in compliance with Mr. Blake's motion of 1884.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I wish to call the attention of the House to the statute, and I would ask the Government to explain how they can appoint an Acting Commissioner to discharge the duties for which the statute provides. I find, in the first place, that the statute provides that the High Commissioner shall act as a resident agent in the United Kingdom. Now, as I understood the hon. Minister, in the explanation he gave a day or two ago, in reply to a question put by my hon. friend, the High Commissioner is not to reside in England, but is to be a member of this Government, and is to reside in Canada, being engaged to discharge the duties of a member of the Government in Canada. I would like the Minister of Justice (Mr. Dickey) to tell us how a High Commissioner, acting or permanent, can be appointed, and how, at the same time, the Government shall undertake to decide that he need not reside in England, but may continue to reside in Canada? Those hon. gentlemen are, as the sworn advisers of Her Majesty, bound to act in conformity with the law. They bind themselves to discharge their duties as the law itself requires. Now, the law requires that the High Commissioner shall reside in England. But these hon. gentleman say: What signifies the law? It is a matter of no consequence; the High Commissioner shall reside in Canada; and we, the Ministers of the Crown, the servants of the Crown, will over-ride the law by assuming to ourselves to do what Charles the I. undertook to do in England. We will put ourselves above the law by declaring that the law is made for ordinary mortals, but must not regulate the conduct of the Government of the day. That is the position taken by these hon. gentlemen. The law provides that the High Commissioner shall act as a representative, and a resident agent of Canada in the United Kingdom. Now, I tell those hon. gentlemen that they have no authority to appoint a High Commissioner who is not to reside in England. They have no right to pass such an Order in Council, and no right to ask His Excellency to sanction such an Order in Council. The Act further provides that the High Commissioner, while residing in England as the agent of Canada, shall, in that capacity, execute such powers and perform such duties—where? Here? No, Sir, in England—as are from time to time conferred upon and assigned to him by the

Governor General in Council. Does that Act contemplate a High Commissioner sitting here in Council, preparing a provision defining what his duties shall be—preparing himself, it may be, an Order in Council defining his duties, and asking His Excellency to sanction the order, and which order provides that he may discharge those duties three thousand or four thousand miles away from the place where, under the statutes, he is bound to discharge them? The Act provides that he is to :

Take the charge of, supervision and control of the immigration offices and agencies in the United Kingdom.

But how is he to take charge of the duties of the Immigration Office or see that the work is performed, if he does not reside in England? Then he is to :

Carry out such instructions as he, from time to time, receives from the Governor General in Council.

Carry them out where? In England. By residing there, by being upon the ground, by seeing that the work which is assigned to him is discharged, either directly by himself, or indirectly by those under him. It is further provided that he shall receive a salary of not more than \$10,000 per annum, and the same shall be paid out of the unappropriated moneys forming part of the consolidated revenue fund of Canada. Sir Charles Tupper, on one occasion, violated that law. He undertook to discharge his duties by the acceptance of the office, and it was said he would discharge them independent of salary. I pointed out at the time that there were two cases in England where this question had come up—I shall not detain the House by reading those cases—showing that the agreement to accept vacated the seat, that it was not necessary there should be a salary earned, that the very moment the party agreed to accept an office to which a salary is attached, he, by that agreement, vacated his seat, and that a gentleman who had agreed to accept the office of Chancellor of the Exchequer was compelled to go back to his constituents and be re-elected, although he did not get the office at all, in consequence of the alienation of mind on the part of the King after he had made that agreement, or given that assent. So it was perfectly clear, and in consequence of those two decisions this House found it necessary, in order that Sir Charles Tupper, who had vacated his seat under the provisions of the law, might sit here without going back for re-election, to propose a statute which enabled him to continue in his seat. In fact, that statute made him a member of this House, and he did not become a member by virtue of any election. Now, it was provided by that statute :

That nothing in this section shall render ineligible any person holding any office, commission, or employment of the nature or description

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).

mentioned in such section A of this clause, as a member of the House of Commons, or shall disqualify him from sitting or voting therein, if, by his commission or other instrument of appointment, it is declared or provided that he shall hold such office, commission, or employment, without any salary, fees, wages, allowances, emoluments, &c.

And it was under that provision that he continued at that time to hold the office of High Commissioner. I do not know whether that statute is now in force or not. I have not looked at the law. I find here in the Consolidated Statutes of Canada, in 1886, two years after that statute, a statute defining the duties of High Commissioner, which absolutely declares that he shall have a salary and does not refer to the exceptions provided for in that special statute. But even though the commission had been issued to Sir Charles Tupper, and even though, under that commission, it was declared that no salary is, for the time being, attached to his office—I do not care how that may be—it does not authorize the Government in appointing a man to that office who is to reside in this country, and who cannot, in consequence of the position he holds here, reside elsewhere. I deny that any such appointment can be validly made, and therefore Sir Charles Tupper cannot legally be Acting High Commissioner in England in the face of that provision of the law. I say that the Government cannot issue to him a commission—I do not care in what form it is—which will enable him legally to discharge the duties of High Commissioner, when the law itself—which is above Ministers of the Crown, and under which it is their duty to act—says that the High Commissioner to England shall be a resident agent of the Canadian Government in that country. He is not a resident agent, he cannot be resident agent. The fact that he takes the position of Minister of the Crown the law conclusively presumes that he has his residence in the capital where the duties of his office are to be discharged. There are, besides that, inconsistent duties that exist as between an agent of the Government who is High Commissioner and a Minister of the Crown, and that being so, I maintain that this House ought not, for one moment, to recognize so flagrant a violation of the law as the Government have committed in undertaking to make Sir Charles Tupper the Acting High Commissioner. I do not care what name they give it—they may call him High Commissioner if they please—if he undertakes to discharge the duties and receive an appointment under the great seal of this country, he is in fact a High Commissioner, he is in law a High Commissioner, and the adding of the word "acting" cannot alter the character of the office he holds. He is disqualified by the law from accepting the office, and it is an outrage on parliamentary government in this country that the Government should assume to make him acting

High Commissioner and Minister of the Crown at the same time. He may be one or he may be the other, but he cannot be both. The duties of a Minister of the Crown, require him to be here at this capital for the discharge of the executive duties attaching to his office. He cannot be elsewhere; no act on the part of the Ministers can place him elsewhere. No more can he hold an office under the great seal as High Commissioner of Canada and reside elsewhere than in the United Kingdom where his duties are to be discharged.

Mr. DICKEY. I understand the hon. gentleman's objection to be based particularly at that section of the statute which requires the High Commissioner to be the resident agent of this Government in London. I take it for granted that the hon. gentleman would agree with me that that would not mean continuous residence, but that a man might be High Commissioner and absent himself from London and from the United Kingdom. So there is no objection to Sir Charles Tupper being in Canada and being High Commissioner representing this Government in England.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). But when you make him a Minister of the Crown here, you give him another residence.

Mr. DICKEY. That is another point. I am speaking of temporary absence from England being no objection to his holding the office of High Commissioner under the statute. But, Sir, my mind is a good deal relieved with regard to the hon. gentleman's constitutional point—although I must say that it is raised by him quite unexpectedly to me—by the fact that the practice that the Government has adopted in this instance was adopted, I believe in 1887 by so high a constitutional authority as Sir John Macdonald. At that time, if I remember aright, Sir Charles Tupper was appointed a Minister of the Crown and was also acting High Commissioner. The hon. gentleman is far better aware than I am that, with regard to Ministers of the Crown themselves, the practice has grown up, in case of a vacancy or the absence of a Minister, to appoint an acting Minister. I do not know exactly in what category that officer would stand before the law, but that is the practice. Now, it seems to me that the hon. gentleman's attack is not exactly in point, because this Government has not appointed Sir Charles Tupper High Commissioner in England, nor has it issued a commission to him under the great seal. He resigned the office of High Commissioner and that resignation was accepted and the office was in that way vacated. As I take it the office of High Commissioner is vacant at the present time. For convenience there were two courses open to the Government. They could have appointed a junior officer in London as acting High Commissioner—

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Under what authority?

Mr. DICKEY. I dare say the hon. gentleman may be technically correct; there may be no authority under the statute for such an appointment. But I assume that the British Government, for the convenience of transacting business between this Government and the home government, would recognize an agent appointed in that way, though, technically, there might be no authority for it under the statute. The Government, as an alternative, had the opportunity of availing themselves of Sir Charles Tupper's very great and intimate knowledge of the business at London which is now going forward and appointing him temporarily as acting High Commissioner. They chose that alternative. The hon. gentleman sees and the House sees that the constitutional question raised by the hon. gentleman is a tempest in a teapot. The arrangement is certainly not intended to be permanent. There is no salary or remuneration of any kind attached to the office. The simple fact of the matter is that Sir Charles Tupper, without any formal commission or anything of that sort—and possibly the hon. gentleman is right without any legal authority technically—is acting as intermediary between this Government and the home government.

Mr. CASEY. May I remind the hon. gentleman of the statement made by the leader of the House that Sir Charles Tupper has been appointed High Commissioner without salary. What sort of an appointment was it?

Mr. DICKEY. The hon. gentleman, I think, has not read it correctly. The leader of the House said he was appointed acting High Commissioner. I have his answer here. So the effect of the hon. gentleman's point is this that we may be to-day without a High Commissioner. Our attempt to name Sir Charles Tupper for that purpose may be a total failure; we may not have authority under the statute to do such a thing. But that is the whole point. Even if it be so, that is a point that may be raised by the British government and may be productive of some inconvenience. I quite recognize the force of the hon. gentleman's statement as affecting the position of High Commissioner that the appointment of a High Commissioner for any great length of time to the position of Cabinet Minister would lead to a very great practical inconvenience. But I can assure the hon. gentleman, so far as my assurance is of any service, that the moment any practical inconvenience arises out of the situation as it is, steps will be taken to make a change in the existing arrangement. It is admittedly a temporary arrangement, and on constitutional grounds cannot possibly cause injury in any quarter. I must say that I

think the attack of the hon. gentleman is not quite called for.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I really feel sorry for my hon. friend the Minister of Justice (Mr. Dickey). It is abundantly apparent to the whole House that the hon. gentleman agrees with the point taken by my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills). In fact, the argument is irresistible, incontrovertible; it is so plain that it cannot be misunderstood, and the hon. Minister of Justice in his halting and inconsequent answer, practically admits its soundness. Everybody who knows the hon. Minister knows that he will not submit to put forward an argument to the House that he does not believe to be sound as a matter of law. Therefore the statement made by the hon. member for Bothwell stands, that the appointment of Sir Charles Tupper as acting High Commissioner is unconstitutional and illegal, and that argument is practically assented to by the Minister of Justice. It is a humiliating position for this country to stand in that this man can so dominate the party with which he is connected that he can compel them to appoint him from time to time illegally to the office of representative of this country at the Court of St. James. Now, what answer does the hon. member give? He pleads to the House a misercordian that it has no permanency, and no salary. What has that got to do with it? The hon. gentlemen might appoint the Finance Minister Acting High Commissioner at Washington. He has equally as much authority to do it. The statute gives you authority to appoint one man, and one only, in London to represent this country, and it declares that when he is so appointed, that man, in order to hold his office, must be a resident agent, and if he ceases to be a resident agent, he ceases to be a qualified High Commissioner. You can appoint a High Commissioner at Washington, if you choose, over-ride the statute law, or act without statute law altogether. If the Governor in Council are to constitute themselves a power paramount to Parliament, and superior to the statute law of the land, they can appoint a High Commissioner, I assume, to almost every Court in Europe, and they can say whether it is intended to be a permanent or a tentative appointment; they can say, we will see how it gets along, and we will withdraw it if it becomes, as the Minister of Justice says, inconvenient, and, perhaps, after that, as he says, the English government won't find fault, they won't take any exception, and we will flounder through in this miserable haphazard way, as we are floundering through the other government business now before the House. Well, Sir, it is not an enviable position for the Government to occupy. It may be—I am not sufficiently conversant with the official acts which the High Commissioner has to perform—but it may be that very serious consequences will

Mr. DICKEY.

flow from this. Perhaps the government of England may not inquire very closely, probably they would not inquire whether he is being legally appointed; but I imagine that if he came there as Acting High Commissioner, with the imprimatur of Lord Aberdeen on his commission, they would probably, as a matter of courtesy, assume that he was properly appointed. But this Parliament cannot assume that. This Parliament has had brought before their notice that this appointment is illegal and unconstitutional, practically admitted to be so by the Minister of Justice; and still, Sir, that man's power in his party is such that while he holds office as Secretary of State, I believe, he compels them illegally and improperly to appoint him to the Acting High Commissionership in England, and the only excuse they have to give is that there is no salary attached to it, and no permanency. Well, Sir, I regret exceedingly that the Government have allowed themselves to be driven into this ignominious and ignoble position, and I pity the Minister of Justice that he is forced upon his feet to attempt to defend that which he practically admits is indefensible, and to palliate and excuse it when he cannot defend it, alleging it is only a temporary appointment, and there is no salary attached to it. Now, he says that the appointment was made by Sir John A. Macdonald. Sir John A. Macdonald never attempted to argue that it was constitutional. Political exigencies compelled him, or impelled him, to make the appointment then, and he laughed it off in the House because he had a majority of sixty or seventy behind him. But I do not think the hon. member is prepared to say that everything the late Sir John Macdonald did or sanctioned is, perforce, to be a precedent in this country that we are for all time to follow. Sir John A. Macdonald might be able to laugh these things through the House, but I trust we have reached that state now when the House and the country will require something more than a jocular laugh to convince it that appointments of this kind can be made by the authority of the Governor in Council, directly in contravention to the express words of the statute.

Mr. CASEY. I do not think that my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies) need be afraid that the hon. gentlemen opposite will try to laugh things off at present. I do not think they are in that humour, by any means. But the Minister of Justice seems to think that the only difficulty that might arise in this matter would be that the British government might find that Sir Charles Tupper's appointment was illegal, and might raise some difficulty. Now, Sir, it is not that which concerns us at all. It is not what the British government will think about it, but it is what the Canadian people will think about it that concerns us,

and, moreover, what Sir Charles Tupper's position will be in this House.

Now, it is admitted by the Minister of Justice himself that this appointment as Acting High Commissioner, or any other kind of commissioner, is not legal under the Act. If that appointment is not legal, the exception made by Sir John A. Macdonald's amendment to the Election Act in favour of men legally appointed by commissions to such offices does not apply to this case. So that if the contention of my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills), and which is admitted by the Minister of Justice, is correct, Sir Charles Tupper is at this moment ineligible to be elected a member of this House.

Mr. FOSTER. Oh, oh.

Mr. CASEY. The Minister of Finance tries to have a little laugh about it. He will feel himself laughing very much on the other side of his mouth, if, after all the trouble and expense of getting Sir Charles Tupper elected in Cape Breton, it were to turn out that he had never been eligible there at all.

Mr. FOSTER. He is going to be elected there all the same.

Mr. CASEY. It is very likely he is going to be elected, but he won't stay elected if he was ineligible when he was put in nomination. Hon. gentlemen may be quite sure of that. They do not control everything in this country yet. The members of the Government have been mesmerized, perhaps I should say, Tupperized, but the people of the country have not been Tupperized yet, and if a man is ineligible on account of his office, and on account of receiving an allowance and profit from an office to which he is illegally appointed, he is not eligible to be elected, no matter how many votes he may get in Cape Breton. The hon. gentleman need not be so dead sure, either, that he is going to get a majority in Cape Breton. The hon. gentlemen were quite sure a day or two ago, after the latest developments that had taken place in Charlevoix, that their candidate was going to be elected there, but he is not—by a large majority. Now, Sir, that is the only point I wished to make in reply to the Minister of Justice, that the difficulty is not as to how the British Government may view Sir Charles Tupper's position, but it is as to how the British government may view her of this House, and as a servant of this country.

Mr. LISTER. I do not see why there should be so much discussion on this subject. Sir Charles Tupper has come out to Canada, as he came out frequently before, just before an election. He came out in 1891, he was out, I think, in 1886, and, after the elections were over, and the Conservative party had succeeded again to office, then Sir Charles Tupper went back again to the loaves and fishes. This is but

a little scheme of a wrecked party to gather themselves together. They think that the name of Sir Charles Tupper will draw the Conservatives all together, and they will have another victory, and as soon as that victory takes place, they will reappoint Sir Charles Tupper as High Commissioner, and he will leave the Government, as he always did before. However, I think, Sir Charles is somewhat foolish in resigning the position with the expectation that he might go back in that way, because, if the indications can be relied upon at all, there will be very little of the Conservative party in this House after the next election. I think we are going to sweep you, I think you are a wrecked party. Subscribing \$3,000 or \$4,000 in this House, in No. 16, and sending it down to Cape Breton by a member of this House, is not going to save you. Notwithstanding all the money you may put in, and the efforts you may make, the probabilities are that he will be defeated. You expected to carry Montreal Centre, you were almost sure you would carry it, hon. gentlemen would have bet on the result, but instead of carrying it, you were defeated by 1,200 or 1,300. You expected to carry Jacques Cartier, and you were defeated there. The Conservatives were almost sure of carrying Charlevoix to-day, but, according to the returns received to-night, you have been defeated there also. My hon. friend beside me (Mr. Choquette) says you sent \$1,000 into Charlevoix.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. The money came from the Post Office Department as a deposit.

Mr. LISTER. At all events, whatever was sent to Charlevoix has been lost; that country has remained true to the Liberal cause, and instead of my hon. friends opposite having another supporter, there will be another member sitting here to oppose them—another nail in their coffin.

Mr. FOSTER. Another member to vote for a commission.

Mr. LISTER. Then hon. gentlemen brought on elections in two constituencies where they thought they were reasonably secure. In Cardwell they did not prove very successful, it must be admitted. In North Ontario also they were not very successful; if there had been two candidates the Conservatives would have been unseated there. Taking altogether, the by-elections, if they may be taken as any indication, they show that the Government is not particularly strong in the country. The fact is, the people have no faith in the Government. Its shifting policy has been such as to convince the electors that the Government is not to be trusted. The Minister of Agriculture, in his county, represented the remedial order as simply a decree of a court, which of necessity had to be issued; it did not follow that it had to be enforced.

Mr. FOSTER. It strikes me that we are deviating somewhat from a debate on the position of High Commissioner.

Mr. LISTER. We are discussing somewhat the propriety of Sir Charles Tupper's position as High Commissioner, and so on. In Verchères, the Postmaster General and Minister of Public Works visited the county and urged upon the electors that the Government were bound to pass the remedial legislation; they were bound to pass the legislation which the Minister of Justice, in emphatic tones, had proposed, and which it was represented must be passed even through fire and brimstone. But the legislation was not passed. When the Government were unable to carry out the strong promises made, those two hon. gentlemen and a colleague left the Government. Then it was perfectly understood that no remedial legislation was to be enacted. But another promise was made by the Government, that if they would only come back and re-enter the Government, a special session would be called and remedial legislation would be passed. The session has arrived, but instead of the remedial legislation talked of, which was to follow exactly the lines of the remedial order, the ex-Minister of Justice informed the House the other evening that the measure would be of such a character that almost everybody could support it.

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not see the connection between the speech of the hon. gentleman and the motion before the House.

Mr. LISTER. I was going to refer to the contest which is now going on in Cape Breton. I do not like to say anything that might be considered harsh so far as Sir Charles Tupper is concerned, but the country at large, I think, will look upon it as a somewhat indecent thing that a gentleman who has occupied that high position for so many years, drawing such enormous salaries from the exchequer of this country, should make a convenience of Canada, because that is all he is doing, resigning that office when he thinks proper, coming out here, entering the Government, trying to build up the Government and help it along, and as soon as he has succeeded, returning to his old nest in old London and resuming the office and all its emoluments. When Sir Charles Tupper assumed the office of High Commissioner, it was generally understood that he accepted the position of an ambassador of a European government. It was supposed that he had given up politics as a game, and he would work there for the best interests of Canada as a whole, a servant of this Dominion, drawing his salary from the people of all Canada, not of the Conservative party nor of the Liberal party, but of all the people. It was supposed he would devote his time, energy and ability to discharging those important duties. What would we think if an ambassador of Great Britain, the moment an election was an-

Mr. LISTER.

nounced or was near at hand, should return to England and temporarily resign the position he occupied and take an active part in politics, expecting to be re-appointed to the position he had resigned as soon as the elections were over. Such an act would never be tolerated in the old world for a single moment, such a thing has never been attempted; yet here we have the spectacle of the ambassador of Canada to the British government, when he pleases or it suits his own convenience, resigning for the time being and plunging into elections in Canada for the purpose of serving one political party, in order that he may resume the office he had resigned. When I say that such conduct is indecent, that phrase fully describes the position of affairs. Sir Charles Tupper is coming here to save the Conservative party. That party has wrecked itself. Vacillation, incompetence, extravagance, corruption of the very worst kind can be charged against that party, and for the purpose of booming the party they have brought Sir Charles Tupper over here, thinking that the name of Tupper will becloud the political actions of the party and enable it to snatch another victory. They will find, when the elections come on, the people understand this action. They will find Sir Charles Tupper is a back-number, and that he cannot come here and resuscitate the Conservative party. He is a reminiscence, a galvanized corpse. The party will find when the elections come on that with or without Sir Charles Tupper the Conservative party is doomed. I am sorry for the sake of the Controller of Inland Revenue. If I were following my own inclinations and feelings, I should like to see him longer in office. Whether in office or not, the chances are exceedingly good, if we can look upon it in that light, that he will be defeated at the next elections; at all events, he will not be able to hold the present honourable position in the Government nor draw the emoluments, which are no doubt a trifling matter to him as compared with many other hon. gentlemen. The motion before the House is fully warranted by the facts. The position which Sir Charles Tupper occupied is contrary to law; there is no law giving authority to the High Commissioner to discharge the duties of the office to which he has now been appointed, and to which the Government have no power to appoint him.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Following the example of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lister), and carrying on the logical discussion which he has carried on, starting the discussion on Sir Charles Tupper and bringing in the election of Charlevoix, I should like to say one word on the subject, and it is that if the election in Charlevoix has been carried by a friend of the hon. gentlemen opposite, it is because the candidate representing the Liberal cause in that county at the last moment declared he would vote for the policy of the Conservative party.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. TARTE. He never did so.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Hon. gentlemen may laugh, but when the vote of that hon. gentleman is taken in this House, hon. gentlemen opposite will not feel as happy as they feel to-night. It is well known to those from both political parties who are carrying on that fight, that Mr. Angers proclaimed by telegrams all over the county that he would not support the policy of his leader, the Hon. Mr. Laurier, in his policy upon the Manitoba School Bill.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. That was in the "Gazette" only.

Mr. LISTER. The Bill may be such that any one could support it.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I am telling the hon. gentlemen opposite what their candidate did. Further, I am telling them, that if it had not been for Mr. Anger's adhesion to the policy of the present Government on that question, he would not have been elected in the county of Charlevoix.

Mr. TARTE. Mr. Speaker, the Postmaster-General seems to know everything about that Charlevoix election. The wires may have told him a great many things that we did not know before he knew them; but there is one thing I am sure of, and that is, that my hon. friend (Sir Adolphe Caron) is quite mistaken. I challenge him to put before the House immediately those famous telegrams that he speaks of. Mr. Angers never pledged himself to vote for the hon. gentleman's policy.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. On the school question.

Mr. TARTE. He never did even that.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. He did.

Mr. TARTE. We are now face to face with a very simple question of fact. My hon. friend (Sir Adolphe Caron) has stated that Mr. Angers has pledged himself to vote for the policy of the Government.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Will the hon. gentleman excuse me for interrupting him. Mr. Angers pledged himself to vote against the policy of the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Laurier) upon the commission of inquiry.

Mr. TARTE. I say that my hon. friend (Sir Adolphe Caron) is altogether misinformed. There is a very simple thing to do in the matter. Let the hon. gentleman who has spoken of telegrams produce these same telegrams that he says Mr. Angers sent over the county. It is no use for the hon. gentleman (Sir Adolphe Caron) to speak of things that he does not know all about. He has alluded to that Charlevoix election; he should not have done so. Through the wires on Saturday went to the county of Charle-

voix a pastoral circular—if I may express myself that way—which did not approve of the policy of the Government, but which asked the electors to pledge themselves to vote for a thing that they had not seen, and the electors did not pledge themselves to vote for that thing which they had not seen, and they ought to be congratulated by all free men. The Government, in that election, relied on a thing that has not had its effect. I speak freely here, and I speak proudly, because in Verchères we had to do with the same—I would not say, as some extreme people do, the same dangerous influence; surely not—but with the same ill-advised influence. I may be excused, and I may be pardoned, if I speak strong language here to-night, but it is the fault of the hon. gentlemen opposite. Surely the Government, it seems to me, was able to carry on its warfare in Charlevoix without expecting the Bishop of Chicoutimi to interfere in their behalf. And since I am on my feet, since my hon. friend (Sir Adolphe Caron) has himself brought the question before the House, I ask the leader of the House to state to-night, if it is true or not, that they have submitted to the bishops of the province of Quebec the Remedial Bill that they have pledged themselves to introduce into this House?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Would the hon. gentleman (Mr. Tarte) permit me to ask him, as confidentially as he asked me, to produce the telegram which he says asked the bishop to send letters, or to interfere in the election?

Mr. TARTE. I never said there were any telegrams sent.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Well, telegrams or anything else?

Mr. TARTE. Do I understand my hon. friend (Sir Adolphe Caron) to say that the bishops had no communication with them on that very Remedial Bill? I do not accuse the bishops. They have a perfect right to have any communications whatever with the Ministers. It is only a simple question of fact that I want to know, and we will know then in the most positive way where we are. The leader of the House, it seems to me, should answer that question. He is free not to answer it, but at the same time it will be remembered that the question has been put to him.

Mr. FOSTER. I had no communication with the bishop.

Mr. TARTE. Who is then the leader of the House? Of course, I may be mistaken in him.

Mr. FOSTER. The question was not as to who was the leader of the House. I answered your question, and I said that I had no communication with the bishop.

Mr. TARTE. The hon. gentleman (Sir Adolphe Caron) should not have brought up that question of the Charlevoix election here.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend has not answered the question which my colleague (Sir Adolphe Caron) put to him. He has not produced those telegrams, or that communication which he stated most positively had been sent, if not at the instance of the Government, at least in the interests of the Government, to the voters of Charlevoix asking them to vote in the direction indicated.

Mr. TARTE. My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) has not understood me correctly.

Mr. FOSTER. If my hon. friend (Mr. Tarte) would say it in French I would understand him better.

Mr. TARTE. Although my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) is a great French scholar, I doubt if he would understand me better if I spoke in my native tongue. But, Sir, to speak seriously. The Postmaster General has been wrong in bringing that question up here to-night. It is not correct to say that Mr. Angers pledged himself to vote against the policy of my hon. friend (Mr. Laurier).

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Yes, on the school question.

Mr. TARTE. My hon. friend (Sir Adolphe Caron) is mistaken about that. He is mistaken. Mr. Angers has not pledged himself to vote for the policy of the Government.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Yes.

Mr. TARTE. He has not pledged himself and there is very good reason why he should not, because the policy of the Government on that question is not yet known, and it may be that it will take some time more before it is known.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. But the policy of the leader of the Opposition is perfectly known.

Mr. TARTE. What is it then?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. It is no policy at all.

Mr. TARTE. You are mistaken again.

Motion agreed to.

THE INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

Mr. McMULLEN moved for:

Return showing the number of employees on the Intercolonial Railway on the 30th June last.

The number of miles of railway operated at same date.

The number of stations and station-masters.

The number of cars put on the line during the fiscal year ending 30th June, 1895, and charged to working expenses.

The number of engines put on the line and charged to working expenses.

The number of cars put on and charged to capital account.

Mr. FOSTER.

The number of engines put on and charged to capital account.

The number of tons of new rails put down and charged to working expenses.

The number of tons put down and charged to capital account.

The number of ties put down and the number charged to working expenses and capital account respectively.

The number of bridges repaired or put in and charged to capital account and the number put in or repaired and charged to working expenses.

The number of overhead bridges renewed and charged to working expenses and the number to capital account.

The amount spent on fencing and charged to working expenses and the amount charged to capital account.

The total amount spent on new buildings of any kind along the line, and the portion charged to capital account and working expenses respectively.

The total amount spent in repairs of buildings and the amount charged therefor to capital account and working expenses respectively.

The amount spent on drains, ditches and culverts along the line, over and above what was done by section-men, and the portion thereof charged to working expenses and the portion to capital account.

Mr. HAGGART. The number of employees at a particular date will not give the hon. gentleman the number of men employed as a general rule on the Intercolonial Railway, because at some periods of the year there are more required than at other periods. As the hon. gentleman evidently wants to know what amount of the expenditure on the railway has been charged to capital account, I may tell him that no increase has been made in the mileage of the road since my last annual report. As regards the rolling stock, it is kept in as efficient a condition as possible, and has not been charged to capital account, but has all been paid for out of revenue account. The same is the case as regards rails and ties. Some thirty miles of the road have been laid with new rails, all of which have been charged to revenue account. All works and repairs on drains, ditches, bridges, &c., have been charged to revenue account, and none to capital account. There have been no charges to capital account on any of the items in the hon. gentleman's motion. The return will be a very long one, and he must expect that I cannot have it ready in a short time; but I will get it ready as soon as possible.

Mr. McMULLEN. If I might be permitted to reply to the hon. Minister of Railways, some years ago, when Sir Charles Tupper was Minister of Railways, he stated that when any new engines or cars were put on the line, they were charged to capital account, while all repairs were charged to working expenses. On several occasions he also charged fencing and over-head bridges to capital account. Now, I would like to know whether the policy that was adopted previous to the present Minister of Railways coming in is still being carried out. If none

of these items have been charged to capital account, then the return should not be a very long one, and should be very easily made up. It would be interesting to the House to know what has been charged to capital account and what to working expenses. My motion asks for the number of men employed on the Intercolonial Railway on the 30th of June last. I cannot see that it should be a long work to give the number on the pay-roll on that date. I do not ask for the average number employed throughout the year, but the number on the 30th of June.

Mr. HAGGART. There would be no trouble in giving that.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The explanation given by the hon. Minister of Railways left on my mind the impression that this return could be made up almost instantaneously. There has been no expenditure on capital account for nearly two-thirds of the subject-matters mentioned in this motion, so that there ought to be no difficulty in giving in the return. I would suggest that after that part of the motion asking for the number of employees, there be added "distinguishing between permanent and temporary employees," otherwise the return would not give the information to the House which it appears desirable to have.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman must note that a great deal of information is required, whether the expenditures are charged to capital account or not. But I can assure the hon. gentleman that all this work has been done, and that the road has been kept in as good repair as it has ever been in, and it has all been charged to revenue account. It is very difficult to distinguish between permanent and ordinary employees. There are none permanent on the road at all.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) We understand by a permanent employee, one who receives regularly his monthly wages, whereas a temporary employee is only employed by the day.

Mr. HAGGART. If the hon. gentleman asks for the maximum number employed and the number employed on that date, I could give that.

Mr. GIBSON. The hon. Minister must know that every section foreman is a permanent employee, with perhaps four or five men under him; but when there is extra work to be done, such as the removal of snow, an extra number of men are put on and are paid by the day; and it is quite easy for the department to show the number of men regularly employed on the railway as distinguished from those employed only occasionally. As the Minister properly says, there are no permanent employees. At the same time, that is misleading, because there are a number of men who have been in the employ of the Government railways for a

number of years. My hon. friend, I understand, simply wants the number of regular employees as distinguished from those put only on temporarily. In my opinion, there would be no difficulty in distinguishing between them.

Mr. DICKEY. What does the hon. gentleman say about train hands?

Mr. GIBSON. I beg to tell the hon. gentleman a point that he must know. I do not know what is done on the Intercolonial, because the employees there are perhaps treated in a different manner, or engaged somewhat differently from what they are on ordinary railways—they are, perhaps, put there for political purposes; but an ordinary railway is run on business principles. There is regular gradation. A man starts as a brakeman, then comes to be a freight conductor, and then is made a passenger conductor. The hands on a railway are, to a large extent, looked upon as permanent employees, and receive promotion according to good behaviour and long service; and I may tell the Minister of Justice (Mr. Dickey) that it sometimes takes eight, ten or fifteen years for a railway employee to reach the position of first-class railway conductor. Perhaps things may be different on the Intercolonial down by the sea. Now, if a man has been in the employ of a company fifteen years, he may well be looked upon as a permanent official. Train hands are dealt with in the same way as all other employees; so long as the men behave themselves they are promoted. I have had twenty-seven years' experience in railway matters, and I know that the men are promoted from one grade to another, according to length of service. On the Grand Trunk, so long as everything else is equal, each man takes his turn for promotion. So well is this carried out, that even if a man is not aware that his turn for promotion has come, he still obtains it, and those below him are promoted in turn.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Notwithstanding all the explanations we have had, the fact still remains that the information asked for by the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) will be very difficult, indeed, to make out upon paper. It is all very well for hon. gentlemen to get up and, in a general way, give their experience of what constitutes a permanent and a temporary employee on a railway. We may all have in our minds some very definite idea; but I think the hon. member for Queen's will now agree with me that when that comes to be classified and put upon paper, when we come to divide permanent and temporary, where there is really no permanency, except length of service, it is exceedingly difficult, indeed. Let me ask the hon. member for Queen's, if he will call a permanent employee one who has been six months on the road, or three months?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) In the railway I know the most about, the Prince Edward Island Railway, no difficulty is experienced at all. All the employees of the road are called, in ordinary parlance, permanent employees. They are not permanent in the technical sense of the term, but permanent as distinguished from casual or temporary labour, employed from time to time for casual or temporary purposes. I do not intend to use the term in the technical sense to which my hon. friend refers, but I wish to distinguish casual and temporary employees from the usual employees.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think we are bound to look rather at the nature of the employment than the nature of the contract that may exist between the railway company or the Government and the individual. If the employee is a person engaged in doing work that always existed, and requires to be done every day, although he may be changed every day, he must be regarded as a permanent employee of the road, in the sense my hon. friend wishes the word to be understood. Whereas, if the work is something that has arisen through casualty or some particular exigency and which requires service for a short period of time, the person engaged in the performance of that work would be regarded as a temporary employee.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Since the hon. gentleman from Queen's interrupted me, I withdraw my objection, because I do not think there will be any difficulty. We have had three definitions from the other side as to what permanent and temporary employees, respectively, are, and as these definitions all differ, no doubt the Minister of Railways will have very little difficulty in getting at the facts.

Motion agreed to.

RETURNS ORDERED.

Copy of the Order in Council concerning the superannuation of J. B. Guévremont, railway mail clerk, and of any power of attorney given by him to any party to draw his retiring allowance; and of all other papers and correspondence in connection with this matter.—(Mr. Flint.)

Return showing the number of employees in the several departments, temporary or otherwise, that do not contribute to the superannuation fund for each of the years 1892-93-94 and 1895; and the gross amount of salary paid to such employees in each department for each of the years above named.—(Mr. McMullen.)

Statement showing the names of all persons appointed to any positions in connection with the Customs at Toronto since 1st July, 1891, with dates of appointments and salaries of such appointees.—(Mr. McMullen.)

THE BUDGET SPEECH.

Mr. FOSTER. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to say that I had arranged to deliver the Budget Speech to-

Mr. MONTAGUE.

morrow, and last Saturday morning I sent a letter to the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), informing him of my intention. That gentleman had left town, however, just before the letter went to his residence, and he did not get it until he came back to-night, so that I have decided to postpone the speech. I had some conversation with the hon. gentleman, and to what I am going to propose I do not suppose there will be any objection, namely, that on Thursday the Government orders take precedence. To-morrow, which is Government day, when we come to Government orders, we will let them stand, and the work of private members will go on just the same as it would on Thursday. Then on Thursday, I shall deliver the Budget Speech.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I have no authority to agree to that proposition, and it must stand for consideration of the House to-morrow.

PREPARATION OF CUSTOMS RETURNS.

Mr. HAZEN. Before the Orders of the Day are called, there is a matter I would like to bring to the attention of the Government. It is one of great importance, affecting, as it does, the returns of the export trade of the Dominion. I think it will be admitted by every hon. member of this House that it is extremely desirable that the returns of exports furnished by the collectors of customs and other officers in charge of these matters should be as accurate and complete as possible, and that credit should be given to the country for all the goods exported from the Dominion.

Mr. SPEAKER. I am afraid the hon. member is raising a question that will be provocative of discussion.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Take it on the adjournment.

Mr. FOSTER moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. HAZEN. I was saying, Mr. Speaker, when I was called to order, that it was desirable and that every one would admit that it was desirable, that the returns of exports from the country furnished by the customs authorities from time to time should be as complete as possible, and that full credit should be given the country for all the goods exported. For some time past I have had my attention called to this matter, and I have reason to believe that large quantities of goods are being exported from this country to Great Britain and to the United States for which credit is not given in the trade returns of the country. During this winter, as many members of the House are aware, there have been large shipments

of western produce from the port of St. John to Great Britain. During the last six weeks on the lines of steamships that are now running from that port, about a million dollars' worth of produce, chiefly the product of western Canada, a small portion of it the produce of the maritime provinces, and a portion from the western states, has been shipped from St. John to Great Britain. People in that city, members of the board of trade and others who take an interest in these matters, looked into the subject to see to what port these shipments would be credited. They found that only a small portion was credited to the port of St. John, and that the rule prevailing in the customs service was that this produce should be credited to the port nearest the district from which the produce came. For instance, in the case of goods from the province of Ontario shipped from the port of St. John the goods would be credited to the custom-house in the county nearest to the point of origin. It would appear, however, from information furnished by gentlemen who have looked into the matter, that a considerable quantity of this produce has not been credited either at the port of export or at the port of origin, and, as a result, there is going out of the country a large quantity of produce for which the country gets no credit whatever in the trade returns. Further, Mr. Speaker, it is claimed, and I think it can be proved beyond question, that a large amount of produce from Miramichi and the northern counties of New Brunswick is being shipped to the United States, which produce is not credited to any custom-house in the province of New Brunswick or elsewhere in the Dominion. And so, as I have said, the Dominion of Canada is not getting credit for the full amount of the exports of the country. This, I think, every hon. gentleman of this House and every citizen of the country will admit is not desirable. The returns should be as complete as possible. In order to make the matter more clear, I will read an article from the St. John "Sun" of Saturday last, which explains the matter more clearly, probably, than I have been able to do :

BETTER EXPORT RETURNS WANTED.

Since the close of navigation on the St. Lawrence ten steamships have taken cargo on the west side of the harbour for Great Britain. The value of the first cargo shipped by the "Lake Superior," as officially recorded, was \$138,000. The same ship on her second trip had a more valuable cargo. It is safe to estimate the value of the produce taken hence in the four sailings of the Beaver line at over \$500,000. The Donaldson and Furness ships have, since the middle of December, taken away \$300,000 or \$400,000 worth of goods. The value of exports to Great Britain by these regular steamships has been close to a million dollars in less than six weeks.

According to the official reports, the total exports of the port of St. John to all countries for the year ending last June was \$3,310,215, or less

than four times the business done by the steamships sailing from the west side since the middle of last December. The present prospect is that during this winter not less than \$2,500,000 worth of goods will be snipped across the Atlantic from St. John in regular line steamships, and nearly all of this is western freight.

Notwithstanding the increase in the export business of St. John, it will probably be found, when the Trade Returns are taken up next year, that the exports of the port are about the same as the previous year. Not more than 10 per cent of this winter trade will, under the present system of book-keeping, be credited to St. John. All that will go down as the trade of St. John will be goods, mostly lumber, which are gathered for export in this immediate vicinity.

The first cargo of the "Lake Superior" may be taken as a sample. This ship took hence a cargo valued at \$138,000. The value of the goods entered as the export of St. John was \$16,000, in round figures, chiefly representing deals. The value of goods entered with clearance from inland points to the westward was \$42,000. Concerning the origin of the remaining \$80,000 worth of goods, or their place of entry, the custom-house authorities here have no official information. These shipments may possibly appear as the export of some western town, or may not be recorded at all. The chances are all in favour of a great part of the goods escaping entry altogether.

The collector here has regarded the law, which requires that the goods should be entered as the export of the port nearest the original place of lading. St. John is not that port. The collector has also obeyed this law in regard to goods shipped to the United States and other countries from New Brunswick inland points. For example, fish from the north shore, lobsters, eggs, berries and other goods forwarded by way of St. John are supposed to be entered for export in the customs district whence they are first shipped by train or other conveyance. It is known that, as a matter of fact, a great part of these exports do not go into the statistics of any port. The export trade of the country is misrepresented to that extent in the trade tables of the Dominion. At least \$1,000,000 worth of Maritime province produce shipped from St. John does not appear in the trade returns of St. John or any other place.

Collector Ruel forwarded to Ottawa some time ago a full and fair statement of the circumstances, pointing out that the present system greatly impaired the value of the trade statistics. He showed that the proper and sure way of recording the export trade is to keep the return of goods at the port of exit, whether it be a seaport or a frontier station. The United States Government has found it necessary to adopt this method in order to obtain greater accuracy.

The reason this has not been done in Canada is probably because the inland towns desire to be credited with the exports from the district of which they are the centre. This is a natural and proper ambition. Moreover, it is desirable that there should be a return of the trade of local customs districts. But the first consideration is to have a reliable and complete general statement. The failure to make entry of a great part of the goods gathered at inland points defeats both objects. It ought to be possible to devise a method by which each port of exit should be credited with the volume of goods passing through it, while at the same time a record would be kept of the value forwarded from each port of origin. Then the amount of foreign busi-

ness done in each district would be recorded, the value of the foreign trade of each seaport would be known, and the aggregate exports of the country would be accurately stated. At present not one of these three things happens.

I desire, Mr. Speaker, to call the attention of the Controller of Customs to this state of affairs. It seems to me that the greatest pains should be taken, if we wish to measure the condition of our foreign trade, to credit the country with every dollar of exports from our shores. It seems to me that the absolute accuracy might be obtained if that rule which at present prevails, is continued, and the exports credited to the port nearest to the place of shipment. At the same time there should be an accurate entry kept of the exports from every port of the Dominion, whether by sea or by railway. By that means it seems to me that object might be accomplished. I trust the House will pardon me for bringing it at this late hour, to their attention and to the attention of the Controller.

Mr. WOOD. In reply to the hon. gentleman I must say that I think he is labouring under a misapprehension of the facts. It is quite true that all goods that are shipped abroad are entered at the nearest port to the place of shipment. But I beg to draw the attention of the hon. gentleman to a clause in the Customs Act, as to which he has apparently been misinformed, or at least, his attention cannot have been drawn to it. Section 101 meets completely the case that my hon. friend has made out. I will read this section, and leave it to the hon. gentleman himself to fight it out with Collector Ruel at the port of St. John. He is a very good officer, and I do not think he would act in ignorance of this plain section :

Before clearance is granted to any vessel bound to a port or place out of Canada, the owners, shippers or consignors of the cargo on board such vessel shall deliver to the collector or other proper officer of customs, entries of such parts of the cargo as are shipped by them respectively, and shall verify the same by oath ; and such entries shall specify the kinds and quantities of the articles shipped by them respectively, and the value of the total quantity of each kind of article, and whether the said goods are of Canadian or foreign production or manufacture ; and such oath shall state that such entry contains a full, just and true account of all articles laden on board of such vessel by such owners, shippers or consignors respectively ; and that the values of such articles are truly stated according to their actual cost, or the value which they truly bear at the port and time of exportation ; and, in case the goods so shipped, or any part thereof, are, or is, liable by law to any export duty, the amount of such duty shall be stated in such entry ; and no such entry shall be valid, and no clearance shall be granted to such vessel until such duty is paid to the collector or other proper officer of Customs.

Now, compliance with that section was the plain duty of Collector Ruel, and would meet the case which the hon. gentleman has

Mr. HAZEN.

put so eloquently before the House. I was very much surprised to hear the hon. gentleman speak of the Trade and Navigation Returns in the way he did, surprised, because I am quite sure that any such blunders, for I can characterize them as nothing else, perpetrated at any port of exit or entry in this country where sea laden vessels are going forth to the world, would have been discovered long ago. I cannot for the life of me see how the hon. gentleman came to be so misinformed upon the law of the case ; and I cannot, as I said before, believe that the collector of customs at the port of St. John would have neglected his duty in so important a particular as this. There is no inconsistency in having goods entered for export at the port nearest to the place where the consignor makes the delivery, and in accordance with section 101 this, so far as I know, has been done. I shall look into the matter very carefully to see whether I am wrong in my pretension. I cannot be wrong in the construction of the Act ; and if there has been any mistake at the port of St. John in the direction indicated by the hon. member for St. John, I can assure him that I will look into the matter at once.

Mr. WALLACE. In addition to what has been correctly stated by the Controller of Customs, I may say that each vessel sailing from this country has to make a clearance or manifest in which every article of the cargo has to be distinctly specified to the collector of customs. That is in addition to the outward entry made by the exporters themselves, so there is a double check. The only point the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Hazen) raises is whether the exports shall be credited to the city of St. John, to the place where the goods leave the country, or to some other inland port from which the goods have been sent. That is a matter of not much importance, but it has been the common custom of the department and the proper one to credit the goods to the inland town, or wherever the goods are carried from by the exporter. If the exporter sends them from the city of Montreal, as in this case to Halifax or St. John, the goods would be credited to Montreal ; but if he is a St. John exporter, he credits them to that port, and I think very properly. So I think the returns as they are now prepared give an accurate report of the exports of the country.

Mr. HAZEN. That was not the point I raised. The point I raised was not whether they were credited to St. John, or some other point, but said the feeling prevailed among many of the merchants in that community who give attention to these trade matters, as appears from that article in the "Sun," which I read to the House, that there is a large quantity of goods being shipped from this country that do not appear in the trade returns at all, and are not credited to any port, and that is the point I wished to raise.

I think the section read by the Controller of Customs meets the case, and I hope he will ask Collector Ruel for a report on the matter, because if there is any misunderstanding or any misapprehension of the facts on a question of importance like that, the sooner it is cleared up, the better. The collector at the port of St. John is one of the oldest and most experienced collectors in the service, and I am sure he would strive to the utmost to do what was right.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 10.25 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 28th January, 1896.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

TRANSIT OF AMERICAN CATTLE THROUGH CANADA.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called I desire to ask the attention of the House to a matter which took place on Friday, and which it appears to me requires a good deal of explanation. It will be in the memory of the House, that on the motion to adjourn last Friday, my hon. friend from North York (Mr. Mulock) asked that the Government should lay on the Table at the earliest moment the Order in Council and all other papers bearing on the question of the scheduling of Canadian cattle. To this the Minister of Agriculture replied :

Mr. MONTAGUE. The Government will be very pleased to lay on the Table, perhaps on Monday, the papers in connection with the matter which the hon. gentleman has referred to.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Might I inquire of the Minister whether the Order in Council giving his permission has been passed ?

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. gentleman will see on Monday exactly what has been done.

Now, Sir, I find in the "Star" of Friday, which was published at 4 o'clock in the afternoon, (these answers being given by the Minister of Agriculture at 6 o'clock) a declaration that an Order in Council was passed on Thursday in the following terms:—

An Order in Council was passed yesterday looking towards the return of the conditions that existed prior to the establishment of the cattle quarantine between Canada and the United States. It permits the shipment of American cattle from St. John, and is in the following terms : That the regulations relating to the quarantine and transit of the United States cattle through Canada shall be, and the same are hereby

amended in such way as to allow shipment of United States cattle from the port of St. John, in New Brunswick, subject to the following conditions : 1. That the regulations relating to the inspection and isolation of United States cattle passing through Canada in transit from one United States port to another be made applicable to cattle shipped from the port of St. John. 2. That such cattle not having pratique in Canada, but simply passing through in bond, be shipped as United States, and not Canadian cattle.

If that be as stated here, a true report of the Order in Council passed on Thursday, published in the "Star" newspaper at 4 o'clock on Friday, while we at 6 o'clock on the same day were told that the Government would tell us on Monday what would be done ; all I can say is : it appears to me that the House has been treated with very gross discourtesy indeed, and an explanation is due—if there be an explanation—to the House and to my hon. friends, as to how it came to pass that this was communicated to newspapers, and that the information was refused to members in this House.

Mr. MONTAGUE. In answer to the hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright), I may say that he has read correctly the conversation which took place across the House, between the hon. member from North York (Mr. Mulock) and myself on Friday last. The position which I took then was the correct one under the circumstances. At that time the Order in Council had been passed by the Council but was not signed by the Governor General, and as the hon. gentleman quite well knows, I had no business to give any information to this House as to the facts which had been brought before Council, and upon which a decision had taken place, but which decision had not been communicated to His Excellency, and approved, and signed by him. As to the facts having been given to the newspapers, I may say that I was myself astounded. As the reporters in the gallery who asked me the question upon Friday will bear me out, I refused to give them any information whatever, and I confess that the resentment of the hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright), as against this fact being given to the newspapers, was joined in most heartily by myself. I have no explanation to offer to the House, except simply to say that I knew nothing whatever in regard to it, and I was astonished, and pained, when I found that it was done. Now, as to my position in the matter. I intended to bring the Order down to the House yesterday. I had it in my pocket, but as attention was not called to it I forgot about it, because I was not feeling very well and not paying very close attention to matters that were going on at the time the House adjourned. I have the Order in Council in my hand now, Mr. Speaker, and I will ask your permission to lay it on the Table. In doing so, I offer just this word of explanation made necessary by reason of the fact that the position of the Government has been misrepresented

to some extent. I want to say two things. In the first place none of those restrictions, none of those regulations thought necessary for the purpose of protecting the health of Canadian herds, are to be in any sense withdrawn or made less. In the second place,—and I make this explanation because I have been asked many questions by telegrams and by letters from shippers interested—I say in the second place: The Order in Council is not intended to relate to one steamship company or the other, but is a general Order in Council dealing with the shipment of American cattle from the port of St. John. I wish, Sir, to repeat and emphasize that so far as I am concerned, the communication was not given to the public press by me, nor do I believe it was given to the public press by any of my officers, and I desire to express my humiliation that it was not given to this House before it was given to the press.

Mr. LAURIER. Was the Order published in the press the correct one?

Mr. MONTAGUE. I know nothing of the publication, except that I was informed of it by parties who had seen it.

Mr. MULOCK. Mr. Speaker, just one word before you proceed to the Orders of the Day.

Mr. SPEAKER. If the discussion is to continue it must be put in order by a motion.

Mr. MULOCK. Mr. Speaker, I have only a word to say. I ask the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Montague) to make clear a portion of his statement, in order that there should be no misapprehension as to the nature of his explanation. I understood the hon. gentleman (Mr. Montague) to say, that the terms under which this traffic of American cattle through Canada was to be conducted, were the terms applicable to the same traffic from the United States through Canada as heretofore existing. The Order in Council which the hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) read, states that this traffic via St. John, N.B., was to be conducted subject to all the terms heretofore applicable to traffic from the States through Canada.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock) understood me quite correctly, except that I would add this: My statement was a general statement saying that none of the regulations, and none of the restrictions thought necessary for the safety of Canadian herds, would be in any sense withdrawn and we continue—I speak generally now—all these restrictions and all these regulations thought necessary, when the trade was simply a transit trade through Canada; with the addition of other safeguards because of the fact that the cattle are being shipped from a Canadian port.

Mr. MONTAGUE.

Mr. MULOCK. I am not going to argue the question now. I only want to find out clearly what is correct. The regulations that were thought necessary, among other things involved quarantining cattle for ninety days, I think. Is that one of the terms that is continued now?

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock) quite knows that for the transit trade, these quarantine regulations were not observed.

Mr. MULOCK. I am aware of the law and the regulations on the subject. I ask if these cattle require to be quarantined at all in this country?

Mr. MONTAGUE. Not at all; the hon. gentleman knows that very well.

Mr. FOSTER. Before proceeding to the Orders of the Day, Mr. Speaker—

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Excuse me. An adjournment is about to be moved on this question—because we must have some information on that point.

Mr. FOSTER. I believe the correct way to bring a paper of this kind down so that it may appear on the records is to move that an Address of the House issue for the production of the paper. I therefore move:

That an humble Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General, praying that he will cause to be laid on the Table, all Orders in Council relating to the transit of American cattle through Canada to be shipped at the port of St. John.

Mr. McMULLEN. This is unquestionably a very important matter. The transportation of American cattle through Canada formerly caused a great deal of trouble, and eventually resulted in the scheduling of our cattle by Great Britain. The very lax manner in which that business was conducted years ago brought down on the farmers of this country a very serious restriction. I think we should have full information from the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Montague) whether any communications have passed between this Government and the United States Government with regard to the removal of the restriction that is now placed on Canadian cattle passing through the United States in transit to Great Britain. If we give the Americans the privilege of competitive points for the shipment of their cattle, it is right that they should extend the same privilege to us. If our cattle shippers had had the advantage of shipping by American lines years ago, it would have been a great saving to them. The hon. Minister of Agriculture did not quite satisfy the House on the question put by the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) with regard to the regulations now in force. Prior to the order imposing a quarantine of ninety days on cattle shipped in transit through this country, the regulations were very lax, though

it was intended they should be very strict. Now, we want to know what course will be adopted in regard to American cattle shipped by the port of St. John, and also why the order confines the privilege to that port. Why are American shippers not allowed to send their cattle to other ports as well? The old regulations provided that a Government agent should go on each train, that the cattle should be inspected on the American side by a veterinarian before being sent to Canada, and that they should be sent to the port of export under the charge of a Canadian officer. We want to know whether these regulations are to be continued in regard to cattle exported from St. John. It is very important that we should know this, because, if American cattle are to be admitted promiscuously to any port close to the United States, such as St. John, the disease which unfortunately resulted in the scheduling of our cattle may again be brought into Canada. I would also like to know if any communication has passed between the Government of Canada and the United States Government with the view of securing to the Canadian exporter the privilege of shipping his cattle by New York, Boston, or Portland. If we have removed our quarantine of ninety days, the United States Government should remove theirs, and allow our cattle to be shipped by their ports. We want to know whether we may look forward hopefully to the restoration of this privilege in the coming spring, when there will be no doubt a large number of fat cattle ready for export from this country; for April, May, and June are the months when the largest number of stall-fed cattle are exported. What are we getting in return for the privilege we have thus granted to American exporters?

Mr. LAURIER. There is in this matter, a question of privilege that appears to have been lost sight of. The hon. Minister stated that he was not at all responsible for the publication of this Order in Council in the newspapers before it was communicated to Parliament. I have no doubt that it was not through him that this gross breach of the privileges of this House was committed; but whoever it was, somebody has been guilty of it. We do not know to-day who it was; but somebody must have had access to the order, and sent it to the press, because, on comparing the order presented to-day with the text in the newspaper, I find that the publication is a verbatim copy of the Order in Council itself. It is evident that somebody had access either to the Minister's report to the Council or to the Order in Council. Somebody is responsible for that, and I submit that the answer given by the hon. gentleman is not complete. He has stated that he intends to take steps to find out who is responsible for this breach of privilege. I am not aware that such a thing has happened before in Canada, though I believe it has happened in the

United States Congress. As this is the first breach of this kind that has taken place here, I think both sides of the House should resent such conduct, and should see that, as far as possible, the guilty party is found out and punished.

Mr. MONTAGUE. So far as that is concerned, I shall take steps to inquire how this matter was given to the press.

Mr. McMULLEN. I would like to have an answer from the Minister of Agriculture to the points I raised, if he is in a position to give it.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I saw another hon. member rising, and I thought it would be better to reply to both at the same time.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). As I understand the Order, read from the newspaper by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), it discriminates against every other port in Canada in favour of St. John, and I suppose the hon. Minister will be able to explain why that was done. Certainly to make an order of that sort requires some very full explanations on the part of the Government, and some very good reasons to justify this discrimination. With regard to the breach of privilege, there can be no doubt that such was committed. Either the order was communicated by some party, who knew its contents, in the department of the hon. gentleman, or was communicated from the Department of the Privy Council. One or the other must have furnished a copy of this order to the press. My hon. friend (Mr. Laurier) says that this is introducing a practice which has, to some extent, prevailed in the United States, but to which we have hitherto been strangers in this country. This is the first instance in Canada of anything of the kind. In England, at the time of the Berlin Conference, the secret treaty between England and Turkey was communicated improperly, by some one in the Foreign Office, to the London press, and it certainly produced as great excitement in the United Kingdom as if there had been a declaration of war. And I think with good reason. It seems to me that the hon. gentleman is bound to make a most thorough investigation and to see that the confidence of the Government in this regard is not to be violated with impunity. There is but one course for the Government to take towards parties who are guilty of such gross breach of duty, and the House will expect the hon. gentleman to discharge his duty in this regard.

Mr. McMILLAN. Last year I asked for copies of all correspondence between this Government and any one on its behalf and the United States Government with regard to arrangements concerning the shipment through Canada of American cattle, and vice versa. Those papers have never been brought down. We have been told from

time to time that a statement would be given to the House, but so far none has been given. If the Americans are allowed to ship their cattle through Canadian territory, our Government should certainly take steps to get our cattle shipped through American territory. It would be of great benefit to us if we could, in the winter season, ship our cattle via Boston or New York, and I see no reason why we should not be allowed to do so in exchange for the equal privilege which we grant American shippers. The Cattlemen's Association passed a resolution some time ago asking the Canadian Government, if possible, to get the quarantine regulations withdrawn, so as to enable us to ship through any port in the United States. It is of the utmost importance to the cattle trade of Canada, which is in a very low condition at present, that something should be done.

Mr. HAZEN. I would suggest to the hon. gentleman that he and his constituents, who are shippers of cattle, should consider the advisability of using the port of St. John, which now furnishes ample facilities for the trade. There are now running from that port to Great Britain three lines—one to Glasgow, one to Liverpool, and the other to London. Two of these lines—the Beaver Line and the Donaldson Line—are admirably adapted for the cattle trade. Their boats have already taken out of the port of St. John during this season a large quantity of western Canadian cattle. One of them, in one trip, carried over two thousand sheep. It seems to me that, as patriotic Canadians, our cattle shippers should encourage Canadian ports in preference to foreign ports, when our own ports give equal facilities. A few days ago I received a telegram from the agent of the Beaver Line, informing me that he had entered into a contract for the shipment of sufficient cattle from the distant province of Manitoba to fill all the steamers of that line going out from St. John. If cattle from Manitoba can be shipped with advantage to Great Britain from St. John, it seems to me that cattle from Ontario could be shipped with equal advantage. Under the contract which the Government have entered into with the Beaver Line of steamers and with the city of St. John, that line is compelled to carry freight and produce from the western part of Canada to Great Britain at rates not higher than those charged for the same classes of goods out of the ports of Boston and Portland. They have to meet competition at every point, and I just call the hon. gentleman's attention to the matter so that he may be aware that the port of St. John offers quite as good facilities for the shipment of Canadian cattle as can possibly be obtained in any of the ports of the United States.

Mr. SPROULE. If the hon. member for Huron (Mr. McMillan) had been watching the papers of late, he would have noticed

Mr. McMILLAN.

that when this order was given by the Canadian Government, a somewhat similar order was given by the American Government, allowing the privilege of shipping Canadian cattle from Portland and one or two other ports. With regard to the statement of the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), I do not think it should be allowed to go uncontradicted. His statement was to the effect that the way in which the quarantine regulations were carried out in Canada resulted in our cattle being scheduled in England. The hon. gentleman is certainly wide of the mark in making that statement. It was on account of the finding of disease in the lungs of two animals that were taken from Canada which they declared to be similar to pleuro-pneumonia, and not because there was any laxity in carrying out the quarantine regulations as regards American cattle shipped through Canada.

Mr. MULOCK. Whatever the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) may consider as having been the reason, the British Government, at all events, has given what they consider their reason, and that was the finding that certain Canadian cattle were afflicted with pleuro-pneumonia. That was the finding of the court of inquiry, whose investigation was not confined to the case of the two cattle. There were appeals from that finding, and the British Government had subsequent investigations, and rightly or wrongly the reports were that more than two cattle were found on subsequent occasions suffering from this disease. So that we may as well accept the finding of the court without imagining, on mere suspicion, other reasons why the British Government took the particular course it did. If this were the proper occasion, I think it could be very well shown that the hon. member for North Wellington was entirely within the facts when he made the statement he did.

Mr. SPROULE. No.

Mr. MULOCK. It was my duty to prove beyond all question in this House how this arose.

Mr. IVES. You tried to for six hours, but without success.

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. gentleman had not a word to say against it. He floundered for hours in an effort to dispose of the facts I had presented, but from that day to this neither he nor any of his friends have succeeded in disposing of them. There are certain records showing a distinct bargain under which the transit of cattle through Canada from the United States to Great Britain was to take place. These regulations were the result of an agreement between Great Britain and Canada, and they were set aside, grossly neglected, violated and ignored by the Canadian Government. Now, does the hon.

gentleman from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) deny that ?

Mr. SPROULE. Yes.

Mr. MULOCK. Then the hon. gentleman denies the facts.

Mr. SPROULE. I say they were not grossly neglected.

Mr. MULOCK. I will give the hon. gentleman an instance. One of the terms of the agreement between Great Britain and Canada was that not one single animal was to come into Canada from the United States unless put under quarantine.

Mr. SPROULE. No.

Mr. MULOCK. I have here the "Hansard" of 1894, but, without wearying the House with reading I will say that in the debate in July, 1894, I read and placed on record the documents in this case. Though I have not looked at them for some time—this debate having sprung up without warning—I assert in the presence of this House that these records show what I state to be true. They have been before the country for a year and a half. They show that there was a distinct treaty between Great Britain and Canada, that if Great Britain would not schedule Canadian cattle, we would only allow American cattle to pass through Canada to England in bond secured in a certain way, and with that exception would not allow one single beast to linger in Canada.

Mr. SPROULE. Will the hon. gentleman read the conditions, seeing he has them there.

Mr. MULOCK. I will read if you wish.

Mr. SPROULE. Yes.

Mr. MULOCK. Then the House will understand that I read at the request of the hon. gentleman. We shall see whether I can make good what I say. And, that there may be no misunderstanding as to what I say, I will repeat it in advance. Not having looked at these documents for 18 months, it is just possible I may be in error, but I think I am not. I assert that on the occasion in question, Great Britain had established an embargo against American cattle entering Great Britain, and was about to extend the embargo to Canadian cattle. The Canadian Government, through the instrumentality of my hon. friend to my left (Sir Hector Langevin), then a member of the Government, opened negotiations with the Imperial authorities and induced them not to embrace Canadian cattle in the embargo. The hon. gentleman had correspondence with the English Government, and that correspondence became the foundation of the terms arrived at. The terms arrived at were substantially these:—That if we would conduct this transit trade in a certain way and, with that exception, totally prohibit the importation of American cattle

into Canadian territory, the British authorities would not schedule Canada. My hon. friend (Sir Hector Langevin) remembers this and says it is right. I assert that, in violation of that bargain, the Canadian Government allowed American cattle to come into Canada year by year for a term of years, without quarantining them, without inspecting them, without adopting the first regulation to carry out the terms of that agreement. I assert not merely that they violated the bargain in admitting American cattle at all, but that they grossly disregarded their obligation and admitted those cattle without the first attempt to ascertain whether they were healthy or not.

Mr. DALY. Where was that ?

Mr. MULOCK. I will show you. That is what I assert to have been the bargain. I will read the documents and the House will see whether I am correct or not. On the 25th April, 1879, Sir Hector Langevin, being then in England, addressed the following letter to the English Government upon this question:—

The undersigned, as representing the Government of Canada, has learned with concern the improbability of the consent of the Imperial Government being obtained to the reception upon the same terms of Canadian cattle, of cattle shipped from the United States through Canada via a Canadian port. But, while regarding this result, the Canadian Government will highly appreciate the interest displayed by the Right Hon. the Privy Council in considering the question and endeavouring to reach such a solution of it as would relieve the cattle trade of Canada from the heavy loss entailed upon it by the present order of things.

Assuming, therefore, that the proposal heretofore under discussion cannot be further pressed on the consideration of the Imperial Government with a reasonable expectation of its acceptance, the undersigned venture to submit a suggestion which, if acted upon, will effect an important and most desirable improvement in the condition of the carrying trade in Canada, without infringing the Imperial Statute, and without incurring any risk of transmitting the disease either to Canada or to this country.

The cattle carried by the Canadian railways may be divided into three classes: those which are imported; those which are intended to be shipped from Canadian ports, and those which only pass through a part of Canada in their transit from some point in the United States to some other point in that country.

The proclamation of the Canadian Government—

There was a proclamation then in existence.

—prohibits the entrance of cattle from the United States for any of these purposes, but it is obvious that there is a wide distinction between a mere transit across Canada from one point in a foreign territory to another, and shipments of foreign cattle from Canadian ports.

It is to the latter class of transaction—

That is the transportation of cattle from the United States to a Canadian port and thence to Great Britain—

—that the proposal of the Canadian Government was more directly applicable. But, with regard to the transit of cattle, the undersigned venture to submit, that it would not be necessary to schedule Canadian cattle merely because of such transit, provided effectual precautions be taken to prevent the possibility of contagion from the animals when in transit.

Then the memorandum goes on to refer to our railway system and to describe the route taken by the cattle trains—that is, from Detroit easterly crossing the Suspension Bridge to the United States, or via Rouse's Point to Montreal—and proceeds :

These journeys are all performed continuously. The cattle are landed in the United States in closed vans, called cattle cars, prepared for the purpose. They enter Canada in these vans, and they remain in them until they reach their destination, being fed and watered in them, and not being removed from them on the way for any purpose whatever, and it seems plain that, if their transit could be so regulated as to prevent the possibility of contact, directly or indirectly, with Canadian cattle, there would be no ground for placing Canada among the countries scheduled merely because of such transit.

The undersigned is unable at the moment to lay before the Right Honourable the Privy Council any complete plan for such regulation of transit, but it appears to him that it might be effected by adopting some such precautions as the following :—

1st. That steps be taken to ensure the retention of the animals in transit in the cattle cars from the time they enter Canada until they have left it.

2nd. That a plan be adopted for separating the cars used for the transport of foreign cattle, from those to be used for the movement of cattle from one point in Canada to another, and for preventing those used for the former purposes from being applied to the latter.

3rd. That means be adopted for preventing the manure of the cattle in transit from remaining in the country, or for destroying it in some effectual manner.

Well, that document received a reply on 2nd May. The English Government, through the Secretary of the Privy Council, sent the following letter to Sir Hector Langevin :—

Sir,—I am directed by the Lords of the Council to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 25th ultimo, inclosing memorandum on the subject of the transit of cattle from one part of the United States to another, through Canada, in which arrangements are proposed for isolating cattle in transit in such a manner as to ensure a complete security against any chance of cattle within the Dominion becoming affected with disease. The adoption of those arrangements is proposed on the grounds that Her Majesty's Government would thus be enabled to continue the present system under which Canadian cattle are allowed to be landed without being subject to slaughter or quarantine under part 4 of the 5th schedule of the Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act, 1878, and that at the same time an important improvement in the condition of the carrying trade in Canada would be effected.

This proposal—

That is the hon. gentleman's proposal.

Mr. MULOCK.

—has received the most careful consideration of the Lords of the Council, who have also had before them a suggestion submitted by Mr. Pope, through Sir John Rose, on April 21st, to the effect that, under certain conditions, the present restrictions on the introduction of cattle from the United States into Canada might be relieved.

Their Lordships observe, that both these proposals proceed on the view that no contagious disease of cattle exists in the western parts of the United States, and that there is no movement of cattle from east to west (except in the case of expensive animals for breeding), and that, therefore, if the proposed transit were allowed, there would be little or no danger of diseased cattle being brought into or moved through Canada.

I am, however, to point out to you, that the action which the Lords of the Council can take, with reference to the importation of animals into the United Kingdom is strictly limited by the terms of the Act of Parliament.

The general rule which applies to all foreign animals (which term by section 5 of the Act includes animals brought from any country out of the United Kingdom) is laid down in the 5th schedule of the Act. Special animals can only be landed at a foreign wharf defined for that purpose by an Order in Council, and are not to be moved alive out of the wharf.

The provisions under which Canadian cattle are at present exempted from slaughter or quarantine are contained in part 4 of the same schedule, which provides that if, and so long, as the Privy Council are satisfied with regard to any foreign country (that is, any country out of the United Kingdom) that the laws thereof relating to the importation and exportation of animals and to the prevention of the introduction or spreading of the disease, and the general sanitary conditions of the animals therein, are such as to afford reasonable security against the importation therefrom of diseased animals, then, from time to time, the Privy Council by general or special order shall allow animals, or any special kind of animals, brought from that country to be landed without being subject to slaughter or quarantine.

By the Foreign Animals Order, as originally issued, animals from the United States and from the Dominion of Canada were admitted under the exceptional provision, but, in consequence after the discovery of pleuro-pneumonia in cattle from the United States, the Lords of the Council were reluctantly compelled to withdraw the exemption accorded to cattle from that country, and the same course would have been adopted with regard to Canadian cattle but for the prohibitory order passed by the Dominion Government, February 1st of this year.

I again remind the House that this was written in the light of the fact that there was a prohibitory order in Canada totally prohibiting importations of any cattle for any other purposes into Canada at that time. The communication goes on to say :

Application has been made to Her Majesty's Government by the United States Government for the restoration to the United States of the privilege to land their cattle under part 4, but under existing circumstances it has been found impossible to accede to this request, and the Lords of the Council have been unable to draw any distinction between different parts of the United States territory.

With reference, therefore, to the proposals now made on behalf of the Canadian Government, the

Lords of the Council regret to have to inform you, that, if cattle from the United States are allowed to pass through Canada, they would not be justified under the Act of Parliament in continuing the exemption from slaughter at the port of landing, which has been hitherto extended to the Canadian cattle.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,
(Sgd.) G. L. PEEL.

Now, you will observe that the proposition made by the Canadian Government was rejected. What was the next step? My hon. friend here (Sir Hector Langevin) replied on the 5th day of May, 1879, as follows:—

Sir,—I have the honour to acknowledge receipt of your letter of the 2nd inst. (No. 61702), with regard to the proposals laid before the Lords of the Privy Council, one respecting the importation of United States cattle via Canadian ports, the other respecting the transit of United States cattle through a portion of Canada. I have to express my gratification at the careful consideration which they have received from their lordships, and I am emboldened by the desire which, it is apparent, is entertained by their lordships, to meet the wishes of Canada, if they can do so under the terms of the Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act, 1878, to lay before their lordships some further representation, which I venture to hope may induce their lordships to reconsider their views upon one of these proposals. When I had submitted my memorandum of the 25th ult., I had become aware of their lordships' views against the importation of United States cattle via Canadian ports, and I was prepared for the decision upon that point, conveyed in your letter, and I propose to confine my present remarks to the suggestion that, subject to proper precautions, Canadian railway trains might be permitted to traverse a part of Canada loaded with United States cattle. I observe by your letter, and by part 4 of schedule 5 of the Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act, that the continuance of the privilege allowed to Canadian cattle depends upon the question whether, in the language of the schedule: "The laws thereof relating to the importation and exportation of animals, and of the suppression of disease and the general condition of animals therein, are such as to afford reasonable security against the importation therefrom of diseased animals."

I am aware that unless I can show that the laws of Canada with regard to the transit of cattle are satisfied, I cannot hope to obtain any relaxation of the existing system, and I now venture to trouble their lordships in the hope that a more full knowledge of the circumstances connected with the trade, and of the freedom from danger with which it could be carried on, may induce their lordships to reconsider the subject, and may enable them to reach the conclusion that the suggested modifications will not deprive our Canadian laws of the character they are admitted to possess.

As I had the honour to observe in the memorandum submitted—a carefully considered system of isolation could be adopted with regard to the United States cattle in transit, among the details of such a system might be included the inspection of the animals by competent officers of the Canadian Government before the cars containing them were allowed to cross the frontier. If such inspection proved satisfactory, the Government officers might take charge of the train and proceed with it during its entire transit through

Canada, in order to ensure the observance of all the prescribed rules.

And just at this point in this communication, I would emphasize that condition. Mr. Speaker. The Canadian Government represented that, as a term of this permission, the Canadian Government would send independent officers of their own to take charge of the cattle trains and see that all the regulations that the English Government required were lived up to. I emphasize that, because it was one of the points upon which the question turned, as you will see, if my memory serves me rightly, that the British Government in reply especially selected that one condition as one of the important terms of the treaty under which they were going to allow this traffic to be carried on. The communication goes on to say:

Each cattle car could be kept locked by the officer in charge, and, as foreign cattle are dutiable, they pass through in bond, and all the precautions provided by the Customs Department for the safe custody of goods through the country in bond would be adopted. The transit would only occupy a length of time varying from ten to forty hours. The trains are never stopped except for a few minutes at stations to ascertain if the line is clear. The cattle are always fed and watered in the cars, and arrangements for these precautions could be easily made, if they do not already exist, by which such feeding and watering could be effected without opening the doors.

There would be no necessity for cleaning out the cattle cars during the period of their transit, and such cleaning would be prevented.

Such precautions as these, under the circumstances as explained, would be considered by the Canadian Government sufficient to prevent the transmission of the disease to Canadian cattle, and I beg their lordships to believe that the Canadian Government are desirous of protecting their animals from infection much more because of the intrinsic importance of the subject within the country than on account of any privileges as to their importation, to which freedom from disease would entitle them. But it is precisely because the Canadian Government are satisfied that cattle may be carried in transit as proposed in my memorandum, without danger of contagion, that they have determined to prevent such transit if they can do so without interfering with the privileges their cattle already enjoy in English ports.

I would, therefore, respectfully ask their lordships to consider whether the prohibition of the importation of foreign cattle into Canada, with the sole exception of such importation for the purpose of transit, under proper provisions against infection, does not constitute such a law in that respect as in the end of the schedule already referred to "would afford a reasonable security against the importation from Canada of diseased animals."

If their lordships should become satisfied that such a law would be sufficient, the existing prohibition would be continued, after a further provision creating the only exception to its universality, namely, that cattle might pass from one point on the frontier to another, subject to such conditions as might be imposed upon such transit from time to time by Orders in Council, and an Order in Council would be immediately prepared describing the nature and the details of the pro-

cess of isolation, and containing, in addition to the precautionary measures which the experience and knowledge of the facts would enable the Canadian Government to devise, such further conditions as their lordships might impose, and such Order would be submitted to their lordships and would be modified or amended in any respect according to their desire.

Have I not shown that my hon. friend on my left (Sir Hector Langevin) proposed to continue the total prohibition then in force, and there was to be no limit to the universality of the prohibition with the slight exception of the transit through Canada under those regulations. That is proposed here. The communication continues :

Under these circumstances I fail to see how any danger of infection to Canadian cattle could arise from permitting the mere transit of cattle, and it is only the infection of Canadian cattle which this country would have to fear, and no part of the cattle so passing through Canada could by any possibility be shipped from Canadian ports. And I would respectfully ask on these grounds a reconsideration by their lordships of the decision conveyed to me in your letter.

What was the answer of the British Government to that proposition? It is contained in the answer of the Privy Council, dated 9th May, 1879, as follows :—

Sir,—I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 5th instant, containing the conditions upon which the Canadian Government would be prepared to insist in the event of their allowing the transit of animals by railway through Canada from the western to the eastern states of America, and requesting to be informed whether, if such transit were permitted on these terms, the Imperial Government would deem it necessary to make any change in the conditions under which the Canadian cattle are now admitted into the United Kingdom, and, in reply, I am to inform you that the Lords of the Council considered this fresh proposal and the details of the stringent precautions which it has proposed to adopt for the isolation of the cattle during transit under the personal supervision of a Government officer, and they have arrived at the conclusion that, so long as no diseases exist in the Dominion, and provided that the measures indicated in your letter are found sufficient to prevent the introduction of cattle from the United States into Canada, their lordships would not think it necessary to make any change in the existing regulations.

I have given the terms of the bargain, which show that there should be total prohibition of American cattle entering Canada except for the purpose of sending them from the western to the eastern states via Canada under conditions set forth, one of which was, that each train loaded with cattle was to be under the supervision of a Government officer who should see that the railway officers and others did their duty. I propose to prove a gross breach of that bargain. In 1881 there were admitted into Manitoba 2,310 head of cattle from the United States; 1882, 5,130; 1883, 1,480; 1884, for ranching purposes, 10,847; 1885, 2,810; 1886, 10,510; 1887,

Mr. MULOCK.

13,521, or in round figures a total of perhaps 50,000 head.

Mr. QUIMET. Where did you obtain those figures?

Mr. MULOCK. From the Trade and Navigation Returns. I read them from my place in the House in 1894, in the presence of the hon. gentleman and a great many of his colleagues. They appear in "Hansard;" they are uncontradicted and uncontradictable. I assert them to be correct, and the reports are to be found in the library. No body has ventured to challenge their correctness since that time, nor will they do so now. I come to another point. The introduction of cattle in the vicinity of 50,000 head into Canada from the western states was a distinct breach of the compact; but as if that was not sufficient, could any one understand a more gross breach of the spirit of the compact than the way in which the traffic was allowed to proceed? For several years the trade was allowed to go on, cattle were allowed to enter Canada without inspection and without quarantine, and it was not for several years after the traffic began the Government introduced the first element of protection in order to prevent diseased animals entering Canada. That is a broad and wide statement to make. If I cannot make that statement good I am assuming a very serious responsibility. I made that statement in the House in the year 1894; I made it in the country; I make it here in the House again, and I challenge any member of the Government, before this House and the country to show that I am not telling the truth. I have read the reports of speeches of gentlemen opposite, going through the country and drawing on their imaginations.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Did you read your own.

Mr. MULOCK. I read yours. I take the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Montague) and I bring him face to face with the statement I am going to make, and I ask him to make good his statements if he can. In 1884, the Government passed an Order in Council establishing quarantine in Manitoba and the North-west Territories. Remember this unrestricted importation of cattle had been going on during these years that I have named. I ask the Minister of Agriculture to answer me this question: What precautions did the Government take to see that these cattle that were imported into Manitoba and the North-west Territories, during the years 1880, 1881, 1882, 1883 and 1884; I ask him to tell the House and the country, what precautions and regulations were adopted to ensure that these cattle had a clean bill of health before entering Canada. Let that point not be missed, because I will give him my evidence upon it. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Montague) will find in his department a collection of all the Orders in Council, and all the regulations applicable

to this cattle trade, and he will find in connection with the Order in Council of 1884, the first Order in Council establishing any quarantine, the following explanatory memorandum :—

This Order contained the first restriction to the free importation of cattle from the United States into Manitoba and the North-west Territories. Before this date there was, as regards quarantine, untrammelled importation.

The official records in the hon. gentleman's own department state, that until the passage of the Order in Council of 1884, there was "untrammelled importation" of American cattle into Manitoba and the North-west Territories. In the face of the distinct agreement made by my hon. friend (Sir Hector Langevin) in 1879: That with the solitary exception of the transit of cattle through Canada under safeguards, there would be a total prohibition of the admission of American, or any cattle, into Canada—not into western Canada or eastern Canada, but Canada as a whole—in the face of that, what did the Government do? This disregard of the agreement gave an excuse to the English people who may have been clamouring for some sort of restriction such as this, and, when from time to time rumours reached them of the prevalence of pleuro-pneumonia in the western states, and when, as I showed in 1894, communication had reached the English Government through the press, referring to the prevalence of disease amongst cattle in the United States; the English Government commenced a correspondence with the Canadian Government, warning them of the risk they were running, and the danger to which they were exposing the Canadian cattle trade. That correspondence is on record here; that correspondence came from the custody of the Government; that correspondence warned the Government that a great industry was in danger. But the warning fell upon deaf ears. My hon. friend to my right (Sir Hector Langevin) was at the time Postmaster General, and for the sake of brevity of debate, I shall refer to him in that capacity. You remember, Mr. Speaker, that when my hon. friend (Sir Hector Langevin) made the proposition at that time, one of his terms was: That the trains were to be conducted through Canada under the custody and eye of a Government official to see that the regulations were lived up to. You will remember, Sir, that the answer from the English Government, dated 5th May, 1879, dwelt particularly upon that condition, and attached great importance to it, knowing as they did that paper regulations were of little value unless they were carried out. They selected that provision as one of the principal safeguards which moved them to make the concession in question. Now, Sir, how did the Canadian Government carry out that regulation? I would ask the member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), who is defend-

ing this transaction, to come to the assistance of the Minister of Agriculture now, for I know of nobody better fitted to do so. We saw his name recently mentioned in connection with that same portfolio of Agriculture. When the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Montague) went on strike, there were lots of gentlemen ready to take up the job, and only for the efficiency of the bolters' pickets, the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) would have been sitting in the chair of the Minister of Agriculture, to-day, and would be trying to defend this act. However, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) looks forward, of course, to a possible bolt in the near future, and it is right he should win his spurs and qualify himself to succeed. He therefore, very properly, selects himself as the deputy on this occasion to assist the actual Minister of Agriculture. As the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) took part in this debate on the former occasion, and as he is thoroughly posted on all the facts as you can readily see, I will ask him to explain how he can justify the Government, for having ignored the stipulation that they would put Government officers in charge of these cattle trains. What sort of Government officers did the Canadian Government put in charge of the trains? Let me ask in the first place, what was the idea of requiring Government officers to take charge of these cattle trains? It was to see that the inspection took place at the point of entry; to see that the cattle were put in the cars; to see that the cars were properly constructed so as to prevent the droppings of American cattle falling on the track and perhaps coming in contact with our Canadian cattle; to see that the cattle trains were not allowed to stand on sidings in Canada alongside of cattle trains containing Canadian cattle; to see that the cattle cars were properly cleansed and disinfected after the cattle had left Canada and the cars unloaded; to see that before the cattle trains came back to Canada, lest the cars should carry Canadian cattle, these cattle cars were properly disinfected; to see, in fact, that all these paper regulations were lived up to from the time the train entered Canada with its cargo until it returned to the United States. And, Sir, whom was this guardian, this Government officer, to watch? He was to watch the trainmen; he was to watch the Government inspector; he was to watch every man in charge of the train from beginning to end, to see that every man did his duty until the possibility of danger had passed by, the American animals having left our boundaries either at the Suspension Bridge or at Rouse's Point. He was to see this possible danger safely out of this country, and to see that not one of the railway officials, or others, neglected to comply with these stipulations. Now, Sir, whom do you think the Government appointed to watch and guard over

these men? They sent out blank appointments by the dozen to the railway company which was promoting this traffic, authorizing it to fill up those documents with the names of the trainmen themselves. The conductors were to watch themselves—men not in the pay of the Government, but the servants of the railways, whose negligence might endanger this traffic; the men whom the English Government would not trust, but required to be guarded and watched, and whom they specially mentioned in the letter by which they suspended the scheduling. The English Government attached supreme importance to the regulation providing for the watching of those trains. And yet, with that order staring them in the face, hon. gentlemen opposite systematically violated the stipulation by sending out these blank appointments and ignoring the spirit of the whole bargain; thus not only endangering this great industry, but characterizing their own conduct as a gross breach of faith—what would be had faith of the worst kind between hostile governments, but absolutely inexcusable as between Canada and the mother country. All the circumstances are such that I am unable to understand how the Canadian Government can justify such a gross breach of the agreement they entered into. This negligence on the part of the Government brought upon us all the disastrous consequences that followed, and gave the people of England a peg on which to hang their argument for scheduling our cattle, whether there was disease among them or not; and the scheduling is now conceded to be a permanent institution. Therefore, when the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) forgets the facts and makes the statements he does, it is my duty in the interests of truth to say exactly where this responsibility lies; and I have no hesitation whatever in asserting that it is not possible for any person to break down the statement of facts which I have presented to this House. Everything I have stated is founded on documents which have been before this country for a length of time, which were uncontradicted at the time they were read in this House, and which cannot be contradicted to-day. The bald fact stares us in the face that by breach of faith, by breach of contract, by negligence of the regulations, by bad faith, the Canadian Government have caused a loss of perhaps a penny a pound on every Canadian animal which we would otherwise be able to export alive to the United Kingdom. The loss of a penny a pound is the loss estimated by the Deputy Minister of Agriculture himself, and this means a loss of from \$15 to \$20 a head, according to the weight of the animal—a loss which could not be compensated for by the most efficient of all governments, let alone the most inefficient. Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to speak on this question. I had simply intended to move an amendment to the resolution of my hon. friend

Mr. MULOCK.

the Minister of Finance, applicable to the traffic question. We are told by the hon. Minister of Agriculture that an Order in Council was passed last Thursday permitting this traffic from the United States via St. John to take place. I am not now criticising that Order in Council; I am not expressing an opinion as to whether it was a wise thing to do or not. I am simply desirous of ascertaining whether the traffic under it is to be conducted in the lax way in which the former traffic was conducted, or whether precautions are to be adopted in this case that would not be open to the criticism that brought trouble upon us before. With that idea, I beg to move that the following be added to the motion:—

And copies of all other Orders in Council and departmental and other regulations applicable to the transit of cattle from the United States through Canada, and a statement showing what provision has been made for the transit of such cattle being carried out according to the requirements of such Order in Council and regulations; also a statement showing what numbers of American cattle, if any, have been shipped via St. John, under the terms of the Order in Council.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I will accept the amendment. I am willing to bring down all proper papers.

Mr. SPROULE. With the permission of the House, I would like to say a few words on this question. The hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) started out with the statement that in order to fulfil the requirements of the agreement between Canada and England, which gave to Canadian cattle the freedom of the English market, all cattle coming into Canada must be quarantined for 90 days. Afterwards, in reading the correspondence which led up to the negotiations which were made, the hon. gentleman showed that the privilege was allowed of transporting through Canada cattle from the United States. He read a great deal that was apropos, and a great deal that was not relevant to the subject whatever. I have here the regulations which were submitted to the British Board of Agriculture, and which were accepted as satisfactory, and I would like to draw the attention of the House to them, because to my mind they contain in a crystallized form all that was agreed to between Canada and England with reference to this matter. They are contained in the Order in Council passed here, and are as follows:—

Section 15.—The transit of cattle and swine between the points mentioned in the next preceding paragraph, shall be subject to such regulations as the Minister of Agriculture shall prescribe, and in accordance with the arrangement which may be made between the said Minister and the Grand Trunk, the Great Western, and the Canada Southern railway companies, for the proper carrying out of the present Order, and the necessary measures to save the live stock of Canada from the dangers of contagion and infection.

Section 16.—Amongst other things, these arrangements of the Minister of Agriculture shall provide :—

And these were the arrangements submitted to the British Board of Agriculture and accepted as sufficient to secure the freedom of Canadian cattle from infection.

Mr. MULOCK. Would you just read anything you can showing that the English Government accepted them.

Mr. SPROULE. I am prepared to show that they were accepted exactly on these conditions.

(a) That an inspection of the said cattle and swine shall be made before they are admitted in transit,—

Not a quarantine of 90 days, but an inspection simply—

—permission for which transit shall only be given on a certificate or clean bill of health from the inspector,—he being a veterinary surgeon appointed by the said Minister.

A veterinary surgeon was to inspect these cattle, and a clean bill of health was to be given. I contend it was done.

(b) That each train carrying American cattle or swine, or both, from frontier to frontier in bond, shall be accompanied by one of the staff of guardians also to be appointed by the said Minister.

The hon. gentleman says the guardian appointed by the Government was the conductor of the train. Well, I do not see anything in the regulations to prevent a conductor who is properly qualified from seeing that the cattle are properly carried from one point to another, as well as any other person. The hon. gentleman forgot this fact, that every train was in bond and, therefore, had to be taken through, and could not be opened during transit, except at Lyn and Rouse's Point, where the cattle were taken off for feed and water and put on again under special regulations laid down and carried out. There was no necessity for that train being accompanied by a special person because it could not be thrown off on any siding, or stopped or opened.

That the cars and trucks employed for such traffic be specially and exclusively devoted for such purpose.

There has been no effort made to show that they were used for any other purpose.

Mr. MULOCK. I will correct the hon. gentleman. I must ask him to keep to the facts.

Mr. SPROULE. I am keeping to the facts, as I find them here, and in the reports of the officer who was in charge of that work at the frontier at Detroit.

Mr. MULOCK. Will you allow me to make a suggestion ?

Mr. SPROULE. I cannot allow the hon. gentleman to interrupt me every minute. I asked his permission, while he was speaking, to interject a question, and the hon. gentleman quietly motioned me to keep quiet. I shall proceed with my remarks, and if I say anything which the hon. gentleman can successfully refute, he will have an opportunity of doing so.

That the cars and trucks employed for such traffic be especially and exclusively devoted to such purpose.

That no Canadian animals shall be carried at any time in the same train, in company with, nor in close proximity to American cattle or swine ; and that no car or truck employed in the transit of American cattle and swine shall be used to carry, at any time, Canadian animals.

It has never been proven that this regulation was violated.

That no unnecessary delay occur with any train engaged in the said transit passing through Canadian territory.

There was no contention that there was any unnecessary delay in the transit through Canada.

That due precautions be taken to retain in the cars or trucks, and disinfect, if need be, the droppings of cattle and swine thus carried in transit.

The hon. gentleman said that there is a regulation providing that some one must be along to see that the excretions or droppings from the cattle must be kept in those cars and disinfected. The regulations do not say so. They say :

That due precautions be taken to retain in the cars or trucks, and disinfect, if need be.

That meant in the event of animals dying, or being found infected with contagious disease. In such cases the cars and trucks should be disinfected before being used afterwards.

That no such cattle or swine, nor their carcasses, in case of death occurring (unless immediately buried under the directions of the proper guardian), nor parts thereof, nor articles having been employed about them, be permitted to remain in Canada, or to come in contact with any persons other than those engaged on the train or thing, whilst thus undergoing the said transit.

Was there any allegation that this was violated ? The hon. gentleman went on to show that there was to be some kind of an inspector, not mentioned in the Act at all, or in the Order in Council or anywhere else, who was to oversee every one, who was to travel with the train, and to overlook the veterinary surgeon and every one else. But there is no such provisions to be found anywhere.

Section 17.—Inasmuch as it is of absolute necessity, owing to the length of the trip on the Grand Trunk Railway, to provide for a place where American cattle and swine can be fed, watered and rested, it is ordered that the said resting place shall be

established at the station of Lyn, in the province of Ontario, where a double, isolated inclosure shall be provided by the railway company, selected, established and fitted to the satisfaction of the Minister of Agriculture, before the said company is permitted to transport American cattle or swine over their line. The said inclosure, besides other requisites, shall be provided with a high board fence and a vacant space around the said board fence, the said outside space to be also fenced, in order to prevent any approach to the inner inclosure; the said inner inclosure shall be provided with a special siding, with two locked doors, for the admission of isolation, under key, of the cars or trucks carrying American cattle or swine in transit.

Section 18.—The two fenced inclosures mentioned in the next foregoing section, situated at the Grand Trunk Railway station at Lyn, in the province of Ontario, with all appurtenances therein, or things belonging thereto, are hereby declared to be infected places, in the meaning and for all purposes of the Animals Contagious Diseases Act.

Section 19.—The inclosures through which American cattle and swine enter Canada, in transit at Sarnia, on the Grand Trunk line, must be arranged, fitted and isolated, in like manner, to the satisfaction of the Minister of Agriculture, and the said inclosures, situated on the Grand Trunk Railway grounds on the frontier, near Sarnia station, in the province of Ontario, with everything thereto appertaining, are also declared to be an infected place.

These are the principal and practical regulations under which cattle were allowed to be carried in transit through the country. Afterwards it was found necessary, in the settlement of the North-west Territories, to bring cattle into that country; but it is also known that these cattle were being imported into Canada from five hundred to two thousand miles west of the line on the American side, where pleuro-pneumonia was ever known to exist, and, therefore, when the information was conveyed to the British Board of Agriculture, with full explanations, that Board did not object to allowing the free importation of these cattle into that country. But after it was found that the cattle might be shipped this way, then regulations were made by the Minister of Agriculture, establishing quarantine stations along that frontier, where cattle were detained for a length of time sufficient to satisfy the Minister of Agriculture that disease could not be imported through that channel. The reasons which hon. gentlemen put forward why the British Board of Agriculture raised that schedule were not the reasons given by themselves, or taken into account by them, so far as we know. Then the hon. gentleman says that these regulations were made in 1884. They were made in 1884, and from time to time, this information was communicated to the British Board of Agriculture, but they never raised any valid objections, they never raised any objection which was not satisfactorily explained afterwards, and the business was allowed to continue, as it had gone on heretofore,

Mr. SPROULE.

up to the time that the first infected animals were found in the "Huron" and "Monkseaton" in 1892. Upon examination of the two infected animals discovered, it was declared that these cattle were found to be diseased with pleuro-pneumonia, coming from Canada; and upon that ground alone our cattle were scheduled, and the hon. gentleman cannot successfully show the contrary. He said they only required an excuse. Well, they did not give that as an excuse, but they gave the examination of the cattle, which they believed to be infected with pleuro-pneumonia, as an excuse and acted upon that. If we be allowed to do, as the hon. gentleman has done, give a reason why the schedule was made, we would be amply justified, from what appeared in the press, and from what we know, in believing that the schedule was raised, and that we are shut out from the British market because of a desire to protect the British farmers. We know that the British farmers are pressing very hard for protection, which the British Government refuses to grant, and, to meet their wishes in another way, this schedule on Canadian cattle was imposed, and is equivalent to putting on a protective tariff. We have just ground for believing that that was very largely the reason rather than the pretense that infected animals had been found in those vessels. Afterwards, there were two more cases, in all, I believe, only six; but any one who understands the nature of that disease—whether he be a medical man or a veterinary surgeon—and examined the report made in these cases very closely, can come to but one conclusion, and that is that the data given were not absolutely correct, and that there are sufficient grounds for the belief that there was laxity in that examination which was not compatible with what might have been and ought to have been required of the veterinary surgeons of England, who are doing a great act of unkindness towards us if they did not find—as I contend they did not—absolute cases of pleuro-pneumonia. I believe, and firmly believe, that the embargo will not be raised. And why? Because the British agriculturists do not want our cattle to enter their country without being killed at the port at which they are landed. I believe that, for that reason, no matter what efforts we make, that species of protection which the British farmer enjoys will be continued whether we like it or not. I contend that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock) has not shown that it was owing to laxity in carrying out the regulations made as a result of the understanding come to between the Minister of Agriculture of Canada and the British Board of Agriculture that Canada was scheduled and we were prevented from sending Canadian cattle into Great Britain without being killed at the port of debarkation, as is at present the law.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I would like to ask if the Minister of Agriculture will authorize the statement made by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule). Has the Government information from Washington that Canadian cattle are allowed to be shipped at American ports? Will the Minister of Agriculture answer that question?

Mr. MONTAGUE. I am to speak in a few minutes.

Mr. LANDERKIN. It is easy to give the answer. If that information has been received the House could be informed of the fact in a word. The hon. member for East Grey says that they have that information but the hon. Minister of Agriculture has not made that statement, though he has given permission for American cattle to pass through the port of St. John, but no other port.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I thought every member of the House knew that.

Mr. LANDERKIN. That the Government had that permission from Washington?

Mr. MONTAGUE. Our Canadian cattle were being shipped from American ports long before this permission was given for the shipment of American cattle.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Have the Government authority from Washington to say so?

Mr. SPROULE. It has been done for a long time.

Mr. LANDERKIN. It would seem that this is the kind of reciprocity described by the hon. Minister of Agriculture the other day as "jug-handled" reciprocity. The Americans can ship through our ports, but our Government has no authority from Washington to say that we can ship from theirs.

An hon. MEMBER. Chestnut.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Then I should think it would be very palatable to the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Ives); he has had a good many chestnuts in his time. As to the contention of the hon. member for East Grey that the quarantine regulations were in force, I will read what the hon. member said in 1892 when discussing this question. The hon. gentleman has given his statement to-day; I will quote his statement when this subject was discussed on a previous occasion. I quote from "Hansard" of 1892, page 2038:

Mr. SPROULE. I would like to ask the Minister, if he has considered the advisability of establishing a quarantine at Fort Macleod? In that part of the country, I am told, there are a great many cattle crossing the line, and the cattle trade at that centre is a great one at the present time. Great numbers of horses are brought in from the other side, and cattle are brought in in many places without any inspection whatever. I see from the Minister's return that the cattle are inspected, but I do not think that an ordinary inspection is sufficient to detect

or prevent danger. The number of cattle in that locality is very large, and, if cattle infected with pleuro-pneumonia were brought in from the other side, as they may be at any time, it will cause great loss to the country.

Mr. SPROULE. If the hon. gentleman will go a little further, he will see that the answer was given that the quarantine regulations were being carried out.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Then the hon. gentleman will say now that he was making very reckless statements at that time.

Mr. SPROULE. I made a statement based upon information published in a western paper, which turned out to be incorrect.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) did not base his statement upon information in an American paper; he based it upon the official returns of the department, and he has shown conclusively to the House and to the country that there was the laxity of which the hon. member for East Grey at one time complained. If the hon. member for East Grey has made statements which he finds to be incorrect, now would be a good time to amend those statements. Now, with reference to the publication of this quarantine Order in Council, which was passed last Thursday, and which was referred to by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), the Minister of Agriculture characterized in severe terms the newspapers that had published it. It appeared in the "Star" of Friday evening. I noticed it in the morning issue of both the "Mail and Empire" and the "Gazette," and these newspapers are not supposed to contain articles without the authority of the Government, though the Ministers reflect very severely on the reporters for having published this information.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I did not reflect upon them.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I think there should be some information on this subject. I am glad the Minister of Agriculture is going to speak, and I hope that when he speaks he will say something that will settle the minds of the people upon this question. I would like to know if negotiations have been going on between this Government and the government at Washington to carry out this regulation and allow our cattle to be shipped from their ports as well as allowing their cattle to be shipped from ours. This is an important matter to the cattle dealers, and the earliest information should be given with regard to it.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I do not think that the statements which have been made by the hon. gentleman who has just sat down need be referred to at very great length. The hon. gentleman is evidently out of his element when he comes to discuss this ques-

tion, since he does not seem to have inquired into any of the facts. He evidently rose to attempt a little humour at the expense of my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule). But I think I need not say that any attempt of that kind will do the hon. member for East Grey no harm either in this House or in the country. The members of this House, as well as the farmers of Canada, who have watched the course of the hon. member for East Grey in connection with agricultural subjects know full well that that hon. gentleman has done good service to the agricultural interests, both as chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and as member of this House. Any attempt to work off stale bits of humour on questions of this kind will be appreciated by the country no more than they have been appreciated by this House this afternoon. As to the attempt to show, or rather to insinuate, that the conduct of the reporters in connection with the publication of this information was to be condemned, I have only this to say: having made the statement which I did make, and having promised to investigate the matter, and that statement having been accepted by the hon. hon. leader of the Opposition, I think it would well have become hon. gentlemen on that side of the House not to refer to it again. I have no fault to find with the reporters in connection with this matter. It is their business to collect news, and to get it as best they can, and they must have got it in order to publish it in their correspondence. The debate on the motion of my hon. friend the Finance Minister has taken a range which, I am sure, no hon. member of the House supposed it would take. It is being made the occasion by the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) to read his speech of a few years ago, a speech which, if I were not in this House, I would say was made for political effect. And if I were not in this House, I would say that that speech was repeated to-day for political effect rather than for the purpose of benefiting the Canadian live stock trade: and I shall show, by reference to opinions from other sources, that my opinion upon that subject is very well founded indeed. Now, an attack has been made this afternoon—or perhaps insinuated rather than made openly—that in passing this Order in Council the Government in some way removed the quarantine against the cattle of the United States when imported into Canada, the regulation requiring that they should be left 90 days in quarantine before they were allowed to come into this country. Certainly the gentleman who tries to present the question in that form on the floor of this House or elsewhere is either trying to mislead the House and the country or knows nothing at all about the subject. The fact is that in this Order in Council we are not interfering in any way with the quarantine regulations which have been en-

Mr. MONTAGUE.

joyed for some time, transit privileges of which the British Government and the British Board of Agriculture were perfectly aware, and as against the enjoyment of which by the American people the British Board of Agriculture have never entered a protest, and never said that they should be removed at all. The fact is that this is simply an extension of the transit trade at this particular point, in response to a strong invitation that the Government might help Canadian trade at this particular juncture, and under those circumstances, which would work no injury to the live stock industry of Canada, in other words, we are trying to build up a Canadian trade. It is our duty above every other duty to build up the trade of Canada, and if possible, to keep Canadian ships upon the ocean, plying between Canadian ports and the ports of the old land, in order, Sir, that Canada's trade may extend, and in order that our destiny as a great people should be fulfilled.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. MONTAGUE. My hon. friends sneer. They always sneer when any attempt is made by this Government to develop Canadian trade or to extend it. Why, Sir, we have had even the financial leader of the Opposition sneering at a new member of the Government, namely, Sir Charles Tupper, and saying that he had brought discredit upon Canada.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Hear, hear.

Mr. MONTAGUE. "Hear, hear," my hon. friend says. I want to tell him that Sir Charles Tupper at that time was fighting the fight of Canada, and establishing and maintaining Canadian credit in the markets of Great Britain, while the man who faces me now was writing to the London "Economist" the most slanderous article that ever a Canadian wrote with regard to Canada.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman, in the first place, states what is absolutely without foundation in fact, if he dares to say that I put one word of slander in that letter. I will read that letter and show it, when he has done.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I need only to repeat what I have said—

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is out of order.

Mr. SPEAKER. What is the point of order?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman alleges that I had used most slanderous language. I have no objection, if you rule that to be correct, because I shall know how to put myself right.

Mr. SPEAKER. The House knows, of course, that if an hon. member charges

another with using slanderous language in this House, he is not in order.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I did not say the hon. member for South Oxford used slanderous words in this House, it would be unparliamentary to do so, even if it were true, and I do not say it was true. But, Sir, the hon. gentleman did do this, and if the hon. gentleman is not ashamed of it, there are hon. gentlemen behind him who are ashamed of it, and there are people in this country who are ashamed of it. What the hon. gentleman did, Sir, was this, and although in the heat of debate a man's tongue may sometimes run away with his judgment, he sat down coolly in his study, after the fight of 1891, when he had been defeated in Canada, and when his fads had been rejected and spurned by the Canadian people, he sat down and deliberately wrote to the London "Economist" an attack on Canadian credit; he sat down and wrote that we were poverty-stricken; he sat down and wrote that the farmers were bled white; he sat down and warned British investors, in almost so many words, that if they had money invested in Canada, they had better look out for its safety. Sir, I am well within parliamentary privilege when I ask this House whether those statements with regard to Canada, were slanderous or not. I say that this was being written and sent abroad among the British people, among whom we desire to keep that credit which guarantees and ensures our future, at a time when Sir Charles Tupper, who has been attacked in this House by the hon. gentleman, was doing his very best in connection with this cattle question, and in connection with every other question, to show, what was the truth, that Canada today was the most prosperous self-governing colony of the British Crown; and that under the flag of Great Britain we were working out a destiny of which Great Britain would in the end be very proud indeed. So, Sir, I say that when we attempt to put Canadian ships upon the sea, or attempt to develop Canadian trade with all other countries in the world, we are met with discouragement from the leaders of the Opposition. But thank Heaven, though we have made mistakes on this great question, the heart of the Canadian people is with us, has been with us, and will be with us to the end. Now, Sir, what did we do? We found that we could establish successfully Canadian steamship lines, we found that from the port of St. John we could have a large trade with the old country, and in order to assist, not that steamship line alone, because this privilege is not confined to that steamship line, but in order to assist all other steamship lines that carry cattle, aye, Sir, and more, in order to reduce freight rates for the Canadian farmer—because, when the steamship lines are established, there must be greater competition, and greater competition must reduce

the carrying price to the Canadian farmer—we inquired whether we could, without injury to the life of our Canadian herds, give them the privilege of carrying American cattle. We found by the reports of those best informed upon the subject that we could do it, and we did it; and in spite of all the carping of the hon. gentleman who seeks at this moment to procure political advantage, we will be defended in that action by the cattle traders of Canada, as well as by the tradesmen of Canada generally. Now, what is the fact? We have heard it said this afternoon, you have done this without getting any corresponding advantage from the American people. That shows how little these gentlemen know of the circumstances. For months, Sir, aye, last session, and before last session, we were enjoying this privilege at the hands of the American people, and the hon. member for Huron (Mr. McMillan) last year discussed this very question of Canadian cattle being shipped in transit through the United States and sent through the American ports to Great Britain, and was answered upon that occasion by myself standing here where I now stand in the House. So that instead of our giving the American people an advantage without getting any advantage in return, for months we have been enjoying a similar advantage from the people of the United States, and have not given them any special advantage in return. But I repeat what I stated at the outset, that we did not do this to advance the interest of the people of the United States, but we did it to advance the interest of our Canadian trade, and in the end to reduce the freight rates at which our cattle could be shipped to the other shore. As to the regulations—as to what is being done—hon. gentlemen opposite want more particulars, they are most anxious to have minute details. I think the wording of the Order in Council gives fully and completely the position of the Government and the state of Canadian herds. What we say is this, that action must be taken without disadvantage to our Canadian herds, and that all these regulations and these restrictions were advised by the officers of our department, required for the protection of the health of Canadian herds, and these must be kept up and maintained, and when this is not done, it will be time for hon. gentlemen opposite to raise a question in this House in connection with carelessness in this matter. Then the question is raised, why do we discriminate against every other Canadian port in favour of St. John? I trust this is not the cropping out of the old policy of setting one point of Canada against another. I trust this is not the old policy of setting east against west, north against south, and province against province. We have no particular liking for St. John, or any other port; what we are anxious to do is to promote Canadian trade, and when any other port asks us for the same privilege

we now extend to St. John, when that privilege can be granted without injuring the health of our Canadian herds, when it can be granted for the purpose of promoting Canadian trade, this Government will not consider whether it is St. John, Halifax, Montreal, or any other place, but will be prepared to deal with the question on its merits as every other question is dealt with by the Canadian Government. So much for the Order in Council. Just a word or two in regard to the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock). The House was scarcely edified by the repetition of the old statement the hon. gentleman made last year, and which the hon. gentleman sought to impress so strongly on the House this afternoon. I want to say this, that the hon. gentleman did not establish his case when he spoke about it in this House, the hon. gentleman never has established his case, and cannot possibly establish his case, for he charged that it was on account of carelessness in connection with the transport trade in cattle the British embargo was placed upon Canadian cattle. It is true the hon. gentleman strung together this statement and the other statement, but he lacked one element of truth all along, which he has never yet furnished, and I challenge him now to produce one tittle of evidence which shows that the British Government placed the embargo upon Canadian cattle on account of any carelessness in connection with quarantine. That is the point, and the hon. gentleman has missed it entirely. It is true the hon. gentleman has dealt with many points in connection with it. He has told the House that great carelessness existed, he has stated that on that account the embargo was imposed, but he forgot that that carelessness, which he has elaborated so often in the House and before the country, occurred eight years before the embargo was established, and that embargo was put on, as the hon. gentleman will find admitted in the statement of the British Board of Agriculture, because pleuro-pneumonia, they said, was found to exist in two cattle taken from a point two thousand miles from the point where carelessness was supposed to exist eight years before the embargo was levied. What is the object which the hon. gentleman has in view? Suppose carelessness had caused the embargo to be imposed, suppose the Government had been guilty of carelessness, was the position taken by the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) one of which a Canadian should be proud, was it one that was in the best interests of the Canadian industry and Canadian cattle breeders? On the other hand, was it not calculated to injure beyond measure the Canadian cattle industry, and also give the British Government another reason for not removing that embargo, when their feeling at the time was against such action, the British Government desiring to afford protection to British cattle raisers against

Mr. MONTAGUE.

competition with the people of the Dominion of Canada? Was not the hon. gentleman's speech calculated to give them one reason more which they might urge for keeping up that embargo rather than removing it, which we hoped would prove the result of the efforts of Sir Charles Tupper in connection with this matter? I ask the hon. member to-day if he has found one leading stockman or one leading stock journal to congratulate him on the course he pursued on that occasion? And let me say the course he has pursued to-day is a course which may be characterized in the same language in which the attack made by him in 1892 or 1893 is characterized, as an attack made, perhaps not for the purpose, but having the effect of leaving upon the public mind the impression that we are relaxing our quarantine regulations, going back on our agreement in connection with this matter, an impression that will make it still more difficult than it is at present to secure the withdrawal of the embargo, and to remove even the faintest hope we now possess of having that embargo against Canada removed in the future. Just a word or two as to what people engaged in the cattle industry thought of the attacks of the hon. gentleman. He is perhaps aware that we have a Canadian Cattle-dealers' and Butchers' Journal, the editor of which watches the trade pretty closely, and knows whether the movements of politicians are in the direction of promoting the best interests of the Canadian cattle trade or not, and I commend the words of the editor of that paper to the hon. gentleman's serious consideration, when he comes to repeat his attacks respecting this question in the House. The article is headed "Mulock on the Rampage," and let it be remembered that this is not a partisan paper, but a journal of the trade. It is as follows:—

Mr. Mulock has again been indulging in his loquacity, and treating the members of the Federal Government to one of his harangues on the question of the Canadian cattle embargo, if indeed it may be called a treat.

He occupied the time of the House on Wednesday afternoon for nearly four hours with a bitter tirade against the Minister of Agriculture and the Deputy Minister, interspersing his speech with copious extracts from the regulations respecting the transportation of cattle in Canada. While pretending to try and benefit the Canadian cattle trade, he has done more harm to this industry by his meddlesome interference than if he had been specially retained for the purpose of advocating a continuance of the embargo. It is quite evident that Mr. Mulock has never paid any attention to the study of pleuro-pneumonia in cattle and how it is likely to be communicated from one animal to another. He has, however, studied the spirit of opposition for pure love of it, and he made the occasion one for indulging in that same to a most unpardonable extent. Nothing could be more calculated to injure the cattle trade of the Dominion, or to play in the hands of its opponents in Great Britain, than the speech of Mr. Mulock. Canadian cattle exporters have suffered recently from American competi-

tion, and just now, when there is a chance of their realizing good profits, owing to the short shipments of American cattle caused by western railroad strikes, it is doubly hard to think that a prominent Canadian M.P. should so ruthlessly rush in and try to stop the progress of this once promising industry.

I will leave the hon. member for North York in the hands of those most interested in the trade. Reverting again to the subject under discussion this afternoon, I can only say that while endeavouring to assist in extending the trade, it will be the bounden duty of this Government, as it will be its privilege, to see that while seeking the extension of that trade, which will be to the advantage of Canadian cattle business as well as to Canadian trade generally, the restrictions in the regulations shall not be relaxed to any extent—even the slightest—that will leave the herds of Canada open to any danger.

Mr. McMULLEN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to say a few words.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Spoken.

Mr. MULLOCK. I moved an amendment.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I beg your pardon, you did not.

Mr. MULLOCK. I beg your pardon, Mr. Speaker, I moved the amendment and handed it in.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, you did not.

Mr. MONTAGUE. May I explain?

Mr. MULLOCK. Excuse me, I have the floor.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. MULLOCK. I am speaking to the point of order. I concluded my speech by stating that I moved that amendment, and I handed it in, and the Minister of Agriculture said he would accept it as an addition to the main motion. I pressed it then as an amendment, and I press it now as an amendment.

Mr. SPEAKER. I was not in the Chair when this amendment was sent up; but I understood the Deputy Speaker to say that, as an amendment to be added to the main motion, Mr. Mulock proposed the following words:—

And of all other Orders in Council and departmental or other regulations applicable to the transit of cattle from the United States through Canada, and a statement showing what provision has been made for the transit of such cattle being carried out according to the requirements of such Orders in Council and regulations; also statement showing what numbers of American cattle, if any, have already been shipped via St. John under the terms of the Order in Council.

May I ask the Deputy Speaker if I am correct in that?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Yes, Mr. Speaker. I may also say that at the time I un-

derstood the Government were willing to accept that amendment and add it to the main motion; but I considered it as an amendment to the motion, and for that reason I allowed the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule) to speak a second time.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The Minister of Agriculture was going to answer the question I asked—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member for Grey (Mr. Landerkin) has already spoken.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I beg your pardon, Mr. Speaker, I was just going to ask a question.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. McMULLEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to make a few remarks in reply to the speech delivered by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Montague). In that speech he attempted to evade altogether the point raised, and properly raised, and well presented by the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock). The hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule) has challenged the correctness of the statement made by the hon. member for York (Mr. Mulock), with regard to the responsibility of this Government for the unfortunate condition of our cattle trade in England. The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Montague), with a great deal of power, and exhibition of earnestness, tried to turn the point by talking about other questions rather than the issue before the House. Now, the hon. member for York (Mr. Mulock) has clearly pointed out that the Government were responsible for the present condition of our cattle trade in England. The Minister of Agriculture said that it was eight years after the irregularities existed, if they exist at all, that our cattle were scheduled in England. What are the facts? One of their own veterinary officials at Port Huron, a veterinary surgeon who had been employed by this Government, over his own signature and on oath, declared that the irregularities did exist, and that cattle were permitted to go through Canada in transit for the United States in violation of the regulations. That man made the statement, that instead of a veterinary surgeon discharging the duties of inspector; in one case a butcher, and in another case a shoemaker was employed by the Government to inspect the cattle and pronounce them free from disease. When this question was before the House on a previous occasion, the Minister of Agriculture stated that the person who made this statement had to flee from Canada and was living in Detroit. But, this person swore to the statement, and if the Government are prepared to prove that it was untrue, why do they not extradite him and prosecute him for perjury, for it was upon his statement that our cattle were scheduled

in England. Now, the Minister of Agriculture told us that the Government were bound to develop Canadian trade, particularly in the interest of the agriculturist, and that for that purpose they subsidized steamship lines. Well, Sir, perhaps he thinks the Government are developing Canadian trade on the Pacific coast. They subsidized a line of steamers to Australia, and they are bringing over Australian butter and Australian frozen mutton. Does the Minister think that he is developing the agricultural industries of Canada by doing that? It is stimulating Australian trade, maybe, but it certainly is bringing Australian agricultural products in competition with ours. That is the way he and his Government are helping the farmers of Canada. I presume that the line of steamers by which these American cattle are carried on the Atlantic, is a subsidized line, and I presume that by reason of that subsidy they are enabled to carry American cattle cheaper than are the unsubsidized American lines. And, so, the American farmers are having their cattle carried on Canadian subsidized steamers, and the Canadian farmers are putting their hands in their pockets to pay for this privilege for the American farmers. Is that encouraging Canadian trade?

Mr. HAZEN. Would the hon. gentleman (Mr. McMullen) allow me to make an explanation? I wish to explain to him that the line which has probably carried most of the cattle, or an equal portion of the cattle, from the port of St. John this year, and which, so far as I am aware through correspondence, is most interested in being able to carry American cattle, has not received a dollar of subsidy from this Government. I refer to the Donaldson line.

Mr. McMULLEN. The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Montague) missed another point. He says, that the scheduling of our cattle in England was not at all the result of any laxity on the part of the Dominion Government in carrying out the regulations as originally laid down by the English Government. But what are the facts? The hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) has proven that some 46,000 head of cattle were taken into Canada from the United States for ranching purposes, and in violation of the stipulated conditions upon which these cattle should be admitted. Does the Minister of Agriculture deny that? No, he dare not get up in his place and deny it. What was the result? One of the animals from Pilot Mound, in the North-west Territories, was taken to England and pronounced to be diseased with pleuro-pneumonia. That animal was taken from the very district into which American cattle were admitted contrary to the regulations, and when shipped to England, the English veterinary surgeons pronounced it diseased with pleuro-pneumonia, and the result was that our cattle were scheduled. Will the Minister of Agriculture

Mr. McMULLEN.

deny that? He dare not, because the records prove it to be true. The steamer "Winnipeg" went to England with cattle from the North-west, and on that steamer was found an animal pronounced by the English veterinarians to be diseased, and on the strength of that report our cattle were scheduled. Now, Sir, I think that these are very cogent reasons why we are justified in saying, that the laxity of the Canadian Government in carrying out the stipulated terms of the Home Government, has resulted in the present condition of things. Had the Canadian Government carried out the conditions honestly and honourably, and not allowed them to be violated, there would have been no ground whatever upon which our cattle could have been scheduled, and the farmers of Canada would be enjoying the advantage in England, of getting for their cattle, one penny per pound, live weight, more than they do now. But they did not do it. In the next place, to show the liberality of the Government, they agreed with the English Government that a servant of this Dominion should accompany every trainload of cattle from the time it entered Canada until it left Canada, to see that all the stipulated conditions were literally and exactly fulfilled. The Government thought so little of the farming interest that they positively refused to pay the salary of an official of that kind, and they would not appoint one unless the railway companies would pay the whole cost. The railway companies felt that the rates at which they were carrying cattle were so closely cut that they could not afford to pay for a guard, and they refused to do so. The result was that through the parsimony of the Government no such official was appointed, and they issued blank certificates to the railway companies, so that the name of the conductor on each train could be filled in as the guard of the cattle. Whenever a train crossed from Detroit, whoever happened to be the conductor, his name was filled in the blank certificate as the guardian of the cattle on behalf of the Canadian Government, simply because the Government would not pay the salary of an attendant to accompany the train. That is a fact. The correspondence between the Grand Trunk and the Canadian Pacific Railway Companies will prove the statement I make to be true. The result was that step by step the indifference and neglect displayed by the Government brought about the condition of things we have to-day; and, notwithstanding the eloquence of the Minister of Agriculture and his attempt to escape the condemnation which his department and the Government of which he is a member deserve at the hands of the farmers of this country, I tell him that he will not and cannot escape. Hon. gentlemen opposite have got to understand that, and no eloquence and no bluster that the Minister of Agriculture can use to

deceive and mislead the people will accomplish the object he has in view, as he will find out when he goes on the stump and attempts to explain this transaction. Our cattle trade is an exceedingly important one to the farmers of this country, and the advantages they enjoyed in Great Britain should have been preserved to them. And Sir Charles Tupper was in England—a man who has cost us personally \$16,000 or \$17,000 a year—

Mr. FOSTER. And cheap at that.

Mr. McMULLEN—to attend to that duty. But what did he ever do? The only thing he ever did was on one occasion. One morning, when a certain shipment of cattle arrived at Liverpool, he went there, and I do not know what he did—whether he felt the heat of their horns or their tails. At any rate, he got them unloaded and freed from the quarantine. And this single event has been trotted out on every occasion, season after season, to prove the valuable services rendered to this country by Sir Charles Tupper in protecting our cattle trade. But, Sir, we are living in an unfortunate time, the farmers of this country are suffering, and the responsibility lies at the door of this Government.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It has been well observed recently, Mr. Speaker, by my hon. friend beside me (Mr. Davies, P.E.I.) that loyalty is the last refuge of a scoundrel. What my hon. friend meant by that was not that a loyal man is a scoundrel; very far from it. But of all the mean tricks that can be played, to profess loyalty which men do not feel is the meanest, save one, and that is to impeach the loyalty of better men than themselves. Now, Sir, I have a word or two to say touching the letter to which the hon. Minister of Agriculture has made reference. Sir, that hon. gentleman had the assurance to state that I had slandered my native country—that I had issued statements which were slanders in their effect. It is not my habit, Sir, to shrink from the consequences of any word or act of mine, and I am not going to do so now. I stand here to-day prepared to justify to the fullest every syllable, jot or tittle in my letter to the "Economist," of the 13th of February, 1892. But, first of all, let me state to the House why it was that I was compelled to write that letter. It had come within my knowledge that men receiving salaries from the taxes of the people of this country were making use of the positions they had in England to slander one-half, and that the better half, of the people of Canada. It was within my knowledge that the High Commissioner's office was a mint of slanders of the vilest kind—slanders against his own people and his own country—slanders against the loyalty of men who, as I say, were infinitely more loyal to the Empire than those men whose acts have within the last fortnight disgraced Canada

as no other acts have ever done. And I am told by one of that nest of traitors—as one of their own colleagues described them—and what the hon. gentleman's own colleagues think of him, let the hon. Postmaster General (Sir Adolphe Caron), or the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) say—that I have slandered my country. The hon. member for West York has told us what he thinks about that hon. gentleman—and, by the bye, I have not heard that the hon. gentleman, with all his braggadocio, has taken any steps to vindicate his wounded honour, or to bring an action against the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean), or the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace), whoever it is. When he does this, it will be time enough for him to dare to talk to any man in this House of honour or truth or loyalty. Now, Sir, I will give the hon. gentleman and the House what I did say in my letter to the "Economist," and I will comment on it, sentence by sentence, so that there will be no mistake:

Sir, I have observed that there has been a steady attempt for some considerable length of time, in the communications published in the English press as coming from Canada, to misrepresent the actual economic condition of that country, and also the objects of the Liberal party in Canada in pressing for free trade with the United States.

So I say to-day.

As regards the first point, it is well known to you, and to your readers, that Canada has been engaged for the last thirteen years—

I might now say seventeen years—

—in the operation of trying to increase the collective wealth of the country by doubling or trebling its taxation.

Well, Sir, where is the slander there?

But it is not quite equally well known on your side of the Atlantic, that it has become painfully apparent, for some time back, to every one who has been at the pains to examine the evidence which has accumulated on the subject, that, even in that comparatively short space of time, this most ill-advised policy has resulted in a tremendous exodus of the very choicest portion of the population of Canada, and in a very grave depreciation in the selling values of farm lands and of town and village property throughout all the older sections of the Dominion, including Quebec, Ontario, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and Prince Edward Island.

Which of these hon. gentlemen will charge that as a slander? Is it the hon. Minister of Finance, who represents a county which has lost 5,000 souls, including natural increase, if not more, within the period of ten years? I should like to know, Sir, who will stand up here and tell us that the selling value of farm lands has not depreciated. I should like to know who will stand up and tell us that the value of town and village property has not depreciated throughout this Dominion.

This has been accomplished, as usual in such cases, by an immense increase in the aggregate indebtedness of the Dominion, in the shape of large additions to its federal, provincial and municipal debts, and also to the mortgage debts incurred by private individuals and liabilities incurred for the construction of railroads—by far a greater part of all which obligations are held abroad.

Who is there to deny that statement? Not our public accounts; not our municipal accounts; not the evidence of our loan companies. Again, I ask, who is there to deny the statement?

Mr. LANDERKIN. The Minister of Agriculture has run away.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Well, we can spare him.

Briefly, in these thirteen years there has been a great displacement of wealth, caused mainly by artificial legislation, but, as regards the older provinces, absolutely no increase at all in the collective wealth of the community.

That is my opinion to-day. That is the opinion I have justified times without number, here, on the hustings, wherever those hon. gentlemen have dared to meet me.

Two or three cities, and perhaps a score of towns, have increased considerably, and a few hundred individuals, who have been privileged to tax their fellows for their private advantage, have grown rich by this system of legalized robbery; but the great mass of the population, notably the agricultural class, are distinctly poorer and less prosperous than they were twelve years ago.

I said that, and I maintain that. The great masses of the people are poorer, and a few hundred individuals have grown richer. We have grown a few score of millionaires, and we have impoverished many hundreds of thousands of excellent agriculturists.

Mr. FOSTER. That sounds familiar.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I did not think my hon. friend opposite me (Mr. Foster) would be quite such a—it would not be parliamentary to say what I was going to say—but would be quite so indiscreet as to talk of this as slander. If it be, most assuredly not a word has been said here which I have not said again and again on the floor of Parliament, as the hon. gentleman well knows.

Take the returns of the present census. New Brunswick, with an area of 30,000 square miles, inhabited by about sixty thousand families, has added just sixty-one souls to her population from 1881 to 1891.

That was not a slander, but an underestimate, because I am informed that New Brunswick added but thirty-six souls to her population during those ten years, from 1881 to 1891, and, so far, I am willing to submit to correction.

Nova Scotia, with a population of 440,000 souls in 1881, has done a little better, having gained

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

some nine thousand nine hundred people in ten years, or rather less than one year's natural increase.

Is that a slander or is it the truth stated by our own census returns?

Ontario and Quebec, with unlimited quantities of unoccupied land, show an increase of perhaps 1 per cent per annum, being rather less than that of England, and that in despite of an alleged immigration of nearly 900,000 people.

Which of those facts does the hon. gentleman dispute? Do hon. gentlemen opposite—any of them—dispute the fact that, according to the Government records, we brought in nine hundred thousand people—I believe \$86,000 is the exact figure? Do they dispute that the Government returns show that the increases of those two provinces are less than 1 per cent, or about 1 per cent per annum?

In one word, if the assertions and official statements of the present Government are to be relied on, and these nine hundred thousand immigrants did really come to Canada, as they assert, what, between immigrants who came to Canada and who have quitted it, chiefly for the United States, and the loss of its own natural increase, which has disappeared in the same direction, the Dominion has lost not less than one million and a half of people in the last ten years.

Well, I believe I grievously understated the facts. I believe the loss of the population was far in excess; but I put it barely at one and a half millions.

As to the amount of taxation, the agricultural class has been simply bled white.

Sir, no more unjust system of taxation, as regards agriculturists, was ever inflicted on any people as that which disgraces, and will disgrace, probably only for a few months longer, the statute-book of Canada.

Mr. SPROULE. You have never been able to make the people believe it yet, to any great extent.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I have. If my hon. friend would look at the election returns of 1891, he would see that an overwhelming proportion of the agriculturists of Canada believed in and supported our policy. Where we were defeated was not in the agricultural districts. We were not defeated, in point of fact, at all, but gerrymandered out of our victory. We had a majority of the electorate, we had a huge majority of the agricultural electors. It was only in the cities and towns, where certain influences, well known to the hon. gentleman, could be brought to bear, that we suffered any defeat. I went on to say:

Over and above the taxes actually paid to the Dominion treasury, to be expended for so-called federal purposes, they have been mulcted during all these years, under the protective system, of at least an equal amount, which is either totally wasted or goes into the pockets of a very small number of protected manufacturers.

And so I say to-day. I say that I have

proved it again and again. If there be such a thing as an honest and intelligent protectionist, every such protectionist will admit, that it is of necessity the case, that you cannot have a protective system without taking a huge sum out of the people's pockets beyond that which goes into the treasury.

The exact amount levied, or, to speak more accurately, pillaged, in this way, can hardly be estimated.

Mr. FOSTER. I want to ask my hon. friend if that word "pillaged" was interlarded by him into that part of the letter?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is part of the letter. I am not interlarding anything. You may depend upon it that I do not shrink from reading or justifying what I have written or said. On that point the hon. gentleman can, if he chooses, bear accurate testimony.

Mr. FOSTER. I thought it was too good a word for the hon. gentleman to have missed.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The word represents accurately the effect of a protective system of taxation.

In fact, the Canadian tariff, which has been, in the most literal manner, dictated by the protected manufacturers,—

The hon. gentleman knows it, his predecessors know it, I can prove that while the men who wrote out this tariff were paid by the Government, they were paid more by the Manufacturers' Protective Association than they received from the Government.

—is so constructed that, for every single dollar paid into the treasury, three, four, five, and even ten dollars are taken out of the pockets of the consumer. Nay, in many instances, the tax is made absolutely prohibitive, so that the public are heavily taxed without any benefit to the revenue: e.g., the duty on sugar is now so arranged (for the advantage of half a dozen sugar refiners—

I do not see any of them here to-night. They are probably in Cape Breton.

—that the Canadian consumer is obliged to pay a tax of nearly two millions a year, of which only the most insignificant fraction finds its way into the public treasury.

I stand to that, and I have proved that. There is no possibility of denying it. That was the case until the recent modification by which a certain sum goes into the treasury, but the amount taken out of the public for the benefit of the protected manufacturers remains unchanged.

Taken altogether, it is well within the mark to say, that, while the present nominal amount of taxation of the Dominion is about thirty-one millions of dollars, the general actual taxation, i.e., the sum taken out of the pockets of the people for the benefit of the protected manufacturers, in addition to that paid into the treasury, is certainly not less, and is probably a good deal more, than sixty millions (\$60,000,000).

I say it is. I do not go the extreme length, although I do not deny what my hon. friend from North Simcoe, and his friends, are in the habit of giving us as the amount taken out of the public, namely, \$75,000,000 or \$80,000,000 a year. But I content myself with a most conservative estimate of barely \$60,000,000. Then I go on to say:

Such an amount of taxation levied for thirteen years is a very formidable burthen for a country like Canada to bear, and is undoubtedly one prime cause of the great loss of population, and of the immense depreciation in the values of town and farm property (with a few special localities excepted), which has been such a marked feature in the economic condition of Canada during the last ten years.

That, I believe to be the case. I believe that our most vicious and faulty system is more responsible than any other single cause—though there are other causes—for the condition in which we find ourselves to-day. And further, Sir—and this is probably what stings these hon. gentlemen, because it is even truer than the undoubted fact that I have quoted before:

It would be well if this were all, but, unfortunately, the economic results of the protective system adopted by Canada in 1879, grievous as they are, fade almost into insignificance compared with the moral and political pollution it has brought in its train.

And to that ten times more even than to my statement as to the economic facts I adhere to-day.

In this, as in many other cases, the indirect or secondary consequences of the fiscal system, misnamed protection, are even more pernicious than its direct ones. In the first place, by deluding the people into the idea that they can enrich themselves by increasing their taxation, the old, wholesome, natural repugnance to increased taxation and expenditure is wholly done away with, and the Government are encouraged to enter on a career of extravagant expenditure, which invariably involves, per se, a great amount of corruption in one form or other—as has been very notably the case in Canada.

As was proved up to the hilt in 1891 and succeeding sessions. Is there, Sir, one hon. gentleman who does not remember the McGreevy-Counolly investigation, is there one hon. gentleman who does not remember the terrible flood of scandal that disgraced the reputation of Canada throughout the world, and which culminated in this House but a few weeks before I penned this letter?

In the second place, by making it the direct personal interest of a considerable number of active business men, many of whom are wealthy, and all of whom have the control of large sums of money, to support a government which gives them a free hand to tax the rest of the community for their special benefit, you lay broad and deep the foundations of a colossal system of organized corruption, in the face of which honest government becomes an impossibility.

Is there one honest man in Canada who doubts the literal truth of that, is there one honest man who doubts it? Silence all.

In such a case bribery becomes a pure matter of business routine.

And so it does.

The Government gives the protected manufacturers power to tax the country for their own purposes, and the manufacturers, whenever called upon, assess themselves in whatever amounts the Government require, in order to enable it to carry the elections—

Cape Breton and elsewhere.

The thing is done openly and shamelessly by both parties to the transaction. Prior to the elections of 1882, of 1887, and of 1891, Sir John Macdonald and his colleagues deliberately called the protected manufacturers together, and demanded, and obtained, from them such sums as they deemed necessary for the purpose of debauching the electorate, pledging themselves, in return, not to alter the tariff to the detriment of the said contributor, which compact was faithfully carried out and impudently avowed.

And you know, Sir, that that was the exact state of the case.

The facts are too notorious to be denied; and it is to this deliberate conspiracy, on the part of the Government of Canada with the interested manufacturers, that the intolerable corruption which disgraces Canadian public life, is due.

I say that every letter, every jot, every tittle of what has been proved, and proved beyond the possibility of a contradiction on the floor of this House and elsewhere.

When the government of any country deliberately abdicates its highest functions in favour of a few selfish rings, and permits its Minister of Finance to become, in the most literal sense, the mere mouthpiece of the manufacturers' association, in return for the right to toll the proceeds of the robberies for political purposes, it is idle to expect anything from a government or a legislature elected by such means and under such auspices, except precisely the results with which every newspaper in England and the United States were ringing during a great part of the past year.

It is not merely the policy, but the fixed determination, of the Liberal party in the Dominion of Canada to overthrow this system at all hazards, and, after very full deliberation, they have come to the conclusion that the best, and probably the only really available method which presents itself for that purpose, lies in introducing a system of perfect continental free trade or unrestricted reciprocity with the United States.

Yes, and I say so still.

Mr. FOSTER. How about Mr. Snider?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What Snider?

Mr. FOSTER. Ask your leader.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Will the hon. gentleman be good enough to explain?

Mr. FOSTER. I mean the Mr. Snider who said that although he was a protectionist he took all sorts of grist at his mill.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. When my esteemed friend, Mr. Snider, comes here

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

the hon. gentleman will find, I think, that his views harmonize admirably with the views expressed in this letter.

Mr. FOSTER. Then he has an admirable way of concealing them when he speaks to the electorate.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Perhaps he has taken a lesson from the hon. gentleman.

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

After Recess.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. To the best of my recollection, Mr. Speaker, though I am open to correction, I had got as far as this sentence when the House rose: "It is not merely the policy, but the fixed determination of the Liberal party of the Dominion of Canada to overthrow this system at all hazards," &c. Before recess I had been explaining to the House some of the circumstances which had caused this letter to be written, and, as I had got so far, I think that, even at the risk of inflicting a number of pearls of truth upon those who may not appreciate them, I must complete the document in question, with your kind permission. I went on to say, Sir,—and to this I beg the hon. gentleman's attention—

Theoretically, no doubt, free trade with all nations would be preferable; but, practically, and as a matter of fact, free trade with the United States is vastly more valuable to Canada than free trade with all the rest of the world would be with the United States left out. Moreover, there is a fair prospect of obtaining the one, and none at all, humanly speaking, of obtaining the other—at least, within any reasonable space of time.

Mr. FOSTER. Do you hang on to that still?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I most undoubtedly do. I hold that, as the hon. gentleman may learn when he studies his geography, Canada is a part of North America continent, and it is a North American nation. Consequently what I stated is the exact and literal truth. I went on to say:

Canada, no doubt, had very great opportunities in the past, which Canada very foolishly threw away, of securing for herself a fiscal system very nearly as purely free trade as that of Great Britain, and also a very low rate of taxation; but these have passed and cannot now be recovered.

Sir, I will not stop to enlarge upon that; it would take me back into what has become past history. But I do repeat that in my judgment and belief very few countries ever entered upon the career of national life with the extraordinary advantages Canada had in 1867; and very few indeed have made such exceedingly bad use of them. I proceeded then to say:

In these circumstances, the two-fold problem which to-day confronts Canadian statesmen worthy of the name, is how to restore a fair measure of material prosperity to the great mass of their countrymen, and check the tremendous exodus now going on of the very choicest heart of their people to the United States; and, what is even more urgent, how to put a stop to the colossal system of organized corruption which is making Canada a veritable bye-word among English-speaking nations for venality and mal-administration.

Sir, it was with no slight regret that I penned those words. But I think that you, Sir, were in the Chair in 1891, and your memory will carry you back to what occurred in this House and in the committee rooms of this House in that year. You will know, Sir, that in making that statement, grave as it is, I spoke the exact and literal truth.

Free trade or absolute reciprocity with the United States will undoubtedly do more than anything else which can be devised with any prospect of success to restore material prosperity, and to enable us to keep our own people in our own country—in fact, as I have said above, in our present condition it is the one practicable measure which will do so, while as to the second object, it is equally plain that absolute freedom of interchange with the United States means a deathblow to every corrupt ring in Canada and, at the same time, by reason of the fact that, while it will immensely increase the general wealth of people, it will, temporarily at any rate, diminish the revenue collected under the present system, it will enforce an amount of economy on the administration which will compel them to be honest, even if not so inclined, and will make it out of the question to comply with the outrageous demands for fresh bribes in the shape of unprofitable and utterly uncalled-for public works and additional provincial subsidies, which are of continual recurrence as matters now stand.

And I am in the judgment of the House whether I at all exaggerated the state of things that then prevailed. One thing I think ought to be clear to all intelligent Englishmen, and that is that it is utterly impossible that Canada can prosper under her present conditions.

Isolated, and in danger of being still more completely isolated, from trade and commerce with the entire continent to which she belongs geographically, losing her population at the rate of one million and a half in ten years (if the official statements of the present Government are to be relied on), and subject, at the same time, to a system of taxation and of organized political corruption such as you have happily been strangers to since the days of Walpole or Charles II.

Now, Sir, if these statements can be proved untrue, I will retract them at once, but until they are disproved, I claim the right to make them, every one of which, remember, I have made on the floor of Parliament time and again, before this letter was printed. I claim the right of making those statements when and where I please, and that right I mean to exercise. And here,

Sir, I proceeded to deal, to some extent, with this same question of loyalty:

The Liberal party of Canada, and, indeed, the great bulk of the people of the Dominion, wish well to the mother country, and it is very far from their desire to do anything which, in the long run, can injure her interests; but their duty in the premises is plain.

Sir, that may be disloyal, if so, I would like to know where the disloyalty comes in. Here I lay down what I believed to be the duty of all true Canadians:

As Canadians, they must consult the advantage of Canada first, and if it be—as it appears to them it is, beyond all possible controversy—for the best moral and material interests of Canada to form a commercial treaty which will ensure perfect free trade with the United States, you, on your side, must be content to allow them to try the experiment. It is, and always has been, my own very strong desire that this measure should be so conducted that it might ultimately result in removing all possible causes of conflict between the two great divisions of the British race, and end in bringing them together in a firm and durable alliance; and (given only a very moderate amount of prudent statesmanship on the part of the English Government) I see every reason to hope that that end may be accomplished; but, whether or no, I see still more clearly that some very radical change in the position of affairs in Canada must be brought about, and that very speedily, or else that the Canadian confederation must perish, rotten before it has had time to become even half ripe, as the result of the vice and folly with which its affairs have been administered.

I have not deemed it worth my while to dwell at length on the dishonest and dishonourable pretense advanced by the late Sir John A. Macdonald and his fellows, to the effect that their policy of corruption and extortion was prompted by their fervent desire to preserve the connection between Canada and the mother country.

In Canada such allegations are treated with the contempt they merit; and in England the fact that those who make them are the identical persons who, in 1879, deliberately turned their backs upon the fiscal system of Great Britain, and deliberately adopted the system in vogue in the United States—with full knowledge of the results which would inevitably follow—ought to be answer enough to any one who pretends to believe that loyalty to England is at the bottom of the system of protection in Canada or elsewhere.

But, in truth, the question between the two Canadian parties is in reality an economic one, and, in the long run, resolves itself into this—shall Canada be governed for the benefit of the people of Canada, or for the profit of a few hundred protected manufacturers, backed by a subsidized press and purchased majority in the legislature?

To talk of loyalty in such a connection is little short of political blasphemy, and I can only express my surprise that such a shallow subterfuge should have obtained even a momentary credence in the mind of any Englishman of even average intelligence.

I have the honour to remain,

Your obedient servant,

RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT.

Kingston, January 25, 1892.

Sir, as I stated before recess, my reason for writing that letter and publishing it in the "Economist," where I knew right well it would come under the eyes of many thoughtful and intelligent men, was not to slander my own country, but it was to defend the Liberal party and the Liberal policy from these slanders which, in a double stream, had been for many years systematically hurled against them. That was my object, and that object, I have reason to know, was attained. Sir, I am not going to take my notions of loyalty from gentlemen who forge Her Majesty's proclamation to the Indians. I have a better warrant than that. Sir, if the hon. gentleman wanted to know how these things impress intelligent Englishmen whose opinions are worth attention, he might consult my Lord Grey's pamphlet on the condition of the colonies, published within a few weeks after this letter of mine was published, and they will see how my production commended itself, or did not commend itself, to the opinion of an Englishman of weight and knowledge.

Mr. FOSTER. It was eminently successful.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Well, have you got Lord Grey's pamphlet?

Mr. FOSTER. No.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Well, you had better get it, read it, and it will do you good.

Mr. FOSTER. You might tell us what it says.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. My modesty prevents me from quoting it, but I have no doubt if the hon. gentleman is desirous of getting hold of it, he can find it, though I do not know whether it is in our library. Now, Mr. Speaker, let me say this in conclusion. I want to give one word of warning to hon. gentlemen opposite. In my judgment, loyalty is a good deal like religion; those who feel the most usually speak the least about it. I remember perfectly well in my youth once hearing a very eminent merchant asked how it was that he was so successful in avoiding bad debts, and I recollect very well that the rule he gave was, that he never, by any chance, trusted any fellow for a dollar, without good security, who was in the habit of talking much of religion. Sir, these sneers at the loyalty of Her Majesty's Opposition are in exceedingly bad taste, and exceedingly to be deprecated. They are doubly a mistake at this particular moment. I beg to tell hon. gentlemen opposite that they are the very height of impolicy, looking to the general interests of the Empire. Were it true that Her Majesty's Opposition, who, as I well believe, represent the larger half of the people of Canada to-day, were disloyal, what chance have you in Canada of maintaining a united front? But, Sir, they are

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

very risky sneers for hon. gentlemen to indulge in. Now, I pass over their recent exploits, enough has been said on that subject. But I would ask hon. gentlemen, when they indulge in taunts against the loyalty of the Opposition, do they know any history at all—I do not speak of history in the large sense, I speak of the history of their own country. Do they know anything of Canadian history? Do they know anything of the history and antecedents of their most trusted leaders? Sir, who were their leaders, and what were their antecedents? Do they want me to review them to-day, or to state to the House all I know about the loyalty of the trusted leaders of the Conservative party? All I know about the loyalty of Sir John A. Macdonald, all I know about the loyalty of the late esteemed, and worthily esteemed, Sir George E. Cartier, all I know about the loyalty of Sir John Rose, of Sir Alexander Galt, of Sir John Abbott, of Sir D. L. Macpherson? Sir, gentlemen who live in glass houses had better not throw stones. Now, I do not want to stir up any ill-feeling.

Mr. FOSTER. Oh.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No, I do not. I deprecate all this rubbish about the superior loyalty of one side or the other. I am not going to accuse hon. gentlemen opposite of being disloyal because they tax English goods double the amount they tax American goods; but I do say that it is a queer proof of their loyalty. I am not going to accuse them of being disloyal, although there are people who might say that that is a very disloyal thing to do. Sir, I will tell hon. gentlemen one little story. I do not tell many stories in this place, but I think my stories can be depended upon, and this one occurred within my own presence.

Mr. FOSTER. You told a lot in that letter.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No, Sir, I told a lot of good, historical truth in that letter. But this is a true story that I am going to tell you now. In my early days I used to hear a good deal about loyalty, and I am bound to say that I had my prejudices like other people. I remember, in particular, that I used to consider Mr. William Lyon Mackenzie as about the epitome of everything that was disloyal. I continued in that belief for a considerable time, until, one evening, I was assisting at a sitting of the old legislative assembly of the two provinces. Sir, I recollect at that time that my lamented and esteemed friend, Sir George E. Cartier, of whom I always desire to speak with the highest respect, had just returned from a visit to England where he had dined with Her Majesty at Windsor. Her Majesty had bestowed very high attention upon him, deservedly, I think. Her Majesty had invited him to sing a song, but I never heard that Her Majesty repeated the request.

But on that occasion, Sir George Cartier returned to his native land, brimful and running over with loyalty. I remember he took occasion, or perhaps it was William Lyon Mackenzie, rather to twit my excellent friend on the subject of the latter's reception. Sir George retorted, as he usually did, pretty sharply. After the passage of arms, William Lyon Mackenzie told Sir George Cartier that he might have dined with Her Majesty and might have sung songs to Her Majesty but that he had evidence that Her Majesty valued him twice as highly as Sir George, and thereupon he took from his desk an ancient yellow parchment—and this was a genuine proclamation given in the Queen's name, signed Victoria R., and addressed to all her loving subjects—offering a reward for their two heads, £1,000 for that of William Lyon Mackenzie and only £500 for that of George Etienne Cartier. From that time I made up my mind that it was perhaps wise not to talk too much about loyalty, and I suggest to hon. gentlemen opposite that while we will not be in the slightest degree unprepared if they choose to cross swords on this matter, and if they want an historical discussion beginning with the date of the conflagration of the Parliament buildings in Montreal and going down to the present time, we will be prepared to meet them, it is not for our dignity, for our honour or for the welfare of Canada that we should continue to indulge in this kind of useless and unprofitable recrimination, and I do not propose to pursue the subject further. As to the matter under discussion, from which I am bound to say this is a little digression, though not an unprovoked digression, for I am perfectly peaceable when I am let alone, as hon. gentlemen may discover, I do not accuse the High Commissioner—with whom I will settle scores when he comes up from Cape Breton, if he ever does come here—with being responsible for the scheduling of our cattle, but I cannot help feeling that the Government were sorely to blame for negligence in this matter. I am afraid my hon. friend proved only too conclusively that we have been playing fast and loose with the regulations. There can be no doubt that very grave injury was inflicted on the people in this matter and particularly on the agriculturists. It is a matter of very great moment to us to retain the control of the British market. We were the only people permitted to send our live cattle in there. We have lost that privilege. How much that loss may amount to per head I am not prepared to say, but my hon. friend (Mr. Mulock) did not much overstep the loss when he placed it at a penny a pound depreciation in the value of our cattle, amounting to \$15 or \$20 for each fat ox.

Mr. MULOCK. It was the department's calculation, not mine.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Whether we are able to repair that loss, I do not know, but I am afraid that the door having once been shut, bolted and barred against us it will require more than the strength of hon. gentlemen opposite to enable us to re-open it, because the British agriculturist is ever ready to take advantage of any opportunity to keep out our cattle. It is the duty of the Government under these circumstances to bestir themselves, and take every possible measure to obtain for us a market which to some extent may replace the one we have lost, and I hope and trust they will apply themselves to that task with all diligence.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

REPLY TO ADDRESSES TO HER MAJESTY AND PRINCESS BEATRICE.

Mr. FOSTER. Before the Orders of the Day are called I wish to read a telegram sent in reply to the address of condolence passed the other night by this House to Her Majesty:

To His Excellency the Governor General.

London, 28th January, 1896.

Your Lordship's telegram of 26th January, forwarded to Her Majesty the Queen, received. I have Her Majesty's command to convey to the Dominion Parliament, on behalf of herself and Princess Beatrice, their appreciation of the kind message expressing sympathy in their sad bereavement.

(Sgd.) CHAMBERLAIN.

SUPPLY.

Mr. FOSTER moved:

That the House resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am afraid I must object to this motion. It is contrary to all custom and all rule that we should proceed to consider the Estimates without having the Auditor General's Report before us. The public accounts are of no value to us, and I will strongly advise the Minister of Finance not to press his motion. Nothing can possibly be gained by doing so except to subject hon. members to an unnecessary and long-winded discussion. The hon. gentleman himself will see that without the Auditor General's Report there is no possibility of pursuing the discussion of the items. If the Public Accounts were prepared in their old form, this course might possibly be followed, even though then it would be very unusual to go on with scarcely twelve hours' notice, for the Estimates were only laid on the Table of the House late last night, and hon. members on this side of the House have not had an opportunity of considering them. I have not had time up to the present moment to

look over them carefully, although I have a general idea of them; but the rights of other members besides the leaders must be considered. The chief reason why I object to this course being pursued is the absence of the Auditor General's Report, without which we are not in a position to proceed with the discussion. I hope the motion will not be pressed.

Mr. FOSTER. I would be willing to accede to the suggestion of my hon. friend if any fair objection had been taken, but I think he will agree that no such objection has been offered. I recollect that in previous years the House considered the Estimates the day after they were laid on the Table, and on one occasion without the Auditor General's Report having been presented.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In what year?

Mr. FOSTER. The year before last, I think. All I propose to take are the Civil Government Estimates, not including contingencies, and as regards those items the Auditor General's Report contains nothing more than may be found in the Estimates themselves. If contingencies were to be taken up or general appropriations for the public service there would be force in the hon. gentleman's contention; but as I only propose to take the Estimates indicated, his objection is not a strong one. I proposed last night to the hon. gentleman that we should transpose the order of business for to-day and Thursday, and I did so in order not to be met with the objection which the hon. gentleman has raised; and even now if the hon. gentleman will consent, we will go on with the private member's work, and I may then be allowed to make the motion at the end of the sitting to take Thursday for Government business. One or the other of these courses would be perfectly fair, and I do not mind which is taken.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. All I said when the hon. gentleman spoke to me was that I would confer with my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition on the subject, and let him know.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes. Does the hon. gentleman offer any objection to thus proceeding now.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am afraid from what my hon. friend besides me intimates—and they have rights as well as the leaders of the House—they object strenuously to the Estimates being proceeded with. I think the common sense of the House will see that we should have the Auditor General's Report in our hands before we are asked to go on with the Estimates. There can be no good reason for such overpowering hurry in proceeding with the Estimates without the Auditor General's Report being on hand, and it is not our fault that it has not been brought down.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

We have already been twenty-six days in session.

Mr. MULOCK. You must make allowances for the strike.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We have been here for 26 days and the House should not take up the Estimates without the Auditor General's Report.

Mr. FOSTER. It is not proposed to take one hour from private members.

Mr. MULOCK. You have taken Thursday.

Mr. FOSTER. Private members have to-day.

Mr. MULOCK. It is a Government motion we have been discussing.

Mr. FOSTER. Really, there does not seem to be anything strong in the objection, that we should not take up, simply, the items for Civil Government.

Mr. McMULLEN. I have been in this House, at all events, as long as the Finance Minister, and I do not remember that we were ever asked to go into Supply before the Report of the Auditor General was in our hands.

Mr. FOSTER. I remember that was the case one session.

Mr. McMULLEN. I must say that I have no recollection whatever of that having occurred, and I wish the hon. Finance Minister would mention the session. We are establishing a precedent for ourselves in this matter here, and if we go into Supply now, it will be cited at a future occasion as an evidence that the Report of the Auditor General is not necessary to the members when discussing Supply.

Mr. FOSTER. The House has always that in its own hands.

Mr. McMULLEN. I have no doubt the Government is anxious to get along, and we have no desire to prevent them getting along, but the country expects us to discharge our duty as members of the Opposition in this House; and if we are lax in the discharge of that duty the country will have the right to find fault. Surely, the Minister does not want us to go it blind in Supply without having before us the vouchers for last year's expenditure. It may be true that he will go into items that are voted from year to year, but nevertheless I object to the principle of proceeding without the Auditor's Report. I well remember on one occasion, when the hon. member for London (Sir John Carling) was Minister of Agriculture, we were in Supply, and the report of the Department of Agriculture not being down, we made the reasonable request that the items should be postponed until that was done. We sat all night and until 11 o'clock the next day, persisting in what we believed

were our rights, and the next morning, when the late Sir John Macdonald came into the House, he admitted that the Opposition were clearly within their rights in resisting the passing of the items until the report was in our hands. The report of the Auditor General is an important book, and forms the basis of almost the entire of the criticisms on which the expenditure of the Government are based. Hon. gentlemen should have an opportunity of studying it so that they may know how to deal with that expenditure, in the best interests of the country. It will not expedite business, if the Minister of Finance is disposed to rush us into Committee of Supply without our being in possession of the necessary information.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not want to rush hon. gentlemen into business that they are not fully qualified to undertake. As to this forming a precedent, the House has that always in its own hands. I only ask, to take up the Civil Government estimates to-night, in order to expedite business. Surely, having been here a month, we should not interpose any obstacle to the transaction of business, unless it is absolutely necessary. We are all gentlemen who have business to do; our time is somewhat precious, and the country expects us to do its business here. As to the Report of the Auditor General not being down, it does not affect to any material degree the Civil Government Estimates for the permanent officers of the departments. The Public Accounts have been before hon. gentlemen for some weeks, and they give the salaries paid to these different permanent officers. The Estimates, I ask the House to go into do not at all include temporary help where per diem allowances are paid, at irregular periods, and the like of that. There are no contingencies involved, and all the information regarding these items is contained in the Public Accounts. If the House wishes to do business, it can do it, and at no disadvantage whatever. I made a proposition last night which had an element of fairness in it, namely: to transpose the Private Members day for the Government day, taking the two Government days as Thursday and Friday, instead of Tuesday and Friday. Hon. gentlemen did not appear willing to accede to that, but I think they cannot fairly object now to take up that part of the Estimates to which I have referred. I would impress upon them not to continue the objection against the motion. When we go into Supply, all proper information will be given that may be asked for, and business can be done without any detriment to the fullest discussion, even though the Auditor General's Report may not be down.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Mr. Speaker, the hon. the Finance Minister will see that we are not both ready to pull at the same time. We were here early; the hon. gentleman called us together early; we met on the 2nd

of January. Many of us were denied the opportunity of making the first day of the year a holiday, as usual. The hon. gentleman brought us here, and he and some of his colleagues came to the conclusion that the Prime Minister was altogether incapable, and they kicked; and the business of the House was not proceeded with. The Speech of His Excellency was not answered. That was not our fault. The hon. gentleman was in no hurry. He was so little anxious to proceed, that after the Speech was delivered from the Throne on Thursday, we were adjourned until Tuesday of the next week, and if perhaps the adjournment had not taken place, the rumpus in the Cabinet would not have transpired. The hon. gentleman knows the rule: That Satan finds some mischief still for idle hands (and heads) to do; and the hon. gentleman and his colleagues got into trouble on that account. That is my hypothesis, but there may have been some other reason which the hon. gentleman is more familiar with than I am. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) was also told last year that it was very important to give the Department of Audit the small increase of salaries which was asked for in order that the civil servants might have promotion in that department. It was pointed out, that officers in that department worked longer hours than in the other departments of the Government, that they worked gratuitously for a very much longer time each day than they were required to work elsewhere, and that they were not likely to continue that practice, if the hon. gentleman placed them, as he has practically placed them, and as the figures I gave last year shows he has placed them, in a position of inferiority as compared with other departments of the Civil Service. The consequence of the course taken by the hon. gentleman on that occasion is that the Auditor General's Report is not yet before Parliament. We have been in session now nearly a month, and that report is not yet in our hands.

Mr. FOSTER. Recollect that we met a great deal earlier this year.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That is true, but that is not our fault. We were not responsible for that. The hon. gentleman himself is responsible for that. He must remember that this is the sixth session of this Parliament, and that we were called together for a specific purpose, and that that purpose has not yet been brought under our attention. Now, the hon. gentleman asks us to deal with the Estimates, and the Estimates of what year? Of 1896-97. I suppose he requires further Estimates for this year; and one would think that these would have been ready, at all events, as soon as the general Estimates which he has laid before us.

Mr. FOSTER. They never are, as a matter of practice.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). They ought to be. The hon. gentleman is more familiar with what he requires this year than with what he will require next year. Then, hon. members on this side of the House have told the hon. Minister that we require the Auditor General's Report in order that we may consider these Estimates with care. A great many suggestions occur to one in looking over the expenditure that would not occur when the simple Estimates are put before one; and I venture to say that if we were to take the course the hon. gentleman now suggests, there would be a very inadequate consideration of the appropriations for which the Government asks us. Now, I say it would not delay or interfere with the conduct of the business of the country if the hon. gentleman should allow his Estimates to stand over until the Auditor General's Report is in the hands of the members on this side of the House, and also in the hands of his friends; for I apprehend that hon. gentlemen on that side will be disposed to make this session a sort of emancipation day, and will undertake really the discharge of the duties that devolve upon them, instead of giving their minds a holiday, and entrusting the public business entirely to the Administration. That being so, what is the object of the hon. gentleman in pressing unduly for the consideration of these particular Estimates? It may be that when the Auditor General's Report is in our hands we shall be enabled to get through with these Estimates in a very short time. This has occurred to me, Sir, that last session, in fact for many sessions, these appropriations might have been very greatly diminished. I do not know how far the hon. Minister of Finance proposes to economise in the departments of the public service; but of this I am perfectly sure, that there is great room for economy; and, in my opinion, with the Auditor General's Report in our hands, we shall have an opportunity of considering and threshing out that question when we go into committee on the appropriations for next year. So I think the hon. Minister of Finance will not hasten the public business or facilitate the work of the session by prematurely pressing on the attention of the House the public appropriations, when the opportunities for considering them carefully are denied to us. I think he would do well not to press this subject upon us until the Auditor General's Report is in our hands.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Those who have taken part in the discussions on the Estimates during the past few years know well how essential to an intelligent discussion of those Estimates the possession of the Auditor General's Report is. I will venture to say that no man on this side of the House who has attempted a criticism of those Estimates has ever done so effectively without having had the Estimates for some time in his hands, and compared those Estimates

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).

with the expenditure of the previous year, as shown in the Auditor General's Report. The Minister of the Interior smiles, but he is at the head of a department in which he can appreciate my remarks, perhaps, better than he could anywhere else, because the Estimates and expenditure of that department are such as could only be properly criticised when the Auditor General's Report is in the hands of the members.

Mr. DALY. All that the Finance Minister proposes to discuss is the Civil Service Estimates.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I do not care whether he proposes to discuss the Civil Service or any other Estimates; the same argument will apply, though not perhaps to the same extent. You may enter upon the consideration of these Estimates if you like as you have a majority to do it; but both sides of the House will be so absolutely in the dark in dealing with them that you cannot get ahead, because information which members could get in advance from the Auditor General's Report they cannot get at all.

Mr. FOSTER. What would you get from the Auditor General's Report about Civil Government?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The expenditure in the departments, the promotions, and everything else.

Mr. FOSTER. I can give you the expenditures and the promotions.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) And the correspondence which the Government have had with the Auditor General from time to time with respect to promotions, which always appears in his report. I appeal to hon. members if that has not been constantly in their minds, and constantly brought out. Personally, I may frankly say I did not come to Parliament this session with the expectation that I would be called upon to discuss Estimates at all. I came here because I did place some reliance upon the official statement made by the leader of the House last session. If one can understand the English language at all, that language imported plainly that the House was being called at an early day for an important and a specific purpose; and if there was underlying the language he used a real, bona fide intention to give effect to his promise, then I venture the assertion—and I appeal to the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Costigan), who is looking so earnestly at me now—that if honest men, determined to carry out in fairness and fullness the pledge and promise they made last session, were at the helm now, this House would not have sat as long as it has sat without the Bill which we have been called to pass being in our hands. What did we come for? The hon. gentleman told us last year that he was going to call a session of this Parliament, not later

than the 2nd of January, for the purpose of carrying out the remedial order, by submitting to this House legislation to carry that order into effect. We came here for that purpose; and I say it is trifling with this House to keep us in session nearly a whole month and then tell us that we are not going to take up the remedial legislation at all, but are, instead, going to have a month's play over the Estimates beginning with the Civil Service. I tell the hon. gentlemen opposite that, so far as my personal opinion is concerned, I was at one with the policy which my leader propounded during the recess, in different parts of Canada. I thought we would be met, when we came here, with a Remedial Bill, duly framed. Surely when the hon. gentleman, last year, saved his Government from dissolution by giving a specific and solemn promise that the House would be called at an early day for the purpose of considering this Remedial Bill, he was in earnest. Surely he and his colleagues should have had that Remedial Bill drafted before the House met, so that as soon as the Governor General's Speech had been answered, the very first piece of legislation which the House would be asked to take up would have been this important measure. We were prepared to meet it with the policy which the hon. leader of the Opposition laid down, subject, of course, to some extent, to the terms that Bill might contain. But if the Bill contained what we were led to believe it would contain, namely, the proposition embraced in the remedial order—the remedy which they proposed A, B, and C—then my hon. friend declared that he would tender instead his proposition that a commission should be appointed to take evidence on the facts before we legislated. Hon. gentlemen opposite scouted that proposition. My hon. friend from L'Islet (Mr. Tarte) met their refusal of that proposition with a counter one. He said, in answer to the plea that that meant delay; take a committee of the House composed of leading men on both sides, let them meet to-morrow morning, let them summon witnesses, and get hold of the real facts of this case, before we undertake to legislate. My hon. friend said: If you believe that a Royal Commission means delay, then take a committee of the House and let that committee investigate into and report upon the facts, and we will be prepared to draw our own conclusion. I am aware that a certain section of members in this House, notably my hon. friend from Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) take the same ground as does the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Costigan). They do not want an investigation into the facts at all. There are sufficient facts known for them. The one will vote against any Bill, and the other is prepared to introduce a Bill without investigation. That is not where the great mass of members stand here. They look upon this

as the most important measure which has come before Parliament for many a day. They know it has features which are absent from all other legislation. They know that the measure, when carried, will be a measure which cannot be modified, amended or recalled. And this presses upon them the imperative necessity of having a thorough knowledge of the facts before they legislate at all; and the hon. gentleman stands here to-day telling us that he will not have a Royal Commission, and he will not have a committee of the House, and he will not bring down a Bill. In the face of his pledge given last session, that this session was to be called for that specific purpose, he now asks this House to indulge in the pantomime of going into the Civil Service Estimates and fritter away some days in getting some trifling information about them. Does he suppose that this session is to be wasted in that manner and that he is thus going to evade his promise? There are many members in this House—and I am one—who share the belief that such is his desire. There are many, and I am one, who share the belief that he wants to induce this House to go into a discussion of the Estimates and waste day after day and week after week until it is too late to bring down his Remedial Bill. He is determined to avoid any and every attempt to grapple with this great question. He will not have a commission, and he will not have a committee, and he will not give us the Bill; but, he says, in lieu of a committee or a commission or a Bill, let us indulge in a little Civil Service Estimate committee exercise. I ask if this is not trifling with the House. Is not this trifling with the people outside who expect him to keep the solemn promise he made. The mind of the Minister of Marine (Mr. Costigan) is settled as absolutely as is that of the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien). The hon. member for Muskoka says: I do not want any facts, I am prepared to oppose any interference. On the other hand, the hon. Minister of Marine (Mr. Costigan) says: I do not care if the leader of the Opposition has in his pocket a solemn pledge that Manitoba will legislate and legislate satisfactorily on this great question, by giving the Roman Catholic minority all they want, it will not suit me. I am bound to have this question carried in this Parliament, so that the legislation can never be undone. Well, Mr. Speaker, I warn that hon. gentleman that if that be his object, then, above every other consideration should be placed that of ascertaining accurately the facts on which you are going to legislate before you do legislate. While we might agree to vote for or against a commission or a committee or for or against a Bill, there cannot be, in the minds of business members of this House, any but one feeling, and that is, that in trying to force us into committee upon the Civil Service Estimates at this stage, we

are playing a farce, we are masquerading before the people, who have been promised this Bill, as men who do not mean to carry it out, or indulge even in the excuse of considering it. Will the hon. gentleman tell me if that Bill has been agreed to by the Council yet?

Mr. FOSTER. You would like to know?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Yes, and more than that, I have a right to know. I stand here, as a representative of the people, summoned by the hon. gentleman himself, to consider the Bill; I have been here nearly a month, and I have the right to ask him whether the Cabinet have yet agreed upon the provisions of the Bill. Can he tell this House when that Bill will probably be laid on the Table? The hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Daly), not many days ago, told us that we would have it in a few days.

Mr. DALY. So you will.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) How many days? What does the hon. gentleman mean by a few days? Is he in a position to tell us that we will have it down this week? Is he in a position to tell us that the details have been agreed to by the Council? Has the Bill been drafted? The hon. gentleman laughs.

Mr. DALY. We will make you laugh on the other side of the face when it comes down, too.

Mr. TARTE. Bring it down; let us have it.

Mr. DALY. You want a committee now?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman says he is going to make us laugh on the other side of the face. I do not know exactly what he means by that.

Mr. DALY. I am alluding to my hon. friend the member for L'Islet.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Is the hon. gentleman prepared to accept the offer of the member for L'Islet?

Mr. DALY. I do not change my mind as often as he does.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Is the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Daly) of the same opinion as his colleague (Mr. Costigan)? Does he endorse the language used by his colleague the other night that even if there was absolute certainty that Manitoba will legislate in favour of the minority as he would wish Manitoba to legislate, yet he will not let it?

Mr. COSTIGAN. That is not my opinion.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What did the hon. gentleman mean the other night when he said that even if the hon. leader of the Opposition had in his pocket a pledge from Mr. Greenway that he would legislate upon this question, he would not trust him?

Mr. COSTIGAN. No.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Because he could kick it over in three months. There is one only way, he said, to legislate, and that is to legislate here and now. Is the hon. gentleman prepared with his Bill?

Mr. COSTIGAN. If the hon. gentleman will sit down I will tell him what I am prepared to do.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Has the hon. gentleman got the Bill ready? Have the members of the Government agreed upon its provisions and when will this Parliament be treated with common respect and have the Bill submitted to it? Why, Sir, if it has taken twelve or eighteen months for these gentlemen to agree upon the Bill, is it to be thrown upon the House and are we to be asked to go into committee upon it the next day? Are we to have no time to consider the Bill? The idea is ridiculous. The hon. gentlemen instead of pressing us into committee would do better to adjourn the House and let them meet in council and try to settle the details of the Bill which, public rumour says, have not yet been agreed upon. I will not detain the House any longer inasmuch the hon. Minister of Marine (Mr. Costigan) says that he will enlighten us upon the details of the Bill and whether they have agreed upon it.

Mr. FOSTER. He did not say any such thing.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. leader of the House may have learned many things, but there is one thing he has yet to learn and that is that members on this side very much prefer to take the statement of his colleagues for what they think and what they intend to do, and what they have said, rather than his statement. The hon. gentleman has quite enough to do to speak for himself. I heard what the hon. Minister of Marine said quite as well as the leader of the House did.

Mr. FOSTER. What did he say?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I have told you what he said. And, as the hon. gentleman has told us that if I would sit down he would give us the information, I will sit down and receive the information with great pleasure; and I hope that when the hon. gentleman speaks it will be to give us such information as will lead us to believe that this wretched Bill that they have been disputing over so long is so far advanced in preparation that we shall have reasonable grounds for believing that it will be in our hands within a few days.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman has not surprised me at all, nor do I think he has surprised any one in this House who has been accustomed to listen to him address the House upon any important question. First, he says he came here

never expecting to have to consider the question of Estimates at all; he came here to attend a special meeting of this Parliament called for a special purpose, called, as he says, after a solemn pledge given by the Government that this session was to be called for a special purpose not later than the 2nd of January. The country understood that that was a solemn pledge, and that pledge was to be kept, though the hon. gentleman and his friends did not believe it.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Hear, hear.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Still, they have learned that there was no reason for their want of faith.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Does the hon. gentleman not think that we have ample reason in the resignation of the seven bolters or seven traitors?

Mr. COSTIGAN. I am not going to attempt to interpret the hon. gentleman's opinions or conclusions. But I want to give him information upon this point that he dealt with—that this session of Parliament was called for a special purpose after a special and solemn pledge that Parliament should meet not later than the 2nd of January. Now, is there anything inconsistent with the giving of that pledge in Parliament being assembled about the ordinary time of the year—for the session opened only a little earlier than usual—is there anything inconsistent with it in the Estimates and other business before Parliament, being taken up? The hon. gentleman's friends have stated that the calling of Parliament at this time for a sixth time was throwing upon the country an extraordinary expense. That would be correct if the hon. gentleman's views could be carried out and no business but the special business of remedial legislation taken up at this session, making it necessary that another session should be called to pass the supplies and do the other business of a regular session. In that case an additional expense would be thrown upon the country. But if the ordinary business of the country be carried on along with the remedial legislation which is promised under certain circumstances to be carried out, the country is put to no inconvenience and no additional expense. The hon. gentleman said that he would take his seat for the reason—and his friends laughed because his statement was contradicted by my hon. colleague here (Mr. Foster)—that I was to enlighten him as to the details of the Bill.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) As to whether you had agreed upon the details of the Bill.

Mr. COSTIGAN. That is not what I stated. The hon. gentleman was attempting to do what he often does, to put words into my mouth and to quote me as saying things that I did not say. I said that if he would sit down I would explain what I had said.

Now, he stated positively to-night that the other evening I declared that if the leader of the Opposition had a solemn pledge of the Manitoba government to grant separate schools and to give all that the Catholics required there, and even if I was satisfied that their wishes would be fully met, that would not satisfy me but that I must have remedial legislation forced through this House. The hon. gentleman did not quote me properly. I stated, and it is consistent with what I have said throughout, that there is only one way to settle this question. When I spoke on that occasion I was dealing with the proposal of a special commission as indicated some months ago and of not having recourse to this Parliament at all. I stated that if the school law of Manitoba was amended outside of or ignoring the judgment and the remedial order, as a matter of course it would not be worth anything if they changed their minds and wished to repeal the law. I hold that view yet. If the Manitoba legislature will, in response to the judgment and the remedial order give any relief by the amendment of the law, then they will be conforming to the judgment and the remedial order and that will be satisfactory. But, if they do not do that, any amendment they make in accordance with their own will simply, will be good only so long as they keep that amending law on the statute-book.

Mr. MULOCK. What is your opinion as to the remedial legislation here?

Mr. COSTIGAN. I want to refer to that. In certain newspapers on the Liberal side I have been referred to in connection with this matter. The "Globe," for instance, quoted—and quoted accurately—the unrevised "Hansard" report of my speech, which, however, I corrected as soon as I saw it. The hon. gentleman is correct in his quotation, but the report is not accurate, one word having been dropped. I will read the passage so as to set matters right:

If the leader of the Opposition had a guarantee in his pocket, and could produce it before this House, from the government of Manitoba, stating that in twenty-four hours from this time they would amend their law and re-establish separate schools, acquiescing in the remedial order, I say that would be no remedy,—

Mr. MULOCK. Go on—

—that they could kick it aside.—

Mr. COSTIGAN. I have read far enough to show the point I wished to make. What I did say was:

If the leader of the Opposition had a guarantee in his pocket, and could produce it before this House, from the government of Manitoba, stating that in twenty-four hours from this time they would amend their law and re-establish separate schools, not acquiescing in the remedial order, I say that would be no remedy.

The reporter left out the word "not," and I made the correction.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Do we understand the hon. gentleman as contending that if the Manitoba government were to acquiesce in the order it would limit their authority to legislate in the future?

Mr. COSTIGAN. No; that is the whole point I make. If they recognize the judgment and make an amendment in accordance with it, that would be binding and permanent and would be a recognition of the judgment—

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). And they could not alter their law afterwards?

Mr. COSTIGAN. They could, but the judgment would be standing in their face, and they would not alter it. They would have obeyed the judgment, but they could alter their law, of course. Why, the law in itself is not binding; capital punishment would be the only complete finality. You may obtain a judgment, and you may ignore it the next day.

Mr. MULOCK. Would the hon. gentleman allow me to ask him a question? In what way would the Manitoba legislature manifest its acquiescence, by legislation, and in what way could it legislate on the lines of the remedial order and not be acquiescing in it? The distinction the hon. gentleman appears to make is that legislation there would be satisfactory if they acquiesced, but it would not be satisfactory, though on the very same lines, if they did not acquiesce. What is the meaning of acquiescing, as applied to legislation in Manitoba?

Mr. COSTIGAN. I suppose the hon. gentleman takes the ground that any action they would take would be acquiescing. Prominent gentlemen opposite indicate that one of the first acts they would perform if they came into power, would be to repeal this remedial order. Then, of course, in that case there would be no remedial order to obey. The judgment would have been ignored by this Parliament, and then you would be in the position I was picturing to myself, that if the legislature passed a law, it would not be in obedience to that judgment, or the remedial order, and it would not be binding. That is all I need say on this point.

Mr. MARTIN. How is it binding? Supposing the Manitoba legislature did pass a law, as you say, acquiescing in the judgment of the Privy Council and the remedial order, how is that binding on Manitoba? Could not they repeal it the next day.

Mr. COSTIGAN. It is just as binding as the acknowledgment by any act of legislation.

Mr. MARTIN. Just as binding as if there were no remedial order, and no more so.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I will not undertake to discuss the question in that manner with

Mr. COSTIGAN.

the hon. gentleman. My position has been very plain, and I think the hon. member for Winnipeg can understand it. The hon. gentleman who just sat down, and who put this question to me, knows himself what my position is after I made that statement as to what my opinion would be if any remedy were given outside of remedial legislation by this Parliament, by an amendment by the local legislature itself in obedience to a judgment and the remedial order. He knows it very well, because he interrupted me that night and said: then you do not want Manitoba to take action? I replied: the hon. gentleman knows, and this House knows, that we have repeatedly expressed our great desire that they should legislate themselves. What better proof do you want of the position I took upon that question? I have only this to add, that all those who feel interested in that measure, now that Manitoba has refused to act, and thrown the responsibility upon this Parliament, must feel greatly encouraged by the attitude of the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies). There can be no doubt as to the anxiety of the hon. gentleman to see that Bill brought down. He has shaken his fist at my hon. friend the leader of the House, and told him that he shall not escape the pledge made to Parliament to bring down that Bill. No, Sir, the hon. member for Queen's is here to see that that pledge is carried out in good faith, and that a remedial Bill is brought down. Well, I congratulate the hon. gentleman upon the new stand he has taken. It is one that will be well received in his own province. There is another thing about it that I see strange. The hon. gentleman says that this session was called expressly for the purpose of bringing forward that measure and dealing with it.

Mr. MULOCK. That is the announcement you made in July last.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I would sooner listen to the hon. gentleman while he was standing upon his feet. I say that the hon. gentleman has taken the ground that this session has been called expressly to pass that measure, and he is now hurling complaints against the Government because their Bill is not down and printed. He says, bring it down, you are delaying it, and you are not going to leave yourselves time enough to carry this Bill through this session. He then turns around, and in the same breath tells us that as soon as we get the Bill down he will take the ground that was taken by the leader of the Opposition, he will call for a committee to summon witnesses from the north and from the south, from the east and from the west. What for? To extend the time, to give us a better opportunity of carrying it through? Not at all, but to make delay. He charges us now that we are delaying it and losing time by not bringing down this measure, that it should have been laid on the Table at the

opening of the session ; at the same time, however, he speaks of a commission of inquiry to bring evidence here. There is no consistency at all about the hon. gentleman's position. All I can say is that the hon. gentleman has no right to complain. The Bill, I think, will be introduced in good time.

Mr. MARTIN. When ? You "think" it will be down.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Well, my thinking is better than the predictions of some of the hon. gentlemen on that side. I say I think it will be introduced, and I believe it.

Mr. EDGAR. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to ask a question ? Has the hon. gentleman to-night been elucidating the views of the Home Government, or only his own personal views ?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Well, I think I will be content with stating that I am elucidating my own views. I tried to explain them to the hon. member for Queen's, and if I undertook to go further I would have, perhaps, the same difficulty, because, having explained it to him, perhaps it might not be intelligible to the hon. gentleman who first spoke.

Mr. SPROULE. Which one of them represents the views of the party ?

Mr. COSTIGAN. All this must seem strange to the outside world who have followed the course of both parties on this question, and who have followed the course of the Opposition, especially since last session, and especially during the by-elections that have taken place. There is no doubt that the people of Canada were led to understand that the Opposition were opposed to any measure of remedial legislation whatever. There was no doubt at all about that, and the Opposition took very strong grounds to persuade the people to that view. There was a little manoeuvring, and the party divided in two. From the very first the "Globe" and the English wing of the Liberal party took straight ground against remedial legislation, or any interference with provincial rights. But up to the time of the Verchères election and the Antigonish election, the Liberal party in Quebec did not take that ground at all. The Liberal party in Quebec held to the ground that remedial legislation was justified, was necessary, and in case of a refusal by Manitoba to legislate, they pledged their candidates in both these elections to support remedial legislation. That was the ground taken by the Liberal party in Quebec. They got bolder after these elections. When the election came on in North Ontario they found a candidate willing to come out and declare that he was against the policy of the Government generally, and against the policy of coercion, as he called it, or interference with the provincial rights of the province of Manitoba. We had then the Liberal party all through

Quebec and Ontario declaring that there was only one way to settle that question, and that was through Mr. Laurier himself, and they promised that if he came into power he would exercise his influence with the provincial government to settle that matter, and that it could not possibly be settled otherwise. Well, the Conservatives have tried to get a settlement through the provincial legislature. The Conservative party have failed in that ; they have not been able to bring perhaps the same influence to bear on the Manitoba legislature and the provincial government that hon. gentlemen opposite could do. But we are dealing with a constitutional question, and if there is an influence between the Liberal party of Canada and the Liberal party of Manitoba of a nature that enabled them to remove that question from Dominion politics and settle it, then it was carrying politics too far if they could have settled it and did not settle it, when both parties agreed that it would be better to settle the question in the provincial legislature. Now it has come to this Parliament, and hon. gentlemen opposite, some of them at all events have shown it in their speeches, have changed their attitude upon it. It is not a question now of coercing Manitoba ; it is a question, why do you not come down with the Remedial Bill ? Hon. gentlemen opposite have not been such strong advocates of remedial legislation up to the present time that the country will be of opinion that they should take charge of it. The Bill will be brought down.

An hon. MEMBER. When ?

Mr. COSTIGAN. The Bill will be considered, and it will be carried, with the co-operation of many of our friends opposite who believe in doing justice to the minority. I really believe there is a pretty strong feeling among some of the hon. gentlemen who are so fond of interrupting me that it is a source of great disappointment to them, judging from what they have been howling through the country, describing the Conservative party as traitors to their pledges, to find that our pledges are going to be redeemed and kept, and that fact, I say, is disappointing a great many hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. TISDALE. No doubt the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davies) in private life believes in saying what he pleases, but I am afraid his memory is defective, judged by the statements he has made to-night. He has stated that the leader of the House last session in the course of his statement said, first, that this was to be a special session for the purpose of carrying remedial legislation ; and in the second place, that a Bill would be brought in immediately on the assembling of the House. There is no evidence like written evidence, and hon. gentlemen opposite should not assume to

make statements without refreshing their memories as to the facts or quoting the words uttered. I will read to the House the statement made by the leader last session, and I will leave it to hon. members to decide whether the assertions made by the hon. gentleman opposite are in harmony with the statement made by my leader. Mr. Foster said :

The reply of the Manitoba legislature to the remedial order of the 21st March, 1895, and, after careful deliberation, has arrived at the following conclusion :—Though there may be differences of opinion as to the exact meaning of the reply in question, the Government believes that it may be interpreted as holding out some hope of an amicable settlement of the Manitoba school question on the basis of possible action by the Manitoba government and legislature ; and the Dominion Government is most unwilling to take any action which can be interpreted as forestalling or precluding such a desirable consummation. The Government has also considered the difficulties to be met with in preparing and perfecting legislation on so important and intricate a question during the last hours of the session. The Government has, therefore, decided not to ask Parliament to deal with remedial legislation during the present session. A communication will be sent immediately to the Manitoba government on the subject, with a view to ascertaining whether that government is disposed to make a settlement of the question which will be reasonably satisfactory to the minority of that province, without making it necessary to call into requisition the powers of the Dominion Parliament. A session of the present Parliament will be called together to meet not later than the first Thursday of January next. If by that time the Manitoba government fails to make a satisfactory arrangement to remedy the grievance of the minority, the Dominion Government will be prepared at the next session of Parliament, to be called, as above stated, to introduce and press to a conclusion such legislation as will afford an adequate measure of relief to the said minority, based upon the lines of the judgment of the Privy Council, and the remedial order of the 21st March, 1895.

There is not a word there which can be held to convey any intimation that it was to be a special session or that remedial legislation while it was a most important question, would be brought down at the opening of the session. The hon. member for Queen's is unfair, and I regret to have to say that when he has an object to serve, as he often has outside of the discussion before the House, he works himself into a frenzy and seeks to cover up his meaning. I should like to ask him what the Remedial Bill has to do with the objection now under discussion ?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I will answer the hon. gentleman, if he will allow me.

Mr. TISDALE. I prefer to do my own talking, and I do not desire other words to be placed in my mouth than those which I utter, or a different construction placed on my words from that which they properly convey. The hon. gentleman opposite is fond of appealing to members of the House as

Mr. TISDALE.

business men. I do not like the hon. gentleman pretend to be an orator, but I endeavour to attend to the business of the House and endeavour to further it. The question before the House for discussion is that raised by the hon. member for South Oxford, who is the only man of financial capacity on the other side of the House, and the objection taken by him was that the Estimates should not be considered in the absence of the Auditor General's Report.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I rise to a point of order. The hon. member for Oxford did not speak on the motion—he was not in his place. The hon. gentleman spoke on a different motion during the afternoon.

Mr. TISDALE. I am not speaking of the afternoon. I am speaking of the motion before the House now, and whether we should go into Supply.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. member for Oxford did not speak on this motion.

Mr. FOSTER. He spoke twice on it.

Mr. TISDALE. The hon. member for Oxford contended that in all fairness—and there was a great deal in the point—the House should not be called upon to discuss the Estimates without having the Auditor General's Report before it. The hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) rose and said that what he had to complain of in regard to the proposal to go into Supply was, that the Government had not brought in remedial legislation ? That was not at all the question before the House. I may say to the hon. gentleman that I will not allow myself to be talked down by him, although he is an older member and a leader on his side of the House, while I am one of the rank and file of the Conservative party. But the hon. member too frequently lectures hon. members on this side of the House. I may say that I do not support interruptions made from my own side of the House, and at all events I do not think it tends to maintain a proper feeling in the House if hon. members, particularly leaders, are frequently interrupting hon. gentlemen who do not address or occupy the time of the House very frequently. There is something in the point made by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), as to whether it is fair to take up any part of the Estimates in the absence of the Auditor General's Report ; but the hon. gentleman from Queen's (Mr. Davies) took another line of argument, and he said not a word on the issue before the House.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) That is not correct.

Mr. TISDALE. The hon. gentleman from Queen's (Mr. Davies) raised altogether a new point, and a point which I submit was not pertinent to the question of whether or not it was proper to take up the Estimates now. Either the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davies) has put the member for

South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) in the position of merely talking for the purpose of delaying the business of the House, or else he has taken up a question not relevant to the issue for the purpose of delay. Let me ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davies) did he speak simply because he did not want to consider the Estimates which is essentially the business part of our duties in Parliament. I think I remember hearing a very long speech from him the other night on this very remedial question, and I again ask, why did he bring it up again if not to delay business? Are the members of the Opposition going to follow their financial leader, and discuss the question as to whether we should take up the Estimates or not, or do they propose simply to make irrelevant speeches for the purpose of delay. If it means that we are not going to have any Estimates passed until the Remedial Bill is brought down, then, do not let the hon. member (Mr. Davies) put words into the mouth of the leader of the House, which "Hansard" shows that hon. gentleman never uttered, or never promised. I venture to say that outside of this House, not to speak of the members in this House, no one ever dreamt that Parliament was called together simply for that one purpose. I believe that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davies) himself, upon reflection, will agree with me, that it never entered into his mind that the House was called for one special purpose, and for that purpose alone. He knows very well that the Government would be derelict in its duty if it called Parliament without allowing Parliament to transact the financial business, a proceeding which would necessitate calling another session. The speech of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davies) was calculated to mislead the members of the House, and the people in the country, or else to delay the discussion of business; and from my standpoint—he knows better than I—I think I am justified in saying that he never touched the real question at issue at all.

Mr. MULOCK. I am somewhat surprised at the concluding portion of the remarks of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Tisdale). As an old parliamentarian he should recognize the impropriety of assigning to hon. members motives not warranted by the plain interpretation of their words. Sir, two objections have been offered to the motion to go into Supply; and both objections are good, although one goes to the root of the whole question. The first objection was that we could not advantageously discuss Supply in the absence of evidence as to the manner in which our previous vote has been expended. That is so manifest a proposition, that I am surprised the Finance Minister should ask the House to abrogate its functions, and proceed to deal with Supply for the future, without having first audited the expenditure of the Supply of the past year. The Minister of Finance says that

all he proposes to ask is a vote for some fixed salaries. Well, Sir, I would ask, whether the voting of fixed salaries does not involve the consideration of other matters in connection with departmental expenditure? I should like to know, whether it is necessary to vote all these fixed salaries asked for. There are in each department, expenditures that may or may not be fixed, but the consideration of them is proper before we vote one dollar. The fact that the Government, with six months' notice that we were going to meet on the 2nd day of January, is not ready with their Bill a month after the meeting of Parliament, does give evidence of some extraordinary lack of administrative ability. But, Sir, apart from the objection which would be removed by the production of the Auditor General's Report, I take another ground. It is a cardinal principle that the House of Commons shall not vote Supply to any Administration that does not enjoy the confidence of the country. A Government that is existing by mere suffrance, and that protracts existence by manoeuvre, is not a proper Government in whose hands to place forty-one millions of dollars of the people's money. Let me ask, Sir, is there any evidence calculated to make us doubt, as to whether the present Government are the proper custodians of that vast sum of public money. In 1895, when this question became so critical, they, to evade its determination, evidently arrived at the conclusion of appealing to the country. The country was plunged into a campaign, and candidates of both political parties were put in nomination from ocean to ocean. Members of the Government were also put in nomination. Suddenly the Government changed front in the presence of the enemy. They came to the conclusion that they had lost the confidence of the country, but they feared to accept the verdict of the people and so they wobbled, and halted, and withdrew their forces from the campaign, and got behind Torres Vedras. They called Parliament together to deal with the Remedial Bill. The remedial order of March, 1895, shook the Government to its foundation. The then Minister of Justice, who had drawn the order, sent in his resignation. I believe it is pretended, that he did not send in his resignation, but, at all events, he went out on strike. He may have had a string to the resignation, and so he can technically say that he did not resign. But we are informed that powerful men brought their influence to bear upon the fighting ex-Minister of Justice, and, after a while, they succeeded in inducing him to go back to service. The Government, then, after acknowledging that they had lost the confidence of the country, called Parliament together to do the thing that the Minister of Justice thought they ought not to do, to pass a Remedial Bill. They told their followers that they intended to

pass that Bill, if possible, and they called a caucus, and we have what occurred at that caucus, contained in an editorial of the Toronto "World." Last week, the Toronto "World" announced to the country that the Government called a caucus to deal with the Manitoba school question. Everybody knows, that if the Government is incapable of dealing with this question, the Government is dead; everybody knows that the Government cannot live one day unless they can redeem the pledges they have given to pass this legislation. And yet, we have it on the evidence of the Toronto "World"—which, I fancy, speaks correctly on this point, as I have no doubt it does on many others—that when this caucus took place, the Government asked its followers to agree upon a policy, but instead of agreeing, they disagreed, and it was found that they were wholly irreconcilable. The caucus failed to give assurance to the Government, that they would be safe in presenting that Bill to the House, and we have it on the same authority, that the Government adjourned that caucus, and pledged themselves that they would not commit the party to remedial legislation, until after a further conference with their supporters in this House. We have it, also on the evidence of that journal, that that further conference has never taken place from that time to this. Therefore, if that is evidence—and it has never been contradicted, and I doubt if it can be—we have it in evidence that the Conservative Government have not had the courage to confront their followers on this question, they have no right to speak for the Conservative party on this question. They have no right to say that they can control a majority of their followers in this House. On the contrary, they know that they dare not submit their scheme to this House and expect enough of their own followers to support it to enable them to put the measure on the statute-book. Therefore, I say that this Government are simply occupying the Treasury benches because they have failed to accomplish what they promised to do and what every one knows they cannot accomplish without the solid support of their own party. They have not the means or the backing in their own ranks to-day to enable them to make good their pledges to the country, and, therefore, there is ample evidence that they are not the proper custodians of \$41,000,000 of public money. Again, there is further evidence. The House met last March and remained in session till July; and, because the Government failed to redeem their pledges to their own following, three Ministers went out on strike. Two of them were brought back, and if that had not been done, the Minister of Finance would not be occupying a Treasury seat to-day, and the Government would not have remained in power for the remainder of 1895. They had to bring them back in order to retain office for a few

Mr. MULOCK.

months. Is this a Government with a majority of the people's representatives at their back? Is this a stable Government, entitled to be entrusted with the public money?—adopting a shift, a device, for the sake of clinging to office, and shrinking from discharging the duty for which alone they are there? The Minister of Finance, when he stood up in the House in July last and read the document on the faith of which two of the striking members returned to office—one of them, knowing that he could not be depended upon, remaining without—even the hon. gentleman's own following refused to accept that statement. The statement that was read by the hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) to-day, failed to secure the confidence of a certain section of the Government's own following; and it was only after a little play that took place two days afterwards, when the then member for Jacques Cartier stood up in the House and asked the Minister of Finance if he was going to stick to his words—it was only then that their followers seemed to be satisfied. Here is the question which was put to the Minister of Finance on the 11th day of July:

Mr. GIROUARD. I wish to put the following question to the leader of the Government:—Will the negotiations to be entered into with Manitoba, relating to the schools, unless they bring an acceptable arrangement on the lines of the remedial order and the terms of the judgment of the Privy Council of the 29th January, 1895, preclude or postpone the introduction of the remedial legislation announced in your statement of Monday last?

Mr. FOSTER. My answer simply is, they will not.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) made his declaration the next day.

Mr. MULOCK. Yes. However, there was evidence that in his own ranks the hon. Minister could not get a majority, could not get union, could not get agreement. They would not trust him, they would not take his word; they had to demand written pledges; and even his written pledge was not accepted until he was cross-examined on the floor of this House. Yet, with all these assurances, his party have reserved judgment up to this moment, and have allowed this Government, in a way, to hold on to office. So the Government met the House on the 2nd day of January, for what purpose? Now they pretend that they have met in an ordinary way, and, as a mere incident of this session, to deal with the Manitoba school question. Sir, that is not the verdict of the country; that is not the verdict of the press of Canada; and the country will be amazed now to learn that the Government are beginning gradually to put this question behind—gradually shoving it further away, with an evident desire to jostle it out of sight.

An hon. MEMBER. "Jolly."

Mr. MULOCK. Yes, to "jolly" it out of sight, and to "jolly" the party altogether until the life of Parliament expires. Is that the kind of Government we can say enjoys the confidence of the people? Is that constitutional Government? Is that the kind of Government which a party professing to have a monopoly of loyalty calls constitutional? Is that the kind of Government, Mr. Speaker, that should have control of the people's money? This Government, which worships the constitution, met the House on the 2nd January. By accident a gentleman in the public service, Sir Charles Tupper, the High Commissioner, happened to be in Canada. Reading in the public papers to-day, I find that Sir Charles Tupper has given an entirely different version of the circumstances that brought him to Canada. It was represented that he was here by accident—that the Premier had telegraphed him to come here to confer with him on certain public matters, not connected with the conspiracy to destroy the Premier. No doubt the Premier telegraphed for him, and I think it is equally certain that the Premier was advised to do so by gentlemen in whom he had the fullest confidence at that time; and when Sir Charles Tupper arrived here, he was amazed that there was any such conflict as afterwards broke out on the premises. But, speaking down at Cape Breton yesterday, Sir Charles Tupper said that he had come to Canada on the invitation of the Conservative party of Canada to take charge of this Government, and he was prepared to take charge of it. That is the statement of Sir Charles Tupper, which I place alongside of the contradictions given by the Administration.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the hon. gentleman give us his authority for that statement? I read the papers to-night, and I read something entirely different from that.

Mr. MULOCK. It is in the Montreal "Herald" of to-day.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. MULOCK. Well, I will leave it to the hon. gentlemen opposite and the Montreal "Herald" to settle. The Government met on the 2nd of January, 1896, to deal with this question. That was Thursday. Three days before that the public learned through the press that the Government did not propose to go on with the debate on the Address in the usual way, either that day or the next day, which has been the invariable custom ever since we have had a Parliament. I think—at all events, ever since I have been in Parliament. Never before can I recall an occasion when Parliament adjourned for a few days after the delivery of the Speech from the Throne, and before its consideration. Why did that adjournment take place? The country knows why. The adjournment took place because the Government had

found unmistakable evidence that they had lost the control of the country. Montreal Centre had spoken; Jacques Cartier had spoken; West Huron had not then spoken. But the Government learned before the 2nd of January unmistakably that they were usurpers in office. Under constitutional construction and interpretation, they are usurpers. They had lost the confidence of the country, and determined to change front by a change of leaders. They met on the following Tuesday—at least the fragment left met. Seven had struck, seven had gone out from office. On what ground? Here I beg again to bring to the attention of the Minister of Finance the view of the country—a view in which I entirely acquiesce. There is not a man outside a lunatic asylum in Canada to-day who accepts as correct the explanation read on the floor of this House by the Postmaster General (Sir Adolphe Caron) and endorsed by the Minister of Finance. That explanation is contradicted by the language of the First Minister in the other House. The First Minister (Sir Mackenzie Bowell) gave us to understand, in the other House, that the resignation of these seven gentlemen was due to their desertion of his policy of coercion or remedial legislation. Subsequently six of them returned and gave their explanation of their return. They said that they had withdrawn because there was a vacant portfolio; they said that in order to enable the Government to fill that vacancy, they created seven others, making eight in all. In order to enable the First Minister to fill up the vacancy of one, these gentlemen established their pickets outside this chamber, in the lobbies; and the foremost of the strikers to prevent the First Minister accomplishing what he ought to accomplish was the Finance Minister himself. According to public opinion, it was he who stiffened the backs of the kickers from time to time and prevented their enrolling under the banner of the present Premier; and yet we are asked to believe that these gentlemen are to-day representing public opinion sufficiently to enable them to command a majority in this House. If there ever was a discreditable exhibition under the system of parliamentary institution, such an exhibition was given when we came here. This Government has done nothing to expedite business; it has been obstructing public business since we assembled here. We met here for business, but the members of the Cabinet, by their recalcitrant conduct in office, have obstructed public business. They have been true to their pledges, and I verily believe that they are not one whit further advanced to-day towards a solution than they were last July. They know full well that they cannot carry on the affairs of the country one hour after their true attitude on this question is made known. Under these circumstances, I repeat that the objection to grant supplies

to Her Majesty, as represented by this administration, is a formidable objection. It is one that goes to the merits of the situation; and I maintain that if this House is true to itself, it will not allow the Government to proceed in this way until the Government shows that it has a working majority in this House.

Mr. HAZEN. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat commenced his remarks by a little lecture to my hon. friend from South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) upon the proprieties of debate. Everybody who knows the hon. gentleman from South Norfolk knows that he has just as keen and proper a sense of the proprieties of debate as any hon. gentleman in this House, and certainly more than the hon. gentleman from North York (Mr. Mulock), who undertook to lecture him. The remarks which that gentleman made were, in my opinion, unnecessary and gratuitously offensive, and will so be regarded by all who know both those hon. gentlemen. But there seems to be two objections taken to the motion of the hon. Finance Minister, that the House now go into Committee of Supply. The first is the objection that the Auditor General's Report has not been brought before the House, which was taken by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) and fairly presented by him. There might fairly be two views taken of that question, but it seems to me, that, in view of the explanation of the hon. Minister of Finance, that only such items will be taken up upon which no additional light will be thrown by the Auditor General's Report and concerning which he was prepared to furnish all necessary information, the objection might have been withdrawn and we might have been allowed to go on with business instead of wasting our time in useless discussion. And if any items should be reached concerning which it was clear that the Auditor General's Report was necessary in order to a proper understanding of these items, then they might have been allowed to stand. I desire to take this other ground, and that is that we must not admit, for one instant, that the business of the House shall depend on the course of the Auditor General. The Auditor General, it must not be forgotten, is not an officer of the Government but of this Parliament, and if we admit that we must not, under any circumstances, go into Supply or proceed with the business of this House until his report is before us, we may at any time be subjected to most unnecessary delay in consequence of our officer's dilatoriness in submitting his report. The Auditor General might be unable, because of indisposition, to lay that report before the House as expeditiously as he ought, or he might not be disposed, for some reason of his own, proper or improper, to proceed with the work of preparing that report with all necessary despatch, and yet we are to

Mr. MULOCK.

be told that we might be delayed from week to week and month to month waiting for that report and not be allowed to vote the necessary supplies, even though the heads of the departments were able and willing to give all necessary explanations. I think that is a proposition which it is not in the interests of this House to admit, and which we ought not to-night to agree to. But there is another objection taken to our going into committee now. That is the objection taken by the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies)—if I have caught correctly the line of his argument after disassociating it from the mock heroics and the many extravagances of language and gesture in which the hon. gentleman indulged—that we ought not, under any circumstances whatever, during the present session of Parliament, vote the supplies, or do anything else except deal with the question of the Manitoba schools, and that another session of Parliament should be called this year for the purpose of voting the supplies. In the name of the Canadian taxpayer I protest against any proposition of that sort. Now that we are here, why should we not go on and do the ordinary business of the House? Why should we not vote the supplies? Why should it be necessary to call Parliament again for that purpose, and put the Canadian taxpayers to an expenditure of at least a half a million dollars which is entirely unnecessary and can be very well avoided by our going on with the business this session and which we can do just as well this session as at a future one. The hon. gentleman says that this session was called for a special purpose, but he cannot from the pages of "Hansard" maintain the statement. As was pointed out by my hon. friend from South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale), the language of the Finance Minister, when last year he gave the pledge that Parliament would be called not later than the 2nd January, did not indicate that it would be called for that special purpose at all, but showed clearly that it would be called at that time and that, when so called, among other business to be taken up would be this question of remedial legislation, provided the legislature of Manitoba had not in the meantime, dealt with the question. I further say that from the language of the Finance Minister can be drawn no fair inference that the sole purpose for which Parliament would be called together this session was to deal with the case of the Manitoba schools. In order to emphasize that view, let me read what he said on that occasion. He said:

A session of the present Parliament will be called together—

Mr. MARTIN. What date was that?

Mr. HAZEN. This is on the 5th of July, and I am quoting from page 3997 in Vol. II. of the "Hansard" of last year.

—a session of the present Parliament will be called together, to meet not later than the first Thursday of January next.

His language is general.

If by that time the Manitoba government fails to make a satisfactory arrangement to remedy the grievance of the minority, the Dominion Government will be prepared, at the next session of Parliament, to be called, as above stated, to introduce and press to a conclusion such legislation as will afford an adequate measure of relief to the said minority, based upon the lines of the judgment of the Privy Council, and the remedial order of the 21st March, 1895.

I submit that there is not even an inference to be drawn from that that this was the special object for which Parliament would be called. And I would ask this House what good purpose can be served by delaying the business of the country and the work of this House until that remedial legislation comes down, the Government having given its assurance that it will carry out the pledge it made to the House and the country on the 8th July last. As I said before, speaking from the standpoint of a Canadian taxpayer, should this country be called upon to have another session this year, when Parliament can save half a million dollars to the taxpayers by having the work done at the present session? The hon. gentleman who last addressed the House, who poses as a great economist, should make some reply. There is hardly a small appropriation that comes before the House but the hon. gentleman criticises it, and complains of the extravagance of the Administration. What has he to say to the proposition that this House shall spend half a million dollars of the people's money in another and unnecessary session of Parliament, to do the work that could be done at this session. There is no answer to such proposition. Any one listening to the hon. gentleman, when he discussed everything but the question that was under the consideration of the House, could come to but one conclusion, and that is that the desire of the hon. gentleman, for some reason or other, is, as far as possible, to obstruct the business of Parliament. The hon. gentleman, towards the close of his remarks, said that it was not proper to vote supplies to this Government, because the Government did not enjoy the confidence of the country. On what does the hon. gentleman base such a statement? Since the last session of Parliament there have been a number of elections in this country, and two constituencies that formerly returned Conservatives have returned Liberals—Montreal Centre and Jacques Cartier.

An hon. MEMBER. West Huron.

An hon. MEMBER. Charlevoix.

Mr. HAZEN. I will discuss every one of the by-elections. Is the fact I have given any reason for saying that this Government does not enjoy the confidence of the country.

An hon. MEMBER. Certainly.

Mr. HAZEN. Some hon. gentlemen have contended that the fact that two constituencies that formerly supported them have returned opponents of the Government is a reason why we should conclude that the Government does not enjoy the confidence of the country. If that argument is sound, all I can say is that the late Hon. Alexander Mackenzie's Government should have resigned long before it did. Some hon. gentleman mentions Charlevoix. And what does Charlevoix prove? In 1891, a Liberal was returned in that constituency by a majority of about 300 votes. Yesterday a Liberal was returned by a majority of less than half that number. If that proves anything, it proves that there are more electors in Charlevoix who believe in the Conservative party and the Conservative policy than there were in 1891. Some hon. gentleman refers to certain elections in the province of Ontario. Surely he does not refer to the county of Cardwell, where the Liberal candidate did not even save his deposit. Surely he does not refer to North Ontario, where the Liberal candidate came within forty votes of losing his deposit. Surely the gentlemen opposite do not say that the result in West Huron, represented by my hon. friend (Mr. Cameron), who was introduced the other day, shows that the Government has lost the confidence of the country, when that hon. gentleman's majority is less than it was in 1891, though it is true that the county was since carried in a by-election by a gentleman who had the advantage of being a Minister of the Crown, and therefore had greater prestige.

Mr. MARTIN. If the hon. gentleman is pressing that argument, he had better refer to the election in Victoria, B.C.

Mr. HAZEN. I can readily understand that the election in Victoria is a sore point with the hon. member for Winnipeg. He travelled thousands of miles in order to take part in that election. He told the people of Victoria that this Government should be removed from office because of its attitude on the Manitoba school question. In a thoroughly Protestant constituency he made the fight along that line, and he had a number of circumstances in his favour. It was at the time of the ministerial crisis, and one of the reasons that cut down the majority of the hon. Controller of Inland Revenue (Mr. Prior) was the fact that telegrams were sent from Ottawa and spread broadcast throughout the city of Victoria, and throughout the whole constituency, that the Government had resigned, and that Mr. Laurier had been sent for. Everything helped the hon. gentleman. But his candidate was defeated. I think the hon. gentleman should hardly quote that constituency as an evidence that the Government has lost the confidence of the country.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). What about giving the Controller a seat in the Cabinet. The hon. gentleman has omitted that point.

Mr. HAZEN. The reasons that influenced the Government to give the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Prior) a seat in the Cabinet are not known to me. But, from my own standpoint, I think it is only proper and right that the gentleman who fills the important position of head of the Inland Revenue Department should have a seat in the Cabinet in order to be able to deal there with the management of the department. And I think the hon. gentleman is one who will bring no discredit upon the office he has been called upon to fill. The hon. gentleman who last addressed the House stated that the Conservative party were within the lines of Torres Vedras. I would remind the hon. gentleman of the axiom of natural philosophy that no two bodies can occupy the same space at the same time. According to the hon. gentleman's own leader, he and the other members of the Liberal party are within the lines of Torres Vedras.

An hon. MEMBER. We've got out of it.

Mr. HAZEN. The hon. gentleman says they have got out of it. I defy mortal man who has listened to the speeches of the leader of the Opposition and the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies)—who, to-night, one would think, was the greatest champion in the world of remedial legislation—to say what position they occupy. It is evident the hon. member for Queen's, until he is compelled to vote, does not intend to give us any idea of the position he will take. Both leader and followers are, as they have been for months, within the lines of Torres Vedras.

Mr. FLINT. It is somewhat amusing, Mr. Speaker, to hear hon. gentlemen opposite complaining of the expense to this country through the wasting of the time of Parliament in connection with the transaction of public business. Gentlemen who have supported an Administration that has done nothing since the 2nd day of January till this moment, but waste the time of Parliament and the resources of the country in attempting to settle their own differences, certainly ought to be the last ones to complain of any little time taken up by members of the Opposition in offering legitimate complaints as to the position in which the public business now stands. We find that after wasting a month in quarrels, recriminations, in opposing conspiracies and forming reconciliations, these hon. gentlemen have not even yet laid before the House the most important blue-book connected with the business of the country. We find that we are called upon to discuss Supply, involving over forty millions, without the Auditor General's Report to enable us to discuss those Estimates intelligently. I must say that a more impudent proposi-

Mr. HAZEN.

tion, in my opinion, a more outrageous proposition, has not been brought before this Parliament by the present Government. The excuse given by the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Hazen) is, I think, one of the most shallow that could possibly be imagined. His argument is that the Auditor General is not under the control of the Government, that he is an independent officer, and that in all his movements from the auditing of the accounts to the preparation of the volume, the Government is entirely helpless in relation to him. Only last session, an entirely opposite position was assumed by the Government and their supporters in this House, and when the complaint of the Auditor General was brought before the House as a matter with which we should deal, these hon. gentlemen took a precisely opposite ground, and they argued with great force and ability, from precedent, from practice and from example, that the Auditor General was an officer of the Government, that all his movements were under the control of the Government. But now we find that hon. gentlemen are attempting to excuse a delay, by laying the blame upon one of their own officers. The Government were well aware that the House would meet upon a certain day; the Auditor General, as a servant of the Government, no doubt, was acquainted with their desire, or should have been made acquainted with their desire, that the accounts audited by him should be in possession of Parliament at the earliest possible moment after its meeting, and yet a month has passed away and that work is not before us. I understood the Minister of Finance, the other day, in giving some reasons why his work was not before us, to lay the blame largely, if not entirely, on the printing bureau.

Mr. FOSTER. I said exactly the opposite.

Mr. FLINT. Then, of course, I misunderstood him. At any rate, I think hon. gentlemen on this side of the House have a right to contend that the Government should have taken every precaution to have the Auditor General's Report before the House ere this, or, if they found it impossible, owing to the pressure of business, or owing to their own neglect in providing him with sufficient clerical assistance, the least they could do would be to delay going into Committee of Supply until that volume was accessible to members. Now, Sir, I understood the hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale), in his observations in reply to the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) to take the strange ground that the financial leader of the Opposition having raised a certain objection to proceeding with Supply, namely, that we were not in possession of the Auditor General's Report, that alone should form the basis of objection, and that it was not open to any of his followers to take any new

ground. Sir, it only needed the statement of such an objection to show its own absurdity. Every member of this House has a right, and it is his duty, to state such objections to the procedure of the Government as, in their opinion, would really facilitate public business. Hon. gentlemen are perfectly aware that any attempt to proceed with Supply without the Auditor General's Report before us, as well as other reports which should be before the House, would in no wise tend to hasten the business of Parliament. There could be nothing but delay. Almost every item would require to stand over until further information could be obtained. The voluntary statement by a supporter of the Government that the Finance Minister would be prepared to give all the information in his power in answer to any questions made in criticism of the items of Supply, is entirely beside the question, because the Finance Minister has no right to be in possession of facts to which every member of the House has not equal access. If there are facts in the Auditor General's Report which are in the possession of the Finance Minister, these facts should be equally accessible to members of this House who desire to criticise the proceedings of the Government during the past year in order to compare them with the Estimates laid before us. Another reason which might be given for not proceeding so hastily with Supply, in answer to the argument against the short delay which might be occasioned in waiting for the Auditor General's Report, is the fact that we have not yet had the committees of this House struck for the transaction of the business of the House. The House has been a month in session, and yet hon. gentlemen are not aware to which committees they are to be assigned, and public business which should have been assigned to committees of this House is consequently delayed. It is a perfectly legitimate argument of the hon. member for North York that the signs of the times show that the Administration has not the confidence of the country, and it was entirely idle for the hon. member for St. John to refer to the case of Cardwell and North Ontario. Although the Liberal Opposition to the Government was not supported in those elections, yet the Government was not supported either. Did the people of those fine counties rally to the support of the Government? Did they show by their votes that they had confidence in the Government? No, Sir, the result of those elections, if not favourable to the party to which I have the honour to belong, was certainly very unfavourable to the Government. They showed that in constituencies where the Government, on former occasions had a majority, they had forfeited the confidence of the people. Now, this Parliament meets as a moribund Parliament, as a Parliament which has lost the confidence of the country, as shown in the by-elections

that have recently taken place. Parliament has not been called to consider the Estimates and to consider the finances, and these should really not be considered at all by this Parliament. If the wishes of the people were well understood, if the Government were to listen to the remonstrances of the people as evidenced by these elections, they would dissolve Parliament and take the sense of the people at once, and leave a new Parliament to deal with these questions of finance. I contend that the Opposition would be derelict in its duty, they would forfeit their right as honest critics of the Administration, if they did not protest in vigorous language against the indecency of forcing the Estimates upon the House in absence of the Auditor General's Report, especially in face of the fact that the committees have not yet been struck, in face of the fact that they themselves have been responsible for the long delay which has ensued since Parliament met. These complaints of delay come from gentlemen who spent three weeks of the valuable time of this House in attempting to reconcile their own differences. I think the spectacle is one which ought to make every Canadian blush, if he has any regard for the honour of his country. We now find an hon. gentleman contesting for a seat in this House under what, I think, every fair-minded man must consider false pretenses. From the very first announcement that Sir Charles Tupper was coming to this country until the present moment there has been a series of false pretenses presented to the people of this country. The first announcement made was that Sir Charles Tupper was coming to Canada at the request of this Government to confer with it on two important questions, the fast Atlantic steamship line, and the Pacific cable. Events which have taken place since have shown that these were false pretenses. Evidence is almost as plain as if it was written on the wall that the scheme which is being slowly elaborated was concocted before that gentleman left the old country for Canada. That is being made plain by Sir Charles Tupper's speeches on the stump in Cape Breton, and by observations made by hon. gentlemen opposite when they have the opportunity to address themselves to interviewers or their own constituents. Only the day before yesterday we saw in the public press a report of what was stated by an hon. Minister, and no doubt at a later date it may form the subject of discussion in this House. If there is any truth in the statement as published, it shows that the whole transaction was fully elaborated long before Sir Charles Tupper left the old country for Canada. The other day the Minister of Trade and Commerce met his supporters at the Continental Hotel, Sherbrooke. The report says :

Owing to the dissatisfaction expressed by many of those present, Mr. Ives gave a sort of explan-

ation regarding his recent conduct in the House of Commons. He stated that he and his colleagues had resigned their portfolios because they were sure Sir Mackenzie Bowell did not possess the confidence of the whole Ministry, and because he could not have commanded the vote of the seven dissentients on the remedial order.

If that statement is correct it shows that other statements made by Ministers were not correct. The report continues :

They had again gone back into the Ministry because, with Sir Charles Tupper as Premier, they would unanimously support the remedial order.

It seems, then, that the whole object of this conspiracy, the whole cause of the trouble was a desire and determination on the part of the dissentient Ministers not to meet the House or go to the country with the present Premier as their leader, that they had no confidence in him, that another gentleman had their confidence, but he was not a Minister, but a servant of Canada, and it was resolved that he should oust the present Premier from his position. The report continues :

He added, that the remedial order would be brought down next Saturday, and that it would pass the House by a large majority. He also stated that he and Hon. Mr. Montague were the two hardest working men in the Cabinet, favouring the remedial order. Mr. Ives did not explain why he and his fellow Ministers had gone back under Sir Mackenzie Bowell, nor why they would support the remedial order under the present Premier, after having resigned because he (the Premier) could not command the whole Ministry. He added, that the closing of the present session would see a reconstruction of the Ministry, and that Hon. Chapleau and Angers would be members of the new Ministry, and Sir Charles Tupper Premier. This last matter, said the hon. gentleman, was decided and was settled before the seven Ministers resigned.

This shows that there are still further developments of this conspiracy to be revealed. It shows that a prominent Minister of the present Administration is responsible for the statement that two gentlemen not at present in Parliament are to come in as Ministers, that we are to have a new Premier, and that, of course, some of the present Ministers must go out of office. Who is the hon. gentleman who will leave the Ministry to make a place for the new Minister for Quebec? I certainly hope it will not be my genial friend the Postmaster General. I sincerely trust we will not lose his pleasant countenance as a member of the present Administration, although it may not last for a very long time. So the drama is to be opened up again. I hope the hon. gentlemen will not long delay the performance because the people of the Dominion having become accustomed to this opera bouffe performance would be somewhat disappointed if they knew it was not to be continued until the farce is completely played out. Under present circumstances and in view of the fact that the Administration is not yet complete.

Mr. FLINT.

that members of the Administration have still to go out and new members come in, and there is to be a new Premier and a new policy, it would be highly improper and unbecoming that the Ministry should ask Parliament to proceed with the Estimates. When Parliament is asked to consider the Estimates, let there be a Minister responsible for those Estimates and for the carrying out of the sums voted by Parliament. This House is not prepared to vote \$20,000,000 or \$40,000,000 to men, some of whose names are not yet known as members of the Administration. We want to know into whose hands we are going to place this large sum, and although we have not great confidence in hon. gentlemen opposite, yet we want some assurance as regards the constitution of the Ministry to be entrusted with this expenditure. We have already shown abundant reason why the Estimates should not be forced on the attention of the House under the present circumstances. One argument is as good as twenty if it be a sound one, and our objection is based on the absence of proper information before the House. It is no use for hon. gentlemen opposite to excuse their own delay and incompetence by seeking to throw the responsibility on the Auditor General. I believe when the facts come to light it will be found that the Auditor General was ready with his report, but for some reason not yet revealed the report has been purposely delayed for the purpose of obstructing public business.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I do not propose to occupy much of the time of the House, but I think I should give the reasons for the course which I am about to adopt. It is asking a little too much from the Opposition that the Estimates should be proceeded with before the Auditor General's Report has been brought down. Last year, and during the previous year, that report revealed that large amounts had been improperly expended. Last year a large sum of money appeared to have been expended for blackening shoes and pressing hats, and for wines, liquors and cigars. We do not know what has been going on during the past year and how the large sums voted by Parliament have been expended. It is an outrage on the House to ask us to proceed with the Estimates before the Auditor General's Report has been presented. Who is to blame for the delay? What business have the Government to call together 215 members a month before they are ready to proceed with the public business? What right have they to keep members kicking their heels around the House for a month at large expense to themselves and the country? Yet, hon. gentlemen opposite now come and, in piteous tones, ask the Opposition to allow them to discuss the Estimates before members know anything as to how last year's appropriations have been expended. I think it is asking too much of the country. When the House was called

together on the 2nd of January, the Government ought to have been ready to proceed with the work, and if they had not their preparations made, they should not have called the House to meet until they were ready. After being here for a month, nearly, they tell us they want to go on with business now, but they ask us to take it for granted that they will spend the money properly. Well, from our knowledge of how they have spent the money in the past, it is asking us to take a good deal for granted. I have serious objections to the manner in which they have spent former appropriations. I believe that a Government that cannot run this country with less than forty-one million dollars a year, is not an economical Government, nor a Government that the people ought to trust. I am glad to see that there are evidences on all sides, and from all parts of the country, that this Government have lost the confidence of the people, and will soon be compelled to give place to their successors. Every single election that has taken place has been a black eye to the Government. They got one in Charlevoix, and they will get another in Cape Breton a few days hence. If they dared to open up the other constituencies they would find the same results awaiting them. Will they issue a writ for Pontiac; will they issue a writ for Mississquoi? Will they issue the writ for Soulanges? They will not, because they know very well that if they did, their policy would be condemned, and they would find that Liberals would be returned in these constituencies. Taking all these things into consideration, we should not be asked to discuss the Estimates until we know how the Government dealt with last year's supplies. Until we know that, I have, for my part, a decided objection to proceeding with any Estimates.

Mr. IVES. Mr. Speaker, I do not rise to take any part in this debate, but I understand that the hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint), a few moments ago, favoured the House with an extract from a recent issue of the Montreal "Herald," purporting to give an account of some remarks that I was supposed to have made at a meeting of my friends in Sherbrooke, a few days ago. I have read the item in the Montreal "Herald," to which I have no doubt he has referred, and, excepting in the particular that it exhibits a wonderful imagination in one so young as the Sherbrooke correspondent of that paper, it has no other admirable characteristic. It certainly lacks one very essential element, and that is, truth. Whatever I said in Sherbrooke was confined to a few of my friends. It was said in the parlour of one of the hotels in Sherbrooke, and it was said in privacy.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. After dinner.

Mr. IVES. No; it was not after dinner, and even in that case, my after dinner and

before dinner statements are not so much tainted by my dinner, as are the hon. gentleman's sometimes. What I said was to a few intimate friends in strict privacy in the hotel parlour. There was no newspaper reporter there, and whatever the newspaper reported, was reported out of whole cloth, and from an exceedingly vivid and not very scrupulous imagination. There is not the slightest truth in the "Herald's" statement. I never made any such remarks, and no such remarks could have been repeated to a reporter as having been made by me. I said nothing that I would be afraid to say here on the floor of this House.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What did you say?

Mr. IVES. Perhaps when I get ready to tell you I may gratify your curiosity.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ives) should not leave us in that sad position of uncertainty, as to what passed on that occasion. He said it all happened in an hotel parlour, that there was no reporter there, and I suppose the inference is that all reports of it that have got out may be somewhat tinged by a locality which is not conducive to certainty in the reporting of what has passed.

Mr. IVES. The hon. gentleman ought to know.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. gentleman does know, and I may say, that the Minister knows perfectly well. A locality in which private, or semi-private political meetings are generally held, in a tavern, is not the most favourable to exact reporting. But, we have had no denial of this report in the Montreal "Herald." The hon. gentleman (Mr. Ives) must have seen it, or must have had his attention called to it, and he has not denied it. Now, he tells us calmly and coolly, that he has no objection to stating here what he stated in the tavern parlour at Sherbrooke. He says he is not afraid to do so, but yet he does not do so. Is not that proof that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ives) dare not tell us what he said on that occasion? Perhaps he will not trust his own memory as to what happened then, any more than he would trust the reports of the newspaper correspondent. At all events, he is unable to tell us what did pass, after asserting that what was in the newspaper is not a proper report of the occurrence.

Perhaps the hon. gentleman's memory may be more trustworthy in regard to something else that he is reported to know about. Perhaps, it may be within his personal knowledge, whether he and all the other, or nearly all, or most of, the worthy members from the Eastern Townships, protested, and signed a protest against the elevation of Mr. Baker to the Senate, a promotion which was made under the gentleman whom he (Mr. Ives) at

present recognizes as his leader? His memory may be clear on that point. He may also remember, whether or not he stated that, unless a certain Mr. Foster got that vacancy in the Senate, he would resign his seat in the House?

An hon. MEMBER. In the Ministry.

Mr. CASEY. It was reported he had said that. Perhaps he will deny it, as he is in a denying mood to-night. If he won't deny it, then he stands, or rather sits—because it appears he refuses to stand—in the position of a man who has had a most tremendous dose of humble pie to eat, and I must say, Mr. Speaker, he does not look as if the humble pie had agreed with him. But, he must remember this, that men who will kick, and bolt, and try to wreck governments, will find out, if they have not got the backing to support them in that obstreperous course, that they must eat dirt, and the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ives) must have eaten his peck of dirt.

Mr. IVES. That is not the worst of it, we have to listen to nonsense here.

Mr. CASEY. That is exactly the complaint made by the hon. the Minister of Finance, of the state of things existing in the Cabinet, before he came out. He said they did not hear sense there. He may have been referring to the hon. gentleman himself when he made that statement, as well as to the Premier.

I say the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce has had to eat his peck of dirt and his humble pie, and, perhaps, a little bit of cheese with it; and he certainly feels very uncomfortable after his meal. He has not digested it yet, and I am afraid it may give him some internal complaint from which he may not soon recover. But let it be a lesson to him and to all kickers, not to kick when they have not the necessary influence to make their kick successful. The hon. gentleman threatened to go out if Mr. Baker was appointed; Mr. Baker was appointed and he did not go out. He threatened to resign if Mr. Foster was not appointed; Mr. Foster was not appointed, and he did not resign; but instead, he crawled back to his office and to the salary and emoluments connected with it. But can he say that he has crawled back to any influence, after the affront that has been put upon him? It cannot be said that he has. He finds himself sitting here unable to deny statements that impugn his dignity, unable to make any defence of himself, unable to do anything but sit there.

So much for the little interlude introduced by the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce. The hon. Minister of Finance, in proposing that you should leave the Chair, did produce something like argument, and it is with his remarks that I wish specially to deal. He tells us that it is not his fault that the Auditor General's Report is not down—that

Mr. CASEY.

it is the Auditor's own fault. Well, Sir, I do not know that the hon. gentleman can expect us to take his ipse dixit in regard to that as being absolutely infallible. There may be reasons, which he has not chosen to explain to the House, which have delayed the Auditor in making his report. In fact, if I were to judge from the opinion entertained of the Minister of Finance by his leader, the Premier of Canada, I would not feel bound, as a member of this House, to accept all his statements as expressing his sincere convictions: for what did Sir Mackenzie Bowell say in the Senate, when he was dealing with the deliberate written statement of the Minister of Finance in regard to his reasons for leaving the Cabinet? He said:

I might naturally, I think, ask, if these reasons were the sincere convictions of the gentleman who wrote them, or of the others who acquiesced in the sentiments.

The Premier, under whom the hon. Minister is serving, after the humiliation of his going out and coming back, has put on record in the Senate "Hansard," that he did not unquestioningly accept the statements of the Minister of Finance as expressing his sincere convictions. And yet the hon. gentleman expects us to take everything he says in regard to the delay of the Auditor General's Report in its pure and literal signification!

The hon. gentleman went on to tell us that an exchange of days was proposed—that this day was to be given to private members, and next Thursday we were to go into Supply. Well, Sir, that might not be such a bad proposition, if the hon. gentleman had carried it out. But, instead of giving this day to private members, he began it with a motion of his own, which led to a lengthened and heated discussion, in which he and the Minister of Agriculture and other members on that side of the House took up fully their own share of the time; so that at the hour at which he proposed to go into Supply, about 9 o'clock, private members had not had a moment of to-day's time. There had not been a single chance for private members to bring anything on the paper before the House.

This is the kind of proposal the hon. gentleman is in the habit of making. He offers to trade one thing for another, but he does not give the thing for which he wants us to exchange something else. He expects us to take the mere offer of that which is not given, as equivalent to his carrying out the proposal he makes. We cannot do it. We did not expect him loyally to carry out the proposal he made, and we are not disappointed. Then, he argues that it is necessary to get on with the business of the country—with the votes for Civil Government. I do not know that there is any hurry in regard to this. Supplies for this purpose are voted up to the 1st of July

next. We have been sitting here since the 2nd of January, wasting a lot of time in consequence of the hon. gentleman's own plots and conspiracies, and the disorganization incident to the breaking up of these plots; and now, all of a sudden, the hon. gentleman is anxious to get us to vote some money.

I would call his attention to the fact that, according to British constitutional practice, the redressing of grievances always comes before the granting of supplies. The hon. gentlemen opposite told us last year by an Order in Council, that there was a grievance which it was the duty of this House to redress. He told us in the last days of the last session that, although the Government were unable to remedy that grievance during that particular session, they would call an extra session, not later than the first Thursday of January, for the express purpose of remedying that grievance. The present Judge Girouard asked them whether they would be prepared with their measure at the opening of the next session, and would be prepared to go on with it immediately, in case Manitoba had not in the meantime done what was expected in regard to the minority in that province. The Minister of Finance himself said that they certainly would—that they would not delay one moment after the House met in order to have any further negotiation with Manitoba, but would go on immediately with legislation strictly on the lines of the remedial order.

On this promise they had their note renewed, as it were, for five months. During the five months they had some negotiations with Manitoba. They refused a proposal to have a royal commission to investigate the matter. They insisted that they knew all the facts, and were able to settle the matter without a royal commission. They called us together at an inconvenient time of the year for the express purpose of presenting this legislation and having it considered. And, Sir, here we are, on the 28th of this month, and not a word of that Remedial Bill yet.

We have statements confidently made by the Government organs in the province of Quebec, that this Bill has been revised by a sub-committee of council, has been presented to council, has been considered in council, was ready for presentation to the House, and would be presented to the House the moment the debate on the Address was finished. The debate on the Address is finished, the council met last Saturday, and we are told by the omniscient reporter who seems to know everything that goes on even behind closed doors, that at that meeting that Bill was not even considered. So that we are no nearer seeing that Bill before this House than we were in July last—not an inch nearer, according to appearance.

In the meantime the public feeling has been getting hotter in certain parts of

the country, and the difficulties in the Conservative camp are becoming greater than they were. The longer this Bill is postponed, the greater these difficulties will be. The sooner it is brought down, the better it will be for the Government. If they had any consistent policy on the subject, we would have had the Bill by this; but I charge across the floor of the House—and I think I am justified by the existing condition of affairs—that the Government do not know what they are going to propose.

I charge the Government with trying to get the supplies before producing its Bill. I charge it with wanting to get all the money it can from this House before discovering to this House how weak it is. It wants to get supplies before its defeat, and I think I am perfectly justified in charging the Government with the expectation of defeat, when it exhibits such extreme cowardice. I do not say who is going to defeat it. I do not say that the Remedial Bill will be the more displeasing to the people of Quebec or to the people of Ontario; but, it is evident from the attitude of the Government, it is evident from their abject failure to take the House into their confidence, that they expect the Bill to be displeasing to the majority in this House, no matter how that majority be composed. They dare not bring it down, and they are trying to steal a march, and get money voted to which they have no right.

No administration in Great Britain ever dreamed, no administration in any constitutional country could dream, of asking for supplies until it had shown that it possessed the confidence of at least a majority in the House, whether it had or not the confidence of the majority in the country. As to their having the majority in this House, I shall not express an opinion, but we know the opinion of one of their supporters on that subject, the hon. member for Gaspé (Mr. Joncas), who does the editorial correspondence for "L'Événement" of Quebec. In his Ottawa letter a few days ago to that journal, he wrote this:

The job put up by the opponents of separate schools to make Sir Mackenzie Bowell disappear and replace him by a man not bound to his political programme, having failed, thanks to his own energy and the opportune intervention of the Governor General, those who do not wish the central power to intervene to make the constitution respected, begin to agitate anew, and prepare a new campaign against the remedial law. Messrs. MacLean (East York), Weldon and McNeill are at the head of the movement.

There is a statement by a prominent supporter of the Government, one, to some extent in their confidence, a gentleman well qualified to judge of the state of feeling on that side of the House. He says there is a strong movement against the Remedial Bill amongst the supporters of the Government itself, and that this movement has

been growing from day to day. Can the Government, under those circumstances, ask us to presume that it has the confidence of the people or of the House? They cannot, until they present their Remedial Bill to the House and move its second reading.

I started out with the statement that the remedy of grievance must go before the granting of Supply. There is a grievance which the Government themselves say exists, which they claim the Privy Council have declared to exist, which they called this session to remedy, and the remedy for which they dare not lay before this House. And yet they ask us to vote supplies. Perhaps they expect that, in course of time, by wearing out the patience of the grumblers amongst themselves—by making arrangements to put one in the Senate, another in the Post Office and another somewhere else—they may succeed, in restoring harmony and obtaining support for their Bill. Is that constitutional conduct? Is it conduct on their part which is respectful to this House, and which will be approved by the country? I say that until they remedy the grievance which they themselves have declared to exist, which they have pledged their political existence to remedy, they are not in a position to ask us for money.

A great deal is made of their having staked their political existence on a Remedial Bill. They say that it is a great proof of their disinterestedness and adherence to principle. Well, if they are disinterested, if they are willing to adhere to principle, if they wish to do what they promised to do by their Order in Council of nearly a year ago, let them bring down a Bill to-morrow or the next day, drawn on the lines of that remedial order, and let them stand or fall by it. I do not believe yet that they will stand or fall by a Bill framed on the lines of that remedial order. When we see the Bill they bring down, we shall find it probably some sort of abortion which nobody will be willing to acknowledge the paternity of. They will be open to that suspicion until they produce the Bill. If they are willing to risk their political lives on it, let them go on and do so. Then we will believe in their sincerity; and when they have induced a majority of this House to vote for the second reading of that Bill, they will be in a position to ask for supplies. The report of the Auditor General not being down is an excellent ground for our refusing to go into Committee of Supply, but the reason I last mentioned is a still greater one, which renders it absolutely unconstitutional, unjustifiable and improper to ask this House to vote any money at present.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). It is past the hour now at which the leader of the House suggested, and suggested properly, that we should adjourn, but I just want to make one or two remarks on this subject. I think

Mr. CASEY.

it is not necessary perhaps to convince the hon. Minister that he was taking an unwise step when he asked us to go into Supply, knowing that we had not the Auditor General's Report before us. I think, from the few observations that have been made, that he will have arrived at that conclusion himself. As he seems to have some little doubt as to its propriety himself, I just wish to remind him that in the promises which the Government put into the mouth of the Governor General in opening Parliament this year, was the promise that the accounts of the past year and Estimates of the ensuing year would be laid before us. They are coupled together, as they should be. The Government cannot fail to recognize that before asking for supplies to be extended to them during the coming year, they should lay before Parliament the accounts of what was done with the money which we voted last year, in order that we might ascertain whether we had good, capable and faithful stewards who had made a proper use of what we had entrusted to them. I call his attention also to this fact. He suggests simply that we go into the matter of Civil Government. He must see himself how difficult it would be to do that in anything like an intelligent way. One of those items is the Department of the Secretary of State—a very important department. We have no Secretary of State in the House. We have no one now at the head of that department; we have none to give us any information with regard to it. I ask whether, when the gentleman charged with the management of that department is a gentleman who, according to the estimate of the Tory party, according to the convictions of Ministers themselves,—by their actions if not by their words—is the only man who is able to lead and conduct the Government at all, we could properly proceed to vote the supplies for that department in his absence. He is not in the House. In that department is the important department of printing and stationery, about which a great deal of information is wanted and should be given. Then again, this important functionary, who is not in the House, and who seems to be the only man capable of leading the Conservative party or guiding the affairs of this country, according to the opinion of gentlemen opposite, as he is to be made Prime Minister, and is to be brought into this House, occupies also the office of High Commissioner; and it is necessary that we should have information of the expenditures upon that office. I think it is scarcely necessary to argue the point further, because the Government have already grasped the idea and feel that their motion to go into Supply involves them in a position which they should not have taken. But, while I am on my feet I would like to make a remark in answer to one or two gentlemen whose remarks seem to indicate that the Opposition are to blame because business has

not progressed better in the House. We feel that that is rather adding unkindness to injury already done. Why, the Opposition have been here; they have been prepared to do business; they have obeyed the summons of the Government and have assembled at Ottawa. If there has been delay, what has caused the delay? We were called for the 2nd of January, and Parliament assembled on that day, and the Speech from the Throne was delivered. As soon as the Commons returned from the Senate Chamber, Mr. Foster moved:

That the Address with which His Excellency has been pleased to open the session, be taken into consideration on Tuesday next, the 7th inst. The leader of the House was the gentleman who, at the very outset, proposed an adjournment of five days. We on this side did not make the motion; we did not second it; but it was made and carried. Very well, the five days' adjournment took place, and on the 7th January we met again. What for? To consider the Address and proceed with business? No, but to have Sir Adolphe Caron, instead of Mr. Foster, rise and make the statement that:

Since the opening of Parliament, seven members of the Cabinet have tendered their resignations to the Prime Minister.

And among these was the hon. gentleman who had proposed that the Governor General's Speech should be taken into consideration on this day. Sir Adolphe Caron, as leader of the House, moved that when the House adjourn it stand adjourned until the 21st inst. And, if we did not have an adjournment of that length of time, it was owing to my leader and our friends on this side taking the constitutional ground that while willing to afford every reasonable facility to the Government in the difficulties in which they found themselves, the House should not adjourn for that length of time. I think I have said enough to show that, from very shame, gentlemen opposite should not say the delay in public business has been caused by members of the Opposition. It has been stated that different grounds have been taken by different gentlemen on this side. That is quite true. Other reasons have been urged, as they might fairly be urged. While the Minister's statement last year, as the hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) contended, did not in so many words say that this was to be a special session to deal with the Manitoba school question, still that was the impression abroad in the country. And I think, looking at the circumstances surrounding the case, the country had a right to hold that opinion. Five regular sessions of this Parliament having been held, and five supplies having been voted to this Ministry, and the Ministry having been unable to deal with this question last session, it was natural to infer that this session was called specially for the purpose

of dealing with this subject. And, had the Bill been prepared, it might, perhaps, have been disposed of inside the thirty days and at little cost to the country, so far as the indemnity to members is concerned. But the thirty days are already almost gone, wasted by the Ministry themselves. It was clearly their duty to have been better prepared. I do not say that they should proceed with their Bills in the exact order in which they are presented, but I notice that the first, and presumably the most important measure mentioned in the Speech from the Throne is on the subject of the Manitoba schools. The Finance Minister and other members of the Government must have known that the Auditor General's Report could not be ready for this session, and that Parliament could not properly go on with that business in the consideration of which that report is necessary, should have been prepared with some other measures, so that we might have gone on with some other business without waiting for the Auditor General's Report. If there is any measure which we have a right to expect to find prepared and waiting it is the one under discussion to-night. The subject was considered last year; the Government has had the matter before it for a long time. They gave a solemn pledge that they would prepare a measure, and surely we had a right to expect that it would be here and ready for consideration as soon as the Address was passed by this House. But the fact is that this measure is not prepared, and, apparently, the Government have no other Bills ready. In fact, the Government is not complete; if we may judge from what hon. gentlemen themselves say, it is without a head, and will not be ready to lead in legislation until a gentleman comes who, in the judgment of his colleagues, is able to conduct the business of the House. It seemed to me, Mr. Speaker, expedient to make these few remarks in order that the country might distinctly understand where the blame lies for the slow progress that has been made. I am not afraid that the people will fail to grasp the situation; but some gentlemen have been bold enough to take another position, and I thought that these few remarks were necessary.

Mr. DICKEY. I do not intend to follow the hon. gentleman in the argument he has raised with regard to the delay in public business. His remarks and those of other hon. gentlemen opposite have, of course, convinced me of their industry and their ingenuity. I must say I have not been able to take very seriously the arguments they have used with reference to the delay on going into Supply. One thing seems to be quite evident, and that is that these hon. gentlemen do not want to go into Supply, and do not want to proceed with the business. And in order to carry out that intention, some half dozen reasons, each equally useless from a constitutional standpoint,

have been urged with vehemence by the different gentlemen who have spoken. I do not propose to discuss these reasons. I rose simply for one purpose—to correct the misapprehension of the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock), which misapprehension seems to have been carried forward into the address of the hon. gentleman who has just sat down. The hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson) spoke of the adjournment moved by the leader of the House on the 7th of January as being a delay for which the Government was blameable. The hon. member for North York said that that was in pursuance of a conspiracy which, he alleged, was then forming against the Prime Minister, and that the arrangement was come to after the elections in Jacques Cartier and Montreal Centre. Well, Sir, I was sorry the leader of the Opposition was not present, because he could have informed his followers that he had agreed with the leader of the House that it was more convenient for members of both sides that there should be no business done between the 2nd and the 7th of January, so as to enable members who lived at a distance to spend their New Year's Day at home and come here ready to attend to business on the 7th. Therefore, so far as that reproach is made against the Government, it is shown by that explanation to be entirely unfounded, in fact. I must say that I was extremely pleased when I looked at the seat of the leader of the Opposition and saw it vacant, because I was sure he would never have allowed a statement of that sort to be made in his presence, even by a supporter, without correcting it. The hon. member for North York also stated that Sir Charles Tupper was reported in the Montreal "Herald" to have said in Sydney that he had left England at the request of the Conservative party to take the leadership.

Mr. MARTIN. It is stated also in the Toronto "Globe."

Mr. DICKEY. Well, I will leave the hon. gentleman to quote the Toronto "Globe." The member for North York referred to the Montreal "Herald." I have read the report in the Montreal "Herald," and I can find no such statement in it. The hon. member for North York made that statement because it would contradict statements made here and elsewhere by Sir Charles Tupper himself. I have looked over the reports in the paper the hon. gentleman referred to, and I can say that there is no such statement reported as being made by Sir Charles Tupper at all. The statement that is made by Sir Charles Tupper, to which, possibly the reference may have been made, is this :

Sir Charles Tupper said his present position did not justify that charge. He had been shown all the honours a man could wish to have, and had left a position of comfort and ease in London in answer to the unanimous request of the Conservative party.

Mr. DICKEY.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. DICKEY. Yes, and that the hon. gentleman from Winnipeg says, is in the Toronto "Globe." Sir Charles Tupper left that position of ease and comfort in London on 15th January, at the unanimous request of the Liberal-Conservative party of Canada, from one end of it to the other, but he did not leave London for that purpose. He left his position in London, which he held in London. I will read it again, so that there may be no mistake :

Sir Charles said that he had left a position of comfort and ease in London in answer to the unanimous request of the Conservative party.

What position did Sir Charles Tupper hold in London? He held the position of High Commissioner, and no other position, and that position he resigned on the 15th day of January, and not before, when he was sworn in. I say Sir Charles Tupper was quite justified in saying that he left that position on the 15th day of January at the unanimous request of the Conservative party, from one end of Canada to the other. I rose simply for the purpose of saying that in the conduct of this discussion, which has been begun, it seems to me, for very insufficient reasons, the hon. gentlemen, in their wanderings to find arguments have been led, perhaps without intention, into distorting the facts, and in the case to which I have just directed attention, in doing absolute injustice to a man who is absent.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman from Brant (Mr. Paterson) has reminded me that last year we adopted the rule, as nearly as possible, not to continue our discussion after 11 o'clock. So far as I am concerned, I have no disposition to stay very much later than that during the present session, therefore, I would suggest that the House go into Supply, pass one item, and then we will adjourn.

Motion agreed to, and House resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Governor General's Secretary's Office.. \$11,112 50
Resolution reported.

ADJOURNMENT—THE BUDGET.

Mr. FOSTER moved the adjournment of the House. I suppose my hon. friend knows that it is my intention to deliver the Budget Speech on Friday next.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would like the hon. gentleman, if possible, to give us the last ten days' statement, and I would also like to know if the Supplementary Estimates for the current year will be ready to discuss in connection with the Budget?

MANITOBA SCHOOLS CASE—PAPERS.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Before the House adjourns, I would like to ask the attention of the leader of the House to the papers relating to the Manitoba school case. I suppose, judging from the speech put into the mouth of His Excellency that the hon. gentleman has further correspondence than the papers of 1895 to bring down. I observe on looking over those papers of 1895, that there does not seem to me to be adequate reasons for some of the steps the Government have taken. I assume that the Government must have papers other than those which are contained in the blue-book that has been laid before the House. I would like the hon. gentleman to bring those papers down. The point, I may briefly state to the leader of the House, is this: That there are certain rights and privileges guaranteed to the minority. The Government are acting upon the assumption—which I am not questioning at all—that the local legislature, subject to the appeal here, have power to repeal or to injuriously affect the rights of that minority. Now, there is an appeal given to somebody or other, and, as I take it, from the reading of the statute, that appeal is given to the minority, speaking of them as if they were a community living separate and distinct from the majority altogether. Now, that being so, of course two or three individuals could not speak for the minority, because the hon. gentleman is proceeding upon the assumption that if the minority had acquiesced, or had approved, of the legislation, there would be no ground for appeal whatever. Now, when I look at this statement of the reason for appeal, I find that certain parties, some half dozen or more, are named in these papers:

* * * Louis Laventure, and Louis J. Collin, all of the province of Manitoba, in the Dominion of Canada, on behalf of themselves and of all other persons forming the Roman Catholic minority of the Queen's subjects in the province.

Now, I apprehend that the Government took some steps to ascertain whether that statement was an accurate statement or not, and whether those persons did represent the majority—I mean, the majority of the minority—because it is a community and not one or two individuals to whom this right of appeal is given; and I assume, when that statement is made, that the Government did obtain some evidence that the minority wished to have these rights and privileges restored which they had previously enjoyed, that steps were taken to ascertain that fact before the appeal was entertained at all. I wish to see those papers—that evidence. I desire that the Government should bring them down to the House and lay them upon the Table, so that we may have those papers before us to see that those proceedings have been regularly taken throughout.

Mr. FOSTER. I understand the point the hon. gentleman raises is, as to whether or not the minority have really appealed.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. All the papers in possession of the Government in connection with this matter will be brought down.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.30 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 29th January, 1896.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

OFFICIAL REPORT OF DEBATES.

Mr. LaRIVIERE presented first report of the select committee appointed to supervise the Official Report of the Debates, as follows:—

Your committee recommend that their quorum be reduced from eight members to five members.

Mr. LaRIVIERE moved:

That the House concur in the first report of the select committee appointed to supervise the Official Report of the Debates.

Mr. MULOCK. What is the number of members on that committee?

Mr. LaRIVIERE. About fourteen.

Mr. MULOCK. Five is a very small number.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. It is the usual number—the number we have always had.

Motion agreed to.

ALIEN LABOUR.

Mr. TAYLOR moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 24) to prohibit the importation and immigration of foreigners and aliens under contract or agreement to perform labour in Canada.

Mr. MULOCK. Explain.

Mr. TAYLOR. This Bill is a copy of a law now in force in the United States against Canada, and I think we should have reciprocity in this matter. For that purpose, I introduce the Bill, and I hope it will receive favourable consideration from both sides of the House.

Mr. MULOCK. I suppose this is the same Bill that was introduced last session, is it?

Mr. TAYLOR. Practically.

Mr. MULOCK. Well, I do not know whether the hon. member is introducing this Bill merely to put himself on record on the question, or with the view of securing its passage by the House. I do not remember his ever having made any effort to press such a Bill as this to a conclusion. He gets up and introduces the Bill, and there lets it rest. It is his privilege to leave it in that shape if he likes; but I submit that the duty is cast upon him to show some bona fides in this matter by pressing the Bill, if opportunity is given. Perhaps it may be said that this Bill was introduced last session at too late a stage, and therefore had not an opportunity to go to a second reading. That was the fate of several Bills introduced by private members; I myself suffered in that respect. But while the hon. gentleman for several sessions has been very loud in clamouring for justice to Canadian workmen, I have never seen him adopt any serious measures to give practical effect to his views. So I submit that he should let us know now whether this is an annual farce, or whether it is only an attempt to secure a certain end.

Mr. DAVIN. I have no doubt that my hon. friend is perfectly sincere in bringing forward this Bill. I shall, however, have some important amendments to propose when we go into committee on this Bill; and if I thought my hon. friend were not likely to press this latter, I would introduce a Bill of my own.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) must know that last year, at the time this Bill was put on the paper, it was impossible for it to reach its second reading. Some thirty-six or thirty-seven other Bills were in the same position when the session closed. I do not think the hon. gentleman is very charitable in his remarks towards the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor), because he must have known that every time this Bill has been before the House, the hon. member for Leeds has made a reasonable endeavour to have it become law. The first time it was introduced, it was allowed to stand over. I think by the strong advice of the late Sir John Macdonald, because important negotiations were taking place at the time between this Government and the Government of the United States. Since that time, the hon. member has twice introduced the Bill, but on each occasion he has been unable to reach the second reading before the session closed. I am quite sure he is not bringing forward this Bill merely for the purpose which the hon. member for North York intimates, but with the object, if possible, of crystallizing it into law, and benefiting the labouring men of Canada.

Mr. INGRAM. I quite concur in the remarks of the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), and I would suggest to the

Mr. TAYLOR.

hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) that instead of lecturing the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) as to his sincerity in the matter, he would accomplish more if he would use some of his time in trying to induce some of his own friends to support the Bill. I am glad that the hon. member for Leeds has introduced the Bill, and I think the time has arrived when Canadians should take a stand on this matter. We find, day after day, and year after year, that persons going from this country to the United States are debarred from getting employment there owing to the Alien Labour Law of that country, and the manner in which it is carried out; and I think some legislation of this kind should be placed on our statute-book, and that hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House should use their best efforts to frame a law that will secure the object of this Bill.

Mr. GILLMOR. Mr. Speaker, I do not know what is going to become of this Bill. The object may be a very good one, but when we reflect that fourteen gentlemen sitting on the Treasury benches have made it their policy to protect about 1 per cent of the people of this country, and leave 99 per cent to the tender mercies of the man who introduces this Bill, I think there is a poor prospect for these people getting redress. It appears to me that this sort of farce is about played out. If ninety-nine out of every hundred of the people of Canada want to be protected, the Government had better take hold of the matter and try to protect them; and the gentlemen who sit behind the Government ought to compel them to do it, or else not support them in protecting the minority.

Mr. MCKAY. I believe the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) is perfectly sincere in introducing this Bill, and I believe that the members on this side of the House will give it their hearty support. If the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) has any amendments which will make this Bill stronger or clearer or more workable, I hope those amendments will also receive the support of this House. The legislation of the United States in reference to Canadian workmen is becoming more clearly defined, and we should make ours equally clear.

Mr. CASEY. I should like to ask one or two questions with regard to this Bill. In the first place, it has been stated in the press, and generally understood throughout the country, that the hon. gentleman who introduces this Bill has secured the opening of negotiations between our Government and that of the United States with regard to making the Thousand Islands and other pleasure grounds of the St. Lawrence a sort of international park. It is understood that it was proposed to offer to American citizens the right of fishing in our waters as a "quid pro quo" for some relaxation of the

alien labour law now in force in the United States. That is to say, if we allowed them to fish in Canadian waters, they would allow our workmen to cross the river to work. It has been reported from time to time that these negotiations were making some progress, but now, right in their midst, if these reports in the press be correct, we find the hon. gentleman introducing a retaliatory Bill, which could only have the effect, if adopted, of breaking up the negotiations which he is credited with having originated. I would like to have from the Government some statement as to whether any such negotiations have taken place, and I would like to have, from the hon member himself, a statement of how he reconciles his alleged intention with regard to such negotiations with the introduction of this retaliatory Bill. It would be proper for him to explain the benefits to Canada, as a whole, to be derived from those negotiations, if successful, and the greater benefits to be derived from the adoption of this Bill instead of the other plan. It is quite clear that the two policies of an international park and a retaliatory labour Bill cannot be carried out simultaneously.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I really scarcely think it is right to question the sincerity of the hon. member who introduced this Bill, when he has showed such anxiety in producing it year after year for the past ten years. He has got it up to a first reading, and I believe once to a second reading, but has never been able to impress on the Government the importance of taking it up as a Government measure. He has wonderful influence, we know, on the Government, then why does he not compel the Government to take up this Bill, if he is really sincere. I think if he would issue another proclamation, he could compel the Government to take up this Bill and have it enacted in the name of Her Glorious Majesty. Let the Government go on and pass this measure, if it is in the interests of the labouring men of this country. Anything in the interests of the labouring men will certainly receive the support of this side of the House. But the hon. gentleman, with all his sincerity and desire to help the labouring man, has been unable to get any further than the second reading of his Bill in the last ten years, and has only succeeded in getting it to the second reading once.

Mr. TAYLOR. I wish to say this to my hon. friend who has just taken his seat, and to the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock), that the second time I introduced this Bill, it was referred to a special committee, which was empowered to call witnesses and take evidence. And I would suggest to these hon. gentlemen to procure a copy of that evidence and read it before this Bill comes up for discussion on the second reading.

Mr. LANDERKIN. When was that?

Mr. TAYLOR. I thought the hon. gentleman was not very well informed. I would refer him to the hon. member for Charlotte (Mr. Gillmor), who was a member of the special committee which took the evidence.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The evidence is printed, and, I presume, it is possible for the hon. gentleman to give us the year.

Mr. TAYLOR. About two or three years ago; two years I think.

Mr. LANDERKIN. It was during the time of Sir John Macdonald, and he is gone five years.

Mr. TAYLOR. No, Sir; you will find it up in the distribution office. I would recommend the hon. gentleman to get a copy and read it.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The hon. gentleman is not well informed. He does not know the date.

An hon. MEMBER. 1890.

Mr. LANDERKIN. That is six years ago. He has been working hard since on the evidence.

Mr. TAYLOR. It may be possible, if the hon. gentlemen opposite persist in obstructing progress, as they have done in the last two days, that this Bill will not be reached this session. It was due largely to the tactics they pursued last year that it was not reached. I hope they will facilitate work, so that we will be able to reach it and a number of others on the paper of pressing importance, before this House closes.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

VALENTINE SHORTIS.

Mr. RIDER asked:

1. Was an Order in Council passed commuting the sentence of death made against Valentine Shortis into imprisonment for life? If so, when?
2. Did the Minister of Justice make a report to Council recommending that the sentence of death pronounced against V. Shortis be commuted into imprisonment for life? If so, what is the date of the report?

Mr. DICKEY. In reply to the hon. gentleman, I beg to say that the answer to each of his questions is "no."

NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES SCHOOL ORDINANCE.

Mr. DAVIN asked:

Whether the Premier is correctly reported when he said that His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor of the North-west Territories explained his not having given his assent to the School Ordinance passed during the last session of the North-west assembly in the following words:—"That the ordinance had only been placed in his hands within a few minutes of the time when he was to prorogue the House, and that he had not time

even to look at its contents to ascertain whether there were any clauses which might be considered ultra vires, or not strictly within the limits of their power, and that after consultation with the Premier, Mr. Haultain, and with his consent, he withheld his assent to the ordinance?"

(1.) Is Mr. Haultain's consent necessary before the Lieutenant-Governor can give his assent to an ordinance?

(2.) Has Mr. Haultain any authority to advise His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor as to whether he should or should not assent to an ordinance?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. As to the first part of the question, I desire to say that it is substantially true. The Premier, however, requested me to state that he may have used the words "a short time," instead of "a few minutes." As to the two other branches of the question, the reply is "no."

ALCOHOL OF AMERICAN MANUFACTURE.

Mr. RIDER asked :

Whether there has been admitted in Canada, free of duty, during the year 1895, any alcohol of American manufacture? If so, under what statute or regulation? For what purpose? How much, and by whom has it been imported?

Mr. WOOD. In answer to the hon. gentleman I desire to say that no alcohol of American manufacture was admitted free of duty during the year 1895.

THE TERM OF PARLIAMENT.

Mr. RIDER asked :

What is the full constitutional term allotted to the Parliament of Canada?

What is the latest date, to which this, the seventh Dominion Parliament, will possess constitutional authority to act?

Mr. DICKEY. Mr. Speaker, I am not prepared to answer that question, as I think it is a matter of opinion upon a point of law.

EXPORTS AND IMPORTS OF MAPLE SUGAR.

Mr. RIDER asked :

1. How much maple sugar has been exported from Canada between the 1st day of July and the 31st day of December, 1895, both days inclusive?

(a.) How much was exported to the United States, in pounds, and value?

(b.) How much to all other countries, including the British Empire, in pounds, and value?

2. How much maple sugar has there been imported into Canada during the same period? The countries from which it came, quantities in pounds, and value?

Mr. WOOD. In answer to this question I should explain that the figures below are incomplete, inasmuch as quarterly returns of exports have not been received in the department from Collingwood, Peterborough, Toronto, Quebec, Weymouth and Winnipeg

Mr. DAVIN.

for the quarter ending 31st December, 1895. These reports will be to hand in a few days. With the exception of those ports there has been exported from the Dominion of Canada, between the 1st day of July and the 31st of December, 1895, both days inclusive, 229,054 pounds of maple sugar. Of this, 223,804 pounds, of the value of \$12,947, were exported to the United States; and 5,250 pounds, of the value of \$475, were exported to other countries, including the British Empire. The maple sugar imported into Canada from the United States during that period was 169 pounds, of the value of \$26.

MAGOG WHARF.

Mr. RIDER asked :

Whether the Government was aware, when paying \$2,500 to Messrs. C. C. Smith & Co., on the 7th of August, 1895, for the old wharf on the shore of Lake Memphremagog, at Magog, that the land along the shore thereof controlling the wharf belonged entirely and exclusively to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and that there was no public highway or street duly established insuring to the public an independent and free access thereto? If not, is the Government now aware that such is the case?

Mr. OUIMET. The corporation of the town of Magog, by a resolution dated the 18th April, 1895, which is on file in the department, has guaranteed access to the wharf by a travelled highway 50 feet in width.

POUND-NET LICENSES IN BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Mr. MARTIN asked :

Whether any persons or corporations in British Columbia are allowed to fish with pound-nets, and why these persons or corporations are exempted from regulations binding upon all other fishermen? Whether either of the members for Victoria (British Columbia) is interested in any such institution?

Mr. COSTIGAN. By Order in Council, 20th March, 1894, the issue of salmon pound-net licenses was authorized in the waters of Boundary Bay south of the mouth of Fraser River, to British subjects resident in British Columbia. The reason for the exception being made in this particular locality, was that complaints were made by British subjects that this class of fishing engines was being used by the United States citizens at Point Roberts, about nine miles south of the mouth of Fraser River, shutting the fish off in their run to that stream, and to the detriment of the fishing operations of British subjects, who were forbidden by law to use such nets. Pending some mutual international arrangement to prohibit the use of these traps, the Order in Council was adopted with a view to placing Canadian fishermen there, under the peculiar and exceptional circumstances, on a footing of equality with their neighbours in the matter

of intercepting the run of salmon moving coastwise to the Fraser River. Meanwhile the United States authorities were approached as to joint action towards prohibiting such nets, and this point is included in the work of the International Fisheries Commission at present proceeding. The Government is not aware that either of the members of Victoria is interested in any such institution.

WRECK OF THE "SAN PEDRO."

Mr. MARTIN asked :

Whether the Government intend removing the "San Pedro" steamer from off the rocks near Victoria, British Columbia ; and if so, when ?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Proceedings are under way for the removal of that wreck, and no unnecessary delay will take place.

REORGANIZATION OF THE CABINET.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I believe that this question was answered, but probably the hon. gentleman would like to have the answer formally on record. In the question as it appears in the Order paper it applies to the Minister of Agriculture. It should refer to the Minister of Trade and Commerce. I will read it as it should have appeared :

Whether the Honourable the Minister of Trade and Commerce stated a few days ago that the Cabinet would be reorganized shortly with Sir C. Tupper as Premier, and with the addition of Messrs. Chapleau and Angers, or words to that effect ?

Mr. IVES. If the question should have been addressed to me, my answer is, no.

STEAMSHIP SUBSIDIES.

Mr. HAZEN asked :

1. Has the Government been informed by memorial or otherwise that a recent meeting of the board of trade of the maritime provinces, composed of the various boards of trade of the provinces of New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island, the following resolution was passed :—

"Whereas for years past after the navigation of the St. Lawrence has closed, through Canadian freight, carried on steamers subsidized by our Canadian Government, after mails have been landed at a through port, has been landed and shipped at a foreign port to the detriment of maritime province ports.

"Therefore Resolved, that this maritime board of trade memorialize the Dominion Government urging that in future subsidies be granted to steamers sailing between the port or ports in the United Kingdom and port or ports in Canada only.

"Also Resolved, that all affiliated boards of trade be requested to urge upon their representatives at Ottawa that they unite with other maritime province members in seeking to secure subsidies as will result in the through passage, mail and freight business being done through Canadian ports."

2. Is it the intention of the Government to discontinue the granting of subsidies to lines of steamers between Canada and Great Britain touching or terminating at ports in foreign countries ?

Mr. IVES. The answer to the first part of the question is, yes. As to the second part, I may say there has been no change since the policy of the Government was declared in the debate which took place when the Fast Line Subsidy Act was before the House.

RETURNS ORDERED BY THE HOUSE.

Mr. LANDERKIN asked :

1. Is it true, as stated in the public press, that 43 returns ordered by this House during the session of 1894 have not yet been brought down ?

2. If not, what is the number ?

3. Is it true, as stated in the public press, that out of 106 returns ordered by this House only 42 have yet been brought down, leaving 64 returns not yet brought down ?

4. If not, what are the correct figures ?

Mr. OUMET. I am informed by the department that 139 returns were ordered by the House in 1894, and 105 were submitted.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Then as to the next question ?

Mr. OUMET. That covers the whole.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There are two separate years referred to.

LOBSTER FISHERY REGULATIONS.

Mr. BOWERS asked :

1. Can traps be set and lobsters fished for on the 31st day of December ?

2. If not, why not ?

3. Would the Department of Fisheries uphold their overseers in exacting penalties from fishermen who fished for lobsters on December 31st in any year ?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Under the reading of the Order in Council traps may be so set and fished. The close season for lobsters in Nova Scotia, according to locality, is "between the 1st (15th) July and 31st December." Although the word "between" would, strictly speaking, permit of fishing on the 31st December, yet in the interest of the fishery the open season has generally been interpreted to begin on the 1st January. Penalties will not be imposed on parties fishing on the 31st December.

ROBERT ROGERS OF MANITOBA.

Mr. GRIEVE asked :

Has President Robert Rogers of the Conservative Association of the province of Manitoba paid the amount due from him to the Government for binding twine and reported unpaid last session ? If so, when paid ?

Mr. DICKEY. I beg to say that that question is irregular, as stating a fact. The Department of Justice has no dealings with

the president of the Liberal-Conservative Association of the province of Manitoba. If the hon. gentleman will strike that out of his question, I can give him the information.

Mr. GRIEVE. Then I will ask the question in this manner :

Has Robert Rogers, of the province of Manitoba, paid the amount due from him to the Government for binding twine and reported unpaid last session ? If so, when paid ?

Mr. DICKEY. The amount of the invoice has been paid. There is an amount of about \$65 still due for freight prepaid by the penitentiary, which the agent of the department has been instructed to collect.

INSPECTOR OF WEIGHTS AND MEASURES FOR THREE RIVERS.

Mr. LEDUC asked :

Whether the Government have had communication by letter or otherwise with any member of this House, or other person, in relation to the appointment of an inspector of weights and measures for the division of Three Rivers ?

Mr. PRIOR. Yes.

GRINDING CORN FOR HUMAN FOOD.

Mr. McMULLEN asked :

The names of the operators and location of mills in which corn was ground for human food during the year ending the 30th of June, 1895 ?

The number of bushels ground by each, and the gross amount of rebate made to each ?

The amount of rebate yet due, or claimed by each, and not paid, if any ?

Mr. WOOD. I shall have to ask the hon. gentleman to allow that to stand as a notice of motion for a return.

CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE.

Mr. FORBES asked :

Is the Controller of Inland Revenue a Cabinet Minister of full rank ? If so, what portfolio does he hold ?

Is he responsible to the Council for the administration of the Inland Revenue, or is he under the general instruction of the Minister of Trade and Commerce ?

Mr. FOSTER. I think that question was answered in large part yesterday. If my hon. friend wants more information I shall be glad to give it. The Controller of Inland Revenue is a Cabinet Minister of full rank. He is Controller of Inland Revenue. He is responsible to the Council, as are all other members of the Cabinet. With reference to the other part of the question, I must refer my hon. friend to the Act governing the matter.

Mr. DICKEY.

DAIRY STATIONS IN PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's) asked :

Is it the intention of the Government to continue the supervision during 1896 (which, up to this time, has proved so successful) of any, or all, the experimental dairy stations now in operation in Prince Edward Island ?

Will the same supervision be extended to new experimental dairy stations during the current year ?

Mr. MONTAGUE. The Government will continue to give supervision to the cheese factories and creameries in Prince Edward Island through the service of a dairy expert, who will visit them from time to time, and be available for consultation by the farmers, or those who manage the factories for them. It is not the intention of the Government to continue to manage all the cheese factories and creameries in Prince Edward Island during 1896. Through the action of the Government since 1892, the business of manufacturing and marketing cheese and butter for export, is now so well established there that joint stock companies of farmers have gained sufficient knowledge to conduct it successfully at the several factories themselves. The Agricultural and Dairy Commissioner will be instructed to render all practicable assistance to those companies, particularly by advisory information on the marketing of the products for export. The Government may continue to manage a few of these small factories, and will take charge of two new factories, if put up by joint stock companies of farmers in suitable localities, on terms similar to those given to new factories in 1895.

REVISION OF THE VOTERS' LISTS.

Mr. MONET asked :

What has been the cost of each revision of the voters' lists for the Dominion since the year 1885 and up to this date ?

2. Were certain lists for the county of Napierville, between 1885 and 1895, printed at the office of "La Minerve," or at some office other than the Government Printing Bureau ? If so, what amount was paid for printing the said lists ?

Mr. FOSTER. The second part of the question put by the hon. member can be answered readily. The voters' lists of Napierville were printed elsewhere than at the Government Printing Bureau. The revision of 1895 was printed by the St. Hyacinthe "Courrier," for which \$465.26 were paid. The revision of 1891 was printed by "La Minerve," of Montreal, for which \$45.91 were paid. This sum paid to "La Minerve" was for the names added, not for the whole list. For 1894-95 "La Presse," Montreal, was paid \$42.78 for lists of names added and removed in Laprairie and Napierville. The first part of the question will in-

volve making a long list, and if my hon. friend will make a notice of motion, the return will be brought down.

PRIVILEGE—COMMUNICATING AN ORDER IN COUNCIL TO NEWSPAPERS.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I presume as a matter of privilege I may inquire of the Government whether they have discovered who is responsible for the breach of privilege which took place in communicating to the newspapers an Order in Council refused to us?

Mr. FOSTER. The Order in Council with reference to the cattle trade, about which my hon. friend spoke yesterday, and about which a question of privilege was raised, has this history: There was no order of the House for a production of papers. The paper was asked for by members of the House, and my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture stated in reply that he would bring it down. The Premier was not aware that the House had asked for it, and of course, did not see any order emanating from the House asking for it, and he gave it to the press after it had been signed by the Governor General. The error arose in that way. There was no desire, of course, to withhold any courtesy, or to make any breach of the privileges of the House.

Mr. LAURIER. Does the hon. gentleman think it is merely an error on the part of the Premier, or anybody else, to communicate a state paper to the press before it is laid on the Table?

Mr. FOSTER. Well, my hon. friend will see quite easily that papers of just the same character and equal importance, are given out, after they have become orders and are signed by the Governor General, every week in the year. It is information which we ought not to withhold, and which cannot be withheld from the public, and consequently the practice has always prevailed of giving to the public these important items of information,—which are not in any sense state papers—just as soon as they are available. It was following that practice, and not knowing that the paper had been asked for in the House, and seeing no order for its production, that the paper was given to the press.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I desire to ask, in this connection, whether the deep humiliation and grief which the Minister of Agriculture has expressed has assuaged.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) This is a question of privilege, and I submit I can speak to it. The leader of the House and my leader have both spoken to it.

Mr. SPEAKER. A question was asked from the Opposition side of the House, and

the Minister has fully answered it. I cannot allow hon. members to enter into a discussion.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I have another question to ask. Has this humiliation and shame expressed by the Minister of Agriculture been assuaged by notice being called to the fact that the culprit was the Premier himself?

Mr. FOSTER. That subject would require a good deal of investigation, and the hon. member had better, I think, put a notice on the paper.

Mr. MONTAGUE. My presence here is evidence that I have survived it.

REPORT.

Auditor General's Report (First Section).—
(Mr. Foster).

CLAIMS UNDER THE McCARTHY ACT.

Mr. LaRIVIERE moved for:

Return of: 1. All fees received by the Government under the provisions of the Act commonly known as the "McCarthy Act" from the several municipal corporations or from parties applying for licenses under that Act, in the electoral district of Provencher, in the province of Manitoba.

2. A list of unpaid claims and amount thereof in connection with the said Act in the same electoral district.

He said: In regard to this motion, I beg leave to state that under the provisions of the McCarthy Act, fees were collected from the several applicants for licenses in my district, and while those fees have been reimbursed in all other parts of the Dominion, and even in some parts of the province of Manitoba, I am informed that several hundreds of dollars which have been contributed to the fund under that Act have not been returned to the parties, and the municipalities of the towns of St. Boniface and Emerson are claimants for large amounts in each case. Besides, I am informed that officers who were acting under the provisions of that Act have not been fully paid for their services, whilst certain amounts which were deposited to the credit of that fund in one of the banks have been appropriated by the Government, and by leaving these claims unpaid, the Government have had the benefit of funds remaining in the hands of the banks, to be afterwards taken out on the order of the Government. I hope this statement will show the actual situation, and I trust proper steps will be taken by the Government so that these municipalities, respectively, shall be reimbursed the amounts to which they are entitled.

Motion agreed to.

THE CASE OF VALENTINE SHORTIS.

Mr. BERGERON moved for :

Copies of all petitions, applications, letters, &c., asking for a commutation of the sentence of death recorded against Valentine Shortis, into imprisonment for life, and of all letters and memorials asking that the law be allowed to take its course; also the report of Mr. Justice Mathieu, and the report of the Minister of Justice and any decision, order or warrant dealing with the said case.

He said : I rise to perform a very disagreeable duty. Under ordinary circumstances, complaints are made that mercy has not been extended to individuals. In the present instance, I intend to question why mercy was extended in the case of Valentine Shortis, who was condemned to be hanged on 3rd January. Although I am asking, by the present motion, for certain papers, which I hope will be brought down to the House for the information of the members and for the public at large, still, in order to reach the conclusion intended by my motion, it will not be out of place to state as shortly as possible what I know, personally, of the acts of Shortis in Valleyfield, and of himself. Every one knows, I suppose, that on the 1st March last year, the peaceable population of Valleyfield was startled by one of the most horrible murders even committed in this country. Two murders had been committed, and another man was supposed to be mortally wounded, and the perpetrator of those deeds was Valentine Shortis. The population of Valleyfield at the time felt very much inclined to take justice into their own hands. Wise counsels, however, prevailed, and, relying upon the administration of justice in this country, and they being law-abiding citizens, they did not follow the advice of one or two hot-headed persons, but they left the case in the hands of the officers of the law. Shortis was arrested. He was afterwards brought down to Beauharnois jail, and subsequently taken to Montreal. Before we come to the time he was brought back to stand his trial, I desire to show how the crime was committed. That illustrious individual, Shortis, from the time he put his foreign foot on our hospitable shores, had been in Valleyfield during a few months. He was looked upon as a very eccentric person; the people of the place were accustomed to note and characterize him as very original in his way. He had accepted a position in the Montreal Cotton mills, under Mr. Simpson, the present manager. He was never looked upon there as being in any sense a fool, as was put forward in the plea made later by lawyers for the defence. He had been employed for a few months as secretary to the manager. He left his position because he did not perform the work in hand, because he was not assiduous in his duty. Whenever he did work he did it well, as

Mr. LaRIVIERE.

was proven under oath at the trial. But he would leave the office and go out to amuse himself or make calls, and not being assiduous to his duties the manager of the Montreal company discharged him from his employment. I mention this to show that Shortis knew all the ins and outs of the factory and how business was conducted there. He was the friend of the officers of the company and was consequently the friend of those whom he killed and wounded. They looked upon him in a friendly way, and this explains how it was that he was allowed into the office, although entry to strangers was absolutely forbidden. That night they were counting the money, amounting to about \$30,000, which was to be paid out to the mill hands on the following day or so. Shortis knew there was a good deal of money spread out on the tables, and that it was being counted and put into envelopes, and he knew, that because of his acquaintance with the clerks, he would be allowed into the office. I wish to emphasize this, because it was said later on that Shortis was not looking after money, and that his parents being very wealthy—as was shown afterwards—used to keep him in money. This was denied under oath by the people of Valleyfield, who deposed that Shortis had hardly enough money to pay his board. He was sent from home, not as a fool, but on account of many acts of cruelty as proven by the story of his escapades in the testimony taken in Ireland. His mother, like many other mothers, sent him some money without the knowledge of his father, but this money was evidently sent so that he would not starve. It amounted to \$30 or \$40 a month, but it did not keep Shortis and he was always indebted to everybody. Shortis knew there was a good deal of money in the office of the factory this night. On two or three occasions previously, while passing in what is called the "bank" of the factories, he remarked to another young man, that it would be a very easy thing to rob the Montreal Cotton Co. on those nights they were counting the money. This was in evidence. On the night of the 1st of March he went to the office and knocked at the door. One of the clerks, I think John Loy, went to the door and seeing it was Shortis he admitted him, although he would not have allowed any one else to enter as it was against the rules. Mr. Simpson, the manager, was absent at the time, and had he been in Valleyfield, it is almost probable the rule would not have been broken by admitting Shortis, because Mr. Simpson had a very poor opinion of Shortis, and in fact they were far from being good friends. When Shortis entered there was a 32-calibre revolver on one of the desks. It was known that Shortis had a mania for firearms. In fact a few days before he went to a carnival at the Valleyfield rink, when young men and women were present, and carried a double-barrelled rifle which was loaded. Some

one had to bring him out and force him to unload the weapon by discharging it on the lake. It was, therefore, known that he was familiar with firearms, and consequently, John Lowe, who was acting as first clerk that evening, said to him : Give me that revolver, Shortis ; I won't allow you to play with it. Mr. Lowe took out the cylinder and handed the revolver back to him. Shortis examined it, oiled it, and cleaned it up, and then put it back on the desk and promenaded around the office. Mr. Lowe, when he found that Shortis had finished with the revolver, again fixed in the loaded chambers and put it in the desk. Shortis again came to the desk, pulled out the drawer, and taking the revolver, aimed at Wilson who was standing near the door, and shot him, the bullet passing through his cheek. John Loy, who was working at the desk, thought it was an accident, and immediately went to telephone for a doctor. Wilson was bleeding freely and had fallen to the floor. Just as Loy went to the telephone, John Lowe had gone over to take Wilson in his arms and help him, but Shortis cried out : "Lowe, stand still ; don't move, or I will shoot you ;" and turning to John Loy who was reaching for the telephone, Shortis discharged the revolver at him, and Loy fell dead. While this was occurring Lowe and Leboeuf had time to gather up the money that was spread on the table, and they fled into the large vault, and closed the door. Shortis then found that he was left alone, the other two men being in the safe, and young Wilson having disappeared after being wounded. Following the track of the blood stains on the floor, Shortis traced Wilson to the private office of the manager. Wilson tried to hold the door against him, but Shortis being a strongly-built fellow six feet high, forced the door and catching Wilson tried to choke him with his hands. However, Wilson managed to escape. Just at that time Leboeuf, the watchman, came in with a lamp in his hand. He was a particular friend of Shortis, as was admitted by Shortis himself, because he remarked later on that the only regret he had was for having shot Leboeuf. Leboeuf seeing that there was something wrong, said : "What is the matter," as he entered the room, and Shortis said : "Hello, Maxime, how are you," and he immediately pointed the revolver at the poor fellow and shot him. Leboeuf fell on the floor, but Shortis seeing signs of life in him, and being afraid he would not die, went over to the telephone, pulled off the receiver, and going back to Leboeuf smashed his skull with it, so as to make sure of his victim. Then Shortis thought he had the whole thing to himself, and he went to the door of the vault. I am making those explanations to the House because it was said later, that Shortis was a fool and a plea of insanity was presented at the trial. As everybody knows, the jury in the case did not believe in the plea of insanity ; although unfortu-

ately some people afterwards did believe in it. When Shortis went to the door of the vault he tried to open it, but failed. Lowe played a trick on him, and said he could not open the door because he was locked in. Shortis asked for the combination, and Lowe gave him the combination to lock the safe, so that he really locked Lowe and Leboeuf in the safe, and remained outside himself. He shot his revolver once or twice at the slit of the safe door, but of course the ball did not go through. He then tried to make Lowe and Leboeuf, who were in the vault, believe that he was setting fire to the mill. He burned some paper in a spittoon near the opening, so that the smoke would go in and make Leboeuf believe the place was on fire, and induce him to open the door to save his life. Not having received what he expected, a favourable answer from Lowe, and not having obtained by means of the burning paper in the spittoon, the opening of the vault, and seeing that he had lost young Wilson, he started again and followed the traces of blood until he reached the second floor of the building, where under a table he found Wilson. He thought Wilson was dead, because, of course, Wilson kept quiet, yet he shot at him there several times. Fortunately and providentially, the balls did not strike any vital part in Wilson's body, and he is alive to-day and in perfect health. Shortis then went back to the office, and Wilson went forward as far as the boiler-room and gave the alarm. Those in the boiler-room sent for Dr. Sutherland, and the doctor came down, accompanied by Delisle, the watchman, who was in another part of the building. When Shortis got back to the office, he found the body of Leboeuf ; and being evidently afraid that this would attract attention, he took off his braces, tied them around Leboeuf's body, dragged it to the stairway, and threw it down the stairway, so that it would be out of the way. This is about the way the crime was committed. Then Dr. Sutherland and Delisle came in, and Shortis put up his two hands, and said "I give myself up, I have lost the game," or something of that kind, and begged them to shoot him. He said : "I have done something very bad, and I deserve to be shot." They would not shoot him. Just then the secretary of the company, Mr. Smith, came in, and said, "We will not shoot you, but we will leave you in the hands of the law." He was then arrested, and brought down to Beauharnois for trial. I am speaking of this matter because I believe the proper administration of justice in the country is the fundamental basis of the whole structure of society. If we take away from the people the idea that our laws are good and justly administered, very little will remain to encourage them to be good and honest and reasonable citizens. When the time for the trial came on, a change of venue was asked by the

lawyers for the defence, who contended that if Shortis were tried in Beauharnois, where the deed was committed, he would not be likely to receive justice. That application was made before Judge Belanger, and he refused to grant the change of venue. Consequently, the trial took place in Beauharnois. Before that there had been a commission sent to Ireland to make inquiries about Shortis and his previous life; and this man, whom people wanted to pass for an insane man, gave to his lawyers, like a very sensible fellow, full information as to all that had happened in Ireland which would explain what kind of a boy he had been at home, and what kind of a man he was altogether. He gave them full details. It was said afterwards at the trial that the father and mother had never heard of any of those things. I was present in the court when the report of that investigation was read, and it gave a very good idea of Shortis's general character. For instance, one thing that was stated was this. He was walking one day along the street, when he met a good old man, who said to him, "Good morning, Valentine, how are you this morning?" Shortis answered, "Good morning," and went on. He had a shillelah in his hand, and he had not gone five feet before he turned around and gave the old gentleman a blow. This was not reported to his parents, but he himself told it to his lawyer to show the kind of character he had in Ireland. In fact, the report of that commission did more to convince the jury that Shortis was not a fool, but a bad and cruel young man, than anything else that took place at the trial. The case came on. Shortis was defended by three of the best criminal lawyers in Montreal. The presiding judge, Judge Mathieu, was one of the best judges in the province of Quebec, a man who had been for many years Crown Attorney in his district before he became judge, and is held in high esteem by the bar. The trial went on. Twelve good, respectable jurymen were selected—not twelve of the unwashed, as Shortis called them afterwards in an interview with a reporter of the Montreal "Star." They were chosen, I believe, out of about 70 jurymen, and everything else was done to be as liberal as possible to the prisoner; for we all know that British law is as broad and as liberal as possible in that respect. Even the judge, as will be seen if these papers are brought down, seemed—I will not say to favour the prisoner, but to be very liberal towards him. Doctors were brought from every lunatic asylum in the country to give evidence, and they were paid, I am told, \$50 per day each. They worked very hard and stated a great deal that was most plausible, and it was pretty hard to shake their testimony. I remember, for instance, that one question Mr. McMaster asked was, "Do you believe it was the act of a fool to hold at the end of his pistol, John Lowe

Mr. BERGERON.

and young Leboeuf, when suddenly he turned and shot John Loy who was at the telephone, so as not to give alarm?" "No," the doctors answered, "that was the work of a fool." All the doctors answered in the same way. The Crown prosecutor was taunted that he had not had Shortis examined by a doctor. The answer was that the Crown had sent a doctor, I believe, Dr. Villeneuve, one of the doctors in the asylum of St. Jean de Dieu, and Shortis refused to allow the doctor for the Crown to examine him. Consequently, he could not be examined by any of the doctors sent by the Crown. But the Crown acted, I think, in a very sensible way; they brought into the court people who had seen Shortis for a year or a year and a half, and asked them what they thought about him; and the evidence of those people convinced the jury that Shortis was not insane, but legally responsible for his acts, knowing perfectly as the law required, the difference between right and wrong. The verdict of the jury was that he was guilty in the first degree of the murder of John Loy, because at the commencement of the trial the lawyers for the defence asked the court to try Shortis on the one indictment for the murder of John Loy, and leave the other matters aside. This was granted by the judge, so that Shortis was only found guilty of the murder of John Loy. The judge charged the jury in a most impartial way; and, after the verdict was rendered, the judge congratulated the jury, thanking them for the long time they had spent on the trial, and saying that so far as he was concerned, their verdict was based upon the evidence. He then condemned Shortis to be hanged on the 3rd of January. Now, I need not say that it was a matter of general satisfaction to the people of Beauharnois that a verdict of guilty was rendered. It was the idea of everybody that Shortis was guilty, but there was something that troubled the public mind at the time, and it was this. There was no doubt that the father and the mother were doing everything in their power—and this was quite natural—to save their son from the scaffold. They had lots of money, they used to boast of it, and the people of Beauharnois were afraid that by means of their money something might happen to prevent the law following its course. I never believed that for a minute, and I used to tell everybody who spoke to me about it that I could not understand how mercy, under the circumstances, could be granted. I happened to be in Chicago when the verdict was rendered, and I then wrote to the Minister of Justice expressing my hope that the law would be allowed to follow its course. Later on, when I was in Montreal, learning what efforts were being made to obtain a commutation of sentence, I again wrote to the Minister of Justice to the same effect. I never believed for a moment

that commutation would be granted. I have stated all that I know about this case. The papers I am asking for will give more information and explanation, I hope. There is no doubt, in my opinion—of course I may be wrong—that some one is guilty of having extended too much sympathy, and that consequently there has been a miscarriage of justice. Now, with regard to the question of insanity, I heard all the pleadings and the reading of the English and French authorities on that question, a great many of which were read during the trial. Of course, if it had been proved that the man was purely and simply insane, I have no doubt that the community would have inclined to the side of clemency. But in this case, my impression is that it was not a question of insanity. My impression is that this was only a pretext, and that it was purely and simply a question of sympathy which was extended, unduly I am afraid. We can all understand sympathy for the mother and father; but is there not ground also for sympathy with the relatives of the victims? Think for a moment of that poor young man, John Loy, the pride of his father and mother, a good young man—a better never breathed, not only in the district of Beauharnois, but anywhere else—a model in his town; and should we not extend sympathy to his parents, who have nearly been distracted since this shooting. Have we not ground also for extending sympathy to Madame Leboeuf, the widow of poor Maxime Leboeuf, who was also one of the best men living? It is worthy of note that the two victims—three, if I may include Wilson—were young men without reproach. Leboeuf was married and left a widow and some little children, who will grow up fatherless through the act of Shortis. If we are to extend sympathy, it seems to me we should extend it to these people. It seems to me we should extend it also to the family of poor Wilson, who lay for a month between life and death, and whose poor mother nearly lost her own life taking care of and nursing him. But, I say, sympathy was granted to Shortis. The pretext was taken that the plea of insanity was a good one, and we shall see, probably, when these papers are brought down, from the report of the judge or the Minister of Justice, or any decision or warrant dealing with the case, whether it was the plea of insanity on which was decided the commutation of his sentence. If it was, why was he sent to the penitentiary and not to a lunatic asylum? My impression is that there might be a flaw in the warrant or procedure. If the sentence of death was commuted because of insanity, he should have been sent to a lunatic asylum. But he was not. It was found out afterwards, perhaps, that according to law, even the Crown could not commute a sentence on the plea of insanity, because that plea has been brought before a jury and

the jury had declared that the man was not insane, and was legally responsible for his acts. And probably having found that out afterwards, yet wishing to prevent his mounting the scaffold, he was purely and simply sent to penitentiary, where, according to reports from the officials, he is one of the best behaved prisoners ever sent there. Far from being insane, he is doing his work well, and is, in fact, a model in his ward. The danger I wish to point out is this. If mercy has been granted to Shortis for the reason I have mentioned, why should not every criminal condemned to be hanged hereafter address himself to the same authority and obtain the same treatment; and if he does not, the people will believe that he is not treated according to justice. I remember a case, which I believe the ex-Minister of Justice (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) will remember very well, that of old Chatelle, in the province of Ontario. He was an old French-Canadian from St. Hyacinthe. He was, I think, a fool of the first water. That is my impression, the crime he committed was so horrible. He committed this crime in Ontario, was accused and brought into court. He had no lawyer and no money and no friends. Still, the court did not even ask, as is generally done, a lawyer to defend him for nothing, which I have seen done in Montreal very often. He stood his trial without any lawyer to defend him; sixty witnesses, I believe, were examined, and his case went through in the one day. He was found guilty, and condemned to be hanged the very same night. Some people expressed doubts as to the legality of that condemnation. The rapidity with which the trial had gone and the fact that this man, by the answer he gave to the court, showed he was entirely a maniac, convinced them that he was wrongly convicted. I will not say that he was not responsible for his acts, but petitions and demands were sent in that he should not be executed, but that his sentence should be commuted, and these were refused. I believe that the ex-Minister of Justice did well to refuse them. I believe that Chatelle deserved to be hanged; but if Chatelle deserved to be hanged, under the circumstances, why did not Shortis deserve the same fate under similar circumstances? We might understand the influences which have prevailed in this case, but the people in the country do not, and that is why I say that this has done, I think, to the administration of justice in this country more harm than could have been imagined by those responsible. Now, there was a question the other day in the papers about arresting Shortis once more for the murder of Leboeuf. My impression is that the case of Shortis will be a bad precedent for a long while. I do not say that the Government did not—because I have not the papers—but it strikes me that if the Government had purely and simply advised the Governor

General that the law should follow its course, there would have been no commutation of the sentence. That is my impression. Now, if there has been a commutation of sentence, we shall see the reasons why that commutation was made. But, in the meantime, we can say this: Suppose that the government of the province of Quebec—and it is not yet decided—should again arrest Shortis and again bring him to trial for the murder of Leboeuf. It may look small to speak of a question of money in this case, though I believe the Shortis trial must have cost the province \$15,000 or \$20,000. To try him again would impose upon the province a further expenditure of a like sum. And even if he were found guilty of murder in the case of Leboeuf, my opinion is that those who have commuted the sentence in this case, to be logical, to be consistent, would have to commute the second sentence of death into imprisonment for life. So, what is the use of a second trial? What I dread is that the administration of justice, at any rate in the district of Beauharnois, will be but inexpensive in future cases—that the people will carry it on themselves. It is a terrible thing to speak of, but my impression is that if another murder were committed in Valleyfield in the way this was committed, there would be no trial and no chance for a commutation of sentence—the murderer would be hanged to the first telephone pole. This is the danger, not only in Beauharnois, but everywhere else throughout the country. This danger is a terrible one, for, if the great mass of the people lose confidence in the administration of justice, how can you keep them within the law? They will take the law into their own hands; and if they do, what will you do with your code and your books of law? I have been informed that the other day a question was asked in this House by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) as to the constitutionality of the act of His Excellency the Governor General. I shall not speak about that, for it will be useless to discuss it before the papers come down. Now, I may put this question before I finish these remarks: If anything wrong has been done, if no satisfactory explanation can be given why such a departure from the ordinary course of justice should have been made, would it not be possible for the whole procedure to be undone and matters put again in the same position as they were before? Now, we were told—I think I have seen it in the newspapers, though I am not quite sure—that some of the members of the Cabinet were opposed to the death penalty. I have no doubt that some of the members of the Government, and also members of this House are conscientiously opposed to capital punishment. Very well, Mr. Speaker, then the question of capital punishment may be a matter to be discussed in this House. Let a Bill on the subject

Mr. BERGERON.

be prepared and let the matter be decided after debate by the representatives of the people. If it then becomes law that capital punishment shall no longer be inflicted, we shall have the same law for all, for those in poor circumstances as for those in good circumstances. But, until that is done, the commutation of the sentence of death, except for just cause, is a gross miscarriage of justice. I have no words admissible in parliamentary debate strong enough to express my indignation at the conduct of this man since his reprieve. He has been telling all with whom he conversed how he acted during that trial, has been telling the sheriff of Beauharnois all that he did in Valleyfield, and has been saying that he knew from the first he would not be hanged, that certain parties were working for him; and has been saying, moreover, since being sent to the penitentiary, that he would not be there very long, and that again he would set foot upon the soil of Ireland. Well, if ever Shortis leaves the penitentiary he had better return to Ireland and not again set foot upon the soil of Canada. But I do not believe that Shortis will ever leave the penitentiary, except to ascend the scaffold, and I say that it rests with those who have charge of the administration of justice to make it clear to the people of the country that, at least, he will be kept where he is now for the remainder of his days. Now, Mr. Speaker, reserving to myself the right to speak again on this motion, I beg to move the resolution of which I have given notice.

Mr. DICKEY. I am quite sure, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. gentleman sincerely felt the sentiment he expressed at the beginning of his remarks—a sense of the serious responsibility under which he lay in bringing this matter before the House. I may say, Sir, on behalf of the Government, that no objection will be made to bringing down the papers which are asked for. All I wish to do now is to deprecate any discussion on the merits of the case until the information is before the House. The hon. gentleman has stated somewhat in detail the particulars attending the act of this young man, Shortis, and I am quite free to say that they are of such a character that they never seem to grow old. I can quite understand that the bare recital of these facts, which we have read, perhaps, over and over again, is quite sufficient to make every one within the sound of the hon. gentleman's voice thrill with horror at the crime that was committed. But, of course, as the hon. gentleman well observed, that is not the question at issue here, the crime having been practically undefended, as the hon. gentleman has said, so far as the facts were concerned. It may seem somewhat presumptuous in me, being somewhat young in the office which I now occupy, to offer some observations to the House, on the general subject of parliamentary inquiry into

the exercise of the prerogative of mercy. I am not able, as a matter of fact, to treat the subject exhaustively, but I desire to make one or two observations upon the point. In the first place, I think that the House should not forget that the exercise of the prerogative of mercy is part of the administration of the criminal law. The functions which Council discharges in connection with crime in this country, are part of the machinery by which the country deals with crime, just as much as the functions of judge and jury, though of a somewhat different character. Therefore I trust that this House, in approaching this question, particularly since I am quite aware that strong feelings are aroused, will not forget that in discussing this question it is discussing the administration of a part of the criminal law of the country. I fancy that any hon. gentleman will quite realize that no more painful duty can be cast upon the members of Council than to decide the issue of the life or death of a fellow-man. It is, I need scarcely say, quite beyond the range of political considerations; it is a matter of conscience for every man upon his oath to settle. I am quite sure that every hon. member of this House will realize the very serious character of the responsibility that is thrown upon members of Council in that connection. Now, I do not wish the House to understand me for one moment as intimating that this House has no right to inquire into the exercise of the prerogative of mercy. I fully admit that, but I wish both sides of the House, as well as the hon. gentleman who made this motion, to join with me in maintaining the dignity of the administration of justice, even when it reaches a point upon which we feel strongly that injustice has been done. It is not incompetent for this House to discuss the proceedings of the courts, it is within our powers. We all know with what great care that power is exercised, and how extremely inexpedient it is that it should be frequently exercised; so that while I do not in the slightest degree pretend to deny to the House the constitutional right of investigating this subject, and of requiring the responsibility to be assumed by those constitutionally charged to assume it, I wish to say to the House that I do hope that in undertaking that investigation they will be most careful to do so in such a manner as not to injure the general course of the administration of justice, and to be sure that they have all the information at their hands. Now, I do not propose to do more than cite to the House, in support of what I have said, the opinions of Lord Macaulay and the opinion of Sir Robert Peel. They are both familiar to those hon. gentlemen who have read Todd, but it seems to me that they are very impressive. It is quite true that they were not speaking on an occasion exactly like this; they were speaking on an occasion where the English House of Commons was

invited to interfere directly, or by resolution, in the administration of the prerogative of mercy. But their views are exactly pertinent now. Lord Macaulay said:

I have no hesitation in saying with regard to this power—the prerogative of mercy—that I would rather entrust it in the hands of the very worst ministry that ever held office, than allow it to be exercised under the direction of the very best House of Commons. * * * If you think the ministry do not exercise the prerogative of mercy where they ought, then, address the Crown to remove them.

He goes on in the same direction, deprecating the direct interference of the House of Commons. Sir Robert Peel also says on that occasion:

If anything could tend to strengthen my conviction of the impolicy of discussing a question of legal punishment like the one before us, in a popular assembly, the speech of the hon. colleague of the gentleman who brought forward this motion, would have that effect.

He goes on further to discuss the very bad effect of bringing questions of this sort before a popular assembly. I quote these opinions, not to question the jurisdiction of this House in the premises, but to show this House the grave responsibility which men of such high position as Lord Macaulay and Sir Robert Peel felt was assumed by the House when it took cognizance of a question like this; and I ask the House to reserve their judgment until the papers in this matter have been brought down. Every hon. gentleman who is connected with the administration of justice knows that the report of the judge who tried the case, is of critical importance in settling questions of this kind. No lawyer in the House would pretend to offer an opinion on this subject until he had the report of the judge who tried the case. There are other papers of immense importance in this case. I may say on behalf of the Government that there is not the slightest wish to evade any constitutional responsibility in this matter. When the papers come down the Government will be quite prepared to take all the constitutional responsibility that belongs to them in connection with this matter, and all I ask now is that the discussion shall not be precipitated, undertaking that the preparation of the answer to this return shall be forwarded with all possible speed so that we may get it soon before the House.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would ask the hon. gentleman whether it is the experience of the department that letters and petitions are received in favour of the execution. Is that a usual thing in the department?

Mr. DICKEY. No, I think it is not.

Mr. LAURIER. I quite agree with my hon. friend, the Minister of Justice, that this is not a time nor an occasion to discuss the merits of the case of Valentine Shortis. Whether the sentence of the law should

have been carried out or whether mercy should have been extended to him, is a question which, I agree with him altogether, cannot be debated at this time. I doubt if, under the circumstances which have attended this case, that question can be debated at any time; at all events, I am quite clear that this is not the time or the place. But there is another question which arises in regard to this case, and it is this: Have the Government of Canada, have the advisers of His Excellency, discharged the duty which is theirs to discharge, when they failed, as it is a matter of fact that they did fail, to advise His Excellency as to whether the sentence should be commuted or not. There is no man who, at this stage of the case, would feel at all disposed to pass an opinion as to whether the sentence should have been carried out. But the hon. gentleman who has just spoken knows, and the House also knows, that in this matter, the prerogative of mercy is now to be exercised in the same manner as it is exercised in England. It is no longer the prerogative of the Sovereign that may be exercised at his own discretion, according to the dictates of his judgment or his heart, but he must act upon the responsibility of his ministerial advisers. Sir, it is a matter of fact, the ministerial press have received the authoritative statement from the Government themselves, that in this matter they failed and refused to discharge a duty which they owed to His Excellency in advising him whether he should extend mercy or not. On 1st day January, the day before the sentence should have been executed at Beauharnois, the ministerial press published the following authoritative statement—I quote from the "Mail and Empire," of Toronto:—

Ottawa, January 1st (Special).—Regarding the announcement that the death sentence of Valentine Shortis has been commuted to imprisonment for life, the following statement, which is official and authoritative, has been given to your correspondent:—

It is understood that, after a number of meetings of the Council, at which the case of the prisoner Shortis was discussed, the Cabinet not having recommended any interference with the sentence of the court, His Excellency the Governor General made representations to the Home Government by cable, stating the facts, and received a reply to the effect that in such a case his duty would be to exercise his own judgment. His Excellency thereupon decided that, under the circumstances, the sentence should be commuted to imprisonment for life. The necessary steps have been taken to carry out the decision of His Excellency. There can be no doubt that a criminal lunatic asylum will be Shortis' future place of confinement.

It appears, however, that this course was not carried out, from what the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) has stated to the House, but Shortis was sent to the penitentiary. The correspondence goes on to say—and it is to this point I specially wish to call the attention of the House—as follows:—

Mr. LAURIER.

From the above statement it is clear that Valentine Shortis escapes the gallows solely through the intervention of Lord Aberdeen on his behalf.

In this paragraph I consider we have the whole matter. The Government refused from first to last to shoulder the responsibility as to what should be done with the prisoner. The question had been raised as to his insanity and decided; it had been raised again before the Executive; the Executive failed, however, to assume the responsibility, they failed to advise the Governor General. His Excellency then asked for instructions in England; the instructions he received were that he was at liberty to exercise his own judgment in the matter. I agree with my hon. friend that this is not the time to discuss the propriety or impropriety of the decision that was arrived at; but this is the time to discuss the fact that the Government in this matter refrained from discharging an important duty they owed to the Sovereign as well as to this country. Why was not that advice given the representative of the Sovereign had a right to receive?

Mr. DICKEY. The hon. gentleman will find out when the papers come down.

Mr. LAURIER. I find that the Government have not discharged an important duty in this regard. We have been told that the advisers of His Excellency were divided, seven on one side and seven on the other.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Where does the hon. gentleman find that statement?

Mr. LAURIER. I think it is in the correspondence here,—I may be wrong as to that. But I assume that the report of the Minister of Justice was against commuting the sentence. I assume that in this matter the Minister of Justice followed the precedent laid down and placed before this House in the matter of Louis Riel. The Governor General at that time was in a similar position. A petition had then been submitted for the commutation of Riel, and the Government came to the conclusion that as the fact of the insanity of Riel had been passed upon by the jury, the Government could not undertake to review the sentence of the jury. Let me recall the words that were spoken in the debate on that occasion by the then Minister of Justice. Sir John Thompson said:

I admit that, when a man has political delusions, there may be a connection between his delusions and his crimes, but that is a question to be submitted to the jury. In this case it was submitted to the jury, with the most liberal instructions by the judge, and the finding of that jury, sustained by judgments in appeal, was that he was undoubtedly the subject of political delusions, but that his conduct was not so connected with them as to lessen his culpability. I admit that a jury ought to be careful in such cases to ascertain that there is no connection

between the delusion and the crime, but in this case the great patience exercised by the jury in sifting the fact, and the careful scrutiny this case received on appeal, show that the jury discharged their duties carefully and conscientiously.

In this matter no one will pretend that the jury in the Shortis case did not discharge their duty carefully and conscientiously, and I presume, though I have not seen the report of the Minister of Justice, which will come before us later on, this is admitted; and I have no doubt, following that precedent, the then Minister of Justice, the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) refused to allow the sentence to be commuted, and that he reported against commutation. I cannot conceive that he did otherwise, in view of the precedent laid down on the celebrated occasion to which I have referred. Something, therefore, must have taken place in Council, which we do not know, but the result of which was that the hon. gentleman's advice was not accepted and the Ministers refused to abide by his report; something occurred in Council, which I cannot understand, but we know as a fact that the advisers of His Excellency deliberately declined to discharge the duty they owed to His Excellency, and not only to him but to the people of Canada. That is the question we have to deal with at the present time, and I conceive the Government cannot escape responsibility of the charge that on this occasion they were guilty of gross dereliction of duty towards the Sovereign and towards the people.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I will appeal to hon. gentlemen, notwithstanding the observations which have fallen from the leader of the Opposition, to follow the advice or suggestion of the Minister of Justice, not only as regards the question involved in the motion of the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron), but also as regards the equally important question which the leader of the Opposition has touched upon. The hon. gentleman has been compelled to direct the attention of this House to that important phase of the subject by relying upon assumptions, and I will point out to him the difficulties in which the House will find itself placed in following up the subject he has opened this afternoon, when I confess to him my own embarrassment from not knowing at this precise moment how far I am at liberty to go in regard to the facts of the case until these papers are brought down and the records are before us, to revive my recollection of the action of Council and other matters, which the hon. leader of the Opposition considers to be important by referring to them so emphatically. Until this is done, I am utterly unable to discuss the subject as thoroughly as I hope to be able to do at a later period. I desire also to call the hon. gentleman's attention to the danger of dealing with so important a subject with-

out full and proper information. For instance, before referring to his observations particularly, I would refer to the fact, that the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron), in referring to the case of Shortis has travelled over ground and referred to facts of which we have no information whatever, and I doubt very much in regard to some of his statements whether any information can be given to this House to bear them out. For instance, there is a report mentioned by the hon. gentleman with respect to Shortis at St. Vincent de Paul penitentiary. When I left the Department of Justice no such report had been received, and I should like to know how the hon. member obtained information in regard to the conduct of this prisoner since he was sentenced.

Mr. BERGERON. I have seen it in the newspapers—I have seen it two or three times.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That shows the danger of discussing a subject of this importance on mere rumour or newspaper report.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It is a Government organ.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. A Government organ, the hon. gentleman says, but the hon. the leader of the Opposition must find how unreliable that authority may be on an occasion of this kind, as he had to admit that the statement of the 2nd of January was shown not to be entirely correct, because it referred to the decision of His Excellency the Governor General in reference to sending this prisoner to the lunatic asylum instead of to the penitentiary. In that very correction we have what I should think ought to influence the House very much indeed. These two subjects are interesting, and the two subjects are reported. I have no doubt they will be thoroughly and fully discussed in this House, and that a proper spirit in reference to the discussion will prevail. I appeal to the House again, that it is better not to accept any of the features of the case at the present moment, for within a very reasonable time we may expect all of these papers, which, although important ones, are not very long.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). These petitions, of course, were to His Excellency the Governor General, "per se." They were referred to the Department of the Minister, and he reported. Was there any answer, or advice, given to His Excellency with reference to these petitions?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman will see, of course, that in my individual case, I am not able to give an answer at the present moment. I can tell the hon. gentleman really nothing just now, and I must go by the record that is

produced. I have my own strong opinions on both of these subjects, and when the papers are here, I will be better able to ascertain how far the record will allow me to put my own opinions, as fully as I would like, before this House.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). You could obtain leave.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Yes, but I think the papers which the Minister of Justice has consented, so far as he is concerned, should be brought before the House, would be all any hon. gentleman would require, to understand every important feature of the case. I do not propose to admit a theory which the leader of the Opposition has adopted, that there was, under any circumstances—even under the assumptions which he has made to-day—a failure on the part of the Executive, in regard to the responsibility.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). When there is an application for mercy, certainly the Government must pass upon it.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That is not the question the hon. gentleman raised; the hon. gentleman raised a question even more important than that. But, I would point out to-day, just briefly, a distinction that I propose later on, and on a fitting occasion, to elaborate. It is a distinction that I should think ought to be borne in mind in regard to the responsibility of the Executive here, in connection with this claim of prerogative of mercy. The hon. the leader of the Opposition will forgive me, I hope, if I correct his statement as to the practice in England. The practice in England in this case, has nothing to do with the Cabinet, or with the Executive, as such. The hon. gentleman will agree with me that it has now fallen on the Home Secretary, and that he is individually responsible.

Mr. LAURIER. It is part of his ministerial responsibility.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. But he is individually responsible, and he, and he only, would be responsible to Parliament. That is, I think, beyond question; but it points to us, it seems to me, a distinction between the responsibility of the Executive as a rule, and their responsibility in these peculiar cases. If that be so in England, it is more remarkable in connection with the Government of this country, because, when the hon. gentleman (Mr. Laurier) was a member of the Government, he will remember that the Imperial Government "did not permit" the Government of this country to exercise any responsibility whatever upon this subject of prerogative. And, so much was this the case, that there are records in the department, and records in our own authorities here on parliamentary procedure and practice, showing that the Governor

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.

General of the day made it a point, in his order, in a certain important case, that he had acted so, wholly regardless of the advice or opinion of the Executive. That decision was so extraordinary in the minds of the advisers of His Excellency that Mr. Blake, as Minister of Justice, took up the subject and proceeded to England. But, up to 1877 we have it beyond dispute, that the Governors General—before confederation, and afterwards—in regard to the exercise of this prerogative, acted upon their own individual responsibility. Now, in 1877, this mission of Mr. Blake's took place, and, to a large extent, it was satisfactory; but, nevertheless, he came back with an admitted anomaly, in regard to the difference that exists in this matter between a self-governing colony and the mother country. For instance, there is no question in Great Britain as to the responsibility for every act of the sovereign; but in Canada, I have pointed out one distinction that exists, and the distinction remains to this day. No lawyer in this House will deny that, notwithstanding the new instructions subsequent to Mr. Blake's mission, the Governor General is instructed again in terms, that in a matter concerning the prerogative of mercy, where Imperial interests are involved—for instance, in a case of treason or a crime of that character—he has there again to act upon his own individual judgment.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Foreigners.

Mr. IVES. Not necessarily foreigners.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. According to all constitutional authorities in connection with the British Government, we know that that is an anomaly. It does not exist in England, and therefore we must in fairness, or for academic purposes, or any reason whatever, remember in this House, that we do not stand here as regards the Governor General in exactly the same position. The Government here do not stand in regard to the Governor General in exactly the same position as Her Majesty's Government in England in regard to the Queen. I admit that that is an anomaly.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Are you arguing in reference to cases where Imperial interests are involved?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Yes, but I do not now say that it applies in this case. I am only showing that there is a departure in Canada, from that rule of responsibility on the part of the Executive which obtained in the mother country. That brings one down to other features in connection with the latest instructions; and the interesting question which I think will be found to be involved in the Shortis case, when the papers are here, is whether these instructions have carried out fully the intention—of certainly Mr. Blake and the Government which he represented in

1877—or whether they require to be further amended. According to one view, there is still a case, outside of the case where Imperial interests are involved, in which the Governor General, under instructions from England, may act on his own individual judgment. If that be so, I will go with any hon. gentleman in this House for pressing in a proper manner upon the attention of the Imperial authorities that that distinction should be obliterated, and that the only case which should be considered as one from which this Government are free of responsibility, would be a case where these Imperial interests are directly involved. I mention this to-day, not for the purpose of discussing it, but in order to show that the question is not only of the importance that has been suggested, but that it is too great and too important, indeed, to be discussed in the absence of the records.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. ex-Minister of Justice has informed the House that where Imperial interests are concerned, as they would be in the case of the trial of a political offender who was a foreigner, the Imperial Government have reserved for themselves certain authority with respect to the exercise of the prerogative of mercy. Well, Sir, that is outside of this case, so that it is wholly unnecessary to consider it. What we have to consider is whether any such rule as the hon. gentleman has invoked applies to this case. The hon. gentleman has referred to a case in which he said the Governor had exercised the prerogative on his own authority. That was the case in which Lord Dufferin had exercised the prerogative alone. But in that case the offence was committed outside of our jurisdiction. It was committed in a territory foreign to this country at the time. The territory was not then embraced in Canada; it became a portion of Canada some time subsequently; and, when that offence was committed, it was an offence against the law of England, committed in a territory under the jurisdiction of England.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Does the hon. gentleman say that in that case that was one of the reasons which induced the Governor General to act?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That was one of the considerations; and if the hon. gentleman will look at Lord Carnarvon's speech, where that matter was discussed, he will find that that fact is mentioned. Even if it were different it would be a matter of no consequence in this case. The point here is that the petitions asking for the commutation of this man's sentence were placed before His Excellency as the representative of Her Majesty, and these petitions were such as His Excellency could not act upon without the advice of his Ministers; and so his Ministers would be called upon to advise His Excellency on that subject. Now,

what advice did these hon. gentlemen give to His Excellency in respect to the prayer of those petitions?

Mr. HAGGART. Does the hon. gentleman know of a case in which advice was given to His Excellency on a petition in a case of commutation?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Why, Sir, the petitions are all referred by His Excellency to his Ministers for advice.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Would not the commutation state the facts, and then say, "His Excellency is pleased to grant," etc., according to the wording of the commutation?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That would be the mere formal language of the Secretary of State. Does the hon. gentleman say that the law would be allowed to take its course if the petition were not presented at all? I say that is not the rule. If it was the proceeding in this case, it was a most irregular proceeding, and is not the rule followed in the office of the Secretary of State for Home Affairs. The act must be on the part of the proper officer entrusted with the administration of the law. Take the case of Comin, who was convicted of a capital offence in Ireland. A petition was presented to George IV., and he directed that a commutation of the sentence should issue, without reference to his Ministers. The Duke of Wellington was Prime Minister, and Sir Robert Peel was Secretary of State for the Home Department. The latter was very indignant at what had taken place, and informed His Majesty that he could not act without the authority of his Ministers. The Lord Lieutenant was instructed that the law must take its course, and Comin was executed, notwithstanding the fact that the king undertook to exercise the prerogative of mercy on his behalf. I mention that as an instance showing that in all such matters the proceedings ought to be regular, and on the advice of responsible Ministers. That advice to His Excellency is not given by the Minister of Justice, but by the Council. The instructions to the Governor are to that effect, and the instructions in that particular would no doubt be followed. When the papers are brought down, we shall no doubt be better prepared to discuss this question; but there can be no doubt that whatever is done is done upon the responsibility of the Ministers, whether they act or whether they abstain from acting. If they informed His Excellency that they were unable to agree, or if they refused to advise him with respect to those petitions, then they abnegated their functions in forcing His Excellency to look elsewhere for the advice which he was constitutionally entitled to receive from them.

Mr. MULOCK. I do not find that the language of the motion—

Mr. O'BRIEN. My hon. friend will allow me one moment. If this discussion is to go on, let us understand it; but if it is to be dropped until the papers come down, it is as well that we should act on that understanding. If one speech is to be given, and then another, there will be no stopping the discussion. We should either drop it altogether or go on with it.

Mr. MULLOCK. I am not going to discuss the motion. I rose because the original motion was not full enough. I understand—if we can know anything from general information—that when the case went before Council no decision was arrived at, and no Order in Council was issued. Therefore, I would like to ascertain what became of the application, and what action, if any, the Council took; and I was going to ask, if my hon. friend has no objection, that the following should be added to the motion:—

Also for a statement showing whether any petition for the commutation of the death sentence were submitted to Council, and what decision, if any, was arrived at in regard thereto.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. BRODEUR. Before this motion is carried, I would like to make a few observations, because I have on the Order paper a motion similar to the one which has been made by the hon. member for Beauharnois; but my motion goes a little further than his. The hon. member for Beauharnois has made a statement which has led the House to believe that this man Shortis got a very fair trial, and that the commutation of the sentence should not have been made. Well, I ask by my motion that the record and the evidence should also be brought down.

Mr. DICKEY. If the hon. gentleman will allow me, I would suggest that it would be better for him to make a separate motion for that; otherwise it would very much delay the return to this motion.

Mr. DAVIN. Would it not be better to act on the suggestion of the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien), because if we go on discussing the question, we shall all want to discuss it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. BRODEUR. I think it would be proper also for the Government to declare to-day whether the statement that was published in the Government organs on the 2nd January was correct or not. For example, I see in the Montreal "Gazette" of that date a statement which is declared by that paper to be official. It is published as a despatch from Ottawa, and it reads as follows:—

The statement made in this correspondence last night, that the death sentence of Valentine Shortis had been commuted by His Excellency the Governor General to imprisonment for life, is officially confirmed to-day. It is understood that, after a

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).

number of meetings of Council, at which the case of the prisoner Shortis was discussed, and the Cabinet not having recommended any interference with the sentence of the court, His Excellency the Governor General made representations to the Home Government by cable, stating the facts, and having received a reply to the effect that in such a case his duty would be to exercise his own judgment, decided that, under the circumstances, the sentence should be commuted to imprisonment for life. The necessary steps have been taken to carry out the decision of His Excellency, and there can be no doubt that a criminal lunatic asylum will be Shortis' future place of confinement.

Now this statement is absolutely the same as the one published on the same day in the "Mail and Empire," and which was quoted by the leader of the Opposition. I do not see, therefore, why the Government should not tell us at once whether that statement is correct or not. It was published in the two Government organs in Toronto, and, I also think, in the "Citizen" of this city, and I should like to know if it is correct or not, as I think that will help us in the discussion which will take place later on this question.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. When the warrant is brought down, it will give the hon. gentleman the information on that point.

Mr. BRODEUR. Then am I to understand that the statement is not accurate?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The leader of the Opposition said it is evidently incorrect, and I say so too, as regards the last part.

Mr. BRODEUR. The last part says that the sentence has been commuted to imprisonment for life, and no doubt necessary steps have been taken to carry out the decision of His Excellency, and there can be no doubt that a criminal lunatic asylum will be Shortis's future place of confinement.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That part is obviously incorrect.

Mr. BRODEUR. Then I understand that the first part is correct?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I think so. The imprisonment for life is undoubtedly correct.

Mr. BRODEUR. Then I do not understand why the Government should not be willing to-day to discuss the constitutional features, when, on the 2nd of January, they gave to their papers the official announcement I have just quoted. I think the Government should be willing to bring down the papers immediately and to give, at all events, an answer to that question, because if we are going to wait for the papers, we may be kept waiting months, perhaps two or three years, as has happened in some cases I brought and which concern my hon. friend the Postmaster General (Sir Adolphe Caron).

I think that it would have been only fair on the part of the Government to tell us to-day that that first part of the statement was correct or not.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It is perfectly evident that when the papers come down this House will discuss, probably at some length, the responsibility which attaches to the Government, the advisers of His Excellency, for the commutation of the sentence of Shortis. It is perfectly evident to both sides that that discussion will be very important and that we should have all the papers necessary to a proper discussion. The address has been already amended in certain directions by my hon. friend from North York (Mr. Mulock), but there was an interjection into the debate by the Minister of Railways (Mr. Haggart) during a speech made by my hon. friend the member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), which leads me to believe that some of the papers are not called for, which it will be necessary for us to have. I did not quite catch the exact meaning of the hon. gentleman's interruption. What he led me to understand was that he doubted whether there ever had been a case in which the advisers of His Excellency had given their advice on such a question.

Mr. HAGGART. Not at all. The hon. member for Bothwell was stating to the House that petitions were referred to the Council, and what answer we gave to the petitions for commutation. I asked the hon. gentleman whether he was aware of petitions ever having been presented to the Council for commutation and of an answer being given by the Privy Council?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I am speaking from personal knowledge, and I know myself that this has been done.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) That is what I understood. I have no experience of it personally, but as a lawyer I never doubted that such was the almost universal practice.

Mr. HAGGART. I am not aware of it.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It is perfectly plain to my mind from the statement made by the ex-Minister of Justice (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) informing the House that in certain particulars the official report which was read by the leader of the Opposition was not accurate. It is perfectly evident that these portions of that report which were not denied may be accepted approximately as correct, and it is now admitted, I think, that His Excellency cabled to the Colonial Secretary asking for advice in this matter. It seems to me that it will be essential to a proper discussion on this subject, that any cablegrams which His Excellency sent to the Home Office and any received in reply should be laid before the House along with the other papers. I therefore move to amend the Address by adding the following words:—

Also for any correspondence between His Excellency the Governor General and the Colonial Secretary, whether by cablegram or otherwise, on the same subject.

Amendment agreed to.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I would suggest that in the original motion the word "report" should read "reports" by the judge, because there were two reports.

Mr. SCRIVER. Before that motion is submitted, I desire to say a word or two. With the general tone of the remarks of my hon. friend from Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron), I could find no fault. He certainly gave, so far as I know, not only a very vivid but a very accurate description of the events of this unfortunate case, but he did say something to which I must express my emphatic dissent. He led this House to suppose that the feeling of indignation is so great in the district which he and I have the honour in common to represent, that there would be great danger, on the recurrence of any similar event, of the people of that district taking the law into their own hands. I cannot allow such an imputation to rest upon what I know to be a law-abiding community. I do not think there is the slightest danger, under any circumstances, that the people of that district would be disposed to import and put into exercise the vile practices which prevail in another country under similar circumstances, and I express my emphatic dissent from the opinion to which my hon. friend has given utterance.

Mr. MULOCK. There appears to be some question—

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman has spoken already to the main motion.

Mr. MULOCK. But there is an amendment.

Mr. SPEAKER. The amendment has been put and carried, and the question now is on the main motion as amended.

Main motion, as amended, agreed to.

AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENTS.

Mr. DAVIN moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, the duty on agricultural implements should be removed.

He said: This motion is one of great importance to the North-west Territories and to Manitoba. Mr. Speaker, I fear that many hon. gentlemen in this House and out of it find it difficult to understand the discussions which sometimes arise in connection with the tariff. The average political mind seems equal to the task of understanding the politician who will vote for a protective tariff without any modification whatever, or the politician who says that he is opposed to protection and will vote against every form of protective tariff. But the man

who says : I am in favour of protection and, under certain circumstances, protection may mean the abolition of all duties whatever, is not understood. For, what is the object of all protection ? The real object of all protection is not to protect the manufacturers, but to protect the country itself. If the main object of protection was to protect manufacturers without any consideration for the country at large, why that protection, by the very statement of the formula of it, is condemned as iniquitous. And so the protective tariff must be framed to so affect the industries of the country as to bring the greatest possible advantage to the country itself. Now, Sir, in this motion I declare in favour of removing the duties on agricultural implements going into the North-west Territories. And why do I do so ? For this reason : I hold, and all persons who thoroughly understand what a protective tariff should be, hold to these propositions—that under a protective tariff a duty should be imposed only when necessary to the healthy existence of the native industry affected ; and that when imposed, it should be no higher than is necessary for protection. Our object is not excluding as to the foreign article, but fostering as to the native article. The aim is not to absolutely deprive the local market of healthy competition from abroad. You do not aim at giving the local or home manufacturer an extravagant profit ; what you aim at is enabling him to carry on his manufacture free from designed and destructive competition from the outside manufacturers. And if you were to find that any industry was, in consequence of your tariff, making an excessive profit, that would be a time at once to interfere. And I hold that there is another time for interfering also, and that is when your tariff brings about a monopoly. The object to aim at is an equilibrium between the needs of the local industry and the interest of the community.

Mr. SCRIVER. Scientific protection.

Mr. DAVIN. Exactly. As my hon. friend says, scientific protection. Now, Mr. Speaker, this requires constant care and occasional readjustment. My friends of the Opposition might think that that is a peculiarity of a protective tariff law. Not at all. All social philosophers and thinkers on the subject of laws in all countries and at all times have laid down this general proposition—that all laws have the tendency to inure to the advantage of the rich rather than the poor. And, Sir, though here espousing the cause of the farmers of the North-west Territories and the farmers of Manitoba, I am in principle assailing a large number of interests, and, directly, one great interest, and therefore taking what must be an unpopular position for a politician. For, though the interest one assails is singular, the votes that interest will af-

Mr. DAVIN.

fect are many. It may be said, and is said, and might properly be said, for instance, by my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Daly), if he were to speak—and as I have again and again shown in this House and on a hundred platforms—the prices of agricultural implements have fallen in consequence of the National Policy. The prices of agricultural implements to-day are vastly lower than they were before the National Policy, and that reduction is, in the main, in consequence of the National Policy. But although that is so, and although that is a strong point to make in favour of the National Policy when discussing it generally, yet, when discussing one item, as we are here to-day, that fact does not estop us from contending, in regard to this item, that in order to reach the equilibrium between the interests of the community and the needs of the manufacturing industry, it may be a good thing either to get rid of the duty altogether or to lower the duty. My hon. friend, the ex-Controller of Customs, the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace), has declared that to take away the duty from agricultural implements would be to the advantage of Manitoba and the North-west, but it would be no advantage to Ontario. Now, Sir, in regard to the large agricultural implements, in regard to the implements, for instance, which the Massey-Harris Co. sell in the North-west Territories, the protection that is at present afforded is not required. And I will tell you why. It was stated within these very walls a few years ago by that company's leading man, that less protection than they have at the present moment—I think at that time he said 15 per cent—would be quite sufficient for them. Not only that, but my hon. friend the ex-Controller of Customs was wrong in supposing that this firm could not take their staples into the American market. At the present moment they declare that they are likely to go to Lockport. If they are likely to cross the line and to establish a manufactory there, it is clear that they do not fear those patents of which we sometimes hear. It is clear also that they feel confident that they could hold their own in the United States market. And as a matter of fact, as was more than once shown in this House by myself, and, I think, by my hon. friend from South Huron (Mr. McMillan), in foreign countries divided from us by vast stretches of sea, they hold their own against the world. Under those circumstances, the need for protection in their case does not exist, and all cause for protection disappears. Is it necessary, therefore, to retain that protection in order to foster that industry ? Clearly not. They can live elsewhere ; they themselves declare they can live in the United States against the competition that they would have here if this duty were taken away. Not only is it to be kept up then for the

sake of the duty. Why, the duty is infinitesimal. To show that the North-west and Manitoba are the most interested in this matter, I may say that the importation from the United States into Manitoba of harvesters, self-binding and without binders, for the year ending June, 1895, amounted to 645, valued at \$61,392. There were entered for home consumption, 685, valued at \$65,392, and paying a duty of \$13,078. There were only 151 imported into Ontario. Only a very small number came into the North-west Territories, but I cannot say what number, because they would be credited to Manitoba. Again, in regard to mowing machines, nearly seven and a half times as many came into Manitoba as came into Ontario.

RETURN ORDERED.

Return of all Orders in Council and official correspondence, and all other documents, not already laid on the Table of this House, in reference to the Manitoba school question.—(Mr. La-Rivière.)

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

After Recess.

ROYAL MILITARY COLLEGE.

Mr. MULLOCK. Before Public Bills and Orders are called, I desire to mention a matter relating to the Militia Department. I have received a communication from two gentlemen connected with the Royal Military College Club, in which they mention to me that the Board of Visitors of the Royal Military College, which has been put into active operation in consequence of a discussion last year, had met at Kingston in October last, and drawn up a report, making certain recommendations, and these recommendations they desire to be acted upon at the earliest possible date. In the communication to me they intimate that possibly the report may not be made public during the present session, or, perhaps, during the present fiscal year, and they ask me to call the attention of the Government to the report, and express the hope that it will be laid upon the Table of the House at an early date, so that the House can consider the recommendation. In compliance with their request, I bring the matter now to the attention of the Government.

Mr. DICKEY. While I was at the head of the Militia Department I became cognizant of that report, and intended to lay it on the Table of the House. But I omitted to mention it to my successor in office, and no doubt he was not aware of it. My personal impression was that it should be laid upon the Table of the House at an early date; however, I have no authority from the Government for stating that. I will consult with the head of the department,

and if he agrees with me, I will bring the report down, or ask my colleague to send it down. There are some recommendations in it to which I attach great weight, and with me it was only a question of time when those recommendations should be taken up.

MAIL SERVICE BETWEEN PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND AND THE MAINLAND.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I ask your indulgence for one moment to call the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and of the Postmaster General, to the condition of the mail service between Prince Edward Island and the mainland. I want to know whether the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has yet given instructions to have the ice-boats put on in order to carry the mails for the winter service. During the past week, the winter boat, the "Stanley," was detained by ice at Picton for over five days, and during these five days there were no mails or passengers carried across at all. My correspondents in the Island write me that their only dependence is to have the ice-boats put into service at the earliest possible moment. I think, as a rule, the department, about the latter end of January, does give these instructions. As the steamer has been detained, to the very great inconvenience of the mercantile public, for five days at one stretch, and the possibilities are that she may be detained again for a similar time, the straits there being full of ice, I would earnestly ask the hon. gentleman's immediate attention to this, and ask him to give instructions to-morrow to his agent in Prince Edward Island to have the ice-boats put on in order to avoid a similar delay in the future.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I am under the impression that the service has already commenced, but I will not state positively.

AUDITOR GENERAL'S REPORT.

Mr. CASEY. Before we proceed with the Orders, I wish to make a brief explanation. Some remarks I made the other day, in discussing the delay in the presentation of the Auditor General's Report, appear to have been taken to imply a censure on the officials of the Finance Department. The words I refer to are these :

The Auditor General has to work with materials sent to him by the Finance Department. He must get vouchers and all sorts of papers from that department before he can complete his report, correct proof, and sign it for printing. It is very much more likely, according to our experience, that the delay has arisen from the slackness of the Finance Department in furnishing the Auditor General with the necessary material, than from any slackness on his part.

I suppose it is hardly necessary for me to say that in these remarks I did not wish to

imply any censure upon the officials of that department. The House probably understood them to imply, as I meant them to imply, a political censure upon the political head of that department, for his political conduct of the department. I may say that a letter has been placed in my hands from the Auditor General in which he states distinctly :

The report in this office has not been delayed by the Deputy Head of the Finance Department, or by any one under him.

I make this explanation publicly in order to remove any possible misapprehension that might exist on the subject.

LIABILITY IN CONSTRUCTION OF PUBLIC WORKS.

Mr. McLENNAN moved second reading of Bill (No. 4) respecting the liability of Her Majesty and public companies for labour used in the construction of public works. He said : Mr. Speaker, it was not my intention in proposing this legislation to place any unnecessary responsibility upon the Government, or upon the railway companies. My great desire is to place a law on the statute-book that will furnish some means whereby an honest and poor labouring man can get his day's pay when he has earned it, and prevent irresponsible sub-contractors and men who are really dishonest, depriving labouring men of their wages. In the first section of the Bill I have asked that the Government should be responsible to the amount of money held in their hands for the security of the completion of the work. I will deal with the question of security later on, and all I need say at present is that, after notice is sent and the Government is satisfied that the statement filed is correct, the Government can then pay the men who may have been left unpaid by such contractors. Section 2 is as follows :—

2. Her Majesty may demand that each contractor or sub-contractor shall, not later than the fifteenth day of each month, file in the office of the said Minister, a list showing the names, rate of wages, amounts paid and amounts due and unpaid for wages or labour done by any foreman, workman, labourer or team employed by him during the previous month, and attested upon the oath or statutory declaration of such contractor or sub-contractor, or his authorized agent.

I claim this is a protection to the Government. It is not necessary that the Government should ask such a statement from a contractor unless they have reason to suppose that an attempt is being made to defraud the men employed on the work. I can instance cases in which such a clause would have proved a protection to the Government. In the case of the Curran bridge, the Government took all possible steps to investigate the matter at the earliest pos-

Mr. CASEY.

sible moment. But, if such a provision as I now suggest had been in force, and such a Bill as the present had been on the statute-book, the Government could have called upon the contractor to furnish a full account under oath or statutory declaration, and if the return was not honestly made up, the Government could at once proceed against him criminally. I understand that the April estimate was not put in until June. There was no law in force to compel the contractor to file a statement in writing ; but under the present provision they would be obliged to file a statement in writing not later than 15th May for work done in April. This would have prevented any fraud or chance of fraud being perpetrated on the Government through estimates and pay sheets having been allowed to lie over from month to month, the Government, I repeat, not being in a position to demand that pay sheets should be filed within a certain specified period. The Government under this Bill would be amply secured for money paid out to the men. On letting a contract they demand 5 per cent deposit. This is put up on the estimate of the whole work, and is more than sufficient to pay any drawback held for wages, because the wages of the workmen form only a small percentage as compared with the other expenses in connection with the work. I draw attention to the fact that every class of the community other than the labouring men is protected in some such way as is here proposed. The manufacturers are protected, and their employees, through our present protective policy are given constant employment. Farmers are also protected, and mechanics are protected through the Mechanics' Lien Law, so that the only men left out are poor labouring men who are paid less for their work than any other class. If it is within the power of Parliament to legislate in this direction, I hope this Bill will pass, for it applies to men whose wives and children are dependent on the husband's daily wage, and every member of this House with a heart within him should make an effort to place a law on the statute-book which would assist in securing justice for these men. Further, the Government retain 10 per cent on every estimate made from month to month until the work is completed. This amounts to a large sum, and is more than sufficient to meet any claim that might be made against the Government. Again, the Government reserve to themselves the right to hold all machinery, horses and plant, that may be upon the work as security for the completion of the work, and, if the contractor is then indebted to the Government, they can sell the machinery, plant and horses for the purpose of securing themselves. Again, the Government grants subsidies to railways. I have had some experience with sub-contractors on railway works ; I have been connected with railway works, and I

have seen poor men deprived of their honest day's pay. A company lets a contract. The contractor sub-lets, and, perhaps, the sub-contractor sub-lets again to some irresponsible individual, who goes to that section of the country and represents himself as a practical and competent man. Probably he is an adventurer, who, perhaps, does not own one dollar and possesses only limited experience; but he is ready to take the work at any price, with the idea that, if he cannot make money honestly, he will make it at all events. The work proceeds. At the end of the first month he is behind in his payments, and he finds that the prices he is receiving are not sufficient. He goes to his men and tells them that there is a mistake in the measurements. They have to work until 15th of the following month before they know anything about it. At all events, they accept his story and his assurance that the engineer has made a mistake, and that the estimate will be put all right next month. The men work on for another month. The sub-contractor keeps the money he receives, and on the next pay-day pockets the money for the next estimate, and leaves the place; or again, he tells a story that he cannot get his money, or that the measurements are not correct. Then the workmen go to the original contractor, or to the company, who say: We owe you nothing; we have let the contract and have paid the contractor every dollar coming to him, and we have nothing to do with you. In the end, these poor men are obliged to go without their money. My chief object in this Bill is to make the company responsible for the payment of the wages of the workmen employed upon their work. It often occurs, I regret to say, that the contractor, or sub-contractor who is directly responsible for the payment of the wages, invents some excuse in order to defraud the unfortunate men. Sometimes he resorts to peculiar expedients to excuse his fraudulent intents. He fires a bullet through his hat, or through his coat tails, and cuts up the satchel which was supposed to have contained the money, and when he meets his men he tells them an extraordinary story about his having been robbed. A dishonest person will sometimes make any kind of an excuse for the purpose of defrauding his employees. But, Mr. Speaker, I must say that there are very many respectable and competent sub-contractors who are a credit to the business they are engaged in. This Bill will have the effect of benefiting these respectable men, because it will prevent fraudulent and incompetent men from taking work at prices which they know to be ruinous. Honest sub-contractors will no longer have to compete with those irresponsible persons. Now, Sir, there is no reason why the company should not prevent all such conduct on the part of fraudulent sub-contractors. They have it in their power to safeguard the interests of the workmen,

and it is the duty of the Parliament of Canada to compel them to exercise that power. If a company letting a contract, takes precaution to let the work to practical men, men known to be honest, and men of reputation, then the difficulties in connection with the payment of the workmen would be at once removed. But it often happens, that a company will let the work without taking any of these precautions, and in many cases they do not seem to care whether or not the labourers will be paid. There is another feature which enters into this matter of companies letting contracts on large works: and that is, that frequently the work is given out at prices which the company must know very well the contractor cannot afford to do it for. As I have already stated, Mr. Speaker, it is a very great hardship on men, who can least afford to lose their wages, that the present condition of things should be allowed to continue. There is no class of men in our community who are paid so poorly for their work as are the labouring men of Canada. That, Sir, is all the more reason why they should be protected by legislation such as I now propose. I will read to the House the last clause of this Bill. It says:

7. Any number of persons, having similar claims for wages or labour against any company, contractor, or sub-contractor, may consolidate their claims and institute a joint action for the recovery thereof.

Hon. gentlemen will, I think, readily understand my object in incorporating that clause in the Bill. There are many labouring men, who, owing to the small wages they receive, have not very much money coming to them. It amounts sometimes to perhaps \$5 or \$10, so that they cannot afford to engage a lawyer to fight for their just rights against a powerful and rich corporation. Therefore, it is in my opinion proper, that they should be allowed to unite in one action, in order that they might seek redress and receive justice in the courts of this country. Mr. Speaker, I submit this Bill to the House, trusting that it will meet with the approval of hon. gentlemen here. It is hardly necessary that I should say much more about it, because I know that every member of this House understands it thoroughly. There are, I believe, but few constituencies in the Dominion of Canada, which have not experienced in some degree, the injustice of these frauds being perpetrated on workmen. It is, I think, the duty of every member of this House, regardless of political considerations, to assist in placing upon the statute-books the provisions of this Bill. I confidently ask the support of hon. gentlemen for the measure. I believe that it is the feeling of this House that our labouring men, a most deserving class in the community, should not be badly treated, and imposed upon by those inclined to dishonesty. I believe that hon. gentle-

men feel, that it is necessary, even at this late date, that legislation should be passed to protect the labouring classes. There is no part of the United States in which there has not been a law passed for the protection of the labouring men; and persons who take contracts are, in that country, obliged to give heavy bonds before they get any work. Let us not be behind in Canada in this respect. Let this Parliament take means to secure that our workingmen shall be protected.

Mr. KAULBACH. Mr. Speaker, I was fortunate enough to enter the House this moment while the hon. gentleman (Mr. McLennan) was speaking in advocacy of this Bill, and was much pleased with the remarks the hon. gentleman made. I feel that he is moving in the right direction, and that the measure which he proposes will meet the approval of the House. I am pleased also that he had been prompted by such excellent motives in promoting the Bill. We find that, from time to time, labourers are employed, not only upon railways, but upon other public works, either under the original contractor or under sub-contractors, who sometimes perpetrate frauds upon those poor men who have been giving their honest day's toil for an honest day's wage. I believe it is the duty of this House to protect those workingmen in every way possible. It appears to me, however, that the Bill of my hon. friend (Mr. McLennan) is not wide enough in its scope, not sufficiently far reaching. It is entitled: "An Act respecting the liability of Her Majesty, and public companies for labour used in the construction of public works." Should not this measure take a wider range, and include labourers on any works for which a contract has been taken, or on any work on which a labourer is employed either by the original contractor or by sub-contractors? We find, that not at all times, works are subsidized by the Government, and we also find that there are works which are constructed without any subsidy at all; works such as electric roads. Whether or not they come under local legislation, I cannot say; but it does appear to me that such works might be embodied as a part and parcel of the Bill. It would then include those employed as labourers, whether they were on Government work or not and thereby protect them. It was not my intention, Mr. Speaker, to say anything on this Bill, but as I came into the House and heard the remarks of my hon. friend (Mr. McLennan), I thought I might make a comment in favour of the principle of such legislation of so prudent and thoughtful a character. I feel satisfied that the House will look upon this Bill, so ably explained by the hon. member (Mr. McLennan), with such favour that Parliament will feel fully justified in passing it into law.

Mr. MCKAY. Mr. Speaker, the legislation introduced by the hon. member for

Mr. McLENNAN.

Glengarry (Mr. McLennan) is legislation in the right direction. It is in the interests of a large class of the population of this country, a class which up to the present time have had no protection in this direction. Anybody with any knowledge of public works, can recall instances where those workingmen,—who are, as has been stated, the least able to protect themselves,—have been swindled by contractors and by sub-contractors of public works on which they were engaged. We find, Sir, that it has been the custom lately, among those originating railways and other large public works, that a system has been brought into vogue whereby the original promoters of those schemes form themselves into what is called a construction company, and they themselves thus take the contract for completing the work. They use the bonuses and the subsidies, and then issue all the bonds that the scheme will stand. Frequently they let the contracts to what are called sub-contractors. They secure the very lowest possible prices, never thinking or caring whether they are taking the work at a price that will pay them or not. Those men start the work, and it has often been found, as has been stated by the hon. gentleman, that they had taken it at too low a price, and were not able to pay the workmen or the people from whom they got their supplies. In a great many cases the contractors or sub-contractors are not responsible men. Then, contractors from other countries come here, and after the work is done, they leave the country with many debts behind them. We had a case of this kind in the neighbourhood from which I come. It was shown very plainly before the Railway Committee of this House last session that a firm of contractors in Hamilton left the wages of their labouring men unpaid to the amount of \$40,000 or \$50,000. The work was done in winter, when there was a great many unemployed men who were anxious to get work, and who did not stop to inquire anything about the contractors, taking for granted that they would get their pay. After working for some time, they found that they were not getting paid, and they could not pay their store bills and other debts, and a great deal of suffering was caused. I know cases in which some of those workmen, in order to obtain money, actually sold their wages tickets at 50 cents on the dollar; and some of them are not yet paid. This legislation will prevent anything like that in the future. Other people are protected by the laws to a certain extent; mechanics who work on buildings are protected by the lien law of the province; but the ordinary labouring man, who is less able to protect himself and who is unable to enter into suits against large corporations, has not hitherto been protected by legislation. The introducer of the Bill has gone into the subject fully, so that there is little more for me to say except that I hope the House will see fit to pass the Bill.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, it is very pleasant to hear a matter discussed on the floor of this House occasionally on business rather than partisan grounds. When we find matters of this kind coming up, on which both sides of the House substantially agree, the query is suggested whether we might not be able to agree better about other classes of questions also if it were not for the names which divide us? Now, I think that this Bill of the hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. McLennan) is one the principle of which all can approve, whatever criticism may be due to the details. I think it is highly proper that some security should be afforded for the labourer who works under a contractor or a sub-contractor.

I think the provisions of the second clause of the Bill are extremely useful. On one memorable occasion—an occasion so frequently referred to in the party press that it would hardly do to mention it in a friendly discussion like this—they would have prevented very serious frauds upon the revenue of the country. The hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. McKay) has referred particularly to a case in which this measure would have been extremely useful. Last session a considerable share of the time of the Railway Committee was taken up with attempting to apply to a particular railway company the provisions which this Bill makes general. We inserted a clause in the amended charter of the Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Railway Co., to compel the payment of claims such as would be covered by this Bill. That clause has not had the effect, up to the present time, so far as I am informed, of securing the payment of those claims, though it may ultimately secure their payment. But if the Bill of the hon. member for Glengarry had been in force and had been applicable to that railway, it would have secured the payment of those claims. I am, therefore, very glad to see an effort of this kind made to secure a general provision applicable to all such cases, instead of our being left to apply the principle to each individual company that comes here asking for amendments to its charter.

When we charter a railway company, a telegraph company, a steamboat company, or any other company of that class, we should not forget that we are creating to some extent a monopoly in favour of that company. We are, in fact, making it a present of a most valuable franchise, and we have a distinct right to impose upon it certain stringent conditions under which it shall act towards the public; and undoubtedly one of the very first of these stringent conditions should be one providing that it will act in a fair and honest manner towards its employees.

In the case of contracts let directly by the Government, there has been, as a rule, I fancy, less difficulty in securing justice; because a considerable percentage is retained by the Government, out of which pay-

ments may be made and sometimes have been made, I believe, to the workmen, without any actual law requiring them to be made. But it is very well to have such a provision put in the shape of a permanent law. The difficulty of applying this principle seems to rest specially with the case of the sub-contractor. I had hoped that my hon. friend from Glengarry would have explained clause four, so as to make it a little more clear how the funds are to be provided, out of which claims against sub-contractors, as well as contractors, are to be satisfied.

This clause provides that every company incorporated by or receiving a cash subsidy from the Parliament of Canada, shall be liable for the payment of the wages, etc., due by any contractor or sub-contractor, provided that a notice stating the claim in detail for such wages shall have been served on the company within three months. But it does not provide for the retention by the company of a percentage from such contractor or sub-contractor sufficient to cover the claims of the workmen, and I think the clause requires to be made clearer in that respect. It strikes me that it would be fairer to provide that the company should not be liable for the debts of the contractor or sub-contractor, unless notice were served by the employee at the beginning of his engagement, on some officer of the company, that he would look to them for his pay in case the contractor or sub-contractor failed to pay him. Then the company would be in a position to hold back the money to meet the claim. It strikes me also that perhaps three months is a pretty long term to allow for the serving of a notice, as it would keep the transaction open for a very long time. It would keep the contractor from getting his money for three months after the work was completed, unless every transaction had been settled up in full before that time.

But those are more proper questions for a Committee of the Whole, or a committee on the Bill; and I would suggest that Bills of this class should properly be submitted to small special committees. I made that contention with regard to one of my own Bills, which passed its second reading a few days ago, and I think it is equally applicable to this. There is a numerous class of Bills on the Order paper, in which a good deal depends on the terms of each clause, and we are all aware that details of expression, and so on, cannot properly be considered at all in the Committee of the whole House, and cannot be as well considered in the large committees as in a small committee, specially appointed to take cognizance of the particular Bill. I would suggest, therefore, that the practice be adopted in this case, and continued in others, of submitting Bills of this kind to committees composed of seven members, subject, of course, to final passage through the Committee of the

Whole afterwards, as in the case of any other Bill. We all know that the Railway Committee, the Private Bills Committee, and others of that class, are specially appointed for the consideration of private Bills. Their time is fully taken up with such business. Their numbers are too large for careful consideration of the details of a measure of this kind. I believe that in respect to the size of those committees, our whole system is wrong, but this is not the proper time to consider that point. But with regard to referring public Bills to these Private Bills Committees, I take this opportunity of entering a protest against the principle, and of urging that the British system should be adopted, of naming small committees for Bills of this kind. I have great pleasure in supporting the general principle of the Bill, and I hope to see it made as perfect as possible before it goes through the House.

Mr. SPROULE. My hon. friend from Glengarry (Mr. McLennan) certainly deserves the thanks of the labouring men of this country for the effort he is now making in their behalf to protect them from unscrupulous and dishonest contractors. There is scarcely a public work in our country that has not had, at some stage of its operations, experience of dishonest men taking the labour of the labouring men and giving them no return. When the Canadian Pacific Railway was built, we remember distinctly that a large number of Italians—men not very well able to earn their living in this country—were turned adrift at the Soo—I believe some three hundred of them—without a single dollar to pay their way either towards their homes or to protect them against the inclemency of the winter. They were brought by charity to Toronto, from Toronto they were passed on to Montreal, and what became of them very few know; but, at any rate, it is known to a great many that these men laboured very hard all summer, and at the end of the season were turned adrift by a dishonest contractor, without receiving a dollar of their wages. Had such a Bill as this been law then, these poor labourers would no doubt have been paid their wages. In the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and of the Grand Trunk the same thing occurred, and also in the building of the Northern Railway. In the case of almost every railway that we know anything of in our country—and Manitoba and the North-west Territories are no exceptions to the rule—this has happened, so that all over the country you can find instances where hundreds of labourers, after working hard for months were discharged without receiving a dollar of wages. The dishonest contractors got the money and cleared out, upon one excuse or another, and the poor labourers who did the actual work were left without a cent. If some means could be devised for the purpose of securing fully their rights,

Mr. CASEY.

such means should be taken. I see no objection to this Bill becoming law, or to a Bill of this kind being introduced by a private member as well as by a member of the Government. It matters not who introduces the Bill so long as it becomes law. As my hon. friend from Glengarry has said, in private contracts we have the Mechanics' Lien Act, and in almost every other line we have some law to protect the labouring class. The only exception is public works. This Bill seems to me to be designed for a good purpose, and, so far as I can judge, it will accomplish that purpose in its present shape. There may be some imperfections, which members of this House will recognize, but these imperfections can be made right. I for one am heartily in accord with the hon. gentleman who introduced this Bill, and shall be glad to give him any assistance I can.

Mr. FLINT. I join heartily in the expressions of approval of the principle of this measure which have already been given by hon. gentlemen on both sides. I agree with the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Kaulbach) that possibly this principle might be extended still further with advantage to the public and to the class of persons intended to be protected. Every hon. gentleman in the House is aware of instances in his own locality probably during the past twenty-five years when, for the want of some measure of this kind, great hardship was occasioned to many well-deserving, hard-working men. It is somewhat surprising that the Government of the day did not long ago take up this question and deal with it as a Government measure. Probably before this Bill has reached its final stages, the Government may see its way clear to assume the responsibility of the measure, and, assisted by the able technical staff at their command, to perfect its details that it may have greater force than, perhaps, it could have in its present shape, introduced by a private member. The principle of this measure has been adopted in Nova Scotia. I do not think there is a statute going the full length of this Bill, but there are powers given to the local administration, which they carry out in their contracts, and which are drafted in the contracts themselves. I am not aware of the precise terms in which these contracts are worded, yet the responsibility of the contractors to the men who do the actual labour is fully recognized and protected through the agency of the Government, when entering into these contracts. This principle has been found to work to the advantage, not only of the workingmen, but of the contractors themselves. Of course, there are cases which even a general law, giving power to the Government, in making contracts, to protect the labourers and others, does not yet reach, and I trust the day is not far distant when some public-spirited member will propose a measure

which will go even further than this. We know that there are companies, from time to time, chartered by this Parliament to undertake public works, particularly the building of railways. Sometimes subsidies are promised verbally, or, perhaps a contract is entered into with the Government under which they are to have subsidies at some future stage of their work—probably when a certain portion of their work is completed. But these parties, before earning their subsidies at all, undertake obligations. And if they fail in carrying out their work, they earn no subsidy, and consequently there is no fund out of which the labourers can be paid. This Bill suggests means for the protection of the labouring men under such circumstances. I trust that the efforts of the hon. gentleman will be crowned with success. He is a practical man and has an extensive and intimate knowledge of how this protection may be afforded to the greatest advantage. From the somewhat cursory examination I have been able to make of the measure he proposes, I think that he has provided for almost every contingency. When the Bill reaches a select committee or the Committee of the whole House, any difficulties that may be brought forward can be provided for. I think that the gratitude of labouring men and those who are likely to be engaged upon public works of this kind ought to be, and will be, extended to the hon. gentleman for taking this matter in hand.

Mr. BAIN. I think there can be no question that the hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. McLennan) has attempted to crystallize into a law a feeling that a great many of us have entertained for some time, that there is a weak side to the present laws relating to labour on public works. This House has never been slow in granting charters of incorporation for various public enterprises and in giving to promoters very extensive privileges. Further, those who have had experience in this House know how slow the House is, having once given a charter with all its privileges to a company in connection with a public work, to encroach upon the rights so granted, if the company is making any reasonable attempt to proceed with the work in contemplation. But I think that the experience of localities in connection with certain of those public works recently indicates that there are strong grounds of complaint on account of the way in which many of these companies treat the labour engaged in the construction of their work. Municipalities have not been slow in aiding these enterprises, and it does seem too bad that, in addition to that, aid should be practically levied from the labourers who construct the work by paying them at the rate of 30 cents or 50 cents on the dollar of the limited amount they would receive even were their services paid for in full. Two public enter-

prises last session occupied a large share of attention of the Railway Committee, whose members had their attention particularly directed to the difficulties which the Bill now before us is intended to remedy. In one case, if I recollect aright, the company, after making contracts and executing a large amount of work, offered a settlement of something like 30 cents—not over 35 cents—in the dollar. In the case referred to by the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. McKay), the company carried on their work in a peculiar manner. A number of those who were incorporators of the railway company formed a construction company to take the contract from the railway company. This construction company in turn sub-let its contract to an American firm of contractors, who came here, like all other outside contractors, with an enormous reputation for wealth—they had money by millions; they were wealthy, experienced contractors, and were able to do the work without any difficulty. They took the contract at what the hon. Minister of Railways called starvation prices. Then they in turn, sub-let the work in sections to sub-contractors. And if the original prices were starvation prices, as they were called by the hon. gentleman who spoke whereof he knew, I ask what were the figures of the sub-contractors when they came to employ labour in the winter months when employment was not abundant and men and teams were wanting work? And what was the result of the enterprise? It was established before the Railway Committee that these railway millionaires, the contractors, instead of putting their own money into the work, borrowed the very first monthly payment from one of the local banks in the vicinity, giving their contract in security therefor. And when the second month's payment came due they were not able to pay the men in full, and only partial payment was made. In a short time they went into insolvency. What was the position of the unfortunate labourers and of those who had furnished material and supplies for this public work? The contractors had borrowed the money they had to pay for the work done, and whatever they had was in a foreign country and beyond the reach of the men who had put their labour into the work. When the facts were presented to the Railway Committee, the committee immediately did the only thing that was left for them to do—they simply provided that the company to whom the original charter had been granted, and which had come to this House asking for additional rights and privileges, must settle these claims before these additional rights and privileges could be granted to them. And I wish to say to this House that another session of Parliament has come and that company has not yet settled the claims of last season and consequently realized the benefits from the legislation they asked for here last session.

There is a rumour that, instead of coming back to this House for additional legislation, they have given notice of an application to the legislature at Toronto for certain privileges to enable them, by some means, to reach the object they have in view without coming within the range of legislation passed here last session. Sir, we have never been niggard in giving privileges to these companies, but I think the time has come to consider our policy, and if I am to be called a protectionist in giving my support to legislation of this kind, I am well content to submit to the charge, if this House will devise some means by which the workmen of this country will be protected against such schemes. I do not care whether the object is gained by the legislation which my hon. friend has introduced, or by amendments to the Railway Act. I am sure my hon. friend himself is not particular about the form of the legislation, or whether this particular Bill becomes a law of the land, provided that the object he has in view is accomplished, and that in future it be made more difficult for such schemes as this to be carried out whereby the labouring men of this country have been repeatedly defrauded. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that perhaps the simplest way to reach this matter would be to attach an amendment to the General Railway Act, or the Public Works Act, of the Dominion, providing that under these circumstances the roadway or public work should be charged with the lien, similar to that which mechanics now have upon work they have constructed, or upon which they have bestowed labour, as now provided in some of the provincial legislatures. I think the Minister of Railways should consider whether some simple measure of that kind could not be devised. I have heard it asserted on the floor of this House, but I cannot vouch for the correctness of the statement, that on the American side there is such a system in existence, by which contractors are prevented from thus defrauding labourers of their rights. Now, I have no wish to embarrass contractors or companies in constructing these great public works; in many cases they have serious difficulties to contend with. But our experience goes to show that in many cases such as I have referred to, there appears to be a systematic resort to a process by which the final loss shall fall upon the labourers, and upon those who furnish supplies for the construction of these works. I think it is about time that companies securing exclusive rights and privileges should understand that they are not to be allowed to reap the benefit of the labour that goes into the construction of those works, and quietly to enter into the fruit of those labours, while the men who did the work are deprived of the legitimate returns for their labour. I venture to say there is no class of men in this Dominion to-day who so hardly earn the money that is promised them, even when

Mr. BAIN.

every cent is paid to them, as the men who labour on our railways and public works. When times are as hard as they are to-day, and when our business men, in many cases are going down, because they are not able to make both ends meet, it is discouraging in the extreme that, when they are struggling with their ordinary liability, they should be subjected to loss by a contractor who comes into the locality, heralded as having a pocket full of money, and who quietly goes into bankruptcy in six weeks or two months, leaving them with a lot of claims due to them by labourers and contractors, varying from one or two hundred dollars up to a thousand, and then to find that they cannot realize more than 30 or 40 per cent on the dollar. I think the time has come when legislation of some kind should be passed to put a stop to such a condition of things. I shall heartily support anything that will tend to put these men in a safe and equitable position, which will do them justice and do them nothing more.

Mr. RYCKMAN. I congratulate the hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. McLennan) on bringing forward this Bill. I consider it one of great importance. We have had some experience in regard to the difficulty of workmen getting their pay in some parts of our country, especially in the city of Hamilton. The workmen who labour upon these great public works, are often in positions of great danger; they work hard, both in wet and dry weather, and for wages that are usually very moderate, and then they have to run the risk of not getting paid. I think the workmen of this country will be grateful to the hon. member for Glengarry for introducing this Bill, and for one, I shall give it my support.

Mr. HAGGART. I am fully in accord with the objects the hon. gentleman has in view in introducing this Bill, and I have no doubt that he has done it with the best intention. However, let me draw the attention of the House to some of the difficulties in the way of legislating in the way he proposes. In the first place, he proposes to dispose of the money that is deposited with the Government as security for the completion of the work. That money is paid into the Consolidated Fund of Canada, it is not at the disposition of either this House or the Minister, and the question will arise whether we shall have power to dispose of that money in any other way than that provided by law. A clause would have to be drawn very carefully which would make it obligatory on the Government to dispose of this money in the manner proposed by the hon. member for Glengarry. My own opinion is that it will require a Message from His Excellency, and that legislation, such as is proposed, can only be introduced with the consent of the Government. I may be mistaken, and it may be possible for this House to dispose of that money by statute.

But after that legislation is passed, the difficulties will commence. At what time are we to return the deposit to the contractor? Suppose any person files a claim against the Government, that claim has to be considered. Who is to decide whether it is just or not? Is the Minister of Railways to constitute the court, or is the claimant to have a statutory right of action against the Government and bring a suit in the Exchequer Court? The hon. gentleman did not cite an instance where any men who have laboured on a public work in Canada, or any teamster, have not received their pay. The Minister of Railways and the Minister of Public Works always see to it that the men and teams employed are fully paid. The percentage that is detained from the contractors, as security that they shall complete the work, we always apply, if necessary, for the purpose of paying men and teams employed on the works. If that is not sufficient, I have tried by Order in Council to get the money which was deposited and paid into the Consolidated Fund of Canada, for the purpose of supplementing the sum required to pay the men fully, but I found I could not do it. Where there is a just claim from men labouring upon a public work, we have hitherto come to Parliament and got the money to pay them. This must always be done. I do not see how the legislation introduced by the hon. gentleman can compel the Crown to supplement their claims in this way. It must always be a matter of grace, to a certain extent. No hon. gentleman occupying the position of Minister of Railways or Minister of Public Works in Canada will fail to see that the men employed on public works are paid. I have no objection to the Bill passing its second stage, but I desire the hon. gentleman who has introduced it to consider these difficulties: the difficulty of disposing of sums which are in the Consolidated Fund; the difficulty of making the Minister of Railways a judge as to whether the claim is one which should be entertained or not; the difficulty of compelling the contractor to be without the money which he has deposited, on account of a claim which may be fallacious, when the contractor has a statutory right of action against the Crown. I think the hon. gentleman should consider whether he prefers to send the Bill to a special committee or have it considered by the Committee of the whole House, and the Government has no objection to either course being taken; but the hon. gentleman should consider the difficulties that may arise in connection with the working of the Bill, and should endeavour to reconstruct the first section. The fourth section says:

Every company incorporated by or receiving a cash subsidy from the Parliament of Canada, shall be liable for the payment of the wages or labour done by any foreman, workman, labourer or team employed by any contractor with the

company, or by any sub-contractor, in the construction of the works of the company.

I think that is a correct principle. Whether we can apply it to companies that received their entity from this Parliament some time ago and obtained a constitutional right to their present charter, I am not at the present moment prepared to say, but a provision might be inserted in the Bill that it should apply to all corporations and companies which receive their entity from this Parliament subsequent to the present time. I merely mention these points to show the objections that will probably be raised in committee to the hon. gentleman's Bill, and, no doubt, he will consider them before the next stage is taken.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I have no hesitation in saying that the general principle embodied in this Bill has my very cordial support. I think the hon. gentleman's object is one which should receive the assent of nearly every hon. member. I am not considering the details of the Bill at the present moment, but only the principle, for its details can be worked out in committee. Referring to the objections which the Minister of Railways has raised, I can cite an instance where a public work was carried out under the direction of the Railway Department, where large contracts were let by the Government, and sublet by the Government contractor, and where enormous sums of money due to workmen and labourers were not paid. I refer to the Oxford and Cape Breton Railway, known as the short line. I remember, the sub-contractor was supposed by the people of the district to be a man beyond doubt capable of paying his men. He took the contract, employed men and horses, ran up bills at stores, built this public work for the Government, and in the end went off and did not pay a dollar to these men. Such a wrong existed that the Government came to Parliament and obtained a vote of public money for the payment of these men, and sent down ex-Judge Clark—and very grave fault was found by political opponents with respect to the way in which the business was carried out, and it was very near an election—who held court, sat all night long, settling in a perfunctory way, for it was impossible to do absolute justice, bills sent in, and paid the men by cheques on the public treasury. No opposition was offered in this House to the enormous sum required being voted and paid. Men who had worked all summer, with their boys and horses, found themselves penniless at the end of the season. It was such a gross outrage that the Government felt impelled to come to Parliament and ask for a vote. We voted the money and paid the men. No doubt, other cases might be cited by parliamentarians of greater experience than myself. I acknowledge that what the Minister of Railways has stated is entitled to some weight. There is difficulty, no doubt,

in the way of carrying out this principle. I invite the attention of the House, in the first place, to the consideration of the principle itself. Is the House satisfied with the principle which the hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. McLennan) seeks to carry out, and is it considered a just one? What is the principle? The hon. gentleman states that, if on a Government work a contract is let and is sublet, and labourers, their sons and their horses do the actual work of construction, security should be taken by the Government to ensure the payment of wages due to the workmen. Is that right? Ought there to be any difficulty in accepting that principle? I think not.

Mr. HAGGART. That is not the principle of the Bill at all.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Yes. The Bill is entitled: "An Act respecting the liability of Her Majesty and Public Companies for labour used in the construction of public works." I was confining myself to the provisions relating to public works. The first section reads:

In case any contractor with Her Majesty, or any sub-contractor in the construction of any public work let under contract by Her Majesty, makes default in the payment of the wages or labour done by any foreman, workman, labourer or team employed on such work, providing a claim therefor is filed in the office of the Minister entering into such contract on behalf of Her Majesty, not later than three months after the same becomes due, and satisfactory proof thereof is furnished, Her Majesty shall become liable for the payment of such claim to the extent of the amount of all moneys or securities in the hands of Her Majesty for securing the performance of the contract at the time of the filing of the said claim.

I take it, that the main object the hon. gentleman has in view is to ensure to foremen, workmen and labourers payment of wages actually earned by them. As a means of securing that result, the hon. gentleman suggests that the Government should be liable to pay these sums, when the claim is proved to the satisfaction of the Minister, up to the amount of the deposit made with the Government for the purpose of carrying out the contract. The Minister says there are difficulties in the way of disposing of money held in this way. I do not see, at the present moment, that these difficulties are by any means insuperable. What is the fact? A contract is entered into for the construction of a public work. The proposed Bill declares that the proper performance of the work shall include payment by the contractor or sub-contractor of the wages of the workmen. Then it provides that, if these payments are not made by the contractor or sub-contractor, they shall be made out of security deposited with the Government. If Parliament passes that law, there will be no difficulty.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. It means a larger security.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I know it does. At present, contractors do not give security to the Government for the payment of workmen. The hon. gentleman proposes that the security they deposit with the Government for the performance of the work shall be held for the payment of wages. What is the difficulty about that? If they half do the work you hold this money in order that you may finish it, and if they fail to pay the workingman's wages, you hold the money in order that you may pay these wages. Therefore, I say the principle in itself seems to me to be sound, and I do not know but that the hon. gentleman (Mr. McLennan) has struck upon one mode of carrying it out pretty effectively. No doubt the Bill will require some amendment in the committee, but I understand that we are addressing ourselves now to the principle of the Bill, and reserving to myself reasonable discretion in amending the details in committee, I desire for one, and I only speak in my own behalf, to express my cordial approval of the object, the hon. gentleman (Mr. McLennan) has in view, and my belief that so far as I have read his Bill, I see no insuperable difficulties in carrying it out.

Mr. OUIMET. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Davies) has succeeded in giving the House an insight into the many difficulties which would follow from the passage of this Bill. As a rule, contracts are let by tender, and, with the tender, security for the due performance of the work is exacted. According to an old Order in Council which has been in force about fifteen years, the sum of five per cent is deposited on the gross amount of the contract. I may say at the outset, that, in my opinion, this amount of 5 per cent is, in most instances, quite insufficient, and especially so in view of the great competition existing now which enables us to get work done at very low prices. In my department, as a rule, works are tendered for at least 25 per cent, and even 50 per cent lower than the estimates of the engineer. I have already suggested that this deposit of 5 per cent was insufficient, but it is argued that if we increase the security, it will give to wealthy contractors a kind of monopoly in the business. A contract for \$10,000 requires a deposit of 5 per cent, amounting to only \$500, which is quite insufficient, and which I should like to see increased to 10 per cent at least. The result of this would be, of course, that poor contractors would not get the money to deposit, and so they would be unable to tender. It would perhaps be a good thing for contractors with experience and money, and I believe myself that the country would be the gainer in the long run? My experience is, that the man who takes a contract at a low price,

is, per force, bound to try and get in the cheapest labour and material possible in order to secure any profit. Many difficulties arise from letting contracts at these low prices. There are contentions with the superintendent in charge, and contentions with the engineer, and in the end, notwithstanding the attention and care of the officers of the department, the Government often loses, at least in the quality of the work. The poor contractor will always find a way, while the superintendent's back is turned, to put in some bad piece of work. That security which we demand at present is for the performance of the work, and if the contractor fails in completing it, we draw on the 5 per cent to pay whatever difference the work will cost to the department, either by asking for new tenders, or by the department completing it under its own officers. Now, if we ask for a further security for the payment of the wages, it will decrease the number of tenders, and the result will be an increase in the cost of those public works. I do not say that this would be an unmixed evil. In England and in France, contractors for public works are chosen men, who are in a position to prove beyond all doubt, not only their pecuniary responsibility, but also their experience and their good reputation as contractors. If this system could obtain in Canada, it would certainly be a benefit to the country, and to those who are responsible for the administration of the Departments of Public Works and of Railways and Canals. But, let me ask: Is this according to the notions of the present day when cheapness is considered the great object to be achieved in this life? It certainly would not agree with the ideas I hear propounded here every day, and which are used as arguments against the present administration. When my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies) says, that the Government should interfere between contractors and sub-contractors, I presume he has forgotten his cast-iron and enthusiastic advocacy of provincial autonomy. He knows very well that the law of every province regulates the relations between labourers and contractors. Suppose that my department does work in Prince Edward Island, are we to have a staff to keep the time of every man who works, and to report every day to the department how much wages are due to the labourer by the contractor or sub-contractor. If that were necessary, it would be much better to abandon the system of giving contracts, and to have the work done—except in very few cases, and then only when contractors of great responsibility were employed—it would be better, I say, to have the work done by day's labour under the control of the department. We would then have the machinery, and the 20 per cent or the 10 per cent at least, which is a reasonable profit for a contrac-

tor to expect on every work, would go to the benefit of the Government. Another inconvenience which would follow from the adoption of this principle, which after all may be considered a right one, is this: According to the ideas of this age, the Crown is considered as being on the same footing as every ordinary creditor. This Bill, by tending as it does to assimilate the Crown to the ordinary proprietor giving a contract for the building of a house, the Crown would stand in the very same position as the private proprietor does; but with this difference: that the ordinary proprietor, or business man, is always on the spot to follow the work, and the provincial law tells him that if he does not follow the work as it goes along, and if he does not see that the wages are paid, then he himself is responsible. That at least is the law in the province of Quebec. But in the administration of a public department, with works going on from the shores of the Atlantic to the shores of the Pacific, I think it would be a very great inconvenience, especially when we know that this liability is to last for three months. The labourer has three months after he has completed his work to file his claim in the department in order to secure on the part of the department the obligation to see that his wages are paid; and the department, to guard against this contingency, would have to delay every payment by three months. Although the principle of securing to the wage-earner the legitimate pay for his labour is correct, I see that the practical working of this Bill would be very inconvenient, and would probably accomplish another thing which the House must not lose sight of, that is, an increase in the cost of every public work that would be carried on under it.

Mr. LAURIER. But you said the tenders were too low.

Mr. OUIMET. I said that, and all the difficulties arise from that fact. Let me give the House an illustration of that. The other day the department invited tenders for a large work which we intend to have done on the Georgian Bay. The cost of the work was estimated by our chief engineer at \$200,000. A tender was received for \$144,000, while the tenders of what I would call experienced and responsible contractors ran all the way from \$200,000 to \$444,000. In the opinion of my chief engineer, the lowest tender would not have enough, not merely to make any profit, but to pay his men as the work went on. If that happened, the security for the performance of the work being so small, in the end we should have a lot of claims against the department for materials, which may be placed on the same footing as labour, and these claims would be before us for years. As a matter of fact, claims against the Department of Public Works never die. I

have had to consider claims that existed even before hon. gentlemen opposite took charge of the public departments, and many of them have come from their own time. It is, I think, the greatest worry the Minister has—to go through masses of documents, with the result, as a rule, that he has to give the same answer as before, that the claim cannot be entertained.

Mr. LAURIER. Is there no remedy for that?

Mr. OUIMET. The only remedy would be to plead the statute of limitation, which in the opinion of the public should never be availed of by the Crown. So far as railways are concerned I have nothing to say; but before this Bill becomes law I think it should be considered by the departments themselves. If the hon. member for Glengarry will consult the Department of Justice and the Public Works Department, he may find some way of making his Bill acceptable. I may say that in every one of our contracts we take power to pay the wages of the labourers; but when we have not the money we cannot do it. When there is not enough money to complete the contract, we cannot draw on the security deposited with us. As the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Haggart) says, these funds go into the public Treasury, and they are only drawn upon to complete the contract.

Mr. INGRAM. Mr. Speaker, after listening to the discussion which has taken place on this Bill, I conclude, like other hon. gentlemen who have spoken, that legislation of this kind is necessary. The case of the Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Railway, in which injustice was done to the labouring men employed in the construction of that railway, proves to me that all hon. gentlemen occupying seats in this House have a duty to perform in adopting legislation to meet cases of that kind. The hon. Minister of Public Works has suggested to the hon. gentleman who has introduced this Bill that it would be well to consult the Departments of Justice, Railways and Public Works, with the view of perfecting legislation to meet the difficulty. Now, when a railway is subsidized, it strikes me that before the subsidy is paid in ten-mile sections, it would be reasonable to suppose that the Railway Department would ascertain whether the wages of the labourers had been paid. It seems to me that would be a remedy, and it could be very easily carried out. The hon. Minister of Public Works suggests that moneyed contractors should be given the preference in the awarding of contracts. As one of those who represent the views of the labouring men of this country, though I know their views on that subject are somewhat opposed to that suggestion, I think, it is a very wise one indeed. I know of no case in which moneyed contractors have failed to pay their men. It is generally the speculat-

Mr. OUIMET.

ing contractor, who want to obtain money by any means, whether honestly or dishonestly, that have trouble with their workmen. With respect to public works, it seems to me that every contract for the construction of a public building or a dock is subject to certain specifications, and a provision should be inserted in the specifications that all the wages owing to the labouring men employed on the work should be paid before the money is paid to the contractor. It strikes me there is another way of getting out of this difficulty. I do not think that the hon. member for Glengarry imagines for one moment that the legislation he is introducing can be carried through this House. The hon. gentleman is not a lawyer, and I do not know whether he has secured the services of a lawyer or not, in framing his Bill, but this we do know, that the hon. gentleman has had more experience in the building of public works than perhaps any other hon. gentleman in this House, and for that reason he has thought it his duty to propose this measure. I have heard of complaints, but I know that in the riding I have the honour to represent, we had public works going on last fall and the early part of last year, and there is not one labouring man employed on them, there is not any one in that district or locality who has furnished any material or anything else in connection with that public work but who has been paid every cent for his labour or material. In saying that, I wish to draw the line between honest and dishonest contractors, and I feel that any legislation of this kind will not be objected to by the honest contractor.

Mr. McMULLEN. I have listened attentively to the discussion, and am entirely in favour of the principle of the Bill. It would be a pity if, in an assembly of legal talent such as this is, a Bill could not be framed that would, to some extent at least, meet the difficulty which this Bill proposes to remove. I am glad to find the general opinion of the House is in favour of the measure. The objection raised by the Minister of Railways (Mr. Haggart) could be overcome, at least to some extent, if a special committee were named to revise the Bill. As has been said by the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, no doubt the extended experience of the hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. McLennan) in public works has led him to bring this subject before the House, and for my part I shall be glad if we can frame a law to remedy the evil he seeks to remove. With regard to the remarks that fell from the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Ouimet), I would not for a moment consent to our going back to the experience we have had of the system of day labour. We tried that on the Curran Bridge with the sad result that this House is too well aware of. And it would be very much to our discredit if we should return to that system. I believe

in the system of public contracts, and I think if the Government would endeavour to hold sufficient money in their hands to pay the wages of the workingmen, a great deal of complaint would be avoided. As to the other portions of the Bill, I frankly confess that there are a good many difficulties in the way, but I do not think that in the committee there would be much difficulty in framing clauses that would meet these difficulties and prove advantageous to labourers. We know very well that last winter a case was brought before the Railway Committee, which has been referred to by the hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. Bain), in which a number of men, who had done labouring work, were about to be clearly cheated out of their whole winter's labour. And if there ever was an act for which the Railway Committee deserves credit at the hands of the labourers, it was that act by which they amended the charter of the company in question so as to compel them to pay their labourers. I do hope that the efforts put forth by my hon. friend from Glengarry will not be in vain. He has introduced this Bill now for the second or third session. He has the sympathy of both sides, and there ought to be sufficient legal and business ability in this House to enable us to prepare a law which will meet the case.

Mr. MONCRIEFF. The Bill which my hon. friend from Glengarry (Mr. McLennan) has introduced unquestionably seems to meet the approval of the House. I do not see any insurmountable difficulties in the way. Perhaps in the working out of the details a good deal of careful consideration will have to be given by the officers and Ministers of the departments—Public Works and Railways especially—but I think that eventually a measure could be worked out which would be satisfactory. I do not agree with the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Ouimet) when he says that to make such a lien on the deposits would do away with the very object of the deposits. That difficulty could be easily overcome. If the ordinary security required is not sufficient—and I believe it is 5 per cent—let the Government require the deposit of an extra percentage to meet the lien of the labourers.

Mr. McLENNAN. There is 10 per cent on the monthly estimates retained by the Government until the completion of the work.

Mr. MONCRIEFF. I do not care whether it is retained by taking it out of the monthly estimates or whether it is deposited at the beginning, so long as sufficient security is held by the Government to protect the workingmen. Of course there is a number of details that suggest themselves. I should think that a limit would have to be put upon the amount of wages for which the security would be held. If a man chooses to work five or six months without drawing wages, he should not be in a better posi-

tion than a man who has only worked 30 days. Under any circumstances, the wage-earner ranking on the fund should not be allowed to rank beyond a certain number of days. I do not see anything very serious in the objection raised concerning the difficulties of ascertaining who are first entitled to the wages. On all public works there is generally a superintendent who could give information on that point, and who could tell whether the men were being badly or well treated. If they are badly treated, I suppose the department could manage in some way, as is done in the courts of law, for instance, by giving notice on the works that all claims which came in within thirty days would be entertained, and that claims furnished later would not. Then again it has been urged here to-day that claims might be made against this fund which were not just, and that the Government would have great difficulty in ascertaining what amount was due to each person. I do not think there should be a great deal of trouble about that, for the contractor who owns this reserve in the hands of the Government will certainly look over every claim to see if it is right. If he admits that it is right, that is the end of it; if he says it is wrong, it is for him to show what the amount ought to be. These are matters of detail, and I do not think that these details are of such a character that they cannot be adjusted; I do not think that the difficulties are so great as to forbid us adopting the measure with any necessary amendments. On the whole I am in favour of the Bill. The hon. Minister of Railways says he never knew of a person having suffered under the present system. There may be protection enough at present, but perhaps we may not always have a Minister of Railways who will take the same interest in the workingmen of the country that the present incumbent of the office does. So long as he is there, I think, for my part I would be quite willing to work for any body, confident that the hon. Minister would see that I got my pay if I gave value. For these reasons I simply say that I am in accord with the principle of the Bill, and I do not think that there are any difficulties of detail to prevent a measure being framed by the committee or the Department of Justice that would meet the case.

Mr. McNEILL. I would like to add my voice to those of hon. members who have expressed their sympathy with the object of my hon. friend the promoter of this Bill. No doubt there is a great deal of force in the objections that have been urged by the hon. Minister of Railways and the hon. Minister of Public Works that there will be difficulty in arranging the details necessary to carry this measure into practical effect. But the evil to be overcome is so great and the objects of the Bill so just that the measure commends itself to the sympathy of hon. members on both sides of the House; and I

do think it would be a reflection upon the business capacity of the members of the House to assume that it would be impossible to give effect to a measure of this kind. I was very much struck with an observation which fell from the lips of my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works, for it would seem from what he said that the Bill would incidentally have another and very valuable result, which, perhaps, was not in contemplation by my hon. friend from Glengarry (Mr. McLennan) when he introduced this measure. It would seem that it will be necessary, in order to carry out the object of the Bill, to increase the deposit required of contractors on public works. From what the hon. Minister has said, it would appear that the increasing of the deposit would be a great protection to the public. There can be no doubt that one of the great difficulties that the Minister of Public Works has to encounter—and I suppose the same would apply to the hon. Minister of Railways—arises from the fact that men tender for contracts who are ignorant of the work they have to perform and are really incompetent as contractors, besides not having the means at their back to carry their contracts into effect, and who often tender at much lower figures than it would be possible to perform the work for. As the law stands, and in the present state of public opinion, it is exceedingly difficult for the Minister to avoid allowing such men to obtain a contract, even though he may know very well that thereby the public runs the risk of serious loss. I have known such cases to occur more than once; and, if the result of the Bill of the hon. gentleman is to make it more difficult for such contractors as these to get hold of contracts, I think a most valuable object will be secured and that this is a very strong argument in favour of the Bill introduced by my hon. friend.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). This discussion is calculated to impress upon the mind of any listener, I think, the view that a sixth session is not a very good occasion to discuss a measure of this kind. It seems to me that it is of some importance to guard the public interest in matters of this kind as well as the interest of the private parties who are dealing with dishonest contractors. I have no doubt there is a great deal to be said in favour of the view expressed by the Minister of Public Works that the security required of contractors ought to be increased in the public interest. It seems to me that the hon. promoter of the Bill and some other gentlemen on that side who have discussed it have failed to distinguish between the amount placed in the possession of the Government as security for the proper performance of the work and the amount which may be due by the Government to the contractors for work actually done. I cannot see upon what ground the sum placed in the hands of the Government for the purpose

Mr. McNEILL.

of securing the proper performance of the work can, in the public interest, be devoted to any other purpose whatever than that for which it has been deposited with the Government. In preparing plans for a public work, in advertising for tenders, in letting the contracts and in placing parties on the work for the purpose of seeing that the work is properly performed, the Government incurs a good deal of expense in the public interest; and if you were to adopt the proposal in this Bill that the sum deposited with the Government shall, to the full extent, be subject to a lien for the purpose of protecting the labourers under the contractors, you wipe out the security of the Government altogether. Whatever loss or inconvenience the public might sustain in consequence of having let the work to parties who have failed would have to be borne entirely without compensation.

Mr. McNEILL. Will my hon. friend allow me to explain. I spoke with the understanding that additional security would be demanded for the purpose of meeting the requirements of this Bill.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That is not what the Bill says. I am not objecting to the principle of the Bill—if it may be called the principle of the Bill—to provide some security for the payment of persons employed. You are to bear in mind that the charge must be a charge against what the company have earned, and not against what the company have deposited. What you propose, in fact, is a Bill which will make the Government the paymaster on behalf of the contractor, and on every public work in the country. I do not say that this is an improper thing, but let us not confuse things which are altogether different. That is what you propose to do, if you propose to do anything that is effective. We have first to consider the utility of the public work; we have to consider the public interest in the construction of the public work; we have to protect the public treasury against loss in that undertaking; and the deposit with the Government is made for the purpose of protecting the public treasury and the public against that loss. What the hon. gentleman proposes to do is to impose upon the Government the duty of becoming guarantors to the amount of money in their hands, for the payment of the parties. I say that cannot be. The amount of money on deposit belongs to the public for the purpose of a public security. What may be charged is what the parties have earned, which is a wholly different thing, and it is towards that that the Bill should point. Now, to make the Government responsible for the amount of money earned by the contractors, and to see that it is paid over to those who are sub-contractors or labourers upon the work, is what the hon. gentleman aims at by his Bill. I do not say that that cannot be accomplished. You im-

pose additional duties upon the Government, you propose to increase the expense of the management of the department, or of the two departments, that may have work of this sort to let. That is to be borne in mind. I do not say that the object may not be of sufficient consequence to impose on the Government that duty and to prepare the necessary machinery for the performance of that duty. But my point is this, that the Bill in its present form will not accomplish that object; you have to change radically the form of the Bill. Now, is there a public evil of such a character as to necessitate this legislation? The Minister of Public Works says that, if you increase the amount on deposit, you will get a better class of tenderers, you will have less risk in securing the proper performance of the public work, and you will have less necessity for security. I suppose the hon. gentleman who has prepared this Bill has had a number of cases brought under his attention, and I think it would be of great consequence to show that there have been numerous practical evils of that kind which this Bill was intended to remedy, in order that there may be a sufficient ground for proceeding with the Bill. It seems to me that what should be done is to have the Bill read, to let it go to the Railway Committee, and to have a special committee, with the hon. gentleman upon it, to see that the Bill is properly devised and properly prepared, so as to accomplish that object. I also think that the Minister of Public Works and the Minister of Railways, on behalf of the Government, ought to assume the responsibility of saying whether an additional expense and an additional duty, imposed upon the Government, are warranted by the evils which the hon. gentleman undertakes to correct.

Mr. DICKEY. There seems to be a pretty general consensus of opinion, so far as I have been able to judge from the discussion in favour of the object the hon. gentleman who introduced this Bill, has in view, if I may distinguish the object of the Bill from the principle of the Bill. I think every one of us must feel great sympathy with what the hon. gentleman endeavours to accomplish by this Bill. I do not propose to discuss it from the point of view that has been taken by other hon. gentlemen, but simply to mention the position towards it taken by the department over which I have the honour to preside. I have to say that in my opinion the Bill as it is drawn will not effect the object the hon. gentleman desires to attain. I do not think it is impossible to draw a Bill that will attain that object, but I think that a committee of the whole House would be a very inconvenient place to discuss a Bill of this kind. I agree with the hon. gentleman from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) that the Bill needs a radical reconstruction in order to make it effective, and I

am speaking now from the standpoint of the hon. member for Glengarry. It may be found convenient to legislate in the direction of a statutory provision in every case; however, that will be for the committee to say. What I would propose to the hon. gentleman is that his Bill be read now a second time, and that it should then be referred to a select committee of members of the House. I would suggest the names of Messrs. McLennan, Haggart, Mills (Bothwell), Davies (P.E.I.), Tisdale, Flint, Masson, Northrup, and Sir Hector Langevin. In making that suggestion, which of course is subject to correction, I have kept the legal fraternity pretty well to the fore, putting on a couple of men who have had large practical experience, also, in dealing with contracts. I take it that this committee would consult with the department especially interested, and would also, perhaps, avail themselves of the advice of the Justice Department, and in that way I think the hon. gentleman's object would be better accomplished than by sending this Bill to a committee of the whole House.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

Mr. McLennan moved:

That the Bill be referred to a select committee composed of Messrs. Haggart, Mills (Bothwell), Davies (P.E.I.), Flint, Masson, Northrup, Sir Hector Langevin, and the mover, with power to send for persons and papers, and to report from time to time.

Motion agreed to.

SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 7) further to amend the Act respecting the Senate and House of Commons.—(Mr. Mulock.)

SIR ADOLPHE CARON moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and the House adjourned at 10.25 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 30th January, 1896.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES.

Mr. FOSTER, from the Special Committee appointed to prepare and report with all convenient speed, Lists of Members to com-

pose the Select Standing Committees ordered by the House on Thursday, the 2nd instant, presented the following Report:—

No. 1.—ON PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS.

Messieurs

Amyot,	Leclair,
Beausoleil,	Lister,
Bruneau,	McCarthy,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	McDonald (Victoria),
Choquette,	McLeod,
Coatsworth,	Martin,
Costigan,	Masson,
Daly,	Mills (Bothwell),
Davies (P.E.I.),	Moncrieff,
Desaulniers,	Mulock,
Dickey,	Northrup,
Edgar,	Quimet,
Flint,	Pelletier,
Fraser,	Préfontaine,
Geoffrion,	Tisdale,
Ives,	Tupper (Sir Charles
Langelier,	Hibbert),
Langevin (Sir Hector),	Weldon, and
Laurier,	Wood.
Lavergne,	

No. 2.—ON EXPIRING LAWS.

Messieurs :

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

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

Messieurs :

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

Mr. FOSTER.

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

No. 4.—ON MISCELLANEOUS PRIVATE BILLS.

Messieurs :

Allan,	Ives,
Barnard,	Joncas,
Beith,	Kenny,
Belley,	LaRivière,
Bennett,	Lavergne,
Borden,	Leduc,
Bourassa,	Legris,
Boyd,	Lépine,
Brodeur,	Macdonald (Huron),
Campbell,	Macdonell (Algoma),
Carpenter,	McAlister,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	McDougall (Cape Breton)
Carroll,	McInerney,
Casey,	McKay,
Chesley,	Marshall,
Choquette,	Mignault,
Cleveland,	Miller,
Cochrane,	Moncrieff,
Corbould,	Monet,
Corby,	Northrup,
Craig,	Ouimet,
Davies (P.E.I.),	Pelletier,
Delisle,	Prior,
Denison,	Proulx,

Dickey,
Dupont,
Edwards,
Fairbairn,
Frémont,
Gillmor,
Guillet,
Harwood,
Hazen,
Hodgins,

Robillard,
Roome,
Rosamond,
Ross (Dundas),
Smith (Ontario),
Stairs,
Vaillancourt,
Weldon,
White (Shelburne), and
Yeo.

No. 5.—ON STANDING ORDERS.

Messieurs :

Bain,
Bergeron,
Bourassa,
Bowers,
Brodeur,
Brown,
Burnham,
Cargill,
Colter,
Desaulniers,
Dyer,
Earle,
Featherston,
Ferguson (Leeds and
Grenville),
Ferguson (Renfrew),
Gillmor,
Girouard,
Grieve,
Hodgins,
Hughes,
Hutchins,
Ingram,

Lavergne,
Macdowall,
McInerney,
McNeill,
Marshall,
Masson,
Miller,
Mills (Annapolis),
Monet,
O'Brien,
Paterson (Brant),
Patterson (Colchester),
Perry,
Pridham,
Rinfret,
Rosamond,
Rowand,
Scriver,
Semple,
Stevenson,
Wilmot,
Wilson, and
Wood.

No. 6.—ON PRINTING.

Messieurs :

Amyot,
Bergin,
Bourassa,
Charlton,
Costigan,
Davin,
Grandbois,
Innes,
Kaulbach,
Landerkin,
LaRivière,

Lépine,
Maclean (York),
McLean (King's),
McMullen,
Putnam,
Rider,
Somerville,
Stevenson,
Sutherland,
Taylor, and
Tisdale.

No. 7.—ON PUBLIC ACCOUNTS.

Messieurs :

Amyot,
Bécharde,
Belley,
Bergeron,
Bergin,
Boyle,
Bryson,
Cameron,
Campbell,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),
Carscallen,
Cartwright (Sir Rich'd),
Chesley,
Coatsworth,
Cochrane,
Costigan,
Craig,
Daly,
Davies (P.E.I.),
Devlin,
Ferguson (Leeds and
Grenville),
Forbes,
Foster,
Fraser,

Joncas,
Landerkin,
Langellier,
Lister,
Lowell,
Macdonald (Huron),
Macdonell (Algoma),
McDougald (Pictou),
McGregor,
McInerney,
McKay,
McMullen,
Martin,
Mills (Annapolis),
Mills (Bothwell),
Moncrieff,
Montague,
Mulock,
Ouimet,
Paterson (Brant),
Rinfret,
Scriver,
Somerville,
Sproule,
Tarte,

Gibson,
Gillmor,
Haggart,
Haslam,
Hughes,
Jeannotte,

Taylor,
Tupper (Sir Charles
Hibbert),
Wallace, and
Wood.

No. 8.—ON BANKING AND COMMERCE.

Messieurs :

Allan,
Amyot,
Bain,
Baird,
Barnard,
Beausoleil,
Bécharde,
Beith,
Bernier,
Blanchard,
Borden,
Bowers,
Bowman,
Boyd,
Boyle,
Bruneau,
Burnham,
Calvin,
Cargill,
Carnar,
Carling (Sir John),
Caron (Sir Adolphe),
Carscallen,
Cartwright (Sir Rich'd),
Charlton,
Chesley,
Cleveland,
Coatsworth,
Cochrane,
Cockburn,
Colter,
Corby,
Craig,
Daly,
Davies (P.E.I.),
Devlin,
Dickey,
Dugas,
Dyer,
Earle,
Edgar,
Edwards,
Featherston,
Flint,
Forbes,
Foster,
Fraser,
Fréchette,
Geoffrion,
Gibson,
Gillies,
Grant (Sir James),
Guay,
Guillet,
Haggart,
Hazen,
Henderson,
Ingram,

Ives,
Joncas,
Kaulbach,
Kenny,
Lachapelle,
Landerkin,
Langellier,
Langevin (Sir Hector),
Laurier,
Lister,
Livingston,
Lowell,
Macdonald (King's),
Macdowall,
McAlister,
McCarthy,
McDonald (Victoria),
McDougald (Pictou),
McDougall (Cape Breton),
McIsaac,
McKay,
McLennan,
McLeod,
McNeill,
Mara,
Martin,
Masson,
Metcalf,
Mills (Bothwell),
Moncrieff,
Mulock,
Northrup,
O'Brien,
Ouimet,
Paterson (Brant),
Pelletier,
Pope,
Préfontaine,
Prior,
Putnam,
Rider,
Rosamond,
Rowand,
Ryckman,
Sanborn,
Scriver,
Semple,
Smith (Sir Donald),
Stairs,
Sutherland,
Temple,
Tisdale,
Turcotte,
Wallace,
Welsh,
White (Shelburne),
Wilson, and
Yeo.

No. 9.—ON AGRICULTURE AND COLONIZATION.

Messieurs :

Bain,
Beith,
Bergeron,
Bernier,
Blanchard,
Boston,
Bowers,

Hutchins,
Ingram,
Innes,
Jeannotte,
Joncas,
LaRivière,
Leclair,

Bowman,	Leduc,
Boyd,	Legriss,
Brodeur,	Lépine,
Burnham,	Lippé,
Calvin,	Livingston,
Cameron,	Macdonald (Huron),
Campbell,	Macdonald (King's),
Carroll,	Maddowall,
Carignan,	McDonald (Assiniboia),
Carling (Sir John),	McGregor,
Carpenter,	McLean (King's),
Casey,	McLennan,
Choquette,	McNeill,
Christie,	Mara,
Cleveland,	Marshall,
Cochrane,	Metcalfe,
Corbould,	Mignault,
Daly,	Miller,
Davin,	Montague,
Davis (Alberta),	O'Brien,
Dawson,	Paterson (Brant),
Desaulniers,	Patterson (Colchester),
Dugas,	Perry,
Dupont,	Pope,
Dyer,	Pridham,
Earle,	Proulx,
Edwards,	Putnam,
Fairbairn,	Reid,
Fauvel,	Rinfret,
Featherston,	Robillard,
Ferguson (Leeds and Grenville),	Roome,
Ferguson (Renfrew),	Rosamond,
Forbes,	Ross (Dundas),
Fréchette,	Ross (Lisgar),
Gibson,	Rowand,
Gillies,	Sanborn,
Gillmor,	Semple,
Girouard,	Smith (Ontario),
Godbout,	Sproule,
Grieve,	Sutherland,
Guay,	Taylor,
Harwood,	Turcotte,
Henderson,	Tyrwhitt,
Hodgins,	Wilnot, and
Hughes,	Wilson.

Mr. FOSTER moved :

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

Motion agreed to.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING.

Mr. FOSTER moved :

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

Motion agreed to.

Mr. FOSTER.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE LIBRARY.

Mr. FOSTER moved :

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

Motion agreed to.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER, BART.

Mr. CASEY asked :

During what period or periods did Sir Charles Tupper hold office as Minister of Railways since his appointment, without salary, on the 30th May, 1883 ?

Mr. HAGGART. Sir Charles Tupper held office with salary since May, 1883, for a period of eleven months and twenty-four days.

BRAMPTON POSTMASTER.

Mr. FEATHERSTON asked :

Has any person been appointed postmaster at Brampton since the death of the late postmaster, M. M. Elliot ? If so, what is the person's name, and when was the appointment made ?

Mr. OUMET. On behalf of the Postmaster General (Sir Adolphe Caron) I have to reply that Mr. W. B. McCullen was appointed temporarily on the 2nd May, 1890, and permanently on the 10th October, 1891. He resigned on the 9th May, 1894, and Mr. W. A. McCullen was appointed to succeed him on the 6th May, 1895.

EXPERIMENTAL FARM.

Mr. FEATHERSTON asked :

Is it the intention of the Government to appoint a competent practical man as live stock manager at the Experimental Farm, Ottawa ? If so, has any person been selected for the position, and what is his name ?

Mr. MONTAGUE. Up to the present, Professor Robertson has performed the duties of agriculturist and dairy commissioner as well. He asked to be relieved of the duties of agriculturist on account of his time being fully occupied in promoting our dairy interests and in his successful efforts to aid our cheese and butter interests in the English markets. It was felt that these duties were so important and Professor Robertson so well fitted to perform them, that we felt that we should meet his request, and his resignation as agriculturist was therefore accepted. He was named "Canadian Dairy and Agricultural Com-

missioner." In consequence of this, the question of the appointment of a first-class practical man to take charge of the live stock and agricultural department is under consideration. The appointment has not yet been made, but we hope to be able to get a first-class man. I have received a great number of recommendations of a leading man in the stock industry.

FISHING LICENSES.

Mr. LANDERKIN asked :

Is there any regulation of the Fisheries Department prohibiting the fisheries overseers and inspectors from disclosing the names of the licensees who paid \$10, or less, for their licenses ?

What are the names of the licensees for the district of Lennox, who, during the past two years, paid \$10, or less, for their licenses, and how much was paid by each ?

Mr. COSTIGAN. There is no special regulation in this particular connection, but the general instructions issued to all fishery officers contain the following paragraph :—

Fishery officers are strictly forbidden to communicate to newspaper reporters or to any person matters connected with their official correspondence or official duties, without the authority of the department.

PAYMENTS made by E. H. Sills, F.O., Napanee, of amounts of \$10 and under, on account of applications for licenses, during the fiscal year 1893-94 :

Year.	Sent on behalf of	Amount.
		\$ cts.
1894....	Charles White.....	10 00
1894....	O. Rikely.....	10 00
1894....	Donald Rikely.....	10 00
1893....	R. Keech.....	5 00
1893....	V. Keech.....	5 00
1893....	Fred Jennings.....	5 00
1894....	R. Keech.....	5 00
1894....	Chas. Moore.....	5 00
1893....	Parks & Bray.....	3 00
1893....	F. Keech.....	3 00
1894....	Jas. Pollard.....	3 00
1894....	Thos. Ruttan.....	3 00
1894....	Ruttan & Beaubien.....	3 00
1894....	Thos. Ruttan.....	3 00
1894....	Ruttan & Beaubien.....	3 00
1894....	W. H. Joyce.....	3 00
1894....	Irvine Joyce.....	3 00
1894....	W. H. Diamond.....	3 00
1894....	Jonas Sharp.....	3 00
1894....	Peter Lloyst.....	3 00
1894....	Ed. Fournier.....	3 00
1894....	O. Rikely.....	2 40
1893....	J. N. Post.....	1 75
1893....	Ed. Moore.....	1 50
1894....	S. Quackenbush.....	1 50
1894....	Chas. Moore.....	1 50
1894....	Wm. Davy.....	1 50
1894....	G. Spencer.....	1 50
1894....	Ed. Moore.....	1 50
1894....	P. Brown.....	1 25
1894....	Thos. McWain.....	1 00

REFUNDS.

AMOUNTS forwarded by E. H. Sills, F. O., Napanee, Ont., with applications for licenses, which were not granted, the money being refunded—1893-94.

Year.	On behalf of	Amount.
		\$ cts.
1893....	Parks & Bray.....	3 00
1893....	Fred Jennings.....	5 00
1894....	Thos. Ruttan.....	3 00
1894....	Ruttan & Beaubien.....	3 00
1894....	do do.....	3 00
1894....	S. Quackenbush.....	1 50
1894....	R. Keech.....	5 00
1894....	Wm. Davy.....	1 50
1894....	Thomas Luffman.....	*6 50
1894....	Chas. Moore.....	5 00
1894....	O. Rikely.....	2 40
1894....	Chas. Moore.....	1 50
1894....	Edward Fournier.....	3 00
	Total.....	43 40

*T. Luffman sent \$13. Licensed for \$6.50 ; balance refunded.

1894-95.

Chas. White.....	\$10 00
O. Rikely.....	10 00
D. Rikely.....	10 00
F. Shewman.....	10 00
Thos. VanOrder.....	6 00
James Hann.....	6 00
Ed. Moore.....	5 00
Ed. Moore.....	5 00
McCabe Brothers.....	3 00
James Pollard.....	3 00
Robt. Cousins.....	3 00
Thos. Ruttan.....	3 00
Thomas McWain.....	3 00
Jonas Sharp.....	3 00
Peter Lloyst.....	3 00
Wm. Davy.....	1 50
Ed. Moore.....	1 50
Wm. McHendry.....	1 50
Post Bros.....	1 50
Samuel Davy.....	1 50
Levi Fish.....	1 00

PROPOSED PUBLIC BUILDING AT PICTON.

Mr. DAWSON asked :

1. Do the Government intend to erect a public building upon the land purchased from Mr. J. N. Carter, in the town of Picton ? 2. If not, or if the question of the site of the proposed public building has not been settled yet, why did the Government purchase the said land ? 3. Why is the question of the said site not settled yet ?

Mr. OUIMET. The answer to the first question : No ; another and more desirable site has been obtained. As to the second question, at the time the Cartier site was purchased the other property was not obtainable. As to the third, the question is under consideration with a view to a very early settlement.

GOVERNMENT RENTS AT PICTON.

Mr. DAWSON asked :

1. What amount of rent has been paid to the collector of revenue for the Department of Public Works since February, 1894, by each of the tenants of the buildings on the land purchased by the Government from Mr. J. N. Carter, as a site for the proposed public building in Picton; giving names of tenants or occupants, date of payment, and amount? 2. Are any of them in arrears? If so, their names and the amount of arrears of rent?

Mr. OUIMET. The Collector of Revenue for the Department of Public Works has as yet received no money on account of these rents. All of these rents are in arrears, the list to 1st November last being as follows:—

Alcorn & Young.....	\$105 00
Richard Hubbs.....	105 00
Richard Benson.....	105 00
Sixsmith & Baker, and J. N. Carter (estimated).....	105 00
Cowan & Hodgins.....	84 00
	\$504 00

Less reduction claimed by Mr. Hubbs of..... 13 50

Total..... \$490 50

Some taxes paid by Mr. Carter are also to be deducted.

COMMUNICATION WITH PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

Mr. PERRY asked :

Have the ice-boats commenced crossing between Cape Traverse, Prince Edward Island, and Cape Tormentine, New Brunswick? If so, when? If not, why not? Are the mails now carried across by the boats?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Ice-boats commenced running Friday, 24th instant, three boats from Cape Traverse. On Saturday, six boats ran from Tormentine. On Sunday, 26th instant, three boats returned from Cape Traverse with twenty-six bags of mail. On Monday the boats left Cape Traverse, but had to return on account of lolly ice. On Tuesday there was no crossing from either side because of the north-west gale and drifting snow. The mails are now carried across by the boats as far as possible.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER, BART.

Mr. PERRY asked :

Is it a fact that Sir Charles Tupper, Secretary of State, is travelling in a private car through Cape Breton county during the election campaign at public expense?

Mr. HAGGART. I do not know how Sir Charles Tupper is travelling. I loaned him my private car. I have no doubt he is travelling at his own expense.

Mr. OUIMET.

NAVIGATION OF ST. JOHN RIVER, N.B.

Mr. COLTER asked :

1. What sums were appropriated by Parliament for improving the navigation of the St. John River, New Brunswick, and its tributaries, during the years from 1887 to 1895, inclusive? 2. What amount of such appropriation was annually expended in such improvements on said river and its tributaries during the same period? 3. At what points and places on said river were these sums expended?

Mr. OUIMET. The answer to this question will cover several pages of foolscap. It is now being prepared. I would request the hon. gentleman to give notice of motion for a return, and the information will be ready when the motion is presented.

SHIPMENT OF CATTLE VIA UNITED STATES PORTS TO EUROPE.

Mr. LANDERKIN asked :

Have any negotiations taken place between the Canadian Government and the Government of the United States with the view of obtaining permission for the shipment of Canadian cattle via United States ports to Europe, and if so, at what period were these negotiations carried on, and with what results?

Mr. MONTAGUE. I may say, in reply to the hon. gentleman, that my officers tell me that there is no official record of such correspondence.

MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY—THE MANITOBA SCHOOLS.

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

Mr. SPEAKER read the Message, as follows:—

ABERDEEN.

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons, a copy of further correspondence between the Governor of Canada and the government of the province of Manitoba, respecting the Manitoba school question.

Government House,
Ottawa, 30th January, 1896.

FOREIGN RELATIONS OF THE EMPIRE.

Mr. McNEILL. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to call attention for a moment to the first resolution standing in my name on the Order paper. It has reference to a matter of very deep importance, upon which, I understand, a number of members on both sides of the House are desirous of expressing their views. I would suggest, with the concurrence of the House, that it should be made the first order of the day for an early day next week.

Mr. LAURIER. What day?

Mr. McNEILL. I would say Wednesday of next week.

Mr. FOSTER. I have no objection—it is a loyal resolution.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Of course you will give us one of your days for it.

Mr. FOSTER. I supposed the hon. gentleman would claim this as his own motion.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I propose to speak upon it, and you will then know my views. I think it is of sufficient importance to give a Government day to it.

Mr. FOSTER moved :

That the resolution standing in the name of Mr. McNeill, under date of January 17, be made the first order of the day, after questions are asked by members, for Wednesday next.

Motion agreed to.

PAPERS IN THE MANITOBA SCHOOL CASE.

Mr. LAURIER. I would like to ask if the papers which the hon. gentleman has brought down lately with regard to negotiations with Manitoba are the whole of the correspondence, or if some more are to come ?

Mr. FOSTER. I think I may say they are all down.

RAILWAY PASSES TO MEMBERS.

The House resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 7) further to amend the Act respecting the Senate and House of Commons.—(Mr. Mulock.)

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Mr. CASEY. I am glad to find I can act in sympathy with my hon. friend from North York in regard to his Bill this year ; as I stated last year that I objected to his Bill as then introduced, but that I was willing to accept the principle of not granting mileage where expense had not been incurred by members coming to or returning from Parliament. I am glad, therefore, to be able to support the principle of the Bill this year. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman promoting the Bill as to the meaning of the words "attending or returning from having attended," in the first section of the Bill. I think that it should only prevent the use of a pass when coming down to attend the opening of Parliament, and on the final return after the close of Parliament, and that it should not be intended as a bar to the use of a pass during the session, when one has occasion to go home on business during the sittings of the House. The mileage granted to us is in-

tended to cover merely the expense of coming down here to attend the opening, and the expense of going back after the session. If the mileage is to be set against the pass, I think it should only be as far as those expenses are concerned, and that a member should be allowed to use his pass at other times without forfeiting his mileage. If the hon. gentleman intends that to be the meaning of the clause, I think it should be so expressed, so that there may be no doubt about it.

Mr. MULOCK. In answer to my hon. friend from East Elgin, I may say that the present mileage is sufficient to cover four trips home and back during the session. I do not think that many people travel much oftener than that. The present mileage of 10 cents a mile will cover the four trips.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I understand this section has relation to travelling to Parliament and returning home from Parliament, but it has nothing to do with travelling in the interim. A member of Parliament may go backwards and forwards as often as he pleases, but he does not get mileage for it, nor is mileage to be deducted for it, it has nothing to do with mileage. The mileage that he receives is for coming to Parliament in the first instance, and for going home from Parliament when the session expires ; and this section only has relation to that.

Mr. CASEY. I want to get an explanation from the mover of the Bill as to what he means by it.

Mr. MULOCK. Well, I mean just what the language says, attendance at Parliament. I think it is quite clear.

Section negatived : yeas 24, nays 81.

On the preamble,

Mr. McMULLEN. I want to say a few words on this Bill. Unquestionably there has been a strong agitation throughout the country with regard to members of Parliament travelling on passes. Now, I must say that so far as my own experience goes, members of Parliament are the poorest paid individuals in this Dominion. At the same time, to prevent any suspicion that we are at all actuated in the discharge of our duties by influence exercised by railway companies in granting them favours or in the way of legislation, I would be quite willing to give up the privilege of travelling on passes. I would much prefer to do that than to encourage a suspicion throughout the country that members of Parliament are influenced by receiving passes. Now, I must say that I have been a member of this House for some fourteen or fifteen years, I have been on the Railway Committee for that time, and I can honestly say, having followed the business of that committee throughout, that I do not think one single instance can

be pointed to where members of Parliament waived their independence or declined to perform their duty in what they conceived to be the interests of their country or their constituency, because they had a pass. I think the general transactions of this House are conducted in a manner in committee which shows that hon. members are quite independent of any favours granted, but, at the same time, I hold there is a very strong feeling in the country in opposition to the pass system. For that reason, I would be quite willing, personally, to drop it, if only to allay any public suspicion.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. An exceedingly sensible suggestion, to my mind, was made by the Minister of Public Works when this question was last under discussion, and it is worth our while, particularly as the Government say they are economical, to consider it. If I remember rightly the suggestion made by the Minister was (which I think is reasonable), that where this country has subsidized railways at very heavy cost to the public, those railway companies should be required to carry members of Parliament free. That is fair and just, and I, for one, will support such a proposition, if any hon. gentleman chooses to make it. Thereby, it would follow, that we would save the mileage, which amounts to a considerable amount, both for the Senate and the House of Commons. That must be understood distinctly, too. I do not propose to travel free and have mileage; but that is, I think, a rational solution of the difficulty, because it is not desirable or proper that railway companies should be granting favours to one or two members, or to one side of the House, and not the other. There are objections to that, and to railway companies making fish of one and fowl of another, because they may think that this man or that is a friend or opponent; but there is very strong reason in a country like Canada, where subsidies have been granted to the great railways of the country, to require that they should carry members of Parliament free.

Mr. OUIMET. I am afraid there is not enough life left in this Parliament to carry out the proposition suggested last year by me. It is one of the good things that we must leave to the next Parliament to deal with, and I am glad to know that the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) unites with me on the suggestion I made.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). You may not be here.

Mr. OUIMET. We will try to come back.

Mr. TARTE. You will try unsuccessfully.

Mr. OUIMET. Perhaps not; I think we will be pretty sure to come back. Next

Mr. McMULLEN.

year, no doubt, this valuable suggestion will be acted upon by the House.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Now is the accepted time.

Mr. CASEY. I am delighted to hear the Minister of Public Works say that he thinks this House is too moribund to consider the question of railway passes. No doubt, therefore, he will find it to be his duty to urge his leader to advise the Governor General that as this House is too far gone in the sere and yellow leaf to tackle the question of railway passes, he should dissolve the House immediately, as it is incapable of dealing with such questions as a Remedial Bill or Supplies.

Mr. OUIMET. Not before the thirty days are expired.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We can debate the question until the thirty days are up.

Mr. MULOCK. I think the committee is not responding to the sentiments of the House if it adopts the motion to vote out this preamble, and defeat the Bill. The Act which it proposes to amend is "An Act respecting the Senate and House of Commons of Canada," and it contains a provision for indemnifying members in respect of their attendance at Parliament. The sessional allowance of \$1,000 is not a salary, it is only an indemnity. The sessional allowance for mileage is not an increase to the salary, it is a recoupment as an indemnity; it is a return of money we are supposed to expend in attending Parliament. When public opinion without this House describes the action of members of this House as it does, in language that is equivalent to a charge of obtaining money by fraud or by dishonest means out of the public treasury, because we take as an indemnity from Parliament, mileage money which we never pay out, the time has arrived for Parliament to respect its own dignity and remove any opportunity for so alluding to members of Parliament. The travelling allowance of 10 cents per mile is a trifle in itself. It enables a member four times in the session to attend at Ottawa and at home, but no matter what the allowance may be, I submit that our actions here should not enable the public to form a low estimate of the position of Parliament, and when public journals reflect on the integrity of hon. members, and assert, as they frequently do, when railway legislation comes before this House, that we are influenced, perhaps, sometimes they suggest it mildly, that we are unintentionally and unconsciously influenced, but, at other times, it is charged that members are directly influenced by reason of these gifts from railway companies, the time has arrived when we should respect the dignity of Parliament and remove the occasion for

such criticisms. I regard it as unfortunate, therefore, that a majority of this committee should have adopted this course in order to defeat the present measure. It will be my duty, at a subsequent period, to enable the country to form a correct opinion as to the views of hon. gentlemen, to take the sense of the House at a time when the votes can be recorded, yea and nay, and thus show the attitude of every hon. member. I will illustrate. Take the hon. member for East Assiniboia (Mr. McDonald). I did not observe how he voted in committee, and, therefore, I only cite his case for purpose of illustration, and the argument may not apply to him. The hon. member lives, perhaps, two thousand miles from here, and his mileage will amount to \$400. The Canadian Pacific Railway, we will assume—I do not know whether it is so or not—may give him a return pass to and from Ottawa, and thereby the hon. gentleman saves \$400, he receiving \$400 from Parliament for railway fare, not one penny of which he pays out, with the exception of the charge for his sleeping-car fare. So he is practically subsidized to the extent of \$400 yearly by the Canadian Pacific Railway. The same applies, in a greater or less degree, to all the members who happen to use these privileges, and I submit that the proposition offered is a fair and proper one, and is one that should commend itself to this committee, and certainly it is demanded by the sentiment of the country. We cannot, as honourable men, receive, from the public treasury, mileage for coming to this House when we do not pay it out, but are allowed to travel free by the generosity of the railway companies. Why are the railway companies generous to members of Parliament? Is it for any reason except one? Do they not give passes to members because they are members? Do they give passes indiscriminately, whether the individuals are members or not? What is the reason the companies present these passes to members of this House? The answer is manifest; I need not ask. Every hon. gentleman can answer for himself. The country understands it, and the country will answer it, and this is the last of this question either in the House or in the country.

Mr. DICKEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to give some reason for the vote I gave in committee, a vote which I am quite prepared to repeat in this House and to be put on record. I do not take the same view as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock) does, with regard to the indemnity. You may call it what you please, but it is not an indemnity. I wish to ask this committee: if any hon. gentleman comes here, and lives at the house of a friend, or a relation during the session, and pays no board; is he a thief and a scoundrel because he draws his indemnity of \$1,000? Does the hon. gentleman from North York (Mr. Mulock) make

an account of what he spends in travelling, out of his 10 cents per mile each way, and does he refund to the treasury of the country the balance which he does not pay a railway company. This is really not an indemnity; it is some compensation for the attendance of members in Parliament. Regarding it in that light, I do not consider that the question of expenses for travelling or for board, enters into the matter at all. I am quite prepared to vote for a resolution taking away all indemnity from members of this House. I am quite prepared to withdraw from them any compensation whatever, if the majority of the House would agree with me. I doubt the wisdom of such a course in a country as young as this, but I think there is a good deal to be said for it. I have great respect for public opinion outside of this House—no one has more; but, Sir, I will not allow public opinion that is not properly informed, to lead me against my better judgment, and to lead me into doing a thing which I would consider as throwing an aspersion upon myself and upon my fellow members. That is the position which I take in regard to this matter, and therefore, I voted as I did. That opinion I have long held. I hold it firmly and I am ready to avow it on the hustings. I am ready to be responsible for it before my constituents, and when my constituents think so little of me, as that I would be influenced by a matter of this kind, or that they would think I would be dishonest on account of such, I am quite willing they should leave me at home and get some one else to represent them.

Mr. DAVIN. I wish, Mr. Chairman, to say a few words, as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock) made reference to my friend from East Assiniboia (Mr. McDonald) and to myself. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock) was mistaken in the calculation he made, because the distance from here to where we live is not so great as he made out; but that is a mere detail and is of no importance. Let me say this, and I think the House will accept my statement: if I were conscious for one minute, that in accepting a pass from the Canadian Pacific or any other railway I would be influenced, I would not hold such a pass for a moment. I never asked for a pass, it is sent to me, and before I was a member of this House I always travelled on a pass, which was given to me at that time I suppose because I was editor of a paper. But, Mr. Chairman, whether it was given me as the editor of a paper or given me as a member of Parliament, if I were conscious for one moment that it influenced me, I most certainly would not use it. The idea of its influencing me never occurred to me. The idea it was given to influence me never occurred to me, and judging by the speeches that I hear in this House from members that I know travel on passes, because I see them produce them; it is

palpable to me that these passes do not influence them. For instance, as I have been referred to myself, I may point out : in 1891, I had a Bill dealing with railway matters on the Order paper. Sir John Thompson was then leading the House, and after a struggle, he put it on the Government orders. I know that Bill was not regarded with favour either by the Canadian Pacific Railway or by the Grand Trunk Railway, but it did not matter a pin to me. I pressed it forward and had it put on Government Orders, but when it got to the Railway Committee, that committee in its wisdom practically slew my Bill. Now, my hon. friend from Essex has a Bill on the paper. If that Bill goes into committee, I will propose amendments that will place it in precisely the same position as my Bill of 1891. My hon. friend from East York (Mr. Maclean) also has a Bill on the paper, which goes over part of the ground my Bill went over. I asked my hon. friend (Mr. Maclean) this year if he was going to press his Bill, because if he was not, I would have put a Bill on the Orders. Last session I proposed a resolution having reference to the Canadian Pacific Railway. Although I did not hear directly, or from any source that I would pay the least attention to ; and although I did not try to verify it by communicating with any person connected with the Canadian Pacific Railway ; yet, I heard indirectly that the motion was one that the Canadian Pacific Railway would regard with a great deal of dislike. Nevertheless, I discussed the matter here, and my motion was voted down. If I were conscious for one moment, that having a pass influences me, well, I would not have a pass, and I have no doubt that most hon. gentlemen hold the same opinion. Now, Mr. Chairman, let me say this : Eight years ago when I came into this House, if that Bill of my hon. friend from York (Mr. Mulock) was brought forward, I think I would have been inclined to support it. But, since I have been eight years a member of Parliament, and to my bitter experience know well, what sacrifices are made by every member of Parliament who has any capacity or any power of making money of his time, I have changed my opinion. There are vast sacrifices, utterly unweighed by the constituencies and utterly unknown to the people, which are made by every member of this House. Take the Reform side of the House, and who does not know what the vast sacrifices a man who is no longer a member of this House, has made to the public ; I refer to the Hon. Mr. Blake. Who does not know what the sacrifices, the leader of the Opposition has made to the public ? Who does not know what the sacrifices hon. gentlemen of many talents on the Government side of the House, have made to the public ? The public do not weigh that. They think it is a great thing to be member of Parliament. They think

Mr. DAVIN.

in voting for you they are endowing you ; when the fact is, that instead of that, it very often turns out that being a member of Parliament is injurious to a man's business. Take my own case. I had to leave my business in order to come here, and after eight years, I can speak now with a frankness which I could not before. I made a great paper ; it is to-day independent of everything but newspaper income ; it is a great paying property, and I had to sell it because I could not carry it on and come here for four or five or six months a year. The sacrifice a member of Parliament makes is a terrible thing, and I only wish the constituencies could be made to understand it. If they did understand it, instead of regarding these passes in the way some of them do now, they would be apt to look on the matter in the way my hon. friend the Minister of Justice says he regards it. But, the fact is, Mr. Chairman, a larger question is raised and it is a question that will have to be faced. We are too timid ; we are afraid to meet the public upon it. As a fact, justice to the members of Parliament is justice to the country, and if there is any injustice done to members of Parliament in this matter, it is inimical to the interest of the country. For my part, if ever the larger question is raised here, I shall meet it in a very different way now—after an experience and observation of eight years—from the way I should have met it when I first entered Parliament. Eight years ago I would have been prepared to cut down the indemnity that is paid to members, so much do I dislike the idea of men having the least temptation to come here for any other purpose than to serve the public. But after a man has been a member of Parliament for a short time, he knows well that the only possible motive that can bring him here is the public spirit that urges him to love the perilous duty of doing good to his fellow-men.

Mr. McNEILL. I desire to say just one word in explanation of the vote which I was compelled to give on this question. In the first place, I utterly disbelieve, and would repudiate in the strongest terms, the imputation that any member of this House was influenced at all in his course of conduct here by the receipt of a railway pass. I do not believe that for one moment ; but I do know that there is a very strong feeling out of doors, which tends in the direction of the belief that members of this House are so influenced, and I think it would be a most unhappy thing if we did anything here to give any countenance whatever to such a belief on the part of the public. I think, for the sake of the dignity of this House, it is most important that any such idea should be displaced from the public mind ; and it seems to me that the only way to do that is simply to say that we will not accept these railway passes. Since I have risen

to refer to this matter, I will say that I was very much impressed by the view placed before the House by my hon. friend the Minister of Justice. I have heard this matter discussed in many places and from many points of view, but I have never heard the case put so strongly as my hon. friend put it to-day. Still, notwithstanding the very strong argument he made in support of the railway pass, I do think that in the interest of this House, which in the larger sense is the interest of the public, it would be better if members of Parliament would simply make up their minds to refuse railway passes when they are offered. I must say that I think the public are very much astray in the view they take with regard to the indemnity which members of Parliament receive for their services or their expenses. It is thought, apparently, that when a member of Parliament receives \$1,000 in the way of indemnity, he is receiving a very large sum of money—that he is being very handsomely recouped for his loss. Now, setting aside altogether the consideration of the loss, the enormous loss, which many members of Parliament incur by coming here and leaving their business, just look at the matter from the very lowest point of view, and consider the number of letters which a member of Parliament writes from one year's end to the other. Lay aside altogether the expenses that are incurred here, and compute the value of those letters at what they would cost if written by an ordinary solicitor—even by the most pettifogging solicitor you could find—and I think you would find that the whole of the \$1,000 indemnity would be exhausted in payment for the letters alone. Without at all meaning to suggest an increase to the indemnity, I think it would be as well if members of Parliament would speak out a little more plainly and let their constituents understand that when they receive \$1,000 in the way of indemnity, they are not being enriched to that extravagant degree that too many of our friends in the rural districts, at any rate, imagine.

Mr. INGRAM. It appears to me that the question for us to consider is whether or not the mileage we receive should be regarded as any portion of our indemnity. Now, to pursue the argument of the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock), based on his reference to the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) drawing \$400 for mileage. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman whether he means to say that a member representing the city of Ottawa or the county of Russell, and residing here, should receive the same amount for indemnity as a member residing at a distance from the capital? If hon. gentlemen conclude that the mileage is simply for travelling expenses, then the fair way to deal with the matter would be this. Let the Act be so amended that at every new parliamentary term the Speaker of the House of Commons,

the Speaker of the Senate, the Clerk of the House of Commons, and the Clerk of the Senate, shall issue to each member a card that will be recognized on all the railway and steamship lines that are subsidized by this Parliament; and let them issue orders to these railway and steamship companies to recognize this card as an official authority given to the member of Parliament or the senator holding it the privilege of travelling free over their lines. If that were done, then you could wipe out the mileage; but in doing that you would do an injustice to gentlemen residing at a distance from the capital, who are obliged to neglect their business to a greater extent than those living at the capital or in its neighbourhood. Then it would naturally follow that the indemnity to each member of the House and to each senator would be rated according to the distance at which he lived from the capital. I have no doubt that the hon. member for North York has no desire to do an injustice to gentlemen residing at a distance; and if he would incorporate something of this kind in his Bill, I would be ready to support it. But I do not consider that the mileage we receive is intended simply to pay our travelling expenses. I regard it as a portion of the indemnity to those who reside a long distance from the capital.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) As one of those who support the Bill, I do not think we are open to the imputation which the hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Dickey) rather flung at us, that we wish to attach a stigma to hon. gentlemen who vote against the Bill. I, for one, have no such idea in my mind at all. It is a Bill on which we may honestly have differences of opinion. I intended, if I had time, to move a small amendment to the first section to provide that if a member travelled only a part of the distance on a pass, he should only lose the mileage for the portion that he so travelled. In this discussion, I think, we are missing the point of the matter before the House. We are discussing the propriety of receiving passes at all. That is not before the House. Some hon. gentlemen may think there is no harm in their accepting a pass; others may think differently. There is another view of the case which has not yet been presented. What is important is not what the member may feel on the subject so much as whether or not the public at large believe that the acceptance of a pass influences our judgment. We know that a very salutary rule, which has existed for a long time in the British Empire, is that no judge who is appointed to sit in judgment between two of his fellow-citizens shall receive a favour from either of those citizens, be it small or be it great. I suppose there could not be a greater insult offered to a British judge by a litigant than to tender him a favour of the smallest kind.

Mr. DICKEY. That is not in issue here.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I say it is not. The question of receiving passes is not in issue here, but the principle which leads the public British mind to believe that it is wrong for a litigant to offer a favour of any kind to a judge prevails, to some extent, in the mind of the public, who think that it is wrong for a railway company, seeking favours continuously from this Parliament, to offer even the smallest favour to any member who may be called upon to vote for or against the request of the company. That is the point. We must be, as a judge, above suspicion, and if it comes to the question as to whether it is right to receive passes or not, there are many points of view from which it may be regarded, and possibly those who urge that it is right may be justified in their view. With regard to the question raised, whether it is expedient or not to abolish indemnity, the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) said he was much impressed with the view of the Minister of Justice (Mr. Dickey). It did not impress me in the slightest. I do not see what the question of indemnity has to do in this discussion at all. I am not at one with the hon. gentleman. I think you would do a great injustice, not only to the members, but to the country at large, if you provided that the indemnity should cease. You would exclude the very best class of men. Experience has shown that while you may get a Parliament in England, where there are many wealthy men able to give up their time to the public, in this country, where every man has to earn bread for his family by his own labour, it would be impossible to get men to come here and spend three months, at their own expense, without indemnity.

Mr. McNEILL. I understood the Minister of Justice to say that in a new country like this, he is not prepared to do away with the indemnity.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) He said he was prepared to abolish the indemnity altogether.

Mr. McNEILL. He said so, speaking for himself, but in a new country like this he was not prepared to go so far.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) We are not discussing whether members should be indemnified or not, or whether they should accept passes or not. Personally, I am strongly in favour of the proposition made last session by the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Ouimet), and endorsed to-day by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), of compelling every railway company in Canada which receives a subsidy from Parliament, to give passes over its line to the members of the House of Commons and Senate. But the one point we are invited to discuss, is whether, having received passes and having used these passes, we could fairly ask for the mileage indemnity as well. I do not pro-

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

pose to impute motives to anybody. Some think we are entitled to it, and others think we are not. I think not, and I vote in that sense, not because I wish to throw any obloquy on the motives on those who think otherwise, but because I think, honestly, that the Bill, to the extent to which I say it ought to have gone, is laying down a correct principle.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). I do not desire to prolong the discussion on this very important question. I am very glad, indeed, to hear my hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) declare that he is personally in favour of compelling all railways and steamship lines, subsidized by the Parliament of Canada, to grant passes to every member of Parliament on both sides of the House. I think that this will remove any suspicion from the public mind that members of Parliament would be biassed by receiving passes from these companies. I do not believe that any such opinion exists in any part of this Dominion, unless where it has been created by some parties interested in obtaining cheap popularity among the people. The indemnity granted to members of Parliament is \$1,000, and a mileage of 10 cents per mile to those who attend Parliament during the whole session. If they do not attend during the whole session, \$8 per day is deducted from that indemnity. Now, the mileage is just as much a part of the indemnity as the \$1,000.

Mr. MULLOCK. Then why is it variable?

Mr. CAMERON. I think I shall explain to my hon. friend. The indemnity is supposed by some to be simply for the purpose of covering the expenses of members of Parliament during the session, but I am more inclined to put it on the basis that it is a small compensation for the loss of time to the majority of us through our attendance in Parliament. Those who are furthest distant from the seat of Parliament, unquestionably lose very much more than those who live at the seat of Parliament, or near it. The mileage is more intended to cover the loss of business incurred by those who live at a distance, in excess of that which is incurred by those who live nearer the capital. In Nova Scotia, the indemnity is \$500 for the session, and 20 cents a mile. It was never supposed that 20 cents a mile was intended to cover the travelling expenses to and from the local legislature. That was not the intention there, and I am sure it was not the intention here. The object of paying 20 cents a mile additional indemnity to those who live at a distance was simply to cover the extra loss incurred by them on account of the distance at which they live from the seat of Parliament. What I would complain of is that the mileage allowed here is not sufficient to cover the additional loss which must be

experienced by those who live far from this city. It is well known that those who live within a few hundred miles can go home to their business once a week, and thus keep a sharp supervision over it, which those who live at greater distances find it impossible to do. They must remain here from the beginning to the end of the session, unless compelled by some unfortunate circumstances to absent themselves, and then they are docked \$8 per day. The point I desire to make is this, that the mileage is a part of the indemnity, and that it is not sufficient to compensate those who come from a distance, as compared with those who are nearer the capital. I do not think that any one will acquire very much fame in this Dominion by cheese-paring of this kind. To my mind, it looks very much like straining at a gnat. As far as the passes are concerned, my opinion is that very few companies who give passes to members of Parliament are asking for any favours from this Parliament; and even if they were, I think they are simply doing a duty which devolves upon them. Every railway company that is subsidized by this Parliament should give a pass to every member of Parliament on both sides of politics; and, if they were compelled to do that, no person would be suspected of being under any obligation to them.

Mr. CASEY. I regret that the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) has on this occasion raised the general question of the propriety of accepting passes. I understood him to limit the scope of his proposal, and the scope of his discussion to what was actually stated in the Bill. I do not wish, by the support I have given to the Bill as introduced by the hon. gentleman this session, to be understood as endorsing the idea that it is in any way improper for a member to take or use a pass. I stated in the discussion last year that I would support a Bill similar to the one he has introduced, and I have done so. But there is a difference between the Bill of last session and the present measure. The Bill of last year practically provided that a member should not use a pass under any circumstances, on pain of losing a large part of his indemnity as well as his mileage. But I do not wish to be understood as endorsing the hon. gentleman's remarks this session as to the impropriety of the use of passes by the members of this House.

Mr. MULOCK. I am perfectly aware that public life involves sacrifices, great and small, on the part of all members who devote their time to public affairs. This is a consideration to govern each person in determining whether he will or will not enter public life. I am not aware that, when a man comes to the decision to enter public life, he expects to be recouped in money for public services rendered for the benefit of the country. I believe that many men in

Canada voluntarily, cheerfully and loyally make sacrifices of their time and strength—perhaps more than they can afford—because of their interest in the country. We constantly see citizens taking a deep interest in public charities, for instance, simply for the good of the cause involved. And so in this higher sphere, in this greatest and most important institution in Canada, corresponding sacrifices have to be made by all of us. These sacrifices are, no doubt, more onerous to some than to others. Nevertheless the fact that they are sacrifices is to be considered in connection with the nature of the work and the fact that the man making these sacrifices will, perhaps, receive the gratitude of the public, or at all events, will enjoy the consciousness or having served his country well. So that the question of sacrifices made, I submit, has nothing to do with the question involved in this Bill. My hon. friend from Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies), I think, effectually disposed of the argument of the Minister of Justice. The hon. Minister suggested whether a gentleman would be warranted in accepting the indemnity of \$1,000 if he did not expend the whole of it attending Parliament. The indemnity of \$1,000 is given as a fixed sum, subject to certain limitations or deductions, which are set forth in the statute. One of the chief objections to the acceptance of a present in the way of a pass from a railway company by a member of Parliament is that the member is obliged from time to time to sit in judgment upon applications which affect financially the very giver of the present. My hon. friend from Queen's P.E.I., suggested, and very properly, the dictates of public opinion as to the conduct of judges. Are we not in the position of judges? The hon. member for Inverness (Mr. Cameron) says that it is a rare thing for these companies to come here for favours. I do not know that we can call an application for legislation an application for a favour; we have no right to regard them as such. We have no right to grant favours in the ordinary sense of the term. We are here as trustees of the public treasury, trustees of certain powers which we, as representatives may exercise or not in our discretion. But this is not an arbitrary discretion to be exercised whimsically, but a discretion to be exercised, to the best of our judgment, for the welfare of the country; it is a matter of duty, not a matter of discretion how we shall treat these applications. And I submit, with all respect to the opinion of others, that it is unseemly for us to be sitting with gratuities in our pockets from the railway companies that are applying to this Parliament for legislation. Further, I emphasize again the opinion that we owe it to the public not to allow them to lower their opinion of Parliament or of the individual members of Parliament. I can pass with indifference such suggestions as fell from the lips of my hon. friend from

Inverness. If any one attempts to remove an abuse, he is liable to such complimentary references as those with which my hon. friend favoured me. I accept these observations as a necessary incident of any legislation of this kind; but the fact that my hon. friend can view the legislation in the way indicated by his remarks causes me to attach very much less weight to any remark he may make. However, I trust that the personal element can be, to some extent, left out of consideration, and that we deal with this subject on its own merits. I may say that the hon. gentleman from Inverness is entirely in error if he supposes that this is not a live question. This proposal did not originate, so far as I know, with persons seeking cheap popularity, or a popularity of any other kind.

Mr. CAMERON. I mean in the country.

Mr. MULOCK. In the country or here. This is a question the feeling regarding which is widespread among the people, and the people have in various forms expressed opinions hostile to the present condition of affairs. The very sentiment that prevents men who occupy judicial positions accepting favours from those persons likely to come before them in the capacity of suitors applies, pro tanto, to the case under discussion, and is an additional objection to the system. So the Bill I have the privilege of introducing, I think, claims support on two good grounds—one that we are taking money from the public treasury by way of recoupment for expenses in travelling, which money we do not pay out, and the other that we are accepting favours from suitors to this Parliament for legislation—two sound objections, either one of which, I submit, ought to commend the Bill to the favourable consideration of this House.

Mr. TAYLOR. Just a word or two, Mr. Speaker, from my point of view as to why railway companies grant passes. I believe that railway companies grant passes to members of Parliament for business reasons, and, if I were president of a railway company in this country, I would adopt the course pursued by most of the railway companies in this respect. We know that members of Parliament, no matter whether they support the Government or whether they are in opposition, are compelled, in the interest of their constituencies and in the interest of the country, to visit the capital very often, even when the House is not in session. Take the case of a member of Parliament at Toronto or London. He probably has to visit the capital four, five or six times during the recess, usually coming down for the purpose of accompanying some deputation having business with the Government. If that member has a pass in his pocket over one line of railway, and there are two other lines of railway from that point to the capital, the member will go on the road by which he has free transport, and the depu-

Mr. MULOCK.

tation who pay their way, will accompany him. Now, to my mind that is the reason, and the only reason, why the railway companies of this country try to induce travel by their respective roads. I do not believe that a railway company ever offered a pass to any hon. member of this House for the purpose of influencing his vote in any way in favour of legislation that they may have before the House. Even if they did, we are here simply to see that proper laws safeguarding the interests of the people as well as those of the railway company, are passed by the House. We have no favours to give to railway companies, and the railway companies, in my opinion, give these passes purely from a business point of view. If I were president of a railway company, with a competing line, I would give a railway pass to every member of both the Dominion and provincial governments. The companies give passes to many others, they give them to newspaper men, simply because newspaper men are running over the road a good deal, accompanied by their friends, who pay their fares, and they will go on whichever line of railway that is taken by the gentleman whom they are accompanying. That is the way I have always viewed passes. I believe it is the common-sense way to view them, and that is why the railway companies give passes to members. A great deal of noise has been made in this House and in the country by persons who charge members of Parliament with being bribed by railway companies. I don't believe these charges amount to the snap of your finger in the country. These passes do not influence the hon. member who has raised this question in the House, nor any other hon. gentleman in the House, whether he has passes or not. That is my opinion, and it is my opinion that some of the railway companies will continue to issue passes to men in public life, and to other prominent men who do a great deal of travelling, in order to induce them to go over their lines and to bring with them their friends who pay fares.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). I am sure my hon. friend from North York (Mr. Mulock) would not for a moment suspect that I meant, in my remarks, that any member of this House would endeavour to acquire a cheap popularity by any movement of this kind. But I do distinctly say that there are some persons in the country who are trying to agitate the people in regard to passes given by railway companies and steamship lines. Their object is manifest, they desire to gain some popularity by which they may obtain seats in Parliament. It is persons outside who, as a general thing, agitate questions of this kind, and the agitation gains strength in various constituencies to such an extent that even persons who are fixed in their positions as members of Parliament, such as my hon. friend for North York, are disturbed by it. But my impression is that it has very little effect in the country. I am

also of the decided opinion that the generous people of this Dominion do not desire, or require, that any public man should make great sacrifices in their interest. I believe they are not only willing to indemnify their representatives for the time and expense which are entailed by their attendance in Parliament, but they are willing to compensate them fairly well. I go further, and say that the indemnity given to members of Parliament is not sufficient, even including the travelling expenses allowed them, to compensate them for their loss of time, and their services to the country. I am satisfied that if a large majority of this House were to grant a reasonable amount in addition to what we now receive, the common-sense people in the country would justify it. I have no hesitation in saying that I would be willing to defend, not only the existing indemnity, but to defend an additional indemnity as well; and I would go as far as my hon. friend the Minister of Justice, and say that unless the people whom I have the honour to represent here were willing to acquiesce in granting additional indemnity to members of Parliament, I for one would have no hesitation in making way for some other gentleman who would be willing to serve for the present compensation.

Committee rose.

SAFETY OF RAILWAY EMPLOYEES AND PASSENGERS.

Mr. CASEY moved second reading of Bill (No. 2) further to secure the safety of railway employees and passengers. He said: In moving the second reading of this Bill, I beg leave to call the attention of the House, in the first place, to the question of jurisdiction. That question was raised in connection with a Bill I had up the other day in regard to drainage across railways. It was maintained by the Government and others on that occasion, that the jurisdiction as to drainage on railway property, did, and should, inhere entirely in this Parliament, in spite of the strong contention, on the other hand, that that subject was especially under the care of the local legislature. In the present case I am sure the Government will not raise the question of jurisdiction, for this Bill proposes to regulate the conduct of railways which are under the control of the Dominion Parliament, some of which have been chartered by us, and whose methods of procedure, I think, we have undoubtedly a right to control. I maintain that in regard to property and matters of that kind, the railways of Canada should be under the control of the respective provinces. But I do think that when this Parliament has taken control of certain railways in the sense in which it has brought them under its own special jurisdiction, we have a right to prescribe how those railways shall carry on their business, and how they shall

perform their duties towards the public, and towards their own employees.

This Bill relates to both these classes of duties; it concerns the conduct of railway companies towards their employees and towards the public who travel over those roads. I did not intend to bring it up at so early a period of the session. I have had a number of copies of the Bill printed for circulation amongst those specially interested, and I wished to get the opinion of railway men, both employers and employed, before I proposed the second reading of the Bill. But I was afraid that it might get smothered up, as happened last year, with other business, and that I would not have a chance of taking the sense of the House upon it at all. I am, therefore, going to ask the House to read it the second time to-day, and then to do as was done with the railway drainage Bill, refer it either to the Railway Committee, or to a select committee, who may thresh out the particulars of the proposed law. I desire an opportunity to lay before the committee in charge of the Bill the opinions of those interested, and have a full discussion of its various details, apart from any possible partisanship.

I hope that there will be no partisan feeling in connection with the discussion of the Bill, but that it will be discussed as was the Bill presented by the hon. member for Gengarry (Mr. McLennan), on sound, general, business principles, and that it will receive the support, at least for its second reading, of all those who wish to see something done in the direction indicated by the Bill.

Mr. HAGGART. I desire a full discussion of the principle of the Bill on the second reading, and I then propose to send it to the Railway Committee.

Mr. CASEY. I thank the hon. gentleman for his statement. Accordingly I will now describe, as briefly as possible, the principles involved in the Bill, and I will accept the hon. gentleman's proposal to send the Bill to the Railway Committee after it has received its second reading.

The general provisions of the Bill may be said to come under three heads. A number of the provisions look towards protecting employees and passengers in the operating of the road. Another set of provisions look towards securing a minimum fixed compensation for employees who are injured, or permanently disabled, in connection with the operating of the road, or for the families of those killed in the performance of their duties. The final clause relates more particularly to the duty of the company to maintain the road-bed and plant in first-class order.

I may say, in the first place, that when we grant a franchise to a railway company we are giving it something that is extremely valuable, we are making it a present of what is practically a monopoly of transportation along certain routes. I wish

to lay down the general principle that we have a right to demand something in return for this franchise, that it is not to be regarded as a free gift to which a railway company has an absolute right, but rather as a concession, in return for which the public have a right to demand that the company shall take proper precautions for the safety of the public and their own servants.

Looking first at the clause respecting duties towards employees, I would say in general terms that no class in the country deserve more credit for their general good character, for the fortitude with which they endure severe and trying labour, and the skill which they have to exercise in many branches of their employment, than those who operate the railways of this country. From the newest hand in a railway yard, to the brakeman who risks his life on the top of a slippery freight car on a frosty night, and on up to the skilled engineer, the responsible conductor, and so through even higher grades of the service, these men must be of high quality, and possess careful training, in order to secure as well as they do the safety of the lives and property committed to their charge.

No doubt some hon. members have taken a ride in the cab of a locomotive, and any one who has done so will realize, in some degree, the necessity for a keen eye, a strong hand and level head on the part of men so employed. Everybody must realize who travels on a passenger train how entirely his life depends upon the capacity of the man who drives the train. But we do not always realize the fact that this man himself and others who ride with him on the engine are the very first to suffer in case of accident, that they are placing themselves in immediate danger of their lives.

The first provision of the Bill is intended to give special security to those who drive the locomotive, as well as the passengers of the train itself. It provides that all cars fitted with air-brakes shall have an automatic device, either in the hose coupling of the air-brake—that is in the rubber pipe connecting the air-brake under one car with that under the next—or the “train pipe” which passes under the floor of the car, which will warn the engineer when a coupling is broken, accidentally or otherwise.

That may not seem to the non-technical mind a very important matter. I am sorry to be able to recall an instance in the capital city of my own county where many lives and much property were sacrificed for the want of such a device as that to which I have referred. An excursion train coming from Port Stanley northward through St. Thomas attempted to stop in the usual manner at the station there; but when the engineer attempted to apply the air-brake, he found that the connection had been broken, and he was unable to control the speed of the train. It rushed

Mr. CASEY.

through the station, struck a train on another railway which crossed the line, composed of oil cars, smashed the engine of the excursion train, setting fire to the wreck and causing a conflagration, involving heavy loss of life and tremendous destruction of property. If the provision contained in the first section of this Bill had been in force and carried out, the engineer would have been warned the moment the connection was broken, and he would have been able to prevent that accident.

The second clause provides that freight cars built for use in Canada shall be of a uniform height, prescribed by the Minister of Railways, and shall have certain attachments for the greater security of those who have to do with handling the freight. They are to have automatic extension running boards on top of the cars, making a safe pathway from one car to the other; they are to have a continuous rail alongside the running board for the brakemen to hold by; they are to have outside ladders conveniently placed for brakemen to climb on to the roof of the car, and iron rails on top of these ladders for the further convenience of those who climb them, perhaps in the dark, or perhaps in a storm, and who will find it a great convenience to have something to catch hold of when they go on top of the slippery roof of a car. All these attachments are to be subject to the approval of the Minister of Railways.

Clause 3 provides :

Every such car already built, which is the property of a Canadian railway for use in Canada, shall, within two years after the passing of this Act be fitted with the foregoing attachments.

Clauses 4 and 5 provide for penalties for a breach of these provisions. The 6th clause is very important, because it provides that the Minister of Railways shall proceed against any railway company, or car builder, handling, using or building such cars contrary to the provisions of this Act; on the information of any credible person. Without that provision, I am afraid nobody would intervene to see the law carried out, and I propose to make it the duty of the Minister of Railways. It might perhaps be left more properly to the Solicitor General, but that is a matter for further consideration.

Clause 7 provides :

7. When cars fitted with automatic couplings are made up in a train with cars not so fitted, the cars with automatic couplings shall be coupled together, and those not so fitted shall be coupled together, so that there shall be only one coupling in the train between cars with automatic couplings and those without them.

2. When cars fitted with air-brakes are made up in a train with cars not so fitted, the cars with air-brakes shall be placed next to the locomotive, and the air-brakes shall be coupled and used in braking such cars.

3. When flat cars are made up in a train with other cars, the flat cars shall be coupled together.

The reason of these provisions is, that a brakeman who has to attend to cars not automatically braked, will not be obliged to run over other cars to get to the one which he needs to brake. The provision in regard to flat cars ought to explain itself. It is a very inconvenient thing to get down from the roof of a box car, to a flat car, and then climb again to the roof of the next box car. If the box cars were all together it would be much safer and easier for the brakeman.

These details will, of course, be subject to discussion in committee; but I must say, in regard to all these provisions, that I have taken counsel with the best authorities on the subject that I am acquainted with, namely: with the Executive Board of the Railway Brotherhoods of Canada, through their representatives in this city, and also by direct communication with others of the committee. I introduced the Bill last year, after consultation with these gentlemen, and I have revised it this year after further consultation with them, so that so far as regards most of its details, it is now in a shape dictated by the practical knowledge and experience of those who are most interested, namely, the men who operate the trains.

Clause 8 of the Bill provides extra pay, pro rata, for any railway employee who is kept at work beyond ten hours, or whatever shorter period may be the regular stipulated time agreed upon by him and the company, for his daily duties. Clause 9 provides for a meal hour at a convenient time for yard men and others employed about the shunting yard.

Now we come to clause 10, which seems to me to contain some of the most important provisions of the Bill. This is the clause which provides for a fixed minimum compensation to those injured in the discharge of their duties, or to the relatives of those employees who have been killed. It provides:

10. Every employee of a railway company injured while in the discharge of his duty shall, for every day during which he is thereby unfitted for duty, be entitled to compensation from the railway company at the rate of not less than sixty per cent of the current rate of wages for men similarly employed by the company at the time the injury occurs, to be paid for not more than fifty-two weeks.

2. Every such employee permanently disabled while in the discharge of his duty, shall be entitled to compensation from the railway company to the amount of not less than three thousand dollars.

3. The legal representatives of every employee who is killed, or who dies from injuries received, while in the discharge of his duty, shall be entitled to compensation from the railway company to the amount of not less than three thousand dollars.

4. The foregoing provisions as to compensation and extra pay for overtime shall be without prejudice to any further damages which a court of law may adjudge to any such employee or his legal representatives as against any railway com-

pany, and shall not be capable of being renounced or given up by such employee by any agreement or contract with the railway company, for value or otherwise, or of being made void by any rules or regulations of the railway company.

The sum of \$3,000 is mentioned in a tentative way and is subject to future discussion. The percentage of 60 per cent mentioned in the subsection is also, so to speak, a tentative one. It is what is allowed by railway benefit societies, and in other similar cases, and could be subject to change without affecting the principle involved. I understand that in the laws of some of the United States, this plan of fixed compensation is adopted. I am not in a position to say in what states that is the law, but I thoroughly approve of the principle. I maintain, that when an employee is injured or killed in the discharge of his duty on a railway, and when that death or injury is not the result of his own negligence, he is entitled to some fixed compensation from the company. Nearly all such accidents occur because of some defect in the plant, or road-bed, or cars, or locomotives; or through the negligence of some employee other than the one who is injured. I hold that in all such cases the company should be liable.

It may be said, that we should leave this to the courts to settle, but I say, that no employee of a railway company is able to fight that railway company in the courts. If it is left to the courts to settle between the two, the employee will always come out at the small end of the horn. A company can appeal the case from court to court, until it goes to the Privy Council if necessary, without seriously affecting its revenues, but the employee will be stranded at a very early stage of the litigation.

Subsection 6, of clause 10, provides:

6. The foregoing provisions as to compensation shall be void in the case of any employee whose injury, disablement or death is caused by his own negligence,—the burden of proof of such negligence being upon the railway company; but if such injury, disablement or death occurs in the handling or use of trains, locomotives, cars or appliances which are out of repair, or insufficient, or not in accordance with the provisions of this Act, or if the provisions of section eleven of this Act have not been complied with, the railway company shall not be allowed to plead contributory negligence on the part of the employee so injured, disabled or killed.

I think that section carries its own justification with it. If the company is not observing the law, or if its tracks or other equipment are not in good order, it should not be allowed to plead contributory negligence on the part of the employee.

Subsection 5 makes provision for the ascertainment of the permanent disability or unfitness for duty of the person claiming compensation. It says:

The certificate of two duly qualified disinterested physicians shall be sufficient to prove permanent disability; and the certificate of the at-

tending physician shall be sufficient to prove unfitness for duty, for a period not exceeding ten weeks, after which time a monthly certificate of two disinterested physicians shall be required: Provided that, in any case, the certificate of a physician named by the company shall be sufficient.

Nearly all railway companies have a railway doctor—a physician appointed to attend their men, and I provide that his certificate shall be sufficient in any case. I have no doubt that, in most of these cases, the injury or disablement would be so plain and obvious that the railway's own physician would report it, and avoid the expense of calling others.

Now we come to another very important section—section 11, which is as follows:—

Every railway company shall at all times employ a sufficient number of telegraph operators, train men, section men, and other employees and workmen to safely carry on its business, and to keep its bridges, track, roadway, rolling stock and plant in good condition.

If it fails to do so, it shall be held responsible for all injury to life, person, or property in connection with its operations.

I submit that this section, which applies to passengers, employees, shippers, and everybody concerned, carries its own justification with it. If the railway allows its means of transportation to get into a bad state of repair, I think it should be distinctly held liable for all injury that may occur to life and property in connection with its operations.

I may be told that the provisions of this Act are rather severe on railway companies. I do not think they are, and I do not think the companies, if well advised, will maintain that they are. I have already pointed out what I believe to be the absolute right of the public, to insist on any conditions they please in connection with the granting of a railway franchise. I think that the conditions embodied in this Bill are reasonable, and that it would be to the advantage of the railway companies themselves to agree to them.

The railway companies are constantly put to expense by going into court to litigate matters connected with injury to life and property. Some companies seem to think it cheaper to risk the killing of an employee once in a while than to go to the necessary expense to make the operation of trains safe for those employed. I do not mean to say that they do that deliberately, by any means; but their general course of conduct is to allow things to go on in a way that is unnecessarily risky to the lives and limbs of those employed, until accidents occur, and then, instead of providing against such accidents in future, they pay damages, and go on in the old method. I do not think we can trust to the companies themselves to introduce the necessary improvements, unless we force them to do it.

Mr. CASEY.

When I compiled this Bill for presentation to the House, I took it for granted that my hon. friend from East York (Mr. MacLean) was going to introduce his Bill of last year, which provided for the placing of air-brakes and automatic couplings on all cars used in Canada. If I had not expected that, I would have put in the clauses of that Bill as part of this Bill. It will be possible to do that in the committee, and, after the Bill goes there, I will move their insertion, or leave my hon. friend from East York to do so if he thinks fit. I mention that to explain why I have provisions in this Bill of apparently less importance, without including those to which I have referred. Some of the provisions of this Bill would be unnecessary, and therefore void, when the provisions of the Bill of the hon. member for East York came into force; but the others are of permanent usefulness and necessity. Thanking the hon. Minister of Railways for agreeing to the second reading, I leave the matter in the hands of the House.

Mr. TISDALE. I think this Bill is of too much importance altogether not to be discussed somewhat as to its principles before it goes to the committee, because the details are what the committee has largely to deal with, while the House has to decide the principles of legislation of this kind. I do not think myself that this is a very opportune time, looking at the history of railways, not only in this country, but all over this continent, to increase their already heavy obligations, unless it is shown to be not only beneficial and desirable, but reasonable in every respect. I quite agree that from time to time it may be necessary by legislation to look after and improve the position of people who have dealings with railways, and it may be necessary, at times, by legislation to deal with the rolling stock, but I do not think that either of these matters should be enforced upon the railways by any legislature unless it is clearly made out that their equipment is imperfect and of a character that is essentially dangerous. I believe that hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House will agree that legislation against any particular class, forcing upon that class regulations, either as to the character of the implements or machinery it uses in a particular trade, or as to the wages or hours of labour agreed to between it and its employees, or as to compensation for injuries, embodies principles of such a far-reaching nature that all legislatures should move very slowly in adopting it. When I say that, I do not mean that there may not be particular cases when the interference of the legislature is necessary, but I think all hon. members of this House will agree that such cases should be clearly made out before we should be asked to exercise the potent power of the legislature along these particular lines. My own experience as a legislator, and as a

lawyer before I came to Parliament, has taught me that the greatest danger of the present day in regard to legislation, is in having too much of it. Gentlemen outside of the House—because I never impute motives to members of the House, I do not believe in that, nor do I think, as a rule, that it is justified—gentlemen outside of the House, and interests outside of the House, often seek to promote their own selfish ends, or to serve some feeling they have in regard to corporations or individuals, by getting members of Parliament to introduce legislation in the legislatures of the different provinces or in the legislature of the Dominion. I am one of those who believe that we should legislate on lines applicable to the whole country, and be very careful not to make ourselves the instrument of any particular interests or individuals. Take the first clause of this Bill, which deals with automatic brakes, and which is largely in the interests of gentlemen who think they have the wisest and the best devices in the world, simply because they have patented them.

Mr. CASEY. It is not about automatic brakes at all.

Mr. TISDALE. The clause reads :

All cars fitted with air-brakes shall, within one year from the passing of this Act, be provided with an automatic device—

That is the same thing.

Mr. CASEY. No.

Mr. TISDALE. What I am objecting to is that we should pass a clause of this kind when we know that these devices are things which railway companies themselves have to be very careful about adopting. The history of railway advancement and improvement shows that the great railways have always kept in the front in adopting devices which are excellent and practicable : but I am within the mark in saying that out of all the air devices or brakes, or whatever you call them, standing in the Patent Office in the United States, not one out of a thousand has been accepted. But from the brains that inventors have put into that direction, some most excellent and great improvements have been discovered and used. Speaking with all deference, I do not think that we are competent judges in this matter, and we certainly ought to be very careful before compelling railways to use any particular devices. The railway companies themselves adopt improvements readily when they are satisfied that they are worth adopting. When the master mechanics, when the associations of master mechanics pass upon these improvements and declare them to be useful, safe and beneficial, the railway companies are only too ready to adopt them; and in assuming that we know better, we are assuming a superior knowledge in matters which these people have made the study of a lifetime. I think it would be very dan-

gerous on our part to compel the railway companies to provide themselves with any particular devices which we may consider an improvement but which they have not seen fit to adopt, and, therefore, I think we should hesitate before passing this clause. We do not know how much it may mean to a railway company. We all know that the railways of this continent and of the old world as well, are just emerging from a period of the greatest financial struggle, mainly for existence. On the other side of the line, hundreds of them have passed into the hands of the receiver, so that while some of these devices may be useful, we should go very slow before compelling the railway companies by statute to adopt them. Take section two of the Bill. There are two sides to the question raised by that section. I am quite willing to do all that is possible and reasonable in requiring railway companies to adopt improvements which will accomplish objects of general benefit, especially as regards safety, but it requires some knowledge of the subject before you attempt to compel railway companies to adopt appliances which theoretically appear very fine, but which practically may not be workable. Subsection A of section two provides :

That the railways shall have automatic extension running boards, making a safe pathway from car to car.

That seems, theoretically, a very praiseworthy proposition, but before applying it we must consider, right at the threshold, the fact that no railway which amounts to anything in Canada is without through traffic connection with the American lines. You get, therefore, on the American roads cars with different arrangements and of different heights, over which we have no control, and the very device, which theoretically looks very wise, may become really a source of danger. Take the next subsection :

A continuous rail, at a uniform and convenient height, with sufficient and firm supports, along one side of each running board, the whole length of the car.

How can you make a continuous rail and how can you arrange a height which will suit cars in the United States, which have not that continuous rail and are of different heights ?

Mr. CASEY. If the hon. gentleman will allow me to explain, the rail is only continuous for the length of one car.

Mr. TISDALE. I understand, and the next car will have no rail at all. The proper way to consider this is to put yourself in the place of the man whose life is in danger. On the next car there is no rail. If he gets used to a rail on his own cars, he will look for it on the other cars, and passing along on a dark night, especially in dangerous places—because any one who knows anything of the operations of trains

knows that a brakeman is never sent out except when the safety of the train is at stake—he feels for the rail and not finding it is more liable to accident than if he knew the rail was not there. If we have power to legislate over our own railway lines, we have not the right to legislate over others. There is besides a difference of opinion among railway companies as to whether this railing is desirable or not, though if all of them could be compelled to adopt it, it would seem to be useful, because even if it made a man careless, he has something to grasp; but under the circumstances, it looks to me as if the attempt to force this on the railway companies would be more dangerous than to leave the thing as it is. I want to tell the hon. gentleman that I am not more interested in railways than he is, and I have had no more to do with railways since I have come to the House than probably he has. All I have had to do with railways have been in connection with a couple of small lines in my own county.

Mr. CASEY. Hear, hear.

Mr. TISDALE. The hon. gentleman says "Hear, hear." I merely mention that to show that I am not afraid to stand in this House or anywhere and advocate what I believe, whatever attempts may be made against me—because these views are unpopular among the people who cultivate, or, at least, attempt to cultivate, as sometimes happens, the popular side of a question. When gentlemen are on the stump, as the saying is, they may seek to make charges against others of doing thus and so for a railway. I never did "thus and so" for a railway or for anybody in connection with any legislation before this House, and I never said anything in a committee or in this chamber that I was not prepared to have brought to the light of day, or that I was afraid to justify. It cost me a good deal of time and money to get my experience of railways—money on the wrong side of the ledger, in connection with large railways built through my own part of the country. That is how I got my experience.

Mr. LAURIER. That is the best experience—the experience that costs money.

Mr. TISDALE. I believe the hon. gentleman is right, and one reason why it is the best experience is that it takes the conceit out of a man. My experience took a good deal of conceit out of me. I have had my experience, as the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin) knows, for he undertook part of the labour and helped to put through the railway I speak of. I learned many things about railways. You may believe many things about railways, but your opinions will be a good deal changed when you come to have practical experience. They say a burnt child dreads the fire; I know that since my first experience I have not had so much to do with railway building.

Mr. TISDALE.

and I have had little or nothing to do with railway operation. So, reverting to the hon. gentleman's "hear, hear," I am prepared here or anywhere to vote or speak to defend the rights of railway companies, even though it may not be so popular as to take the other side. But I am equally prepared to speak and vote in favour of compelling them to recognize the rights of the people. So, coming back to the point under discussion—for this has been a digression—I would be quite prepared, if the railways showed a tendency to neglect the provisions necessary for the safety of their employes and of passengers, to favour any wise measure that would effect a remedy. But I do not believe in unduly burdening these companies, particularly at a time when it is hard for them to earn even their operating expenses. I am prepared to vote whatever is necessary, but I want hon. gentlemen who have proposals to make to the House on this subject to take the responsibility of preparing legislation which they can clearly show to be practical and not unduly burdensome upon the company. Now, as to the outside ladders, these are not considered as at all times of so much advantage as one might think. The great objection to them, according to the best information I have been able to get, is that, as a matter of experience, they are seldom used. Even where there is an outside ladder, the men usually prefer to go up the ladder at the end, as they do now. The practical test is the habit and practice of the men who use and become accustomed to these appliances, not the theoretical opinions of those who regard the subject from outside. It may be said that two ladders are better than one, or that a ladder on the outside is better than a ladder at the corner. But the experience of railway men is that if you provide the two ladders, only one is used. In regard to the—

—arched iron rails, extending from the top of each ladder to a sufficient and firm support, placed at the side of the running board, and so arranged as to assist a person climbing on to the roof by means of such ladders,

—the argument I advanced with regard to the other rail would apply equally to this. If these rails are provided in some cars and not in others their absence when they are absent may cause more accidents than their presence where they are present will prevent. Those who have watched the brakemen on freight cars must have wondered at the expertness they acquire. Moving about on a particular class of cars becomes second nature. The most dangerous thing you can do is to make a difference in the cars so that appliances that are present in one will be absent in another. No one can deny that braking on freight trains is a difficult and dangerous job. But men in foundries, in smelting works, in coal mines and other large undertakings have dangerous places, and must rely for their protec-

tion upon their own skill and knowledge in using the appliances of their trades. Any attempt to protect these men otherwise may actually increase their danger, and that is the great reason why a proposal of this kind should be considered very carefully from all points of view. Now, the hon. gentleman speaks of the position of cars in the train. Well, I dare say he knows from experience that passengers are apt to be impatient, often unreasonably impatient, when they are kept waiting. The Bill provides that all cars with automatic couplings shall be placed together in the train. No doubt the hon. gentleman knows how great may be the delay caused by the shunting necessary to place these cars together. To enforce such a law would cause, often, very serious loss of time. Whether it would increase the risk of danger or not, is a proposition that only practical railway men can solve. I do not see myself that there is very much to be gained in the case of freight trains. But in a mixed train there would be a great public inconvenience, because passengers would be so long detained while the cars were being coupled in the way proposed, that the convenience to the public of having a passenger car attached for making small journeys, would be practically rendered nil. There would be so much shunting where some cars are automatic and some are not, that it would be almost impossible to make up a train in any reasonable time. In many places where there are only a limited amount of sidings, as is the case at many points on our small railways, which, after all, are those most used by the public in rural districts, it would be almost impossible to do the shunting without such delay as would be destructive to traffic, and would be such a loss of time that the companies could hardly afford to submit to it. One of the results would probably be that they would decline to change traffic at these particular points, and they would be compelled to take it to larger centres where the shunting could be done by shunting engines in the yard, and by yardmen employed for that purpose. Now, coming to the larger questions of running overtime, and hours for meals, the hon. gentleman's proposition looks very nice in theory, but it seems to me it is going a very long distance. I think the history of our two great railways, because, practically, that is the bulk of our system, so far as my knowledge goes, furnishes the best criterion of the working of the present system. They have got along very well, and if you try to make a particular hour apply to everybody, you will create confusion. Any one who knows anything about handling traffic, and the management of yards, knows that the public want traffic handled as cheaply as possible. You will find it impossible to conduct all the business of a great railway according to clockwork.

You might as well say that a busy man in his office who has a typewriter, should be compelled to send the typewriter to lunch every day at a particular hour, although the typewriter himself might be willing to change the hour, and the interest of the employer would require it. Now, take one of these great railways where there are numerous yards and places of that sort, and which handles yearly traffic amounting to millions of tons, do you believe that this proposition could be made to work? Why, the employees of these great railways will tell you themselves that it would not work. They agree, mutually, upon the meal hours, for their mutual convenience and interest. Of course, it is well to have uniformity when that is possible, but the instant you try to make it compulsory, numerous difficulties will arise. Why, Sir, there are a great many more important things than these on a great railway in regard to which you might legislate, if you are going to have paternal legislation at all. Unless the hon. gentleman can show some evils existing at present, he ought not to seize upon a particular point like the hours for meals, and attempt to legislate upon it. Unless it can be clearly shown that there is actually a large grievance, or a misusage, and I do not think that the hon. gentleman has any evidence of such, there is no reason for this legislation. Then, as to overtime, does the hon. gentleman know what that might possibly mean? Every railway has a schedule, showing the hours that their employees may be called upon to work without extra pay, for they do not always have to work. I say that the present economy of the railways is beneficial to the public. I have been myself a railway man, I have employed thousands of men, and I think I know something about the business of conducting a railway. I say it is not in the interests of the employees themselves to attempt to put their employers under such conditions as may injure the business in which they are engaged, to say nothing of public convenience, which is a higher consideration than the interest of either the men or the companies. All of us know that economy in time, and in all these arrangements, is essential to carrying on the wonderful works that we require, and that the world requires at the present day. I am one of those who believe that the best possible law is to leave the employers and the employed, as far as possible, to agree amongst themselves. I do not think it is wise, or fair, in the interest of the workingmen, to encourage a belief that those who employ them are always trying to oppress them. I have many times visited the shops of great railway companies, I have ridden over their lines, and I have had to manage large business concerns where I have dealt with men in large numbers, and there is no trouble, and the men do not care what the law is. I have employed men in the state of Michi-

gan, where they have all sorts of laws, and they have a great deal more trouble with the men in regard to strikes than we do. I object to being called upon to make sumptuary laws of this character, to be burdened with the responsibility of making regulations between employers and employed. I tell the hon. gentleman that there are not many larger questions, in my opinion, than some of those he has attempted to deal with in this Bill. He proposes to change the whole scope of our law in regard to compensation. He is going to make arbitrary rules to apply to all cases. That is not freedom, that is not justice, that is not British, that is not the principle of public liberty. The proper principle is to give compensation according to the injury, and let the measure be meted by a tribunal, whether a jury or a judge. In my opinion, the best tribunal is one composed of both. When you begin to make laws of that sort about damages, where are you going to stop? Probably I shall not remain long in this legislature, but others will come after me who will have the same responsibility that we have, and we should be very careful how we break through these rules of compensation which have been so long tried, and have become part of the best constitutional system of the world, and that is the British system. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, without having given very much study to this Bill, I have pointed out some of the serious objections that I see in it, and the hon. gentleman would do well to consider them before he attempts to interfere with matters of this sort in the summary manner that he proposes. He has put the burden upon us of either accepting or rejecting the several points of his Bill. Year after year the burden is put upon us by Bills of this description, and some other Bills that are on the paper, of legislating on matters that I think might as well have been left alone. I therefore repeat that I do not care whether the party is a legislator or a poor man, or a railway company, or an employee, I will stand in this House and vote for what I believe to be for the good of the country, and in the line justice demands.

Mr. DAVIN. After the exhaustive speech of my hon. friend (Mr. Tisdale), I will occupy the House only a minute or two. I wish to say that there are features of this Bill which seem to me to be very important, and there are other features that are certainly unreasonable, and when it goes before the committee I would suggest that subsections a, b, c and d, of clause 2, be omitted. They will only raise opposition on the part of the railway people, and I am informed on the very highest authority, speaking for the employees of railways, that they do not need those provisions, they would be useless. I observe that four clauses have been added to the Bill since last year, and under clause 10 there is

Mr. TISDALE.

a lot of matter with which I certainly could not agree. In regard to the remarks offered by the hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale), I want to point out that there are certain advantages of legislating, or even attempting to legislate, in this direction. I am afraid, when this Bill goes before the Railway Committee, it will have as slim a chance of adoption, as my Bill had in 1891, although Sir John Thompson, then leading the House, said he would place my Bill, and he did so, on the Government Orders; and although my Bill went before the Railway Committee with the baptismal charm of the Government endorsement, nevertheless a member of the Government, who is not in this House now, rose and moved that further time be taken to consider the important features of the Bill. The striking feature in the tragical close of my Bill in the Railway Committee in 1891 was a speech by my hon. friend (Mr. Tisdale), who made a speech very like that which he delivered to-day—I hope he does not carry that speech about with him as a railway formula for dealing with young legislators who come forward in Parliament with railway Bills. It will be asked, why is it that I have not brought forward a Bill since 1891? I will tell the House why. There are two reasons. The first is this: It is to be said to the credit of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company that the two features of the Bill which I consider of most importance to the North-west are being carried out by the company themselves. For instance, there was the ploughing of fire breaks. The company have been ploughing fire breaks along the line. Again, there was the question of automatic couplers, and they are putting those in the cars with all reasonable speed, and the company's officers have pointed out to me that that it is a result of my efforts in the direction of legislation. That is one reason why I have not introduced another Bill. Another reason is, that after my Bill had passed its second reading, and had been placed on the Government paper, and come before the Railway Committee—and I could hardly get in, a red herring could have hardly got in, there was such a crowd—I saw at once that all the members, Grit and Tory, Liberal and Conservative, were all dead against my Bill. When we got to a vote only four members voted with me, and Grits and Tories, Liberals and Conservatives voted against me. If I may make allusion to what took place to-day, there is that which throws into complete contempt all this talk about railway passes. It is not in railway passes that the power of great railway corporations come in. But I am afraid I am violating the rules of the House. Your frown, Mr. Speaker, is enough. None of the minor gods of Olympus felt more fear when Jove frowned and all Olympus shook, than I do when I see those august brows brought down. But I hold that there is good done by giving voice

to the claims of a large class of the community, and by bringing forward legislation such as this, and although, as the Bill is now drawn, I could not support it in toto, and there are amendments which would have to be made, I will support its second reading, and if it goes to the Railway Committee, I will go to that committee and give my hon. friend who has charge of the Bill whatever little assistance I may be able to render. But I may tell him that he has something to fear more than a division in this House.

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

After Recess.

Mr. INGRAM. Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Casey) who has moved the Bill deserves some credit for introducing legislation on this matter. However, in reference to the details of the measure, as a practical railway man, I do not entirely agree with them. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Casey) started out by saying, he would not discuss the question of jurisdiction, and neither do I propose to discuss that question. He also said, that he hoped the discussion would be free from any partisanship, and that both sides of the House would consider the Bill on its merits. Now, Sir, I was pleased to hear the hon. gentleman (Mr. Casey) make that statement to this House, and I shall go back a few years ago, to the occasion when I had the privilege of moving a resolution in this House, calling the attention of the railway companies of this country, and the attention of the public men of this country, to the necessity of adopting safety appliances to protect the railway employees of Canada. Since that time, the Liberal newspapers supporting the hon. gentleman (Mr. Casey), as well as a number of his political friends, have stated in my constituency, that while I moved that resolution in this House, yet it was simply a resolution of buncombe. They also said, that I had done nothing else in the matter since, and that now, it became the duty of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Casey), who did not represent a constituency in which railway employees resided, to perform the duty of introducing legislation on this question. It may perhaps surprise the hon. gentleman (Mr. Casey) to know, that some of the provisions of his present Bill were introduced into this House in the years 1887 and 1888. I am sorry the hon. gentleman who represents North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) is not present in the House to-night, because if he were, I could prove that I, and another gentleman residing in the constituency in which I live, framed a Bill, with a view of having it discussed before this House through Mr. McCarthy. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I say: it is unfair that these gentlemen should charge me with being neglectful of my duty

in Parliament in regard to promoting measures favourable to the interests of the workmen of this country. I deny the charge and I state that on any question in this Parliament, involving the welfare of workmen, I have never been neglectful of my duty. I have always endeavoured to the best of my ability, to promote any legislation which would be in their interest. Before dealing with the Bill, Mr. Speaker, I also wish to draw the attention of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Casey), and the attention of this House, to the result which followed the moving of my resolution in 1891. Since then the Government, through the Minister of Railways and the Department of Railways and Canals, have placed upon the Government railways certain safety appliances, and have been testing them from time to time. And, Sir, one of the most important devices that could be brought into existence for the protection of railway employees, is now being tested on the Government railways. I refer to automatic couplers, and I know that some 12 or 14 of these are now being tested. I may mention also that in the city in which I live there has been an automatic coupler patented, and it has been sent the other day for the purpose of being tested. My hon. friend (Mr. Casey) starts out in section one of his Bill, to deal with a certain kind of tap for the purpose of making it safer to stop trains at all times. This tap is one that has been recently invented, I believe, and one which if adopted might serve a very good purpose. But, I understand there are gentlemen in Canada who have also patents in the same line, and it is a question with the railway companies of this country as to which patent they will adopt. That is all that prevents them from adopting it immediately. Clause 2 of the Bill says:

2. All box freight cars built in Canada, for use on Canadian railways, shall, after the passing of this Act, be of a uniform standard height, to be approved by the Minister of Railways and Canals, and shall be provided with the following attachments for the security of railway employees:—

(a.) Automatic extension running boards, making a safe pathway from car to car;

(b.) A continuous rail, at a uniform and convenient height, with sufficient and firm supports, along one side of each running board, the whole length of the car.

Well, Sir, any practical man in this country knows, that that is one of the things that is impossible; and why? It is because you will take furniture cars, you will take hay cars, you will take meat cars and you will take the ordinary freight cars on the train, and these cars will always be higher or lower, as the case may be. Therefore, there is not very much in that provision. Now, with regard to the continuous rail. The hon. member from South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) drew the attention of the House to-night to the impracticability of having a continuous rail on the cars. Why, Sir, the ob-

ject of this House, and the object of this legislation, should be for the purpose of doing away with the necessity of trainmen going on the top of the cars at all; and if automatic couplers and automatic air-brakes are placed on all trains, there would be no necessity whatever for adopting this section of the Bill. My hon. friend from West Elgin (Mr. Casey), I fancy, looked inquisitively at me when I said "hear, hear," to the remarks of my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), but I may tell him that I disapprove of section 2 of his Bill and its subsections. Why do I disapprove of them? It is because the legislation proposed in section 2 and its subsections are behind the age. It does not meet the requirements of the present day. There is not the same necessity for this legislation that there was in the year 1887, when the Bill which I have referred to was first introduced. The cars in several of the states of the Union, and a great many of the cars in Canada, are at present fitted with patent couplers and automatic brakes. Therefore, you will see that the necessity for a brakeman getting on top of the cars is almost done away with, and it is our duty to legislate here so that it will not be necessary to have the men go on top of the cars. The hon. gentleman provides, that this change in the construction of the cars shall be made within a two years limit. If we adopted this provision it would simply mean that railway companies who are from time to time constructing their cars with the latest appliances, would be compelled to go to this enormous expense of putting on the extension running boards and the iron railing on top of the cars. My opinion is, that it would be useless to do so, because when men are running over cars, you must endeavour to place them in as little danger as possible. If often occurs, that men in passing over trains are thinking of other things in connection with the running of the train, when passing from one car to the other. After long practice they do not pay that strict attention to it that new men do. You do not want to have a railing on one car, and no railing on the next car, because if that were done you would increase the danger to the men instead of lessening it. It would be more dangerous to have a train with a number of cars fitted with a railing, and a number not fitted with a railing, than to have no railing at all. I shall not discuss the penalty clauses of the Bill, because I do not think that portion of the legislation will pass this House, nor as a practical railway man do I think, that it would be in the interest of the railway men to adopt it. Now, with respect to placing cars fitted with automatic air-brakes in front of the train in order to have engines fitted in the same way and handle these trains with greater ease; I may say that on some of the lines in this country, such as the Canada Southern, the Michigan Central,

Mr. INGRAM.

the Grand Trunk that runs through the district in which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Casey) and I reside, they do make a practice of placing these cars in the front of their trains in order to use the air upon them. Applying that rule to local trains is simply out of the question, for the reason that cars are taken off and others are put on at almost every station, and it would be impossible to do that without great loss of time. Again, we have a provision here that railway employees shall receive pay for overtime. I have no doubt that in some cases this would be a very good thing; but I understand that the Grand Trunk Railway, the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Canada Southern Railway Companies all have certain agreements with their employees to pay them for overtime. Whether these agreements are carried out or not, I am not prepared to say. I am not aware what the practice is on the Intercolonial Railway. The next clause deals with the hours for meals for yardmen and other persons engaged in yard work. I have never heard of any particular dissatisfaction arising from those men not having regular meal hours. In some cases I believe they have them now. I have no particular objection to that part of the Bill; it may do good, and it can do no harm. The next clause deals with compensation to railway employees for injuries. I know that the law with regard to that does not work very satisfactorily at the present time. In the province of Ontario some years ago a Compensation for Injuries Act was passed, and certain railway companies were exempted from its provisions because of the existence of certain insurance societies in connection with those companies. I believe something might be done in that direction. If the Ontario Act does not apply to the railways in that province, then, I think, some legislation might be passed by this House that would cover them, and anything in that direction I would heartily support. The next clause deals with the matter of compensation to employees who are permanently disabled. In some cases very great hardships have been suffered by men who have received permanent injuries, and certain advantages have been taken of them, with the view of guarding the interests of the companies as against the claims of the employees. This Bill may do something to remove that evil. As regards contributory negligence, that is a very particular point, and I think something should be done in the direction proposed, because foremen in charge of certain works or officers in charge of trains may sometimes be negligent, even after they have been notified that the cars or works are unsafe or improperly attended to. Now, the hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) raised a few objections. I agree with him in his objection to the continuous rail, because I think that device would do more harm than good, and cause more accidents than it would prevent. So

far as running boards are concerned, the fact that American cars come into Canada with running boards of all kinds and of different heights, renders that proposal subject to the same objection as the continuous rail. With regard to outside ladders, I agree with the hon. gentleman who has proposed this Bill that they should be on every car. To save time, trainmen frequently require to go upon different portions of the train, and these ladders are much safer than the ladders on the ends of the cars. With regard to arched iron rails from the top of each ladder, I do not think there is much advantage in them, and I am not in favour of imposing that additional expense on the railway companies. I think the cars would be quite safe with the appliances I have already mentioned. This is all I have to say on the Bill at present. If it is referred to a committee, I shall be glad to discuss there the different sections in detail, and will then offer anything further I have to say on the Bill.

Mr. HAGGART. Mr. Speaker, I have a few words to say in reference to the Bill before the House. As to whether or not this House has jurisdiction over this matter, I think there is no doubt that over every railway that has received incorporation from this House, we have jurisdiction in reference to the subjects mentioned in the Bill. As to its provisions, I may perhaps be speaking on technical subjects on which I have not sufficient knowledge to speak; but I am speaking from information which I have received from different railway companies, as well as in connection with the railway which I myself control. The first clause in the Bill provides that cars fitted with air-brakes must be provided with a certain device. There is no practical plan that I know of which has yet been introduced or which is known to any of the railway companies to meet this provision. The hon. gentleman has, perhaps, got hold of some person who has a patent device and is anxious to have it introduced on the different railways of the country. I may be misinformed, but I am told that a Mr. Deyell, who resides somewhere in the same neighbourhood as the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey), has a patent device of this kind. All I can say with reference to that invention is that it has been submitted to the mechanical superintendents of the different railways throughout the country, and I have the report of the mechanical superintendent of the Grand Trunk Railway to the effect that it was not worth consideration, or that he did not intend to use it because it was practically useless. Why we should compel the railroads throughout the country to introduce a patent of this man—

Mr. CASEY. It does not compel you to introduce that patent at all.

Mr. HAGGART. Well, any patent. There is no device known to the railway companies that is of practical utility in that direction.

Mr. CASEY. Yes, there is.

Mr. HAGGART. Well, none known to the railway companies that I have consulted on the subject. It is possible that some invention in that direction may be devised which would be of practical use in connection with air-brakes. When it has been proved to be so, the railway companies themselves will introduce it and apply it to the different freight trains throughout the country. The second clause of the hon. gentleman's Bill, which has been so admirably discussed by the hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) and the other hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Ingram)—that is, with reference to box freight cars built in Canada being of uniform standard in height—what is the object of uniform standard in height? The hon. gentleman says it is for the purpose of applying automatic extension running boards, making a safe pathway from car to car. How is that possible? You would have to load the freight cars equally before you would have them of equal weight. One car may be more loaded than the other, so as to bear down three or four inches, and it would be impossible to apply this automatic extension. Besides, the coupling between the cars must have a certain extension. With that extension how are you to have the automatic board, so that an equal height may be maintained. Subsection 3 provides:

A continuous rail at a uniform and convenient height, with sufficient and firm supports along one side of each running board, the whole length of the car.

The objection to that has been very well taken by the hon. members for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) and Elgin (Mr. Ingram). When you go across the line, you will have cars without that continuous rail, so that instead of being a protection to the trainman, this provision will be the very reverse. On a dark night, passing along, he would have a hand-rail on one car, and then passing to the next car, on which there was no hand-rail, he would be more liable to accident. The plan, as I am informed, has been tried by four or five railways on the other side of the line—the South Shore, Michigan Central, and others—and they all have abandoned it as worse than useless. Clause c says:

Outside ladders, on opposite sides of the end of each car, projecting below the frame of the car, and with one step of the rung of the ladder below such frame, such ladders to be placed close to the end of the sides to which they are attached.

The hon. colleague of the hon. gentleman from Elgin thinks that this is a useful appliance. The railway companies whom I have consulted with reference to the hon.

gentleman's Bill, say that it would never be used. Some say that it might be used, but that the ladder, which is at present used, is sufficient for all purposes. Perhaps the most objectionable part of the Bill is the clause 8 :

Every railway employee, whether employed on trains or locomotives, or in or about the offices or stations of any railway company, and whether paid by the trip, day, mile, hour or otherwise, shall be entitled to extra pay for overtime, pro rata of his ordinary pay, for every hour or part of an hour beyond ten hours (or whatever less number of hours may be agreed upon between the company and such employee as the schedule time of his duties) during which he is delayed or kept on duty by accident, stress of weather, orders from his superior, or any other cause not arising from his own carelessness or neglect of duty.

All the railway companies throughout the country have a by-law providing for that. Are you going to introduce a law which will compel a railway company to pay a particular rate of wages to any individual in its employ? I think that clause is very objectionable. Then, section 9 provides :

Every yardman and other person employed about a station or shunting yard, or on a shunting engine, shall be allowed one hour for a meal between noon and two o'clock in the afternoon, and one hour between midnight and two o'clock in the morning.

It would be impossible to carry that out. It would have the effect of delaying the trains. The action must be continuous. Every railway company allows a certain time, an hour per day, for the parties to get the mid-day or midnight meal, but you could not compel them to fix it at a particular time, because it would stop all traffic on the railway at that particular hour of the day. Another clause provides for compensation to employees injured in the discharge of their duty. Well, if there is not contributory negligence on the part of the employee, he has his action against the company. The railway companies are liable; and for all other accidents there is an insurance fund provided by nearly all the companies, owned and subscribed by the men themselves, and in some cases the companies contribute a large sum. The Grand Trunk Railway contribute \$10,000 a year towards this fund. This fund is managed and administered by the men themselves, and I think where there is contributory negligence, where the man himself contributes to the injury, the railway companies should not be called upon to pay beyond the amount provided by the sinking fund, to which the companies contribute a large amount to pay for damages. Another provision is :

The certificate of two duly qualified disinterested physicians shall be sufficient to prove permanent disability.

I do not understand that clearly. I do not know what would constitute a qualified physician. I suppose it means one who has passed and received a regular certificate.

Mr. HAGGART.

Mr. CASEY. A judge trying the case would know, probably.

Mr. HAGGART. What would you call a disinterested physician? Then the provision goes on to declare :

And the certificate of the attending physician shall be sufficient to prove unfitness for duty.

Is that all that is required for the purpose of proof in the case—the certificate of two disinterested physicians? Would you not allow the right of examining these physicians in the court as to how they arrived at their decision? No, the certificate would be final. The hon. gentleman, I have no doubt, introduced his Bill with the best possible intentions. Some of the information which I have in reference to technical matters may be incorrect. We will have an opportunity, if the hon. gentleman sends his Bill to the Railway Committee, of having the opinion perhaps of experts, because the railway companies are generally represented upon that committee; and if there are any objections to the Bill, we will hear fully from them. I think the intentions of the hon. gentleman are the very best, and his Bill is worthy anyway of full consideration in committee, and I would suggest to him that, after the second reading, he refer it to the Railway Committee for full discussion.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

Mr. CASEY moved :

That the Bill be referred to the Select Standing Committee on Railways and Canals.

He said : In moving that motion, I wish to refer to one or two points that have come up since I first spoke. I should have preferred, as I have already said, to have had this Bill referred to a smaller committee of experts, where there would have been a better chance of examining into the merits of the Bill than there can be in the Railway Committee. But I must accept the hon. minister's suggestion as a means of getting this step in advance for the Bill.

I am afraid, however, from the appearance of the weather, from the remarks of the hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale), and of the Minister of Railways himself, that the fears of my hon. friend from Assiniboia are going to be realized. I am afraid that this Bill is sent to the Railway Committee with the intention of being disposed of there in the most humane fashion possible. The hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) related, almost in tears, the fate of an infant which he himself had nourished for some time, and which was sent to that committee and very quietly strangled. He tells us that it was the very same gentleman who played the part of a baby strangler there, who made such a threatening speech with regard to this Bill this afternoon. I refer to the hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale).

Then, my hon. friend the Minister of Railways (Mr. Haggart), although he allows the Bill to have a second reading, clearly indicates his own impression that it will not do at all. He has evidently been well coached by the counsel of the different railway companies whom, as he says, he has consulted. He has the railway side of the case down very fine. But he does not seem to have the other side of the case nearly so clear in his mind. Both my hon. friend from South Norfolk and the hon. Minister of Railways had a great deal to say about the views practical men take of these provisions—that no practical man would agree to this, and no practical man would favour the other, and so on.

But my hon. friend from Norfolk showed that he did not even understand the provision of the Bill he was objecting to—namely, the first clause—at the time he made that statement, and neither the hon. gentleman nor the Minister of Railways seem to have been aware that this Bill was compiled almost entirely by the advice of, and in consultation with, the Dominion Executive Board of the Railway Brotherhoods. I think that the men connected with this executive board ought to be quite as good practical authorities in this connection as the hon. Minister of Railways or the hon. member for Norfolk.

I do not pretend to possess any deep practical knowledge of railroading myself; and, for that reason I have listened with great attention and respect to the remarks of my hon. friend from East Elgin (Mr. Ingram). That hon. gentleman has urged some points worthy of consideration, and, to one or two of these I should like to refer. The question of the continuous rails is one of the principal points he discussed, and the question of the making up of local trains was another. I must admit that, in regard to these two points the gentlemen who consulted with me in compiling the Bill were not united in opinion.

Some of them thought that to have a rail on some cars, when it could not be made compulsory on all would give rise to the difficulty my hon. friend from East Elgin pointed out—it might lead a man to expect what was not there. Others thought that only a few cars in a long train would be without the rail, and it would be safer for the man on the top of a train where the rail was partially provided; that it would be better to have some safety rather than uninterrupted risk along the whole train.

As to the making up of local trains, I think the point made by the hon. gentleman is worthy of consideration. I do not know that it would be possible to arrange, definitely, all the automatically-coupled cars together in making up a local or mixed train. I think it would be better, perhaps, to make an exception in that case. That was suggested to me, but I

omitted to make the exception when drafting the Bill. But, so far as the clause affects through freight trains, say those made up at Windsor and going through to Montreal, I do not think that any difficulty will arise.

My hon. friend from East Elgin also attacked all the provisions under section 2 as being unpractical. I will not enter into a discussion of this clause in detail. It will be a question between the hon. gentleman's opinion and that of other railway experts before the committee and throughout the country. I am still of the opinion that my advisers were right in regard to these clauses, and that the hon. gentleman will probably find himself more or less mistaken—I will not say altogether mistaken—in the objections he has urged.

But he laid down one general proposition which requires notice—that we should aim at doing away with the necessity for such attachments to the cars as are provided for in this section. In this I quite agree with the hon. gentleman. Had he paid attention to what I said this afternoon he would have known that I stated to the House that I should have included the compulsory introduction of automatic couplings and air-brakes, if I had not expected that the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean) would again introduce the Bill he presented last session. I propose, before the Railway Committee, to move for the introduction of sections equivalent to those of the Bill I refer to. I quite agree with my hon. friend that it is our duty to do away, as far as possible, with the necessity for these appliances. But, until we have automatic couplings and air-brakes on all trains, the provisions of this Bill seem to be not only useful but necessary to the saving of life and limb.

Now, my hon. friend from East Elgin feels rather bitter about some attacks which have been made upon him, for not having done his duty by the workingmen, by the introduction of a Bill of this kind. I did not attack the hon. gentleman, nor am I trying to draw any such inference against him. I think my hon. friend should be glad of the opportunity to discuss this Bill, instead of grumbling at it being introduced, even though he has not had the good fortune to bring it before the House.

Mr. INGRAM. I ask leave to interrupt the hon. gentleman. I think he misunderstands me. While I complimented him upon introducing the Bill, I drew attention to the fact that his friends never miss an opportunity of accusing me of want of sincerity in anything I do on behalf of the workingmen, while, on the other hand, our friends are always ready to give the hon. gentleman credit for what he does.

Mr. CASEY. I must say that I found it rather difficult to hear the hon. gentleman, particularly at the beginning of his remarks. It is the newspapers and not me he

accuses of being severe upon him. Of course, the newspaper can defend itself. But I do not understand that the newspaper charges him with insincerity in what he did for the workmen. I understood the charge to be that he did not do anything at all.

However, that is not the question I am discussing: I am not trying to draw that inference in anything I say to-night. But, Sir, both my hon. friend from South Norfolk and the hon. Minister of Railways have got on the wrong track about the provisions in section 1, regarding the automatic device in connection with the air-brake. My hon. friend from East Elgin has done the justice to the Bill and to myself, and to my advisers in this matter, not to fall into that error. The hon. Minister of Railways quite unnecessarily introduced the name of an inventor into the discussion, and even went so far as to state that this man's invention was reported no good by the Grand Trunk mechanical authorities.

Now I thought that was rather too bad of the hon. Minister of Railways. I do not think that it was any part of his duty to publish in this House and throughout the country, a declaration, whether true or not, that So-and-so's invention was no good. It was no part of my duty, on the other hand, to boom any particular device for the purpose indicated in the Bill; and I did not. But I may tell the hon. gentleman that there are several devices for carrying out what I aim at in this clause. The hon. gentleman says that he does not know of any of these devices having been tried, that no practical device is in existence. I may inform the hon. Minister that Mr. Deyell's device—since he has been named already, there is no reason why I should not mention his name—for this purpose and that of somebody else whose name I do not, at the moment, remember, have both been in successful operation on the Canada Atlantic for nearly a year, if not longer. They were also tried in the Canadian Pacific yard in Montreal some time ago, and, I understand, favourably reported upon.

And these are only two of numerous inventions for warning the engineer when anything goes wrong with the air-brakes. I may say for the hon. Minister's information, that the effect of one of these devices is to stop the train when anything is wrong; the effect of the other is to blow a whistle in the cab of the engine. There may be half a dozen other methods that I do not know about. We do not want to bind the railway companies down to any particular method, but, under the Bill, they must provide some method by which the engineer will be advised when the brakes will not work. My hon. friend from East Elgin will agree with me, and I understand that he did agree, that such an invention would be an exceedingly useful thing.

Mr. CASEY.

Now, the hon. Minister objects to the provision regarding the height of cars, because one might be loaded down a little more heavily than another. Well, I suppose that must have been one of his jokes, for he does like to have a joke, for I am sure that he could not have seriously argued that the slight difference in height, caused by a difference of degree of loading, would prevent cars, of uniform build, from presenting a practical even surface in height when they were put together in a train. But my hon. friend from Elgin (Mr. Ingram), as well as the Minister of Railways, does not think much of this idea of a standard height for a box freight car. Now, Sir, he knows as a railway man that practically throughout the States there is a standard height for all box freight cars; at least that is the practice, although it may not be enforced by law.

But a box freight car does not include a refrigerator car. The refrigerator cars, of course, and other cars of that sort, must be of particular heights, and they would be, as far as possible, kept together at one end of the train. They are always on through trains, and would be kept together. What I wish to provide is that the ordinary cars—which are known as box freight cars—in which you ship grain, in which you ship apples, cheese and articles of that sort, should be of the same height. I do not say that cattle cars should be of the same height, because that would be absurd; I do not say that meat cars should be of the same height, because it would be absurd; but I say the ordinary box freight cars—and this is a point that was specially suggested to me by the executive of the brotherhood as an amendment to my Bill as originally drawn; so that I am satisfied there is some practical basis for the suggestion.

Now, as to the automatic running board, I do not describe any special pattern for that either. I do not know which is the best, that will be a question, as the Minister says, for expert evidence, whether there is such a practical thing and such a workable device in existence. I have been informed that there are workable devices in existence, and that a slight difference in the height of the cars to which they apply, does not interfere with the operation of that automatic board. It does not go on sticking out until it meets something else, it only goes out a certain distance beyond the end of each car. It need not necessarily go to meet the running board of the next car, but it goes so near to the board on the next car, or so near to the end of the next car, if there be no extension board on that, that it is very easy to step from one to the other. On the outside ladder question, my hon. friend the unpractical Minister of Railways, does not agree with my friend the practical member

for East Elgin, who is undoubtedly right. The outside ladder is the one most generally desired.

The overtime pay provision is the one which the Minister of Railways thinks the most objectionable to all. There again, Sir, he shows signs of his coaching by the railway lawyers. He thinks it is not right that we should prescribe what rate of wages any corporation should pay to its men. I do not ask you to prescribe that in this Bill. The provision of this Bill really is, that when a man is compelled to work one or more hours longer than the time he has agreed to work per day, he shall be paid pro rata of his ordinary wages for that extra time. I do not prescribe the rate, I only say it is to go on at the same rate per hour, if he is kept an hour or more beyond his regular time. Of course, I understand that some of the work on railways is done not by the day, or by the hour, but by the trip. I provide for that in a clause, as anybody can see by referring to the wording of it, but I need not go over it again at length. I take the trip as the unit of pay, and the day as the unit of pay, as the case may be. But when a man is kept over his scheduled time, whatever duty he is employed upon, he shall be paid pro rata for that extra work.

Now, I think, notwithstanding the elegant comparison of my hon. friend from South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale), of the case of a typewriter employed by the hour, I think railway men and others will agree with me that it is only fair a man should be paid extra for extra work. The Minister of Railways thinks that all railway companies provide for this already. Well, if so there can be no objection to the clause in the Bill. If there should be any railway companies in the future niggardly enough not to provide for such extra pay, this Bill will catch them. I do not know whether they all do it or not, but there is certainly no harm in putting in the principle and recognizing it as a proper one.

The proviso about compensation my hon. friend from East Elgin, I am glad to find, thinks might be rather a good thing, and says there is Ontario legislation providing for something of the kind. It is a remarkable fact that Ontario legislation is generally found to make very good provision for matters which affect the workmen, and I am happy to have testimony borne to that fact by my hon. friend from East Elgin, who was himself a member of that legislature before coming here. The Ontario legislature is very enlightened and progressive in these matters, and its legislation is good, and I am merely proposing, in this instance, to introduce something of the same kind.

Now, Sir, that we have jurisdiction in this matter is admitted by the Minister of Railways, he has no doubt about jurisdiction, so I need not argue that.

As to the propriety of making this fixed minimum compensation, I have something to say and an illustration to give. The law, as it stands at present, no doubt, does provide for the recovery of damages by an employee from a railway company, but in order to recover these damages, preliminaries must be entered into, and finally a law suit entered, and then a man claiming damages has to fight the company from court to court. Now, I do not pretend that any law whatever will secure that justice shall be done without an occasional resort to the courts, but I do pretend that the law can be so simplified that the matters which need to be proven in court shall be very few, that the matters on which an appeal can be taken from one court to another shall be very few; and that the chances of a rich company tiring out a poor suitor shall be greatly reduced. These are things I am trying to provide for by this Bill.

The provision for a minimum compensation practically amounts to this, that in order to have prima facie ground for compensation from a company, the person injured or the relatives of the person killed, need only prove the injury and base a claim upon that. The railway company will be able to plead contributory negligence if they can show that, at the time the accident occurred, their plant, cars and everything else were in good order, and that they had been observing the other provisions of this Act; otherwise, being in the wrong themselves, they could not plead contributory negligence against the claimant. That is a simplification of the law which I introduce in this Bill, and I think it amounts to a great deal.

Let me give you, Sir, an instance of what occurred in Montreal, in 1888, I think. The circumstances of the case were brought to my notice, in the first place, last year by a legal gentleman concerned in it, Mr. T. Cassie Hatton, and they have been refreshed since by reference to the authorities. Mr. Flynn, an employee of the Canadian Pacific Railway, was killed in the yard at Hochelaga by an accident caused by the negligence of a fellow employee. His widow sued for damages, and after going through a lot of preliminaries, she got the case to trial, and obtained a verdict of, I think, \$5,000 from the jury. Then the company took the case up to the Court of Review for interpretation of judgment, as I believe the phrase is in the province of Quebec; that is, to declare the exact effect of the answers given by the jury in their verdict. The judgment being confirmed in favour of the widow, they went further, to the Court of Appeal, and asked for a new trial. The Court of Appeal refused a new trial. The company went from there to the Supreme Court at Ottawa, and that court granted a new trial.

So after the fourth step, the extremely expensive one of an appeal to

the Supreme Court, the widow was obliged to go before the jury and prove over again her case from the beginning. She did so. A new trial was held. The jury gave a verdict for rather larger damages than the first time. In the meantime, in some of these proceedings, I do not know at what stage, it was decided that the company was liable when an employee was killed in the manner in question, and so this issue was really already decided, but the company went on fighting in the hope of tiring out the poor widow. They went back to the Court of Review, and the decision was again favourable to the widow. They went to the Court of Appeal again, but that court decided against the company. They went to the Supreme Court again, and this time the Supreme Court did not grant a new trial. Then they took the case across the sea, to the Privy Council; and the Privy Council finally confirmed the judgment of the first court, and the widow got her damages, and the railway company had to pay the costs.

I am sure before the course of litigation closed the costs must have been more than the original damages awarded. If that poor woman had not had liberal friends who assisted her with loans of money, if she had not had a most unselfish advocate in the person of her counsel, a man who took the case on charity to a large extent, she would never have got justice. Although the case was as clear as could be from the beginning, the company would have defeated her by the power of the purse, and she would never have received anything for the death of her husband. That is the kind of thing I wish to avoid by this provision for a minimum fixed compensation. I want to provide that something at least shall be paid by the railway company, whether you call it compensation, or a payment in the nature of penalty for the accident having occurred on the road, or of a contribution to insurance, I do not care. I want to provide that this minimum amount shall be paid without any elaborate litigation in any way, and without prejudice to the right of the claimant to secure further damages in a court of law if the law shows the party to be entitled thereto.

The Minister of Railways seems to think it is quite enough that the railway company should subscribe something to the benefit fund of the employees. I do not think it is. Those men run special risks on account of the nature of their calling, and they should not be taxed again in the shape of heavy insurance premiums to protect them against extra risks. This should be borne by the railway companies employing the men, and it should be borne in this form of a specific minimum fixed compensation in the case of every man hurt, disabled or killed.

As to doctors' certificates, I do not think there is any uncertainty or difficulty. The Minister of Railways does not know appar-

ently what a "duly qualified and disinterested physician" may mean. A duly qualified physician under the law means a physician who possesses a degree and is registered according to the law of the province. I present him with that piece of information. As to a disinterested physician, I do not know what the phrase may mean in the dictionary sense of the term, but in the legal sense of the term it means a man who is not the doctor appointed by the railway company or employed by the man hurt. Two doctors duly qualified according to the law of the province and having no pecuniary interest in the case, I provide, shall give a certificate. Of course, as the Minister suggests, they will be liable to be called in court and questioned about the certificate. I intend to provide that this shall make a good prima facie case, and enable the plaintiff to sue for compensation. I may say that these provisions respecting doctors' certificates are practically the same as those used by the railway employees' benefit and insurance companies. I think that is practically all that need be said at this stage, and I hope to produce expert evidence before the Railway Committee on behalf of the Bill, as well as to hear the expert evidence which the Minister of Railways promises to produce against the Bill, and we will in the present slackness of private Bill legislation have a good opportunity of talking it over. And whatever may be the fate of the Bill we will elicit valuable information for the use of the House and the country, and this Bill in whole or in part, or some Bill to effect the same purpose, will, I trust, be pressed through this session.

Mr. McNEILL. I desire to make a few observations which I think may be considered germane to the subject under discussion. The number of people who are destroyed at railway crossings in this country is horrible. I believe a great saving of life might be accomplished in this direction. It would be very easy to have some appliances introduced for opening and closing gates as trains come along the line. The train advancing would complete an electric circuit and set machinery to work to open the gate, and by having a bell ring before the gate began to move any person, with a team, coming near the railway crossing would have due warning of the closing of the gate. I believe if the Minister offered a reward for an invention of that kind, such mechanism could be secured with very little trouble and expense. No step that the Minister of Railways could take in connection with his department would be more popular in the country than measures to prevent, as far as possible, the loss of life and injury that occurs at railway crossings almost every month from one end of the season to the other.

Mr. HAGGART. I do not know of any device, and if there were any means of do-

ing it. I suppose it would have been discovered before this. I believe the railway companies would be glad to have self-acting, opening and shutting gates, on railway crossings, especially in the cities where it entails a very large expense to pay men to watch the gates. With reference to my observation about Mr. Deyell, I told the hon. gentleman (Mr. Casey), that I had not the mechanical or technical knowledge necessary to discuss his Bill. I took the best possible means for getting information on the subject, and I wrote to the different railway companies in the country to give me their opinions upon the clauses of the Bill, which opinions I might use either in committee or in the House.

Mr. CASEY. Did you consult the railway organizations ?

Mr. HAGGART. No ; I was not aware that there were any railway organizations. The Grand Trunk Railway Company gave me the information with reference to Mr. Deyell. I am glad to hear from the hon. gentleman that we are misinformed on the subject, and that a gentleman has patented an invention of great utility. I am also glad to learn from him, that the Canadian Pacific Railway have adopted an invention, or that they have tried it and were working it very successfully.

Mr. CASEY. I did not say they had adopted it. I said it was tried in their yards and reported on as being successful.

Mr. HAGGART. Well, from the information I have received from that company, they tell me that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Casey) has evidently been imposed upon by some one who has a patent, and that they had no information of any invention of practical utility. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Casey) said I was poking fun at him when I spoke with regard to the different heights of the cars. As I have said, I was not speaking from my personal knowledge, but on information furnished me, and the information I have from the Canadian Pacific Railway Company reads as follows :—

It would not be practicable to carry out section 2 of the Bill, inasmuch as there is very considerable variance in the height of cars, especially between light and loaded cars, in which case the continuous running board, as it is described, would not be on the same level, and would prove to be rather a dangerous trap than safeguard.

The technical information which I have received from this company may be all bosh; it may be a joke played upon me, but it is the information I received, and I gave it to the House.

Mr. McNEILL. I wish to make a personal explanation as to what I said a moment ago. I was not at all referring to railway crossings in cities or towns, for I assumed that the railway companies are forced to have people to look after these

crossings, and no doubt they are put to very considerable expense in doing so. I was referring exclusively to crossings on country roads, where there is no provision of any kind for the safety of the public. My hon. friend (Mr. Haggart) knows that in the mother country the railway companies are not allowed to cross any public road on the level at all, and even the gate keepers have been done away with in the mother country. When I spoke, I was referring to country roads in Canada, and I did not at all assume that my hon. friend (Mr. Haggart) knew of any such invention as that to which I referred. It was because I believed he knew of no such invention that I made the remark, for if I thought he knew of such an invention, and withheld it from the public, I would suppose he was acting criminally, and I did not suggest anything of the kind.

Mr. O'BRIEN. There is one matter which the introducer of this Bill has not included, and which I think might very properly be incorporated in legislation of this kind. One of the greatest sources of danger to the public, and to railway employees, is the very long and unreasonable hours which men are sometimes compelled to work. Any legislation which would put it out of the power of railway companies, for the sake of saving money, or out of the power of the men for the sake of earning higher wages, to work these unreasonable hours, would be exceedingly advantageous. In England, the working of long hours by the men has constantly been a source of serious accidents. In fact, there has hardly been a serious railway accident in England, of late years, which has not been attributable to the fact that the employees were so overcome by long hours and want of sleep that they were unable properly to discharge their duties. Therefore, if we were to legislate in this direction, it would give greater protection to the lives, both of passengers and employees, and it is a subject which we ought seriously to consider. I think it might properly be embraced in this Bill if the mover (Mr. Casey) or the committee, would suggest a clause to that effect. Now, with regard to the height of cars. One can easily understand the difficulty which has been suggested, that there are a great number of cars of uneven height, and that if a brakeman supposed they were all of the same height, he would be very liable to danger in going from one car to the other. It is evident, however, that the more uniform the height of the cars on the whole, the greater the benefit to the brakeman. Any one who has seen freight cars passing constantly, as I see them at my place, cannot help feeling a degree of apprehension and pity for the men employed on these trains. Any measure that we could adopt to insure them greater safety, we certainly ought to adopt, even though, as has been suggested, the

railway companies are not now in a condition to undertake any great improvement. In regard to the remarks made by the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill), I wish to say, that this is, perhaps, the only country in the world in which the public have no rights whatever, as against the railway companies. There is no country in the world where the public are exposed to such risk of life and limb as they are on our country roads. In my neighbourhood, there is a crossing which I never venture to go over without the greatest apprehension, and I never like to see any of my neighbours passing it, because, on account of the construction of the line, it is absolutely impossible for any one to know when the train is coming until the whistle is heard—often it is not sounded at all—and then it is too late to escape. This is a constant source of danger on our country roads, and it seems utterly impossible for the public to get redress. I would mention an instance in order to let the House understand how difficult it is to obtain any satisfaction in a case of this kind. There is a railway crossing in the village of Allandale, near Barrie, where trains not only crossed in the regular course of traffic, but where they are constantly backing and shunting over the road. Well, Sir, it was a struggle for years before the municipal corporation could get that railway company to put gates there, although there was not a single day that life was not in danger. We had to come to Ottawa, and there was the greatest possible trouble. A simple matter of that kind had to be referred to the Railway Committee of the Privy Council before the company could be forced to do that which, in any other country under the sun, pretending to be civilized, would not be tolerated for a single day. But, Sir, in Canada, in opposition to a railway company, I say that the public practically have no rights at all. The hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) read the House a lecture upon the exceeding impropriety of any member trying to legislate so as to get popular votes. Well, Sir, it would be a very improper thing for any one to do so, but I think we might retort and say: It is just as improper for a gentleman to make a speech in this House which I might, with equal justice, say was intended to propitiate the railway companies. If there is danger and impropriety in one case, there is equal danger and impropriety in the other. In this country, not only with regard to particular railways, but with regard to railway corporations generally, the power which they possess is not commensurate with the advantage they give us, and it is altogether out of accord with the system which prevails in other countries. As the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) has said, even in Ireland, on a single line, where there is not half the traffic that there is on our railways, such a thing as an open crossing like those we

have in Canada would not be tolerated, and no railway company would dream of exposing the public to the danger of such crossings. I do hope that the railway companies, which we are told are so poor at present that they cannot spend any money, will soon get a little richer, so that this Parliament or the legislatures of the different provinces may feel justified in adopting such measures as will compel them to pay more regard to the public safety than they do at present.

Mr. INGRAM. The hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) finds fault with the Minister of Railways for consulting the railway companies while not consulting the labour organizations in regard to this legislation. Now, instead of its being the duty of the Minister to consult the labour organizations, I believe these organizations have men representing them here in Ottawa, and it would be their duty to go to the Minister and ask him what he proposed to do in regard to this measure. I think the Minister has been quite right in consulting the railway companies. Having some knowledge of the difficulties and hardships which the railway companies of this country have to contend with, I have a great deal of sympathy with them, and I tell the hon. gentleman that any man employed on any railway in this country, if he is faithful to his own interests as well as to the interests of the company, will do all in his power to promote their interests, and they will in return do all in their power to promote his interests. Some people run away with the idea that because a man is employed on a railway, he should not consider the interests of the company at all, in respect to such matters as safety appliances. It is remarkable how many miles of railway have been constructed in this country within the last few years. This is a young country, and our railway companies are under very heavy expenses and are not in a position perhaps to pay for many improvements on their rolling stock which they would like to have. I am happy to say, however, from the experience I have had, that the railway companies are just as eager to have these appliances placed on their rolling stock as their employees are. The railway companies, so far as I know, have always been willing to meet the wishes of their employees as far as possible, while reserving the right to some extent to decide as to the length of time it would take to effect the improvements desired. My hon. friend from West Elgin rather objects to the remarks of the hon. Minister of Railways in regard to the device he proposes to be used with air-brakes; but that is a small matter, indeed, looked at as a matter of legislation. It is only within the last few years that this device has been thought of at all, and it is intended chiefly for passenger trains. At the present time passenger trains have automatic air-brakes, and it is true that a device of this kind, if adopted, would prevent in-

Mr. O'BRIEN.

jury and loss of life to passengers. This is something that the railway companies themselves are willing to adopt without any legislation, if they can get the proper device. My hon. friend also finds fault with the remarks of the Minister of Railways with regard to the standard height of box cars. Does the hon. gentleman pretend to say that all the cars are of standard height, and that high and low cars are not mixed up together? It is not a fact that cars of similar height are always put together. They are placed indiscriminately in different parts of a train, so that men passing from one car to another will have to step down from one car and up to another; and the Minister was quite right in what he said in regard to that. The hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) speaks of some legislation being necessary to shorten the hours of labour for railway employees. I know that a very strong objection was raised a few years ago to certain railway companies because of the long hours they obliged their employees to work; but I am happy to say that now the Grand Trunk Railway and other companies have issued special orders that every employee, after having been employed a certain number of hours, shall have a certain rest before he can be called upon to resume his duties.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) How many hours?

Mr. INGRAM. Eight hours rest, I believe, is the rule on the Grand Trunk Railway.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) After how many hours work are they entitled to rest?

Mr. INGRAM. I cannot state that.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I am only asking for information.

Mr. INGRAM. I will give the hon. gentleman an instance. Starting at the city where I live there are two divisions, one running to the Detroit River and one to the Niagara River. Some of the trains take three hours and a half to make the journey and others ten or twelve hours. After the train arrives at the end of the division the men are entitled to a certain number of hours rest, and when they make the return journey to their homes, they cannot take out a train again without having eight hours rest. So that the companies are providing for this matter themselves. The hon. member for Muskoka objects to open crossings, holding that there should be gates across the highways at all such crossings. I could understand such a proposition being made if this were the Imperial Parliament and this measure had reference to railways in the old country. But every one must know that in a thinly-settled country like Canada, stretching from the Atlantic to the Pacific, it would be simply impossible to provide gates at all the railway crossings in the country. It is impracticable—it could not be done.

Mr. COCKBURN. Mr. Speaker, as there seems to be a somewhat general impression in the House that due care has not been exercised by some of our railways in protecting the lives of passengers and others, I think it but right that I should refer to the document which I hold in my hand. After I have read the figures given here, they may help those hon. gentlemen whose sympathies are so strong in this matter to come to the conclusion that the loss of human life on our railways has not been so great as they imagine. All losses must be considered relatively. I would call attention to the fact that we have invested in our railways a sum much larger than the whole national debt; and these railways have to be operated under conditions of marked disadvantage as compared with the conditions under which railways are operated in Europe. Now, I want to draw attention to the fact that the passengers carried last year numbered 13,987,580, or nearly fourteen millions, the freight carried was 21,500,000 tons, and the mileage run nearly forty-one million miles. Out of these fourteen million passengers, the colossal sum of murder perpetrated was the loss of nine lives. My hon. friend from North Bruce tells me that that is not the point to which he referred. I am coming to the point, but I think it is a fair point to make, that if we have carried fourteen million passengers over forty-one million miles, with the loss only of nine lives, very great care indeed must have been exercised by these railways in order to show such results. I know that my hon. friend has reference more particularly to the country neighbourhood.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That would give a distance, which each passenger rode of four miles.

Mr. COCKBURN. That may be. I am simply saying that fourteen million passengers were carried forty-one million miles, and it is just as easy to kill a man in four miles as in forty. A man is not killed all the way along. It is not like the case of the Opposition, whose life is being dragged out of them hour by hour, and who are screwing up their courage to meet their inevitable fate. It is a case of instantaneous death. My hon. friend from North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) is more interested in the country neighbourhoods. He comes from a district where the sound of the railway whistle is heard but rarely, and I can easily understand, in these circumstances, that alarm is felt by cattle and men at this extraordinary sound which now and then awakens them from their peaceful slumbers. Still, when I look into the facts in that connection, when I take the number of people, sober, drunk or otherwise, who, in walking along the railway track or lying on it, have met with the misfortune of their death, I find that altogether there were ninety-one.

Mr. McNEILL. How many were injured?

Mr. COCKBURN. My hon. friend will be delighted to hear that there were only fifty-eight. I am willing to charge all the consequences I can against the railway companies, but I do ask that they should get honest, fair play. We have been told to-day that they are a body of corruptionists who, by means of passes, are trying to ingratiate themselves in our favour, so that whenever they come to ask us for an extraordinary gift, we will be ready—bribed by a 10 cent fare or whatever it may be—to grant it. I ask you simply to deal fairly with the railway managers, and not to be carried away by the impression that they are running their roads at all risks and hazards. I say you may take the railway statistics of this country and compare them with those of any other country, and in no other country similarly situated will you find less destruction of life. We have reason to be proud indeed of what is being achieved by the railways of Canada, and I wish to give them credit and encouragement for what they have done, and I hope they will continue to improve in the future as they have in the past, mending, if possible, their ways so far as the killing or maiming of our friends may be concerned, on the highways or byways.

Mr. McDOWALL. I merely call the attention of the hon. gentleman who has just spoken to the fact that, according to the returns, the total number of killed was 211, and of injured 694.

Mr. COCKBURN. I thought my hon. friend was away back in the backwoods. He is quoting the returns of 1893, and the railway companies have so improved since in every respect, that whereas the slaughter then was comparatively colossal, they have been able within three years to reduce these hundreds down to so many tens.

Motion agreed to, and Bill referred to Committee on Railways and Canals.

ADULTERATION OF FOOD, DRUGS AND AGRICULTURAL FERTILIZERS.

Mr. SPROULE moved second reading of Bill (No. 10) further to amend the Act respecting the adulteration of food, drugs and agricultural fertilizers. He said: In asking the House to allow this Bill to be read the second time, I wish to make a few remarks, because I presume the Bill is one not well understood by the House. I shall first draw attention to the fact that the large number of people who are engaged to-day in the manufacture of honey in Canada, have made it one of the important industries of the country. It is not like any other industry which requires a large expenditure to obtain a return; but by the able assistance of the industrious little bees which gather the honey from the flowers and other sources, stores of this food are laid up

Mr. COCKBURN.

for human use and add considerably to the prosperity of the country. I have before me a return of the year 1891—the year the census was taken—showing the number of beehives in Canada and the amount of honey that was made. In that year there were in the Dominion 200,000 hives. Now, a fair average quantity of honey realized, where bees are properly attended to, would be about fifty pounds to the hive. That will give an idea of the returns which may be realized from these stores, upon which man has to make a very small outlay. If you take 200,000 hives and multiply them by fifty—and in a fair average year, with particular attention, bee-keepers may realize 100 pounds per hive—you have 10,000,000 pounds of honey produced in one year. At 8 cents per pound that amounts to \$800,000; and the year 1891, I may say in passing, was not even a fair average year, for it was below the average for the production of honey. But it meant a return to the Canadian people of at least \$800,000 from the operations of the bees and the bee-keepers, which we would not have enjoyed had it not been for that industry. In most lines of life in which the people are engaged, there is usually great attention given to their industry so as to protect and preserve it. Take, for instance, the seal life of Canada. A few years ago we had a good deal of talk about the preservation of the seal and what it cost the country for protection. I find that in six years we realized from that source only \$1,256,497, and we thought it advisable to incur very large expense in order to settle the international dispute between Canada and the United States, and pay our share of the cost of the arbitration for the purpose of protecting this industry. But, during the same six years, upon the calculation I have made, according to the last census the amount realized from honey was \$4,800,000, instead of \$1,000,000. I only give these figures to show the importance of this industry to the people who are engaged in it and to the people of Canada at large. Then there are a very large number of people who are engaged in this industry and are asking for this legislation. And why do they ask for it? Because it has been found, as the result of many years experience that, as in other lines, there is a disposition to adulterate the product, so as to make it more cheaply. The effect of that adulteration is to reduce the reputation of our whole product in the market, so that it is not saleable at the figures which could be realized some years ago. Therefore the industry out of which we have been making so much and is capable of such expansion is rapidly being destroyed. The bee-keepers all over the country have recognized this, and year after year, as their associations have met, they have applied to Parliament for legislation to prevent the adulteration of honey. I may state, in passing, that there are several methods practiced in the adul-

teration of honey. One method is to take pure cane sugar syrup and mix with it a little pure honey, putting the mixture up in jars labelled "Pure Honey." Another is to take glucose and add liquid honey. Another method is to feed the bees with sugar, treacle, glucose or some other material of saccharine properties. The bees so fed will produce what is called honey, but what is really only a syrup which can be sold as honey. When I state to the House that a swarm of bees will store away from 50 to a 100 pounds of this material in a few days, and that when it is exposed in the market it can be sold at a much higher profit than can genuine honey, hon. gentlemen will understand the inducement there is for people to engage in this spurious manufacture. But the effect is to destroy their own trade; because, as it becomes known that this material is not honey in the proper sense of the term, but only an adulterated product, people will not buy it. To overcome this evil the bee-keepers have been asking that some legislation be enacted in this House or by this Parliament. To give you an idea of the feeling that exists, if the House will permit me, I will read what prominent bee-keepers and associations have said on this question:

The "Canadian Bee Journal," in reporting the annual meeting of the Ontario Bee-keepers' Association, held at Walkerton, says: "The convention asked the bee-keepers of Canada to unite as one man in crushing the hydra-headed monster, sugar-honey, before it is born. The weapon agreed upon for this purpose is an Act of Parliament by which he is to be threshed out of existence before he comes to life." The editor of "Gleanings in Bee Culture" says: "We believe the advocacy of the sugar-honey matter, in the first place, was unwise, and, therefore, opposed it with all our might." No one at the annual meeting of the North American Bee-keepers' Association, held at Washington, D.C., in 1893, endorsed producing sugar-honey. Thomas William Cowan, F.G.S., F.R.M.S., and editor of the "British Bee Journal," says in a letter to me, dated 3rd February, 1893: "I was pleased to find by your letter that the Ontario Bee-keepers' Association had taken up the matter of the so-called sugar-honey, and have decided to ask for legislation on the subject. I saw also that you had brought the matter before the Oxford Association, and was very glad to find that it has brought forward this desire to put a stop to the practice of feeding sugar to produce comb. I can only look upon such a proceeding as almost suicidal to the industry, and would do all in my power to prevent it."

Answering the question: If we feed sugar syrup to bees and send the product to the English markets, what effect would this course have upon the sale of Canadian honey in English markets? Mr. Cowan says: "It would not be long before your product would be shut out of our markets, and it would do you an injury that you would be years in getting over." Answering another question—Can bees make honey of sugar syrup?—"To this I unhesitatingly answer, 'No.' Sugar syrup stored in the combs by the bees remains sugar still. It is quite possible that a portion of the cane sugar in the syrup may be con-

verted into grape sugar, but this does not make it honey. "In conclusion," he says, "I would urge you to leave no stone unturned to prevent this attempt to introduce adulteration, which, I think, would not fail to have most disastrous consequence of the industry of bee-keeping."

Mr. Secor, a bee-keeper of high standing, who judged the honey at the Chicago World's Fair, said, in his address at Washington, D.C., as president of the North American Bee-keepers' Association: "In my judgment, we cannot long prosper if we adopt methods which will put us on the defensive in every honey market in the world. Adulteration is the crying sin of the age. The people are becoming aroused upon the subject. We ourselves are trying to put a stop to it. It will not be sufficient to say that the improved article is to be sold for just what it is. If it is possible to produce it at a profit, it will not be long before every consumer will have heard of the trick, and conclude to make his own honey."

I. F. Moore, of Tiffin, Ohio, writes: "I can see no good results whatever from the discussion. Its principal use has been to give hints to would-be imitation honey-producers. The devil does not need any aid. Can we not profit by the experience of the dairy people in their fight with oleomargarine, &c.?"

N. P. Aspinwall, of Harrison, Minn., writes: "It would be the death knell of the bee-keeping interests of the country."

Allen Pringle, of Selby, Ont., writes: "I regard the proposed 'sugar-honey' as one of the worst forms of adulteration, worse because it emanates from producers themselves."

C. Theilmann, of Theilmanton, Minn., says: "Every experienced bee-keeper knows that sugar cannot be changed to honey by the bees. It is sugar first, and sugar last. I am afraid our industry has received a blow from which it will not recover for many years, by this sugar-honey swindle."

Thomas G. Newman, formerly editor of the "American Bee-keepers' Journal," writes: "The degradation brought upon the honey-producers by this sugar-honey abomination is almost unbearable; it cannot be right; it is a fraud upon the bees; it would compel the bee-keeper to be dishonest, and it would be a dishonourable and fraudulent trick played upon consumers. The instigators of this nefarious swindle have sown to the wind and are now reaping the whirlwind."

Thomas Pearson, of Lacolle, Quebec, wrote me: "I am glad to see that the Ontario Bee-keepers' Association have taken the matter in hand in regard to the sugar-honey fraud. I am in sympathy with you, and shall do all I can to help you."

Ira Reeves, of Carmi, Ill., writes: "It was put on exhibition at the drug store of Reeves & Co., and admired by everybody, and we could readily have sold every pound of it for 15 cents; but we did not; it was simply syrup without the taste of honey to it."

I will give you the names of a few of the associations that have asked for this legislation, to show you that there are a large number of people engaged in the industry who are anxious to see the Bill I have introduced made part of the law of the land:—The Farmers Institute, Elgin county, Ontario; The Dairyman's cheese meeting at Belmont, Ont.; the Ontario Bee-keepers' Association, Brant Bee-keepers' Association, Perth Bee-keepers' Association, Middlesex Bee-keepers' Association, Oxford Bee-keep-

ers' Association, and Listowel Bee-keepers' Association. In fact I know of but two or three bee-keepers in Canada who object to this Bill. I quote these expressions of opinion in order to bring to the attention of the House the importance of this measure. I need not refer to the extent to which the export trade in honey would grow if it were developed under proper protection in Canada; it is enough to say that we are already exporting large quantities of honey to Great Britain and the United States. England offers us a great market for honey if we would take advantage of it by sending pure honey, such as can be produced in Canada. I have here a letter from the Statistical Department, which gives some information regarding the trade. It says:

We have not much to do with bees and honey in the Statistical Branch of the Department of Agriculture. The census returns for 1891 indicate that there were about 200,000 hives in the Dominion, 146,341 of them being in Ontario, which in this respect, as in so many others, is the banner province of the Dominion. At an average of 50 pounds to the hive of 5,000 bees, the production in Canada would be about ten (10) million pounds. Our trade returns show that we exported \$264 worth in 1891 and imported \$3,558 worth, chiefly from the United States. Our neighbours exported \$83,325, of which \$36,000 went to the United Kingdom. We certainly ought not to import honey, and I am glad to be able to say that the import is becoming less each year, having been \$4,673 in 1890, and being but little over \$2,000 in the last fiscal year, while the export has shown considerable increase, having been \$1,700 in 1892, of which nearly \$1,200 went to Great Britain.

The United Kingdom imports over 3½ million pounds of honey, valued at \$250,000. About 1,300,000 pounds of this comes from Chili, or over one-third of the total import. Over one million pounds come from the Spanish and British West Indies.

Now, I give this simply to show the possible development of this trade in the country, and what it might be brought to if we had the proper protection which we ask for the Canadian bee-keepers of Canada. Now, some question the propriety of passing an Act similar to this. It is held that because an article is manufactured or produced which cannot be fairly claimed to be injurious to health, we should allow it to be purchased. Those who were in this House a few years ago when an Act was passed prohibiting the manufacture of oleomargarine, will remember that exactly the same arguments were advanced with regard to that. Nevertheless, the judgment of this House was that it was better for the country that we should not allow it to be produced, and we have an Act upon the statute-book for the purpose of prohibiting the manufacture of that article, and offering it for sale. Now, the bee-keepers ask for similar legislation in their interest. I think this Bill can be made to fit into chapter 107 of the Revised Statutes, in the Act intituled, "An Act respecting the Adulteration of

Foods, Drugs and Agricultural Fertilizers." It can be made an amendment to that by a change in the wording of this Bill which is before you. I am sorry I have not had time to get it printed in a different and revised form, as compared with what it is in the Bill before the House. But I will read it so that it may be understood by those who take an interest in it. I am told that it can be easily added to the Adulteration of Foods Act as subsection a.:

The feeding to bees of sugar, glucose, or any other sweet substance other than such as bees gather from natural sources, with the intent that the same should be used by bees in the making of honey, or the exposing of any such substance with said intent, shall be deemed a wilful adulteration of honey within the meaning of this Act; and no honey made by bees in whole or in part from any such substances, and no imitation of honey, so-called, or other substitute for honey, shall be manufactured, or produced, or sold, or offered for sale, in Canada; provided that this Act shall not be interpreted or construed to prevent the giving of sugar in any form to bees to be consumed by them for food.

Now, I may say that at some seasons of the year when there is a scarcity of honey, it becomes necessary to feed bees to keep them alive, but when that is done it is used by them simply as food, and not stored away for honey. That is requisite and necessary, and could be done without in any way infringing upon the provisions of this Bill. Bees usually gather their honey in the summer; a scarcity of food generally takes place in the fall, or winter, or spring, and therefore the time that it is necessary to feed bees is not the time when they store away honey. But when sugar, or glucose, or syrup, or any other saccharine material, is fed to bees for the purpose of being converted into honey, it is spread out, and they take it up very readily and store it away in the cells, where it is manufactured into honey in large quantities in a very short time. Now, some may ask: How could this law be enforced? How could you secure a conviction in the event of a violation of the law? Well, that would be very easy. In Ontario we have a law to-day under which a party is appointed by the local government, who is called an inspector of foul brood of bees. He goes around from time to time to see if there is a foul brood and he has the legal authority to examine apiaries. When he goes there, if the production of honey has been carried on by this process, it is plain as anything can be, because the material is placed there for the purpose of consumption by the bees in such a way that he knows that they are producing honey by that means. Therefore, it is an easy matter to secure conviction under the Act. But we require to go further than that, and have an analysis of the honey made. It is equally easy to secure conviction, because he only requires to submit it to an analytic test by the chemist belonging to the department at Ot-

tawa. I am told by Professor Macfarlane, the analyst here, that there is no difficulty whatever in detecting honey made by this means as distinguished from pure honey. One means used and the most delicate and surest is what is known as the polariscope test. It is one of those little instruments made like a tube, in which there is placed a small vial, or tube, containing liquid. If the light is allowed to pass in through a lens at one end and to pass through that liquid, the ray of light is changed to the right hand, if it is cane sugar or glucose, or other production of saccharine matter, produced from cane or beet, or other such source. But if it is honey, the ray of light is changed to the left, and is always on the negative side. It is changed to a certain to the left, and then it is known as standard honey. It is true you may use what is called the inverted sugar to feed bees or adulterate honey, and that would show a mirror test by the polariscope, but the change is so great, reaching as it does in adulterating honey or sugar-honey, as called, to about twenty to twenty-three degrees to the left, that it is at once evident that it is sugar instead of honey. Therefore, it is impossible to manufacture honey in this way in such a manner that it cannot be detected by the polariscope test. It is quite easy to determine whether this is adulteration within the meaning of the Act or not, and, therefore, it is easy to secure a conviction. In view of that fact, I do not see where any objection lies. I am told that some people object on one ground and some on another, that some object on the principle that we should not prevent any person manufacturing a commodity when it is not injurious to health. I have given reasons why I believe we should do so. The Act respecting the adulteration of food specifies two kinds of adulteration, for each of which there is a penalty attached. For a food adulterated with some article that is not injurious there is a certain penalty, but it is not so heavy as when the adulteration is with an article injurious to health. When that is the case it seems to me that there is no reason why we should not attach a penalty to the production of this article under discussion, because it is practically an adulteration within the meaning of the Act, the same as when food is adulterated with something that is not injurious to health. In consideration of the important industry that is being destroyed by unprincipled people who are manufacturing honey, some by one means and some by another, it is necessary that effective preventive measures should be adopted. I am told there are several manufactories where this product is made, that there are two in Montreal where honey is made without the aid of bees, and where the product is labelled pure honey. It is manufactured in some such way as I have indicated, and there seems to be an urgent necessity for this or some other such

Bill to prevent its manufacture. The bee-keepers of Canada believe that if this Bill became law it would be effective, and there might be no necessity of prosecuting parties for violation of the law, because people would refrain from violating it, just as they did from producing oleomargarine from the time we placed the law on the statute-book prohibiting its manufacture. We all know that before that time it was manufactured and sold, and it was claimed by many persons that as it was an article of food not injurious to health its production should be allowed and it should be allowed to be sold; but as it came into competition with butter its manufacture was stopped, and no complaints have since been heard of violations of the law, and if this Bill were passed and placed on the statute-book it would be a standing menace to those contemplating the production of adulterated or sugar-honey, and its manufacture would cease. In view of the great interest at stake, and the number of people interested, and the frequency with which they have knocked at the door of Parliament asking legislation, and especially in view of the amount of money invested, there being no less than \$1,000,000 invested in this industry in Canada, it is important that this law should be passed. I ask this House to give the Bill its favourable consideration, and if possible, enact it, because I believe it will not only be a satisfaction to the bee-keepers of the Dominion, but it will be instrumental in preventing what is a fraud on the consuming public, and a manufacture that must ultimately destroy that important industry, if we do not come to the aid of those engaged in it by passing such a Bill as that now under consideration and without punishing those manufacturing sugar-honey and like products in future.

Mr. PRIOR. The House must have listened with great interest to the remarks of the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) in regard to the honey industry in this country. I may say for myself that I was very much surprised indeed at the extent of this industry, it having, as the hon. gentleman said, about \$1,000,000 of capital invested, and, being the means of bringing \$800,000 per annum into the country. The Bill which the hon. gentleman has brought forward does not meet altogether with my approbation or the approbation, I think, of the Government, but as it is one that is brought forward with the intention of protecting an important industry, protecting men who wish to give honest honey to the consumer, the Government have no objection whatever to the Bill going to its second reading and being afterwards sent to the committee, where I hope fuller explanations perhaps may be given and such alterations made as will be more in consonance with the views of the Government on the subject than is the present Bill. There is no doubt we ought to do every-

thing possible to assist honey-makers in getting an article on the market that will maintain the value of our honey, so that we can export it and meet the competition of foreign honey and have a good name in any market to which it may be sent. So far as I understood the hon. gentleman, the adulteration that is mentioned is not deleterious to health, it is an adulteration from sugar and glucose; but at the same time this adulteration makes a great difference in the market value of the product. I think my hon. friend has done his duty in introducing the Bill, and I shall be only too glad to assist him when the Bill is before the committee and when certain alterations will be proposed which may be thought necessary.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I am glad to hear the favourable remarks of the hon. Controller of Inland Revenue. I expected to have heard from the Department of Agriculture in respect to this matter. I am aware that it has been before the department—not before the present Minister—for several years. Representations have been made by the different bee-keepers throughout Ontario, and recognizing these facts that it is an important industry, that it is in the interest of the trade to be able to export honey which is recognized as a pure article, that it means a source of great revenue to Canada, those engaged in the legitimate trade of producing pure honey are very anxious that legislation should be passed to protect their interests. I quite recognize that there are difficulties in the way, as indicated by the remarks offered by the Controller of Inland Revenue, such as that so-called adulterated honey or sugar-syrup, under whatever name it may pass, is not apparently injurious to health, and, therefore, the Government probably would not be inclined to deal so severely with those manufacturers as with the manufacturers of an article put on the market that is injurious in its nature. However that may be, the honey industry is recognized as a very important one, and those interested in it have during several years been urging that some legislation be passed to maintain the good name of Canadian honey in the foreign market. That, so far as I can judge, is the only desire of those who are producing and shipping pure honey, and I had expected that the Department of Agriculture, through the Minister, would have stated the views which had been formed by the department on the question, as so many representations had been made by petition, letter and personally. I am in sympathy with the Bill, and any action that can be taken in the way of legislation to encourage this industry and maintain the quality of the honey now produced in Canada, which holds a very high position in the markets of the world.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. gentleman having referred to the Department of Agricul-

Mr. PRIOR.

ture in connection with the Bill now before the House, I may say that the Bill is one that hardly comes within the purview of the department. The Bill has reference, as the hon. gentleman knows, to the adulteration of a food product, and it is a matter within the control of the Department of Inland Revenue, where a technical staff is kept to make the investigations necessary in connection with that kind of work. So far, however, as the general question of assistance to the bee-keepers of Canada is concerned, that does come within the sphere of the Department of Agriculture; and I am very glad to be able to say to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) that I trust we shall be able to meet the view which has been so often expressed—not so much in the House as in the agricultural journals of the country—and lend some assistance, in the way of making experiments in connection with the bee-keeping industry. There is no doubt, Sir, of the importance of that industry to Canada. The money that is made out of it is found money, because the money that is taken from the flora of the country would have been wasted had it not been collected by the bees, and consequently, there is no loss, but an actual gain of all the value that is produced by these insects in connection with their work. Hitherto we have not made any very special effort for the bee-keeping industry at the Experimental Farm. There was an apiary established some years ago, chiefly, I think, at my suggestion. I happened to be a member of the Bee-keepers' Association myself, and was in as practical sympathy as possible with the work, and at my representations, and those of other members of the House, the matter was undertaken by Professor Fletcher, and he is doing really good service. But, his other work has grown so much, that I hope to be able in a short time to tell the House, that I have taken a new man upon the staff for that special department; a man who I am sure will command the confidence of bee-keepers all over Canada. So far as the importance of the industry is concerned, it has not at all been magnified by the member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule). It exists in almost every province of the Dominion. In the province of Ontario, however, the great body of that industry is, but the experience of those who have made experiments in even the province of Manitoba, and in some parts of the Territories, is very favourable indeed. In parts of the province of Manitoba, bees winter first rate, with care, and the flora of that particular province is very rich in honey, though at first the contrary was supposed. So far as the Bill is concerned, I confess that as a member of the House, I have a great deal of sympathy with the object that the Bee-keepers' Association has in view; an object which is voiced by the member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule). It is true, I think, that there would be con-

siderable difficulty in putting the Bill into force as it is at the present time, but I have no doubt, if the Bill is allowed to go into committee, that with suggestions from both sides of the House we will be able to make such a law as will be of actual benefit to the bee-keepers and will not be oppressive to trade in any way. I am sure my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) is not wedded to any particular form of Bill, but that the object he wishes to serve is to help the bee-keeping industry. The hon. gentleman will see that it is a Bill regarding the adulteration of food product, and requires very careful consideration before it is passed.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

REPORT.

Annual Report of the Department of Militia and Defence.—(Mr. Dickey.)

Mr. HAGGART moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and the House adjourned at 10.30 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 31st January, 1896.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

ST. LAWRENCE AND OTTAWA RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. McINERNEY moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 25) respecting the St. Lawrence and Ottawa Railway Company.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Explain.

Mr. McINERNEY. This Bill is for the purpose of allowing the company to take the proceeds of the sale of certain lands along the line of the railway and devote them to the construction of iron bridges, instead of wooden bridges, and other permanent structures, as shall be agreed to by the Minister of Railways or some other competent authority appointed for the purpose.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 26) respecting the Nelson and Fort Sheppard Railway Company.—(Mr. Mara.)

Bill (No. 27) respecting the Lindsay, Bobcaygeon and Pontypool Railway Company.—(Mr. Henderson.)

Bill (No. 28) to incorporate the Huron and Ontario Railway Company.—(Mr. Sproule.)

Bill (No. 29) to amend the Act to incorporate the Supreme Court of the Independent Order of Foresters.—(Mr. McGillivray.)

Bill (No. 30) respecting the Guelph Junction Railway Company.—(Mr. Masson.)

Bill (No. 31) to incorporate the Hudson Bay and Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Macdonell, Algoma.)

Bill (No. 32) respecting the Winnipeg Great Northern Railway Company.—(Mr. Boyd.)

Bill (No. 33) to incorporate the Equitable Benefit Company of Canada.—(Mr. Taylor.)

Bill (No. 34) to consolidate and amend certain Acts relating to the Nipissing and James Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. Tisdale.)

Bill (No. 35) to incorporate the Canadian Electric Railway and Power Company.—(Mr. Tisdale.)

Bill (No. 36) to incorporate the South Shore Suburban Railway Company.—(Mr. Girouard, for Mr. Lachapelle.)

Bill (No. 37) to confirm a certain lease and agreement between the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada and the St. Lawrence and Adirondack Railway Company.—(Mr. Bergeron.)

Bill (No. 38) respecting the Montreal and Ottawa Railway Company.—(Mr. Bergeron.)

Bill (No. 39) respecting the St. Lawrence and Adirondack Railway Company.—(Mr. Bergeron.)

Bill (No. 40) respecting the South Ontario Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Sutherland.)

Bill (No. 41) respecting the Lake Erie and Detroit River Railway Company.—(Mr. McGregor.)

Bill (No. 42) respecting the Canada and Michigan Bridge and Tunnel Company.—(Mr. Ingram.)

Bill (No. 43) to incorporate the Queenston Heights Bridge Company.—(Mr. Tisdale.)

Bill (No. 44) relating to the Board of Trade of the city of Toronto.—(Mr. Tisdale.)

Bill (No. 45) to incorporate the Schomberg and Aurora Railway Company.—(Mr. Tisdale.)

Bill (No. 46) to promote the safety of railway employees.—(Mr. Smith, Ontario, for Mr. Maclean, York.)

SIR CHARLES TUPPER.

Mr. CASEY. Before you pass to the Orders of the Day, I wish to call attention to a matter arising out of the answer given by the hon. Minister of Railways yesterday, and if you find it necessary, I shall conclude

with a motion. The question and answer I refer to are as follows : —

Mr. PERRY asked :

Is it a fact that Sir Charles Tupper, Secretary of State, is travelling in a private car through Cape Breton county during the election campaign at public expense ?

Mr. HAGGART. I do not know how Sir Charles Tupper is travelling. I loaned him my private car. I have no doubt he is travelling at his own expense.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member, as I understand it, is proposing to bring up a reference to a former debate on a question for adjournment ?

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, I do not think an answer given by the Government is a previous debate.

Mr. SPEAKER. Well, that is my ruling.

Mr. CASEY. I wish to submit a case for your ruling. Cannot a question and answer be quoted in any subsequent debate ?

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not think so. Upon a motion to adjourn, a reference to a question and answer in the House, is not permissible. That is my reading.

Mr. CASEY. Very well then. I wish to refer to an alleged fact, stated in the press and commonly believed, and that is that Sir Charles Tupper—

Mr. FOSTER. If the hon. gentleman will allow me, I would ask him whether he would not think it better—

Mr. CASEY. Does the hon. gentleman rise to a point of order ?

Mr. FOSTER. I rise to ask the hon. gentleman a question, as one gentleman might ask another. I would remind the hon. gentleman that a day was fixed for the Budget, and it is not an easy thing to prepare for a Budget, and to come into the House, and have the half or whole of the afternoon taken up with other matters. I just suggest to my hon. friend whether he would not think it better to defer this matter to another day.

Mr. CASEY. If I had not thought this matter of sufficient importance to justify me in bringing it forward now, I should not have done so.

Mr. FOSTER. I never knew the like being done before.

Mr. CASEY. There need not necessarily be a debate on it. I wish to ask for some explanations, and to make a few references to the alleged facts of this case. It is stated in the public press that Sir Charles Tupper is travelling through Cape Breton county in a car which is not a private car, but an official car, a car belonging to the Minister of Railways as Minister of Railways, and for the use of that gentleman only in his capacity as Minister

Mr. CASEY.

of Railways—a car, the property of the Government of Canada, in other words, for governmental service in Canada, and that he is travelling at the public expense on that car, in so far, at all events, that he pays nothing for the cost of hauling that car. I do not know whether the Government will have to pay the railways over which the car runs for haulage, or whether the railway companies will make a present of that amount to the candidate for Cape Breton county, the High Commissioner of Canada. The car is properly for the public service ; it should not be devoted to private use, it should still less be devoted to partisan use. I need not point out what an unfair advantage the Conservative candidate in Cape Breton possesses in having a car provided for him at the public expense, in which he can travel free over the railways, in which he can lodge at night, carry about the necessary refreshments, and get his boots blacked every morning without paying Chicago prices for the service. The man who is carried about in this fashion at the public expense is no small potatoes. The famous car "Jamaica" has been allowed to carry small potatoes on other occasions. Perhaps the Minister of Agriculture will understand the allusion.

Mr. COCKBURN. Allow me to ask a question. As the hon. gentleman is introducing a new phrase, perhaps he will give us some explanation of its meaning.

Mr. CASEY. Certainly, I shall be happy to give the ordinary and figurative signification of those words. Small potatoes are an ordinary esculent grown in fields and gardens. I am told they are cultivated as far south-west as the neighbourhood of Dunnville. That is the agricultural small potato, and the literal meaning of the word. The phrase "small potatoes" in the figurative sense refers to people who are perhaps not quite as important as other people. There is a difference in the size of the natural potato ; there is a difference in the size of the political potato. I say that in both senses of the word the famous old "Jamaica" has been promoted from carrying small potatoes to carrying big potatoes. Now I hope the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Cockburn) understands the meaning of that phrase.

The "Jamaica" is useful, I say, to the Government candidate in Cape Breton, as a means of locomotion, and as a portable boarding house. I believe it had been used for that purpose before. Perhaps the Minister of Agriculture will explain whether he ever knew it to be used as a sea-side boarding-house, or practically for that purpose. It is alleged that he knows something of that kind ; but I am only speaking of that en passant.

The point to which I wish to call the attention of the House particularly, is the extremely unfair advantage given to Sir Char-

les Tupper by the use of a public car, at the public cost, to enable him all the better to defeat the candidate of the opposite party. He is using public funds and public property for partisan purposes. It is no new thing for him. In the election of 1891, when High Commissioner on full pay, he came to Canada, and drawing his pay and allowances as High Commissioner in London, he used the public official car on our railways; he used his time, which belonged to the public as High Commissioner in London; he used his influence, all of which the public hired him to use in their service as High Commissioner, for partisan purposes in Canada. He is repeating that course now. Although he is said to be not receiving his pay as High Commissioner, no doubt his allowances are going on as in 1883-4. I do not think this course of action should be allowed to go without protest, as it was in 1891. On that occasion the election came after the session and there was no opportunity to protest till it was over. But now, when the House is sitting, I cannot allow this unfair and improper use of public property and public funds to pass without entering my protest against it. In order to allow Ministers or other members to make any observations they please on the subject, I move the adjournment of the House.

Motion negatived.

SUPPLY—THE BUDGET.

Mr. FOSTER moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee of Supply. He said: Mr. Speaker, the House will remember that the Budget speech was delivered last year at a rather late period, namely, on 3rd May, being so short a time before the expiry of the then current year that it was possible to detail the course of financial events of that year with pretty considerable accuracy, and to that extent the exposition for the present year will lose somewhat in interest to those who have followed the course of events as described in my last Budget speech. It will be remembered that last year at that date I estimated the revenue that would be derived at \$33,800,000, arriving at that figure by estimating for a betterment in the period elapsing between 20th April and 30th June of that year over the corresponding period in the preceding year of \$419,724. I remember that my hon. friend opposite took exception to and questioned the reliability of the estimate; but I am happy to inform him and the House that I was within the mark, and that the improvement which did accrue was greater than that I had estimated, and reached the sum of \$597,851. This revenue was made up from Customs \$17,640,466, being a diminution to the amount of \$1,557,648 from the Customs receipts of the preceding year; Excise amounting to \$7,805,732, a decrease of \$575,356 from the preceding year, and miscella-

neous receipts coming up to \$8,531,930, or a diminution of \$263,559 from the receipts of the preceding year, so far as that item is concerned. The whole falling off in the revenue of 1894-95, as compared with the preceding year, was therefore \$2,396,563.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What date did the French Treaty come into operation?

Mr. FOSTER. About May, if I recollect rightly. The imports for home consumption for 1894-95 show a decrease of \$7,841,472, and the exports have decreased \$3,886,146. The decrease in exports, the produce of Canada, is \$1,076,758, as compared with the previous year. There is, further, this fact to be noted, a similar fact to which has existed only once, I think, since confederation. It is that the exports from Canada last year exceeded its imports by \$2,857,121; although the average of the excess of imports over exports from confederation up to the end of that year was \$18,740,063. Whatever there may be in what is known as the "balance of trade," other circumstances being equal, the fact that there was last year an excess of exports over imports is a fact which is to be placed to the credit of Canada, and is so much gain to the general business interests. With reference to, in the first place, the customs duties, there was a reduction as compared with the preceding year, in a large proportion of the articles of import, a reduction which extended pretty generally over the whole range. The following statement will show the reduction in import duties as compared with 1893-94:—

REDUCTIONS IN DUTY AS COMPARED WITH 1893-94.

Ale, beer and porter.....	\$ 16,047
Animals, living.....	7,032
Books, periodicals and other printed matter	21,196
Cement	9,921
Drugs, dyes, chemicals and medicines....	76,488
Earthenware and china.....	59,860
Embroideries	21,274
Fancy goods.....	45,033
Fish and products of.....	14,679
Flax, hemp and jute, manufactures of....	14,521
Fruits and nuts, dried.....	52,664
do do green.....	14,708
Furs and manufactures of.....	22,901
Glass and do	25,773
Gloves and mitts.....	12,062
Gutta percha and India rubber, manufactures of.....	34,342
Iron and steel and manufactures of.....	509,010
Oils, coal and kerosene, and products of..	60,358
do do all other, N.E.S..	35,918
Oil-cloth	16,214
Packages	11,809
Paints and colours.....	14,114
Paper and manufactures of.....	26,606
Provisions, viz.: butter, cheese, lard and meat	42,553
Silk, manufactures of.....	66,979
Spirits and wines.....	295,857
Tea	11,466

Tobacco	\$ 24,311
Watches and parts thereof.....	11,567
Wood and manufactures thereof.....	134,084
Wool do do	349,309

As against these decreases, we have to note an increase of duty on the following articles :—

INCREASE IN DUTY COMPARED WITH 1893-94.

Arrowroot, biscuit, rice, macaroni, &c... \$66,641	
Grain of all kinds..... 60,851	
Carriages	54,515
Coal and coke..... 33,782	
Cotton, manufactures of..... 70,752	

Gold and silver, manufactures of.....\$ 21,520	
Jewellery	18,065
Leather and manufactures of.....	39,566
Printing presses.....	7,822
Sugar of all kinds.....	222,313
All other dutiable goods.....	50,422

When we come to Excise, we find that there was a decrease in all the articles from which excise duty is taken, with the single exception of cigarettes; and the decrease in some cases is somewhat large. The following table will show the details of the excise duty, comparing the year 1894 with the year 1895 :—

EXCISE.—QUANTITIES AND DUTIES.

	Quantity. 1894.	Quantity. 1895.	Duty. 1894.	Duty. 1895.	Increase. 1895.	Decrease. 1895.
			\$	\$	\$	\$
SpiritsGalls.	2,754,607	2,545,054	4,131,387	3,870,752	260,635
Malt Lbs.	51,311,206	50,659,627	950,815	759,929	190,886
Cigars No.	115,392,857	105,528,770	689,184	635,028	54,156
Cigarettes "	55,143,500	66,628,440	82,715	99,943	17,228
Tobacco & snuff. Lbs.	9,837,084	9,568,437	2,364,153	2,267,738	96,415
			8,218,254	7,633,390	17,228	602,092
						17,228
						584,864

The total decrease in the duty of excise as shown by these returns, amounts to \$584,864. Looking at the per capita consumption of liquors of the various kinds, for which a table has been given from confederation down, we find that in 1894-95 the lowest consumption of most of these articles, per capita, was reached, the consumption of spirits being .666 gallons per head; of beer, 3.471 gallons per head; of wine, a very slight increase in consumption, amounting to .09 gallon per head, and of tobacco, a consumption of 2.163 pounds per head of the people. Whether that decrease arises from reasons of economy, or from change in the ideas of the people with reference to these articles, I am not here to say, probably both reasons have something to do with it.

EXCISE : CONSUMPTION PER CAPITA.

Average.	Spirits.	Beer.	Wine.	Tobac'o.
	Galls.	Galls.	Galls.	Lbs.
From 1867.....	1.052	3.069	.141	2.170
For 1893-94.....	.742	3.722	.089	2.264
For 1894-95.....	.666	3.471	.090	2.163

In miscellaneous receipts there has been, as I said, a falling off of \$263,559. But this is to be noted, and it is a fact worth noting, that although the receipts fell off that much in 1894-95, yet the receipts from these sources were greater in 1894-95 than in any other year since confederation, with the exception of 1893 and 1894.

Mr. FOSTER.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Just pardon me. In the miscellaneous receipts, I suppose you include all not received from the four great sources of revenue.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, they are really the earnings. The revenue from that source now in 1894-95, is one-fourth of the total revenue accrued, and one-half million dollars more, than double what these receipts reached in 1878-79. The average of these miscellaneous receipts from 1890 to 1895 was \$8,583,107. The average of the five preceding years was \$7,842,365. So that I may say generally that there has been a continuous and steady increase in these sources of revenue during the whole period. The total revenue received during the year is the smallest that has been received since 1885-86. The customs revenue is the smallest that has accrued since 1879-80—smaller by 6½ millions of dollars than it was in 1889-90, when the large diminution in duties made during the last five years commenced.

The per capita rate of customs collections from 1874 to 1878, including both years, was an average of \$3.44 per head of the people. The rate in 1874-75 was \$3.95 per head of the people. In 1894-95 it was \$3.52 per head, that is, only 8 cents per head greater than the average of the period from 1874 to 1878 inclusive, and 43 cents less than the per capita customs taxation in 1874-75.

Taken in connection with that, and illustrating to a certain extent the difference

that exists between the two Administrations in the collection of revenues as regards the incidence of taxation, this may be noted—that the excise revenue is now nearly twice what it was in 1879-80; that it has been exceeded only three times since that period—namely, in 1892, 1893, and 1894; that the excise revenue in 1877-78 was \$1.19 per head of the people, and in 1894-95, \$1.53 per head; that from 1874 to 1878 inclusive, it averaged \$1.32 per head, while from 1891 to 1895 it averaged \$1.59 per head, or 27 cents per head more than the average per capita from 1874 to 1878. As this excise taxation is to a large extent what may be called voluntary taxation, its higher rates and the larger amount accruing from it are to be considered together with the fact that the rate of customs taxation has been at the same time reduced as I have stated, attaining the low figure which it did in 1894-95. These two facts, taken into consideration together show the difference which I have stated marks the taxation as between the two Administrations.

In speaking of miscellaneous receipts, it might be interesting to the House to know in what the decline, small though it was, took place. The following are the items:—

Post Office.....	\$ 16,551
Public works, including railways.	111,056
Casual	112,796
Premium, discount and exchange.	132,195
Dominion Lands.....	42,226

The gains in miscellaneous receipts were as follows:—

Interest on investments.....	\$118,237
Patents	11,499
Fines and forfeitures.....	10,129
Penitentiaries	13,461
Fisheries	15,797

Coming now to the expenditure for 1894-95, it was estimated on the 3rd of May, last year, that the expenditure might be set at the sum of \$38,300,000. In doing that I anticipated a decrease of \$184,134 from the 20th of April of last year, as compared with the same period of the preceding year. But, by the exercise of strict supervision, that sum was made larger, amounting in the end to \$352,108; so that the actual expenditure was brought down to \$38,132,000, being about \$170,000 below the estimate I made on the 3rd of May.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not want to interrupt the hon. gentleman unnecessarily; but as we have only had the Auditor General's Report in our hands for a day, perhaps the hon. gentleman could state from recollection whether the extra expenses of Parliament after the 1st of July are charged to last year or to this year?

Mr. FOSTER. Those after the 1st of July would be charged to the current year.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There would be a difficulty, then. The indemnities, I suppose, would not be paid until after

that time, so that, unless the hon. gentleman had drawn in advance, a good deal would be charged to this year instead of to last year.

Mr. FOSTER. I would not like to vouch that the indemnities were all left till the session was over.

The increase in expenditure for 1894-95 over the preceding year was, therefore, \$546,979. This increase may be explained by the following observations. The charges on debt, which, of course, are fixed charges, and the increased subsidies to provinces, which are also fixed, amounted to \$399,545, and there were extraordinary expenditures under militia, which properly should be called capital expenditures, but which were paid out of the consolidated fund. These three items together made up the whole increase in the expenditure of 1894-95 over that of 1893-94. The expenditure of last year, amounting to \$38,132,000, was one of the largest expenditures we have had. We find, however, that for the last eight years the expenditures out of consolidated revenue fund have been remarkably steady. In 1887-88 the expenditure was \$36,718,494. The average of the eight years from that time up to the end of last year was \$36,908,862, or less than \$200,000 greater than the expenditure of 1887-88. The facts that the charges on the debt have largely increased during that period, as the debt is much larger, that the subsidies to provinces have been increased by over \$300,000 under the decennial arrangement, and that the amount laid up in sinking fund has increased each year, show to the House that the expenditures of the country during these eight years have been kept pretty nearly upon a steady basis of about \$37,000,000 per year.

The expenditure in 1894-95 amounted to \$38,132,005, and the revenue came up to \$33,978,129, leaving a deficit of \$4,153,875. Of course, in looking at that deficit, we must remember that \$2,002,311 is accounted for by the amount which is laid up in the sinking fund—a provision, of course, against debt at the maturity of the loan. So that the real result of last year's operations, so far as the consolidated revenue expenditures are concerned, is that out of revenue we paid the ordinary expenses of the country and laid up \$2,002,311 in the sinking fund against the debt, and that the deficit, but for this payment would have been only \$2,151,564. The deficit then amounts to \$4,153,875, which is less by about \$350,000 than I anticipated on the 3rd of May last year. Adding to that the deficit in 1893-94, the two make up a total of \$5,364,207. These are the deficits for the two years succeeding surpluses in the other three years of the parliamentary term. Against those two combined deficits of \$5,364,207, we must recollect that last year the saving to the people in taxation, which was remitted, and which would otherwise have accrued upon sugar alone, amounted

to \$5,475,000, or a little more than the deficits of 1894-95 and 1893-94 added together. This means simply that if the Government had not relieved the people of that taxation on raw sugar, it would have gathered sufficient revenue to meet all the expenditures of the country and have left besides a slight surplus of one or two hundred thousand dollars in the Treasury.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Assuming the importations to have been the same.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes. There is a margin left for considerably less importation, but the price of sugar is so low at present, and has been for a number of years, that the amount of added taxation which would have been placed upon it would not have acted very largely as a bar upon the consumption of sugar in this country.

It is very well, however, to take into account, when we are speaking of deficits, the five years period when hon. gentlemen were in power, and compare that with the five years period which has just closed, in order to refresh the mind of the House and the country as to the relative position of affairs. From 1890 to 1895, which was the period of the hard times and business depression we have passed through under the present Administration, there have been deficits of \$5,364,207 and surpluses of \$3,746,276, leaving a net deficit of \$1,617,931. In the period from 1874 to 1879, there were deficits amounting to \$6,426,958 and surpluses amounting to \$935,644, leaving a net deficit of \$5,491,314. And it is necessary for me to draw attention of hon. gentlemen this year again to the fact that although the net deficit in that period, under hon. gentlemen opposite, was five and a half million dollars, they remitted no taxation but laid on extra taxation; while in the period during which the net deficit, under the present Administration, amounted to one and a half million dollars, we relieved the people, in sugar taxation alone, of upwards of \$19,000,000 of taxes.

Coming to capital expenditure, we find that 1894-95 compares with 1893-94 as follows:—

	1894-95.	1893-94.
Railways and Canals.....	\$2,829,088	\$3,612,913
Public Works.....	102,392	102,058
Dominion Lands.....	99,842	149,146
Total.....	\$3,031,322	\$3,864,117

Being a reduction in 1894-95 in expenditure on capital account of \$832,795 as compared with 1893-94.

Railway subsidies paid amounted to \$1,316,549 in 1894-95, as against \$1,229,335 in the preceding year, so that the total capital expenditure, including railroad subsidies, was \$4,341,871 in 1894-95 as compared with \$5,094,002 in 1893-94. There was, therefore, a decrease in capital expenditure, including railway subsidies, of \$752,131, and an increase in expenditure under the consolidated

Mr. FOSTER.

fund of \$546,979, as I have before mentioned, so that in the total expenditure of the country, there was a net decrease of \$205,152 compared with the preceding year.

Coming to the debt, we find that the net debt on the 30th June, 1894, was \$246,183,029. When we add together the capital expenditure in 1894-95 of \$4,341,871 and charges on the loan of \$399,199—being mainly the discount on the loan—and the deficit of \$4,153,875 and a small consolidated fund transfer—

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is that consolidated fund transfer?

Mr. FOSTER. It is a mere matter of account, \$94—the total amounts to \$8,895,042. Taking the sinking fund, \$2,002,311 and \$833 refund, and subtracting that from the total, we have \$6,891,897 as the net addition to the debt, making a net debt on the 30th June, 1895, of \$253,074,927. The statement tabulated is as follows:—

DEBT.

Additional, 1894-95.

Capital Expenditure.....	\$4,341,871	
Charges, Loan Management.....	399,199	
Deficit	4,153,875	
Cons. Fund Transfer.....	94	
Total.....	\$ 8,895,042	
Less—Sinking Fund.....	2,002,311	
Refund	833	
		\$ 2,003,144
		6,891,897
Net Debt, 30th June, 1894.....	246,183,029	
Net Debt, 30th June, 1895.....	\$253,074,927	

The increase then in debt for the period from 1890 to 1895, inclusive, is \$15,544,885, or an average of \$2,590,814 per year. We find that, during that period, we have spent on capital account the following sums:—On canals, \$11,319,379; on the Intercolonial Railway and connecting roads, \$4,918,781; on the Canadian Pacific Railway, \$754,145, a total of \$16,992,308, which more than offsets the addition to the debt. We have also paid in railway subsidies in these years \$7,543,945. So that, in calculating the addition to the debt, and appraising it at its true value, the country must simply ask itself whether or not the deepening and widening and finishing of the canals, the expansion and completion of the Intercolonial Railway and its connected railways, and the railway subsidies which have been instrumental in increasing the railroad and consequently the commercial facilities of the country, are a sufficient offset. If they are, the addition to the debt is fully justified; and, in my opinion, it is fully justified. But the real standard by which to judge the increase of the debt is the amount of interest which is required each year to carry it. The following remarks may be of interest in that connection. The net interest on the

debt in 1887-88 was \$8,891,288. The average from that time to 1895, a period of eight years, was \$8,784,452, which is \$106,000 less than the amount paid in 1887-88, the reason, of course, being the lower rate of interest. In 1894-95 the interest paid was \$9,330,247. The interest per capita of the people paid in 1887-88 was \$1.90; in 1894-95 it was \$1.83. So we see that the incidence of the interest charged upon the people was less heavy by 7 cents per head in 1894-95 than in 1887-88. Coming to the expenditure and revenue for 1895-96, the year is not sufficiently advanced, of course, to enable me to make estimates with certainty. No one can tell what may happen in the five months which are still to run, so far as commercial disturbances and the general course of trade are concerned. But, knowing what was expected and what has accrued up to the present time, and making an estimate as nearly as one can for the remaining period, I arrive at the following results:—The revenue, up to 20th January, 1895, was \$18,080,197. The expenditure for the same period was \$19,833,399. From the 20th January, 1895, to the 30th June, 1895, the revenue accrued amounted to \$15,897,931. The expenditure in the same period was \$18,298,605. For the present year, the revenue up to 20th January amounted to \$19,560,174, a betterment of about \$1,500,000. The comparative expenditure for the same period amounted to \$19,302,244, a decrease of about \$530,000. From the 20th January, 1896, to the 30th June, 1896, I estimate a revenue to accrue of \$17,439,826. In order that this may be realized it will be necessary that the course of trade shall show progressive increase and development compared with the preceding portion of the year for which the revenue has actually accrued. If that estimate proves correct, there will be for the current year a revenue, in the gross, of about \$37,000,000. Coming to the expenditure, I find that up to the 20th January, 1896, there has been an expenditure for the current year of \$19,302,244, as I have stated.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That differs from the statement the hon. gentleman was good enough to send me.

Mr. FOSTER. This is up to the 20th January.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The statement furnished me does not agree with the hon. gentleman's figures. There is a discrepancy for the same period of several hundreds of thousands of dollars.

Mr. FOSTER. I am confident that the figure I have stated is correct.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I hope then that the hon. gentleman will send me an amended statement.

Mr. FOSTER. There may be some error in the figures.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The statement furnished me by the hon. gentleman, for which I am obliged to him, shows, up to the 20th January, 1896, an expenditure of \$18,902,000. I can send the statement across to the hon. gentleman so that he may see.

Mr. FOSTER. I am satisfied that the statement I have is correct.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No doubt. I am merely calling the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that there is a discrepancy.

Mr. FOSTER. The estimated expenditure from the 20th January, 1896, to the end of the fiscal year is \$17,697,756. This, with the expenditure already accrued, will give a total expenditure in round numbers of \$37,000,000. So that, on these estimates, the revenue and expenditure for the current year will about balance. There may be a little difference one way or the other, and, of course, the estimate, covering so long a period, may not be quite correct. But I think, on the whole, I am safe in saying that there will be no very great discrepancy between the revenue and expenditure for the current year 1895-96. That is to say, we have passed through the period of commercial depression, we have turned the corner of which I spoke last year, concerning my estimate of which, I fear, from the remarks that were made at that time, I did not inspire confidence in the minds of my hon. friends opposite. But events since that time and the course of business for the year thus far, have proven my forecast to be, in the main, entirely correct. I think we can say, then, that we have passed through the period of commercial depression; that times are better; that trade is picking up; and that from this period and for succeeding years we may consider that the time of deficits is over for the present administration, and that the time of surpluses is approaching again. I never expected to convince my hon. friend, who shakes his head. Even time can scarcely do that.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then I understand the hon. gentleman to say that in this calculation which he has submitted, and to which, of course, I do not expect him to pledge himself, he counts on an increase for the next five months?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, I count on that, as I stated. In regard to capital expenditure for 1895-96 up to the present time, there has been an expenditure on railways and canals, public works, Dominion lands, and railway subsidies, \$2,391,866; and from the 20th January to 30th June, the estimate for these services is \$1,690,000. The expenditure on capital account up to the 20th January, is less by \$225,651 than was expended on that period last year. Adding together what has been already expended, and the estimate for

the succeeding months of the year, the capital expenditure will amount to about \$4,100,000. If that estimate is carried out, as I think it will be, we shall have, taking away the sinking fund of \$2,070,000, which will be about the same this year, an increase to the debt in the current year of about \$2,000,000, in round numbers. With reference to the expenditure and revenues for 1896-97, we are too far removed from that period to make any estimate which can be at all reliable, and I shall not attempt it. With reference to the expenditures, hon. gentlemen have had the Estimates for this year laid before them, and will find that the expenditures total, as estimated for, \$38,250,000 or thereabouts. The increases over the preceding year are, in some cases, quite large, and the larger ones I shall read to the House. Interest, sinking fund, premium and discounts, show an increase of \$250,983, the total sum estimated for these purposes being in the neighbourhood of \$13,000,000 in round numbers.

The Public Works estimate of last year was reduced to about \$1,500,000. There is an increase of \$247,270 in that. Indians show an increase of \$80,263. The vote for Indians was also reduced last year, and the \$80,000 of increase is chiefly, as I understand, for the establishment and maintenance of schools. The North-west Mounted Police show an increase of \$30,000 in the vote. That \$30,000 is to meet the expenses incurred by the establishment of a post on the Yukon river, from which, however, a considerable revenue is expected, which will go, I hope, far to meet the added cost of placing there a detachment of the Mounted Police, and of bringing the reign of law and order into force there, as it has so effectually been done in the other parts of the North-west Territories.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Will the hon. gentleman pardon me for one instant? I did not observe that he made any statement as to whether he expected to bring down any supplemental Estimates for the service of the present year.

Mr. FOSTER. There will be a supplemental estimate, though not a large one.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. You know we ought to have that, if you can possibly give it.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, and we should have had more Supply the other night, but we did not get it. In Customs, the increase for the next year is \$25,095; but when it is taken into account that last year the cut in the Estimates for Customs was about \$50,000, the increase this year will not seem large. In the Post Office, we have an increased estimate of \$240,780, which is a large increase. The demands for the opening up of new lines, and for greater frequency and greater thoroughness in the delivery and despatch of mails, are continu-

Mr. FOSTER.

ally pressing upon the Post Office Department, and a large expenditure has necessarily to be made if we are to keep at all even with the requirements of the times, which we are bound to do. There is now a deficit of somewhere near \$800,000 between the total receipts and the total expenditures of our post office service: and this, I fear, makes the time somewhat distant when, what otherwise might be fairly asked for, can be granted, that is, a reduction upon the rates of postage in this country. Considering the large extent of country, the sparseness of the population, and the great expense necessarily imposed for carrying letters and papers in our North-west and in other parts of the country, there is no doubt that the carriage of letters, newspapers and parcels in this country, is cheaper, for the population, than you would probably find it in any other country in the world.

In the Militia Estimates there has been an increase of \$247,270 over last year's vote. For a number of years, only a portion of the active militia have been called out for drill each year, and this consequently left the whole force to be drilled only once in two years. It may have been that there was the same necessity in preceding years for drilling the whole force, as in this year; but recent events have brought the lesson a little closer and nearer home to us, and the Government has come to the decision that, for the present, and we hope for each year after this, the rural militia will all be called out for drill during each year. It is largely for this purpose that the increase of \$247,270 has been made in the Estimates, although the appropriation also stands for better equipment and accoutrements, and clothing and the like of that, for the militia force. No part of this sum, however, is to be devoted to the arming of the militia with new rifles, or for whatever else may be considered necessary to be done in the way of equipment, and strengthening the defences of the country. For that purpose, a special credit will be asked for later, but the sum is too large to allow its being taken out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund.

Now, we may be met by objectors of two or three classes to an increase of this vote for this purpose, at the present time. There is one class of people who believe, or affect to believe, that any more than an ordinary expenditure upon the militia force of Canada at the present time, might be interpreted to the disadvantage of Canada as regards its relations with the United States, as implying a hostile demonstration thereto. There is another class of people, and I believe a very small class, in this country, who do not think it worth while that the militia of this country should be put in that forward state of efficiency, as they may believe that it would not be the worst of calamities if, after all, this country were quietly and peaceably to merge itself with the country to the south of us. The Government, how-

ever, does not believe with either of these small classes of objectors in our country ; it does believe that at the present time, and under the present circumstances, increased efficiency is both necessary and prudent. We take this step, not with any feeling of hostility to any country under the sun, not with any wish for war or bloodshed, but with the highest and strongest hopes for the continuation of those blessings of peace in the future, which have been so long the lot of this country in its relations with the United States of America, and with other countries. But I think we cannot forget that here we have an heritage, the accumulated wealth of which is very large at present, and the accumulations of wealth of which in the future are almost illimitable : that we have a country and institutions which are worth the sternest and strongest defence that can be given to them, and that Government and Parliament would not be doing its duty to the great trust it has reposed in it if it refused or neglected to place into the hands of its citizenship means of defence and adequate means of resistance to any armed invasion were it unfortunately to come upon us. More than that, Mr. Speaker, by birth, by adoption, by the enjoyment of ample freedom, by the long possession of good government, the people of this country, whether French-speaking or English-speaking, all the people, I think, of this country have their convictions continually forming and strengthening in the line of what I may call the great centripetal forces which in this country, in Australasia, in all the dependencies and colonies of Great Britain are tending to marshal the outlying dependencies of the Empire around the common centre of power and life. And if Canada is to become, as it must become, one member, and a very important member, of that great unity, it is well that in addition to the other sacrifices we have made, the other moneys we have spent to make Canada a strong part of the Empire, who should also make proper provision for the equipment of our militia for the defence of our country, a provision which, while it is not open to the charge of extravagance, will certainly go so far as is reasonable to meet the demands of adequacy.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Are you prepared to state how much ?

Mr. FOSTER. Not at present.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think the hon. gentleman should state to the House, on the occasion of his Budget speech, how much is required.

Mr. FOSTER. That will be stated before long.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Before the Budget debate closes, I hope. We ought to know it.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman certainly will know it, and the Government will take the House into its confidence in due time.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The House should know it when the hon. gentleman is stating the expenditures of the country and the amount of the debt.

Mr. FOSTER. That does not at all follow. It has been the habit ever since this was a Parliament to bring down Supplementary Estimates, and the same will take place this year.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. And a very bad habit, too.

Mr. FOSTER. Passing away from this subject, I think I am justified, after the short review I have made of the finances of the past year, in saying that the trying period of 1890 and 1895 has passed. The returns for the last six months of the current year show an increase in imports of \$2,500,000, of exports \$500,000, making a betterment of \$3,000,000 in the half-year. The increase of revenue, as I have stated, amounts to \$1,500,000, and the savings of the people in 1895 as compared with 1894, show an increase of \$10,500,000. I do not think I can enforce my view as to the fact of the improvement of trade in the country and the fact that we are passing out of the period of depression more effectively than by reading an extract which I cut from the report of the president of the Board of Trade of Toronto, one of the chief commercial metropolises of Canada. Its president, in his annual address to that board, made use of the following words :—

The year 1895 has been for the most part a year of quiet recovery from the depression of 1893-94. The restoration of trade has not been quick, but has gradually been getting better. Raw materials, which had fallen during 1894 to the lowest point known for many years, have risen considerably. Manufacturers in most branches of trade are fairly well occupied with orders, and the public returns indicate that the country is slowly, yet surely, getting over the long depression that for the last few years has overshadowed every commercial interest. What is particularly wanted now is confidence in the future of our country, and belief in its natural great resources, and determination to develop every legitimate industry to the fullest possible extent.

How has the country passed through this period from 1890-91 to 1894-95 ? It has been a period of world-wide commercial depression, a depression which has affected this country as it has other countries, but to my mind, in far less degree, and for certain very good reasons. We have come through this period with a trade \$9,500,000 greater in exports and home consumption imports than that with which we entered it, with exports \$17,000,000 larger than in 1890. We have come through with an increased debt of \$16,000,000, a deficit of

\$1,600,000 net, while at the same time, as I have stated already, we have given a customs reduction on raw sugar alone amounting to over \$19,000,000. Our savings in that period have increased from \$221,000,000 to \$267,000,000, an increase of \$46,000,000, or 21 per cent, a notable and encouraging increase. We have come through that period as few other countries in the world have come, with increased railway traffic. The operated mileage has increased by 2,700 miles, the passengers carried by 1,100,000; freight carried shows an increase of 750,000 tons, whilst gross earnings—a notable fact—in 1894-95 were equal to what they were in 1890-91. We have come through with increased shipping returns. The tonnage of vessels coming in and out of our ports, not including coasting vessels, has increased in that period by 640,000 tons, and the coasting vessels by 2,700,000 tons. We have come through with our industries well maintained, with employment very general, and with an almost total lack of what you might call want and poverty in this country from one ocean to the other.

Have not our industries been well maintained? Let us take one of the most patent proofs that they have been, namely, the importation of raw materials, which form the basis for the work of our industries:

IMPORTS.—RAW MATERIALS.

Article.	1890.	1895.
Wool Lbs.	8,905,261	7,750,050
Cotton	36,635,187	56,924,286
Hides \$	1,712,012	1,950,530
Gutta percha & rubber "	536,386	739,916
Hemp Lbs.	774,587	622,396
Lumber, &c..... \$	897,903	1,485,714
Raw sugar..... Lbs.	162,469,350	345,518,582

The lumber mentioned above is of foreign product, and is used in the making of furniture and cabinet work of all kinds.

Therefore, so far as the argument from the imports of raw material goes, my contention is justified that the industries of this country have been well maintained. Sir, I may go further and state that not only have these industries been well maintained, as is shown by the imports of raw material for the use in manufacturing, but there is another test, namely, the export of manufactured articles. The time has gone by when people can point the finger of scorn at the exports of the manufactures of Canada. Small they are, even yet, compared with some of our exports, but they are every year increasing, and to-day they form no inconsiderable amount of the general exports of the country. The export is as follows:—

	1890.	1895.
Export of manufactured articles.....	\$5,741,184	\$7,768,875

Mr. FOSTER.

This shows an increase of 35 per cent. That is the second argument which goes to show that our industries have been well maintained in this period. We can go a little further, Sir, and we can point to the old industries which have been well kept up, and that is within the experience and observation of every man who sits around these boards. We can also point to the establishment of new industries; one lately in the city of Hamilton, at the foot of Lake Ontario, an industry for the smelting and manufacture of iron and of steel, and which to-day, after it has expended \$400,000 on buildings and plant, has a capacity for making 200 tons of iron per day, and is now about to turn out one-half this quantity, and to turn it all out from Canadian ore, mined in this country, and handled in this country, by Canadian labour.

In British Columbia there has been a decided advance in mining work of all kinds, and a large and remunerative industry is already established there, the prospects for the enlargement of which are most excellent. And the time is not far distant when British Columbia, from the mountains on this side, to the Pacific Ocean, will be a busy hive of industry so far as the working of minerals and metals is concerned.

The pig iron which has been made in this country in the period from 1891 to 1895 is 193,000 tons, as against 137,000 tons manufactured in the preceding five years, which is a large and notable increase.

Passing from these to the agricultural interests of the country, it is not affirming too much, Sir, to say that from 1891 to 1895, these have shown a gradual, a continued, and a healthy advance. The home market has been constantly increasing. The increase in population itself from 1890 to 1895 has added to that home market. The increase of urban population which gathers in cities, and towns, and villages, and largely gathers there from the establishment in these places of industrial establishments of different kinds, has largely increased. And, Sir, every thousand of the urban population is so much of the healthiest and best increase to the markets of the farmers of this country, for it affords a market near to them for products which would not carry to foreign markets, many of which are perishable in their nature, and for which a home market is absolutely essential.

But, Sir, if the home market for agricultural products has increased in that time, so also has the foreign market, as shown by the exports of the country. Agricultural and animal products, taken together, were exported to the amount of, in 1890, \$37,000,000, and in 1895, to the amount of \$50,000,000, an increase in this period of \$13,000,000, or of 35 per cent. Let me exemplify by the exports in certain articles, the increase in the agricultural exports of this country, comparing the year 1890 with the year 1895. The statement is as follows:—

EXPORTS.—AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS.

	1890.	1895.
Cheese	\$ 9,372,212	\$14,253,002
Bacon	607,495	3,546,107
Hams	23,584	260,502
Apples (green and dry).....	997,922	2,071,788
Wheat and flour.....	910,244	6,298,221
Horses	1,936,073	1,312,676
Sheep	1,274,347	1,624,587
Cattle	6,949,417	7,120,823
Total.....	\$22,071,294	\$36,487,801

Taking these items, they total in this way : \$22,071,294 exported in 1890 ; \$36,437,801 worth exported in 1895, an increase of 65 per cent.

There is a decrease in the value of horses exported in the latter period, but, considering the wonderful drop in the price of horses, and especially in that grade of horses which were so largely used on the street railways of large cities, before the substitution of electricity for horse-power ; it is a decrease which is not at all remarkable, and the decrease in the exports of that class of horses, has been met largely by an increase in the export of more profitable and valuable horses to the British market ; and the British market opens a chance for the extension of that trade in a good grade of horses, which is being taken advantage

of, and which promises rich returns to the country.

But, Sir, not only has the farmers' market been increased by the home market from the accretion of population, and the foreign market by the extension of exports, but there is another point as well which must be taken into account. That is, the saving of market in this country for the farmer of this country, which was formerly exploited by the farmer of the United States. And the National Policy, by the reasonable protection given to agricultural and animal products, is to be credited for that gain of market to the farmer of this country. Let me give you some figures which will bear that out. In the year 1889-90, taking bacon hams, and shoulders, beef, mutton, pork and lard, there were imported for home consumption, 33,112,701 pounds. The duties were increased after that, and importations have steadily decreased, until in 1894-95, it reached the small amount of 6,335,842 pounds, or less than one-fifth of the preceding figures. In 1889-90 the value of these importations was \$1,734,225. In 1894-95 that value had sunk to \$401,638. In flour of wheat we imported, in 1889-90, 185,458 barrels. This has diminished, until 1894-95 sees an import of only 47,883 barrels. The following table shows the importations for each year :

IMPORTS OF MEAT ENTERED FOR HOME CONSUMPTION.

	1889-90.	1890-91.	1891-92.	1892-93.	1893-94.	1894-95.
Bacon, hams and shoulder.....Lbs.	4,353,653	2,570,412	1,016,367	670,155	457,658	826,822
Salt beef (in barrels)	6,445,105	2,715,101	2,251,298	2,316,588	1,945,516	2,011,866
Mutton	246,363	6,388	11,680	2,132	87,277	57,845
Pork	17,185,794	11,116,948	9,514,266	3,862,546	4,611,874	3,203,023
Lard	4,881,786	991,655	693,269	147,630	160,881	236,226
Total lbs.....	33,112,701	17,400,504	13,486,880	6,999,051	7,263,206	6,335,842
Value	\$1,734,225	\$973,312	\$726,394	\$452,812	\$499,952	\$401,638
Flour (wheat).....Bbls.	185,458	65,884	36,559	34,507	32,506	47,883

I think, therefore, that I have fairly made my statement good that the agricultural interests of this country have been continuously advancing in that period. Nor must we lose sight of this fact, that in those five years a very large extent of new territory has been opened up in the North-west for the production of grain and cattle and the products of cattle, which in 1894-95 reached a very large and very valuable total. It is calculated that in the province of Manitoba and in the North-west Territories the grain alone, reaped from fields which but a few years ago were almost unknown, amounted to close on 80 or 85 millions of bushels ; and this increase in that short time is but the earnest of a greater increase in the future. Once the basis of population and of production has

been settled in that county, its accretions in the future will be larger and more rapid, and the increase of production will in ratio be greater. Better methods have also been followed in agricultural pursuits, and the establishment and introduction of these better methods is largely due to the increased governmental expenditure for the encouragement of agriculture in the North-west as well as in the other provinces of the Dominion. Experimental farms have been placed in different parts of the country ; and the information which has thus been disseminated by example and by the distribution of the results on those farms to the farming population in the different provinces has induced better methods of feeding, and has turned the attention of the farmers to more remunera-

tive classes of products than those to which they had formerly devoted their attention.

In mining the same advance appears. In Nova Scotia, in New Brunswick, in Quebec, in Ontario, in the North-west and Manitoba, and in British Columbia there has been an advance in mining operations, as regards both the precious metals and the useful metals, which has been noted and steady. One proof of this exists, aside from our observation and experience—that is, in the exports of the products of the mines. I find that in 1890 these amounted to \$4,853,717 worth, and in 1895 to \$6,983,227 worth, an increase of 43 per cent in that period of five years.

The business failures in the country have been reduced from \$18,000,000 to \$15,800,000 in the same period, the average amount of the failures per year during the period being \$15,700,000 against \$22,200,000 in the period from 1874 to 1878.

The banks and financial institutions of our country have been sound and steady and strong—so much so as to be matter of remark in other countries, which have pointed to the banking institutions and the currency system of Canada, and have noted the strength which their soundness has imparted to commercial life and business in this country during the period of depression which is now happily passing away.

It may be said also that the credit of Canada in the London market has remained unimpaired, and is to-day stronger than it was in 1890. Canada enjoys greater hope at home and greater prestige abroad.

Now, Sir, I desire for a few moments to speak with reference to an idea which is sedulously instilled into the minds of the people of the country, that the Liberal-Conservative party and policy have been responsible for an immense increase of taxation upon the people of this country. It is true that in 1879, when the National Policy was introduced at the command of the people, that command having been given by an immense majority at the polls, and when protection was adopted as the basis upon which the tariff was to be framed, the list of dutiable articles was enlarged, and the rate which was charged upon them was heightened. That was necessary. In proportion, however, as manufactories became established, and in proportion as the revenues of the country became buoyant, in the good times that followed, two things were done. Attention was had to the people of the country as the payers of the revenues of the country, and attention was also had to the reasonableness of the protection that ought to be given from year to year, as circumstances required, and I have this assertion to make : that notwithstanding what may be said as to the increase in the rate of taxation upon goods in 1879, notwithstanding all that may be said as to the high taxation which has prevailed from that time to this, any student of our tariff system, going to the records

Mr. FOSTER.

and studying them with a desire to get at the truth, will come to this conclusion, and cannot escape it ; that the Liberal-Conservative Government from 1880 to the present time has been sedulously careful of the interests of the people as far as taxation is concerned, and has upon the whole remitted an amount of taxation which cannot be credited to any Administration in similar times—certainly not in this country—and I doubt if it can be, in proportion to its population, in any other country in the world.

Now, Sir, I propose to make that good by facts and figures, so that the people, if they are told that they pay a certain tax on a certain line of goods, may know on what goods they have been relieved of taxation, and to what extent they have been relieved of taxation. In 1882, this Government found that tea and coffee were taxed, and taxed largely, and this was a taxation which no man could avoid who drank tea or coffee. It was a taxation upon articles which were not raised in this country, and consequently every cent of that taxation was paid directly by the people who consumed these articles. The same was true with reference to an article which goes into the manufacture of common articles used by the people everywhere—the article of tin. There was a duty upon that as well. In 1882 the Liberal-Conservative Government struck off entirely the duties upon tea, coffee and tin : and from that period until the present time there has thus been saved to the people on these articles alone the following amounts :

On tea	\$11,034,039
On coffee.....	832,528
On tin.....	1,465,103
Total.....	\$13,331,670

Every dollar of this amount has gone directly into the pockets of the great mass of the consumers in this country. In 1883 this Government struck off the duty upon bill stamps and the duty upon newspapers—upon bill stamps a tax that went into commercial transactions from the highest to the lowest, and upon newspapers a tax which was styled a tax on information for the people. Well, from 1883 up to date there have been saved to the people on bill stamps alone the sum of \$3,267,388, on newspapers the sum of \$613,864, or a total of \$3,881,252 on these two items.

In 1887 an agitation was raised, which became successful, for taking the duty off anthracite coal, which was supposed, and which did bear heavily upon the western provinces. The duty of 50 cents per ton was taken off, and from that time up to 1895, inclusive, the amount of \$6,044,355 was remitted to the consumers of anthracite coal. In 1890, besides other reductions in the tariff, there was a reduction of 10 per cent on common window glass, and 15 per cent on molasses, and on these two articles alone, articles of common consumption,

there has been saved \$521,755 to the people of this country.

In 1891 the duty on raw sugar was removed, and the duty on refined sugar was reduced, and from 1891 to 1895, inclusive, there was saved to the people, in the remission of taxation on raw and refined sugar, the sum of \$19,851,995. And that saving was upon an article which goes into common and general consumption.

In 1894 a general reduction of the tariff was made all along the line.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. I thought I should evoke one of these pleasant exclamations from my hon. friend, and I had hoped to provoke another from the leader of the Opposition. But perhaps he will favour me with it yet. For both these hon. gentlemen, not on one, but on many occasions, have taken upon themselves to inform the country that in 1894 the Minister of Finance came down with good intentions, proposed to reduce, considerably, the duties levied upon articles which entered into the consumption of the

country, but that when he came before the House, the manufacturers scared him off, he ran his pencil through the reductions, and next to nothing was done at all.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Less than nothing.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman says less than nothing. His statement is just as extreme as usual. In that general reduction in 1894, it is estimated that \$1,500,000 taxation was taken off the people. Now, if you add these amounts together, you will find that we have taken from the people an amount of taxation of \$45,131,027.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. FOSTER. The sincerity of hon. gentlemen opposite, who profess very great desire to take away the burdens of the people, is evinced to-day by the laugh and the sneer with which they greet the statement that we have taken \$45,000,000 in taxation from the people of this country, from 1882 to the present.

The following table will show at a glance the savings made, as I have stated :—

SAVING in Taxation caused by transferring Tea, Coffee, Anthracite Coal, Tin, Raw Sugar, Bill Stamps, from the Dutiable to the Free List, the carrying of Newspapers free from office of publication and by reducing the Duty on Tea and Coffee not imported direct, and on Molasses, Refined Sugar and Window Glass.

Year.	Tea.	Coffee.	Coal.	Tin.	Sugar.	Bill Stamps.	News-papers.	Mo-lasses.	Window Glass.
	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
1882	445,879	36,334	57,225	139,448
1883	818,703	50,875	102,732	224,645	44,088
1884	732,164	44,776	82,353	227,225	44,594
1885	836,475	82,785	90,269	229,805	45,100
1886	1,021,151	76,778	96,461	232,385	45,606
1887	815,434	36,220	75,191	101,840	234,965	46,112
1888	751,558	54,877	1,068,652	104,539	237,546	46,618
1889	735,775	61,206	643,052	112,495	240,126	47,124
1890	770,260	61,473	600,667	117,503	242,706	47,630	21,198	13,239
1891	751,969	64,559	699,533	113,011	227,474	245,286	48,136	75,461	34,789
1892	953,511	64,241	739,553	152,353	5,200,000	248,629	48,795	59,924	39,245
1893	759,323	69,402	750,275	121,018	4,000,000	251,798	49,416	59,876	38,142
1894	815,226	62,452	765,261	123,690	4,821,000	254,840	50,014	64,560	34,869
1895	826,611	66,550	702,171	89,614	5,303,000	257,984	50,631	54,756	25,636
					*300,521				
	11,034,039	832,528	6,044,355	1,465,103	19,851,995	3,267,388	613,864	335,775	185,980

Grand Total.....\$43,631,027

* Refined sugar.

The customs revenue accrued in 1895 amounted to \$17,887,267, which, per head of population, was \$3.52. In 1875, hon. gentlemen opposite charged the people of this country, by their customs taxation, \$3.95 per head. The average, as I said before, from 1874 to 1878, under hon. gentlemen opposite, was \$3.44 per head, and as I have said to-day, the amount of customs taxation per head in 1894-95 was brought down to \$3.52. Well, all this time the free goods of the country have been continually increased. Articles

have been taken from the dutiable list and placed upon the free list until this comparison is afforded, that whereas in 1874, \$47,000,000 worth of free goods were entered, and whereas, in 1879, under the administration of hon. gentlemen opposite, the free list had fallen to \$23,000,000, a decrease of \$24,000,000, we find that from 1880 to 1895 there was an increase of \$26,500,000 in the free list. Sir, the fact is made perfectly clear by this one assertion, that in 1874, 38 per cent of the imports for home consump-

tion were free, that in 1879 this had fallen to 30 per cent, whereas, in 1895, 42 per cent of the imports for home consumption were free.

Now I come to ask, and I am nearly at the conclusion of my speech, whether I was right or not—

An hon. MEMBER. No.

Mr. FOSTER. An hon. gentleman to your left says "no" before I had finished the question. That is the way hon. gentlemen opposite judge with reference to the affairs of the country. They wish no argument, they listen to none. They have their preconceived opinions—and poor opinions the electors of Canada have told them they were, at four or five different elections. They need no argument, they require no in-

formation. But I want to ask the hon. leader of the Opposition, and my hon. friend opposite me (Sir Richard Cartwright)—the latter of whom said that in 1894 the reductions in the tariff were less than nothing, while the former declared that they were next to nothing—I want to ask them whether or not it is possible for them to revise their opinion. At least I now propose to put before the House statements which will place the matter clearly in the eyes of the country, so that the people may judge whether hon. gentlemen opposite or I have made the correct statement. I propose to submit a list of the articles on which reductions have been made, showing the extent of the reduction on each article, and this list extends over the whole range of imported goods. It is as follows:—

STATEMENT showing sundry articles on which reductions of duty were made by tariff changes of 1894 and since.

Article.	Old Rate of Duty.	New Rate of Duty.	Reduction.
Animals, living, viz. :—			
Horned cattle.....	30 per cent.	20 per cent.	10 per cent.
Sheep.....	30 do	20 do	10 do
Hogs.....	2c. per lb.	1½c. per lb.	½c. per lb.
Baking powder in packages of less than one lb.....	8c. do	6c. do	2c. do
Bells, except for churches.....	30 per cent.	25 per cent.	5 per cent.
Brass and manufactures of :—			
Nails, rivets and burrs.....	35 do	30 do	5 do
Wire.....	15 do	10 do	5 do
Biscuits of all kinds, sweetened.....	35 do	25 do	10 do
Macaroni and vermicelli.....	2c. per lb.	25 do	23 do ad val.
Barley.....	15c. per bush.	30 do	15 do do
British gum, dextine, sizing cream and enamel sizing.....	1c. per lb.	10 do	20 do do
Brooms.....	25 per cent.	20 do	5 do
Buttons of vegetable, ivory or horn.....	10c. per gross and 20 per cent.	8c. per gross and 20 per cent.	2c. per gross.
do hoof, rubber, vulcanite or composition.....	5c. per gross and 20 per cent.	4c. per gross and 20 per cent.	1c. do
do all other, N. E. S.....	25 per cent.	20 per cent.	5 per cent.
Candles, paraffine wax.....	5c. per lb.	4c. per lb.	1c. per lb.
Cane or rattan, split or otherwise manufactured.....	25 per cent.	17½ per cent.	7½ per cent.
Carriages, &c. :—			
Farm wagons and farm carts costing less than \$50.....	\$10 ea. & 20 p.c.	25 do	30 do ad val.
do do \$50 and less than \$100.....	\$15 do	25 do	18 do do
do do \$100 and over.....	35 per cent.	25 do	10 do
Cases for jewels, watches, silverware, platedware, cutlery and other like articles.....	10c. ea. & 30 p.c.	5c. ea. & 30 p.c.	5c. each.
Clocks.....	35 per cent.	25 per cent.	10 per cent.
Clothes wringers.....	\$1 ea. & 30 p.c.	25c. ea. & 20 p.c.	75c. ea. & 10 p.c.
Coal tar and coal pitch.....	10 per cent.	Free.	10 per cent.
Cocoa mats and matting.....	30 do	25 per cent.	5 do
Cocoa nut, dessicated, sweetened or not.....	8c. per lb.	5c. per lb.	3c. per lb.
Coffee :—			
Extracts of or substitutes therefor.....	5c. do	3c. do	2c. do
Roasted or ground, not imported direct.....	3c. p. lb. & 10 p.c.	2c. p. lb. & 10 p.c.	1c. do
do and substitute, N. E. S.....	3c. per lb.	2c. per lb.	1c. do
Collars of cotton or linen, xyolite, xylonite, celluloid.....	24c. per doz. and 30 per cent.	24c. per doz. and 25 per cent.	5 per cent.
Copper and manufactures of :—			
Nails, rivets and burrs.....	35 per cent.	30 per cent.	5 do
Copper, old and scrap.....	10 do	Free.	10 do
do in pigs.....	10 do	do	10 do
do seamless drawn tubing.....	10 do	do	10 do
do ingots, sheets, plates and sheathing, not planished or coated.....	10 do	do	10 do

Mr. FOSTER.

STATEMENT showing sundry articles on which reductions of duty were made by tariff changes of 1894 and since.

Article.	Old Rate of Duty.	New Rate of Duty.	Reduction.
Copper, in bars, rods and bolts, in length not less than 6 feet.....	10 per cent.	Free.	10 per cent.
Cordage, cotton.....	30 do	25 per cent.	5 do
Cotton, manufactures of:—			
Clothing, including corsets.....	35 do	32½ do	2½ do
Cuffs of cotton, linen, xylonite, xyolite and celluloid....	4c. p. pr. & 30 p.c.	4c. p. pr. & 25 p.c.	5 do
Dressing, harness, leather and shoe.....	30 per cent.	25 per cent.	5 do
Drugs, dyes, chemicals and medicines:—			
Acid, phosphate.....	3c. per lb.	2c. per lb.	1c. per lb.
Glue, sheet, broken sheet or ground.....	3c. do	25 per cent.	15 p. c. ad. val.
do liquid.....	30 per cent.	25 do	5 do
Liquorice, paste.....	2c. per lb.	20 do	5 p.c. do
do in rolls and sticks.....	3c. do	20 do	9 do
Yeast, compressed in bulk or mass of not less than 50 lbs.	4c. do	3c. per lb.	1c. per lb.
Earthenware and china:—			
Brown or coloured, and Rockingham ware.....	35 per cent.	30 per cent.	5 per cent.
Decorated, printed or sponged, and all earthenware, N.E.S.....	35 do	30 do	5 do
White granite or ironstone ware, C.C. or cream coloured ware.....	35 do	30 do	5 do
Manufactures of earthenware, N.E.S.....	35 do	30 do	5 do
Feathers, ostrich and vulture, dressed.....	35 do	30 do	5 do
Fertilizers.....	20 do	10 do	10 do
Fruits, green:—			
Blackberries, gooseberries, raspberries and strawberries, N.E.S.....	3c. per lb.	2c. per lb.	1c. per lb.
Plums.....	30 per cent.	25 per cent.	5 per cent.
Furniture, house, cabinet or office.....	35 do	30 do	5 do
Glass, &c.:—			
Flasks and phials of 8 oz. capacity and over, telegraph and lightning rod insulators, jars and glass balls and cut, pressed and moulded table ware....	5c. per doz. and 30 per cent.	30 do	5c per doz.
Silvered glass, bevelled.....	35 per cent.	32½ do	2½ per cent.
Gunpowder and other explosives:—			
Gun, rifle and sporting powder.....	5c. per lb.	3c. per lb.	2c. per lb.
Gun, rifle and pistol cartridges and cartridge cases.....	35 per cent.	30 per cent.	5 per cent.
Gun wads and percussion wads.....	35 do	30 do	5 do
Gutta percha and india-rubber and manufactures of:—			
Belting.....	5c. per lb. and 15 per cent.	32½ do	4 do ad. val.
Ink, writing.....	25 do	20 do	5 do
Iron and manufactures of:—			
Agricultural implements—			
Binding attachments.....	35 do	20 do	15 do
Drills, seed grain.....	35 do	20 do	15 do
Harrow.....	35 do	20 do	15 do
Harvesters, self-binding and without binders.....	35 do	20 do	15 do
Mowing machines.....	35 do	20 do	15 do
Ploughs, sulky and walking.....	35 do	20 do	15 do
Reapers.....	35 do	20 do	15 do
Iron, bar and round rods, galvanized.....	30 do	27½ do	2½ do
Bar iron, rolled or hammered, comprising rounds, squares, &c., &c.....	\$13 per ton.	\$10 per ton.	\$3 per ton.
Cast iron pipes of every description.....	\$12 do but not less than 35 per cent.	\$10 do but not less than 35 per cent.	\$2 per ton when not less than 35 per cent.
Engines, other than locomotive and fire, and boilers	30 per cent.	27½ do	2½ per cent.
Hardware, viz.:—Builders', cabinetmakers', harness-makers' and saddlers' hardware, including curry combs and carriage hardware.....	35 do	32½ do	2½ do
Iron or steel sheets or other iron, or steel of all widths, sheet iron, common or black, smoothed, polished, coated or galvanized and Canada plates, No. 17 gauge and thinner, and hoop, band or strip, iron or steel, N.E.S.....	12½ do	5 do	7½ do

STATEMENT showing sundry articles on which reductions of duty were made by tariff changes of 1894 and since.

Article.	Old Rate of Duty.	New Rate of Duty.	Reduction.
Iron and manufactures of—Continued.			
Iron in slabs, blooms, billets, loops, puddle bars, or other forms less finished than iron in bars, and more advanced than pig iron, except castings..	\$9 per ton.	\$5 per ton.	\$4 per ton.
Locks of all kinds.	35 per cent.	32½ per cent.	2½ per cent.
Portable machines :—			
Portable steam-engines, and parts of.	35 do	30 do	5 do
Threshers and separators, and parts of.	35 do	30 do	5 do
Sewing-machines, or parts of.	\$3 each and 20 per cent.	30 do	1½ do
Machines, type-writing.	30 do	27½ do	2½ do
All other machinery, except portable machines, composed wholly or in part of iron and steel.	30 do	27½ do	2½ do
Malleable iron castings and steel castings.	\$25 per ton and not less than 30 per cent.	25 do	14¢ do ad. val.
Nails and spikes and sheathing nails, composition..	20 per cent.	15 do	5 do
Nails and spikes, wrought and pressed, galvanized or not, horse-shoe nails, and all wrought iron or steel and other nails, N.E.S., and horse, mule, and ox-shoes.	1½c. per lb.	30 do	11 do ad. val.
Nails and spikes, cut.	1c. do	¾c. per lb.	¼c. per lb.
Nails, wire.	1½c. do	1 do	½c. do
Plough-plates, mould-boards, land-sides, when cut to shape from rolled plates of steel, but not moulded, punched, polished, or otherwise manufactured, and being of greater value than four cents per pound.	12½ per cent.	5 per cent.	7½ per cent.
Other plates for agricultural implements.	35 do	5 do	30 do
Pumps, other than steam.	35 do	30 do	5 do
Railway fish-plates and tie-plates.	\$12 per ton.	\$10 per ton.	\$2 per ton.
Safes and doors for safes and vaults.	35 per cent.	30 per cent.	5 per cent.
Screws, iron or steel, commonly called wood screws :—			
2 inches or over in length.	6c. per lb.	3c. per lb.	3c. per lb.
1 inch and less than 2 inches.	8c. do	6c. do	2c. do
Less than 1 inch.	11c. do	8c. do	3c. do
Scales, balances, and weighing beams.	35 per cent.	30 per cent.	5 per cent.
Skates of all kinds.	20c. per pair and 30 per cent.	10c. per pair and 30 per cent.	10c. per pair.
Stoves.	30 per cent.	27½ do	2½ per cent.
Swedish rolled iron nail rods, under ½ inch in diameter, for manufacture of horse-shoe nails..	20 per cent.	15 do	5 do
Boiler tubes of wrought iron or steel.	15 do	7½ do	7½ do
Other wrought iron tubes or pipes, not classified.	1½c. per lb. and 30 per cent.	1½c. per lb. and 30 per cent.	1½c. per lb.
Wire fencing, barbed, of iron or steel.	1½c. per lb.	¾c. per lb.	¾c. do
Wire, covered with cotton, linen or other material.	35 per cent.	30 per cent.	5 per cent.
Surgical and dental instruments.	20 do	15 do	5 do
Steel ingots, cogged ingots, blooms and slabs.	30 do but not less than \$8 per ton.	\$5 per ton.	\$3 per ton and in some cases more.
Saws.	35 per cent.	32½ per cent.	2½ per cent.
Manufactures of iron or steel, not classified.	30 do	27½ do	2½ do
Jellies, jams and preserves, N.E.S.	5c. per lb.	3½c. per lb.	1½c. per lb.
Lead pipe and lead shot.	1½c. do	1½c. per lb. and 25 per cent.	5 per cent ad. val.
Leather :—			
Leather, sole.	½c. p. lb. & 15 p.c.	15 per cent.	½c. per lb.
Leather, belting leather, dressed, waxed or glazed..	20 per cent.	15 do	5 per cent.
Calf, kid, lamb and sheep skins, dressed, waxed or glazed.	20 do	17½ do	2½ do
Upper leather, dressed, waxed or glazed.	20 do	17½ do	2½ do
Japanned, patent or enamelled leather.	25 do	22½ do	2½ do
All other leather and skins tanned not classified.	20 do	15 do	5 do

Mr. FOSTER.

STATEMENT showing sundry articles on which reductions of duty were made by tariff changes of 1894 and since.

Article.	Old Rate of Duty.	New Rate of Duty.	Reduction.
Manufactures of leather:—			
Harness and saddlery	35 per cent.	30 per cent.	5 per cent.
Leather belting	25 do	20 do	5 do
Manilla hoods	20 do	Free.	20 do
Gas, coal oil and electric-light fixtures, or parts thereof.	30 do	27½ per cent.	2½ do
Milk, condensed, sweetened	1¼c. p. lb. & 35 p.c.	3¼c. per lb.	17 do ad. val.
do do not sweetened	35 per cent.	3¼c. do	
Plumbago			
Plumbago	15 do	10 per cent.	5 per cent.
Blacklead	30 do	25 do	5 do
Plumbago, manufactures of	30 do	25 do	5 do
Mucilage	30 do	25 do	5 do
Oils:—			
Mineral—			
Coal and kerosene, distilled, purified or refined, naphtha and petroleum, N. E. S.	7½c. per gall.	6c. per gall.	1½c. per gall.
Products of petroleum	7½c. do	6c. do	1½c. do
Lubricating oils, composed wholly or in part of petroleum and costing less than 25c. per gall.	7½c. do	6c. do	1½c. do
Essential oils	20 per cent.	10 per cent.	10 per cent.
Paints and colours:—			
Colours and paints, pulped or ground in oil or other liquids and all liquid, prepared or ready-mixed paints, N. E. S.	30 do	25 do	5 do
Ochres and ochrey earths and raw seinnas	30 do	25 do	10 do
Oxides, fire-proofs, umbers and burnt seinnas, N. E. S.	30 do	25 do	5 do
Paints ground or mixed in, or with, either Japan, varnish, lacquers, liquid dryers, collodion, oil finish or oil varnish, rough stuff and fillers.	5c. p. lb & 25 p.c.	25 do	5 cts. per lb.
Putty	25 per cent.	15 do	10 per cent.
Paper, leaf and grass, &c., manufactures of:—			
Bags or sacks, printed or not	35 do	25 do	10 do
Ruled, boarded and boxed papers	35 do	30 do	5 do
Straw board, in sheets or rolls, plain or tarred	40c. per 100 lbs.	30c. per 100 lbs.	10c. per 100 lbs.
Paraffine wax	3c. per lb.	2c. per lb.	1c. per lb.
Pencils, lead, in wood or otherwise	30 per cent.	25 per cent.	5 per cent.
Pocket-books, purses	35 do	30 do	5 do
Lard, tried or rendered	3c. per lb.	2c. per lb.	1c. per lb.
Meats:—			
Bacon and ham, shoulders and sides	3c. do	2c. do	1c. do
Canned meats	3c. do	25 per cent.	3 per cent.
Dried or smoked meats and meats preserved in any other way than salted or pickled, N. E. S.	3c. do	2c. per lb.	1c. per lb.
Other meats salted	3c. do	2c. do	1c. do
Sand paper, glass, flint and emery paper	30 per cent.	20 per cent.	10 p. c.
Sauces and catsups in bottles	40c. per gall & 20 per cent.	35 do	16 do ad. val.
do do bulk	30c. per gall & 20 per cent.	35 do	56 do
Soy	10c. per gall.	35 per cent.	23 per cent.
Flax seed	10c. per bush.	Free.	10c. per bush.
Soap:—			
Common or laundry, not perfumed	1¼c. per lb.	1c. per lb.	¼c. per lb.
Harness soap	30 per cent.	25 per cent.	5 per cent.
Perfumed or toilet	1c. p. lb. & 10 p.c.	35 do	22 do ad. val.
Powders, pumice, silver and mineral soaps, sapolio and like articles	3c. per lb.	35 do	10 do do
Ginger, preserved	35 per cent.	30 do	5 do
Sugar candy, brown or white and confectionery, including sweetened gums and candied peel	1¼c. per lb. and 35 per cent.	½c. per lb. and 35 per cent.	¾c. per lb.
Glucose or grape sugar, glucose syrup or corn syrup	1¼c. per lb.	1¼c. per lb.	½c. do
Turpentine, spirits of	10 per cent.	5 per cent.	5 per cent.
Twine for harvest binders, of jute, manilla or sisal and of manilla and sisal mixed	25 do	12½ do	12½ do

STATEMENT showing sundry articles on which reductions of duty were made by tariff changes of 1894 and since.

Article.	Old Rate. of Duty.	New Rate of Duty.	Reduction.
Twine, cotton.....	1c. p. lb. & 25 p.c.	25 per cent.	1c. per lb.
Twines of all kinds, N. E. S.....	30 per cent.	25 do	5 per cent.
Twines, manufactures of, viz. :— Hammocks and lawn tennis nets and other like articles, N. E. S.....	35 do	30 do	5 do
Varnish, lacquers, japans, japan driers, liquid driers, and oil finish, N. E. S.....	20c. p. g. & 25 p.c.	20c. p. g. & 20 p.c.	5 do ad. val.
Tomatoes, fresh.....	30c. per bush. and 10 per cent.	20c. per bush. and 10 per cent.	10c. per bush.
Tomatoes and other vegetables, including corn and baked beans in cans or other packages.....	2c. per lb.	1½c. per lb.	½c. do
Webbing, elastic.....	25 per cent.	20 per cent.	5 per cent.
Wood and manufactures of :— Barrels containing petroleum or its products, &c. . .	40c. each	20c. each.	20c. each.
Caskets and coffins.....	35 per cent.	25 per cent.	10 per cent.
Mouldings, plain.....	25 do	20 do	5 do
do gilded, &c.....	30 do	25 do	5 do
Hubs, spokes, felloes and parts of wheels, rough hewn or sawn only.....	15 do	Free.	15 do
Shingles.....	20 do	do	20 do
Show cases.....	\$2 each & 35 p. c.	35 per cent.	\$2 each.
Woodenware, pails, tubs and churns.....	25 per cent.	20 do	5 per cent.
Picture frames.....	35 do	30 do	5 do
Veneers of wood not over $\frac{1}{8}$ inch thick.....	10 do	5 do	5 do
Coke, (2,000 lbs. to a ton).....	50c. per ton.	Free.	50c. per ton.
Marble, in the rough, in blocks, containing less than 15 cubic feet.....	15 per cent.	do	15 per cent.
Marble, in the rough, in blocks, containing 15 cubic feet or over.....	10 do	do	10 do
Ship timber and ship planking.....	20 do	do	20 do
Timber, hewn and sawn and timber used for spars and in building wharfs.....	20 do	do	20 do
Timber, square or sided.....	20 do	do	20 do
Creosoted lumber.....	20 do	do	20 do
Sawn boards, planks, deals, and other lumber, un- dressed or dressed on one side only.....	20 do	do	20 do
Pine clapboards.....	20 do	do	20 do
Spruce do.....	20 do	do	20 do
Posts, last blocks, wagon blocks, oar blocks, gun blocks, heading, and all like blocks or sticks, rough hewn or sawed only.....	20 do	do	20 do
Laths.....	20 do	do	20 do
Pickets and palings.....	20 do	do	20 do
Staves of wood of all kinds.....	20 do	do	20 do
Flax fibre, scutched.....	1c. per lb.	do	1c. per lb.
do hackled.....	2c. do	do	2 do
Flax, tow of, scutched or green.....	½c. do	do	½ do
Raspberries, wild.....	3c. do	do	3 do
Album insides, made of paper.....	35 per cent.	do	35 per cent.
Blast furnace slag.....	20 do	do	20 do
Bibles, prayer books, psalm and hymn books.....	5 do	do	5 do
Books printed in any language, other than the English and French languages, N. E. S.....	15 do	do	15 do
Bookbinder's cloth.....	10 do	do	10 do
Buttons, shoe, papier maché.....	5c. per gross & 20 per cent.	do	5c. per gross 20 per cent.
Oxide of copper, N. E. S.....	30 per cent.	do	30 per cent.
Curling stones of granite.....	25 do	do	25 do
Ammonia, nitrate of.....	do	do	do
Cyanide of potassium.....	do	do	do
Saltpetre.....	20 per cent.	do	20 do
Soda, chlorate and bi-sulphite of.....	20 do	do	20 do
Tin crystals.....	20 do	do	20 do
Zinc, salts of.....	5 do	do	5 do
Sumac, other than for dyeing purposes.....	20 do	do	20 do

Mr. FOSTER.

STATEMENT showing sundry articles on which reductions of duty were made by tariff changes of 1894 and since.

Article.	Old Rate of Duty.	New Rate of Duty.	Reduction.
Glove fasteners, metal, eyelet hooks and eyelets	30 per cent.	Free.	30 per cent.
Globes, geographical, topographical and astronomical	20 do	do	20 do
Grommets	According to metal.	do	
Ingot moulds	1½c. per lb. but not less than 35 per cent.	do	1½c. per lb.
Iron sand or globules and dry putty for polishing granite	20 per cent.	do	20 per cent.
Lamp black and ivory black	10 do	do	10 do
Manilla hoods	20 do	do	20 do
Brass in bars, bolts not bent or otherwise manufactured, and in lengths not less than 6 feet	10 do	do	10 do
Brass, drawn, and plain and fancy tubing, not bent or otherwise manufactured, in lengths not less than 6 feet	10 do	do	10 do
Brass in strips for printers' rules, not finished	15 do	do	15 do
Lead, nitrate of and acetate of, not ground	5 do	do	5 do
Lead, tea	30 do	do	30 do
Stereotypes, electrotypes and celluloids of books and bases and matrices and copper shell for the same, whether composed wholly or in part of metal or celluloid	¾c. per sq. inch.	do	¾c. per sq. inch.
Mohair yarns	10c. per lb. and 20 per cent.	do	10c. per lb. and 20 per cent.
Carbolic or heavy oil	10 per cent.	do	10 per cent.
Olive oil for manufacturing and mechanical purposes	20 do	do	20 do
Plumbago crucibles	30 do	do	30 do
Potash, caustic	20 do	do	20 do
Potash, red and yellow prussiate of	10 do	do	10 do
Prunella for boots and shoes	10 do	do	10 do
Rosin oil	20 do	do	20 do
Saddle jiggers and stirrups	35 do	do	35 do

This list includes all the articles on which reductions have been made, and shows that there was an important and significant reduction. And hon. gentlemen must take into account this fact—that this reduction in tariff was made at a time when reduction of the tariff was accompanied with the greatest difficulties. It was made at a time when prices were lowering in the United States, in Belgium and in every great manufacturing country; not only when prices were lowering as quoted in the regular markets, but when hard times had made it necessary for manufacturers to sell, if they could get cash, even if they had to sell at cost or less than cost. Many and many a case occurred in which manufactured goods were held as collateral by the banks, and the manufacturers being unable to meet their obligations, the banks sold the collateral security for whatever they could get, in order to turn it into cash. It was in this period of depression, this period of strong competition, this period of slaughter prices, that we undertook the revision of the tariff. Taking all these things into consideration, the remarkable cut that was made in the tariff on

these articles, going to the very verge of the extreme, shows that a great advantage was afforded to consumers in the remission of taxation and the consequent cheapening. I think I have disposed of the statement made by these two hon. gentlemen, that, though I proposed a reduction of the tariff, I did not carry it out. Now, Mr. Speaker, one further subject, one that may pertinently be discussed at this the last session of the term of the present Parliament, and it is this:—From 1878, when the people, by a large majority, gave their verdict for the change in the fiscal policy of this country, the Liberal-Conservative party and the Liberal-Conservative policy have dominated in this country and have moulded the administrations. Upon these seventeen years, the Liberal-Conservative policy is written. That record is before the country, upon that record they are quite willing to be judged. But, Sir, the Liberal-Conservative party wish to be judged upon their whole record, and not upon any particular part of it, administrative or otherwise, that any hon. gentleman may choose to pick out to suit his convenience. I do not fear, neither does the Liberal-Conservative party, that if that re-

cord is fairly and adequately looked at, the people of the country at the coming elections will not be exactly of the same mind that they were in 1878, in 1882, in 1887, and in 1891, and that they will not be in favour of the continuation of a reasonable policy of protection for this country. Sir, what has been the record of these seventeen years? A vigorous public policy has been carried on in this country in favour of improved facilities for internal communication, which have been pressed upon this Parliament, which have been acceded to by this Parliament, and which have been carried out in the country. The record of the Liberal-Conservative party embraces the building and completion of the Canadian Pacific Railway and of the many miles of railway, aided by subsidies more or less liberal, which have been spread over the country, in addition to our great trunk lines of railway. Not only, Sir, have these railroads been projected and built as a part of the Liberal-Conservative policy, and against the steady opposition of hon. gentlemen opposite, but in reference to the canals, and some parts of the canal system, the same fact appears. A vigorous public policy in connection with the canal system of this country, is within the record of the Liberal-Conservative party. Not only have they widened and deepened the old canals until they are now within two years of completion to a fourteen foot depth, from the great lakes to the city of Montreal, but they have taken that other step, of making this country entirely independent, so far as water communication on the great lakes is concerned, of any other people, and have built the great Sault Canal, a channel of communication which opens to us the remotest of the great lakes, without asking permission of any other people in the world. With regard to our railways and our canals, there has been a vigorous policy pursued; so there has been with reference to lines of communication external to this country. In regard to our steamship lines of communication, whenever our policy has been brought before this country, it has been met either with sneers, or with active opposition by hon. gentlemen opposite. Take the line to the West Indies and to South America, which, seven or eight years ago, was projected in this House, which received the assent of Parliament, and which was carried into execution. Every one knows with what opposition it was met by the leader of hon. gentlemen opposite, and by his party. What has taken place? Why, Sir, with reference to the West Indian trade, whereas, in 1887, our total trade was but \$4,000,000, in 1895 our total trade with the West Indies amounts to \$8,500,000, an increase of about 112 per cent in our trade with those islands in those few years. And to-day, Sir, the West Indies, in its aggregate of trade, takes the third place in the list of countries with which Canada is carrying on business. Every one knows the

Mr. FOSTER.

opposition which was met by the proposal to subsidize a line of steamers from the western coast to China and Japan, but it was carried out. It had in it that good feature, that sterling feature, of co-operation with the British government in the matter, and that line has been carried out successfully, trade has increased; and the average of the trade, during the last five years, with China and Japan, amounted to \$2,800,000, whereas it was but a beggarly average of \$623,000 from 1874-5 to 1879, when hon. gentlemen opposite were in power. Take, also, the line of communication with Australasia, a line which was put on some five years ago, a line which encountered the strongest opposition from hon. gentlemen opposite, but a line which has been successfully put in operation, and is to-day uniting the Australasian colonies and Canada hand in hand in mutual support of the service; and it is also doing this great thing, giving a successful and progressive increase of trade. But, Sir, out of it there has come something more valuable than this co-operation and communication; there came, as the natural result, an inter-colonial conference of delegates from the great colonies of Great Britain, held here in Ottawa two or three years ago; and as a result of their deliberations, as a result of their resolutions, as a result of the persistent and prudent way in which these have been brought to the attention of the British government, we have to-day something that should be noted and is remarkable—the British government itself proposing to ask the British taxpayer to put his hand into his pocket to the extent of £75,000 yearly, for ten years, to co-operate with Canada and Australia in building up a great line of steam communication from Sydney and Melbourne, in the far Pacific Ocean, across this continent, and over the Atlantic to Liverpool and the ports of Great Britain. But, Sir, in addition to that, the great scheme of a trans-Pacific cable has been discussed, has been presented to the British government, and has so far claimed the attention of the British government that the Colonial Secretary has asked for delegates from the Australasian colonies and from Canada, to meet in London to talk over the possibilities and prospects of achieving that great line of swift communication between Australasia, Canada and Great Britain. So, Sir, I say that in regard to steam communication, we have had a vigorous and consistent policy, and a policy which has not only succeeded in a business point of view, but it has, I contend, still more succeeded in awakening interest and sympathy in other colonies and in Great Britain, and which is drawing closer and closer together, on lines of mutually helpful enterprise, all the colonies, and Great Britain co-operating as one. In addition to this we have this year subsidized a most successful winter service between St. John and Liverpool, and have in

contemplation the establishment of a direct ss. service between Canada and France.

Sir, I need not make an extended argument with reference to the establishment, and maintenance, and expansion of the industrial life of this country. That that industrial life has been established, and has expanded, we have proofs on every side.

Every one who has experience dating back to 1878, and who compares that period with 1895, knows the advance that Canada has made in her industrial life. I will not press that argument a single step further. I merely wish to call your attention to the result of ten years, as shown by the census of the Dominion of Canada :

CANADIAN INDUSTRIES PER CENSUS RETURNS.

	1881.	1891.	Variation.	
			Increase.	p.c.
Number of establishments.....	49,722	75,768	26,246	52
Capital invested..... \$	164,957,423	354,620,750	189,663,327	114
Number of employees.....	254,894	370,256	115,362	41
Wages paid..... \$	59,401,702	100,663,650	41,261,948	69
Cost of raw material..... "	179,929,193	256,119,042	76,189,849	42
Value of products..... "	309,731,867	476,258,886	166,527,019	53

That does not take in the increase that took place between 1879 and 1881, nor does it take in the increase that took place between 1891 and 1895, which is nearly a half decennial period. These figures may be laughed at by hon. gentlemen opposite. They are in the habit of taking part of the census that suits them and declaring it must be relied on, and then of taking another part which does not suit them and declaring it cannot be relied on. The same Government was in power when the censuses were taken, and if one part is reliable the other part we must suppose to be equally reliable. Hon. gentlemen are prone to make a point of looking over the census and finding some small knitting works, entered as a manufacturing industry to declare that no reliance can be placed on the enumeration. The whole argument is taken away when hon. gentlemen examine that portion of the census which groups industrial establishments with reference to their output. Five classes are given with respective output, viz., those under \$2,000, those from \$2,000 to \$12,000, from \$12,000 to \$25,000, from \$25,000 to \$50,000, and those over \$50,000. From an investigation of these five classes it will appear that the per cent of total output of the first class is exactly what it was in 1881, whilst the increase in the fifth or largest class is 14 per cent greater than that of the smallest class for the decennial period of 1881 and 1891. Alongside of that, put the other fact that the same system of enumerating establishments which was followed in the census of 1881 and 1871, was adopted in the census of 1891, the taking of the census in each case having been pursued upon the same plan. But if we are not to continue the same policy, I wish to ask myself and to ask this House the question, why should we change? Is there any reason why we should change? Is there any reason in the record of the past seven-

teen years why the fiscal policy of this country, which has resulted in such improvement and advance, should be changed for some other? No. Is there any reason to be found in the bases which have been laid down from time to time by hon. gentlemen opposite as tariff and trade lines on which they think this country should mould its policy and carry on its administration? Hon. gentlemen opposite are men of many political faiths so far as tariff is concerned, but they are men of no steady convictions so far as those same faiths are concerned. Hon. gentlemen opposite have put before this country during the last five years, several plans, several bases of operation. They have had Commercial Union, they have had Unrestricted Reciprocity, they have had Free trade as it was in England—all of these have been advocated and strongly advocated by my hon. friend who sits opposite me (Mr. Laurier), and by my hon. friend who leads the financial section of that side of the House, in so many strong, sturdy and plain English words; and if there was any doubt in regard to the position of the last mentioned gentlemen, he cleared away that doubt two days ago when he took occasion to reiterate his position by reading a letter written in 1891.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In 1892.

Mr. FOSTER. The political belief he held then, he reiterated as held by him now. One of his beliefs is this, that free trade with the United States is of greater moment to this country than free trade with all the rest of the world, with the United States left out.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes; and no man knows better than my hon. friend that free trade

with the United States of America is impossible without discriminating against the rest of the world, and he himself has stated it again and again. Everybody knows that the temper of the United States even under Democratic rule was far removed from free trade, and under Republican rule is still further removed from free trade. My hon. friend as the coming financier of a possible new government, if hon. gentlemen opposite should get into power, is determined, taking his last confession, to give to this country unrestricted reciprocity with the United States, though it involves discrimination against the mother country and every other country. I take that as the latest confession of the political faith of the hon. gentleman who is to be Finance Minister, as the hon. leader of the Opposition has stated, and who will rule and dominate the tariff policy of hon. gentlemen opposite if they got into power within the natural term of his life.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Instead of the Manufacturers' Association, as is the case with you.

Mr. FOSTER. I will use that statement before the country as a lesson which the people may ponder over in connection with the political faith, the political action and electoral action took place in 1891. Is there any reason why we should change our line of reasonable protection in order to adopt any of those facile political faiths which have been confessed from time to time by hon. gentlemen opposite? Is there any reason for a change to be found in the general circumstances of the world to-day? If in 1878 the people of this country thought that a reasonable protection was necessary to give them the vantage ground in competing with the world and building up and establishing industrial life in this country, is it any less necessary to-day? Is the competition less keen to-day than it was in 1878? Are the tariff lines of the various countries of the world lower to-day than in 1878? Is the tendency of the commercial countries of the world changed in the direction of freer trade and lower duties? No, Sir. They have changed and are changing in the direction of greater stringency and more prohibitive tariffs, and circumstances, if they have changed from 1878 to this time, are stronger to-day in the direction of making Canada keep, for the sake of her trade and business interests, to the line of reasonable protection, instead of taking the line of free trade or of partial free trade. Why, to-day, after the Democratic administration had lowered the duties to a small extent, but so far away from free trade that they enjoy a tariff with an average of 42 per cent on dutiable articles for home consumption in that country, when they had given Canada some little better footing in their market by lowering to some extent duties on agricultural products, what to-day has happened? A Republican majority

Mr. FOSTER.

in the House of Representatives has sent to the Senate a Bill which proposes to raise the rate of taxation on all those articles, and to raise them so as to be prohibitive as regards the introduction of the products of Canada into the United States. Is that a reason why we should change our line of policy? If in 1878 there was reason for the adoption of this policy, in 1895 there is greater reason that this policy should be continued, and we should hold to it in Canada.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). You say you have abandoned it. You claim you have taken off \$6,000,000.

Mr. FOSTER. No one is so foolish as to think that is an abandonment of the principle of protection. When the hon. gentleman goes to the country and wages political warfare against this party and the Government the last thing he will say is that we have abandoned protection. The first assertion and the only assertion he will make is, that we are hide bound protectionists, and that therefore we should be put out of office. But there is a line which I think it is possible, and I believe it is right that the statesmanship of this country as well as of Great Britain and other colonies of the Empire should consider and ponder carefully and well, and that is whether it is not possible for statesmanship in the colonies and Great Britain to bring about between the colonies as amongst themselves and between the colonies and Great Britain concurred action which will be conducive to the commercial interests of both, and which will result in greater power and strength. I read an article but a little time ago in the "Nineteenth Century Review," in which the general question which is agitating many thoughtful minds at the present day was raised and discussed, as to whether the Empire would be able to feed itself in the event of a war against Great Britain which would cut off her supplies from hostile nations. Feed itself! Why, Sir, if statesmanship is not able, practically to solve that question, statesmanship must find it impossible to solve any of the great questions, which from time to time present themselves for consideration. The Empire able to feed itself! Yes. This article showed that 100,000,000 bushels of wheat were necessary to England, other than what the colonies afforded her at the present time, in order to feed the people of the Empire there. One hundred millions bushels of wheat! Why, fifty thousand Canadian farmers with 100 acres each, in wheat, and raising twenty bushels to the acre, would produce the 100,000,000 of bushels of wheat needed by Great Britain. And, what is fifty thousand farmers cultivating five millions of acres, compared with the English farmers wanting employment and the numbers of millions of acres of good wheat land in Manitoba and the North-west Territories, which has not yet been scratch-

ed by the plough. Meats to the value of one hundred and forty millions of dollars would need to be supplied by the colonies, to make up for Great Britain's deficiency, supplied now from foreign countries. Well, cattle, and horses, and pigs in illimitable quantity could be raised in this country. And as to butter and cheese; fifty thousand farmers owning each fifty cows, amounting to 2,500,000 in numbers, would supply butter and cheese going far to meet the demands of Great Britain for such supplies. And, with the vast lands of the North-west, that is not an estimate which cannot be reached, if adequate means were taken to bring it about. So, Sir, I might go on to amplify this. The sugar which is necessary for the consumption of Great Britain could be supplied by the West Indies, and by the East Indies, with the cultivation of the cane lands which are now going out of use, and which by its diminution is impoverishing the planters and the labourers of the West Indies. That industry might again have its period of flourishing and its reward of remunerative production were concurrent action taken in Britain and the Islands. So, all the way through. It is a problem which only requires time and good statesmanship to solve. And, as I said before, it is for Canada, for Australia, for the other colonies of Great Britain and for Great Britain herself to ponder seriously and carefully; to consider whether or not, an arrangement cannot be come to which will make the Empire and its dependencies sufficient within themselves to feed the Empire, and by doing that add to the volume of business, and to a mutually remunerative production. And, Sir, the statesmanship which could formulate some such policy of mutually beneficial trade would achieve an end infinitely higher and more wide-reaching. It would evolve from the dark foreground of the not distant future, a national life of singular strength and beauty, in which Canadian Britain, and Australasian Britain, the Britain of Asia and Africa and of the Isles of the Sea, would group themselves in grand imperial unity; the old enriching the new, and the new imparting fresh strength to the old.—through whose world-wide realm the blood of a common commerce should mingle with the blood of a common patriotism, whose power would compel peace, and whose millions of happy people would march in the van of the fullest freedom and the highest civilization.

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

After Recess.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, in the course of the almost pathetic appeal for another lease of place, if not of power—for, to do the hon. gentleman justice, I think he, and his friends, too, fully realize that they are mere tools and agents

of other and more formidable combinations behind them—slaves of the ring if not slaves of the lamp—I say that in the course of the almost pathetic appeal with which the hon. gentleman closed his speech, he put one question which I shall endeavour to answer. The hon. gentleman asked, almost with tears in his voice and his eyes: "Why make a change? Why turn us out? We are very comfortable as we are—can't you leave us alone?" Sir, there appears to me to be three reasons why a change is desirable, and I will briefly state them. First of all, Mr. Speaker, it appears to me that every single, solitary promise which was made by hon. gentlemen opposite, or rather by their predecessors, to the people of Canada in 1878, has been utterly and signally falsified; in the second place, every prediction which was made by myself, by Mr. Mackenzie and by our colleagues on this side of the House in 1878, as to the inevitable results of turning our backs on an honest, wholesome revenue policy, and adopting the worn-out rags of the American system known as protection, has been fulfilled to the letter; and, in the third place, Sir, the fact of the matter is this, that the conduct and doings of the hon. gentleman and his colleagues, notably since this House met this session, have contributed in an extreme degree to create such a profound distrust in the minds of the people at large—indeed, in the minds of their own supporters—that the general conviction is that any change must be for the better.

Now, Sir, with respect to the hon. gentleman's speech itself. To do the hon. gentleman justice, I am not disposed to criticise his speech too harshly. The hon. gentleman was skating over the thinnest of thin ice, and he knew it. This was not an occasion for a paean of exultation by any means. This was an occasion, Mr. Speaker, for exposing as little of his flank as possible to the enemy; and looking at the case he had, I am inclined to think, that the hon. gentleman, on the whole, conducted his retreat—for it amounted to that, although it was not to the lines of Torres Vedras or to any other place of strength—

Mr. FOSTER. No, they are occupied.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. He conducted his retreat, Sir, with a reasonable amount of strategic skill. Sir, I remember once upon a time hearing an eminent professor of legerdemain—not of finance—declare that he never thought that he had mastered a card trick properly until he could play it so well as to cheat himself; and, listening to my hon. friend I began to think that he had repeated sundry of his sophistries so often that he had at last come to believe some of them himself. I may remind the hon. gentleman that one of the severest penalties which according to Holy Writ can be inflicted on any people is that they may suffer a strong delusion that they

may believe a lie; and one might suppose that upon him and also upon some of his supporters that ultimate penalty—or perhaps I should say that penultimate—the ultimate will come later—has been inflicted.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it appears to me that there are more serious matters to deal with on this occasion. There is no doubt whatever that we are standing in Canada to-day at the parting of the ways; there is no doubt whatever that both political parties require to gird themselves for a very grave struggle indeed; and there is no doubt whatever—and there the hon. gentleman is right—that success on this side will be attended, not with revolution, but with a very substantial measure of reform, in which as a matter of course important interests, very important interests, will be considerably affected. Sir, to my mind the position of Canada to-day is of a very precarious character indeed. Although I have a great deal more faith in the resources of Canada than the hon. gentleman gives me credit for, I do not believe that we can continue for many years longer to stand the enormous drain in men and money to which we have been subjected for the past sixteen or seventeen years. Sir, the nearest analogy which I can find to the present position of Canada must be looked for on the other side of the sea; it must be looked for in the case of Ireland. I may recall to the hon. gentleman's mind, and to the minds of the other members of this House generally, a certain very remarkable statement made by an eminent Irish historian as to the effect on Ireland in the last century—and for that matter, up to the present hour—of the process of depletion of her best and bravest, very closely analogous indeed to that which has been going on for the past seventeen years in Canada. I shall make no apology whatever to the hon. gentleman for imitating his example, even if I have stated this before. Mr. Lecky was speaking of the effect of an exodus from Ireland, not one iota more important or greater in proportion than that which we have seen from Canada for many and many a year past. Speaking of the number of men who, having quitted Ireland, had distinguished themselves in other countries, he said:

These examples might easily be increased, but they are quite sufficient to show how large a proportion of the energy and ability of Ireland was employed in foreign lands, and how ruinous must have been the consequences at home. If, as there appears much reason to believe, there is such a thing as hereditary transmission of moral and intellectual qualities, the removal from a nation of tens of thousands of the ablest and most energetic of its citizens must inevitably, by a mere physical law, result in the degradation of the race. Nor is it necessary to fall back on any speculations of disputed science. In every community there exists a small minority of men whose abilities, high purpose, and energy of will, mark them out as in some degree leaders of men. These take the first steps in every public enterprise, counteract

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

by their example the vicious elements of the population, set the current and form the standard of public opinion, and infuse a healthy moral vigour into their nation. In Ireland for three or four generations such men were steadily weeded out. Can we wonder that the standard of public spirit should have declined?

But not only were the healthiest elements driven away: corrupting influences of the most powerful kind infected those who remained.

Sir, strike out "Ireland" and put in "Canada," and you have a very true description of what has been going on here for the last seventeen years, and of one of the causes why we demand a change.

Then there is another analogy to Ireland which hon. gentlemen would do well to note. Sir, what, by unanimous consent of every historian worthy of the name—whether he be of English or Irish descent—was the most potent cause of all of Ireland's woes during the last two centuries? Sir, a ten times greater curse to Ireland, a ten times greater source of evil to Ireland, than even Cromwell's sword or Strongbow's, either, was that vile system of protection which, for the sake of propitiating a small number of English manufacturers, stamped out ruthlessly and crushed every attempt which the people of Ireland made to raise themselves in the scale of nations and humanity. Protection in former days was the curse of Ireland as it is to-day the curse of Canada. Now, I say to the hon. gentleman this, if he and his colleagues knew anything about political economy, they would know—it is a fact which cannot be gainsaid or disputed—that of all countries in the world at this moment, you could not, if you tried, select one more utterly unfit to try the experiment of protection in than this same Canada of ours. The reasons are very plain. They are physical and geographical reasons, which no man who looks at the map and who understands the nature and situation of Canada, can, for one moment, dispute. What is our position? Why, we occupy a portion of the northern half of the north temperate zone, stretching from sea to sea, inhabited by four or five communities, separated from each other by large tracts of barren territory, which can only be crossed at great expense to those who send goods from the one to the other. Take my own province of Ontario, take the province of Manitoba and the province of Quebec—what is our geographical position? Sir, we stand with our backs to the north pole, and I do not suppose that the hon. gentleman intends to open negotiations for trade relations with the Esquimaux, although they would be quite as profitable as some of those he has undertaken. If we choose to set our faces westward—although, as regards our friends in British Columbia, there might be some hope—we must send every ounce of goods to our friends westward over three thousand miles of railway and then seven thousand miles of sea. If

we turn our eyes eastward, we find we have to send our goods perhaps twelve hundred miles to the sea, and then three thousand miles to meet the competition of every nation under the sun. If we want to trade with each other, we find ourselves separated by long tracts of country which we cannot colonize, or, at any rate, have failed to colonize up to the present. Under these circumstances, as every one knows, I am speaking the simple truth to-day when I say that the markets to the south of us, if we could get them, are worth to us all the rest of the markets of the world.

Now, I do not know what new discoveries may be made, nor does the hon. gentleman, but this I do know, that unless some new and startling discoveries in science are made, it is scarcely possible for Canada to hope to become a great manufacturing country, at any rate in the sense of being able to export any great quantity of her manufactures. I was not astonished, but amused, to hear the hon. gentleman, before dinner, launch into an eulogium of the extent to which the manufactures of Canada had grown during the past eight or ten years. Now, Sir, I have here a statement to which I call the attention of the hon. gentleman, contained in his own last Trade and Navigation Returns, of the total manufactured goods exported from Canada, and I want the attention of the House to this, too. Sir, the total amount of manufactured goods exported was correctly given by the hon. gentleman for the year 1895 at \$7,768,000. The House will remember that he boasted that that showed a large increase over the exportations of the year 1894 or 1893. Sir, I have been at the trouble of analysing these exports, and what do I find? We exported manufactured goods, \$7,768,000, and the first item was household goods of settlers, \$1,000,000. These are included among our exports of \$7,700,000. I give him all the credit of that. That, Sir, is due to the National Policy—far be it from me to dispute it. I find for the second item, wooden goods, \$1,300,000. Does the hon. gentleman, will any hon. gentleman, deliberately rise and tell me, or the country, or the citizens of Ottawa—will the hon. gentleman tell the lumber kings of this region that the exportation of wooden goods from a country like Canada, with such natural facilities as it possesses, is due to its National Policy? Sir, I find another item in our exports, sole and upper leather, \$1,270,000. I do not think that exportation is due to the National Policy at all. I know it existed in very large proportions previous to the National Policy. But I find another item of a rather curious character. I find that among our manufactured goods we exported, is included \$325,000 of whisky. Here is a curious fact? The hon. gentleman gives an exportation of 116,000 gallons of whisky valued at \$325,000. How did he or his friends who compile these books, get that value? That is a value of

\$2.50 for each gallon of whisky. Did he collect duty on it before it went out of this country?

Mr. FOSTER. It must be good whisky.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am glad to see the hon. gentleman knows that much, but when did he hear before that it cost \$3 a gallon to manufacture whisky? You exported 116,000 gallons of whisky, costing, unless my memory is at fault, perhaps \$30,000 or \$40,000 to make, and you put it down in your exports at a figure of \$325,000. Well, it appears to me that that class of statement will bear a little explanation. But I have another thing to point out. I grant the hon. gentleman did increase our exports of cotton. They amounted to \$546,000. I grant he did increase our export of agricultural implements—my hon. friend from Huron may take a note of it—to \$663,000, on all of which, I presume, a huge drawback was given for the purpose of enabling these manufacturers to sell their implements to the inhabitants of Argentine or elsewhere, and at our expense—because that is what it amounts to—enable these people to obtain a cheaper agricultural implement than our farmers can, and thus more efficiently compete with our farmers. Musical instruments, \$300,000. The long and short of the matter is that if you strike out this prodigiously high figure for whisky and the sole and upper leather and the wooden goods and household goods for settlers, you will find they account for \$4,000,000 out of the \$7,000,000. I will make the hon. gentleman a present of the sole and upper leather, but this follows, at any rate. We exported, in 1878, \$4,127,000 worth, and there were no household goods among them.

Now, as I say, we strike out whisky and household effects, and the wooden wares, and the result is this, that from 1878 to 1895, we have not increased our total volume of exports one whit.

Mr. FOSTER. Strike off another million and you will have a decrease.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would be well entitled to, so far as any effect can be credited to the National Policy in the way of increasing exports. I would just like the hon. gentleman—and I will give him the floor now if he chooses—to point out to us how the National Policy—and it is for the credit of the National Policy that he took all the benefit of this increase of two or three millions—contributed to increase our exportation of wooden goods? It may, possibly, in the matter of whisky. There I bow to the hon. gentleman's superior knowledge. But, Sir, even if I gave him the benefit of the wooden-wares, the result would be that in 1878 we were exporting \$1 per head, while in 1895 we were exporting \$1.25 per head. So, the practical result of this is that, for the sake of increasing our exports 25 cents per head, we

have been charged some \$20,000,000 or \$30,000,000 extra taxation. By the by, it may interest my hon. friends from the maritime provinces to know that in 1878 we sold ships to the value of \$1,250,000, while in 1895 we sold ships to the amount of \$172,000.

There is no doubt that there are in Canada a very fair proportion of what I call natural industries, industries which can thrive and would thrive, if only the Government would condescend to let them alone. Such industries are always beneficial, always useful, in a country; but, as for these pampered exotics on which the hon. gentleman has been expending the money of the people of Canada for so many years, either they prove utterly useless or they cost us a prodigious sum and give us an extremely small amount of benefit in return. Our policy is to let manufacturers of all classes have fair play. We desire to render justice to all, but to grant special privileges to none. That is the policy of the Liberal party. And I will add, for the information of the hon. gentleman, that I hold, and always have held, that his present tariff is most unjust to a great many classes of manufacturers. There is not a man in Canada who deals in iron in any shape who is not grossly oppressed by the hon. gentleman's tariff. The agricultural implement men are grossly oppressed by it; the stove men are greatly oppressed by it; those who manufacture tubes and other ware of that kind are grossly oppressed by it. The hon. gentleman and his friends inflict upon these classes of men a tax of 40, or 50, or 60, aye, in some cases, as high as 70 per cent upon certain portions of the raw material they use. What justice is there in that; what reason is there in that; what wisdom is there in that? But for the sake of pampering one or two establishments away down in Nova Scotia, these men, who employ ten hands for one that these Nova Scotia industries can employ in the iron industries, are put to extreme hardship and inconvenience. I repeat, Sir, the present tariff is grossly unjust to many manufacturers, and none would benefit more than these men would from a return to a natural, reasonable and healthy system.

Mr. FOSTER. Perhaps the hon. gentleman would point out cases in which a tax of 70 per cent was levied.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I have pointed it out again and again. There are several qualities of iron used by the agricultural implement makers on which—not, perhaps, by the way he calculates his duties, but in actual tax measured by the cost of the goods to the manufacturer—the protection is fully 70 or 80 per cent. No doubt, my hon. friend behind me (Mr. Paterson, Brant) will supply the details. I know I have given them more than once in other speeches on the subject. The hon. gentleman

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

and his friends have attempted, time and again, to impress upon the people of Canada the idea that the Liberal party are the enemies of the manufacturers. Sir, I deny the accusation of the hon. gentleman: I hurl it back in his teeth. The manufacturers of the country, all of them that are worth their salt, prospered more under the tariff of 1878 than they have prospered under the extremely extortionate tariff that has been in force since. I know, every one knows, that, under our present conditions, a considerable customs tariff must still be exacted for the purpose of revenue. Sir, I have never gainsaid that; I have never denied it; I do not deny it now, nor will I allow the hon. gentleman to pretend that I entertain or have ever entertained any other opinion. But, as the hon. gentleman appears to be in glorious ignorance as to what the policy of the Liberal party is—we shift our base so often that he, this consistent, steadfast man and his consistent colleagues find it difficult to know where we stand—that I will take the liberty to read to him the policy of the Liberal party on the question of the tariff:

That the customs tariff of the Dominion should be based, not as it is now, upon the protective principle, but on the requirements of the public service:

That the existing tariff, founded upon an unsound principle, and used, as it has been by the Government, as a corrupting agency wherewith to keep themselves in office, has developed monopolies, trusts and combinations;

It has decreased the value of farm and other landed property.

It has oppressed the masses to the enrichment of a few:

It has checked immigration;

It has caused great loss of population;

It has impeded commerce;

It has discriminated against Great Britain—

—and let the hon. gentleman note it—

In these and in many other ways it has occasioned great public and private injury, all of which evils must continue to grow in intensity as long as the present tariff system remains in force.

That the highest interests of Canada demand a removal of this obstacle to our country's progress, by the adoption of a sound fiscal policy, which, while not doing justice to any class—

—manufacturing or other—

—will promote domestic and foreign trade, and hasten the return of prosperity to our people;

That to that end, the tariff should be reduced to the needs of honest, economical and efficient government.

That it should be so adjusted as to make free or to bear as lightly as possible upon the necessities of life, and should be so arranged as to promote freer trade with the whole world, more particularly with Great Britain and the United States.

We believe that the results of the protective system have grievously disappointed thousands of persons who honestly supported it, and that the country, in the light of experience, is now prepared to declare for a sound fiscal policy.

The issue between the two political parties on this question is now clearly defined.

The Government themselves admit the failure of their fiscal policy, and now profess their willingness to make some changes; but they say that such changes must be based only on the principle of protection.

We denounce the principle of protection as radically unsound, and unjust to the masses of the people, and we declare our conviction that any tariff changes based on that principle must fail to afford any substantial relief from the burdens under which the country labours.

This issue we unhesitatingly accept, and upon it we await with the fullest confidence the verdict of the electors of Canada.

—as was shown in Verchères, Antigonish, Jacques Cartier, Montreal Centre, West Huron and Charlevoix. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman knows, if he never knew before, what the platform of the Reform party is on the question of tariff reform. Let him lay it to heart and profit by it. To-night I propose to deal partly with the estimates and deficits, partly with the assertion made, though very gingerly, by the hon. gentleman, but still loudly made by his followers, that the tariff favours Great Britain; and also with the impudent assertion—and a most impudent assertion it is—that they have promoted general prosperity by their precious tariff. There are a great many other fallacies in the hon. gentleman's speech which I must defer for future consideration. I do not propose, at the moment, to follow him through the vast mass of figures in which he took refuge. And this for two reasons: first, I have learned to require that the hon. gentleman's figures should be verified before I accept them too implicitly, and, second, it seems to me that many of the figures do not bear out the deductions he drew from them. But, Sir, we will take the first. And here I pause for one moment to call the hon. gentleman's attention to the rather curious assertion he made, as it appears to me, as to the effect of some of his tariff changes. Sir, the people of Canada for a long time have been asking for relief from this tariff, the people of Canada for a long time have been asking that more practical economy should be introduced into the management of our public affairs. We have the hon. gentleman's answer in his estimates, we have the hon. gentleman's answer in his speech. His estimates show that, without taking into account a good many items that I alluded to, and without counting supplementaries, he wants \$38,500,000, or thereabouts, for the service of next year. He went on to state—and I took his words down, though I am open to correction—that in his last revision of the tariff, he had reduced the taxation to the extent of a million and a half; and he went on, as the House will remember, with a very long list of so-called reductions, to which, when I get his speech, I will pay a little more particular attention. Now, I want to call the attention of the House to the true effect and value of the hon. gen-

tleman's reductions in the tariff. In 1895 we imported dutiable goods to the value of \$58,557,000, on which we charged the public \$17,887,000. Sir, if the hon. gentleman will take the trouble to subdivide, he will find that the average of taxation, under his reduced tariff, mind you, amounted to 30·30 per cent. Now, we will go back to 1893, when they had an unregenerate and unreduced tariff. In that year the importation of dutiable goods amounted to \$69,837,000, and on this we paid \$21,161,000; so that the effect of an unregenerate and unreduced tariff was to charge the public on the dutiable goods they consumed, 30·3 per cent, while the reduced tariff gives 30·6 per cent. Sir, the hon. gentleman will find that this calculation, at any rate, will not require revision, and I commend it to the attention of his followers who are shouting about a reduction of a million and a half that the hon. gentleman has made. Now, I will not at present go into the hon. gentleman's statement as to the amount that he saved, or the amount of extra revenue to be got on this year's transactions, for this reason: the ten days' statement which he was good enough to give me, appears to be incorrect. In that ten days' statement, however, I observe three matters which go to show that the saving of a million in the expenditure was wholly imaginary. For instance, in it about \$400,000 less interest was charged, up to the present date, than up to the corresponding date in 1895, although, as every one knows, our bill for interest is larger this year than it was last. Also, we spent \$100,000 less for militia. This certainly is not going to be a permanent reduction. We spent \$300,000 less for public works, which likewise is not a permanent reduction, as he very well knows. Sir, I am bound to say that, looking at the estimates which he submitted in 1895-96, it looks to me like a mere sham attempt at economy. He brought down estimates for 1895-96 amounting to \$36,900,000. Well, if that was a permanent reduction, I would give him credit for it; but to-day we find estimates brought down amounting to \$38,300,000, not taking into account any possible supplementary estimates, not taking into account any of those large sums which we may be called to pay if the hon. gentleman's glowing visions of subsidies to Australian lines, and subsidies to Australian cables, and subsidies to lines across the Atlantic for other purposes, take form and substance. Sir, adding the statutory liabilities for which the hon. gentleman has made provision, allowing for a very moderate amount of contingencies, and for the increased sum of interest which we will have to pay when we take into account various items that he has alluded to, although but gingerly, to-night, it is pretty clear that the people of Canada are now committed to an annual expenditure of very little short of \$40,000,000 yearly, if at all short—\$38,300,-

000 the hon. gentleman owns up to. And here let me say that I do not at all approve of part of his system of book-keeping by which a number of items are put to capital account that, in my judgment, ought to go to income. Sir, the hon. gentleman guesses that if he does better in the succeeding five and a half months than he has done in the preceding six and a half months, he may come out square. Well, I think we will sit here long enough to test those guesses, and therefore I do not propose to waste more time on them at present. But this is clear: After two heavy deficits, the best he can do is to express a dubious hope that per-adventure he may make both ends meet. Well, we will see. As to 1896-97, so far as I could hear, he hardly ventured a guess at all. He has added \$1,300,000 to the estimated expenditure for 1895-96, and I did not hear him say how he expected that \$1,300,000 to be made up. More additional income, I suppose; more guessing, and no provision. He tells us that he hopes for \$37,000,000 of receipts for this year. Perhaps he may get it, perhaps he may not. But he comes down to us at the same time and he asks for \$38,300,000, and for the other contingent liabilities I have alluded to, which amount to probably a million and a half more, the hon. gentleman makes no provision at all, he does not pretend to make a provision. Now, if we do no better in 1896-97 than we are doing in 1895-96, there is a deficit looming ahead for us, on his own showing. For my own part, I do not hesitate to tell him that I consider a yearly expenditure of \$40,000,000, or \$38,300,000, altogether too large for the present resources of Canada. I say it is a disgrace and a shame to the Government that have been entrusted with our affairs, that they come down to us and ask for an expenditure of \$38,300,000 a year for federal purposes. Sir, the thing is utterly unjustifiable. I do not wholly blame the hon. gentleman for it, but the plain truth is this, that we cut our clothes some years ago on far too large a pattern. To-day Canada is one of the most overgoverned countries on the face of the earth. Canada requires at this present moment a most unduly large proportion of her citizens for the purpose of serving in her various Parliaments; and it would be a happy day for Canada if they were reduced to about one half their present number. The fact of the matter is that hon. gentlemen opposite have been discounting the future at a most tremendous rate, and now the bills have come back, and there are no assets wherewith to meet them. Sir, there is very little use on the part of hon. gentlemen whining over this matter. They ought to try and meet it, and the way to meet it is to reduce our present establishment, the way to meet it is to reduce your present extravagant mode of government, and to reduce your extravagant ideas. By the way, what were we told, aye, and told

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

by a member of this Government, though he is not here now? We were told—the hon. gentleman knows it well—that we could build the Canadian Pacific Railway, and it would not cost us a penny. Why? Because, by the 1st of January, 1890, there would be \$58,300,000 in cash, or securities, better than cash, quoth Sir Charles, in our treasury, ready to pay for the whole Canadian Pacific Railway, from the proceeds of land sales in the North-west. Sir, the hon. gentleman told us that he thought we would have in the North-west something like 85,000,000 bushels of grain of various kinds. What a paltry picayune set they are! Why, Sir, it is full ten years ago since Sir Charles Tupper promised us 640,000,000 bushels of wheat, and are we to be put off with a miserable 85,500,000 bushels, and half of them oats? Give us our good old Sir Charles. And, by the way, he has never been done justice to, because I was lately looking up his statement, and what he did tell us was that if he were a true prophet, we would have 3,000 million bushels, because, he said, the wheat belt was five times as large as the quantity that he named, and would produce the higher number of bushels. And all the hundred thousand iron workers—I cannot see them, I suppose they are still in the dim and distant future.

Speaking seriously on this matter, the plain truth is this: Everything we have done for a great many years has been based on the assumption that in 1895 we might reasonably expect—I am not going to say the expectation was wholly unreasonable at the time—to have 10,000,000 or 12,000,000 people in Canada, instead of the 5,000,000 we find here to-day. But we must to-day look these things in the face. We have not got ten millions or twelve millions, we have barely got five millions, and, accordingly, we must prepare ourselves to deal with the exigencies of the situation, not on the basis of a population of ten millions as likely to come to us in any reasonable space of time, but on the basis of a population of five millions. Here I come to another assertion very frequently made—I observe it has not been so frequently made to-night by the hon. gentleman—by the hon. gentleman's friends and supporters throughout the country. Sir, those gentlemen are fond of telling us that theirs is a purely loyal and British policy, and that their tariff favours England. Why, Sir, the thing is absurd on the face of it. If the tariff means anything and can do anything, what it means and what it can do is to keep manufactured goods out of Canada. Who are the chief producers of manufactured goods? England. Who are the manufacturers who can sell cheaply? Why, the manufacturers of England, and nobody else. But let us analyse the matter a little. Let us first analyse it with respect to the statement that we have grown so rapidly within the last period of

seventeen years. I will take our imports And this point is worthy of the attention of our friends, because I know an idea has gone abroad that there has been a large proportionate increase. In 1868 our gross imports amounted to the value of \$72,000,000; in 1878—and mind, I am taking our very worst year—they amounted to \$91,199,000. Consequently, from 1868 to 1878, a period of ten years, our imports had increased \$19,000,000. Sir, that is an increase of 27 per cent, or an increase amounting to 2 7-10 per annum during those ten years.

Mr. FOSTER. Some new provinces were added during that time.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Very possibly: that does not alter the situation. The new provinces, allow me to inform the hon. gentleman, did not add very materially to our importations. In 1895 our total imports were \$105,000,000, being an increase of \$24,000,000 in seventeen years, or 27 per cent. So that the total increase in the one period was at the rate of 2 7-10 per cent per annum, and in the other 1 6-10 per cent, a remarkable proof of the exceedingly rapid growth under hon. gentlemen opposite. As I said, I took 1878, which was the most unfavourable year. I had a right to take 1874 or 1875, or an average of the four or five years, were I to follow the fashion of the hon. gentleman. I will now take the grand totals of exports and imports and apply the same test. In 1868 the exports and imports were of the value of \$131,027,000; in 1878 the value was \$172,405,000; an increase of \$41,500,000, being at the rate for the ten years of 30 per cent, or 3 per cent per annum for each of those ten years. In 1895 the total value of exports and imports was \$224,420,000, an increase of \$52,000,000 in seventeen years, equal to 30 per cent, or less than 2 per cent per annum. So while the increase under a protective policy was 1 3/4 per cent during a period of 17 years, the increase under a revenue tariff was 3 per cent, very nearly double; or to put it in other words, our rate of growth was 100 per cent greater under a revenue than under a protective tariff. We will now try the hon. gentleman's favourite per capita plan, and I will take the average from 1874 to 1878. The average during those five years was \$195,000,000, or \$51.25 per head of the population. Taking the hon. gentleman's own customs returns, the amount in 1895 was \$44.25 per head, or \$7 per head less compared with the average from 1874 to 1878. But that it was claimed showed great prosperity. I turn now to another subject, and I am afraid the hon. gentlemen's loyal hearts will sink into their boots when it is brought to their notice—I call attention to the increase in trade with Great Britain. Take the imports. We imported from Great Britain in 1874, goods to the value of \$63,076,000; in 1895, we imported goods to the value of \$31,131,000, considerably less than half. In

1878, our very worst year, we find the imports from Great Britain were of the value of \$37,431,000, with a population of barely 1,000,000 as against \$31,000,000 in 1895, with a population of 5,000,000. That is the way hon. gentlemen opposite have developed and extended our trade with Great Britain. We may sell Great Britain more goods, we buy from Great Britain a great deal less.

But we have increases in certain directions. In 1878 our imports from the United States were of the value of \$48,631,000, and in 1895 of the value of \$54,630,000. So if we diminished our imports from Great Britain we increased our imports, though not quite to the same extent, from the United States.

There are several deductions which I make the hon. Minister of Finance a present of. First, I point out, and I have proved it, that, having reference to our population per capita there has been absolutely no growth in our general trade, but the reverse. In the next place, I point out to him that there has been a most enormous reduction in our imports of British goods. Taking it per capita, it amounts to this, that in 1878 we imported from Great Britain, goods to the value of very nearly \$10 per head, not quite; and in 1895 our imports were of the value of \$6 per head. If you go back to 1874 we imported goods to the value of \$17 per head from Great Britain, as against \$6 in 1895, from the same country. I have pointed out the increase in imports from the United States, and I pointed out the other night, and I repeat the statement for the information of the hon. gentleman, that not only has an enormous reduction in goods imported from Great Britain occurred, but, as a matter of fact, the taxation we levy on British goods is nearly 100 per cent, on the average, greater than taxation on American goods. I trust we shall hear no more for some time of the extent to which the tariff fosters trade with Great Britain.

Mr. McNEILL. Will the hon. gentleman do me the favour to mention the amounts of imports from Great Britain in 1873, and also in 1870 or 1878?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes. In 1873 the value of the imports was \$68,000,000; in 1878, \$37,000,000, and last year, \$31,000,000. Now, Sir, I have gone at some length into this matter, and for good reason. I have found extraordinary ignorance among a great many supporters of hon. gentlemen to the effect of the present tariff, and a very remarkable illustration was brought to my notice recently.

Sir, a gentleman who has been long in the service of the Conservative party, but who has now deserted them for the Patrons, came to a friend of mine to obtain some information and pointers. In the course of the conversation, it turned out that this gentleman who was a local luminary of distinction, and had taken the stump even for

hon. gentlemen opposite, was under the impression—and very much astonished he was to be informed of the contrary—that all British goods were admitted into Canada free of duty.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is a literal fact, and I no longer wondered after hearing that, that the hon. gentlemen opposite had been able to yet retain some measure of confidence on the part of a certain number of their supporters.

Mr. COCHRANE. That man must have been reading the Grit newspapers.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Well, I asked him the question, and like a great many other honest Conservatives, I found that his habit was never to look at a Grit newspaper, and never to go to a meeting where any Grit speaker had a chance of addressing the audience. Consequently, he remained in that blissful ignorance as to the dealings with British goods of that most loyal Government opposite. He was, I believe, a true sample of a very great number of the supporters of my hon. friend opposite.

Now, Sir, I shall not,—because I do not want to trespass to-night too long upon the patience of the House—I shall not at this moment go into the minute analysis which I had intended, of certain statements made by the Secretary of State recently, with respect to the condition of the country in 1878, and its present prosperity. I shall reserve that for a little. But, I want to call the attention of the House to this, and I want to call the attention of hon. gentlemen opposite to this. Hon. gentlemen may say what they please, hon. gentlemen may take up what position they like as to the census, but one thing at least they do know, and that is this: that the census shows, as no other document ever did, that all over Canada to-day, the rate of increase has fallen to something less than half of that which prevails in other countries similarly situated. That has occurred, under what circumstances? It has occurred in a country which every man knows is able to support in peace and prosperity, fifty millions, or perhaps one hundred millions of people. It has occurred in a country, which as everybody knows, contains huge tracts of territory up to the present moment absolutely untouched by the plough. Sir, I think I may well ask, how comes it; if these hon. gentlemen opposite have produced an era of universal and unexampled prosperity as the Finance Minister has frequently stated; how comes it to pass, if everything is as we desire it to be, that of every seven immigrants who come to this country, six desert us and take up their abode in another land. How comes it to pass, I ask, that it is the case to-day, that over a whole province you find that the population is absolutely at a standstill. How

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

comes it to pass, that over innumerable districts in the province of Ontario—not to speak of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick—the rural population are diminishing and decreasing day by day. I would like to hear my hon. friend from Toronto (Mr. Cockburn) endorse the statement which was made by the Finance Minister recently, as to the unexampled prosperity of the city of Toronto at present, and if he will not, perhaps I may afford a little light on that subject by and by. Sir, I will just put this one question to the Finance Minister, a question at least as pertinent as that with which he concluded his remarks. I ask: If, as hon. gentlemen opposite say, and as I say, and have said over and over again; if the resources of Canada are great; if the soil of Canada is good taken as a whole; if Canada contains within its bounds ample room, and space, and verge, to maintain, perhaps, one hundred millions of people in peace and prosperity; if the climate is good and the people are intelligent, why is it that these things come about? Sir, I say the answer is clear. If the soil is good, and the people are good, and the climate is good, Canada must be afflicted with an unexampled bad government, and an unexampled bad policy, to produce this result. The reason is this: Is it because the people of Canada have been for years and years running after financial and economical will-o-the-wisps, and it is because they deserted the dictates of common sense and reasonable political economy, that they find themselves in the position in which they are to-day. There is, Sir, ground for believing, that the people of Canada, as a whole, are alive to the situation, and before I conclude the remarks I intend to make on this occasion, I believe I shall be able to prove to hon. gentlemen opposite that they have even better reason than I have already given for entertaining that opinion. Now, Sir, I propose to imitate the English precedent. I have always felt it was treating the Finance Minister with a sort of disrespect, not to wait until I had his speech fully reported and in my hand, before I proceeded to deal with the great mass of figures which it contains. Therefore, I propose to move the adjournment of the debate, and when I get the hon. gentleman's figures, then I propose to deal with them. I think I shall be able, if not to show him, at least to show a good number of those who sit behind him, that whatever else his figures did or did not prove, they certainly did not prove the conclusions he drew from them.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. FOSTER. It may be convenient at this time to settle the question as to procedure. We have heretofore been in the habit of going on with the debate on the

Budget de die in diem. Last year when I made the proposal there was an objection for a day or two, and then we went on from day to day. I suppose hon. gentlemen have no disinclination to proceed with this debate consecutively until it is concluded?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Not yet surely. Why, we have not a single Bill forward yet, and then, there is my hon. friend from Bruce (Mr. McNeill), who has a motion of supreme importance which cannot be dispensed with.

Mr. FOSTER. That is already arranged for Wednesday. If we cannot agree on it now, I shall give notice in the regular course that we do go on de die in diem.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman takes me a little by surprise with this proposal. I have no objection to confer with him at a later period, but I cannot agree to it at this moment.

ADULTERATION OF FOOD, DRUGS, ETC.

The House resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 10) further to amend the Act respecting the Adulteration of Food, Drugs and Agricultural Fertilizers.—(Mr. Sproule).

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I have not had an opportunity of looking over this Bill, but I would suggest to the Minister of Finance that it had better be referred to one of our committees, such as the Banking and Commerce Committee. We pass Bills here sometimes without knowing much about them, although they affect matters of commerce, and should be carefully looked into.

Mr. FOSTER. It will have to be reprinted, and there will be time to look over it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The Minister of Justice might look over the Bill.

Mr. FOSTER. The Minister of Justice has looked over this.

Mr. INNES. I think the suggestion of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) should be adopted; and the provision of this Bill with reference to honey might very well be referred to the Dominion analyst. I am not an expert in matters of this kind, but I know that there is quite a difference of opinion with regard to the nature of honey produced from sugar. I have in my hand a pamphlet written by the Rev. W. F. Clarke, who has made a life-long study of bee-keeping, in which he strongly opposes this Bill. I believe that this Bill originated with the Bee-keepers' Association. At the same time, it has met with strong opposition, not only from the Rev. Mr. Clarke, but from others as well; and for the information of the House, I will read a few extracts from letters that were

published by him on this subject in the "Mail" newspaper last year. He says:

ABSURD LEGISLATION.

The Anti-Sugar Honey Bill.

Abortive attempts have been made during the past two sessions of the Dominion Parliament to pass a Bill prohibiting the manufacture of honey from sugar-syrup. Recent researches in the science of chemistry have proved that the nectar of flowers and the saccharine quality of a pure commercial sugar, such as that known in the market as the best granulated, are one and the same. The best granulated sugar has been largely fed of late years to bees not sufficiently provided with honey stores for winter, and it has been accidentally discovered that this quality of sugar is converted by the bees into a honey which cannot be distinguished by experts from the best grades of floral honey. No sooner was this discovery made public than a hue and a cry arose among ignorant, unscientific, narrow-minded bee-keepers against what they alleged to be threatened adulteration of honey. The parties who have been at work to promote the passage of this Bill declare that they are "determined to prevent adulteration." It would be well for them to show first wherein the alleged adulteration consists. Chemistry asserts that there is none. It affirms that the nectar of flowers and the saccharine quality of pure commercial sugar are one and the same. So little is known by the community in general of the nature of bees and honey that it is not strange the House of Commons should have passed the Bill in question last session, when it was found to be lobbied by the bee-keepers. It was, however, thrown out by the Senate. Unfortunately, our Parliaments have too often passed Acts in the interest of monopolists and combines rather than for the good of the general public. The anti-sugar honey bill is one of this class.

Then he states, in succinct form, the objections to the passing of this Bill, and I think that the Government should pause before giving it their assent. Certainly because it may seriously interfere with an industry which is steadily growing throughout the country, and which the Government, I understand, have concluded to encourage and foster still more. He sums up his objections to the passage of this Bill as follows:—

1. Because the proposed Bill interferes improperly with the liberty of the subject. It is outside of the proper function of legislation, which is supposed to give freedom of action to every citizen within such limits as are consistent with the rights of others, and the general good.
2. The manufacture of honey from a pure article of commercial sugar is a legitimate business with which a legislature has no right to interfere. There is no fraud about it, and no adulteration. It is not proposed to sell sugar-honey as white clover, linden, or any other kind of honey. Those who favour it are perfectly willing to have it conspicuously labelled and sold as "sugar-honey." Will any man who pretends to know anything about political economy assert that there is any wrong here to be prohibited by law?
3. The fact pointed out by me, in my first article, that bees have the function of transmit-

ting indigestible cane sugar into digestible grape sugar, is a strong argument against the Bill. Her is a great possible good to humanity, which this Bill seeks to forbid. I showed that in the belief of many physiologists, indigestion, kidney trouble, diabetes, and even Bright's disease, were traceable to the vast consumption of an indigestible and poisonous kind of sugar. Is it not in the interest of the human family that an injurious article of food should be changed into a kind that is wholesome?

4. Another objection to the Bill is that it is unnecessary, and all needless legislation is an impertinence and a nuisance. Even granted that sugar-honey is an inferior, second rate kind of honey; so is buckwheat, but it is not proposed to have an anti-buckwheat honey Bill. I find some people think I spoke too disparagingly of buckwheat honey in my first communication. All right, I am not asking a Bill to make its production and consumption illegal. I do not think much of Limberger cheese, but I am not seeking a law to prohibit its manufacture and use. Honey is able to take care of itself in the world of trade and commerce. Dealers and customers can discriminate its various grades.

I think that before the Government allow a Bill like this to pass, they ought at least to get the opinion of their own analyst with respect to the merits of the two kinds of honey, and it seems to me it would be very foolish to pass a Bill of this kind without having particular knowledge on the subject, even though it has been advocated by a few bee-keepers, because I am satisfied it would do an injury to an industry we are all inclined to encourage. The communication of the Rev. Mr. Clarke, a gentleman who has made a life study of the business, ought to have due weight, and the Bill should be allowed to stand over until next session.

Mr. SPROULE. I would like to say a word or two with regard to that communication from the Rev. Mr. Clarke. It might be assumed that so far as Mr. Clarke's knowledge went, it was absolutely correct, and that he took the trouble to ascertain that the statements he makes are perfectly well founded. Well, he has made the statement that this Bill was hurried through this House last year and thrown out by the Senate. I need hardly tell the House that this is absolutely incorrect, and that it must stamp the whole communication as likely to be equally unreliable.

Mr. INNES. That was a mistake.

Mr. SPROULE. If the whole communication is filled with such mistakes, one can easily understand what little value there is to be attached to it. With regard to his statement that it is impossible to tell the difference between this so-called sugar-honey and pure honey, I have the authority of the Government analyst for saying that there is no trouble whatever in distinguishing by chemical analysis the difference between honey made in this way and pure honey. And as one who knows something about chemistry and has given a little attention

Mr. INNES.

to the subject, I fully agree in the statement that there is no difficulty whatever in telling the difference. There are several other statements in this communication which I might refute, but it is not my intention to take them up one by one, although they are equally as unreliable as the one I have referred to. As regards the Rev. Mr. Clarke being an expert in bee-keeping, no doubt he is, but twice during the last few years the foul brood inspector of Ontario was compelled to go into this gentleman's yard and burn his bees because they were not kept in proper condition. It seems to me that this ought to stamp him as not being an expert of a very high order.

Mr. INNES. It does not say anything against his contention here.

Mr. SPROULE. It indicates that he is not an apiarist of as high order as he ought to have been or this would not have happened. As regards his statement concerning cane-sugar being converted into digestible grape sugar by the bees, every medical man knows that it is not a fact that cane-sugar is indigestible. The fluids of the stomach and the saliva mix with it and cause it to digest as rapidly as most other kinds of food taken into the stomach. As regards the opposition to the Bill, it comes from, I believe, only three men in Canada. One of them is Mr. Clarke and the other two I could name, if necessary, but it is not necessary to do so to-night. The unanimity of opinion is such that I have only heard of three bee-keepers in Canada who oppose the passage of this Bill. All the rest, as far as I am informed, are in its favour. They think it does not go as far as they desire; but this draft is submitted on the advice and consent of the Minister of Justice (Mr. Dickey) as one that would be acceptable and answer the purpose. I am quite sure that when the Bill is reprinted, and this House goes over it carefully, they will be satisfied that there is nothing objectionable in it, but that it is a valuable measure for the purposes intended.

Mr. INNES. I think the Government should pay as much deference to the opinions of those opposed to the Bill as those in its favour. If the Government are not themselves able to determine regarding the merits of the Bill—whether this kind of honey should be inderdicted or not—they ought to get the opinion of some competent person, and hold over the Bill until that opinion is obtained. Some expert should be consulted with regard to the matter. The bee-keepers themselves being divided in opinion, who is to judge which opinion is right?

Mr. SPROULE. The great weight of opinion appears to be on the one side. We have adopted the same principle in other matters. We punish the adulteration of food in the

same way. When the adulteration is not injurious to health, we inflict a lighter penalty than when it is injurious, and this Bill is exactly on the same lines.

Mr. INNES. This particular kind of honey has not been proved injurious to health. That is simply your assertion.

Mr. SPROULE. I am not contending that it is. I am contending that it is an adulteration.

Mr. INNES. I do not think so. It is simply the conversion of one kind of food into another kind, which has not yet been proved to be deleterious to humanity.

Mr. CASEY. If I had not thought that the principle of the Bill was not fully established by the second reading, I should have said something before with regard to it. I am quite satisfied that we did right in prohibiting the manufacture of oleomargarine, and I am quite satisfied that we would do equally right in prohibiting the manufacture of imitation honey. The question is not whether it is wholesome, but whether you are going to pay the price of honey for some preparation of sugar. But, Sir, there is another and possibly a larger question. I believe we ought to have and could have, a very large export trade in honey. But I am satisfied that the exportation of any considerable quantities of these imitations of honey would prevent the growth of this trade in honey. It was as much to protect the export trade as to prevent fraud upon the domestic consumer that we prevented the making of oleomargarine.

Mr. SPROULE. And filled cheese.

Mr. CASEY. And the same is true of imitation cheese, as my hon. friend from Grey (Mr. Sproule) remarks. I do not see how an honest bee-keeper can object to this Bill. I do not know who they are who are said to object to it; but it does seem to me that if one could know who objected to a Bill to prevent the adulteration of honey or the manufacture of imitation honey, it would be a warning to one to buy his honey elsewhere. I do not wish to attack anybody, and I do not know who they are who raise this objection, but these are my opinions.

Mr. INNES. I would have objected on the second reading, Mr. Chairman, but I was not in the House at the time. I understood from the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) that he would not bring up the Bill without letting me know. I was absent in Montreal when the Bill was read a second time, or I would have objected then.

Mr. McNEILL. It cannot attach great weight to the objections that have been urged against this measure. I have heard with great surprise the statement read by my hon. friend opposite (Mr. Innes) that it

was impossible to distinguish between this bogus and the genuine honey. I think if the statement given by my hon. friend—I do not refer to his own statement but to that of some other person which he read—were true and that chemistry could not detect any difference, I should be inclined to say, so much the worse for chemistry. I am quite sure that every one who is in the habit of using honey knows that there is a great deal of difference in the value and flavour of natural honey. Some kinds of honey are worth more than others and some are better than others, the flavour being finer. Therefore the statement that honey made from sugar cannot be distinguished from other honey would lead to this, that all honey must be of the same flavour, which, we know, is not the case. What has been said by my hon. friend from Elgin (Mr. Casey) is a very important consideration—that if we allow bogus honey to be manufactured in this country, we shall bring all our honey into disfavour. I hold that we ought to guard very jealously the reputation of all our natural products—I mean that class of products that we succeed in raising on our farms. This honey industry has already become important and is capable of very great expansion. But it needs the same protection we have endeavoured to give other similar industries, that of preventing the substitution of the bogus for the real article. I would really hope that my hon. friend (Mr. Innes) would withdraw his objection to this measure. I have not heard a single argument that, in my opinion, ought to cause this committee to do other than pass this Bill. It seems to me, from every point of view, a most valuable measure, and one that we ought to place upon the statute-book as quickly as possible.

Mr. INNES. The hon. gentleman's argument with reference to the fact that chemistry is unable to distinguish between this sugar-honey and the other seems to me a very strange one. I am just as anxious as the hon. gentleman is to keep down any product that is of a bogus character. But the mere fact that there is a difference in flavour does not indicate, necessarily, any difference in the essential qualities of the two articles. You have a number of different flavours of honey, according to the kind of flower from which it is extracted. But the question is this:—It has not been determined yet that this kind of honey is of a deleterious character, that it is not equally as wholesome as the other kinds of honey. That being so, I think the Government should hesitate before passing this Bill, for this legislation is of a sumptuary character. This kind of honey has been purchased for years and this is the only time that any objection has been raised.

Mr. McNEILL. My hon. friend will see that this is not a question as to whether

this product is deleterious or not. My hon. friend who has charge of the Bill has stated so distinctly that the statement on which the hon. gentleman bases his objection that chemistry cannot distinguish between these two products—has been disproved, that there is really nothing left in the objection that I can see.

Mr. FOSTER. I would suggest that, as the amendment, which has been given in writing, has not really been before the House, the committee should rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again, and that, in the meantime, the Bill be reprinted as it is proposed to amend it. Then the House will be seized of the amendment. As it is now, only those gathered around the table can understand the scope of the Bill.

Mr. SPROULE. I am quite satisfied that that should be done. I had not expected that the Bill would come up or I would have had it reprinted and distributed.

Committee rose and reported progress.

Mr. FOSTER moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 10.05 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 3rd February, 1896.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 47) respecting the Brandon and South Western Railway Company.—(Mr. Davin.)

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 25) respecting the St. Lawrence and Ottawa Railway Company.—(Mr. Sproule for Mr. McLeod.)

Bill (No. 26) respecting the Nelson and Fort Sheppard Railway Company.—(Mr. Mara.)

Bill (No. 27) respecting the Lindsay, Bobcaygeon and Pontypool Railway Company.—(Mr. Fairbairn.)

Bill (No. 28) to incorporate the Huron and Ontario Railway Company.—(Mr. Sproule.)

Bill (No. 29) to amend the Act incorporating the Supreme Court of the Independent Order of Foresters.—(Mr. McGillivray.)

Mr. McNEILL.

Bill (No. 30) respecting the Guelph Junction Railway Company.—(Mr. Sproule for Mr. Masson.)

Bill (No. 31) to incorporate the Hudson Bay and Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Sproule for Mr. Macdonell, Algoma.)

Bill (No. 32) respecting the Winnipeg Great Northern Railway Company.—(Mr. Sproule for Mr. Boyd.)

Bill (No. 33) to incorporate the Equitable Benefit Company of Canada.—(Mr. Sproule for Mr. Maclean, York.)

Bill (No. 34) to consolidate and amend certain Acts relating to the Nipissing and James Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. Sproule for Mr. Tisdale.)

Bill (No. 35) to incorporate the Canadian Electric Railway and Power Company.—(Mr. Sproule for Mr. Coatsworth.)

Bill (No. 36) to incorporate the South Shore Suburban Railway Company.—(Mr. Girouard for Mr. Lachapelle.)

Bill (No. 37) to confirm a certain lease and agreement between the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada and the St. Lawrence and Adirondack Railway Company.—(Mr. Bergeron.)

Bill (No. 38) respecting the Montreal and Ottawa Railway Company.—(Mr. Bergeron.)

Bill (No. 39) respecting the St. Lawrence and Adirondack Railway Company.—(Mr. Bergeron.)

Bill (No. 40) respecting the South Ontario Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Sutherland.)

Bill (No. 41) respecting the Lake Erie and Detroit River Railway Company.—(Mr. McGregor.)

Bill (No. 42) respecting the Canada and Michigan Bridge and Tunnel Company.—(Mr. Ingram.)

Bill (No. 43) to incorporate the Queenston Heights Bridge Company.—(Mr. Coatsworth.)

Bill (No. 44) relating to the Board of Trade of the city of Toronto.—(Mr. Coatsworth.)

Bill (No. 45) to incorporate the Schomberg and Aurora Railway Company.—(Mr. Coatsworth.)

APPOINTMENT OF SENATORS.

Mr. SUTHERLAND (for Mr. Landerkin) asked :

How many Senators were appointed from the 4th of January to the 15th of January, both days inclusive, in the year 1896 ?

What is the name and post office address of each of them ?

How many other appointments were made to the public service during the same period ?

How many portfolios were vacant in the Cabinet when said appointments were made ?

Mr. FOSTER. 1. Three senators. 2. Hon. Michael Adams, Newcastle, N.B. ; Hon. J. C. Aikins, Toronto, Ont. ; Hon. Geo. B. Baker, Sweetburg, P.Q. 3. Twenty-eight

appointments and six Ministers pro tem. 4. Five.

GOVERNMENT CHEESE.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT asked :

1. What number of cheese have the Government in store at the present time ?
2. Why were the said cheeses not disposed of as manufactured ?
3. Why were they shipped to Montreal to be stored or otherwise disposed of ? Have they been sold ? If so, to whom, and price realized ?
4. If disposed of to Hudson Bros., why has this firm handled the entire product turned out under Government supervision ?

Mr. FOSTER. There are about eight hundred cheese in store in Prince Edward Island, under the control of the Dairy Commissioner as trustee for the patrons of the dairy stations. Some of these are in store to meet the local trade on Prince Edward Island in the winter, and some, because they were not made or not cured, until navigation to Montreal closed in November. The risk of injury by frost renders it unsafe to ship cheese from Prince Edward Island until April. There are one hundred and twenty-four cheese at the dairy school at Kingston, Ont., and about sixty at Montreal and at the dairy school at St. Hyacinthe, Que. These will be sold as soon as they are cured and ready to ship. Cheese were shipped from Prince Edward Island to Montreal during the summer, because that route gave the cheapest and best facilities for marketing the cheese, storing them and shipping them to Great Britain. These cheese have been sold to Messrs. Hodgson Bros., Montreal, on terms which are to be kept private until the cheese are disposed of by them. Messrs. Hodgson Bros. have bought the cheese from the dairy stations in Prince Edward Island for the past three years, because they offered and paid higher prices than could be obtained from any other Canadian firm.

VOLUNTEERS OF 1837-38.

Mr. BOSTON asked :

Is it the intention of the Government to make any grant of money or land to the volunteers who served during the rebellion of 1837-38 ?

Mr. FOSTER. It is not.

THE SHORTIS CASE.

Mr. YEO (for Mr. Rider) asked :

1. Whether the sentence of death pronounced on Valentine Shortis has been commuted into that of imprisonment for life, and when was the commutation made ?
2. Did the Minister of Justice make a recommendation to Council in the Shortis case ?
3. Was such recommendation in favour of the law taking its course, or what was the nature of the recommendation ?
4. Did the Council fail to deal with such recommendation ?

5. What was the nature of the memorandum made by the Department of Justice or the Government to His Excellency ?

Mr. DICKEY. The Address of this House to His Excellency will bring down all the information in reply to these questions that can be submitted to the House, and as they will be down very shortly I think it would be better it should not be answered in the fragmentary way, as is here suggested.

Mr. LAURIER. This week ?

Mr. DICKEY. I think so. In a couple of days, I hope.

RETURNS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. SUTHERLAND (for Mr. Lauderkin) asked :

Is it true, as stated in the public press, that out of 106 returns ordered by this House in the session of 1895, only 42 have yet been brought down, leaving 64 returns not yet brought down ? If not, what are the correct figures ?

Mr. OUIMET. The number of returns voted by the House during session of 1895 was 107 ; and of these 77 were submitted, leaving 30 as yet unanswered.

COLLECTORSHIP OF STANSTEAD.

Mr. YEO (for Mr. Rider) asked :

Is the port of Stanstead, in the county of Stanstead, without a collector, and when did the vacancy occur ? What was the salary paid to the late collector ? Has the late collector been superannuated ? When, and at what yearly amount ? Is the Government aware that the continuance of such vacancy is causing serious inconvenience to business and anxiety to many of its friends ? Have there been any applications for the position, and how many ? Is it the intention of the Government to fill the vacancy at once ?

Mr. WOOD. The duties of the collector of customs at Stanstead are fulfilled by an acting collector. The collectorship became vacant on the superannuation of the late collector on 12th July, 1895. The late collector's salary was at the rate of \$1,150 per annum, and his superannuation allowance is at the rate of \$805 per annum. The Government is not aware that serious inconvenience is caused to business owing to the duties of the office being attended to by an acting collector, and no anxiety has been expressed. The acting collector has applied for the appointment. The question of an appointment is receiving consideration.

THEODORE BOUCHARD, OF QUEBEC.

Mr. GUAY (for Mr. Tarte) asked :

Whether there is a person named Théodore Bouchard in the employment of the Customs Department, or the collector of customs, at Quebec ? Are the Government aware that he went down and worked at the election which has just taken place, in the interest of the candidate Cimon, and that he declared that the Government would

shut their eyes to the acts of smugglers who voted for the candidate Cimon ?

Do the Government know that Théodore Bouchard has been several times convicted of smuggling ?

Mr. WOOD. The answer to each of the three questions of the hon. member is, no.

PASPEBIAC HARBOUR OF REFUGE.

Mr. JONCAS asked :

Whether petitions have been presented to the Government asking for the construction of a harbour of refuge at Paspébiac, in the county of Bonaventure ?

If so, by whom were the said petitions signed ?

Mr. OUIMET. Two petitions have been received by the department, one in February, 1882, through Mr. Beauchesne, then M.P., signed by Rev. Cyprien Larrivée, Messrs. Charles Robin & Co., LeBoutillier Bros., the mayor and councillors of Paspébiac, and 184 others, asking for the construction of a public wharf at Paspébiac. Another petition was transmitted by Mr. Georges Romeril, agent for Messrs. Charles Robin & Co., on the 1st June, 1891, asking that necessary works be constructed at Paspébiac to make it a harbour of refuge. This petition was signed by Messrs. LeBoutillier Bros., Georges Romeril, Rev. Mr. Larrivée, and 113 others. Letters were subsequently received to the same effect from Mr. Romeril, on the 8th January, 28th November, and 26th December, 1894, and from Messrs. Robin, Colas & Co., on the 28th March, 1894.

FISHERY LAW AND ALIEN LABOUR LAW—NEGOTIATIONS WITH THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. CASEY asked :

1. What negotiations have taken place between the Government of Canada and that of the United States, in regard to the proposal of a reciprocal relaxation of the Canadian fishery laws and the United States alien labour law, in the Thousand Islands, or elsewhere on the St. Lawrence ?

2. Who was appointed to represent Canada in these negotiations, and what is the present state of the negotiations ?

Mr. COSTIGAN. No negotiations have taken place between the Government of Canada and that of the United States, in regard to the proposal of a reciprocal relaxation of the Canadian fishery laws and the United States alien labour law in the Thousand Islands, or elsewhere on the St. Lawrence.

PURCHASE OF PADLOCKS FOR THE MAIL SACKS.

Mr. GUAY (Translation) (for Mr. Tarte) asked :

Whether the Post Office Department has purchased padlocks of a new pattern for the mail

Mr. GUAY.

sacks ? If so, from whom were they purchased, and what was the amount paid ?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. (Translation.) The amounts paid are as follows : October, 1894, \$825 ; June, 1895, \$700 ; July, 1895, \$770 ; August, 1895, \$1,330 ; November, 1895, \$700 ; December, 1895, \$1,401.40 ; total, \$5,726.40. Those padlocks were manufactured by Mr. George Low, of Ottawa, from October, 1894 to December, 1895, and the sums of money just mentioned were paid.

PURCHASE OF PADLOCKS FOR THE MAIL SACKS WITHIN THE LAST SIX MONTHS.

Mr. GUAY (Translation) (for Mr. Tarte) asked :

Whether the Government have, within the last six months, renewed the padlocks used for fastening the mail sacks ? If so, from whom were the new padlocks purchased, and what was the outlay caused by the change ?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. (Translation.) In reply to the question put by the hon. gentleman, I may say that the Government, of late, have changed the copper padlocks for steel padlocks. The reason why the change was made is that the latter are looked upon as less expensive and better adapted to the mail service. Within the last six months, fifty-two of these padlocks were renewed by the department, and the work was done by the manufacturer at his own expense, from a contract entered into with him.

REPAIRS TO THE WHARF AT ST. LAURENT.

Mr. GUAY (Translation) (for Mr. Tarte) asked :

What was the price, per hundred, paid for the deals used in repairing the wharf at St. Laurent last summer ? Where were they purchased ; what is the name of the seller, and how much was paid for carriage ?

Mr. OUIMET. (Translation.) The materials used for these repairs were deals 12 feet long by 3 inches thick and 9 inches wide, at the cost of 20 cents each. Those deals were purchased from Ovide Philion, of St. Laurent, Island of Orleans. There was nothing paid for carriage.

EXTENSION OF THE WHARF AT RIMOUSKI.

Mr. GUAY (Translation) (for Mr. Tarte) asked :

Whether, since last session, the Government called for tenders for the work of extending the wharf at Rimouski, and the making of a basin at that place ?

Are the works estimated at \$100,000 ?

What are the names of the parties tendering, and the amounts of their several tenders ?

Have contracts been signed, and if so, what are the names of the contractors ?

Who prepared the plans and specifications ?

When are the works to be commenced ; when are they to be completed, and what sums have been voted by Parliament for the said works ?

Mr. OUIMET. (Translation.) The Government, since last session, have called for tenders for certain public works at Rimouski. No contract has yet been signed. I cannot now give the names of the parties tendering, which cannot be made known until the contract has been let. The plans and specifications have been prepared by the engineer-in-chief of the Department of Public Works and the works are estimated at over \$100,000.

SCAB IN SHEEP.

Mr. DAVIN asked :

1. Whether the Government is taking steps to guard against the introduction of scab from the United States into the flocks of the North-west Territories ?

2. Whether the quarantine of sixty days will be imposed upon all importations of sheep from the United States into the North-west Territories ?

3. Whether quarantine grounds for the keeping of bands quarantined, will be set apart at suitable points along the international boundary ?

4. Whether the course suggested is not necessary to secure the British market for our North-west sheep ranchers ?

Mr. FOSTER. 1. The Government has been and is taking, it believes, all necessary steps to guard the North-west Territories from sheep scab. 2. A quarantine of 60 days is unnecessary against sheep scab. All sheep affected with it are prohibited from entering. 3. The Government has properly isolated and well guarded grounds at all the important trails between Manitoba and the Rocky Mountains. 4. It is believed the measures taken are ample for the protection of the North-west, but Prof. McEachren, in accordance with instructions from the department is taking the matter up afresh with a view to a still more perfect system if such be found possible.

DUTY ON AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENTS.

On the Order,

Mr. DAVIN :

That, in the opinion of this House, the duty on agricultural implements should be removed.

Mr. DAVIN. Mr. Speaker, six o'clock arrived the other day when I was proposing this motion. I had argued that from a strictly protective standpoint the course suggested by the motion should be taken. I find, Sir, that one of the public prints—in fact, one of the two greatest papers in Canada, a paper which certainly, for some years now, has been singularly fair—the Toronto "Globe"—commenting on the position I took up, seemed to think that I was in the gall of politico-economic ignorance and in the bonds of trade iniquity. But if

we could have the names of the writers of the anonymous articles that appear in the public journals appended to those articles, we should be able to appraise the value that should be attached to the politico-economic judgments of the writers. Nothing is easier than to state dogmatically that a speaker or a writer on those subjects is mistaken. I may say here that connected with every tariff, whether such an one as exists in England, or, above all, such an one as exists in the United States or in Canada, in nearly every item propositions will be involved that it will require the greatest care and the greatest mental astuteness to properly judge. In regard to this very subject of implements, we have had from a man of undoubted honour in this House, a member of the Reform party, the assurance that implements are sent into Canada by McCormack invoiced at \$80. If that be the case, we may fairly assume that the 645 binders sent into Manitoba, which are appraised for duty at \$95 each, were amongst the number that were invoiced at \$80. If that be so, it is one of the instances which undoubtedly do occur in the incidence of a tariff where the manufacturing exporter to the country where there is a protective tariff pays the duty. In this case McCormack would pay \$15 of the \$19 duty on each of those 645 binders. I have no doubt whatever that there are cases where the duty is paid by the manufacturing exporter, and of course there are other cases in which the proposition would be simply absurd. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have stated my main reason for putting this motion on the paper. It is that, owing to circumstances which we need not enter into detail, we in the North-west Territories are now shut up entirely to the Massey-Harris Company. I may say for that company that its manager in the North-west Territories and the men subordinate to him are as a rule kind and considerate in their treatment of the farmers. There have been complaints to the contrary, but only individual complaints. But what is generally complained of is this, that the Massey-Harris Company now have a monopoly of the Territories ; and, although as a fact, as I am assured on good authority, they are selling binders as cheap as they are sold in Dakota, certainly as cheap, nevertheless it is an unpleasant thing to have a monopoly like that in existence. What we feel is that if we had competitors with the Massey-Harris Company in the Territories, even supposing the farmer would not get his implements at lower prices, better terms could be made than are made to-day. It is necessary that the legislature should exercise a strict surveillance over the transactions of this and every other company of the kind ; and, as I told the House the other day, we have passed an ordinance in the North-west Territories forbidding the farmer to mortgage

his growing crop. That will be a protection to him. It is probably to be regretted that any of our citizens, especially any man occupying the responsible position of a farmer, should need this kind of paternal protection; but as a matter of fact, our farmers do need it, and I was very glad to see such legislation passed. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have brought this matter before the House; I have pressed it upon the attention of the Finance Minister; he has brought down his Budget, and nothing this year is done. I hope that next year my hon. friend may see his way to do in regard to these implements what he did in regard to other articles two years ago—revise the tariff, and consider whether the duties on them may not now be taken away or reduced. We had a vote on this a few years ago, and the House on division voted, not practically but literally, against my motion; and as there are some other motions of mine on the paper and no practical result can be gained by pressing this matter further, I shall not press the motion.

Motion dropped.

GRADING WHEAT.

Mr. DAVIN moved:

That a committee consisting of Hon. Mr. Prior, Messrs. McDonald (Assiniboia), Boyd, Martin, Sproule, McMullen and the mover be appointed to inquire into the present system of grading wheat in Manitoba and the North-west, and especially as to the frauds whereby, it is alleged, the farmers are cheated of what they are justly entitled to for their wheat. The committee to have power to send for persons and papers, and report from time to time.

He said: The motion that I have on the paper is one of the most important, in my opinion, that can be brought before the attention of the Government and the House. In making it, I quite feel that I ought to be in a position to put my finger on this and that case of fraud or presumable fraud; I feel that I ought to be able to give this and that case where fraud was alleged to have taken place; but I am not in that position, and for this reason, that it is almost impossible, without such an inquiry as I suggest here, to arrive at instances of the kind. But that there is a great grievance to be got rid of with regard to the grading of wheat, no man who lives in the Territories can have the least doubt. I will give you an instance of what has come before me. A farmer goes and sells his wheat in one town: it is considered to be of a certain grade, and he is offered a certain price for it. He hears later that in a neighbouring town, the same wheat is sold as of a higher grade. He goes there the following day, and for the same wheat he gets a better price—so much better as to make a difference of some 10 or 12 cents a bushel. Some farmers have told me that they have come into a given

Mr. DAVIN.

town and had the wheat rated as No. 2 or No. 1, as the case might be, and the following day they brought again the same kind of wheat, and the persons who rated it the previous day laughed at them, and said they would give nothing like the grade that was given yesterday, although the wheat was exactly the same, and there was no change in price. I consider there is a radical breach of the ground principle that we should rest on in grading wheat, in the fact that the buyers of wheat have something to say in it. I hold that the buyers of wheat should have nothing whatever to say in finding the grade, and two or three years ago a letter was published from Sir William VanHorne, who ought to be an authority, in which he said that it was wrong in principle that the buyer should have anything to do with the grading of wheat. I ask the Government to give me a committee in this matter. If we have a committee, I shall be able to show, by witnesses, that a very great grievance does exist. I know that there is the greatest possible discontent in the North-west Territories: I know that there is a strong feeling among the farmers that they are being swindled systematically in this matter. I may tell you that I have it on very good authority, whose name I am not permitted to give, but an authority that leaves no doubt whatever in my mind, that the farmers are being squeezed and injured, that they are being, to use the strong language of my authority, robbed. I have brought the grievance now before the House and the Government. The outcry with regard to it is so strong that I do not think that this House or Government can leave this matter any longer in its present position.

Mr. PRIOR. I have listened with interest to what the hon. gentleman has said on this question. The question is one, I am sorry to say, with which I am but imperfectly acquainted, having only just taken charge of the department, and having, so far, found it impossible to look thoroughly into this matter. No doubt, however, my hon. predecessor, the Controller of Customs (Mr. Wood), will give to the House the benefit of his experience. My hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) has stated that frauds are being committed on the farmers. All I can say is that, so far as I know, no such frauds as the hon. gentleman complains of have been reported to the Government. I can promise the hon. gentleman, however, that I will look thoroughly into the question, and if I find that any frauds are being perpetrated, I will see that such legislation be brought down as will prevent their recurrence.

Mr. WOOD. I may just say that my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) has touched upon a question which has excited the widest controversy. The interests involved in his motion, simple as it may ap-

pear, are very widespread and diverse. The interests of the farmer have, of course, to be considered, and also the interests of the different boards of trade throughout the country. In fact, having regard to our export trade and to the importance of the commodity itself, we are bound to consider this question from a national and commercial standpoint. Now, so far as my experience went—and we had a good deal of discussion of this matter when I was at the head of the department now presided over by my hon. friend who has just taken his seat—the opinions among farmers in the North-west vary to a considerable extent. I may say to the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) that after he has gone into the subject as fully as I know he will—for it is a question that bears very closely upon the interests of those whom he so ably represents in this House—he will find that the farmers are not united on the subject of grading wheat. The illustration that he gave of a farmer selling a load of wheat at one town at a certain price as graded by the buyer, and finding afterwards that in a neighbouring town the wheat would be so graded as to bring another price, is, I must confess, to me scarcely comprehensible. The standard is fixed every year by the grain standard board at Winnipeg. The farmers are more largely represented upon that grain board than upon any other grain board in America. One of the first things I did when I took charge of the Department of Inland Revenue and had time to look into this question, was to enlarge the representation of farmers on the board, at the instance of Mr. Braithwaite, of Portage la Prairie, a gentleman who largely represents the interests of the Patrons and the farmers in that section. In other respects, the board was enlarged by the addition of farmers from various parts of Manitoba and the North-west; so that, so far as the particular interests represented by my hon. friend from Assiniboia are concerned, there can be no doubt that the action of the department in the past three years has been in the direction of enlarging the representation of that class upon the grain board. But the trouble that has arisen, I submit, is due not so much to the grading of the wheat as it is to the practice which prevails in the elevators in Port Arthur known as the mixing of grain. That is a very wide subject, and one which I should be quite willing to discuss with any gentleman when we have certain papers before the House, but which is entirely apart from the motion now before the House; and therefore I shall not go into it on this occasion, unless it is necessary. The frauds which the hon. gentleman seeks to remedy by this motion are something of which, as I stated before, we have no knowledge, the department has no knowledge. The practice between buyers

and sellers cannot be regulated by any law passed by this Parliament beyond the simple grain standard which is made in September of every year by the board which meets in Winnipeg. If a farmer goes to a buyer, or a buyer to a farmer, with a view to the purchase and sale of wheat, there is one standard which is before them both, and the purchase can be made only in accordance with the standard which is before them. If that standard is not before them, it should be before them. If a buyer says to a farmer: I will not grade your wheat No. 1 hard because this wheat does not come up to that standard—it is for the farmer to say: It does come up to the standard, and if you will not take it as No. 1 hard, you cannot have it at all. It is a matter of bargain and sale, so far as concerns the case presented to-day by my hon. friend from West Assiniboia. If the hon. gentleman could present any case to this House or to me showing that the farmers of the North-west are actually defrauded under the present system, I am sure I should be glad to co-operate with my hon. friend the Controller of Inland Revenue in perfecting the machinery of the department so as to overcome the difficulty. The department and the Government surely have no interest in protecting the buyer or in protecting anyone, as against the interest of the other party to a bargain. The farmers especially are a class who ought to receive at least equal protection with others; but when you come down to a point of bargain and sale, no legislation can protect the farmer from being overreached.

Mr. MARTIN. I notice a very great difference between the utterance of the present Controller of Inland Revenue (Mr. Prior) and the gentleman who has just vacated that office (Mr. Wood). I understood the hon. Controller of Inland Revenue to promise my hon. friend from West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) that he would bring into this House legislation to cure the evils depicted and put an end to the frauds—

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. MARTIN. So I understood the hon. gentleman.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. MARTIN. Well, I think I have fairly good ears, and I understood the hon. gentleman to state that very clearly. I understood him to say that he would be very glad, if these frauds were pointed out to him, to bring legislation into this House to cure the evil—

Mr. PRIOR. If there are frauds.

Mr. MARTIN. There are frauds; I do not think there can be any possible doubt about that. There always will be frauds, I fancy—

Mr. PRIOR. No, no.

Mr. MARTIN. I do not ask the hon. gentleman to take my word for it, but I think

he might pay some attention to the declaration of his hon. supporter from West Assiniboia. I think it must be within the knowledge of every member of this House that purchasers of wheat, like purchasers of every other article, will take advantage of every opportunity—and no doubt they have had considerable opportunity in this wheat trade—to buy at a lower grade and a lower price than is just, and that I think may fairly be denominated fraud. But the hon. gentleman who has just left the office of Controller of Inland Revenue (Mr. Wood) has pointed out that this is an evil which it is almost impossible to cure by means of legislation. Parliament can provide what the grade shall be and take means to prevent frauds by the Government inspectors, but, as the hon. Controller of Customs (Mr. Wood) has pointed out, it would be a very uphill job indeed to make an Act of Parliament to prevent frauds of the kind referred to by the hon. member for West Assiniboia. The real remedy for evils of that kind is competition; and I think that at most points in Manitoba and the North-west we have very keen competition in the wheat business. For that very reason, I doubt, for my own part, that the frauds are very extensive. To my mind the real difficulty with regard to the question of wheat grading, as to which the hon. gentleman has moved for a committee, has not been touched upon either by himself or by either of the members of the Government who have spoken upon the question. On the basis of my present information, I am opposed to the present system of grading, which is what I understand, the hon. gentleman wishes to inquire into. I am opposed to the present system because the grading is done from year to year. I think the law is very much against the interests of the farmers of Manitoba and the North-west. It would be much preferable, in my opinion—and I should be glad to join the hon. member from Assiniboia in bringing before the attention of the House and the country evidence to that effect—that there should be one grade, an absolute grade, which should not vary from year to year. I shall endeavour, Mr. Speaker, briefly to show the House why I think that it would be in the interest of the farmer. Under the present Canadian system, the grades are, as explained by the Controller of Customs, made each year by a board which meets in Winnipeg, upon which board the farmers of the country are only slightly represented; I say slightly, because their number is very small, indeed, compared with the number of the opposite party, if I may so call them, the wheat buyers, who are represented upon that board. That board meets each year, generally in September, and settles the grade for that year. Now, Sir, I cannot understand why that should be necessary. It seems to me that we might adopt a law similar to the law that is in force in the

Mr. MARTIN.

United States, in the state of Minnesota, at any rate, where the circumstances are similar to our circumstances, where the wheat to be dealt with is the same kind of wheat that we grow in Manitoba and the North-west Territories. There they have an invariable grade for wheat, and I may say, a grade considerably less severe in its provisions, than the grades laid down by our Act of Parliament, and adopted year after year by the board at Winnipeg. Now, Sir, I will explain the reason why I think that these grades should be invariable, and the same argument applies to the sale of every natural product. Our market for the wheat of the North-west, is the foreign market; that, at any rate, is the place where the price is fixed. We grow in that country as fine a sample of wheat as is grown in any part of the world; in fact, with the exception of wheat grown in the American territory immediately adjoining our territory, there is not in any part of the world any wheat which can compare in value, for the purposes of making flour, with the wheat grown in Manitoba and the Territories. It is therefore of the utmost importance to that country that it should establish for itself a name in the markets of the old country, and the only way in which that name can, in my opinion, be firmly established, is by having an invariable grade, so that when a buyer in Liverpool buys Manitoba No. 1 hard, he knows, no matter what the season is, that he gets the same kind of wheat. The difficulty with the present system is that No. 1 Manitoba hard this year is a very different article indeed from No. 1 Manitoba hard last year, and different from what it may be next year. The only reason that I can see why the changes are made, is in the interest of the wheat buyer; I cannot see any possible advantage in varying the grade, except in the interest of the wheat buyer. The grades are made according to the quality of the crop as it is grown each year in that country. The grades are not made until the character of the crop is ascertained, and they are made from samples which are collected from all over Manitoba and the North-west Territories. Now, would it not be far better to have one grade Manitoba No. 1 hard, which should not vary from year to year, but which should get a name and a place for itself upon the Liverpool market, so that a buyer in Liverpool buying No. 1 Manitoba hard upon the certificate of the Government inspector at Fort William, or Winnipeg, or wherever else it might be graded, would know positively that that grade would have to correspond with certain definitions laid down in the Act of Parliament. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is my view of the question, and I believe also that it is the view of the great majority of the farmers of Manitoba and the Territories. I believe it is the view of those gentlemen who have acted from time to time upon the board as the farmers' re-

representatives, when it met in Winnipeg. I have never yet heard a valid reason given in the interest of the farmers why the grade should vary year after year, although I have heard most cogent and logical reasons given for this variation, from the standpoint of the wheat purchaser. We have to remember, Mr. Speaker, that wheat is purchased in Manitoba and the Territories for a number of different purposes. It is purchased very largely, indeed, by the Ogilvie Company and the Lake of the Woods Company, the two large milling companies in that country, for the purpose of manufacturing into flour, either in Manitoba where they both have large mills, or in Keewatin, where the Lake of the Woods Company have a mill, or in Montreal where the Ogilvie Company have a mill. These two institutions have at different seasons entire control of the price of wheat in Manitoba and the Territories, and it does make a most material difference to these people what the particular grades may be in a particular year. Then we have also the ordinary wheat buyers who buy Manitoba wheat for two purposes, either to be shipped to Ontario, where it is largely used for the purpose of making a better class of flour than Ontario wheat alone, without mixture with Manitoba wheat, will make; and for the second purpose, of shipping it to the old country markets. The interests of these buyers for these different purposes, change from time to time with the condition of the wheat market, and they dominate almost entirely and control the board which meets in Winnipeg. With the representatives of the eastern millers who are sent up there, they come there understanding thoroughly the situation in that year, understanding the quantity of the crop that is likely to be produced in the country, understanding the quality of the crop as it is likely to turn out, understanding the state of the markets in the old country, understanding the state of the markets in the province of Ontario; and putting all these things together, they are enabled to judge what kinds of grades will be most to their interest. But so far as the farmer is concerned, the only kind of grade that can be in his interest is a grade which shall not vary from year to year, but which shall enable him to obtain that permanent place in the minds of the buyers in the old country which the product he raises in that province and in those Territories, should enable him to obtain. We hear much of the efforts that the Government are making with regard to butter and cheese; we have heard it said time and again in the House, how important it is with regard to these two articles, and also with regard to the articles of apples, and in fact everything that is sent to the old country, that the article itself shall come to have a permanent value, to have a permanent name, so that a buyer in the old country buying Canadian cheese of a certain brand, will know posi-

tively that he gets a certain article. So in regard to butter, and apples, and more than all other articles, because the amount of export is so very large and the product is of such vast importance to that particular portion of Canada of which I am speaking, it is of the utmost importance indeed with regard to wheat that the grade should be permanent and become well known to buyers. It is also important from the fact that the state of Minnesota, in which Duluth is situate, which is the great competing point for hard wheat with our country, has established a different rule, and a person buying wheat in Duluth, on Government certificate, knows that no matter what the yield may be or how much frost may have affected the crop in that particular year, when he buys No. 1 hard he obtains the particular article, an article that does not vary but each year contains so many pounds of hard wheat and a certain proportion of soft wheat with it. It is not so in Manitoba. If the frost is more prevalent in one year than in another, there is an inferior grade of hard wheat. The grade was very good last year and in 1894 and in 1893 when there was scarcely any frost, during which years the wheat was graded up so that our No. 1 hard was a very fine article; but in the years previous, when frost did serious damage, the grade of No. 1 hard was depressed. All these changes militate against the interests of the farmers, and while I am not prepared to use the word fraud with respect to these transactions, because I suppose it is fair for wheat buyers to take advantage of the laws of the country, so long as they are the laws, these varying grades of wheat, changing from year to year, enable the wheat buyers, with their superior knowledge of the conditions of the trade, to take an unfair advantage of the farmers. I understand the desire of the hon gentleman (Mr. Davin) who moved the motion is to elicit such information as to enable this House to legislate in the interests of the farmers. I am satisfied that so far as the interests of the farmers are concerned, the grades of wheat should be made permanent, not only as regards No. 1, but as regards No. 2 and No. 3, or any other grades that are considered desirable in the country. The hon. Controller of Customs has referred to the custom of mixing wheat, and I should like very much if the hon gentleman (Mr. Davin) will include in his motion the right to inquire into that subject, because it is one that touches most closely the matters to which I have referred, and it is one on which as the hon. gentleman has very properly stated, there has been a great deal of discussion and a wide difference of opinion, and I might add a great many changes on the part of the Government so far as regards its attitude on this particular question. In fact the Government has changed its position so much on this ques-

tion that I am not at the present moment aware as to what the law is as regards the mixing of wheat. The hon. gentleman did not explain what is meant by the mixing of wheat. I will explain what it is. We are troubled very much in our province with smut, due largely to fault of the farmers themselves, because so far as my experience goes, I find, that where the farmers are careful with respect to their seed and obtain a proper change of seed from time to time, and are careful to have the seed properly pickled in blue vitriol, the chances of having smut in the crop are very small. But unfortunately many farmers do not take this precaution, and every year in that country we have a considerable portion of wheat with smut in it. It has been the practice for several years to send this smutted wheat to Fort William, where there is a hospital for wheat, where the smut is taken away, leaving it clear, and in the opinion of a great many people as sound as if the smut had not been in it. It has been the habit of the Government to allow a certain proportion of scoured wheat to be mixed with regular hard wheat. That is all wrong. If it be true that wheat after it has been scoured is as good as other wheat, then it is not to the disadvantage of the farmer who grows this wheat or to the wheat buyer who purchases it. Let there be, however, a grade, or if you please various grades, including wheat which has been subjected to that treatment, because if it be true that wheat is as good after it has been scoured as wheat that has not undergone that process when bought by millers and others, very well; but I am quite satisfied that it is not so good. The smut being in the wheat, it is utterly impossible even by the most improved methods to utterly eradicate the smut, and so when buyers mix it with other wheat the effect must be to lower the grade. If wheat which is in all respects No. 1 hard, weighing a certain number of pounds to the bushel, and in other respects being fully up to the standard, and if a certain proportion, however small, of scoured wheat is added, it must have the effect of depressing the whole grade, and fails to fulfill the requirement as regards the farmers, which is a permanent standard. The object of the farmers should be to have wheat of qualities which deserve to have a permanent reputation in the markets of the old world, and therefore both things are wrong; varying grades of hard wheat, which take from the value of the Government inspector's certificate, the shipments to the old country not being of the same standard in any particular year; and the other fact, of mixing scoured wheat with regular standard wheat. Both these changes are in the interests of the grain buyer and not the grain producer. I therefore ask the hon. member for Assinibola (Mr. Davin) whether he objects to adding to his motion these words, "and also as to the mixing of

Mr. MARTIN.

scoured wheat with the regular grades of wheat." If the hon. gentleman does not object, I move an amendment in these terms.

Mr. SPROULE. I think the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin) is labouring under a misapprehension if he believes that the law allows scoured wheat to be mixed with No. 1 hard, because it does not.

Mr. MARTIN. It does not now, but I understood it did so at one time.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that it did so now, and therefore, if so, he was wrong.

Mr. MARTIN. It still can be mixed with No. 2 and No. 3 hard, and that is just as objectionable.

Mr. WOOD. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to object to the scoured wheat being put on the market and sold.

Mr. MARTIN. No, no. What I object to is: I say, let us have a separate grade for that, "Scoured No. 1," "Scoured No. 2," or "Scoured No. 3," but keep it away from the regular grades of hard wheat.

Mr. SPROULE. There may be some force in that contention, but the difficulty is, that if you have so many grades of wheat, people are much more liable to misunderstand them in making a comparison so as to know what grade their wheat belongs to. Last fall, when the representatives of the different boards of trade, and the grain-buyers, and the farmers, sat as a board to fix the standard, it was decided that scoured wheat might be mixed with No. 1 hard, and sold in that condition. On the other hand, it was contended that this mixed wheat could not be No. 1 hard, which should be wheat of the finest quality, that had come to its full development and perfect purity. It was held that No. 1 hard should have nothing mixed with it that could in any way deteriorate the quality of the flour. Any one who has had anything to do with wheat, or flour, or grain, knows that scoured wheat cannot be divested from all the smut. Even if you go to the extent of washing it, you cannot make it as perfect as is fully developed and pure wheat, which never had any smut.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That is a good reason for not mixing it.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Mills) is correct in that, and for that very reason it was contended that it was a mistake to mix it. I confess that I am inclined to agree with that opinion. I think it was a mistake to mix it, because No. 1 hard is always supposed to be a pure wheat, and free from everything that could, in any degree, deteriorate it in quality, or the flour from which it is made. There might be some reason for establishing a grade of wheat known as scoured wheat, and I think there are some grounds why it would be

wise to make such a grade. But, a great many think it would be unwise to do so, and perhaps, therefore, it is better to mix it with a second or third quality, than to mix it with the first quality. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Martin) contends that the grade should be permanent, and not changed from year to year. At first sight that appears to be a reasonable proposition, but the hon. gentleman must remember that one year, as compared with another, will yield a poorer sample of wheat. In a given year, the first quality may turn out more flour of the finest kind and may be a harder sample of wheat than would be the same grade of wheat another year, so that the hon. gentleman will understand how difficult it is to make a permanent grade which will be applicable to a series of years. That fact is known to every miller. Some years, in Ontario, the wheat is so soft that you cannot grind it and turn out a really good quality of flour, unless you mix with it a very large proportion of Manitoba wheat. In drier seasons, the wheat is a great deal harder, and is therefore of an entirely different quality, and will turn out a better flour. Now, if you made a grade of wheat for a year when the quality is of the very best, that grade may be much ahead of the very best in the succeeding year. For that reason, it seems to me to be desirable that the standard should be fixed from year to year. I know of no means by which we can reach a standard that would be equally applicable one year to the other. The very purest and finest quality one year would be up to a certain standard, but perhaps the best wheat of the succeeding year or the year after would be below that standard. If you had wheat of the very best quality every year it would no doubt be desirable to have a permanent standard, but, under present circumstances, I think it would be practically impossible. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Martin) says that at Duluth they have a permanent standard. It is true they have a state standard there, but it is equally true that a large percentage of the wheat is not bought on that standard at all. There are two classes of wheat-buyers at Duluth. There are the men who have their elevators, and who control the wheat in connection with the state standard or under state law; and then there are men with private elevators who buy wheat upon their own authority. There you have a difficulty again. One class try to keep within the bounds of the law, according to the state standard, and these men mix the different grades the same as they do in Canada, and mix them, perhaps, to a much greater extent, but the law there compels them when they mix a percentage of No. 1 hard and No. 2 hard, or any other grades, and it becomes a new sample, they are obliged to make known the percentage of each quality mixed, and they have to sell it by certificate stating that it con-

tains, say, the actual per cent of No. 2 hard and No. 1 hard, or any other grades.

Mr. WOOD. That holds true of the public elevators in Duluth, but, mind you, a large quantity of the wheat is sold through the private elevators, exactly as it is in Port Arthur.

Mr. SPROULE. That is what I say. The elevators that are controlled by the state law do that, but, on the other hand, the larger proportion of the wheat is handled by private elevator companies, who make the law to suit themselves, and who do not come up to the state standard. Therefore, you are more at the mercy of them than you are at the mercy of the grain-buyers who buy the wheat under the state standard, and dispose of it under said standard. I can understand why the farmers of Manitoba have a grievance, but, as the late Controller of Inland Revenue (Mr. Wood) said, the grievance is, unfortunately, of such a nature that it is very difficult to legislate so as to protect the farmer against his enemy, the grain-buyer, because the avarice of human nature is such that every man who buys grain endeavours to buy it at as low a price as possible. A buyer may have in his office different qualities of grain, according to the fixed standard, which he can show the samples to any farmer who comes to sell his grain and tell him that his wheat is not up to the standard. The farmer may exercise his judgment as well as the buyer, and say: Oh, my grain is up to the standard No. 1 or No. 2, as the case may be, and I will not accept any lower price than the market value of that standard, and he can take it away if he likes. On the other hand, in some cases he is at the mercy of the buyer, where, for instance, there may be only one or two buyers in a locality, and perhaps one buyer's elevator is filled, and the other's is not, hence, he can purchase at his own figures. Again, the buyer may persuade the farmer that his grade of wheat is worse than the standard when, as a matter of fact, the best of the farmer's wheat may be fully up to the standard. The trouble, unfortunately, is that some farmers clean their wheat very badly, while others clean it well. The very same kind of wheat when it is properly cleaned may be graded as No. 1 hard, but if it is improperly cleaned, it may be graded lower. Sometimes, two men on adjoining farms bring in their wheat, and one who may have cleaned his wheat well gets the highest grade, while the neighbouring farmer who fails to clean his wheat, may only get a grade lower. The difficulty is, in many instances, attributable to the fact that one farmer takes better care of his wheat, and has it cleaned, than does the other. If it were possible for this House to enact any law which would secure in every case to the farmer his rights, and the fullest return for his wheat, I am sure the

House would be glad to pass it. I do not see how any law which may be passed by this House, can, under such circumstances, protect the farmer from sometimes getting a lower price than he is entitled to. In addition to that, I notice that in Ontario, when we buy No. 1 hard, or No. 2 hard, we sometimes get a much better quality of No. 2 wheat at one time, than we do at another. It is sometimes much better cleaned, and when you grind it you can turn out a better quality of flour. Therefore, with all these gradings of wheat, and with the law regulating grading, there is no absolute security against imposition by those who handle wheat. Our millers in Ontario who buy wheat find that, from time to time, they may get a carload of wheat graded No. 1 hard, in one week, which is much superior to a consignment in another week, which is also graded No. 1 hard. You may buy both according to standard, and according to the sample you have with you, but you will find that the wheat represented or sold to you as the same grade of wheat, is not exactly the same quality in each case. Now, if any standard of grades could be made which would always secure the absolute quality of the wheat, it would be very desirable for us to adopt that standard, but I do not believe we have reached that perfection either in our grading or standard, or judgment, which would entitle us to believe that we can accomplish that. Therefore, I think no law will be likely to much improve the situation in the direction that the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) aims at. If it could be done, it is desirable that it should be done. I for one can see no objection to the committee, because if we can get any additional light on the subject, which will enable us better to determine this very troublesome and vexed question, the sooner we can do it the better for all concerned. It may establish the impression among the farmers that they are getting what they are entitled to, and if we do nothing more than satisfy them that justice is being done to them, it will be a step in the right direction—in the direction of grading wheat to the different standards. I believe there is one defect in the grading of wheat at the present time. While it would be unwise to have too large a number of standards, I think we should have a larger number than we have at present; and then the law ought to be absolute and stringent—I am not sure that it is so now—with regard to the mixing of the different grades. When different grades of wheat are mixed, the certificate accompanying that wheat should honestly represent the percentage of each grade in the mixture. If this was done, a buyer in any part of Ontario or in any other part of the world can look up the values of the different standards and calculate in a few minutes exactly what the value of that wheat ought to be, so that he is not likely to be cheated or imposed upon

Mr. SPROULE.

when he buys it. At the present I do not think the law requires the certificate to represent the percentage of each quality of wheat in a carload, and therefore a person buying is likely to be imposed upon.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Speaker, if I may now speak to the amendment that is in your hands, I can assure hon. gentlemen who have taken part in this debate that, notwithstanding all they have urged, among the farmers, the millers, the buyers and all classes interested in this question, there is a very large divergence of opinion. If hon. gentlemen conversed with those men who have given the subject earnest thought for some years, they might have reason to change their views even on the subject of grading. There are two kinds of mixing involved in this whole question—the mixing of scoured wheat, and the more important question—one on which the discussion has taken place to-day—whether, owing to the fact that for No. 1 Manitoba hard the standard was so low that No. 2 could be graded up to it. The farmers contended, and with a good deal of justice, that if the standard of No. 1 Manitoba hard was fixed, as it ought to be, according to the best growth of every year, the buyer could not buy a quantity of No. 2 or an inferior quality and get it graded up to No. 1 standard. Let me briefly state what the practice was which gave rise to so much adverse criticism of the inspector and the buyers. Standard No. 1 was placed low to meet the views of some parties who made representations similar to those set forth to-day by the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin). Manitoba No. 1 hard was put at 60 pounds to the bushel, when, as a matter of fact, that particular year's growth, that is, last year's, weighed 64 pounds to the bushel. Not a single bushel of wheat was grown in Manitoba last year that would not weigh that. Three or four years ago the practice was to grade that, not at 64 pounds to the bushel, which would allow of a certain quantity of red Fyfe being mixed with it; but to put it down to 59 or 60 pounds. What was the result? The buyer, who the hon. member for Winnipeg says, cheats the farmer or gets the better of him, and who is the special object of the hon. gentleman's adverse criticism to-day, purchased, say, a cargo of No. 2 and a quantity of No. 1 hard, buying the latter at 60 pounds to the bushel, when as a matter of fact, it would weigh 63 or 64 pounds. What did he do? He took a quantity of No. 2 and mixed it with a quantity of No. 1, bringing the whole up to the existing standard of No. 1 Manitoba hard. The result was that the farmer was unquestionably deprived of some of the profits which he should have received from his labour. In consequence of that, the standard board, which met at Winnipeg last year, placed the standard of Manitoba No. 1 hard at 64 pounds to the bushel, based upon the actual

results of the crop of that year. I confess, Sir, that that action at that time commended itself to my approval, because at the same time it was decided that there should be no mixing of wheat in No. 1 hard. So that this year, if the Manitoba farmer produces a crop of Manitoba hard, he sells it for what it is, the best of Manitoba's growth, and it goes forth to the markets of the world like Caesar's wife, above suspicion. That was my great object, when I was at the head of the department, and I believe that view met with the approval of the best minds that had given any attention to this subject. That is one branch of the case that has not been at all touched upon to-day. There are other branches of this discussion which I might go into; but I wish to refer more particularly to the question which the hon. member for Winnipeg raised, that is, the mixing of smutty wheat. The great trouble with many people is that they do not know what smutty wheat is. They either have not taken the pains to study the question, or they talk about what they are not as well informed upon as they ought to be. The smut ball, I am informed, is nothing more nor less than a sterilized, dwarfed grain of wheat, which, taken between the finger and the thumb, crumbles to an impalpable powder. When a portion of this wheat becomes mixed with good wheat, that powder gets into the crevices of the wheat grain and into the pollen at the end of the grain, and certainly discolours it; but I contend—and it is the view of every man to whom I have ever spoken on the subject, that when that wheat is cleaned and the discolouration is removed, it is just as sound as it ever was before. It has been claimed that this smutty wheat affects the quality of the flour ground from it. On that subject there is a great difference of opinion among millers. When I had the honour of being in Winnipeg a gentleman, a member of the deputation from the board of trade of Portage la Prairie, whom I had the pleasure of meeting, and with whom I discussed this subject, was the partner of the hon. member for Winnipeg, who urged upon me the necessity of not prohibiting the sale of smutty wheat, because the farmers of Manitoba must find a market for such damaged grain; and he was right, because they have found a market for it for years, and no one opposes its sale and use. Some years ago this smutty wheat was brought down to Ontario, and the Ontario millers used to clean it themselves. Machinery for that purpose, perhaps the most perfect in the world, now exists in Port Arthur. It is just as perfect as the machinery used at Duluth; so that this wheat is cleaned at Port Arthur, and does not come uncleaned into the province of Ontario. It is cleaned at Duluth and scoured at Duluth to a far greater extent than exists at

Port Arthur. If we had undertaken, during the last season, to stop the practice of scouring wheat, we would have caused an immense loss to many of the poor farmers of Manitoba, whose crop was smutty, and who had nothing else to rely upon, whilst their neighbours across the line, in Dakota, found a ready market for their smutty wheat.

Mr. SPROULE. You would not stop that, but stop the practice of mixing scoured wheat with No. 1 hard.

Mr. WOOD. If you admit that the mere presence of a quantity of smut balls in a cargo does not destroy the character of the wheat, nor prevent it producing a quality of flour that can be used—

Mr. SPROULE. I do not admit it at all.

Mr. WOOD. I will give you the best authority that will convince you that, in the case I put, the wheat is not actually injured in the slightest degree. The whole subject is one that has been very carefully thought out by the department. Everything done has been done in the interests of the class most largely affected, and that is the farmers, and I would here point out that when the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin) says that the farmers representation on the Corn Exchange is nothing in comparison with that of the buyer, he is wrong.

Mr. MARTIN. There are more grain men on the boards of trade than farmers.

Mr. WOOD. Are there? Let the hon. gentleman name the farmers, and he will find that there are more farmers than grain buyers. I say that the representation of the farmers on the Standards, a board which selects the standard to remain in operation for the year, is larger in number than the grain buyers. What the hon. gentleman evidently meant was that the farmers were outnumbered by the grain buyers and representatives from the Millers' Exchanges in Ontario and the boards of trade. I simply wish to correct him where he is wrong. The machinery has been in operation for some years, and I am sure my hon. friend the new Controller of Inland Revenue (Mr. Prior) will give the whole subject even better attention than I have given it, and that the matter will receive, as it has in the past, the earnest attention of the Government, with the aim and object of not alone benefiting one class over another, but of seeing that Manitoba's grain crop is sent out to the world to the best advantage. I believe that we grow in Manitoba the best wheat in the world. I believe we grow a better class of red wheat there, strange as it may appear, than is grown in the neighbouring state of Minnesota. Now, at Minnesota they have a very low grade for their No. 1, but that has been a subject of great complaint on the part of western farmers. It was one of the complaints brought out by what was known as the Populist Move-

ment two years ago. They complained that the standard was too low, and justly so, because if you place standard No. 1 Manitoba hard too low you cannot prevent mixing. The inspector at Port Arthur has the standard simply before him as the wheat goes into the elevator. He has to see whether the character of the wheat will grade No. 1 hard according to that standard. This year he has to see that it weighs sixty-four pounds to the bushel and contains the necessary quantity of red Fyfe wheat.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not rise to discuss the technical matter which has been so fully discussed by hon. gentlemen on both sides and which has been so clearly explained by my hon. friend who has just sat down. I think sufficient has transpired to bear me out in this, that the department, under the control of my hon. friend the new Controller of Customs (Mr. Wood) has made very careful and thorough investigation into the whole subject. He made that investigation on the ground, in the North-west Territories and Manitoba, where the information is more readily obtainable than at a distance. He has also stated some of the difficulties which arise in the grading of wheat. Both he and my hon. friend who now has charge of Inland Revenue (Mr. Prior), have declared that attention will still be given to this matter and that, if any further improvements can be made, they will be made, especially with reference to frauds alleged to be practised against the farmers. They have stated that if any information is given in that connection, the clue will be followed out and every endeavour made to prevent the recurrence of such frauds. I think this statement should be sufficient to induce the hon. gentleman who moved this motion to allow it to drop. There are some objections towards the granting of a committee. In the first place, a committee of this House is a long way off from the seat of operations. It would have to be entirely dependent for information upon what it could obtain in the way of written reports and oral evidence. The oral evidence would have to be brought from the North-west and Manitoba, and the distance and expense would make it necessary that a comparatively small number of witnesses be summoned before the committee. At the expense, therefore, of a great deal of money only partial information could be obtained. Of course the expense should not be a bar if corresponding benefit were sufficient compensation; but I think it will occur to my hon. friend that with the work which the department has already done, supplemented by the promise that it will follow the matter up still further, follow it up in the territory itself where the information will be close at hand and be more generally obtainable over a larger area, and where the investigation will probably be more effective than that of a special committee

Mr. WOOD.

in this House, he might leave the matter in the hands of the department. This is particularly a part of departmental policy and administration, and it is a question how far this would carry us if these questions of departmental administration were to be handed over to committees of the House. It seems to me that the proper way is for the department to make its investigations, determine upon its methods of grading and the like, and then take the responsibility before the House. With these few considerations which may be taken into account, I would ask my hon. friend whether he would not think it better to leave this subject in the hands of the Government and department rather than press for a committee.

Mr. LAURIER. I do not expect that my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) will take any advice from me, but it seems to me that his motion is one which he ought to press and which ought to be adopted. This is not the first time he has had this subject before the House. It has come up repeatedly year by year.

Mr. WOOD. That is the first time it has come up in this shape. Last year the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin) found fault with the salary paid the inspector at Port Arthur. I then assured him that the matter was receiving departmental attention, and that it was my intention to bring in an Act to alter that. We did bring in such an Act and we also took power—although the Prince Arthur and all other elevators are private ones—to have our officers go in and examine the books. Any discussion which then took place was upon that matter. This is the first time in my experience the question has come before the House.

Mr. LAURIER. Certainly, my hon. friend must remember as well as I do,—and I remember it very distinctly—that the subject of grading wheat has come before the House repeatedly, year after year. I do not remember the form of motion upon which the subject came before us last year, but I remember that the subject was debated and almost in the same manner as it has been to-day. If I remember well the present Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Costigan), who was then Minister of Inland Revenue, brought the matter before the attention of the House upon more than one occasion,—certainly upon one occasion. So I am quite within the mark when I say that this matter does not receive attention in Parliament for the first time to-day. For several years it has engaged the attention of business men all over the country. It cannot be disputed that the present regulations are not satisfactory to a very large number of people. I do not know whether they should be amended or not, but, undoubtedly, there is great difference of opinion among those interested in this trade

at the present time. I think the hon. Commissioner would do well to allow my hon. friend from West Assinibola to have his committee and investigate the question. The only serious objection raised by the hon. Commissioner is that of expense. The hon. gentleman knows very well that the expenditure would be small; and, even if the expense were considerable, the question is of such vast importance that the country can well afford the expense. Undoubtedly witnesses would have to be brought from great distances; but I think most valuable information could be had from men living in this city or within comparatively short distance from it. The representatives of the trade in Montreal, Toronto and Ottawa should be heard, because some of the largest mills are located in those cities and some of the largest buyers have their headquarters there. For instance, Mr. Ogilvie's chief establishment is in Montreal. The Lake of the Woods Company also has its headquarters and its manager's office in that city. In Ottawa there are large firms engaged in this trade. The testimony of these men would be as important as that of men coming from the West. If we had this committee, we could have the opinions of both buyers and sellers of wheat, and, by that means, I think we should have the best means of arriving at a solution of this vexed question which has been so much discussed for so many years past. For my part, I shall support the motion for the appointment of the committee.

Mr. DAVIN. I have listened with much interest to the speeches that have been made by both sides in this debate. It is quite evident that the question I have brought before the House is one that demands our most serious consideration and the most serious consideration of the Government. A point was brought forward by my hon. friend the Controller of Customs (Mr. Wood) which was referred to also by my hon. friend from Winnipeg (Mr. Martin). As stated by my hon. friend the Controller of Customs, if you had a year when the No. 1 hard averaged 64 pounds, and, in that year, it was graded 59 or 60 pounds, the farmer would be overreached; and when there was a fixed grade and you had a yield of wheat that gave an average of 63 or 64 pounds for No. 1 hard, the farmer, as a matter of fact, was overreached. That subject has been discussed out west, and this idea was suggested as the best solution—that you should have a definite standard, and that, when you had a yield that exceeded that, the farmer should be paid extra for the wheat. Now, Sir, I am in this difficult position in regard to this matter. When these farmers came to me and complained bitterly of the present grading of wheat and the grading of wheat last year, they behaved as men frequently do who are not accustomed to do any business other than

that by which they make their living—they told their story, but when I asked for samples of the wheat they were not forthcoming. Consequently, at first, I paid no attention whatever to the complaints. But the reason that I afterwards paid attention to the complaint and the reason that I have brought them to the attention of the House is that they became so general. Wherever I went I found these complaints, and I found farmers asseverating that they had had the very same wheat rated differently at places forty miles apart, so that sometimes they went considerable distances out of their way to sell their wheat rather than take it to the town that, having regard to the distance, they would naturally patronize. I quite feel the importance of this motion and the necessity there is for meeting this sense of grievance that obtains—a sense of grievance which, even if it were only such—if it were founded on nothing—it is necessary it should be met. But I feel my difficulty, that, if the committee were appointed, I ought to be in a position to hand to the chairman whoever he might be a list of witnesses who might be sent for and examined. But I am not in a position to do that. And it is not my fault that I am not in a position to do that, because, although so many complaints came to me, not a single one of those who made complaints could furnish a sample of the grain. There is another point in connection with this matter that I hope will be taken up by the Government, a point that the farmers of the North-west feel keenly. No. 1 hard is graded "Manitoba." Well, Sir, it is asserted by my constituents at Moose Jaw and around Regina—and I just give this as one of the circumstances that ought to be taken into account—that they produce a better grade of wheat than is produced in Manitoba, and they say that they suffer because they have to come under the Manitoba grading. In this and in other matters we feel that the shadow of Manitoba is over us, whereas, in population, we shall very soon be far more important than Manitoba, and, geographically and in the potentialities of varied interests we are far more important than Manitoba to-day. So that the relative position of Manitoba and the North-west Territories is a part of the question that will have to be considered. Mr. Speaker, having the assurance of the Government that they will inquire into the matter, and that they will seek to meet any grievances that exist, I will not press the motion. But I will say this, that next year, if these complaints are still made, I will myself, if spared—

An hon. MEMBER. Spared by the people.

Mr. DAVIN. No, I need not say by the people, the people will do the decent thing in my regard; I will say, if spared by Heaven, I will myself take pains, if these complaints are made, to individualize cases.

Let me say to my hon. friend who presides over the department, who has come to it so recently, but which, I am sure, he will manage with great energy and with satisfaction to the country, and with distinction to himself, that if he does what he says will be done, why, there will be no necessity for my bringing this motion before the House; but unless it be so dealt with, I shall certainly have to bring it before the House, and press it to a division next time.

Amendment (Mr. Martin) negatived.

Motion negatived on division.

BOUNTY FRAUDS.

Mr. BOWERS moved for :

Copy of all correspondence and petitions concerning bounty frauds in the provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, from the year 1890 to the present date, and of all correspondence between the Marine and Fisheries Department and its officers, and the parties accused of such frauds, and all others concerned.

He said : Mr. Speaker, In moving for this order, I desire to call the attention of the House, and of the Government to several cases of alleged bounty frauds, which took place in the county of Digby, and to the very unfair and harsh manner in which I consider they have been treated. A great many cases, I may say hundreds, if not thousands, have been brought to the notice of the department, in which thousands of dollars have been at stake, but in none of these, as far as I can ascertain, have the parties been prosecuted and persecuted as vigorously and as harshly as those alleged cases in the county which I have the honour to represent. In 1891 several parties made application to the fishery officer at Sandy Cove for bounty blanks, stating that they had fished the requisite number of days, and had caught sufficient fish to be entitled to bounty. It seems that previous to their making application, the fishery overseer or officer, Mr. Robert Bishop, had sent word to some of these men to come and fill out their blanks, and told them that they had a perfect right to the bounty, as the fish were deep-sea fish, and there were no regulations to the contrary. Now, through the connivance of the fishery officer, these men were led to believe that they were within their rights in making their applications, as he was intimately acquainted with each one of them, and was thoroughly cognizant of their manner and mode of fishing, of the fish caught, and of the time spent in fishing. They therefore went before him and filed their claims, he taking their depositions and placing the kind of fish and amount on their blanks, and forwarding said claims to the Department of Marine and Fisheries, or to his superior officer. Now, I want the House to understand that I do not desire to impugn the motives of Mr. Bishop, or to cast the least

Mr. DAVIN.

reflection upon him, as I believe he was thoroughly conscientious in doing what he did, and in giving them the information that led them to make their claims, as was shown by he himself putting in a claim, and making a demand for bounty under similar circumstances. Later on, we will come to the judge's ruling in his case, Queen vs. Bishop. The facts were these : These men fished a trap or weir for some months in St. Mary's Bay, during the season of 1891, and caught a sufficient amount of deep-sea fish, mackerel, to warrant them in claiming a bounty. They also caught an amount of line fish, besides, but, as there were sufficient fish caught in weir, they, in filing their claims, said nothing about the line fish caught, and which omission probably cost them all this trouble. There was nothing in the regulations or Orders in Council of the department up to this time that would show they were wrong, and I have no doubt but that bounties had been paid to owners or fishers of traps previous to that time, and probably were paid to some that year, besides the accused. However, in the fall of 1891, somewhere between August and October, or about the time the parties were filing their claims, the Department of Fisheries ruled that bounties should not be given on fish caught in traps or weirs. At least, I have been so informed by an officer of the department, since my arrival this year at Ottawa. But such order or ruling I have never seen posted in any fishing place or village in the county, although the counsel for defendants acknowledged before the Exchequer Court in Halifax that decided the cases, that the same was posted at Sandy Cove. This the defendants, by private letter to me, deny, saying that they had no intention of defrauding the Government, and were not cognizant of so doing. About two or three years after these men had received their bounties, the Government commenced actions against them. How ? By first acquainting them that they had done wrong and were not entitled to bounty, stating reasons, &c., and asking them to return the money that they had mistakenly taken, and which, as honest men, they would only have been too glad to do. No, if my information is correct, the first intimation that they had of wrong-doing, was in the shape of writs served upon each one of them for fraud and perjury, by the sheriff of the county, and with it an enormous bill of costs. They were startled and well they might be, considering that they were poor fishermen, and the amount was beyond what they were able to pay. They wrote to me about it last season, just before this House closed. It was my last day here, and although I had a good deal of work to do for myself, I laid it aside and endeavoured to get the matter settled with the department before I went home. First, I went to the Fisheries Department, and obtained all the information I could. They sent me to

the Department of Justice; they could do nothing, but sent me back to the Department of Fisheries again, and they, in turn, to the Minister of Justice. Back and forth that hot summer day, I travelled, trying to arrange the affair so that the suit might be withdrawn and to save further costs. Finally, the Department of Justice informed me that the papers in these cases had gone to the Crown prosecutor at Halifax, and they would make inquiries and see what could be done. Nothing was done, however, towards clearing the defendants. At that time, I told them that the accused would repay to the Government all the moneys that the Government claimed they had been defrauded out of.

The charges made by the department against these men were, as near as I can ascertain :

1. That they did not fish the time.
2. That they did not catch a sufficient quantity of fish.
3. That they had no boat, and if so, that she was not long enough.
4. That they did not fish in St. Mary's Bay or elsewhere. Whether these were the charges against only part of the accused or the whole of them I am hardly prepared to say, having had no personal talk with them, as my facts have been learned by correspondence. On these charges, they were accused, and those charges can be and were disproved in the county court at Digby on similar cases. In the Exchequer Court, at Halifax, the judgment was given on the grounds that the fish were caught in traps or weirs, and, therefore, were not deep-sea fish. How the judge could say that they were not deep-sea fish is a puzzle.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The question was deep-sea fishing ?

Mr. BOWERS. Quite so. I am not up in the law points. I will now read you some letters from the parties accused, and, Mr. Speaker, you will notice that the facts stated and the tenor of the letters are about the same. I fully expected to receive letters and affidavits of each one before this, but I am sorry to say that they have not yet come to hand. It takes some time for a letter to be sent and an answer received from that part of our Dominion. This letter is from Samuel Gidney :

Sandy Cove, Digby County, N.S.,
January 6, 1896.

E. C. Bowers, M.P., Ottawa.

Dear Sir,—In 1891 we set a fish-trap for the purpose of catching fish, and for which right we had to pay to the Government \$40 per year. In November, Robert Bishop, of Sandy Cove, who was appointed commissioner to fill out fishing claims, sent us word to come and fill out ours, which we did, believing we were entitled to the same. In 1895, we were served with a writ from Exchequer Court for obtaining bounties fraudulently and falsely, saying that we had not caught

amount of fish, boats were not the lawful length, and did not fish sufficient time.

As regards the fish, we caught double the amount; our boats were considerable longer than required length, and we fished from 10th April to 1st November. This was acknowledged in court. They claim that there was no bounty on traps that year. Why did not the Government instruct their commissioner in regard to traps, if such was the case? I believe Bishop did it, thinking that he was doing right, as he had no orders to do otherwise. Why did not the Government make a demand on us for the amount of bounty (\$7), which we would willingly have repaid back, had we known that we were not entitled to it, and not served with a writ and run us into cost which we are not able to pay? Please bring our case before the House and state the matter to them, as we were ignorant in the affair, and, if any one is to blame, it was the Government official. I trust the Government and the House will consider us, as poor fishermen, and that we did not designedly do wrong, and will not exact the cost. We are willing to pay back the bounty claim.

Yours respectfully,

SAMUEL GIDNEY.

I received another letter yesterday. It is as follows:—

Mink Cove, Jan. 27th, 1896.

Hon. E. C. Bowers, Ottawa.

Dear Sir,—When I last wrote you, I gave you all the particulars in the matter of the fishing bounties in connection with ourselves. Ingram Saunders will send you the newspaper which has Judge Savary's decision on the case of Bishop. You will see that he decided that we fishermen made the application in good faith, as we were instructed by Robert Bishop, who was acting as commissioner for the Government. He told us we were entitled to bounties on fish caught in the trap. As we were compelled to pay \$40 yearly (license) for setting our trap, it was a small sum (\$7) to receive for a bounty. Had the Government notified us we were not entitled to it, we would have refunded it. I wrote to the Minister of Fisheries. He answered me, he would give the matter due consideration.

Hoping this will be satisfactory and the Government will relieve us of the costs,

I am yours truly,

SAMUEL GIDNEY.

You will see, Mr. Speaker, that the writs were not served until 1895, or over three years after the claims had been paid. This man is willing to repay the money back, and would have done so before costs had been added, if he had been told that he had done wrong. The next letter is from J. E. Morehouse :

Sandy Cove, 27th January, 1896.

Hon. E. C. Bowers, M.P.

Dear Sir,—I am informed by Samuel Gidney, that you wanted each of us that are concerned in the bounty affair, to write you how we obtained it, and what on. I met the officer on the street. He asked me if I was going to apply for a bounty. I asked him if there was a bounty on mackerel, and he said, yes, on all deep-sea fish; if I caught 2,500 pounds, I was entitled to it. So I got him to fill out the blank for 2,600 pounds of mackerel, caught in St. Mary's Bay, and he sent it. I was engaged in fishing

over three months; my boat was larger than the law required. I made it in good faith, believing I was entitled to a bounty.

Yours respectfully,

J. E. MOREHOUSE.

The tenor of this letter is, you will observe, the same as my contention, i.e. that they were induced to put in their claim by the Government official. I will also read two letters from Mrs. Holmes Saunders, wife of one of the accused and mother of the boy by whom one of the defendants was innocently placed in a wrong position before the Government and his fellow-men. The first letter is as follows:—

Sandy Cove, 16th December, 1895.

Mr. Bowers.

Dear Sir,—I suppose you think strange of me writing on such an important matter as I am about to mention, concerning the fishing bounty affair. First, I will state my reason for writing on this question, as my husband is very poorly with heart disease. He has to keep perfectly quiet, and so is not able to do any business. I suppose you have heard that judgment has gone against the parties, on the point that there was no bounties on weirs and seines for 1891. The admissions made by the parties to Harris was allowed, that the quantity of fish caught was sufficient, and time, and length of boat was all right. 1st. The charge they was taken up on was that they did not fish the time. 2nd. They did not catch the quantity of fish. 3rd. They had no boat, and, if they had, she was not long enough. 4th. They did not fish in St. Mary's Bay or elsewhere. So on these charges we put in our offset, hoping to win. Now I will explain to you how my husband was drawn into this matter. My son was fifteen years of age, and at that time, of course, he did all he could in the fishing business. That season he fished the time and caught the quantity and had the boat. He tended his father's share of the weir and seine, besides line-fishing. So Bishop met the boy and told him he was entitled to a bounty. So he went with Bishop, and he filled the blank out for him and told him to sign it. He only specified 2,800 pounds of mackerel, but did not mention the line-fishing. He also put his father in as owner of the boat. That was all right; he was owner. The boat was engaged the season through by different parties, so she was entitled to a bounty. The father knew nothing of the affair until the cheque came for one dollar for the boat. So, you see, his father has to stand the cost for both, as the boy is under age, and God only knows what I am to do. I have a daughter nearly blind, and it takes every cent I can get hold of to get along with. I have not one cent I can call my own. It will ruin us if we have to pay it: it will turn us out of doors. So I thought I would mention it to you, and see if you would state this matter to the Minister of Fisheries, and get the cost taken off. We would willingly pay back the four dollars, if we can get clear of the cost. We never was notified to pay back the bounty until there was papers served by the sheriff, with about \$50 and cost at that time. So we thought our case was so clear we would win for sure on the charge made against them. They did not say anything about not being bounties on weirs and seines. Bishop said there was, and the fishermen did not know any better, or they would not of done it. I think

Mr. BOWERS.

Bishop thought the fishermen was entitled to the bounties. He said the law was not repealed until 1893. I think we would of won if our case had been made plain to the judge. We engaged Harris to handle the case through other lawyers, but they did not go to Halifax to state the case to the judge. So he reserved judgment until he went back to Ottawa, and we have heard he gave his decision against us. Harris says the cost will be \$50 each. Do you think it would be any use for me to state this affair to the Minister of Fisheries, with sworn statement? The blank at the Fishery Department will show that my husband never made any application for the bounty. The boy, through Bishop's advice, made the application, and the father has to suffer for the ignorance of Bishop. And if you think it necessary for me to state the matter to the Minister of Fisheries, please head me a copy how to address, if you think it will have any weight on the case. Hoping to get an answer soon as possible from you, as my husband does not know that judgment has gone against him. We dare not let him know it, on account of his health. If you will be kind enough to attend to this at once, please address letter to

MRS. MARY SAUNDERS.

Sandy Cove.

I have another letter here which I received yesterday and which I will read to the House. It is as follows:—

Sandy Cove, 27th January, 1896.

E. C. Bowers, M.P.

Dear Sir,—I am informed, through Samuel Gidney, that you wanted a plain statement of those fishing bounties. So he thought it would be advisable to make a personal statement, as each one knows their own case, how they obtained their bounties. As you are aware, I have already stated to you how my husband and son obtained theirs. So I thought it would be advisable for me to say again how it was done, in case you have not the letter with you that you received from me in December last. 1st. Bishop met my son (fifteen years of age) on the street, and tells him to call at his office, and he would give him a bounty schedule. So my son went, and Bishop filled the schedule out and told him to sign his name to it. It would have been all right if he had put the line fish in he caught in the Bay of Fundy; he caught the fish, and fished the time required. He also had the boat. Bishop also put his father in as owner of the boat. That was right; he was owner. The boat fished the season through, and was entitled to a \$1 bounty. His father made no application for a bounty, nor did he know anything of the affair until the cheque came for \$1 bounty. Concerning Bishop's affair, I will send you the judge's decision, and you can pick out of it what you like. I enclose you the letter from William Smith, Deputy Minister, Marine and Fisheries, in answer to my letter to him.

I remain, respectfully yours,

(Sgd.) MRS. HOLMES SAUNDERS.

In these letters of Mrs. Saunders, you will again see, Mr. Speaker, how they were led astray by the Government official, who, as I before observed, seemed to think that he was only doing his duty to the fishermen. This Harris, spoken of in the letter, informed them that if they would give him \$5 each that he would get them clear, as he had

a brother in the firm of Gillies & Harris, of Annapolis, and that by their influence with the Government, he would guarantee that they might consider the question as settled, and that they would never hear of it again. Poor, innocent man, he may have thought so. If so he not only deluded himself, but them also, as I will give the late hon. Minister of Justice this credit, by saying that I do not think he would swerve from what he considered to be the ends of justice by any improper means brought to bear by such parties as are referred to in this letter. And, I really think that the Minister thought he was doing right, and that the cases were flagrant abuses of the Bounty Act, and that frauds had been designedly committed. But I am convinced that when all the facts of the case have been brought to his notice, he will be one of the first to ask for mercy from the present incumbent of the office of Minister of Justice. Right here I might say, Mr. Speaker, that this man who had promised to look after their case, did not go to Halifax to attend the Exchequer Court. The firm of Gillies & Harris did not attend, and the only one who represented the accused was the firm of Harris & Henry, of Halifax, who did not understand the facts of the case at all. The accused did not know anything about what time it would be tried, and, even if they had known, it would have been almost impossible for them to have found means to pay their way there and back. I believe if they had been there themselves, there would have been just as good a chance of a verdict being rendered in their favour as was the case in the suits brought before Judge Savary. I am not versed in legal points enough to know why they were not tried in Digby instead of in Halifax, without it was on account of those that were tried in Digby, the verdict did not suit the Government, and they thought the probabilities would be better for a verdict if tried in the Exchequer Court. I will also call the attention of the House to a case at Digby last spring, tried before Judge Holdsworth, and his decision, dated January 26th, 1895, reads as follows:—

FISHING BOUNTY DISPUTE.

Captain J. Snow was before Judge Holdsworth, last Saturday, on alleged charge of perjury in connection with a declaration made in 1893 for a bounty claim of the schooner "James Farnham." The complaint was laid by Inspector Kinney, of Yarmouth. James W. Cossaboom was the principal witness. It appears that Cossaboom, who was at the time a fishery officer for the county, was interested in a weir at St. Mary's Bay, and hired the schooner from Snow, and she was used to attend the weir from 21st July to 24th August, 1893, when she returned to Digby, where she lay until 3rd October, when she sailed for Grand Manan, entering again at Digby, 10th November. The Crown claimed that the thirty-four days attendance at the weir would not count in the time to entitle the schooner to bounty ;

also that, in any case, including the attendance on weir, she was employed only seventy-two days, instead of three months. The judge, however, dismissed the complaint, finding that there was no evidence on which to hold the accused.

You will see here, Mr. Speaker, that although the time was not even long enough, he thought there was not evidence enough to convict of perjury, although a great deal worse in all its bearings than the cases before us. Now, I wish to call the attention of the House more particularly to the judgment given in the county court by Judge Savary—Queen vs. Robert Bishop. This Bishop was the fishery officer before whom the parties accused filed their claims for bounty, and was similarly situated in every respect to the defendants for whom I am pleading, and was the means of all the trouble which ensued. If the court could clear him with so small a fine at first, and afterwards declare him not guilty, how in the name of justice could these poor men be found guilty. I would like to call the special attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to this judgment of Judge Savary's, the report of which reads as follows:—

THE QUEEN VS. ROBERT BISHOP.

This case, which was tried in the County Judge's Criminal Court, has excited a great interest throughout the county, and we herewith publish Judge Savary's résumé of the particulars :

"At the trial of this cause I held, as I held in all other and similar cases tried before me the same week, that there was not the slightest ground for imputing to the defendant the making of any false pretense in reference to the number or quality of the fish caught, and for which the bounty was claimed. The defendant, according to the form of the application for the bounty used at that day, represented that he had taken 3,200 pounds of 'sea fish' in St. Mary's Bay, and so he did. He did not say he caught them in the deep sea ; the form did not require him to say how he caught them, whether in weirs, or by the usual methods employed in the open sea ; he was not required to state anything whatever on that point, and it is due to him as well as to the others, to say that I have no doubt every one of them honestly believed that they were entitled to a bounty on fish caught, independently of the question how they were caught, either in weirs or otherwise. I believe that to have been the very general opinion of fishermen throughout the county. In this case, however, the boat for which the \$1 bounty was claimed, was not of the length she was represented to be. This, I considered, was the result rather of a reprehensible carelessness than of any deliberate design to defraud, especially as the money was not claimed or received by the defendant for himself, but for another person's benefit, and immediately paid over to that person ; a circumstance which goes far to negative any 'animus furandi.' The Department of Fisheries, moreover, did not pay the \$1 on receipt of the claim, but objected to do so, and communicated that objection to the defendant, on the ground of the informality of the claim and declaration. It was inadvertently sent to the defendant some time later by an officer in the

department, who overlooked the fact that payment of it had been refused. I had made up my mind previous to the day to which I had adjourned the further consideration of the case, to convict the defendant as guilty from this technical point of view—undue carelessness and haste in overstating the size of the boat—but reserving the point raised that the \$1 was not paid as the immediate result of this alleged false pretense; and, in the event of the court above, on argument of the point, affirming my decision to sentence him to twenty-four hours' imprisonment, as my only alternative, but, as I thought that a small pecuniary penalty would be a more appropriate punishment, instead of pronouncing judgment on the day fixed, I on that day further remanded him to another day on his own recognizance in the sum of \$25. He did not appear on that day; I, therefore, ordered the recognizance to be estreated, and he paid over the money, and I certainly thought, in view of my thoroughly expressed opinions that the ends of justice had been sufficiently served by such a disposition of the case, that it would have been allowed to end there. I am sure that in the case of an indictment, no reasonable attorney general would hesitate, in deference to such strong opinion of the court, to enter a nolle prosequi. But I am, notwithstanding, pressingly moved on behalf of the Government for a more definite decision. Perhaps, as the case has been made the subject of a discussion in Parliament, in which some members have made statements showing themselves to be very much misinformed as to the real facts, public policy requires a more definite decision. Under the circumstances above detailed, and at this late date, instead of a conviction, with grave legal doubts and a point reserved, it would, in my opinion, be out of the question to do otherwise than give the defendant the full benefit of those doubts.

"I therefore find the defendant, Robert Bishop, not guilty.

"A. W. SAVARY.

"Digby, 14th August, 1895."

I will leave all remarks on this judgment to the seconder of my motion, who is much more able to review it than myself; but I will say, in concluding this statement, that if these were all the cases of fraud that had been committed, I would not ask for mercy. But when we hear the late Minister of Fisheries stating from his place in the House, that gigantic frauds had been perpetrated, and that in one case he was just in time to save \$5,000 from being misappropriated; and when we ascertain from the blue-books of the department that in Digby, Yarmouth, Queen's and Shelburne counties for six years the percentage of claims disallowed was only $\frac{5}{8}$ of 1 per cent, and that they amounted in Gloucester for the same space of time to 18 per cent, in Gaspé to $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent, in Cape Breton to 5 per cent, and in Victoria, N.S., to 3 per cent, we come to the conclusion that the sword of justice should not fall on Digby alone. Why, in 1891 in Gloucester county the claims rejected were 41 per cent; and still we cannot find that any were fined or imprisoned. While in 1893, and for years previous vessels were only paid \$1.50 per registered tonnage, since that period, and with

Mr. BOWERS.

the same expenditure of money nearly \$3 per ton has been paid to vessel owners and crews, showing that gross and gigantic frauds, as the Minister observed, must have been committed in former years of distribution.

In closing, I would not have the Minister or the Government think, for one moment, that I would palliate wrongs or frauds as committed against the Bounty Act. On the contrary, I would uphold them in trying in all lawful ways to save such moneys for the use of those only to whom it should go. But in the cases of these parties for whom I am pleading, I believe that if wrong was done by them it was not done intentionally; and what was done was done with the connivance and cognizance of the Government officials. Therefore, I would ask the Government to take into consideration and to ascertain whether the cause of justice will not be fully served by remitting the costs in the above suits of Gidney, Eldridge, Saunders, Morehouse and any others as defendants in similar cases, and to simply ask for a refund of the money which the parties accused and convicted claim was obtained with fraudulent intent. If not, great distress and ruin will be caused, and the innocent will suffer in consequence.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend from Digby (Mr. Bowers) called my attention to the motion which he had on the Order paper, and asked me if I would second it. After going into the facts with him, I said I would do so most cheerfully; and I think my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Costigan), if he looks into the matter closely, will see that the application made by my hon. friend is a reasonable one. Personally, I would be sorry to use any word which would in any sense or way weaken the Department of Marine and Fisheries in its efforts to prevent or punish fraud in connection with the distribution of the fishery bounty. I should also be sorry indeed to countenance any such word being used by anybody else. I know the difficulties which the hon. gentleman has to contend with, and so far as I am personally concerned, I shall be ready on all occasions, not only not to weaken his hands, but to do what I can to strengthen them. I know that he has from time to time to act in a way which at first sight may look oppressive; and I know that a great deal of difficulty is experienced by the department from time to time in discriminating between cases where there has been fraudulent intention on the part of the parties, and other cases where there has been a misadventure or a miscarriage of justice by inadvertence. The case my hon. friend presents to-day is simply a case of inadvertence, not of wrong-doing. The charge of fraud was tried by Judge Savary, the county court judge, a year or two ago, and has been satisfactorily and finally dis-

posed of. The department were not entirely satisfied with the ruling of the learned judge. Of course, they accepted his judgment in the case, fraud or no fraud, and it ended so far as the question of criminal prosecution was concerned. I have no fault to find with the department in that respect. Having ruled that ordinary weir fish are not deep sea fish within the meaning of the Act, the parties who had had these moneys paid them under a wrong impression, should refund, when called upon. I want to call attention to what was done. It did seem to me that the department, having at first thought that there was fraud and collusion between this officer and the parties who received the money and having prosecuted these people for these supposed frauds, and the people having been discharged by the judge, then the question having come up as to the civil liability of the parties to refund the moneys they had received, it did seem to me—and I submit it to the hon. gentleman as a question of justice—that the criminal part of the case having been entirely disposed of and the question being reduced down simply to one of civil liability to refund the money, the first duty of the departmental officers was to demand the refund of the money. I want to call the attention of my hon. friend to the facts stated by the hon. member for Digby (Mr. Bowers) and emphatically asserted, time and again, that no demand or notice was made upon any of these parties for the refund of the money. There having been no fraud in the matter—the charge of fraud having been finally disposed of by Judge Savary—and there having been no notice or demand made upon the parties, the next step taken was an action filed in the Exchequer Court. If the hon. gentleman's officials were simply taking an action for the purpose of determining a legal point, there could be no objection, but even then I respectfully submit that the legal point could be ascertained by bringing a test action against one of the parties. But instead of a test action being brought, five or six of these poor people, who had received \$4 or \$5 in 1891, had actions brought against them. There was no dispute about the facts, and a case was agreed upon. I examined the record in the Exchequer Court. There was a case agreed upon, the facts were all admitted, and the only point was whether or not, within the meaning of the regulations, weired fish are entitled to the bounties payable under the statute. I obtained from the department a copy of the regulations passed in 1891, on which the judge passed, and, of course, it is not for me to question his judgment, nor am I personally disposed to differ with him. The instructions read as follows:—

Claimants for fish bounty, to be entitled thereto, must be engaged in deep sea fishing.

That is the only material part of the instruc-

tions. Those instructions were not made into an Order in Council until 21st of November, 1891. They were mere instructions issued by the department, and they were ratified on the 21st of November, 1891, by Order in Council; but before the Order in Council had passed, the officer of the department sent for these men in Digby and told them they were entitled, on his construction of his instructions from Ottawa, to receive the bounty. Acting, therefore, on the advice and at the suggestion of the officer appointed for the purpose, they signed the necessary blanks which he filled up. The judge of the Exchequer Court determined that fish caught in weirs are not entitled to the bounty. The officer in 1891 thought that they were. By strict law, these parties, having caught fish in weirs, were not entitled to the bounty, and ought to pay it back. They state that they were always ready to pay it back, but instead of having been notified to pay, writs were issued against them in the Exchequer Court, and they have been put to considerable expense. As there was no demand for repayment, and as there was no refusal on their part to repay, it seems to me wholly unjustifiable that they should be put to this large amount of costs. I understand my hon. friend's application now is that these poor people should not be ruined by these costs. I cordially join in his motion and support his application. It would certainly be a cruel imposition if these people were obliged to pay costs in addition to the refund.

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

After Recess.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Before you left the Chair, at six o'clock, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) discussed the motion for papers in connection with frauds on the fishing bounties. I do not intend to say much on the subject, as there is no intention of opposing the motion, and the papers will be brought down. Any discussion that is deemed necessary can take place then. But as the hon. member for Queen's stated—and I think I understood the same from the hon. member who moved the resolution—that the object was to make an appeal that the costs in the case he referred to might be refunded—

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Might not be exacted—

Mr. COSTIGAN. Of course, the hon. gentleman will not expect me to give a positive answer to that proposition. In the first place, these cases arose some time ago, and I am not acquainted with the details of all the suits. The first suit was for fraud, and that was not sustained. Immediately afterwards, civil proceedings were taken to recover the amounts that

were paid to these parties, and those suits involved considerable cost, although there was no defence put in, I believe. If that be the position taken by the hon. gentleman who moved for the papers, I am prepared to say that I will look into the matter, and will consult the Department of Justice. I am prepared now to say this also—that I was very strongly impressed with the point made that after criminal proceeding had failed, from whatever cause, and it was decided to take civil proceedings to recover the moneys, a demand should have been made for the moneys, which might have made the expense of the civil proceedings unnecessary. I shall be quite willing to look into the matter from that point of view. I would like the hon. gentleman and the House to understand that, in these, and all similar cases, the Government stands in a difficult position, in an unpleasant position. Last year we had the same point discussed for two hours, and hon. members then took very strong ground against the Government for non-enforcement of the law, and for not prosecuting vigorously, cases of fraud wherever they occurred. It was said, in fact, that there was a want of vigour in the department in following up and punishing the parties guilty of these frauds. We know that while there is a general feeling that the Government should administer the law as Parliament intended it, yet, when any party has offended or is proceeded against, he can always find some sympathy, and can have that sympathy expressed in this House in the form of a request for leniency. I do not say that this is a case where an appeal of that kind is made. But I mention it to show that it is exceedingly difficult to enforce the law in such a manner as to avoid fault-finding. I am quite sure that when they spoke last year, the gentlemen who have brought forward this resolution complained that there was a want of vigour, and cited cases like the present, and implied that my predecessor had shown a good deal of vigour in proceeding against those who had committed fraud, but that his efforts were neutralized or paralyzed by the interference of local members, who felt bound to represent the views of the parties affected. The same argument might apply here—no doubt the hon. gentleman is representing the views of his constituents who are particularly affected. I do not wish, however, to deal with the matter in that sense. I say frankly that there may be something in the statement made by these hon. gentlemen that this expense might have been avoided if a demand for the money had been made. I will look into the matter carefully.

Mr. DICKEY. I have not been long enough in the Department of Justice to have any personal knowledge of this matter whatever, but I understood the hon. gentleman who moved this resolution to state that the Department of Justice had

Mr. COSTIGAN.

acquiesced in Judge Savary's judgment in the Bishop case, that the evidence of fraud was not sufficient. I am informed by the permanent officers of the department that that statement is not quite correct; that the officers of the department did not, in any sense, acquiesce in that judgment. I do not wish to discuss the judgment, but simply to save the department from an implied admission which might be claimed if I allowed the statement to go without comment.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The prosecution against Bishop was against the officer of the department, and not against one of the fishermen.

Mr. DICKEY. That is what struck the department.

Mr. BOWERS. I feel thankful that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has agreed to look into this matter carefully. As I stated, in moving the resolution, I would be the last to ask the hon. Minister or the Government to be lenient to parties who had offended, knowing that they were guilty of a fraudulent act. But these men were told by the Government officer that they were doing right. He asked them to bring their cases before him, and they made the affidavit before him. Knowing the circumstances and he being intimately acquainted with them, and he also applying, at the same time, and having a share in the weir or trap, it is clear that no fraud was intended by these fishermen, and Judge Savary decided that no fraud had been established. I am sure that if the hon. Minister will look into the matter he will relieve them of the costs of the suit and be convinced that no fraud was intended.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) If the hon. gentleman will permit me, I wish to call attention, specially, to the statement made by my hon. friend from Digby (Mr. Bowers) that before the civil actions were taken, he had personally called at the Department of Justice and had assured the department that these people were willing to repay the bounty if the department thought it had been illegally taken. We have the hon. gentleman's personal statement, and that I would wish the hon. Minister to bear that in mind.

Motion agreed to.

MODUS VIVENDI, TREATY OF 1888.

Mr. LAURIER moved for :

Copies of all correspondence between the Government and the Secretary of State for the Colonies, and between the Secretary of State for the Colonies and the American authorities with regard to the withdrawal of the 'Modus Vivendi' under the Treaty of 1888.

He said: It has been stated in the press that the Government had taken steps towards having the modus vivendi under the treaty of 1888, set aside. I do not know whether there is any correspondence on the

subject, and this statement in the press is my own reason for making this motion. The Government can say whether there is any such correspondence.

Mr. COSTIGAN. There is no objection to bringing down the papers. The hon. gentleman will find there is very little correspondence.

Mr. LAURIER. Has anything been done ?

Mr. COSTIGAN. There has been no material change in the policy of the Government in regard to that question.

Motion agreed to.

CONTROLLERS AS PRIVY COUNCILLORS.

Mr. LAURIER moved for :

Copies of all Orders in Council and correspondence relating to the appointment of the Honourable E. G. Prior, and of the Honourable John F. Wood, to the Privy Council of Canada.

And if the House will permit, I would like to add the following amendment :—

Also, copies of the commission or instrument appointing them to the Privy Council, and appointing them also to the respective offices which they now hold in the Administration.

He said : I desire by this motion to call attention to a very important matter, that is to say, the status which is occupied by the Controller of Customs and the Controller of Inland Revenue in the Government of Canada. In my humble judgment the position of both these hon. gentlemen as members of the Cabinet, is not only anomalous, but is not warranted by the statute of the country, and moreover is a direct infringement of the principles of responsible government as they are now well understood. It is a mere truism to say that under the system of responsible government such as it has been developed, all the members of the Cabinet are not only a unit, they must be a unit, but at the same time they are directly responsible both to the Crown and to Parliament. This is a point which, it seems to me, need not be supported by authorities, but in view of the anomalous position which has been taken by the Government, perhaps it would not be amiss for me to draw the attention of the House to the doctrine of standard authorities on the subject. I quote from Todd, page 3 of the last edition :

It is the distinguishing feature of parliamentary government that it requires the powers belonging to the Crown to be exercised through ministers, who are held responsible for the manner in which they are used, who are expected to be members of the two Houses of Parliament, the proceedings of which they must be able generally to guide, and who are considered entitled to hold their offices only while they possess the confidence of Parliament, and more especially of the House of Commons.

I cite from the same authority, page 384 :

For it must be observed, of all the royal prerogatives, that they are held in trust for the benefit of the whole nation, and must be exercised in conformity with the constitutional maxim which requires that every act of the royal authority should be performed by the advice of councillors who are responsible to parliament and to the law of the land. This responsibility is now acknowledged to be thorough and complete ; and, as no public act of the sovereign is valid which is not performed under the advice of some responsible minister, so, on the other hand, for every exercise of the royal authority, ministers must be prepared to account to parliament, justifying the same, if need be, at their own peril.

And again at page 420—this is a quotation from May :

“ The limits,” says May, “ within which parliament, or either House, may constitutionally exercise a control over the executive government, have been defined by usage upon principles consistent with a true distribution of powers in a free state and limited monarchy. Parliament has no direct control over any single department of the state. It may order the production of papers for its information ; it may investigate the conduct of public officers, and may pronounce its opinion upon the manner in which every function of government has been, or ought to be, discharged ; but it cannot convey its orders or directions to the meanest executive officer in relation to the performance of his duty. Its power over the executive is exercised indirectly, but not the less effectively, through the responsible ministers of the Crown. These ministers regulate the duties of every department of the state, and are responsible for their proper performance to parliament, as well as the Crown.”

I have made these quotations to illustrate the doctrine with which I set out at first, that the business of government is carried on through the instrumentality of Ministers who are directly responsible to the Crown and directly responsible to Parliament also ; who are responsible for their acts to Parliament and who are amenable immediately to the jurisdiction of Parliament. Now, it so happens that the two gentlemen who preside over two of the most important departments of the Government, the Department of Customs and the Department of Inland Revenue, are also members of the Cabinet, and are at the same time subordinate officers of a Minister. They are not responsible to the Crown, not responsible to Parliament, but responsible to another Minister, to one of their own colleagues, as advisers of the Crown. This, it seems to me, is a singular anomaly, it is a violation of the principles of responsible government. Suppose, for instance, that the administration of the Department of Customs were not satisfactory to Parliament ; at the present time Parliament has no means of making the holder of the office amenable to its jurisdiction, because the holder of the office is not responsible to Parliament, but somebody else is responsible for him : the Minister of Trade and Commerce is responsible

for the actions of the Controller of Customs. The Minister of Trade and Commerce is responsible for the administration of the Controller of Inland Revenue. So those hon. gentlemen are not in any proper sense, and they could not be in any proper sense, members of the Cabinet; they could not be advisers of the Crown, because they have no responsibility to the people, no responsibility to the Crown itself, but they are responsible to the hon. gentleman who is responsible both to the Crown and to Parliament for their administration. And therefore, under the circumstances, it seems to me that it is, to say the least, a very singular anomaly, to see those hon. gentlemen members of the Cabinet, because, I contend, by the very nature of their office they are debarred from being members of the Cabinet. Perhaps it may be said they might be members of the Privy Council. There is a question as to that. Members of the Privy Council need not be members of the two Houses of Parliament; members of the Privy Council are at present honorary advisers of the Crown, and under our system we have several members of the Privy Council without any portfolios. But I contend that in this case, when an hon. gentleman who holds an office under the Administration, but who is at the same time not responsible directly either to the Crown or to the people, but is directly responsible to another officer, to a Minister, who is himself responsible to the Crown and to Parliament, is debarred by the very nature of responsible government from holding a position as an adviser of the Crown and forming part of the Cabinet. He may be part of the Administration—I do not contend that he may not be; but to be a member of the Cabinet and a member of the Administration are two different matters. I now proceed to show by the debate that took place when the office was created, and by the statute itself, that it never was the intention of Parliament when the offices were created that those holding them should be members of the Cabinet, but the reverse was contemplated. When the Bill was introduced in 1887, it was introduced and carried through Parliament by Sir John Macdonald. Speaking of the establishment of the portfolio of Trade and Commerce, he said:

This will add a Minister to the present list. On the other hand, we consider that the two departments of Customs and Inland Revenue are administrative only. They are not suggestive, but administrative, and, after the policy of the Government with respect either to Inland Revenue or Customs is settled, the Ministers at the head of these departments will see that the law is carried out. It is proposed, therefore, that, when the reorganization has commenced, the Minister at the head of Customs and the Minister at the head of Inland Revenue will not necessarily be Cabinet Ministers. They will be political heads, but they need not necessarily, as a matter of practice, be members of the Cabinet.

Nothing can be clearer than the language

Mr. LAURIER.

of the Prime Minister of that day, that those officers were to be simply what they are in England, under secretaries, to conduct the administration of affairs under the political head, but it was never contemplated, even for a moment, that they should hold office as members of the Cabinet. That language, emphatic as it was, in the mouth of the Prime Minister, was made more emphatic by the language of the statute itself. The legislation to which the Prime Minister then adverted is to be found in chap. 10 and 11. Chap. 10 recites:

There shall be a department called the Department of Trade and Commerce, over which the Minister of Trade and Commerce for the time being, appointed by commission under the Great Seal, shall preside, and the Minister shall have the management and direction of the department, holding office during pleasure; and the Minister of Trade and Commerce shall be a member of the Privy Council of Canada, with a salary of \$7,000 per annum.

Chap. 11, "An Act respecting the Department of Customs and the Department of Inland Revenue," at section 3 provides:

The Governor in Council may appoint an officer who is to be called the Controller of Customs, and an officer who is to be called the Controller of Inland Revenue, who shall hold office at pleasure, and shall be under the general instructions of the Minister of Trade and Commerce or of the Minister of Finance, as the Council may direct.

So here it is laid down very plainly that the Controller of Customs and the Controller of Inland Revenue are simply parliamentary heads to be here as subordinates of the Minister of Trade and Commerce, but responsible to him directly, not responsible to Parliament or responsible to the Crown. It is a matter of history that this Act, which was passed in 1887, was left in abeyance for several years, and was not put into practical effect until two or three years ago; and when it was put into effect it was put into effect in the manner provided by the Act, that is to say, those two gentlemen, the Controller of Customs and the Controller of Inland Revenue, while they were taken into the Administration, were not taken into the Cabinet. They were not made Cabinet Ministers, they were not made members of the Privy Council, they did not hold the rank of advisers of the Crown, and for the obvious reason, and for the well known reason that being debarred by their office from having direct responsibility themselves, it was of course felt that they should not hold positions as Cabinet Ministers. A departure took place. When did it take place? A few weeks ago. On what occasion? On the occasion of the election of the Controller of Inland Revenue. I say the election, not the appointment of the hon. gentleman, the Controller of Inland Revenue, but if I am correctly informed, when the Government was organized in December, when the present Controller of Customs was transferred from Inland Revenue to Customs, and when

the present Controller of Inland Revenue was appointed, but were appointed in the same manner as occupants of those offices had been appointed before, that is to say, the hon. gentleman who occupied the position of Controller of Inland Revenue was transferred to the position of Controller of Customs with the same rank, the same rank in the Administration, but not in the Cabinet; and the present Controller of Inland Revenue was admitted in the ranks of the Administration, but not in the Cabinet. The hon. gentleman had left for Victoria to seek re-election, having simply the position which his predecessor had held, that is to say, that of Controller of Customs, a member of the Administration, but not of the Cabinet. But when the hon. gentleman went to the electors he had been preceded by the news that he was a full-fledged Cabinet Minister. But when he came to Victoria the matter was ventilated by the electors, and then it was found out that he was not a Cabinet Minister, but simply a parliamentary head, without any voice in the Cabinet; and it is now a matter of history that Lieutenant-Governor Dewdney wired to the Prime Minister informing him that there was a misunderstanding as to the rank held by the new Controller of Inland Revenue in the Administration. Well, Sir, there should be no misunderstanding as to that matter. The people of Victoria knew right well, if they knew anything of the law, that the new Controller of Inland Revenue simply had a position in the Administration, but had no position in the Cabinet. Then, Sir, it was simply for an electoral expediency and for no other purpose, that the hon. gentleman was taken into the Cabinet; and, of course, one of the Controllers being taken into the Cabinet, the other had to be taken in also. Then it was that, when the election was at its thickest, on the 27th December, Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper, at that time Minister of Justice, wired to Mr. Prior as follows:—

Hon. E. G. Prior, Victoria.

His Excellency informed me, last night, that he had signed the Minute of Council sanctioning your appointment as member of the Cabinet and Privy Councillor.

As far as my information goes, that was the occasion when the appointment took place, and took place as a matter of political expediency, so as to give more influence to the Controller of Inland Revenue with the electorate of Victoria, and so obtain votes in that city. We all know that the election was close. I do not know what effect it had, nor is that the question at the present time, but the question is a grave one which I submit for the consideration of the House. I do not intend to press the matter at the present moment, because we have not all the papers, but I do not believe that the papers which are to be brought down, can at all alter the facts which I have stated, namely, that the posi-

tion held by the Controller of Inland Revenue, and by the Controller of Customs, in the Cabinet, is altogether antagonistic, not only to the principles of parliamentary government, but also antagonistic to the letter of the statute which has created both of those offices.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Mr. Speaker, I see no reason why the papers called for by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Laurier) should not be brought down. I fully agree with the hon. gentleman when he stated that before discussing this question further, it might be better to wait until the papers are on the Table of this House, and if he had thought of that in the beginning of his speech I think it might possibly have been better. I also agree with the hon. gentlemen, that the language of Sir John Macdonald, when he introduced the Bill to the House, is absolutely clear, and it is so clear that it seems to me impossible that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Laurier) should draw any deduction from it than an endorsement of the course which the present Government has followed in calling these two hon. gentlemen to the Privy Council. The late Sir John Macdonald, in explaining the measure, said that of necessity the hon. gentlemen might not be Cabinet Ministers, and that these hon. gentlemen in acting as members of the Administration, but not as members of the Cabinet, would be in a position to be later on taken into the Cabinet. It seems to me that what the present Government has done in this matter is exactly in accord with the announcement then made by the great leader of the Conservative party. Now as to the responsibility to the country, and as to the responsibility to the Crown. The hon. gentlemen who are members of the Privy Council and Cabinet Ministers, are responsible for the advice which they give to the Crown. There cannot be a question as to that. True it is, that recommendations connected with the administration of their departments are transmitted through the Minister of Trade and Commerce, but the responsibility still exists in all its entirety, and these gentlemen who are members of the Privy Council have their responsibility as well as any other advisers of the Crown. I do not see that there can be any question as to the position taken by the Government in calling these hon. gentlemen to the Privy Council. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Laurier) has talked a good deal about history, and he has picked out his history from the columns of newspapers, and read to the House what newspapers said as to the manner in which these hon. gentlemen have been called to the Cabinet. Well, I believe that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Laurier) on reflecting over the matter, will think as I do, that this newspaper history is not altogether that sort of constitutional history which Parliament would like to have laid before it. All I can say to the hon. gentleman is, that when the papers are brought down, if the hon.

gentleman then questions the policy of the Government, he must find other reasons than those which he submitted to the House. He must rely upon some other argument, than the manner in which the Bill was introduced by Sir John Macdonald, because I believe that what the then Premier advised has been carried out. I cannot see how the hon. gentleman (Mr. Laurier) could find in the extracts from "Hansard" which he has read, any reason to prove that the Government should not have taken the course they have taken in this matter.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Mr. Speaker, the whole proceeding in connection with the appointment of these hon. gentlemen to seats in the Cabinet, as well as to the position of Privy Councillors, is, I think, most unusual. There can be no doubt whatever, that when it was proposed to create two subordinate departments of the Government—which the Prime Minister (Sir John Macdonald) who introduced the Bill said, that they were departments that were administrative only, and were not suggestive departments—he assumed that those who presided over the departments were not required in the Privy Council, and that there was nothing connected with their departments that made their consultation on subjects of public policy a matter of importance; and so the proposal was that these two administrative officers who were to become Ministers of the Crown, but not members of the Cabinet, were to hold subordinate offices in the Government, and were to be placed under the control, either of the Minister of Finance or the Minister of Trade and Commerce. Now, it is not the usual practice under the English parliamentary system, to make one Minister of the Crown subordinate to another. Each Minister of the Crown is independent. Each Minister of the Crown stands upon a footing of equality, and his vote in the Cabinet counts for as much as the vote of any other member of the Cabinet. But, Sir, that is not the position either of the Controller of Customs or of the Controller of Inland Revenue. Let me call your attention, and the attention of the House, to the words of the statute by which these two offices are created. The first section provides:

The Department of Customs and the Department of Inland Revenue, respectively, shall, from and after the coming into force of this Act, or so much thereof as relates to either the said departments, in accordance with the provisions hereinafter contained, be under the control and supervision of the Minister of Trade and Commerce, or the Minister of Finance, as the Governor in Council from time to time directs.

That is the position of subordinate members of the Administration. That is the position naturally assigned in law to those who are to be members of the Government, but who are to have nothing to do with the shaping of the policy of the Government—who are,

Sir ADOLPHE CARON.

even in the discharge of their duties, subordinate to and responsible to a Minister who is responsible to the Crown and Parliament. The position legally assigned to those hon. gentlemen makes neither of them responsible to the Crown or to Parliament for the general policy of their departments. For the administrative acts of their departments they are responsible; but for the general policy of their departments the Minister of Trade and Commerce, under whose supervision they are placed, is the responsible Minister, and their position, being one of inferiority and subordination, is one as Cabinet Ministers, hitherto unknown to the law of our constitution or to that of the Imperial government of which ours is a transcript. It is further provided here:

The Governor in Council may appoint an officer who shall be called the Controller of Customs, and an officer who shall be called the Controller of Inland Revenue, each of whom shall hold office during pleasure, and shall, under the general instructions of the Minister of Trade and Commerce or of the Minister of Finance, as the Governor in Council directs, be the parliamentary head of the said departments respectively.

Wherever, by any Act, any duty is assigned to, or any power is conferred upon, the Minister of Customs, or the Minister of Inland Revenue, such duty shall be performed, or such power shall be exercised, by the Controller of Customs or the Controller of Inland Revenue, respectively; but any duty or power assigned to the Controller of Customs or the Controller of Inland Revenue shall be performed, or exercised, subject to the supervision and control of the Minister of Trade and Commerce or of the Minister of Finance, as the Governor in Council directs.

Now, Sir, it is perfectly clear from the provisions of this statute that these two officers were to be Ministers, but not Cabinet Ministers. They were to stand outside of the Cabinet. They were to be responsible for the actual discharge of the duties of their departments; but in the public policy of the Cabinet, in its general direction, in anything that concerned the policy of the various departments, the one Minister who was responsible, both for the acts of the Controller of Customs and for those of the Controller of Inland Revenue, was either the Minister of Trade and Commerce or the Minister of Finance, as the Government placed these subjects under the one or under the other. That position is one altogether out of keeping with seats in the Cabinet—altogether out of keeping with the position to which these hon. gentlemen have been raised by the political necessities of the Administration. It is true that in England, sometimes an outside Minister, one who is not a Cabinet Minister, may be a Privy Councillor. He may have acquired that honorary distinction before he ever entered the government or parliament at all. We know that that rank is usually conferred on the governors sent to the various colonies, and on ambassadors sent abroad; and if a governor or an ambassador, on his return, should become a member of the administra-

tion, even a junior member, without having a seat in the Cabinet, although he has the rank of a Privy Councillor he does not become a member of the Cabinet. He is outside of the Cabinet, and he only differs from other outside members of the Cabinet in this, that while others may prepare a memorandum for council which has to be submitted through some Minister who has a seat in the Cabinet, he may appear in person before the Council, and may explain what he desires to have done, although he can take no part in its deliberations as a member of the administration. Now, Sir, there is but one way known to the law of the constitution, I believe, of making an officer a member of the Privy Council—I am not now speaking of the Cabinet; that is, by his appearing personally before the representative of the Crown and being sworn in of the Privy Council—being sworn to keep the secrets of Her Majesty and to advise her truly, and subscribing to the Privy Council roll. Now, what do these hon. gentlemen say? The late Minister of Justice, in a communication by telegraph to the present Controller of Inland Revenue, said this:

His Excellency informed me, last night (that is, on the 27th December), that he had signed the Minute of Council approving of your appointment as a member of the Cabinet and of the Privy Council.

Now, I would like to know whether that is true. I would like to know by what authority an appointment was made in that way. I would like to know how Mr. Prior became a member of the Privy Council without taking the oath or subscribing the roll. It is a novel proceeding—one which, I venture to say, is wholly unknown to the law; and if that is the way in which Mr. Prior has been made a member of the Privy Council, I will venture to say that in law he is not a member yet. Now, the hon. gentleman has a good deal to explain in the proceedings that have been taken in connection with this matter. I venture to say that the appointment of these hon. members, holding these two offices as members of the Privy Council, is a rather unusual proceeding. I do not say that it is unconstitutional. I admit that the Crown may make any member of this House, or even Mr. Audette down stairs, if it thinks proper, a member of the Privy Council. There is no doubt about that. But to make him a member of the Cabinet in virtue of his holding the office of Controller of Customs or that of Controller of Inland Revenue, when the law intends that he shall not be such, is a most extraordinary proceeding. Now, Sir, I venture to say that you will not find in the whole history of England an instance in which any one holding an office of under-secretary or any one of the subordinate offices as an assistant to a Minister, has been raised to the position of a Cabinet Minister. There is not a single instance of the kind; and yet two gentlemen who have seats in

this House, who are subordinates of the Minister of Trade and Commerce, have been made members of the Cabinet—have been put upon a footing of equality with the man under whom they are to serve and who is responsible to Parliament and to the Crown for all they do. I say that is an unusual proceeding, and the hon. gentleman will have to submit very unusual papers to the consideration of this House to justify what has been done. Sir, our constitution in a large degree consists of understandings, and if you undertake to trample these under foot, what becomes of your constitution? It is not in writing. It is not a hard and fast instrument; it is not a mechanical contrivance like the American constitution. It is a vital organism. It is intended to grow and develop, but there is no propriety in undertaking to raise men, holding subordinate and, in a large degree, irresponsible offices in the Administration, to the position of Cabinet Ministers. This is contrary to the understanding, it is contrary to what the law contemplates, as shown by the very words of the statute, and I trust that the House will be prepared to give an intelligent and independent consideration to this question when it has all the papers before it.

Mr. DICKEY. I do not propose to discuss at any length, until the papers come down, the very interesting question which has been raised by hon. gentlemen opposite. I do not think after all, that, so far as the present material at our service is concerned, there is very much difference between hon. gentlemen opposite and ourselves with regard to the constitutional principles underlying this case. There is not much room for difference. The only point of difference that I see is that the hon. gentleman from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) seems to hold that the position of the office of Controller is a disqualification for a seat in the Cabinet. He admits that the Queen may call to Her Privy Council any member of this House she chooses, without portfolio. The hon. gentleman, in the government of which he was once a member, himself tendered that advice to the Crown on more than one occasion, and had members of this House in the Cabinet without any responsibility to Parliament for administration, so that we are not very far apart, in practice or in theory, in regard to this matter. I could not, and that is the only question to which I intend to allude, altogether follow the leader of the Opposition in his argument. His argument, if I understood it correctly, was that this appointment of Controllers to the Cabinet was wrong, because Parliament had no control over it, that another officer—their superior officer,—was responsible to Parliament, and that therefore these men had no place in the Cabinet. I am quite unable to follow that because the position of these gentlemen, the Controllers, in the Cabinet does not in any way affect their

responsibility to Parliament. The House is seized of full control over the administration and policy of the Department of Trade and Commerce. The presence of the Controllers in the Cabinet, or their absence from the Cabinet, does not affect in any way the responsibility of the Minister to the House. The responsibility for the policy and the administration of that department is exactly as it was before these gentlemen became sworn of the Privy Council. It is quite clear to the House that Sir John Macdonald, when he introduced that Bill, introduced it avowedly as a tentative measure. He introduced it as an experiment, he did not negative the right of appointing these gentlemen, the Controllers, to the Cabinet. He said that they were not necessarily Cabinet officers. Experience has shown along what lines that development is likely to take, so that I do not see any radical inconsistency between the position assumed by the Government to-day and the position of Sir John Macdonald when he introduced that Bill. I am quite sure the leader of the Opposition will not find any objection to the personnel of the two Controllers, or their right to sit in the Cabinet, so far as regards their ability and standing in the House.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). How were they appointed ?

Mr. DICKEY. I am coming to that presently. If the hon. gentleman will look at Sir John Macdonald's speech, he will see that one of the results which Sir John Macdonald hoped from that Bill was that it would train young parliamentary hands into expert Cabinet Ministers, and I am quite sure that, in the case of our hon. friend the Controller of Customs (Mr. Wood), that end has been thoroughly attained.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). By promotion to other offices.

Mr. DICKEY. With regard to the Controller of Inland Revenue (Mr. Prior), I beg to say that I see nothing improper whatever in the Minister of Justice of that day, (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) or the Prime Minister (Sir Mackenzie Bowell), for the matter of that, telegraphing what was the fact to any person in Victoria or elsewhere. The question whether the inquiry was made of the Governor or not is quite another question, but when the inquiry was made the answer evidently was as to the fact. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) knows far better than I do that the practice with regard to members of the Privy Council is to appoint them by Order in Council, and they are sworn sometimes at a subsequent day, sometimes at a date a good deal subsequent, but he must not imagine for that reason that the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Prior) is not now a member of the Privy Council and a member of the Cabinet.

Mr. DICKEY.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Then he was appointed after his election ?

Mr. DICKEY. I can assure the hon. gentleman that the position of Controller of Inland Revenue is quite straight and legal in that respect. I cannot follow the hon. member for Bothwell altogether in his reading of precedents, but I have no desire to prolong the discussion to-night. I wish merely to clear up the position of the Controller of Inland Revenue, and to meet the main objection made by the leader of the Opposition as to the responsibility of these gentlemen to the House and not to the Cabinet.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I desire to add but a few words to the discussion which has taken place with reference to the appointment of the two Controllers to the Cabinet. When the proposal was made to the House some years ago and its then leader (Sir John Macdonald) asked the House to agree to a Bill, he gave the House to understand very clearly that these gentlemen were not to become members of the Cabinet. My hon. friend and leader read a quotation from Sir John Macdonald's speech on that occasion. I myself wish he had gone on with a few sentences further, because Sir John Macdonald on that occasion, made very clear, so that no one could misunderstand it, what the proposition was.

Mr. DICKEY. Yes.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. Minister of Justice assents. He not only made it clear what the proposition was, but he made it pretty clear that it was not desirable that these gentlemen, whom we appointed Controllers, should be members of the Cabinet. The hon. gentleman shakes his head. I will read the language of the late Sir John Macdonald to show which is right :

It is of considerable importance that the number of Cabinet Ministers should not be increased, that is to say, that every member holding a political office in Parliament should not, ex necessitate, be a member of the Cabinet.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Ex-necessitate.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Yes, he says he was against the necessity, or desirability either, of the two Controllers holding positions in the Cabinet.

Mr. DICKEY. I quite conceive that that was Sir John Macdonald's scheme at the time, but nothing that he said goes against the constitutionality of the appointment.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). But you have not changed the law to suit the change.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What I contend was that Parliament was induced to assent to the Bill creating a new Minister—the Minister of Trade and Commerce—on the distinct understanding that the two gentlemen who were to be Controllers of the Inland Revenue and Customs Department were

not to have seats in the Cabinet. I recall the attention of the House to the sentence I read :

It is of considerable importance that the number of Cabinet Ministers should not be increased, that is to say, that every member holding a political office in Parliament should not, ex-necesse, be a member of the Cabinet.

Why ?

That would overload a Cabinet, and in that regard would not promote promptness of action ; but, by this system, young members of Parliament, comparatively young members, who have taken prominent positions in Parliament, can obtain entrance into public life, and commence official training by holding these offices, and, after certain probation, if they assert themselves before Parliament, they will, very naturally, be promoted and become Cabinet Ministers.

So they were to act as under-secretaries as in England. They were to undergo a certain training and if they qualified themselves, they were to be held for promotion to the head of a department, and a seat in the Cabinet. He goes on to say :

The proposed proposal is, that when these Acts come into force, the Minister of Customs and Minister of Inland Revenue shall be members of the Government, and, on appointment, they must seek re-election, and they will have a salary, as it is proposed, of \$5,000 a year. They will go out with the Government, and they will be political personages as much as if they were members of the Cabinet. It is believed that the expense will be diminished after the new Act relating to the Customs and Excise goes into force. It is proposed that the permanent officer under the political head will hold the position of chief clerk,—

And so on.

These two departments, the Department of Customs and the Department of Excise, which are the departments furnishing the chief portion of the revenue of the country, will be under the control and supervision of the Minister of Trade and Commerce, who will be the head of the whole of these two departments, will deal with matter of trade and commerce, and will have the supervision of these two branches.

Almost the exact language the hon. gentleman used was afterwards embodied in the statute. These officers were appointed merely as administrative officers, to take their orders from the Minister of Trade and Commerce who was to have the forming of the policy which it was to be their duty to carry out. And Parliament, I believe, would not have agreed to the Bill as then proposed unless it had had the guarantee of the Prime Minister himself that these were to be subordinate administrative officers, and not charged with the duties or responsibilities, or endowed with the powers of Cabinet Ministers. If the hon. gentleman shelters himself behind the absence of negative language in the statute, he is clearly violating the spirit and intention of the Act, and the promise and intention of the Prime Minister when he introduced it.

Motion agreed to.

BEER LICENSE IN NEEPAWA, MAN.

Mr. MARTIN moved :

Copies of all correspondence with regard to the granting of a license to manufacture and sell beer in the town of Neepawa, in Manitoba. Also, copies of all petitions from residents of said town protesting against said license.

He said : In the town of Neepawa they have had in force for some time what is known as the Manitoba Local Option Act, under which municipalities are authorized to adopt, practically, a prohibitory law with regard to the sale of intoxicating liquors. While it is true that that Act has been declared unconstitutional by one of our judges in Manitoba, that does not alter the particular grievance which I have to refer to. While, under provincial laws, no intoxicating liquors are allowed to be sold, it is felt to be a great grievance that the Dominion Government should allow, within these municipalities, a brewing license or other license under which the local law is practically annulled. It is felt to be a particular grievance in Neepawa, where for a long time no licenses have been issued under local law, that recently a brewery has been started in the town, operating under Dominion laws, and under a Dominion license. Under that license this brewery has been enabled to sell its product, beer, in violation of the local law, or, at any rate, in antagonism to the local law which, up to that time had been in force and had been acted upon by the municipality. I do not desire to express any opinion as to the wisdom or otherwise of these local prohibitory laws, but it does seem to me, Mr. Speaker, that where a law of that kind has been enacted, and the people have been allowed to place themselves in a position to have no intoxicating liquors sold within their municipality, it is a very unfortunate thing, and a very unfair thing, to those people that an outside power like the Dominion Government should practically set aside the wishes of the people in this indirect way by licensing a brewery. I understand that very strong representations have been made to the Government, practically by the unanimous voice of the people in the town, protesting against this license being allowed there. I desire to have the information asked for in the motion with the view, if necessary, to again alluding to the matter.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. There is no objection to the papers coming down. I am sorry that the Controller of Customs (Mr. Wood), who, at the time this license was issued, was Controller of Inland Revenue, is not in his seat at the moment. But, I suppose it is better to wait until the papers are brought down before any discussion is entered upon.

Motion agreed to.

BREAKWATER AT TIGNISH.

Mr. PERRY moved for :

Copy of the report of the engineer appointed to examine and report on the state of the breakwater at Tignish, Prince Edward Island, during the year 1895.

He said: In making this motion I desire to make a few remarks. Tignish harbour is a harbour of refuge for the fishermen. It is a place where a large trade in fishing is carried on and has been for a number of years, as far back as I can remember. Under the Liberal Administration a vote of money was obtained in order to build the breakwater, and the building of that breakwater much improved navigation. The fishing boats of Tignish are of a smaller size, by a good deal, than the boats that come across from the county of Gloucester, from Shippegan and Pockmouche. These boats are large boats, and as a general rule draw about five feet of water. Just at the inner part of the breakwater there is a bar of tough mud, or marsh mud, and these boats are not able to go over that bar, therefore they must keep outside of it. Our small boats are drawn across this bar inside, and in the morning when they want to go out to try and catch mackerel—because every hon. member who is acquainted with mackerel fishing knows that it is done in the morning and evening—these small boats find that harbour filled up with large boats from the other side, and they cannot get out until two or three o'clock in the afternoon, or whatever hour of the day these large boats are prepared to go out. I have lived in the vicinity of Tignish harbour, and I know that thousands of dollars are lost to our fishermen yearly because these small fishing smacks are not able to get out. A few years ago I endeavoured to persuade the late representative of the county of Gloucester to assist me, as he was a supporter of the Government, in trying to induce the Government to help me to get a grant to improve the navigation of this harbour, and get a dredge sent there to dredge this bar, in order that these large boats might get over it and move into the bay and make room for the small boats to get out. Why, Sir, I have gone there myself, on days when these boats were lying there, and the harbour was so full that I could have driven a horse and wagon right across the harbour over the tops of these boats. I could not put my hand, I may say, between these boats they were so close together; therefore, it would be impossible for the small boats to get out. But the representatives of the county of Gloucester have not thought proper to assist me, and I am sorry for it. I have seen no less than a hundred of these large boats come across from the county of Gloucester to fish on the banks, and whenever a storm arises, they have to look for shelter in Tignish

Sir ADOLPHE CARON.

breakwater or in Tignish harbour. When they come there they monopolize the whole harbour, the fishermen of Tignish are not able to get out, and when they are not able to get out, the loss which they suffer can hardly be estimated. Now, Sir, I drew to this subject the attention of the Minister of Public Works—I am very sorry he is not in his place—a few days ago, and asked him if he was aware of the condition of the breakwater at Tignish, and he said he was. He said his engineer had made an examination and a report. He said, also, that he was aware that the breakwater was in a very dilapidated condition, and was liable to be carried away any day, either by ice or storm. I asked him if the department had taken any steps towards securing the breakwater, and he said no, and the reason was, he said, because the Government had no money at their disposal. They were prepared to let a breakwater costing \$15,000 go adrift the same as they allowed the wharf to do at West Point a few years ago. An Order in Council could not be passed placing \$3,000 or \$4,000 or \$5,000 at the disposal of the Minister of Public Works to enable him to save the breakwater at Tignish, which has cost \$15,000. Sir, what is the reason? The simple reason is this, that the breakwater at Tignish is in a constituency represented by a Liberal. Why, Sir, some men have said to me time and again: "Why don't you support the Government? You will never get a grant for the Tignish breakwater unless you do." Sir, this feeling is confirmed by the action of the present Minister of Public Works. In 1894 he promised me that he would send his engineer to inspect the breakwater and make a report. He did not do so. He says that last year he did send an engineer there. Well, I would like to know who the engineer is that he sent there. I would like to find out the date he was there. I would like to know the reason why that engineer was not instructed to notify me that he was coming. I know that some hot-headed Tories of Tignish were invited to accompany him, but I was not invited. The idea was to make me as unpopular as possible. But, Sir, the Minister of Public Works and the Government at his back, need not think that by doing wrong and injustice to the people of Tignish, they will compel the people to return a Tory in my place. There is no danger of that. We are mostly French in Tignish, recollect I am a Frenchman myself, and I am proud of it. If this Government wait until a member is sent from Tignish to support a Tory Government, while the people are suffering this injustice, this unpatriotic treatment at the hands of the Government that they have been receiving for the last seventeen years, they will wait until there is hair growing on their teeth. The

Minister said, "Yes; but we have no money at our command." The hon. gentleman has not even thought proper to place a sum in the Estimates to repair Tignish breakwater. The only amount in the Estimates under this head is \$6,000 for general repairs of breakwaters, with the exception of two special sums, one for Souris, \$37,500, which is much needed, and it is fortunate for those people they are represented by two supporters of the Government; and another amount for Kier's Shore. In regard to Souris, let me tell the House that at the next general elections there will be only one representative in this House for that district owing to the gerrymander of the present Government, and, therefore, I suppose only one half the amount will be available. In regard to the latter grant, the locality is my own county, and I feel obliged to the Minister to having shown interest in the eastern part of my constituency so that repairs will be made to the breakwater there. But I should like to know the reason why repairs have not been carried out at Tignish. I was born and brought up in the locality, I have property interests there and I have been connected with the fisheries, and if a Government officer had been sent to the district I should have been glad to have driven him to the location of the breakwater and have given him full information. At the present time I intend to confine my remarks to Tignish. There are other harbours in Prince County which deserve attention, and that might call for remarks to show how neglected they have been by the present Government, how unpatriotic this Government has been to Prince County. It has been represented since 1873 by Liberals with the exception of two occasions when it was represented by a Liberal and Conservative, but even then the Conservatives had not sufficient interest to obtain a vote for a breakwater or wharf in the county. I ask the Minister of Public Works as follows:—

Mr. PERRY asked :

Has the Department of Public Works caused a survey to be made of the breakwater at Tignish, Prince Edward Island, during the season of 1895, as promised by the Minister of Public Works in the sessions of 1894 and 1895; and, if so, has a report been made?

Mr. OUMET. An examination of the breakwater at Tignish, P.E.I., was made during the session of 1895, and a report has been submitted.

Mr. PERRY asked :

Is the Department of Public Works aware of the fact that the Tignish Breakwater, Prince Edward Island, is in a dilapidated condition and liable to be carried away at any moment by storm, &c.? Has the department taken steps for the immediate repair of said breakwater?

Mr. OUMET. The department is aware of the fact that the breakwater at Tignish, P.E.I., is in need of repair. The department has not taken steps for immediate repairs to the breakwater, owing to lack of funds.

Suppose the whole breakwater was about

to be swept away, has not the Government power to pass an Order in Council to raise \$4,000 or \$5,000 for repairs? The Government are liable to violate the constitution when they please. They can appoint men to the Cabinet who had no right to hold such positions. They can humbug the people for four or five weeks by announcing public measures in the Speech from the Throne and refusing to bring them down. They can hold back elections in certain constituencies when it suits them to do so, and when the reverse is the case they can have an election within nine days. Yet hon. gentlemen opposite will argue that they have not power to expend \$3,000 or \$4,000 to save a public work from destruction. I suppose when the proposal of the Minister of Public Works came before the Cabinet they were quarreling among themselves, for it was about the time that the "kick" took place. I advise the Minister of Public Works not to wait until these Estimates are passed before he orders repairs to the Tignish breakwater. Perhaps these Estimates will never be passed—I am a little doubtful whether they ever will be. If we are to judge the future by the past we must remember that there is a "to-morrow" still, and these Estimates may never be carried into force. However, I would advise the Minister to make preparations to put the breakwater in order, and let him not take action because of the statements made by the Liberal member for the county, but let him act from a sense of justice, economy, patriotism, and a desire to help the fishermen, who are called upon to expose their lives in the Gulf of St. Lawrence to earn a living. These fishermen consume more dutiable goods per head than even the Minister of Public Works himself, except champagne, which, we are now told, is very cheap. I regret the hon. member for Gloucester is not present to aid me in this motion, as no less than a hundred large boats cross the Straits and seek to enter Tignish Harbour. This, however, is difficult to accomplish for lack of dredging, which would not cost more than about \$200. Last summer some boats came to the entrance of the breakwater during a storm on a Saturday night, but they could not get in. It was nip and go that the craft was not smashed, and the crew lost. How would the Minister of Public Works console himself if he were the means of losing these lives? Could he restore them? I presume there were three or four married men in that boat, and how was he going to support these widows and orphans? What reparation could he make to prepare these souls to go before their maker in the next world—and they were not so well prepared may be as, perhaps, the Minister is at all times. The hon. Minister of Public Works says he had no money on his hands for this work. Why, I thought he controlled most of the revenue of this country, and that his department spent more money than any other

department in Canada. He must think that I am a child, and that he can play with this House, and with the people of Prince Edward Island, when he tells me that he has no funds in his hands. Who can believe a statement of that kind? Does it look honest, or reasonable, or manly? Now, I would advise the Minister of Public Works to send as early as possible next spring a dredge down to dredge the bar at Tignish. The fishermen of Tignish have a charge against his department for losing several thousands of dollars because they could not go out of harbour on account of its being closed. There is another thing I would wish to ask, the Minister of Railways this time. I know he is very fond of myself, and very apt to do as I tell him, and I am quite sure he will not refuse the small request that I am going to make. Last year he was very liberal in offering to build branch railways in Prince Edward Island. He was going to give us a hundred miles of railway at an estimated cost of \$1,100,000, and I hope and trust his mind tends in that direction yet. I am going to ask him now to build a branch railway from Tignish station to the breakwater. He cannot point to any harbour on Prince Edward Island where there is no railway, except this very harbour of Tignish. At Alberton, Summerside, Charlottetown and Souris, there are branch lines for the shipping. I can tell the hon. gentleman that there is a large traffic from Tignish station down to the shipping. The produce, especially fish, must be shipped by rail, and it takes a great deal of hardship to haul fish from the shore down to Tignish station.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). How far is that?

Mr. PERRY. About two miles. The land is level and there are no bridges to be built, except a small one across Tignish river, which won't cost very much. That branch will pay just as well as any other part of the railway system, and the people are expecting it. It would facilitate trade very much, and the merchants there would be willing to pay freight for the haul. I know one gentleman who keeps four spans of horses to haul the freight in spring and fall, through the muddy roads, where the horses are not able to carry half a load. All that trouble might be obviated by having a small railway from the station to the breakwater. Perhaps the Minister may say that the people have not asked for it, but I can tell him that they are having a meeting at Tignish to-night, which no doubt will be a large one, for the purpose of getting up a petition to ask the Government to agree to a small grant so as to build this short line. I would not doubt but that the Minister would do that, seeing we are on the eve of an election, and that his friend, the Conservative candidate who is opposed to me there, might possibly have a chance

Mr. PERRY.

of occupying a seat in this House instead of myself. At all events, the refusal of the Minister will not have the effect of keeping me out. I think he will find me here once more to talk about Tignish, Miminegash, Pockmouche, and all those other places down there where the people are not treated well by this Government. The Minister of Public Works says this is a small matter, and, that being the case, I don't think I need say any more about it.

Mr. OUIMET. I have no objection to bring down the papers asked for by the hon. gentleman. I believe they will show to his satisfaction that the promises I made last session have been fully carried out. I sent an engineer to examine the breakwater at Tignish, and to inquire also as to the advisability of having some dredging done. The report of the engineer has been sent to the department, and as to what shall be done, or as to what amount shall be placed in the Estimates, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Perry) shall see when the supplementary Estimates are brought down. I am sorry the hon. gentleman should have taken me at a disadvantage by complaining generally that his county has not been well treated, because when the papers are brought down, the hon. gentleman will see that his county has been just as well treated, and I think better treated than any other county in Prince Edward Island. The hon. gentleman is certainly wrong in complaining that I have any grudge against him, or that I wish to be the instrument of preventing him coming back to this House next Parliament. As I have already suggested, I would say for the general information of the House, that if my department were going to undertake all the works that are necessary on these—I won't say unimportant harbours—not only along the coast of Prince Edward Island, but also New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, the sum of \$3,000,000 at least would be required. My hon. friend, I hope, will help me in getting the money as soon as the finances of the country justify us in asking for this large expenditure. We are doing everything we can in our department to keep up these numerous works in the county of Prince and in the other counties of the lower provinces, and I am sure that the hon. gentleman, if he said everything he believed, would say that we are doing our duty towards his county, as well as towards every other county, however it may be represented in this House.

Mr. PERRY. Well, Mr. Speaker, I think that is very poor satisfaction. The hon. Minister of Public Works says he hopes that I will help him to get the money. So I will, if he will only show me how. But before the money is got, according to his statement, the breakwater may be carried away.

Mr. OUIMET. Oh, no, the breakwater will give the hon. gentleman every chance

to complain against the Government. It will remain there.

Mr. PERRY. All I want is that the Tignish breakwater be repaired and put in condition to serve the people who require it, and that this bar be dredged. These people have as good a right to use that harbour as anybody else, and in order to afford them the accommodation they require in their fishing operations the breakwater ought to be repaired and repaired in good time; and that bar ought to be dredged as early in the spring as possible. The large boats do not come across until some time in July or August, just about the time our mackerel fishing begins. Every one who knows anything about that fishery knows that those engaged in it fish in small boats; and when the large boats come, they monopolize the harbour so completely that the small boats cannot get out. The result is that these small boats lose hundreds and perhaps thousands of dollars in the season, because they have to go out at the break of day and return at 9 or 10 o'clock, in order that the fish may not be spoiled by the heat of the day, and they go out again in the evening. Is it any wonder that I speak on their behalf, and assure the Minister of Public Works that this work is needed? I am not asking it merely for the sake of talking. I know I do not talk very well, and I do not talk to please the Minister of Public Works. I talk because I believe this to be a matter of necessity; and if these works are not looked after immediately, I contend that the people are badly used and that the Government are neglectful of their duty. The people of Tignish pay their taxes, and perhaps a little more than their full share. They are citizens of Canada, and if the Government are going to neglect us in this way, we might as well break up the union between Prince Edward Island and the Dominion. The hon. Minister says his engineer was there. When was he there. I would like to know? He has not stated that. I do not know whether he knows himself. I hope the engineer was there, though I did not see him. However, I hope the Minister will be as good as his promise. He is not always so. But I do hope that he will be in this case, if not for the sake of the people of Tignish, whom I represent, for the sake of saving the property belonging to the Government of which he is the Minister of Public Works.

Motion agreed to.

CENTRAL EXPERIMENTAL FARM.

Mr. McMILLAN moved for:

Statement of the total expenditure in connection with the Central Experimental Farm at Ottawa, up to the 1st day of January, 1896:—The price paid for the land. The total cost of buildings, and labour in making permanent improvements, and the total cost of other labour on the farm. The amounts paid for manure and fer-

tilizers. The amount paid for live stock. The total amount paid for machinery and implements. The amount paid for harness. The value of live stock on the farm, 1st January, 1896. The total revenue from sales of live stock, butter, cheese and produce of the farm, to 1st January, 1896.

He said: Mr. Speaker, before the experimental farm was established the Minister of Agriculture of that day stated that \$300,000 would be required to complete the buildings and equipment of all the experimental stations, including that at Ottawa, and that \$30,000 or \$40,000 a year would be all that would be required to keep them up. Now, I see that \$70,000 was voted last year as the annual expenditure on the experimental farms. I see that there is an increase of \$5,000 this year which brings the expenditure up to \$75,000. I am sorry the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Montague) is not in his seat, but I understand that the Government is going to take a new departure with respect to stocking those farms. The department of live stock has not been attended to as it should since the Experimental Farm was established. We hear a great deal about the great benefit of our butter and cheese factories, but in order to be thoroughly successful in these industries, we must have the foundation of a good herd of cows. I hold that this is one of the duties which the experimental stations ought to undertake. They ought to show the farmers how to establish a good herd of cows, as this is the root of success in all our dairy operations. We were told some years ago that they were going to keep on the Experimental Farm here forty head of cattle on forty acres of land, but that experiment has evidently fallen through for we hear nothing now about it. We all know, as farmers, that the success of farming to-day depends upon being able to raise the greatest quantity at the smallest cost upon a given quantity of land. The greater the quantity that can be raised on a given quantity of land and the smaller the cost is the test of practical farming. Our Experimental Farm has not been successful in this respect. In this age of keen competition, when we have to come in contact with the different nations in the markets of Great Britain, it is the country which can succeed the best in raising produce at the least cost and best quality which will control the market. The foundation of both the butter and cheese industry consists in the building up of a thoroughly profitable herd of cows which will produce, at a very cheap rate, good milk for ten or eleven months of the year. That is the first thing to which the Government should pay attention, and I do not think it requires any special line of husbandry in order to do that. Our travelling dairies have been of great benefit to our farmers by showing them how to produce better butter and cheese, but the foundation has not been laid. The Government have not by means of their Experimental Farm and stations, shown our

farmers how they can raise a good herd of dairy animals, and it is this which really lies at the foundation of their success. I presume, that the Government intend going in for herds of costly cattle, composed of thoroughbred animals. But that is a branch of industry which has been carried to the highest perfection, in the province of Ontario, by private individuals, so that the Government need not undertake it. What we want the Government to show us is how we can get a thoroughly good herd of cattle in the shortest time, bred upon the farm, which will give the best results.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The information will be brought down which the hon. gentleman requires, but I must express my regret that my hon. colleague the Minister of Agriculture was not in his place, as he no doubt would have taken a great deal of interest in the hon. gentleman's remarks and entered thoroughly into the discussion of the subject. As the hon. gentleman has said, however, the discussion will be gone into later on, and then my hon. colleague will be able to give it his attention.

Motion agreed to.

RETURNS ORDERED.

Copies of all correspondence between the Government and the Secretary of State for the Colonies concerning the Atlantic Fast Service and the proposed Pacific Cable.—(Mr. Laurier.)

Return of the receipts and expenditures in detail chargeable to the Consolidated Fund from the 1st day of July, 1895, to the 1st day of February, 1896, and comparative statements from the 1st day of July, 1894, to the 1st day of February, 1895.—(Mr. Laurier, for Sir Richard Cartwright.)

Return showing the names of the operators and location of mills in which corn was ground for human food during the year ending 30th June, 1895. The number of bushels ground by each, and the gross amount of rebate made to each, and the amount of rebate yet due or claimed by each and not paid, if any.—(Mr. McMullen.)

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I beg to move the adjournment of the House, and in doing so I wish to tell my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, that from this out it will be necessary for us to sit later than we have done so far. The Budget discussion, of course, will take some days, and there is important legislation which must be brought down, and in order that there may not be any misunderstanding, I desire to say that from this out we will have to sit later than we have done so far.

Mr. LAURIER. I do not exactly know what my hon. friend means. It was understood some days ago that the House would sit until about eleven o'clock. Do I understand that the Government intend to have later sittings?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Yes.

Mr. McMILLAN.

Mr. LAURIER. Until what hour?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I cannot tell the hon. gentleman. I am only expressing to the House what the leader of the House desired me to express; but he did not state the hour to which we would sit. But it is the intention of the Government to have later sittings than we have had so far.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) After the Bill is brought down I suppose.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The Bill will be brought down soon enough for the hon. gentleman.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 10.15 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 4th February, 1896.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 48) respecting the Canadian Jockey Club.—(Mr. Tisdale.)

Bill (No. 49) respecting the Huron and Erie Loan and Savings Company.—(Mr. Taylor.)

Bill (No. 50) respecting the South-western Railway Company and the St. Lawrence and Adirondack Railway Company.—(Mr. Bergeron.)

INSOLVENCY.

Mr. MARTIN moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 51) respecting insolvency. He said: I wish to offer a few explanations to the House as to the nature of the Bill I desire to introduce. The House will remember that in 1894, the different boards of trade, principally the boards of Montreal and Toronto, spent much time and money in considering this question of bankruptcy, and in co-operating with other boards of trade in Canada, I understand, a Bill was drawn and sent to the Government for consideration. The Government, I understand, adopted practically the whole of the Bill, departing from it, it is true, in some respects. In the Speech from the Throne in 1894, we were informed that a measure affecting bankruptcy and insolvency would be introduced during the session. In pursuance of that promise a Bill was introduced in the Senate. It was discussed more or less in that chamber, and was referred to a

committee. The Toronto Board of Trade, and also, I think, the Montreal Board of Trade, sent here representatives, legal gentlemen, to watch the progress of the Bill, before the committee of the Senate. Other persons also took an interest in the Bill, persons representing the trading community, and there was a great deal of time spent in perfecting the Bill in the committee in the Senate. Towards the end of the session the Bill was finally passed in the Senate, and introduced in this House. But it never got further in this House than the first reading, no discussion of it took place, and it was allowed to die at that point. It is a fair inference from the conduct of the Government in the matter that they intended from the beginning not to proceed further than merely introduce the bill in the Senate and give an opportunity for discussion, although the Government deliberately informed the House and the country through the Speech from the Throne that it was their intention to deal with this most important question, and I think that representatives of the boards of trade were assured most positively that it was the intention of the Government to press that matter to a conclusion. Relying upon that promise, those boards of trade have spent considerable money, and members of the different boards have devoted a large amount of time to help the Government to prepare a perfect insolvency measure. The following year, 1895, His Excellency the Governor General again announced to Parliament that it was the intention to ask Parliament to legislate on this important question of insolvency. Again a pretense was made of doing something in respect to the matter. The Bill, as amended during the previous session, was introduced in the Senate by Sir Mackenzie Bowell, the Premier, and considerable discussion again took place in the Upper House. Again the matter was referred to a committee of the Senate, and that committee held a great many sittings and spent much time in considering the details of the measure. Again the boards of trade, relying upon the renewed assurance of the Government that this was not a mere pretense, but that it was the actual intention of the Government to proceed with this legislation, sent legal gentlemen to represent the views of the respective boards. Deputations came from Montreal and Toronto, and perhaps other cities, to represent to the Government their views upon the question; and in spite of the inglorious failure of the Government at the previous session to carry out their promise, the business men appeared to believe the very strong assurances which were given to them in 1895, that a measure would be put through. However, in 1895, the Bill did not get so far even as it did in 1894; because after it had gone to the committee of the Senate, it was tied up there, and never reached the House of Commons. Now, Mr. Speaker, I fancy

that no member of this House will dispute the proposition: that the question of bankruptcy is considered most important by those classes in the community which a measure of that kind would affect, notably the trading classes of the country. I see that Mr. Stapleton Caldecott, the retiring President of the Board of Trade of Toronto, in his recent address made allusion to this matter. I shall trespass upon the time of the House long enough to read an extract from his address, because I think it fairly represents the views of business men with regard to this question. He used the following language:—

DOMINION BANKRUPTCY ACT.

Through a judicial decision which showed that, under the Ontario Act for the equitable distribution of insolvent debtors' estates, it was possible for a debtor to assign a portion only of his estate, a deputation waited upon the hon. Attorney General to point out the mischief that might thus be caused, and it is gratifying to know that immediately Sir Oliver Mowat's attention was called to the point, he promised to make the needful amendment, which has since been carried into effect, and is now working very satisfactorily. But though the Ontario Act for the equitable distribution of insolvent debtors' estates is much better than nothing, it is far from meeting the wants of the commercial community. What is required, and what this board has been incessantly calling for year by year, since 1882, is an equitable Dominion Bankruptcy Act for the whole confederation of Canada, which, while giving the creditors the full control of an estate that is evidently insolvent, will prevent fraudulent preferences, punish reckless selling, compel proper book-keeping, and yet give a discharge to the man who has honestly given up his estate to his creditors, and not been guilty of either reckless selling, fraudulent buying, or extravagant living. Such a Bill as this was drafted by a united committee of the boards of trade of Canada, and brought before the notice of the late lamented Sir John Thompson, who promised to give this important subject his early attention, but, unfortunately for Canada, the angel of death cruelly and suddenly snatched him away from what promised to be a long career of usefulness. The present Premier, however, consented to take up the matter, but it is to be regretted that, so far, though a Bill has been prepared that largely fills the wants of the trading community, this much-needed legislation has not been presented to the notice of the House of Commons.

Meantime, the need of a sound bankruptcy Bill is deeply felt. The passing of such a Bill will greatly advance that interprovincial trade which every patriotic Canadian desires to promote, will reduce to a minimum fraudulent and reckless trading, and will powerfully help forward the commercial progress of the country. May I not ask how much longer shall the commerce of the country call before this needed Bill shall become the law of the land?

I am satisfied, Sir, that these remarks of Mr. Caldecott, the retiring President of the Toronto Board of Trade, represent fairly well the views of the business portion of the community. I have ventured as a private member to introduce into this House

an insolvency measure founded upon the Bill to which Mr. Caldecott refers and which was drawn up by a committee of the boards of trade of Canada, and upon which the Government founded their Bill of 1894, which was followed by a similar Bill in 1895. The first matter of importance which this Bill deals with, is the applicability of the Act. Of course this question of insolvency, especially when we get into details, is one upon which there is great divergence of opinion, and a divergence of opinion even amongst the commercial classes who are in favour of the principle of the Bill. The Government measure which was introduced last session confined the operations of the Bill to traders; to those persons who made a living by buying and selling merchandise and manufacturers. I understand that in committee the operation of the Bill was extended to the farming and other producing classes. I may be wrong as to that, but, at any rate, this Bill which I now present to this House for consideration, does apply to the two classes, namely, the trading class who earn their living by buying and selling merchandise and manufacturing, and also, all those who earn their living by growing or producing the natural products of the soil. In this latter class would be included farmers, miners, lumbermen, and other persons who cannot be said to manufacture their goods, but who produce them from the soil. Section 4 deals with the circumstances under which a person may become insolvent. These are such as have shown themselves, from long experience in the working out of previous Insolvent Acts, and in the working out of the equitable distribution Acts of the various provinces, to be such as to warrant the placing of a man, a firm, or a company, in insolvency. At this stage of the Bill, it would probably be premature to discuss minutely the different circumstances under which a man can be made insolvent, but I fancy that the section, as it appears in this Bill, governs all the cases which are proper to be included in a section of that character. The next clause provides that when any of these events referred to in section 4 occur, any creditor of a person whom it is proposed to place in insolvency, with a claim above a certain amount, may apply to a judge, and, upon proof of his case, the judge makes an insolvency order. In the Government Bill, this order was called a receiving order, but, as the plan of the present Bill differs considerably from that of the Government Bill so far as the effect of this order is concerned, I have thought it better to change the name, and call it an insolvency order. The creditor making the application, is entitled, under the provisions of this clause, to name, in his application, the official liquidator whom he desires to be appointed for the estate in question. It will be seen when I get further on in the Bill, that it provides for the appoint-

Mr. MARTIN.

ment in particular places of a number of persons qualified to act as official liquidators; and the creditor is allowed to choose such one of the official liquidators in a particular place whom he wishes to act for the estate.

In some cases it is provided that an insolvency order may be made without any notice whatever to the debtor. In other cases, such as that where the application is made on the ground of the general inability of the debtor to meet his indebtedness as it falls due, it is provided that notice shall be served on the debtor before the insolvency is made. By section 11 it is provided that where an insolvency order is made without notice to the debtor, he may, within five days after being served with the order, apply to the court to annul it. In the case where notice is required to be given to him, he has the privilege on the return of the notice of showing that it is not a proper case for an insolvency order to be made. These sections are carefully worked out, and give to a debtor every reasonable opportunity of bringing his case before the court, and preventing a particular creditor using the provisions of the Act in a harsh and unfair manner. At the same time, they give to the creditor the opportunity and right of placing a debtor who is really insolvent into insolvency without any unnecessary delay.

Section 16 provides that the effect of an insolvency order shall be to stay all other actions. This, of course, is usual in an insolvency Bill. It is quite proper that when this particular means of disposing of man's estate is resorted to, the other means provided by law of bringing an action and getting a judgment and execution shall be stayed.

The next matter which the Bill deals with is one of very great importance, and one which I fancy is, after all, the crucial test of the efficiency of an insolvency law; that is, the question of the appointment of official liquidators. No doubt the principal reason why previous insolvency Acts in Canada have not been satisfactory has been that the official assignees who were appointed and who acted under those Acts, took advantage of the opportunities given them, and converted to their own use the estates of insolvent debtors which were placed in their charge; and I fancy that is one of the principal reasons which have prevented the Parliament of Canada, since the repeal of the last insolvency Act, again venturing upon that subject of legislation. It became a crying disgrace to the administration of the insolvency laws that so many estates were absorbed by the assignees into whose hands they came. This Bill proposes to deal with that question by providing that the boards of trade in each city whose population exceeds 20,000 may appoint an official liquidator, and in each city whose population exceeds 50,000, the board of trade shall have

the privilege of appointing an additional official liquidator for every 50,000 people. It is complained that in the operation of previous insolvency Acts political motives interfered with the appointment of proper men to the position of official assignee—that men were appointed more for their political services than on account of any qualifications they possessed for the position. The object of section 17 is to place in the hands of those organizations in the country which peculiarly represent the commercial portion of the community, namely, the boards of trade, the appointment of official liquidators. Section 18, however, also confers upon the Governor General in Council the power of appointing official liquidators. The appointments made by the Governor General in Council are to be confined to particular localities; that is to say, Canada is to be divided into districts, and the Governor General in Council is to appoint one or more official liquidators for each district, and an official liquidator appointed in that way is not to have power to act beyond his district. An official liquidator appointed by a board of trade is to have power to act in any place within the province in which the city whose board of trade made the appointment is situated. In the case of the city of Winnipeg it is provided that liquidators appointed by the board of trade in that city shall have the right of acting also for the North-west Territories. The reason for that apparent exception is that there is no city in the North-west Territories which, under the provisions of this Bill, would be entitled to appoint an official liquidator; and it is well known that the city of Winnipeg is the wholesale centre, not only for the province of Manitoba, but also for the North-west Territories. As a matter of fact, at present the official assignee appointed by the government of Manitoba practically does all the work for the Territories as well as for the province of Manitoba. I may say that in the city of Winnipeg the deepest interest has been taken in the question of the character of the official assignee. We have been fortunate in Manitoba for many years past in having practically but one official assignee, under the provisions of the local Act providing for assignments for the benefit of creditors. It is true, there are one or two assignees appointed for outside districts. But, so far as the great bulk of business is concerned, the official assignee residing in Winnipeg, Mr. S. A. D. Bertrand, practically does all the work; and when it was announced in 1894 that the Government intended to deal with this question of insolvency, it was with very considerable alarm that the Board of Trade of Winnipeg contemplated this change. If, however, provisions such as I have referred to, and which are contained in sections 17 and 18 of the Act, were allowed to become law, and the boards of trade of the different important cities in Canada were allowed to make

appointments of official liquidators, then the creditors would have a choice. If the Government, by any accident, should appoint a good man as official assignee, no doubt in this particular district he would have lots of work to do. You will understand that in this Bill there are no voluntary assignments, that a man can only get into insolvency on the application of a creditor, and that creditor has the privilege, under the Bill, of selecting from among several persons, who are qualified to act, the one whom he desires to be the assignee of that particular estate. So, for the purpose of illustration, taking the case of Manitoba and the North-west, if the Government appointed unsatisfactory persons as official liquidators in any portion of that territory, the commercial community would have the power, under this Act, of selecting the gentleman appointed by the Winnipeg Board of Trade, no matter in what part of Winnipeg or the North-west Territories the insolvency might take place; and experience has shown that the gentleman to whom I have referred, Mr. Bertrand, is able, with the experience he has had and the staff he has collected round him, to manage the estates of insolvent debtors all through the North-west. I may say that his record is an excellent one, and it would be with very great regret indeed that the commercial community in that part of Canada would regard any change in the law by which the work would be taken out of the hands of this gentleman. It is provided in my Bill that the boards of trade may change their appointment, that is to say, they may dismiss the person first appointed and appoint another person at any time after one year has elapsed from the appointment. Of course, in the case of appointments made by the Governor General, a change may be made at any time.

Section 27 provides that an insolvent, as soon as the insolvency order is made, shall prepare and sign a complete statement of his affairs, showing in every way of what his estate consists, showing also his liabilities, and also his opinion as to what has been the cause of his insolvency.

Then the next step the Act provides for is the calling of the first meeting of creditors; and the object of that first meeting is to decide finally who shall be the assignee or liquidator of the estate. In this regard, the Bill which I offer differs radically from that proposed by the Government, because it is provided by the Government measure that there should be an officer, to be called the official receiver—one in each district—and that all assignments, or rather, all receiving orders, as they are called in that Act, should provide for the estate being handed over to an official receiver. And it is provided that the official receiver should not, in any case, become the final liquidator of the estate. He is to be a mere official for the purpose of taking charge of the estate from the date of the insolvency order to the first

meeting of creditors. Now, there are very strong objections to a provision of that kind. The expense rendered necessary by this official receiver taking charge of the estate, putting a man in charge, carrying on the business possibly for the time being, taking stock, providing for all these matters, would be a very great expense indeed. The reason the Government were induced to adopt a provision of that kind was that it had been found, in the operation of the older Acts, that the official assignee, who was appointed in the first place, spent his whole energy between his appointment and the first meeting of creditors in lobbying amongst the creditors in order to secure his appointment as permanent assignee. It was, therefore, thought advisable that the official receiver should be debarred from becoming the final liquidator, and should have no interest whatever in anything except taking care of the insolvent's estate during this period, which must be, in every case, from two to three weeks. I think it might fairly be said that in a majority of cases it would be a period of three weeks. However, I think it would be found that the difference between this insolvency Bill and the old Acts in the manner of placing the man into insolvency would get over any objection to the first assignee working for his appointment the second time. Under the old Act the debtor could make a voluntary assignment, and he would really have the choice of his official assignee. Under this Bill the debtor has no choice, has nothing whatever to say as to who the official assignee shall be. That is the choice of the creditors, so that I have ventured, in drawing this Bill, to depart from the arrangement provided in the Government measure, and to allow the official liquidator chosen by the creditor who makes the application, to become the final liquidator, if the creditors so express their desire at their first meeting. The advantage of that course is, I think, abundantly clear, because all these expenses which the official receiver would be obliged to incur, under the Government proposition, are largely done away with, since it is quite clear that if you have an official receiver appointed first, and who remains in charge of the estate for three weeks or longer, many of the expenses which he incurs and which have to be paid to him, will again be incurred by the creditors' assignee when he is appointed. So that if you can, without getting into difficulties of a worse nature, allow the first appointed assignee or liquidator to become the final liquidator, you save a very considerable amount of expense, and I think I may venture to say that the provision which appears, I think for the first time, in this Bill allowing the boards of trade to appoint official liquidators is another reason why it is advisable to allow the first liquidator to become the final liquidator under the provisions of this Bill; because, if the official liquidator, appointed

by the board of trade of the city which does the wholesale business of the locality in which the debtor lived at the time of his insolvency, be chosen, the chances are that that gentleman will be quite acceptable to the creditors when they meet, and, in nine cases out of ten, I venture to say, the first appointed liquidator will become, by vote of the creditors, the final creditors' liquidator. If that can be done, a very great objection to the Government's proposed measure will be done away with. Section 33 provides for the appointment of inspectors not exceeding five in number. Section 35 provides for the examination of the insolvent at the instance of the creditor or of the inspectors, and section 36 provides for the examination of any person whatever, including the wife of the insolvent, who may be shown to the court to be likely to give important information with regard to the affairs of the insolvent. Now, these two sections are very valuable, no doubt. The debtor may be able to withhold the information, but this provides for the examination of other persons, including the wife of the debtor, who may be shown to be the possessor of important information. These provisions emphasize the advantage of a Dominion insolvency Act over the Acts which are in force in the different provinces for the distribution of insolvents' estates. It is found so much easier, under a general Act, to make general provisions of this kind effective. Mr. Caldecott emphasizes the importance of this. He admits that, so far as it goes, the Ontario Act for the distribution of assets is valuable; still, in this and other respects, a Dominion insolvency Act would be of very much greater value to the commercial community.

Section 38 deals with the important matter of discharge. That is a matter that the local legislature cannot deal with. It has been decided by the Imperial Privy Council that those enactments of the local legislatures which provide for the equitable distribution of insolvent estates among the creditors pro rata rather than by the old system of allowing one creditor to get judgment and thereby establish a preference lien on the estate of the insolvent are *intra vires*, in the absence of a general Dominion insolvency law. But none of the local legislatures have ever attempted to make provision for the discharge—that is the legal discharge—from the claims of creditors of an insolvent; for it has been admitted, and it is perfectly clear under the British North America Act, that that is a matter coming exclusively within the jurisdiction of this Parliament. I think it is a matter of very great importance indeed to a young and growing community like Canada that there should be provisions for the discharge of all honest debtors. It is no advantage to the creditors of an insolvent, it is no advantage to the commercial community, that a man who has been unfortunate in business, even

if from his own fault, if it is an honest fault, and who cannot pay his debts in full, should be refused a discharge except upon payment in full. When a man has been engaged in a very large business and his liabilities represent a large amount, it is quite hopeless for him ever to dream of being able, even with the greatest industry, to pay all his debts. It is surely a great advantage to the community to allow an honest man, a man of ability, who, perhaps, through circumstances over which he has no control whatever has become liable for large amounts, to obtain a discharge from those liabilities enabling him to start again in the business world, probably in much better shape to successfully engage in business than he was before, by reason of this very experience. Since 1879 in Canada there has been no means whatever by which the unfortunate debtor could be relieved from these claims except through the voluntary action of his creditors. I may say that, so far as the commercial community is concerned, they have manifested a desire to relieve their unfortunate debtors where they have been satisfied that the debtor had been honest in incurring his liabilities. But it has often occurred that, while a man has been able to obtain his discharge from his commercial creditors, yet, during the course of his business, he has become involved with other persons who were not in general commercial trade, as in the purchase of real estate or other property, and has assumed, on account of those purchases, very large liabilities. Many a man, since the repeal of the Insolvency Act in 1879, has been weighted down for life by liabilities of this kind. I do not think there has been a better illustration of that than in the real estate booms that have taken place in different parts of the Dominion. I may refer particularly to the cases of the city of Winnipeg and the city of Toronto, where, during a limited time, real estate rose rapidly in value, and speculative persons were induced to assume enormous liabilities not thinking at the time that they were liabilities. But the inevitable reaction came and real estate values fell, and these unfortunate persons, without any fault except an undue speculative spirit, found themselves loaded with mortgages and covenants for amounts which it would take them a thousand years to pay, even if they earned very considerable salaries.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I would like to ask the hon. gentleman why his Bill does not apply to all classes?

Mr. MARTIN. I have already explained that this Bill applies practically to every one. It does not apply to professional classes, but it applies to traders, and to all those persons who make their living by producing anything from the soil, including farmers, or miners, or lumbermen who produce saw-logs, and classes of that kind. It does not

apply to the professional classes, and in that regard, no doubt, it does involuntarily a certain amount of injustice to those classes. It does not allow a man to go into insolvency of his own accord; he must be put into insolvency by his creditors.

Mr. MULOCK. Why don't you apply it to professional classes?

Mr. MARTIN. Well, Mr. Speaker, there are many reasons why it should not apply to professional classes. But as I said when I was discussing that section, I do not think that this is the time to go fully into that matter. I may say that personally I am very strongly of the opinion that it should apply to every one of the trading classes, after having heard the arguments that were offered before the Senate committee last session, I think that it would be justifiable to extend it to all those persons who are practically in trade, because it seems to me that a farmer, so far as insolvency purposes are concerned, is practically in trade, and, therefore, is a producer; and so is a miner. They are dealers, in a sense. They do not obtain their livelihood simply by the exercise of their brains, without applying them to natural objects. A lawyer, for instance, or a doctor, has nothing whatever to do with any natural object; all he has to do is to consider in his own mind the cases that are laid before him; and so with dentists and other professional men. But a man who deals in something, is admitted by all to be a trader, a person to whom an insolvency Act may be applied, that is to say, a man who buys and sells merchandise at a profit as a means of making a living. It seems to me there is no distinction between that class and the classes who do not deal in merchandise, but who, with the help of the soil, produce a crop of wheat, or a crop of corn, or a crop of fruit, that is, persons who, by delving in the earth's surface, convert the natural constituents of the earth into valuable products, or persons who make saw-logs out of trees—all these persons are actually engaged in what may be called trade. However, as I say, that is a matter upon which there may be a great difference of opinion, but it seems to me it is not a matter which should decide the question of whether there should or should not be an insolvency Bill.

Mr. MULOCK. Does your Bill provide machinery for giving discharges?

Mr. MARTIN. Yes.

Mr. MULOCK. On what principle would you relieve one man from liability and not another?

Mr. MARTIN. Of course, as I say, there is apparently an injustice done to the lawyer who has become involved in speculation, who has loaded himself up with mortgages and assumed liabilities; but in all matters of legislation, it is quite impossible to be

thoroughly fair, and to be thoroughly consistent. No matter what the law is, there always will be persons who do not receive the same benefit from it as other persons; there always will be opportunities of pointing out how the law works unfairly.

Now, one of the objections to the Insolvent Act we had in force before, was the fact that discharges were too easily obtained, that the provisions of the Act allowed men to go purposely into insolvency, to start out in business with the intention of becoming insolvent, and by the easy provisions of that Act, to obtain a discharge, and relieve themselves of their liabilities, having the money in their pockets which they had made out of their transactions, and then launch forth into business again. So far as this provision is concerned, I follow the Government measure, and in these respects the Bill surrounds the discharge with many precautions which, I fancy, will obviate objections of that kind. In the first place, it is provided that a man may obtain his discharge under a deed of composition and discharge, provided the deed is signed by creditors representing three-fourths in value of his liabilities, and a majority in number of those whose claims exceed \$100 in amount. Even in that case the discharge is not obtained at once, because it is provided that after a deed of composition and discharge, duly executed by the proper number of creditors, both in number and value, it is necessary to call a meeting of creditors, so that any one person who is opposed to the discharge, may attend that meeting and examine the insolvent fully as to his business operations, as to his estates, and to his manner of trading, and in that way bring the facts before the attention of those persons even who have signed the discharge, and after that, it is necessary for the insolvent to apply to the court to confirm this discharge. In making his application to the court, there is read to the judge a report of this meeting, and any resolutions that the creditors may have passed with regard to the action of the insolvent. It is then left open for any man, even though he has signed the deed of composition and discharge, to oppose his discharge before the judge. It is also provided that no deed shall be valid unless it provides for a payment in cash of all costs and charges connected with the insolvent, all privileged claims—I shall explain later what constitutes privileged claims; and it must also provide for the payment within one year of at least one half of all claims. This provision takes away from dishonest persons many of the inducements that formerly existed for going into business with the express intention of becoming an insolvent.

Then, Sir, section 45 sets out a number of cases with regard to the action of the insolvent in which the court, if it is shown that any of these irregularities have occurred, may refuse to confirm the deed. Then by section 46, there is another provision for an insolvent to obtain a discharge. After the

Mr. MARTIN.

expiration of a year from the date of insolvency, he may appeal to the court for a discharge, without the consent of any of his creditors. That application is only to be made after due notice to all the creditors, and any of the creditors may appear before the judge and oppose the discharge.

In section 49 there is a very valuable provision by which the court is not bound to give an absolute discharge, but, in view of all the circumstances shown to the court, they may grant a discharge on terms, either of payment of so much money, or of the application by the insolvent of a portion of his future earnings for the benefit of his creditors, or the discharge is to be granted under certain circumstances: in this way, the court is given ample jurisdiction to punish with the refusal of discharge any evidence of fraud, reckless trading, extravagant living, or any other circumstance which would justify the court in refusing the privilege granted by the Act in the direction of the discharge of a debtor.

Section 57 is copied from the Government Act, and is, to my mind, a very valuable section indeed. It provides that in cases under the local laws, since the repeal of the last general Insolvency Act, a man who has made an assignment for the benefit of his creditors may apply to the court constituted by this Act for a discharge. If that section should become law, it would greatly relieve the large number of persons to whom I have referred who, during the past seventeen or eighteen years have encountered business difficulties, given up all their property to their creditors, have acted in every way as honourable and straightforward men, but, on account of the neglect of this Parliament to deal with the question of bankruptcy and insolvency, there have been no means for those debtors obtaining a discharge from their liabilities. This section, I say, gives an opportunity to all such persons to make application, upon notice given to their creditors, and if, in the opinion of the judge, the debtor has practically complied with the conditions which would entitle him to a discharge under the provisions of this Act, if he had been adjudged insolvent under it, the judge may make an order releasing him from the liabilities included in the assignment he made under the local law.

Section 61 deals with the question of privileged claims. The privileged claims provided for are (1) liquidator's charges; (2) arrears of salaries of employees or workmen or servants in the employ of the insolvent, not more than one month prior to the date of the insolvency, covering not more than three months' arrears or salary or wages. The last privileged claim is rent.

Section 63 contains the necessary provision to be found in all Insolvent Acts, that where a creditor has security he must file his security on preferring his claim, and deduct from the amount of the claim the value of the security. The assignee then

has the privilege either of accepting the creditors' proposition and taking the amount of his claim after the value of the security has been reduced from it, or of taking over the security at the value placed upon it.

Section 67 provides for the doing away with liens obtained under judgment. Under the various local laws, creditors may obtain judgments and executions and get a preferential lien for their debt. This section provides that where an insolvency order is made, all those liens should be done away with. Where liens exist at the time of the coming into force of the Act, they are not to be interfered with. Section 68 deals very fully with fraudulent acts of the insolvent. One of the most important functions of an Insolvency Act is to guard against fraud on the part of the insolvent; and this section provides that any conveyance made voluntarily without consideration, or any conveyance made fraudulently, with a view to giving a creditor preference over other creditors, or for the purpose of placing beyond the reach of the creditors any portion of the property of the insolvent, are to be deemed fraudulent and void against the assignee. It also provides that the payment and transfer of property, even if legitimately made, within thirty days before insolvency, is to be considered null and void, and, in case of payment, the money is to be refunded, and in case of transfer, the property is to be deeded back.

Section 76 deals with the very important question of the responsibility of the liquidator in the case of leases having been entered into by the insolvent. Under the ordinary law, the assignee, for the benefit of the creditors, represents the debtor, and he is bound by all the obligations which are binding upon the debtor. It has been found in cases where covenants have been entered into in leases, that this is a very onerous law, and this Bill makes provision by which the official liquidator is enabled to relieve himself of the onerous provisions by taking certain action.

Section 83 gives a liquidator power to disclaim any property which comes to him from the insolvent, loaded with liabilities more than it is worth, and it enables the liquidator to abandon all claim to his property, and in that way to relieve the estate from liabilities which, except for a provision of this kind, would attach to it. Section 89 provides the procedure to be adopted in those cases where claims sent in by creditors are not admitted by the liquidator. If the creditor sends in a claim, and the liquidator is not prepared to admit the justice of it, he is obliged to give notice to the creditor, and then, unless the creditor within a time limited by the section, brings an action against the liquidator and proceeds to establish his claim in a court of law, it is barred.

Section 92 provides that in all cases of unclaimed dividends the money is

to be paid over to the Minister of Finance. This is in pursuance of the policy adopted by this Parliament some time ago, by which all unclaimed dividends and unclaimed bank deposits are, after the expiration of a certain time, appropriated by the Government of Canada to its own use. Section 95 contains a very salutary provision giving the creditor the right, in case the liquidator refuses to pursue a claim belonging to the estate of the debtor, to take up that claim and pursue it on his own account. In case the debtor is possessed of an asset which the liquidator is not prepared to spend any money in attempting to collect, this section gives to any creditor the right to apply to the liquidator to collect this claim on his own account, and if he fails in the collection of the claim, of course he is obliged to pay all the costs himself. On the other hand, in case he succeeds in the collection of the claim, after paying all his costs, the proceeds are to be applied, first, in payment of that creditor's claim in full, and then, if there be a surplus, he is obliged to pay that over to the liquidator for the general benefit of creditors.

Section 93 contains provisions for the administration, in a somewhat cheaper manner, of small estates where the value does not exceed \$2,000. It provides that in cases of this kind, some of the provisions which are more or less expensive as laid down by the Act may be done away with.

Section 97 contains very explicit provisions intended to guard the interests of the estate. These provisions compel the liquidator to deposit all moneys received by him on behalf of the estate in some chartered bank, and they also provide that this money cannot be paid out, except on the joint cheque of the liquidator and one of the inspectors.

Section 102 deals with the important question of the remuneration of the liquidator. The provision adopted by this Act is that the liquidator is to be remunerated in an amount to be determined by the creditors. If the liquidator is not satisfied with the amount allowed him by the creditors, he is given the opportunity of applying to the courts to have the amount increased. I think, Mr. Speaker, a provision of this kind is much more fair and equitable than some of the provisions which we have had in previous insolvency Acts, by which the liquidator was entitled to a percentage of the money handled by him in the management of an estate. Payment by percentage in a case of that kind is not a very fair way of gauging the value of the liquidator's services, because it may often happen that an estate may be very large, so far as the amount of money is involved, and yet take very little time and the exercise of very little ability on the part of the liquidator to manage it. On the other hand, a small estate, where the amount in question is much smaller, may require very much more time and responsibility on the part of the

liquidator. Therefore, it seems very reasonable and very fair that the creditors, at a meeting held for the purpose, should decide what they think is fair to the liquidator, giving him as a protection to any unfair action on the part of the creditors an opportunity to apply to the court to have this amount increased. Section 104 provides that, after an estate is completely wound up, the liquidator must apply to the court for his discharge. A provision of that kind gives any creditor who is dissatisfied with the manner in which the liquidator has managed the estate, an opportunity of making his complaint to a judge and having effect given to it.

Section 104 deals with the question of offences and penalties, and here also is a phase in which the advantages of a general Dominion insolvency law comes out very strongly, as compared with the local laws which the different provinces have been forced to pass since 1879, on account of the neglect of this Parliament to deal with this important question. Of course, the most effective means of stopping fraud in connection with trade and commerce is the application of the criminal law, and it is quite clear that none of the provinces have any jurisdiction in the matter. The provisions which are contained in section 105, make the ordinary offences which we find occur in connection with fraudulent bankruptcy, fraudulent and reckless trading, misdemeanours punishable by imprisonment, and also other offences punishable by fines or penalties. This is one of the great advantages which a Dominion Act would confer upon the commercial public.

Section 122 deals with the question of appeals. In certain matters it is provided that the decision of the original court is to be final, but in most matters of importance it is provided that there shall be an appeal from the original court (which is the county court in most of the provinces) to the highest court of appeal for the province. In the province of Quebec to the court of appeal there, in the province of Ontario to the court of appeal, in the province of Manitoba to the Court of Queen's Bench, and in the other provinces to the Supreme Court of the province. Now, I notice that in the Government Bill there was no further appeal provided for, once you got to the highest court of appeal in the particular province in which the insolvent lived. I cannot agree with that proposition, and so I have inserted a clause giving an appeal to the Supreme Court of Canada. If there is any justification for the expenditure of the large sum of money which the Supreme Court of Canada costs each year, it appears to me that it should be availed of as a final court of appeal for the important cases of commercial law which are bound to arise in the administration of an insolvency Act. It seems to me that we would fail to take full advantage of the establishment of the Supreme Court here in

Mr. MARTIN.

Ottawa if we did not allow it to become the final arbiter in these important cases which in the past have always arisen in the administration of insolvency laws; and no matter how fully an insolvency Act may appear to cover all the cases likely to arise, our past experience shows that there is always a large amount of litigation resulting from its operation. So it appears to me that the Government's proposition to allow cases to go only to the highest court of appeal in the province is defective. It is most important, if bankruptcy legislation is to be final, that the course of judicial decision should be uniform. If the provision of the Government Bill were allowed to stand, cases would be decided one way in one province and another way in another province. The only way to get over a difficulty of that kind, it appears to me, is to take advantage of the court which this Parliament has established, and in all cases of importance to allow an appeal to the Supreme Court of Canada. Of course, there are at present limitations as to what cases can be appealed to the Supreme Court; and this Act provides that the same limitations shall apply in matters of insolvency as in other matters. Section 132 and the following sections to the end of the Act deal with the application of the Act to incorporate companies. It is intended that the Insolvency Act shall supersede, in the case of certain companies, the present Winding-up Act. It is, however, provided that the Insolvency Act shall not apply to the following classes of companies: first, incorporated banks; second, savings banks; third, insurance companies; fourth, loan companies; fifth, building societies; sixth, railway companies; seventh, telegraph and telephone companies; and eighth, municipal schools and other public corporations. As to these the Winding-up Act is to apply where it applies now, and where it does not apply now the ordinary rules of the courts of the country are to apply. But all other companies, including all trading companies, incorporated for the purpose of carrying on the business of buying and selling merchandise, and companies incorporated for the purpose of carrying on farming, mining or lumbering operations, are to come within the scope of this Act. That being so, it becomes necessary to have a number of provisions for the settlement of the question of the right or liability of contributories, and matters of that kind which arise from the peculiar constitution of an incorporated company.

These provisions show the object of the Act. I think it will be seen from them that this Act meets the definition laid down in Mr. Caldecott's speech as to what an insolvency Act should be. He says:

What is required, and what this board has been incessantly calling for year by year since 1882, is an equitable Dominion Bankruptcy Act for the whole confederation of Canada, which, while giving the creditors the full control of an estate that

is evidently insolvent, will prevent fraudulent preferences, punish reckless selling, compel proper book-keeping, and yet give a discharge to the man who has honestly given up his estate to his creditors, and not been guilty of either reckless selling, fraudulent buying, or extravagant living.

Now, I think that the House, on examination of the clauses of this Bill in detail, will find that it does comply with that definition laid down by the late president of the Toronto Board of Trade, in his final address to that body a few weeks ago. Under these circumstances, in spite of the fact that the Government have been negligent of their duty and have deceived the commercial public in 1894 and in 1895, with the most express promises that legislation on this subject would be placed on the statute-book. I hope that this Parliament will take advantage of the fact that the Government apparently have no legislation which they desire to bring down and pass at this session of the House, and will place upon the statute-book a measure which will meet the case of that very considerable number of the community who have fallen into business difficulties largely on account of the unfortunate policy in trade matters which this Government have induced Parliament to adopt for the last 17 or 18 years. After having done so much harm to the commerce of Canada. I think that the least this Parliament could do in its dying hours would be to offer this small measure of retribution to the commercial community by placing on the statute-book this Act, improved as no doubt it would be after full discussion in the Committee of the Whole by those members of the House who take an interest in matters of this kind.

Mr. EDGAR. Mr. Speaker, I know it is not very usual, on the first reading of a Bill, to enter into a very full discussion of its merits; but I think the mover of the Bill was obliged to do so to-day in order to bring the very important subject of insolvency legislation before Parliament at all. When I take up the Order paper and see what little opportunity there would be of reaching the second reading of this Bill, I am not surprised at my hon. friend seeking this opportunity to explain it, because a little further down on the Order paper to-day I see a motion by the Government proposing to take Thursday away from private members' legislation at this early period of the session. If we look at the state of the Order paper, if we look at the number of Bills down for second reading, I think that by the time this Bill is printed—if the Government propose to take away Thursdays—it will be utterly impossible to reach it this session. I think that it is time the House took into consideration this important consideration. The Senate has been considering the question of insolvency for several years, and I do not see why this House which is more in touch with the people than the other House and has

more opportunities of understanding the wants and the desires of the whole commercial community, should not discuss this question to some extent. Bankruptcy legislation, of course, has a double object. One is to provide for the equitable distribution of the assets of debtors, but concurrently with that is the object of providing for the discharge of honest insolvent debtors; and, in my judgment, the one object is quite as important as the other. I should like to see this Bill become law, if it only provided an efficient means for the discharge of honest insolvent debtors. We had in Canada a complete bankruptcy or insolvency law in force from 1864 to 1880; and I think that the repeal of that law was brought about chiefly by the strong objection to the expense of carrying it out, more particularly in the province of Quebec. In that province a great many instances were shown of estates thrown into insolvency and eaten up by the costs of lawyers and official assignees, and that happened while, at the same time, they had upon their statute-book provincial legislation, which, they claimed, provided for very fair and very equitable distribution of the estates of all insolvents. Now, since then, the province of Ontario has also placed upon the statute-book, legislation for the equitable distribution of the estates of insolvents and the prevention of preferential transfers. Since 1884 we have had a very fair condition of law in the province of Ontario. But, and possibly that might be an answer to a portion of this Bill, Parliament might consider that it would not be wise to place another set of machinery in operation, which, they might think, would increase the cost of distribution of assets; but this Bill contains another principle which Parliament ought not to overlook. That is the giving of a discharge or a release or a settlement or composition to the honest trader who has done his best to make a living, who has given up all he possesses to his creditors, and who, under very stringent provisions, has laid before the court of his creditors absolute proof of his honesty. Now, this country, since 1880, has been without any such provision of law.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. It is very bad.

Mr. EDGAR. It is very bad. A man to-day can get a discharge from his creditors, I admit. But how can he do it? Only by getting a discharge from every one of his creditors. The whole of his creditors have to sign a release before he can be relieved. Is that fair? I do not think it is. How does it work out? Every business man knows perfectly well how it works out. A man gets into difficulties; he goes round and shows his creditors how much he can pay,—50 cents or so in the dollar. He proposes to pay that. The consent of ninety-nine out of a hundred is of no use to him. He has got to get them all; and among the credi-

tors there is nearly always some man who puts the pistol at his head, and says: I will never sign that, unless I am some way arranged, so that I shall receive a hundred cents in the dollar. The insolvent is black-mailed, and the other creditors, if he consents to this, are defrauded out of that much money, which should have been divided among them, and the commercial morality of the country is very much injured. How much better it would be to provide squarely and honestly, as is provided in all civilized countries, that when the debtor gives up all that he has to his creditors and when he pays, if you choose, a certain percentage in the dollar, and, if you choose, when he gets the consent of a certain percentage of his creditors, and submits to examination under oath as to all his affairs, he shall then, after due notice and caution, be entitled to get his discharge. How many men are there in this country to-day who are doing business in their wives' names or in the name of some relative? That is neither honest nor satisfactory. And how many are driven out of the country altogether because they are paralyzed and rendered unable to exercise their energy and industry and create wealth in this country, through some creditor refusing to sign a discharge. A few years ago, I had the honour of bringing this matter before the House in the shape of a Bill providing that a discharge should be given to honest debtors. That Bill passed its second reading and was referred to the Committee on Banking and Commerce. I am sorry, however, to say that it was opposed in that committee by the boards of trade of Toronto and Montreal, who sent their representatives down here to insist that no consideration whatever be shown to traders, unless coupled with it there was a provision for the compulsory forcing of traders into bankruptcy and distribution of their assets. Since then I have not had as much sympathy for the wholesale men who are pressing for bankruptcy legislation. I have rather come to the conclusion that they desire such legislation in order to crush out retail merchants throughout the country, in order to put the screws on them, from time to time, and get preferences, so that they might deal more rigorously and promptly with those debtors. Now, Sir, I read to the House a letter which I had received at that time. With the permission of the House I will read a few words of it now. The writer says:

I do pray to the God of heaven to prosper your efforts. By a life of almost incessant toil I earned and saved \$40,000. I put the whole into a woollen mill. The market fell for that particular line, and I had to give up all, and I lost every dollar and honestly relinquished everything. And yet I have no relief. I hope and pray that your measure may succeed.

And I hope that, if time afforded this session for the full consideration of this measure, Parliament may see its way to carry through this much-needed legislation.

Mr. EDGAR.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I do not intend to spend any time in going into the details of this Bill. Ordinarily, the courtesy is extended to any hon. gentleman who moves for leave to introduce a Bill on this important subject, to do so without discussion. But I propose to occupy the time of the House for a very few minutes while I call attention to a very few considerations which I think are adverse to the adoption of such a Bill. Under ordinary circumstances, I should think it almost hopeless for a private member to carry such a measure as this through Parliament, under present circumstances, I think it quite impossible. A Bill on this subject was introduced in the Senate two years ago, and was by that body referred to a committee. After a great deal of evidence had been taken, the Bill was carried through the Senate, and sent to this House. Last year, the Bill was introduced in the Senate, and got as far as the second reading, but so great was the opposition manifested in the Senate, that it was practically withdrawn by the Government because, even with all the support of the Government, they did not see the slightest prospect of carrying the Bill through the Senate. Now, as a matter of fact, at whose instance was the Bill introduced? The only class in the community that I know of who sought to force this Bill upon the attention of Parliament was that of the wholesale merchants. It is alleged that the bankers also gave their support to the Bill, but those who examine the evidence taken before the Senate committee will find that that is not so, that the bankers only appeared upon the scene after the Bill was introduced and for the purpose of giving such evidence as would lead to the bankers' interests being protected in case the Bill was passed. There were no petitions, so far as I can gather—and if I am wrong I wish to be corrected—and I do not think there are any this session, from the great consuming classes of the community, the working class, the middle class of merchants and traders, farmers, mechanics and the others who may be largely affected by the introduction of this measure. We must remember that, in 1875, in a period of very great commercial depression, strong influences were brought to bear to induce the Government to pass an Insolvency Bill. An Insolvency Bill was passed in that year, and remained in force until 1880. And I will venture to say that its repeal was received with general approval. The Act of 1875 was a good Act, that is, it was well drawn, and, if the circumstances had warranted it, that Act would have carried out the intention of the draughtsmen most effectually. But the difficulties in the way of such a measure in a scattered community such as Canada, which were unforeseen at the time the Bill was passed, were found to be insuperable; and, after remaining five years on the sta-

tute-book, the Act, to the relief of the community generally, was repealed. We are passing through another period of commercial depression, and similar influences are brought to bear to induce us to re-enact this measure. I admit that there is a good deal of force in the argument presented by my hon. friend from West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) with respect to the discharge which an honest trader who has got into difficulties ought to receive. No doubt a great many cases can be cited of men, who, without any wrong-doing on their part, and carrying on their business with the best of intentions, honestly and properly, are caught in difficulties from which they cannot extricate themselves without the intervention of an Act of Parliament. But I do not think that these instances are numerous enough, or that this evil is widespread enough to induce this Parliament to give its sanction to a Bill of this kind, accompanied as it is by essential faults which have been proven to be weaknesses in previous Bills. In the United States they have no insolvency law. Once or twice during the past century they attempted legislation of this kind. I think that on two occasions a bankruptcy law was adopted, tentatively, and remained in operation a very short time. They are to-day discussing the desirability of introducing two Bills, one to re-enact a general bankruptcy law for the whole United States, and the other to confer upon the different states the power to pass such a law. But those measures have not been introduced yet; and, vast and complex as are the commercial relations of the different states of the union, and strong as one would imagine the commercial interests demanding a Bill of that kind, they have found that they get along much better without it. Then, if we come to Great Britain, which is the instance always cited in support of an insolvency law, we know that, while it has been in force for many years, they are continually amending it, and it gives rise to very great difficulties in practical working. We must recollect, also, that that is a compact country, with a comparatively small area, and that the people are a commercial people. It is comparatively easy to carry out the bankruptcy law there. But in this country, with our enormous area and diversified interests, it would be next to impossible to carry it out. Nor must we forget that in Great Britain these bankruptcy laws were introduced to mitigate the horrible hardships resulting from the system of imprisonment for debt. It is not many years since even an honest debtor was liable to be incarcerated in a debtor's prison and die there—rot there, as they used to say—because he was not able to pay his debts. This abuse has been done away with. In modern times, in all the provinces of the Dominion, the policy of imprisoning people in order to compel them to pay their debts has been entirely abolished; and, to-day, I do not think there is a

law in any of the provinces of the Dominion which tolerates the imprisonment of a man in a common prison because he is not able to pay his debt. Why should we introduce this bankruptcy law? In the province of Ontario, we have a law for the distribution of the assets of insolvent debtors. A year or two ago—I think when this agitation for the introduction of an insolvency Act here was initiated, the constitutionality of this Ontario Act was questioned. That question was carried to the Privy Council, and was set at rest by that tribunal. We know that the law of Ontario has been declared to be *intra vires*, and we know, from those capable of judging, that in its practical operations it works very well. In the province of Quebec a similar law has been in existence for years; and those competent to speak say that it works even better than the law adopted in Ontario. So, in the two great provinces of the Dominion where the commercial life is strongest, they have legislated in the direction of removing most of the evils which had arisen, and that legislation works very well. And what is the result? In New Brunswick they have adopted the Act, and in Nova Scotia, the Act was introduced and carried through the lower House, and was only lost by an accident in the upper House, the legislative council, at the close of the session. I believe it is to be introduced this session, and, no doubt, before the present session of the local legislature closes, we shall have a similar Act passed in that province. The consequence will be that in the four great provinces of Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia, and New Brunswick, we shall have, practically, one law in force for the equitable distribution of the assets of insolvent debtors. So there will be very little practical evil to meet. If this Bill is to be discussed, there are other points to be considered. In the province of Manitoba, I think I am correct in saying, the local legislature, under the special circumstances of the country, exempted property to the extent of \$1,000 or \$1,500. Well, Sir, that law would be indefensible in other provinces, absolutely indefensible. If you introduce this insolvency law here, it will have the effect of repealing the law which the people of Manitoba thought was defensible and necessary in their own interest. And so you may go on from point to point and prove that the circumstances of Canadian life do not necessitate the introduction of this law. We point back to the few years when a similar law was in operation, and we say, judging from the experience of the past, that we are not justified in again introducing the turmoil and the misery, and the heart-burning, that was consequent upon carrying out the bankruptcy law of this country between 1870 and 1875. I did intend to discuss some of the leading features of the hon. gentleman's Bill, where I thought they were de-

fective, but more time has already been taken up, perhaps, than the House expected, although the importance of the subject fully justified it; and, as my hon. friend has remarked, this is about the only occasion when, judging from the Order paper, we will have an opportunity of speaking upon it at all. But, holding the views that I do upon the subject, I thought I would trespass upon the indulgence of the House for a few moments while I expressed myself adverse to the introduction of the Bill at all—though of course, as a matter of courtesy, I am prepared to vote with the hon. gentleman for the first reading.

Mr. MULOCK. I cannot quite agree with my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies) as to there being no necessity for an insolvent Bill. It is true there is local legislation providing for the equitable distribution of an insolvent's assets. But there is another principle involving insolvency, and involving legislation in this House, and that is the relief of honest debtors. That feature is certainly entitled to consideration, and an equitable and just measure that will relieve from burdens persons who have been honestly unfortunate, I think ought to commend itself to the House. When I put the question to my hon. friend from Winnipeg (Mr. Martin) whether his Bill proposed to extend this relief to all classes, he mentioned a few classes which were not to be entitled to the benefit. Well, it then amounts to class legislation, which is always vicious and to be deprecated. Now, I submit that a question of this kind is one of sufficient importance to be entitled to the judgment of the Government. It is one that very intimately affects the state of trade and commerce in the country, and an unwise Act would be productive of more harm than good. The Act of 1864, which was in force for a period of fifteen or sixteen years, was abused, and it practically destroyed the whole value of commercial contracts. Men engaged in trade, men who could avail themselves of the provisions of the old Insolvency Act, were able to dictate terms to their creditors. The machinery of that Act was absolutely defective, and it became at last an Act to whitewash debtors, to destroy the value of commercial contracts, and to deprive creditors of their debtors' assets. That was about the working of the Insolvency Act of 1874. It ultimately became a mere instrument in the hands of official assignees to enable them to become agents for the insolvents, and to procure discharges from liabilities. The effect of that law, as administered, was to render property unsafe, and to interfere seriously with honest trading. But it was repealed, and not a bit too soon. Now, I do not know that the measure promised will be superior to the old Act, but I do submit that the question is sufficiently important and has been sufficiently before the public,

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

to be entitled to be dealt with by the Government. It is idle for an individual member of the Opposition, or any private member of this House, to attempt to pass through this House a measure of the importance of an insolvency Act. At the same time, each member of this House has his rights, and I am not for a moment seeking to deprive my hon. friend from Winnipeg of his just rights to make this motion. Now, I would ask the Minister of Finance if the Government have no opinion upon this question. They have been petitioned as a Government, boards of trade in commercial centres have presented petitions to this Government for years, deputations have come down, views have been presented. Well, is the Government not without an opinion upon this question? The Minister of Finance is here—is the Government without any opinion as to whether the best interests of this country demand an insolvent Act? Certainly this is a question upon which the Government should speak. There is no excuse for their not speaking, unless, of course, they profess that on this, as on many other occasions, they cannot arrive at any kind of a conclusion. However, if they cannot arrive at a conclusion on an important question like this, then they admit their incapacity to deal with a live and important public question of the day. The trade, public opinion, has demanded legislation. Now, Sir, I am not in favour myself of imperfect legislation being put upon the statute-book. The old Act enabled traders alone to obtain discharges, and great bodies of the people, the farming community, for example, the non-trading community, men who did not technically buy and sell, and therefore were not entitled to the benefit of the law, got no discharge. Is it proposed to re-enact this measure, even to a small extent? Equality is equity, and if an unfortunate debtor, being a trader, being a manufacturer of lumber, or whatever else may be suggested is entitled to be discharged from the payment of his full liability, the same principle should apply to any other person who honestly fails. It is now fifteen years since there has been a mode by which unfortunate debtors could get discharges, and it is idle to contend that there have not been numerous failures, and that there is not to-day a large number of worthy citizens unable to carry on business in their own name because of liabilities that they cannot become relieved of. Whilst it may not be a wise thing for all time to say that our statute-book shall always have upon it an Act relieving people from their liabilities, it is in all civilized countries regarded, at all events, as proper that there shall be occasionally, as it were, courts of oyer and terminer to relieve debtors from liabilities. Even if it were only a temporary relief, if we were to pass an Act that would be operative for a brief period, allow-

ing the unfortunate debtors that are now in our land to obtain discharges, it would be a meritorious Act. But if the Act is going to be a half measure, a class measure, making fish of one and flesh of another, then it is an Act that I for one cannot approve of. Therefore, I would impress again upon the Government that it is their bounden duty to move in the direction of placing upon the statute-book an Act which, at all events, in respect of the past, will afford a proper court whereby unfortunate but honest men may again become free, and be enabled to proceed and earn a living in our land. To-day what do we see? Many persons trading in surreptitious ways, in the name of wife or friend, adopting colourable means whereby to carry on business without being hampered with liabilities which they are unable to discharge. The present state of affairs is a hardship. I will admit that in many cases creditors are generous, and discharge their debtors if they are satisfied that their debtors have been honest and only unfortunate. But all creditors are not able to arrive at the same conclusion, and the result is that, scattered throughout the whole of this country to-day, from ocean to ocean, are numerous persons whom it would be an advantage to the country to set on their feet again, to make them free men, and again give them a chance to acquire property and become useful citizens. They are marking time, they are standing still, because, though willing and able, they are prevented by their misfortunes from again entering upon business. This is the feature which has always commended itself to legislators. Sir John Macdonald, speaking on this subject, in Parliament, if I remember rightly, expressed himself as unfavourable to a continuous statute to relieve people from liabilities. To do so perhaps encourages laxity in trading, and in some ways affords opportunities for immoral trading. If we place on our statute-books an Act that is to be permanent or apparently for all time, whereby men may be relieved of liabilities for less than the full amount, we may be affording a premium to people to avoid payment and therefore to abate their energies or become less careful and energetic in the management of business. But that is quite a different matter from passing an Act which would be retroactive and relieve those who are now suffering. To that extent, if I recollect, the attitude taken by the late Premier, was that it was the duty of Parliament from time to time to pass measures, temporary in duration, which would have the effect of relieving the class to which I have referred, and to that extent I differ from the hon. member for Queen's and favour a Bill of that kind. At the same time the Bill of the hon. member for Winnipeg, if its length is to be at all measured by the time occupied by the hon. member in briefly skimming over and

explaining it, is a measure which must be cumbersome and lengthy and one that it will not be possible to pass through this House this session; and therefore I will renew my preliminary point, that this is a question upon which the country to-day is entitled to obtain the opinion of this Government, if they have an opinion; and if their opinion is favourable towards a relieving Act, then it is their duty, on this occasion in this Parliament, to introduce and press to a conclusion such a measure.

Mr. MACLEAN (York). I desire to say that the commercial opinion in the city from which I come is in favour of an insolvency law. Business men think we should have a uniform law for the distribution of assets and to secure the discharge of insolvent debtors. Some of us know, or at least we think we know, why these great questions which concern our commercial interests have been neglected. A class of questions which turn on the constitution, or are at all events of a constitutional character, have the main portion of the time and threaten to occupy too much of the time of the House. The commercial community is in favour of more time being given to commercial questions, rather than the time of the House being taken up with constitutional issues; and I must say in behalf of the business community of Toronto, and I believe of all Ontario, and I think I can also speak for the business men of Montreal, that more attention should be given to problems of this character, and I trust that if the Government are not ready this session to go with an Insolvency Bill, they will come forward next session with such a measure as will secure these two points, namely, an equitable distribution of assets—

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) That you have already.

Mr. MACLEAN (York). It is not uniform. I mean a Bill which will secure the uniform distribution of assets, and also give a discharge to insolvent debtors who have surrendered all they possess for the benefit of their creditors.

Mr. SPROULE. I would not attempt to say a word at the present time except for the fact that probably this is the only opportunity during the present session when this subject will be reached, and also for the fact that at different times some years ago in this House I opposed the passage of an insolvency law. My opinions have undergone considerable change during the past years. I have seen many cases of absolute hardship, where men, by misfortune, have lost all they had in the shape of finances, and although they had many years of useful labour before them, and were comparatively young, yet, owing to the unfortunate fact that they could not get a discharge, they were unable to again start in business. The result was that several of them

were obliged to leave and go to enrich another country, while others were compelled to remain at home and attempt to do business in the name of a relative or in some other way, but under circumstances that made it almost impossible for them to succeed or re-establish themselves in the commercial community. One reason why I have always opposed an insolvency law is on the principle enunciated by the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock), where it only applies to one class of the community, the trading class. I have always held that an insolvency law, to be satisfactory, should apply to all classes, otherwise it is class legislation. If it is good for the trader it is equally good for the farmer. I do not see that it should be impossible to introduce a Bill and crystallize it into law—I refer to a Bill which will apply to every class of the community.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that he is in favour of compulsorily applying such a Bill to farmers?

Mr. SPROULE. The law should be one that would apply to all classes.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) And be compulsory?

Mr. SPROULE. I do not think a law should be passed that would be of such a character as to compel any one to take advantage of it; but if a man has given up everything to pay his debts he should have an opportunity, whether he be a trader or farmer, to start anew in life. In view of the fact that an insolvency Bill is demanded by the boards of trade, the commercial fraternity and others, I think the Government should be prepared to take up the question. I do not think it can be taken up at this late stage of the present Parliament, for it would be almost impossible to do so successfully; but an expression of opinion by this House would do much to induce this Government or any other government who might follow it to take up the question of insolvency and carry a measure through Parliament. I think we should have such a law. If we do not obtain an insolvency law, we should have some means by which traders could secure discharges from the liabilities that hang over them and be enabled to start life anew.

Mr. DAVIN. In the North-west Territories there is a general opinion in favour of legislation of this kind, and I would add my voice to the expressions of opinion by those who have preceded me in urging the Government to take this matter up. It is quite impossible for a private member to pass a Bill of this magnitude through the House, and especially this session, but there is not the least doubt that there is great need of legislation of this kind in the Territories.

Mr. SPROULE.

Mr. COATSWORTH. I probably would be lacking in my duty to my constituents if I did not say a few words on this occasion, and it must be in the same line as the three or four last speakers. So far as Toronto is concerned, we want an insolvent Act for several purposes: (1) to prevent preferences by traders; (2) to secure an equal distribution of assets; (3) to secure the discharge of insolvent debtors. Those who have been unfortunate in business, from no fault of their own, are fairly entitled to their discharge. It is true, as the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) has said, that some of the difficulties which have presented themselves to our merchants are beginning to be disposed of by the provincial authorities. In some of the provinces, the law differs to such an extent, that it is almost impossible that a merchant residing in Toronto or Montreal could obtain any satisfaction out of an estate, in either the east or the west. These matters are being somewhat harmonized by the legislation of the provinces, but at the same time there is a very strong and general feeling in all large business centres, that the matter ought to be dealt with by the Federal Parliament, and that a law should be passed by Parliament which would provide for the equitable distribution of assets and the discharge of all debtors who are fairly and reasonably entitled to their discharge.

Mr. FLINT. Mr. Speaker, I have not been here during every word of this discussion, but I think I have heard the most of it, and I have not yet heard any explanation from any member of the Government, or from the Government side of the House, as to why the Bill which was brought in the session before last and passed through the Senate, had not been proceeded with by the Government. If it was deemed important that such expense, time and skill, should have been devoted to that measure, I really cannot understand why it was not pressed to a conclusion in this branch of Parliament and dealt with as other Government measures are. It is a demand from almost all the business centres of the Dominion, that a measure dealing with insolvency, upon a large and comprehensive basis, should be brought before Parliament and if possible enacted into law. It seems almost too much to expect that the Bill introduced by the hon. member from Winnipeg (Mr. Martin) could be passed this session; but from the elaborate and careful explanation he has given us of its provisions, it appears to me to be very similar in all its essential features to the Government Bill of the session before last. That Bill having received full discussion in the Senate and passed that branch of Parliament, it appears to me it might be possible, with the aid and concurrence of the Government, that this measure, with such amendments as the good sense of Parliament might see fit to place in it, might become law at the close

of this session. There are, of course, questions in regard to the application of the provisions of this Bill which could be discussed more intelligently and more properly if it should reach a committee of the whole House, or a special committee; such as the question, as to whether the Bill should apply to farmers as well as to traders, or, as to what classes of the population the Bill should apply. My own preference would be that the Bill should not apply to the farming or professional classes, except in so far as the persons included in these classes are also traders. The Bill might possibly be (unless very carefully guarded) made use of improperly, and to the prejudice of the credit and the financial interests of the professional and the farming classes; because their transactions in the way of trade are comparatively small, and they are not supposed to be so amenable to meeting their liabilities promptly on the hour, as are the trading classes. In any future discussion of this Bill, this clause will, no doubt, be carefully considered by members having the various points in view in connection with these matters. The principle of the Bill, I think, should receive the sanction of this House, and I sincerely hope the Government will lend its aid to enacting a comprehensive measure of insolvency before the close of this session.

Mr. CRAIG. There are no doubt a great many objections to an insolvency Act. Those who were in business at the time the other Act was in force experienced some of these objections, and one reason why I speak on this question, is, because I had a little experience of this matter myself. I found that one objection to the Insolvent Act which was in force some years ago, was this: that a great many men who obtained credit, took advantage of this Bill in order to compromise and settle with their creditors, and in many cases got off very easily. It was found, that if they got into debt they thought the easiest way to get out of it was to make an assignment and get rid of their debts in that way. There were great objections to the Bill on the part of many wholesale men at that time, and whether or not these objections can be overcome in a new Bill, I am not prepared to say. Then, another very strong objection was this: that after the debtor had made an assignment to the official assignee, the official assignee generally kept the whole estate and the creditor got nothing at all. I know that was my experience in some cases, and personally speaking, from my own point of view, I would be in favour of having no insolvent Act at all. But, I wish to say this: I do business at present with wholesale men in Montreal and Toronto, and I know that they want an insolvent Bill, and some of them want it very much. They give this reason: they say, that while there are good laws in some of the provinces, yet these laws vary a good deal; and in some other provinces the law

is not good at all, because men obtain preferences and the estate is not equitably divided. I am not sufficiently acquainted with the law of the different provinces to say if that is the case, but that was stated to me. Now, if a law could be framed by which an estate could be divided speedily and cheaply so that the creditors would really get what they ought to get out of the estate, I would be in favour of such a law. But, I think it will be admitted by all who have thought on this subject, that it is very difficult to frame such a law. It is difficult in the first place to frame a law which will not be taken advantage of by men who get into debt and do not want to pay their debts. That is a very unfortunate state of affairs, and I think that those who know something of the operation of the old Insolvent Act, know that the law did bring about such a condition of things. If a way can be found in which an estate can be divided cheaply, so that the creditors could realize to the fullest extent possible, it would be a most desirable thing. The hon. member (Mr. Flint) who last spoke, stated that the Government have not said anything about this Bill, and a great deal of objection was urged by the promoter of the Bill against the Government because they did not carry through this House, the insolvent Bill which was introduced in the Senate and discussed there. Well, I have no doubt at all the Government felt, that if the sentiment of the country was in favour of an insolvent Bill of that kind, or, if the Government thought a Bill could be framed which would meet the wants of the people of this country, they would have great pleasure in carrying through such a Bill. I believe the reason why the former insolvent Bill was not carried through this House was this: In framing that Bill it was found impossible to meet the wishes of those who are interested. The wholesale men, the manufacturers, the retail men, and the farmers, all had conflicting interests, and it was impossible to frame a Bill which would meet their views. I hope that some day a Bill may be framed, by somebody who has studied the question and given it a great deal of care and attention, and by which Bill estates may be cheaply and speedily wound up. I will be glad to support a Bill of that kind.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Mr. Speaker, as we have departed from the usual custom of confining the discussion on the principles of the Bill until the second reading, I will just say a word on this subject. So far as our law in Ontario is concerned, which makes provision for the equal distribution of the estate of a person who is embarrassed financially, or is insolvent, I think we have a law there, which is likely to work more satisfactorily than any bankruptcy law it is possible for this House to enact. There is very great difficulty in dealing with the subject of traders and non-traders, and

there are, I think, serious practical difficulties when you undertake to put non-traders upon the same footing as traders. I think our former Insolvency Act confined its provisions to traders. This was one difficulty which made the Act extremely unpopular. It is no uncommon thing for retail dealers in the country to get non-traders to become accommodation endorsers for them. They go into bankruptcy, and while they are discharged under a Bankruptcy Act, the unfortunate accommodation endorser who is a non-trader, is obliged to pay the last farthing, although he can collect nothing as against his principal. That is a mischievous principle, and if we were to have an Act on the subject at all, it would be necessary to confine the discharge of traders from obligations incurred to traders. Obligations to non-traders ought to stand on precisely the same footing as those of non-traders. If you can do anything to put a stop to or to discourage the practice of men engaged in commercial affairs seeking the aid of the credit of non-traders, you ought to do it. The provisions of the law ought not to be such as to draw non-traders into the meshes of misfortunes and accidents attendant on those engaged in trade. But, Sir, looking at the provisions of our statute for the equal distribution of the assets of persons who may become insolvent, it seems to me that we have there gone as far as it is necessary to go; and no serious inconvenience has resulted from the operation of that law. It was largely on account of the provisions of the old common law which were recognized in the province of Ontario that a Bankruptcy Act was adopted here. Then, there are the difficulties mentioned by my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island. Probably you will supersede the provisions which were made in the Homestead Act with reference to the North-west Territories and Manitoba by undertaking to legislate on this subject, and that is a matter of very serious consideration. If all the provinces were to adopt a liberal homestead law, which would place the home of a trader beyond the reach of the accidents that are attendant upon commercial life, it seems to me it would be a very great advantage. If that were done, I do not think we would ever hear a demand for a Bankruptcy Act. When we consider the trials that have been made here before, the failures that have attended the efforts put forth to secure a workable Act, how soon these Acts become unpopular, and how soon it becomes necessary to remove them from the statute-book in order to satisfy public opinion, I do not think we ought to be in a hurry to make a further trial. Taking that view, while I am not going to oppose the first reading of the measure introduced by my hon. friend from Winnipeg (Mr. Martin), I have no notion whatever of committing myself to a declaration in favour of an Insolvency Act passed by this Parliament. I am rather

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).

disposed to leave the subject of the distribution of the assets of insolvent persons under the local law of the province to those who are administering that law, than to undertake to deal with the subject here at all.

Mr. McNEILL. Mr. Speaker, I am not at all surprised that the Insolvency Bill has not been pressed very strongly by the Government upon this House, in view of the fact that the greatest legal intellects of the United Kingdom have for years been attempting, unsuccessfully, to grapple with this problem of insolvency. I am not at all surprised, I say, that we have ourselves been a little reticent in proceeding further with this matter. I recollect very well that when I was in England a great deal of interest was expressed by members of the legal profession in the Insolvency Bill which was then in course of preparation by one of the greatest of English lawyers, Lord Westbury. It was hoped that his wonderfully acute and massive intellect would succeed, perhaps, in overcoming the enormous difficulties that confronted him. But the result proved that even he was unable to frame a measure which commanded the approval of the public after it had been subjected to the test of experience. Under these circumstances, as I believe, the insolvency law in England to-day is not satisfactory, and I am not at all surprised to find, on the part of my hon. friend who has just addressed the House, and other hon. gentlemen of legal experience, a reluctance to commit this House to an approval of any insolvency measure which is likely for some time to come to be presented to this chamber.

Mr. MACDOWALL. Mr. Speaker, I would just say a few words before the discussion closes, merely to express my adhesion to the principle of the Bill introduced by the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin). I do not think the argument that has just been adduced to show that there are difficulties to be met, is any argument against the principle of such a measure. There will, no doubt, be many difficulties to be met, but these may be got over. We cannot expect that the first Insolvency Act will be perfect; but it may be amended and improved, while the principle remains. The principle of such a measure, as I understand it, is that if an honest trader, through circumstances over which he has no control, gets into debt, he may get a clearance and be given a start again. I also think the principle should be as widely applied as the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) has indicated. I think it should not be class legislation at all. There might be some difficulty in regard to homesteads, as the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) has said; the Act might conflict with the local laws of the provinces or the Territories; but I should think that difficulty might be got over. At any rate, I desire to express my adhesion to the principle of the Bill.

Mr. MARTIN. I desire to say only a word or two further on this matter, and I would not do that had not the Bill been made the subject of a general discussion, owing to the possibility of its not being reached again this session. The hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) made the bold statement that the laws for the equitable distribution of assets in the various provinces were working well. I desire to take very strong exception to that statement, because I do not believe that in the opinion of the commercial community, in the different provinces, these laws, imperfect as they are in the nature of things, are at all satisfactory, even so far as the distribution of assets is concerned—that is, in the provinces where they exist at all. In some provinces, I understand—Nova Scotia, for example—there is no law for the equitable distribution of assets, there is only the old law by which the creditor who steps in first gets the money. So that I am satisfied that the statement that these laws are working well would be controverted by the commercial community, for two reasons. First, that it is not true that they do work well in the individual provinces; and second, that it would be a great advantage indeed to have a uniform commercial law in matters of this kind instead of having conflicting laws in the different provinces. Another point raised by the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies), which I omitted to allude to, and which, it is possible, the Bill does not cover, is that it would be necessary to practically repeal the homestead exemption laws if we put in force an Insolvency Act. I would not be prepared to agree to that, and I would ask, when this measure comes into committee of the whole House, to have an amendment adopted by which all homestead exemption laws, passed by the various provinces, should be respected, and that an insolvency order should only convey to the official liquidator such property as is not exempt, under local laws, from seizure under execution. I am not myself personally in favour of the extent to which the legislature of Manitoba has gone in the direction of exempting property from execution. I think that they have gone a great deal too far in that province, but at the same time I believe that that is a matter entirely pertaining to the local legislatures, and I think it would be eminently proper for this House, in passing a measure with regard to insolvency, to only take from the debtor such property as now can be reached, under the various provincial laws, by judgment and execution. My hon. friend who spoke a moment ago suggested that if there were more liberal homestead laws in the other provinces, something similar to those in Manitoba, that would do away largely with the demand for an Insolvency Act. Now, that is shown not to be the case by the fact that in Manitoba, where they have

the most liberal homestead exemption law of any province in the Dominion, an insolvency law is strongly desired in the commercial community, as represented by the boards of trade in the different towns, especially in the city of Winnipeg. The hon. gentleman also thought that it would not be advisable to hurry in dealing with this question of insolvency. Well, if we should be so precipitate as to pass an Insolvency Act this session, I do not think any one could urge against the Parliament of Canada that it had been in a hurry to legislate upon this question, because it is now seventeen years since the last Insolvency Act was repealed. The hon. member for Bruce (Mr. McNeill) defended the Government in their failure to proceed with an Insolvency Act in 1894 and 1895. His excuses might apply to a refusal on the part of the Government to take up the question of insolvency, but I cannot see how he can possibly excuse the actual conduct of the Government. The Government announced that they were going to pass an Insolvency Act. They did that after they had been urged by deputations from all the boards of trade in Canada to take up that subject. The boards of trade in Canada had joined together and prepared what they thought was a good and fair Insolvency Act. They did that at very considerable expense to themselves. They came down to Ottawa and interviewed the Premier and laid before him this Act, asking him to have it made law. The Premier promised that he would pass an Insolvency Act. In pursuance of that promise, the Speech from the Throne in 1894 contained a declaration that a Bankruptcy Act would be passed that session. A bankruptcy Act was introduced. Again the commercial community were encouraged to spend a large amount of time and a considerable amount of money in laying before the committee of the Senate their views upon the Bill as introduced by the Government. Again they were distinctly promised by Sir John Thompson, at that time First Minister, that the measure would be put through. It was not put through. The apparently reasonable excuse was offered for not putting it through that a large amount of time would be taken in discussing the revision of the tariff, but it was promised that the Bill would be put through the following session. In 1895 we again had a declaration from the Governor General that this insolvency measure would be placed on the statute-books. Again delegations came from the boards of trade and legal gentlemen were sent here at large expense; and again the Premier, Sir Mackenzie Bowell, promised most definitely that that law would be introduced in the Senate, would come into this House, and after discussion become law. It was brought into the Senate but never came into this House. There was plenty of time to pass it. The Government were not so pressed with busi-

ness, because, for a considerable time during the session of 1895, we witnessed the spectacle here of the House adjourning from day to day, while waiting for the Government to make up their minds as to what they would do in connection with the Manitoba school question. That would have been a most opportune time for the Government to have redeemed the pledge which they had time and time again given to the commercial community. It would have been an excellent opportunity to redeem their promise, but they failed to do so. I cannot see that any inherent difficulties, such as those given by the hon. member for Bruce, are any excuse whatever for this very unsatisfactory progress and this very unsatisfactory treatment by the Government of the important bodies coming to them and this House, under the most explicit promises, with regard to this question. Under these circumstances, I am satisfied that the commercial bodies hold the Government responsible. The address from which I read to-day from Mr. Caldecott, the late President of the Board of Trade of Toronto, outlines that very clearly. It expresses briefly and without equivocation the great disappointment of the Toronto Board of Trade, no doubt joined in by the boards of trade of other important centres, at the failure of the Government to redeem its promises in this behalf. I therefore feel impelled to bring the question before the House in this way, not entirely with the expectation that the measure may become law, but for the purpose of pointing out how important the question is, for the purpose of giving the commercial bodies of the country the opportunity of bringing some pressure to bear upon those members of the House upon whom they can have influence, with the view of urging the Government to redeem its pledge in this respect. We have plenty of time before the 25th of April to put upon the statute-books a well considered measure, and I am satisfied that the objections put forward by the hon. gentleman from East Durham (Mr. Craig) as to the working of the old Insolvency Act are completely met by the provisions that are to be found in this Act. I claim no credit of course for that, because its provisions are copied from the Government Bill which was drawn after the model of the Bill, prepared at so much trouble and expense by the joint committee of the Boards of Trade of Canada.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. FOSTER moved :

That Government Orders have precedence on Thursdays, after questions, during the remainder of the session.

Mr. LAURIER. Does the hon. gentleman intend to press this motion ?

Mr. MARTIN.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I think I shall have to press the motion. We have now been in session about one month—

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Sixteen days.

Mr. FOSTER. The House was called for the 2nd of January, and it is now the 4th of February. So, according to my calculation, we have been in session a little over a month. It is not very early, therefore, to ask the House to give the additional day for the Government work. I am moved to do that with all the greater confidence, because hon. gentlemen have repeatedly stated that, Parliament having been called largely for the purpose of dealing with a certain Government measure, therefore the House ought to devote itself particularly to that. What the Government proposes to do is to ask the House to pass the Estimates and to discuss and pass the Bill which will be brought down within a few days; and there is probably none too much time to do that between now and the time when the House will have passed through its term of life. The private legislation is not very large, nor will it probably be very heavy. I have no doubt, for instance, that my hon. friend who introduced his Bill this afternoon has not the least idea of pressing that Bill to a conclusion. It will serve its purpose—has, I suppose, partly served its purpose—but there is no supposition in the House on either side that that measure will engage very much of the attention of the House.

Mr. LAURIER. Why ?

Mr. FOSTER. For the reasons which hon. gentlemen on my hon. friend's own side have stated in their speeches.

Mr. LAURIER. Answer for the other side.

Mr. FOSTER. And taking the arguments of my hon. friend into account, for a very good reason on the line of their strong assertions that in a Parliament at this stage of its existence it would be highly unwise that very important measures of this kind should be pressed and legislated upon. Taking all these things into consideration, I do not think I am unreasonable in asking the House to devote one day more to Government business.

Mr. MULOCK. You have nothing on the Order paper.

Mr. FOSTER. We have quite sufficient on the Order paper.

Mr. LAURIER. In regard to what the hon. gentleman has said, I do not wish to enter into a controversy. The hon. gentleman will perhaps agree to defer the consideration of this proposal until the Bill he has referred to has been brought down.

Mr. FOSTER. I think my hon. friend is quite unreasonable. We have the Budget

debate standing upon the Order paper, a debate which usually takes a fortnight of our time, and which, probably, in this last session of a Parliament will take no less. The House is anxious and eager to engage in that debate, which is always one of the most important debates of the session. Gentlemen opposite, no doubt, wish to air their new theories of tariff and trade so as to offer an explanation to the country to which they soon hope to go; and they will find on this side of the House members quite willing to defend the policy of the Government and make good the Government's case. I do not think we ought to prevent hon. gentlemen on either side from engaging in this debate. Then we have the Estimates before the House, and we have that 'vade mecum,' the Auditor General's Report.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Only in part. Where is the other part?

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend ought to be perfectly satisfied with the volume before him, seeing that it is so large.

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

After Recess.

Mr. LAURIER. I would have hoped that the hon. gentleman would accept the very reasonable proposition which I made to him before dinner, that the consideration of this motion should be deferred until such time as the Government has brought down the measure which they have announced in the Speech from the Throne, as, above all, the one measure for which this session has been called. And I must say I do not even yet despair of convincing the hon. gentleman that the motion he has made is altogether unprecedented. The hon. gentleman stated before six o'clock that we had now arrived at a period of the session when such a motion as this was always made and granted. I take issue with the hon. gentleman on that point. I will prove that, according to the records of this House, not a single precedent can be quoted for presenting a motion of this kind at this stage of the session. The House has always been ready, in so far as my memory goes, when the session has proceeded for a certain length of time, and when the business has reached a certain point, to grant to the Government one of its days in order to expedite the business which the Government has in charge. Sir, I shall be able to show the hon. gentleman that the motion he now makes is at once unprecedented, uncalled for, unjustified and unfair. First, let me show the hon. gentleman that his motion is unprecedented. I can show him that, as a rule, within the last eleven years, at all events, such a motion as this has not been made before the 35th or 36th day of the

session, and quite ordinarily not before the session has lasted 40 days or more.

Session of Parliament met	Motion to take Thursdays made	After session had lasted
1885—20th January ..	10th Mar.	More than 40 days.
1886—21st February ..	26th Apr.	do 50 do
1887—13th April.....	17th May.	do 30 do
1888—23rd February..	11th Apr.	do 55 do
1889—31st January...	4th Mar..	do 30 do
1890—16th January ..	25th Feb.	do 45 do
1891—20th April.....	19th June.	do 50 do
1892—25th February..	30th Mar.	do 30 do
1893—26th January ..	8th Mar..	do 40 do
1894—15th March....	24th Apr.	do 40 do
1895—18th April.....	4th June.	do 45 do

And last session was the first in which the hon. Minister of Finance was leader of the House. So that out of the eleven years, the motion to take Thursday was made twice after the lapse of thirty days. On three different occasions it was made after an interval of fifty days and on five different occasions it was made after the session had lasted more than forty days: so that as a rule this motion never was made until forty days had elapsed, and the session had lasted for that length of time. Now, Sir, how is it this year? The House met this year on 2nd January, and we are to-day in the 4th February, this is the 30th day of the session. But surely the hon. gentleman does not take into consideration the peculiar circumstances of this session. The House met on 2nd January, it is true, but the House met only to adjourn until the 7th January. On the 7th January the House met again, the members were here, but the hon. gentleman cannot have forgotten that for eight days more the members of this House could not transact any business. The hon. gentleman surely has not forgotten that for eight days more the members were kept dancing attendance upon the hon. gentlemen until such time as they were able to patch up, in the best way they could, their differences, their troubles, their squabbles and their quarrels. In point of fact, the business of the session only commenced on the 16th January, when the debate on the Address began. Up to that time nothing could be done, not a member could do anything at all towards discharging the duties for which we were called together. Therefore, I say, and the hon. gentleman cannot gainsay the assertion, that this House has been in session for only eighteen days, and not one day more. It was only on the 16th January that the members of this House addressed themselves to the business for which they were called here, and it is after only eighteen days of work that the hon. gentleman asks to take away one day from us. Sir, is there any reason for it? I say the

delay has been unprecedented, and this motion is unprecedented. I say more, I say it is uncalled for by the business of the Government. Why, Sir, what is the business of the Government to-day? Look at the Order paper. It is an absolute blank so far as the business of the Government is concerned. There is only one notice of motion of a very trivial character, one to replace the bonds of the Montreal Turnpike Trust with other bonds. That is all we have before the House to-day, with the exception of the consideration of the Budget. Now, we have been called for a special purpose upon this occasion. We have been called to pass important legislation, the session was called especially to deal with the Manitoba school question. That Bill we have long been waiting for, and we have not got it yet. We have other measures which were announced in the Speech from the Throne, several important measures. There is one with regard to arming the militia and with regard to the defences of the country. What have we got with regard to that? Not one single word so far. We have another important measure which was announced, one with regard to increasing the representation of the North-west Territories; but we have nothing at all before us with respect to it so far. The hon. gentleman is unable to find in the records of this House that a motion to take the first day from us has ever been made unless the Order paper was crowded with the business of the Government, and with the projects they had in hand, with measures which were intended to be submitted to the consideration of the House. Why, Sir, while the Order paper, in so far as the business of the Government is concerned, is absolutely blank, while there are before us none of the measures which we were told we should be called upon to consider, on the other hand, the paper is crowded with most important business of private members. On the Order paper, to be taken into consideration during the three days only that we have at our disposal, there are some of the most important measures which will come up for discussion during the present session. There are no less than twenty-one Bills in all, on the Order paper ready for the second reading, and five more to be introduced to-morrow. Among those Bills which are already set down for a second reading, there are some of the most important that can be taken up this session, or any session. There is, for instance, a Bill to secure the independence of Parliament, a most important measure it is, and the present condition of the country and of Parliament itself shows that it requires our earnest attention. There is also a Bill which has been often before us, but which has never been taken into such consideration as it should have received, a Bill relating to conspiracies and combinations formed in restraint of trade. I believe there is no more important measure than this one. There is also a Bill to

Mr. LAURIER.

amend the Dominion Elections Act, a most important one indeed. There is a Bill, the urgency of which is evident, a Bill of the hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Rider) for facilitating voting by employees at election of members of the House of Commons. We are on the eve of an election, and this Act will come in most appropriate in order to facilitate the voting by employees of large companies. There is also a Bill, which was introduced a few days ago by my hon. friend from Winnipeg (Mr. Martin), with regard to the representation of the North-west Territories. All these Bills are of the greatest importance. According to the rule of the House, we have only one day, Thursday, to devote to these Bills. There are twenty-one of them on the list, and the hon. gentleman proposes at this stage to take the only day upon which we can take these measures into consideration. Suppose his motion is carried, what time would be left in which to take these Bills into consideration? Only Wednesday, that is all. Why, Sir, it is a mere farce, it is an attempt to gag the members of the House, to prevent them from promoting the measures which they deem essential to the interests of the country. But that is not all, there are on the paper no less than thirty-two notices of motion, some of them of the greatest importance. The first now on the Order paper is one which, I am sure, ought to receive the consideration of the hon. Minister himself, that is to say:

That in the opinion of this House, the manufacture, importation and sale of intoxicating liquors, except for medicinal, sacramental and mechanical purposes, should be prohibited by law.

Now, this is a motion which must interest every member; and there are several other motions of the same character, every one of which is of the greatest importance. Therefore, I submit to the hon. gentleman that if he wants to be fair to the members of this House, he should not proceed with the motion which he has now in hand. I speak very seriously upon this question. The hon. gentleman is not in a position to-day to press such a motion upon the House. If this had been an ordinary session, if we had been able to proceed with the business of the country from the moment we were called here, perhaps, there might be some justification for this motion. But when two weeks of the session were consumed by causes for which the members of the House are not responsible, were consumed by delays for which the Government are alone responsible, I say it is most unfair to the members of the House, at this stage of the session, to take away from them one of the days to which they are entitled to enable them to discharge the business and the duties which were entrusted to them by their constituents. I appeal to the hon. gentleman, I appeal to his sense of fairness, I appeal to the hon. gentlemen who sit behind him, and I submit to them that if the members of this

House are to have an opportunity of discharging the duties which they feel it incumbent upon them to discharge, the Government should not at this stage press the motion which is before us. Sir, I do not know whether my appeal to the hon. gentleman will be heeded, but if the appeal which I now make to him fails to enlist his sympathies, the only thing that I shall have to do will be to leave the decision of this question to the sense of justice which, I am sure, must preside upon both sides of the House.

Mr. FOSTER. I have listened very carefully to my hon. friend who has detailed the reasons why he thinks the Government is not justified in asking for an additional day at this stage of the business of the session. I have listened to the hon. gentleman trying to find, if I could, whether or not there were really strong reasons why the motion of the Government should not be pressed, and I must say, after having listened very attentively, that I fail to see the strength of the hon. gentleman's position. I do not wish, neither does the Government wish, to ask the House for any unfair privilege. The only object the Government has, the only object I have is to see that the business for which we have been called this session is as rapidly as possible performed, and it is with this object in view and this object alone we have submitted the motion, and wish to press it on the attention of the House. Now, what are the reasons submitted by my hon. friend? He has read a detailed statement of the number of days which have elapsed in ordinary sessions, and in most cases his examples proved that a longer time has elapsed between the opening of the session and the asking for the extra Government day. But my hon. friend must remember that this is, to a certain extent, an extraordinary session, and he must recollect that the very same methods of procedure which possibly might have been followed during an ordinary session are difficult to be followed this session. In the first place, no one more strongly than the hon. gentleman himself holds the opinion, so I understand, that the time of this Parliament will expire on or about the middle of April. That means then, that within that period, whatever business the Government has to do must be done, and he has himself stated that the Government has called this session specially for a piece of business which is grave in its character, and one which will evoke a great deal of discussion, and occupy a large portion of the time of the House. That is very true, although I must disclaim the idea, or any such interpretation of the statement made by the Government, that this session has been called for the special purpose of passing the legislation in question, and for no other purpose. From no statement the Government has made, can it be fairly argued that this is a special session, or that

it is called simply for the one object. The very arguments the hon. gentleman has addressed to the House have been most cogent reasons why the House should grant the Government Thursdays, so that the necessary business of the Government, which is now waiting to be done, should be got out of the way, as far as possible before the most important piece of legislation to come down shall be laid before the House. We have other duties to perform than the discussion of the remedial measure. The country's services must be carried on, and the Estimates are before the House, and it is the intention of the Government to press these Estimates upon the House, and with the Budget speech in front of them it is impossible to press them. The discussion of the Budget is not altogether a Government proceeding, it is a discussion in which the House has the greatest interest, and it is a discussion, which, as I have stated before dinner, takes ten days or two or three weeks, generally, to conclude. I submit it is in the interests of the speedy and proper conduct of the House, of the larger business of the House, which has to come before it, that we should endeavour to expedite the business of the Budget, and make fair progress with the Estimates, so that there may be more time for the House to discuss the important legislation which is to come down afterwards. There is another reason to which I think it is perfectly fair for me to call the attention of the House. Not one hon. gentleman opposite, but many hon. members, not only in this House, but outside it, have, by implication and by actual assertion set forth to the House and the country this idea, that it was the policy of the Opposition not to allow the Government to proceed with any business this session except the business of remedial legislation. That has been avowed, not by one member, but by several members of the House. It has been urged as the dominating policy of the Opposition during this session of Parliament. That is another reason why, paying the importance the Government does to the passage of the ordinary Estimates for the services of the country, why those Estimates should be put in a position to be pressed and to be judged on their merits by the House. Another point the hon. gentleman forgot to mention. When he read the list of days showing the time that elapsed between the opening of the House and taking of an extra day by the Government, on every one of these occasions, nearly, on many of them, most certainly, and if my memory does not fail me, on nearly all, the debate on the Budget proceeded from day to day, this extra day being thus taken by the consent of the House, while I am asking that it be taken by a formal motion. I will say this to my hon. friend, if he will agree, as in former years, to go on with the debate on the Budget 'de die in diem,' keeping one day for the work of the House,

I will postpone the motion, in the meantime, and we will go on with the Budget debate as in other years. That is a proposition which should strike my hon. friend as a perfectly fair one, but the Government would be wanting in their duty to themselves and to the country, seeing the peculiar situation of affairs, if it did not press with all its vigour and all its force for the expediting the public business under its control, and which it proposes to carry out. If the hon. gentleman opposite will accept this alternative proposition I make, and agree to the Government going on with the Budget debate 'de die in diem,' I will withhold this motion for the present. I yet hope the hon. gentleman will agree to my proposition, and if not, the Government, in duty to itself, and to the country, must press the motion to a vote.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The Government, for some years, has practically disregarded the rules of this House. The rules are based on public experience and are framed with a view to public convenience. The hon. gentleman has said that on former occasions we have proceeded from day to day with the consideration of the Budget until the discussion on that subject was concluded. That is so. But what has been the effect of that? It has been that all the business in the hands of private members has been sent to the wall, the result has been that practically the whole session has been devoted to the business of the Government, and little or no time left to the transaction of business in the hands of private members. That was the case last year, the year before, and the year previous to that; in fact, every year in which the practice to which the hon. gentleman has referred has been pursued in this House, the business in the hands of private members has suffered in consequence. The hon. gentleman has been here but a very few days transacting public business. Parliament was formally called and met, and then we adjourned for several days. When we met again there was a Government crisis on hand, the Finance Minister and six of his colleagues having retired from the Government, and there was no public business of any kind transacted, and the House adjourned from day to day at the instance of the Administration, because they were not prepared to go on with public business. Not only has the business in the hands of the Government been delayed in consequence of the proceedings of members of the Administration, but the business in the hands of private members has been equally delayed, and the result has been that nearly a month of the session has been wasted. The hon. gentleman now asks at this early period of the session, because, as my hon. friend has pointed out, we have been in session, practically, but a fortnight, to take one of the three days that the rules of Parliament have placed

Mr. FOSTER,

at the disposal of private members. Why have the rules been so framed, and why have three days out of five been placed at the disposal of the private members of this House? It is because experience has indicated that as a fair distribution of time, between the Government and the private members of this House. The proposal of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) is practically to set at defiance the rules of Parliament. My hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) has declared that this was a moribund Parliament, and that the business which Government had marked out for itself, was business that ought to be undertaken after the elections, and not before. That observation, of course, does not apply to a great portion of the business in the hands of private members; business which is for the furtherance of the interests of various undertakings and various organizations. It is the business of the Government and of Parliament to exercise proper oversight on these, but those are not matters affecting the general policy of the Government. They stand in a wholly different position from the measures of the Government, and in a Parliament like this, it is rather the private members who ought to encroach upon the time of the Government, and not that the Government should attempt to encroach upon the time of private members. There is another rule which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) has forgotten. He has called this session, with the concurrence of his colleagues, and at the instance, I suppose, of the Prime Minister, for the purpose of dealing mainly with one special question; indeed, I may say, wholly for that purpose; because I can affirm, without any fear of successful contradiction, that the session would not have been called if it had not been that that measure required to be dealt with. If the Government had agreed upon their policy last year, we should not have had to meet now. There is the well settled constitutional rule: that the redress of grievances should precede the granting of supplies. The leader of the House, and his colleagues, say: there is a grievance, a wrong has been done, and the great trust committed to this Parliament should be exercised for the purpose of redressing that wrong, and restoring to certain parties rights and privileges that were taken from them. That is the subject with which the hon. gentleman proposes to deal, and that is the grievance which he says, it is the duty of Parliament to redress. But, the Government, without submitting any measure upon the subject, and without giving the House the slightest idea of what the policy of the Government is, asks us to vote the supplies. Sir, let us look at the facts. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) went to the country in various constituencies; in Cardwell, in North Ontario, in West Huron, in Montreal Centre, in Jacques Cartier, and what has been the result? The hon. gen-

tleman is asking this House to place at the disposal of a Government, that, in so far as they have appealed to the country, has been declared not to possess the confidence of the people. Under these circumstances, the course of the Government is an extraordinary one. It is one which, as my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition has shown, is not justified by precedent. Heretofore, in the history of this country, the business of Parliament had always made a very considerable degree of progress before the Government undertook to take away any portion of the time at the disposal of the members. I say then, that, giving to the Government the time of private members for the discussion of the Budget; time which ought to be employed for the promotion of business in the hands of the private members, is a matter of very great consequences. Now, Mr. Speaker, I suppose the Government intend to propose a measure dealing with the subject of the issue of the writs. I have called their attention to the importance of such a measure, and so far they have presented no Bill to the House. Why is it that there is no measure on the subject? The last Parliament was dissolved on the 3rd of February, and the writs were made returnable on the 25th April, a period of eighty-six days having intervened. Is there any warrant for that in point of law? Not at all. The law in force in all the older provinces in this Dominion says, that not more than fifty days shall elapse between the dissolution of Parliament and the return of the writs for the constitution of a new Parliament. In 1891, there were 36 days taken, beyond the time the law allows. Then in British Columbia and Manitoba, both of which had the English law extended to them within a comparatively recent period, the English law of to-day is in force in those two provinces, and it provides, that not more than 35 days shall elapse between the dissolution of one Parliament and the return of the writs electing another. And yet, 86 days elapsed after the dissolution of the Parliament of 1891. Now, Sir, if the Government can disregard the law to the extent of 51 days, they can disregard the law apart from supply to the extent of 51 years, and we might have them refusing to call Parliament at all, if by any means they could carry on the affairs of the country, without any regard to the law of the country whatever. It is important that this Parliament shall not see its end, and that dissolution shall not take place, until it is declared within what time all those writs shall be made returnable. A measure on this subject is a measure that belongs to the Administration, and a measure which they should introduce. The law should be made uniform by them, and taking the most extreme time limit, namely 50 days, they disregarded it in the last election to the extent of 36 days. That is a condition of things that should not be

tolerated. It strikes at the very foundation of our system of Government, and we have a right to say to the Government: Propose to us redress of those grievances of which we complain; grievances that are patent to every person. You must consider the subject before you undertake to ask from this Parliament the appropriation of revenue required for the maintenance of the Government of this country.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It appears to me, Mr. Speaker, that the Government are deliberately taking advantage of their own wrong-doing. Now, I do not want to revive the extremely unpleasant discussion we had respecting the conduct of the hon. the leader of the House, and six of his colleagues, some time ago.

Mr. FOSTER. Oh, don't mind.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I will not mind, if necessary, but I am not going to do it unnecessarily. I will call the attention of the House to this: Here, these gentlemen come to us, and they demand of us that we should give up our undoubted right, because for fifteen mortal days they were quarrelling among themselves, because for fifteen mortal days they could not agree, and because for fifteen mortal days they were telling their present chief that he was an incompetent and an imbecile. Now they have got together under him again, now they are satisfied he is good enough for them, at any rate—and I am perfectly sure he is, and I believe too good for them, in my humble opinion. But, Sir, the point is this—and neither the hon. gentleman or his colleagues, nor any man on that side of the House, has answered it, nor can they answer it—the waste of time was not ours, the waste of time was not because of any act of ours; but the waste of time, in point of fact, was largely shortened by our action. Why, Sir, did not the present Postmaster General (Sir Adolphe Caron) come down and ask us to adjourn, not to the 16th, but to the 21st? And was it not at our instance that those five days were saved? The least the hon. gentleman can do is to give us those five days which we saved to him and the country. Instead of that, in the most unreasonable possible fashion, he proposes to take one of our pitiful three days. Now, Sir, what is the practical result if we pass this motion? The practical result is—and he knows it as well as I do—that to all intents and purposes you render it utterly impossible to have a single Bill properly discussed. To all intents and purposes, our power for legislation will be utterly put an end to; and our power for obtaining the opinion of the House on those important questions which have been alluded to will also be utterly put an end to. Now, that is as unreasonable a proposition as could be advanced. There is no answer to the statement made by my hon.

friend that to all intents and purposes we are not at the 31st day, but at the 18th day of the session, and it is the Government's fault that we are at the 18th day. More than that, everybody who has the slightest regard for English law, English precedent or English custom knows that it is of the very essence of the meeting of Parliament that grievances should be discussed before Supply is granted. He knows that that is the foundation of parliamentary law and usage; and it is our bounden duty to see that those grievances are discussed before a Supply is granted—and he may be right sure that those grievances will be discussed before a Supply is granted. I say that the Government has no business at all, under the circumstances, to have a sixth session. I say—and the hon. gentleman knows it, and the House and the country know it—that this Parliament does not represent to-day two-thirds of the existing electorate of Canada. I say that not more than 60 per cent of the existing electorate are represented by these 211 or 214 gentlemen. Under such circumstances, it is monstrous for the hon. gentleman to attempt to oppress and dragoon Parliament in this fashion. The province of Manitoba would be perfectly justified in disregarding constitutionally the action of this House, because this House has ceased since the census of 1891 to represent the province of Manitoba, or the province of New Brunswick, or the province of Nova Scotia, as they constitutionally ought to be represented. The law and the custom of England require that when there is any material alteration in the representation, at the earliest convenient time, the people should be appealed to and a proper representation obtained; and if that be the case in the Parliament of England, which is not a federal Parliament, it is ten times more the case in the Parliament of Canada, which is composed of representatives of seven different provinces. On that ground alone, there is no sort of reason for the position the hon. gentleman has taken. If the hon. gentleman really does desire to expedite the business of the country, he will not press this motion at present. He can gain nothing by it except a very unseemly and unnecessary wrangle, in which both parties will tire themselves out to little purpose. We shall probably go on debating and disputing, debating and disputing, this thing and that thing; and so far from gaining his additional day, he will find himself in a position to lose several days which he would otherwise have got. It would have been a personal convenience to me to have gone on to-night. I would like very much to do so. I do not want to be caged and bottled up for another week, as I have my respects to pay to the hon. gentleman opposite, and I would prefer doing so at once. But I am willing to waive all my own personal feelings in that respect when a great

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

principle is at stake. I repeat that the hon. gentleman is doing a thing for which neither he nor his colleagues can find a just precedent. No instance can be cited in which, after a Government had deliberately wasted one-half of the preceding month, they had, within sixteen or seventeen days after the beginning of the debate on the Address—which is the true commencement of parliamentary work—come down and said to the Opposition: From this time forth, you, though having had no opportunity whatever of pressing your Bills, shall be practically deprived of all chance of obtaining a discussion on any of them. Because it is as well that my hon. friends should understand that if the debate on the Budget or Supply goes on while these Bills are on the Order paper, they cannot bring them up before the House goes into Supply, as our rules prevent that. They have only this one day in which to do it, and the hon. gentleman proposes to take that away from us. The proposition appears to me to be as unreasonable and untimely as one can conceive.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, I think the country, and certainly the Government, desires hon. gentlemen opposite to come out from behind the lines of Torres Vedras.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Well, give us a chance.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. We want to give you a chance. The Government days are the occasions when, if you have any policy, you will dare to come out with it; and the Government throw down the challenge to discuss immediately and as quickly as possible the actual business for which this Parliament was summoned.

An hon. MEMBER. Remedial legislation.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Remedial legislation, of course, as the leader of the Government has stated. But the whole afternoon has savoured of obstruction. It would not perhaps be within the rules of order to do as I think I could do if I were permitted—give very good evidence of the extraordinary tactics adopted on the motion for leave to introduce a Bill—the discussion of that Bill to go on clause by clause without probably more than two or three members listening to the discussion. But I pass that by. I take the speeches of the member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) and the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) on this very motion as a proof positive that hon. gentlemen opposite do not wish the Government to get on with any business this session, whether Supply or legislation. For what has the hon. member for South Oxford argued? At one moment he says that this is a moribund Parliament—that this House no longer repre-

sents Manitoba, New Brunswick or Nova Scotia, and therefore it has no right to legislate; while in the next breath he says that if the Government take this day from private members most important legislation will be shelved, and hon. members will not be able to press forward important Bills they have in hand. The hon. gentleman's position is transparent; his motives are obvious. The hon. gentleman's tactics are poor indeed when in ten minutes he had to argue in that manner. Then, he is surely too old a parliamentarian to press seriously an argument which he borrowed from an equally experienced parliamentarian, the hon. member for Bothwell—in their desperation they had to make use of it—that the grievances of Her Majesty's subjects could not be properly ventilated unless this day were retained for private members. When are these grievances to be properly heard? On Government days, when the Government proposes that the House go into Supply. That is the proper occasion for any member to bring forward any grievances that exist in this country. The hon. leader of the Government has told the House that the Government wish to press on the necessary supplies, and they will, of course, in due course bring forward also the grievance for which this session was called.

Mr. LAURIER. And then we will grant this motion at once.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman wishes to take charge of the House. The Government propose to do Government business in the usual order. They propose to obtain the necessary supplies and press forward the necessary legislation. But, forsooth, they are almost threatened to-night by the leader of the Opposition, who says that we must reverse that procedure and bring in all our legislation before supplies are granted. If he were in charge of this House, and had its confidence, that would settle the matter, but I think the Government will be perfectly justified in doing their best to press forward the ordinary supplies which ought to be voted, and go on, as soon as possible, with the remedial legislation. But what if obstruction obtain? What if hon. gentlemen opposite propose to go on as they have been going, what will happen? Time will be consumed, and important legislation, even remedial legislation, postponed, and dangerously postponed. The Opposition would like to make this side of the House responsible for that, because, as they say, if the majority had submitted to its dictation, then the Bill for remedial legislation would have been considered, but since the majority did not reverse the order of procedure, they will prevent them doing any business whatever. I should think very little of the Government, if, in a matter of this kind, they yielded one jot of the unanimous offer which the leader of the

Government has made this evening. He has proposed to do what the House has always done, what the House, as a rule, has done.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. member for Bothwell contradicts. I do not wish to have a controversy on that small point, and I simply say that the usual course to follow is to get through with the business before the House, which stands in the way of everything, and must be disposed of. If the Government possesses the confidence of the House, this question of Supply and the Budget must be moved out of the way before any Government business can possibly be considered or dealt with. There are no people more ready to point out to the country the weak and imbecile position of the Conservative party in this House than the Opposition, if they can get the slightest ground for it, and they would not hesitate to do so if the Government were to withdraw now from the stand they have taken. I have pointed to what has occurred to-day, and I think the House and the country will observe the significance of the discussion. Perhaps a more extraordinary course has not been followed during any session of this Parliament than has been taken suddenly on the eve of a Budget debate, or on the day when the Budget debate was supposed to be continued. I trust that the Government will adhere to the position it has taken.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I respectfully submit that the hon. gentleman who has just spoken has attempted, not only, to use a vulgar expression, to bulldoze the Opposition, but to bulldoze the Government. He seems to be afraid that some amicable and reasonable settlement may be reached, and he rises in his place, not so much to discuss the question, as to threaten the Government and the Opposition, and to tell us what he would do if he were leading the Government, and how he would not yield one jot or tittle. It is a very undignified position to take. In a matter of this kind, practical and sensible men can come to a practical and sensible conclusion, and there should be no occasion for threats. The hon. gentleman surely must have forgotten himself when he referred to the very interesting debate which took place this afternoon as a debate which was started and continued for the purpose of obstruction. Does the hon. gentleman know that sitting behind him to-night are seven members who took an intelligent part in that debate?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. How long did they speak?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Where are the hon. members for West York (Mr. Maclean), East Grey (Mr. Sproule), East Durham (Mr. Craig), North Bruce (Mr. McNeil), West Assinibola (Mr. Davin), Saskatchewan (Mr. Macdowall) East Toronto (Mr. Coatsworth)?

Mr. FOSTER. The whole of them did not consume more than thirty minutes.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Every one of them took a part in the debate, and an interesting part. Some of them spoke very shortly and some at length, but many hon. gentlemen on this side spoke just as shortly as they did. The hon. gentleman who introduced the Bill had, necessarily, to speak at some length.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have already intervened to prevent an hon. member referring to a former debate, and I have to do so again. Surely we are not going back to discuss a question that was discussed the whole afternoon?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I did not catch that you called the hon. gentleman to order when he referred to it.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I took the hint from Mr. Speaker.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman is gracious enough to make his apologies for having broken the rule of the House, and I join him in his apologies. The leader of the House has told us that this has been an extraordinary session. I used somewhat similar language the other night, and I was called very severely to question for having used it. I shall not refer to that debate again, Sir, but the hon. gentleman—I think I can refer to his language—said that this was an extraordinary session, and he referred to the fact that the Government were shortly to bring down to the House the Manitoba coercion or remedial Bill.

Mr. FOSTER. I did not say that.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) He did not use the word "coercion" but the word "remedial." It is all the same, call it by what name you please, I fancy it has the same meaning. The hon. gentleman, after admitting that this was an extraordinary session, presumably called for a special purpose, which was shortly to be fulfilled, so far as the Government could fulfil their part of bringing the Bill down, then said that the object of the Government was to see that the business for which we are assembled would be speedily performed. That is capital. But if we are met for the purpose of discussing and passing a Remedial Bill, how are we to do that unless the Bill is brought down? We are here ready and willing to perform that work. I made a proposition to the hon. gentleman the other night to bring down his Bill instantly. One hon. gentleman wanted to have the question referred to a committee in such a way that it might be examined into by that committee, and passed unanimously by the House, if possible. The hon. leader of the House would not accept that suggestion. We submit that to attempt to take up the day of private members before the Bill which we are called to consider is brought down, is an

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

avowed attempt to deprive all private members of their rights to propose and carry legislation. If this House yields to the demand which the hon. gentleman makes, by giving up its private day and entering upon the discussion of Supply from day to day, the result must be to postpone the introduction of the Remedial Bill many days, if not weeks.

Mr. FOSTER. Not one single hour.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) And the result must be, perforce, either to prevent discussion in the complete manner in which such a Bill ought to be discussed or to prevent its being passed at all. The Bill cannot be passed without being fully discussed. The hon. gentleman knows that there has not been a Bill introduced into this House for years which will probably give rise to more lengthy discussion than the one he says he is about to introduce. Why should it not? The hon. gentleman himself was not able to bring it down last session owing to its complicated character. He took weeks and months to prepare it. A Bill which has taken so many months to prepare must, necessarily, provoke a very great deal of discussion. It is a Bill which strikes strongly at principles which many hon. gentlemen believe should be preserved. That is a Bill unique in its character. It is a Bill which will have effects more extraordinary than any other ever passed by this Parliament, in the regard that it can never afterwards be amended, altered or repealed. It is a Bill, therefore, which must be gone over section by section, line by line, and I think the hon. gentleman heard the hon. leader of the Opposition say to him that, if he brought down that Bill and showed, by bringing it down, a readiness to go on with the work for which the session was called, the hon. gentleman was prepared to favourably consider his proposition to give up one of the private members' days.

Mr. LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) My hon. friend cheers that statement, and, therefore, the House will take it as an offer made by him across the floor. What objection can the hon. leader of the House have to that? If he accepts it, I have no more to say; I shall resume my seat. If he does not accept that or does not give any indication of his willingness to accept it, I shall go on to show that there are other reasons which should preclude him from having a vote of the House in favour of the proposition he has made to-night. The hon. gentleman who last spoke said that the consideration of grievances must precede Supply. He acknowledged that as a proper parliamentary rule, and he said we were preventing the discussion of grievances because we were preventing a motion for Supply being made.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Not at all. I said that on Government days

these grievances could be brought up on going into Supply. By having another day for the Government, more opportunities would be had for bringing these grievances before the House.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The answer has already been given. I do not wish to go over these points again and again. But the hon. gentleman will see that on the Order paper there are twenty or thirty notices of motion relating to the removal of grievances.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I am sure the hon. gentleman will allow me a moment. I referred to the statements made by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) and the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). They said it was a well-understood parliamentary practice that the consideration and redress of grievances should always precede Supply; and I said that, under the ordinary parliamentary practice, to add to the number of Government days would add to the opportunities for ventilating such grievances as are usually brought forward on motion to go into Supply. I think I am quite safe in that.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The common sense of the hon. gentleman, as an old parliamentarian, will show him that the Order paper is filled with notices of motion relating to specified grievances, and the hon. gentleman knows that no grievance of which a notice of motion has been given can be made the subject-matter of speech or motion on going into Supply, and so he is choking off the whole House.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I say that is the result of the adoption of this course. Surely that is not open to question. If we had passed the Budget debate and the ordinary motion to go into Supply had been moved, there is not a member of the House who could bring before the House any of the grievances set out in this Order paper.

Mr. FOSTER. And on that paper all the grievances are to be found, 'of course.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I do not say that. But I will call the hon. gentleman's attention to some of the grievances to be found here. There is one, at any rate, the need of calling attention to which the hon. gentleman will not challenge, for I have heard him dilate for four hours on this, which he said was greater than any political grievance existing under the constitution. All others, Sir, were mere figments, mere make-believes; we were to sacrifice our party allegiance and everything else to carry out what he then advocated as the prohibitory law—the prohibition of the manufacture, importation and sale of intoxicating liquor. The hon. gentleman may forget these things for they occurred before his official days. But we have not forgotten them. Though

he has not retracted, he has said that he made that four hours' speech in a moment of weakness.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman would not suggest that a motion in favour of prohibition was pertinent on going into Supply?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) If the former statements of the leader of the House are to be accepted, it would be a most admirable motion on going into Supply, and it should be adopted before we go into Supply if his argument on that point was good. We have here the motion of the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), which I do not know that anybody in the House can understand. It is a sort of omnium gatherum. It seems to be intended to air all the grievances of the North-west Territories.

That it is necessary—

Mr. SPEAKER. I hope the hon. gentleman is not going to anticipate the discussion on this motion.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Certainly not, Mr. Speaker; but I am going to point out to the House, with your permission, the importance of some of these notices of motion.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the hon. gentleman is going a long distance in the direction of expressing an opinion with regard to the notice of motion placed on the Order paper by the hon. member for West Assiniboia.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) If you rule, Mr. Speaker, of course I must not express an opinion upon it. But I desire to show, without expressing an opinion, what this resolution is:

That it is necessary to (1) the prosperity and progress of the North-west Territories, important to the stability and progress of the Dominion, and of great moment to the Empire, that the North-west Territories shall be treated on a different footing from that of heretofore; (2) That the self-respect of the people of the North-west, not less than the material interests of those vast territories, demands that the Territories shall not be treated on a plane of inferiority; (3) That the climate, soil and conditions generally of the North-west are different from those of other parts of Canada, and a policy specially adapted to its needs and resources is called for in order that the settlers shall be rendered prosperous and immigration policies be made effective.

The hon. gentleman, no doubt, has an important policy underlying these words, affecting that part of the Dominion whose soil, climate and conditions are different from those of the rest of the Dominion. And I would rather gather from the concluding part of it—though I would not express an opinion—that he is not in accord with the immigration policy which the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Daly) supports in this House.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Or the state of the weather.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) As to the hon. gentleman's position with regard to the state of the weather, I am not informed. Then we have a motion which may or may not be made, but from the earnestness with which it has been discussed year after year it seems to be considered of great importance by the hon. member in whose name it stands, the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Macdonell) relating to the towing of sawlogs across the great lakes. Then we have a number of motions which may not be considered extraordinary, and then we come to the proposition to purchase branch lines of the Intercolonial Railway—not all, but one of the branch lines.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That is a grievance.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Grievance! I should think so, if it were carried out. This will give rise to the discussion of the great question raised by the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) whether these branch lines are to be bought out or not. Then we have the proposal from the hon. member for West Assiniboia that we should give away the Government property in and about Moose Jaw at any figure it will bring in order that it may be taxed by the people out there. That I assume to be an important motion, from the tenor of it. Then we have a proposition relating to a bonus upon butter. That is an important one, I will admit. I do not want to make light of that, because it is an important motion in itself. Then you have one to aid in the establishment of creameries and cheese factories, and from the importance which we attach to these manufactories in the eastern part of the Dominion, I can well concede that that is a subject which we would like to have discussed. I would not impute to the hon. gentleman that he puts these motions on for the mere purpose of having them appear in his name, and that he would move them, and then ask liberty to withdraw the motions as soon as he had made his speech, because that would impute to the hon. gentleman a desire to make political capital only. I will concede to him that he has higher and better motives than that. Then we have the motion in the name of the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) relating to Imperial duties to be levied for Imperial defences. Well, there is no member of the House who would at the present time make light of a serious resolution of that kind. I know my hon. friend is altogether in earnest about that, for he has time and again spoken incidentally of it in this House. For one, I will be exceedingly interested to hear his deliverance upon it, and to see if he has any well-formulated scheme which will commend itself to the statesmen of the Empire as calculated to carry out the object which he seems

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

to have in view. I wonder if that is to be shelved also. Then we have the question of protection embodied in the resolution of the hon. member for L'Assomption (Mr. Jeannotte), in which the whole principle of protection is to be brought up by a motion with reference to the development of Canadian tobacco. Well, Sir, my hon. friend smiles, but I have no doubt that his resolution will cause a good deal of discussion, and will be looked forward to with a great deal of interest. Passing by a great many others, which are of more or less importance, and which would perhaps not give rise to much discussion. I come to the motion of my hon. friend from North Victoria (Mr. Hughes), one of the most important on the whole paper, a resolution in favour of preferential trade.

Mr. HUGHES. I do not want any introduction.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I will undertake to say that he is going to vote to-night in favour of a Government motion the effect of which will be to relegate that to limbo. I am pointing out to the hon. gentleman that if we give up at this early stage, the time that is allotted to that portion of the business of the House which the rules of the House have accorded to hon. members like himself and myself, for the purpose of airing our political views upon Imperial or Dominion questions, we are simply putting it out of our power to move these questions at all. But I need not go through the list, I do not propose to weary the House by going through the list. In addition to these notices of motion, some of them on inter-provincial subjects, some of them on Dominion, and some of them on Imperial, you have a large number of public returns and orders many of which I will venture to say are almost as important as any of the Bills which the Government will bring down, barring the Manitoba Remedial Bill. I look upon that as the most important Bill of the session, as the Bill for which the session was primarily called, and I look upon that as the Bill which we ought to tackle at once, as soon as the Government can agree upon its terms and bring it down. But we have, in addition to that, a number of important Bills here which ought not to be overlooked. We have a Bill respecting the adulteration of food and agricultural fertilizers, by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule). We have an Act respecting interest by my hon. friend from North York (Mr. Mulock), which will provoke very lengthy discussions, if he expects to carry it in this House. I know that a great many gentlemen are opposed to its principle, and I believe there are a good many supporting it; but it will not be a party question, it will be a question upon which members will divide outside of party lines altogether. But if this day is given up, that Bill, along with others, will be slaughtered, there will be a

regular slaughter of these innocents. Then we have the Bill to secure the independence of Parliament, preventing members from accepting office for 12 months after they have ceased to be members. My hon. friend from Inverness (Mr. Cameron) shakes his head, whether at me or at the Bill I do not know; but he will have an opportunity of discussing the Bill. I do not object to that. The object is, I believe, to prevent a member from accepting office in the gift of the Government having emoluments attached to it, for 12 months after he ceases to be a member of the House.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does that include senatorships?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I will not express an opinion upon the Bill without hearing it, but it does affect all offices of emolument, at any rate outside senatorships, possibly it may include them.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). It will affect members of Parliament.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) And prevent them from accepting offices for 12 months after they have ceased to be members.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member will confine himself to the motion.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Well, I will not trespass upon the rules of the House by discussing the principle of the Bill. I was induced to go so far as I did by the interruption of the hon. member for Inverness, who intimated that I had not properly described the Bill. Now, there are other Bills the importance of which I beg leave to point out. There is a Bill relating to conspiracies and combinations formed in restraint of trade. Some seven years ago a Bill of this kind was passed in this House, but which became a nullity because of an amendment made to it in the Senate by adding the word "unduly," and it has remained a nullity ever since upon the statute-book. It is proposed that that Bill should be amended so as to make it effective, and I want to see in what direction. I remember well, when that Bill was proposed some years ago, the interest that was taken in it by almost every member of the House, being one of the most important Bills that had come before us for many years, affecting the mercantile community, and the commercial interests of the community all through Canada. That Bill is going to be slaughtered, if this day is given up, along with others. I think the hon. member who has introduced that Bill, the hon. member for East Grey, should at least rise up in protest against this motion, and argue in favour of the proposition which the leader of the Opposition made to the Government. Now, I won't weary the House by going through these Bills. I have shown that there are a large number of important Bills which can only come up either on Wednes-

day night, under our rules, or on Thursday, the day specially set apart for their consideration by the rules of the House. The hon. gentleman seeks to take that away, and it simply means that not one of these Bills can be considered during this session of Parliament. While hon. gentlemen are taking a course which avowedly will prevent the discussion of any public Bills proposed by members on either side of the House, they tell us that this is an ordinary session, called together for ordinary purposes. Mr. Speaker, it is perfectly plain to my mind that if this is an ordinary session called for ordinary purposes, it is unfair and unjust to pass any resolution the effect of which will be to throttle public Bills and orders proposed by private members. If it is not an ordinary session, if it is, as the leader of the House has said, an extraordinary session, called for a particular purpose, the passage of the Remedial Bill, then the Opposition simply ask that the Bill be brought down, that we may see its terms; and the leader of the Opposition pledges himself that when it is brought before the House for discussion, he will, for one, willingly surrender Thursdays to the Government in order that speedy progress may be made with the Bill. Well, Sir, that being the case, I think, notwithstanding, the dire threats which the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) has made, that the leader of the House will do well to listen to the proposition of the leader of the Opposition, which ought not to engage the attention of the House for another five minutes. The hon. gentleman, of course, has it in his power to prevent progress being made. He may obstinately refuse—a thing which I have never seen done by the leader of the House before, on a motion of this kind—to consider any alternative proposition. I think the alternative proposition is a very reasonable one, and one that should commend itself to members on both sides of the House, and with that view I have spoken in its favour.

Mr. DAVIN. The hon. gentleman has excelled himself this evening. He is the windmill of the Opposition: but the machine has been thoroughly oiled and the breeze that set him going has been a blizzard. The hon. gentleman appeared this evening to support his leader, and the relative position between leader and lieutenant, the admirable balance we have had, is instructive and picturesque. The leader of the House—I mean the leader of the Opposition.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Slightly previous.

Mr. DAVIN. Hon. gentlemen lay flattering unction to their souls from even a slip of that kind. I do not think much consolation can be drawn by hon. gentlemen opposite from the news received from the lower provinces. The election will put in one of

these chairs a man who is a terror to the hon. gentleman. The leader of the Opposition did not appear this evening in as favourable a light as usual. His speech contained its own refutation. If he had made out a strong case I do not know but that I would have, might have, been inclined to stand with him.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. MARTIN. The hon. gentleman voted against his own motion.

Mr. DAVIN. I will come to that, and the hon. gentleman will have mighty little comfort when I come to it. The leader of the Opposition declared in the speech that is fresh in the memory of the House that it would not be unreasonable to make the proposition that the leader of the Government makes if the House had sat continuously from 2nd January. But, he said, it was utterly unreasonable because we had lost two weeks. Therefore, all this contest and all this warmth is about two days, two Thursdays, and to-night's action, to-night's conduct is a disgrace to Parliament, a disgrace to the Opposition.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not understand that the hon. member for Assiniboia has applied that term to any hon. member.

Mr. DAVIN. I am in perfect order. I say the leader of the Opposition did not appear in as favourable a position as he usually does when he was making his arguments to-night. But we come then from the principal actor—I do not know whether I am parliamentary or not, but I aim at being picturesque—and while perhaps what I intend to say might not have been parliamentary, I will make my remarks parliamentary. At a fair in the old country you have an actor and you have the jack pudding, and in criticising the performance you have to pass from the actor to the jack pudding. I have said that the leader of the Opposition did not appear in as favourable an attitude as that in which he usually appears. The hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) appeared in a more discreditable attitude than he is accustomed to appear in this House, and that is saying a great deal.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. DAVIN. There is nothing out of order in that.

Mr. MULOCK. I rise to a point of order. I submit that it is unparliamentary for an hon. gentleman to say that an hon. member of this House appeared in a more discreditable manner.

Mr. SPEAKER. I understood the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) to refer to the hon. member for Queen's attitude as discreditable. That is certainly unparliamentary.

Mr. DAVIN.

Mr. DAVIN. Less creditable.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Withdraw.

Mr. DAVIN. Less creditable. The hon. member for Winnipeg does not seem to be aware of this, that if I adopted—

Mr. MULOCK. Order. There has been a ruling given by you, Mr. Speaker, and I submit that the hon. gentleman cannot continue the debate, but must submit to your ruling and withdraw the expression.

Mr. DAVIN. If I used the word discreditable, I withdraw it. I meant to say, less creditable. We had from the hon. member for Queen's—I do not know whether he occupied half an hour or three-quarters of an hour—a flagrant manifestation of obstructive tactics.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. MARTIN. I rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman has charged the hon. member for Queen's with having been guilty of obstructive tactics—flagrant, obstructive tactics. I submit that that is a reflection on the hon. gentleman, which is not justified by the rules of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the hon. member should withdraw that word.

Mr. DAVIN. Is it the phrase obstructive tactics I have to withdraw?

Mr. SPEAKER. If the reference to the hon. member for Queen's was that he had adopted obstructive tactics, then, I think, the hon. gentleman should withdraw the expression.

Mr. DAVIN. Of course I withdraw it, Mr. Speaker. But I must say that I have heard in the Imperial Parliament—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. DAVIN. There is nothing disorderly in this. I say I have heard in the Imperial Parliament language just as strong used by the leaders of debate in that Parliament. But I will say this, and I hope I will be in order, that the hon. gentleman manifested here to-night conduct wholly inconsistent with the desire that should be in his bosom to facilitate the business of this House. The hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin) said something about my proposing a motion and then not dividing the House on it, and the hon. member for Queen's made a similar reference, and that in face of the fact that not a man of them has had the courage to divide the House, if I remember rightly, this session. The leader of the Opposition last night did not dare to divide the House. The hon. member for Winnipeg has not dared to divide the House. What, I ask, is the difference between the conduct of an hon. member who knows his motion will be voted down and does not wish to put the House to the trouble of dividing, and that of going through the mockery, through the

cowardly mockery we have seen on that side of the House?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. MULOCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order again. I take exception to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) charging this side of the House with having been guilty of "cowardly mockery." I object to that language as unparliamentary.

Mr. SPEAKER. I did not understand that the hon. member (Mr. Davin) has applied the phrase "cowardly mockery" to members of this House.

Mr. FOSTER. He applied it to their tactics.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) can himself explain as to whether he desires to attribute it to members of the House.

Mr. DAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I will explain. Now, I have a vice-chancellor of a university and a mathematician opposite me, and I have some learned gentlemen opposite, and some who are not learned, and I shall ask their attention while I point out how impossible it is that that phrase could apply to any gentleman on that side. I said that they went through a "cowardly mockery."

Some hon. MEMBERS. Who are they?

Mr. DAVIN. I did not say they were guilty of "cowardly mockery." I spoke of a thing. I spoke of their action as "cowardly mockery." Mr. Speaker, you will at once see the distinction. Now, Sir—

Mr. LAURIER. We wish to know if the Speaker has seen the distinction before the hon. member proceeds.

Mr. DAVIN. Oh, well, I think my hon. friend (Mr. Laurier) sees it, because I know he has a metaphysical mind.

Mr. LAURIER. Yes, but you addressed yourself to the Speaker, and we want the ruling of the Speaker.

Mr. DAVIN. Well, while the Speaker is resolving that intricate problem I shall go on—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. I hope the House will aid me in endeavouring to maintain order. I read in "Denison's Decisions" the following:—

The word "cowardly" is not to be used.

It was applied in that instance in this way:

Major Dickson characterized the attack made upon that gentleman (Mr. Churchward) as "wanton and cowardly."

Mr. OSBORNE rose to order.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. and gallant member will, no doubt, withdraw that word.

I hope the hon. member (Mr. Davin) will withdraw that expression.

Mr. DAVIN. I will withdraw it, Mr. Speaker. Now, Sir, to pass from cowardice to courage. The hon. gentlemen opposite have been, not facilitating business here this evening, and I think they have had another motive—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Take care.

Mr. DAVIN. I think they have had another motive.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. DAVIN. Well, if you are not rational creatures to whom one can attribute a motive, I do not know how to deal with you. I will have to deal with you as the herd of Circe, instead of as members of Parliament, if you cannot have a motive applied to you. Mr. Speaker, I am not going to transgress the rules of this House as my hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Davies) did, and I will not refer to past debates; but I will say this, that a deep impression was made upon this House by the financial statement of the Finance Minister, and we had expected to-day that the continuation of the refutation of that speech would be given us. But the fact is, that so badly did the ex-Finance Minister (Sir Richard Cartwright) get on the other evening, that he was afraid to proceed to-night, and his friends have thrown a buffer between him and his subject, in consequence of the failure of which I spoke.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). Hear, hear: that is the general impression.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. DAVIN. Now, if that is their motive for delaying business, it is a rational one, and I commend the prudence of hon. gentlemen opposite for having given way to it. Now, Mr. Speaker, let me speak more seriously.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Speak to the question.

Mr. DAVIN. I have been speaking to the question.

Mr. LANDERKIN. But you were out of order.

Mr. DAVIN. Once or twice. Mr. Speaker, out of mere kindness to my hon. friend (Mr. Landerkin), I like to keep his aberrations sometimes in countenance. Let me seriously speak of what has taken place here to-night. It is a thing we ought to deprecate in this House, that men of the standing of these hon. gentlemen opposite, should take such a course as they have taken this evening. What will the people throughout the country think of the House?

An hon. MEMBER. Don't bother about that.

Mr. DAVIN. What opinion will the people of the country form of this House, when they find hon. gentlemen opposite starting

on a course that may result in this Parliament failing to pass the Estimates, and thus the country have the expense thrown on it of having two sessions of Parliament within one year? And, Sir, if such a policy should succeed, then the country will know at whose door to lay the blame, and they will know how to regard the conduct of my hon. friend (Mr. Davies); and the people in the lower provinces, in his constituency will know how to regard conduct far more serious, and far more offensive, if I may say so, against what should be the rules of Parliament, and against what should be the standard of the conduct of a man who aspires to so high a position as my hon. friend aspires to.

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) was scarcely successful in his attempt to aim at being picturesque. He sought to be picturesque, and can we fancy what he would be if he had not aimed so high. Had that not been his high ideal of decorum, and of proper parliamentary demeanour, what would his condition have been had he not thought he was in perfect order? If he did not think he was in perfect order, what an exhibition he might have made of himself. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) entertained this House, but he certainly did not add any to the information respecting the subject under discussion. Sir, I have come to regard the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) as a wild-eyed son of destiny, who must be allowed his full swing in this House whether in order or out of order. I shall not follow such a lead, but shall try to bring this debate back to the proper channel. Let me dispose of the professed generous and magnanimous offer, as it is called by the member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper), which the Minister of Finance has made. The motion of the Minister of Finance is that he shall take Thursdays, one of the only three days left to members, and he proposes that if, instead of that motion we will consent to give him all the three days, less one, he will waive the motion. If we will allow the Government to proceed 'de die in diem,' excepting one day, he will then not ask to have the Budget debate proceed for part of that time. That is his proposition. Now, I challenge the Finance Minister or any other member of this House to tell me of a case when during the Budget debate a motion has been made to take away one of the days of private members. The Budget debate, as a rule, continues to a particular stage of the session before it is allowed to go on de die in diem; but when has the motion been made to proceed with the debate de die in diem at a time when the session was but in its infancy? There are important measures before this House in the hands of private members. I am interested in the promotion of one which I do not wish to see shelved. I think it is one of far-reaching importance. I do not

Mr. DAVIN.

wish to argue it now; but there are conditions in this House at present which call for a further application of the principle of the Independence of Parliament Act. The hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) suggested that if we did not allow this motion to pass, we might be charged with preventing the consideration of remedial legislation. How can we be charged with obstructing remedial legislation when it is not before the House? In fact, the Government, up to this moment, I presume, have not the slightest idea whether they will introduce that Bill or not. The country has not any confidence in them. The hon. member for Inverness (Mr. Cameron) points to Cape Breton, as if one swallow made a summer—as if one instance proved a general. I could point out, on the contrary, the conclusion to be drawn from the procession, beginning in Nova Scotia, and going through Antigonish, Verchères, Jacques Cartier, Charlevoix, Montreal Centre, Cardwell, West Huron; and if East Assiniboia had been opened, we would have had that too; and even the fallen majority in Victoria told its tale. All these results prove unmistakably that the country has no confidence in the assertions of this Government in regard to any matter claiming public attention. The Government are evidently seeking to escape the necessity of introducing remedial legislation. They have wobbled on it ever since it was first before the country. For five years they have fenced with the question, professing to be deeply interested in it, and at the same time adopting tactics calculated to prevent their ever being obliged to show their sincerity. Last March they declared their intention of going to the country on the question. Then they wobbled, and called Parliament together to pass the measure. Parliament met to consider it, and in the presence of Parliament they halted and stood still. They went on strike in July last, some of them, on this question. The country doubted their sincerity, and they had to give a written pledge to this House. The House took them at their word, and allowed them to remain in office until the 2nd of January, when they were expected to proceed with the business. The House met on the 2nd of January, and was there ever such an exhibition of wobbling? They actually went out of plumb, and they did not wobble back for a couple of weeks. At last they again took shelter on the Treasury benches, having been for the moment reprieved by their supporters; and from the day they got their reprieve to this moment they have made no progress with their Remedial Bill. They say the House is obstructing the measure which they refuse to advance. They have it locked up in the Council Chamber, and we know nothing about it except what dribbles out through the press from time to time. Who has any confidence in the position of the Government at the present moment? Here is the

House in its second month, with not more than a couple of months more to live, and the Government not ready to tell the House what their position on this matter is; and then, in the face of their own inaction, they say the Opposition is obstructing them. Is it the fault of the Opposition that the Government do not bring this measure forward? What is the initial cause of delay in the progress of this measure? It cannot be charged that it is this House when the measure is not before this House. So that evidently the real object of the Government is to shelve the measure—to exhaust the time of the House in getting the Supply Bill through, and then do as they have done again and again with their measures which remain unfinished till the end of the session—allow it to be killed because of the state of public business. Either that, or they propose to introduce the measure in question at so late a period that it will be incapable of receiving proper criticism. If there ever was a measure, so far as one can judge of its character, that ought to be carefully considered, and to be before the country for the longest possible time before it becomes law, it is the measure we have heard so much about. Members of Parliament are entitled to the benefit of the country's advice; but they cannot have the benefit of that advice on this measure if it is kept locked up in the Council Chamber until the dying days of this Parliament. Every circumstance connected with this matter points either to the bad faith of the Government in seeking to shelve it, or their inability to accomplish the main object for which this session was called. The hon. Minister of Finance says that this House was called together for the discharge of general business. If it was, then I claim that private members have their rights; and private members' days are their right until the Government have put themselves in a proper position to take away from them those days. On the Order paper to-day there does not stand a single Government order, whilst in the hands of private members, as has been pointed out, there are dozens and dozens of important measures. Sir, there have been many vacancies in this House during the past year; what caused them? There are many gentlemen occupying seats here who wish they were not occupying seats—why? The Parliament of Canada has been degraded by the practices that have existed. The Parliament of Canada has been degraded in the minds of the people by taking away members of this House to places of emolument during the term of their office. I conceive that no greater blow could be struck at the independence of Parliament than by allowing the idea to permeate the minds of members of this House that they can, by abnegating their judgment and their responsibility to their constituents and giving a blind support to the Government, es-

tablish a claim to an appointment to some place of emolument. No greater blow could be struck at the independence of Parliament than the practice that produces such results. Sir, is a place in Parliament to be considered but the stepping-stone to office? How many members of this House have already gone to their rewards, and how many more are sitting here seeking for rewards? How long is this practice to continue? Why it is being recognized in the country that the highest aim of men seeking parliamentary position is not to represent their country but to prostitute their positions in order that they may obtain offices of emolument under the Government. I submit that that is a crying evil which strikes at the foundation of representative government. Last year I introduced a measure calculated to deal with this question, and I hoped this session to be able, if not to advance it to a final stage, to make some progress. I did hope that public opinion would have made some impression on hon. gentlemen opposite, and that I would have been able to secure an opportunity, at least, of placing that measure upon the statute-book.

Mr. McDONALD (Assiniboia). Why not get the local legislators of Ontario to adopt such an Act?

Mr. MULOCK. I am not a member of that legislature and I am not here to defend it; but when the evil exists in this House, it is for this House to redress it. I submit that it exists here in an intense form at this moment. Why, I see before me now hon. gentlemen who are office seekers.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. MULOCK. Is that in order, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. SPEAKER. It is not in order.

Mr. MULOCK. Then, I shall take it back.

Mr. FERGUSON. Try and be decent.

Mr. MULOCK. I will try and be decent. I say that the first duty of this House is to see that we do nothing calculated to impair our judgment, warp our minds, or interfere in the slightest degree with our capability to represent public opinion. If there is a practice in force here to-day of offering inducements to hon. members which are calculated to wean them from their loyalty to the people, we cannot too soon address ourselves to the correction of such an abuse. Being of the opinion that the evil exists in an intense form, I submit that if the Government insists on taking Thursdays from us, they will make it impossible or exceedingly difficult to press to a final conclusion a statute upon our books which will do away with this very serious wrong. There are many other important measures upon the Order paper which ought to receive our consideration, and I trust that the Government will not turn a deaf ear to our reason-

able requests. They pretend to be super-sensitive about the rights of minorities in Manitoba. Has the minority in this House no right? Have we no claim to consideration? Surely the Government which is extending its protecting wing to the minority in another section will at least look at home and have some regard for the minority in this House.

Mr. FERGUSON. Are you against the consideration being given to minorities in the country?

Mr. MULOCK. I believe in justice being done. When I see the measure I will give my opinion as to whether it is a proper measure or not; when I see it I will decide after discussion. The hon. Finance Minister says that this has been an extraordinary session. Nobody will controvert that statement. There has never been such a session probably since the Long Parliament of England. I am not aware of a Parliament having ever existed before which practically usurped office. This Parliament has existed five years. It has voted five years' supplies. The legislation of this Parliament extends until the 1st July, 1896. It entered upon its duties the 29th day of April, 1891. It has thus existed the five years assigned to it by the Confederation Act, so far as the voting of supplies is concerned. Technically you may say it can violate the constitution and vote supplies to enable the Government to remain in office fifteen months after Parliament has ceased. Sir, it is an extraordinary spectacle, an amazing spectacle. There was never any such Parliament in the history of Canada, when we had old parliamentarians, who had respect for the law. Sir John Macdonald, for example, and others. Did they ever propose that Parliament could survive the five years and vote supplies, to enable the Government to sit in defiance of the country's wishes and cling to office for fifteen months after they have ceased to enjoy the confidence of the country. It is an extraordinary spectacle following that other extraordinary spectacle which we witnessed four weeks ago, and which was furnished us by seven members of the Cabinet. I am sure that that was a unique event in the history of representative institutions, and I doubt if it will be repeated. And now we have a Government, which everybody knows cannot command a majority in this House to vote remedial legislation. We have a Government which we know will be abandoned by twenty, thirty or forty of its own followers.

Mr. McDONALD (Assiniboia). How do you know?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) We have that Government sheltering themselves behind their desks and refusing to bring down the measure which they called us together specially to discuss. That is another extraordinary spectacle—that of a Government with a

Mr. MULOCK.

majority on other matters and a large defection from its own ranks on this one question.

Mr. McDONALD (Assiniboia). How do you know?

Mr. MULOCK. Will the hon. gentleman himself say he will support it on that question?

Mr. McDONALD (Assiniboia). I will.

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. gentleman will probably change his mind before long. He knows full well that a very large number of hon. gentlemen opposite intend to vote against the measure.

Mr. McDONALD (Assiniboia). How do you know?

Mr. MULOCK. We have heard them stand up in the House and make the assertion.

Mr. McDONALD (Assiniboia). How many?

Mr. MULOCK. I have not kept count, but there is an increasing number I understand, and we will see the total when the vote is counted. At present there is the bald fact before us that a large number of the Government's supporters are abandoning it in this particular matter. Under these circumstances the country will recognize that the Government are shirking their duty in respect of this matter as they have done for the last five years, and are seeking to put the Bill in a position which will enable them and their followers, who refuse to follow them in this transaction, to escape or, to use the vulgar expression, to take to the woods. I would again remind the Finance Minister that if he means to make a bona fide offer, he had better make one that is not so unreasonable. He asks to take Thursdays and he tells us that if we will not consent he will take Thursdays and Wednesdays as well. He tells us that if we will allow the debate on the Budget to go on from day to day, he will not ask to take one of the days. What sort of offer is that? The hon. gentleman says that has been the practice. I would remind him that that practice was only adopted when the Budget began at the commencement of the session, not, as in this case when the Government had, by their methods prevented public business being done for a couple of weeks.

Mr. FOSTER. That is a shifting of the ground.

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. gentleman knows that it was through his own action that the progress of the public business was hindered. He was the chief striker; he was the one who established the picket, and the public business was delayed for two weeks through his conduct. If the public press is to be believed, when the Premier was trying to re-organize his Cabinet, the hon. gentleman stood there in room

16 and harangued the members and prevented the Cabinet being re-formed. Talk about obstruction. The Finance Minister led the strike which prevented the reorganization of the Cabinet. He stood as a picket would stand in a labour strike, preventing men returning to their allegiance, and preventing the progress of business, preventing the Premier doing his duty in the service of the country. Why, Sir, I shall never forget while memory lasts, the appearance of the Premier on the floor of this House immediately after our adjournment, when, in the presence of a hundred members, and standing not three feet from where I stand at this moment, he said: "For twelve months they have been trying to assassinate me." Since the Finance Minister chooses to seek escape, let me read him an opinion from a public journal upon his conduct. This is from the "Evening Star," of Toronto.—

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds). Give us the Bobcaygeon "News."

Mr. MULOCK. I know the hon. gentleman does not like to hear it, but let him have patience.

The shadow of Sir Mackenzie Bowell, the assassinated, will fall upon every caucus and secret council of the party for years. Faith, the sense of security, reliance upon each other are gone for a generation. Tricks and treasons will be suspected where they do not exist, and will exist where they are not suspected. Haunted by the wraith of a strangled leader, the party house will permit no repose to the red-handed. Peaceful sleep will be impossible, and waking ease out of the question. The sighing of the wind will be ominous; the bellying curtain at the open window will suggest a hidden bravo, the word of a man will be held worthless and his oath of small value. Before eating, every dish will be tested for poison with the finger-ring of Machiavelli; before sleeping, every couch will be probed with daggers, as in the palace of Henry VIII. Sir Charles Tupper is not the man to lay the ghost. It cannot be done in his generation, nor by one who was accessory before the fact. What is to be done to rethroner faith and to re-establish confidence? Shall the men who introduce treachery at the hearthstone be made heads of the house or sent into exile? Can they be exalted without treachery becoming the whole habit of the ambitious?

The attempt to assassinate Sir Mackenzie Bowell was made by his own colleagues, by men who accepted office under him, and pledged themselves as hon. members to be true and loyal. These are the men who assassinated Sir Mackenzie Bowell. And the last scene of the tragedy will be enacted in a short time, when, no doubt, he will be deposed from his high office. They may succeed in this conspiracy—

Mr. FOSTER. Order, order.

Mr. MULOCK. What is the point of order?

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman has no right to charge conspiracy.

Mr. MULOCK. Well, Mr. Speaker, it may be a painful subject to the hon. gentleman. But the country has already described his action. The facts are known outside this House, and, however the hon. gentleman's actions are described here, the people understand that but for what he has done we should have been discharging our public business regularly since coming here, and the hon. Minister would, perhaps, have been justified in making the motion. But, as we have been prevented from prosecuting public business by means of their wrong-doing, I protest against that wrong-doing being made the reason for depriving us of our rights. Mr. Speaker, the country will not endorse the coercion the Government is trying to bring to bear upon the House. They may practice or attempt to practice coercion on the minority in this House, and they may fail. But there is a day of retribution coming and we shall have an opportunity of appealing to a tribunal higher than this, to the whole people of Canada. And, when that appeal takes place, I warrant that the Government that has been untrue to themselves, untrue to the country, will be placed where it should be placed—in contemptible oblivion.

Mr. LAVERGNE. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, in rising to address the House, it is a matter of sincere regret to me that, owing to my inability to speak the language of the majority, I am precluded, in an extempore speech, from the advantage of using that language, but I shall avail myself of the privilege of using my own vernacular language. Allow me to state, at the outset, Sir, that I resent the charge of obstruction laid against members on this side of the House, and I venture to say that, on the contrary, the progress of the debate is being every day obstructed by the tactics resorted to by the Government. I do not intend, Sir, to indulge in any lengthy remarks, but I think it may not be out of place to take a retrospective view of the situation and to go as far back as the beginning of the session, the better to understand the cause of the delays experienced in the expediting the business of this House during the session. What was it, I ask, Sir, that prevented us from approaching the great question which was to be introduced this session? Was it not the Government themselves? This is, to a certain extent, an extraordinary session. Parliament has not been summoned for the transaction of ordinary business; it has not been called together to vote supplies in order to enable the Government to mismanage public affairs and remain in office fifteen months after Parliament has ceased. No, Sir; Parliament has been summoned for the purpose of dealing with a great question, which has been in suspense for over five years. Sir, it was truly an extraordinary spectacle we witnessed at the opening of

the session. Hardly had two days elapsed from the opening of Parliament, after the Government had agreed as to their policy, one of the main planks of which was the redress of the grievances of the Catholic minority in Manitoba, when we witnessed the amazing spectacle which was furnished to us by seven members of the Cabinet throwing up their portfolios and abandoning their leader in such a way as I shall refrain from qualifying here, as I do not wish to depart from the rules of parliamentary language and etiquette. The outcome of all this was that, upon the very opening of the House, a whole week of the session was wasted, owing to the adjournment of the House. After the House had resumed its labours, one of the hon. Ministers stood up on the floor of the House and told us in so many plain words that he and six of his colleagues had retired from the Government because the leader of the Government was an incompetent and an imbecile, unfit to be at the head of affairs in this country, and that he would have to give way to another gentleman, better qualified to fill the position. Now, what spectacle did we witness, a few days later? The House adjourned from day to day, at the instance of the Administration, and we were told that Sir Mackenzie Bowell was making superhuman efforts to reconstruct the Cabinet. Then, the bolters or the strikers, as they are called in common parlance, came back to the fold, and their leader read to the House a statement which, from what had transpired, was at variance with the facts. They came down and asked the House to believe that the reason they left, was not because the Premier was too weak a man, too incompetent a leader, but because the vacancy created in the Cabinet by the retirement of Mr. Angers had not been filled. Thus, we have lost two weeks and wasted a precious time which could have been devoted to the transaction of public business. I say, Sir, that after having prevented us from prosecuting public business for a couple of weeks, it ill becomes them to charge us with resorting to obstructive tactics. Obstructionists, indeed! Why, Sir, these hon. gentlemen, from the very beginning of the session, have kept wasting the time of the House and it is through their action that the progress of public business was hindered. We have now before us a Government which, up to the present time, have not dared to bring down their measure for which they called us together, and they propose, at this stage, to take away one of the days of private members, without being able to justify such a demand. Talk of obstruction! We are no obstructionists. Who kept the debate on the Address dragging on for days? Was it not the hon. gentlemen on your right, Sir? Did not the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) detain the House for three

Mr. LAVERGNE.

long hours on that occasion? He spoke at greater length than any other member of the House or of the Government, even those among the latter who resumed their positions in the Cabinet. It cannot, therefore, be charged that the members on this side of the House had resorted to obstructive tactics and hindered thereby the progress of the public business. Now, Mr. Speaker, what do we ask? We simply ask the Government to bring down the measure they have declared themselves ready to introduce this session. As you are aware, Sir, that in 1890, a law was passed by the Manitoba legislature, affecting the rights of the Roman Catholic minority in relation to education. Petitions were sent both to Parliament and to the Government. The Catholic hierarchy called upon the Catholics throughout the length and breadth of the land to sign petitions asking for the redress of the grievances and wrongs perpetrated on the minority of that province. What has become of all those petitions which were largely signed throughout the Catholic parishes? They were thrown into the waste basket. The very same thing occurred in 1894. Numerous petitions asking for the disallowance of the statutes passed by the North-west legislature, and which were very largely signed, met with the same fate. Where have they gone to? To the waste basket. We have kept intimating to the Government to state their policy. We have intimated to them to intervene in favour of the Catholic minority. But the Government decided to refer the matter to the courts. The proceedings in those cases were initiated in the Court of the Queen's Bench in Manitoba, and the matter came on appeal before the Supreme Court, and finally, it was carried up in appeal before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council of England. And recollect, Sir, that all these proceedings were gone through in order to decide a question which was as clear as noonday. The Government kept the matter in litigation for years, merely to find out whether they had the right to intervene. But, strange to say, no sooner had the courts decided that the Government was vested with such power, the latter declined exercising the same. What did the Government do? They appealed to the Supreme Court and submitted questions for the opinion of that tribunal, whether the Government had the power to interfere, within the meaning of section 93 of the British North America Act. It was no use resorting to the courts, to find that out, for everybody knew that there is, in such a case, a corrective jurisdiction, vested in Parliament by the constitution of the country. The hon. leader of the Opposition has over and over again made a statement to the same effect. He stated that the question to be solved was not a question of law, but simply a question of facts; and that as soon as the facts should have been ascertained, then the

powers of interference would be exercised by the Government. It is merely a political question, and not a question of law to be decided by the courts. For years past, we have been ready to deal with that question. For years past, we have been ready to consider and to discuss remedial legislation. But the Government, all this time, had not pluck enough to bring down their Bill. We have always had our misgivings about the good faith of the Government in the matter; we always had our doubts about the sincerity of the pledges made by the Ministers, and such a doubt I have myself given expression to in the columns of the newspaper which I control, in the district where I reside. I say that the time chosen by the Government to introduce such a legislation, in the dying days of a moribund Parliament, is not the proper time, especially when several constituencies have no representatives in the House. Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentlemen say that the Opposition is obstructing them; but, I ask, can the hon. gentlemen expect any favours at our hands? Is the Government of the day reconstructed in such a way as to entitle them to the least favour? Have all the vacancies in this House been filled up? Why is it that several constituencies have no representatives here now? The reason is that the Government are afraid of facing the people of this country. No, Mr. Speaker, we are by no means open to the charge of obstruction, when we claim that the Government have no right to take away one of the days upon which private members can take into consideration and discuss the measures before the House. There are enough Bills on the Orders of the Day to take up all our time. With the exception of the school legislation, there are to be found several Bills far more important than the Government measures. We have been called together to deal with the Manitoba school question, but the Government seem in no hurry to address themselves to the task. We say to the Government: Bring down your Remedial Bill and we are ready to go on with the business of the session. The hon. the Finance Minister has been telling the House: Let us endeavour to expedite the business of the Budget, and make fair progress with the Estimates, so that there may be more time for the House to discuss the remedial legislation. I answer that we do not want the Government to come with a measure of that importance in the dying days of the session. We want all the time necessary for the House to consider and discuss that legislation. We are quite in our right when we say to the Government: You have called us together for a certain specific purpose, and five weeks have elapsed without any progress having been made. You are to blame for such a state of things. Two weeks have been wasted, and wasted merely through your fault. At any rate, very little business has been transacted during the last

two weeks. When we ask the Government to proceed with the legislation which they have called us together to consider, are we blocking the public business? We do not want to make any obstruction; we only ask the Government to bring down the promised legislation. Certain newspapers charge us with being opposed to remedial legislation. Well, Sir, we ask the Government to come down with the measure as soon as possible. It must be ready now, from what I hear; since they have been keeping it in the drawer of their bureau for over a year. The hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) has spoken to-day about the windmills of the Opposition. I do not think the hon. gentleman has said anything calculated to throw much light on the subject; while he has been forced to withdraw every expression he used; he spoke for twenty minutes, and I should like to know whether the question has advanced one jot in consequence? The same remark applies to several of his friends on the other side of the House. The members on your left, Sir, have refrained from indulging, so far, in idle talk, from a desire to promote the public business, and, after all, I do not think we have made any fair progress. Now the Government want favours at our hands. They ask us to go on with the business of the Budget, and help them to get the Supply Bill through. When the Budget debate is through, and the supplies are voted, then Parliament will be prorogued, and where shall the school law stand? Mr. Speaker, we want the Government to carry out their pledges concerning their school law. We are ready, I say it again, to discuss it. Three years ago, as I just said, the leader of the Opposition stated that it was unnecessary to appeal to the Privy Council, that the question was one of fact, and whether Parliament was vested with the powers of interference with a view to redress grievances, whether it was proper for Parliament to intervene, was, he said, merely a political question. The Government declined to entertain the suggestion offered to the effect that a commission be appointed to investigate the case; then let them bring down their law, and we will judge it on its merits, and whether justice is meted out by it to the Manitoba minority. That is the only way we intend to obstruct public business. We are ready to do right, but let them give us a chance, and bring forward their famous law. We may disagree on the action to be taken; but we are in favour of a measure which will remedy the grievances of the Manitoba minority. Therefore, I say, the Government are not warranted in asking us to vote the supplies before they have brought down their measure. A Government who do not command the confidence of one-third of the existing electorate of Canada, who against all parliamentary usages and precedents, called a sixth session, and who are every day devising new schemes to remain in power; who wants us to vote supplies to

enable them to remain in office fifteen months after Parliament has expired,—such a Government warrants us in suspecting their sincerity, and asking whether they are not bent upon playing another of their nasty tricks upon Parliament. Had they been sincere, why should they not have introduced their measure last session, after the Privy Council had given their decision? But the hon. gentlemen, it appears, had taken a wrong step; they had taken the Manitoba government by the throat; and they found out that in order to patch up matters, they must practice conciliation, and approach the province in a friendly spirit. Now, Mr. Speaker, the Government intend keeping us here transacting other business, for three or four weeks, when they will bring down their measure, without allowing us time enough to consider and discuss it. Should there be found in this House some members who decline to accept the law as submitted to the House, they will not fail to scatter broadcast throughout the province of Quebec that, if the law was not passed, it was owing to the Liberals obstructing the measure. Mr. Speaker, such is not my way of thinking, and I challenge the Government to bring down forthwith their measure, and there will no longer be any obstruction; on the contrary, we shall lend them a helping hand to facilitate the business of this House. We have not only to deal with the Supply Bill, but also with the Remedial Bill. That is what we ask, and we are quite willing to help the Government on the lines I have mentioned. But, I say it again, I am under the impression that the Government do not intend to carry out their pledges and that is the reason why they want to go on with the business of the Budget. The Government, who do not want to use their powers of interference in dealing with the Manitoba school question, bring up before the House all sorts of measures in order to escape introducing their remedial law. Let them bring down their measure, and we shall be ready to make all reasonable concessions. It is not my intention to review all the Bills now before the House, in order to show their importance and why it is necessary we should discuss them. But, Sir, I speak from my own experience, when I say that no member of this House can expect to get a Bill through and have it put upon the statute-book, if it be not supported by the Government. I have occupied a seat in this House for nine sessions at least, and I never yet succeeded in getting a Bill through the House, without having the support of the Government. We wish to avail ourselves of our privileges as members of this House. We wish to avail ourselves of the advantages secured to us by the rules of the House, and that is the reason why we want the Government to bring down their legislation on the Manitoba school question. That is all we ask for.

Mr. LAVERGNE.

When the Government decide to bring down their famous Bill respecting the Manitoba school trouble, we will give way and will be ready to make concessions; we will even give up our privileges as members of this House, in order to give the Government all the time they need to take into consideration and discuss the contemplated legislation. But until then, we shall abide by our rights, and I think we are perfectly justified in so doing.

Mr. BRODEUR. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I would surely have taken no part in this debate, had not the hon. leader of the House made some statements in connection with the position of the members on this side of the House with respect to the question now under consideration. The hon. the Minister of Finance stated here that he wished to proceed with the business of the House, but that we wanted to a certain extent to prevent him from doing so, because we did not want the remedial legislation so much promised by the hon. gentlemen opposite, to be brought down. I may say that, for my part, Mr. Speaker, not only am I willing to have a Remedial Bill brought up, but introduced as soon as possible, and not indefinitely postponed, as the Government are trying to do. It is plain they are waiting to bring up their Bill till the dying days of the session, when Parliament will have passed through its term of life. Then, for want of time, it could not be passed, and there would be no settlement of the Manitoba school question. There is one thing plain, the hon. leader of the House does not want any remedial legislation to be brought up before the Estimates are discussed.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. (Translation.) Would my hon. friend allow me to interrupt him in order to ask him a question? As I understand the hon. gentleman, he stated that the hon. the Minister of Finance had declared that he did not wish the Remedial Bill to be brought up before this House until the Estimates had been voted.

Mr. BRODEUR. (Translation.) This is what I understood. I understood the hon. the Minister of Finance to be quite anxious to proceed with the discussion of the Budget before the Remedial Bill was brought up.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. (Translation.) I ask the hon. gentleman if I understood him correctly when he stated before this House that the hon. the Minister of Finance had declared he did not wish to bring up the Remedial Bill until the Estimates had been voted? Did I correctly understand the hon. gentleman.

Mr. BRODEUR. (Translation.) The best proof, Mr. Speaker, that such is the intention of the Government is that by the motion now before the House, one additional day is asked by the Government, so as to compel us to discuss the Estimates before the Re-

medial Bill is brought up. Why should not the Government bring up that Bill immediately? Have they gone so far as to do such an act of cowardice when there is a question of meting out justice to the Manitoba Catholics? Why have not the Government yet brought up this legislation?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I rise to ask the hon. gentleman if I am correct in understanding him to state that the Minister of Finance, the leader of the House, had stated that he did not wish remedial legislation to be brought down and submitted to the House until the Estimates had been voted? I ask the hon. gentleman whether I understood him correctly, and this is a question to which, I think, I am entitled to receive an answer.

Mr. BRODEUR. (Translation.) What I stated was that the Government intended to discuss the Estimates before bringing up the Remedial Bill, whereas we have been specially called together to deal with the Manitoba school question.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. (Translation.) I ask again the hon. gentleman whether I was right when I understood him to say what the hon. leader of this House had never stated, namely, that the latter was anxious not to bring up the Remedial Bill before Parliament until the Estimates had been voted? I say the hon. gentleman has thereby made a statement which is not based on facts.

Mr. BRODEUR. (Translation.) By his motion, the hon. the Minister of Finance wishes to compel the House to discuss the Estimate.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. (Translation.) But he did not state the Bill would not be brought up until the Estimates were voted.

Mr. BRODEUR. (Translation.) The promises of the Ministers we know quite well. They are trying to have us believe that the Government will soon bring up their Bill. Why not bring it up immediately? We know what the ministerial promises are worth. To show the House what these promises are worth, I have only to read the "Minerve," the mouthpiece of the Postmaster General, owned and subsidized by him in the city of Montreal, and to compare the promises made by that paper during the elections in Montreal Centre and Jacques Cartier with the present events. During the elections in Jacques Cartier and Montreal Centre the hon. Postmaster General delivered speeches which his mouthpiece hastened to reproduce and comment. Every one knows that it was stated in "La Minerve" of the 12th December last that the Bill was already framed, and that before a month it would be brought down in the House. We are now on the 4th of February, and the Bill is not yet brought up. More than that: the Government are not even agreed on this legislation, and this is why they wish to force the

discussion of questions that are entirely foreign to it, in order that they may reach the end of the session.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. (Translation.) The hon. gentleman does not answer?

Mr. BRODEUR. (Translation.) And then they will try and prevent the Bill from being carried out.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. (Translation.) But the answer?

Mr. BRODEUR. (Translation.) The answer, here it is: We find it in "La Minerve," the organ of the hon. gentleman which had promised us, during the Jacques Cartier election, that we would have this Bill before the 12th of January. Well, the hon. gentleman has not yet redeemed his promise. If there is any one doing any obstruction in this House, the guilty parties are the members of the Government, and more particularly the hon. Postmaster General. Why, indeed, does he not compel those who deserted the Government and afterwards came back to the fold to bring up this Remedial Bill? But I find in the "Minerve," that well inspired paper, that on the 23rd of December last, in the presence of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, of the hon. Postmaster General, a statement was made by the hon. the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Ouimet) to the effect that the Bill would not only be brought up, but also passed in the month of January, 1896. The month of January is over and the Bill is not yet introduced. We have been called together here for an extraordinary session, in order to pass that Bill. In the month of April last, during the contest in Verchères, the hon. the Minister of Public Works in a burst of enthusiasm, under the promptings of those generous feelings he is sometimes wont to yield, called God to witness that during the session about to open in April last, a remedial law would be brought down. The month of April elapsed, the month of July came on and the solemn pledge was not redeemed; and instead of introducing their legislation, the Government contented themselves with making an official statement to the effect that at a session of the present Parliament to be called together to meet not later than the first Thursday of January, 1896, the Government would be prepared to introduce and press to a conclusion such legislation as would remedy the grievances of the minority. Then, Sir, during the electoral contest in Montreal Centre and in Jacques Cartier, the Catholic and French Canadian Ministers just mentioned, came down and made an appeal to the religious prejudices of the Catholics of the province of Quebec, asking them to vote in favour of their candidate, and assuring them that they would rely upon their word that the Bill was already framed. Now, Mr. Speaker, if the Bill was already framed on the 12th of December last, as stated, why

is it that it was not introduced at the very outset of the session? Is the blame to be laid on the Opposition? Why, the "Minerve" daily states in its columns that if the Bill has not yet been brought down, the leader of the Opposition is to blame for it.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. (Translation.) Where do you find such a statement in that paper?

Mr. BRODEUR. (Translation.) I think the article the hon. gentleman wants me to read is rather lengthy, but, since he wishes so, I am going to read it. It appeared in the issue of "La Minerve" of the 23rd December, 1895, under the heading:

MR. LAURIER CONFESSES HIS IMPOTENCY.

I do not say that I can settle the school question, but I am going to try, at least,"—such was the artless statement made on Saturday last, at St. Laurent, by the Hon. Mr. Laurier, before a large meeting of electors of the county of Jacques Cartier. We attended the meeting, and never before did we see such a disappointed crowd.

In fact, I may say that the parish of St. Laurent proved quite a disappointment to the hon. gentleman. That parish where the hon. gentleman believed he would roll up a majority of five hundred votes, gave him only seventy-five votes.

That statement came down upon the meeting like a shower-bath. Everybody was astounded, dumbfounded. Friends and foes alike looked at each other in mute astonishment, some of them were bewildered. The Liberals were thunderstruck. And, forsooth, there was reason for it. For a full half hour, we listened to that gentleman, gesticulating, charging the Conservative chieftains with having betrayed the national and religious cause through their inaction, their dilatory means, their dread of losing office. By the means of deceitful arguments—and garbled statements he had succeeded in pointing out the course the Government should have taken. Prejudices, said he, must by no means be aroused; the conscientious convictions of the majority had to be respected; caution was necessary in order to find out the rights and wrongs existing on both sides; Protestant opinion had to be gradually brought to make its "mea culpa" and to restore to the minority their constitutional rights. In short, after the judgment of the Imperial Privy Council had been rendered, the remedial order in council should not have been passed on to Manitoba, but a commission appointed to investigate the matter. It is rather late now, he added, to resort to the latter means; it is perhaps too late; such is the reason why I do not tell you that I can settle the question, but, at least, I will try. After which everybody was mum.

The Hon. Mr. Ouimet, who was most emphatic in his utterances, cried out almost in the same breath:

Mr. Laurier has just stated that he did not know whether he could settle the question of the rights of the Catholic minority in Manitoba, but, anyhow, he would try his hand. Well, now, gentlemen, a Protestant, an Orangeman,

Mr. BRODEUR.

the leader of the Government, Sir Mackenzie Bowell has stated that, for his part, should the Manitoba authorities decline to deal with the question, he was ready, in January next, to make a settlement of the question that would prove satisfactory to the minority.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. (Translation.) Is that all what he said?

Mr. BRODEUR. (Translation.) In case the Manitoba authorities did not make a satisfactory settlement of the question, the hon. Minister of Public Works pledged his word that the rights and privileges of the Manitoba minority would be restored, as early as the month of January last. Such was the statement made by a Minister of the Crown, before the electors, while no step has yet been taken in that direction. Two Ministers of the Crown came down to the county of Jacques Cartier and publicly stated that the rights which the Catholic minority had been deprived of, would be restored to them. That the great wrong inflicted upon them was to be redressed by that great enemy of Catholics, Sir Mackenzie Bowell, to quote the words of the Minister. Now, January is over, February is just begun, and yet the promised settlement has not been made, the grievances of the minority have not been redressed, and the Government who had pledged their word to deal with the question at the beginning of January, 1896, declare by their action, in contradiction to their statements made in Jacques Cartier County, that they are not ready to bring down their remedial legislation. The Government have not yet dared to bring forward their oft promised legislation. Why so? The explanation is to be found in the course followed by the men who left the Cabinet, the bolters, as stated by my hon. friend the member for Drummond and Arthabaska (Mr. Lavergne). Now, the bolters likely enough came back to the fold, with the understanding that the Bill, which was stated to have been framed long ago, should be altered and modified before being brought down to the House. Such was probably the price exacted by the bolters for their coming back to the Government. What is the reason why the Bill has not yet been introduced? It is because certain Ministers have insisted upon the Bill being altered: it is because they have insisted upon more important concessions being made than those promised by the Minister of Public Works and the Postmaster General. It is those very concessions that are now being taken into consideration by the Ministers in question, by the very men who gave so many solemn pledges to the country. What a ridiculous position do they not occupy now in the eyes of the country! The remedial order of March, 1895, contained three pledges: (1) a pledge to restore to the Catholic minority the rights they had been deprived of by the law of 1890; (2) a pledge to relieve the minority from contributing to the support of

public schools; (3) a pledge to give them their share of the public grants. Such are the three solemn pledges which the Government were bound to carry out in the Bill which was to be framed on the lines of the Order in Council of March, 1895. Can the hon. the Postmaster General tell us whether the remedial legislation which is about to be brought down, will be carried out on the lines of the Order in Council of March, 1895? Shall the Manitoba Catholics have their rights restored to them? Shall the bishops control education as they did formerly? Shall Catholics have the full control of their schools? No, he cannot tell us that, for he knows quite well that the legislation he is now considering is not consistent with the Order in Council of March, 1895. What do we read to-night in the newspaper "The Mail." We read that the hon. gentlemen opposite decline to give to the House communication of some very important papers. They decline to give to this House the very same papers upon which the Remedial Bill ought to be grounded. They decline to let us know the general provisions of that Bill and the Conservative papers of Ontario are working the public opinion to cause it to accept a legislation that cannot be satisfactory. They intend, Mr. Speaker, to bring up a mutilated Bill. They evidently intend not to restore to the Manitoba Catholics the rights they were deprived of by the legislation of 1890. They decline to redeem the promises made to the voters of Jacques Cartier and Montreal Centre. Under such circumstances, is it not fair to ask the House that the Government should carry out their pledges? Is it not fair to inquire from the Postmaster General where is his Remedial Bill? Is it not fair to tell that Minister and his colleague the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Ouimet): You have promised that a Remedial Bill would be passed in January, why do you not redeem your pledge I say once more, Mr. Speaker: Under such circumstances is it not fair to claim now from the Government the carrying out of their promises, to require from them that they bring up forthwith their Remedial Bill? Instead of carrying out their promises, the leader of the House is manoeuvring to have the House proceed with the discussion of the Estimates without their bringing down this famous remedial measure. They evidently intend to wait till the latter part of the session—for the discussion of the Estimates may be quite lengthy—it may possibly last three weeks at least—and after that protracted debate, we will have reached the month of March without having had any legislation on the Manitoba school question. Possibly, they will then go into some other matters of debate. They may likely consider the question of preferential trade between Great Britain and her colonies, the fast steamship line, the laying of a submarine Pacific cable, all matters which

largely concern the electoral funds of the Conservative party for the next election and which have surely nothing to do with the Catholic schools of Manitoba. They would also have the House to discuss other matters and the Remedial Bill will be left standing, if ever they dare to bring it up. I therefore say that under these circumstances, we are entitled to ask that this Bill be immediately introduced. We do not wish it to be said by the Government on the 25th April next, when this Parliament will cease to exist, that we have not been able to pass that Bill, that we had not time enough to pass it on account of the Opposition making obstruction. On these several grounds, I will heartily support the motion of the hon. leader of the Opposition. We have been sitting here over a month. We allowed the Government to take several days that were intended for private Bills, in order to expedite the debate on the Address in answer to the Speech from the Throne. I think the members of this House have actually had but one Thursday at their disposal for the introduction of private Bills. Many important Bills are on the Orders of the Day requiring our consideration. Here is one, for instance, that has for its object to enable employees to vote on polling day. Before long, voters will be called upon to give their votes, it is therefore urgent to give employees every possible chance in this respect. This Bill of the hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Rider) is worthy of every consideration on our part. Are the Government afraid that the workingmen should not vote for them? Do they believe it to be advantageous to restrict the votes of the working classes? If one takes as a test the late election in Montreal Centre, they may as well oppose so fair a Bill as that of the member for Stanstead. The Government wish, therefore, to oppose the introduction of this Bill which is so very important for the workingmen. I also find on the Orders of the Day many other Bills which are required by the people of this country. If there is any obstruction in this House, Mr. Speaker, it comes from the Government. I therefore say before closing my remarks, that it is only justice to oppose the motion of the hon. the Minister of Finance, and I hope that after conferring with his friends, he will consent to withdraw it.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. (Translation.) The question now before the House is of such paramount importance, affecting as it does to a high degree, our rights as members of this House, that I deem it my duty to offer a few remarks. In the eyes of the members who have not a thorough insight into the schemes and devices of the Government and their friends, the motion moved by the leader of the House may, at first sight, appear quite innocuous; but, in the eyes of those among us who are somewhat familiar with the proceedings the Cabinet is wont to resort to in dealing with the public

business of the country, it is quite obvious, as before stated by the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Brodeur), and the hon. member for Drummond and Arthabaska (Mr. Lavergne), that in trying to take away an extra day from us, the Government aim at duly expediting the business of the Budget, and getting the Supply Bill through as quick as possible, and later on proroguing the House, for no other purpose than depriving us of the advantage of thoroughly debating the Remedial Bill, supposing it happens that they introduce it; or else, should it happen that they do not bring it down, to enable them to tell the country they lacked the necessary time to do so, in which case, they might have enough brass to charge the Opposition with having obstructed the measure. Therefore, I deem it of the utmost importance, in the interest of all the members of this House who are anxious to have the debate honestly and fairly conducted, that the contemplated measure be introduced without delay, and before the Budget debate is closed and the supplies voted. If, after five weeks, so little business has been transacted, the hon. gentleman cannot possibly throw on us the blame of the delay. Whose fault is it, I ask, if the Government measures, if the Budget has not yet been discussed? Was not that state of things brought about by the odious course pursued by at least one-half of the State Ministers? Is the Opposition to blame if the Premier had to use every exertion during a whole week to bring back to the Government kitchen the stray cats that had deserted it on the 3rd January last? Is the Opposition to be found fault with if the Prime Minister and one of his colleagues had to hire the services of detectives and experts from the United States, to find out which of their colleagues had written anonymous letters to the Governor General, accusing one of them. Does the Opposition deserve blame if the members of the Conservative party, and even of the Cabinet, have wrangled and disputed for a whole week as to whether it was right and proper for them to swap horses previous to crossing the stream and being swallowed up by the wave of popular indignation, at the next general elections? Is the Opposition to bear all the blame of the Government not having yet brought down the bill for the taking into consideration of which we have been called together here? The Government have stated no reason why it is justified in coming here and asking us to give them the only day upon which we can take into consideration the measures promoted by private members, and as everybody knows, the measures on the Orders of the Day are important ones and fully deserving of our attentive consideration. Parliament has been called for a certain definite purpose. And if we go back, one moment, to what occurred last session, when the ministerial crisis was on hand, and three

Mr. CHOQUETTE.

Ministers of the Government had to throw up their portfolios, because they could get no positive pledges from their colleagues as to the Manitoba school question and the redress of the grievances of their co-religionists, it will be seen that on the eighth of July last, the hon. leader of the House stated here that at a session of Parliament to be called together to meet not later than January, if by that time the Manitoba government had failed to make a satisfactory arrangement to remedy the grievance of the minority, such remedial legislation would be introduced as would afford an adequate measure of relief to the said minority. At the outset of the present session, the Government pledged themselves to the same effect, as shown by the following extract from the Address in answer to the Speech from the Throne:

We thank Your Excellency for the intimation that immediately after the prorogation of Parliament Your Excellency's Government communicated through the Lieutenant-Governor of Manitoba with the government of that province, in order to ascertain upon what lines the local authorities of Manitoba would be prepared to promote amendments of the Acts respecting education in schools in that province, and whether any arrangement was possible with the Manitoba government which would render action by the federal parliament in this connection necessary. We receive with a deep sense of its importance Your Excellency's statement that you regret to say that the advisers of the Lieutenant-Governor have declined to entertain favourably these suggestions, thereby rendering it necessary for Your Excellency's Government, in pursuance of its declared policy, to introduce legislation in regard to this subject. We also thank Your Excellency for the information that the papers will be laid before us.

We are happy to be informed by Your Excellency that the representations of Your Government and the suggestions of the Ottawa conference respecting steamship communication have resulted in an announcement by the Imperial authorities of their willingness to grant a substantial subvention towards the Atlantic portion of the scheme.

Now, if, on the 8th of July last, the Government could state that a measure would be introduced in connection with the Manitoba school question; if, again, on the 2nd of January, they pledged themselves again by the words placed in His Excellency's mouth, then I say that measure ought now to be already framed and introduced. In fact, I think, the Bill was already framed and had been endorsed by the bishops and of the religious authorities who have a special right to be consulted on the matter; but it was later on referred to the bishops for their approbation by a venerable missionary. I contend the Government should bring down their Bill now, without delay. If they failed so far to do so, the reason is that certain members of the Government opposed it, under the pretense they had not considered it previous to its being submitted to the hierarchy. That is the reason why the

measure was indefinitely shelved and why we are still kept waiting for it.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. (Translation.) We are waiting for the commission.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. (Translation.) I am satisfied there are many people, including the hon. the Postmaster General, who are anxious to have that commission appointed. A great many people who hastily perhaps passed judgment on the commission would be ready now to accept it, or a committee of the House who would report without delay and within such a period, at any rate, as would enable the Government to introduce their measure at the earliest practical moment. The hon. Postmaster General himself, if he would unbosom himself to the House, could tell us that he is ready to accept such a commission as would investigate all the facts of the case. I would be quite willing to support the Government should they adopt my suggestion; and I am also ready to vote in favour of a Bill that would give back to the minority the privileges they are entitled to and which the Government pledged themselves to restore to them by the Order in Council of March, 1895. As often stated by the hon. the leader of the Opposition, we do not want to make political capital out of the school question. Let the hon. Postmaster General and the Government make a statement here to-night, that from now till next Thursday, they will bring down their measure, and I will vote in favour of the motion against my own party. Let the Government appoint a commission to investigate the facts and report without further delay during this session, with a view to satisfying the Protestants that the Manitoba public schools are really Protestant in character, and that the grievances complained of by the Catholics are well founded, and I am ready to support the hon. gentleman and vote in favour of such a Bill as will remove the grievances and remedy such a deplorable state of things. Would the hon. Postmaster General tell us when such a Bill will be brought down and what are its main provisions? Should the hon. gentleman vouchsafe an answer to my question, I am ready to vote in favour of the motion moved by the leader of the House. The hon. Postmaster General seems to be amused at my question: the agreeable smile he usually wears, lights up again his countenance to-night, but while these hon. gentlemen are exchanging smiles, whenever tired of making grimaces, lo! our poor co-religionists out in Manitoba are in dire distress and their grievances are unredressed! I will go still further, Sir. It is within our recollection that, during last session, a certain number of Conservative members came near bolting out. They only consented to come back to the fold after a pledge had been given them to the effect that a Remedial Bill would be introduced at the beginning of the present session. Has any of these gentlemen, I

wonder, risen in their seats to condemn the Government for delaying so long to introduce their Bill? There are among them some editors of renown, such as my hon. friend from Gaspé (Mr. Joncas), who stated, not very long ago, in his paper, that not only was the Bill such as would afford full satisfaction to the minority in Manitoba, but that after having been taken into consideration by the Cabinet, and printed, it had been found acceptable to the hierarchy. But when the crisis broke out, it leaked out that the bolters who had smashed the Cabinet, were dead against the Bill, as they thought it was too strong in meting out justice to the Catholic minority; and that is the reason they sent in their resignations, as they declined to shoulder the responsibility of the Bill. Now, Mr. Speaker, we have now a proof of the amount of good faith of these hon. gentlemen. If, as stated, the law is ready cut and dried at their hands, why has it not yet been introduced; and we all know that the hon. Prime Minister has stated that he would bring it down, even at the risk of being defeated in the House. Did not the hon. Controller of Customs (Mr. Clarke Wallace) state that his speech of the 12th of July last, had not been disapproved of by the Premier?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. (Translation.) My hon. friend does not pretend, I think, to make statements at variance with the facts. I tell my hon. friend that his statement is absolutely groundless.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. (Translation.) The hon. Postmaster General says that my statement is groundless, but he does not know the facts. Can he deny that on behalf of the Prime Minister?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. (Translation.) Yes; I deny it on behalf of the Premier.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. (Translation.) Well, the "Moniteur de Lévis," the organ of Senator Landry and of an important section of the Conservative party, is my authority for the statement that the Controller of Customs had declared in Toronto he had submitted to the Premier his speech of the 12th July, in which he criticized the Remedial Bill, and he made bold to say that the Bill would never be introduced. The "Moniteur de Lévis" said at the time that such a statement, coming from the Controller of Customs, called forth a written denial from the Prime Minister. Now, this article has been brought to the notice of the hon. Premier and the hon. Postmaster General two months ago. I now put the question to the hon. gentleman: How is it that when such a statement has been made by a paper, the editor of which is a particular friend of his, he got appointed to the Senate, he comes out so late with a denial to-day, on behalf of his leader, the Prime Minister? I shall hold the statement as true, so long as it is not denied by the hon. Premier himself. I am quite willing,

however, to accept the Postmaster General's denial for all it is worth.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. (Translation.) The statement was denied by the ex-Controller of Customs as well as by the Prime Minister.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. (Translation.) May I ask the Postmaster General to state the place and the very words, or the paper containing the Premier's denial?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. (Translation.) The Prime Minister denied it in the Senate. The ex-Controller of Customs denied it here, in the House; and you need but refer to the "Hansard," where his statement is on record.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. (Translation.) Can the hon. gentleman give me the exact date?

Mr. BELLEY. (Translation.) The hon. gentleman is going a little too far.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. (Translation.) The statement is important enough for us to inquire as to its exact date.

Mr. BELLEY. (Translation.) The "onus probandi" lies upon the hon. gentleman who made the statement.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. (Translation.) The hon. Postmaster General will allow me to tell him he alters his mind quite frequently on that question. As to the hon. member for Chicoutimi, it is still within our recollection how, last summer, he roundly abused the Government, and asked the Liberal party to support him.

Mr. BELLEY. (Translation.) You may take my word for it, I shall never join hands with the Liberals.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. (Translation.) Now, Mr. Speaker, it is very strange that the Government should stick to the motion before the House. They may take it for granted that we will not yield one inch of ground; and I, for one, have made up my mind not to vote one single item of the Supply Bill, not to let pass one single Government measure, until the Remedial Bill has been brought down. I do not know what decision my hon. friends on this side of the House have come to on the matter, but my constituents would certainly resent my voting the supplies asked by the Government before they gave us a substantial proof of their good faith and fair dealing in connection with the pledges given to the House and reiterated in the Speech from the Throne with regard to the Manitoba school question, and the redress of the grievances of the minority. The Conservative papers, subsidized by the Government, and, among others, a certain paper well known to the Postmaster General, in which an Orange Senator holds large interests, the "Minerve," edited in the city of Montreal, had the following statement in its issue of the 12th December last, to wit: that

Mr. CHOQUETTE.

the Remedial Bill would be introduced in January, through the great energy displayed by the hon. Postmaster General and the hon. Minister of Public Works. Not only did the "Minerve" state that the law would be introduced; it further added that it would be voted. It is quite transparent to what an extent the organ in question fooled its readers. I must tell the Government that we are not ready to yield and that, should we be forced to have recourse, not to obstruction tactics, but to speaking as long as required to obtain from the Government the introduction of the promised measure, before giving them the necessary money to carry on the public affairs, we will do it. We are often charged with not being very earnest. On the hustings and in the salaried press of the Government, our opponents contend that we are not favourable to the rights of the Catholic minority in Manitoba being restored to them, that we are only asking for a commission or suggesting a committee of inquiry of the House because we wish the question to be put off till after the elections, so as not to be compelled to deal with it should the Liberal party come into power after the next electoral contest. We wish to prove our sincerity and the want of sincerity of the Government. It is a very simple thing, after all. We say to the Government: Bring up your Bill if you have any which might be efficient, we will have faith in your sincerity and we will support it. But the hon. gentlemen opposite do not intend to introduce a really efficient Bill and one which would do justice to the minority in Manitoba. It is impossible that men who despise and detest each other could agree upon a measure that could be acceptable to the Catholic minority in Manitoba and even to the right-thinking Protestants of the country. Before voting the Estimates, we tell the Ministers: If you are willing to fulfil your promises and grant a legislation that will be approved by the competent authorities, then bring it before the House and your Estimates will be voted. We will then allow you the necessary money to carry on the public affairs. We want to have the Bill, not only to consider it, but also to submit to the clergy and bishops, as well as to the representatives of the Catholic minority in Manitoba. The hon. Postmaster General and the hon. Minister of Public Works have not all to themselves the right to confer with these authorities. We are as good Catholics as they are and as is the hon. member for Chicoutimi (Mr. Belley), who is getting just now much excited. We want a complete and efficient Bill, no matter whether it be the work of the Cabinet, a commission or a committee of this House. We are willing to vote for a Remedial Bill grounded on the Order in Council of the 21st March last, if it gives full and complete satisfaction to the Manitoba Catholics. I make that statement on behalf of the voters of my county, but I do

not want a law that could not be carried out and would only be used to throw dust into the eyes of the clergy and the bishops. Such a Bill would not meet the approval of my electors. We say to the Government: Why not introduce such a law now? Why not fulfil your promises, now that the time has come to do it? You have deceived the electorate. You have deceived the country and this House by these promises which you are now unwilling to fulfil, and you would still like to try and continue these same tactics. We wish to know wherein we stand before voting the Estimates, before giving the hon. gentlemen opposite the money required to dissolve Parliament and go on with the elections without giving justice to whom justice is due. We are not going to be fooled in this way. We are not going to give them any money, and even though we might have to talk it over till the 25th April next, at midnight, we will do it in order to prevent you from getting the Estimates before having made known your legislation with respect to the Manitoba schools. Now, Mr. Speaker, reference was made, a moment ago, to a victory in Cape Breton, but it was not such a signal victory as the Conservative party had hoped for. We all know that the hon. gentlemen opposite were claiming at the start a majority of at least 2,000, and when the future Prime Minister was made aware that the Liberal party intended to test the strength of the Government, that majority went down to 1,500 and then to 1,000. The hon. gentlemen are now satisfied with 700. After all, the Government have only kept their ground, after expending large sums of money and hypocritically promising once more to the bishops that a Remedial Bill would be introduced, immediately after the election. Such a victory is rather one for us, for, in the first place, we have held our own, and then we will avail ourselves of it to denounce the Government in stronger words than ever, if they do not introduce the promised legislation. But the hon. gentlemen are easily consoled. After the wounds received by them in Jacques Cartier, Montreal Centre, Cardwell and Charlevoix, they have found out a little plaster to apply in their victory in Cape Breton, and they are satisfied. The votes given in these by-elections enable us to speak in the strain we are speaking to-night. Let them be happy, for these electors have shown that they have no more faith than we have ourselves in the fulfilment of the promises of the Government. The Conservative papers will no doubt make the best against us of the fact that we are unwilling to grant the request made to-night by the Government. They will say to-morrow that the Liberals wish to delay the introduction of the Remedial Bill. But the obstruction we are making—if it can be called such—shows the contrary, and proves that we are sum-

moning the Government to introduce as soon as possible their Remedial Bill, in order that we may have time to consider it and the opportunity of discussing it with people outside of this House who are ignorant of the question. We have the greatest interest in doing this.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. (Translation.) And the commission?

Mr. CHOQUETTE. (Translation.) The commission is the best mode for the efficient settlement of this momentous question. We know that competent religious authorities, such as the late Bishop Langevin and His Eminence Cardinal Taschereau, have stated that any Catholic may take the means which are dictated to him by his conscience in order to efficiently settle a religious question. We contend that, for every good Catholic, who has earnestly at heart that the Manitoba schools be efficiently restored to the Catholics, there is no other practical mode than a commission or an arbitration between interested parties. On the other hand, we state that should the Government bring up a Bill likely to receive the sanction and approval of the interested parties, and including all the conditions that a committee of this House or a commission could insert into it, and should this Bill be put forthwith before this House so that we might thoroughly discuss it, we are willing to give a loyal support to the Government—for my part, I am—and help them to have it passed. But we are not willing to give up the right to say, in our conscience, what means we deem the best to settle this great question. It is not because the Conservative papers will ridicule such a commission, which the Postmaster General would be anxious now to accept, that we should acknowledge that we are wrong—

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. (Translation.) No, no.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. (Translation.) And I might add that a distinguished bishop would be anxious now to accept it as the only efficient mode. I do not intend, Mr. Speaker, to further protract this debate. I think the position we are taking is quite justifiable. Our only purpose, at the present moment, is to compel the Government to introduce this so long promised Bill, so that we might discuss it and have it passed before the end of the present Parliament.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The statement that was made by the leader of the Opposition at the commencement of the debate should have been sufficient to let the Finance Minister see that the position he took, perhaps somewhat hastily, was not tenable in its nature. The Finance Minister stated that the House had been in session for over a month, and that it was not an unusual thing that at the end of a month the Government should ask to take one of the days devoted to private members. It was clearly

pointed out to him that the House had not been in session for actual work for anything like that length of time. I have been in the House for 24 years, and according to my remembrance I have never known a motion like this put upon the paper when the gentleman who was leading the House intended that it should go into effect for the first time on the week in which he put it on the paper. I think I am correct in saying that in every case it has been put on as a sort of warning, and that on the week after the one in which it was put on, the Government would take possession of the day for Government business. But the Minister of Finance has departed from that rule. He put a notice on the paper, and, listening to no protest, he has taken the ground that he is determined to take, beginning this week, one of the days of private members. We have been discussing the question and there has been no reply made, no reply can be made to the position we have taken. The argument of the Opposition has been simply unanswerable. An hon. gentleman opposite ventured to ask what the country would say in reference to this matter. Well, I do not know what that hon. gentleman's constituents may say in reference to his action in the matter, a gentleman who himself has a Bill among the public Bills and orders, which, if the Minister's motion prevails, will be slaughtered, a gentleman who has notices on the paper that he considers very important, and which, if the Minister's motion prevails, he probably will never reach; I do not know what that hon. gentleman's constituents may say with reference to his conduct in this matter, but I think the people of this country will say that the Opposition, in taking the stand they have taken to-night, maintaining the rights of the people and the rights of the people's representatives in Parliament, are doing their duty, and only their duty. Sir, the hon. gentleman should not have brought this debate upon the House. It brings to our remembrance what have been the causes of the delay in legislation during this session. If the Opposition was in any way to blame for the public business not being further advanced, then there might be some force in the objections raised by them now. But the country knows more upon that subject than it does upon many others, because the Conservative as well as the Liberal press have given to them an accurate idea of what it was that blocked the passage of legislation in this chamber. They have learned through the instrumentality of their own organs that it has not been due to the Opposition, but it has been due in a large part, primarily, I may say, to the hon. gentleman himself who this night attempts to force through a measure calculated to abridge the rights and the privileges of the private members of this House. Sir, it was not the Opposition who summoned Parliament on 2nd January, and

who immediately adjourned it for about a week; it was not they who, when Parliament met again, went on strike, and destroyed the efficiency of the ministry, and who prevented the reorganization of that ministry by sending out pickets to prevent other men joining it. That cannot be laid at the door of the Opposition, and the country understands it. And the country knows that those gentlemen, after having delayed business in that way, having taken the stand they did, reprobated by every public man, every man that desires the welfare of the country—those gentlemen now come before this House, and undertake to deprive the private members of the rights and privileges that are theirs to bring forward measures that are in the public interest. Sir, I said there was one gentleman on the opposite side who had been willing to efface himself, if I might so speak, a gentleman with motions on the paper, that, I suppose, he considers important, that have to do with the well being of the North-west Territories which he believes to be labouring under grievances, a gentleman who has a public Bill that would come up on this day that the Government mean to take—I say there has been one gentleman found on the Government side of the House who has so far effaced himself as to be willing to speak in favour of a proposition that will take away his rights as a private member of this House. But, Sir, to the credit of the other members, none of them have ventured to take such a humiliating position as that. Possibly they may do it by their votes, but I scarcely think they are prepared to do that. At any rate, as an independent member of the House, although I have not a public Bill upon the notice paper, I recognize the necessity of considering many of those Bills that have been placed there by other gentlemen. I recognize their right to introduce these Bills to the House, I recognize the fact that when they placed these Bills there, they expected to get ordinary parliamentary usage, and that they would have an opportunity to reach them. The Government have allowed these members to put those notices upon the paper, and by carrying this motion, they would preclude them from bringing those notices before the House. Being on the Order paper they cannot be moved in amendment to going into Supply, there is no other time, there is no other occasion, on which they can be brought up. The Government are taking Thursday, and yet a gentleman has ventured to ask, what will the country think of the Opposition? Sir, I will tell him what they will think. They will think the Opposition are the only representatives in Parliament, unless gentlemen on the other side come to their assistance, who stand up for the rights of the people, and the rights of the people's representatives. That is what they will think, and they can come to no other conclusion. Why, Sir, out

of the nineteen Bills that stand upon the Notice paper, to be dealt with, no less than eleven are proposed by hon. gentlemen on the other side, and yet the Government expects that they will get the eleven gentlemen who have introduced those Bills, in their party allegiance, to efface their own rights, and vote in favour of a proposition that takes away the only opportunity they have to bring these important questions up for discussion before the House. Well, if they choose to take that position, they are at liberty to do so. Some have taken it by speech; others will be called upon, perhaps, to take it by voting. But so far as the Opposition are concerned, I think they are standing on their rights, they are standing for the defence of the rights and privileges of the people, and the people's representatives in Parliament. They are protesting against the passage of a measure that, so far as I can remember—I speak subject to correction—in my nearly twenty-four years' experience in this House, I have never seen brought forward and pushed through at this early stage of the session, a motion to take away one of the days belonging to private members. As I said before, I believe in every case where a notice of this kind has been put upon the paper, it has not been seriously intended to apply to the day that is mentioned in the week on which it is found upon the paper, but it is put there as a sort of warning that the Government were in earnest, and that in the week after, it would be prepared to move in that direction. Yet the leader of the Opposition has gone back over the record and has shown that for many years back no such motion has been introduced at such an early period of the session. What makes it more difficult to understand, and what makes this action utterly indefensible on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite is the further fact that when a motion of this character has been moved in previous sessions, it has been when the order paper was crowded with Government orders. But at the present time there is nothing except the ordinary orders, that the House resolve itself into Committee of Supply and also into Committee of Ways and Means. The Bill which this Parliament was especially summoned to consider, and which, as a speaker has told us, was declared by the Minister of Public Works and by the Postmaster General as a measure that would become law early in January, is not to-day before Parliament. Yet, with no Government Bills on the paper, the Finance Minister who was the prime cause of blocking business for days, if not weeks, pleads urgency and seeks to take away members' privileges. And this is done without arguments being presented by hon. gentlemen opposite. So this night has been spent in discussing this question by Liberal members, who have sought to point out how this would be an interference with the rights and privileges of members. In doing so they

have taken a perfectly incontrovertible position, and yet the Finance Minister still adheres to the motion he has proposed. I feel that members of the Opposition in taking the ground they have taken on this question have been simply discharging a duty incumbent upon them, and I feel confident that they have been advancing public interests, and that they will be prepared to go before the people and defend their conduct against the attempt made by the Minister of Finance to take away from them their rights and privileges.

Mr. FOSTER. We have had to-night a very interesting debate, and after having had a little conversation with my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, I now propose, with the consent of the House, to change the motion to read as follows:

That Government orders have precedence on Thursdays after questions during the debate on the motion to go into Committee of Supply.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. FOSTER moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and the House adjourned at 11.50 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 5th February, 1896.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 52) to incorporate the Hudson's Bay Canal and Navigation Company.—(Mr. Amyot.)

Bill (No. 53) respecting the Pontiac Pacific Junction Railway Company.—(Sir James Grant.)

Bill (No. 54) respecting the Edmonton District Railway and Improvement Company.—(Mr. Davis, Alberta.)

CHINESE IMMIGRATION.

Mr. McSHANE asked:

1. The total number of Chinese who have come to our cities and towns during the last twelve months?
2. The total number landed at Vancouver and elsewhere during past twelve months?
3. How many paid the duty?
4. How many were shipped east in bond?
5. What became of them?
6. By what means are the bonds cancelled?

Mr. IVES. 1. 1,702, exclusive of those passing in transit through Canada. 2. Vancouver, 2,552; Victoria, 813; Montreal, 28; Winnipeg, 3; Halifax, 5; St. John's, Que., 3. Total 3,404, including those passing through in bond. 3. 1,664. 4. 1,472. 5. They either went out of Canada or paid duty at eastern ports, or are still under bond pending investigation by United States authorities as to the validity of their papers. 6. The so-called bond or manifest, is cancelled upon certificate of the customs officer at the port upon which manifested that they have been forwarded out of the country under customs supervision, or have paid the duty in order to remain in Canada.

IMPORTATION OF SUGAR.

Mr. DAWSON asked :

1. Total number pounds of sugar, above No. 16 D.S. in colour, entered for home consumption, from 1st January to 3rd May, 1895, and the duty paid thereon ?

2. Total number pounds of sugar, not above No. 16 D.S., entered for home consumption during same period, and the duty (if any) paid thereon ?

3. Total number pounds of sugar, above No. 16 D.S., entered for home consumption from 3rd May to, and inclusive of, 30th June last, and the duty paid thereon ?

4. Total number pounds of sugar, not above No. 16 D.S., entered for home consumption during same period, and the duty paid thereon ?

5. Total number pounds of sugar, above No. 16 D.S., entered for home consumption during the six months ending 31st December last, and the duty paid thereon ?

6. Total number pounds of sugar, not above No. 16 D.S., entered for home consumption during the same period, and the duty paid thereon ?

Mr. WOOD. The answers are as follows, except in regard to queries No. 5 and 6, in which the total given are exclusive of the business of the port of Quebec and the port of Peterborough, returns for which have not yet been received for the quarter ending 31st December, 1895 :—1. The total quantity of sugar above No. 16 D.S. in colour, entered for home consumption, from 1st January to 3rd May, 1895, was 4,822,967 pounds, and the duty paid thereon was \$30,866.99. 2. The total quantity of sugar not above No. 16 D.S. entered for home consumption during the above period, was 153,877,328 pounds, on which there was no duty collected. 3. The total quantity of sugar above No. 16 D.S. entered for home consumption from the 3rd day of May to and inclusive of 30th June last, was 930,910 pounds, and the duty paid was \$10,612.37. 4. The total quantity of sugar not above No. 16 D.S. entered for home consumption during the same period, was 36,216,286 pounds, and the duty paid thereon was \$181,081.78. 5. The total quantity of sugar above No. 16 D.S. entered for home consumption during the six months ending 31st December last, was 1,683,773 pounds, and the duty paid was \$19,195.28. 6. The total quantity of sugar not above No. 16 D.S. entered for home consumption dur-

Mr. McSHANE.

ing the same period, was 93,717,498 pounds, and the duty paid thereon was \$468,587.49.

THE FISHING BOUNTY.

Mr. LAVERGNE asked :

1. What are the reasons which prevented the payment of the fishing bounty to the schooner "Pioneer" for the year 1892? Upon what officer or employee's report was this bounty refused?

2. What are the reasons which prevented the payment of the fishing bounty to the schooner "Gleaner" for the year 1893? Upon what officer or employee's report was this bounty refused?

3. What are the reasons which prevented the payment of the fishing bounty to the schooner "P. Fortin" for the year 1894? Upon what officer or employee's report was this bounty refused?

Mr. COSTIGAN. 1. (a.) Because claim is irregular, as claimants swore on 6th October, 1892, that they had fished to the 3rd November. (b.) Not considered sufficiently proved that the vessel was entitled to the bounty. Dr. Wakeman having stated that no one fishes from a schooner at Esquimaux Point or Charles Island. 2. Because according to the sworn statement of the owner and crew the vessel was not engaged in fishing the time required by law. 3. Because of information that the vessel was not engaged in fishing the legal time. Facts obtained from the collector of customs and fishery officer, George Gaudin.

TRANSIT OF AMERICAN CATTLE THROUGH CANADA.

On the question,

Mr. CASEY :

1. Is the Honourable Minister of Agriculture aware that a copy of an Order in Council concerning the shipping of United States cattle from a Canadian port was published in some of the morning newspapers of Friday, 24th January ?

2. Did he say on the afternoon of the same day, in answer to a question across the floor of the House, that he would produce that Order in Council to the House on Monday, 27th ult. ?

3. Is the Honourable Minister correctly reported in the official debates of Tuesday, 28th ult., as follows :—

"Mr. MONTAGUE. In answer to the hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright), I may say that he has read correctly the conversation which took place across the House, between the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) and myself on Friday last. The position which I took then was the correct one under the circumstances. At that time the Order in Council had been passed by Council but was not signed by the Governor General, and, as the hon. gentleman quite well knows, I had no business to give any information to this House as to the facts which had been brought before Council, and upon which a decision had taken place, but which decision had not been communicated to His Excellency, and approved and signed by him. As to the facts having been given to the newspapers, I may say that I was myself astounded. As the reporters in the gallery who asked me the question upon Friday will bear me out, I refused to give them any information whatever, and I confess that the re-

sentment of the hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright), as against this fact being given to the newspapers, was joined in most heartily by myself. I have no explanation to offer to the House, except simply to say, that I knew nothing whatever in regard to it, and I was astonished, and pained, and humiliated, when I found that it was done.

* * * I wish, Sir, to repeat and emphasize that so far as I am concerned, the communication was not given to the public press by me, nor do I believe it was given to the public press by any of my officers, and I desire to express my humiliation that it was not given to this House before it was given to the press.

4. Has the Honourable Minister since heard that the said Order in Council was given to the press by the Premier, and when did he hear it?

5. Has he since heard that said Order in Council was communicated to and approved and signed by His Excellency before it was given to the press, and when did he hear it?

6. Are the statements referred to in the last two questions correct?

7. If so, how did it happen that he knew nothing whatever about such dealing with an Order in Council specially concerning his own department?

8. Does he still think the course he took then was the correct one under the circumstances, in not producing the Order in the House when asked for?

9. Does he still feel that the resentment of the honourable gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) because the Order was given to the press, is joined in most heartily by himself?

10. Is he still astounded, and pained, and humiliated, that the said Order in Council was not given to this House before it was given to the press?

Mr. SPEAKER. I wish to point out that the second and third paragraphs of this question are in violation of parliamentary rules, as they refer directly to past debates in this House this session. The second paragraph refers directly to a debate which took place on a motion to adjourn on the 24th of January. The third paragraph quotes verbatim from "Hansard" a statement made in a discussion which was informally commenced, but which was put in order by a motion for the production of papers on the 28th of January. The rule is clearly laid down, and will be found in the ninth edition of May, at page 356:

It is irregular to refer to past debates of the same session, either in a question or answer.

So that these two paragraphs in this question must, in my opinion, be struck out.

Mr. CASEY. May I ask for information, on the question of order, is it not in order to ask if a member is correctly reported?

Mr. SPEAKER. I have already stated that it is irregular and out of order to refer in a question to a past debate.

Mr. FOSTER. Those two paragraphs being excised, I shall have to ask my hon. friend to allow the rest of the question to remain over. I suppose it is not important, and had better be answered by the Minister himself.

Mr. CASEY. Does the hon. gentleman expect that the Minister will be in his place again this session?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, before the end of the session.

MAIL CONTRACTS—BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Mr. McMULLEN asked:

1. Who holds, or held, the contract for carrying the mails between Spence's Bridge and Kamloops, British Columbia?

2. What route is, or was, followed, and what offices are, or were, supplied under such contract between Spence's Bridge and Kamloops?

3. For how many months in each year is the mail carried between Ashcroft and Lillooet, British Columbia, by way of the Marble Canyon?

4. What is paid for the said service?

5. Was the contract for such service awarded to the British Columbia Express Company after public tenders had been asked for, and if so, what other tenders were received, and amount of each?

Mr. COSTIGAN. 1. John Clark as contractor for the Kamloops and Spence's Bridge service. 2. The offices en route are Rockford, Quilchena, Nicola Lake, Coutlee, Lower Nicola and Campbell Creek. 3. For eight months each year between 1st April and 30th November. 4. This service is under a contract which includes several routes between Ashcroft station and Barkerville, and as the contract rate is a bulk sum of \$24,000 per annum it is impossible to say definitely what is paid for the service in question. 5. Tenders were not asked for this contract as the prior contract of the British Columbia Express Company was renewed.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. MARTIN. Before the Orders of the Day are read, I would like to say that some few days ago, in the course of my remarks, I stated that when the question of the disqualification of the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Turcotte) was before this House because of his connection with certain public contracts, the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) had voted with the Government. I have been informed since that I was incorrect in that statement—that, on the contrary, the hon. gentleman had voted against the Government on that question. I wish therefore to correct the erroneous statement I made at that time.

BRITISH CONNECTION AND IMPERIAL DEFENCE.

Mr. McNEILL moved:

That, in view of the threatening aspect of foreign affairs, this House desires to assure Her Majesty's Government and the people of the United Kingdom of its unalterable loyalty and devotion to the British Throne and constitution, and of its conviction that, should occasion ar-

happily arise, in no other part of the Empire than the Dominion of Canada would more substantial sacrifices attest the determination of Her Majesty's subjects to maintain unimpaired the integrity and inviolate the honour of Her Majesty's Empire; and this House reiterates the oft-expressed desire of the people of Canada to maintain the most friendly relations with their kinsmen of the United States.

He said: There is, Mr. Speaker, an obvious objection that may be urged against the resolution which has just been read. It may be said that it is superfluous, that it is unnecessary to assure the Government and the people of the United Kingdom of what they are already very well aware. I do not doubt, for my own part, that it is well understood in the United Kingdom that the people of Canada are devotedly attached to the Throne, and devotedly attached to the constitution under which they live, and under which they enjoy such an ample measure of freedom, and so many inestimable benefits. But we have not to regard only the view that may be held of this resolution in the mother country, we have also to consider how it may be viewed in foreign countries, and it would seem that in some foreign countries very curious ideas prevail concerning the political aspirations of the people of Canada. If we may judge from statements made by public men on public occasions, and by articles which have appeared in the newspaper press, the idea seems to prevail in the United States, among a certain section of the people, that the people of Canada are only desirous of seizing the first favourable opportunity to transfer their allegiance from the Crown of England to the republic of the United States, and that the hauling down of the Union Jack and the substitution in its place of the Stars and Stripes on every flagstaff in Canada, and on every Canadian mast-head and peak that sails the sea, would be hailed with paeans of joy by the people of Canada. Now, Sir, to the members of this House, the representatives of the people of Canada, that view seems to be simply amazing. It seems to be simply amazing to the representatives of the people of Canada that the sentiments of Canada should be so entirely misapprehended by a section of the people who live in such close proximity to her. Why, Sir, as you know very well, from Halifax to Vancouver, there is not one single constituency in which, if the policy of annexation were advocated upon the hustings, the result would not be a hopeless and overwhelming defeat of the candidate who had the audacity to make that policy a plank in his platform. If there be one question more than another upon which the rank and file of the people of Canada are solid, it is this question of annexation to the United States. Sir, it is the earnest wish of every Canadian to maintain the most friendly relations with the great people who divide this continent with us, whom we regard as our kindred, and

Mr. McNEILL.

in whose magnificent achievements on behalf of civilization it is not too much to say that every Canadian has almost a personal pride. But while we admire the great qualities of our kinsmen of the neighbouring republic, we have no desire whatsoever to enter into political partnership with them. We very much prefer our constitution to theirs, we very much prefer British connection to connection with the United States. We claim the right of a free people to choose between our own mother country and the American republic. We only ask our good friends to the south to leave us alone, and to allow us to work out our own destiny in the way which seems to us best. We have made our choice, and our choice is with our mother country, and if necessity should, unfortunately, arise, the people of Canada will do what men may do to preserve for themselves and for those who come after them what they hold to be their most precious political inheritance—their birthright as British subjects. I think, Sir, that it is very much better that there should be no misunderstanding with regard to this matter, and therefore I have endeavoured, in very simple and plain language, to state what the simple truth in regard to it really is. For misapprehensions in regard to matters of this kind have before now given rise to very grave consequences. The people of Canada are determined to maintain the position which this Dominion holds as an integral part of the British Empire, and they are perfectly well satisfied that a united British Empire is well able to take care of itself. Sir, we are for peace first of all, for honourable peace, but if we are assailed, we believe that we shall not prove altogether unworthily of the stock from which we come, and we know that at our back will be all the resources of an Empire whose resources are practically inexhaustible, more especially as regards the number of fighting men that can be, in case of emergency, placed in line. Those who know anything of the Sikh war, those who know anything of the losses that were sustained by the British forces at Chilianwalla, and on many another battlefield of which Lord Gough could tell only too well, and those who know anything of the extraordinary military prowess of the Ghoorkas and the many other tribes of hardy hillmen of India (among the most warlike races in the world), and those who recollect with what promptitude and enthusiasm our eastern troops responded to the call of Lord Beaconsfield when he summoned them to Malta some twenty years ago, will understand to what I refer. I repeat that the resources of this Empire, so far as the number of fighting men is concerned, are practically inexhaustible, and we are not altogether destitute of the financial strength which would be necessary to prosecute a great war to its conclusion. But, Sir, we do not want war. And we do not expect we are going to

have war. And least of all do we want war, and least of all do we expect to have war with our own kith and kin. There has been an extraordinary development of the sentiment of kinship, if I may so express it, among the British peoples during the last ten or fifteen years. So that in the Empire to-day, even more than ever before, a war with the United States would be regarded as a horrible and unnatural fratricidal strife. We have been surprised and pained by the recent explosion of ill-feeling towards this country and towards the mother country in the United States of America. But we refuse to believe that that explosion of ill-feeling adequately expresses the sentiments of those who are most competent to speak for the people of the United States. And, furthermore, we believe and hope as we believe, that it does not even express the sentiments of so large a section of that people as at one time we supposed. But, Sir, it would be an act of simple folly; it would be an act of culpable negligence on the part of any reasonable people not to recognize and take note of the patent fact that there is a disreputable and rowdy section of the American people who may some day cause us trouble; and it is absolutely necessary that any sober-minded people should take means to meet that trouble if unfortunately it should arise in the future. Therefore, I have been much gratified, as I am sure the country has been much gratified, to find that we have been called upon to make provision for the better defence of Canada. Not that I wish to assume or suggest that this provision for better defence arises altogether because of anything that may have happened on our southern border. For, Mr. Speaker, unhappily we know that these symptoms, these proofs of hostility have not been confined to the section of the people of the United States to which I have referred. Unfortunately, these proofs of unfriendliness seem to come from the four corners of the world; and, as my hon. friend from Albert (Mr. Weldon) said in that magnificent speech with which he delighted this chamber a few days ago, it would seem as though the very magnitude and wealth and prosperity and happiness of our Empire had engendered envy and cupidity where least we expected to find them. And it would seem to-day as if trouble and trial, and even danger, were closing down over those famous islands "set in the silver sea," that we all hold so dear. For, Sir, there have suddenly loomed up the most threatening thunder clouds of war that have darkened the political horizon of England for many and many a long year. And, Sir, how has England, our own England, borne herself in the midst of the menace and danger which compass her about? Why, Sir, she has borne herself like the mighty mother of heroes that she is—the great heart but beat fuller and prouder in the hour of danger.

Sir, the spectacle of England's majestic composure and unflinching self-reliance in the presence of the undisguised and the altogether unexpected hostility of so many of the great powers of the world has sent a thrill of admiration and of pride through the pulses of every loyal subject of the Queen. And, Sir, I venture to say that England's conduct of to-day will not be found wanting even though "in far off summers that we shall not see," it be weighed in the balance against some of those splendid incidents that are set like precious jewels in the history of mankind. Mr. Speaker, we wish the people of England and of Ireland and of Scotland to know that the people of Canada are no mere fair-weather friends. We want our kinsmen in Australasia, some of whom we welcomed here so recently, to know that we are with them in this issue heart and hand; and we want the whole world to know that, come what may, in whatever part of the Empire they may happen to reside, the British people are one people, animated by one spirit and determined to stand together as one man in defence of their common rights and in the maintenance of their common interests. Sir, we desire peace before all. We regard war with horror. But we are prepared to accept it with all its consequences, come from what quarter it may, if it be necessary to do so in order to defend the honour and integrity of our own Empire.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I rise with pleasure, Mr. Speaker, to second and to say a few words in support of the resolution my hon. friend has just proposed. Speaking personally, I might say that, had I had the pleasure of seeing the resolution before it was put upon the Order paper, I would have suggested the elimination of some of the more formal phrases which appear in it. It appears to me that this is not an ordinary resolution, and should not be treated in an ordinary way. It is a resolution asking the representatives of the Canadian people to pledge Canada to a substantial sacrifice, if necessary, to maintain the integrity of the Empire; and personally I would have been glad, when we were asked in Parliament assembled to pledge ourselves to a solemn resolution of the kind, that all mere formal expressions which are used in passing formal resolutions year after year, should be entirely eliminated, and that the resolution should be as simple as befits the gravity of the situation, as, I think, it could be made with the elimination of a few words. However, I do not rise to criticise, but to support, and that I do most cordially, after the sympathetic criticism of the phraseology of the resolution. Great Britain has passed through troublous times lately which have called for her latent strength. If isolated—whether splendidly or dangerously, I won't debate—she has, in Mr. Chamberlain's words:

Stood sure in the strength of her own resources, in the firm resolution of her people, without respect to party, and in the abundant loyalty of her children from one end of the Empire to the other.

Sir, we often notice that Mr. Punch hits off in a cartoon the better view, and voices better the higher wishes of the people of England, than, perhaps, can be done in a column of the "Times," and those who have followed "Punch" lately have noticed that in describing the situation of affairs there, he pictured Britannia standing on the shores of the sea-girt isle, stern, solemn and alone, looking over the troubled waters and exclaiming :

Come the three corners of the world in arms
And we shall shock them : naught shall make
us rue,

If England to herself do rest but true.

In these words there is a whole volume written. Sir, since Shakespeare wrote these words, there has arisen a greater Britain in the world. There is the great Canadian Dominion, the Australasian Empire, I was going to call it, the colony at the Cape, and the great dependency of India. From each and all of these have come home words of cheer and comfort to the motherland. The hearts of her children have gone out to the great, lone, isolated mother, and we to-day but do our duty when we pledge ourselves solemnly in Parliament, that if the occasion arises we are prepared to make material sacrifices for the integrity of the Empire. At present, Sir, the continent of Europe may be said to be a great armed camp. The nations there face each other with armies literally numbered by millions, and we are told that the Empire of Great Britain is counted amongst them, on account of the few men she could put into the field from a military standpoint, as a second or third-rate power. But, Sir, when the American interests of Great Britain were threatened in the now celebrated Venezuelan Message of the President of the United States, there went up from the English people a cry of surprise, a cry, almost, of horror, that such a threat or menace should have come from her own kin. When her interests in the Cape were menaced by the German autocrat there went up from her a shout of defiance; and the response which she gave in fitting out a flying squadron, in accession and addition to her ordinary navy, was the best answer which she could give, and was an assurance to her colonies and to the world at large that if she was only a third-rate continental power, she was to-day, and would continue to be what she was in days of yore, at least, mistress of the seas. As part of this great Empire, Canada, more than other part, is open to attack. With thousands of miles of coterminous frontier, and divided from the United States only by an invisible line, with many international questions existing calculated to cause bitterness and strife, it

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

becomes doubly our duty so to comport ourselves that we will lessen and not increase Great Britain's difficulties. The recent troubles have accentuated our determination to remain part and parcel of the Empire. The splendid dream of an Imperial federation, which my hon. friend has sometimes presented to the House, has never yet presented itself in such a practical shape to the people of Great Britain, or to the people of the colonies, as to have claimed their allegiance. The sentiment which underlies that scheme is such as to have commanded their sympathy, not only in the British Isles, but in every colony of the British Empire. We desire to unite more closely and firmly the different parts of the Empire. We may not have at present, and so far as I can see, there is not at present any logical scheme ready; but in the lumbering and blundering way in which Old John Bull goes on, and is going on, I have no doubt that we will succeed, and that events themselves will evolve some scheme by which the Empire will be more closely united together.

Sir, the resolution which we are asked to pass, the national pledge which we are asked to give here, as representatives of the people, is a small step, perhaps, but it is one step, at least, in that direction. The resolution reiterates our desire to maintain the most friendly relations with our kinsmen of the United States. I believe that desire, Sir, to be universal in Canada. Commercially and socially, our relations are intertwined and united, and are becoming yearly more so. We look across the frontier, the invisible line, at the greatest republic the world has ever seen, and we see that great republic grappling with some of the greatest problems that ever a people have had to face. We see them grappling with the great problem of how to cement and unite forty-two commonwealths into one great republic welded into a harmonious whole, which, while guaranteeing state rights and individual liberty, will not be inconsistent with national power and greatness. We see them trying to solve the mighty problem how to assimilate and to make worthy citizens of the myriads of foreigners who have for the past fifty years found an asylum within her borders. We see her trying to solve the problem of what to do with the eight millions of coloured people who, released from slavery, are now her citizens. In these and other attempted solutions of mighty problems, we wish her God-speed. But I re-echo the statement made by the hon. gentleman who moved the resolution, that while we have every sympathy with them, and while we wish them well, we do not desire to take any part in the solution of those problems from a political standpoint. Largely speaking the same language, largely drawing inspiration from the same sources, and worshipping at the same altars, I believe in the sentiment expressed the other day by a senator of the

United States that, after all, blood is thicker than water, and that the man or the nation who precipitates a war and all its horrors between these two great English-speaking nations, would be committing a crime against humanity.

As for Canada, we have our own problems to solve, our own difficulties to meet, and we propose to solve them and to meet them as part of the Empire, and under the protection of the Empire's flag. Now, Sir, Canada can assist Great Britain in two ways. We can assist her with means and with money, and, perhaps, compared with the amount of means and money which Great Britain requires for her defences, our contribution would be only a drop in the bucket, but at any rate, the feeling with which that contribution would be made, would make up, possibly, for the amount. But above all, we can assist her in the cultivation of the kindest feelings between us and the great republic lying to the south of us. An alliance between Great Britain and the United States would be the guarantee of the world's peace, no nation and no combination of nations is strong enough to withstand a union between the greatest Empire in the world and the greatest republic in the world. I re-echo the words lately spoken at Bristol by the Right Hon. J. A. Balfour, when he said :

He felt that England and the United States should work together, each in its own sphere, to promote and extend the Anglo-Saxon ideas of liberty. If, he declared, Great Britain was in alliance with the United States, she could fulfill the duties Providence had entrusted to her, and need not fear a foreign foe or international divisions.

These, Mr. Speaker, are noble words, and they have found a worthy echo during the late troubles from many of the most distinguished statesmen, orators and speakers of the United States. That the two great nations may grow in harmony and goodwill to each other is our earnest hope, and every Canadian who helps forward such a blessed consummation, makes a substantial and national offering to the Empire.

Mr. COCKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I have listened with great pleasure to the eloquent addresses on the resolution before the House, and it is a source of unalloyed pleasure to find that there is one platform at least on which both parties in Canada unite, and sink for the time the bitterness of party politics. Out of evil good often comes, and the menace of troubles hanging over the British Empire of late has stimulated the sentiment of loyalty to the mother country and strengthened still more the ties that unite us to the Empire and to our brother colonists. It has practically within the last few weeks consummated the union of federated Australia, and but a few days ago New South Wales voted \$50,000 annually for three years to subsidize the Canadian-Australian line by which the ties that bind us to our brethren in Australia

may be continued and drawn still more closely. At the same time we find here in our Dominion a desire, which has been even strengthened by recent events, to connect ourselves with our brother colonists by new fast steamship lines and also by the Pacific cable. In South Africa, which has her own problems of pressing moment to solve and has to deal with questions that we dealt with perhaps two generations ago, the pulse beats in unison with the pulse of the Canadian and Australian colonies. While we have had wars and rumours of wars to excite us, it has been to me a source of honest pride to find that the Canadian press has risen fully to the occasion, and that while our neighbours to the south may have indulged in language which I think was unsuited to the circumstances, our Canadian press has conducted itself in a way that was in every sense becoming of the gravity of the occasion. There has been a full sense of the gravity of the situation, and men have knitted their lips tightly and their cheeks have perhaps blanched, but not through craven fear but through stern realization of the gravity of the duties which were being imposed on them, and which with God's help they intended to fulfil. But though we have, so to speak, taken our lives in our hands, we have never been wavering or halting in our allegiance to the motherland. We have not sat down and weighed the consequences materially and otherwise, and said that under certain circumstances we would be prepared to join the powerful nation of 70,000,000 to the south. Such a course seems never to have entered the Canadian mind, and I feel proud to-day in this public manner to draw attention to the fact, which does honour to the whole of the Dominion. I regret deeply that while England and Canada now entertain the most kindly feeling towards the United States, the same kindly feeling has not been universally reciprocated. They are no doubt peoples whose national roots go down deep into the same past as our own ; we draw from the fountain of the same literature ; we have the same science, the same arts, the same language ; we worship, as the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) has eloquently said, at the same altars ; our institutions are to a great extent similar, and it would become us, one would think, to rise to the conception of a higher patriotism. We have the domestic patriotism of the Scotchman for Scotland, of the Englishman for England, of the Irishman for Ireland, and the Canadian for Canada, and we have an Imperial patriotism for the Imperial Empire ; and I trust that as time goes by, as the years roll on, that feeling which now separates the United States from us will become less and less intense, and they will at length appreciate the fact that we glory in their success and in their progress, just as a grandfather may glory in the progress of his grandson. But

I fear perhaps the bitterness, I might almost say, were it parliamentary, the political animosity, the bitter animosity of political life here, the aspersions cast on political parties, and both sides are equally guilty of the same fault, the fact that our politics assume so severe and stern and partisan a character has led many people in the United States to believe that we are not one people, one Dominion, that we are not satisfied with our condition, that we are ready to open our arms and welcome them. And it was this same opinion that in the Fenian raid, as we know, brought many a man over to Canada with the expectation that when he landed in our country, instead of being received at the bayonet point, he would be welcomed to our homes and regarded as a friend. I trust we will endeavour to conduct our debates in such a way that when reported they will cease to give foreign nations the opinion that we are divided. For we are not divided. We have our differences politically, we have our party differences in regard to the tariff, and these differences seem to be growing less and less, new light is coming in on our friends opposite and they are enlarging to some extent their views and coming more and more over to ours, and no doubt with the advance of years they will come nearer and nearer to the common platform, and then we shall be happy to receive them into our midst. I am glad too that the hon. member for North Bruce has so strongly declared that we desire no war with the United States. It would indeed be a horrible monstrosity to contemplate. But the feeling of unkindness, to use no stronger term, does exist largely in the United States, and we found during the recent troubles that there were, I think, but two Governors of the states which did not profess allegiance to the mad declaration of the Monroe doctrine promulgated by the President. Six large vessels of war, to cost \$24,000,000, were at once ordered; other ships of war were also ordered, and 25 torpedo vessels were to sweep the ocean. Every pinchback politician was ready to back up the President, and the voice of the rabble with their asinine bray could not be drowned in the discussion, and everything was done to support the wretched caricature of the Monroe doctrine. I trust when this resolution of Parliament becomes known it will be felt that we have here once for all determined at all hazards to throw in our lot with the mother country, that we have no desire to change our allegiance politically, or commercially even, that we desire to live peaceably on this northern part of the American continent, and that we intend as British subjects to live and as British subjects to die.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I desire also to say a word or two on this subject. I am not myself in the

Mr. COCKBURN.

habit of advocating loud professions of loyalty, nor do I believe to any very great extent in those loud professions of loyalty. But there is a time for all things, and I am of opinion that now is a very proper time indeed for some such expression as my hon. friend the member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) proposes to place on our Journals. Sir, I do not mean to say there is at the present moment danger of war with the United States, but I do mean to say that under very slightly different conditions there might have been real danger in such a message as was recently delivered by President Cleveland had it been received in England in the same tone and temper as that in which it was conceived. And, Sir, therefore, I agree with several of the speakers who have preceded me, in highly commending the temper in which the press and the people of Canada, as a whole, received that threat, for it amounted to no less than a threat in the way in which it was delivered. I hope, as the member for Toronto (Mr. Cockburn) has said, that we will hear the last of these idle and foolish aspersions, thrown by one political party in this country, on the loyalty of the other. I trust that will be the case. It will tend to harmony, although on this side of the House we are not in the slightest degree disposed to hesitate at entering into a comparison of loyalty if that be the desire of hon. gentlemen. Now, Sir, on the present occasion, I beg to say that I speak for myself alone, and that it would be most unfair to hold any other person on this side of the House, or anywhere else, responsible for anything that I have to say on this question. For my part, I have not hesitated to say elsewhere, and I do not hesitate to repeat here, that to a very great extent, the choice for Canada lies between these two alternatives. As Canada is placed between England and the United States, Canada will either have to be a hostage for the good behaviour of England to the United States, or Canada will have to be a bond of union between those two countries. Which is the more honourable distinction? Which is the one more likely to promote our self-respect; which is the one more likely to promote the real welfare of Canada, I leave without hesitation for the people of Canada to decide. It is perfectly true, as my hon. friend (Mr. Cockburn) said, that out of evil (often) comes good, and I believe on the present occasion, very great good, indeed—although it may sound a paradox—is likely to arise from President Cleveland's message, in the first place, and from the somewhat petulant defiance of the German Emperor, in the second. Sir, that last message, if it has done nothing else, has shown England where she stood, and while I feel that there may be truth in the statement made by the Finance Minister on the one side, and in the statement made by myself on the other, I propose to treat my hon.

friend (Mr. Foster) to a compromise, and we shall say in future, not that England stands in a state of splendid isolation, or of dangerous isolation, but that England stands in a state of splendid but dangerous isolation. I believe that would pretty nearly define the actual state of the case. But whatever may be the truth as to that, there is no doubt either as to this, that the spirit and pluck with which that haughty message was received has extorted unwilling admiration even from those who formerly were most disposed to disparage England, and has shown as few other things could have shown, the great vitality and resource which the British Empire undoubtedly possesses. Sir, I agree with the member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill), I agree with my hon. friend (Mr. Davies) beside me, that the mode in which that message was received has filled all Englishmen, whether they be in Canada, or Australia, or the Cape, or in England itself, with just and honest pride. And, Sir, it has gone very far to justify the old-time boast, that England is still, in spite of all that has come and gone, the mistress of the seas. It is not by any means an insignificant exact fact at this present moment, that among other things that display of strength and power called forth, was (although, perhaps, an unwilling) very decided appreciation and admiration on the part of our neighbours to the south of us; and that even from those who were most disposed in former times to cast ridicule on the pretensions of England. As for Mr. Cleveland's message, I say, and I believe, and if we could get at his inmost sentiments we would find that he now also believes that the tone and temper of his message was most unfortunate, and very greatly to be regretted by all. But, Sir, while that is true, the results which straightway followed on that message have tended a very great deal, after all said and done, to pave the way for a better understanding and more permanent peace between the two countries. For, if there be one thing more certain than another, it is this, that that same message, and the results of that same message, brought infinitely greater ruin in American homes than it did in English homes. The United States now know two things which I doubt whether they understood thoroughly before. They know, in the first place, to what an extraordinary and close extent, the interests of England and the United States are intertwined in a thousand ways. And they know further, what they did not fully understand before, the tremendous cost to them, as well, perhaps, the tremendous cost to us, which would be entailed in a war with England. Why, Sir, the mere name and sound of war (if Mr. Depew is an authority, as I believe he is) cost the United States, in a week, one thousand millions of dollars in depreciation of their securities, and I have strong reason to believe that Mr. Depew did not ex-

aggerate one particle the mischief that had been done. Sir, among others, I had my attention lately called to three very remarkable testimonies to the present position of affairs from three Americans, of more or less note. First of all, I observe that the American commander-in-chief, General Miles, had the manliness and the courage, in a public place to tell his hearers that whatever else the United States might be able to do, or might not be able to do, they were at present utterly defenceless in the face of even a second-rate naval power, as regards the defences of their sea-coast. At the same time, Mr. Depew, who is a man well known and highly esteemed in most portions of the United States, pointed out with equal force, that it was a most unfortunate extension of the Monroe doctrine, if the United States were going to make themselves the protectors of every little petty despot in the southern hemisphere, and hold themselves responsible for every act of oppression or injustice he might commit on the subjects of any European power. And Mr. Depew took occasion, and with reason, to warn his hearers, that no good result could come from such exorbitant pretensions. Sir, I might give, if I pleased, many and many a testimony from the better and more thoughtful writers of the United States, all going to show that the sensible portion of the United States—whatever the jingo element among them might think—have at last woke up as they have never awakened before, to the tremendous consequences which would most undoubtedly follow a collision, should such a collision unhappily ever occur between the two great Anglo-Saxon nations. Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a word or two as to our share in Canada in this matter. There has been enough in this thing to make us reflect, although the war scare so-called lasted but a few days. It would not have been any light matter if we found ourselves suddenly dragged into war, and we might have been dragged into war, by reason of a quarrel over a few acres of bog in South America, with which we had no sort of concern. Sir, what I claim for Canada, what I have always claimed for Canada, and what I think, on calm consideration, all true Canadians will claim for Canada, is this: We do not claim a sole voice, of course, but I think that we have a right to claim co-equal voice in all things appertaining to affairs in North America; and, after recent events, I am not sure I should not say, in South America, too. That is a claim which I have advanced here, which I have advanced in England, which I have advanced on the platform, and which I propose to maintain. I claim it not as a favour, but as a right. Let me say to this House that rights and duties are strictly coterminous. Every man who has a right, has a duty to perform, and every man who has a duty to perform has a consequent right. Now, Sir, it is five and twenty years since

Great Britain, to all intents and purposes, devolved upon the people of Canada the responsibility and the duty not only of maintaining peace and good order in the northern half of North America, but of defending it against all comers. Five and twenty years ago England withdrew all her garrisons from British North America, with the single exception of the naval station at Halifax, which hardly counts in the scale; I think it is the only place to-day in British North America where Great Britain maintains a garrison. Sir, we accept that responsibility. We are willing to maintain peace and good order in this northern half of the continent; we are willing to defend it, please Providence, against all-comers to the best of our ability; but, hand in hand with that responsibility goes the right to a free hand, in this hemisphere at least. All other risks the people of Canada are ready to face, if not with a light heart, at least with a cheerful heart; and if Great Britain found Russia, France, Germany, or the whole continent of Europe, arrayed against her, and if the fleets of the combined powers, as they possibly might, were to threaten our territory, I have no doubt, for my part, that Canada would gird herself, and gird herself well, to meet any emergency that might arise. Sir, there is but one foe, that is, the possible foe to the south, with whom we might undoubtedly hesitate to enter into a conflict, and for no unworthy reasons. English statesmen talk of fratricidal war with the United States. I will not say that that is a mere phrase in their mouths; but while they talk about fratricidal war, we know that such a war would be a fratricidal war. There has been an enormous alteration in the Dominion of Canada within the last thirty years, as any one who has watched the movement of our population knows. I believe that I am strictly in the right when I say that at this moment there is scarcely one family in ten in the Dominion of Canada which has not a son or a brother or a near relative in some part of the United States. It is literally true, and it is well that our friends on both sides of the House should remember it, that Canada and the Northern States, at any rate, are more closely knit together in a great many ways than the North and the South were before the war. Now, I am not going to enter into a disquisition on the military aspects of the question, although time was, not long ago, when I might have said something as to that. But there are two plain truths which it is well that we should bear in mind; and which, if General Miles could afford to tell his countrymen the truth, we can afford to tell ours. One of these plain truths is that, by no fault of the people of Canada, this Dominion is one of the most defenceless countries on the face of the earth—at any rate, from Maine to the Rocky Mountains. The corollary of that is that the United States, along its sea-

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

coasts, from Maine to New Orleans and from San Francisco to Oregon, is likewise one of the most defenceless countries on the face of the earth; and if it were possible that our neighbours to the south should carry fire and sword to every town in Canada, it is equally true that the British fleet could lay in ashes every city on the seaboard of the United States. If it did so, it might destroy tens of thousands of millions of property held by Americans, but it would also destroy a proportionate amount of property held by British subjects living in England. The truth is, that England and the United States could do infinite harm to each other; but I trust, and I think everybody will trust, that means may be found whereby England and the United States may be prevented from ever again meeting in hostile collision. Why is it that Canada is so hard to defend from an enemy coming from the south? I have ventured to say elsewhere more than once what the reason for that is. I have ventured to point out that if Canada be defenceless, as it is to a great extent, against an enemy coming from the south, it is true to no fault of the people of Canada, least of all of the founders of Canada. It is due simply to what the late Lord Charles Beresford described as the "savage stupidity" of 1774 and 1776, when a lot of miserable incapables annihilated the Empire which the genius of the elder Pitt had created. If hon. gentlemen want to know why Canada is so defenceless, they cannot do better than cast their eyes over pages 4 and 5 of a pamphlet which was recently sent to me, on "Canada and Her Relations to the Empire," under the authorship of Colonel G. T. Denison—not our friend, whom I am sorry not to see here, but I believe a brother of his. Now, it is not my purpose to-day to review the series of negotiations, dating back over 120 years, from the Treaty of Paris down to the present day, in which our sharp-witted neighbours to the south got the better of English statesmen and English diplomatists; but I venture to say that there was one negotiation in which they did not get the better, and that was because the negotiation on the British side was conducted solely by Canadian diplomatists, Canadian lawyers and Canadian statesmen. Sir, in my opinion, the true attitude for the people of Canada, now as always, is the attitude of a people who are loyal, but not subservient—a people who know their rights, and will assert and demand them. If there be anything which a true Briton despises, it is, in the first place, anything that savors of flunkeyism and gush, and, I may add, anything that savors of unworthy jingoism. Our history has not many traditions, but it has one valuable tradition that redeems it—that is, the tradition of the settlement of Canada, or a large part of it, by the United Empire Loyalists. How they were treated by the British Government it is not my pur-

pose to enlarge upon to-day. I will merely say that that page in our history has not a correspondingly glorious page in British history. But, Sir, while I desire and my friends desire, so long as we are a part of the British Empire, to do our duty to the utmost, while we are prepared to shrink from no proper sacrifice for the purpose of assisting the Empire to the best of our means, yet, as a Canadian, I take leave to tell the House and the country that it is not a question of obligation between Canada and the Empire; or if there be any obligation, the obligation is by no means confined to one side. Great Britain is the greatest colonizing power on the face of the earth. How many hundred colonies she possesses I hardly dare say. She has acquired colonies in every possible way—colonies by conquest, colonies by inheritance, colonies by purchase, colonies by exchange, colonies founded by her sons who left her shores to obtain religious liberty, and colonies founded by others who left her shores to benefit their position; but among her hundred colonies she has but one which was founded and created by men who did not leave the shores of England to benefit themselves, but who gave up all they had for the purpose of maintaining their loyalty to England—and the name of that colony is Canada. Nevertheless, Sir, although it be largely by England's own fault, it must be confessed that, as regards the United States, Canada is a weak spot in the British armour. There can be no doubt that we are liable to a sudden attack by a foe from the south, and there is no doubt that it would tax all our resources and the resources of the British Empire to effectively defend this country against such an attack. As to the quarrel with Venezuela, if I were to give my opinion, it would be closely akin to that of Prince Bismarck with reference to certain difficulties on the eastern frontier, when he declared that he would not be willing to sacrifice a single Pomeranian grenadier for the sake of all the Turks in Europe and Asia put together; and for my part, I think it would be a thousand pities were a single drop of Anglo-Saxon blood shed for the sake of all those murderous man-monkeys in South America. What they do is to have a revolution and a massacre every half-year, and the only possible chance of their living in peace is for some strong tyrant like General Rosas or Dr. Francois to keep them in due subjection at the point of the bayonet. Sir, my counsel in this matter is this, and it is a counsel which I am beginning to hope and think may possibly be realized one of these days. I hope that if anything is to come of the scheme of Imperial federation, so dear to our hon. friends opposite, it must come in one shape or another after and not before some such thing as I am about to suggest has been put into practical effect. I referred just now to a certain speech of

Mr. Depew. I am not going to say that we have nothing to complain of in the Americans and that the Americans have nothing to complain of in us. My own impression is that, as is usually the case, there are faults enough on both sides. We cannot see those of our own, but we can those of the United States. But I hold that when Mr. Depew proposed, as I see he did, in a recent speech, that a common tribunal should be established, a tribunal before which the English-speaking nations, at any rate, might adjust all their differences in a rational and reasonable way, Mr. Depew did really suggest, whether the time has come for carrying out his suggestion or not, what would be the best outcome and solution of all these difficulties with which we have been confronted in Canada, not now only, but for the past nine or ten years. Sir, I think that the events of the last month have brought that idea of common tribunal within measurable range of the region of practical politics, and I believe that the people of Canada, the journalists of Canada, the public men of Canada, have it in their power, in no insignificant degree, to contribute in bringing about such a result. Sir, my experience, and I dare say the experience of others here, is that, after all, men are to a very great extent what you make them; and although we are a long way from the golden rule, yet the chances are that men will deal with you as you deal with them. In this matter, I may say, that if there be anything in our traditions, if there be anything in the fact that we are here representing, to a great extent, the traditions of the U. E. Loyalists, those men will best represent the idea which underlay the sacrifices made by the U. E. Loyalists, who aid and assist in promoting and restoring in any other way the object which they aimed at, which was not, by any manner of means, to prevent the British Government of the day to levy taxes, without representation, on the Americans. I have reason to know that the U. E. Loyalists took no stock in that idea, but their object was to preserve together the British Empire which had been acquired at such loss and sacrifice and with such danger, within a very recent period, to their fathers and themselves. Sir, I cannot stop now—the theme would be large and too great—to contemplate the spectacle of what would be the results of an alliance between 140,000,000 of English people. All I can say is this, that if such an alliance—and I do not hope, of course, for any restoration of common government, or desire it—but if any alliance could be formed or tribunal established which would put a stop, practically at once and for ever, to all fear of hostility between those countries, then I say that a very great security would be given to the peace and welfare of the world at large and to the future progress of the world at large. And I believe, like my hon. friend,

that the statesmen, the journalists, and all men who can aid and help, and who do aid and help, in promoting that, will render the greatest service that can be rendered to Canada in the first place, and the British Empire at large, in the second place.

Mr. CRAIG. This resolution is one which must commend itself to the whole House. I have listened with great pleasure to the speech of the mover, and have no doubt that his sentiments are shared by every hon. gentleman who has listened to his remarks. If there is one thing that does not need proof it is the loyalty of Canadians. That is a thing which we take for granted, and yet this resolution is very timely, for this reason. Canada occupies a very peculiar position. Lying alongside the great republic, it may be thought at times by people not familiar with Canadians, by people living in the Empire, that we may have thoughts of living in union with the republic. But this resolution is not only timely, as assuring people of the Empire that Canada is indeed loyal and proud of its connection with such a great Empire—proud of being a part, and no small part, of such an Empire, but it is also timely as regards the people of the United States. A great many people in the United States have the idea—and it is almost impossible to get that idea out of their heads—that many people in Canada desire annexation. In my sojourn in the United States a few years ago, I found that the people there thought it a ridiculous idea that Canadians should not desire annexation. They asked: How is it that a small country like Canada does not desire to be annexed to the States? I told them that there was no such desire, that we were satisfied to remain as we are. This opinion in the United States arises from a misconception of our position. They look on Canada as a small country, one of the dependencies of Great Britain; they have the idea that we occupy a very inferior position; they know little about our position and the relation in which we stand to the Empire; and I am glad to-day to have the opportunity of supporting a resolution like this, which will show to the people of the United States that all the people of this country are loyal to the Empire. It will show them that this feeling is not confined to one party or one section, but that both the great parties of this country and all sections of it, are one in loyalty to the Empire. I think that sometimes a mistake is made in accusing any party in this country of disloyalty, because the people of the United States, when they see such statements, imagine that they are true, that there is something in them. Whereas, on the contrary, those who make such statements make them perhaps for political purposes, knowing that those whom they accuse of disloyalty would be, if the occasion should arise, as capable of proving their loyalty

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

as those who make the charge. I have travelled all over the country, and am glad to say there is no annexation sentiment in it. You might find one man in perhaps one hundred thousand who might think that union with the United States would be an improvement, but that is about all you would find. The people generally, in every part of the country, are satisfied with their position. They are satisfied to be a part and, as I said before, no small part, of the greatest Empire the world has ever seen. The people of the United States, therefore, may dismiss the idea from their minds that any section of this country has any desire at all for annexation with the United States; but while I say that, I advocate very strongly, as I did in this House some two or three years ago, the most friendly relations with the United States. I said then, as I say now, that they have a people whom it is most difficult to govern. They have a population made up of a great many different nationalities. They find it almost impossible to please them all, and sometimes their rulers and those in authority do things which they would not do unless impelled, as they think, by political reasons. I hope and I believe that the late message of President Cleveland was inspired almost altogether by political considerations. I think he felt that he had to do something in that line, and took this means of making himself popular. In some respects that message was not an unfortunate thing for this country. In some respects that message was fortunate, because it showed the people of the United States that Canadians are united. It showed Canadians, at the same time, that while there were some Americans who had feelings of hostility to Canada, the great bulk of the people of the United States—and the best part of the people—had the most friendly feelings to Canada; and although some have held other opinions, I was pleased to see that some of the most influential papers in the United States expressed the most friendly feeling to Canada and the utmost abhorrence of having any war which would imply an attack on Canada. They took the right view of the situation; and I was pleased, at the same time, to see that some of the party men, at the very outset, when in so doing they exposed themselves to unpopularity, took the strong stand that the United States were not right in their contention, but, on the contrary, had overstepped the mark. I believe in the most friendly relations with the United States, and I think I may say here that our newspapers can do a great deal to strengthen those relations. I have, as we all have, a great respect for the power of the press. As a rule our newspapers commend themselves to all who read them; but sometimes it is possible that paragraphs may appear which should not appear, paragraphs tending to show that we have some feeling of enmity towards the United States.

Sir, I hold that, while there is no annexation sentiment in this country, yet, from one end of the country to the other, there is the most friendly feeling towards the American Union and its people. As was well said by the last speaker, there are few families in this country but have a son or a brother in the United States. Speaking for myself, I have a son there; and that fact does not make me feel less friendly to that country. He had to go there for his health—I would rather he could live in this country, but he is there, he has friends there and among the people of that country are many who have befriended him. I have, as we all have, many friends in the United States. But, above all, the hundreds of thousands of Canadians that are scattered throughout that country are our brothers, not only in name but in reality. I would advocate as strongly as I can that nothing be done to impair the friendly relations between these two countries. It would be a terrible thing if any war between us should arise. We cannot imagine the ruin which such a calamity would bring upon this country and upon that as well. But, Sir, I have no fear of war. I think a remark made by the present Minister of Justice (Mr. Dickey), who at that time occupied the position of Minister of Militia, was a most sensible remark. When asked about the defences of Canada, he said that the best defence of Canada is the "good sense of the people of the United States." I think the people of the United States have been reflecting, and they are reflecting to-day; and that they realize that they have no desire for war, and that Canada is a country perfectly friendly to them. Not only that, but our business relations are immense. Most of us are doing business with the United States, and the great commerce between us brings about most friendly feelings. I trust that nothing will be said by the newspapers or by members of this House, or by those outside which will in any way disturb our present friendly relations. On this continent there is plenty of room for two great nations. It is true that at present Canada has a population of only about 5,000,000. But we have room for many millions more, and I hope that I shall see the time when we shall have twenty millions. I hope, and I believe, that these two nations will go on rivalling each other, not in war, but in commerce and in the arts of peace. I have great pleasure, Mr. Speaker, in advocating this resolution, which expresses my sentiments most fully, and I congratulate the mover upon introducing it to the House.

Mr. CASEY. I, too, must congratulate the mover of this resolution upon his good fortune in being the one to evoke the expression of an opinion that is evidently unanimous in this House. And I beg leave to add my small contribution to the expression of that opinion. The hon. gentleman's resolution deals with the question in three

or four phases. It refers first to the threatening aspect of foreign affairs so far as Great Britain is concerned. There is no doubt that the foreign affairs of Great Britain have, within a late period, assumed a somewhat threatening aspect. I think the reason for that is not far to seek. It is not aggression on the part of Great Britain that has aroused a certain amount of suspicion among her neighbours; it is not any wrong she has committed against other nations.

The great and over-growing progress of Great Britain has created this feeling. I claim that the feeling of other nations towards Great Britain at the moment—and I hope and believe that it is only a temporary feeling—is aroused more by jealousy of her great success in commerce, in colonization and in enterprise of all kinds, than by any fault on the part of the mother country herself. It is to be expected that this feeling should be manifested for the moment; but it is to be expected also that further consideration will remove that feeling and that the relations of Great Britain with other countries may be, again, as cordial as they have been in the past. One great consideration alone, it seems to me, should be sufficient to allay this feeling of jealousy, and it is this—that the progress of Great Britain has always been in the past, is in the present, and always will be in the future, the progress of humanity.

In every period of her history, when Great Britain has made a step in advance with her commerce or her colonization, it has meant that humanity, as a whole, is better off. It has meant an increase of the means of subsistence, the cultivation of more land, the development of means of intercourse between different parts of the world. Britain's flag has been the pioneer of progress and the pioneer of development wherever it has gone. And I am sure that when this is fully realized throughout the world, the temporary jealousy of her success must give way to the feeling that all other nations share more or less directly in the prosperity of that great country.

In spite of the fact referred to as the threatening aspect of foreign affairs in this resolution, I do not feel inclined to adopt the phrase "splendid isolation" as descriptive of Britain's position. That phrase has acquired a certain popularity, and, prima facie, it may have appeared the proper phrase to describe Great Britain's position. But I feel that Great Britain is no more isolated in the present juncture of affairs than is the mother of a great family of grown-up children. Great Britain can never be isolated so long as the family tie is maintained between her and the great communities that have sprung from her. I believe that tie is now stronger than it ever was before, and that it will become stronger still in consequence of the temporary feeling against Great Britain which has now arisen. In

view of that fact I deprecate the use of the phrase "splendid isolation." I would prefer to substitute for it some phrase, which I am not eloquent enough to coin at the moment, descriptive of a united family supporting the head of that family under all circumstances.

Now, Sir, the resolution, in the second place, voices the unalterable loyalty and devotion of this country to the British Throne and constitution. That phrase, I think, is perfectly correct. There is no doubt of the loyalty of all those who inhabit Canada at the present time. In the discussion of this question, it would be beneath the occasion to attempt to prove that one political party in the country, as compared with another, is equally loyal or more loyal. I do not think any one in this House ever believed for a moment that there was a difference on that point. I wish, however, to refer briefly to the different races which inhabit Canada, and to the reasons why they are, as such, loyal to the mother country.

The largest proportion of the people are of the British races, from the British Isles. Their loyalty is as undoubted here as it was in their native land. Even the race to which I have the honour to belong myself, the noble residents of the ever-green isle, are found in Canada as loyal as anybody else, and a little more so? The Irishman, when he becomes a full citizen of the Empire, with all the privileges and rights of every other citizen, is just as loyal as any other citizen, and has always been. No matter how he was disaffected towards the particular methods of government in the mother country, he has always been ready to shed his blood for the Empire at home.

The next in number of the great strains of blood in Canada, although first in colonization, is that race with which we are so proud to be associated, our cousins from France. I say our cousins from France, because, in the course of centuries, what with the Norman conquest of England, the interchange of settlement between the two countries, the mixture that has taken place in Canada, we cannot affect to consider our fellow-citizens of the French race otherwise than as relatives at the present time. I claim that there is no such thing, or should be no such thing as a racial problem, or a racial difference, between the people of Canada. This country was first discovered, first practically made use of, by our French friends and relatives. They showed their very good ability to look after this country, and to maintain their hold upon it. In the course of events they have acknowledged the sovereignty of the Empire, established by one of their own Norman race, in the first instance.

I say, Sir, there is no racial difference between people so situated. The cry of the aggrieved in all parts of the British Empire to-day, as it is still in the Channel Islands, and was in Normandy, is virtually a cry of "Ha Rou!" the cry to Rollo, when any

Mr. CASEY.

one is doing them harm. And if there were occasion to display their valour in the field in defence of this country, the cry of "St. George for England," and that of "En avant la Normandie," would be heard side by side. Sir, the other race who form an important portion in our population, is the Germans, especially in the western part of the province of Ontario, and in certain parts of Nova Scotia. These Germans, some of them born in the old fatherland, and some of them born here, have all adopted Canada as their country; and it goes without saying that the devotion of the Germans to their fartherland, on the field or in other circumstances, equals that of any other race. Our Germans will show the same valour in defending Canada as they have always shown in defending the old land in Europe.

From all this, I conclude that there is nothing whatever amongst the people of Canada to divide us in the expression of an unalterable loyalty to the Throne and constitution of Great Britain. Examples of that could be given, but this is not an occasion for wasting time in long-winded descriptions of what everybody knows. I pass to that branch of the resolution which speaks of the substantial sacrifices by which we would be ready to attest our loyalty. There is no doubt on that point, either, Mr. Speaker. Substantial sacrifices would be made by Canada, and I believe by all other off-shoots of Great Britain to defend that country, or their sister dependencies against aggression. Solidity against aggression is, I believe, the present condition of the British Empire, and the only condition which is capable of maintaining its integrity in the future.

I have great hopes that out of the present circumstances, the uneasy feeling in Great Britain, the discussion of the relations between her and her family, may come to something like that for which many have hoped for many years back, I mean to say, something more than a nominal union of this great British Empire. I do not wish to commit myself to any special plan of Imperial federation, or customs union, or differential duties, or anything of that kind; but I do hope to see the day when every British subject, no matter where located, shall be a full citizen of that Empire, with the rights and duties of such citizens.

This branch of the question leads us to consider our relations with the United States, as is done in the last clause of the resolution. What those relations should be has been well pointed out already. By connection of blood, by geographical position, by long tradition, we ought to be the closest friends in the world. But it often happens that those who are the most nearly related by blood, the most contiguous to each other, are not always on the very best of terms, or at least, are not so at all times. I am in great hopes, however, that the pre-

sent state of irritation existing—not in Canada, for it does not exist here, but existing on the other side of the line, towards Canada—may be only of the nature of a lovers' quarrel, or a quarrel between near relatives, which will soon be composed by more serious considerations. I am sure that will be the case, as long as the better elements in the great republic to the south of us, hold the upper hand.

The only possible danger that can arise, will come from the sudden effervescence of the lower elements in that country, leading them to acts which would necessarily bring about a war. It is to be hoped that the good sense of the many will keep the turbulent few in subjection, and avoid that danger.

With that great nation, related to us, as the hon. member for East Durham (Mr. Craig) has pointed out, directly by blood, in many cases, indirectly by blood to all of us—with that great nation, I say, we should endeavour to the utmost of our ability, to preserve good relations at all times; to preserve those relations of commerce which are the surest methods of bringing about personal and national good feeling; to preserve those diplomatic relations which are consistent with continued respect for each other, and to preserve those personal individual relations which lie at the root of all broader relations. I should even have great hopes of seeing some realization of that great future alluded to by my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies), some sort of union for purposes of peace and progress between all English-speaking countries. I should be very glad to see that union between the greatest Empire and the greatest republic on earth, to which that hon. gentleman has referred.

Our position, in the meantime, must be one which will give no studied offence to that or any other neighbour, and which will leave it still open for us to realize such high possibilities, and our actions should be directed towards converting those possibilities into actual facts. I hope the present discussion will do something towards that great end, and I am sure honour will be reflected on the House by the way in which it has treated the subject.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to see this debate close without a word being said by a member from the province of Quebec and of my origin. I do not suppose that it is necessary to speak of our loyalty to the Queen of England and to the Empire. Ever since this Canada of ours became a dependency of Great Britain, whenever the necessities of our position called upon us to come forward and do our duty as British subjects, we were not behind: we never refused to do our duty, but we did it cheerfully and cordially. At times the loyalty of the French-Canadians must have been tried very much. Only a few

years after this country became a dependency of England, the Thirteen Colonies revolted and asserted their independence. At that time we were called upon to join them and help them against England, which had possession of the country, and against which the French of Canada had fought for years to maintain their allegiance to the King of France and remain a portion of France. But the result of the appeal from the other side, not only from the Americans, or the revolted British subjects, but from the French commandant and generals then on the other side of the line, to come forward and join the standard of France, was that the offer was spurned and the French-Canadians stood by the standard of Great Britain. They shed their blood in defence of that flag, and, though they may have had difficulties in bringing their friends to the convictions they held at that moment, nevertheless, they did their duty, and that duty was performed again at later periods, as I shall show to the House. When this country, by the war of 1812, was threatened again by the United States, you did not see the French-Canadians turn their backs on the standard of Great Britain, but they fought for the liberties of England, for the liberties of Canada, and for the liberties of the world. Later on, again, when our great, gracious Queen ascended the Throne of England, the difficulties that had existed for several years in Canada on account of the manner in which this country was administered by officers and officials from England, came to a climax, you did not see the mass of the people take a position in antagonism to the established authorities. No doubt, they sympathized with those who were asking for their complete liberty, that liberty which was granted afterwards, and granted by England, and which we now enjoy, under which, while we enjoy the rule of Great Britain, we have responsible government here. Ever since that time, when we have been called upon as a race, as British subjects, to defend the British flag, you never saw the French refuse, any more than members of the other races and they even left their province to go thousands of miles westward to re-establish the authority of England. I do not wish to make a speech, I am not prepared to do so; but it occurred to me, that, on an occasion like this, at all events, a voice from the French-Canadian people might be heard, and that voice would say: We, a million and a half of people in this country, having blood different from the other nationalities, worshipping at other altars than the majority of the inhabitants, having different ancestors from those of the large majority in this Dominion, join with the other race, join with our fellow-subjects, in declaring that Great Britain has not in the vast Empire more loyal subjects, more devoted subjects, than those of my race. I do not say that we are better than the other people in the Empire—we are satisfied if we are as

good as they. I thank the House for the attention paid to me while saying these few words.

Sir JAMES GRANT. Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to detain the House by any lengthy observations, more especially after the address delivered by the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill), as well as the speech of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). I have listened with a very great degree of pleasure to the able, laconic observations that have fallen from both of those hon. gentlemen on the important subject presented to the House by the mover of the resolution, and it was with pleasure indeed that I listened to the few words uttered by one of the Nestors of the great French nationality in this country, an hon. gentleman who, I regret to say, is almost too silent. I was pleased beyond measure to have heard him address the House on the loyalty and patriotism of that great French nationality, of which he is an ornament. We know well that in the history of this country the French nationality has worked with the Anglo-Saxon, to build up in Canada that prosperity we are now enjoying. On every occasion where their assistance was required in the development of the resources of this country and in the protection of the rights and privileges of our people we always found the French people fighting with the Anglo-Saxon. Then again, the able address delivered by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) is proof, if proof were wanting, that to-day in Canada, whether Liberal or Conservative, whether French or English, and no matter on what side of politics we arrange ourselves, we live together as one people fully determined to protect the Empire. We are living at an important era in the history of this North American continent. At no time within the past century, have the clouds hovered so gloomily over us as within the past few months. It is a reassurance to see that the principles of peace are likely to prevail, and that there are indications of peace all along the line. Only a few days ago the Rt. Hon. Mr. Balfour, who occupies so important a position in the government of Great Britain, addressing his electors at Manchester, said :

I do not believe that public opinion on either side of the Atlantic or in Europe will permit the outbreak of a war whose end no man can foresee. This expression of opinion from a gentleman, competent to judge of the doings of the nations of the world, is a source of encouragement to the people here who are working with all their power and ability to build up this portion of Her Majesty's Empire. There is another reason why we should be interested in the motion now before the House. Within a few months Her Majesty will have closed sixty years of her reign, and at no time in the history of this

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN.

world has the Empire made greater progress than during that period. In every part of the world there have been evidences of advancing civilization. What are we devoted to? Our Queen and our country, or rather the Empire of which we are a conspicuous part. We may ask what has this Empire, British in its surroundings and entirety, accomplished, in the past sixty years, to cause such enthusiasm and admiration, not alone by British subjects, but the world at large. In the marked advancement, there has been no grasping disposition, but merely the outgrowth of progressive revenue development cotemporaneous with advancing civilization. Since the Queen ascended the Throne, the "Thin Red Line," which marks the British territorial boundaries, has extended very considerably. Since 1843, the acquisition in India, of Scindh, Punjab and Oudh and Upper Burma as well as the Shan States, have added to the Indian Empire fully 275,000 square miles of territory. In the same period the occupation at Aden, the administration of Hong-Kong, as well as considerable portions of North Borneo, have given to the Empire an additional 80,000 square miles, in fact a territory fully as large as Great Britain. When the Queen commenced her illustrious rule, England had in South Africa 100,000 square miles; at present she holds sway over 300,000 square miles, in this same region. The North American and Australian colonies cover over 6,500,000 square miles of territory. When the Queen ascended the Throne, Canada had, about 1,000,000 population. Now we have over 5,000,000 people. During this same period the progress of the Australian colonies, has been very marked indeed. In Australia in 1837,—the population was about 175,000—to-day the population is fully 4,500,000, and only five years after Her Majesty ascended the Throne, was self-government conferred on New South Wales. To-day the British Empire embraces an area of fully 10,000,000 square miles, with a population of 350,000,000 of people. When we remember the position of Canada as a portion of that great Empire, should we not see that the motion of the hon. gentleman (Mr. McNeill) is well timed. It is the duty of as many hon. gentlemen as possible to express their opinions upon that resolution, because it will tell the world at large that we in Canada are determined to remain a portion of the British Empire. We have no desire to become annexed to the United States. We live in peace and prosperity and happiness here. When they were in trouble in their civil war, it is well known that thousands of our young men fought and fell on their battlefields for the abolition of slavery, and for the extension of the principles of civilization. And, if the United States were in trouble again to-morrow, the people of Canada would be willing to assist them out of their difficulty. This resolution of the hon.

gentleman (Mr. McNeill) will show the strong desire of our people, that come what may, we are ready to do our utmost to protect the best interests of the Empire. I again express the hope that the little cloud which hovers over us will pass away, and that when President Cleveland comes to a full appreciation of his manifesto, he will see that his course was irregular, and that there is no desire whatever on the part of Great Britain to grasp territories that belong to any other nation. Great Britain in the acquisition of her vast territories, in the extension of her powers, has merely taken what she was entitled to, and she merely wishes now to protect her Empire and to protect her own subjects. We are one people on this North American continent. We cultivate the same fields, and we promote the same principles of literature, science and art. Let us advance in unity and peace. Canadians are working in the best interests of their own Dominion, and we are at the same time glad to see the great American republic occupy the high position she does among the nations of the world. We wish her every prosperity, and when Canadians are called upon, not one of us will be found wanting to rise as one man to protect the best interests of this country and to maintain that allegiance to the Crown which makes us one people in saying, God save our Queen.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. Speaker, I had never supposed that Her Majesty the Queen or the British Government, or the British people had any doubt in regard to the loyalty of the people of Canada. I am in full accord with almost all the sentiments that have been expressed in regard to this resolution to-day. I was more than pleased with the speeches of some hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House. When I listened to the speeches of the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Cockburn), the hon. member for East Durham (Mr. Craig), and others, it occurred to me that probably one of the objects of this resolution, the opportuneness of which has been referred to by hon. gentlemen on both sides, was to make it known to Her Majesty the Queen, and to the British Government, that the many of the statements on the subject of loyalty, made in the Conservative press and on public platforms by Conservative speakers, were not true. These hon. gentlemen may have thought that some impression might have been made on the minds of some members of the British Government by the misrepresentation that more than one-half of the Canadian people were disloyal to the Crown; and I suppose we are to accept the speeches made by hon. gentlemen opposite to-day as an apology to the Liberal party for that misrepresentation. We accept it gratefully, and if no other good came from this debate, it will, I trust,

make them feel with us, as Canadians having a common interest in our country, that it was more than bad taste—that it was wicked and injurious to our country—that statements should have been made in the House, on the public platform, and in the press, which we all know were incorrect, and could only be made for petty partisan purposes. I have always thought it was to be regretted that such statements were made, and I hope that, in the future, if hon. gentlemen opposite who have spoken to-day are in earnest in what they say, we shall be relieved from hearing any public man trying to make political capital by repeating statements which he knows to be untrue, and by trying to disparage any one of our own people, no matter to what political party they may belong. I am fully in accord with the resolution and with the many loyal sentiments which have been expressed to-day, and good results may possibly come from the resolution and the many able speeches with which it has been supported.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to ask the House to listen to me for five minutes on this resolution. I simply rise lest, if no member of the Government said a word on the resolution, it might be thought or said by any one that we were not in sympathy with it. To correct that impression, and for that purpose alone, I rise. But while on my feet, I cannot but congratulate most heartily the mover of the resolution upon his speech. The matter of it was excellent, but the matter of even was exceeded by its good taste. I do not think that any person on either side of this House, or any citizen of this or any other country, could find fault with the spirit of the hon. gentleman's address. I have also listened with a great deal of pleasure to most of the addresses delivered on the other side of the House, as well as on our own side. I think the resolution is an opportune one. I think it will help to guide opinion in Canada itself. It will certainly help to inform public opinion in the United States and in Great Britain as well. It will tend to an increase of that warmth of interest, that feeling of common interest which is all the time growing between Great Britain and her colonies, and which, despite all obstacles and difficulties, which may seem practically to be in the way, is tending continuously and strongly to a complete union of Great Britain and all her colonies. I simply wish to make this statement of my accord and the accord of the Government with the resolution. It can do no harm, it must do a great deal of good, and it will be as agreeable to our own people as it will be to the people of Great Britain, to whom it especially goes.

Mr. LAURIER. Mr. Speaker, though this resolution meets with general acceptance from all sides, and though it requires no

support on my part, I also beg to add a few words just to express my entire concurrence with it. I am glad to believe that at this moment, when this resolution comes up for debate, there is, perhaps, less urgency for it than there was one month ago, when it was first placed on the Order paper. At that time the sky was cloudy; now it seems brighter. At that time it looked as if England were on the verge of war, and would have to fight single-handed almost the whole world—as if she would have to face many enemies combined, both from quarters where she might expect to find foes, and also from quarters where she might have expected to find friends. At this time, I am glad to say, matters look better. It is true, England was—as the Minister of Finance said on a former occasion, and is yet, isolated—whether splendidly isolated or dangerously isolated, I will not now debate; but for my part, I think splendidly isolated, because this isolation of England comes from her superiority, and her superiority, to-day seems to be manifest. Apart from the realm of letters and art—in which, in my humble judgment, France is her compeer, and even her superior—in everything that makes a people great, in colonizing power, in trade and commerce, in all the higher arts of civilization, England not only excels all other nations of the modern world, but all nations in ancient history as well. She is isolated to-day; but we can remember that the present position of England, the degree of marvellous development she has attained, dates from the day when her fortunes seemed to be at the lowest ebb, that is, at the close of the American war in the last century. At that time, England had just lost her colonial empire, she had lost her American colonies. The only colonies left to her were a few isolated spots here and there, and the colony of Canada, at that time containing only about 80,000 souls. Since that day, the career of England has been simply marvellous. Since that day she has conquered India, grappled with Napoleon and brought down that colossus, reduced her public debt, reduced the number of her paupers and criminals, doubled her population, trebled her trade, and planted strong and permanent colonies in Asia, Africa, Australasia and almost every other corner of the world. As I said, these splendid accomplishments date from the day when her fortunes seemed to be at the lowest ebb. She has done more, she has done what has not been done by any other nation. At the present day, when the nations of Europe, her competitors, have been concentrating all their energies in creating and increasing their standing armies and in maintaining stupendous armaments, England has devoted all her energies to the arts of peace, so that to-day her accumulated wealth is such that she is the banker of the world. The citizens of England to-day hold in their pockets the bonds of kings and nations, and on the recent occa-

Mr. LAURIER.

sion when she was threatened with war from across the sea, from a quarter where she had reason to expect nothing but friendship, just by declining the bonds of that nation she inflicted upon it almost as much harm as would war itself. Well, these are guarantees of peace, I think, these are splendid guarantees of peace; but if the day should come—which God forbid—if the day should ever come—which I again say God forbid—when England should have to repel foes, I am quite sure that all British subjects, all over the world, would be only too glad to give to her what help they could—all British subjects all over the world, not only British subjects of her own blood, but British subjects who are not of her own blood, but who have received from her the inestimable blessing of freedom.

Mr. McSHANE. Mr. Speaker, I cannot refrain from rising to give my humble support to this resolution, and to express my approval of the remarks of the hon. gentleman who moved it, and of those who supported it. I am not going to speak as to other portions of the Dominion, but shall confine the few remarks I intend to make, to my own native city of Montreal. I desire to say, that everywhere in the city of Montreal, the people are solid to a man in their support and defence of the British flag. I well remember the words used by one of the greatest men whom England ever sent to Canada—Lord Dufferin. At the time of the Fenian raid there were some in this country who attempted to decry the race to which I belong, but Lord Dufferin amply vindicated their loyalty by these patriotic words which he used, and which have endeared him to the heart of every Irishman. On that occasion, Lord Dufferin said:

During my various progress through the country, I have come into contact with hundreds and hundreds of kindly Irishmen, labouring in the field, the forest, by the riverside or in the mine; and never did I meet one who did not give me a hearty welcome, both as a fellow-countryman and as a representative of the Queen. Nay, on the day of peril, if in the Canadian line of battle I could find a regiment more essentially Irish in its composition than the rest, it would be to the keeping of that regiment. I would by preference entrust the standard of the Queen and the flag of the Dominion.

Mr. Speaker, we are a loyal people in the city of Montreal, loyal not only to the Empire, but loyal to ourselves. Let me mention a fact, Sir, which will illustrate how the people of all races and creeds in Montreal act loyally together. You know, Sir, that almost seven-eighths of the population of Montreal is Roman Catholic, but yet so liberal are we, so united are we in our desire to do justice to all, that only the other day, we elected a Protestant mayor by acclamation. That was not only an act of justice of the majority, but it was the right of the Protestant minority. If all the people of

Canada were as united as are the people of that city it would be all the better for the unity of Canada and of the Empire. I hope that this lesson will be remembered in other parts of the Dominion. I hope that throughout our entire country this example will be followed. I trust that no one will be debarred from occupying the highest position in the land on account of his religion, but that, under a broad spirit of toleration, a man's merit, and a man's good record as a citizen, will alone be taken into account. Every subject of the Queen felt proud when a few days ago, great England placed her battle ships in line, and in the face of an almost united Europe against her, declared her readiness to defend the flag which had braved a thousand years the battle and the breeze. If we hope to make Canada a great country, and entitle her to a prominent part of the British Empire, we must stand united amongst ourselves. We must have no religious bigotry or intolerance, and we must ensure that to be a good Canadian, is the best recommendation for any preferment at the hands of the people. I shall say no more except to repeat, that I warmly and heartily support the resolution proposed by the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill), and to thank the House for having given me the opportunity to express the sentiments of loyalty which actuate myself, and the people I have the honour to represent here.

Mr. DAVIN. As we have heard from every quarter hon. gentlemen rising to support the motion of my hon. friend from Bruce (Mr. McNeill), I do not think it would be proper that the sentiments of the North-west Territories in regard to this question should remain unexpressed. Since President Cleveland sent forth his message, I have received from every part of the North-west Territories letters asking me to see the Minister of Militia and endeavour to have arrangements made for the establishment of a volunteer and militia corps in the North-west Territories. This we should have but cannot have at present. I do not quite agree with all that fell from the lips of the hon. member from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), much as I admire the magnificent speech which he contributed to this debate. There was one remark in it to which I feel obliged to take exception in particular. He said that Canada was a hostage on the part of England for her good behaviour to the United States, and that the choice lay between our being a hostage and being a bond of union between the United States and England. Sir, I do not wish, of course, to misrepresent the hon. gentleman but I apprehend that by his proposition he meant to imply that, in some way or other, at present, Canada is a hostage, and the comment of the hon. gentleman which followed, namely, that from the Atlantic to the Rockies, Canada was the most defenceless country on the face of the globe, showed that, in his

opinion, Canada was to-day, to some extent, a hostage to the United States on the part of England. Now, I do not subscribe to the view that Canada is any source of weakness whatever to England or the Empire. On the contrary, I regard Canada at present as one of the strongest portions of the Imperial panoply of England. You have only, Sir, to fancy what the position of England would be if the preachments of twenty-five or thirty years ago of such men as Mr. Goldwin Smith had been listened to. Some twenty-five or thirty years ago, Mr. Goldwin Smith, and others, were preaching independence; but when they saw that that doctrine did not take with the people of the Dominion, they began to preach annexation. Suppose that either independence or annexation had taken place, and suppose President Cleveland had sent such a message as he sent a few weeks ago with regard to Venezuela, would Britain have been in the strong position she is to-day—strong by reason of the fact that she has on the Pacific coast and the Atlantic coast the finest harbours in the world, and the greatest potentialities of war? So far from admitting, therefore, that Canada is a source of weakness, I believe that Canada is a source of strength to the Empire and contains within itself the possibility of far greater strength. It is this want of foresight, this inability to see what the future has in store, that is one of the main causes of the position which hon. gentlemen opposite have so long occupied. My hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) condemned with a sneer, and a deserved sneer, those paltry greengrocer statesmen at St. Stephen's who followed the great Chatham who created an Empire, but it is the same want of foresight, which these men exhibited, that is shown by hon. gentlemen opposite. They cannot tell what Canada is likely to become twenty or thirty years hence, or even less. I will, with the permission of the House, say a few words expressive of the feeling in the North-west. The people of the United States some twenty-five years ago were talking of manifest destiny. They had no idea then of what the North-west Territories and Manitoba were likely to become. They had no idea at the time, of what Manitoba was likely to be. But, Sir, they thought, and thought mistakenly, that the people of Canada were in favour of annexation. Time passed on and they found that there was no feeling of that kind. And now, Sir, I hope I shall not be misunderstood if I refer to a circumstance which occurred in Toronto some 22 years ago. At that time Dr. Tiffany came from the United States to Toronto and gave a lecture in Shaftesbury Hall on "The New Civilization." And what was this new civilization that was to enlighten the world, this new civilization at the feet of which old England was to sit, at the feet of which men who had in their veins the blood, and in their hearts and brains the traditions, of old Eng-

land, were to sit? That civilization was the civilization of the United States. Sir, I yield to no man in my admiration of the United States; I yield to no man in my sympathy with the struggle that country has made. But, if I am to look at it from that point of view, I must compare that civilization with the civilization of other countries. I am driven to believe that, while that country has energy, while it has inventiveness, while it has 65 millions of dollar-getters and breeders of dollar-getters, it is lacking in many of the great qualities of civilization which have marked the progress of other countries. Now, Mr. Speaker, Dr. Tiffany heralded the immediate annexation of this country to the United States. The St. George's society waited upon a young man who was just then come to Toronto, who was not a Canadian and had then no intention of becoming a Canadian, and asked him to reply to this speech of Dr. Tiffany. The young man accepted that invitation and, in replying to Dr. Tiffany he made a quotation from John Stuart Mill, which I desire to give to this House. When men of the school of Bright and men of the school of Mill spoke in favour of the view that the colonies, the very moment they should express the desire for independence, should be allowed to go, it never entered their heads for one moment that the time would come, when all over the world wherever British colonies were, the sentiment of those colonies would be not a centrifugal but a centripetal force, not a desire to move away from the old motherland, but actually a desire to draw nearer to England, regarding the mother country with a passion of reverence and patriotism greater even than Englishmen have. A great man, a man born in India, has asked:

What should they know of England who only England know?

The poor little street-bred people who vapour and fume and brag,

They are lifting their heads in stillness to yelp at the English flag.

But that is not the sentiment all over the colonies; this is not the sentiment of the people of India. Their sentiment is more Imperial, as is the sentiment of Canada, than the sentiment of many parts even of England itself. Now, John Stuart Mill,—and I happened to have the honour, and it was one of the greatest honours of my life, to meet that gentleman,—thought, notwithstanding his extraordinary powers of thought and his extraordinary political insight, that the time would surely come when the colonies would want to leave the mother country. But still, he perceived the great advantages of the colonial relation, and this is what he said:

But though Great Britain could do perfectly well without the colonies, and though on every principle of morality and justice she ought to consent to their separation, should the time come when, after full trial of the best form of union,

Mr. DAVIN.

they deliberately desire to be dissuaded; there are strong reasons for maintaining the present slight bond of connection, so long as not disagreeable to the feelings of either party. It is a step, as far as it goes, towards universal peace, and general friendly co-operation among nations. It renders war impossible among a large number of otherwise independent communities; and, moreover, hinders any of them from being absorbed in a foreign state, and becoming a source of additional aggressive strength to some rival power, either more despotic or closer at hand, which might not always be so unambitious or so pacific as Great Britain. It at least keeps the markets of the different countries open to one another and prevents that mutual exclusion by hostile tariffs which none of the great communities of mankind, except England, have yet outgrown.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, sh.

Mr. DAVIN. Yes, that is a splendid adumbration of the Imperial Zollverein that my hon. friends are in favour of.

And, in the case of the British possessions, it has the advantage, specially valuable at the present time, of adding to the moral influence and weight in the councils of the world of the power which, of all in existence, best understands liberty—and, whatever may have been its errors in the past, has attained to more of conscience and moral principle in its dealings with foreigners, than any other great nation seems either to conceive as possible, or recognize as desirable.

It is quite clear that the man who wrote that splendid paragraph, if he could have conceived of a time when the colonies would have the passionate Imperial patriotism that they have to-day, would have regarded it as a harbinger of a civilization greater than anything the history of the past can show. Well, Mr. Speaker, time passed away, and the Americans saw that the people of Ontario and the people of Quebec did not wish to join them. They found this true, not merely of the Anglo-Saxon—and, after all, that is an unphilosophical use of the term Anglo-Saxon? Why, Sir, does any one suppose that the Anglo-Saxon element is the largest element in Canada or the largest to-day in the British Empire? The Celtic element is just as large or larger. Here we have my hon. friend from Three Rivers (Sir Hector Langevin), who spoke so pregnantly and eloquently for the French Celts, and the leader of the Opposition, who spoke, as he usually does on occasions of this kind, with a mastery of his theme that it would be an impertinence on my part to eulogize. And we have my hon. friend from Montreal Centre (Mr. McShane), who grew dithyrambic in his enthusiasm for the British flag—reminding me that he was one of a committee on the platform, some sixteen or seventeen years ago, when I spoke, in a theatre in Montreal, on the subject of "Ireland and the Empire." Well, as I say, time passed away, and we opened up the North-west Territories. A political reference has been made—I think not with the taste which usually character-

izes my hon. friend from North Oxford (Mr. Sutherland). I think that, considering the character of the two speeches that opened the debate, and others, it would have been better if that political reference had not been made. Without making any political reference, I will only state the historical fact that the Conservative party came into power and opened up the North-west and Manitoba. And since then what has happened? The waste lands of the United States, the lands opened there for settlement, are giving out. The American farmer is coming into the North-west under the immigration policy of my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Daly.)

Mr. MCGREGOR. Politics.

Mr. DAVIN. I am not bringing in politics; I am only stating a historical fact. These men are coming into the North-west, and what has happened? We have had visits from General Sherman, we have had visits from leading statesmen belonging to the United States; we have had a visit from Mr. Thompson, a literary man, who has contributed an article to one of the American magazines. And what does he say? He says that we have in the North-west Territories a grander heritage of fruitful and arable lands than the United States ever had. And what has been the result? Covetousness in regard to the North-west Territories has begun to fire the breast of the people of the United States, and the fact is that when they talk of Venezuela, and when they talk hostilely in regard to any other geographical spot on the map of the world, the spot they are thinking of is Manitoba and the North-west Territories. These places they covet; these lands they need. But, Mr. Speaker, Canada's position is such to-day that with the potentialities of war and with the developed and inchoate material that we have on the Atlantic and Pacific coasts, we in Manitoba and the North-west Territories would not fear one whit. The writer in the St. Paul paper who stated that Manitoba and the North-west Territories could easily have been gobbled up, would have been greatly surprised if he could have witnessed what took place in Winnipeg on 30th December last, when the mere mention of Canada standing shoulder to shoulder with England, come what might, ready as our fathers have been, to fight and to win, and if we could not win, to die, created an enthusiasm so great that this gentleman would have been convinced that for the United States to capture Manitoba and the North-west Territories would have been a bigger job than they ever dreamed of. Sir, a gentleman spoke at that meeting—if a reference to his speech may be allowed—though it may procure a narrow sneer, but I can bear a narrow sneer—who could have used the very language with which he concluded a little

speech that he made twenty-two years ago, and the first he made in Canada. These are the words he used, if I may be allowed to read them, and they sound almost prophetic:

They evidently regard us as if we were but a chip on the outer circle of a whirlpool into whose vortex we must inevitably be sucked. They have made laws with the idea of coercing us. They have now learned their error, and know they had to deal with.

A spirit too delicate

To act their earthy and abhorred commands.

I am certain it would not be good for Canada, whose spirit and the laws of whose development are evidently British. No! There is no danger of annexation. March may wed September and time divorce regret, and the frost of January nip the flowers of June, but not a law of separation pass between us and the country of our great forefathers, in order that there should take place a marriage traitorous to our most valued and sacred traditions. Let the United States go on in their own course. We neither envy nor fear them. Let them flatter themselves with manifest destiny. But if they would hear the truth I can give them the result of nine months' critical experience. I know the loyalty of the noble people of this country; and I can tell our Republican friends here to-night that that day shall never come when scattered nations of British race, looking with loyal love from every compass to the little mother isle,—

Girt by the dim strait sea,

And multitudinous wall of wandering wave—
and reposing, safe and glorious, in that sapphire embrace—will turn round to call on Canada to add her voice to swell the peal of filial gratulation, of proud assurance of co-operation, and, should need be, of help, and will turn in vain.

Motion agreed to.

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

After Recess.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 47) respecting the Brandon and South-western Railway Company.—(Mr. Christie, for Mr. Davin.)

Bill (No. 48) respecting the Canadian Jockey Club.—(Mr. Tisdale.)

Bill (No. 49) respecting the Huron and Erie Loan and Savings Company.—(Sir John Carling.)

Bill (No. 50) respecting the South-western Railway Company and the St. Lawrence and Adirondack Railway Company.—(Mr. Tisdale, for Mr. Bergeron.)

ADULTERATION OF FOOD, DRUGS, &c.
—(HONEY.)

The House again resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 10) further to amend the Act respecting the Adulteration of Food, Drugs, and Agricultural Fertilizers.—(Mr. Sproule.)

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Mr. INNES. When this Bill was before the committee on a former occasion, I directed the attention of the committee to some remarks that I read, giving the opinion of a gentleman who is thoroughly versed on the subject, and who had made a life-long study of bee-keeping. His remarks were altogether in favour of the wholesomeness of honey made from granulated sugar. Of course, there are differences of opinion on that subject, as there are differences of opinion with regard to the qualities of honey. Some contend that honey, the product of sugar, is really not honey; others, again, maintain that it is. One authority which I have states that:

By the action of powerful salivary glands, and a secretion of formic acid, the nectar of flowers and the sweet of granulated sugar are changed by the bees from cane sugar to grape sugar. This transformation is one of great importance. Grape sugar is easy of digestion. Cane sugar is one of the most indigestible things in nature. The honey bee, among other good offices which it performs for the human world, transmutes the indigestible nectar of flowers into a digestible and luscious article of food.

That is one opinion with respect to the nature of this particular kind of honey, and the transformation it undergoes in process by the bees. Again, this authority says:

Honey is of various grades or qualities. There is that made from white clover and linden or basswood, which stands at the top of the market. There is that made from buckwheat, which is of inferior quality. There is the honey sometimes made from aphides, or honey-dew, which is worse than buckwheat honey. There is that quality of extracted honey which is thick, ripe, thoroughly evaporated, and will keep till doomsday. There is also a thin, watery, unripe kind, which has been rushed almost out of the mouths of the bees by the use of the extractor, and will turn sour inside of a month.

So we have very different kinds of honey, some good, some bad, and some very indifferent. However, as there is so much difference of opinion with respect to this matter, as this difference of opinion exists among the authorities, not only in Canada, but in the United States, I have not the slightest objection to one or two clauses of this Bill with respect to the prevention of the sale and prevention of exportation. I may be allowed to quote a sentence or two from authorities in the United States, showing that there is a wide difference of opinion even there, and they are hesitating whether legislation should be had on this subject or not. An authority says:

Even in the United States, not a single prominent bee journal dare open its columns to a discussion of it.

Again:

It is a pity this matter could not be discussed in a broad spirit, but I do not think that even

Mr. DAVIN.

you have a fair idea of the prejudice and wrath this subject has aroused.

Another authority says:

Over on our side we think the better course is to be quiet mostly on the sugar-honey question at present, but, if our enemies were so cantankerous as to try to get our legislatures to pass laws for simple purposes of persecution, then the case would be altered.

I have said that I do not object to the clause of the Bill with respect to preventing honey of the kind in question being offered for sale or for exportation, but hon. gentlemen will see towards the latter clause of the section that there is an infringement on the rights of individuals. The clause reads:

No imitation of honey, or sugar honey, so called, or other substitute for honey, shall be manufactured or produced or sold or offered for sale in Canada.

I would ask the committee why it is considered desirable to prevent the production of this kind of honey by individuals for their own use. According to this clause, its sale would be forbidden; not only so, but its production would be followed by a penalty in case the law was infringed. It seems to me that this is going too far in this direction, and I call the attention of the Government to it. I think they should modify the Bill in this respect. If the honey is not unwholesome or harmful—and nothing has been shown to prove that it is unwholesome and harmful—why should an individual be indicted for producing it for his own use? I would suggest that the clause be amended so as to read:

No imitation of honey, or sugar honey, so-called, or other substitute for honey shall be manufactured for sale, or offered for sale in Canada, or for exportation to foreign countries.

Mr. SPROULE. If the right to manufacture for their own use was allowed to bee-keepers, sugar-honey of this quality would be sold. I do not think any one would go to the trouble of manufacturing honey in that way for his own use, but it would be to make money out of it, because honey is rarely so scarce that it cannot be obtained at a very moderate price. I do not apprehend that any person would feed sugar to bees in summer when he can get flowers at hand, and thus produce honey in the regular way.

Mr. INNES. There are many seasons of the year when flowers are scarce, and so the bees are fed with sugar.

Mr. SPROULE. Flowers are never so scarce that those who keep bees cannot obtain them in sufficient quantities to secure an abundant crop of honey for any family, the year around.

Mr. McMILLAN. There are some seasons during which flowers are so scarce that it is impossible for bees to make honey.

Some of my neighbours keep a large number of hives, sixty or seventy, and last winter they had almost no honey. While I believe it is right to prevent individuals feeding sugar to bees and putting the product on the market, I hold that the clause should be amended so as to read "provided that this section shall not be interpreted or constructed to prevent sugar being fed to bees by the owners of bees, when it is for their own use." I believe it would be wrong to prevent any individual feeding sugar in a season like the last one, when it was difficult to obtain enough natural food to keep them alive. I am strongly in favour of preventing such honey being placed on the market and exported, but it would be a great hardship that the owner of a number of hives should be prevented from getting sufficient honey for his own use by feeding sugar to his bees.

Mr. SPROULE. Canadian honey sold last season for 8 cents per pound, and so it could not have been very scarce. The opinion of bee-keepers generally is that if each individual was allowed to feed sugar to his bees to manufacture honey for his own use, the present Bill might as well be dropped, because when a prosecution was attempted, and honey of the kind mentioned in the Bill was found in the bee-keeper's possession, he would set up as a defence that it was manufactured for his own use.

Mr. INNES. How are you going to prevent it? You would require a whole army of inspectors throughout the country.

Mr. SPROULE. Not necessarily. The inspector who examines apiaries would be sufficient for the work.

Mr. FOSTER. It does not seem to me that this Bill, as it stands, would be workable. The legislation proposed, at all events, goes very close to debatable ground. If it were established that honey made from bees that were fed from syrup or something of that kind was a deleterious article, I think the argument then would be very strong from the sanitary point of view that it should not be made. I acknowledge the strength of the argument made from this point of view, that honey is an article of manufacture, that honey-makers are anxious to obtain and maintain as good a reputation and name as possible, for Canadian honey, and it would be much better if nothing but the honey which is produced by natural process should be made. There is a good deal to be said on that side of the argument, especially with respect to maintaining our market for honey in the old country, but I think it will be very generally admitted that the honey made from feeding bees with syrup or sugar is not as good an article, is not as pure and not of as high a class as that made by bees, from natural flowers.

Mr. INNES. Still, it is very wholesome.

Mr. FOSTER. These two sets of arguments have weight, one against the other. But there is a good deal to be said if we try to eliminate the article of honey which is made from the artificial feeding of bees for sale. There is a good deal to be said in this way, that persons having hives, and when flowers are scarce, or for any other reason, making an inferior grade of honey, should have an opportunity of doing so. It is pretty stringent legislation to say to a man that he shall not manufacture, through his bees, an article of food which is not deleterious and which he does not propose to sell to any one, but to use in his own family. The argument which the hon. member (Mr. Sproule) uses against this is, that if you allow bee-keepers to make honey by using artificial food for bees, the makers have a basis of operation by means of which they will be able to put the product on the market. I think you can press this argument too far. You have in the first place, to make it illegal to offer for sale or to sell it, and you impose a penalty as strong and as high as you can, and that will certainly have the effect of preventing it being manufactured to any large extent for sale. I think you had better run the risk of a little of it being put on, or run the risk of making it a little more difficult to detect it, than to go so far as to say to a man, that he shall not manufacture artificial honey for his own use. I would strongly recommend my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) to change the latter section, and to insert something which would leave it possible for a man to make honey from artificial bee food for his own use, but which would not allow him to put it on the market under the same name as honey of the best grade. I would suggest that you should allow a man to make honey for his own use, but that you should prevent him offering it for sale as genuine honey. You could compel him to stamp it and mark it so as to show it was not made from the natural flower.

Mr. GIBSON. I wish to say a word in reference to this Bill. Last year in the Niagara Peninsula, we were very much in the same position as mentioned by my hon. friend from South Huron (Mr. McMillan), we had a scarcity of clover, and the result was that the bees instead of being fed honestly with sugar by the bee-keepers, wandered down to the vineyards, and I know from my own experience that they swept away nearly half of my vines. How will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) protect the buyer of honey, and distinguish between honey made from the grapes gathered by the bees, and honey made from good sugar supplied by the bee-keepers? I think it is far better that the suggestion of the Finance Minister should be carried out, and that when honey is put up either in casks or tins, it should be labelled, as made from sugar or not made from sugar, as the

case may be. In my own village there is a bee-keeper, and he gives his personal guarantee on the label under his own signature, that all the honey he places on the market is not made from sugar. But in a season when there is a scarcity of flowers and clover, as we found on account of the dry weather last year, it would be far better that that man should be allowed to feed his bees on sugar, rather than lose them and so destroy an industry which is becoming important in our section of the country. I hope the suggestion of the Minister of Finance will be given effect to.

Mr. SPROULE. My information is that if you allow honey to be made at all in this objectionable way, the Act will be of little avail. A few years ago, a petition was presented to the United States Congress signed by over thirty thousand people, asking for a similar Act to this, and in that petition it was claimed that if the privilege of marking such a product as an adulteration or a substitute for honey, it would be of no use whatever. Although they have tried strongly to get such an Act as this passed in the United States they have not succeeded. An American work which I have in my possession upon this subject says: That it is a known fact, that the analysis of specimens of honey taken from all over the country shows, that in every single case the adulterated article was marked "pure honey." The only samples they found to contain pure honey, were those which were not so marked, and which were simply labelled "honey." You can see where designing people endeavoured to cover up their own misdoings by labelling the adulterated honey in a way to mislead the public. The amendment proposed by the Minister of Finance would not at all meet the case. If you give those persons the right to manufacture for their own use, you will do away with the best possible proof that you can have in a prosecution under the Act. If your inspector goes to the bee hive and finds there is a vessel containing the syrup from which the bees fill themselves and deposit it in the cells, it is prima facie evidence that that is placed there for the purpose of making it into sugar-honey, because it is there during the season of the year that it is not required for food. The very fact that the syrup was found there would be a violation of the law, and would subject the offender to punishment. If you allow the right to manufacture such artificial honey for private use, it will materially destroy the value of the Act. So far as I have been able to ascertain, and I have endeavoured to find out, there are only two prominent bee-keepers in Canada opposed to this measure. All the rest are united in favour of it. They have been asking for this Act for years. It is an important industry, out of which they make on an average \$800,000 a year, and those engaged in it ask to be protected. When the butter-makers asked Parliament for a law to pro-

Mr. GIBSON.

hibit the manufacture of any substitute for butter, there were some members in this House who declared that artificial butter was as palatable as most of the butter made by the farmers. However, the Bill known as the Oleomargarine Act was passed, and it says:

No oleomargarine, butterine, or other substitute for butter, manufactured from any animal substance other than milk, shall be manufactured in Canada or sold therein; and every person who contravenes the provisions of this Act in any manner whatever, shall incur a penalty not exceeding \$400, and not less than \$200.

There we prohibited the manufacture or the offering for sale. Now, the bee-keepers say that that Act was effectual, because, since it has been on the statute-book, we have never had any reasonable ground for supposing that oleomargarine or butterine was manufactured in Canada, and the makers of butter have been greatly benefited. The bee-keepers ask the same protection for their industry; and they say that as their product is sold at a low price, at about 8 cents per pound, and is, therefore, within the reach of everybody, there is no need of imitations being placed upon the market. They have urged Parliament for years to give them this small protection for their industry, which they think would develop greatly if it had such protection, but which they believe without it will be ultimately destroyed.

Mr. FLINT. In my opinion the amendment is a great improvement on the original Bill: but the point I wish to make is this: I think Parliament has gone a great length in prohibiting absolutely the manufacture and sale of substances that are not in themselves deleterious or injurious to public health. I think the utmost length to which this committee should be asked to go would be to compel persons manufacturing and selling such articles to correctly indicate their character and quality by label. We know that when Parliament is asked to legislate in reference to an article on the ground that it is injurious to the public in ways which are pointed out by the advocates of the legislation proposed, a great deal of excitement is always occasioned, and hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House are apt to argue that public liberty is restricted by legislation of that kind. Now, I think we are in this case going to a length which is dangerous. I see no reason why any person who manufactures an article which is not injurious to the health of any individual should not be permitted to manufacture and sell it, provided the nature of it is properly indicated to the public. I would go as far as any member of this committee to compel persons who manufacture substances in imitation of honey to properly label them, and to protect the manufacturers of honey produced by bees. However, the House having passed the principle of this measure, it is, perhaps, a little too late now to take ex-

ception to it. I only rise to protest against this species of legislation—the exercise of the powers of Parliament to create an offence, with enormous penalties, of what is in itself no offence and no injury to any individual in the state or to the state itself. If it is necessary to protect the genuine manufacturers of certain articles, and I admit that it is, then let that protection go only to the extent necessary for that purpose.

Mr. FOSTER. I propose the amendment which I spoke of a little while ago, and with that amendment I would be disposed to support the Bill. On previous occasions I have had conferences with the bee-men, who are all anxious in this matter. Bee culture is a beautiful culture, and it may be made a very profitable branch of business in this country; and the bee-keepers allege that it is absolutely necessary to keep the reputation of their honey clear and distinct in the British market, where they are looking to establish a permanent market for it. I think we go a long way when we stamp as illegal the sale of artificial honey, but I think we should not go so far as to prevent persons manufacturing an article which is not injurious to health. Therefore, I think the case would be met by inserting in line 15, “manufactured or produced for sale, or sold or offered for sale in Canada.”

Mr. McNEILL. What is this going to be manufactured for if not for sale?

Mr. FOSTER. For a man's own use. This will put a stop to any one offering it for sale.

Mr. McNEILL. Might there not be a question of law involved as to whether honey which had some of this material mixed with it, would be a commodity that might be offered for sale under this Bill? I think we should take care that neither this thing itself, in its pure state, if you can call it pure, nor this material combined with pure honey, should be offered for sale. What we want to do is to prevent the adulteration of our honey and the destruction of the market for our honey; and if we do not guard against the danger of this article being mixed with honey, we shall not, I think, be advancing the interests of the bee-keepers.

Mr. MULOCK. Under the amendment of the Minister of Finance the offence is in offering for sale. If you would strike out the words, “manufactured or produced,” and let it read, “shall be offered for sale,” I think you would express the object of the amendment. Strike out those words, “manufactured or produced,” and let it read, “shall be offered for sale.” There is no use in inquiring as to a man's motive in manufacturing or producing. The offence is in offering for sale.

Mr. SPROULE. If you did that you might as well not pass the law at all.

Mr. LISTER. It seems to me that, under section 21a, there will be about as much difficulty in obtaining a conviction as there was under the old Combine Bill. The first portion of the section prohibits the feeding to bees of sugar, glucose, or any other sweet substance other than what they gather from natural sources, but, at the end of the section, there is the proviso that this section shall not be interpreted or construed to prevent the giving of sugar in any form to bees to become consumed by them as food. I do not see how you can ever obtain a conviction under this section. If you charge a man with having fed his bees on sugar or other sweet substance other than what is gathered from the natural flowers, with the intent that such substance shall be used by the bees in the making of honey, he will simply reply that he gave them the sugar to be consumed by them as food.

Mr. SPROULE. They never require to have sugar in the time when the flowers are in bloom.

Mr. LISTER. There might be a scarcity of flowers. Last year the clover was very scarce, and there might possibly be a scarcity of the natural sources, so that sugar would have to be used. Then, suppose the bees were fed on one-half sugar, and the other half they got from the flowers, would the owner be liable under this Act? This Bill does not protect the bee interests of the country at all. The remark of the Minister of Finance, I think, was a reasonable one, and that was that the moment you begin to prohibit the manufacture of a thing which is not in itself unhealthy, and which the community have a right to use, you are going a long way in the wrong direction. It is not pretended by any one that honey made from sugar is injurious, so that if the honey manufactured from natural sources is branded so as to inform the public that what they are buying is honey from the flower, that ought to be sufficient for the bee people. If honey be not so branded, the people will know that it was manufactured by the bees out of sugar or glucose, and they will know what they are paying for.

Mr. McNEILL. I would suggest, in order to meet the objection of my hon. friend, that the words of the last proviso be altered to “to be consumed by them for the purpose of food only.”

Mr. LISTER. That would not get over the difficulty.

Mr. McNEILL. What is the difficulty? If the sugar be given for the purposes of food only, no one will object, no matter what time it may be given. There may be times of the year, even in the summer, there may be peculiar seasons when the bees may require some assistance in the way of artificial food, and in that case these words will cover such contingencies.

Mr. INNES. Where will you draw the line, and who will be the judge?

Mr. McNEILL. It will be drawn by the evidence. As a rule, it will be known very well that it is altogether unnecessary to give sugar for the purposes of food in the summer time.

Mr. INNES. There may be summers when it would be necessary.

Mr. McNEILL. Very strong evidence would have to be produced to prove this.

Mr. FLINT. What the hon. gentleman seems to be aiming at by his Bill is a very simple thing. It is, that no one should attempt to palm off on the public as pure honey something which is not pure honey, made in the ordinary way by bees. We have a clause here under which the feeding of bees on certain articles can be called the adulteration of honey, and somebody must be punished, nobody knows how, for this new offence. It is a most absurd piece of legislation. A very simple clause, which any legal gentleman could draw in five minutes, would accomplish what is desired. What is desired is that no person in Canada shall put upon the market as pure honey what is not pure honey. Let the committee rise, and then let us have an amendment providing, in as few words as possible, for the accomplishment of that result. As has been pointed out by hon. friend from Lambton (Mr. Lister), no one could be convicted under this clause. The clause is absurd, both legally and logically, and will not accomplish what the hon. gentleman desires. The House is going at an extent which would not be tolerated on most subjects of legislation. Let us confine ourselves strictly to what we are asked to do. Let us say that a certain punishment shall be meted out to those who label as pure honey any article containing that which is not pure honey, and offer it for sale, allowing those who wish to do so to make an article resembling honey which is not injurious to anybody if it is honestly labelled, just as we do with certain proprietary compounds that are sold throughout the country. If necessary, let the articles of which the compound is made be stated on the label.

Mr. SPROULE. What the hon. gentleman regards as so absurd is already the law with regard to the adulteration of food generally. The law specifies two classes of adulteration, those that are injurious to health, and those that are not injurious, but one is as clearly prohibited as the other. The law says:

No person shall manufacture, expose or offer for sale any food product or agricultural fertilizer which is adulterated within the meaning of this Act.

Then it goes on to provide that whether the adulterant is injurious to health or not, the person making the adulteration

Mr. McNEILL.

shall be punished. So that this Bill, if it passes, will not be so totally absurd as the hon. gentleman seems to think. This Bill was drafted by one of the ablest lawyers in the western section, from which the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister) comes. I am sure from the reputation of the gentleman that he would not allow anything to pass through his hands unless it contained good common sense, and was likely to be effectual in attaining the object sought after. The hon. member for Lambton asks how we could prosecute, as it may be necessary to feed bees in the summer. My information is that it is only during the seasons of the year when there is an absence of honey that you require to feed bees sugar syrup, in order to keep them alive. Even when there seems to be few flowers, they will find food to sustain themselves. Therefore, if the inspector, on his rounds in the summer, finds sugar-syrup exposed in a bee-hive, he will know that it is not for the purpose of keeping the bees alive. But if, in the winter, or spring, or fall, he finds a bee-keeper feeding his bees, he will know that, owing to the absence of the food necessary to keep them alive, such means of feeding are necessary. The analyst can distinguish between the product which is the result of feeding the bees sugar-syrup, and that gathered by the bees from the flowers. Mr. Macfarlane tells me that there is no difficulty in determining this fact. He says that, although they have made no regular analysis of honey upon which they have sent out bulletins, they intend to do so, and that there is no difficulty in distinguishing between the honey made by bees fed on sugar-syrup, and the honey collected from the natural sources. This Bill goes no further in relation to honey than the general Bill goes in regard to the adulteration of other food: and I think it is not unreasonable to ask the House to pass the measure as it is.

Mr. GIBSON. There is one point, it seems to me, that has escaped the attention of the committee. I do not anticipate so much harm from the manner in which the bees are fed as I do from the adulteration of the honey after it has been extracted from the comb.

Mr. FOSTER. That will come under the general Act.

Mr. GIBSON. This is how the difficulty arises: Dishonest honey dealers who wish to sell their honey at prices a cent or two cheaper than their neighbours are selling at, buy refined sugar for a few cents a pound, boil it down, and add it to their honey, and sell the mixture from 12 to 15 cents per pound. If the proposer of the Bill will accept the advice of the Minister of Finance and prohibit the labelling as pure honey of that which is not pure, the main difficulty will be met, which is in the adulteration of the honey in the liquid

state, as the hon. gentleman who introduced the Bill knows. The hon. gentleman might as well object to feeding the bees on buckwheat or anything else. The bees will take whatever kind of food they can get. As I stated, they cleared a large portion of the crop of the vineyards in the Niagara district last year on account of the lack of buckwheat, clover, and other flowers. This is the first time I have ever heard that feeding bees on any kind of saccharine matter in order to save them made worse honey than that which is made up from the saccharine matter taken from the flowers, the buckwheat or the grapes. The whole difficulty of adulteration, I believe, lies in the adulteration which is made in the honey in its liquid state.

Mr. SPROULE. Evidently the hon. gentleman who has just spoken, knows nothing of the difficulties the bee-keepers have to contend with. The general Act provides against the adulteration referred to by the hon. gentleman. But the other form of adulteration is growing. It is very common in the United States; it was practised more than twenty years ago, and is being done more largely every year. This practice is destroying the reputation of all the honey that is collected.

Bill, as amended, reported.

THE RATE OF INTEREST.

The House resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Mulock for second reading of Bill (No. 8) respecting interest.

Mr. COCKBURN. I should like to say a few words upon this Bill before any further steps are taken. I must say I am rather astonished that a Bill of this character should emanate from a gentleman so thoroughly conversant with mercantile transactions as the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock), a gentleman who is the able president of the Farmers' Loan Company, and who has managed with great ability, various trust estates that have been placed in his hands. I think, Sir, that whatever reasons there may be for fixing by statute the rate of interest to be paid when no rate has been agreed upon between the parties, no rate should be fixed which would offer any inducement to the party borrowing to make default in one payment of his obligation. Any statute that would have that effect, would be greatly detrimental to the best interests of the public. Now, with the exception of loans upon the security of real estate, and upon stocks and debentures which are immediately convertible into cash, my hon. friend must be aware that the prevailing interest is 6 per cent, and that in all commercial transactions of the best character, that rate is the rate which is now charged. If this proposition were made

into law so that in case of default only 4 per cent could be charged, a direct inducement would be held out to the borrower to delay or postpone, by every means in his power, the day of payment; he would thus be making the difference between 4 per cent and 6 per cent on the loan. I may be told, of course, that it is quite possible for the lender to insert such terms in the loan as to secure himself for the full 6 per cent. after default. But there are numerous cases in which no stipulation is thought of, and it would affect injuriously the borrower himself were such an enactment as is here proposed passed into law. The effect would be that in the majority of cases, not only would the object of this Bill be defeated, for lenders would, by their contracts, provide for payment of interest after default at a higher rate than the statutory rate; but a serious injury would be inflicted upon the commercial public. If the lender did not provide in the contract for the higher rate of interest, in case of default the tendency on the part of the borrower in most cases would naturally be to press for payment immediately when the obligation became due. This might be very inconvenient to the person who had borrowed money, but the lender would be placed in the advantageous position of being able, in the exigencies of the case, probably to force a higher rate of interest from the borrower than 6 per cent, which we think to be the present regular commercial interest in commercial transactions. Then, Sir, if this proposition of the hon. gentleman were made law, another trouble would arise. We would be placed in this most peculiar position, that we should be lending money in Canada at 4 per cent as if we were the wealthiest country in the world, while in the States immediately to the south of us, in New York state, for instance, the legal rate of interest is 6 per cent. I may say that in twenty-eight states, out of the fifty states and territories in the United States, the rate of interest, where no special rate has been agreed upon, is 6 per cent; and in twenty-two of those states the rate runs from 7 to 10 per cent.

Mr. LISTER. That is the usurers' paradise.

Mr. COCKBURN. Well, I may tell the hon. gentleman that I do not consider that the twenty-six states in the union are controlled by usurers. I repeat that in the United States there are twenty-eight states and territories where the legal rate of interest is 6 per cent, and in twenty-two of them, it runs from 7 to 10 per cent, according to the risks, and no man can effectually make it more or less by law. Eventually there would means be found of evading any attempt of this kind to fix the price of an article which is variable.

Mr. LISTER. The National Policy has tried to do so.

Mr. COCKBURN. The National Policy has done a great deal for the country, and my hon. friend seems to be so enamoured with the results of it, that he even wishes us to take into our hands the whole of the monetary transactions of the country, and deal with them. We already have savings banks, and other deposit banks under the charge of the Government; we have a Government Banking Act; but if it is the desire of the party opposite that we should take under our immediate care the whole of the monetary institutions of the country, I dare say the Government, in its wisdom, may consult with my friend, and deliberate as to how his wishes can be best effected. However, I want to draw attention to the fact that in twenty-eight states of the union the legal rate of interest is only 6 per cent; and in twenty-two of them it is from 7 to 10 per cent. In only two states of the union, Louisiana and Illinois, the rate is 5 per cent, but as usury laws prevail there, the example is not one which we can, under the circumstances, safely follow. When we consider what is ordinarily paid to a depositor for his money by those going to loan out that same money, when we reflect that the depositor usually gets from 3 per cent to 3½ per cent, I think that when my hon. friend tries to fix the rate at an additional ½ per cent, which has to cover all the risk, with the expenses attending the management of it, he is undertaking a risk which I am sure I am safe in saying he has never ventured to undertake, either in the loan company which he so ably controls, nor has he ever undertaken such a risk in the disposition of those funds of which he has charge as trustee. This effect, I think, must inevitably follow—perhaps that may have been an idea in the mind of my hon. friend—the effect must be to raise the price of money to the poor man. Of course, if 4 per cent is to be the rate, we cannot expect that the capital which can find ready employment at 6 per cent, 7 per cent, 8 per cent and 9 per cent, is going to find its way into Canada. There will be a gradual withdrawal of that capital to England and elsewhere, so that the amount of capital left on hand would be smaller, while the number of those who want to borrow it will remain the same. The inevitable result would be to force up the rate of interest still higher than it has ever been. The supply will be cut off, because there will be no inducement to the Englishman to put his money here, and my hon. friend who may now be contented with 6 per cent on his mortgages, would be netting 7, 8 or 9 per cent.

Mr. MULOCK. I suppose you are aware that we have so much money in the country that a great deal of it is sent out of Canada for investment.

Mr. COCKBURN. Where is it sent?

Mr. MULOCK. New York, principally.

Mr. COCKBURN. In New York the rates are higher, so that if this law were to pass

Mr. COCKBURN.

it would drain still more largely the country of money, which would be sent to New York. I am obliged to my hon. friend for the suggestion, it illustrates the very fact I am pointing out.

Mr. MULOCK. Surely the hon. gentleman, as a banker, knows better than what he is saying now.

Mr. COCKBURN. I know perfectly well what I am saying. Perhaps the object of my hon. friend's Bill is not so much to raise the price of money, as to manufacture farmers' votes.

Mr. MULOCK. That is a piece of impertinence.

Mr. COCKBURN. I wish also to point out to the House that in England, which has had an experience of centuries, which is the money market of the world, to which we all look as the guiding star in commercial matters, while the rate of discount for commercial paper may have been less than 1 per cent for the twelve months, the legal rate of interest established in the courts on money in default is 5 per cent. Surely the hon. member is not going to hold out a premium to a man not to meet his legal obligation and to remunerate the borrower for a breach of contract. If a man has borrowed from you \$10,000 at 6 per cent and you have made no arrangement with him as to the rate of interest in case of default, you do not wish him to be in a position of trying to keep you out of your money because he is going to make \$200 on it by paying you 4 per cent instead of 6. I think that when the House has fully considered this matter—and I cannot help thinking that my hon. friend, with his long experience, will himself be convinced—it will arrive at the conclusion that apart from the little advantage that is going to be gained perhaps among the farming community during election time, there is nothing to be gained for the benefit of this country by passing such a proposal as that made.

Mr. LISTER. The hon. gentleman who has just addressed the House has referred to the Act relating to interest passed many years ago, when the farmers were obliged to pay from 10 to 20 per cent on mortgages. But money has come down to 5 and 5½ per cent.

Mr. COCKBURN. No.

Mr. LISTER. Any quantity can be obtained over the country at 5½ per cent.

Mr. COCKBURN. That is on mortgage.

Mr. LISTER. Money has come down from 10 and 20 per cent to, say, 6 per cent. The statute which the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) proposes to amend is a statute passed when high rates of interest prevailed many years ago. During all these years no attempts whatever have been made to reduce the rate of interest. No

man will say that 6 per cent was an unreasonable rate when people who went to the banks to borrow money would have to pay 10 per cent exchange and on mortgage from 10 to 15 per cent. Six per cent was then not unreasonable when no contract was made between the parties. It was in the interest, then, of the borrower to allow the loan to go on, if no rate of interest was fixed. It was the interest of the lender to exact payment because he could get a higher rate than the law provided he should receive in the absence of a contract. But the position has altogether changed since that time. Money can be obtained on good security at 5 per cent; it can be obtained from the banks at $5\frac{1}{2}$ to 6 per cent if the security is good. Then upon what principle should we retain the legal rate of interest which in the absence of a contract was fixed at 6 per cent, when money can now be borrowed at a lower rate than 6 per cent? The dire calamity which the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Cockburn) mentioned, that English capitalists would draw their money out of Canada, that money would become scarce here, and the rate of interest would surely advance, might occur under different conditions from those which the Bill would bring about. Capital will go to whatever place will pay the largest return, either to the United States or South America or elsewhere; and if our people will not give 4 or 5 per cent, capital will be withdrawn from Canada and seek investment at a higher rate than can be obtained here. But the hon. gentleman does not profess by this Bill to limit the rate of interest, to restrict the right of the individual to contract as to the rate to be paid. All it provides is, that where no contract exists as to rate of interest, then the rate shall be 4 instead of 6 per cent. So the hon. gentleman is drawing on his imagination when he pictures to the House the lamentable condition of affairs that would follow the passing of this Bill, the withdrawal of capital from Canada and the consequent increase in the rate of interest. Money is like wheat or any other commodity; a chunk of gold will bring what the necessities of the case demand; if plentiful, it will be low, if scarce, high. So interest, like every other commodity, depends upon the scarcity or abundance of money.

Mr. COCKBURN. Will the hon. gentleman explain how mercantile paper is frequently discounted at a fraction of 1 per cent per annum, and seldom reaches the rate allowed by the courts when the parties have not agreed upon it, the rate so allowed (5 per cent) largely exceeding the average rate upon mercantile transactions. That is in England.

Mr. MULOCK. Everything in England is under the control of capital.

Mr. LISTER. It does not follow that where the statute law provides that in the

absence of contract there should be a certain rate of interest paid, the volume of business is affected, but only the man who allows an overdue note to remain in that condition. If the legal rate is 4 per cent, and he can obtain 6 per cent, he will say to the maker of the note that he must pay up the note. It has no influence whatever upon the volume of the money in the country, and it cannot affect the credit of the country whether it be 1 per cent or 2 per cent, or if the law provided it should be nothing at all. As I pointed out to my hon. friend, the statute does not interfere with the contracting rights of individuals, and nearly every contract for the payment of money fixes the rate of interest to be paid. If the loan is by a bank, the discount is taken off at the time the money is advanced. It is covered on the face of the note, and all the bank would be entitled to recover would be the 6 per cent after the maturity of the note. I need not tell my hon. friend (Mr. Cockburn), who is a banker, that banks are not in the habit of allowing overdue paper to remain in the bank any longer than they can help.

Mr. COCKBURN. Let me ask my hon. friend (Mr. Lister) whether you would not force the bank to deal harshly with a man in that case, and whether it would not be in his interest to be in default instead of honestly keeping to his obligations.

Mr. LISTER. The bank will make every individual whose note it holds pay up; no matter whether the interest is 8 per cent or 9 per cent. If the borrowers allow their overdue paper to remain, their credit is destroyed, and it is not business anyway. Besides all that, the conditions can be made on a promissory note that after maturity it should bear interest at 7 per cent or 8 per cent, or whatever may be provided. It all comes within the contract, and the contract can be made by the bank. So long as the statute does not interfere with the right to contract, no injury can be done to any person. It cannot affect our credit in England. It cannot attract money here from England or from any other country, to say that because the rate is 6 per cent in Canada where there is no contract English money will find its way into this country. This Bill is in the interest of the community at large, and in view of the fact that the rate of interest has come down from 10 and 15 per cent to 5 and $5\frac{1}{2}$ per cent, we should reduce the rate of interest chargeable upon overdue paper, so as to conform with the reduced rate. I can see no objection to the Bill. On the contrary, I can see everything in favour of it. Nobody can be injured, because money is not worth more than 4 per cent, for that is all an individual can get for it. A man has money to pay his note, and, if he takes it to a bank, or to a loan company, the highest rate of interest he can get would

be 4 per cent on deposit. I do not think you should exact from the people of the country more than they could get from our financial institutions for their money on deposit. I shall certainly support the Bill.

Mr. SPROULE. I have no doubt the object of the Bill is a good one, if we could carry it; but this Bill will not reach cases where the hardship is most felt in questions of interest. It is not because people are compelled to pay 6 per cent that it is such a great hardship, but the trouble is when they are compelled to pay 8, or 10, or 12, or even 20 per cent, as is the case in many parts of the country to-day. If the hon. gentleman's Bill went so far as to prohibit that, I would willingly support it, even though he might fix the rate at 6 per cent—which is not considered unreasonable he would be doing great good towards those people who can least afford to pay a very high rate of interest. But, provided this Bill should become law, any sharp business man—and they are the men who always get the high rate of interest—or the banks, or the loan companies, can easily evade it by making a contract. They can make a contract and provide for any rate of interest, no matter how high, even though this Bill should pass, and, therefore, I say this provision does not prevent the evils which now exist. Those who would be benefited by the Bill are those who are indifferent and pay little attention to their business transactions, and they represent only a very small portion of the business community. I agree with the hon. gentleman, that the rate of interest is coming down all the time, and that 4 per cent might be fairly considered reasonable to-day. If we could make that the general rate for business transactions all through the country, then I would say that this legislation conferred a great boon upon the people. If the hon. gentleman does not go further than he proposes in this Bill, I am afraid that it will accomplish little or no good.

Mr. MACLEAN (York). If the argument of the hon. gentleman from Toronto (Mr. Cockburn) is good for anything, it proves that the Act respecting Interest ought to be repealed. But he does not go that far. If Parliament takes the position that it ought to make a legal rate of interest, then Parliament ought to keep in touch with the times, and, if the rate of interest has a downward tendency, Parliament ought to fix the legal rate in harmony with that decline. That is all this Bill proposes to do, and, if it does that, then Parliament ought to accept its responsibility and make the legal rate in harmony with the ordinary commercial rate. If the Bill does not remove all the grievances that exist, under the present rules and laws with regard to interest, it does, at least, afford some measure of relief to people who are paying in-

Mr. LISTER.

terest, and to that extent it should be supported by the House.

Mr. MARTIN. It seems to me that the hon. member (Mr. Mulock) has not gone far enough in this legislation, if he desires to have the rate of interest in cases of this kind fixed at 4 per cent, because he still leaves the law as it was with regard to interest upon judgment debts.

Mr. MULOCK. No.

Mr. MARTIN. Yes. The Bill does not affect that in any way.

Mr. MULOCK. Yes, it does.

Mr. MARTIN. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. The Bill says:

Whenever interest is payable by the agreement of parties or by law, and no rate is fixed by such agreement or law, the rate of interest shall be 4 per cent per annum.

The hon. gentleman has not altered the wording of the existing Act at all, except to change 6 per cent to 4 per cent. The effect of that has been determined by the courts in Manitoba, and, I think, in British Columbia. In Manitoba the rate of interest upon judgments is 4 per cent, in spite of the fact that that section applies to Manitoba. That is because our rate of interest upon judgments is determined by the English law that was introduced into Manitoba. The hon. gentleman will find that the rate of interest on judgments in Ontario is 6 per cent; not on account of the section 2 of the Interest Act, but on account of the fact that it was 6 per cent prior to confederation. That is the case in British Columbia also. In 1894, by chapter 22 of the Statutes of this Parliament, the Act respecting interest was amended with regard to British Columbia, so as to provide that the rate of interest upon judgment debts should be 6 per cent. We have then these differences in the different provinces. In British Columbia it is 6 per cent by express enactment of this Parliament; in Manitoba, 4 per cent, because there is nothing in the Interest Act which affects the question of interest upon judgments, and in Ontario it is 6 per cent, not because the Interest Act affects it, but because that was the law prior to confederation. If I am right with regard to this, and the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock) reduces the rate of interest in case of agreement or by law to 4 per cent, then there would be a very considerable inducement, as the hon. gentleman for Toronto (Mr. Cockburn) has suggested, for creditors to sue at once upon an over due liability which carries interest, in order to escape the law, by which they would only get 4 per cent, and take advantage of the other law by which on a judgment debt they would get 6 per cent. If this Bill is passed, it should be made to include judgment debts in all the provinces, and reduce the rate on

judgments debts from 6 per cent to 4 per cent.

Mr. CAMPBELL. The point raised by the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin) is a legal one which I do not profess to enter into, but it seems to me that section 2 of the Bill would cover all debts.

Mr. MULOCK. It is easy enough to get over that point in committee.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Yes, that could be easily arranged, if the principle of the Bill is adopted by this House. For my part, I would rather see the rate of interest fixed at 5 per cent than 4 per cent. I believe that the present rate should be reduced. The rate of interest was fixed at 6 per cent when money was quite freely going at from 10 to 12 per cent, but now the rate has come down very much. The city of Toronto has borrowed large sums of money at 3½ per cent, and I believe the city of Ottawa has floated its 3½ per cent debentures above par at 102 or 103. Gilt-edged mortgages can be obtained at 5 per cent or 4½ per cent. If a man wants to lend \$1,000, and thinks he should have 6 per cent for it, this Bill does not prevent him getting that, if he states it in the contract. It is the duty of the man lending the money either to get the note renewed, or to see that the amount is paid, and I know that banks will never allow a note to run past due, if it can be collected at all. That would be a silly kind of banking. A bank manager always sees, when the day arrives, that the note is payed or renewed, as it should be. The only objection I have to the Bill is that I would like to see the rate fixed at 5 per cent, instead of 4 per cent.

Mr. COATSWORTH. I am disposed to agree with the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Campbell) in thinking that the present Bill is too radical a change. I do not know that we ought to make any change this session, because the matter is certainly a very important one. Undoubtedly the tendency of the rates of interest for the last two or three years has been downwards. As one hon. gentleman said, a borrower can get money on gilt-edged security on mortgage as low as 5 per cent.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Yes, at 4½.

Mr. COATSWORTH. I have not seen any mortgages going through at 4½. I have seen some go through at 5, and where the security is not first-class the rate is generally 6 per cent. But undoubtedly during the last five years there has been a decrease generally in the rates of interest, and I think it is a proper subject for the consideration of this Parliament whether the legal rate of interest should not be lowered. Speaking for myself and for those I represent, I would not be prepared to say definitely whether I ought to support or oppose this Bill in the long run; but at present I think

it is too radical a measure to pass this session. There has been no expression of opinion in the country with regard to the subject, and without such an expression of opinion I think we ought not to pass so radical a measure. There is another subject which I think might well have been considered in connection with this; that is, the question whether we should limit the possibilities of contracts in relation to interest. In some of the states on the other side they have what they call laws against usury, which forbid even contracting above a certain rate. While I do not think the evil has grown to such an alarming extent in this country as it must have grown there to require legislation upon it, yet in my experience in dealing with cases coming before the courts, I have seen contracts in relation to interest which certainly ought to be stopped in some way. There is no doubt that advantage is often taken of the necessities of people in that respect. I do not think that is so much the case in mortgages on real estate as it is in chattel mortgages, and I think that possibly we ought to consider the question whether some limitation in that respect should not be imposed. But so far as the present Bill is concerned, while personally I am disposed to favour a reduction in the rate of interest, I do not think we ought to move hastily in the matter. It may be that before the next five years pass over the rates of interest may go up somewhat again.

Mr. LISTER. No, no.

Mr. COATSWORTH. It may be that the hon. member is right. I hope he is right.

Mr. CAMPBELL. The whole tendency is downwards.

Mr. COATSWORTH. Yes, it has been for a number of years, and I hope it is a permanent tendency. At the same time we ought not to be in any haste to pass a measure so radical in this sense, that it interferes with a condition that has existed for many years, that is well known throughout the country; and until we have some expression of opinion from the business community, the boards of trade, the banks and other interests, some of whom would of course be against any reduction in the rate of interest, I think we ought not to pass the Bill. While generally speaking, I am favourable to the lowering of the rate of interest, I would not like to see this Bill passed during the present session.

Mr. TISDALE. I agree with the proposition that it is desirable to lower the rate of interest, but I do not agree at all with the hon. gentleman that that can be done by legislation.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). You are for free trade in money.

Mr. TISDALE. I am for free trade in money, and my reason is this. I want to

see the interest as low as possible ; but I am perfectly convinced, and I think history proves conclusively that the way to get low interest is to keep money free. Any one who has lived many years in Canada will remember the contest which took place at the time the usury laws were abolished. Those laws had the effect of compelling the borrower to pay high rates of interest, and the rates have tended to go lower ever since. I cannot remember a single case in which a man was ever convicted of usury. There were extensive law suits brought with the view of taking advantage of the law then in force, but they were almost always unsuccessful. I can remember well when 10 or 12 per cent was more easily got for money than 5 or 6 per cent is to-day. I oppose this legislation on the broad principle that it is best for the borrower to leave money free. If you fix the rate of interest at 4 percent to-day, what will happen? Money cannot be borrowed at that rate, and the instant a note becomes due, if the maker of the note failed to meet it, he would be sued, and he would have to be sued, because he would not be able to borrow money to renew it at as low a rate as 4 per cent. We know that business men are very well satisfied indeed to get money at 6 per cent from the banks. The effect of this measure would be to punish the very men in whose interest it is avowedly introduced. I believe in lines that are practicable—on lines that can be successfully put in practice. I am prepared to say with the greatest confidence that a measure of this sort would be an injury to the very people whom it apparently proposes to assist. Hon. gentlemen who have had an opportunity of studying this matter in the light of experience will agree with me that the result of leaving money free in this country has been to bring millions of dollars from the old country, where money is plenty, to this country for investment ; and this movement has always tended to reduce the rates of interest. I agree with one remark which has been made. It is generally a good sign when the rates of money go up ; I mean the ordinary rates in business circles, because it indicates an activity in business. When money is low it is generally plentiful, because the state of business is such that it cannot find employment. While I would like, if possible, to reduce the rates paid by those who borrow on securities, I think it would be a step in the wrong direction to apply that principle to business transactions, as this Bill is designed to do, because the rate at which you can borrow money depends on the quantity of money in the market. With regard to borrowing from people who have money to lend and who live on the interest of it, the rate depends on the class of security and the plentifulness of money. There is no logic so convincing as the logic of events. On all lines I am strongly op-

Mr. TISDALE.

posed to any attempt to interfere with the existing legal rate. I am satisfied that any attempt to alter it by legislation would simply make things worse for the man we would all like to see get the best of it, the man who pays the interest. Every man whose contract or note became due would not be able to borrow money unless at a higher rate.

Mr. LISTER. Why did not that deplorable condition of affairs happen when money was lending at twelve or fourteen per cent and the legal rate stood at six. People were not then forced to the wall.

Mr. TISDALE. The distinction is this : The borrower who did not borrow from the moneyed institutions, such as banks, which were quite ready to lend at the legal rate, but who had to borrow at commercial rates, had to pay these higher rates because of the existence of the usury laws. The danger of the transaction was so great that the lender charged higher rates for the risk.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). We have not had usury laws since fifty years.

Mr. LISTER. This is not a usury law. The usury law is dead.

Mr. TISDALE. But it is on the same lines. You use compulsion. You compel a lesser rate than the commercial borrowing rate. Take a simple illustration : A merchant sells goods to a man ; he must have credit. The merchant then, to carry on his business, has to borrow at a higher rate of interest from the bank than what he gets from his debtor.

Mr. LISTER. Then put the rate up to 8 per cent.

Mr. TISDALE. I believe in letting well alone. There is no desire for a lesser rate by those who desire not to get an advantage.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I wish to say a word or two in reply to the first speech which the hon. gentleman addressed to the House. I think it only requires a moment's consideration to satisfy the House that the question of usury or free contracts with reference to interest is not involved in this Bill at all. The parties are free to make their own contract with regard to the rate of interest ; and with regard to the plentifulness or scarcity of money in the country, the question does not arise here at all. Then the hon. gentleman said that when the rate of interest was high the country was prosperous, and when low the country was not so prosperous, and he told us that where there is free trade in money the rate is always lower, because the money is more plentiful, and he is in favour of free trade in money. So that he must be in favour of a condition of things in which the country is not so prosperous. I am unable to reconcile the various propositions which the hon. member

for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) has put forward. I do not think they can very well stand together. My impression is that when the great money centres of the world are making loans to nations about to engage or actually engage in war, the rate of interest will become high everywhere, and is likely to become high in Canada as well as elsewhere, and that we owe in part the very low rate which has prevailed for some time in this country—first, to the freedom of contract with reference to interest, which has caused money to flow here for the purpose of investment, but also very largely in consequence of the general peace which has existed throughout the world, especially in those countries which are the great money lending centres of the world. Now, I think that the only point involved in this measure is a very simple one, and that is, whether the rate of interest proposed to be fixed by this Bill is very much below the average rate of interest that prevails amongst parties whose credit is fairly good. I do not think that you should judge in this matter by comparison with cases of loans extending over a period of a long time, made by persons who may be advanced in years and with large sums to invest, who do not care to be troubled looking constantly after avenues of investment, and to whom a permanent investment is of more consequence than a very large rate of interest. You should look at the ordinary transactions of life, that occur with reference to the lending of moneys, to the accommodation given in banks and elsewhere, for the purpose of enabling a fair rate of interest where no rate of interest has been agreed upon. Now, there is this to be considered in fixing the rate under these circumstances: What will be the effect upon the man who is a debtor, where credit has been given, say by the retail merchant and by various parties from whom loans are affected? What will be the effect upon the relations which exist between the debtor and the creditor in these cases? My impression is, that, if you fix a rate of interest very much below the ordinary rate, one of two things happens. The merchant will charge more for his goods when he parts with them on credit, or, if he sells at a narrow margin, he will press for immediate payment or for some security upon which there shall be a higher rate of interest than you fix. The ordinary merchant goes to the bank and obtains credit, and he gives credit to his customers. If the bank compels him to pay a rate very much higher than that which he charges to his creditors on over-due bills, of course, he will insist upon the settlement of the account, or upon a note being given in which the rate of interest is fixed. So that while it may be that, as my hon. friend who moves this Bill has stated, that the present legal rate of interest, 6 per cent, is above the current rate of interest which is ordinarily charged, I am not at all sure that

the rate he proposes is not too low, and that it will not lead to an immediate demand for the payment of all over-due bills and of due accounts, or for their settlement by bills or notes bearing a higher rate of interest than that named in this Bill. There are very many cases where men allow an amount to stand, between parties where the debtor is perfectly good, but is not prepared to make immediate payment, at the ordinary rate of 6 per cent, because he regards that as a fair charge. It seems to me, that the House, in dealing with these questions, ought to be certain, as near as may be, what is the current rate between the parties, and to see to it that the rate fixed is not higher than that. My hon. friend from Kent (Mr. Campbell) has suggested 5 per cent. I am inclined to think that that is very near the right figure, and that, if you were to go very much beyond that, you would be charging the party more than he could obtain the money for upon his note, if his security is good; and, if you put it below that figure, you will compel a settlement by notes, or bills, or cash, where otherwise an inconvenience of that sort need not be incurred. The whole question here is not a question in reference to free trade, or in reference to usury; it is a question as to what is a fair compensation looking at the present abundance of money, to the party who, for the time being, is exercising his forbearance towards a debtor, in order that the business of the country may be carried on with as little inconvenience as possible. You do subject the parties, who may be perfectly upright and ready to trust each other, to a certain amount of inconvenience, if you fix the rate of interest so low as to force an actual settlement at every moment when an account becomes due.

Mr. FOSTER. The remarks of my hon. friend who has just sat down seem to me to get at about the kernel of this question. No doubt, since the rate was fixed at 6 per cent, there has been a considerable lowering in the general rate of money. The whole question for the House to consider is, first, whether any change is to take place; and second, whether 4 per cent is not too low in comparison with the general rate of interest. I am a little surprised to hear that money is loaned generally at so low a rate as 5 per cent. That is not my experience. And I think that we who come from the maritime provinces will be unanimous in saying that there is very much more loaned on mortgage in small sums at 7 per cent than at 5, and very little loaned at less than 6 per cent. There is a good deal to be thought of when you undertake arbitrarily by law to interfere with the rate of interest in the country. I am not going to discuss the question to-night, because I have a proposition to make to the House which, I think, will bring the matter into better shape; and that is, that, having had this discussion—

in a rather thin House, I must say—the Bill be read the second time and referred to the Committee on Banking and Commerce, which is one of the best committees of this House, and that the whole matter be taken into consideration there. I am impelled to make this suggestion all the more because I have received a large number of representations from business men, from loan societies and from the bankers' association, asking that they may be heard and putting some pretty strong objections, as I look at them, to the lowering of the rate to 4 per cent. These gentlemen might be heard by the Government, and the Government might make up its mind whether it would declare in favour of 4 or 5 per cent, or whether it would oppose the Bill altogether; but I think it would be much better that these gentlemen should have a chance to be heard before the Banking and Commerce Committee, and of laying the peculiarly business aspect of this question before that committee. The subject will be discussed there, and, probably—though I am not going to make a prophecy—it may be decided that, while there should be a lowering of the rate of interest, yet 4 per cent is too low a figure.

Mr. MULOCK. The suggestion of the Minister of Finance does not appear to me an unreasonable one. But, before assenting to it, I would like to make a few remarks in reference to some observations that have fallen from some hon. gentlemen in this discussion. Of course, it is unfortunate if one's motives for introducing legislation are impugned. But that is one of the consequences we have to face, and I will not make any further remark upon that point. There seems to be some misapprehension as to the meaning of the Bill, its extent and its object. It would be more fairly discussed if hon. gentlemen would speak to the text, instead of importing arguments based upon an imaginary state of affairs. This Bill proposes to deal with the matter of interest where persons have made an agreement to pay interest, but have not fixed the rate; also, to provide a rate of interest where interest is payable by law, and no rate has been stated. Now, let me say that the language of this Bill is the exact language of the Revised Statutes, with the exception of the word "four" in lieu of the word "six." Turning to the original statute, passed in 1858, section 5 is as follows:—

Six per cent per annum shall continue to be the rate of interest in all cases where, by the agreement of the parties or by law, interest is payable, and no rate has been fixed by the parties or by law.

That section was incorporated in the Consolidated Statutes of Canada, 1859, and has continued to be followed ever since. So that there is nothing novel in the language of this clause, the only change being to re-

Mr. FOSTER.

duce the rate from 6 to 4 per cent. On that point, as has been suggested in the course of the debate, I concede there is scope for difference of opinion. But, at all events, it is a fair subject of debate and consideration whether the existing rate is not too high. Now, to what class of people will this apply? Let us illustrate. Let it apply to the case of over-due bills mentioned by my hon. friend from Centre Toronto (Mr. Cockburn). Commercial paper discounted, how is that to be drawn? As a rule, notes are drawn for a fixed sum of money without reference to interest whatever, and the interest is deducted by the banker by way of discount. Three months after date the promisor promises to pay \$100, in some cases, "with interest," is added; in other cases, and in most cases, without; so that as to the great bulk of commercial paper, there is no reference whatever to the subject of interest. The agreement, therefore, is not that interest shall be paid upon that note, the agreement is to pay a fixed sum of money when the note is due. The court allows interest or not on overdue paper, as a matter of damages, and the matter is in the direction of the court. The great class of cases to which this will apply will be the cases of money owing upon mortgages. Farmers have been alluded to, and perhaps they are not altogether to blame if they are not able to pay their mortgages when due. Others, besides farmers, I am afraid, in great numbers, have mortgages upon their property. Mortgagors are not in the habit of paying their mortgages when due, as makers of notes are. Mortgages run on for years after they are overdue. In some cases the rate of interest entered into may have been a high rate at the time the contract was made, and there has been a great change before the mortgage fell due, still the mortgage continues as an overdue mortgage. Now, it would apply to a case like that. If a mortgage were entered into five years ago bearing 8 per cent interest, to-day it becomes due, and what rate should he pay to-day? Should he be compelled to continue to pay his 8 per cent, or should he get some amelioration, and if so, what? He has agreed to pay interest up to the end of five years, he has not stipulated what interest he is to pay afterwards. How much is he to pay?

Mr. TISDALE. They generally put a clause in the mortgage to compel him to pay the same rate.

Mr. MULOCK. I am not interfering with the right of contract.

Mr. TISDALE. Then your argument is no good.

Mr. MULOCK. Where they have agreed to pay interest, but have not stipulated the rate, then the rate is fixed by this statute. Now, the hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) argues that the introduction of a change like this would be pro-

ductive of great injury. In 1858 the current rate was nearly twice the legal rate, and a considerable difference continued from 1858 to the present time, a period of thirty-eight years. During the whole of that period, the current rate has been, we may say, in excess of the legal rate. Have any of those disastrous consequences followed which have been predicted in the case of this Bill becoming law? In 1858 the rate was fixed at 6 per cent, and that condition of affairs has existed up to the present time. Five years ago, the current rate of interest on the best securities was about 2 per cent above 6 per cent. During those five years did we hear of debtors being oppressed? Did we hear of lawyers going about stirring up litigation, and usurious men oppressing borrowers? I have not heard of any such experiences. And if, when there was that difference of, say 2 per cent, within the last few years, there were no serious consequences, what right have we to assume that to-day, with the current rate at 6 per cent, if we fix the legal rate at 4 per cent, there will be a different state of affairs from what happened before? We can imagine consequences, but we have got the absolute evidence to prove that nothing injurious will follow. Probably the only effect will be that the placing upon the statute-book of a lower rate of interest, will have an encouraging effect upon the market price of money, encouraging it downwards, and gradually inducing borrowers and lenders of money to look to 4 per cent as the standard rate, and gradually work down towards that rate.

Mr. McALISTER. Won't the demand for money regulate that?

Mr. MULLOCK. The demand will have its influence, various causes will have an influence, but the public mind has to be educated, and men who have money to lend are influenced by various circumstances. The fact that there is a fixed rate by law, is accepted by many persons as a reasonable rate in itself, and the moment one man recognizes a fixed rate as a reasonable rate to adopt, and adopts it, others will follow suit; and so by voluntary agreement, by free trade, we find the rate coming down to the rate fixed by law. Therefore, I think the measure is in the right direction. I see no force whatever in the argument that because banks choose to pay a certain rate of interest on deposits, therefore, this rate of interest should be in excess of the rate allowed on deposits. There is no connection whatever between the two circumstances. The banks lend vast sums of money in excess of what they receive on deposit, banks have great privileges. But I do not think that our law is to be wholly controlled by regard to the banks, although we ought to have a very great regard too for them. At the same time we must not

lose sight of the fact that there is a large borrowing class, and I have not heard any argument whatever on their behalf. The hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Cockburn) is acting in their behalf when he pronounces against this measure.

Mr. COCKBURN. I have no interest whatever to promote, except the interests of the country; I have not the interests of the farmers or of any other class.

Mr. MULLOCK. No one would suspect that in this case the hon. gentleman was seeking the support of the farmers; certainly he has not sought to advance their interests by his remarks on this measure.

Mr. MACLEAN. What about the Patrons?

Mr. MULLOCK. The hon. gentleman for East Toronto said he had not heard of any agitation for this measure. I have read during the last two or three years, in organs representing the farming community, articles in the direction of this measure, and I submit it is one demanded by a large section of the public and that it will be in the interest of the public—that it will be injurious to none, and beneficial to all. If there is any question as to the side upon which legislation ought to lean, it ought to be, I think, on the side of those most in need of protection, most in need of amelioration of their condition.

Mr. FOSTER. You alighted on an unfortunate word.

Mr. MULLOCK. Protection from oppression. If it was a matter of a philanthropic character between two classes, my leanings would be towards the weaker, and I think, as a rule, those in debt are more in need of consideration than are the creditors. However, that is not the principle on which we are to legislate altogether; at the same time, many of the arguments advanced have been adduced by hon. members who have taken a limited view of the question. I have no objection to the Bill going to the Committee on Banking and Commerce, but I hope that will not be the end of it for this session.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

Mr. FOSTER moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 10.10 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 6th February, 1896.

The **SPEAKER** took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

DOMINION ELECTIONS ACT.

Sir **CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER** moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 55) further to amend the Dominion Elections Act.

Some hon. **MEMBERS**. Explain.

Sir **CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER**. This is an adaptation of the Act passed at the last session of the English Parliament, entitled an Act to amend the Corrupt and Illegal Practices Act. In short, it makes an illegal and corrupt act the publication of any false statement in relation to the personal character or conduct of either of the candidates during an election without reasonable cause. While I ventured to introduce the Bill, my purpose was not to press it upon the House, even if opportunity permitted. But, as we have legislated in line with the larger part of the election laws of Great Britain, it occurred to me that this measure would be well worthy of the consideration of the Government. I have ventured, therefore, to ask leave to introduce this Bill, so that the Government might, before the session is ended, observe the principle of it, and consider whether it might not be probably taken up and made a part of the law of the land.

An hon. **MEMBER**. What is the penalty ?

Sir **CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER**. It makes the offence a corrupt act under the election law, which would affect the election just as any other corrupt act.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

MONTMAGNY VOTERS' LISTS.

Mr. **CHOQUETTE** asked :

What was the total cost of the preparation of the voters' lists, in 1894, for the electoral district of Montmagny ? What was the total amount paid to A. C. Darveau, Esq., revising officer, for salary and emoluments for the preparing of the said lists ?

Mr. **FOSTER**. By reference to pages J 25, J 29 and J 31 of the report of the Auditor General for 1894-95, the answer to the hon. gentleman's question may be found, the total cost of the revision being \$711.41.

PUBLIC BUILDING—PICTON.

Mr. **DAWSON** asked :

On what street (giving numbers of the lots or other description of the land obtained) in the

Mr. **MULOCK**.

town of Picton, is the new site, which is said to be more desirable than the Carter site for the proposed public building ?

2. Has the said new site been purchased yet ? If so, from whom ? When, and at what price ? If not, name of present owner, and price asked ?

3. How will the Government dispose of the Carter site ?

Mr. **OUMET**. On the north side of Main Street, between Ross and Elizabeth Streets, adjoining the Standard Bank building—opposite the present post office—(part of lot 265). In answer to the second question, no. Owner's name is David J. Barker : price asked, \$4,000. In answer to the third question, by sale for the price paid for it.

ORDER IN COUNCIL RE SHIPPING UNITED STATES CATTLE.

Mr. **CASEY** asked :

1. Is the Honourable Minister of Agriculture aware that a copy of an Order in Council concerning the shipping of United States cattle from a Canadian port was published in some of the morning newspapers of Friday, 24th January ?

2. Has the Honourable Minister since heard that the said Order in Council was given to the press by the Premier, and when did he hear it ?

3. Has he since heard that said Order in Council was communicated to and approved and signed by His Excellency before it was given to the press, and when did he hear it ?

4. Are the statements referred to in the last two questions correct ?

5. If so, how did it happen that he knew nothing whatever about such dealing with an Order in Council specially concerning his own department ?

6. Does he still think the course he took then was the correct one under the circumstances, in not producing the Order in the House when asked for ?

7. Does he still feel that the resentment of the honourable gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) because the order was given to the press, is joined in most heartily by himself ?

8. Is he still astounded, and pained, and humiliated, that the said Order in Council was not given to the House before it was given to the press ?

Mr. **FOSTER**. Stand.

Mr. **CASEY**. Has the hon. Minister any idea when the Minister of Agriculture will be here.

Mr. **FOSTER**. I have not.

Question allowed to stand at the request of the Government.

NEWFOUNDLAND BAIT ACT.

Mr. **KAULBACH** asked :

As the amount of refund has been recovered in the courts and paid over to the Dominion Government on the action taken against the Government of Newfoundland for money collected from Canadian fishermen for licenses under the Newfoundland Bait Act of 1890, when will the sums due the respective claimants be paid to them ?

Mr. COSTIGAN. The answer given to a similar question will be found in "Hansard" No. 14, 27th January, 1896, pages 679-680. The latter portion of which intimated that the distribution might be expected at an early date.

TIGNISH BREAKWATER, P.E.I.

Mr. PERRY asked :

Who is the engineer that made an examination of the breakwater at Tignish, Prince Edward Island, during the season of 1895? What is the date of inspection?

Mr. OUIMET. J. B. Hegan, July 25th and 26th, 1895.

Mr. PERRY asked :

Is it the intention of the Minister of Public Works to take steps for the immediate repair of the breakwater at Tignish, Prince Edward Island?

Mr. OUIMET. It is the intention of the department to make such repairs as soon as the necessary money for that purpose is at the disposal of the department.

CASCUMPEC HARBOUR.

Mr. PERRY asked :

Is it the intention of the Government to cause further blasting of rock in Cascumpec Harbour, Prince Edward Island, during the coming season, with a view of improving navigation in said harbour?

Mr. OUIMET. It is not the intention of the department to cause further blasting of rock in Cascumpec Harbour during the coming season.

McKIE'S PIER, P.E.I.

Mr. YEO asked :

What amount has been expended on McKie's Pier, Egmont Bay, Prince county, Prince Edward Island, during the past year? Was the work done by public contract? If not, under whose supervision was the work performed?

What depth of water is at the outer end of said pier?

Is the work completed, or is it the intention to extend it during the present year?

Is it the intention to dredge the channel leading to this pier during the coming season?

Mr. OUIMET. The sum of \$1,395.19 was expended on McKie's (McGie's) pier during the past year. The work was done by day labour under the supervision of Gilbert Perry, foreman, directed by Mr. J. B. Hegan, the resident engineer. The depth of water is two feet six inches at low water, spring tide, and seven feet at high water, spring tide. The pier is reported by the resident engineer to be in good serviceable condition, and it is not the intention to extend it during the present year. It has not yet been decided whether the channel leading to the pier will be dredged during next season.

MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY— REPLY TO ADDRESS.

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

Mr. SPEAKER read the Message, as follows:—

ABERDEEN.

Gentlemen of the House of Commons :

I thank you for the loyal Address which you have voted in reply to the Speech with which I opened the session. I am gratified to receive your assurances that the matters which may come before you will have your earnest consideration.

Government House,

Ottawa, 6th February, 1896.

CANADIAN DEFENCES.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I beg to ask the Government what foundation there is for the statement which appears in the newspapers this morning, that the Imperial Government were to assist the Canadian Government in the construction of defences, by advancing to them the necessary money for the purpose? Has any communication taken place? And if so, what is the character of that communication?

Mr. FOSTER. I know nothing of it except what the hon. gentleman has seen. It appears to be a newspaper rumour.

REPORT.

Annual Report of the Department of Railways and Canals.—(Mr. Haggart.)

CANADIAN MILITIA.

Mr. MULOCK. I would inquire of the Government when they propose to take the House and country into their confidence with regard to the provision for an increased militia defence. It was intimated in the Address and subsequently that the proposed expenditure on militia and defence would be too large to admit of its being provided for out of the annual grant, from which one must assume that a considerable vote is going to be asked for. To-day we have had a deputation from Toronto presenting a petition.

Mr. SPEAKER. I hope the hon. gentleman is not going to enter into a discussion of this matter.

Mr. MULOCK. Not at all. I merely wish to say that this deputation has asked for expenditure in this direction, and it is probable that similar requests will come from other parts of the Dominion, and it seems to me that the policy and the proposed scheme of the Government ought to be before the House and country at a very early day.

Mr. FOSTER. All I can say is that the Government will use all diligence in bringing down this measure as well as some others.

RETURNS TO ADDRESSES.

Mr. CASEY. When will the return to the Address moved for by myself some time ago for the Order in Council and other documents relating to the appointment of a High Commissioner in London, be laid before the House? I notice that one of the returns laid on the Table is in answer to an Order I moved for last session. If similar delay is to take place in this instance, the papers will not be of much use, and it is important that we should have them, in view of the discussion which must take place in the near future.

Mr. OUMET. I have taken a note of the hon. gentleman's request, and will see that the papers are brought down.

NORTHUMBERLAND STRAITS.

Mr. PERRY. The hon. gentleman promised to lay before Parliament a map of the borings in Northumberland Strait.

Mr. FOSTER. I shall endeavour to stop this boring as soon as possible by finding that map.

CABINET CRISIS.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I see by the Montreal "Star" that His Excellency the Governor General has been obliged to cancel his engagements in Montreal by reason of another crisis here. I do not know whether any of the Ministers have again bolted or not, but it states that there is a disagreement between Sir Charles Tupper and Sir Mackenzie Bowell. Will the Government have the kindness to inform the House and the country how the matter really stands and relieve us at once?

Mr. FOSTER. All I have to do is to refer my hon. friend to the editor or reporter of the "Star," who no doubt will give him all the information he requires. He appears to have a lot on hand.

SUPPLY—THE BUDGET.

The House resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Foster, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go again into Committee of Supply.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Before proceeding to discuss the matter more particularly before us, it is my duty to call your attention, Mr. Speaker, to a very grave misrepresentation which has been made both of myself and the Reform party at large. Now, I am not at all disposed to com-

plain of the manner in which our friends, the reporters of "Hansard" usually discharge their onerous duties. My impression is that, as a whole, their work is exceedingly well done, and I am bound to say, for my own part, that I have very little indeed to complain of. Now and again slips do occur. I recollect, no very long time ago, when I had occasion to refer to the political Styx, and I found, to my horror, that the reporters had made it "political stinks." On another occasion when I had quoted, in the same connection, the words: "Strike but hear me, as Themistocles said," I found to my amazement that I was reported: "Strike but hear me, as Peter Mitchell said." These things I have borne like a man, but one must draw the line somewhere, and when I took up Friday's "Hansard" and found that I was represented as having supplicated the elder Sir Charles Tupper for a subscription for myself and the Liberal party, I felt that I could not stand that. Why, Mr. Speaker, it would not require my parliamentary experience to know that no human being could well go on a more hopeless quest than to ask Sir Charles Tupper the elder, to give a portion of his hardly earned—or, perhaps, I should say his hardly won—gains for the benefit of the Liberal party. And then, too, Sir, I felt that there was imminent peril, if this thing went uncontradicted, that we should have cablegrams speeding across the Atlantic and sapient English journals reporting that the reason the Liberal party attacked Sir Charles Tupper was that he refused to make a fair division of the spoils. Sir, this is a grave and serious matter. Here I am reported, on behalf of myself and the Liberal party, addressing Sir Charles Tupper, and saying: "Give us gold." I need not say that no such thought ever crossed my mind, no such words ever crossed my lips. What I did say was: "Give us good old Sir Charles," and that I said without any disparagement of my hon. friend from Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper), for whom I have always had a strong sneaking liking—more particularly since he began to devote his talents to antiquarian research. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am bound to say for myself that I never entertained the smallest or faintest idea that Sir Charles Tupper, who is now restored to us, thanks to my prayers and those of the Bishop of Antigonish—I never entertained the slightest idea that he would celebrate his return in knightly fashion by distributing largesse on this side. I desire to be corrected in this matter, and I hope that the misrepresentation will disappear very shortly from the "Hansard."

And now, Sir, to come down from Sir Charles Tupper to the Minister of Finance. I accorded to the Minister of Finance the other day praise for his skill in executing a strategic movement. Looking over his speech with more deliberation, I am bound

Mr. MULOCK.

to accord to him praise for one other merit, and that is the merit—if it be a merit—of the most persistent possible denial of the plainest possible fact, facts which, if they have not been manifest to him, have been manifest, I think, to every man of business in Canada for these several years past. What is the hon. gentleman's position, Sir? He comes before us obliged to announce a deficit of over four millions of dollars, the largest deficit recorded in our history, with the exception of one for which, no doubt, the rebellion in the North-west was largely responsible. The hon. Minister of Finance knows that; he knows what it means; he has told us often enough what an ugly and grim-visaged thing a deficit is and how terribly it reflects on the financial capacity of the Government of the day, and particularly of the Finance Minister thereof; and, therefore, he can offer no excuse for minimizing or attempting to minimize the real weight and significance of this huge deficit. The hon. gentleman knows well—no man knows better—that the prices of the chief articles which the Canadian people produce are frightfully low to-day, that they are, in all human probability, particularly if you regard the margin of profit obtainable from them, scarcely one-half what they were a few years ago. The hon. gentleman knows likewise, no man better, that his efforts and the efforts of his colleagues to obtain for us any new markets of value have been utterly and entirely futile. He knows quite well that the British market, to which we naturally look, and which is open to us, as it is to all comers freely and without tax—he knows that, so far as one important branch of our trade in cattle is concerned that market is entirely closed, and that there is considerable danger of it being closed as regards another branch. The hon. gentleman knows—no man can know so well, because he comes from the province of New Brunswick and represents a constituency, where, for many years back, there has been no increase at all—that our population in many large districts is absolutely at a standstill. He knows perfectly well, although he attempts to conceal the facts, that our taxation, more especially if you take the real and not the nominal taxation, is enormous for a country of our age and resources. The hon. gentleman knows well, and has had to admit it, that our debt is a very heavy debt, and is piling up in despite of his promise to the contrary made to us for many years back. Nevertheless, with full knowledge of these important facts, the hon. gentleman holds it compatible with his position to come down and prate to us of the great prosperity of the people of Canada; to tell us, almost in so many words, that Canada is the most prosperous country on the face of the earth. I am not sure that he did not tell us that in so many words. He deliberately chooses to close his eyes to every item on the debit side of our

account, while he takes credit, and more credit than he deserves, for those which by any exercise of ingenuity can be brought to the credit side. He ignores completely the competition which presses day after day more and more heavily on our farmers and other producers in this community. Moreover, the hon. gentleman, as the House knows, deliberately refuses all economies of any real value. Last year he talked economy. Last year he brought down a Budget, as he said, reduced to the lowest proportions. This year he proposes a Budget which already exceeds by a million and a half the amount he declared necessary last year, and which, before this House rises, as I shall be able to show, is likely to be further, and largely, increased. More than that there are too many indications in the hon. gentleman's speech that, in the teeth of all these facts, in the teeth of increasing debt, in the teeth of huge taxation, in the teeth of a huge deficit for the last year and of probable deficits for the present year and succeeding year, the hon. gentleman and his colleagues and supporters are ready to plunge this country into all manner of rash and ill-considered engagements, whereby, if they are permitted to take their own way, a further huge sum will be added to our debt and a very large amount to our annual expenditure.

Now, Sir, on the present occasion, I propose to do what I do not very often do; I propose to take the hon. gentleman's speech and analyse it in some detail. It is possible that the hon. gentleman may have suffered, as I have suffered, from a little inaccuracy on the part of our reporters, but I would call his attention, in the first place, to a statement made by him, which reads as follows:—

There is, further, this fact to be noted, a similar fact to which has existed only once, I think, since confederation. That is, that the exports from Canada last year exceeded the imports by \$2,857,121, although the average of the excess of imports over exports during confederation up to the end of that year was \$18,740,000. Whatever there may be in what is known as the balance of trade, other circumstances being equal, the fact that there was last year an excess of exports over imports is a fact which has to be placed to the credit of Canada, and is so much gained to the general of our business interests.

Is that reasonably correctly reported?

Mr. FOSTER. Reasonably correct, yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Now, I want to call the attention of the House to that statement, I want to call the attention of the House to our Trade and Navigation Returns. I find in them—the hon. gentleman will correct me if I am wrong—that our total importation for the year 1895 to which he refers, is \$105,252,000 of goods entered for consumption. I find, looking further on, that our total exports of Canadian goods, including coin and bullion,

amounted to \$103,085,000, wherefore, it would appear that so far from having an excess of exports over imports, if that be a benefit, there was really an excess of imports over exports, of \$2,200,000, contrary to the hon. gentleman's statement.

Mr. FOSTER. I think my hon. friend will allow me to draw his attention to this one fact. As he has put it, he leaves the impression that I have made a misstatement.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Not a misstatement, but a mistake.

Mr. FOSTER. If my hon. friend will look on page 7 of the Trade and Navigation Returns, he will see that since confederation our balance of trade as regards imports and exports has been calculated all through upon the total exports and the total imports, not taking into account what is simply the produce of Canada, or what is not, not taking into account, either, the bullion or coin on either side; and the figures that I have stated are perfectly correct in the line of the statements which have been compiled from confederation, including the five years during which my hon. friend presided over the finances.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I thought the hon. gentleman would take refuge in that statement.

Mr. FOSTER. I beg my hon. friend's pardon. He has no right to imply that I am seeking refuge.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Well, I think I am.

Mr. FOSTER. I think not.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not think that is unparliamentary, but if Mr. Speaker rules that it is so, I will make use of another phrase.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not object to its being unparliamentary, but I say the idea implied in that assertion is an idea that ought not to be implied.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is a little too fine. I think the hon. gentleman will have to sit still under the imputation.

Mr. FOSTER. I will not sit still when you misrepresent me.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. You will have plenty of opportunities to correct me. Now this is rather an interesting point. The hon. gentleman, you will observe, referred to 1880, when our imports entered for consumption were \$71,782,000. Canadian exports in that year, of our own produce, were \$74,471,000. It was, therefore, perfectly correct to say that in 1880 our exports exceeded our imports, and, so far as there is anything in the balance of trade—to which I, myself, I may remark, attach no importance whatever—the balance of

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

trade in 1880 was in our favour. Now, I would like to ask, when the hon. gentleman talks of the balance of trade, will he assert that if we had exported of foreign produce, instead of ten millions, say thirty millions, as we would have done if our Yankee friends had used the St. Lawrence to its full advantage, would he rise in his place here and tell the House that there was a balance of trade in favour of Canada, of \$22,000,000?

Mr. FOSTER. I have simply this to say to my hon. friend. I have followed out the calculation since confederation, from statistics which the Trade and Navigation compilers, the Controller of Customs, and the Ministers of Finance, have supplied, and upon which alone you can carry out a comparison between the different years, of the balance of trade. I ask the hon. gentleman, is not what I have stated with reference to the balance of trade based upon a comparison between our total exports and total imports? And if he will look on page 7, he will say whether or not that is so.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. They do not talk of the balance of trade, and the hon. gentleman did talk of the balance of trade. I am as well aware as the hon. gentleman that there was an excess of total exports, foreign and Canadian, over the total, not of those entered for consumption, but the total goods alleged to have been imported for all purposes. But I beg to point out to him that that has nothing in the world to do with the balance of trade. I beg to point out to the hon. gentleman and to the House that supposing, as I say, that the returns showed thirty millions exported via St. Lawrence, that would not enable us to pay for goods which are imported and consumed in Canada. The balance of trade means, if it means anything at all, that out of our own exports, out of the proceeds of our own exports, we are able to pay for all the goods we import and consume, and have a surplus besides. All we can be said to get out of foreign goods passing through our country via the St. Lawrence, all we can possibly get, are the tolls, whatever they amount to, and the value of the freights that go in Canadian bottoms to Montreal, and in Canadian bottoms from Montreal to the point of consumption. Now, the hon. gentleman does not appear to understand the question yet. I will put it to him a little plainer. Supposing a Chicago merchant chose to send one million barrels of flour via the St. Lawrence and Montreal to Liverpool, does the hon. gentleman mean to tell us that the price of that one million barrels of flour would go to help us pay for imports consumed in Canada?

Mr. FOSTER. No, I would not.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Well, then, how would it help our balance of

trade? Now, why could he not consult the Premier, who is an ex-Minister of Customs, of long experience, and who would have put him right on that question, and prevented him from—I do not say deluding—but undoubtedly misleading the House by talking of having a balance of trade in our favour when, in point of fact, so far as there is anything in it, the balance of trade to the extent of \$2,200,000 is against us. Sir, if the hon. gentleman is not satisfied, all I can say is that I am afraid I shall have to refer him to my hon. friend from King's (Mr. Borden), and my hon. friend from Brant (Mr. Paterson), who will no doubt endeavour to indoctrinate him with the true principles regarding the balance of trade.

Mr. FOSTER. I am quite willing to discuss the question with my hon. friends any time.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Very well, does the hon. gentleman maintain that if we send a quantity of foreign goods via the St. Lawrence, they enable us to pay for a part of our imports entered for consumption.

Mr. FOSTER. Not necessarily.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Not at all. And if they do not, it does not affect the balance of trade. It may be a very good proof, and a very good evidence, that we are benefiting by the use of our waterways, and had the hon. gentleman congratulated us on that, I would have agreed with him. But when he talks of the balance of trade, I must put in a caveat. The balance of trade is against us to the extent of \$2,200,000, and not in favour, as he mistakenly supposes. Now, I would say this is very like a mistake which the hon. gentleman made some years ago with respect to the benefit in respect to agricultural products that had been gained for the farmers of Canada by the operation of the National Policy, and I think he had better, in the future, consult with my hon. friend the Premier, who will put him right on these interesting questions. Sir, for the second point, I observe that the hon. gentleman, I suppose some of his old associations leading him that way, claims credit for a considerable reduction in the consumption of spirits. Now, if there be a reduction in the consumption of spirits, I am very glad of it, but I have my doubts whether the data on which the hon. gentleman founds that statement are quite correct, or quite safe. I have been informed—the hon. gentleman no doubt is in a position to speak with more authority on that point—that there is, at the present moment, a great amount of smuggling going on in the St. Lawrence, and in certain parts of the maritime provinces. I have likewise been informed, but that has reference, doubtless, to particular localities only, that there is a

considerable amount of illicit distillation in various parts of Canada, and that in these two ways there is a considerable amount of whisky which finds its way into consumption without paying any duty, and that the diminution which the hon. gentleman speaks of is, therefore, more apparent than real. However, on that point, also, I do not want to dilate too much. I call the hon. gentleman's attention to it, and I think it is worth while that he attend to it.

Mr. FOSTER. I remind my hon. friend that that unknown quantity, whatever it may be, which is and has been equally unknown every year, is never taken into account in our statistics at all, and cannot possibly be. The hon. gentleman knows well enough that my comparison was made upon statistics, not upon suppositions.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am not quite sure whether the hon. gentleman is correct in saying that his statements are made on statistical data, at any rate, so far as the increase of expenditure goes. The other day I thought he was indulging in promiscuous guessing, and I think that while he was guessing, he might have guessed a little as to the quantity of illicit spirits which are imported. My reason for calling attention to it is this: It is tolerably well known that this smuggling traffic has been increasing largely during past years, to an extent which is well worthy the attention of any Minister of Finance. If he will look at the English speeches on the Budget, he will see that these are matters which are, to a considerable extent, taken into account and calculated on by English Chancellors of the Exchequer, when delivering their annual statements, as, indeed, they have good cause to be.

Mr. FOSTER. They never interject them in their statistics.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I beg your pardon. Very often they allude to the amount, using it as an argument that it is not safe to extract further revenue from that particular article.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes, and they allude to it. However, I am not going to quarrel with the hon. gentleman over that point—there are plenty of other points. The hon. gentleman in another place, and here again I quote the hon. gentleman's statements, because, as I say, I wish to give him every opportunity to correct them if I am in error, spoke as follows:—

The per capita rate of customs, calculating from 1874-75 to 1877-78, including both years, was an average of \$3.44 per head of the people. The rate in 1874-75 was \$3.75 per head of the people. In 1894-95 it was \$3.52 per head; that is, only 8 cents per head greater than the average of the period from 1874 to 1878, inclusive, and 39 cents less than the per capita customs taxation of 1874-75.

Less than the per capita taxation of 1874-75! Now, Sir, I might very well say to the hon. gentleman that he was rather wasting his own time and time of the House when he felt himself called upon, in order to defend himself and his policy, to enter into these minute calculations as to what occurred twenty years ago. But as the hon. gentleman has done so, he has made it my duty to some extent to follow him. In the first place, I want to call your attention, Mr. Speaker, and the attention of my friends to this, that no grosser fallacy was ever attempted, no grosser fallacy can ever be attempted, than to institute a per capita comparison between the taxation inflicted under a revenue tariff and the taxation inflicted under a protective tariff. What is the essence of a protective tariff? That of taxing the people highly for the benefit of certain trade industries, which taxation does not go into the treasury. Therefore, all these per capita comparisons made by the hon. gentleman are, I will not say the veriest nonsense, because that would be unparliamentary perhaps, but they are utterly and entirely irrelevant and beside the point. The hon. gentleman by this time, I think, might have arrived at a definite opinion as to what protection really means, on a scientific basis, and if so, he would have known that, be protection good or bad, this is inherent in it, that under any protective system a vastly larger sum must of necessity be taken out of the pockets of the people than is ever paid into the treasury. That cannot be avoided, it is of the essence of the thing; and therefore all per capita comparisons are not merely misleading and fallacious, but they are, as has often been pointed out, calculated in a high degree to deceive and mislead the people. Sir, what is the real fact? It is perfectly true, and I make the hon. gentleman a present of the fact, that probably no human being can fully estimate the mischief which arises from a protective system. Its ramifications are so immense, its ramifications are so widespread that all any of us can do, in treating of it, is to say that the amount of mischief it does is, on a conservative estimate, so and so. I have gone over the hon. gentleman's tariff time and time again. I have made calculations time and time again as to the amount which the protective system takes out of the pockets of the people over and above the sums that go into the treasury, and I say it is on a conservative estimate about \$30,000,000 annually, taking excise and customs taxation, and in addition to this amount \$30,000,000 at least more are taken out of the pockets of the people and distributed amongst a favoured few. Sir, that altogether amounts to \$60,000,000. Many men whose opinions are entitled to high respect believe that that is utterly too small an amount. My friend the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), whom I do not see here to-day, places the amount at

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

from \$70,000,000 to \$80,000,000, and I will not contradict him.

Mr. FOSTER. May I ask the hon. gentleman for what year he calculates \$30,000,000 of extra taxation?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I believe on a fair average from 1879 down to the present day, the amount of taxation taken out of the pockets of the people which does not show in our printed returns or in our revenue statements, reaches on an average not less than \$30,000,000 a year for the sixteen or seventeen years. That is a computation the proof of which I am fully prepared to give in detail, and of which no doubt there are thirty hon. members who will be prepared to give proof in detail. Take an article of common consumption like rice. Does not the hon. gentleman know that for every dollar of taxation that goes into the treasury, two, three, four or five dollars go into the pockets of the manufacturers? Does he not know that all through the tariff, there are innumerable cases where for every dollar that goes into the treasury four, five and sometimes ten dollars are taken out of the people's pockets, and do not go into the treasury, but go to benefit this or that particular manufacturer. There have been cases well known to us, which I cannot stop to enumerate now, where millions have been taken out of the pockets of the people and not a cent has gone into the public treasury.

Mr. FOSTER. Millions?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Millions. Do you want the proof?

Mr. FOSTER. In Canada?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes. If the hon. gentleman will look at the duties on sugar preceding the recent addition, it will be seen that millions were taken out of the pockets of the people and only the most insignificant possible fraction of it found its way into the treasury. So I put it—and let me observe here in passing of this fact, which I allude to as a very strong argument against the protective tariff, that although it applies to such a tariff with ten-fold force, it applies also against any high tariff, any attempt to levy the bulk or greater part of our revenue by high customs tariff—you cannot impose high customs tariff, more particularly on any article which partakes of the character of raw material, without enormously increasing the cost to the consumer in the end. That is a simple fact which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) or any other hon. gentleman can work out for himself. What was the hon. gentleman's declaration? It was that in 1895 under his tariff the people of Canada were paying 39 cents less than they were in the period of 1874-75. What are the facts? The facts are these: to-day the people on an average are paying per family

\$60, taking five individuals to a family, as against \$25 under the Administration of Hon. Alexander Mackenzie. The present Government have not saved 39 cents per head, but they have lost \$7 per head, if a fair account were taken.

Sir, the hon. gentleman, proceeding a little further, attempted to lessen the weight of his deficit of \$4,153,000 by observing that an amount of \$2,000,000 went into the sinking fund, which, as he truly said, reduced the debt, and he claimed credit for that. I do not object to give the hon. gentleman credit for it. But as we are raking up old history, I may remind the hon. gentleman of the fact that none of his predecessors ever gave such credit to Hon. Alexander Mackenzie when they were howling about the deficits of 1876-78. Then the hon. gentleman proceeded to make what I shall not call a fallacious, but a very incorrect and unfair comparison between the deficits of the Mackenzie Administration and his own. And here again I apologize to my hon. friends and to the House for going into this, which I think might well have been omitted. But, as the Minister of Finance has thought fit to do it, I am obliged to provide my friends with the answer. What he said was this :

In the period from 1874-75 to 1878-79 there were deficits amounting to \$6,426,000, and surpluses amounting to \$935,000, leaving a net deficit of \$5,491,000.

Sir, I take exception to every line in that statement. I am not responsible in the slightest degree for the fact that after I went out of office, the hon. gentleman opposite, or his predecessors, chose in 1879 largely to exceed my estimate. I am responsible for this fact : That when I took office in 1873 I found that my predecessor had run up his Estimates to \$24,000,000 odd, and I succeeded in keeping down the expenditure to \$23,316,000. I am entitled to credit for that, Sir, and I am not entitled to the responsibility for the year 1878-79. Now, what are the true facts, and it is worth while to spend a minute or two in showing them ? We had three deficits for which we were responsible. We had the deficit of 1876, the deficit of 1877, and the deficit of 1878. Collectively these deficits did not amount to \$6,000,000 odd, but to \$4,488,000. We had two surpluses fairly earned in 1874 and 1875, amounting to \$1,824,000, leaving a deficit, not of \$5,000,000 as the Finance Minister said, but of \$2,564,000.

Our sinking funds during the five years amounted to \$3,663,000, so that there was really on an honest statement, a balance to Mr. Mackenzie's credit of \$1,101,000. Aye, Sir, and there was more. During Mr. Mackenzie's administration was conducted, as I said not long ago, the one arbitration by Canadian statesmen which resulted to the profit and honour of Canada, and in fairness and equity we ought to be given credit for the \$5,000,000 of hard cash we got out of

the Americans under the Halifax award, and in fairness and in equity, we ought to be entitled to credit for the \$1,000,000 we got out of the Northern Railway and which our predecessors were prepared to throw away. So that, if you give us fair credit on the line the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) was using for himself, the Mackenzie Administration—three deficits to the contrary notwithstanding, would come out with a clear credit of \$7,000,000 odd.

Mr. FOSTER. Oh.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does the hon. gentleman dispute that ?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. On what ground ?

Mr. FOSTER. If the hon. gentleman is going to subtract the sinking funds during the Mackenzie Administration, which were had on a small amount, will he also, in making a comparison, subtract the almost double of the sinking fund now ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am simply following the hon. gentleman's principle, and I am pointing out how grossly unfair he was in charging me with the deficit of 1878-79 over which I had no control, and where the expenditure hugely exceeded the estimate I brought down. I am responsible for my Estimates, but I am not responsible for hon. gentlemen's extravagance. But, Sir, there is another thing I will remind the House of as we are now on this subject. What was the position of the Mackenzie Government when they went into office ? As I have told the House, again and again, the first thing my deputy did, was to call my attention to this fact : That when the Macdonald Administration went out of office they had left encumbrances and charges involving an annual expenditure of \$4,000,000, to meet which they had not made a copper of provision. When they went out of office they had incurred liabilities under the statement which Leonard Tilley made in his own Budget speech in 1873) involving \$60,000,000 addition to the public debt, and a further annual charge of \$3,300,000. So that, we were called upon in our term of office to face an additional annual expenditure of \$7,300,000 for which our predecessors had made no provision at all. If under such circumstances there were three deficits, let the men who are responsible for them, the men who imposed these obligations, entirely against our remonstrance, utterly against Mr. Mackenzie's remonstrance, utterly against the united remonstrance of every man on this side of the House at that time ; let them bear the brunt and responsibility, for on their shoulders does the responsibility rest.

Sir, there is another statement which deserves a little attention. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) declares that the Liberals

remitted no taxation, but that the Conservatives did. The Liberals remitted no taxation. Well, Sir, that is true, because the Liberals having to face a charge amounting to \$7,000,000 a year imposed by their predecessors, were not in a position to remit taxation, and no blame to them. But, if the Conservatives did remit taxation, the Conservatives first took care to put on such a pile of taxation that there was mighty little credit to them in removing a small fraction of it. Did the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) ever hear of that pious saint who stole a goose and gave away the giblets in charity, because the Conservative remission of taxation is strictly analogous to the device of that worthy.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I turn to the hon. gentleman's estimate of revenue and expenditure. I take here, as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) took, the 20th January, and I take it for this reason: I am obliged to him for sending me the ten days' statement down to the 31st of that month, but I think that even he will agree that the 20th January is a fairer date, and for this reason: Whenever, as he knows, the Minister is going to make his financial statement, a very large amount of dutiable goods are invariably taken out of bond, and I have no doubt, as has occurred on previous occasions, so it occurred on the present occasion, that a considerable amount was taken out of bond and the revenue for that ten days would, therefore, not afford a fair standard of comparison with the same period of 1895. I take the statement of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) up to the 20th January, and I am quoting from his figures, and, of course, if they are incorrect I am perfectly open to correction. The hon. gentleman, I see here, gives the revenue up to the 20th January, 1896, at \$19,560,000. That statement I suppose he accepts?

Mr. FOSTER. I presume so.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is the statement reported and apparently it is correct. Now, I would call the attention of the hon. gentleman to this: Six months and twenty days elapsed up to the 20th January. It follows, therefore, that our annual receipts for that period were at the rate of \$2,930,000 a month. There remain five, and one-third months, and if we continue to receive revenue at the same rate, that would yield \$15,616,000; and consequently, unless there is a marked improvement during the next five months the total of revenue upon that ratio would only amount to \$35,176,000, and not \$37,000,000 as he calculated. Even if we add for "miscellaneous receipts" say \$824,000, which I think would be a pretty high proportion, it would only give us a revenue of \$36,000,000 instead of \$37,000,000. Sir, I am not going to dwell too much upon that point, but I am going to show to the House this: that on the data we have we cannot count upon more than \$36,000,000. If the hon. gentleman's guess proves correct, and

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

we receive a larger revenue in proportion for the five and one-third months that are to come, than we have received for the six and two-thirds months past, then, no doubt, we may come up to \$37,000,000. But this is a mere hypothesis, and not by any manner of means, in the present situation of the country, a very safe hypothesis for the hon. gentleman to build upon. Also I notice that in his expenditure statement, although he will admit that the expenditure for interest in 1896 must be—his own estimate shows it—\$514,000 more than in 1895; nevertheless the charge up to the 20th January is \$130,000 less than it was in 1895. Now, of that \$514,000 for these six and two-thirds months, the proposition would be \$300,000. So that it appears that his expenditure statement is on that head alone at least \$430,000 less than it ought to be, if a fair proportionate sum, in proportion to the amount paid last January, had been entered against it. I do not at all pretend to say that the hon. gentleman has kept back any payment of interest—far from it; but I point out to him that these two facts—the fact that on so important and easily ascertainable a matter as the expenditure for interest, we are visibly \$440,000 or \$430,000 below the figure we ought to have put it at, if a proportionate scale had been observed, and that other fact, to which I have called attention, that unless there is a great improvement in the next five months we cannot get more than \$36,000,000 of revenue—ought to cause the hon. gentleman to have some considerable doubts as to whether he will escape a deficit for this year.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend, in making his estimate of expenditure, is basing it on the statement up to the 20th January.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend will recollect that I made the statement of the expenditure up to that date some \$400,000 more.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I have given credit for that.

Mr. FOSTER. I did not catch that.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. So far as I understand it, I may have possibly misread the hon. gentleman's statements, but I think he will find that I am correct. Perhaps he does not quite understand what I said. I have pointed out that in 1896 we have paid \$514,000 more for interest than we did in 1895, as appears from these estimates in my hand. I have pointed out that although that would involve an extra payment in six and two-thirds months of \$300,000, yet we were charging up to the 20th of January, 1896, \$130,000 less instead of \$300,000 more.

Mr. FOSTER. As a payment of interest.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes. So that on that head alone there was \$430,000

which the hon. gentleman knows must be paid, and which, in ordinary circumstances and on an ordinary computation, would be credited up to the 20th of January, 1896.

Mr. FOSTER. Then, my hon. friend did take the twenty days statement, and not my statement as given in the Budget speech.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. They appear to be the same.

Mr. FOSTER. No, they are different.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Under that head they seem to be the same. The only difference was in the estimates of sinking fund, which I have not taken into account at all.

Mr. FOSTER. And the interest on investments.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The interest on investments had nothing to do with this matter.

Mr. FOSTER. Interest on trust funds, I mean.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is an item on the credit side, and not on the debit.

Mr. FOSTER. The interest on trust funds is on the debit side.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think I have the hon. gentleman's two statements here. These are two statements for which I have to thank the hon. gentleman. Now, I have here the statement to the 31st January, 1895, which shows the interest on public debt to that date to have amounted to \$4,474,000. Then follows the statement of interest paid to the 31st January of the present year, amounting to \$4,346,000, being as nearly as possible \$130,000 less for this year, on the statement to the 31st of January, than it was for last year.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Well, that is conclusive, I think.

Mr. FOSTER. We must take into this account the fact that \$119,000 or \$120,000 of that is interest on trust funds, the payment of which was made earlier last year than this year, and consequently it does not go into the statement up to the 31st of January, 1896. That is pretty nearly all of the hon. gentleman's \$130,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That does not help the hon. gentleman out. The fact still remains that in this comparative statement he shows an apparent gain of \$500,000, perhaps a little more; and when we come to analyse it, we find that the apparent gain largely consists of the fact that \$130,000 less was charged, whereas we ought to have paid \$300,000 more. He has not disposed of those two facts by the statement that a proportion of the money paid in 1895

consisted of trust funds accounts. However, it is not worth while, I fancy, to wrangle over that matter much longer. If the hon. gentleman conceives that I have been unfair in my computation, he can set me right later.

Mr. FOSTER. It is just a question of deferred payments.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is a question of importance in computing what payments you have to make. The hon. gentleman will see that if I am correct, he has to pay \$430,000 more on that account from this date last year, than he had to pay last year. In point of fact, he has to pay a good deal more than that, because, according to the Estimates, we were to pay \$514,000 more for 1896 than we did in 1895.

Mr. FOSTER. The Estimates can hardly guide you.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Perhaps not, but they are the only things I have to guide me at the present time, and they are tolerably accurate in a matter of this kind. There is no doubt that we owe more money in 1896 than we did in 1895.

Mr. FOSTER. But the estimate is also made on what we would probably have to borrow, either more or less.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am not speaking of the Estimates of 1896-97. I am simply giving the Estimates brought down last year, by the hon. gentleman himself for the year 1895-96, and here is the statement: Public debt (including sinking funds)—for 1894-95, \$12,218,000; for 1895-96, \$12,732,000; an increase of \$514,000. Now, Sir, I think I am reasonably correct in saying that that, at any rate, approximately represents the amount that would have to be paid in 1896. However, the hon. gentleman can, later on if he likes, overhaul and criticise that statement. I fail as yet to see that I am incorrect in pointing out that there are \$430,000 which, on a strict computation of the account, should be put to the expenditure of 1895-96 up to date. And that goes far in my mind to justify the statement that it is more than doubtful whether we shall emerge, as he supposes, with an even balance at the end of the current year. I do not gainsay his statements; all I say is that he has been making a guess, and, according to the data up to date, the probability is against him. I do not say that a lucky revival of trade may not possibly pull him through; very possibly it may; but he has not shown the House any good reason that it will be so; and, as we are likely to incur heavy responsibilities and liabilities not yet disclosed to us, it is important that we should understand in what way the hon. gentleman arrives at his calculation. Now, Sir, it is remarkable—and the hon. gentleman may perhaps see fit to correct the omission now—that as to

the year 1896-97. I failed to hear, and I did not see it in looking over his Budget speech, that he gave us an estimate of receipts at all—a most unusual omission.

Mr. FOSTER. No. If my hon. friend will excuse me, he will see, if he reads my speech, that I expressly stated that we were so far from the year that I did not propose to make an estimate at all, and I did not.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I know that, but I am bound to say that it is a very unusual course to take. I do not think it has ever been done before.

Mr. FOSTER. Oh, yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There have been numerous Budget statements made in February in former years, as early as the present time or within a few days of it, and in all of those an attempt was made, of course subject to correction, to estimate the income. Now, Sir, that is of importance—of very grave importance; because, as I shall presently show, the hon. gentleman's Estimates for 1896-97, instead of being 38½ millions, look to me extremely likely to be 40 millions; and all he computes the receipts for the present year to be is a dubious 37 millions, which looks very much more like 36 millions. Sir, it is a matter of grave importance under such circumstances that before we plunge into new liabilities, we should know on what the hon. gentleman relies, I will not say to meet the \$40,000,000, but the \$38,300,000 which he admits he must have to meet, and which is very considerably below the sum he will really have to meet out of the revenue.

Sir, we will do well to remember that when we are talking of the service of 1896-97, the hon. gentleman, who tells us that he requires \$38,300,000, must know right well that we have in our statute-book an obligation which we may be called upon to fulfil and under which we will have to pay \$750,000 a year for the service of the fast Atlantic line. He knows, too, very well that that obligation will entail other subsidies to the extent, probably, of \$300,000 more. He must know, likewise, very well, that he will probably have to borrow \$10,000,000 or \$12,000,000 more for the various items he requires to raise. He knows that that will add the sum of \$300,000 at least to our annual charges. When you put all these things together, you are within the shortest possible distance of an annual charge of \$40,000,000 a year. This will, more particularly, be evident when you bear in mind this fact, that the hon. gentleman, like his predecessors, has gone on charging to capital account things which ought, in my estimation, to go against income. He charges \$75,000 for Dominion lands to capital, although he knows we have not a chance of extracting it from that source, with our capital account largely overdrawn as it is.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

He charges \$85,000 employed on public works, which ought not to go to capital, but against income.

There is another rather improper statement of account which I find in the public accounts, and to which I would like to call the attention of the hon. gentleman, and the House. I find in the public accounts under the head of customs, the following entries:—Total amount received from customs, \$17,890,000. Then I find these items deducted from it: Less duties returned, \$109,000; less drawbacks returned, \$132,000. Now, Sir, I do not altogether object to this, it has to be deducted, because I think that this ought to be entered—at least one of them—to the debit side, and that we should have a corresponding entry made on the credit side; but here is a thing to which I take very grave objection. I find that the bounty on beet-root sugar, \$29,000, and on pig iron, \$63,000, making in all nearly \$100,000. These have no business to be hidden away in an obscure page of the public accounts. They ought to figure prominently in our expenditure account, so that people should know what the beet-root sugar bounty, and the pig iron bounty has cost. These are not refunds. They are not deducted from duties paid into the public chest, but they come out of the consolidated revenue. Why, we might have a million dollars paid to these various industries, and it would not show. The people would have very little opportunity of knowing how much they cost.

Mr. FOSTER. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. By the law, we are obliged to lay a statement before the House so many days after it is opened.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But these are the books which go into the people's hands, and which they judge from. It is very different, indeed, to have these things hidden away in an obscure page of the public accounts, which probably not one man in twenty in this House—though we are supposed to be all acquainted with the public accounts—look at, I venture to say. Those should be put fairly and squarely in the expenditure account, and if they are, it follows that the annual expenditure is under-estimated by the full amount at least of those two bounties, which would make \$100,000 more.

Mr. FOSTER. But we would have a larger revenue.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not object to that. All I say is that the people would see and know what is done, and that it is the hon. gentleman's duty to so arrange his accounts that they may see and know what is done. I contend that that is a very improper statement; and although it only amounts to about \$100,000 now, it is quite conceivable, if this kind of thing went on that it might amount to many hundreds of

thousands of dollars, and to that extent the people would be kept in ignorance of the amount of taxes they pay or the amount of expenditure for which they have to provide.

Then the hon. gentleman claims merit for the reduction of interest. Sir, that is a process which has been going on all over the world for the last eighteen or nineteen years. Does he pretend that the National Policy or his wise administration has caused the rate of interest in England to fall, practically, from 4 or 5 to $2\frac{3}{4}$ per cent? Does he pretend that it is owing to the National Policy or his wise administration that all through Canada the rate of interest is vastly less than it was a few years ago, and that all over the world it is vastly less? I am willing to give the hon. gentleman credit for that, although he has no right to it, but on one condition. Let him have credit for the reduction in interest if he will likewise shoulder the responsibility for the reduction in the prices of grains, cereals, and other agricultural products. He must not use the one and reject the other. Let him take both, and he shall have the credit of both.

And now I come to a matter which was alluded to by my hon. friend beside me (Mr. Mulock), and that is the hon. gentleman's refusal to take the House into his confidence and inform us what sum he proposes to ask for the special vote for militia. I venture to say this to the hon. gentleman. If he has not made up his mind, if the Council has not made up their minds, on the subject—if, up to the present day, they do not know what they are going to do, and will say that they have not yet decided, I shall not press the hon. gentleman, but if he and the Council have made up their minds, it is the most ostrich-like policy on the face of the earth to refuse, when making the Budget statement, to say how many millions they require for that special vote. What is the hon. gentleman afraid of? Is he afraid of casting dismay into the great American nation by informing the world that Canada wants three millions or thirteen or thirty-three millions, for the matter of that, to put her defence in proper order.

Mr. FOSTER. No danger of that scare after yesterday's debate.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am glad the hon. gentleman's mind is relieved. Then he will tell us, of course, what the amount is.

Mr. FOSTER. I am sorry to say that I am not able to tell the hon. gentleman.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am afraid that the impression we made on the hon. gentleman is going to be evanescent. If he will look at what is done, usually, in similar cases in England, or elsewhere, he will see that my request is very usual and fair, and that there is no ground what-

ever for refusing to tell the House what he undertakes to add to the public debt on that score. I think I may speak for my friends behind me, as well as for myself, when I tell the hon. gentleman that no reasonable, no rational proposition will be harshly criticised from this side. We will, as our duty requires, discuss and debate any proposition the hon. gentleman has to make, looking to the better armament of our militia or the better defence of Canada, but it will be done in no carping, ungenerous, or censorious spirit. We will be willing to aid him to the utmost of our power in making proper provisions in this regard.

The hon. gentleman was good enough to tell us, on the authority of the president of Toronto Board of Trade, that there were notable signs of improvement. Well, I would be very glad to believe that. I think thus far it is probably true, that the immediate effects of the financial squall which swept over the United States, about eighteen months ago, have, to a great extent, disappeared, or at least would probably have disappeared by this time, but for that ill-omened and unhappy message of President Cleveland, who, in my judgment, has put back the improvement in the United States for some time, and may indirectly, in that way, affect us. But I beg to call his attention to the fact that all these things that the president of the Toronto Board of Trade alluded to do not go very far: they do not touch any of the great questions or the great issues now before us; they do not give us any grounds for believing that the real and permanent sources of wealth in this country are materially improved, or are likely to be materially improved. Sir, if I were disposed to be critical, I would ask the hon. gentleman to look at the share list of the city of Toronto, and to see in the condition of the loan companies, and the great extent to which their dividends and the prices of their stocks have fallen, that there is only too good evidence that this improvement which he speaks of is very far from being generally manifest at present, at any rate in the chief city of this province, and the chief province of this Dominion. There is another thing to which he alluded, and with which I shall deal a little later on—the almost total absence, as he said, of poverty. I would, with all my heart, that in making that statement the hon. gentleman were speaking the exact and literal truth. But I am afraid that he is in error; I am afraid that, sitting in his office as Finance Minister, he overlooks a great many of the evidences which come to the eyes of many of us who travel about the country—and not in Jamaica cars—that there is a considerable amount of pinching, if not downright poverty, in Canada at this moment.

Then, Sir, the hon. gentleman referred to another matter, and, to do him justice, I

am bound to say that he did not enlarge upon it so much here as he has elsewhere. He took credit to himself for the great increase in our home market. The great increase in our home market! We have, thanks, I suppose, to the hon. gentleman, several hundreds of thousands of people more in Canada than we had ten or twelve years ago, and they consume a great deal of farmers' stuff, and, consequently, there is a great increase in the home market. I do not know exactly what he put that increase at. I think I saw that on one occasion he counted the increase at thirty or forty millions.

Mr. FOSTER. You will have to produce that rumour again.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I regret to say that I have not, as yet, imitated the excellent example of my hon. friend from Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) of keeping a scrap book of everything that the hon. gentleman says. But I will; I will be wiser another time. But I know this, and the hon. gentleman will not deny it, that he took great credit for the increase in the home market. Now, does the hon. gentleman know what the census proves? Why, Sir, it proves that within the last seventeen years we have lost more than two millions of people to the home market, counting the number of our own people who have left Canada, and counting also the number of immigrants who have come here but have left again. There is a home market which, if he had kept it, he might have boasted of. There was a home market that would consume a large amount of farmers' produce. I credit him with the five hundred thousand—though I do not know that he can claim credit, personally, for any considerable increase in the population—but, if I do so, I must debit him and his Government with the two millions that we have lost during that period. Sir, the home market is somewhat increased. But, upon what earthly pretense can the hon. gentleman, or anybody else, in a country which only contains five millions to-day but which is large enough and rich enough to support a hundred millions or more, claim credit for the five hundred thousand whom the census shows to have been added to our population in ten years. Then the hon. gentleman went on to speak of the increase of our urban population, which he described as the healthiest and best increase. I take issue with him directly on that point. I say that the increase of the urban population is too large as it is, and that it would be far better, a thousand times better, for Canada, if the hon. gentleman could point to an increase of the rural and agricultural population from one end of this country to the other.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not wish to interrupt my hon. friend, but he has misread my statement. I was not making a compari-

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

son between rural and urban population. I was comparing the home and foreign markets, and I said the home market was the better market. It is a matter of phraseology, but I do not wish the hon. gentleman to criticise as mine a different idea from that which I expressed.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I see that I ought to have read to the hon. gentleman in advance:

Passing from these to the agricultural interests of the country, it is not saying too much, Sir, to say that from 1891 to 1895, these have shown a gradual, a continued, and a healthy advance. The home market has been gradually increasing. The increase in population itself from 1890 to 1895 has added to that home market. The increase of urban population which gathers in cities, and towns, and villages, and largely gathers there from the planting in these places of industrial establishments of different kinds, has largely increased. And, Sir, every thousand of the urban population is so much of the healthiest and best increase to the markets of the farmers of this country, for it affords a market near to them for products which would not carry to foreign markets, many of which are perishable in their nature, and for which a home market is absolutely essential.

Now, Sir, if the hon. gentleman is entitled to credit for the increase of five hundred thousand, let him stand up like a man and take the responsibility for the loss of the two millions whom we ought to have had, and who are now emigrants in the United States. By just so much as he can claim credit for the five hundred thousand, by just so much do I charge him and debit him with the two millions, and he cannot escape from that position, at any rate. But I tell him in this lies one of the gravest faults of the protectionist system, one of those I have always dwelt upon most strongly, one that statesmen in other countries have complained of and have tried to remedy. There is to-day, from various causes which I cannot pause to enumerate, a very unwholesome tendency on the part of the rural population to flock to our towns and cities, and desert the wholesome and useful occupations of the farm. That is a fault of our people, a fault of the American people, a fault of the British people, if you will. But, Sir, that is a tendency which is hugely increased by the operation of the protective policy. It is a thing which statesmen should check, but it is a thing which gentlemen on the other side have systematically fostered and aggravated; and it is one of the great reproaches to their policy that, in a country like Canada, with most unusual and extraordinary facilities for increasing the rural population, all over the province of Ontario, and all over the province of Quebec, all over the provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and Prince Edward Island—everywhere you go, almost, the rural population is largely decreasing and has largely decreased during the last fifteen or sixteen years. This is a terrible

misfortune to Canada, and for that terrible misfortune the hon. gentleman's policy of high taxation and protection is, to a very great extent, responsible.

Mr. DAVIN. How does the hon. gentleman account for the existence of the same tendency in England?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I never heard England, of the present day, spoken of as a great agricultural exporting country. If it is so, it is news to me. I do not say that this tendency is wholly the result of the hon. gentleman's policy, but I do say that his policy, and the policy of his predecessors and his friends has largely exaggerated and intensified that mischievous tendency, and, to that extent, it has worked great injury to the people of Canada ever since it was inaugurated in 1879.

Now I come to another claim—and, upon my word, the hon. gentleman deserves some credit for his assurance in making it, and that is that the National Policy has increased farm products. What would my hon. friend from South Huron (Mr. McMillan) say to that? What would my hon. friend from North Wentworth (Mr. Bain) say to that? What would my hon. friend from North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) say to that? And of all things on earth that he claims credit for, one is an increase in the export of cheese. What has the National Policy ever done to facilitate the export of cheese? That trade was growing by leaps and bounds before the National Policy was hatched.

Sir, the hon. gentleman, although he was much more moderate to-night, went on to increase his claims on the people's gratitude by pointing out the great benefit that was done by excluding United States products. Now, really, the hon. gentleman's ideas on that subject are so crude that I shall have to hand him over to my hon. friend from King's (Mr. Borden), who will go through another course with him on that subject to show him how perfectly worthless the National Policy is in the way of excluding United States products. If he proved anything, he simply proved that the effect of his policy, operating along a frontier of four thousand miles, has been seriously to incommodate a considerable number of people, and to deprive them of an excellent and profitable interchange that they otherwise might have made. Let me tell him that his National Policy has deprived us of a valuable market in barley, it has deprived us of a valuable market in horses, and in sheep. In the way of destroying our markets, as regards agricultural products, the National Policy has been a success, but in no other way. Cannot the hon. gentleman and his friends ever be taught that commerce means an exchange, and a profitable exchange, between two communities, of products which the one are able, from their position, to raise more advantageously than the other, and

that all this miserable interference with the course of trade, this miserable interference with the course of nature, this attempt to make water run uphill, can only result in disastrous confusion, and great loss to the people whom it is attempted thereby to benefit? Now, Sir, I will not expose myself to the imputation of misrepresenting the hon. gentleman, so I will read another paragraph:

Business failures in the country have been reduced from \$18,000,000 to \$15,800,000 in the same period; the average amount of failures per year during that period being \$15,700,000 against \$22,200,000 in the period from 1874 to 1878.

Well, Sir, again I apologize for going back into these realms of ancient history, but it is the hon. gentleman who has dragged me there. What does it prove? It proves that there was an insolvency Bill, under which you had an accurate record of failures, from 1874 to 1878; and in the period to which he refers, there has not been, and apparently is not going to be, an insolvency Bill; consequently, all these statements are not worth the paper on which they are written. Where there is an insolvency Act, you can ascertain with some precision what the failures really are; where there is not an insolvency Act, particularly under the state of the law which now prevails, every mercantile man whom I am addressing knows, and every lawyer whom I am addressing knows, that you cannot get an accurate record of all the compositions, and all the agreements, and all the side arrangements that are made between debtors and creditors; and until you have that, you have no warrant for making any such comparison as the hon. gentleman made.

Mr. LISTER. When that insolvency Act was passed, insolvents of twenty years' standing came in and took advantage of it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes, and these were all debited to the Mackenzie Administration. Sir, I return to the question of remission of taxation. I am not going to waste more time about it, except to say this: The hon. gentleman claims that in his seventeen years he remitted \$45,000,000 in taxes. Possibly he did; but he forgets to tell us that in those seventeen years he added \$500,000,000. Yes, Sir, that is the identical effect of the introduction of a protective system. The protective system from 1879 to the present time has added, at the very least, \$30,900,000 a year to our taxation, over and above the sum paid into the treasury. Multiply seventeen by thirty, and you get \$510,000,000; and, as \$510,000,000 is to \$45,000,000, so is the taxation imposed by the hon. gentleman to the taxation remitted by the hon. gentleman.

Sir, the hon. gentleman enlarged on all he had done for Canada by increasing the free goods list. On that list, I believe, there are about 378 articles; of those 378 articles, there are only three which really may be considered as a benefit to the public at

large; every one of the remaining 375 articles are not really and truly articles put on the free list, but special bonuses given to pet manufacturers or special classes, and nothing else. Sir, it is absurd to talk of a free list. What does that free list consist of? I will just state a few articles on one page: Burrstones in blocks, rough or unmanufactured; chalk stone, China or Cornwall stone, cliff stone, and felspar, ground or unground; clays, viz.: China clay, fire clay, pipe clay; emery in bulk, crushed or ground; pumice and pumice stone, ground or unground; flint, flints and ground flint stones; fossils; fuller's earth; gannister; gravels and sand; gypsum, crude (sulphate of lime); marble in the rough, in blocks; minerals, viz.: aluminium or alumnum and alumina, cryolite or kryolite, litharge, nickel; mineral waters, natural, not in bottle; mineralogical specimens; meerschaum, crude or raw; diamonds; salt imported for the fisheries. The hon. gentleman is good to his own people sometimes. Ambergris; fish offal or refuse, fish skins, pearl, tortoise and other shells, turtles, whalebone, oysters, and so on, and so on, and so on. Sir, we can import, if we like, works of the old masters, of the highest value, and get them free; but I know very well that, if we want to put a little wall-paper on our rooms, we have got to pay, in inverse ratio to its value, from 35 per cent to about 100 per cent for the privilege. Sir, this free list, when you come to analyse, it is a sham, a delusion and a snare. It is of no benefit to the public at large; it is there for the benefit of the manufacturers alone. Now, I do not grudge to the manufacturers the right to bring in free the raw material for their articles; I do not particularly object to that. What I do object to is the hon. gentleman claiming that these are bonuses to the community at large. What benefit is it to any one, except those of us who have stock in cotton mills, that the hon. gentleman allows 56,000,000 pounds of raw cotton wool, or waste, to be imported free into Canada? Does that lead to the reduction of one copper on the price of the goods? Does not the hon. gentleman know that the price of goods sold by these manufacturers is regulated by the tariff? They sell for just as little under his tariff rate of imported American or British goods, and just as little under the cost of importation, as is requisite to keep them out, and no lower. Consequently, although it may be a benefit for the manufacturer to be allowed to import 56,000,000 pounds of raw cotton free, it is of no particular benefit for the people at large, nor can it be. I repeat that, taking the list altogether, I can find but three articles of real and general utility, and that the rest, while there may be something said for them, are, after all said and done, simply bonuses granted to particular pet manufacturers. Now, anybody who chooses, can, by inspecting our free list, satisfy himself of the accuracy of what I have said. I have

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

not time to go over the list; I observe, however, one or two things in it that are worth alluding to. I may mention that this beneficent Government allows us to import all the ice we desire into Canada, free of duty; likewise brimstone. Agates can be imported free; curling stones—ah, there is a benefit to humanity—curling stones and granite can be imported free, but, I am afraid, not if they are dressed.

Mr. LANDERKIN. And skeletons.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Attar of roses and oil of roses apparently come in free.

Mr. FOSTER. There must be something more, because they would not amount up to \$12,000,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I grant that tea comes in free, I grant that anthracite coal comes in free—those are two of the three articles I alluded to as being of real benefit to the consumer; but I do not think the hon. gentleman will find many more.

Mr. FOSTER. There must be a great many fish skins brought in free.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There is a large number of articles. Hides are brought in, not for the public benefit, not particularly for the benefit of the agriculturists, who have hides themselves to dispose of. They are brought in for the benefit of the leather trade, and I do not grudge the hides to them. A large quantity of wool is brought in, and that again is for the benefit of the wool manufacturers. I do not grudge it to them. Then there is a large quantity of other articles. Iron or steel rails are brought in, but purely for the benefit of certain railway companies, and I do not grudge them to those companies; but it is not for the benefit of the general public, but for the benefit of a privileged and special class. And so it goes. Whenever you come to analyse this boast as to the free list, you find what I have said is true, that which is put on the free list is placed there not for the benefit of the public at large, but for the benefit of certain manufacturers. I have no objection that they should be benefited, but let the hon. gentleman not attempt to delude us by saying that it is for our benefit and for the benefit of the community at large. Then the hon. gentleman goes on to say:

From 1878, when the people by a large majority gave their verdict for a change in the fiscal policy of this country, the Liberal-Conservative party and the Liberal-Conservative policy has dominated in this country, and has moulded the administration. On those seventeen years the Conservative policy rests. That record is before the country, and by that record we are willing to be judged.

The hon. gentleman goes on to say that they have been sustained in 1878, 1882, 1887

and 1891, and therefore that is proof they have the confidence of the country. I wish to heaven they would show by their acts that they possess the confidence of the country. When did they meet us on a fair field? When did they ever contend with the Liberals unbacked by a gerrymander Act or a Franchise Act, or both together, and all the bribes they could scrape together into the bargain?

Mr. FOSTER. Do you say any time during the last twenty-five years?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The first gerrymander was in 1872. I admit I am wrong as to twenty-five years; the statement should have been the last twenty-four years. During that time hon. gentlemen opposite have not once met us in a fair fight.

Mr. FOSTER. There has been no gerrymander in the maritime provinces.

Mr. AMYOT. Nor in Quebec.

Mr. FOSTER. There have been no elections in the maritime provinces since confederation which have been carried on under a gerrymander Act, and the hon. gentleman knows that to-day, whereas seventeen years ago he and his party had a large majority in the maritime provinces, he can scarcely get a corporal's guard.

Mr. MULOCK. What about the Ontario gerrymander of 1882?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am not speaking of isolated provinces. I am stating the fact that since 1872 we have never gone into a fight on fair terms in the major provinces, and of all the provinces the greatest injustice has been done to my province, the province of Ontario. Did I not stand here when on pretense of adding four constituencies to Ontario, fifty-four constituencies were gerrymandered out of shape and knowledge? At that time I had the honour, for I count it an honour, of being especially singled out, so that the constituency which I then represented, Centre Huron, was broken up and riven into four fragments in order that I might be unable to obtain a nomination, and it was so distributed among four constituencies that I could not point to any one of them and say that I had more interest in it than in any other. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) and his friends possess the confidence of the people, I think they should show it by dissolving this House without any further delay.

Mr. FOSTER. We will do it in good time.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But hon. gentlemen opposite do not show any impatience to meet the people. Five years ago, on 3rd February, 1891, when the House was dissolved, on false pretenses I grant you, an appeal was made to the people. This day is five years and three days since the last appeal was made, and if hon. gen-

tlemen opposite possess the confidence of the people they do not dare to face them to-day.

Mr. FOSTER. We are facing the people to-day in one constituency.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In what one?

Mr. FOSTER. In a New Brunswick constituency. You will see where you will be at the close.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think there are three constituencies left vacant. Why do you not face the people in them?

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman can ask his leader.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I can ask my leader!

Mr. FOSTER. Yes. Ask him now.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Am I to understand that the hon. gentleman has entirely abrogated all control and management of the business of the House, and that he appeals to the Opposition leader to tell us why writs do not issue for vacancies he himself has made? It is certainly a novel constitutional doctrine. I never heard that the hon. gentleman was strong on legal precedents or constitutional lore—

Mr. FOSTER. You should be more united over there, and consult each other.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not see under what possible conditions or circumstances my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition can be held responsible for the fact that the hon. gentleman pitch-forked two or three gentlemen into the Senate, and now hesitates to fill their places, which I take it is the exact position of affairs to-day. But the hon. gentleman has a strong fort to which he retires in case of need. It beats Torres Vedras. Here the hon. gentleman was good enough to give us with much formality and pomp the result of the National Policy for ten years. He said:

Canadian industries per census returns:

No. of establishments: 1881, 49,923; in 1891, 75,768, being an increase of 25,845.

Capital invested: in 1881, \$163,000,000; 1891, \$353,000,000.

Here let me ask why it was that \$165,000,000 of capital invested in 1881 produced \$309,000,000, and \$353,000,000 of capital in 1891 only produced \$475,000,000? "What a falling off was there my countrymen." The productive power of Canadian capital sank from 100 to a little over 30 per cent in ten years, according to the hon. gentleman's return. He proceeded:

No. of employees: 1881, 254,000; 1891, 353,000.

Well, Sir, that is a significant showing, and I now proceed with your good leave, Mr. Speaker, to show what that showing is

worth. It is a misfortune, to which the hon. gentleman, like other patriots and heroes are subject, that there are critics who sometimes put awkward questions. We were told several years ago that the hon. gentleman had added 25,854 industrial establishments—mark you, industrial establishments—to the industries of Canada. Some of my hon. friends were curious to know how those returns “panned out,” and they put questions to the hon. gentleman, copies of which I have under my hand. One was for the town of Strathroy. Strathroy, I believe, contains 3,000 souls, more or less. Strathroy had 131 industrial establishments. But of the 131, in cross-questioning, it turned out that there were only 11 which employed over ten hands. In Mount Forest, my hon. friend (Mr. McMullen) ascertained—and it is a remarkable piece of information to him, because he did not know it before, although he lives there—there were 88 industrial establishments, but only five of them employed more than 10 hands. Yarmouth had one hundred and forty-five industrial establishments, and twenty of them employed ten hands and over; Uxbridge had seventy-eight industrial establishments and of the seventy-eight, seven employed ten hands and over; Guelph had one hundred and seventy-four industrial establishments and forty-one employed ten hands and over; Woodstock, N.B., had twenty-seven industrial establishments of which six employed ten hands and over; Owen Sound had one hundred and thirty-five industrial establishments of which twenty-one employed ten hands and over; Aylmer had seventy-five industrial establishments of which three employed ten hands and over; Blenheim had fifty-four industrial establishments of which six employed ten hands and over; Sorel had one hundred and fifty-one industrial establishments of which nineteen employed ten hands and over; St. Ours—I do not know who represent St. Ours—had seventeen industrial establishments, and not one of them employed ten hands, and the highest employed but four. Clinton had seventy industrial establishments of which seven employed more than ten hands; Montmagny had thirty-seven industrial establishments, not one of which employed ten hands. So, Sir here are fourteen places selected at random, in which there are 1,152 industrial establishments mostly of the new growth, and 142 out of the 1,152 employed over ten hands. Now, I do not take into account Caughnawaga where there are fifty-one industrious Indians of the male and female persuasion, carrying on fifty-one industrial establishments for the manufacture of fancy snowshoes. I make the hon. gentleman a present of that. And I did not take into account that grand discovery made in Shelburne county, N.S., where the ingenious enumerator discovered ninety-three establishments for the purpose of carrying on

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

knitting, engineered, captained and commanded by ninety-three old women, who according to these veracious census returns received in the course of a year, a wage of \$1,800 all told, being at the rate of \$14.55 per year each, 28 cents a week, and 4½ cents a day. I found also, and it is well to remind the hon. gentleman of it, that we had increased most marvellously in the matter of carpet factories. Carpets were really the pride and glory of these new industrial establishments. In 1881, we had eleven carpet industrial establishments; in 1895, they had grown to 537. Fifty-one of these were in New Brunswick and they employed collectively fifty-one hands—mostly old women.

Mr. FOSTER. Does that show in the census?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That shows in the census.

Mr. FOSTER. The old women?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes, the old women. The hon. gentleman has been very accurate. He has distinguished between those of tender years and those of most advanced age. He has distinguished between the sexes, and he has given us the amount of capital employed. By the way, I well know, but I will leave it to some other gentleman to send for the census returns and elaborate these for the satisfaction of the hon. gentleman, and show him the amount of capital employed in carrying on the new, patent, first-class, carpet-making industrial establishments. To the best of my recollection I think the average amount of capital is \$18.

Mr. FOSTER. It is well distributed, then.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I will just read for the information of the House and for the special information of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster), the style of industrial establishments which he takes such just pride in. Sir, here is Montmagny and there were thirty-seven industrial establishments there. There was a blacksmith, and this blacksmith employed one hand, being himself. There was another blacksmith, and he employed one hand, being himself, and there was a third blacksmith, and he employed one hand, being himself. There was a boot and shoe industrial establishment which likewise employed one hand. There was a cabinet and furniture establishment, which likewise employed one hand. There was a carpenter's and joiner's establishment employing one hand, another employing two hands, and another employing two hands, and positively in Montmagny there was one establishment which employed six hands. Carriage works were conducted by two gentlemen, each of whom employed one hand. There were two fish curers, each of whom employed one hand. There was a lime kiln which was run by two men. There was a saw-mill. There

was a tailor employing one hand, and there were four tinsmiths, each of whom employed himself, and so it goes. You will mark, Sir, that I have taken these places at random, scattered over the country, and I have shown no preference. Every section of the community has had its just share. This, Sir, shows tolerably conclusively what is the value to the community of those industrial establishments of which the hon. gentleman boasts so much. I desire greatly to make the acquaintance of some of these enumerators, because their work shows what a wealth of talent is lying loose in the country. I would like to know that ingenious enumerator who for the sake of \$25, that paltry wage, was able to discover and record ninety-three separate industrial establishments for carrying on knitting in the county of Shelburne? Let the Finance Minister look for him. Surely such talent should not go wasted any longer. Why, Sir, he is fit to be the private secretary of the Secretary of State when he comes back to us. He might, with still greater propriety, be made the Dominion statistician and set to edit the Year-Book, and, Sir, if he had a chance he would run the hon. gentleman hard, provided he possesses a fluent tongue, for the position of a protectionist Finance Minister. I will call the hon. gentleman's attention to a little calculation I made with reference to the 25,845 industrial establishments he has discovered in Canada added in ten years. These 25,845 industries, he tells us, employ 112,000 people. Now, Sir, we will suppose that there are one thousand of these which would average forty hands each, not an overwhelming amount considering that there are a great many women and children as well as men to be found in the industrial establishments we are taxing the people of Canada \$30,000,000 in all to support. That would represent 40,000 employees. Suppose 20,000 of them average twenty hands each employed, that would represent another 40,000 hands, or, in all, 80,000; and it leaves this interesting calculation: that there would remain in round numbers, 23,000 industrial establishments employing 22,000 hands, which is a little less than one man, or one woman, or one boy, or one girl, for these 23,000 establishments each. My friend from Arthabaska (Mr. Lavergne) tells me that this may be accounted for by a very ingenious development of the census returns which came to his attention. My friend, I think, made the statement here, that so careful were the census enumerators not to under-rate the number of industrial establishments, that there is one old lady in his village or town, who is reported in the census as carrying on two industrial establishments; one is an establishment for the sale of lollypops which is duly put down as an industrial establishment, and the other is a knitting factory conducted by herself for the manufacture of foot gear for her grand-children, which also figures as an industrial establishment.

Mr. FOSTER. All of which duly appears in the official record?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes, and goes to make up your 25,845 industrial establishments.

Mr. FOSTER. Lollypops are good.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. All of them are entered in your census.

Now, Sir,—and here I must apologize to the House, because this is rather a personal matter—the hon. gentleman found it absolutely necessary to refer to a certain letter of mine in the London "Economist," which I am not going to quote again, as I took the opportunity of putting it on record before, and he expressed a certain opinion about it which was not altogether complimentary to the author. Now, I would like to call the hon. gentleman's attention, and the attention of the House, to a certain remarkable speech which was lately made in England by an American well known, by name, at any rate, to most of the members of this House—a gentleman who has filled the highest offices in his own country, and who is now ambassador to the court of St. James. I will make no apology, then, for reading to the House what Mr. Bayard said recently as to the results of the operation of the American protective system in his own country, of which he had been for many years a most attentive observer. What Mr. Bayard said was this:

In his own country he had witnessed the insatiable growth of that form of state socialism styled "protection," which he believed had done more to foster class legislation and create inequality of fortune, to corrupt public life, to banish men of independent mind and character from the public councils, to lower the tone of national representation, blunt public conscience, create false standards, in the popular mind, to familiarize it with reliance upon state and guardianship in private affairs, divorce ethics from politics, and place politics upon the low level of mercenary scramble than any other single cause.

Step by step, and largely owing to the confusion of civic strife, it had succeeded in obtaining control of the sovereign power of taxation, never hesitating at any alliance or resort to any combination that promised to assist its purpose of perverting the public taxation from its only true justification and function of creating revenue for the support of the whole people into an engine for the selfish private profit of allied beneficiaries and combinations called trusts.

Under its dictation individual enterprise and independence have been oppressed, and the energy of discovery and invention debilitated and discouraged. It had unhesitatingly allied itself with every policy which tended to commercial isolation, dangerously depleted the treasury, and sapped the popular conscience, by schemes of corrupting favour and largesse to special classes, whose support was thereby affected.

Thus it has done much to throw legislation into the political market, where jobbers and chafferers took the place of statesmen.

It was incorrect to speak of protection as a national policy, for that it could never be, because it could never be other than the fostering

of special interests at the expense of the rest ; and this overthrew the great principle of equality before the law, and that resultant sense of justice and equity in the administration of sovereign powers which was the true cause of domestic tranquillities and human contentment.

The enfeeblement of individual energies and the impairment of manly self-reliance were necessarily involved, and the belief in mysterious powers of the state, and reliance upon them, took the place of individual exertion, fostered the growth of state socialism, and personal liberty ceased to be the great end of the Government.

There is the statement of a former Premier of the United States, a senator of the highest position, and to-day the ambassador of the United States at the court of St. James ; and, Sir, to Mr. Bayard's immortal honour be it said—and I wish with all my heart our rules and regulations enabled me to share it—so true were those statements, so much did they wring the withers of that mercenary class created by the system which he denounced that—and I am quoting from the "Congressional Record"—he was impeached in the House of Representatives at Washington for high treason, because he had dared to make that speech before the Philosophical Institution of Edinburgh. If the hon. gentleman has done me the honour of listening to what Mr. Bayard said, or if he will take the trouble to read it, he will find that Mr. Bayard might, *mutatis mutandis*, have written my letter to the "Economist," and I might have delivered Mr. Bayard's speech to the Philosophical Institution.

Mr. FOSTER. Oh, no, not the latter—it is not virile enough.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Well, it is virile enough to bring upon Mr. Bayard a charge of high treason.

Mr. FOSTER. But not enough to satisfy your requirements.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I cannot accept the hon. gentleman's flattering statement. But, Sir, in order that the hon. gentleman may know that when I used the language I did, in the "Economist," I was not anticipating or forestalling what was said about us in England—that I was not directing the attention of Englishmen to blots on our national character theretofore unknown, I want to read to this House a few opinions delivered by the English press in the year of grace 1891, many months before that letter of mine was written. In that year the London "Times," speaking of statements which had been paraded in our Public Accounts Committee and in our Elections Committee, said this :

Here in the mother country there can be only one feeling, that of deep regret for the wrong done to the fair fame of the eldest of her daughter nations by the lax morality of her politicians.

The London "Daily Chronicle" almost of the same date, said :

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

It seems to be possible in the Dominion to secure the political support, not only of individuals, but of whole provinces, by gifts of money. The locality is bribed as well as the member, and the consequent demoralization spreads through all ranks.

The London "Graphic" declared :

It is no longer possible to doubt that corruption in its worst form is rampant in a large portion of the Canadian Civil Service.

The London "Daily Telegraph" declared :

Enough, unfortunately, is already known in England to make it clear that only the most resolute and drastic purification can redeem public life in Canada from the taint of corruption, the like of which we have not seen in our own country for hundreds of years.

The Birmingham "Gazette," if I am not greatly mistaken, the organ of Mr. Chamberlain, the present Secretary of the Colonies, declared :

Rascals out of office defraud the public in order to bribe rascals in office, and rascals in office prostitute themselves, sacrifice their honour and forsake their trust in order to keep on good terms with the rascals out of office.

Mr. J. C. Chamberlain might have written that himself. He is virile enough when he chooses to please my hon. friend.

Mr. FOSTER. A good transcript of yours.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It was before mine.

Mr. FOSTER. I think the information must have been sent over ahead.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The information was not sent by me.

Mr. CASEY. The Public Accounts Committee sent the information.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The London "Echo" declared :

No country can prosper where public departments are in league with fraudulent contractors, and where Ministers are open to offers.

The St. James "Gazette" declared :

The existence of an organized system of corruption among public officials in Canada has been conclusively proved, and, like everything else on the American continent, the bribery has been colossal.

It was no picayune matter that, at any rate, whatever other things may be. The "Graphic" despatch goes on :

The secret of Sir John Macdonald's electoral victories is out. On this side of the water surprise has often been expressed at the patience with which our Canadian cousins submitted to the Tory protectionist rule of that prince of political intriguers. There is now, alas, no difficulty in explaining that curious situation. Sir John's Government rested on a stupendous and all-prevailing system of bribery and corruption. Even Tammany Hall smells sweet and clean in comparison with that huge stink-pot of Sir John's Government.

Mr. FOSTER. That is very like the hon. gentleman.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Those are the opinions expressed by the English press, one and all, and had I space I might have multiplied them, ten, twenty, thirty, forty-fold, for every English paper of any note during 1891 teemed with the hideous record of corruption which was then exposed. But my point is this. My point is to show to the gentleman that he did me considerable wrong when he declared, as he did, that I had set the key-note to the English papers to attack this country. All those things were on record many months before I addressed my letter to the English "Economist," and it was because I knew they were on record and because, therefore, my words could not add further to the effect that had been produced on the English mind, that I did speak as I did, and I spoke with regret—although it was my duty to speak of it—of the extraordinary extent to which Canadian public life had been debased and demoralized by the results of the protectionist policy which the hon. gentleman and his friends had inaugurated.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Will the hon. gentleman object to say what his object was in writing that letter?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I have not the slightest objection. I have stated it before. I had found that certain persons on the other side, and certain persons here—among them men who held positions in our Civil Service—had been, for a very considerable time, systematically maligning and slandering the Liberal party and leaders, and I was determined that that should not go on longer without intelligent and thoughtful Englishmen knowing that there were two sides to the question—without their knowing what the Liberal party was, what it proposed to do, and why the Liberal party advocated the policy it did—and therefore I addressed that letter to the London "Economist." The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) went on:

The Empire will be able to feed itself. Yes, that article said 100,000,000 bushels of wheat were necessary to England other than what the colonies afforded her at the present time, in order to feed the people of the Empire there. One hundred million bushels of wheat! Why, 50,000 Canadian farmers, with one hundred acres each in wheat, and raising 30 bushels to the acre, would produce 150,000,000 bushels of wheat for export to Great Britain. And what are 50,000 farmers, cultivating 5,000,000 of acres, compared to the number of millions of acres of good wheat land in Manitoba and the North-west Territories, which have not yet been scratched by the plough? Meats to the amount of 140,000,000 pounds would have to be supplied by the colonies to make up Great Britain's deficiency, supplied now from foreign countries.

The hon. gentleman went on to say:

Why, cattle, and horses, and pigs, in illimitable quantity could be raised in this country. And,

as to butter and cheese, 50,000 farmers, owning 50 cows each, amounting to 2,500,000 cows, could supply butter and cheese enough to meet the demands of Great Britain for such supplies.

Now, my object is not altogether so much to find fault with the hon. gentleman's statement as to contrast it with a statement from that side of the House, which this House heard years ago, and to which it is worth now calling the attention of the House. The statement with which I wish to contrast that of the hon. gentleman opposite was made by the hon. Secretary of State (Sir Charles Tupper). He said:

I may say that I believe there are few members of this House, much as our attention has been turned to the development of the North-west, who have begun to contemplate in all its fulness what the capabilities of that great country are. I have spoken of the enormous extent, of the unexampled fertility of the soil, of the splendid description of wheat that can only be produced in these more northern and colder climes. But let me just ask the attention of the House for a single moment to a few figures which will indicate what the capabilities of that country are in regard to the production of wheat. One hundred thousand farmers, each farmer cultivating 320 acres of wheat land. Has any hon. member made the calculation of what they would produce?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am glad the hon. gentleman has done so. I am glad his attention has been drawn to the fact that 100,000 farmers, cultivating 320 acres each, or 200,000 farmers, cultivating half that quantity each, and taking the produce at only 20 bushels to the acre, instead of 27 or 30, which is the average in the North-west in favourable years, would give 640,000,000 bushels of wheat, or 50 per cent more wheat than the whole United States produces to-day. You have only to look at those figures for a single moment to see what the future of Canada is, to see what a magnificent granary for the world is placed in our Canadian North-west, and, when you remember we have six belts running through that fertile country that would each give 320 acres each to 100,000 farmers, you can understand, to some little degree, what a magnificent future awaits us in the development of that great country.

Mr. DAVIN. Hear, hear.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is the way it should be whooped up. There is the way—if the hon. gentleman does want to eulogize the North-west—in which it ought to be done. Who cares for his puny hundred millions to feed the British Empire? Let him take example from the hon. Secretary of State (Sir Charles Tupper) and point out that the North-west can feed the whole world and produce six times 640 millions bushels of wheat. If the hon. gentleman wants to go into that line of business, that is the way it ought to be done. Do not let him for one moment confine his energies to the paltry task of feeding the British Empire. Let him go in for feeding the whole world, as did the Secretary of State, and then we will have something like an eulogium. And when it is remembered that we have only

five millions, or thereabouts, in all our territory, which is able to produce enough to feed the whole world, the population of which, I suppose, is a little over one thousand millions. I want to know how the hon. gentleman accounts for the fact that we have lost, under his regime, in the last twelve years, about two million people.

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

After Recess.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I suppose we must get on as best we can in the absence of the Minister of Finance and my hon friend the leader of the Opposition, who, I am informed, are more pleasantly engaged. When the House rose, to the best of my recollection and belief, I had just been making a comparison between the pitiful promises of the Minister of Finance and the gorgeous, cloud-capped visions of a much bigger man. And, Sir, it gives me pleasure now to turn to the master-mind. Like the Scottish chieftain, I like to hear of worthy foes. The master-mind has recently been expanding itself in Montreal before the board of trade of that city. To relieve the mind of my hon. friend from Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper), I may say that I do not propose to analyse that speech to-night, first, because it would take too long; and, second, because I live in hope of hearing it, with certain additional flourishes, within the next few days. But, on the principle that it is always well to sample goods, though I have not been able to find time to read the whole speech, I have read one page and it is interesting, or, at least, it was instructive. In that page I observed that reference was made to twenty-seven "great" things, to ten "vast" things; and that the capital "I"—I by itself I—occurred fifty-one times, having reference to the "great" and "vast" things aforesaid. I will take one statement which was made either on that occasion or not long after, although this is a reference to those ancient times that are getting a little stale. That statement was that Canada had been reduced to the deepest poverty in 1878, and the inference was fair that it had been reduced to the deepest poverty by the misgovernment and mismanagement of Alexander Mackenzie, probably assisted by his then Finance Minister. Sir, I think there are a good many people in Canada of the agricultural persuasion whose land stood at a value in 1878 that they would very gladly see it stand at to-day. I think there are a good many people in Canada of the agricultural and other persuasions whose products stood at prices in 1878 that they would very gladly indeed see them stand to-day. Sir, we will spend a moment in considering this statement, because this

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT,

is a statement that has been used on many occasions, and careless minds not acquainted with the facts, and apt to be misled by a few instances that have been paraded time and again, are in some little danger of being deceived by broad assertions of that kind. I take exception in the strongest way to the statement that Canada was reduced to the deepest poverty in 1878 under a revenue tariff of about 17½ per cent. because the inference is clear that it was in consequence of having a moderate revenue tariff that it was reduced to that state of deepest poverty. To those who choose to examine the economic conditions of the country at that time, that statement will appear not only false, but ludicrously false. I say that the very reverse was the case; that Canada, in all the essentials of real wealth, was very considerably better off in 1878 than Canada is to-day. In population, I grant, we have grown somewhat; but in the elements of real substantial wealth, and, still more, in the distribution of wealth, Canada was better off then than she is now. I will call the attention of the House for a few brief moments to some of the results of the Administration which terminated in 1878. It is known to everybody that the National Policy did not come into operation until the middle of 1879, and it is also known that for a year and a half more it was impossible, no matter what the results of the policy might be, for them to have developed or fructified within that time. Now, to put the National Policy into operation by the establishment of industries under it, took at least \$50,000,000 of subscribed capital for the various enterprises. That was the statement of its supporters, and I have reason to think that it was rather under the mark. Where did that money come from? It was not contributed by England; it was not contributed by the United States. It was produced out of our deepest poverty, which we had struck in 1878. Out of our deepest poverty, we put in \$50,000,000 to be invested in various factories; and I greatly grieve to say most of it was lost, thanks to the foolish advice given by these gentlemen who dare to speak of the deep poverty of 1878. More, Sir, out of the deepest poverty another \$50,000,000 and more was used for speculative purposes in the North-west. And, Sir, I greatly grieve to say that the most of that sum was lost, thanks not so much to the fault of the country as to the gross misgovernment which frittered away and destroyed the great resources it really possessed. Now, Sir, I will tell the hon. gentleman what the real facts of the case were with respect to the period during which Mr. Mackenzie governed this country. The truth is that during those four years the great mass of the people, far from being reduced to the deepest poverty, were living frugally and were accumulating largely, and it was because they lived frugally, because they ac-

cumulated largely, that they were able to invest these large sums afterwards. Sir, they accumulated largely under the wise guidance of Mr. Mackenzie, they launched out foolishly and lost huge sums of money in 1831, and the few years following, under the foolish guidance of those who displaced Mr. Mackenzie. You have there the economic history of Canada during those four years in a nutshell. Under our regime, for reasons I have given already, it is true enough there were two or three deficits, though not of very formidable proportions; but under our regime there was this cardinal difference to which I call my hon. friend's attention, under our regime, though the revenue lost, the people gained; but under the regime of these hon. gentlemen the precise opposite has occurred, the revenue has gained, but the people have lost, and lost very heavily. That is the fact, that is the economic law and the truth about that matter. Now, I am not speaking lightly, I am not speaking recklessly, I am not speaking of what I do not know and what I have not seen; I recollect one small riding in Canada where I had unusual facilities for tracing out the effects of that foolish policy. In one small town, to my own knowledge, \$200,000 in hard cash were, at the instigation of the present Government or their predecessors, invested in manufactures of which not a single solitary shadow remains; the \$200,000 have vanished into smoke and thinnest air. In that same town and vicinity, \$400,000 more were invested in wild speculations in the North-west, all of which has been utterly locked up, and of which by far the greatest portion is a dead loss. In the riding at large, more than double that amount was invested in similar speculative enterprises. What was true of that riding, is true, to my certain knowledge, of many other ridings of my own province, and I believe, though not quite to the same extent, of many other portions of Canada. Sir, it need not have been so, it ought not to have been so. I believe myself that, wisely governed and prudently administered, Manitoba and the region adjacent might have been a mine of wealth to the people of Canada, instead of a sinkhole—and I say this without the least desire to hurt the feelings of the hon. gentlemen from that province—for the immense sums invested there. I say that had the wise policy of Mr. Mackenzie, aye, and the wise policy of the then Minister of the Interior, my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills), been carried out, and had our policy generally prevailed, there would have been very little loss indeed experienced on the part of those who chose to invest their money in endeavouring to develop the North-west and the great territory adjacent.

Now, Sir, various fallacies have been advanced by the Finance Minister incidentally in the course of his speech, to some of which I have alluded briefly, and to some of which

I may allude a little more. One of them I have touched upon already, that is what I described as the home market fallacy, where the hon. gentleman, as I said, took credit to himself for the increased consumption of four or five hundred thousand people added to our population in the course of seventeen years, and utterly ignored the fact that we had lost two millions of people, between immigrants coming to this country and leaving it, and the loss of the natural growth of our own population as has taken place, a far more valuable factor in the national life, which we have likewise lost. Then there was another fallacy to which I alluded, closely akin to his fallacy wherein he claimed merit for the reduction of interest. The hon. gentleman knows, and his friends are often pointing to the fact that in certain lines of goods there is a considerable fall in prices since 1878. Sir, do these people suppose that the world stood still because Canada committed herself to a foolish and evil policy in the matter of trade? During those seventeen years there have been enormous improvements, enormous discoveries, enormous inventions in everything you choose to name, all which tend to cheapen goods. Whether it be discoveries in science, whether it be discoveries in mechanics, whether it be cheapness of transportation, in everything you choose to name, including the large reduction in the cost of capital, there has been enormous improvement. Sir, do these men dare to tell me, do they dare tell the House, that the National Policy of Canada is responsible for the fact that there have been great discoveries in mechanics, great scientific discoveries in a thousand directions, that there has been a great cheapening in transportation? These things have contributed to cheapen goods, no doubt. It may be true that in spite of all we have done to prevent and neutralize the beneficial effects of these discoveries and inventions, goods in certain lines are cheaper than they were in 1878. I do not care if they are, and I may come to that point again. Now, Sir, if they are willing to shoulder the responsibility for the huge reduction that has taken place in the price of our land, for the huge reduction that has taken place in the price of our grains, for the huge reduction which has taken place in the price of almost every agricultural product in Canada, I will give them with all my heart the benefit of the reduction which has taken place in the price of goods. But until they are willing to admit the one, I wholly and entirely deny them the right to assume the other. Sir, all that the National Policy can do is, to a certain extent, to break the force and break the effect of these discoveries and inventions, and to make goods in Canada a little dearer than they otherwise would be. That is the result of the National Policy, that and nothing else.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I come to a matter of more immediate moment. The hon. gen-

tleman, in their time, have sent the people of Canada on many a wild-goose chase, they have sent them after many will-o'-the-wisps. Hon. gentlemen sometimes, however, get hold of an idea which has something to recommend it, and with respect to this question of possible preferential trade between Great Britain and her colonies, not on political-economical grounds, but on other grounds, there is, or there might be, something to be said. But have these hon. gentlemen thought out, have they considered, have they reflected for one moment what preferential trade between Great Britain and her colonies means, and are they prepared to pay the price? Suppose the Government of Great Britain were to come down to us and say: Admit British manufactured goods free into Canada, and we will give you a substantial preference in our markets for your produce, your grain, your cattle, over other countries; are hon. gentlemen prepared to pay the price?—or rather are their supporters, the manufacturers of Canada, prepared to pay the price? Sir, I greatly doubt it; and yet, unless that or something closely analogous to that is done, it is the idlest nonsense to talk about the possibility of preferential trade. John Bull is not quite a fool, and he is not going to give preferential advantages to his colonies or anybody else unless his colonies are prepared to admit his goods, his manufactured products, free of charge into their market, or at any rate, on vastly reduced terms, which, I take it, the hon. gentlemen have not the slightest intention of doing. Now, on this matter, much has been said about the intention and desire of the British Government, and a good deal has been made of a supposed fair trade movement, or a supposed movement in the direction of preferential trade, which is alleged to have found certain champions among certain British statesmen or British politicians—for I cannot imagine any British statesman, properly so called, who has pledged himself to any such doctrine. Sir, I want to call the attention of the House and of the Government to certain utterances made on that subject by men who are responsible statesmen, in whose hands the conduct of the destinies of Great Britain is largely held just now. First, I will take a recent statement on this subject made by Lord Salisbury, the present Premier. Dealing with this subject, he said:

I have simply to say, with respect to the question of protection, that this country has adopted the opposite system after a controversy unexampled in its length, in its earnestness, and in the precision with which the ultimate issue was arrived at. If we are to undertake the re-examination of that question, it must not be done incidentally by insinuations, by allusions, by hints. You must firmly walk up to the fortress that you have to attack, and lay siege to it in form. In my belief, the economical arguments in favour of free trade are very strong, but they are not the strongest with which we have to deal.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

If he (Lord De La Warr) will look back upon the debate of 1846 and read the speeches of Robert Peel when introducing his great proposal, he will see that the political argument weighed more heavily than even the economical argument in his mind. And I believe that the political argument has lost none of its force. I utterly disbelieve that it is in your power to introduce protection. If it were, I think it would be introducing a state of division among the classes of this country which would differ very little from civil war.

That, Sir, is the statement of the present Premier of England, made on his responsibility, within a very short space of time. But that is not all. Lord Dunraven, a gentleman known by name to all of us, introduced a proposal for the advancement of trade in Her Majesty's dominions. Lord Salisbury said:

My noble friend's proposal is, that we and the colonies should enter into a tariff arrangement to discriminate in favour of the productions of the Empire, as against those of all the rest of the world.

And with the remark that he did not intend to use any deprecatory language of it, he proceeded as follows:—

I ask him to look at the state of opinion in this country, especially the state of opinion in our commercial, manufacturing and industrial classes, the state of opinion, above all, among the capitalists and the most educated classes, and say if he sees the slightest chance, within any period to which we have a right to look forward, of such a modification of opinion in this country as will enable any statesman, whatever his opinion may be, to propose the establishment of retaliatory duties. It seems to me to be absolutely out of the question. If you wish to set up a discriminating system in favour of the colonies as against the rest of the world, just consider what are the goods on which you would have to lay a heavy duty in this country in order to make that discrimination felt. They are grain, wool and meat. What chance have you of inducing the people of this country to accept legislation which would make these essential articles of consumption susceptible of such tariffs? I see no probability whatever of it. That being the case, I think we should be hardly behaving respectfully to the colonies, if we asked them to send representatives to a conference to discuss the question, when we know that the answer which many of them, at all events many of their statesmen, would give must be met immediately on our part by the information that such a thing is absolutely impossible.

That is the statement of the Premier of England. That is the opinion of Lord Salisbury. Here is the opinion of a great economic authority, Lord Farrar. He said:

What does she (Canada) send us? Chiefly cattle, meat, corn, cheese, lard, butter, leather, skins, fish, fruit and timber. In 1891 the value of these things which we had from Canada was about £11,000,000, but in the same year the value of these things which we had from all other countries was much more than £100,000,000, and the value of these things which we have imported from Canada's great rival, the United States, was

more than £50,000,000. We are, therefore, asked to deprive ourselves of necessaries from the United States alone valued at £50,000,000, besides an immense quantity from other countries, on the empty promise that Canada's £11,000,000 will, under the encouragement given by a differential duty, grow into the larger amount.

I will now state what a gentleman who is supposed to be a more modern statesman, said on the subject, and it is worth while for hon. gentlemen on both sides to listen, because if we are to be asked to seriously consider the possibility of differential and preferential trade, we might as well know that not merely the oldest statesmen, but those men who are likely in the near future to guide the destinies of the Empire, are equally opposed to any such proposal. Mr. Chamberlain, speaking on the subject, said :

With the growth of intelligence on the part of the working classes, and with the knowledge they now possess of their power, the reaction against such a policy (a tax on food) would be attended by consequences so serious that I do not like to contemplate them.

That is the opinion of Mr. Joseph Chamberlain, the Secretary of State for the Colonies, on the chances of a proposal being adopted for preferential trade. He added :

Mr. Gladstone designates the scheme as wild, impracticable and full of danger.

Hon. gentlemen opposite will not regard Mr. Gladstone's opinion as of much weight ; at all events, Mr. Gladstone is now outside of active political life. Lord Farrar, speaking again on this subject, made these remarks, which are worthy of notice :

Will it conduce to friendly feelings in this country towards Canada, if our working classes are told that their food is dearer or that their employment is lessened in order to give more profit or more employment to the land-owners and farmers of Canada ? And supposing, as is more than probable, that the United States should retaliate, and exclude the £30,000,000 worth of manufactured goods and the many millions' worth of shipping services which we send them, will the loss of that profit and employment make Canada and her people dearer to our manufacturers and our workmen ? I can give Sir Charles Tupper a much easier and more effectual receipt for attracting English settlers to Canada and keeping them from crossing into the United States, when they get there, and that is, relieve them from the heavy and unnecessary tax they now pay to the manufacturers of Ontario by reason of Canada's protective duties on manufactured goods.

I humbly submit that the vagaries of Mr. James Lowther, of Mr. Horace Vincent, and even Sir Charles Tupper, will hardly weigh against the formal and official statements of Mr. Chamberlain, Lord Farrar and Lord Salisbury on this important question ; and I think that until these statements are retracted, until we have reason to believe that the statesmen of the Empire are receiving new light on the subject, we would do well in our present condition, not to waste much

time in discussing the possibilities of preferential trade within the limits of the Empire.

Sir, the Minister of Finance also alluded to the question of reciprocity. I do not know that I would be justified in inflicting on the House a narrative of the proceedings in respect to reciprocity which have occurred during the past few years. But this much I will say. When in the year 1888, I proposed to enter into negotiations with the United States on the subject of reciprocity, I did so with the best possible ground—as was admitted afterwards by Sir John Thompson and by Sir John Macdonald—for believing, that any fair proposition on our part would be responded to generously by both classes of politicians in the United States. How was my proposal met ? It was met by the then Minister of Finance with the declaration, that the Government did not care for reciprocity, unless the interests of their paymasters, the ring of protected manufacturers, were protected. That, in so many words and so many terms, was the resolution with which he answered me. We repeated that in 1889, and we were met with substantially the same answer. Not one step, not one little finger was held up by these hon. gentlemen to meet the advances which were then made freely and readily by many men of eminence in the United States. In 1890, when we brought the matter up again for the third time, does not every man who was present remember right well, that Mr. Colby, then a Minister of State, especially appointed to reply to my speech, said, that reciprocity was a bad thing all through, and especially did Mr. Colby contend that reciprocity was a very bad thing for the farmers of Canada. What was the next act in the drama ? Sir, the next act was, that when the Government found the people of the country were most earnestly desirous of obtaining reciprocity, they pitched their three resolutions overboard, Mr. Colby included, and they deliberately went to the people of Canada, and deliberately went to His Excellency Lord Stanley, with a lie in their mouths, and they told the people that they had the best reason to expect that they could negotiate a reciprocity treaty with the United States. But they said it could not be done in a moribund Parliament which had only a year to run—it was too important a thing for that—and they must have a fresh mandate from the people. That is the history in brief of reciprocity so far as it has gone. I ask this House, I ask this country : Could any men have taken steps more thoroughly calculated to estrange the American people ; could any men have taken steps more thoroughly calculated to destroy all possible chance of obtaining reciprocity, than did the Canadian Government by their conduct, in three times deliberately shutting the door in the face of negotiations, and then at the fourth time at-

tempting to trick the people of the United States and to trick the people of Canada? Sir, I am not speaking without warrant. I have here the Sessional Papers for 1891, and I will read to the House one or two pieces of evidence which will show the statesmanlike fashion in which these negotiations for reciprocity were conducted by the Canadian Government. One of these is a statement of Mr. Blaine, in supplement be it remembered, of a formal letter addressed by him to Mr. Baker, a congressman in northern New York, who made inquiries as to whether any negotiations were going on. Hon. gentlemen will remember that Mr. Blaine denied in the most emphatic manner that any such negotiations had gone on. Mr. Blaine's statement will be found in the Sessional Papers 38-A of 1891, and it is well that hon. gentlemen should make a note of it. Mr. Blaine says:

In view of the fact that you—

That is. Sir Julian Pauncefote—

—had come to the State Department with the proposals,—

That is to say, the proposals for reciprocity—

—In view of the fact that you had come to the State Department with the proposals, and that the subject was then for the first time mentioned between us; and in view of the further fact that I agreed to a private conference, as explained in my minute; I confess that it was a surprise to me that, several weeks later, during the Canadian canvas, Sir John Macdonald and Sir Charles Tupper both stated before public assemblages, that an informal discussion of a reciprocity treaty would take place at Washington after the 4th of March, by the initiation of the Secretary of State.

The Secretary of State referred to was Mr. Blaine himself. He continues:

I detail these facts because I deem it important, since the matter has been for some weeks open to public remark, to have it settled that the conference was not initiated by me, but, on the contrary, that the private arrangement of which I spoke, was a modification of your proposal, and in no sense an original suggestion from the Government of the United States.

There, Sir, is a most formal and emphatic contradiction of the statement made by the late Sir John Macdonald, and by Sir Charles Tupper, that those negotiations were initiated by the United States, and it is also a contradiction of their other statement, that they were sure to get a reciprocity treaty if they came with a fresh mandate from the people. And here is another letter from Sir Charles Tupper to Sir John Macdonald under date 21st April, 1891. Of course it was for no treasonable purpose that Sir Charles Tupper was in Washington. At least I hope not. When I go to Washington it is high treason, but when Sir Charles Tupper dances attendance at Washington, it is for the good of his country. But that is a detail. Here is what I want to call at-

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

tention to, and it is written by Sir Charles Tupper be it remembered:

I told Mr. Blaine that I wished at the outset to recognize the accuracy of the statement contained in his letter to Sir Julian Pauncefote, which I have seen, in reference to the initiation of the negotiations regarding reciprocal trade arrangements between the two countries.

I wish to recognize the accuracy of Mr. Blaine's statement, says Sir Charles Tupper. Sir, in plain terms, Mr. Blaine's statement was a statement that he had been grossly deceived by the Canadian Government, and that the Canadian Government had grossly deceived the Canadian people, and Sir Charles Tupper wishes to recognize the accuracy of that statement. Sir Charles Tupper then spoke the truth, and nothing but the truth, and the whole truth, and I fully believe his statement which I have read to the House.

Now I come to another matter which I have alluded to once or twice before, but which the Finance Minister—or perhaps I should more correctly say, some of his colleagues—found it extremely convenient to disregard. Those men are constantly pointing to little proofs, as I call them, of the progress of Canada, and they say it is a wonderful thing that our savings banks deposits range to forty million dollars or thereabouts. I do not deny that an increase of savings banks deposits, or an increase of bank deposits, or an increase of other deposits of any kind, are pro tanto, and in a certain direction, proofs that a certain section of the community is accumulating money. Whether they are proofs that money could be employed profitably in Canada is another question, and I will not enter on it now. I have again to point out, that while all that might be true, it was a still more important truth and fact for Canada, that the collective indebtedness of Canada has increased enormously during the past dozen years. I gave that collective indebtedness, not lightly but after due consideration, at a sum ranging from \$800,000,000 to \$1,000,000,000, and I pointed out that that debt was almost wholly due abroad, and required an annual tribute on our part, ranging from \$25,000,000 to \$30,000,000. Sir, I might fairly have made it more; but I was aware that while the indebtedness existed, on a considerable part of it we were not in the habit of paying more than a small percentage. Any gentleman who wants to ascertain the facts for himself may look, not to a paper friendly to me, but to the Montreal "Gazette" of that date, where he will find a tolerably accurate summary, not of all the things I have accounted, but of sums quite sufficient to prove my case, which was that our collective indebtedness was probably not less than \$1,000,000,000, and that the tribute we had to pay—and that is a very important matter, especially to gentlemen who are anxious about the balance of trade—ranged

from \$25,000,000 to \$30,000,000 a year, which had to be paid in some shape or form out of the earnings of the people of Canada. But, Sir, there is another side to this matter. Over and above all that, I want tonight to spend a few moments in calling the attention of the House to the fact that grave as our taxation is, and I am not going to underrate it, grave as our debt is, and I am not going to underrate it, there is, besides, this further thing to be taken into account in judging of the financial condition of the people of Canada—that we are at present subjected to an enormous local taxation, which is really a good deal larger than I had supposed it to be. Here again I am not going to quote from authorities which I might be supposed to have influenced in any shape or way. I will take an authority from an independent source, which is not by any means specially favourable to myself, but which is, I think, in this matter speaking by the card. I found the other day in the Montreal "Star" a review of the financial situation of the city of Montreal, and this is what it said :

The city debt of Montreal stands at \$107 per head. No other Canadian city is so afflicted. Some of the per capita debts, roughly estimated, are as follows :—

	Per head.
Halifax	\$71
Hamilton	66
London	59
Quebec	91
Toronto	88
Ottawa	75
Winnipeg	67

Not one of the others run over the century.

Now, Sir, I would like the House to understand what that means. As I compute, if every individual in the city of Montreal is on the average indebted to the amount of \$107 for local indebtedness, if, besides, he has to pay his share of the federal indebtedness, if, besides that, he has to pay his share, as everybody knows he has, and more, of the provincial indebtedness of the province of Quebec; what follows? Why, Sir, this follows, that on the average every head of a family in the city of Montreal, to start with is indebted in, and has to provide for the interest on, the sum of \$885, a very tidy little sum indeed for each wage-earner in a community like Montreal to have to provide for local, federal and provincial indebtedness. Any hon. gentleman who chooses to make the calculation will see for himself that I have not exaggerated the case. If he adds together the local indebtedness of \$107 each per head, or \$535 per family, the federal debt, which is at least \$250 per family, and the provincial debt, which I am told is about \$100 per family, he will find that these amounts make in all about \$885. And the same thing applies, although in a less degree, to all the citizens of all those cities which I have named, who constitute, as everybody knows, a very con-

siderable fraction of the whole bulk of our population.

Now, Sir, we were told a little while ago that we in Canada were in a state of exceeding great prosperity. That has been repeated and enlarged upon many a time by the Finance Minister and by his colleagues. Sir, I shall have to take the liberty of quoting from that same authority again, and I will call the attention of hon. gentlemen opposite who will not listen to my words, to what is said by a paper which has certainly no interest in running down the value of property in Montreal, or in depreciating the citizens of that good city. This is what it says :

The stagnation in building operations and the large number of unemployed in the city are attracting great attention at present. A well-known priest stated, the other day, that not for years had he seen so many unemployed people and so much misery among the labouring classes. His presbytery, he stated, was fairly overrun, and at the present time he was providing for over two hundred families who were in destitute circumstances. Never had he known so many workmen out of employ. Leading city builders and contractors were seen by "Star" reporters, in order to obtain their views upon the causes of the present stagnation of business, with the following results :—

Ald. Peter Lyall, who has for many years now been engaged extensively in building operations in the city of Montreal, also regards the present situation as most serious. The present high rate of taxation in the city, rendered necessary by wasteful and dishonest methods of managing our municipal affairs, has, in Ald. Lyall's opinion, had a most injurious effect upon the mind of the investor in real estate, who looks for a fair return for his investment. "Why, take my own case," said Ald. Lyall; "I have a large sum of money invested in real estate in the city here, and it actually does not return me enough to pay taxes and cost of maintenance."

Now, Sir, if there be a city in Canada which has been prospered by the National Policy, that city is the city of Montreal; and if that be the condition of Montreal, what is likely to be the condition of towns like Halifax, Charlottetown, St. John and a hundred and one cities, towns and villages throughout Ontario which for ten years have not been able to maintain their natural growth, let alone add, as they ought to do, largely to their population. Sir, I might say the same of Toronto. That city I know myself, and hon. gentlemen opposite may contradict me, if they choose to take that responsibility. I know that in Toronto there has not been for many a long year so much difficulty in finding employment, and the professional classes there all through find the greatest difficulty in collecting their accounts. I know that in Toronto, in large and valuable areas, real estate is almost unsaleable. I know that to-day in the city of Toronto it is a matter of extreme difficulty on the part of a great many owners of formerly productive real estate to obtain enough rent from their properties to pay the taxes on them. If I

am wrong in that statement, the Toronto representatives can contradict me, and the Toronto papers may investigate the matter for themselves. While the question of prosperity concerns not only Montreal and Toronto, but the whole country, I named those two cities because they if any stood to prosper by the National Policy. Sir, they are failing to prosper, and why? Because all through Quebec and Ontario the population in the rural districts is stagnant and stationary; because the farmers find it all they can do to make both ends meet; because they have no longer the handsome surplus to dispose of which, when they had it, brought wealth and prosperity to the inhabitants of the cities; and because, in the long result, no city can prosper unless the rural and agricultural communities prosper too. Sir, let me review briefly the Finance Minister's boasts. The Finance Minister and some of his colleagues and supporters, as well as the Conservative press, boast that the deficit is only \$4,000,000. It is only as large in one year as the three deficits of the Mackenzie Government were in 1876, 1877 and 1878. Sir, that is the net result of seventeen years of unexampled prosperity, seventeen years of prudent administration, seventeen years of paternal government. I do not envy hon. gentlemen their position. But the hon. Finance Minister has other boasts. He boasts that our debt is only \$250,000,000—a flea-bite for a country with the resources of Canada. And there are only \$30,000,000 additional liabilities not provided for. He boasts, likewise, that our expenditure is a mere bagatelle of \$38,000,000—\$40,000,000 if everything were provided for. I have said before, and I repeat, that \$38,000,000, let alone \$40,000,000, is, in my judgment, a monstrous sum for this people to be called on to provide for. It is a matter of record and history, that when the United States mustered 20,000,000 strong, their total expenditure for federal purposes was barely \$22,000,000. The United States, with 20,000,000 people, could administer their federal government for very little more than one-half of that which it costs Canada today. And if it be true that \$4,000,000 of that goes in subsidies, remember that we have as yet neither army nor navy, not any of those expenditures for which the United States had then to provide. They make it a boast—and it is a shameful boast—that there are only a million of Canadians in the United States; they boast that only a million of the flower of our population have deserted our country—which, as I repeat, is large enough to provide for one hundred millions—to seek employment in a foreign land. It is their boast that we have lost only 700,000 out of the 800,000 immigrants who came into this country in a period of ten years. They make it their boast that we only owe, collectively, \$1,000,000,000—aye, and I see some of these wisecracs were good

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

enough to take me to task because, when I stated that we owed collectively \$1,000,000,000, I did not say that some—well, I will not describe them as I might—but some statisticians in Canada and elsewhere estimated the value of Canada's territory at \$4,000,000,000. They might estimate it at any amount they liked, that would not render our lands more valuable or our taxes less onerous. This talk of valuing a country at four or five thousand or six thousand millions is preposterous nonsense. The \$1,000,000,000 of debt is there, and the interest on that has to be paid, and the four thousand or five thousand millions of hypothetical values are practically of no value to us whatever. I daresay that this half continent of ours is worth many times four thousand millions if properly occupied and exploited, but that does not, in the slightest degree, at present, enable us to pay the interest on our \$1,000,000,000. Sir, I suppose they would likewise consider it a ground for just glorification that the income of the chief producing class has only been reduced one-half, and when I am speaking of that I do not mean to say simply that the prices of produce have been reduced by one-half, although that is too near the truth in many cases. But I say their income has been reduced because the margin of profit, out of which that income arises, has been reduced one-half or more. When wheat falls from one dollar to 65 cents, the loss to the farmers is not fairly measured by the 25 cents or 30 cents a bushel. That loss represents very nearly the whole margin of his profit, and his whole income might very easily be swept away by a reduction of 25 or 30 cents per bushel. They might also make it their boast that the rate of growth of Canada has fallen to one-half of what it used to be in our time, and to one-half of what it used to be in the time previous to ours—aye, to one-half of that which actually prevails in the mother country, and many other densely peopled countries. They would make it their boast, I suppose—although they are a little tender and delicate on that point—but they might, with equal propriety, boast that growth has ceased altogether in the three important provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island. Nevertheless, all those are just as fit subjects for boastfulness as the boast that we have only a deficit of four million dollars, and only a debt of \$253,000,000. To my poor mind, we have had enough of these impudent misstatements and twaddle about progress. It is time for the people of Canada to hear a few plain truths; and one of these plain truths is this, that seventeen years ago a majority of the then electorate played the fool, and they have since paid very bitterly for it. They put themselves in the hands of a lot of political tickets of leave, and they have been duped and plundered ever since, as few nations have ever been. One thousand

millions of treasure and two millions of people would hardly represent the loss in men and money which they have inflicted on the people of Canada. Over and above all that, we have the control of a huge territory, large enough to carve into half-a-dozen kingdoms. We have lost control of it, absolutely; we can exercise no dominion over it, and we have not got enough out of it to pay for the boundary stakes. I do not speak of the \$58,000,000 promised us in cash and securities better than cash; but I say, as an absolute fact, that we have thrown away an Empire and have not enough to pay for the boundary stakes to measure it off. We have thrown away chances, by a wise and judicious use of which we might well have redeemed a great deal of the loss that has been sustained by us. We have failed utterly to get new markets. The markets we have to-day are cribbed, cabined and confined, for more than they were five or six years ago. The Government have failed completely to keep up the prices of our chief products, which was the main inducement held out to the rural population for voting this National Policy in 1878. I need not say it, we know it too well, that we have failed utterly and completely to colonize those territories which we acquired in the North-west. We have failed to keep our people in our own territory. The plain truth is that hon. gentlemen opposite have failed in everything except in the one thing of heaping debt on debt and tax on tax, and in breeding scandals and plotting and conspiring among themselves to betray one another. Now, these men come whining to us and tell us that these things have arisen from causes beyond their control. They tell us that no government can maintain prices, that prices are fixed by demand and supply. Sir, that is true; but if that be true, why did they and their confederates tell the people in 1878 that it was in the power of the Government to regulate all those things? They tell us that they are not responsible for the shrinkage in the value of our imports. They tell us that they are not responsible for the distress in the United States, or for the short harvests which some time ago overtook portions of our Dominion. Granted; but why did they falsely charge Mr. Mackenzie and his Administration in 1878 with being responsible for all those things? Sir, in many respects, they are very much responsible. They have shown themselves to be ignorant and mischievous charlatans. They have shown that they have devised a policy which was perfectly certain to exhaust Canada—a policy which, of all other policies, I hold and believe to have been most utterly unsuited to our circumstances and position. I tell the hon. gentlemen, if they want to know, what Canada did and does need to-day. What Canada needs is lighter taxes, larger markets, bigger population,

free land for the settlers, and freedom from government interference. I will grant that these gentlemen could not keep up the price of grain, although they said they could, but while they could not keep up the price of grain, they might, if they had been well advised, have kept our taxes down. They could have given the people the benefit of the reduced prices in many other articles of consumption, which, from a variety of causes exist in other countries. They could have given the North-west a chance. Aye, Sir, and they could have kept their hands from picking and stealing. They could have abstained from Tay canals; they could have abstained from Curran bridges; they could have abstained from McGreevy contracts, from Fredericton jobs, from Onderdonk contracts, from Caraqueet railways and from the thousand and one rascalities of a like order, Oxford and New Glasgow short lines included. Sir, what are our prospects now? I say deliberately—and I speak with knowledge won by seventeen years and more of hard study of the situation—that in all the elements of real strength, in all the elements of true national wealth, Canada to-day is worse off than Canada was seventeen years ago. I say that this National Policy of theirs has put back the progress of Canada for a whole generation; I say that a thousand golden opportunities have been lost. I grant that we cannot undo what has been done—not even the gods can do that—but we can, with God's blessing, stop the downward progress of the country.

What have these men been, Sir, but servile copyists of every vice of the United States; servile copyists of every mistake the Americans have made, and made under circumstances which excuse that people, but which do not exist here. If the United States, under stress of civil war, saw fit to adopt a bad fiscal policy, a policy condemned by the experience of every educated man in the world, what must our loyal friends opposite do but straightway adopt from the United States that villainous fiscal policy of theirs? And they did not forget either, to copy their gerrymander, which is also a complete departure from sound British rule. But while they could copy the vices, they took care not to copy the high redeeming qualities of the United States. They would not copy the American's energy; they would not copy the American's ability; they would not copy the American's patriotism. In lieu thereof they fostered a jingoism of which I do not say more than this—that, while English jingoism may be respectable, I have nothing but contempt for Canadian jingoism in any shape or form.

And now, Sir, these incapables to whom we pay a hundred thousand dollars a year to govern the country—and never was money worse spent—these men who cannot meet in the council chamber without coming to blows, this combination who are worse than

Tammany Hall—for the sachems there are at least true to each other—these men take us to task and talk of our having reduced Canada to poverty and misfortune in 1878. I desire to call attention to one charge which these hon. gentlemen are very fond of making against the Liberal party. And of all the members of the Liberal party, I think, that perhaps I have been the one upon whom they have most earnestly tried to fasten this accusation. On all occasions when these gentlemen are confronted with facts such as I have given to-night, such as I have given in other places, they take refuge in the accusation: These men are pessimists; they decry their country, they wish to injure the reputation of their country; do not trust these pessimists. What is the creed of the Liberal party? It is of all creeds the one most opposed to pessimism. The creed of the Liberal party is this—that Canada has such great natural advantages, her people are so intelligent and capable, that given a fair field and fair market they can hold their own against any country, the United States, England or any other. The creed of the Liberal party is that Canada and the Canadians are able to stand alone and need no coddling; that all the manufacturers of Canada who are worth their salt, if they were allowed to compete in a fair market with those of the United States would be able to hold their own, just as the natives of Canada who have left this country and gone to the United States are able to hold their own among the people there. One of the redeeming points of the situation is that our Canadian friends and relatives, when they go to the United States, almost invariably do well, and a very large proportion of them attain positions of eminence and high emolument in the United States. We are pessimists, are we? Well, Sir, I am going to give the hon. gentlemen an illustration of the kind of pessimists we are. I will make no apology for reading a quotation I have read to this House before from one of the most eminent economists in the United States:

North of Lakes Erie and Ontario, and of the River St. Lawrence, and east of Lake Huron, south of the 45th parallel of latitude, and included mainly in the present Dominion of Canada, there is as fair a country as exists on the American continent, nearly as large in area as New York, Pennsylvania and Ohio combined, and equal, if not superior, as a whole, to those states in agricultural capability. It is the natural habitation on this continent of the combing-wool sheep. It is the land which grows the finest barley, which the brewing interest of the United States must have, if it ever expects to rival Great Britain in its annual export of eleven millions, sterling, of malt products. It raises and grazes the finest cattle, with qualities specially desirable to make good the deterioration of stock in other sections, and its climatic conditions, created by an almost encirclement of the great lakes, especially fit it to grow men.

And women, too.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

Such a country is one of the greatest gifts of providence to the human race; better than bonanzas of silver or rivers whose sands run gold.

That is the kind of country we have or at least a large part of it; and there are other portions which are very nearly as good. Sir, is it pessimism on my part or on the part of my hon. friends here to say that men who inhabit a country like that ought to be able, in all conscience and in all honour, to hold their own in competition with the people of any nation on earth? Strike the shackles from the limbs of this people. They need no protective coddling; they can hold their own against the world. I oppose protection, as Mr. Bayard opposes it, in all its aspects, because protection means slavery, because protection means corruption, because protection is arrant folly, and I am bound to oppose such an unholy trinity until I die.

And now, Sir, what can the Liberal party offer to Canada? Gentlemen opposite ask what we can offer and what we can do. I will endeavour to state to the House and to the country what, in my poor opinion, the Liberal party can offer to Canada. First of all, the Liberal party can offer to Canada lower taxes and taxes honestly imposed and far most justly distributed than at present; so adjusted and distributed that every farthing of taxation imposed upon the people shall go into the coffers of the nation, and not into the coffers of a few private individuals as at present. What can we do more; what can we offer more? We can offer a fair and reasonable hope of obtaining a vastly larger and more valuable market than we at present possess, and that, too, at our doors, without ransacking the antipodes in the vain hope of finding it. We can offer a fair prospect of the settlement of domestic disputes, a fair prospect of obtaining a solution of complicated and difficult questions which, if handled as they have been in the past by fanatics and intriguers are capable of rending our young Dominion into a thousand pieces. The Liberal party offer the people of Canada, a clean, honest, economical administration, carried on with a single eye to the public good, and free from those shameful scandals which have brought discredit upon the country and have brought the blush of shame to the cheek of every honest man in Canada, whatever political party he may belong to. These are the things the Liberal party can offer; these are the things the Liberal party can do. They offer a reasonable prospect to the people of keeping Canadians in Canada and elevating Canada and making her what she ought to be rather than reducing her to the level of a mere breeding ground of citizens who leave its shores to swell the ranks and add to the power of another state. Sir, all those things the Liberal party offers, all those things I believe, with God's help, the Liberal party will shortly be able to do; and in that be-

lief I again repeat, the Liberal party have nothing to fear from a comparison with the creed or the record of hon. gentlemen on the opposite side of the House.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, we have heard from the member from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) in three installments. Several days ago we had the first, to-day we have had the last two; and I am in the judgment of this House when I say that in that long speech, and at all these different stages, nothing novel has fallen from the lips of that hon. gentleman with the exception of a reference to preferential trade. There was, of course, the usual criticism of the financial portion of the Budget speech, there was the usual ingenious handling of figures, and the usual effort to minimize any encouraging statement that the Finance Minister put forth. For instance, the hon. gentleman called his opponents again and again, charlatans, liars, conspirators, thieves, rascals, and then turning on the people at large, he called them fools. The language was strong, I might say coarse, but it was not new. For seventeen years we have heard from the member for South Oxford the same style and the same tone, but for seventeen years the people of Canada have preferred to stand his abuse rather than stand him. They had him before, they have been well without him for seventeen years. There was, Mr. Speaker, one new idea that we got from the member for South Oxford. I do not think that in all the other tirades on similar occasions, he has referred to Manitoba as a sinkhole for public money, but to-night he has coupled Manitoba with that description, and thus added to the vocabulary with which he is wont to refer to what he calls the shreds and patches of confederation. Now, going back to installment No. 1 of this long statement of the member for South Oxford, I shall ask the patience of the House while I examine some of his so-called facts and figures, and give some reason why the people of Canada, the fools as he calls them, the majority of the electors of this country, persist in discrediting him, and discrediting any of the different policies that he has adopted and advocated since 1878. That hon. gentleman said there were several reasons why the Government of the day should be turned out of office, and reason No. 1 was that every prediction made by the advocates of the National Policy from 1878 has been falsified. Several times, in the different installments of his speech, he has referred with great glee and at some length to statements made by Conservatives, notably the Secretary of State, where, in his enthusiasm, and in the advocacy of the cause he was then pleading, he had pictured a condition of things as about to take place, or as possible in the history of Canada, in too glowing colours, and he gloried because the prophecies he had made as to the production

of grain and all that kind of thing, had not been fulfilled. Does the hon. gentleman think it would be a proof or satisfactory evidence that the National Policy had been a failure, if he can establish that the advocates of that policy made in connection with it, predictions that have not fully come to pass? If he does, and if that argument be sufficient, what becomes of his darling doctrine of free trade? For instance, what position are the advocates of that doctrine in England to-day forced to take in regard to the predictions of Cobden and of Bright, and even of Sir Robert Peel. The latter statesman, for instance, speaking in regard to the great advantage that free trade would bring to the agriculturists, stated specifically, when endeavouring to still their fears and allay their alarms, that the only country in the world that would ever be able to compete at all with England with reference to cattle, would be Holland. What becomes of the prophesy, what becomes of the arguments, indeed, for they were arguments, and pressed hotly, that if England would adopt free trade, all the great nations of the world would be compelled to adopt it also? Their standing, according to the test which the hon. gentleman lays down, would be poor indeed. I dwell upon this for a moment, because it is evidence, if evidence be needed, of the unfairness of the member for South Oxford in dealing with the position of his opponents. I call his attention to the language of Lord Derby, when dealing with similar criticisms in regard to the attitude of the two English statesmen to whom he alluded. Lord Derby, speaking on one occasion in England, says of Cobden:

He was too sanguine; most Reformers are. I suppose, without that temperament a man can hardly be a Reformer. He allowed, perhaps, too little for the influence of various passions on men. But where—

And I call particular attention to this question of Lord Derby:

—where is the public teacher, I ask again, in any age and country, who has fully realized his ideal? A man is not to be deprived of credit for what he has done because he himself expected to do more.

I am not quoting that as an apology for the advocates of the National Policy. I refer to it simply for the purpose of establishing the exaggerated and unfair position assumed by the member for South Oxford in debate. In regard to the National Policy, I say this, and I am willing to submit to the people of this country upon it—we must perforce submit to their conclusion on that point—I say that taking the arguments of Sir John A. Macdonald and the gentlemen who fought with him from 1875 to 1878, none of them, so far as I can remember, dared to picture the position that Canada has been able to hold in the most extraordinary financial crisis that ever overtook the world. I believe not one of those

men ever ventured to say that Canadian banks, that Canadian industries generally, could ride out the world's financial gale as they have ridden it. I fail to recollect a case, and if there be a case where any advocate of that policy predicted this fact, I should be glad to hear it. But when the hon. gentleman denounces men for having said this or that in their advocacy of the National Policy, has he forgotten that it was often from the benches behind him that appeals came during those years from 1875 to 1878? Has he forgotten that business men who had been life-long Liberals, and who desired to see the Liberal party sustained and triumphant—has he forgotten what those gentlemen told him of the actual condition, not only of their particular business, but of the particular portions of Canada from which they came? Has he forgotten the advice and the predictions of the gentlemen who sits behind him, the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson) as to what a protective tariff would do for this country? Has he forgotten what the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), who is not in his seat, declared at that time? Have their predictions been falsified? I hope that in this debate the member for Brant will show the Finance Minister that the predictions he made in regard to protection have not been falsified, and also that under no other policy, and under no other tariff than that which includes and involves protection, could there be anything like the prosperity that exists in this country to-day. For instance, I have under my hand some words spoken by the hon. member for North Norfolk in 1877, where he told the Finance Minister that:

He believed that the agricultural interests of the Dominion would be promoted by protection, and that the manufactures being brought to the door of the farmer would afford a market for a great many articles of produce that would not be salable if the market were 3,000 miles away. With a home market of this kind established by protection to manufacturers, the agriculturist can benefit his soil by a rotation of crops.

Every word of that statement is correct, and has been borne out by the facts, and the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) was only belittling in a general way to-night the advantage of the home market, which has enabled the farmers of Canada to withstand the extraordinary decline in the prices of agricultural produce in the markets of the world. Mr. Workman, a leading business man, and a Liberal, representing Montreal, applied to the hon. member for South Oxford when he was Finance Minister to look about him and to take notice of the dire distress existing in that great commercial centre, Montreal; and speaking in this House, he depicted the hard times within his own experience under the free trade system between 1827 and 1837. Speaking in 1878 of the establishment of manufactures under a protective tariff, he concluded:

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.

Until two years ago they were better, but, since they had to meet the competition from the Northern States, which had partly destroyed a number of them.

Then there was his colleague, Mr. Devlin, of Montreal, elected a Liberal. He made an appeal to the financial leader of the party during the same session, and was compelled to tell him that thousands of workingmen were in dire distress in Montreal, and starvation was staring thousands in the face. Yet the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) would make this House believe, by turning and twisting statistics, that everything was happy and the people were contented during the period when he ruled.

But what were two of the great articles of commerce in Canada that were in a most unfortunate position in those days, and regarding which prophecies were made and predictions were put forth? One was an industry of which I know something, the coal industry, and the other was the sugar industry. These two interests involved millions of capital. They had sunk into a pitiable position, and Liberals appealed in vain to the Finance Minister to readjust the tariff, to give some protection, particularly to sugar, in order to keep employment in the country for thousands of workingmen, and prevent millions of capital from going to New York and Boston. Members of the Conservative party did prophecy and predict that with a protective system fairly adjusted as regards those two interests in particular, prosperity would be brought to them and advantage would accrue to Canada. Now, what are the facts in respect to those interests? Coal and sugar are cheaper than they ever were in this country, and cheaper than in any year between 1874 and 1878 people said or thought it was possible to have them in 1896. Let us see exactly what happened when this policy was introduced, because from these articles we can gather much in regard to other articles. In 1874 the production of coal in Nova Scotia amounted in round figures to 900,000 tons, and in 1879 that production had declined to 800,000 tons; whereas in 1894, the latest figures at hand, the production amounted to 2,500,000 tons for the year ending September 30th. Taking Nova Scotia and British Columbia together the production was 1,000,000 tons in 1879 and 3,500,000 tons in 1894. Speaking generally of that industry, I refer to statements recently published by one of the best authorities on coal in Nova Scotia, and the condition of the coal trade—Mr. G. R. Lithgow, of Halifax. He says:

Beginning with 688,628 tons in 1879, the sales increased to 2,060,765 tons in 1894, footing up 23,394,765 in those sixteen years of the National Policy. Comparing these with sixteen years, beginning with 1855, during eleven of which our coals went into the United States, free of duty, the increase is 16,831,910 tons, over 1,050,000 tons a year on an average.

In regard to sugar, I call attention to the fact that we imported in 1878 only 19,000,000 pounds of raw sugar, whereas in 1895 we imported 345,000,000 pounds. I do not intend to go very far into statistics. In a debate of this kind I am of opinion that so far as the financial aspect is concerned, we should in reason be satisfied with the statement of the Finance Minister and the statement of the financial critic, and there is so much matter, and there are so many subjects outside of that line that time will not permit me to deal generally with the trade statistics, even if it were necessary. I wish to establish from the mouths of political opponents as well as from the representatives of banking institutions that the laboured argument of the hon. member for South Oxford is not founded upon fact, is not founded upon the experience of business men or upon the experience of the people of Canada at large. I say that the picture of blue ruin drawn by the hon. gentleman, the picture of despondency drawn from the history of Canada, is entirely contrary to the general opinion, not only of the public at large, but certainly against all statements put forth by Canadian business men. I will give the hon. gentleman the opinions of men who do not see eye to eye with us, or eye to eye with him, but who observe what is going on from day to day, and I will refer to the opinion of the Attorney General of Nova Scotia, who has lately taken great interest in federal politics. That gentleman gives his reasons for being opposed to the National Policy. He is honest, but in giving his reason we are enabled all the more easily to detect the falsehood underlying the position of the hon. member for Oxford. Writing to the "Week," he said :

If Sir John's theory of confederation be sound and correct, then the National Policy is just the right thing, for its aim and design is to foster commercial union and intercourse between the various portions of this Dominion. * * If I had any confidence in this confederation, I would support the National Policy with all my heart. The ground on which I venture to call in question its wisdom strikes at the root of confederation itself.

There is much in that statement because the hon. member for Oxford continually dwells on our exports and imports with respect to the condition of trade. But this gentleman, an ally, one endeavouring to upset this Government, who is against and was against confederation and against the National Policy, states what is evident to every hon. gentleman in this House, that the secret of Canada's comparative strength to-day, and Canada's comparative calm at this moment, is that there is growing and has already grown, an enormous interprovincial trade and commercial union in this great country of British North America, and this trade is already complete. But there are other men who are not so pessimistic as the hon. member for Oxford, and

yet who work with him, and their position and his position on the general condition of Canada's National Policy are as far apart as the poles. I find Sir Oliver Mowat, Prime Minister of Ontario, stating in 1887, when we had considerable experience of the National Policy :

That a comparison of the statistics of both countries, for the past half century, would show that the percentage in every department was greater in Canada than it is on the aggregate in the United States, and, as Canada had prospered in the past, so she would in the future.

Again, that gentleman in 1891 when combatting, as I believe he was combatting, the most dangerous policy that was ever introduced or propounded in this country giving a sort of adhesion to the question of greater and freer trade relations with the United States ; he almost pleaded with his party, in a very able letter at the time, against the dangerous doctrine of discrimination. He was snubbed for a moment by the "Globe," but later on, as I once before said, he carried his point. He wrote the late Mr. Mackenzie as follows :—

Our farmers as a class, or our mechanics as a class, or our labourers as a class, whatever the reasons may be, are not less comfortable, on the whole, than the farmers, the mechanics, and the labourers of the United States appear to be.

And yet, we are told by gentlemen on the other side of the House, and it is dinned into our ears, that in the United States there is free trade between forty nations. In the year 1892, I find a colleague of Sir Oliver Mowat's in the province of Ontario, the Hon. Mr. Harcourt, Provincial Treasurer, saying :

Decade after decade witnesses progress and advancement in every direction and in every part of the province.

The Attorney General of Nova Scotia happened to go abroad in July, 1895. That is very close to the present time and when many years had intervened between the introduction of the National Policy and the present. Interviewed by the representative of an important publication "Commerce," he is asked the following question :—

I suppose Nova Scotia can scarcely be looked upon as a likely agricultural colony.

And this Liberal Attorney General, this ally of the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) replied :

Why not ? Agriculture is prosperous, and there are great openings here for the right sort of men. You can have no idea of the charming life a farmer may lead in Nova Scotia on a very moderate income.

I will give the last reference from my political opponents whom I am quoting here to answer the member from South Oxford, as against the lugubrious picture he has drawn of the state of the country. My last reference is to the hon. member for Guysboro'

(Mr. Fraser). The member for Guysboro' is no friend of this Government. The member for Guysboro' is an opponent of this Government, but yet in Boston he told the truth of his country, and in telling the truth of his country he contradicted the larger part of the speech of the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). In the Boston "Standard," reproduced in the Reform paper of my county, the "Eastern Chronicle," Mr. Fraser appears to have said under date Nov. 21st, 1895 :

Canada is cosmopolitan, but none the less sincere in its British allegiance. We look upon it as the cleanest, most contented and most honourably governed country on this hemisphere, and, likely, on the other. We have about five millions of people, spread over an area larger than that of the United States. Most of them are English and Scotch, sturdy, ingenious, progressive and peaceful people. Our schools are excellent.

And so on. Now, then, Mr. Speaker, in order, if possible, to clinch this point I have taken, I shall give some references which will be found interesting as well as instructive, and I desire to quote from the reports of some of the great banking institutions of Canada presented as recently as last summer. I desire to call attention in the first place to the observations made by the president of the largest banking institution in Canada. He says :

A wide-spread prostration of trade has prevailed for now many years past, and, looking back on the traces upon the path of industry, commerce and finance, made by that adverse wave, we are glad to believe that they will be found less deep in Canada than in most countries. In this connection, let me draw your attention to the high rank which Canadian securities have maintained throughout the long depression. A leading English authority, writing recently on the depreciation of high-class securities, remarked : " Taken all around, it will be seen that, as compared with fifteen years ago, the yield upon first-class securities generally has declined upon an average of about 25 per cent ; or, in other words, the capital values have risen to a corresponding extent, for one fact merely implies the other. In a table supplied in this authority, it appears that Canadian 4-per-cent securities have risen 21½ per cent since 1880.

That, Mr. Speaker, is almost coincident with the introduction of the National Policy :

That is a higher rate than most of the bonds of any other British colony. The suggestion arises, that, while a property like the Bank of Montreal is owned practically and exclusively in Canada, a comparison upon the lines indicated would not be without interest, and it will be satisfactory to the shareholders to learn that, while since 1880 the value of the shares of the Bank of England has risen 25½ per cent ; of the London and County Bank, 24½ per cent ; of the London and Westminster Bank, 22 per cent, and of the other principal British banks, somewhat less, the value of the stock of the Bank of Montreal has advanced since 1880 by 59 per cent.

Now, that is more important than some hon. gentlemen would suppose, because it is

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.

an extraordinary fact, that the National Policy in Canada has had to force its way so far as exhibiting results, over the very years and during the very period when a country like Great Britain has had its greatest trial since the introduction of free trade. No one will deny that the statement is correct ; that in England, since 1880, year after year has seen the bitterest struggles with her greatest and staple industries, with financial convulsions of the most extraordinary character, and with periods of depression, lasting and recurring every now and then. Therefore, during that time we have had to try the National Policy, and during that critical period of the world's history, I believe that policy has become firmly fixed in the majority of the minds of my fellow-countrymen. Let me refer to the statement of the general manager of the Bank of Montreal. The general manager of the Bank of Montreal, a business man pure and simple, said this :

Though the past year has not been a prosperous one, it should be a source of great satisfaction to Canadians that the business community in Canada has come so well through the ordeal and with so few failures and disasters. In that we compare favourably with any other country. Indeed, it has been a great surprise to me how well we have stood.

Then coming to another section of the country, and looking at the report of the Eastern Townships bank on the 5th June, 1895, I am glad to be able to read the following statement from the written report of the president :

Most of the Eastern township industries show increased activity. In agriculture there has been an extension of the dairy industry. In manufactures the mills are running full time, although complaint is still made of low prices. The lumber business presents a favourable contrast to last year. In mining there is, at all events, no falling off, and new workings, new applications of scientific skill, and more enterprise are apparent, and should produce good results. There is abundance of employment for increased population, and trade should, therefore, prove more active and remunerative.

Take the Merchants' Bank of Canada, one of the most important financial institutions of this country. The general manager of that bank, Mr. George Hague, said :

With all the defects of our Government and our institutions, there cannot be a question in the minds of any who have impartially considered the subject, that the Dominion of Canada is the best governed portion of the American continent, having the best constitution, the most equitable laws, the best judicial system, the most solid prosperity, and the most rational liberty.

Later on in his report, he said :

Our various lines of manufacture in Canada have been as profitable as they have been in England or the United States.

And later on again, he said :

There is a general air of hopefulness abroad, and I think it is justifiable. The rise in the

value of some great staples is undoubtedly having its effect. Increased railway earnings, clearing-house returns, and high values of stocks are all significant.

And this further statement of Mr. Hague is, I think, particularly interesting :

When I first entered a bank in Canada, in 1856, the whole of the deposits of the country in our banks were \$15,000,000 ; in 1878, these had increased to \$89,000,000 ; in 1890, to \$120,000,000, and in 1894, to \$270,000,000. These figures include, of course, the deposits in loan companies and savings banks, both Government and incorporated. The mercantile loans and discounts of the banks have grown during the same period from about \$35,000,000 to \$203,000,000, and demonstrate that the increase of deposits has not been the consequence of stagnation and want of enterprise, but has been accompanied by just as steady a development in the way of opening up lands, improvement of farms, construction of railroads, public works, development of shipping and navigation, improvement of our harbour and lighting of our coast, the growth of settlements into villages, and of villages into towns, and of towns into cities ; all of which many of us here present have seen with our own eyes. If this statement is not enough to convince the most obstinate amongst us that the country steadily progresses, in spite of all drawbacks, he must be hard to convince.

I think that brings out the difference that exists between the member for South Oxford and many other Liberals in this country. I point to it, not for the purpose particularly of contrasting the position of my party with the position of the party opposite, but for the purpose of showing how poor a guide in these matters is the member for South Oxford—how poor a guide a man of his frame of mind is for any country—a man who makes exaggerated statements which, if true, would contradict the statements I have read, which are known to be true by the bulk of the hon. gentlemen who sit opposite to me. Their position, I hope, is not the position of the member for South Oxford, that Canada is not progressing. The only difference that ought to exist between us is as to which party in this country can make the progress of Canada all the greater and more satisfactory.

The hon. gentleman made another remark which was equally without foundation. He said that every prediction made by himself and Mr. Mackenzie in reference to the effect of the National Policy had been verified. That statement enables me to point out how very little the member for South Oxford really knew of Canada and Canada's possibilities and potentialities. For instance, between 1874 and 1878 the hon. gentleman lived in dread of touching or interfering with the finances or the tariff of the country. He was forced to advance 2½ per cent the tariff which he found when he entered office, but he made the greatest mistake ever made in the history of the Reform party when he declined to readjust that tariff between 1876 and 1878

on the lines suggested by his opponents, and also, I believe, by the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson), and the hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). The hon. member for South Brant will recollect that his objection was not so much to protection—not so much to all the venality which he thinks follows in its train, but his objection was that he could not get any revenue to govern this country with if he increased the tariff rate. That was his position, and I have under my hand a brief reference to the statements that were not fulfilled—statements of the Reform leader, Mr. Mackenzie, and statements of the financial leader, Sir Richard Cartwright. This was the statement of Mr. Mackenzie, made at Fergus, in 1877—and he spoke often in a similar strain, as did also the member for South Oxford. Mr. Mackenzie there said :

You have now a 17½-per-cent tariff for revenue purposes. If we impose more, you will get a higher price for your boots and shoes, machines, &c. But we must have a revenue, and, as we could not raise it on a higher tariff, you would be obliged to pay property taxes, or a poll tax, to make up the deficiency. There would be nothing left for us but to appoint an assessor to go around and make a direct levy on the people, and that is something which, I fancy, none of you would like to see.

And yet, if this boasted policy, of which we heard a little bit in the last five minutes of the speech of the hon. member for South Oxford, were to be put into effect, there would be nothing left but for the tax-gatherer to go around and levy direct taxation. But, leaving that aside for a moment, I give you proof positive that the reason the hon. member for South Oxford and his party hesitated and were lost in 1878 was because they did not know how to get a revenue under a tariff greater than 17½ per cent, for that is the statement of his leader, and his own statement. We have, in another form references to the tariff, and perditions which were certainly not fulfilled. In 1876 the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) presided over a committee that sat to hear the representatives of the languishing industries of this country tell their tale of woe—the committee on the depression of trade. The proposal of higher tariff duties was put before that committee ; a report was made, and some of the conclusions of that report I have under my hand. The report of the depression committee of 1876, referring to the protective system, came to this conclusion, which was the position of the Reform party at that time : First, the consumption of foreign goods would be diminished in Canada. Now, the imports for home consumption in 1876 amounted to \$94,000,000, while in 1894 they amounted to \$113,000,000. The second conclusion was that the amount of taxation received into the treasury would be reduced—that we would lose from customs revenue, \$9,000,000, whereas, the fact is that in 1876 we got \$12,000,000 from customs,

and in 1894 we got \$19,000,000. Then, the prices of goods, it was said, would be increased. It was not the argument we now hear that but for this tariff we could make cheap goods cheaper. But the argument dwelt upon by the opponents of a higher tariff in those days was that you could not raise the tariff without increasing the cost of the articles produced, or else the increase of the tariff would be of no use to the manufacturer. And no man will tell me that the staple articles required by the consumers in this country have increased in cost over and above what they were before the tariff was introduced. Let me give a reference to some articles. I refer hon. gentlemen to the "Journal of Commerce" of the 20th January, 1895, which gives a comparison showing the reductions in price of some of the articles largely used by consumers in this country. That paper states :

Clothing is 35 per cent less in cost than it was ten years ago. Duck overalls, which cost \$15 to \$24 a dozen between 1870 and 1880, now sell at \$6.50. An average suit, ten years ago, sold by travellers at \$10, now sells at \$5 to \$6. The cheapest suit in 1880 which could be bought was \$5.25; the price now is \$3.25. Canadian worsted, which sold at \$13.75, now sells at \$9.50.

But what other predictions were there? We know of all the dire things that the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) would have us imagine have taken place. But there were worse things to happen even than he now claims to have taken place. In 1879, when the tariff was introduced, he predicted a terrific domestic competition which would make the condition of the manufacturers in Canada far worse than it could be made by a foreign war. That was the language of the hon. member for South Oxford. That was the language of the man who would attempt again to guide and to instruct the people of this country. He said that these men, whom he charges now with getting \$30,000,000 out of the people of this country, with fleecing the consumers to the tune of \$30,000,000 a year since 1878—he said in 1879 that in all the years to follow these men would have to meet such a terrific competition inside their own border that they would be worse off than they would be even in the case of a foreign war. Those two positions are not consistent. In 1879, instead of telling us as he now does, how they would obtain three dollars for every dollar that went into the treasury, how they would fleece the people and bleed the agricultural class white, he told us that the National Policy was the death warrant to the manufacturers of this country. Not content with that, he prophesied that it would drive us into annexation. In 1881 that was the prediction of the hon. member for South Oxford; and in 1896, as late as yesterday, he was loud as any one in this chamber in declaring that, from one end of Canada to the other, there was but

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.

one feeling, and that was the feeling of attachment and loyalty to the mother country and the Empire to which we are proud to belong. Therefore in this year of 1896, the prediction that we would be driven into annexation by the National Policy, which he made in 1881, has been decisively falsified. The hon. gentleman said :

I say, that if the hon. gentleman's object be to disgust our people, to incline our people to alter their political relations by preparing them first to enter into a commercial zollverein, and afterwards into political union with the United States, the hon. gentleman is likely to attain his end.

And the hon. gentleman himself, Sir, was the first member in this whole House to propose that we should take the first step to annexation with the United States, which, according to him, was to enter into a commercial zollverein. The second step was to be political union, but the hon. gentleman has lived to 1896, and he has found that the first of the two steps he has signally failed to induce Canadians to take.

Now, the next reference of the hon. gentleman was to Ireland, whose condition he quoted as parallel to that of Canada. Protection was the curse of Ireland, according to the hon. gentleman, just as it is the curse of Canada, and he spoke of the terrible emigration from Ireland as one of the results. But he failed to tell the House—indeed it was not necessary—that the protection in Ireland from which the people emigrated was nothing compared with the protection of the country to which they went. He failed to tell the House that most of the Irish who left Ireland left that country since it enjoyed the blessings of free trade and came to protectionist United States or to protectionist Canada. In both cases, therefore, these people fleeing from the scourge of protection, went to countries that are wedded to it.

The hon. gentleman quoted Mr. Lecky; and although Mr. Lecky did not bear out the hon. gentleman, I wish to add to the information of the House by quoting a statement in point to show that the hon. gentleman cannot make good his position that protection was a curse to Ireland, but that, on the contrary, it is at this moment the prevailing opinion in Ireland that it was first the fiscal tyranny of England over Ireland, and then the free trade system of Great Britain, which have been the primary causes of injury to that country. Let me quote Mr. Parnell, who was an authority on subjects of this kind. I am reading from a little book which I found in the library entitled "Perils to British Trade," by Mr. E. Burgis, dedicated to the late Mr. Froude, and on the first page is a note of approval from Mr. Froude who had read a few of the chapters before he died. On page 125 of this book I find, Mr. Parnell said :

I claim for Ireland that, if the Irish Parliament of the future considers there are certain

industries in Ireland which can be benefited by protection, which can be nursed by protection, and which can be placed in such a position as to enable them to compete with similar industries in other countries, by a course of protection over a few years, parliament ought to have the power to carry out that policy. And I tell English Radicals and Liberals, that it is useless for them to talk of their desire to do justice to Ireland, when, with motives of selfishness, they refuse to repair that most manifest injustice of all—the destruction of our manufactures by England in times past.

Mr. Burgis says in another place :

Ireland's millions of acres of uncultivated land, her ruined manufactures and commerce, her half-starving people, and her landed proprietors, testify to the consequences of free trade. The condition of Ireland is a monument to the folly of the "let alone" policy, or leaving things to the chapter of accidents (the Bible of the fool).

It is quite clear, since the date of the union, during the first forty years, English competition ruined Ireland's mechanical industries, and, since England adopted free imports, Ireland has found, year by year, the cultivation of her soil more and more unprofitable ; particularly since 1874 has foreign produce been substituted for that of her own fields. Ireland has suffered more than England.

And again he says :

No reasonable man can doubt that free imports have brought about the decay of agriculture in Ireland, and are the cause of her being rapidly depopulated.

In another part of his book, touching upon the subject of emigration, Mr. Burgis uses an argument in favour of protection somewhat similar to the hon. gentleman's favourite argument for free trade in Canada :

Emigration is one of the great social problems of the day. The stream of emigration has gone on with steady persistence for many years. The stream of labour, the best bone and sinew of the British Isles, the shrewd workers and skilled artisans, have left our shores to establish industries abroad—mainly in the states of the American Union.

They have turned their backs upon the "blessings" of free trade and gone to a country where their labour is protected. The paupers, and loafers, and ne'er-do-weels remain at home. Under the free trade patent for impoverishing and pauperising the nation, a glorious discovery has been made, that a country must be depopulated to be enriched. Drive out the workers—the able-bodied who produce ; the old, the puny, the infirm, the idlers can remain. The exportation of the flower of the working classes, coupled with the importation of destitute aliens, are the outward and visible signs of "prosperity" under our "blessed" free trade system. This bit of satire is warranted by an utterance a few years ago of that eminent free-trade statistician, Mr. Giffen : "The general increase in emigration to the United States may, no doubt, be considered as an additional sign of the revival of trade."

Then the figures of emigration from 1849-1854, after the introduction of free trade in the British Isles, show that the emigration to the United States amounted to 6,428,389, and that the total emigration to all coun-

tries, up to 1892 was nearly nine and a half millions. That is the number of people who have left Ireland since the introduction of a policy which, according to the logic of hon. gentlemen opposite, should have kept them at home.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Has the hon. gentleman the increase of the population for the same period of time as compared with that of previous years ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I have not. I was showing that six millions of people have left Ireland since the introduction of the policy of free trade, and I was endeavouring to meet the position of the hon. gentleman from South Oxford to that extent.

Mr. GILLMOR. We want to hear your own speech, you are reading others' speeches.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I am sorry to say I shall have to trouble the House with several references. I do not propose to do as the hon. member for South Oxford has largely done, ignore and despise authorities. I propose to give authorities for the statements I make to-night, and in this debate, as I have a particular purpose in so doing.

Now, I wish to deal with a few of the wild propositions on trade that have been laid down by hon. gentlemen opposite in their several utterances. They take a great liberty. I venture to say, in speaking of themselves as Cobdenites, as disciples of Peel, as disciples of Bright, as free-traders. There is not a free-trader before me. I say that with all deference. I do not believe that even the hon. gentleman from Charlotte (Mr. Gillmor) who has paraded his free-trade creed, is prepared for direct taxation, nor would he dare to advocate it for federal purposes in the county from which he comes.

Mr. GILLMOR. I despise indirect taxation.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Exactly ; but the hon. gentleman has not the courage to advocate the alternative. And so with all these gentlemen. And I say that until they have the courage to do as Cobden did, and as Bright did, they should cease sailing or attempting to sail, under the colours of those men.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would like to ask the hon. gentleman—

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I would rather not be interrupted, because I have a long speech to make. The hon. member for South Oxford must give this House credit for very little knowledge, if he thinks that by these wild denunciations of protection he is denouncing only one side of the House. When he denounces protection and attributes to it all sorts of venality and corruption, he is denouncing the his-

tory of Canada, he is denouncing both parties. The only difference between these two parties since 1867 has been in the amount of protection and in the manner in which the protective tariff is to be adjusted. I have already given the authority of Mr. Mackenzie. I will refer again to gentlemen opposite to show that they never denied, that it was impossible to deny, that the tariff that they administered was a protective tariff. It was sufficient for the main purposes of effective protection; it was insufficient to bring prosperity to this country, and it was condemned on that ground. The hon. member for South Oxford used to tell the country that 17½ per cent was prohibitory on certain articles. So, it is absolutely idle for hon. gentlemen opposite to pretend that up to this year they have advocated a policy which they believe is the only policy free from all the vices they have laid at the door of the National Policy. Take, for instance, Mr. Hyam's statement, made in the presence of his leader when that leader was on a tour of education only last fall. Mr. Hyam advocated 25 per cent duties all round on the basis of the imports of 1893, and claimed that that would injure no one. Remember, also, the exhibition made before the people of this country by Mr. Snyder and the leader of the Opposition. Mr. Snyder is a gentleman who is a possible candidate, and who resides, I believe, in Berlin, a seat of manufacturing industry in Ontario. Mr. Snyder stated that, in his opinion, industries had sprung up under the National Policy, and that the Liberal party was not a party that intended to injure them, but, on the contrary, intended to help them—in fact, to give them more protection, or, as he put it, to give them free raw materials which materials they did not now receive free. Whereas, his leader, the leader of the Opposition, having insisted that not an industry in the country had been benefited by the National Policy, endorses Mr. Snyder as a fit and proper representative of the Liberal party. I claim that gentlemen who attempt to attain power or to gain seats in that way cannot talk in the loud tones or use the big words that the hon. member for South Oxford has attempted to do. The leader of the Opposition, on these trade gyrations, said, for instance, at Merrickville, that Mr. Mackenzie's policy of 1878 had been fully vindicated. What was his policy? Not a man in this House will tell me it was a policy of free trade. Not a man can say so, truthfully. I have here what Mr. Mackenzie said as to what it was. In 1880, after it was done and over, Mr. Mackenzie said in this House:

It is said we are hostile to manufacturers. How are we hostile? We believe the revenue tariff which was formerly in existence, gave considerable protection to manufacturers. It was called incidental protection, and, whatever there may be in a name, it was protection nevertheless, because it gave every manufacturer in the country

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.

17½ cents on the dollar more than he would be entitled to were trade entirely free between this and foreign countries.

The only place, so far as I know, in which Mr. Mackenzie was a free trader was in Dundee, when he received the freedom of the city, and declared his belief in the principles of free trade. I believe the hon. member for South Oxford has been initiated into the Cobden club, but none of these gentlemen in Canada ever practice free trade. Later on I am going to give them credit for having defined their position for the next fight to be free trade. But there is this in connection with their policy, and to their disgrace, he it said, that while they are committed to a policy of free trade, they have not dared to do as every other free trader in every other country had to do—advocate a corresponding policy of direct taxation such as must be a part of any policy of free trade that has ever been conceived or advocated.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). You cannot find a single writer who takes that position.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I have nothing to do with writers. We have Bright, Cobden and Peel, who are the very guides appealed to by the Liberal leader.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Not one of them took that position.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Well, we will see a little later on. The leader of the Opposition, for instance, says:

We are English Reformers, Reformers of the school of John Bright, Richard Cobden, and that great and good man, Sir Robert Peel.

Well, in regard to trade, has ever any one read from writers or from speeches of the gentlemen whose names I have mentioned, the pattern for the Reformers opposite, that any of them ever were so wild as to conceive a policy akin to that of unrestricted reciprocity, or of locking-up the business of the country to which they belong to one particular nation, and making a discriminating tariff against all others? Did any one of those gentlemen ever hint at such a thing?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No, because they lived in an island, and not in the middle of a continent.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Then, if there is logic in that, as we are not on an island, we should not advocate free trade. Another difference between the hon. member for South Oxford and Mr. Cobden, is that Cobden was honest in his advocacy of his policy, and insisted that every duty for revenue was a duty for protection. Now, if the hon. member for South Oxford contradicts me when I state that he is contradicting Cobden, his contradiction could be supported by a reference to one occasion when he himself made the admission that

every duty for revenue was a duty for protection. I am showing that while these gentlemen attempt to parade in the clothes of free traders, their conduct has been ludicrous in the extreme when examined. Now, coming down to 1895, I desire to call attention to a statement made by the leader of the Opposition at Montreal, and by Mr. Ross, who went to assist him. Free trade as they have it in England was advocated by Mr. Ross. It was to be an adjustment of trade in a sensible, reasonable and practicable way, a gradual approach to free trade. He pictured how long it took in England, from 1842 to 1880, and Mr. Laurier, coming after him, said at that meeting :

It must come after thirty-eight or forty years, or perhaps more.

Now, I say, Mr. Speaker, that that position is not creditable to the party opposite. We could understand far better their policy on unrestricted reciprocity, but it is not fitting for the hon. member for South Oxford to thunder against a protective tariff when the antithesis to that tariff is a policy that he dare not touch or handle in his lifetime, for, with the best wishes for the hon. member for South Oxford, we cannot believe it probable that he will live long enough to see the day when free trade will have full force and effect in Canada, thirty-eight or forty years hence. But the hon. gentleman was most unfair to a very important interest in this country, and I have to deal with that before I come to what I will call the evolution of the present Canadian Liberal trade idea. The hon. gentleman referred in a sneering manner to the iron industry, as he most always does to any interest which he conceives to belong to the maritime provinces; he came to the iron industry, and so little did he know of that industry that he thought it consisted in one or two establishments "away down in Nova Scotia." He says that these men who employ ten hands, referring to the Ontario industries, for one that these Nova Scotia industries can employ in the iron industries, are put to extreme hardship and inconvenience. I want to call attention to the spirit of fair play that permeates the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite. They have great commiseration for the manufacturers of agricultural implements, for the manufacturers, mark you, Mr. Speaker, because the hon. gentleman dwelt on the hardships of those men, because we had so heavily protected "one or two establishments away down in Nova Scotia." Now, how about the labourers who are concerned, not merely in one or two establishments in Nova Scotia, but in establishments in Quebec and in Ontario, and in the various iron industries where labour is more concerned than in any other manufacturing industry in the world. There is no other industry where labour has so large a share as in connection with iron. But for the supposed sake, and

in the supposed interest, of certain manufacturers, the hon. member for South Oxford promises to strike down those interests so important to the labourer, because they exist, apparently, "away down in Nova Scotia." That brings me to his leader's position in Montreal. When it was supposed that we were to have a general election, the leader of the Opposition pledged himself to the manufacturers of pianos, carriages and agricultural implements, that whatever else was uncertain in his tariff, he would make coal and iron free. That was his pledge in Montreal at the Windsor Hall meeting and at Sohmer Park. Was there a spirit of fair play in that utterance? Is there a member from the province of Nova Scotia who would advocate, for instance, a policy of that kind? Mr. Speaker, those who are interested in these western industries are fully conscious that such a policy could not last, such a policy could not exist for any length of time in this country. The development of the coal and iron interest of this country affect, not the province of Nova Scotia only, but Canada as a whole, just as much as the development of those interests affect any country in the world that aspires to be a manufacturing country, and Canada does aspire to be self-contained in that regard, as she is in almost every other. Those interests are the foundation of the manufacturing interests of every nation. Great Britain, to which reference is so often made, protected these till her output of iron, for instance, equalled half of the total of the world's production. That was the example of the mother country. But Sir Oliver Mowat, a good Reformer himself, does not think that this Government has gone far enough, for after these duties had been imposed, and after a bounty had been provided by the Federal Parliament, Sir Oliver Mowat introduced and carried legislation in the Ontario legislature whereby a manufacturing interest in Hamilton, which I am glad to see has been started, will receive, over and above all that is given to the interests "away down in Nova Scotia," a dollar a ton for every ton of iron manufactured out of Canadian ore. Now, let us see how important these interests are to which this sneering reference was made. "Away down in Nova Scotia," for instance, I find that the output of steel from one establishment in New Glasgow in 1886 was 5,286 tons only, of the value of \$228,000; whereas, in 1893, it had increased from 5,000 tons to 12,400 tons, with a value of over half a million dollars. The labourers employed in 1886 were 175; in 1893 there were 450, and the average rate of wages paid to these men was \$1.45 a day. Iron works have been recently established in the county I have the honour to represent. In 1893 they consumed 126,000 tons of coal, 9,400 tons of ore, limestone and coke, in nine months. The Ferrona iron works, in my county, em-

ploy 425 men and 150 men to mine the coal, and the average wage paid them is \$1.45 per day. The steel works in New Glasgow alone during the seven years up to 1893 paid out \$1,069,180 in wages. But those couple of interests in Nova Scotia are by no means all. I could give the House, and I think I should give the House, in view of the extraordinary statements made, the following record of the various industries during 1895 :

The record of the various Canadian furnaces during 1895 is as follows :—

NOVA SCOTIA STEEL COMPANY.

(New Glasgow and Ferrona, N.S.)

Coke, pig iron made	19,410 ⁴⁴⁸ / ₂₀₀₀	tons.
Ore charged	38,783 ⁵²⁰ / ₂₀₀₀	"
Fuel	28,110 ²⁰⁰⁰ / ₂₀₀₀	"
Flux	16,304 ²⁰⁰⁰ / ₂₀₀₀	"
		Men.
Labour employed in steel works.....	450	
do do ore production.....	100	
do do furnace work.....	250	
		800

This company manufacture all grades of agricultural implements, steel forgings, &c., the basis of which is largely Ferrona iron, made from Canadian ore, so that the utmost possible amount of labour is secured to the country in the special lines now made by this company.

LONDONDERRY IRON CO., LTD.

Coke pig iron made	17,744 ²⁰⁰⁰ / ₂₀₀₀	tons.
Ore charged	41,557 ²⁰⁰⁰ / ₂₀₀₀	"
Fuel charged coke	25,264 ²⁰⁰⁰ / ₂₀₀₀	"
Fuel charged coal	3,088 ²⁰⁰⁰ / ₂₀₀₀	"
Cast iron water and gas pipe produce	2,110 ²⁰⁰⁰ / ₂₀₀₀	"

Average number of men employed, 425 men.
Furnace output of 1895, campaign, 8 months.
Pipe foundry campaign, 7 months.

It is a notable fact that the tariff revision of session 1894, by which a duty on a sliding scale was imposed on wrought scrap iron, has resulted in the Londonderry Iron Company making contracts with Canadian manufacturers of bar iron, which enabled them to start up their rolling mills. The work is just commencing in that department, and will afford steady employment to a large number of Canadians.

CANADA IRON FURNACE CO.

(Charcoal iron produce 1, 1895, in a campaign of 9 months.)

Charcoal pig iron made	6,598 ²⁰⁰⁰ / ₂₀₀₀	tons.
Charcoal consumed	654,361	bush.
Ore consumed	16,203	tons.
Limestone consumed	1,500 ²⁰⁰⁰ / ₂₀₀₀	tons.
Average number of men employed, 600.		

In the year ending 30th June, 1891, the importations of pig-iron, kentledge and cast scrap-iron amount to 81,317 tons. These importations were reduced for the year ending 30th June, 1895, in consequence of home production, to 34,449 tons. In addition to the quantity of pig-iron manufactured in Canada last year from Canadian ore, raw materials have been imported, which have been converted into finished iron and steel to this extent, and exclusive of Canadian scrap worked up in our rolling mills, viz. :—

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.

Iron in slabs, blooms, billets, hooped and puddled bars.....	3,932	Tons.
Less peidel, ferro-silicum, ferro-manganese	164	
Steel ingots, cogged ingots and blooms...	1,036	
Wrought scrap-iron and scrap-steel.....	21,157	
Total.....	25,289	

G. Macdougall & Co..... 629 tons.
Total pig..... 44,382 tons.

In order to show that these are by no means unimportant and that our works are inadequate to the task, I hold in my hands evidence that they have given entire satisfaction to western manufacturers, to the manufacturers of agricultural implements with whom the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) commisserates—not only satisfaction, but the makers are glad to take iron and steel ore from the Nova Scotia works in preference to the iron and steel they formerly used.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Can the hon. gentleman produce a single letter from an agricultural implement dealer in proof of that statement ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I have stated that I propose to do so, and the hon. gentleman is making a not very pleasing exhibition of himself by telling me that I cannot do it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I should like to hear them.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. If the hon. gentleman possesses himself in patience, he will do so. The Nova Scotia Iron and Steel Company writing to me in November last of the Massey-Harris Company stated :

I inclose copies of two or three letters showing that Massey's people have been using our iron with satisfactory results. In reference to a matter of fact not brought out in these letters, I may say that Massey's general superintendent gave us the results of their daily tests after they had adopted Ferrona iron in place of Niagara (which is a well-known brand of Lake Superior iron), and these daily test reports show that the average strength of their castings had increased from about 23,000 pounds per square inch to an average of 27,000 pounds per square inch, or an average, say, over 17 per cent.

We have had similar testimonials from scores of other parties using Ferrona iron, not only for implement work, but from makers of stove plates, machinery castings, and other general works of that kind.

Indeed, Ferrona iron is now being sold to every large concern in Ontario and Quebec.

In a letter from the Massey-Harris Company, written in 1895, to the Steel Company, they say :

We note carefully all you say with reference to the question of iron. In reply, we wish to say that we, too, are very pleased that we have been able to displace Niagara iron with your iron. The result of using your iron, instead of Niagara (after a very careful test for two or three weeks daily), is entirely satisfactory. It is always a

pleasure to the writer to know that we can get within our own country material equal to what we can import, and, whenever we can do so, and the price is equal, or nearly equal, Canadian material is used.

In the same letter they say :

From our former letter you are aware that, to carry us through the winter months, it will take more than 250 tons. We fully expected to receive all the iron that we wanted from you ; the tenor of the writer's conversations with your Mr. Cantley was along that line, that, so far as it would be possible to displace American iron and use yours, it would be done, and this your Mr. Cantley, at the time of our conversation, was anxious we should do.

That letter, I repeat, is signed by the Massey-Harris Company. Again, I have further information in which the hon. member for Huron stands in need :

Ferrona furnace was completed September, 1892. Bridgeville furnace was completed April, 1893. The Toronto Radiator Company has had during the past year a standing contract for Ferrona pig-iron.

No agricultural implement manufacturing firm of any importance is now, or has for some time past, been buying in the United States. The Massey-Harris Company, Frost & Wood, Cossett Eros., Peter Hamilton Manufacturing Co., Coulthard, Scott Company, Noxon Brothers Manufacturing Company, Sylvester Brothers' Manufacturing Company, and others have for years brought from Nova Scotia practically all the implement steel they used. Any exceptions to this can be accounted for by special circumstances. We have now a contract with one alone of above firms, calling for 2,500 tons of steel, and have already delivered to the same firm over 600 tons of Ferrona pig-iron.

I find again a statement that over 10,000 tons of Ferrona pig iron have been sold and shipped to Ontario and Quebec during four months of 1895, and 14,000 tons from last spring to November. These are interesting facts, which show that even before the Hamilton industry was started, with a capacity, I am told, of 150 tons a day, these furnaces in Nova Scotia were doing a great deal to supply the demand for this article in Ontario. With the additional new industry will come healthy competition and greater Canadian production, so that the manufacturers in the west will have great benefit from it, which they full well appreciate, of being able to get that material at a moment's notice in their own country, and being free from the embarrassment when they depended on producers either in the United States or England.

In regard to prices. I wish to point out to the House in reply to the argument often used, that the development of these industries has caused decreased prices to the consumer, that though the Ferrona furnace has only been established a few years, when it began iron was selling in Toronto at \$22 per ton, it has since sold for \$15. I also want to point out again in connection with the industries in Canada that they have developed

when the industries of a similar character in the mother country have been in dire distress. In October, 1893, the London "Times" stated that "the majority of the works now producing iron and steel are making no progress, and it is only too evident that many of them have been carried on at a loss." Therefore, it is not fair, in debate, nor is it ordinary fair-play to those great industries, that this question of how much protection amounts to, should be tested by the prices that have obtained during this extraordinary depression in the iron and steel trade. That trade was never more demoralized in Great Britain than it has been recently, yet it is upon these demoralized prices that hon. gentlemen opposite seek to attack similar interests enjoying protection in our own country. In the London "Times" of Sept. 24, I find the following statement :—

For a number of years past very serious apprehensions have been aroused by the circumstances of the iron industries of the United Kingdom, more especially in view of the progress made by competitive countries. In commercial circles it is now quite a common thing to hear our iron industries spoken of as a manufacture that has ceased to make progress and is doomed to gradual decay.

The same article, later on, says :

It will probably be among the things not generally known, that more German iron is imported into Great Britain than into any country except Switzerland, and, in the latter case, the iron was probably largely in transit for Italy and other countries, while in our own country it had come to stay. During the year 1893, we imported into Great Britain 116,000 tons of German iron and steel, while into the British colonies we imported nearly 100,000 tons more.

And on this subject, which is peculiarly interesting to me at any rate, I wish to give the latest information to show that this protection which the iron industries in Canada enjoys at present, is not exorbitant ; and that there is every necessity to treat these industries in Canada fairly and carefully. I refer to the London "Times" of January 20th, 1896, in which a very important industrial report is reviewed. A delegation of the British Iron Trade Continental Competition went to the continent and reported the result of their inquiry and investigation. The article in the "Times," in reviewing the report, sums up, as follows :—

In 1882 Great Britain produced 8,493,000 tons of iron, against only 3,380,000 produced in Germany ; so that the output of our own country was fully 150 per cent more than that of our competitor. In 1882 Great Britain produced 5,014,000 tons of finished iron and steel, or 100 per cent more than the output of Germany. But since then the German production of pig-iron had advanced to 5,380,000 tons, and the output of finished iron and steel to 5,927,000, while the British production of pig-iron has declined to 7,364,000 tons, and the British output of finished iron and steel has dropped to only a trifle over 4,000,-

000 tons; so that Germany is now producing a considerably larger quantity of finished products than our own country.

That is a most extraordinary revolution in the iron and steel trade of Germany under a protective system, and it is under this policy of Germany that England is having so difficult a road to travel, and such a difficult experience. It is in connection with this that the price has dropped and dropped to such a figure that one reference in the "Times" goes to show that industries were running in England and selling their goods below cost. While this remarkable progress has been going on, both Belgium and Germany have greatly extended their foreign trade, and they are now unitedly supplying at the rate of 374,000 tons of iron and steel a year to Great Britain and the British possessions, valued at something like £3,000,000 sterling. Then, again, the "Times" says:

The disquieting feature of the case thus roughly presented is, that the iron industry is generally understood to be the only one which England is endowed with natural resources specially to prosecute with success, owing to our large command of ores and fuel, our proximity to the sea, and our ample endowment of highly skilled labour. As a single proof of this fact, we need only mention that between 1888 and 1895 the total number of smelting furnaces erected in Great Britain fell from 854 to 706, while the number of furnaces in blast dropped from 429 to 230.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the object of that reference, I think, is clear.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Is that this week's "Times" you have quoted from?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Yes, the "Times" of January 20th, 1896. Then the "Economist" supports the point which I made as to amount paid labour in iron works, although I suppose it hardly needs support. On the 25th January, 1896, the "Economist," speaking on the report of the delegation to which I have referred, says:

The cost of production of any commodity is usually made up of three elements—labour, royalties, or their equivalent, and transport. The first of these three is usually by far the most serious, and in the special case of the manufacture of iron and steel it is computed at from 60 per cent of the whole, in the cruder products, to 90 per cent of the whole in more highly finished forms.

Now, then, when the hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) laid his hand upon that industry, he laid it upon one of the most important, if not the most important in this country, so far as it aspires to a manufacturing position, or a position of independence in that regard. Further, he attacked that one industry which is most directly connected with labour, and which in so marked a degree affects labour. And, judging, therefore, from the fact, that under a protective tariff, higher than we have

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER

ever experienced in this country, these continental countries are now pressing England so severely, according to the authorities I have tested, surely with the success that has already attended the efforts and the enterprise of these capitalists in Canada who have put their money into corresponding industries here, the people of Canada will be wise to stand by and protect those important interests from the hands of the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright).

Now, Mr. Speaker, I desire to give some authorities—and I have taken some pains to put them in handy form—for, believing in the statement, that so far as the trade issues are concerned, the next elections are to be fought out squarely on the issue of free trade and protection. The Conservative party are prepared for that. We are only too glad to have the advantage of that being the honest and above-board issue. There is every advantage to us, politically, as we think, in having that the defined differences of policy between the two political parties in Canada. But let us both be honest. On this side of the House we are to a man, I believe, for protection. There is no beating about the bush with us. We are in favour of protection and all that it implies as judged from the year 1878 down to this day. We take the risk of the indictment preferred by the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). We answer his abuse, and we answer his attack by appealing to the experience of the Canadian people. They know what protection is. They understand how it has worked, and our position is: We propose to continue that policy. We do not propose to budge from it one inch. Now, against that, there is the policy of free trade, advocated by hon. gentlemen opposite. Free trade is certainly not protection, and I have endeavoured to show, according to Cobden, that a revenue tariff is a tariff that depends on customs and involves protection; but free trade, as I will show, involves direct taxation. If the pledges of hon. gentlemen opposite, that they will wipe out every vestige of protection from our tariff, that they will fight us fairly and openly on their policy of free trade, if these pledges are to be redeemed by them, they must have the courage to advocate direct taxation. Or else, they will have to give up the fight, and beat us by that style of campaign, where the Snyders and the Hymans may hold any view they like on fiscal questions, but like the member for Charlotte (Mr. Gillmor) come into the House and vote for the leader of the Opposition, no matter what their individual views are, or what their professions were before the people. Now, I was induced to examine into this matter by the statement of the hon. member for South Oxford. The other day he read to this House a letter which he did not blush to say he was the author of. He tells

us to-night that he has found one man in the history of the world who he thinks did as improper and, as I believe, vile a thing. It was not a Canadian or a Britisher. It was not, however, in reference to any circumstances that exist or ever did exist in this country. It was in reference to another country and another set of circumstances. But was ever such an exhibition seen in a Parliament, as a member saying: "I read to you a document in which I say that the only possible relief for Canada is commercial union or unrestricted reciprocity with the United States of America; that is my policy"; and in the next breath reading a platform, which he says is his policy, and which has nothing to do with unrestricted reciprocity, but is foreign to it in every particular—foreign to it particularly in repudiating discrimination against the mother country. But he said that this policy, which he read, was an answer to the Minister of Finance and to all who asked, What is the policy of the Reform party? Well, all the members of the Reform party on the stump, in the by-elections and during the recess, are in the habit of taking refuge under that platform when driven into a corner. Whether a man advocates a 15 per cent tariff all round or a 17½ per cent tariff, as in Mr. Mackenzie's time, or the present tariff list, with free iron, free coal, etc.—no matter what their particular views may be, they find refuge or attempt to find refuge under that platform of the Liberal party adopted in 1893. The hon. member for South Oxford sought refuge there. He may, however, have what policy he thinks right. We must search for the actual policy of the Liberal party. I find that it develops in this way, and I will give it to you, Mr. Speaker. The leader of the Opposition, we know, down to 1877, in fact including 1877, was an out-and-out protectionist. We have his declarations to that effect, and I will not repeat them. In connection with them he told Parliament in 1878:

There had always been among the Liberals of the province of Quebec a strong tendency to protection. It was with them a matter of tradition. That would probably explain his strong protectionist views up to that date, if not at that particular time. Then, the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson), after the National Policy had been introduced, as late as 1883, without the slightest fear of the hon. member for South Oxford before his eyes, stated in this House:

Free trade has never been an issue in this country. It has always been held that we should afford protection while raising the necessary revenue.

Now, after the hon. member for South Oxford had explained what the policy of his party was, as shown at the convention at Ottawa in 1893, he went on to show the vile features of any system of protection, for he repudiates, as I understand, protec-

tion from top to bottom and all around; but the hon. member for South Brant in 1883 was not of that opinion. We all know Mr. Blake's famous statement in 1887, which embodied the protectionist view. After having preached free trade in the manufacturing city of Montreal, he had ultimately to bow to protection. In 1889, the leader of the Opposition had another policy. At Toronto he stated:

The policy which we have advocated, which we still continue to advocate, is the removal of all commercial barriers between this country and the great kindred nation to the south. * * * I have read history in this way, that every reform has cost to the reformers years of labour, and those years of labour I, for one, am prepared to give; and, though the Democrats may be defeated in the States, and though Canadians may grow faint-hearted in Canada, the Liberal party, as long as I have anything to do with it, will remain true to the cause, until that cause is successful. I will not expect to win in a day, but I am prepared to remain in the cool shades of opposition until the cause has triumphed.

The hon. gentleman was a protectionist, as I have said, in 1877. I call his statement in 1889 protection—protection of such a character as was denounced by the London "Economist," to which paper the hon. member for South Oxford wrote. When he explained what the policy of the Liberals was in 1891, that free trade organ in London denounced in the severest terms his proposal, which was only to exchange one protective tariff for another. But, going on, we find the policy which is to meet us at the next election more clearly defined. The hon. leader of the Opposition has repudiated unrestricted reciprocity; he has repudiated protection; and in 1893, the Ottawa resolution appears. And in this connection I will read a short portion of it. The Liberal party assembled in convention at Ottawa in June, 1893, declared:

We denounce the principle of protection as radically unsound, and unjust to the masses of the people, and we declare our conviction that any tariff changes based on that principle must fail to afford any substantial relief from the burden under which the country labours.

After that policy had been propounded, we had some definitions, and hon. gentlemen opposite will not, I am sure, complain of them, since they are all their own. At Newmarket, in September, 1893, the "Globe" reports the leader of the Opposition as saying:

This is the broad distinction between us to-day. I tell you that the next battle to be fought is to be fought on that ground. We will not levy duties to pay into the pockets of any class, we will levy money in so far only as it is absolutely necessary to carry on the Government of the people. This is the ground upon which I stand. * * * But, if it were not true, on the other hand, that the farmer has not received any benefit from protection, then I say, by all means let us stand by the policy of freedom of trade,

which I believe alone can give the farmer the full benefit of his earnings. * * * We have protection now. Are we going to get more or less? I will not be satisfied until the last vestige of protection has been removed from the soil of Canada. This is the aim towards which we are progressing, the aim which we have in view, and we will not rest until we have achieved that object. When that will be, I do not profess to know, but, at all events, I say that the Reformers of Canada have reforms to carry out, but that our great reform is to put away from the soil of Canada the last vestige of protection. This is one of the planks of the policy that we adopted some weeks ago at Ottawa.

In 1894, we find the leader of the Opposition again defining the policy of his party. At Victoria, for instance, in September, 1894, he says:

If the Liberals were successful, they would cut off the head of protection at once, and trample on its body.

At Winnipeg he said :

There can be a very radical alteration of affairs looked for. We shall give you free trade, and, although it will be a hard fight, we shall not give in one inch or retrace one step until we have reached the goal, and that goal is the same policy of free trade as it exists in England to-day.

Then, we have the financial leader expounding a policy. There were to be no half measures for him. In 1893 we find the member for South Oxford saying in this House—"Hansard," page 714:

Our policy, first to last, has been to destroy this villainous protection system, which has been grinding out the vitals of the country.

Again, in 1894, in the discussion of the Budget speech, page 390 of "Hansard," he said:

But a very great deal still remains to be done. A great many of these burdens have only been touched, not substantially lightened, and it will be the interest and duty of the Government, if they do their duty, to see that relief is made effectual, and not as it is at present, a mere skin-deep relief, a mere two-and-a-half or five-per cent, when double or treble of that is required to render any real or substantial relief to the people who are suffering from it.

On 25th October, 1894, he said:

The time is ripe for very extensive and far-reaching reforms. I, for my part, would be sorry to see the issue dwindled down to a mere question of revenue tariff. We need, among other things, a radical readjustment, not only of our tariff, but of the whole system of taxation.

In Toronto, in 1895, speaking to the Young Liberals, he said:

If that party tenders the people a stone instead of bread, is half-hearted in the prosecution of great aims it sets before itself, it will be deservedly swept out of power.

Then the leader of the maritime Liberals, the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies), speaking at Middleton in 1893, said:

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.

Well, gentlemen, I need say no more. Whatever doubts or difficulties there may have been about understanding our trade policy in times past, there is none now. Our platform is clear and definite. * * * To-day the people of Canada stand face to face with such an issue, and the next contest is to be one between free trade and protection. * * * The policy of the Liberal party, on the contrary, is the reform of the tariff by the elimination from it of every vestige of protection.

Hon. gentlemen may think it is unnecessary for me to weary myself or them with quoting those statements one after the other. I may fail in my purpose, but I do not hesitate to confess that my purpose is, if possible, to find out, by these utterances of responsible leading men of the Liberal party, just as we are going to the people, what their position really is on the trade question. That resolution of June, 1893, as I have shown, will satisfy no one when so many different constructions have been put upon it by members of their own party. I do not quarrel with them for adopting free trade, but I do quarrel with them when they shirk the consequences of the advocacy of that policy. There can be no such thing as free trade, about which these gentlemen talk, unless they adopt the system of direct taxation for federal purposes. Why should the leader of the Opposition try to induce the people to believe that he is following in the footsteps of Sir Robert Peel if he does not propose to do as Sir Robert Peel did? The hon. leader of the Opposition constantly says that he takes for his guide in this fiscal reform in the trade policy of Canada Sir Robert Peel and his policy. I say, then, that if that be true, if that statement be not wholly false and intended to deceive, the policy of the Liberal party means direct taxation, because Sir Robert Peel has stated that only by direct taxation was his policy possible in any one of the forty years to which reference was made in Montreal. It is not treating the people fairly to pretend that you can work out in Canada, in thirty-nine or forty years, the policy of Sir Robert Peel, unless you are prepared to begin, as he did, with direct taxation, for he is our authority for saying that you cannot begin this reform without at the outset adopting that system of obtaining revenue. You must initiate that feature of direct taxation with the introduction of any system of free trade. But what an absurdity. Mr. Speaker, is this policy of the Opposition for Canada? Whatever we may say of the glory and greatness of Great Britain—and there is much to be said—the greatest part of it relates to the years that have gone. There is a keen struggle for existence going on in connection, not only with the agricultural interests in England to-day, but with such industries as those that aforesaid flourished in Lancashire. The condition in Lancashire is something appalling. I have shown what the condition of the staple interest of Great Britain is to-day—the iron

and steel industry. Those things are subjects for anxious thought at any rate; and we are now witnessing the beginning of a very lively and important discussion on proposed changes in the fiscal system. The hon. member for South Oxford makes light of it, but I think no reasonable man would deny that in England to-day there is an agitation with regard to the system of protection, which twenty years ago would have been deemed absolutely impossible by every one, whether in England or Canada. The difference in position between the two great periods is great. The countries we see forging ahead, that are giving England all she can do to hold her own in the different markets of the world, are countries which have fostered their own industries by protective tariffs. No country in the world but England ever ventured to adopt free trade, and that country was in circumstances wholly distinct and different from those which meet us to-day. That is the initial difficulty which hon. gentleman opposite have to meet, if they be sincere in connection with the adoption of Sir Robert Peel's policy. It is a policy under which certain successes were bound to continue for a period of years in a country like England, but take the ground for adopting that policy in England and see how absurd it is to apply it to this country. The ground taken by Sir Robert Peel for his policy, shortly stated, is that England stood midway between America and Russia. She was the connecting link between the old and the new world, and her insular position was unique. She had the greatest merchant marine in the world in 1842, her advantages over every rival chiefly consisted in her deposits of coal and iron, and she had above all—what she still to-day is able to boast of—an accumulation of capital in excess of any rival in the world. That was her position when, for reasons that do not exist in this country, in connection with the price of food, she ventured to try the experiment of free trade. And Sir Robert Peel, on that very occasion to which the hon. gentleman referred, the initial stage of his great reform, said that England was carrying on greater commercial and manufacturing enterprise than any other country ever exhibited. That was the position of England in 1842 relative to all other countries in the world. Then she adopted free trade, but at that time it must never be forgotten that the system of direct taxation went hand in hand with it. The protection policy, Sir Robert Peel stated, was the one "under which, practically, our power and greatness had been established." This is the authority to whom hon. gentlemen opposite look, and I must ask the House to allow me to make good from his words my statement that direct taxation is necessary in connection with any such policy of free trade as was approved by Sir Robert Peel. I have often seen it stated—whether hon. gentlemen opposite

have so argued or not I do not know—that the income tax was a war tax, that it was not necessarily connected with fiscal reform or with the repeal of the corn laws in England. Let me give Sir Robert Peel's statement of the reasons for the income tax in England. Speaking in the House of Commons on the 6th March, 1848, he said:

The property tax was intended not merely to supply a deficit in the revenue, as compared with the public expenditure, but to lay the foundation for a juster principle of taxation to afford the means of repealing duties of the raw materials of important manufactures.

Later on in the same speech he says:

Now, I beg to ask, whether the imposition of the income tax was not the foundation of the commercial policy of the country? Why is it possible that I could propose the remission of taxes to an amount of no less than £7,500,000 if I had not, as a foundation for that commercial policy, an income tax to fall back upon?

And again:

Was it not to lay the foundation of such a commercial policy that the House of Commons assented to the temporary imposition of the income tax? Did any one at that time say, no to it? True, you did not in express words say that the income tax was to be the foundation of such a policy; but the language used by me was identically that I have just now quoted.

Speaking on the state of the nation, on July 6th, he said:

In 1846 we adopted a new commercial principle; we merely carried further the commercial principle which had been adopted and acted upon in 1842 and in successive years.

He stated there the reasons of the income tax. And I find in the British Economic Association Journal a very interesting discussion which took place recently on the origin of the income tax. It leads to the following conclusion:—

It may, therefore, be fairly stated that the function of the tax from 1842 to 1860 was the double one of providing the extra funds needed in time of war, and of securing tariff and financial reform in time of peace.

So, I think it will be admitted by fair-minded men, that, if hon. gentlemen opposite are serious in many of the free trade arguments they have used, it is necessary for them to tell the people straight out and without any beating about the bush, that, hand in hand with the principle of free trade, as advocated by Sir Robert Peel for a period of forty years, must go a system of direct taxation. And these hon. gentlemen know as well as I do what would be the effect of advocating such a policy before the people, so far as their political interests are concerned.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in dealing with the Finance Minister's position of the financial position of Canada, the hon. member for South Oxford, I thought, resorted to many unfair arguments. But he did astonish me considerably, in his criticism when he used

the following language. Discussing the question whether our tariff favoured England or not, he said :

Sir, those gentlemen are fond of telling us that theirs is a purely loyal policy, and that their tariff favours England. Why, Sir, the thing is absurd on the face of it. If the tariff means anything, and can do anything, what it means and what it can do is to keep the manufactured goods of England out of Canada. Who are the chief producers of manufactured goods? England. Who are the manufactureres who can sell cheaply? Why, the manufacturers of England, and nobody else.

Will the hon. gentleman never learn anything? If he will look up his own financial statements when he was Finance Minister he will there find that the competition that played havoc with the industries of this county in his time was not the competition of the manufacturers of England, but the competition of the manufacturers of the United States. The American manufacturers were then feeling their strength, and they were then fighting England and fighting Canada in the Canadian market. For what reason I know not, they took advantage at that time of their opportunities, and the slaughter market in this country was crowded by the competition from across the borders. This idea that when we raised the wall it was practically against England because England alone could manufacture cheaply, is not borne out by the history of the country from 1874 to 1878, nor is it true of the present day. One reason for the decline of exports from England to Canada is the reason I have already given from the London "Times." What is Germany doing, what is Belgium doing in the iron and steel trade? What has the United States been doing from 1878, and particularly of late years in this terrific competition? I propose to demolish this position of the hon. gentleman if I can—it is an important position—by reference to the only authority, I believe, for which the hon. gentleman has the slightest respect. I would refer him to his own speech on the Budget in 1876, where he spoke on this subject differently from the way he speaks to-day :

There is no doubt that immediately the cost of production in America became cheapened, there was an increase in the number of articles brought into this country, and that this circumstance, although advantageous to the bulk of our people, to press with severity on a certain portion of our manufactures.

This is a straight admission. Again, he asks this House :

And that is a point the House would do well to bear in mind—that a good deal of American competition is not competition of American with Canadian industries, but American with British manufacturers, the Canadian consumer being benefited by the operation.

So the hon. gentleman himself may be called to contradict the assertion that, when

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.

we raised the tariff the blow we struck was rather against England than against the United States. On that point, I am not going to rest content with the authority of the hon. member for South Oxford. I wish to refer, for instance, to the statistics themselves, and I will quote again the book I have referred to. At page 161 we shall see the evidence of the changed position of affairs which the hon. member for South Oxford was not fair enough to refer to, of the difficulties that have come over England in the years since the National Policy was adopted, and of the competition she has been compelled to meet. For instance, of manufactured goods, not sent merely into her own colonies, but into her own ports. I find that in 1886 the amount, according to the English returns was £34,802,042, and in 1892, it was £43,244,804. The increase in 1892 over 1886 was 24·3 per cent. And again, at page 186, Mr. Burgis says :

Let all who doubt my assertion, that protected countries undersell us in the British home market, study carefully the board of trade returns, and they will find that in hardware, glass, paper, leather, sugar, silks, and woollens, and many other articles of general use, our markets are invaded by the products of protectionist countries, and so British labour is robbed to pay foreign labour.

I would refer again, though not to read it, to the extraordinary statement from the London "Times" of this month, in regard to the changed condition of affairs, so far as it affects the iron and steel industry. Those facts, the House I think will see, without my labouring the point, destroy the criticism of the member for South Oxford. Now, I have once before in this House referred to a rather offensive criticism of the hon. gentleman made by the "Globe." The "Globe" used to jeer at the hon. gentleman, and call him a "financial juggler," and laugh at his manner of handling what they called figures. Now, if there was an occasion to smile, that occasion was when the member for South Oxford dared to meet the statement of the Finance Minister in this debate. It is true, it was before he had time to prepare, it was the first instalment of his reply to the Minister of Finance. But what troubles the member for South Oxford most is the fact that he has been followed, through a large part of his political career, by a shadow which has seriously affected him, and left him in a very unfortunate mental condition. He has been followed by deficits. In his whole history, deficits stand out in bold relief. The member for South Oxford has signally failed in his life. For instance, he was president of a bank, and a deficit overtook the bank as well as the hon. gentleman. He was member for Lennox, and there was a deficit of votes in the county. He tried Huron, and though he says he was gerrymandered out of it, my recollection is that he was beaten, not only in the gerrymander-

ed Huron, but in those districts which existed in Huron before it was gerrymandered. Therefore it was not necessary to resort to a gerrymander in order to beat the hon. gentleman, after he had been a little while in any one county. But a deficit of votes bothered him there. He was member for Wellington, and had to meet a deficit there. He was Finance Minister, and a deficit finally overwhelmed him. So there is no reason why he should call the people of this country fools as he did to-night.

An hon. MEMBER. Oh, dear.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I have no doubt the hon. gentleman is surprised that the member for South Oxford should do that, but he certainly charged the people of this country with being fools because they had rejected the Reform party so often. But what shall we say of him, or what idea must he have of the back benches, when he actually turned round the other day to make a point such as this, and expected to elicit cheers? In analysing the Finance Minister's figures, he said:

In 1878 we sold ships to the value of \$1,250,000, while in 1895 we sold ships to the value of \$172,000.

The leader of the Liberals in the maritime provinces, the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies), knows that if that was a serious statement, it casts a serious reflection on the intelligence of the hon. member for South Oxford. He knows that if that was a serious statement, it exhibits ignorance of the grossest description on the part of that hon. gentleman. It is a most misleading statement, and no statement could be more dishonest, but I do not want to charge him with dishonesty. I believe that actually he did not know what he was talking about. The hon. member sitting beside him could have told him many things that would have made that reference wholly unnecessary. Take, for instance, the decline in shipping. He gave the values—mark that, Mr. Speaker—he gave the decline in the value of the tons of shipping sold by Canada to countries the world over. Just think of it, leaving aside the fact that we were then building wooden ships, and that the demand for wooden ships in foreign countries does not to-day exist. Iron and steel have taken their place; but pass that all by. Just think, there has been a decline in the value between the year when the hon. gentleman made his comparison and 1893, from \$34 a ton down to \$12 a ton. But he did not give the number of ships, he gave the decline in value, and that of course was enormous. Let us look a little into the actual figures, figures that a fair-minded critic and a man who had any confidence in his position, would not have troubled himself to keep back, and we can see from this sample whether the criticisms of the hon. gentleman, so far as they are based on figures,

deserve our attention. The value, for instance, in 1876, was \$2,189,270 of ships sold. for the hon. gentleman was referring to ships sold. In 1879, under his policy, according to this test, the value declined to \$529,000. The hon. gentleman did not tell the House that; that was kept back. If it was a good argument against our policy, what becomes of this lovely tariff that existed between 1874 and 1879? But take the tonnage, and what becomes of his comparison? Notwithstanding that we were building almost entirely wooden ships in this country, in 1878, of ships sold, the tonnage was 35,000, of the class to which he referred; and in 1894, notwithstanding the change of material in construction, we actually sold of tonnage 22,000, a very small difference under the circumstances. But in the good days of the so-called free trade and revenue tariff, the tonnage sold, in 1876, amounted to 64,000, and in 1879 to 19,000. But to show how unfair any comparison of that kind is, either here or in England, I have merely to mention what the hon. gentleman took care not to mention, namely, that the tonnage of British ships under construction in Great Britain was 371,000 tons less in 1894 than in 1881, and they have all the benefits of free trade, and a policy much different from ours. Now, let us take some more of the hon. gentleman's figures, and look at his system of analysis. With respect to the statement that we have grown so rapidly within the last seventeen years, the hon. gentleman said that he would take our exports and imports as a test. He called our particular attention to this as a test of the growth of Canada. Now, whether that is a fair guide or a safe guide, I will leave him to explain himself. I find that when Finance Minister the hon. gentleman took pains to warn this country about several things. In 1875, in delivering his financial statement, he said:

It is my duty, if the House, or any member of it, choose to assume that the fact of a rapid increase in the past is necessarily a proof that an equally rapid increase is to be looked for in the future, to call attention to the fact that that great country (the United States), though it increased in essential prosperity in all respects in that interval,—

This is the interval between 1836 and 1851.

—remained on one occasion without any great increase taking place in its imports for a period of no less than fifteen years, and that a similar phenomenon occurred at other times, though not on so large a scale.

In the hon. gentleman's Budget speech in 1876, page 11, he said:

I must draw attention to the fact that, as our exports have not appreciably diminished, and as it appears that a very large proportion of the diminished imports does not arise from diminished power of consumption by the people, but simply from the better bargains they have been

able to obtain, it is, on the whole, an advantage and not an injury to our people.

What was the hon. gentleman seeking to establish when he was Finance Minister? It was this: that when a country, as in the case of the United States, had enjoyed a wonderfully successful and prosperous series of years so far as exports were concerned, there came a halt, and for a series of years their trade returns would show nothing like that as an index of prosperity. But, said the hon. gentleman when he was Finance Minister, do not be disheartened, the country may be prospering all the time, for I will show reasons in the history of the United States when prosperity was beyond controversy, and yet at that time their foreign trade was nowhere. That was the statement of the member as Finance Minister, but now that he is in another position he has changed his views. The hon. gentleman goes on to make a comparison of our imports, and said that in 1867 they amounted to \$72,000,000, and in 1878—and the hon. gentleman said he was taking the worst year—they amounted to \$91,000,000. Then the hon. gentleman argued that consequently from 1868 to 1878, a period of ten years, our imports had increased \$19,000,000 and he gave the percentage. The Finance Minister very properly interjected the statement that certain new provinces had been admitted during that time. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) insisted that that made very little difference—although British Columbia, Prince Edward Island, Manitoba and the North-west Territories had been admitted. He then went on to compare the trade for 1878 with 1895 in lump, and he drew the comforting conclusion that there had been a more rapid growth from 1868 to 1878 than since. I have already shown that from 1870 to 1873 the growth of trade, in Canada, England and elsewhere had been phenomenal, and that the trade carried on by this country as shown by imports and exports was nothing short of marvellous. Mark you, Mr. Speaker, that in order to make a contrast unfavourable to the Conservative policy the hon. gentleman took all the years under Sir John Macdonald's Government from 1868 to 1874. And what was that period? It was one of the most remarkable periods in the commercial history of Canada. Why was it remarkable? The Finance Minister of that time was in the habit of calling it a period of inflation, when people were carrying on an immense trade, for the United States had not as yet recovered from the effects of the terrible civil war, when prices ruling were fabulous, when everybody was making money, and it was owing partially to the fact that we had for a time lost our great competitor. But the hon. gentleman calmly took those five years of remarkable prosperity, when high values dominated, when according to the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) it was a time of inflation, and when industries

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.

were worked up to the highest pitch. What did it matter whether the tariff was 12, 15, or 17½ per cent in those days. Mr. Devlin and Mr. Workman explained that between 1867 and 1874 it mattered little whether the tariff was low or not, for it answered the purpose of protection, because there was nothing like competition, but that competition came about when the United States industries recovered after the war and exercised their strength. So that the hon. gentleman took for purposes of comparison one of the most glorious periods of Conservative rule, or at any rate, five years of Conservative rule and four years subsequently of Grit rule,—and compared them with what kind of a period? National Policy or no National Policy, the comparison was with a period when not only values declined in this country, but all over the world, and when competition was brought to a pitch that the world had never dreamed possible twenty years before. With this terrific competition all the world over, with a decline in values, with financial crises occurring, and with the face of our trade competition changed, our imports were affected, not from larger quantities of manufactured materials being brought in but by raw material being brought in under the National Policy in lieu of manufactured articles; and without taking into account all these various circumstances which would alter the calculation utterly, the hon. gentleman made a comparison of percentage in order to show that there had been comparatively no development and rapid growth in this country.

I will now refer to some other criticisms of the financial statement made by the hon. member for South Huron. The hon. gentleman took for instance, the imports from Great Britain in 1874, and mentioned the amount of them. Then he took the imports in 1895 and in 1878, and he attempted to make a comparison to show the effect our tariff had had by diminishing trade with Great Britain and that the effect of the National Policy had been to prevent that country selling Canada as much goods as previously. That was a very unfair criticism. Great Britain's exports of domestic manufactures to the value of no less than \$230,000,000 declined in that period from 1890 to 1894, the period which the hon. gentleman compared with 1870 and 1878. The volume of Great Britain's exports of domestic manufactures fell off not only as regards Canada but every country in the world. Canada from 1890 to 1894 was the only country whose exports increased instead of diminished. Let that be put down in all fairness to the National Policy. But the reason the hon. gentleman was able to make anything like a prima facie case on the question of diminished exports from Great Britain was not on account of the effect of the National Policy on Great Britain, but by reason of the competition of Germany,

Belgium, France and the United States, for figures show that our imports increased from those countries as they diminished from Great Britain, and they were imports of manufactured goods. But the hon. gentleman sought to make his comparison with years that would suit the point he wished to make. Take, however, a fuller statement of the case. The imports from Great Britain in 1874 were of the value of \$63,000,000, from the United States \$54,000,000. In 1879, under the beneficent system of the Opposition the \$63,000,000 from Great Britain dwindled to \$30,000,000 and the volume from the United States—and this trade hon. gentlemen opposite now think is essential to Canada's prosperity—dropped from \$54,000,000 to \$34,000,000. And, under this terrible National Policy, I find that in 1893—the latest figures in the book to which I had reference :—

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That was a year of very great depression compared with a year of inflation.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Yes, but we are taking the hon. gentleman's system of criticism. The figures show that the trade had risen from \$30,000,000, to which the hon. gentleman's policy had brought in 1879, to \$43,000,000, and in the United States from \$44,000,000 to \$58,000,000. But now to show the fallacy of the argument of the hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright), and leave that comparison altogether, I want to point to what Germany was doing in this period from 1879 to 1894. Germany sent us \$440,000 worth of stuff in 1879, but Germany sent us \$5,841,000 worth of goods in 1893. That is what a protectionist country was able to do in a market equally open to her as it was to the United Kingdom. I will not at this moment give another inopportune authority in a discussion of this character, but which was eliminated by the hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright). I refer to the extraordinary decline in prices. This is given in the Year Book, and a great deal of attention is given—and I think proper attention—to the calculations that have been made by many of those authorities on the extraordinary decline in values that have occurred in these two periods. And when these declines in prices are considered, it will entirely destroy the system of analysis adopted by the hon. gentleman for South Oxford.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The decline from 1874 to 1879 was much greater relatively than it has been since.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Well, even admitting that. My position is so strong that admitting that fact, my argument is yet correct. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Mills) has not followed me. Whatever be the decline, I have shown that it was not because of the tariff that this trade from Great Britain diminished in any part. But

there were other considerations. There was raw material substituted for the manufactured article, which would make a great difference. There were these other competitors coming in. If Germany and Belgium could sell right under the nose of the British manufacturer in England, of course they were capturing ground hitherto occupied in Canada by the English manufacturer. Those facts are most important in any comparison, and those facts were entirely neglected by the hon. gentleman for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). During that period when the exports of other countries were declining, it is comforting for us to know that our exports rose \$28,000,000 from 1889 to 1894, and our imports \$3,500,000, while the trade of Germany, France, Great Britain, the United States, and even Australia declined between 1890 and 1894.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It is 12 o'clock.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I am perfectly willing to go on if the House wishes.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Let the hon. gentleman move the adjournment of the debate.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 12 o'clock (midnight).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 7th February, 1896.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

REPORTS.

Report of the Minister of Justice as to Penitentiaries of Canada, for the year ended 30th June, 1895.—(Mr. Dickey.)

Report of the Department of Trade and Commerce, for the year ended 30th June, 1895.—(Mr. Ives.)

Annual Report of the Department of Indian Affairs, for the year ended 30th June, 1895.—(Mr. Daly.)

THE NORTH-WEST MOUNTED POLICE.

Mr. DAVIN. Before the Orders of the Day are called, Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the Government to what is

a very grave insult to the North-west Territories, and to the North-west Mounted Police. The Macleod "Gazette" calls attention to a report of judicial proceedings which took place in Halifax, which report is as follows:—

The two young men charged with burglary from Adams' store, were yesterday sentenced by Judge Johnston to six months each in the county jail. An effort is being made to get the prisoners on the North-west Mounted Police, and if it is successful. But if, at the expiration of six months, such arrangements have not been made, they will be sentenced for the Hubley and Grant burglaries.

The "Gazette" comments very properly upon this when it says:

What makes this all the more diabolically insulting is the fact that the outrage contemplated seems to have had judicial sanction, or, at least, the sanction of whatever person or persons would have the authority to allow these criminals to avoid a sentence for burglary by obtaining admission to the mounted police force.

I have no doubt, Sir, that it is unnecessary for me to protest against any such use being made of the North-west police, for I am quite certain that I shall have assurance from whoever represents the North-west Mounted Police here that such a thing could not be done. But it is a grave mistake on the part of the judge, and I would call the attention of the Minister of Justice to it, to have suggested such a thing from the bench, as he seems to have done. I may say, Sir, as all in the House know, that there are men now serving in the North-west Mounted Police, and have been ever since the force was established, as well bred, as well born, as well educated as those in any position or any rank of life in Canada or elsewhere.

Mr. DICKEY. The suggestion which the hon. gentleman draws attention to is so abhorrent to one's sense of right, that I can hardly believe that it is anything else than a newspaper mistake. I certainly shall cause investigation to be made, and if any suggestion of that sort has been made, will find out how it was that Judge Johnston made such a grave error.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I rise to make a personal explanation. In its issue of the 6th February, the "Globe" makes certain statements affecting myself. I shall not take up the time of the House by reading the whole article, but will simply read the portions of the article to which I wish especially to refer:

The archbishop implored Father Bedard, in God's name, not to allow Mr. Laurier to appear before an audience of students, lest it should encourage the Liberal leader, whom he describes as an opponent of separate schools for Manitoba.

Mr. DAVIN.

The same bishop, in response to the appeals of Sir Adolphe Caron and Mr. Ouimet, interfered in the election in Verchères. The Bishop of Chicoutimi, Mgr. Labrecque, actively interfered in the Charlevoix election, in behalf of the Government candidate, and menaced his people, unless they voted for the candidate who would pledge himself to support a Bill in Parliament "which would be acceptable to the ecclesiastical authorities."

And in another part, under the heading, "Another Chapter," I read as follows:—

Another chapter in the church crusade piously entered upon by such religious-minded men as Sir Adolphe Caron and Mr. Haggart, opened at Montreal to-day, where a meeting of the bishops of the ecclesiastical province of Quebec is in progress, attended by the following bishops:—Archbishop Fabre, and Bishops Bégin of Quebec, Larocque of Sherbrooke, Laffêche of Three Rivers, Emard of Valleyfield, and Moreau of St. Hyacinthe. Sir Adolphe Caron and Mr. Ouimet appeared before them, representing the Government, and submitted a copy of the Remedial Bill, which has passed the Cabinet Council, for their approval.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I wish to give the most emphatic denial to this whole statement. It is a pure fabrication from beginning to end. I did not know, and I do not now know whether there was a meeting of the bishops of the ecclesiastical province of Quebec held in Montreal yesterday. Whether there has been one or not, I can state that directly or indirectly I had no conference with Mr. Haggart, as stated, and no communication, directly or indirectly, with the bishops or archbishop of the province of Quebec. I had no communication, directly or indirectly, with the bishops or the archbishop of Quebec, and I can say that I know sufficiently my duty as a member of the Privy Council, before a Bill is decided upon and settled to go and communicate it to any authority, however high that authority may be. I deny the whole thing emphatically.

THE CAPE BRETON ELECTION.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Before the Orders are called, I desire to call the attention of the House to the statement made by the hon. Secretary of State (Sir Charles Tupper) as reported in the Montreal "Herald," at a banquet which was tendered him in the city of Halifax last night. The hon. gentleman is reported, among other things, to have said as follows:—

If he (Sir Charles) had been successful, the Liberal party would not have brought to the use of human devices in the late contest in Cape Breton. That explains the great emergency of the Liberal party, and he said \$25,000 was sent down by Liberal emissaries to defeat the hopes of the Conservative party in that county. But they were unsuccessful, in spite of the gigantic frauds in the electoral lists and bribery.

I am personally in a position to know that there was not enough in the whole of Canada sent to Mr. Murray to pay the travelling

expenses incurred by him and the gentlemen who went down to assist him, and there is not one atom of foundation for the statement to which Sir Charles Tupper pledged himself at that banquet.

SUPPLY—THE BUDGET.

The House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Foster: That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go again into Committee of Supply.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), in his attempted reply to the hon. Finance Minister, took some very extraordinary positions, as I was endeavouring to point out last night, but none seemed to me so peculiar as his boast with regard to the surpluses which attended his administration of finance, and his plea of total irresponsibility for the deficits which occurred. He had much to boast of in connection with the surpluses, but when it became a matter of loss of revenue and failure to obtain the necessary means to pay our way from year to year, then the hon. gentleman fell back upon the alleged extravagance of his predecessors and the alleged mismanagement of the Government of Sir John Macdonald. But it is an extraordinary fact, which he seemed to have lost sight of, that the surpluses which prevailed under Sir John Macdonald's Government, went on for two years later, and when the effect of Sir John Macdonald's administration was over and the effect of the administration of Sir Richard Cartwright had begun, it was then the deficits appeared, and they never disappeared until that hon. gentleman disappeared himself from the exchequer of this country. The Conservative party certainly started the hon. gentleman well. They certainly started him in such a position that no matter how he managed or mismanaged the finances of the country, gratifying results were exhibited for a period of a couple of years. But for 1876, 1877, 1878 and 1879, the country has undoubtedly held that hon. gentleman responsible. And it does not lie in his mouth at this day to hark back, and charge upon his predecessors such recklessness as he has charged them with. Who has forgotten, for instance, the proof from that hon. gentleman's own hand, on a most important occasion, to the contrary of what he has claimed in this debate. When he endeavoured to borrow money in the London market, he issued a statement—and I venture again to bring that statement to the attention of the House, though it must be well known, because of the audacity of the hon. gentleman in taking a position completely at variance with every line of his position on the present occasion. In October, 1875, after he had been in office two years, after he had had an opportunity of studying the effect of the policy of his predecessors and

of knowing exactly the financial position of Canada and the financial history of Canada, he informed the financial people of London that the whole of our debt had been incurred for legitimate objects of public utility. He continued as follows:—

The indirect advantage from these public works has already been found in the remarkable rapidity with which the commerce and the material prosperity of the Dominion have been developed; while a substantial increase in the direct returns may fairly be expected from the improvements now in progress and to follow the steady progress of population and trade.

Again he said:

The revenue has shown a continuous surplus during each year since confederation, 1867, although it has in the interval been charged with much heavy expenditure of an exceptional kind, such as the outlay connected with the several Fenian attacks on the country, the acquisition and organization of new territory, and providing an adequate defensive force for the Dominion.

In addition to that, we have not forgotten that while he pleads now that the extravagant conduct of his predecessors forced upon the country and upon him the financial calamities that occurred in 1876, 1877 and 1878, and so on, he predicted, after a review of the situation in 1875, and counted upon a surplus. His knowledge and investigation at that time led him—it is beyond doubt and beyond dispute—to the conclusion that from what had happened and from the condition of the country we had a right to expect a surplus instead of a deficit, and had the hon. gentleman, even in those dark days for the commerce of this country, yielded to the pressure of business men and the representatives of the labour interests in this country, I have no doubt, and I think the people of this country are of that opinion, that we would have been not only relieved from much of the depression and the injury to Canadian commerce in the days that followed, but that our financial situation would have been a great deal better.

The hon. gentleman, however, is extraordinary in the realm of finance. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, what hon. gentleman behind him and what leading man in this country has ever taken any stock, so to speak, in his extraordinary statement as to what the National Policy has cost this country. Year after year, altering the figures only by a few millions, as occasion calls for, that hon. gentleman goes into a most extraordinary calculation, which, if it had any real foundation, would excite a great deal of attention at the hands of the people interested in the history and condition of Canada; but not a man on his right, not a man to his left, not a man behind him, has ever ventured to follow him seriously in the calculation he makes.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Oh, yes.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. member for Queen's says "oh, yes." I

would like to hear him, I would like to hear any one in this debate, venture to tell the House that in seventeen years the National Policy has added five hundred millions to the taxation of the people.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Rather more than less.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Rather more than less, says the hon. member for South Oxford. He does not stop at a trifle. What are five hundred millions to him? But the hon. gentleman has an ingenious as well as an amusing way of reaching these conclusions. A great mathematician, as well as a financial genius, is the hon. member for South Oxford. He has told the people, for instance, how he gets at these huge figures. It is difficult even to find them in any official book or official records.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I should think so.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. He himself admits that there is no record outside of his peculiar brain for such a calculation, or such a statement. He told us how he did it at Morrisburg, and I have analysed his statement, and his method of bringing about this result, and will give it to the House. On the 8th October last, at Morrisburg, he said:

To maintain the cost of protection you take the taxation for sixteen years.

He starts in this way with the records and with the books to which we all have access. Then how do you suppose, Mr. Speaker, he proceeds? Why, he simply doubles the amount. That is not enough, however, and he multiplies it by 16. That is a significant and wonderful figure. In that way he reaches, not a paltry \$500,000,000, not at all. It is \$500,000,000 in 1896, but in 1895 it was \$1,000,000,000; and all, as he told them at Morrisburg, was for the purpose of furthering the manufacturing interests of Canada. Well, now let us analyse that and see to what position it would bring the hon. gentleman. He says \$1,000,000,000 is paid in taxes by 5,000,000 people, all told. Now, for a population of 60,000,000 in the United States, that would only be \$12,000,000,000; whereas Mulhall tells us that the total cost of the American civil war was £740,000,000 sterling, or only \$3,700,000,000 at \$5 per pound, less than one-third of the amount which I have given. Now let us take another way. We could make a very ingenious and interesting calculation if we were allowed the liberties that the member for South Oxford takes in a debate and in financial criticism. For instance, you have got to double the amount you find in the blue-books going into the treasury and multiply it by sixteen in order that he may launch that indictment against the National Policy. Now, Sir, with your permission I will take the words "Sir Richard Cartwright, K.C.M.G." There are, I find, just twenty-four letters

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.

in these words. If you double them and multiply them by sixteen and then—I hope he will pardon me—subtract 102, you get 666, just the number of the beast. That is logical, and it leads to a most unhappy conclusion. But, still, I think it is as fair an argument as the hon. gentleman addressed to us on the subject of the taxation imposed by this Government. Now, Sir, I would like to refer to the subject of expenditure. The hon. member for South Oxford has worked up the figures to about \$40,000,000, or \$38,300,000, and he says even the latter figure is altogether too large for the business resources of Canada, and he goes on to say:

I say it is a disgrace and a shame to the Government that have been entrusted with our affairs, that they come down to us and ask for an expenditure of \$38,300,000 a year for federal purposes. Sir, the thing is utterly unjustifiable.

That is the language of the member for South Oxford, but it is significant to observe that from the beginning to the end of the speech, this statesman was not able to tell this House or the people of Canada just about the sum that Canada could be properly governed for, just the amount of money which he, for instance, would undertake to do the job himself, just what the growing necessities and the development of this young country demands, and that, after all, is a very important consideration. I think I can ferret out and can put my hand upon some of the reasons for the hon. gentleman not doing that. I am firmly of the opinion, and I believe the majority of the business men of this country are of the opinion, that it is simply child's play to pretend that in a country like Canada, in a country with Canada's ambition, with Canada's plans, aye, with Canada's preparation for the future, it is within the possibility of human genius, to govern this country successfully for one dollar a year less. As a representative of one of the constituencies of this country, I take the responsibility of saying that whether my party or the other party be successful at the next election, I have not the slightest doubt that the expenditure of this country will increase instead of diminish; and I will go further and say that, provided wisdom presides over the system of management and expenditure, I hope, and devoutly hope, that the expenditure will increase instead of diminish. This country, as it grows, this country as it successfully develops, certainly this country as it accumulates a larger population, will and must require a larger amount than \$40,000,000 a year for its government. We might as well look the thing in the face, we might as well realize, too, the strength of our position. The people of this country are in no wise discouraged by the growth of expenditure by the Government, as long as they get something for the money. What they complained of between 1874 and 1878 was that the gentlemen who used to

shout retrenchment and reform from 1867 to 1874, got into office, and for four years were neither able to reduce the expenditure one farthing, nor to do anything for the money they were laying out year after year. Now, Mr. Speaker, I call your attention to another liberty taken by the hon. member for South Oxford in discussing this phase of Canada's financial position. He refers to the \$23,000,000 of expenditure, being the amount that he found requisite to govern this country when he entered office, and to the \$23,000,000 which he required when he went out of office four years later. But it is significant to observe this fact: his party came into power on November 7th, 1873, and the last full year in which his opponents were in office, the expenditure was only \$19,000,000, and there was money to pay for it in the treasury; whereas, in his first year in office, in 1874, the expenditure was \$23,300,000 in round numbers, and in 1876 it had risen to \$24,400,000, and then there was not the money to pay. The expenditure of his predecessors had been out of revenue, had been out of an overflowing exchequer, but the larger expenditure under himself took place when there was not money in the treasury to pay, and when he was forced to obtain money from other sources. On what ground can we expect, even at his hands, a reduction in expenditure? According to their professions before they took office, they would hold up their hands in holy horror at the growth of the annual expenditure from some \$13,000,000 to \$23,000,000. But when those hon. gentlemen came into power, they were not able to reduce it. We had a little hint from the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin) on an important occasion recently that retrenchment is not to be the order of the day when the Liberals attain office and power in this country. I find, when opposing the return of the present Controller of Inland Revenue, the hon. member for Winnipeg, at Victoria, in January of this year, denied that the Liberals were mean. They are disposed, he said, to spend more money than in 1878. He added that they would raise the wages of the mail carriers and labourers, but they would cut down the payment of higher officials to the least they could get them for. They would, moreover, proceed with the development of the country, which the Conservatives had commenced. Again, and of course the hon. gentleman did not hold this out as a bribe—he said he did not know where money could be spent with more advantage than in British Columbia.

But I now desire to refer to a higher authority in the Liberal party on the question of expenditure. I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, why the hon. member for South Oxford did not say where this expenditure should be reduced. It was enough for him to hold us responsible. But he himself, only two years ago, on 13th July, in this very House, used the following language on this point. Said the hon. gentleman:

Every human being who pays the slightest attention to the state of affairs in Canada, knows that, in all human probability, for some considerable time to come, we will have very great difficulty in making both ends meet, unless we choose to greatly increase our taxation.

On 28th March, "Hansard" reports the hon. gentleman as saying:

The part of our expenditure which is controllable is very small; the amount of saving that can be made is really very limited.

I well remember in 1887, when the hopes of the Liberal party were very high, when they believed, and their leaders believed, they would win the elections, Mr. Anglin came to Halifax and made this statement:

Unfortunately, no matter what government comes into power, it will be simply impossible to get rid of the imposed taxation. We cannot put a stop to that increase.

The late Finance Minister, the hon. member for South Oxford, when in power, used language which corroborates me in the opinion that I have expressed in regard to what we may expect in the future. Said the hon. gentleman in his Budget speech in 1875:

This country, as it grows and increases in prosperity will require additional expenditures, and, though I hope we will always maintain a moderate surplus, a very considerable portion of the natural increase of revenue must go to meet contingencies, which in a country like ours are inevitable.

There is a very interesting reference in the Year-Book for 1894 to show that Canada has by no means come dangerously near that condition when her expenditure would be a strain upon her resources and upon her capacity. The hon. member for Oxford, I believe, has admitted that the outside annual indebtedness of Canada, federal, provincial, and otherwise, was from \$25,000,000 to \$30,000,000. At least, he is so reported in February, 1893, in a speech in this House, though I fail to observe when referring to this matter in his recent speech whether he had increased that amount. I find in the Year-Book on this subject, a paragraph, as follows:—

T. Lloyd, the chief writer for the London (Eng.) "Statist," affirms that "No better means of ascertaining what a country can pay in the shape of interest to outside creditors exists than can be found in the exports of the country. No independent country can pay its creditors more than one-third the value of its exports. After it pays more than one-third, it has reached the danger point. The capacity of the people will be strained. During the last three years the exports of Canada have amounted to an average of \$117,000,000 a year, one-third of which is \$39,000,000. It has been estimated that the outside indebtedness of Canada, federal, provincial, railways, municipalities, and other debts, upon which interest is paid, causes an outgo of from \$22,000,000 to \$25,000,000 a year. Taking the latter figure, there is still a margin of \$14,000,000. We have drawn to the limit of 64 per cent, and have 36 per cent to come and go on.

The only foundation for fear such as the

hon. member for South Oxford has expressed in this House seems to me to depend wholly and entirely upon the population of Canada remaining stationary. The hon. gentleman has drawn a great deal of comfort from the fact that Canada was disappointed in regard to the returns of the last census. It has been shown by that census the hopes we entertained ten years ago in regard to the settlement of this country by an incoming population have not been realized. I would not be so hopeful of Canada's future, nor so bold in regard to expenditures we can afford to make in order to increase the development of the country, if I thought for the next decade the returns in regard to population would not be larger; but before I resume my seat I will attempt to show that no reasonable man can believe there ever will be so disappointing a period of ten years in the history of this country as regards population, as the ten years to which reference so often has been made, and on that score I have no fear. But I believe in regard to any proposed retrenchment or proposed reduction of certain expenditures, the people of this country will want to know where that retrenchment is to begin, upon what line of policy it is to proceed. The hon. member for Oxford has stated explicitly to the Patrons, and in a letter, that he was opposed to railway subsidies. I take it, then, though he does not announce it in this House, as part of the policy of the Government of which he will be Finance Minister, that he will endeavour to prevent such expenditure, and it will be possible, in that way, to effect a great reduction. But I am with the majority of the people in advocating even more liberal treatment of Canadian interests in that regard from the federal exchequer than they have hitherto received. In this country, like other new countries, for Canada is still in a large part exceedingly new and undeveloped, we must have railway facilities in order to secure prosperity and attract population, and we have not yet the railway facilities that a country like ours, with its vast extent and extraordinary resources, demands and requires. Will the hon. gentleman tell the people of the country if he proposes to reduce expenditure on public works? Will he say that he will cut off the bounties paid to the fishermen or to the miners in the different parts of the country? Will he interfere with the policy introduced by the present member for London (Sir John Carlisle), when Minister of Agriculture, of affording aid to the farming interest, all of which costs money and money from year to year? Will he stop the development of the dairying interest? Will he stop all the steps that have been taken to facilitate cold storage? Will he interfere to cut down the expenditures required for technical instruction in that regard? Will he put the knife into subsidies for steamship communication? Will he cut off those facilities for develop-

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.

ing our trade? Will he stop the policy of deepening our canals, and the policy so successfully carried on, of aiding navigation? Will he throw aside that important subject of cable communication now under the consideration of the Government? Will he stop the expenditure that is required for establishing commercial agencies throughout the world, for the purpose of facilitating Canadian trade? All these things cost money, and they are expenditures largely in excess of the expenditure from 1874 to 1878, and expenditures, too, for which I am glad to say the Conservative party alone has been responsible. Will he stop the generous treatment in regard to our postal facilities? Will he be dismayed at the deficit that exists in that department, when the demand from all parts of Canada is for increased, rather than for lessened postal service? Will he cease to give constant attention to immigration, simply because in large part, all the money expended did not bring the returns that we hoped for in the past? Will he throw cold water upon the hopes and aspirations of the business men of this country in regard to the rounding off of confederation by the bringing in of Newfoundland? If the hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) goes for retrenchment; if he goes for a cheap government; all these ambitious schemes must be thrown to the winds; all these ambitious schemes will perhaps be associated with what he calls a "jingo policy." But, Sir, all these efforts towards advancement on the part of this Government have been well appreciated by the people of Canada, and with the National Policy there has come, the ability for the Government, not to foster merely the manufacturing interests, but to do for Canada and for Canadian farmers that which has attracted extraordinary attention in the mother country, and which has induced in large part, the bureaus of the English government to set aside their policy which so long had been laissez faire, and to fill them with admiration, for what is known as "The Colonial Policy in aid of Farming interests." Only in December last, I was glad to see a recognition of the work that this Government has done, in common with some of the other colonial governments, towards assisting the farmers in getting their goods in proper shape to the great market of the world. In the London "Times" of 26th December, I read the following:—

The amount of energy that the governments of these colonies have been, and still are displaying, in order to smooth the path of the colonial producer, and more especially in the way of his sending to Great Britain articles of consumption with which our own farmers are unable or unwilling to supply us; can be adequately realized only by regarding the situation as a whole, and as distinct from isolated examples which attract attention from time to time.

Later on in the same article, I find the following:—

Without going into elaborate statistics, it may be mentioned, as showing the practical results of this careful fostering of Canadian industries, that, in the matter of provisions alone, the value of exports from the Dominion increased from \$12,360,066 in 1890 to \$21,292,733 in 1894; those sent to Great Britain rising from \$10,312,902 in 1890 to \$20,789,467 in 1894. Taking the one item of cheese: the quantity sent to Great Britain, which represented \$548,574 in 1868, rose in value from \$9,349,731 in 1890 to \$15,439,198 in 1894. The weight of our cheese import from Canada in 1894 was over 105,000,000 pounds. It is too, partly if not largely, in order to obtain still further facilities for increasing Canadian exports, that the Dominion Government have pledged themselves to contribute \$750,000 a year for ten years towards the establishment of the new fast Atlantic service.

So, Mr. Speaker, if wisdom prevails I have no fear in advocating most generous treatment to all these interests in Canada, and in giving further fostering assistance to the industries which at this juncture in the commercial history of the world certainly require it more than they ever did in times past. I am in every sense in favour of a fast service instead of a slow service. Party man as I am, ardent for the success of my party, I said in Toronto last summer, and I hesitate not to repeat it on the floor of the House: that so well have the foundations for prosperity in Canada been laid, so rich is this country in resources and possessions of every kind, that no matter what government is in power in Canada, I believe you cannot now prevent the successful growth and successful development of our country. My point of difference with gentlemen on the other side is—and I am glad to believe it is the main point—as to whether their policy or the policy which I advocate, is the one to accelerate the attainment of great prosperity and to hasten the development of all the interests of Canada. The difference between us is suggested by the last word of the quotation from the "Times." The policy on this side of the House is for a fast service; the policy on the other side is, I believe, for a slow service, and I go for the fastest service it is possible for us to obtain.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would refer to another view which the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) expressed in regard to the position of this country. He says, forsooth, that geography is against us. In 1867 or before that, though the hon. gentleman was a much younger man, he was one of the most ardent advocates of the Canadian confederation. His reasons and his arguments which he gave then, I have read, and I have failed to observe anything in them so discouraging as the observations which he addressed to us the other day. If his position be sound now, I cannot conceive how he ever became an advocate of Canadian confederation. Our geographical position! Why, if there is anything in that, what is the position of Great Britain herself? Her position would be

poor indeed, insular or otherwise, situated as she is at much greater distance from most of the markets to which he referred. And the hon. gentleman said we had in Canada long tracts of land hard to colonize. Mr. Speaker, I say, that all we have learned in connection with the census returns to which the hon. gentleman so often refers, is not, that the lands in this country are in themselves hard to colonize, but there were other lands that had to be filled up to overflowing before we could hope for the beneficial results that we believe will yet attend the efforts we have made to colonize these lands. Other tracts have been filled up, and the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) will still be in opposition, I believe, when that argument in which he revels will be taken away from him absolutely by the results of an ever continuing stream of emigration to this country, an immigration which has already so happily begun to an enormous extent, from the states to the south of us, and they will come to this country despite its geographical position. Its geographical position, in my opinion, is one of the grandest things about this northern country. It gives us a climate that has enabled us to boast of a people with all the splendid attributes that appertain to men of the north. It has given us five millions of people, not only healthy, but with abundant courage and an ambition that startles chiefly the member for South Oxford, but commands the admiration of the civilized world. It is a country which filled our Australian fellow-Britishers, when they came here, with rapture and delight when they did come, at the results of the confederation of these long stretches. And instead of their being dismayed, or adopting the arguments of the member for South Oxford, they went back, every one of them, anxious to follow the example of Canada, and to bring about in their own country that combination of strength which has developed in this country since 1867 in so marked a degree. But the hon. gentleman tells us—and that dismal argument of his was but to lead to the statement—that the markets to the south of us are worth to Canada all the rest in the world combined. For what reason does he say that? Does he imply—indeed, we know he does imply—that the barriers of the tariff duties destroy a great deal of the benefit that would accrue to Canada were they removed. But his colleague in the Government, the member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), is an authority for stating that there are many things to be considered in connection with the value of that market. Without saying that the member for Bothwell is right in the position he took, but remembering that the member for South Oxford made a great deal of a statement of Mr. Colby's in regard to this very subject of reciprocity, I want to point out a statement made by his colleague when a Minister in the Mackenzie Administration,

which, if true, destroys at once the position now and for some time assumed by the member for South Oxford, which involves the commercial dependence of Canada upon the United States of America. The member for Bothwell, when Minister of the Interior, speaking in 1878, after a long argument, in which he analysed the official returns and the market prices, stated :

I might go over the prices of barley, rye, and other cereals with much the same result, thus establishing the incontrovertible fact that the duties imposed by the American Congress upon the produce of Canada do not fall upon the people of Canada, but are paid by the consumers of these articles in the United States.

I do not say I subscribe to that ; I do not say it, because the question who pays the duty is a large one. But, generally, I am of the opinion that you cannot lay down, as the member for Bothwell did, a hard and fast rule in regard to it. There are circumstances which bring about very different results. In the main, I believe that in this country our manufacturers and our farmers have taken such advantage of the protective tariff that the principal articles requisite to life are produced in Canada, so that on them the consumer does not pay the duty. I believe that to be the general rule ; of course, there are and always will be exceptions to it. But the member for Bothwell is not alone. The member for South Oxford, as I have often said, and as I will repeat as often as he indulges in his present fallacy, told the people of Canada, when he was Finance Minister, what he said in Halifax in August, 1878, as reported by the Liberal paper of that city :

The men who tell you that reciprocity with the United States is essential to your existence, are, in my opinion, playing a most unwise and dangerous part.

In the same speech, in another place, he said :

We are able to hold our own with the United States.

And later on :

For my part, I will deny that we are dependent upon them in one way or other.

And yet, he would now magnify the favours that we could obtain from the people of the United States, and we know those people are determined and set upon keeping us out of their markets if they can do it, upon keeping out the products of England if they can do it, and upon disheartening, if they can do it, every Canadian in this country. There is no comfort to Canada, or to the business men or farmers of Canada, in a doctrine of that kind, and I am glad to believe that it is a doctrine without foundation. When I read the letter in the London "Economist," to which so frequent reference is made, I not only believed it to be the vilest Canadian production I had ever observed, but I thought, as Shakespeare has said :

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.

I will be hanged if some eternal villain,
Some busy and insinuating rogue,
Some cogging, cozening slave, to get some office,
Have not devised this slander.

No language I could use, Mr. Speaker, could fittingly describe the disgraceful character of that production. There never was anything like it in Canada ; I believe there will never be anything like it again. The man who wrote it has been, I believe, well chastised and corrected by many men associated with him in political life in Canada. Full of misrepresentations, full of contradictions, the writer regularly ran amuck in London with Canadian interests and Canadian affairs. Some one has stated that the reason for it was to educate the English public as to what the Liberal policy was. Fancy a party out in the cold shades of opposition for some sixteen years having to rush in 1891 to the London prints to explain what their policy was, as opposed to a policy which for sixteen years had been bleeding the agricultural class white. I propose, Mr. Speaker, to nail some lies to the counter to-day. I pick them out of that production. I find, for instance, a statement that the agricultural class has been bled white. I will not give my own contradiction to that statement, but I will give the contradiction of the Prime Minister of Ontario, and the contradiction of the brother of the member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) the Rev. Dr. McMullen. This letter was written in the first or second month of 1892, and in the last month of 1891 Sir Oliver Mowat wrote as follows—and Sir Oliver Mowat spoke the truth :—

Our farmers as a class, or our mechanics as a class, or our labourers as a class, whatever the reasons may be, are not less comfortable, on the whole, than the farmers, mechanics and labourers of the United States appear to be, though these are harrassed by no McKinley tariff, and by no like obstruction to the dealing of the states with one another.

Printed along with this letter—because the document containing them both was sent to me by Sir Oliver Mowat—I find a letter of the Rev. W. T. McMullen, I believe a leading divine in the county of Oxford ; and in that letter he says :

Take an average gathering of the Ontario farmers and their families, as you see them at a county or other agricultural exhibition, and in no country in the world will you find their superiors as regards being well kept, well clad and other signs of well-to-do circumstances.

And such is the condition of the agricultural class in the province from which I come, though it is not one of the great agricultural districts of Canada. Take another statement :

The sum taken out of the pockets of the people for the benefit of protected manufacturers, in addition to that paid into the treasury, is certainly not less, and probably a good deal more, than sixty millions of dollars.

And another statement :

The Government gives the protected manufacturers the power of taxing the people for their own purposes.

And another statement :

The Government gives them a free hand to tax the rest of the community for their special benefit.

Still another statement :

Shall Canada be governed for the benefit of the people of Canada, or for the benefit of a few hundred protected manufacturers, backed by a subsidized press and a purchased majority in the legislature ?

Those statements with regard to the interest of the manufacturers in the National Policy and the favours shown to them, and with regard to their opportunities for bleeding the people of the country, are without foundation in fact. They are not believed by the gentlemen that sit upon the benches opposite me. One after another has risen to say, at different periods, that the National Policy has been a curse instead of a benefit to the people of Canada. One after another has risen to ask the people to believe that no single manufacturing interest in Canada was created or benefited by the National Policy. None of these statements is accurate : but the first of the lot to which I have referred are misleading, and nothing less. There is a happy medium. I have given one extreme. It is found in that letter. I shall quote now the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) in answer to the statement in that letter. Whether he had in mind these statements as to the extraordinary manner in which the manufacturers were revelling in wealth and handling millions out of the treasury or out of the taxpayers of this country or what else he had in mind, this is what he said at Collingwood in February, 1891 :

No man in his senses can seriously argue that the manufacturers are as well off as they were twelve years ago.

Yet, Mr. Speaker, sixty millions of dollars per year and a thousand millions of dollars in seventeen years were being wrung out of the people of this country for the benefit of the manufacturers of Canada according to the hon. member for South Oxford. Such a statement is not only without foundation, it is absolutely ridiculous on the face of it. The hon. leader of the Opposition, Mr. Laurier, too, will not agree with one of those statements, for in 1895, I find him saying at Markham, as reported by the Toronto "Globe" :

Not an industry in the country has benefited by the National Policy.

Those were the statements, however, that were put before the English public at a time which, I shall show, was a very peculiar time for a letter or production of that kind to come to the front. But I shall take the

hon. member for South Oxford himself (Sir Richard Cartwright) to contradict those statements. I find that in 1879 he expressed this opinion :

This tariff cannot stand. The manufacturers will find that they may get temporary but no real relief from it. For one or two years they may make a profit, but they will find it a mistake to encourage competition unduly at home, which will inevitably take the place of foreign competition.

That was his prophecy in 1879. In 1880 he said again that these manufacturers derived no benefit from the tariff. Speaking at Uxbridge in 1880, the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson) said :

The manufacturers had less protection than under the old tariff. He stood before them, as a manufacturer, to say that. The great trouble was not the slaughter of American goods. Take, for instance, the manufactures of boots and shoes. There were so many factories that they made more boots and shoes than the people could wear out, and, consequently, the home competition ruined prices all around.

Those statements cannot be true if the statements in the letter be true. That is enough for me at present. I find again at Newmarket in 1893, the leader of the Opposition saying :

We are told that the manufacturers of agricultural implements cannot live without the protective tariff. There are, I am glad to say, manufacturers of agricultural implements in this riding—the mayor of the town of Aurora is a manufacturer of agricultural implements. He does not want protection : he wants free trade. And it is so all along the line.

And the hon. gentleman went into the question of the industry of boots and shoes in Quebec in order to show that more money was made by the manufacturers in that industry before this tariff than under it. Then I find the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson), on the 16th February, 1893, telling us this :

Take the list of failures that occurred during the Mackenzie Administration among the manufacturers of this country, and take the record of failures among the manufacturing classes since the inception of the National Policy, and I venture to say, you will find more capital sunk, wasted and destroyed, under the National Policy, than there was during the whole of the time the Mackenzie Government was in power.

Now, the reason this extraordinary statement found its way to the English public was in order to support the unfair, the diabolical conclusions that the manufacturers supplied, at the call of the Government of this country, a huge fund for corrupting the electorate. And so the picture had to be drawn so as to show that huge fortunes were being made by the manufacturers at the cost of the people, and that by the aid of the manufacturers, by the unscrupulous means to which they resorted, by bribery and corruption of the most determined char-

acter, the Government of the day had managed to remain in power.

Then this letter goes on to say :

The best, and probably the only really available, method to overthrow the National Policy lies in introducing a system of perfect continental free or unrestricted reciprocity with the United States.

Now, the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) does not believe a word of that to-day. There is not a man on the benches in front of him who believes a word of that sentence : " The only possible policy by which we can overthrow the National Policy is by continental free trade." I challenge any gentleman in this House to support that statement or to say that it is accurate. No one in this House, including the hon. member for South Oxford, will say that that is a correct statement to-day, nor was it correct then, as time has shown. Another statement is in effect :

Free trade and a low rate of taxation impossible. Opportunities for this thrown away, and cannot be recovered.

And yet there are gentlemen opposite who talk of us as charlatans, as humbugs, as liars, as I have heard our party described in this debate, and do not hesitate to preach to the people that they advocate the policy of free trade, and, if given power, would bring it about. And yet, this statement is that the opportunities for free trade in Canada have been thrown away and cannot be recovered. The leader of the Opposition himself says that free trade can and will be recovered, and promises to bring it about if he is given the opportunity in the next general election.

Then as to discrimination. Who advocates discrimination against the mother country to-day ? That was the strong point, the essential feature of unrestricted reciprocity. Said the hon. member for South Oxford, speaking at Ingersoll on the 10th October, 1887 :

There is no doubt whatever that, before we can obtain such a measure of unrestricted reciprocity as the advocates of this system desire, it will be necessary for us to discriminate against the manufactories of other countries, against those, even, of Great Britain.

And later on in the same speech :

We can only get it by taxing the goods of every country on the face of the earth except those of the United States, which is, undoubtedly, part of our policy.

A little later on, after this policy had been dished—if I may so express it—the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies) was found saying, in a speech at St. John on the 29th August, 1893 :

He did not favour this discrimination against the home of our fathers. We owed all to the motherland—our free speech, our protection by her fleet, and our free press ; and yet we turn on her, like an undutiful son.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.

He was condemning this Government in these extravagant terms because there was even an element of discrimination against the mother country in the National Policy. But that gentleman did all he could for unrestricted reciprocity, which depended on discrimination direct against the mother country and in favour of a foreign country, until the bottom was knocked out of the whole scheme.

Now, what was the reason of that letter ? The late Finance Minister has explained in a Budget speech how sensitive the money market in England is. Lately we have been accustomed to hear from him that any one could get money easily in London nowadays—that money is so cheap that there is more there than can be invested, that money is lying there drawing no interest, and, therefore, it is no great thing that Canada is able to borrow on satisfactory terms, that all countries do so more or less, and so on. Now, the hon. member for South Oxford did not always hold that opinion, and no financial authorities of any repute or standing ever expressed it. In 1877 the hon. gentleman said :

Unhappily, the very fact that money is plentiful in London does not by any means ensure success to a colonial Minister of Finance in negotiating a loan there. Money is plenty in a great many places, simply because credit is scarce ; and it by no means follows that it is, therefore, easy to induce investors to put their money into comparatively unknown security.

He also goes on to remark, and I would call particular attention to this :

It is perfectly well known that Canada is not looked upon with a friendly eye by some persons having great influence with the London press.

And yet in this very speech which I am endeavouring to answer in part, he almost revelled and gloried in the many slanders that were published in the London press in regard to the conditions of politicians and politics and legislation in his native country. But in 1877 he warned us that there were high authorities in connection with the press not friendly to Canada. Now, I ask you, Mr. Speaker, to bear in mind the fact that in 1892 we were going to borrow money in the London market. The hon. gentleman's opponent, in the direction of financial affairs of this country was going, on behalf of this country, to borrow. It was to Canada's interest to get the money on the best terms possible. In that very year 1892, the hon. member for South Oxford anticipated the arrival in England of the Finance Minister by that letter, for the writing of which he is not ashamed even at the present day. He added to all that was hostile to Canada this letter in which there were statements because of which, if they were believed, no man would lend Canada a single dollar. And yet this is what he told us in 1877 :

More than once, during the progress of the negotiations of previous loans, hostile articles had appeared in the London journals of widely-extended circulation, and I had good reason to think that, if there was much delay, we might be exposed to the same adverse criticism, to the very serious detriment of the operation.

The hon. gentleman knew the possible effect of these adverse criticisms; and yet, in 1892, when we were seeking to borrow money, he managed to get that letter into as leading a paper as the London "Economist." Fortunately the London "Economist" laughed at it, and by the criticism and exposition of the relief he was proposing to give to Canada destroyed the effect of the letter and made the writer of it an object of ridicule. The result was that the loan proved one of the best we have ever made, and, up to that date, the very best loan that Canada had ever put upon the market. Indeed, the letter did good after all, for it brought out the weak position of the opponents of the Canadian Government and showed the character of some of the men who were being kept in opposition. And in 1894 the success of Canada in the London market was phenomenal and the terms of the loan of that year were the best ever obtained. The "Financial News," which is not, I believe, a paper of very high standing, was the only journal, so far as I know, that took that concoction seriously. It stated in effect—and I have the paper under my hand—that if the letter were true the sooner Canadian securities were got rid of the better for the holders, that the bottom had fallen out of Canada and that any man who invested in Canada was exposing his money not only to certain risks but to certain loss. Fortunately no one credited that; and the hon. member for South Oxford himself has to repudiate many of these statements, some of which I have referred to in this debate. And I am glad of it.

Now, the hon. gentleman referred to preferential trade. He thinks that preferential trade necessitates the adoption of a protective tariff in England. And so, while he chides me for reading from what he calls a scrap-book, he produced a very formidable looking compilation from which he read speech after speech from English statesmen, not on the subject of preferential trade, but against protection, and to the effect that protection in England was impossible—just as free trade in Canada is impossible, in my opinion. Now let me show the hon. gentleman that if he had read the lecture to which he so sneeringly referred he would not have done such poor justice to himself. On pages 16 and 17 of the document to which he referred—an address delivered recently before the board of trade by the Secretary of State (Sir Charles Tupper, Bart.)—reference is made to English statesmen, not as to what they said about protection per se in England, but as to what they said more directly referring to this important question of preferential trade. We have the secretary of

Lord Salisbury, for instance, writing on 5th April, 1887, in reply to some inquiry. He said:

I am to reply that Lord Salisbury does not imagine that differential duties in favour of our colonies, whatever may be said for or against them, can properly be described under the term "protection."

So much for the speeches against protection and its possibility, upon which the hon. member for South Oxford relied as meeting, at the very beginning, the arguments that might otherwise weigh in favour of preferential trade. But on page 17, I find another reference of Lord Salisbury. Speaking, I think, to a delegation, he said:

You have to state the details of your policy, and spare no pains in the effort of impressing it upon your fellow-men. But it is essential that you should explain it. You must submit to your countrymen precisely what it is you want them to do, so that they may examine what will be the results upon their commerce and their own life, so that an estimate of their exact value may be formed, and they may give effect to their opinions in consequence. I am sure that those who are thoroughly convinced of the truth of their doctrines, will feel this ordeal to be one from which they will not shrink, but will heartily welcome, and devote all their energies to it. I would ask you, first, to give your propositions sharpness and definiteness, so that these matters may be threshed out and argued before the country. I know the ordinary view of the duty of the Government is to devise for itself the measures it may bring forward, and then let them take their chance, whatever that may be. And, no doubt, it is in a great measure true with respect to the large mass of legislation on secondary questions that they have to propose; but it is not true with respect to "an organic question which concerns, and will control, the very existence of our Empire and the very foundation of our trade." On this matter public opinion must be framed or formed before any government can act. No government can impose its own opinions on the people of this country in these matters. You are invited, and it is the duty of those who feel themselves to be the pioneers of such a movement and the apostles of such a doctrine, to go forth and fight for it, and, when they have convinced the people of this country, their battle will be won.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the "Saturday Review" also had a very important reference to the same subject, of the most hopeful character, evolved out of the distressing events that have occurred in the history of the United States and of England at a recent period. But suppose the thing is not possible, they have been told by Lord Salisbury to think the thing out, to discuss it, and no man can deny that if it were possible, it promises much for the country's benefit. Why scout, why abuse, any man, and abuse him personally, because he advocates this? After all said and done, it is certainly as possible, in my judgment, as was unrestricted reciprocity. Nothing is possible to those who have no courage, or who have no faith. But the subject is well worth a great deal more consideration than the member for South

Oxford was willing to give it. Now, Mr. Speaker, the question of population and of the census is the *pièce de résistance*, so to speak, of the member for South Oxford. He has made a hobby of that subject, and he never wearies of it. It is the same old story, the same old argument, and his position, in short, is something like this: that the census, as regards population, is singularly accurate, that a comparison between 1881 and 1891 can mislead no one; that this part of the census work was done to perfection, but that part of it regarding the growth of manufacturing industry and the development of the wealth of Canada, is a perfect farce, that it is ridiculous to the last degree, and cannot be relied upon by any one in Canada or out of Canada. That is his position in short; that is the position out of which he is extracting a great deal of comfort. Well, now, let us see if every one agrees that Canada has no grounds for hope, because Canada's hopes in regard to population were not thoroughly and fully realized in that decade. I find that the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton)—who I regret to see is not in his place on account of illness—in 1876 put forth this view on this interesting subject. I do not know whether the member for South Oxford ever sympathized with it, but certainly he has entirely ignored it in his arguments, so far as they have been founded on the matter of the census. Said Mr. Charlton:

Although we had in the North-west, as he was proud to state, an extensive and fertile region, for certain reasons, he believed its settlement must necessarily proceed slowly. He did not believe that a great exodus of the inhabitants of Europe would pass to these plains, as had been the case with the prairie states of the American Union. Quite a large proportion of European immigrants would avoid it; the Germans would naturally go further south; the residents of the British Isles, to a great extent, would follow this example. Though the Scandinavians would likely go there, still it would fill up slowly, and, until a great influx came into that region, it was folly to make provisions for their wants.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there were those in this country who thought that we should wait until, in some mysterious manner, a population was injected into those territories before we proceeded to their development. The Conservative party, however, believed that the development of the territories ought to precede settlement. An enormous amount of money, no doubt, has been expended in order to force into those countries a large and valuable population, and to some extent there has been failure. But the results that have attended the efforts of the pioneers have been indeed remarkable, and are most reassuring. I believe, Mr. Speaker—I have said it already, and I propose to give some interesting evidence in support of my belief—that we have seen the worst of disappointment of that kind, and that the money we have expended there has not, after all, been lost. Canada itself has gained from the

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.

money that has been expended in attempting to bring population into her territories, because her resources have been made known all the world over, without loss to Canada, but attended by ever-increasing credit. All these active and energetic efforts have made Canada one of the best known and most favourably known countries in the world. What do we now see? We observe that it was inevitable that the vacant and valuable lands in the western territories of the United States would have to be filled to overflowing before an immigration from those territories could be brought about; but we have the gratifying knowledge to-day that that army, so to speak, forming hitherto the trend of immigration to the Western States, has already begun to march into the North-west Territories of Canada, and those immigrants have given every evidence of their entire satisfaction with the condition of things to be found in this Canada of ours. Now, we have had no assistance, no comfort, from the member for South Oxford, indeed, comfort or assistance offered from a quarter like that would have been suspicious; but we have had from a foreigner, from an intelligent gentleman living in the United States, an inquiry and an investigation into this subject, the result of which is worth all the speeches of the hon. member for South Oxford put together. I propose to call the attention of the House to a most thorough and exhaustive article on that interesting topic, the immigration and settlement of the west. Mr. S. A. Thompson, writing in the "New England Magazine" for October, gives an account of his individual inquiries on the movement of population. It was a curious movement of population from the New England states. There was a movement, for instance, between New England and my native province, because, strange to say, long before the rebellion of the old colonies the movement of population was entirely from New England to Nova Scotia, and the tide seemed to be increasing in volume all the time. And if I am not wrong, the turn of the tide had even begun before the war, but certainly it kept up under the reciprocity treaty, so the wonder is that there is any population in Nova Scotia at all. Thousands and thousands proceeded for a century almost from Nova Scotia to New England states, and from New England thousands and thousands went to the western territories. Mr. Thompson, in a most complete manner, follows out that interesting development and tries to give reasons and assign causes for the currents of human beings, till he comes into Canada. Why does he come into Canada? He finds in state after state out west a movement has already begun, a movement of the most extraordinary character from the western states into Canadian territory. Why? Because the good lands, all the lands, speaking generally, out-

side of arid lands, are fully occupied, settled and owned so far as the United States controls them, and the people are perforce compelled to go north. He points out that the only thing the United States can do to hold the people within their own land is to go extensively into a system of irrigation. But of Canada, the writer tells us, having no regard for the dismal views held by the hon. member for South Oxford :

For Canada the hour of destiny has struck. She has the physical basis for an empire; and the stream of immigration which has now begun will swell into a mighty movement of population like that by which our central west was occupied, until her fertile lands shall be the home of millions of prosperous people.

That is the creed of the Conservative party, and Conservatives will not lose hope, nor will they be discouraged by the Reform finger pointing always to what has gone by and to what is past. We look to the future, we have confidence in the future. We look to the future with confidence because we know the lands which we possess, we know the advantages we enjoy, we know that if you look over this continent and from this continent to continents on the other side of the world, or look where you will, you will fail to find land equal to our land, you cannot find a country, take it all in all, where comfort is so generally enjoyed, and where the people are so generally prosperous.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Mr. Speaker, I have listened with very much pleasure to the remarks made by the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat. He was pleased, in his opening remarks, to allude to the speech delivered in three parts by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), and while we have not been favoured with hearing a speech in three parts from the hon. gentleman we have had an address in two parts. I do not know that I will attempt to follow him in all the statements he has made. The hon. gentleman will himself admit, as he said last night, he was very anxious to refer to authorities, that he has referred to authorities very fully, so fully that it would be impossible to review or criticise anything he might have said in that respect until his speech is in print. I was not quite sure myself whether the authorities on all the subjects were the very best that could have been selected, or not. To-day, the hon. gentleman has left the authorities, and has fallen back largely on his own ideas, and I am glad to say that he possesses the same hopeful mind with respect to the country now that he did many years ago. I am a Canadian, as is the hon. gentleman, and anything said that tends to exalt the country, that tends to picture in a bright light what it is, if true, is something that is always very pleasing to me. But I never forget the fact that to indulge in prophecies which have not been fulfilled, and to draw rosy pictures without being warranted in a

good measure and degree in doing so, is really not tending to advance the interests of the country. If the hon. gentleman, in making forecasts of the progress and prosperity of the country in years gone by, had given himself a status shown that he is worthy of consideration in that respect, we would have been more delighted to-day in listening to his predictions as to what the future of Canada is to be. True it is that he told us in his concluding remarks that we may look for immigration into Canada, because, forsooth, if I understood him rightly, there is no other country where immigrants can well go. I do not think that was very complimentary to this country. True, the hon. gentleman said that there was no fairer land, no better climate, no place where men and women can do better than in Canada. That is my belief, and I re-echo that statement. But I ask if there is no better country under heaven, if there is no country with a richer soil, a more healthy climate, and where people can establish more happy homes, how is it that the men and women have elected to go elsewhere and not settle here, until, as the hon. gentleman alleges, all the other countries have been filled up? There must be some reason. The hon. gentleman said that the reason does not lie in the land or in the climate, or in the absence of home comforts. Might I ask the hon. gentleman the cause which has prevented this country being filled up earlier?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I am very glad to give the hon. gentleman one cause. The means of entering our lands were only afforded a few years ago, after hon. gentlemen opposite had gone out of power. The other countries had been open for years.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The hon. gentleman has given me an answer in part, but still that will hardly explain the whole trouble, I think. I do not know whether the Canadian Pacific Railway was fully built in 1883. Let us see, however, what happened in 1883 before the country was opened up fully. This was what the hon. gentleman said during the debate on the Speech from the Throne at the opening of that session :

A little over forty years ago the people of Great Britain were startled by the fact that in the year 1841 no less than 106,000 subjects had left the British Isles, not only for the colonies, but for the United States of America. This announcement caused at that time great comment in England. It was considered that never, from the time the Goths and Huns had overrun the Roman empire, had such an emigration taken place from any country. To-day, Mr. Speaker, we are in the happy position of knowing that instead of 106,000 men leaving our shore for any such bellicose purpose, over 113,000 men, women and children have come into this Dominion in one year to swell its population and to aid in the march of progress.

That was before the avenues to the North-

west had been opened up. What might be expected when 113,000 people came into the country when the avenues were not fully opened up—what might be expected after the avenues were fully opened? That is the question. The hon. gentleman does not answer me. I expected he would do so.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Would you like me to make another speech?

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The hon. gentleman would not offend me no matter how many speeches he was pleased to make. He can use so many words in elaborating an idea that it is a pleasure to listen to him. The hon. gentleman in the speech to which I have referred, explained how we were blessed with this great immigration.

The manner in which the Department of Agriculture has been administered must command the admiration of our people. All the immense resources that this country can boast of would be valueless without the men and without the money to make them marketable; and, therefore, in viewing the extraordinary immigration which has been brought about, we are not alone to thank Providence and the National Policy, but we must extend a meed of that praise to the successful administrator of the Department of Agriculture, which is charged with the regulation and control of immigration affairs.

We were to be thankful for three things: Providence, the National Policy, and the Minister of Agriculture. Well, Providence was kind to us then, and I trust Providence is as kind to us to-day. What is to blame, then? What has become of the National Policy and the Minister of Agriculture? It surely must be their fault if the immigration has declined. The hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) says that was something that startled Great Britain, and not since the time when the Huns and the Goths overran the Roman empire had there been any such thing known, as 106,000 people leaving the shores of their own country in one year. The hon. gentleman will not deny that 2 per cent per annum is a very small estimate of the natural increase of a country like Canada, and that would make over 800,000. The Government told us by the figures they gave Parliament from year to year (figures prepared by this Minister of Agriculture who deserves a meed of praise) that 886,000 immigrants were brought into Canada during the decade between the census of 1881 and 1891. What would that make, then? It would make over 1,600,000 souls that should have been in Canada in 1891 more than in 1881. The Conservative Government counted the people in 1881; the Conservative Government counted the people in 1891, and, if I remember right, something like 502,000 was the total increase of the Dominion during these ten years. Am I right in that?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Quite right.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Then if the hon. gentleman takes 500,000 from 1,600,000

Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

he will see that in the ten years we had 1,100,000 less people than we ought to have. So that in ten years, 106,000 if it had gone on, would not have amounted to as much as the loss to Canada of the population that has gone from her shores. These are figures from the report of the Minister of Agriculture; that Minister which the hon. gentleman himself has referred to as worthy of a meed of praise. While we would like to rejoice with the hon. gentleman in the prospect that there is better hope for us in the future, than the results that have been obtained in the past, I cannot refrain from pointing out to the hon. gentleman that the hopes held out to us in the past have been very disappointing, indeed. I am, however, glad to endorse him fully when he said that if there be a fault that our population has not increased more rapidly, it is not in the country, it is not in the climate, it is not in the natural causes that prevail in Canada. I believe, taking one country with another, there is not a better country than ours on the face of the globe. And therefore if we have not made the progress we should have made, it does seem to me that there must be some other reason for it. I cannot disassociate from my mind the thought, that if there had been a Government such as this country should have had, there would have been a better showing made in the last census in the matter of population than this Government were able to show.

The hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) touched upon the question of expenditure, and he told us boldly that Canada could not be governed for \$1 less. I would be very sorry to think that the country never should cost more to govern than it does at the present time, re-echoing the sentiment expressed by the hon. gentleman, but coupled with the condition that this extra expenditure was made imperative because of a great increase in population. All will agree with me that in a country adding vastly to its population year after year, the public service must require the expenditure of more money. But, Sir, if the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) means that under present conditions and with the present population of the country, it would have been impossible for this Government to govern the country at a less expenditure than now prevails, then I take wholly and entirely a different view. I unhesitatingly say that I believe, and, notwithstanding that this Government have increased the fixed charges to such an extent, I affirm my unhesitating belief that if a Government were installed in power, if a Liberal Administration were installed in power, with right views and methods regulating their procedure, you would find that the country would be governed for a sum of money very much less than those gentlemen opposite have been expending.

I shall now allude to another point that the hon. gentleman spoke of, and which

was dwelt upon also by the Finance Minister. They maintained that the rate of taxation has increased very slightly, indeed so slightly that it is not worth mentioning. The Minister of Finance himself—and this year for the first time, I believe—ventured to apply a test which, I think, is a good test, that is, the per capita customs tax. It is true the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), speaking of it, and looking at it in one light, refused to accept it as very good authority, because of the fact, as he alleged, that in measuring the taxation you cannot measure it by the amount that actually went into the treasury, as there was a vast amount of taxation taken out of the pockets of the people—estimated by him at \$30,000,000 per year—which did not go into the treasury at all. The hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) makes light of that argument, and, in fact, does not believe it. For my own part, I do not intend to go into figures on that. I will let the statement of the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) and the reasons he has adduced for arriving at his conclusions speak for themselves. I am free to admit that so far as my personal opinion is concerned, I have not been able to see that the rate of duty that was exacted on a certain article, is at all times an extra price exacted for that article by the producer of it in the country. I have never taken that position. But it is manifestly absurd, if I might use that expression, for any gentleman of intelligence to claim that when you have a heavy duty levied upon an article that duty has not the effect of raising the price of that same article when it is manufactured in the country. It is intended for that purpose, and if other circumstances arise (as arise they do, at times) they modify it. But the fact, nevertheless, remains—I will not attempt to fix a figure—that a very large amount of taxation other than goes to the public treasury must be levied from the people by the existence of a high rate of duty. I wish to confine myself to one phase of the subject on which there cannot be argument or dispute at all. I want to get down to the argument on the extra cost of taxation on the people of this country, as revealed by the Trade and Navigation Returns, and as attested by the amount that went into the treasury, leaving the other matter out of consideration altogether. The Minister of Finance told us that from 1873-74 to 1877-78, including both years, the average customs taxation per head was \$3.44, while he says, in 1894-95 it was \$3.52 per head, only 8 cents per head greater than the period from 1874 to 1878. Well, Sir, what was the reason that the Finance Minister ventured in his Budget speech this year—I think for the very first time—to take the customs taxation per head as a test? Was it because this year it was found to be \$3.52 per head, as he states it was, while in the year before it was \$3.86, the year before that

\$4.26, the year before that \$4.20, the year before that \$4.84, the year before that \$5.01, the year before that \$5.02, the year before that \$4.74, and so on? Is that the reason he ventured for the first time, so far as I remember, to adopt this test of the amount of the customs duties per head—because he found that this year it was reduced to \$3.52? Possibly that is the explanation. But I want to point out that the hon. gentleman had during the year 1895 a deficit of over \$4,000,000; and if the people had bought the goods which would have given him the revenue that he absolutely required to make both ends meet, then, Sir, instead of paying \$3.52 per head, they would have had to pay 80 cents per head more; so that instead of the taxation last year being only 8 cents per head more than the average during the period of the Mackenzie Administration, it would have been 88 cents per head more.

But, Sir, let us see what has been the result of this extra taxation. In the five years from 1874 to 1879 the average customs taxation per head, under the Mackenzie Administration, amounted to \$3.31½, while in the sixteen years from 1879 to 1895 the average customs taxation per head was \$4.44. In other words, the excess of customs duties paid in the last sixteen years over the previous five years under the Mackenzie Administration amounted to \$1.12½ per head. Now, suppose you take the population at 4,000,000 during the Mackenzie period and during the period that hon. gentlemen opposite have been in power, although the estimated population under which they arrive at the figure they have given us is set down in the Trade and Navigation Returns as being this year over \$5,000,000. But I say, in order to be within the mark and to leave no margin for dispute whatever—for the figures are sufficiently large and startling to do that—taking the population at 4,000,000 only, \$1.12½ per head of extra taxation means that \$4,500,000 of extra taxation has been taken out of the pockets of the people of this country each year that this Government has been in power above what was required to carry on the affairs of the country, more than was taken by the Mackenzie Administration. This means that in the sixteen years during which they have been in power they have taken no less than \$72,000,000 out of the pockets of the people in the shape of increased taxation, without taking into account any taxation which the people have paid that does not go into the public treasury. That is on the basis of a population of 4,000,000. An hon. member points out that some have estimated the amount to be higher. I am aware that I am taking less than the real population; but I did not want to go into a close calculation, and I always think that in making an argument of this kind, the best plan to pursue is to make it so much within the mark that it cannot be at all assailed. I have not the least doubt, however, that the actual amount is very much greater than I have stated.

The hon. gentleman may say, was there not a deficit in the time of the Mackenzie Government? There have been deficits under the Mackenzie Government, and there have been surpluses under the Mackenzie Government. There have been deficits under the hon. gentleman, and there have been surpluses. But whether deficits or surpluses, these things find their way into the public debt; and during the years that hon. gentlemen opposite have taken this extra taxation from the people, the net debt of this country has increased over \$110,000,000 at the same time.

Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman spoke with reference to the sugar and the coal duties. In speaking of the reduction of taxation, the hon. Finance Minister claimed that he had taken off \$19,000,000 of sugar duties. Well, I do not blame him for making that claim, for a gentleman of his ability would not take the position he did unless he was hard driven to make an argument—I give him credit for that intelligence and keenness in debate. But the hon. gentleman knows that if he took off \$19,000,000 odd from the taxes on sugar, it inevitably follows that he must have put that amount of taxes on at some previous periods. He could not have taken it off unless he had put it on; and it is that one article that strengthens mightily the position taken by the hon. member for South Oxford, that the burden of taxation levied on the people was not to be measured alone by the amount that goes into the treasury, but also by that amount, which cannot be estimated exactly, but which is put by the hon. member for South Oxford and other gentlemen at many millions of dollars. It is one of the items that give great strength to their position. Let us look at it for a moment. I find by the Trade and Navigation Returns that of raw sugar there was imported up to the 3rd of May, 1895, over 309,000,000 pounds at a cost of \$6,700,000 on which there was no duty whatever. But the hon. gentleman knows as well as I know that that raw sugar did not go into consumption, no appreciable part of it, until it was passed through the refineries and was refined and put upon the market as refined sugar. And he knows that the refined sugar that would go into competition with that refined sugar was taxed 64 cents per 100 pounds, while the raw sugar was free of duty. Therefore, I would be warranted in saying that the sugar refiners did not hesitate to avail themselves of a good portion of that duty, as the hon. gentleman can find for himself by referring to the quotations of refined sugar in Canada and the quotations in England at the same time. There was a case in which the public treasury received no revenue at all, while the tariff inflicted a taxation on the people of the country represented by the difference in the prices prevailing for refined sugar in these two markets. But, Sir, we find that of the raw sugar imported last year the entries were

Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

made largely before the changes in the tariff were announced. While 309,000,000 pounds came in prior to the 3rd of May, between that date and the end of the fiscal year only 36,000,000 pounds came in; so that we did not benefit much from the imposition of the duty on raw sugar. Again, we have to look into the matter in this light. Take for granted that the Finance Minister reduced the taxation on the long list of articles which he read to prove that he had done so. Suppose we take him on his own ground, where he reduced the taxation three, five or ten per cent. I say that in claiming these reductions, he admits that during those years when the greater taxation existed, he was leaving a certain amount of taxation upon the people that was not necessary for the administration of the affairs of this country. He cannot deny that proposition. If he was able to reduce it, it must have been a burden which he had put upon the people before, and a burden which was entirely unnecessary. When he reduced the duty on refined sugar to 64 cents per 100 pounds, by that very declaration he said: I have left the refiners enough protection, for I still cling to the policy of protection. I have left them sufficient protection, he said; 64 cents per hundred pounds is sufficient protection for the refiner. Yet, Mr. Speaker, 64 cents was nothing compared to the protection he gave them previously, from year to year, of 80 cents per hundred pounds. Why did he take that 16 cents per hundred pounds out of the people for years, if 64 cents per hundred pounds was adequate protection?

Mr. FOSTER. There was a change in the numbers. You must take that into consideration.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). There was a change in the numbers. The standard was raised from 14 Dutch standard to 16 Dutch standard.

Mr. FOSTER. That would make a difference.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The hon. gentleman must see that there was not a very great difference in that, because the imports of sugar above 16 Dutch standard, to the 3rd May, 1895, at a duty of 64 cents per hundred pounds amounted to \$259,000, on which the duty was \$52,000. My recollection is that there was an amount of something like \$10,000 which went into the treasury the year before, so that the change did not affect the question very materially.

Then we come to another question with which the hon. gentleman dealt—the question of trade with Great Britain. He claimed, as has been claimed by the hon. gentleman who just sat down (Sir Charles Herbert Tupper), that our tariff does not discriminate against Great Britain. Well, we take the opposite ground, and we contend

that we are justified in taking that ground by the Trade and Navigation Returns. We claim that while the nominal duty is the same on articles coming from any country, in the practical working out of the tariff, the articles which are more largely produced in, and come out of, Great Britain do bear a higher rate of taxation than goods coming from the United States.

Mr. FOSTER. Similar goods.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I am talking of the general arrangement of the tariff, and its general effect. It was to emphasize that fact; it was not only to give relief to the people of Canada, which was the main object, but also to do that which we consider right, that Mr. Davies, the hon. member for Queen's, moved, in 1892, the following amendment to the resolution proposed by the hon. member for North Bruce. That hon. gentleman (Mr. McNeill), by his resolution, proposed to the British Government that when they gave us more favourable terms of entrance for our goods into their markets, we would be prepared to give them a substantial reduction in our duties. The hon. member for Queen's moved an amendment to this resolution, as follows:—

That inasmuch as Great Britain admits the products of Canada into her ports free of duty, this House is of opinion that the present scale of duties exacted on goods mainly imported from Great Britain should be reduced.

And hon. gentlemen opposite united in voting down that resolution.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the hon. gentleman tell the House what was the attitude of the Liberal party and the leader of the Liberal party on that amendment.

Mr. MULOCK. In favour of that. We voted for it.

Mr. FOSTER. Your own leader spoke against it.

Mr. LAURIER. I voted for it.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I think my hon. friend will have to look that over again. He has forgotten himself, I am afraid, and looking forward to the future a few months, has supposed the leader of the Opposition to be on that side, and confounded him with the leader of the Government. What are the facts with reference to the working out of the tariff? The hon. gentleman attempted to deny that the practical operation of the tariff is to discriminate against Great Britain. Well, if we take the Trade and Navigation Returns, we shall not have any difficulty in finding out how the tariff works. I find that the imports of dutiable goods into the Dominion from Great Britain amounted to \$23,311,911, the duty collected on which was \$7,006,676, or an average duty of about 30 per cent on the dutiable goods brought in from Great Britain. Then we imported from the United States, dutiable goods to the amount of \$25,795,598,

the duty on which amounted to \$6,897,395, or an average duty of 26¾ per cent. So that, even taking the dutiable goods alone, there was 3¾ per cent more of an average duty levied on English goods as compared with those coming from the United States.

Mr. FOSTER. That is true.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). That is true. The hon. Minister will admit that all I say is true. We come now to look at it, and I think we are justified in looking at it in a broader sense than just the dutiable goods coming from the United States and Great Britain, for dutiable goods and free goods must be taken into consideration. And while the argument might be stronger, when applied to dutiable goods, yet we cannot fully understand the position unless we take into consideration the average rate of duty on the imports from these two countries, both of dutiable and of free goods.

Now, the total imports from Great Britain amounted to \$31,131,737, on which the duty was levied of \$7,006,676, or an average of about 22½ per cent. From the United States the total importations were \$54,634,521, the duty collected on which was \$6,897,395, or an average duty of 12.6-10 per cent. So that, within a fraction, there is 10 per cent more duty exacted on goods imported from Great Britain than on goods imported from the United States. The hon. gentleman, therefore, will have to admit that, much as he may dislike the result, the figures of the Trade and Navigation Reports bear out the conclusion to which I have arrived.

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose my hon. friend has not a similar comparison for 1878.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). No, I have not.

Mr. FOSTER. It would be instructive just to follow it out some time when you have leisure.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). What is the point? Is it that it would show the same relative difference of 10 per cent?

Mr. FOSTER. Probably more.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Some gentleman following me no doubt will be able to take up the point that is suggested by the Finance Minister. I did not think it necessary to do so for my argument and the purposes of comparison. I was simply proving the one point, that the present and past operation of the tariff is in that direction, and if it be not a position which we should take, it would be well to change it.

Now, the hon. gentleman wants to know what the platform of the Liberal party is, and he attempted to lay it down. I am rather amused at the hon. gentleman and his colleagues taking the position they do, in treating the subject of the trade policy of the Liberal party. First of all, we are told we have no policy. I think I read that the hon. Secretary of

State, on his way up, either at Halifax or elsewhere, declared that the Liberal party was without a policy. That hon. gentleman has not caught up to some of the members of the House, who have declared that the Liberal party have a policy, and have attempted to state what it is. The hon. member for Pictou has endeavoured to state that policy. If I followed him correctly, he said that the policy of the Liberal party was a policy of free trade and direct taxation. I do not wish to misquote him. I think that was the hon. gentleman's argument.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Yes.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Without being offensive or desiring to be offensive I would like to ask hon. gentlemen opposite, when they attempt to contrast the trade policy of the two parties, to be kind enough to declare their own trade policy, and to leave the Liberal party to declare theirs. I ask them by what right they speak upon this matter? Who constituted them the tribunal to determine what the Liberal trade policy is and announce it to the country? I would ask the hon. member for Pictou what right he has to declare the policy of the Liberal party? Has he been admitted to its council, is he a recognized representative of that body? How is he in a position to know what the policy of the Liberal party is, except as he is told by those who are in a position to speak? If this point is to be questioned, let us have something authoritative. Does the hon. gentleman ask me my authority for stating what the platform of the Liberal party is? I may tell him that as a member of that party for at least thirty years, as a trusted representative of that party in Parliament for twenty-four years, I think I am in a better position to say what the Liberal trade policy is than any gentleman who has no connection with the party, who has not been admitted to their councils, and has not been consulted in the matter. But it is not because I have been connected with the party for years that I feel myself warranted in stating in authoritative terms what the Liberal trade policy is. Nor is it because I had the honour to be the seconder of the resolution that declared in emphatic terms what the Liberal policy was. Nor is it for the still stronger reason that the leader of the party moved that resolution. But my authority to state the Liberal trade policy is based on this, that that policy was enunciated at a great representative convention of that party, gathered from the Atlantic to the Pacific, from every province. The resolution embodied in that policy was moved by the leader of the Opposition, and I myself had the honour of seconding it. And I have the authority given to state that policy, not because I seconded the resolution, or even because the leader of the party moved it, but because of the unanimous ratification of that resolution by that assembled conven-

Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

tion. And yet, Sir, we find gentlemen rising in this House and telling us that we have no policy. We find gentlemen rising in this House and declaring something entirely different to be the policy of the Liberal party. Sir, let me read to them that resolution, so that they may understand it. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) has put it upon record. But I intend to read it also. I think that, so long as such dense ignorance prevails on the part of gentlemen opposite it should be read by Liberal representatives in this House. I read it here not because the country needs it, but the gentlemen opposite need it, and it should be given to them. This is the trade policy of the Liberal party, as adopted at that convention:

That the customs tariff of the Dominion should be based, not as it is now, upon the protective principle, but upon the requirements of the public service;

That the existing tariff, founded upon an unsound principle, and used, as it has been by the Government, as a corrupting agency, wherewith to keep themselves in office, has developed monopolies, trusts and combinations;

It has decreased the value of farm and other landed property;

It has oppressed the masses to the enrichment of a few;

It has checked immigration;

It has caused great loss of population;

It has impeded commerce;

It has discriminated against Great Britain;

In these and in many other ways it has occasioned great public and private injury, all of which evils must continue to grow in intensity as long as the present tariff system remains in force.

That the highest interests of Canada demand a removal of this obstacle to our country's progress, by the adoption of a sound fiscal policy, which, while not doing injustice to any class, will promote domestic and foreign trade, and hasten the return of prosperity to our people;

That to that end, the tariff should be reduced to the needs of honest, economical and efficient government;

That it should be so adjusted as to make free, or to bear as lightly as possible upon, the necessities of life, and should be so arranged as to promote freer trade with the whole world, more particularly with Great Britain and the United States.

We believe that the results of the protective system have grievously disappointed thousands of persons who honestly supported it, and that the country, in the light of experience, is now prepared to declare for a sound fiscal policy.

The issue between the two political parties on this question is now clearly defined.

The Government themselves admit the failure of their fiscal policy, and now profess their willingness to make some changes; but they say that such changes must be based on the principle of protection.

We denounce the principle of protection as radically unsound, and unjust to the masses of the people, and we declare our conviction that any tariff changes based on that principle must fail to afford any substantial relief from the burdens under which the country labours.

This issue we unhesitatingly accept, and upon it we await with the fullest confidence the verdict of the electors of Canada.

There is the trade plank of the Liberal platform. It is amusing to hear a gentleman of the intelligence of the hon. member for Pictou rising in this House and saying that he is not able to understand what that resolution means. Why, Sir, to make that declaration is to rank himself as having less comprehension than is bestowed upon the great majority of the people of Canada. There was no trouble about understanding it in that vast convention that adopted it, as was evidenced by the acclaim with which it was greeted. And yet gentlemen opposite take out of this, that the policy of the Liberal party is to raise the revenue of the country by direct taxation and wipe out the customs tariff altogether. Why, Sir, if he had but read it for himself, he would have seen how foolish such a statement was. He heard the hon. member for South Oxford declare, in accordance with that platform, that there must be maintained a very large customs duty; but he also heard that hon. gentleman declare, in accordance with this resolution, that the underlying principle of that tariff must not be the principle of protection, but the principle of raising a revenue for the public requirements of this country. In order to understand the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite, I cannot refer to declarations endorsed by the Conservative party, for they have not dared to summon the members of their party, as our leader did, for conference. They dare not. I am forced, therefore, to take the utterances of the Finance Minister in order to understand what their platform is. If I might trouble the House, first, to show that my own views in reference to the resolution I have just read were the same when it was adopted as they are now, I would like to read from the remarks I made in seconding that resolution:

And to-day you have laid down in clear and emphatic language, what? Not a new principle. You have laid down and emphasized again the principle held by the Liberal party held in this matter of trade and commerce, that in the levying of the taxes of the country, regard should be had only to the necessities of the revenue, and that the Government should not seek by tariff legislation to favour any particular class in the community. I say this is no new principle. A revenue tariff was in force when our late leader Alexander Mackenzie, who has gone to his long rest, held the reins of power and he and his Government fell because he would not yield to the cry for a protective tariff. From that day to this the Liberal party have not ceased to proclaim that they believed that it was not right or just that protection, as a principle, should be recognized by the Government of the country, and that they believed that the duty of the Government was to raise the necessary revenue to discharge the duties devolving upon the Government, and to leave the people free to work out their own destiny, giving no undue advantage to any one portion of the community over another.

That, Sir, was understood, and a revenue tariff has always been known to have

been in force during the time the Mackenzie Government were in power. That revenue tariff has been spoken of time and again by hon. gentlemen opposite as a free trade tariff, they themselves giving it that name.

Mr. SPROULE. Why did it not raise a revenue, if it was a revenue tariff?

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). It did raise it.

Mr. SPROULE. No, there was a deficit every year.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The hon. gentleman is mistaken, there was not a deficit every year.

Mr. SPROULE. There was in 1876, 1877 and 1878.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). If the hon. gentleman had listened to the hon. member for South Oxford, or if he will take the trouble to read his speech, he will see exactly what the condition was, and what the facts were. Well, Sir, as I said before, we have to look to the utterances of the leaders of the Government in order to find out what their policy is. Hon. gentlemen have not ventured to call a convention of their party, consequently we are not in a position to quote the planks they may have adopted. We have ours. I am forced, because they have not formally assembled in convention, to take the views of the Finance Minister, who, I suppose, as leader of the House, we may take as enunciating the views of that party. I say they have not ventured to call a convention, and I think I am safe in saying that. I will just read from an editorial in the Toronto "World" of January 20, 1896, under the heading, "Where does the Conservative party find itself." Among other things, the article says:

What follows? That the Conservative party, as a ruling party at Ottawa, is being forced against the will of the majority of its members and against the sentiment of the entire country, outside of Quebec, to grant legislation coercive of Manitoba, because of a pledge given to the French Ministers in the Cabinet by the rest of their colleagues from the other provinces, but a pledge given without consulting the party at large, and in spite of a solemn pledge that the party would first be consulted before an irretrievable step was taken!

That, Sir, is from a paper, the proprietor of which is one of their own supporters. Will any hon. gentleman opposite deny that statement made in the organ of the party, made in a paper belonging to one of the supporters of the Government in this House? Hon. gentlemen do not deny it. They have not ventured to call a convention, they have not dared to do so. We are, therefore, without their views with reference to this matter, and are forced to fall back upon the utterances of the leader of the House, occupying the position of Finance Minister, and whom we shall have to take as speaking for the party. Well, Sir,

what did he state to us in definite terms as the position of the Government in reference to this trade question? Last year, in his Budget speech he said—and I take this statement because he seemed to have made it as a declaration of the policy of his party on this question.

I wish to state here that the Government of to-day, and the party which supports the Government of to-day, take their stand firmly and squarely upon the embodiment and upon the preservation of the principle of protection in the tariff, the degree of that protection to be according to the circumstances of the industry, and the conditions of business and of trade at the present time.

Sir, if that is not the policy of the Government, the hon. gentleman can now state it not to be so. And what does it declare? That the cardinal principle guiding legislation under the Government and the National Policy, is to recognize the protective principle as the fundamental principle; in other words, if I may so describe it, the principle of the Liberal-Conservative party is protection to the individual under all circumstances, and if there be any revenue coming into the treasury, it is an incident; while the Liberal party, on the other hand, have as their fundamental principle the raising of revenues necessary to carry on the Government, and if there be any protection to the individual, it is an incident, and not the principle. That is the difference between the two political parties, and on that difference, as that resolution declares, we are ready to meet the other party. You talk about direct taxation, and seek to force that upon us. As I said, the hon. gentleman has but to read the resolution of the convention if he wants to know where the funds are to be raised, and that to that end the tariff should be—what? That it should be abolished? No, but to that end the tariff should be reduced to the needs of honest, economical and efficient government. It is proposed, Sir, that the revenue should be raised through customs and excise duties, but, in levying these duties, regard should be had to the revenue as the principle, and not to protection to the individual as the principle, readjustment and not abolition. They quote expressions in speeches, and take extracts out of their connection, and seek to attach other meanings to them; but here is the declaration of the party, here are the utterances of the members of the party, taken in the connection in which they stand, and showing the reason for which they are made, and they are perfectly consistent with the platform that was adopted at that convention. I say that, because I hold that when a representative convention like that has been summoned by one of the great political parties of this country, no leader, no member of that party, I care not who, would ever, for one moment, seek to override the convention to which he was a party, and to which the party throughout the country had pledged

Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

itself. No leader would attempt it, and it will never be done. I trust, Sir, I have made myself plain with reference to this plank of the Liberal party. I do not hope, however, that I will silence remarks like those that have fallen from the hon. gentleman who last addressed the House. I have no doubt that hon. gentleman will go through the country, as he has done before, and not hesitate to make statements that are not only wholly inaccurate, but which can only be fittingly characterized by some expression stronger than that. Why, Sir, I will cite one of their principal defenders upon the platform, a gentleman whom I am sorry not to see in his seat at present, and still more am I sorry if it be the fact that his absence is caused through illness. I would have desired that he could be present. He is a gentleman who has stood high in the councils of the Conservative party, a gentleman who has fought their campaigns for them, a gentleman who was recognized as their fighting man before the elder Sir Charles Tupper came into the Government—I refer to the Minister of Agriculture, Sir, take his speech of last year in this House, and if a gentleman will venture to say such things on the floor of Parliament, what will he not venture to say when he takes the stump, with no opponent to meet him? Sir, I will quote from his speech in the Budget debate last year. That gentleman generally speaks late in the debate, and there is not much opportunity of replying, but he was pleased to tell us in that speech, in referring to some of the remarks that had been made: On page 16, I read:

I quote it because I wish to say to this House and to the country, that, neither in this House nor on a public platform, have I ever stated what I believed to be untrue, or stated a fact as to which I had not made all the inquiries in my power to substantiate its truth.

Mr. FOSTER. Hear, hear.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The hon. gentleman says "hear, hear." I am glad the hon. gentleman mentioned that in his speech, because it might not have been thoroughly understood if he had not done so. Now, we understand the statements made by this hon. gentleman as regards hon. members on this side of the House and their policy. I will again quote from the same page of the special pamphlet of the speech, copies of which were circulated, I suppose, by thousands, and probably tens of thousands in the constituencies of hon. gentlemen opposite. After I have read the extract, I will ask hon. gentlemen opposite what they think of themselves for circulating such a pamphlet, and I will ask them whether they had better not recall the copies. Another extract is as follows:—

Hon. gentlemen opposite are anxious to get into power—for the public good, they say themselves—for the pleasure and profit of office, we know very well from their history.

Was the hon. gentleman warranted in making that statement? Such an assertion was never made on any public platform by hon. members on this side of the House. At page 23, I read as follows:—

But the Liberal party not only lives upon the principles that are opposed to it, but, if I am not mistaken, the only way in which it wishes to live is by the decay of the industries of the country; for nothing gives the hon. gentlemen greater pleasure than to find a vacant shop or a silent factory. They rejoice over an individual being out of work, as if they had been returned to power itself.

I say that is an infamous statement. To declare that the Liberal party are men who find greater pleasure in a vacant shop or silent factory and from an individual being out of work than they would if they found themselves restored to power, is to make a statement to which I venture to say the Finance Minister will not say "hear, hear" and endorse. Why, Sir, it carries its refutation on its own face. That hon. gentleman in the same speech, when endeavouring to make a point in another direction, alluded to my own town, and said that in that town there was a bonus given in order to run a large manufacturing concern there; he further stated that in the town of Bowmanville 440 ratepayers voted to give a large sum of money to maintain an industry there, while only four voted against it, and other instances were cited of the same kind. This same gentleman who declared that the Liberal party and the members of it find more pleasure in a silent factory and an individual out of work, stated in almost the same breath that in some towns and cities of the Dominion, members of the Liberal party have put their hands in their pockets, together with their other fellow-citizens, and have paid thousands and tens of thousands of money to keep factories running and help to establish new ones. Yet this is the literature sent out to Tory constituencies.

Mr. SPROULE. If you had called the assistance "protection," your friends would not have done it.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I proceed. As regards statements made personal to myself, I pay no attention to them. I find at page 24, this gentleman said:

I take the town from which my hon. friend from South Brant (Mr. Paterson) comes. I am sorry my hon. friend is not here. He has admitted that the National Policy has made him rich.

He stated in one breath that I had said that I had been made rich by the National Policy, and in the next breath he said:

But my hon. friend from Brant has been making a public utterance as to his industries under the National Policy. He admits that he prospered, but he says it is not due to the National Policy.

That is the literature hon. gentlemen opposite send out to the country in order to inform the electors on public questions. Again he said:

Everywhere, in all lines of industry, capital is being invested and increasing numbers of our people are being employed. Hon. gentlemen know it, and dread it, but the people of Canada appreciate it.

Whoever gave that gentleman warrant for daring to utter such a statement, that the Liberal party fear and dread a return of prosperity to this country. Then he wound up as follows:

I have shown, I think, from start to finish, not only by the facts I have adduced, but by the very sneers which I have produced from hon. gentlemen opposite, that, no matter what they may name their policy, it has but one central and leading idea, namely, that industries should not be established in this country, and that the Liberal party would destroy every item of encouragement for those industries, should the party get into power.

Such are samples of the literature which is sent out by the Conservative party with respect to their opponents. Sir, I hold that a party which is obliged to have recourse to that mode of warfare is a party that has sunk below the level which it was hoped and supposed any party in this country would ever reach.

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

After Recess.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 52) to incorporate the Hudson's Bay Canal and Navigation Company.—(Mr. Boyd.)

Bill (No. 53) respecting the Pontiac Pacific Junction Railway Company.—(Sir James Grant.)

Bill (No. 54) to incorporate the Edmonton District Railway and Improvement Company.—(Mr. Davis, Alberta.)

SUPPLY—THE BUDGET.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Mr. Speaker, when the House rose at six o'clock, I was pointing out what was stated by the opponents of the Liberal party would be the effect of their policy should it be adopted in the country. I was quoting from the utterances of one of the leading Ministers of the Crown, and I think the last utterance I cited was, that no matter what the name of our policy might be, it had but one main and leading idea, namely: that industries should not be established in this country. I criticised other statements appearing in the same speech as being incorrect, and I cannot fail to ask any intelligent man, if it is possible for him to conceive that

one of the great political parties of this country, comprising half the people of Canada, should desire, as he alleges, that industries should not be established in Canada, and that we should not have the benefit of them. Why, Sir, do these gentlemen opposite suppose that they alone are interested in Canada? Do they suppose that they own Canada? Do they suppose that it is their money and their money only that is put into the various manufacturing enterprises of Canada? Do these gentlemen not know that the Liberal party—I am inclined to believe to a greater extent than they, but that I am not in a position to prove—do they not know, I say, that the Liberal party in common with the Conservative party have been forward in advancing the interests of the country? It cannot be a fact unknown to those gentlemen opposite, that connected with the various manufacturing institutions of this country are men who are firm and steadfast in their allegiance to the Liberal party. Do these Liberal manufacturers say that the desire of their party is that manufactures should be destroyed and should vanish?

Then, again, as to the effect of our policy. Hon. gentlemen opposite allege that whether it would be desired or not by the Liberal party, yet the effect of our policy, if put into execution, would be to bring about a disastrous result to our industries. Well, I ask them for the proofs. We are not without the means of determining. A revenue tariff policy is not a thing unknown in Canada. It was put in operation at the time of confederation in 1867, and continued in operation under Sir John Macdonald until 1874. It was continued from 1874 up to 1879 under Mr. Mackenzie. Therefore the country is not without its records as to the effect of a revenue tariff policy. It can refer to the public documents and records and statistics, and, on the other hand, we have also the means of referring to the statistics of the progress of the country under what hon. gentlemen opposite term their National Policy. Now, Sir, if we take the manufacturing industry of the country, that industry which they say will specially suffer under the policy the Liberal party proposes, and if we compare its progress under their policy with its progress under the revenue tariff policy, we can easily distinguish between the two. What was the record of the manufacturing industry during the revenue tariff period from 1867 to 1879: eleven or twelve years? Was that a time when manufacturing industries were unknown in this country? Were there no tall chimneys in those days, were there no operatives employed, was no capital invested in manufacturing enterprises then? Why, the public records show to the contrary, and the public man who would attempt to refute them would take a position derogatory to his standing as a man of intelligence in this House. I suppose when hon. gentlemen

Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

opposite make the utterances they do it is not with a view of influencing members of this House, but to influence the people in the country. Sixteen or seventeen years have elapsed since the Mackenzie Government went out of power. A new generation has arisen, and these gentlemen opposite would fain make that generation believe that under the Mackenzie Administration there was want and poverty and dire distress all through the country, and that it was because the Conservative party were returned to power that any people are now to be found in Canada, or that any progress has been made within its borders. I want to remind these hon. gentlemen—and not to remind them so much as to let my words go out to this rising generation who were not taking an active part in political matters at that time—I want to remind that generation that they should study the records of the country, and not take the statements of these men. And if they study the records of that period, what will they find? They will find that in the last year of the Mackenzie Administration, not only was Canada largely making what she required in many lines of manufactured goods for the consumption of her own people, but that she was in addition to that exporting over \$4,000,000 worth of manufactured goods to nearly thirty different countries of the globe. That is what the public records will show. And, Sir, to-day, after a lapse of seventeen years what do the public records show in reference to the National Policy? Progress, I grant you, but why should not there be progress after sixteen or seventeen years in a country like Canada, with its resources and its natural wealth. But what is the success? Is it something gentlemen opposite can point to with pride: is it something that will magnify their policy? What were the exports of manufactured goods in the year 1895, seventeen years after the National Policy had been put into operation? Why, a bare export of between seven and eight million dollars' worth, and as was pointed out by the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) in those seven or eight millions is included an item of over \$1,000,000 worth of household effects in order to swell the total. Such an item was not to be found in the records of the last year of the Mackenzie Administration. A million dollars of exports of manufactures, the product of Canada, will be found in the Trade and Navigation Returns this year: but is that a thing which the Government wish to claim credit for? What does it mean? It means not that young men are leaving this country in order to better their position in some other country and return to us. It means that heads of families, householders have, for some cause or another, torn up their homes, and, taking their movable effects with them, have left the country. That is the tale that is told by that item of household effects which swells the export

of manufactured goods under the National Policy by over \$1,000,000. Deduct that, and you have only an export of \$6,000,000 or \$7,000,000 of manufactured goods seventeen years after their National Policy was introduced, as against an export of \$4,000,000 of manufactured goods under the revenue policy which was in existence before these gentlemen came into power at all. I ask, is it not possible to conceive that greater progress would have been made under a revenue tariff policy than has been made under this so-called National Policy? I do not deny that there have been extra mills and factories erected. But, Sir, history shows that large capital has been sunk, wasted and destroyed by industries brought into existence by their National Policy, while the real prosperity of the country, even in manufacturing industries, has not been helped as greatly under the National Policy as it would have been had the terms and conditions that prevailed under a revenue tariff been continued. Then, Sir, I say that these gentlemen are not in a position to predict dire distress should the country return to the sounder economic principles involved in a revenue tariff; and I warn those hon. gentlemen who care for their reputation that the signs of the times—I do not pretend to prophesy; I merely say that the signs of the times strongly point in the direction of the Liberal party being in power very soon and putting their policy into effect. And when that policy is put into effect, if, instead of the dire disasters which these gentlemen predict, the country should witness an era of greater prosperity and progress than it has ever experienced before, hon. gentlemen will look very foolish after the predictions they are making at the present time. The hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) spent a considerable time last night in reading extracts from speeches by Sir Oliver Mowat, by my hon. friend from Guysboro' (Mr. Fraser), by the Premier of Nova Scotia, and by several other gentlemen, as well as reports of bank managers, to show that Canada was in a fairly prosperous condition. He read these for the purpose, apparently, of contradicting the statements of the hon. member for South Oxford. I am not aware that the hon. member for South Oxford has said that the country has made no progress at all. I understand that the position he has taken is this—that a country with the resources, the capabilities, the possibilities, and the potentialities of Canada, has not made the progress that its people are justified in expecting, when its circumstances are taken into consideration. That we have not retrograded, that we are not less in population now than we were seventeen years ago, that we have not lost all our wealth, seem to be matters for congratulation to hon. gentlemen opposite. Members on this side, while willing to admit that Canada, in spite of governmental blundering, has prospered, take the

position that she has not prospered to that degree that she might fairly and reasonably expect; and, Sir, the causes that have led to this want of prosperity are not difficult to discover. A great deal has been said with reference to a letter which my hon. friend from South Oxford wrote to an English journal. He has been very much blamed for that letter. He there pointed out certain facts, and he has said that he wrote that letter because men in the pay of the Government of Canada were slandering one-half of the people of Canada, and he felt that it was his duty to place before the English people certain facts. Now, I will read to you what an English gentleman of some standing, in dealing with one phase of that letter, says:

Mr. McALISTER. Who is the writer?

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I will tell the hon. gentleman directly. Here is what he says:

The fact that there is an obvious and urgent need for an alteration of the present fiscal and commercial system of the Dominion has been proved by Sir Richard Cartwright in his exceedingly able letter in the "Economist" of February 13th, 1892, by evidence which seems quite conclusive; and the evils he describes as now existing are most serious. His remarks on the connection there is between the terrible corruption which, to the great grief of its friends, has lately been brought to light in Canada, especially demand much attention, and even more is due to what he says as to the results of the recent census, since with regard to these he is speaking of matters of fact which cannot be disputed. He shows that, notwithstanding the very large number of emigrants who have been received in Canada, the increase of the population since the last census of ten years ago, falls short of what might have been looked for from natural increase alone in a prosperous and thriving country. The inference is inevitable, that during these years the Dominion had not been prospering as it ought to have done, and that very many of its natives, as well as of the emigrants who have reached its shores, have been unable to find in it homes in which they could enjoy such an amount of welfare as to induce them to remain there. When we consider what great natural resources and advantages Canada possesses, it is difficult to see how this fact can be accounted for, except by assuming that there must have been some great fault in the management of its affairs which has prevented the population from being as well off as they have a right to expect, and that many of them have in consequence, sought elsewhere for better means of living than Canada has offered.

That, Sir, is the opinion of this writer. The hon. gentleman asks me his name. His name is one not unknown to many hon. gentlemen opposite, and is held in high respect by them—Earl Grey, K.G., G.C.M.G. That is the conclusion that a statement of the facts forced upon him. And, Sir, looking at the matter in the light of what the hon. member for Pictou told us this afternoon, when he said that we had a country unexcelled in soil, in climate, in all that went to constitute a happy home for people

whom we seek to bring to our shores, I think that the hon. gentleman, having made that statement, must also be forced to the conclusion that there must have been some grave mismanagement, or Canada would have prospered to a greater degree than she has done under their National Policy. The hon. gentleman said that the hope of the country was in its population. Well, Sir, apply the test of population to the revenue tariff period in comparison with your National Policy period, and what do you find? Why, that in the revenue tariff decade, which these hon. gentlemen say means a time for the blotting out of industries and dire distress throughout all the land, the country increased in population something like 18 per cent, while the census reveals that in their National Policy decade the increase of population was a little over 11 per cent. Apply what test you please for a comparison between the revenue tariff decade and the National Policy decade, and I hold that it stands patent to every one that, so far as progress and prosperity are concerned, the comparison is in favour of a revenue tariff policy. Sir, as I understand the distinction between the two parties, the Conservative party believe that the way to secure the prosperity of a country is to restrict its trade, while the Liberal party believe that the way to secure the greatest prosperity in the country is to remove restrictions from trade, and let trade and commerce flow through their natural channels. Trade and commerce is what enriches a nation, and to speak about restricting it as a means of promoting prosperity seems absurd to us on this side of the House. And, Sir, if you bring common sense to bear upon the question, what gentleman believes that a town confining its trade within its own bounds, and having nothing to do with the surrounding country and with other towns and cities, will increase and grow as it ought? The hon. gentleman says that if you have a tariff of 17½ per cent or 20 per cent, you have protection to that extent. We are not denying that protection is there as an incident; but so far as it appears there, it appears as a restriction on trade which is justified by the necessity of raising a revenue. The incident is there and under that incident, as it existed in a revenue tariff in the years of the Liberal Administration, manufacturers prospered as well, I believe, as they have done since, and as they will do again under existing circumstances when a revenue tariff is restored. For in the readjustment of the tariff, in the introduction of a reform tariff based on revenue, that tariff will be framed with care, with thought, and deliberation. That tariff will be made, I believe, by a government composed of men who understand the requirements of the treasury and the needs and conditions of the country. It will be framed by men who will have regard to what is set out in the Liberal platform

Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

which I have read, based on the principle that in reforming the tariff, injustice will be done to no class in the country. More than that, they will recognize,—I believe in the interests of the country they will be forced to recognize—not individual rights, but the fact that having lived for sixteen years, as we have done, under the system which now obtains, conditions have been created, the effect of which will go beyond the individual and become larger in their nature, so that possible reforms which may be desired cannot be effected all at once, but as prudently and carefully as they can be effected with safety to the country and in its interests. Reform will be carried out for the benefit of all classes in the country, manufacturers as well as others. Sir, there is a very strange idea with regard to this matter of restriction of trade, entertained by our hon. friends opposite. I propose to read an extract dealing with that subject, taken from the speech of an hon. gentleman last year, who spoke after I had addressed the House, and whom therefore I had not the opportunity of answering. I quote this extract now because I remember that the sentiments to which he gave expression, at that particular moment, were very heartily cheered by hon. gentlemen opposite. He propounded something new, something quite novel. It is to the hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. Northrup), who spoke on this subject of the restriction of trade, that I refer. That hon. gentlemen did not like to have it said, as it could be said, that the Tory party were in favour of restriction of trade. He thought that did not sound well; and in answering the speech of my hon. friend for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), he said:

He spoke about the removal of the restrictions on trade. Although it may sound strange to his ears—if he requires page and volume for my assertion, I can give it to him without doubt—although it may seem strange to his ears, yet those who are in favour of protection—and they may go much further in that than is necessary for hon. gentlemen to go to support the Government in their policy—those, I say, who are protectionists out-and-out, are just as much in favour of the removal of the restrictions on trade as any hon. gentlemen opposite. The only difference between the two parties is, that, while one party recognizes restriction, another party does not. Let me illustrate what I mean. If a farmer in my riding raises his crops and brings his crops and stock to the country town for sale, I suppose he goes there to trade, and he engages in the occupation of trading when he is selling his stock there. As one who supports the present policy of the Government, I say that anything that tended to hinder the carrying on of that trade or placed a barrier between the producer and the consumer, would be a restriction upon that trade. If that barrier is in the shape of goods coming in from the United States and depriving our farmer of his home market, that is a restriction upon his trade, just as much as any tariff restriction would be, and we, on this side of the House, recognize it as a restriction which ought to be removed.

There is an idea. What we had supposed to be restrictions on trade are really not restrictions at all, according to this hon. gentleman. He illustrated his view by a reference to the operations of a farmer, and he also used an illustration with reference to my business. I am too modest to do the latter. I do not think it is very well for one to refer to his own business; but let me pay the hon. gentleman the compliment of a reference in return, to his profession. He is not engaged in the industry of farming, it is true, but belongs to the legal profession; but none the less he is a producer. He is a producer of thoughts and ideas which he sells to the community. You might term them legal cabbages, if you like, just for the purpose of illustration. Well, this gentleman, probably in his county town, offers his legal cabbages for sale. By and by another legal gentleman, from the outside offers to give his legal services, his advice in that same town. The hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. Northrup), if it were in his power, would have an ordinance passed prohibiting that lawyer from another town or even in his own town, or a dozen other lawyers absolutely from selling their ideas and in doing this,—in doing what ordinary mortals would term restricting trade in that direction—he really, according to his own argument, would be removing restrictions to trade, because if these competitors in the legal field were allowed to give their advice, the community might not seek his. That seems to be the idea of hon. gentlemen opposite with reference to the restriction of trade—that when a man has goods to sell and another desires to compete with him, the one who desires to compete should be prohibited from selling in order that the first one might have the market to himself; and if this were done, instead of its imposing a restriction on trade, it would really be removing the barriers and restrictions from trade. It was a peculiar position to take, yet it was cheered by the other side. But they must see at once that while they are, as they argue, removing the restrictions from trade by forbidding others from selling, they are losing sight completely of the parties in the matter. They are looking only upon the seller and paying no attention to the buyer, forgetting that in matters of trade and commerce, there have to be buyers and sellers, and the terms must be mutually advantageous, so that both buyer and seller will benefit from the transaction.

Now there is another subject I thought I would bring up, although I hesitated somewhat about doing it. But I think perhaps it is well that I should. I refer now to the loyalty cry, which is raised by our hon. friends opposite. I know that it is termed buncombe; I know that many among themselves would admit that when they are raising that cry, they are dealing in buncombe. They do not believe in it themselves.

but the fact remains nevertheless that they have, by their public utterances, served,—and I believe to a greater extent than they were aware of, as late circumstances have revealed,—a feeling abroad that one-half the people of Canada are disloyal. Sir, an opportunity was afforded the other day, I am glad to say, which this House took advantage of to bear testimony to the fact—and which fact was borne testimony to by the entire House—that loyalty prevails equally on the one side as on the other. But, Sir, if that could be done, as was meet it should be under circumstances then existing, what palliation is there for the attempt of gentlemen opposite to give the people of Canada the impression that one of the great political parties of Canada was made up of disloyal men. They prostituted, if I may use that word, the noble sentiment of loyalty to the basest end. It might not do much harm at home, but it might do a great harm abroad. And they had no higher object in maligning and slandering half the people of Canada than the low object of securing by false pretences a few votes that they could not secure otherwise. I read the utterances that have been made in public by them. My honoured leader seems to be especially a target for these shafts, these innuendoes that he is not a loyal man and that he is seeking American applause. What did the hon. Minister of Agriculture say in his last speech on the Budget? Speaking of the hon. leader of the Liberal party, and referring to that hon. gentleman's speech in Winnipeg, the hon. Minister said:

He got compliments upon that speech, but not from Canada. He never gets compliments from the Canadian people.

This is the statement made by that hon. gentleman who never either in the House or upon the public platform, made any statement that he did not believe to be true or without using every means within his power to ascertain its truth. He says the leader of the Liberal party "never gets compliments from the Canadian people." Mr. Speaker, I think I am within the mark when I say—and hon. gentlemen will be my judges in this matter—that the very contrary of the hon. gentleman's statement is true. I know of no public man in Canada of the age of Wilfred Laurier who has received so many compliments from the people of Canada as he has. And a little lower down in his speech the Minister of Agriculture says:

The hon. gentleman seems alwas to talk for American applause, and, I am bound to say, he succeeds in getting it.

The innuendo again. And at Montreal he is reported to have said:

Thank God, the Conservative party was looking for compliments from the Canadian people, and not from the American press.

Well, Sir, I said I hesitated to touch upon this subject. I do not think it serves any good end. But I remember that the wise man has said, "Answer not a foolish man"—that is not the exact word, but I prefer to use it, and it has the same meaning—"Answer not a foolish man according to his folly." And his very next utterance is "Answer a foolish man according to his folly." These statements would seem to be contradictory, but they are not. The reasons are given by the wise man why he gives these apparently contradictory wise maxims:—"Answer not a foolish man according to his folly, lest thou be like unto him: Answer a foolish man according to his folly, lest he be wise in his own conceit." I hesitate to answer these foolish men according to their folly, not wishing to be like them; for I despise such utterances. But, Sir, these gentlemen have been giving evidences of becoming wise in their own conceit, of having what would be popularly called enlarged heads on this subject. And, therefore, while I do not desire to get upon their plane, yet for the benefit of these gentlemen themselves, to reduce the swelling, perhaps I might just discourse upon this matter a little on the same line that they have followed. Looking at it in that light, what shall we say about the leaders of the Conservative party? I am answering them now according to their folly. In the Ottawa "Citizen" of April 20th, 1895, under a head line of capital letters "Montague at Buffalo"—not Boston, but Buffalo,—I find the following:—

Buffalo, New York, 19th April.—Hon. W. H. Montague, with his wife and a party of Canadian friends, celebrated the Haldimand victory by attending the production of the "Milk White Flag," at the Academy of Music here last night, remaining in Buffalo until noon to-day, when they returned to Dunnville.

Laurier went to Boston. What a fearful thing! What a disloyal man! But here is the hon. Minister of Agriculture visiting Buffalo. The hon. leader of the Opposition was invited to visit Boston, a compliment paid to him by a body of men from whom it is an honour to receive an invitation. But that fact has been paraded again and again as evidence of his disloyalty. Men have waxed wroth in their denunciations of him. The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny), only the other day, became greatly excited in his references to the matter. Yet here is one of their leaders who has been guilty, absolutely without an invitation, of going to Buffalo to celebrate a Tory victory gained in the county of Haldimand. Why, Sir, if I might treat this matter as the movements of my leader have been treated, what fine indignation might I not express, that one of the leaders of the Conservative party should go to the United States the very next day after his victory in order to celebrate that victory and receive compliments upon it. Why, Mr. Speaker, we have over three mil-

Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

lions of square miles of territory in Canada. Was there not one spot of land in that whole three million miles where he could have celebrated his victory? We have eleven thousand miles of sea coast. Could not there be launched from some point on that coast line a vessel upon which he could celebrate his achievement upon Canadian waters. Consider our immense island seas and flowing rivers. Could he not, afloat on some of these have celebrated his victory? No; he must go to Buffalo. Is not that a charge against the loyalty of the Tory party—that one of their leaders visited Buffalo to celebrate a Tory victory in the county of Haldimand? Then he took his wife. The wives of Canadian citizens are the mothers of the voters of Canada that are to be. And he took friends with him. And what did he go for? Why, Sir, to attend the production of the "Milk White Flag." Think of that, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Laurier may have gone to Boston, but, I venture to say that, invited as he was by the Boston Board of Trade, his hosts had the courtesy to intertwine the Union Jack with the Stars and Stripes. But no Union Jack was to be found in the Academy of Music. The old red, white and blue is good enough for Mr. Laurier. But Mr. Montague wants the production of "the Milk White Flag." Sir, this is something which I thought it well to bring to the attention of this House. My only reason and excuse for doing it is to give hon. gentlemen opposite the benefit of a surgical operation, for they have shown signs of becoming wise in their own conceit, and in this particular line nobody on this side, so far, has seen fit to follow them. Sir, the evil of it is that while it is unworthy of hon. gentlemen opposite to attempt to secure votes by any such base and despicable means, it is a danger greater, perhaps, than they imagine, as has been manifested and acknowledged by going outside the country and leaving the impression on parties outside that Canadians are not what I believe them to be, both Conservative and Liberal, loyal to Canada, loyal to her institutions, loyal to Canada's Queen, and to the institutions of Great Britain.

Now, Sir, I want to speak on another subject for a few minutes, and it is a point I think the House should take into consideration and that the country should take into consideration. If there is anything desirable in a country enjoying free institutions, as we do, it is that the people's representatives in Parliament should be independent in every shape and form from the Government of the day; that the people's representatives in Parliament should be under no obligation to the gentlemen who comprise the Government of the day; that there should be nothing to tempt them to give a vote in support of the Government in any action, unless that action commended itself to their judgment and to their conscience. Sir, when you

find members of Parliament asking for favours from the Government and receiving promises of favour from the Government, I make bold to say, these gentlemen, whether they are willing to admit it to themselves or not, are not in a position to be perfectly independent members of this House, or to cast their vote as their conscience should tell them that it was their duty to do. And what have we seen? The Government opposite, elected by the aid of gerrymander, a franchise Bill, and other corrupt influences, actually tampering with the independence of members of the House, and with promises of position to these men, receiving, if I say not by virtue of these promises, receiving at the same time that these promises were given, at any rate—which makes it suspicious—the support of these men. Sir, it has been charged that a gentleman lately appointed to the customs in Montreal sat in this House for more than one session with the promise of the position in his pocket. Whether that be true or not, I do not know. It is charged that other members of this House have been promised positions to which they are not yet appointed: of that I cannot say, but I venture to say that if it be the case, these men do not sit there as independent representatives of the people, and that the interests of Canada demand that no man should occupy that position unless he does. But though there may be doubt, it cannot be so, I am sorry to say, with reference to other positions. The Government did make promises to members of this House, and members who received those promises did support the Government in this country in acts for which they should not have received the support of any member on their merits. And those positions were—what? Why, Sir, in it is involved, it seems to me, a double danger to the constitution, a double danger to parliamentary freedom. Whatever doubt there may have been about the other cases, we know that hon. gentlemen supporting the Government sat there, not one, not two, but more of them, with promises from the Government that they would transfer them from this House into the Senate, where the people never could have an opportunity of pronouncing on their conduct. Not only were these men sitting in this House under those circumstances, but they have been transferred to what is called the higher chamber, to review the legislation of this House, removed to a position where their constituents cannot, during their lifetime, have an opportunity of showing at the polls what they thought of the conduct of which these men were guilty. Sir, is our upper chamber to be filled with men in that position? How do I know? I may be asked, I am making a broad statement, some gentlemen may ask: How do I know that these men have the promises of these senatorships? Well, I take it from a written statement signed by Sir Mackenzie Bowell, Prime Minister of

this country, that was read in this House, placed on the "Hansard," and I have not seen it denied. If it can be denied, I will gladly hear it, and I will take my statement back, but I have not heard it denied; and the leader of the House can tell me now whether it is true or not. I have been proceeding on that assumption, and he will, at least, admit that I have been proceeding with due warrant in doing so. This is a copy of the letter that was read:

Privy Council Office,
Ottawa, 2nd April, 1895.

A. McNeill, Esq., M.P.

My dear McNeill,—I have no doubt you have seen, as I have, notices in the papers that you had been or were to be offered a senatorship. I know of no man in the Commons whom I would rather see elevated to the honourable and responsible position of a Senator than yourself; but the rumour must have been set afloat by persons having some ulterior object in view, as no such offer has been made nor has it been considered. Certainly a senatorship was never asked for by you, either directly or indirectly. Moreover, such a step is precluded for the present by the fact that there are no vacancies that have not long since been promised.

Trusting that you may be successful in the contest before you.

I remain, &c.,

Sincerely yours,

MACKENZIE BOWELL.

Now, that was written on April 2, 1895. There was not only one or two, but I think three gentlemen transferred from benches in this House to the Senate since the opening of the session, one, I think, after the close of the last session of Parliament. Therefore, I am forced to believe that these gentlemen sat in this House with the promise of these senatorships in their pocket.

Mr. FOSTER. Your logic is not complete.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Why?

Mr. FOSTER. No names were mentioned in that letter, that I heard.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Is the hon. gentleman's moral sense so blunted, is his perception between right and wrong so dim, that he cannot see that if these promises were not given to these gentlemen who have been appointed, then he must have deceived those to whom the promises were made.

Mr. FOSTER. That does not follow. I have not the charge of filling vacant senatorships.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). No, he is charged with a good many things, but he is not charged with writing a lie. I think he will admit that the logic is complete, at any rate, that if these gentlemen are not the gentlemen who had the promise long since of these senatorships, and they are filling the places, then the men to whom they were promised have been cheated out of them. I think that logic is very conclusive. Sir, I think that, along with many other things we

have witnessed here, tends to lower the dignity of Parliament, tends to destroy its usefulness, and is in itself a fact that might lead any free people having free institutions to wipe out root and branch a Government that would attempt to do such a thing. I want to call particular attention to what the Government is doing in order to advance and promote Canadian trade. We had a statement from an hon. member of this House the other day with respect to reciprocity with our neighbours to the south, and this declaration was not in favour of reciprocity, nor was it opposed to it. It was neither one thing nor the other. That certainly does not manifest any great interest in the development and extension of trade in the direction of the neighbouring republic. Hon. gentlemen opposite will not make any great advance in promoting Canadian interests and enlarging trade with that country while they remain on that line. I do not hesitate to say, moreover, that the leaning of hon. gentlemen opposite is rather opposed to extension of trade with our neighbours. When hon. gentlemen on this side of the House have advocated an extension of our trade with the United States, members on the Government side of the House ridiculed the idea of a market of 65,000,000 of people being of any advantage to us. They have even declared that such an extension of trade would prove disastrous rather than beneficial, even if it was a fair exchange of the natural products of the two countries. No step is being taken in that direction. What has been done in other directions? The United States, despite the barriers erected on the one hand by the Canadian Parliament, and on the other by the Congress of the United States, continues to do a vast trade with this country. The Americans are among our best customers; nearly all our foreign trade is done with the United States and Great Britain, a comparatively small volume being done with several other countries. The Liberal party has maintained that if you can lower the barriers between this country and the United States, to the mutual advantage of both, and do this in an honourable way, and no other way would be accepted, then you would have given an impetus to the prosperity and progress of Canada. But it is said we have no power to do so. It is urged that Britain is our market. Yes, Britain is our market, and a very valuable market is there afforded for much we produce. But I want to call attention particularly—and if any words of mine are to be reported in the press and thus go before the country, I trust that they will be my words on this point—to the question of what is being done by this Government with respect to trade with England.

Sir, I cannot say that I am prepared to believe that Great Britain is about to adopt protection within a very short time. I can-

Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

not tell, of course; I know, however, the progress made by that country under the present fiscal system, and I have read the utterances of leading English statesmen, who stated their determination to retain it. But I have heard what hon. gentlemen opposite think on this matter, and they have not hesitated to declare that in their judgment Great Britain is about to adopt a protective policy, and that at a very early date, and especially protective duties on agricultural products entering the United Kingdom from other countries. I know that in a country situated as Great Britain is it would be possible to protect the grower of agricultural products in that country by the imposition of duties, from the fact that the country does not produce a sufficient quantity of food products for its needs; and I can understand that it is quite possible for the farmer in Great Britain to be a protectionist, for if protection were adopted he would get the benefit of it, while protection might be absolutely useless to farmers in a country which produces a surplus of farm products and exports them to other nations. What I want to call attention to is the opinion of leading men of the Conservative party in this House in regard to the adoption of protection and the imposition of duties on agricultural products going from this and other countries into the United Kingdom. I will read an extract from a speech delivered by the hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. Northrup), and I do so because it was endorsed by the Minister of Agriculture as a very able address, and I remember it was an address largely taken up with quotations from the report of a commission appointed on agricultural depression in Great Britain. I will read from the report. "Will my hon. friend read any extract in which they recommend to put a protective duty on these articles," asked Mr. Flint. Mr. Northrup said:

I will give you a dozen before I get through.

And then, among others, the hon. gentleman gave the following quotations from page 31 of the report:—

Low prices are considered removable by a change in the fiscal system which would force the foreigner to pay a corresponding tax to that borne by the producer of home-grown corn and hay, by the maker of cheese, butter, &c., and by those engaged in every agricultural industry, which is now so severely handicapped by the preference given to the foreigner. This, it is urged, should take the form of duty on all foreign manufactured articles, which would include flour, articles which cannot be produced in the United Kingdom being admitted free of duty.

Again, the hon. gentleman said:

A good many witnesses advocated that a duty should be put on live cattle and all manufactured articles coming into the country; and numbers said that all cattle should be killed on landing.

After giving other quotations to prove the

point he was seeking to make, that British farmers were seeking protection, the hon. member gave us his own view of the necessity of their adopting protection there, as follows :—

It will be remembered that those who advocated free trade said, that within ten years all the nations of the world would have thrown their ports open to the goods of England; and it is well known to every member of this House how entirely that prediction has been falsified. On the other hand, it was predicted by the landed interest that the removal of the protection which they had always enjoyed, and under which they had prospered, would mean direful ruin indeed to them, and I think I can appeal to the reports coming from the motherland, those which I have just read to the House, to prove that those predictions have been, unfortunately, verified to the very letter.

Fancy a Canadian suggesting to the British Parliament the desirability of having a system of protection. Then we speak of the Minister of Agriculture himself, the gentleman who is particularly charged with the duty of watching the interests of the agriculturists of this country. Let us see what he says in reference to this matter, for he dealt with it very fully. In his last Budget speech he said :—

Just a word or two concerning the condition of England; and I do this because of the constant reference which has been made to the growing condition of England by hon. gentlemen opposite who have spoken from time to time. I have here—and I must here pay the highest compliment to my hon. friend from East Hastings (Mr. Northrup), who discussed this question so thoroughly—a report to show just the condition of agriculture in England at present.

That is what our Minister of Agriculture said. And on page 19 of the speech of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Montague) in pamphlet form, he says :

Now, Sir, not only has England failed in regard to securing the markets of the other countries, but England is to-day—and I say it in the light of evidence which I have in my possession—England is to-day, in many respects, growing very weary of the policy which was adopted then; and not only that, but, as I shall prove to this House to the absolute satisfaction of hon. gentlemen opposite, England, in the very highest places is beginning to reverse the policy of free trade which she adopted some years ago.

Again he said :

English boards of trade, trades unions, consuls abroad, agricultural societies, as I can prove by the evidence of the Official Debates in the English House of Commons, are now moving in the direction of a defensive tariff, and the English Parliament itself has practically, in one sense, abandoned the free trade policy, and adopted, in one respect, a protective policy.

And again he said :

We find also, that England is losing the trade of India, and it is going where? To protected countries. She has lost her markets in other countries and her colonies largely, as well. Now, Sir, is all this being suffered meekly by the Bri-

tish people without a murmur. By no means, Sir.

And further he says :

When she opened her markets to the world, she had a monopoly of two things: First, of the world's markets, and, second, of skilled labour and the most improved machinery. The time has come when she has lost both monopolies, and not only that, but her markets at home, largely. Not many years hence we may look for a reversal, to some considerable extent, at least, of her policy of trade. That is my conviction, and it is borne out by the signs of the times.

These are the views of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Montague) himself.

Now, Sir, the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) declared himself this afternoon as holding the same views in reference to this matter as the Minister of Agriculture. No matter what may be the opinion entertained by gentlemen on this side of the House, as to whether England is about to reverse her trade policy or not, the Minister of Agriculture in this country, and the leading supporters of the Government on the other side of the House, have declared their belief, and have read what they considered positive proof that England is about, and very soon, to adopt the policy of putting duties upon Canadian products going into the markets of Great Britain. And, Sir, I have to ask this question: Is there any gentleman representing a constituency in this House—I care not whether it be a rural constituency or an urban constituency, for we are all interested in the progress of our agriculturists—is there any gentleman in this House who can view with complacency the thought that Great Britain is about to adopt the system that we have in Canada, and that she is urged, if not urged, at any rate, she is encouraged to do so, by hon. gentlemen opposite pointing out how she has been ruined by her present fiscal system. Sir, these gentlemen have given all the aid and counsel it is possible for them to give to strengthen the hands of the farmers in England who desire the imposition of duties upon goods which this country sends there. I ask hon. gentlemen opposite, I ask the agriculturists of this country, to make note of this, that the hon. gentlemen opposite believe—if they speak the truth—that England is about to put these duties on, and I ask the farmers of this country what their position is to be then? They will move not to the south. No. Hon. gentlemen opposite say: We are not in favour of reciprocity and we are not against it. They tell us that the British market is about to be closed to us partially, by protective duties such as we impose. Are the farmers of Canada to be asked to support the Government who, by their conduct, by their speeches, by their actions, by their legislation, and in every way they could, have encouraged and strengthened the hands of the men in England who are demanding the imposition of such duties. Ask the farmers

how they would like this state of things? Four cents a pound on our cheese, on which we sent \$14,000,000 worth to that country; that means something serious for the farmers of Canada. Three cents duty per pound on butter going into Great Britain; that means something very serious, especially when we are preparing to promote the export of butter. Twenty per cent duty on live cattle; that is rather a serious matter for our farmers. Seventy-five cents a barrel duty on flour going into England; that is rather a serious matter. Fifteen cents a bushel on wheat going over there; that is rather a serious matter. All the duties imposed in Canada are to be imposed on our goods entering a market which is open to us now, and they are to be imposed, if we are to take the statement of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Montague) the member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper), the member for East Hastings (Mr. Northrup), and others who have spoken on the opposite side of the House. And who have the agriculturists of Canada to prevent that being done? Who is the man in Canada who would be specially charged with the duty of saving that market to us as we have it now? Is it not the Minister of Agriculture? What representations can he make to the British Parliament when they begin, as he says they soon will begin, to entertain this proposition? What plea will he offer in our defence? Will he say to them: It is against your interest to do it. Why, the member of the British Government to whom he would say that, would reply: I read the speech of the Hon. Dr. Montague, which, if it meant anything, meant that the people of Britain were fools for not having adopted a protective tariff against Canadian goods long ago. And if the Minister of Agriculture would venture to say: Well, it is contrary to your traditions to impose barriers on trade in that way, why, the English Minister to whom he was speaking would say: My friend, you have forgotten that that ceased to be a tradition in Britain. Once it was thought that protective duties were a restriction to trade, but do you not know that in the Canadian Parliament, a new light has arisen on political economy, and that the imposition of duties on an article is not a restriction of trade, but is removing restriction from trade. Go back and learn from the member from East Hastings (Mr. Northrup) what true political economy is. What argument can the Minister of Agriculture offer under such circumstances? What position is he in to raise a finger in protest or in pleading, either, with the British Government to prevent such a dire disaster overtaking the people of Canada. I ask him, Sir, if he pleaded their legislation in this country what would the English Commissioner say to him? Legislation? What favour did you extend to us when you had it in your power to do so? Did you not, every one of you, vote down

Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

a proposition made by a member of the Liberal party from Prince Edward Island to give us fair-play under your tariff? Are you not a member of a Government who, from the day of their taking office down to the present time have enacted and maintained a tariff, not for revenue, with incidental protection involved in it, which must be the case with a revenue tariff which covers a great list of articles? That we would not have viewed as an unfriendly act; that is done for purposes of revenue; but you enacted a tariff on the principle of protection, avowedly hostile to British goods, and now you ask us to open our doors freely to you. Sir, what answer could the hon. Minister make, or what answer could the Tory party make to that? It is their record, and they know it, written in the history of this country. Sir, I want that point pressed home to the mind of every farmer and every other man in Canada. If my words be worthy of repetition in the press. I want them repeated again and again, that members of this Government say that England is about to re-enact protective duties against goods coming from this country. I ask them to say that men whose legislation has been to strengthen the hands of a party in England, are men in whose hands it is unsafe to trust the interests of the people of this country. I ask, then, is it not time to turn out a Government who have enacted hostile tariffs against that great mother country that has freely taken our natural products in such immense quantities, and put men in their places whose record shows that while they would impose duties on British goods, it would be done in no hostile spirit, but simply to secure the necessary revenue to carry on the Government, and would, therefore, not be offensive to the British people? Sir, what did the hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. Northrup) say in reference to this matter? He said this:

I was surprised to hear one of the leaders of the Opposition refer to the theory of protection in England and sneeringly turn to this side of the House and inquire, whether that would be a good thing for us in Canada. It seems utterly impossible for these hon. gentlemen to fix their eyes on the country they are asked to legislate for. They have been so accustomed to cast their eyes on another country that they cannot fix their eyes upon the country really interested in any particular case. There is not a man in the Conservative party who would advocate protection in England for the benefit of Canada. It would be a different thing if the members of this party were in England and were called upon to consider it from the standpoint of England. We might then prefer to see it introduced there. Yet hon. gentlemen opposite, who, one would think, must be aware of this distinction, quietly discuss this question as if it was for us to say what would be the effect upon Canada if protection were adopted in England.

This is the same gentleman who takes the things so easily, and says we are not in

favour of reciprocity, and we are not opposed to reciprocity. As if it were for us to say what would be the effect on Canada if protection were adopted in England, says he. Sir, who is to say, and who is to be concerned as to what the effect of the adoption of protection in Britain would be on Canada, if it is not the Canadian people and the Canadian Parliament sent here to represent and preserve their rights? We are the people who are interested. We are the people who not only ought to move in the direction of freer trade wherever it can honourably and beneficially be obtained, but we are the people whose duty it is, if our markets in Britain are threatened, to do all we can honourably do to prevent the dire results that would flow from the loss of those markets. But this gentleman says it does not concern us. Whom does it concern, I should like to know, if not the vast army of agriculturists in Canada, whose products are threatened with taxation? Sir, it was only a few days ago when the hon. Minister of Agriculture, speaking from his place in this House, told us himself that the reason the embargo was put on live Canadian cattle by the British Government was because the British Government desired to give protection to the British cattle raiser over his competitor from Canada—in so many words. Speaking with reference to the speech of the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) the Minister of Agriculture, says:

Suppose carelessness had caused the embargo to be imposed, suppose the Government had been guilty of carelessness, was the position taken by the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock), one of which a Canadian should be proud, was it one that was in the best interests of the Canadian industry and Canadian cattle breeders? On the other hand, was it not calculated to injure beyond measure the Canadian cattle industry, and also give the British Government another reason for not removing that embargo, when their feeling at the time was against such action, the British Government desiring to afford protection to British cattle raisers against competition with the people of the Dominion of Canada?

There is the statement of the Minister of Agriculture made in this House only a few days ago—an embargo put on live cattle by the British Government, involving a loss to Canadian cattle raisers of whom I do not know how much, but every member representing a rural constituency knows what a serious matter it is. Lost—and why? Because the British Government wants to give protection to the British raiser of cattle, he says. And, Sir, they talk about having the embargo removed. Who is to make the effort? The High Commissioner? What argument has he to offer to the British Government why they should, as a matter of justice or right, or as a matter of favour, either, remove the embargo from Canadian cattle, when, according to the Minister of Agriculture, it is protecting British cattle? "Sir," the British authorities would say to him, "have you not, in common with your colleagues,

denounced us in language which would lead to the plain inference that we have been pursuing a foolish course in leaving our markets open? Have you not taught us that by your speeches for years? And now do you ask us to remove that embargo and give free access to your live cattle, which you yourselves have said we were foolish in doing so long?" No. Canada is in evil case: her agricultural products, according to the Minister of Agriculture and others in the ministry, are threatened with high duties in the only free market they have, although the prices of their products are low enough now. That being declared by these hon. gentlemen to be the case, gentlemen who are in office, and guiding the affairs of Canada, their mouths are effectually closed, by reason of their speeches and legislative action, against the possibility of their raising one word of protest or uttering one plea in behalf of our great agricultural industry, which is threatened with such dire results. I have spoken on this subject somewhat warmly, because I have felt that the interest is great, and because it is important, above all things, that the people of this country should grasp the necessity that exists for the removal of this Government from office—not for their other iniquities alone, not because they have brought disgrace on the fair fame of Canada by their quarrels and conspiracies one against another, not alone because they have held power by means which honourable men should not have resorted to, but over and above all because, according to their own showing, while Canada's greatest interest is jeopardized in the only free market we enjoy, their speeches, their conduct, and their legislation preclude them from raising one finger in defence or uttering one plea on behalf of that great interest receiving in the English market in the future the same generous treatment that has been accorded to it in the past.

Mr. POWELL. There is one remark made by the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Paterson) with which I am sure this House is in full accord. I refer to his remark that the trade question of this country is a most vital one. I would that it were possible for me to agree in most of the other remarks to which the hon. gentleman gave utterance. His points with reference to the trade policy of the country, I cannot exactly understand. I have tried in vain, following him closely, to discover the principle on which he bases his criticism. At one time it strikes me that his line of attack is rather that the manufacturing industries of the country have failed to be protected by our protective policy. At another, his argument seems to me that these manufacturing industries have grown to such an enormous extent as to become monopolies crushing out the life of the country. The hon. gentleman must plant himself either upon one or the other position. He cannot occupy both at the same time.

Before, however, proceeding to discuss particularly the hon. gentleman's remarks, I will direct the attention of the House for a moment or two, to some of those that fell from the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). That hon. gentleman treated us, Mr. Speaker, to a new version of Irish history. I had thought, after reading Irish history with some degree of assiduity, that I had at least obtained some grasp of the causes that led to the decay, I might almost say, of that unhappy country. It was entirely a matter of news to me, Sir, that Ireland had a protective policy to encourage her industries. I judged that the heroic men, who left her shores to add to the brilliancy of foreign courts, and give strength to foreign lands, were driven from their native land, not by protective policies inaugurated and prosecuted for the benefit of Ireland, but by penal codes and by commercial policies inaugurated by Great Britain, not for the protection of Ireland, but for the protection of England's own manufactures. The hon. gentlemen referred to Mr. Lecky. I too refer to Mr. Lecky, but shall not confine myself to him, for he is a gentleman who was born in Ireland and educated there; a gentleman with Irish sympathies; but I say here that the statements of Mr. Lecky are supported by English writers and by probably the most original economic investigator of the present century, Professor Thorold Rogers. Mr. Lecky, agreeing with Prof. Rogers in this respect, lays down these facts: That England, for the protection of her own manufacturers and of her own farmers, in 1663, I think it was—passed a statute which prohibited absolutely Irish ships from engaging in the commerce carried on between Great Britain and her colonies. The English Parliament supplemented that statute by another statute prohibiting the export of Irish manufactures to an English colony, except through English merchants and ships. They supplemented that by still another statute, absolutely prohibiting the exportation of woollen goods from Ireland under any circumstances whatever. Ireland, owing to the climate that she possesses, owing to her fertile soil, was beginning to compete in English markets, with the agriculturists of England. Under these circumstances, what did England do? She immediately passed a law preventing the importation among other things of cattle and of beef from Ireland. After that the Irish devoted their attention to the growing of sheep. What then did England do? She passed a law prohibiting entirely the importation of wool from Ireland to England. Restricted in this direction, the Irish then turned their attention to the manufacture of cambrics and woollen goods. What then did England do? She passed a law imposing 30 per cent ad valorem upon the importation

Mr. POWELL

of these goods to England; and not satisfied with that, she subsequently absolutely prohibited their importation with the exception of white and brown linen. There is another statement of the hon. gentleman with which I wish to deal and it relates to a subject which has been also treated by the hon. gentleman who has just spoken. In their criticism of the late census, these hon. gentlemen have attempted to show that the alleged increases in manufacturing establishments from 1881 to 1891 is a fraudulent misstatement. They pretend that included in the census were numbers of basket makers and other small craftsmen of that kind throughout the country. Well, this is true. You could not have, Sir, a complete census without entering in it the product of every manufacture in the country. But I shall not rest the case there. The statements, if honourable, are intentionally misleading—designed to minify the remarkable industrial progress of the country. I have made an analysis which I shall present to the House. First, with respect to the industrial establishments of the country. The American basis of the classification of industrial establishments is to include those whose output is over \$500. Then I have arranged industrial establishments of Canada into classes—from \$500 to \$2,000 output; from \$2,000 to \$12,000 output; from \$12,000 to \$25,000 output; from \$25,000 to \$50,000 output; and from \$50,000 upwards. And what do I find? I find the result shown by the following statement:—

DEVELOPMENT OF MANUFACTURES.

No. of industrial establishments having an output of \$50,000 and over:

1891	1,675
1881	1,108

Increase, 1891 over 1881..... 567
do per cent, 51·1 p.c.

No. of industrial establishments having an output of from \$25,000 to \$50,000 :

1891	1,208
1881	966

Increase, 1891 over 1881..... 242
do per cent, 24·9 p.c.

No. of industrial establishments having an output of from \$12,000 to \$25,000 :

1891	2,679
1881	2,061

Increase, 1891 over 1881..... 618
do per cent, 30 p.c.

No. of industrial establishments having an output of from \$2,000 to \$12,000 :

1891	19,629
1881	13,524

Increase, 1891 over 1881..... 6,105
do per cent, 45·3 p.c.

No. of industrial establishments having an output of from \$500 to \$2,000 :

1891	27,224
1881	17,818

Increase, 1891 over 1881..... 9,406
do per cent, 52·9 p.c.

No. of industrial establishments having an output under \$500 :

1891	23,553
1881	14,253

Increase, 1891 over 1881..... 9,300
do per cent, 65·2 p.c.

Total industrial establishments :

1891	75,968
1881	49,731

Increase, 1891 over 1881..... 26,237
do per cent, 52·8 p.c.

More remarkable than the increase in the number of the industrial establishments is the increase in the capital invested in these establishments. The following is a statement :—

DEVELOPMENT OF MANUFACTURES.

Capital invested.

Capital invested in factories having an output of \$50,000 and over :

1891	\$207,147,467
1881	84,961,653

Increase, 1891 over 1881...\$123,185,814
do per cent, 143·8 p.c.

Capital invested in factories having an output of from \$25,000 to \$50,000 :

1891	\$ 30,152,282
1881	16,142,669

Increase, 1891 over 1881...\$ 14,009,613
do per cent, 86·8 p.c.

Capital invested in factories having an output of from \$12,000 to \$25,000 :

1891	\$ 31,596,006
1881	17,228,465

Increase, 1891 over 1881...\$ 14,367,541
do per cent, 83·4 p.c.

Capital invested in factories having an output of from \$2,000 to \$12,000 :

1891	\$ 60,178,387
1881	33,660,394

Increase, 1891 over 1881...\$ 26,517,993
do per cent, 78·8 p.c.

Capital invested in factories having an output of from \$500 to \$2,000 :

1891	\$ 20,645,997
1881	10,488,064

Increase, 1891 over 1881...\$ 10,157,933
do per cent, 96·8 p.c.

Capital invested in factories having an output under \$500 :

1891	\$ 4,900,611
1881	2,476,178

Increase, 1891 over 1881...\$ 2,424,433
do per cent, 97·7 p.c.

Total capital invested :

1891	\$354,620,750
1881	164,957,423

Increase, 1891 over 1881...\$189,663,327
do per cent, 115 p.c.

Not only has there been this increase in the capital and the number of establishments, but there has been a most remarkable increase in the number of people employed. One would think, listening to the gentlemen opposite, that these numbers had been swollen by basket makers and other paltry tradesmen as they are pleased to call them, but instead of that, when we look to the records, what do we find? We find the following increases, which should have a most inspiring effect on the people of this country —

DEVELOPMENT OF MANUFACTURES.

No. of employees in establishments having an output of \$50,000 and over :

1891	139,080
1881	83,526

Increase, 1891 over 1881..... 55,554
do per cent, 66·8 p.c.

No. of employees in establishments having an output of from \$25,000 to \$50,000 :

1891	28,339
1881	22,386

Increase, 1891 over 1881..... 5,953
do per cent, 26·6 p.c.

No. of employees in establishments having an output of from \$12,000 to \$25,000 :

1891	36,118
1881	27,273

Increase, 1891 over 1881..... 8,845
do per cent, 32·4 p.c.

No. of employees in establishments having an output of from \$2,000 to \$12,000 :

1891	92,343
1881	68,208

Increase, 1891 over 1881..... 24,135
do per cent, 35·4 p.c.

No. of employees in establishments having an output of from \$500 to \$12,000 :

1891	45,446
1881	34,711

Increase, 1891 over 1881..... 10,735
do per cent, 30·9 p.c.

No. of employees in establishments having an output under \$500 :

1891	28,930
1881	18,790

Increase, 1891 over 1881..... 10,140
do per cent, 54 p.c.

Total number of employees :

1891	370,256
1881	254,894

Increase, 1891 over 1881..... 115,362
do per cent, 45·2 p.c.

Now we come to the wages of these workers. There is a very good way of testing the benefit to the farmers of the country, and that is by noting the increase in the numbers of those who afford a home market for them in the Dominion. The larger the number of wage earners and the larger the amount of

money there is in the country to purchase, the larger demand will the farmers have for their products and the greater encouragement will they have to pursue their agricultural calling. The farmers of the country are those who, as we all know, benefit most by an increase in this respect. Taking the same classification as I adopted before, the total increase in wages in this country during that decade has been more than \$41,261,948. There is a very large amount of money indeed to be distributed annually among the farmers and merchants of these provinces. It is considerably more than double the customs taxation of the Dominion, which hon. gentlemen opposite complain of as sapping the life's blood of the people insidiously. A very small part of this gain has been in the wages paid in establishments having less than \$500 output. These are the figures :

DEVELOPMENT OF MANUFACTURES.

Wages Paid.

Annual wage-list of factories having an output of \$50,000 and over :

1891	\$46,842,640
1881	23,964,796

Increase, 1891 over 1881... \$22,877,844
do per cent, 96·3 p.c.

Annual wage-list of factories having an output of from \$25,000 to \$50,000 :

1891	\$8,966,833
1881	5,942,881

Increase, 1891 over 1881... \$3,023,952
do per cent, 50·9 p.c.

Annual wage-list of factories having an output of from \$12,000 to \$25,000 :

1891	\$10,852,514
1881	6,899,127

Increase, 1891 over 1881... \$ 3,953,387
do per cent, 57·3 p.c.

Annual wage-list of factories having an output of from \$2,000 to \$12,000 :

1891	\$22,963,579
1881	15,211,140

Increase, 1891 over 1881... \$ 7,752,439
do per cent, 51 p.c.

Annual wage-list of factories having an output of from \$500 to \$2,000 :

1891	\$ 8,971,506
1881	6,042,015

Increase, 1891 over 1881... \$ 2,929,491
do per cent, 48·5 p.c.

Annual wage-list of factories having an output of \$500 and under :

1891	\$ 2,066,578
1881	1,341,743

Increase, 1891 over 1881... \$ 724,835
do per cent, 54 p.c.

Total wage-list :

1891	\$100,663,650
1881	59,401,702

Increase, 1891 over 1881...\$ 41,261,948
do per cent, 69·4.

This shows that the increase of wages in

Mr. POWELL.

those establishments having an output of less than \$500 has been \$724,835, but that among what may be called the bona fide manufacturing establishments, assuming the United States system of census classification to be correct in principle—an assumption which our friends opposite will readily concede to be correct—the increase in wages has been no less a sum than forty and a half millions of dollars.

Mr. FORBES. It is about 80 cents a day for each employee.

An hon. MEMBER. All that you would be worth anyway.

Mr. POWELL. You have your answer. The figures showing the consumption of raw material in the factories do not make up an interesting table, so I shall not give them. Now I come to the output of these industries. But let me preface what I have to say on this subject by remarking that it was no part of the design of the National Policy that the imports of the country should be increased, except the imports of raw material, so long as that raw material could not be supplied by Canada itself. It is a poor argument against that policy to say that it has failed to increase the imports, as hon. gentlemen opposite say they should be increased. That was no part of the design of the National Policy, and we should look for it. However, as facts have turned out, such has been the improved purchasing capabilities of our people under the National Policy, that there has been a substantial increase in the imports. Taking the total volume of trade of the country, what do we find? By consulting page vii of the last Trade and Navigation Returns we find that in 1878, the last year of the regime of gentlemen opposite, the total exports amounted to \$77,323,000. Last year there was a total exportation of \$113,638,000 a net increase in that time of no less than thirty-eight millions of dollars. If we look at the imports, we shall see that there has been a large increase there. In reading this table, we must bear in mind that the value of goods has declined fully 30 per cent since hon. gentlemen opposite left office. Bearing that in mind what do we find? The total volume of trade for 1895 is \$224,420,000. Adding to that 30 per cent, or \$67,000,000, and deducting from the total the \$172,400,000, which was the total value of the trade in 1878, the last year under the tariff of the gentlemen opposite, we find that the increase has been \$116,000,000. But that is not all. The trade of this country is partly foreign trade and partly home and inter-provincial trade. Unfortunately we have no figures from which we can estimate the interprovincial trade, but we have means of forming a minimum estimate of it. If we take the figures showing the output of the large industrial establishments, they show that the increase, leaving out of consideration those establishments that have an annual output of below \$12,000, which so

offend gentlemen opposite, and confining ourselves to those having an output of \$12,000 and over, there has been an increase of \$155,005,907, as will be seen from the following figures :—

DEVELOPMENT OF MANUFACTURES.

Output.

Annual output of factories having an output of \$50,000 and over a year :

1891	\$ 260,795,190
1881	153,767,771

Increase, 1891 over 1881...\$ 107,027,419
do per cent, 69·7 p.c.

Annual output of factories having an output of from \$25,000 to \$50,000 :

1891	\$42,238,542
1881	33,482,170

Increase, 1891 over 1881...\$ 8,756,372
do per cent, 61·8 p.c.

Annual output of factories having an output of from \$12,000 to \$25,000 :

1891	\$ 47,709,005
1881	36,808,242

Increase, 1891 over 1881...\$ 10,900,763
do per cent, 56·5 p.c.

Annual output of factories having an output of from 2,000 to \$12,000 :

1891	\$ 93,260,957
1881	64,939,604

Increase, 1891 over 1881...\$ 28,321,353
do per cent, 43·0 p.c.

Total annual output of factories :

1891	\$ 444,003,694
1881	288,997,787

Increase, 1891 over 1881...\$ 155,005,907
do per cent, 5 p.c.

Gentlemen opposite say that in our foreign trade there has only been an increase of \$3,000,000 in our exports, and as that increase is included in the \$116,000,000 increase in the total volume of our foreign trade, reckoning values on the basis of the prices of 1878, I will deduct it from the amount of increase in the output of our industrial establishments which I have just given, so that we get an item of \$152,000,000. This amount in determining the increased volume of our home trade must be increased by 30 per cent for the decrease in prices since 1878 in manufactured goods. The 30 per cent comes to \$133,000,000, making the total increase in our home trade, on the basis of prices of 1878, amount to \$285,000,000. Adding that to the \$116,000,000, which is the total increase I show by the trade returns, it is plain beyond all question that the increase in the trade of this country from the time these gentlemen left the treasury benches to the present time is more than \$400,000,000, on the basis of the prices of 1878. In other words, the volume of our trade has absolutely more than doubled in the decade from 1881 to 1891. This is the answer to hon. gentlemen opposite who declaim against this policy on the ground that it has lessened trade or that

trade has not increased in an equal ratio with population. Taking the facts I have given, the case is established beyond question that, although population has not increased more than 20 per cent the volume of trade has increased more than 100 per cent, and therefore the policy must be working advantageously to the country.

I have a word to say with regard to protection generally. The republic to the south of us, whose markets are claimed to be the best markets for us—might if open be excellent markets, but we have not the key to those markets—

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) You threw it away years ago.

Mr. POWELL. We never had the key to throw away, and if hon. gentlemen had their way, we would not only have no key of their market, but we would have no key of our own market. They proposed to hand that key to the United States. Now, I may say, with respect to this 60,000,000 market, that the greatest number of the population in any country is its agricultural population. The United States are no exception. Now, are the farmers of Canada going to trade with the farmers of the United States? Certainly not. It must be only a very small percentage of benefit which our agriculturists can reap from such a policy as the hon. gentlemen opposite propose. However, I am not denying that advantages might flow from a policy of freer trade with the United States. The protection policy is the policy for Canada. Probably the greatest statesman that the United States has ever had, not a man born within the limits of that country, but a man who devoted his life to her interests, I refer to Alexander Hamilton; and the very first act of Alexander Hamilton, after he was selected by Washington to be the controller of the Treasury of the United States, and to place the finances of the country upon a solid and substantial foundation, was to submit to Congress a state paper recommending the establishment of a national policy, the establishment of a protective policy for the United States. Although his scheme was not adopted at that time, shortly afterwards the foundation of American industry was laid, not by the establishment of a protective policy such as we enjoy, but the foundation of her material and industrial greatness was laid by the adoption of a policy of absolute prohibition of the introduction into that country of the manufactures of Great Britain. Then the manufacturing industries of the United States had their start, and from that date they grew, and down to the present moment the United States has ever since, at times in a wavering manner, but mostly in a very pronounced manner, pursued that policy, and her industrial greatness to-day, her greatness in everything that makes a nation, are the proofs of the success of that policy, to which the people cling with the greatest pertinacity; and we may, in following logically and con-

sistently the policy we have adopted, live to enjoy a similar greatness.

Now, I will leave that branch of the subject and pass to another, namely, the effects of protection upon the agriculturists of the country. I was rather astonished that hon. gentlemen opposite should argue for one moment that the protective policy is injurious to the agricultural interests of this Dominion. That above everything, Mr. Speaker, is an illogical and untenable position. If we take the country in the world that has most completely followed out the policy of free trade—of course I do not refer to countries with small populations, like Switzerland and New South Wales—we of course select Great Britain. Now, what is her record? Great Britain most conscientiously, I may say, or unconscientiously if you choose to put it, pursued a protective policy almost right down to the very day when the corn laws were repealed. That is undeniable. Not only did she pursue a protective policy—

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Oh, no.

Mr. POWELL. If the hon. gentleman says no, he has never read the commercial history of Great Britain.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Why, did they not repeal most of the duties twenty years before the corn laws were repealed?

Mr. POWELL. I say that she did pursue a protective policy almost down to the time the corn laws were repealed. She pursued this policy until she had built up her greatness, and could afford to throw down her barriers and challenge the world.

Mr. GILLMOR. Bosh!

Mr. POWELL. She pursued her policy until she had established her industries beyond all possibility of successful competition, and then she threw down the barriers and asked other nations to come on. How has that policy operated with respect to the agriculturists of Great Britain? The hon. member for South Oxford informed us the other night that Great Britain was not an agricultural country. I differ from him. If I were to select a country on the face of the earth in which agriculture is pursued on scientific principles, in which it is almost a passion of the people, that is of the better classes of the people, I would select England. Now, what is the effect of a free trade policy with respect to that country. We have heard a great deal from the hon. member for South Oxford about the depreciation of farm lands in this country. Have they depreciated as much as they have in free trade England? There is no better home market in the world than there is in England, no richer people, the people are crowded together so thick in that little island that the farmers have no difficulty in getting their goods to market cheaply and quickly. The farmers are almost right in the centres of population. Railway freights are low, labour is cheap, and what is the result? Why, Sir, in the decade from

Mr. POWELL.

1871 to 1881 the agricultural population of that country decreased over one million, and from 1881 to 1891 the decrease was almost as marked. Let me mention some of the counties that are better known on account of their names being linked with celebrated breeds of cattle and sheep. Take Berkshire, a decrease; take Norfolk, a decrease; Durham, a decrease; Hereford, a decrease; Leicester, a decrease; Devon, a decrease; Shropshire, a decrease; Suffolk, a decrease. I have the figures here but will not weary the House with details.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Will the hon. gentleman pardon me? I would like to know whether the decrease which he speaks of the agricultural capabilities for productions of Great Britain is attributed by him, to the free trade policy of England or otherwise?

Mr. POWELL. I will give as my answer the views of two most illustrious statesmen of the century. I will give him the answer of Lord Beaconsfield in the life of George Bentinck—if he will take the trouble to refer to it. I do not recollect the page, but he will find that Lord Beaconsfield, speaking of free trade England states, speaking from memory: England by free trade increased her resources, had become a great commercial nation, but the honest yeomanry of Britain would soon be no more. I will refer him to another statesman, the illustrious statesman who now presides over the destinies of Great Britain, Lord Salisbury. Only a few months ago Lord Salisbury said a great mistake was made in passing the corn laws, that they had not properly provided for the interests of the agriculturists, that they had sacrificed the interests of the agriculturists to those of the manufacturers and traders of the country, and said that one of the things that England will soon have to attend to must be the alleviation of their circumstances, either by a reduction of taxation, or giving them a bonus on their products. That, I think, is a sufficient answer to the hon. gentleman—and my hon. friend beside me, the Minister of Finance informs me that one of the measures prepared for the English Parliament at its approaching session is directly in that line. The hon. gentleman has asked me if I attributed the decline in the agricultural interest in Great Britain to the policy of free trade. Well, I will say that I know there is a logical fallacy known, if I may be excused from following the example of the hon. member for South Oxford in quoting a Latin phrase, as "Cum hoc ergo propter hoc." I do not assert that because two things may be in the order of sequence, that one is the logical antecedent or the logical consequent of the other; but I do say that it is a remarkable fact that almost co-eval with the adoption of the corn laws in Great Britain the decline of Irish agriculture commenced, and this decline has steadily continued. Now, I will place the English farmers themselves

upon the stand and let them say what has led to the decay of their industry. Take the report of the commission appointed in England not long ago to investigate this question; the hon. gentleman has read it no doubt. The men who constituted that commission were free traders. I will not ask you to take their report. I will ask you to go further and take the evidence of the men who gave testimony before that commission, and what do they say? You will find their answers tabulated, and almost one and all attribute the decline of agriculture in Great Britain to foreign competition. If that is not due to free trade in agricultural produce, then those hon. gentlemen do not understand the meaning of the English language. I am not here to deny that in Canada there has been a decline in the agricultural interests. I will say this, that if that interest is as it is at present, passing through an ordeal, it is doing so no more than is agriculture in every older country in the world, and on every part of this continent of America, eastward of the Alleghanys. From the moment modern civilization solved the problem of cheap traffic and of reducing the cost of transportation so that four times the quantity of material is carried for the same money four times the distance it formerly was, there were opened the great western territories which have entered into competition with the old countries and the old states. Agriculture has declined, it is true, but it is a remarkable fact, that in this Canada of ours, whether due to our trade policy or to the

energy and industry of our farmers, agriculture is in a much more flourishing condition than it is in Great Britain, and, in speaking of Canada, I do not include the province of Manitoba and the North-west Territories where the increase in this industry is phenomenal. To return to the point from which I digressed when asked the question by the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies), I will, for his satisfaction, compare a free-trade country in point of agriculture with Canada, and in doing so I will not detain the House with details, but will simply take summaries. Of the total arable land in England, Wales and Scotland, combined, there has gone out of cultivation from 1873 to 1883 no less than 2,000,000 acres out of 17,000,000 acres, or one-eighth; in other words, the amount of arable land under cultivation has decreased 12½ per cent. From 1883 to 1893 there was a decline of 1,000,000 acres, or about one-sixteenth, or, in other words, a little over 6 per cent. The farmers there have allowed their land to go, not into common as it is known in this country, but to relapse into permanent pasture, which showed an increase of about 3,500,000 acres. In regard to bare fallow, called here summer-fallow, there was a decrease from 1883 to 1893 to the extent of 250,000 acres, a decrease of one quarter, or 25 per cent. This shows the remarkable decline to those who are acquainted with the English practice of summer-fallowing.

The following is a full statement as respects England, Wales and Scotland:—

TOTAL ACREAGE ARABLE LAND FOR YEARS 1893, 1883 AND 1873.

	1893.	1883.	1873.	Decrease or increase in 1893 compared with 1873.	Decrease or increase in 1893 compared with 1883.
England	11,270,757	12,055,811	13,006,370	— 1,735,613	— 785,054
Wales	849,345	907,876	1,030,765	— 181,420	— 58,531
Scotland	3,516,482	3,577,822	3,443,058	+ 73,424	— 61,340
Total for Great Britain .	15,636,584	16,541,509	17,480,193	— 1,843,609	— 94,925

PERMANENT PASTURE.

England	13,128,378	12,008,679	10,237,814	+ 2,890,564	+ 1,119,699
Wales	1,998,406	1,865,406	1,581,585	+ 416,821	+ 133,000
Scotland	1,365,783	1,191,288	1,096,530	+ 269,253	+ 174,495
Total	16,492,567	15,065,373	12,915,929	+ 3,576,638	+ 1,427,194

BARE FALLOW.

England	498,427	730,569	649,374	— 150,947	— 232,142
Wales	8,221	26,712	34,730	— 26,509	— 18,491
Scotland	7,910	20,922	22,394	— 14,484	— 13,012
Total	514,558	778,203	706,498	— 191,940	— 263,645

These figures show the decline in the agricultural interests of the United Kingdom. Now, we return from these figures and look at the progress in Canada. I shall purposely not include Manitoba and the North-west in the comparison, because it would be very unfair to take a new country, in which agriculture is so very rapidly spreading, and compare it with a country like England, where agricul-

tural interests have been pushed as far as possible. I take Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Quebec, Ontario, British Columbia, leaving out the Territories and Manitoba. The following table shows the increase in the number of occupants of farm lands, in the number of acres of improved land, and the increase in dairy products :—

	For the Year 1881.	For the Year 1901.	Total increase of 1891 over 1881.	Percent- age of Increase.
Occupiers of lots of land.....	453,936	588,671	134,735	30
Improved lands.....	21,619,932	27,108,358	5,488,426	25
Acres under crop.....	14,860,806	18,483,614	3,522,808	24
Acres in pasture.....	6,361,031	8,881,391	2,520,360	40
Acres in orchards.....	398,094	456,790	58,696	15
Pounds of home-made butter.....	101,517,300	104,849,410	3,332,410	3
Pounds of home-made cheese.....	3,164,323	6,079,838	2,915,575	92
Value of factory butter.....	\$337,178	\$860,055	\$522,877	155
Value of factory cheese.....	\$5,564,454	\$9,660,118	\$4,095,664	91

With respect to the English returns, it will be found that there has been a shrinkage in almost every agricultural product with the exception of cattle, solitary increase, which is explained by the large quantity of arable land that has relapsed into permanent pasture. So it is manifest that agriculture in our old provinces under a protective policy, while not as flourishing as can be desired, is flourishing compared with that of any other country, especially compared with that of England, where free trade has full force to run and be justified. Agriculture in England, one of the very few free trade countries in the world, is in a very declining condition, whereas in Canada we may say it is comparatively flourishing. There is another phase to this matter. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Paterson) said, that this policy is making—he did not use the exact term; but to express it in a somewhat succinct manner, and to use a phrase that is generally used by hon. gentlemen opposite—the hon. gentleman said: The National Policy is making the rich man richer and the poor man poorer. Now, Sir, if I were asked to frame a policy that would have the effect of bearing lightly upon the poor man, I would frame the identical National Policy we have to-day; and if I were asked to frame a policy that would bear hardly upon the poor men of the country, I would frame the policy of free trade, after which these hon. gentlemen opposite are hankering as I understand, I say “as I understand,” for it is very difficult to tell just exactly what they are hankering after. The hon. leader of the Opposition says, that in matters political and industrial his great ideal is England, but other hon. gentlemen of his party say: they are not very anxious to abandon the protective policy for a free trade policy, but they want some kind of a mongrel policy. Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon.

Mr. POWELL.

gentleman (Mr. Paterson) said his party wanted to have a policy that was going to bear equally upon the people of this country. Well, if there be a political economist, a writer on the science of political economy who has ever given expression to such a doctrine as that, I—not boasting of the breadth of my reading, but I have read the most of the prominent writers on the subject—I, at least, have failed to see that ever such an idea was broached before. A taxation that will bear equally upon the members of the community, and upon the citizens at large. Who in these modern times has ever heard of such a doctrine as that? Why, Sir, since Adam Smith first published his great work, down to the present time, every great writer on political economy has laid it down as a fundamental principle of taxation, that taxes should be imposed upon the people according to their ability to pay.

Mr. GILLMOR. That is right.

Mr. POWELL. I am glad the hon. gentleman assents to that. I will follow it up for one moment. Take the system of taxation as it is in England. I will not speak just now of the income tax, which, of course, bears harder upon these gentlemen who have large incomes than it does on those who have small incomes; but refer to the custom duties. Leaving out liquor, let us take the two articles that are most heavily taxed, namely, tobacco and tea. Now, if there be two articles, the imposition of a customs duty on which would bear hard against the poor and relieve the rich—that is relatively—they are tobacco and tea. Let us see how it would work out in Canada. The average consumption per head of tobacco in this country is 2½ pounds, and the average consumption of tea per head is four

pounds. Just for a moment let us follow up this English policy that is so dear to the leader of the Opposition, and let us take the English system of taxation, and impose duties on tea and tobacco. In England there is a tax on tobacco of 4s. per pound, or \$1.00. Two pounds and a quarter of tobacco would mean a taxation of \$2.25 per annum per head of the population of Canada. Now, we come to tea. In England the taxation on tea is 12½ cents per pound, and the average consumption per head in Canada being four pounds, then each and every man in Canada would have to contribute 50 cents a year. We have then on these two items alone a tax of \$2.75 per head per annum of the population of Canada, a tax that is almost equal to the whole custom duty imposed by the Government of the country to-day. Now, what does this mean, Sir? It means that every poor man pays just as much as the rich man, and even more, because the poor people of this country drink more tea than do the rich, and the poor people of this country, if I mistake not, smoke more of ordinary tobacco than do the wealthy classes. Allowing the average family in Canada to be five persons, we find that each and every household in Canada, if we adopted the English system of taxation, must pay each year in taxation a sum of not less than \$13.75 on these articles. Such a policy as that would be simply ruinous to the poor people of this country.

The National Policy, Mr. Speaker, has been in force in Canada since 1878. I challenge hon. gentlemen opposite to select any test which we would ordinarily take to gauge the improvement of a country and to apply that test to the condition of Canada. By applying that test we find, that since the inauguration of this policy, Canada has been going ahead by leaps and bounds. It is all well enough for hon. gentlemen opposite to talk about this trifle and about that trifle, and the effect on this industry and the effect on that, and the effect on this portion of the country and the effect on that portion of the country. Sir, we must look at the effect upon Canada as a whole, while at the same time we must not ignore, of course, the effect on a particular province or community in framing tariffs. We are not estimating particular sections of the country; we must look upon the country as a whole. When we do this what do we find? We find that all along the line, taking every index you may please to select, Canada has progressed, and is progressing; and why has she progressed and why is she still progressing? It is because the wisdom and foresight of the Government saw fit, at the time of confederation, to adopt a National Policy. The protective system is only one plank in the National Policy. The first thing was to open up the great international highways, our system of canals and our water stretches, and thus to afford facilities for trade and

give our inland portions of the country access to the sea. The second was to build a magnificent interprovincial system of railways, and the third was originated and developed in the course of time; the inauguration of what is known as the National Policy. The hon. gentleman who last spoke (Mr. Paterson) in criticising the figures given by the Minister of Finance and by the hon. gentleman from Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) spoke of the increase in the custom duties. He said, and the hon. member from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) also said the same thing: that this Government has wrongfully taken out of the pockets of the people by customs duties a sum of no less than \$4,000,000 per annum, and the hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) added to that in connection with the protective policy till he got it up to a total somewhere about \$500,000,000. Now, Sir, I have heard remarks from the hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) before. I have heard him on the stump, and one thing that has always struck me, was the remarkable originality of that hon. gentleman. You cannot limit his resources. He will draw on the immense region of nothingness for his facts, but I had thought that during this past summer, his supply of raw material had been about used up. However, in his speech yesterday, I found that his raw material is yet unexhausted, and the genius of the great artificer is yet unimpaired. When he spoke of \$500,000,000 exacted wrongfully from the people by this Government, he was giving expression to a statement that no hon. gentleman on either side of the House would dream for one moment to take seriously.

Mr. GILLMOR. It is true as Gospel.

Mr. POWELL. I am afraid the hon. gentleman does not know how true the Gospel is. The Gospel seems to be the refuge of the hon. gentlemen opposite for their professions, but not for precedents for their practices. The hon. gentleman from Brant, who last addressed the House, quoted scripture. That hon. gentleman was proven out of his own mouth to have been a protectionist only a few years ago. A protectionist then, he is a free trader to-day. Hon. gentlemen opposite have mesmerised him or metamorphosed him in some way. To apply the language of scripture to him, and to hon. gentlemen opposite—I do not know that the hon. gentlemen from Charlotte is in the same boat with the others:

Ye compass sea and land to make one proselyte, and having so made him, he becometh doubly more a child of Hell than ye are yourselves.

Now, Sir, to continue the thread of the remarks I was following before the hon. gentleman (Mr. Gillmor) interrupted me. I was referring to the statement made by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir

Richard Cartwright) and reiterated by the hon. member for North Brant (Mr. Paterson) that this Government has taken out of the people \$4,000,000 a year of increased taxation. Why, Sir, \$2,000,000 of that was necessary to pay the interest on the indebtedness which these hon. gentlemen piled up while in power, and the other \$2,000,000 is due to the necessities of an increased population and the general development of the country and an enlargement of its facilities, which demand at the hands of the country a larger amount of money to meet them. That is the logical effect of the country's advancement, and no country can progress without the necessary demands of its progress being met by necessary taxation. I shall not trespass further upon the time of the House; I did not intend at this stage of the debate to speak, but for the kind hearing I have received from hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House in the few imperfect remarks I have given utterance to, I beg to return my thanks.

Mr. BORDEN. Mr. Speaker, I must congratulate my hon. friend from Westmoreland (Mr. Powell) for having brought us back to the recollection of a period some three or four years ago when this chamber was frequently—in fact on all occasions when opportunity offered—made to ring with the wonderful accomplishments of the National Policy. I have observed, however, within the last two sessions, that we have not heard quite so much about the doings of that great panacea, and I think that my hon. friend has started off in this enthusiastic line is due to the fact that he has not been with us very long. If my hon. friend had read the speech of the Finance Minister of last session, or if he had carefully listened to that hon. gentleman's speech this session, I think he would have observed an apologetic tone in it; and he would fail to discover in either of those speeches any of the old-time ring which the Finance Minister and his followers were formerly in the habit of putting into their speeches on the Budget. The hon. Finance Minister had to face this year, as he had to face last year, a condition of things in which he had to apologize for the existence of a deficit of many millions of dollars. He had to admit that we were passing through troublous times, that there was serious depression in the country, although a very short time ago we were told that the National Policy was introduced with the very object of preventing depression, and up to two or three years ago we were told that it had not failed to accomplish its purpose.

But, Sir, I desire to pay some attention to the observations of the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Powell). First of all, that hon. gentleman made some reference—the same thing has been done before by other speakers on that side of the House—to an observation made by the hon. member for South Oxford in reference to

Mr. POWELL.

Ireland, and I think the hon. member entirely misapprehended the argument of the hon. member for South Oxford, and I will take the liberty of referring him to the exact statement which the hon. member for South Oxford made. He said:

The nearest analogy which I can find to the present position of Canada must be looked for on the other side of the sea; it must be looked for in the case of Ireland.

Then he went on to say:

Mr. Leckey was speaking of the effect of an exodus from Ireland, not one iota more important or greater in proportion than that which we have seen from Canada for many and many a year past

And he quoted Mr. Leckey's observation with which I will not trouble the House again.

Mr. POWELL. The hon. gentleman will pardon me for one moment. If that be the case, I would ask him to explain how that page of "Hansard" has any bearing on the matter under discussion.

Mr. BORDEN. The hon. member for South Oxford, as I understand, was pointing out the effect of an exodus from a country, and he said that the exodus from this country had had effects upon it as the exodus from Ireland had upon Ireland. He did not refer to the cause of the exodus; he referred to its effect.

Mr. POWELL. That is his putative speech, not his real speech.

Mr. BORDEN. That is the speech he made which I am endeavouring to explain to the hon. gentleman, as he has evidently not been able to understand it.

Mr. POWELL. I shall understand it now, undoubtedly.

Mr. BORDEN. I cannot supply the information and the necessary ability to understand what I say. The other argument which the hon. member for South Oxford, based upon his comparison of the condition of things in Canada with the case of Ireland, was this. He said:

Then there is another analogy to Ireland which hon. gentlemen would do well to note. Sir, what, by unanimous consent of every historian worthy of the name—whether he be of English or Irish descent—was the most potent cause of all of Ireland's woes during the last two centuries? Sir, ten times greater curse to Ireland, ten times greater source of evil to Ireland, than even Cromwell's sword or Strongbow's either, was that vile system of protection which, for the sake of propitiating a small number of English manufacturers, stamped out ruthlessly and crushed every attempt which the people of Ireland made to raise themselves in the scale of nations and humanity.

Mr. SPROULE. Who misunderstood it now? He meant that protection was accountable for the exodus.

Mr. BORDEN. He was speaking of something that took place two centuries ago.

Mr. SPROULE. I admit it, but I was asking what was the explanation of the exodus if he did not say it was due to protection, and you read the very words.

Mr. BORDEN. Not at all. Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman referred to the census, of which he went into a somewhat elaborate analysis in an attempt to prove that the manufacturers of this country have enormously increased. I would like to ask that hon. gentleman where we would naturally look for the proofs of the fact that the manufacturing industries of Canada had enormously increased? Where should we go to ascertain what the agricultural industries of Canada are doing? What the lumbering industries, and the mining industries of Canada are doing? We look to see what results of the energy put forth in those industries have been exported from this country to foreign countries. Applying that test to these, and applying it also to our manufactures, we find that in this year of grace 1895, we exported a beggarly \$7,000,000 of manufactured products from Canada, of which, at least \$3,500,000 cannot be at all attributed to any influence which the policy of this Government has upon those industries. That will reduce the exports of manufactures to about \$4,000,000, which is the figure at which they stood from 1874 to 1878, before the National Policy was inaugurated.

But the hon. gentleman took a great deal of trouble to classify the manufactures of this country. I have not had the opportunity of examining his figures in detail, of course, and I must leave to some one who will follow me to take that up. But it is an opportune moment, I think, to call your attention, Sir, to the extraordinary exhibit which the census of this country shows with reference to the manufacturing industries, so that we may see how these industries have been padded out in the census in every conceivable manner, in order to make them present a respectable showing. I desire to call attention to a few of these industries, and will take more particularly those of the province of Nova Scotia, from which I come. In this large list of industries which is paraded before this country as evidence of those which have been developed by the policy of the Government, that of carpet-making ranks as an important one; and I find that in the county of Antigonish, according to the census, there are no less than seventy carpet-making establishments. I find that on the buildings in which these establishments are carried on, \$100 has been expended for construction. I find that in the tools and machinery used in them, \$1,089 have been invested. I find that the labourers who troop to these different establishments to engage in their daily work consisted of sixty-five women, one boy, and two girls, and that the total wages paid out in one year by these seventy establishments,

amounted to \$4,539. I find, also, that the total value of raw material consumed by them amounted to \$4,990, and that the total output was \$9,803. Well, Sir, I find that dress-making and millinery figures extensively in the census. In my own county, King's, Nova Scotia, there are, according to the census, 114 of these establishments. With reference to these, \$1,472 was invested in lands, \$4,340 in buildings, \$5,900 in machinery and tools, and the working capital amounted to \$4,495. Their employees consisted of 164 women, one boy, and nineteen girls. I find that cabinet and furniture establishments in the county of King's number five, as entered in the census, of which \$305 represents the amount of money invested in the land, \$1,275 in the buildings, \$350 in the machinery, and \$230 in the working capital; and the employees are six men and one woman. There is also one confectionery establishment, with one employee, and one edged tool factory. Of tanneries in my county, the census gives nine, in which thirteen people are employed. Well, Sir, I had the curiosity some time ago, having learned from the census returns that there had been a large increase in the number of new industries in the shiretown of my county, to investigate the matter and find out, really what amount of capital was invested, what number of new hands were employed, and what amount of wages was paid; and I found that the increase in the number of establishments from 1881 to 1891 was seventy-two, that the capital invested amounted to \$5,034, or \$70.20 for each new establishment in that town; that the number of hands increased 124, or a percentage of 1.72 in each establishment; that the wages paid had increased to \$29,308, being an average of \$407 to each new establishment per year, or to each employee, an average of \$236.32. I find that raw material increased \$7,296 in all these seventy-two establishments, giving an average of \$101 for each one. I found that the value of the increase in the products of each factory was \$1,200.55, or a total increase of \$87,160.

Now, I think that the simple reading of those statements is sufficient refutation of the statements made by hon. gentlemen opposite as to the increase of manufacturing industries resulting from the National Policy. The hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Powell) said that there were forty million dollars paid in wages by these establishments, and that the farmers of this country got the whole benefit of that. Well, Sir, some of us on this side were labouring under the delusion, perhaps, that the gentlemen known as monopolists in this country, the gentlemen who own these factories, the gentlemen who have clubbed together and formed monopolies and rings by which they are able to raise the prices of their products to just a little point below the cost

of the imported article, with the duty added, were putting in their pockets a snug little sum of this \$40,000,000. It seems that the hon. gentleman from Westmoreland is giving it all to the farmer. I think it will be news to the farmer that they have received so much money. He said that the National Policy was not intended to increase imports. Well, the hon. gentleman is frank for once. But that is not the story that has been told us up to this time. We were told that the National Policy was to increase trade, but this hon. gentleman seems at last to have grasped the truth and he says that it was no part of the design of the National Policy to increase imports. Therefore, the fact that our trade is diminishing is no disappointment, but, on the contrary, gratification to the hon. gentleman, because it shows the fulfilment, according to his opinion, of the objects of the National Policy. No doubt the hon. gentleman is quite right. The effect of the National Policy is to diminish trade, and it would not have had the effect designed for it if it had not decreased the imports. And so, after seventeen years of the operation of that policy we have at last reached the logical result of its adoption in the large deficits which have overtaken us. The hon. gentleman entered into several intricate and extraordinary calculations to show that the conditions of affairs after all, with regard to our trade, was not as bad as it appeared. He said there had been a net increase in the total value of trade between 1879 and 1895 of thirty or forty millions of dollars. But he then goes on to show that it is more. Everybody knows, he says, that the prices of goods have fallen 30 per cent, and he deliberately added 30 per cent to the figures and showed that the increase had been from forty to fifty millions or more. If this rule is to be applied in this case, I would ask hon. gentlemen opposite, who are constantly talking about what happened in the years from 1874 to 1878 to apply the same rule to that time. As everybody knows the shrinkage in values between 1874 and 1879 was enormously greater than the shrinkage from 1879 to 1895.

But the hon. gentleman had something to say about the markets of the country to the south of us. He said we had not the key to those markets. If the hon. gentleman had been here in 1878 or before that, or if he had taken the trouble to read the speeches of his friends, if he had read the speech of my hon. friend from Cumberland (Mr. Dickey) in this House as lately as last session, he would have learned that they thought they were going to secure for us the markets of the United States. You will remember, Mr. Speaker, for you were here before 1878, that one of the arguments by which the people were induced—or seduced—into bringing into operation the National Policy was the promise that it would force the people of the United States to agree to a treaty of

Mr. BORDEN.

reciprocity with this country. And my hon. friend from Cumberland (Mr. Dickey) said as lately as last session that it would never do to take off the duty on agricultural products and on our manufactured goods, because if we did so we should have no hope of ever securing reciprocity with the United States.

Mr. DICKEY. Does not the hon. gentleman agree with that?

Mr. BORDEN. I am replying to the argument of the hon. member for Westmoreland who said that we had not the key to those markets. Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is right in saying that we have not that key. We had it once, but we have lost it, or we have allowed it to get rusty, simply because hon. gentlemen opposite failed to use that key when they had the opportunity of doing so; simply because these hon. gentlemen while professing every desire to have reciprocity with the great nation to the south of us have adopted every means that skilful men could adopt to avoid using that key and to prevent the opening of these markets to this country. The hon. member for Westmoreland said that it would be a serious blow to the farmers of this country to have reciprocal trade with the United States. He asked: Are the farmers of Canada going to trade with the farmers of the United States? I would like to ask him if he does not remember, or if he has not read the commercial history of his country from 1854 to 1866? If he would take the trouble to read that history, he would learn that this country—then five separate provinces—carried on a trade with the United States through which they prospered as they never prospered before, and as they never prospered since. He would have learned that their trade with the United States, which amounted to about twenty millions in 1854 increased in these twelve years to eighty millions of dollars. Does the hon. gentleman go back entirely upon the history of his own party? Does he go back upon what the party professed, or is he sincere and does he refuse to agree to the fraud which they perpetrated on this country in 1891? Does he deliberately go back upon the policy his party adopted in 1891 and which they asked the people to send a new Parliament here to legislate upon—the policy of seeking to enter into a treaty with the United States similar to the treaty of 1894?

Mr. McALISTER. Who abrogated that treaty? Was it not the United States?

Mr. BORDEN. It came to an end and they declined to renew it. In any case that does not affect the question. The hon. gentleman from Westmoreland has argued that we do not want reciprocity with the United States, that it would be an injury to this country.

Mr. COSTIGAN. He did not say so.

Mr. BORDEN. He said that as plainly as the English language could say it. Otherwise there was no point in his statement whatever.

Mr. FOSTER. Oh, yes, there was.

Mr. BORDEN. Now, the hon. gentleman referred to the policy of the United States. He said that the United States had become great by a policy of protection, and he referred to the strict character of the protection which existed in that country. Well, Sir, I was under the impression that the time of the greatest prosperity in the United States was during the free trade period from 1848 to 1860; and I was under the impression that the evil policy of protection into which the United States has unfortunately fallen was due to the fact that they were forced to raise large sums of money to carry on the war and to pay their debts, and not with a view to protecting their industries. But having done that, having placed in a position of great power and influence men who banded themselves together, selfish men, monopolists, the Government of the country fell entirely into the power of those men. Although they have made great efforts to do so, it seems impossible for the country to free itself from the thralldom of the protective influences under which they have fallen. Now, my hon. friend from Westmoreland (Mr. Powell) had much to tell us about the terrible condition of the mother country, particularly the agriculturists in that country. However, by way of preface, he said that Great Britain did not adopt a policy of free trade until after she had thoroughly developed all her industries, and become mistress of the situation. What a magnanimous nation she was, to be sure. Having become enormously rich, having control of the manufactures of the world, it was only then that Great Britain threw down the barriers, and opened her doors, and asked all the nations of the world to come there and trade. Now, my reading of the commercial history of Great Britain is entirely different from that. I had a notion that it was after the abolition of the duties, the abolition of the corn laws, the adoption of the policy of free trade, about 1843 or 1845, down to the free trade policy which was fully adopted, perhaps in 1860—that it was in those years, and since that time, that Great Britain has made the greatest strides, and had won, in fact, the commercial supremacy of the world. If the hon. gentleman's statement is true, then I have misread English history. He says that the protective policy is the only policy which can lift the agriculturists of England out of the slough of despond in which, he said, they are now to be found. He says that something must be done for the English farmer, and that something, according to his idea, is protection, that is to say, that duties must be imposed upon agricultural products which go into

Great Britain. That would be an interesting thing for the farmers of Canada to know, that it is the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite to advise, by their speeches in this House, the farmers of England to insist upon the adoption by Great Britain of a policy of protection. He says that something must be done. Well, Mr. Speaker, there is something that could be done—give the farmers, give the people of England, Ireland and Scotland, the land of England, Ireland and Scotland, and I will guarantee that the farmers of those islands will be able to take care of themselves against competition from any part of the world. It is the iniquitous land system which is in existence there, against which the farmers of the British Isles have to contend. Protection to farmers! The only protection which you can give to the farmer is to reduce the cost of living, and you reduce thereby the cost of producing the articles which he has to sell. In that way you will protect him. The hon. gentleman says that cheap transportation has had something to do with the melancholy condition in which he says the British farmer is at present. According to the hon. gentleman, cheap transportation is a bad thing, and so he would overcome that by placing a high tariff and increasing the price of the articles which the people of England are to consume. Why, Mr. Speaker, we are asked in this country year after year, to vote thousands and tens of thousands, and millions of dollars, in subsidizing lines of steamboats, and to build lines of railways—for what purpose? For the purpose of cheapening transportation. According to my hon. friend from Westmoreland, cheap transportation is an unfortunate thing, because it is a mistaken policy. Now, the hon. gentleman told us a wonderful economic truth, namely, that free trade was hard on the poor man, and that the National Policy, more than anything else, he believed, conserved the interests of the poor man. Well, this is the first time I ever heard it claimed that protection was in the interest of the poor man. I have heard it said that protection would increase the demand for labour, and indirectly, possibly, it might be claimed that it was in the interest of the labourers; but I have never heard it said before that free trade was against the interests of the poor man. Will he tell me that to permit every man, the poorest man, to buy what he requires to use where he likes, and in the cheapest market of the world, is a hardship to the poor man? Will he tell me that when you grant a man liberty to go where he likes to select his goods in the cheapest market, and to go where he likes to sell what he has produced in the dearest market, is a policy which is inimical to the interest of the poor man? The hon. gentleman referred to tobacco. Well, I am sure if he had listened to the speech of my hon. friend the Finance Minister, he would have learned that tobacco

is a voluntary tax. The hon. gentleman always informed us that certain articles are taxed which the people can use or not, as they see fit, and that, therefore, it is not fair to make a deduction of that kind; consequently, I do not think that the hon. gentleman had a right to make that use of that argument. Well, so much for the observations of the hon. member for Westmoreland. I will now turn for a moment to the speech of the hon. the Finance Minister. I observe that this year that hon. gentleman made a very modest claim as to what the National Policy is doing for the farmers of this country. He told us this year that the National Policy had given to the farmers of Canada an increased market to the extent of about \$1,600,000. And this was after seventeen years of that policy. I remember the hon. gentleman two years ago claiming in this House that his policy had given our farmers a market of about ten and a half millions a year, and that he considered it a very great achievement. I took occasion at that time to point out to the hon. gentleman that he was entirely mistaken, and that the figures which he had given to the House were entirely misleading; that so far from having given to the country by his policy a home market of about ten millions and a half a year he actually lost to the country a trade of ten millions annually as between this country and the United States; that he and Mr. McKisley together, by duties imposed on this side of the line and on the United States side of the line had excluded from Canada a profitable trade to the extent of \$6,000,000 worth of wheat, simply passed through Canada and exported, giving employment to our people and our ships, and that they further destroyed a trade of \$4,000,000 in barley and peas which we sent to the people to the south, and for which we brought back \$4,000,000 worth of corn and cornmeal. The hon. gentleman has never questioned the accuracy of that statement, and now we find that a claim of benefiting the country ten millions and a half dollars annually has dwindled down to the insignificant sum of \$1,600,000, after the operation of the National Policy for seventeen years. This is the gross result of the protection which the hon. gentleman promised to farmers of Canada in 1878. Talk about agricultural interests and a market for the products of the farmers; all the hon. Finance Minister now claims is that a value of \$1,600,000 of pork or bacon is prevented coming to this country from the United States. Where do we look for a market for the agricultural products we have to sell? Is it within Canada? No, it is outside the boundaries of this Dominion. What is the annual value of the agricultural products we export? Is it a paltry sum of \$1,600,000? The farmers of Canada sell over and above what they supply to the home market not less than the value of \$50,000,000, and it is in

Mr. BORDEN.

the markets of the world to which we have to look for purchasers. Where is the best market to be found? In Great Britain, as we all know. Yet we have the hon. gentleman standing up in this House last session and this session to try and teach the people of England that it is necessary to their interest to impose a duty on these agricultural products and inflict on the people of this country severe loss as a result.

One word with respect to the relative importance of the industries of Canada. I have just spoken of the extent of our agricultural products, and I find they form about one-half of our total exports, their value being about \$50,000,000. Next in position stand the products of the forest, \$26,000,000 odd; next the fisheries, \$11,000,000 odd; the mines, \$6,000,000, and last of all the products of our manufacturing industry, of the value of \$7,000,000, which will be enormously diminished by a million in value of settlers' effects. So that we have the following as the relative position of the industries: The products of the farm, \$50,000,000; of the forest, \$26,000,000; of the fisheries, \$11,000,000; of the mines, \$6,000,000. Yet we are asked to tax all these natural industries which belong to Canada and from which most, if not all, our wealth is drawn, in order to maintain manufacturing industries which export only about \$6,000,000 in value out of \$100,000,000.

We have had many changes in the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite, because I have pointed out that while they are constantly charging us with a change of policy, which is entirely unjust, unfair and untrue, they are changing their policy to suit what happens to be public opinion at the time. I have pointed out in this House before that the first policy they adopted was a policy of revenue tariff, later on they were ready to enter into an arrangement for commercial union with the United States, later on they adopted a policy of protection, later on their policy was reciprocity with the United States, on which they appealed to the country, in 1891, and later on it was tariff reform. But now we seem to have a new policy known as the policy of Britain for the Britons; I believe that is the way it was stated by the Secretary of State who has come back to this country to put matters right and make all things pleasant for hon. gentlemen opposite, and perhaps unpleasant for some of the hon. gentlemen opposite, for example the Premier.

Mr. McALISTER. And unpleasant for hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. BORDEN. I said hon. gentlemen opposite. It is pretty difficult to understand just exactly what this new policy is, but it is called a policy of preferential trade, which seems to me to be something like this: say to Great Britain. We prefer British goods; it is a matter of preference with us, but we do not buy them. We put on a tariff

which excludes them, but never mind, in our heart of hearts, we prefer them.

So far as goes any utterances I have been able to see from any of the gentlemen who are now advocating preferential trade, I have not observed any suggestion as to what means they propose to take to open our markets to the manufactured goods from Great Britain. I do observe, however, that they propose coolly to ask Great Britain to impose differential duties against the rest of the world in favour of us. While we are imposing a system of taxation in this country, outrageously unjust to Great Britain, by which the rate of taxation on British goods is 22 per cent upon what we import from her, as against a rate of 12½ per cent on what we import from the United States, it seems we are to have the hardihood to ask the mother country to impose duties against the rest of the world, and to let Canadian products into her markets free. Mr. Speaker, that is all very well, if Great Britain will do it, but it occurs to me from my reading of the speeches and writings of the leading statesmen in England, that this is not very likely to happen. I find that Lord Salisbury very recently has given utterance to the following words:—

I distinctly disavowed any advocacy of such a policy. I was urging a totally different thing, and that was that our principles of free trade should not include measures for obtaining reciprocity. There is no comparison between the two ideas of reciprocity and protection. On the contrary, so far was I from urging for British producers, that I was urging that we should take measures to prevent our foreign competitors from using protection against us. I am sensitive upon the suggestion that I have ever promised or urged upon any audience a belief that protection would return within any period to which this generation can look.

Sir Charles Dilke, who is a high authority upon colonial matters, made use of the following language recently:—

An Imperial customs union was an impracticable idea. Lancashire, he said, would not favour import duties on American cottons for the benefit of the West Indies; Yorkshire would not favour duties on South American wool for the benefit of Australia.

Then, Sir, I find these words contained in a despatch of the Imperial Government of recent date:

A differential duty is open to all the objections, from the consumer's point of view, which can be urged against a general duty, and, while it renders necessary the same restrictions on trade, it has the additional disadvantage of dislocating trade by its tendency to divert it from its regular and natural channels.

Lord Jersey, who attended the Intercolonial Conference at Ottawa as Great Britain's representative, pointed out at the conference:

That British imports from foreign countries in 1893 amounted to \$313,000,000, or 77 per cent, whilst from British possessions the imports were

only \$92,000,000, or 23 per cent. We find a market for two-thirds of our exports of British produce in foreign countries, and for one-third in British possessions; i.e., £146,000,000 to £72,000,000." In his report to the Home Government, he said that the proposal meant in the colonies the remission of taxation, but in Great Britain the creation of new taxation, not a mere variation in the existing machinery, but the introduction of a new system.

In 1894 the gross trade of Great Britain, imports and exports, was £682,000,000, of which £509,000,000 was done with foreign countries, and £173,000,000 with British possessions, 75 per cent with the former, 25 with the latter. But trade with the self-governing colonies, Canada and Newfoundland, Australia and South Africa, was only £84,000,000, or under 13 per cent of the whole, the rest of the colonial trade being with India (£58,000,000) and minor possessions, which would not be affected. Now, Sir, it seems to me that in view of these quotations which I have given from Lord Salisbury, from Sir Charles Dilke, from the message of the Imperial Government itself, and from Lord Jersey, who represented the British Government at the Intercolonial Conference here—it seems to me that it is the merest and veriest nonsense to suppose that Great Britain is to-day going to adopt any such policy as that suggested by the Secretary of State (Sir Charles Tupper, Bart.) and by hon. gentlemen on the opposite side of the House. Sir, I will tell the Government how they can show their desire for preferential trade. If they will take the resolution which my hon. friend from Queen's, P.E.I., (Mr. Davies) proposed here two or three years ago, and adopt that as their policy, they will be taking a very long step towards bringing about better and closer trade relations between this country and the mother country. That resolution reads as follows:—

That inasmuch as Great Britain admits the products of Canada into her ports free of duty, this House is of the opinion that the present scale of duties exacted by Canada on goods mainly imported from Great Britain, should be reduced.

Now, Mr. Speaker, before I take my seat, I desire to call the attention of the House and the country to the promises made by hon. gentlemen opposite prior to 1878 and since that date; and I wish to contrast their promises with their performance. In 1878, and before that time, these hon. gentlemen complained that the annual expenditure of the Mackenzie Government which was less than twenty-three and a half millions, was too much, and they contended that it should be reduced by from one to two millions dollars. How have they kept their promises? They have kept that promise by increasing the expenditure which was twenty-three and a half millions in 1878, up to thirty-eight millions odd, in 1895, an increase of only \$15,000,000.

They told us that we were increasing the debt, although we were doing so in order to carry out obligations which they had imposed upon the country before they went out of office. They told us that we were increasing the debt by leaps and bounds, and in an unjustifiable way, and they said, "Bring us into office and we will see that it shall be increased no longer." But instead of that, the debt which stood at \$140,000,000 in 1878 when these hon. gentlemen took office, stands to-day at over \$253,000,000. That promise they have kept by increasing the debt to the extent of \$113,000,000. The hon. gentleman said that all the best blood of the country was leaving us in 1878, and one of the principal objects of the introduction of the National Policy was to stop the exodus, and to keep the people at home; yet the census shows that instead of the small exodus which was taking place in those years, the people have gone out of the country by hundreds of thousands since the advent of these hon. gentlemen to power. Not only has the natural increase of the country, its best bone and blood, gone out, but immigrants to the number of 800,000 whom these hon. gentlemen boasted had come in, have gone out with them. That is the way they have kept their promise to stop the exodus and increase the population of this country. They promised us that if we adopted their policy they would force the Yankees to give us reciprocity. "Raise a high wall, raise the barriers against American goods," we used to hear this chamber ring with the eloquence of the present Secretary of State (Sir Charles Tupper)—raise high barriers against the United States, and shut out their goods, and in a short time—within two years, I think he said—we will have them on their knees knocking at our doors and asking for a reciprocity treaty. Here we have gone from 1878 to 1896, and we have an hon. gentleman standing up this afternoon and stating that reciprocity with the United States would be the worst possible thing that could befall this country. They promised to increase prices. Everybody was going to get rich; the farmer was to have increased prices for his products, the price of wheat, the price of oats, the price of beef, the price of everything was to increase. I ask hon. gentlemen to compare the prices of agricultural products in the market to-day with the prices of the same products in 1878. In many cases they will find that they are not half what they were in 1878, and the average price will certainly be one-third lower than it was at that time. But, Sir, we had another series of promises—another period of promises; that was the period when the National Policy was being hatched. Later on, we came to a period when hon. gentlemen were approaching the time of a general election, and when they were building the Canadian Pacific Railway, and we find that Sir Charles Tupper, Sir John Macdonald, and

Mr. BORDEN.

Sir Leonard Tilley engaged in a perfect carnival of promises; and, Mr. Speaker, as you must be somewhat tired, and as I am sure my hearers are, I think I will enliven this occasion by reading from the reports some of the promises which were made in those roseate days of 1880. It is almost like reading from the Arabian Nights. I will ask you to compare what those hon. gentlemen promised with what has happened as a matter of fact. In 1880 Sir John Macdonald said:

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There are one or two postulates which I must ask the House to consider, because if we admit them, the rest is simply a matter of calculation. It is believed from the best information we can get that 20,000 people went into the North-west last year.

Mr. BLAKE. There were not more than one-tenth of that number.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I can inform the hon. gentleman, from the returns of the hon. the Minister of the Department of Agriculture, that 12,000 are known to have gone in, and, from the best information we have got, as many more went in that could not be counted, who were not under the supervision of that department; but let us say that 8,000 more went in, and that only makes 20,000. If we are to judge from the reports we have heard, we may rely upon it that 50,000 people will go into that section of the country this year. We know that in the United States, when railways were about to be opened across the prairies in the various states and territories, a large influx could always be calculated upon, because there is always an increasing rush towards those lands which are being opened up by the construction of railways. We are told that 50,000 will come in, but let us put the number at 25,000, and I have been informed by every one—and I have spoken to a great number of persons who have come from the North-west, and who have the best means of judging—that that estimate is small.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I suppose it was the same person who informed Lord Beaconsfield, who thought it was absurd.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Very likely. I would ask the hon. member for Lambton if he really does not believe that number will go in?

Mr. MACKENZIE. As the hon. gentleman has asked me a question, I will tell him that I do not believe so, nor do I believe that 20,000 went in last year. I think a large number will go, but not the number he stated.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Then, the hon. gentleman is the first person that I have heard say that 25,000 was not altogether too small an estimate of the certain rush of emigration going to that country this year. That number, of course, includes the baby as well as the adult; it includes the whole population moving into the country. In ordinary cases the estimate is, the average family numbers five—the head of the family and four others. In the Western States the average is not so large, for obvious reasons; because so many young men go in without families to settle there, and the average is reduced to three instead of five. But in the future I cannot calculate upon such a low estimate, because, if there is the rush estimated, families will move in there in larger numbers than in any previous year, as many may have sent on their sons before them as pioneers. We have made an estimate of four to the family. It is a larger average than has

occurred hitherto in Canada or the United States. If, then, you take four to a family, we estimate that of the 25,000 or 24,000 that go there, 3,000 will be heads of families, occupying homesteads and pre-emption claims. Every man takes up his pre-emption claim. He gets his lot free, and he looks forward to having an additional farm, from the pre-emption; and that is one great advantage of our system over the American system, where a man is obliged to pay cash down for the whole amount of his pre-emption claim. Then, we estimate that one-fourth of the adults, or 1,500, will become purchasers of railway lands—men coming from England, Ireland and Scotland, and some from the United States, who possess money. Notwithstanding the sneer of the hon. gentleman opposite, a great many Americans are going to into that country. There is a large move about to take place from Pennsylvania into the North-west. As I stated, one-fourth of the 20,000 will buy railway lands. They have got money, and every man will take up the homestead and pre-emption claim and become a purchaser of railway lands as well. Probably, another fourth will be labourers, men with families, but men who will not take up land. Some hold that is too high an estimate, and that a mechanic will take up his lot and work it in such a way as to secure a title thereof; but, in making this calculation, we are trying to keep within the bounds, rather than make a statement which would be considered excessive. I calculate that 25,000 people will go into our North-west this year; that 3,000 heads of families will take up free homesteads; that 1,500 will purchase railway lands, and 1,500 will not purchase any. That is a moderate calculation. If this estimate is admitted, then the rest of the problem is altogether a matter of figures. Of the railway lands, we calculate that the average purchase will be 320 acres for each head of a family. We then take the average price of the whole of the lands extending from the \$5 section, within 5 miles of the railway, to 60 or 100 miles away. The average price of lands sold to the 1,500 purchasers would be \$3 an acre; this is greatly under the average. What then would be the result?

Mr. BLAKE. Over the whole belt—220 miles?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes. Take \$1, \$2.50, \$4 and \$5 per acre, and they average \$3; admit we sell at those terms lands in 1880 to the value of \$1,440,000, of which we shall receive one-tenth of the price, or \$144,000; we should receive from the fees for the homestead and pre-emption grants \$60,000 more, making in all \$204,000 in cash. Then we calculate that, as 25,000 would go in 'his year, we may add each year an increase of 5,000, so that we may expect 30,000 to go in next year. That is a very small percentage, if we look to the results of railway enterprises in the United States. We assume, therefore, an increase of 5,000 a year till 1890, and expect in that year 75,000 settlers in our North-west.

Mr. BLAKE. Can you not make it another 10,000?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think that is a very moderate estimate. On those figures the estimate of the total cash revenue to be received for the lands by 1890 is \$38,593,000.

Mr. BLAKE. That is up to 1890?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes, and including 1890.

Mr. BLAKE. That amount with interest?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We expect \$38,593,000, including simple interest for the lands sold in that period.

Mr. BLAKE. What proportion is principal and what interest?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I cannot say. That will be the total sum received in cash to the end of 1890. But, besides, there will be all the instalments to come in after 1890, accruing yearly, so that the lands sold in 1890 will be one-tenth paid for nine years afterwards—for each year there will be an instalment of one-tenth paid. The actual value in 1890 of the pre-emption up to that date, unpaid, will be \$16,444,000. The actual value of the railway lands sold up to that date will be \$16,272,000, making in all \$32,712,000. If you add to that total unpaid the \$38,593,000 that will be paid in 1890, you get a grand total of \$71,305,000. Deduct for that the estimated cost of surveys for the ten years, \$2,000,000, and of the land officers, \$400,000, and you reduce it by \$2,400,000. Having shown that the estimate of the number of settlers, if the land be taken up, and if the average price is not excessive, we find that we have \$69,000,000 either of money in hand, or money for which we shall have the best security in the world—the land itself.

Now, Sir Charles Tupper went a little better than that. He said:

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. When I remind the House that the land alone, according to the authority of the right hon. the Minister of the Interior, upon the calculation, which he believes to be sound, within the next ten years will give us \$38,000,000 in hand, and \$32,000,000 to be received on mortgages within the following ten years, or a total sum of \$70,000,000, it will be seen that we incur no risk. But, suppose the land does not give us that, we have an authority which hon. gentlemen opposite will accept: that the customs revenue from the people who will go into that country for the next ten years will furnish the interest on \$60,000,000.

Then Sir Leonard Tilley said:

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. An hon. member says Oh! but when we have \$4,500,000 assured for this year, when there is no doubt, after the reduction that we propose to make, that there will be a surplus of \$3,000,000 for the next year, it is not, I think, asking too much for the hon. gentleman to accept as reasonable a surplus of \$1,000,000 a year for the remaining seven years of the nine, commencing on the 1st of July last; that would make \$14,500,000, and would with the sinking fund reduce the net debt to \$175,897,680. But, if we estimate the increase of population at but 18 per cent only during the ten years, the increase of the last decade, the result will be that, taking the population at that period and the debt as stated, the net debt will then be \$34.27 per head. If we have any extraordinary increase of our population (which I think it is but right to expect we will, but which I have not estimated for here), it will be ample to meet at any rate any extraordinary expenditure that may be chargeable to the debt which we are not anticipating at the present moment. But, more than that, if the 150,000,000 acres of arable land that will be the property of the Government after handing over to the syndicate 25,000,000 of acres, and which is now as established, as fit for settlement, yields but \$1 an acre for half of it (the other half being offered as a free gift to settlers), it will meet the whole expenditure of the Government on the Pacific Railway and in the North-west down to 1890. If that be the case, then our debt, which certainly is not alarming, provided we realize from these lands the sum that I have

stated, would only be about \$100,000,000, instead of \$175,000,000, or less than twenty dollars per head.

That was the prophecy of Sir Leonard Tilley in 1880, who was then Finance Minister, that the debt of Canada would be \$100,000,000 in 1890, whereas it is \$253,000,000.

Sir Charles Tupper, in the same debate said, speaking of the capabilities of the North-west, when he said, there would be 100,000 farmers, each cultivating 320 acres of wheat land :

I am glad the hon. gentleman has done so. I am glad his attention has been drawn to the fact that 100,000 farmers, cultivating 320 acres each, or 200,000 farmers, cultivating half that quantity each, and taking the product at only 20 bushels to the acre, instead of 27 or 30, which is the average in the North-west in favourable years, would give 640,000,000 bushels of wheat, or 50 per cent more wheat than the whole United States produces to-day. You have only to look at those figures for a single moment to see what the future of Canada is, to see what a magnificent granary for the world is placed in our Canadian North-west, and, when you remember we have six belts running through that fertile country that would each give 320 each to 100,000 farmers, you can understand, to some little degree, what a magnificent future awaits us in the development of that great country.

Now, these were the promises made in 1880. They promised that we should have an export of 640,000,000 bushels of wheat per year ; that we should receive enough money out of Dominion lands in the North-west—and mind you, Sir, this calculation was seriously made and placed before the House and the country—to reduce the debt of Canada from \$100,000,000, or \$20 per head. Yet to-day, after five years longer of this beneficent policy, after five years further opportunity to sell the lands and bring people to the North-west we have a debt not of \$100,000,000, but of \$253,000,000, and a debt per capita, not of \$20, but of \$50. So much for the promises of these hon. gentlemen as compared with their performances. And these are the men who are now, on the eve of going to the country—although they do not intend to do it so long as the law will permit them to avoid appealing to the electorate, and perhaps longer, because although they are great sticklers for the constitution when other people are violating it, they are not such great sticklers for it when their own interests are concerned—but these are the men who are now, on the eve of an appeal to the country asking the people to return them again to power for another five years. In spite of the record I have shown, they have the effrontery to make this appeal. They promised solemnly that the expenditure of Canada which was \$23,000,000 in 1878 should be reduced ; and yet, despite that promise, they have increased it to \$38,000,000. They said that the debt was altogether too great in 1878, when it was \$140,000,000, and they promised that even after building the Canadian Pacific Rail-

Mr. BORDEN.

way they would reduce it to \$100,000,000 in 1890, and yet, despite that promise, they have increased it to \$253,000,000. These are the gentlemen who ask the people to give them another term in office. These are the hon. gentlemen who assured the people in 1878 that if they were put in power, they would, within two years, by means of their policy, secure the boom of reciprocity of trade with the people of the United States. And these same hon. gentlemen stand up in this House and argue that reciprocity with the United States would be an injury to the people of this country.

These are the promises, Mr. Speaker, and these are the performances. What have these hon. gentlemen succeeded in doing ? They have succeeded in inaugurating in this our country a system of ring rule, of rule by monopoly. They have succeeded in carrying into effect a system by which a vast majority of the people are taxed in order to make a few millionaires. In this country, prior to the unfortunate moment when the people so far forgot themselves as to place these hon. gentlemen in office, there was general contentment and general prosperity. It is true there were not so many millionaires as there are to-day. But the farms were worth more money than they are to-day, the farmers were happier and were making more money out of their farms than they are to-day. The money was left in their pockets and they were not forced to pay tribute to make millionaires, and to create rings in this country. The hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) undertook to contrast the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite with our policy. He insisted upon putting words in our mouths. These hon. gentlemen can never stand up in this House, or anywhere else, and argue a case fairly upon the facts as they exist. They put words in their opponents' mouths and then proceed to answer the arguments that they themselves have made ; they build up men of straw for the purpose of knocking them down. The hon. member for Pictou undertook to tell us yesterday that the policy of the Liberal party was one of absolute free trade, and, therefore, necessarily, of direct taxation. That hon. gentleman has no right to speak for the Liberal party. The policy of the Liberal party has been fairly defined, and it has been one and the same continuously from the day when Hon. Alexander Mackenzie took office in 1874 down to this very moment. And the underlying principle of this policy is that taxation should be imposed for the purpose of raising revenue, that the chief object of establishing a tariff is to raise money to meet the public expenses. This is the line of demarcation, the distinguishing point between hon. gentlemen opposite and the policy of the Liberal party—and was admitted by the Finance Minister in his Budget speech either last year or the year before, when he said that his

party stood upon the policy of protection, that they believed that the tariff should be imposed for the purpose of development. That is the word the hon. gentleman used. We impose taxation, as he said, for the purpose of encouraging and developing Canadian industries. That is to say they impose a tariff for the purpose of forcing the great majority of the people to take money out of their pockets and hand it over to the beneficiaries of the tariff—those who have sufficient influence with hon. gentlemen opposite to secure high rates of duty for the protection of the particular wares they manufacture. These are the distinguishing marks between the policy of the hon. gentlemen opposite and the policy of the Liberal party. And by that we are prepared to stand, and upon that we are ready to ask the verdict of the people of this country. Gentlemen opposite talk about the rate of taxation. The hon. Minister takes credit to himself because he says he has taken off certain taxes and has reduced the burdens upon the people. Where does he get the revenue with which he carries on the business of this country? It can only be through taxation. He lowers the tariff upon certain articles, it is true; but he increases the tariff upon other articles. The money comes out of the pockets of the people. And the evil of the system is that, for every dollar that comes out of the pockets of the people under this "development" policy of hon. gentlemen opposite, another dollar goes into the pockets of the gentleman whose industry they are trying to develop. The hon. gentleman has taken credit to himself for having reduced the duty on sugar. I tell you, Mr. Speaker, and the hon. gentleman that if he had framed his tariff in such a way as to place the money in the treasury which he has ingeniously placed in the pockets of the sugar refiners, we should have no deficit at all. He has taken out of the pockets of the people hundreds of thousands, aye, millions, of dollars which money does not go into the treasury at all. Where, then, does it go? Talk about a free country; talk about a free people! when you have a system of taxation by which a vast majority of the people are forced to support and enrich a few who have the influence and good fortune to be able to secure from hon. gentlemen opposite a law which enables them to levy tribute upon the whole community. Hon. gentlemen opposite have accused us of changing our policy. But I will not refer to that. I will, however, before taking my seat, trouble the House, for I think it cannot be too often repeated, with reading the exact words of the Liberal party's policy:

1.—FREER TRADE—REDUCED TAXATION.

That the customs tariff of the Dominion should be based, not as it is now, upon the protective principle, but upon the requirements of the public service;

That the existing tariff, founded upon an unsound principle, and used, as it has been by the Government, as a corrupting agency wherewith to keep themselves in office, has developed monopolies, trusts and combinations;

It has decreased the value of farm and other landed property;

It has oppressed the masses to the enrichment of a few;

It has checked immigration;

It has caused great loss of population;

It has impeded commerce;

It has discriminated against Great Britain.

In these and many other ways it has occasioned great public and private injury, all of which evils must continue to grow in intensity as long as the present tariff system remains in force.

That the highest interests of Canada demand a removal of this obstacle to our country's progress, by the adoption of a sound fiscal policy, which, while not doing injustice to any class, will promote domestic and foreign trade, and hasten the return of prosperity to our people;

That to that end, the tariff should be reduced to the needs of honest, economical and efficient government;

That it should be so adjusted as to make free, or to bear as lightly as possible upon, the necessities of life, and should be so arranged as to promote freer trade with the whole world, more particularly with Great Britain and the United States.

We believe that the results of the protective system have grievously disappointed thousands of persons who honestly supported it, and that the country, in the light of experience, is now prepared to declare for a sound fiscal policy.

The issue between the two political parties on this question is now clearly defined.

The Government themselves admit the failure of their fiscal policy, and now profess their willingness to make some changes; but they say that such changes must be based only on the principle of protection.

We denounce the principle of protection as radically unsound, and unjust to the masses of the people, and we declare our conviction that any tariff changes based on that principle must fail to afford any substantial relief from the burdens under which the country labours.

This issue we unhesitatingly accept, and upon it we await with the fullest confidence the verdict of the electors of Canada.

2.—ENLARGED MARKETS—RECIPROCITY.

That, having regard to the prosperity of Canada and the United States as adjoining countries, with many mutual interests, it is desirable that there should be the most friendly relations and broad and liberal trade intercourse between them;

That the interests alike of the Dominion and of the Empire would be materially advanced by the establishing of such relations;

That the period of the old reciprocity treaty was one of marked prosperity to the British North American colonies;

That the pretext under which the Government appealed to the country in 1891 respecting negotiations for a treaty with the United States was misleading and dishonest and intended to deceive the electorate;

That no sincere effort has been made by them to obtain a treaty, but that, on the contrary, it is manifest that the present Government, controlled as they are by monopolies and combines, are not desirous of securing such a treaty;

That the first step towards obtaining the end in view, is to place a party in power who are sincerely desirous of promoting a treaty on terms honourable to both countries ;

That a fair and liberal reciprocity treaty would develop the great natural resources of Canada, would enormously increase the trade and commerce between the two countries, would tend to encourage friendly relations between the two peoples, would remove many causes which have in the past provoked irritation and trouble to the governments of both countries, and would promote those kindly relations between the Empire and the Republic which afford the best guarantee for peace and prosperity ;

That the Liberal party is prepared to enter into negotiations with a view to obtaining such a treaty, including a well-considered list of manufactured articles, and we are satisfied that any treaty so arranged will receive the assent of Her Majesty's Government, without whose approval no treaty can be made.

3.—PURITY OF ADMINISTRATION—CONDEMN CORRUPTION.

That the convention deplores the gross corruption in the management and expenditure of public moneys which for years past has existed under the rule of the Conservative party, and the revelations of which by the different parliamentary committees of inquiry have brought disgrace upon the fair name of Canada.

The Government, which profited politically by these expenditures of public moneys of which the people have been defrauded, and which, nevertheless, have never punished the guilty parties, must be held responsible for the wrong-doing. We arraign the Government for retaining in office a Minister of the Crown proved to have accepted very large contributions of money for election purposes from the funds of a railway company, which, while paying the political contributions to him, a member of the Government, with one hand, was receiving Government subsidies with the other.

The conduct of the Minister and the approval of his colleagues after the proof became known to them are calculated to degrade Canada in the estimation of the world and deserve the severe condemnation of the people.

4.—DEMAND STRICTEST ECONOMY—DECREASED EXPENDITURE.

We cannot but view with alarm the large increase of the public debt and of the controllable annual expenditure of the Dominion and the consequent undue taxation of the people under the governments that have been continuously in power since 1878, and we demand the strictest economy in the administration of the Government of the country.

5.—FOR RESPONSIBLE GOVERNMENT—INDEPENDENCE OF PARLIAMENT.

That the convention regrets that by the action of Ministers and their supporters in Parliament, in one case in which serious charges were made against a Minister of the Crown, investigation was altogether refused, while in another case the charges preferred were altered and then referred to a commission appointed upon the advice of the Ministry, contrary to the well-settled practice of Parliament ; and this convention affirms :

That it is the ancient and undoubted right of the House of Commons to inquire into all mat-

Mr. BORDEN.

ters of public expenditure, and into all charges of misconduct in office against Ministers of the Crown, and the reference to royal commissions created upon the advice of the accused is at variance with due responsibility of Ministers to the House of Commons, and tends to weaken the authority of the House over the Executive Government, and this convention affirms that the powers of the people's representatives in this regard should on all fitting occasions be upheld.

6.—THE LAND FOR THE SETTLER—NOT FOR THE SPECULATOR.

That in the opinion of this convention the sales of public lands of the Dominion should be to actual settlers only, and not to speculators, upon reasonable terms of settlement, and in such areas as can be reasonably occupied and cultivated by the settler.

7.—OPPOSE THE DOMINION FRANCHISE ACT—FAVOUR THE PROVINCIAL FRANCHISE.

That the Franchise Act since its introduction has caused the Dominion treasury over a million of dollars, besides entailing a heavy expenditure to both political parties ;

That each revision involves an additional expenditure of a further quarter of a million ;

That this expenditure has prevented an annual revision, as originally intended, in the absence of which young voters entitled to the franchise have, in numerous instances, been prevented from exercising their natural rights ;

That it has failed to secure uniformity, which was the principal reason assigned for its introduction ;

That it has produced gross abuses by partisan revising barrister appointed by the Government of the day.

That its provisions are less liberal than those already existing in many provinces of the Dominion, and that, in the opinion of this convention, the Act should be repealed, and we should revert to the provincial franchise.

8.—AGAINST THE GERRYMANDER—COUNTY BOUNDARIES SHOULD BE PRESERVED.

That by the Gerrymander Acts, the electoral divisions for the return of members to the House of Commons have been so made as to prevent a fair expression of the opinion of the country at the general elections, and to secure to the party now in power a strength out of all proportion greater than the number of electors supporting them would warrant. To put an end to this abuse, to make the House of Commons a fair exponent of public opinion, and to preserve the historic continuity of counties, it is desirable that, in the formation of electoral divisions, county boundaries should be preserved, and that in no case parts of different counties should be put in one electoral division.

9.—THE SENATE DEFECTIVE—AMEND THE CONSTITUTION.

The present constitution of the Senate is inconsistent with the federal principle in our system of government, and is in other respects defective, as it makes the Senate independent of the people and uncontrolled by the public opinion of the country, and should be so amended as to bring it into harmony with the principles of popular government.

10.—QUESTION OF PROHIBITION—A DOMINION PLEBISCITE.

That whereas public attention is at present much directed to the consideration of the admittedly great evils of intemperance, it is desirable that the mind of the people should be clearly ascertained on the question of prohibition by means of a Dominion plebiscite.

Mr. Speaker, as our friends opposite are in the habit of continually taunting us that we have no policy, and as possibly some of them have never had an opportunity, as they never read good, sound literature, of hearing this policy, I think it is desirable that it should be embalmed in the proceedings of this House; so that when in future hon. gentlemen opposite are in doubt as to what the Liberal policy is, they can turn up the pages of "Hansard," which records of the policy of the Liberal party which I have had the honour to read.

Mr. FORBES moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 12 a.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 10th February, 1896.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FISHERY OVERSEER, RIVER THAMES DISTRICT.

Mr. YEO (for Mr. Campbell) asked :

Who is the fishery overseer for Lake St. Clair, Ontario? How many licenses were issued by him during the past year? How much was received for each license? What is the salary of the said overseer?

Mr. COSTIGAN. The fishery overseers are Joseph Boismier at Sandwich, and C. W. Raymond at Mitchell's Bay. In 1895 they countersigned and delivered sixty licenses for said lake, besides issuing eighty-seven angling permits. The fees received were as follows:—By Overseer Boismier, for thirty licenses \$405, for nineteen angling permits at \$5 each, \$95; by Overseer Raymond, for thirty licenses \$188.25, for sixty-eight angling permits at \$5 each, \$340, total, \$528.25. The salary of Overseer Boismier is \$200 per annum, and that of Overseer Raymond \$150 per annum.

46½

POST OFFICE, LINKLETTER ROAD, P.E.I.

Mr. YEO asked :

Has a post office been established at Linkletter Road, Prince County, Prince Edward Island, as promised by the Postmaster General in July last? If not, why not? If so, who is the postmaster?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. A post office has not been established at Linkletter Road, P.E.I. The Postmaster General did not, upon making further inquiries, deem it advisable to establish the proposed office.

INTERCOLONIAL WORKSHOPS AT RIVIERE DU LOUP.

Mr. CHOQUETTE asked :

1. Whether the superintendent of the Intercolonial Railway workshop at Rivière du Loup has been instructed not to take any more apprentices into the said shop?

2. If so, when was the order given, and why?

Mr. HAGGART. The foremen of the Intercolonial Railway workshops along the line, have not the power of taking on apprentices in the shops without instructions to do so from the mechanical superintendent, who obtains his authority from the general manager. It is the practice to limit the number of apprentices, and to employ others when vacancies occur. It is only in this manner that any instructions apply to Rivière du Loup shops.

BUSINESS FAILURES IN ONTARIO AND QUEBEC.

Mr. MARTIN asked :

Whether the attention of the Government has been called to the large number of business failures, many for large amounts, which have recently occurred in Ontario and Quebec? Whether the Government propose to offer any remedy for the position of affairs indicated by these failures?

Mr. FOSTER. The attention of the Government has not been called to the large number of business failures, many for large amounts, which have recently occurred in Ontario and Quebec.

MAIL CARRIAGE TO ST. ROCH DE RICHELIEU.

Mr. BRUNEAU asked :

Who holds the contract for carrying the mail between the station on the South Shore Railway and the parish of St. Roch de Richelieu?

Were tenders asked for, and if so, who were the parties who tendered, and what was the sum named in each tender?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The service between St. Ours and the Montreal and Sorel Railway station, by which St. Roch post office is served, is in the hands of Thomas Duhamel, at the rate of \$80 per annum. Tenders were not invited for the service, as

a private arrangement was made with Mr. Duhamel.

BAIE DES CHALEURS RAILWAY.

Mr. CHOQUETTE asked :

1. Whether the Government are negotiating with the government of Quebec in relation to the purchase of the Baie des Chaleurs Railway ?

2. Is it the intention of the Government to purchase the Baie des Chaleurs Railway, in order to make it a section of the Intercolonial Railway ?

3. In the event of the Government purchasing the Baie des Chaleurs Railway, is it their intention to push on the construction as far as Gaspé Basin ?

Mr. HAGGART. 1. The Government are not negotiating for the purchase of the Baie des Chaleurs Railway. 2. The matter has not been under consideration by the Government. 3. The answer to the previous question also answers this one.

POSTMASTER OF BATISCAN.

Mr. TARTE (Translation) asked :

What is the name of the postmaster of the parish of Batiscan, in the county of Champlain ?

When, and upon whose recommendation was he appointed ?

Are the Government aware that the said postmaster is also a lighthouse keeper ?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. (Translation.) In answer to the hon. member, I may say that the name of the postmaster of Batiscan is Ephrem Labyssonière. His appointment is from the 10th January, 1896. The post office has not yet been transferred to him. The Post Office Department is not informed that Mr. Ephrem Labyssonière is a lighthouse keeper ; but I have given instructions to get some information in that respect.

LIGHTHOUSE AT BATISCAN.

Mr. TARTE asked :

Whether the Government recently sent an agent to Batiscan, in the county of Champlain, in order to purchase a right of way to the lighthouse in that locality ? What is the name of the said agent, the sum agreed upon for the purchase of the right of way, and the name of the person or persons to whom the money is to be paid ?

Mr. COSTIGAN. I am not aware of any agent being sent to that place.

TERRITORIAL EXHIBITION.

Mr. DAVIN asked :

Has the Government read the report of His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor of the North-west Territories to the Honourable the Minister of the Interior, in the Department of the Interior, as follows :—

" TERRITORIAL EXHIBITION.

" The grant of \$25,000 made by Parliament during the session of 1894 towards the holding of a
Sir ADOLPHE CARON.

territorial exhibition in the North-west promises to be fruitful of beneficial results. Up to the present time the small district fairs have established the ability of producers to compete with those of any country in the world so far as cattle, cereals and diversified farming are concerned. The success achieved at the World's Fair naturally enough stimulated all classes to improve upon the prevailing methods, the consequence being that throughout Alberta, Saskatchewan and Assiniboia a marked progress is already noticeable. In holding the proposed territorial exhibition, it was considered advisable that this initiatory object lesson of North-west products should take place at the capital, provided a suitable site could be procured. The town of Regina voted \$10,000 towards erecting suitable buildings, while the town site trustees, representing the Canada and North-west Land Company, the Canadian Pacific Railway, and the Dominion Government, agreed to give a site whereon to erect the necessary structures ; the result being that a well-located and commodious plot of ground a little west of the Territorial assembly building, north of the railway track and immediately upon the main trail, comprising fifty acres, has been secured. I am glad to say the farmers and industrial producers generally throughout the North-west are already taking an active interest in the project, and the agricultural associations have already given assurance of substantial aid. Local committees are now in course of formation ; prize lists are being prepared, keeping in view the resources and distinctive capabilities of each district ; and it is confidently anticipated that the first territorial exhibition, marking a decade since the last spike was driven in a railway connecting the two oceans, will meet with universal support. Alberta, Saskatchewan, and Assiniboia, possessed as they are of certain distinct and well-defined advantages in cattle, horses, and small farm products, lumber and cereals, mixed farming, grain and cattle, will make such a showing as will convince even the most sceptical of the advancement already achieved, as well as of their future possibilities. Long distances have, to a great extent, prevented the intermingling of the people, and interchange of ideas, as well as of products. This, at all times, tends to create jealousies and to jeopardize that unity so much to be desired in new and sparsely-settled communities. A generous rivalry will stimulate the farmers, and, as the settlers are public-spirited and quite capable of accomplishing tenfold what has already been done, they only require encouragement and a recognition of their industry to bring about this much-to-be-desired result. Great satisfaction is expressed that His Excellency the Governor General has consented to open the proceedings, and many leading public men, both from Canada and the United States, have promised to be present."

To the above Mr. Burgess refers as follows in his report to the Honourable the Minister :—

" With regard to the territorial exhibition to be held at Regina, and towards which Parliament at its last session granted the sum of \$25,000, His Honour says, among other things :—

" The town of Regina voted \$10,000 towards erecting public buildings, while the town site trustees, representing the Canada and North-west Land Company, the Canadian Pacific Railway, and the Dominion Government, agreed to give a site whereon to erect the necessary structures, the result being that a well-located and commodious plot of ground, comprising fifty acres, has been secured. I am glad to say the farmers and the industrial

producers generally throughout the North-west are already taking an active interest in the project, and the agricultural associations have given assurance of substantial aid."

Has His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor of the North-west Territories placed a statement of accounts due for work done and goods supplied to the Territorial Exhibition ?

Does the Government intend to take steps to secure that the creditors of this exhibition, many of them poor men, shall be paid ?

Mr. FOSTER. His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor of the North-west Territories has been asked for a complete statement of the expenditures, liabilities and accounts with reference to the territorial exhibition. As soon as these are received, the Government will take the whole matter into consideration.

N. K. AND MICHAEL CONNOLLY.

Mr. LAURIER asked :

1. Have Messrs. N. K. and Michael Connolly paid their share of the judgment rendered against them in favour of the Crown in the Exchequer Court, on the 11th day of September, 1894 ?

2. Has process of execution been issued against them ? If so, when ?

3. Has execution taken place ? If not, for what reason ?

Mr. DICKEY. 1. No. 2. Writs of execution against the goods and lands of the defendants, N. K. and Michael Connolly were issued on 14th day of October, 1895, directed to the sheriff of the county of Frontenac in Ontario ; and the sheriffs of the district of Quebec and the district of Montreal, respectively, in the province of Quebec. These writs of execution were sent to the said sheriffs respectively, on the date of issue, 14th October, 1895. 3. Under the writ of execution against goods in the hands of the sheriff of Frontenac, a steam dredge was seized, and on several occasions was offered for sale by the sheriff, but no sale could be made for want of buyers. The last attempt made by the sheriff was on 31st January last, when, in consequence of there being no buyers, the sheriff returned the writ with his return, that he had seized goods of the defendants, N. K. and Michael Connolly, to the value of \$35,000, which remained on hand for want of buyers. A writ of venditionis exponas is now being issued under which the sheriff will have to sell the dredge. The sheriff of Frontenac returned the fi. fa. lands, with his return, that the defendants N. K. and Michael Connolly had no lands in that county. The sheriff of the district of Montreal, under the writs of fi. fa. goods, seized in October, 1895, 50 shares of stock in the Richelieu Navigation Company, standing in the name of Michael Connolly, and 84 shares of same stock standing in the name of J. K. Connolly. The sheriff likewise seized certain lands in the district of Montreal owned by N. K. Connolly. On these seizures being made, oppositions were filed by the Connollys

against them, and in consequence, the sheriff of the district of Montreal, on 19th November last, returned these writs to the Exchequer Court with the oppositions, to be dealt with there. The sheriff of the district of Quebec seized certain household furniture and effects of N. K. Connolly, and certain lands, and to these seizures the defendants, the Connollys, filed oppositions, and in consequence the said sheriff returned the writs, with the oppositions, into the Exchequer Court, to be dealt with there. After the writs were returned to the court the questions raised by the oppositions were brought before the judge of the Exchequer Court immediately after the Christmas vacation was over, and the judge made an order disposing of the questions raised by the oppositions, and these writs were again, on the 3rd February instant, returned to the sheriffs of the districts of Montreal and the district of Quebec, respectively, to be executed by them in due course of law.

PROHIBITION OF THE LIQUOR TRAFFIC.

On the Order :

That, in the opinion of this House, the manufacture, importation and sale of intoxicating liquors, except for medicinal, sacramental and mechanical purposes, should be prohibited by law.

Mr. FLINT. Stand.

Mr. FOSTER. I must say that, looking at the state of the Order paper, henceforth these motions which are not ready to be gone on with, will have to be dropped, unless specially good reasons are given.

PAYMENTS TO MR. ISRAEL TARTE.

Mr. TARTE moved for :

Statement showing the amounts paid to Israel Tarte, by the several public departments, since 1st January, 1880 ; the dates of such payments, if any, and the object for which the same were made.

He said : I move this motion because of certain statements that have appeared in the public press. Among the many reports circulated about myself there is one to which I desire to give a full answer by moving this motion, the charge being to the effect that during the Riel agitation some of the Ministers gave printing work to me, and I received payment therefor. From 1877 to 1889 I never was owner of a press or printing establishment, and as a matter of fact, I never received from this Government a cent's worth of patronage. As the statement has been circulated broadly in the press of my former allies, I wish again to state publicly that I never received a cent from this Government. This is the place and the time for some of the Ministers, if they have any statement to make, to make it. I see in his seat the Postmaster General, with whom I was working as a political ally, and I

am sure he will be the first man to be ready to declare that during the Riel agitation, far from receiving anything, I gave away a great deal of money.

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose the hon. gentleman will not object to the addition of two or three lines to the motion by way of amendment. I move to add after the words "Israel Tarte," "or to 'Le Canadien' or 'Le Cultivateur' newspaper."

Mr. TARTE. I have no objection whatever to those words being added as an amendment. I beg, however, to add that from 1877 to 1889 I never had a copper of interest either in "Le Canadien" or in "Le Cultivateur," and I make this statement and challenge any contradiction of it.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It seems to me that if the statement made by the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte) is a correct statement, there is no relevancy in the amendment, and it is scarcely in order. My hon. friend has moved for certain information. The leader of the House has proposed to amend his motion by adding a request for information in regard to certain newspapers. If the hon. gentleman were proprietor of those newspapers, then there might be some relevancy in the amendment; but when my hon. friend has declared that he is not proprietor, and no hon. gentleman opposite affirms the contrary, then it seems to me if the Minister wishes for any information of that sort to be brought down to the House, it should be brought down by a separate motion, and not by an amendment tacked on to the motion of the hon. member for L'Islet.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Mills) must not have heard what the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte), who moved the motion, stated. The hon. gentleman stated that he had no objection to the amendment. In the second place, the period he mentioned did not cover the period mentioned in the amendment.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Whether the hon. gentleman objected or not can make no difference as to the question of the propriety of the amendment.

Mr. TARTE. I had no interest in it—you may move what you like.

Mr. SPEAKER. With regard to the point of order raised by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), it seems to me that the point is not well taken. I understood from the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte) that he disclaims having received any moneys from the Government as a newspaper proprietor since 1st January, 1880. Whether he was proprietor of those newspapers is a question that is not relevant.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). My point is that an amendment must be relevant, it must be germane to the question. An amend-

Mr. TARTE.

ment with respect to the salary of a judge would not be germane to the motion. This amendment is no more germane, unless it can be shown that the proprietor of the paper was the hon. member, who received the money. That is my contention—that having no interest in payments made to those newspapers so far as Mr. Tarte is concerned, the amendment is altogether foreign to the main motion.

Mr. MULOCK. Suppose it was the Toronto "Globe."

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Or the London "Times."

Mr. SPEAKER. Does the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte) state that he has no connection with those newspapers?

Mr. TARTE. I state on my word of honour that I had not a cent's worth of interest in those newspapers.

Mr. SPEAKER. During the period mentioned?

Mr. TARTE. From 1877 to 1889 I have not one cent of interest in it.

Mr. SPEAKER. The motion is for a statement showing the amount paid Israel Tarte by the several public departments since 1st January, 1880. Does the hon. gentleman say that he has had no connection with either newspaper during that period of time?

Mr. TARTE. Not one cent of interest. Since 1889 I have had an interest.

Mr. SPEAKER. If the hon. gentleman says he has had any interest since 1889, which would be during a period since 1st January, 1880, because this motion covers the whole period from 1880 down to the present time, then the amendment is regular.

Mr. TARTE. I do not wish to deceive the House. What I have stated is that from 1877 to 1889 I had not a cent of interest in the papers. The reason why I moved the motion was that I was accused of having received money for printing in 1886. At that time I had not one cent of interest in "Le Canadien" or "Le Cultivateur." In 1889 I became owner of "Le Canadien," and since that time I have been responsible for it.

Mr. SPEAKER. Having heard the statement of the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte), I shall rule the amendment is in order, because it covers the whole period from 1880 down to the present session.

Mr. TARTE. Then I suppose we can amend the motion by saying from 1880 to 1889.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. TARTE. I have no objection to have the whole accounts brought down, because I have no interest in it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. TARTE. I am just speaking to the point of order. I say I had no interest in it then. "Le Canadien" might have got patronage that I do not know anything about. I suppose "Le Canadien" did get something, but what I say is that I had not one cent of interest in it. If you want to have a statement of what I got when I was interested, make the motion read: "From 1889 to the present time," if you like. I say here, upon my honour, before Parliament, that I had not one cent of interest in it.

Mr. MULOCK. Does the motion mention the dates?

Mr. SPEAKER. The motion reads as follows:—

Statement showing the amounts paid to Israel Tarte by the several public departments since the 1st of January, 1889; the dates of such payments, if any, and the object for which the same were made.

The amendment moved by Mr. Foster reads as follows:—

That after the word "Tarte," the following words be inserted: "or to 'Le Cultivateur,' or 'Le Canadien.'"

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). You will see, Mr. Speaker, that this amendment is still out of order. Supposing that there should have been paid sums, between 1880 and 1889, they will be altogether irrelevant, and that amendment would be confined to a period since 1889, and not to any period before.

Mr. FOSTER. I beg to call my hon. friend's attention to this, which I think establishes a relevancy sufficient to make the amendment in order. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Tarte) has stated that in 1889 he did have a substantive interest in "Le Canadien." Payments were made to that newspaper before the newspaper became his property, and if large sums were paid to it, it was largely built up by the payments that were made. The House has quite the right to make the amendment, and it is relevant.

Mr. SPEAKER. I am of the opinion that, on the statement made by the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte) himself, the amendment is in order.

Mr. TARTE. I have no objection to it.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

GOVERNMENT PROPERTY IN MOOSE JAW, N.W.T.

Mr. DAVIN moved:

That the Dominion Government should at once take steps to alienate, at any figures obtainable, whatever property it possesses, directly or indirectly, in Moose Jaw, North-west Territories,

other than property used for public offices, and in such a manner, that the property alienated shall thereafter be liable to taxation.

He said: This motion, Mr. Speaker, has to some extent been already discussed in the House this session, because the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies), when going over the motion list the other evening, dwelt on this motion.

Mr. MARTIN. Order.

Mr. DAVIN. There is no impropriety in that. The impropriety was on the part of the member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) in discussing the motion the other evening.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of order. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) has referred to what was said by the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) in a previous debate.

Mr. SPEAKER. I did not catch what the hon. member (Mr. Davin) said.

Mr. DAVIN. Really, Mr. Speaker, what I was saying was of no consequence.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIN. It was of no consequence any more than the interruption of the hon. member (Mr. Martin). The hon. member (Mr. Martin) has been guilty of a piece of hypercriticism.

Mr. MARTIN. Well, Mr. Speaker, the point of order is this: the hon. member (Mr. Davin) in moving his motion, said: that this question had already been discussed in the House by the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies).

Mr. DAVIN. Well, what of it?

Mr. SPEAKER. Even supposing the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) had made such a statement, that would be a direct reference to a past debate only by way of illustration.

Mr. MARTIN. But he was going on to explain what the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) had said, and I proposed to stop him.

Mr. SPEAKER. If the hon. member (Mr. Davin) undertakes to refer directly to anything that took place in a previous debate, I shall certainly intervene.

Mr. DAVIN. I will submit the point of order for your decision now. A few evenings ago, the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) took up the Order paper, and he made a sneering comment on the motion I now propose. Now, what I submit for your decision is this: whether when I move that motion now, it is not 'ad rem' that I should refer to the sneer in regard to that motion, which was then improperly made.

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not see that there was any improper reference to a past de-

bate. As I understand, the reference which the hon. member (Mr. Davin) has made to what fell from the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) was made by way of illustration.

Mr. DAVIN. My hon. friend from Winnipeg (Mr. Martin) jumps a little too quickly, and a little too often. Now, Mr. Speaker, this motion which seemed to excite the scorn of the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies), will, I suppose, also excite the scorn of the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin), because I have failed to find in this House, during this, the last session of this Parliament, any proposal whatever from the Opposition that would show that interest in the North-west Territories, which I should expect from a great party at this period of its career. That kind of scoffing at whatever North-west members bring forward in the interest of the North-west Territories, has been a common thing in the past on the part of the Liberal party in this House, but it is a very imprudent thing for them to do, and especially at this hour. This is a matter which may seem a thing of very little consequence to an hon. member who knows nothing about the North-west and nothing about Moose Jaw. Such an one might suppose that I am asking the Government to do some thing unreasonable, whereas, the matter is of very great consequence indeed to Moose Jaw. Sir, the position is this: Moose Jaw is what is called a Government town site, and I may say that if there is any vicious principle in Government town sites, I am afraid that has to be laid at the door of my friends of the Opposition. Mr. Blake, when leader of the Opposition, denounced the Government of the day for allowing the public domain to get into the hands of speculators. Then, that little pamphlet, which I believe is at present the Bible of the Reform party—the report of the great convention that took place here in 1893—contains nine or ten resolutions which were passed on that occasion, and which seem so inspired and so full of wisdom that they have been quoted in full in this House by an hon. member, and one or two of them have been twice or thrice quoted by other hon. members. Mr. Charlton, in speaking there, on a motion that would never have been passed if the land in question in the North-west had been understood by the members of that convention, especially excepts town lots from his statement that the Government should allow the land in the North-west to be opened to the settler. Now, Sir, what happened in regard to Moose Jaw was this: A pooling arrangement was made between the Government, Canadian Pacific Railway Company and the Canada North-west Land Company, under which the lots were to be sold and the proceeds divided in the proportion, I believe, of one-fourth to the Canada North-west Land Company, one-fourth to the Canadian

Mr. DAVIN.

Pacific Railway Company, and one-half to the Government. The way that affects a town is this: All the property in the town site that is not alienated to private parties is untaxable. The town is progressing, private persons are spending money, property is increasing in value. The property of the Government, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and the North-west Land Company is increasing in value, and yet all the time it remains untaxed. We say that is not just. It is not just under any circumstances, but in the case of Moose Jaw it is especially unjust, because in that town very little public money has been spent. In the case of a town where a large amount of public money were spent, even though there might be a large number of lots in the position of those in Moose Jaw, you could say to the people who complained: It is true, a large number of the lots in your town are untaxable, because they are held by the Government, but a considerable amount of Government money has been spent in your midst. But that is not the case in Moose Jaw. It is not only unjust, but it is useless from a public standpoint, because the Government are receiving no income, or, at least, none to speak of, out of this property. I moved last session for a return giving a statement of the receipts by the Government from the Moose Jaw town site, and here it is:

Receipts from 1883 to 15th October, 1895.	
1895-Oct. 15th—	
Total sales to date	\$147,315 73
Less balances which were uncollectable and therefore written off.....	\$35,983 77
Balances still due.....	5,050 09
	41,033 86
	106,281 87
Interest paid	2,473 77
	\$108,755 64
Expenditures.	
Expenses—Improvements \$	3,519 39
do Surveys.....	2,500 00
do General charges, salaries, etc..	14,139 00
do Taxes.....	4,042 80
	\$24,241 19
Losses on real estate	1,448 84
do through agents.....	218 16
do on premises.....	167 65
	1,834 65
	26,075 84
	82,679 80

Dominion Government's proportion of $\frac{1}{2}$ \$ 41,339 90

The Dominion Government's proportion of that, for the time extending over twelve years, is only \$41,339.90, which, divided by twelve, will give something over \$3,000 a year received from the Moose Jaw town site. Well, Sir, \$3,000 is a very small sum to a Government, but this state of things is a very large burden for a town to carry. What I contend is that the advantage the Government have received is so small, and I believe it is diminishing yearly—because that \$3,000 is the average, the main portion of it having been received during the earlier

years—that it would be in the public interest for them to take steps to alienate the land they now hold at any price they could receive for it—and I suppose they would receive a fair price. At any rate, suppose they would put up the lots at auction rates, they would get something, and they would place one of the principal towns of the North-west Territories in a better position to fight its municipal way. I do not apprehend that my hon. friend will have any objection, in principle, anyway, to offer to what I propose. He may have a technical objection, but I should think that would be the only objection that could be raised against this proposal. Now, I will revert to what I started out with. I said that there was, I thought, a very unjust and unfair desire on the part of the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies)—I am sorry he is not here—to cast discredit on my motion, as though I were asking something unreasonable. I am asking something which I hope this House and the Government will see in the light in which it is seen by the people of Moose Jaw, who feel the shoe pinch. It is a practical and a rational proposal. It does not ask the Government to give away the land.

Mr. MULOCK. At any price.

Mr. DAVIN. At any price that is obtainable.

Mr. MULOCK. That is a farthing. That is giving it away, is it not?

Mr. DAVIN. No, you would not be giving the lots away if you got a farthing. When I ask that they should be alienated at whatever price can be obtained, I mean that they should be put up at auction. They would fetch their market value at the time, whatever that might be. If their market value is a farthing, they might as well be alienated at a farthing.

Mr. FRASER. What taxes would you collect on them if they were sold at a farthing?

Mr. DAVIN. My hon. friend from Guyshoro' (Mr. Fraser) seems to show the same antagonism towards this motion as the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies), and the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock). The old leaven is still working in them all—the leaven of carping criticism in regard to any proposal for the benefit of the North-west Territories. I had expected to get support from the hon. gentlemen on the Opposition side, and I now say that if the hon. leader of the Opposition will look into this and will come to it with the same fairness of mind that he generally brings to bear upon public questions I think that he will, instead of sneering at my motion, be inclined to agree with me.

Mr. DALY. The hon. member is certainly making a very laudable effort, on behalf of his constituents in Moose Jaw, to get the

Government to alienate at any figure such interest as the Government owns in the Moose Jaw town site; and he is only seeking to have carried out what he has been, in the interests of the same constituents, making efforts to obtain by representations to myself and my predecessors. But the Government have not the full say in this matter. It appears that in October, 1883, an agreement was arrived at between the Canadian Pacific Railway, the Canada North-western Company and the Dominion Government, by which they agreed to subdivide the lands which they severally owned at Moose Jaw, Regina, Virden and Qu'Appelle, into town lots, and create town sites, and the agreement which was then made provided, among other things, that the Government should bear an equal share of the cost of the administration of those lands. From that date to this sales have been made at Virden, Qu'Appelle, Regina and Moose Jaw, of a very large number of these lots, and a very considerable amount has been realized. The hon. gentleman has given the figures which pertain to Moose Jaw, the town site under discussion, and it is shown by them that the gross receipts were \$108,755, of which the Government received \$41,339, as its share, after deducting expenses. Of course the Dominion Government are holding their lands in trust for the people of Canada, and I think it is going too far to ask the Government to alienate this portion of the public domain in the town site of Moose Jaw at any figures obtainable at public auction, as the hon. gentleman desires. In order to carry out the idea of the citizens of Moose Jaw, the lands would have to be sold at public auction, without any upset price being placed upon them, and the people of Moose Jaw might buy them in at any figures they chose. It is a fundamental principle, so far as Government lands are concerned, and especially lands held in trust as these are, that they should not be sold without an upset price being fixed. If the hon. gentleman's motion were agreed to, we would have to act contrary to that principle in order that the citizens of these places might be relieved of some taxes. No such representations as have been made by the hon. gentleman on behalf of Moose Jaw, have been made by the people of Virden, Regina or Qu'Appelle. Until the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Canada North-west Land Company consent to the disposal of the lands in the way the hon. gentleman asks, the Government could not possibly take any action in the matter. Representations have previously been made by the people of Moose Jaw with reference to the disposition of the Government's interest in these lands; and in June last the Liberal-Conservative Association of Moose Jaw sent a copy of certain resolutions that were passed by them in connection with this matter. Among other things they asked that the Government should transfer its interest in

the Moose Jaw town site to the Moose Jaw council in trust for the town. The reply was that the Government had not the power to transfer the lands in the manner proposed, nor would the council have the power to hold the lands, were such a request entertained. It was next contended as unfair that the taxpayers of Moose Jaw should be required to pay taxation on lands held by the Government. The memorialists were informed in this case that the question of taxes on unsold lands within the town site had been settled some years ago through the joint trustees, who paid something like \$4,000 to the town in full of the arrears, and agreed to pay one-quarter of future taxes, which had been done from year to year. As to the general question of taxing Government property, which was involved in the resolution, the memorialists were referred to the specific provisions of the British North America Act in that behalf. I may have omitted to say to the House the fact that these town sites of Regina, Virden, Qu'Appelle and Moose Jaw are held by trustees who may dispose of the land from time to time, as occasion requires, the receipts from which sales are funded, after which the trustees make a return, handing over one-half of the proceeds to the Department of the Interior and giving an account of their stewardship.

Mr. LAURIER. For whom are they trustees ?

Mr. DALY. For the Government, the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Canada North-west Land Company, who are the original proprietors of these several town sites. The trustees are, I think, Sir Donald Smith, R. B. Angus and the Minister of Finance. No action could be taken by the Government without the consent of the other proprietors.

Mr. MULOCK. Have the trustees sole discretion ?

Mr. DALY. Yes, as to the price, terms of sale and everything of that kind, as was outlined in the agreement of October, 1883.

Mr. MULOCK. What is the area ?

Mr. DALY. I am not in a position to say ; perhaps the hon. member for West Assiniboia might be able to say.

Mr. DAVIN. About a section.

Mr. DALY. That would be in four quarters. The Government would have one-half, the Canadian Pacific Railway one-quarter, and the North-west Land Company one-quarter.

Mr. MULOCK. What is the area of the town as a whole ?

Mr. DAVIN. Originally it was larger, just as Regina was larger, but afterwards it was contracted a little. Perhaps it is one and a half miles square.

Mr. DALY.

Mr. MULOCK. And a mile of this is reserved ?

Mr. DAVIN. No.

Mr. DALY. The fundamental objection to the motion is that it asks the Government to sell whatever interest they may have in this town site for any figure that can be obtainable. There is a considerable asset to the public in this town site, and it would be contrary to the first principles of Government that we should dispose of the property in the manner indicated by the hon. gentleman. The Government cannot see their way to meet the hon. gentleman's wishes as expressed in this motion.

Mr. MARTIN. I should imagine that if the hon. gentleman were desirous of referring to carping objections and carping criticisms of motions made by representatives of the North-west Territories, he would be very much more justified if instead of attacking a few unfortunate members on this side, who simply ask some questions for information, he should make an attack upon my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Daly) and the other members of the Government, who have had occasion to reply to the hon. gentleman, not only on this but on many other matters, which I do not know whether it would be parliamentary to characterize as buncombe. I do not know whether it would be parliamentary to say these are buncombe motions, but I would like to use the parliamentary term that would express that as my opinion of resolutions of this kind—resolutions that are made for the purpose of making for their mover a little cheap political capital, but so arranged that they shall not at all embarrass the Government. Of course, the Government know perfectly well that, after the hon. gentleman from West Assiniboia has made his speech, and has called upon them to do such things as these he asks of them, from time to time, all they have to do is request him to withdraw his motion, and he promptly withdraws it. There are exceptions, such as we saw a few days ago when, under the rules of the House, a motion could not be withdrawn, in which case the hon. gentleman shows his loyalty to the Government of which he is a supporter by just as promptly voting against his own motion. So often is this done that it has become well known as characteristic of the hon. gentleman's political methods. Though he is always bringing forward motions before the House and taking strong ground upon political matters in respect of which he thinks reform is necessary in the interests of the people of the North-west, he invariably votes exactly opposite to the way in which he has spoken.

Mr. DAVIN. Is that true ?

Mr. MARTIN. Yes, Mr. Speaker, that is true. I believe it cannot be found in any of

the records of this House that the hon. gentleman has voted against the Government in connection with its tariff policy. Session after session we find the hon. gentleman bringing forward motions here with regard to the tariff on different items—agricultural implements, binder twine, and so on—and when the Budget debate comes on, we find him attacking the policy of the Government very strongly because of its effect on the North-west, but I have never yet—I may have overlooked a case, but I doubt that the hon. gentleman can point out a single one—known or read of a case of the hon. gentleman voting in opposition to this policy which he has arraigned so often before the bar of public opinion. I think the people of the North-west understand the object of these motions by the hon. gentleman. This motion, I think, is about as striking an example of the kind of thing to which I refer as we have ever had. Of course, if it is proposed for any particular constituency that the Government shall hand over to it a certain portion of the public property, or give to it a certain sum of public money, so far as that constituency is concerned there will be no particular objection. And, in case objection is made by members representing other constituencies to a proposition of that kind, the hon. gentleman finds that they have no sympathy at all with the North-west or with the constituency which he represents. I do not think, I do not believe, that the people of the North-west Territories thank the hon. gentleman for coming here and asking for alms on their behalf, as he has done on this occasion. I do not believe that there is any real desire amongst the people of the North-west to be treated differently from the people of any other part of Canada. The feeling that I find prevailing among the people there is that the Government's policy with regard to a great many matters involves unfair treatment of the people of the North-west, and that is what they object to.

Mr. DAVIN. Explain that, please.

Mr. MARTIN. What I say is that I do not believe the hon. gentleman's own constituents would support him in coming here and asking different treatment for them from that which every other constituency would be entitled to. And, of course, this is a proposition, as the hon. Minister of the Interior pointed out, which cannot be accepted—to hand over the public property as a gift to any particular constituency. However, I quite agree that the position of affairs in Moose Jaw, in Regina, in Qu'Appelle, and in Virden, is not a satisfactory one so far as these Government lands are concerned. It seems to me that the proper remedy would be for the Government to pay taxes upon these lands. The Government have gone into business as real estate speculators. In each of these towns they have appropriated a section or a half section of land of the public domain for a

town site. I do not see any reason why, under these circumstances, the Government should not pay taxes like any one else; and I think that the Government's failure to do so involves a great hardship. But I think it is as great a hardship to the people of Regina, in which the hon. gentleman lives, as to the people in Moose Jaw. I cannot see the force of the hon. gentleman's suggestion that, because Regina has had the benefit of the expenditure of a considerable sum of public money, that this evil is not as great there as it is in Moose Jaw. It does not appear to me that the expenditure of public money in Regina changes the position of affairs one iota. The objection made by all these places is that the Government tie up a portion of the town site and refuse to pay taxes upon it, and that it is too great a burden upon the ratepayers of the town to have so large a portion of the town site exempt from taxes. It seems to me that there is a very great and very clear distinction between lands of this kind and the lands of the public domain, consisting of land that is not disposed of, and is held simply for public purposes, or land that is used in a place like Ottawa or Toronto, or any other of the cities, for actual public purposes, for the transaction of business. Under our system, whether it is right or wrong, lands and buildings used by the Government are exempt from taxation. But surely, Mr. Speaker, this is a very different thing. Surely if the Government go into the real estate business, as they have done in this case—and I do not propose at this moment to criticise the policy of the Government in taking that step, which may or may not have been a wise one on their part—they would be perfectly justified and there could be no objection to their course, from a public standpoint, or so far as other points of the Dominion are concerned, if they were to pay taxes like others in the same position. And if the taxes were paid, the citizens of Moose Jaw and the other places named would have nothing to complain of. But it is certainly a most absurd and ridiculous suggestion that is made by the hon. gentleman that because these lands do not realize any taxes for the municipality of Moose Jaw, therefore the Government should throw them away. The hon. gentleman is perfectly well aware of the fact that if the property owned by the Government in Moose Jaw were put up at auction, they would not bring anything at all. The hon. gentleman knows that. He knows the circumstances of Moose Jaw, he knows the circumstances of Regina, he knows the circumstances of the west generally, and he knows that at the present moment, if these particular properties were offered for sale, they would not pay the expenses of a sale. Now, under these circumstances, the Government could not be justified in parting with their property. If times were such that the Government could get a fair price for their property at a sale

of this kind, there might be some reason in the suggestion. But at the present moment and under circumstances as they exist there to-day, it would simply mean, as has been suggested by some hon. members, that the Government should give away their public property. I do not hesitate for one moment to say—and I am perfectly willing to be judged by the people up there—that I dissent entirely from any such suggestion. I think it is a most unreasonable thing for the hon. gentleman to ask, and I do not believe that the people of Moose Jaw would justify him in making any such request on their behalf. It certainly is a great hardship to all these four places to be deprived of the taxes, and as long as the Government remain in this real estate business of holding and selling town lots in these four towns, it would be very difficult to support them in a proposition to pay their legitimate municipal taxes upon these town lots, just as any other real estate owner does in those towns.

Mr. DAVIN. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat was quite afflicted that the rules of this House would not allow him to characterize this motion of mine, and other motions, as "buncombe motions." He said what he cannot substantiate, and although, logically, I should not be called upon to prove a negative, I will prove a negative; and if I were to adopt the buncombe style of rhetoric of my hon. friend, I would say that I could ram, what is unmentionable in this House, down his throat.

Mr. MARTIN. I do not understand what the hon. gentleman means.

Mr. DAVIN. The hon. gentleman will understand when I have done with him. He says that it is my invariable practice to move motions and then withdraw them.

Mr. TARTE. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIN. You hear the cuckoo note "hear, hear." I will deal with him in the same way.

Mr. MARTIN. I beg to say that I did not say that.

Mr. DAVIN. I have his words. Do you withdraw them, then?

Mr. MARTIN. What I said was that the hon. gentleman was very careful not to embarrass the Government by his motions, and that when the Government asked him to withdraw them, he either withdrew them or, if he could not do that under the rules of the House, he voted against them.

Mr. DAVIN. I will take that statement, and I say that there is not a tittle of foundation for it, and I will prove it from the records of "Hansard." The hon. gentleman said: "I would like to see him produce a single motion in regard to which he voted against the Government."

Mr. MARTIN.

Mr. MARTIN. No, I did not say that. I said that I would like to have the hon. gentleman produce a single motion on which he voted against the Government's tariff policy.

Mr. DAVIN. Then what does the hon. gentleman mean? He was talking about my motion. He said he would like to find a single instance in which I voted against the tariff principles of the Government. Why, Mr. Speaker, suppose the case of a clergyman who had been preaching the gospel, the hon. gentleman might just as well try to blame him because he had not been able to bring forward a single instance in which he had preached a sermon against the divinity of our Lord—just as absurd. Mr. Speaker, if that was what he said—and we will look at the "Hansard" for it—it had no relevancy to the rest of his remarks. The statement that he, and some newspaper writers of about the same calibre, have made is that motions are brought forward by me and then withdrawn. I saw in one of the city papers here an article in which a clever young writer said that I had got a reputation for doing this. The reputation, Mr. Speaker, is in the mouths of Reform newspaper writers and politicians, who believe in that policy that I heard denounced in fitting terms only a short time ago, in the town hall here—they believe in the policy of calumny, and that there is something in the proverb, "Kill a man with lies." Now, Sir, I am going to give an instance to meet the charge of the hon. gentleman. Last session I brought forward a motion that I shall bring forward again here—"That in the opinion of this House it would be expedient to apply \$20,000, &c., to establish creameries." We divided on it; the division will be found on page 4021 of "Hansard." All the ministerialists voted one way, and I find the name of Davin in very bad company, amongst the whole Liberal party, headed by the leader of the Opposition. I do not suppose the Opposition voted that way to help me, but merely in antagonism to the Government. I call the attention of the leader of the Opposition to this fact—because, after all, in dealing with the leader of the Opposition, one has this great advantage, that you are always dealing with a fair-minded man, you are always dealing, either in this House or out of it, with a perfect gentleman. Now, I have, I know, that the leader of the Opposition is interested in this matter; and I say that such remarks, coming from a man of some prominence, like the hon. member for Winnipeg, even supposing they had any foundation in fact, are calculated to do harm to the usefulness of members in this House; and I will tell you why. I lay down, as a parliamentarian, that it is the recognized practice in England, and here, and in every Parliament in the world, that if a member wishes to press certain views upon the

country, and upon Parliament, he brings them forward in a motion, and has them discussed in order that he may see what is the opinion of the House, and of the country, and when he has ventilated the question, if he sees no chance of passing his motion, then, at the suggestion of the Government, he withdraws it. Now, Mr. Speaker, if I dared refer to what has taken place in this House this session, I could show that in the two cases where I brought forward motions prior to this, those two cases which were referred by the clever young journalist writing in the "Journal" here—and I do not think he meant any unfairness, I thought the writer was too clever, but it only indicated a mistaken attitude on his part—but I could show that in regard to the second important motion, at least, I carried my point. Why, what have we seen when Mr. Blake was a member of the House, one of the most powerful men in the country we have ever had in Parliament? He has risen and proposed a Bill, and when the leader of the House said it could not be taken into consideration this session, but that the Government would take it into consideration the next session, Mr. Blake did what every parliamentarian would do, he withdrew his Bill. We know that my hon. friend from Winnipeg has got a Bankruptcy Bill on the paper, but he knows well that no private member can carry such a Bill this session, he knows precious well that if the Government, by and by, says to him, this session, that it will be considered next year, but it cannot be considered this year, he will withdraw. The hon. gentleman is in the habit of suggesting that I am always making motions in this House and not being able to carry them, when the fact is that I have carried nearly everything I proposed. I have here "Hansard" for 1891, from which I can give the hon. gentleman proof of his utterly mistaken attitude—I will not put it stronger than that. I have no temptation to exaggerate the consequences of the absolute error made by the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin), but I will say this, that the hon. gentleman has been trying to give an utterly false view to the people outside, which is unworthy of him and his standing in this House and the country. In 1891 I had motions on the paper. I will take two cases from memory. Last year I submitted a motion to the House and had only four or five against me, and in 1891 there was a majority of only 14 against me.

Mr. MARTIN. That was not on the hon. gentleman's question at all.

Mr. DAVIN. It was in 1891.

Mr. MARTIN. The vote was not taken on the creamery matter and on the hon. gentleman's motion, but it was on the question whether the debate should be adjourned.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. DAVIN. Mr. Speaker, you see the kind of applause I receive—I am afraid to use unparliamentary language, but you can imagine what I would say if I were allowed to be strictly accurate. The hon. member for Winnipeg has made a false parry or thrust, and I will point out what it is. I stated in regard to the creamery resolution that I voted with the Opposition last year, or rather that the Opposition voted with me, and that I was voting on the motion. My hon. friend thinks that because a vote was not taken as to whether my creamery motion should pass or not, I was not actually voting for my motion and against the Government. What is the fact? My action was far stronger than if I had voted with the Opposition and against the Government on a straight issue as to my motion; and, Mr. Speaker, I will tell you why. This motion, if carried, was capable—as the hon. member for Winnipeg says—of being construed as actually not a division on my motion, and therefore if I had not been very earnest about it, I would have voted with the Government. But as every hon. member knew at that time, voting for the postponement meant that the motion would never come up again, and consequently I would never have the chance of voting in its favour, and this was a stronger opposition on my part—and I appeal to the leader of the Opposition as a parliamentarian—than if I had voted on the motion. Take 1891—and I cannot at the moment give the references—these are the only two cases I remember, and I am prepared to go on any platform and prove a negative to the statement which some newspapers have brought forward, that I have been accustomed to introduce motions and to withdraw them, and such an assertion has not a leg to stand on in the records of "Hansard," and it is only due to the mendacity of scribblers.

Mr. MULLOCK. Oh, oh.

Mr. DAVIN. If you wish, you can apply it elsewhere, but I dare not do it. The hon. member for Winnipeg tells the House that Moose Jaw, in whose name I speak here and whose views I have expressed, is asking alms from the Government.

Mr. MARTIN. I did not say so. I said that the hon. gentleman was doing it for them, and I said I did not believe the people there would ask favours of that kind.

Mr. DAVIN. I say I am speaking for Moose Jaw, and I have the authority of Moose Jaw behind me. When the hon. gentleman says I am here asking for charity, asking for alms, and that he did not believe Moose Jaw would support me, all I can tell the hon. gentleman is, that I have the authority of the people there for my action, that I have their authority, and I have discussed the subject with their leading men. The hon. gentleman, however,

does not see why any different treatment should be dealt to them from that which is dealt out to other districts, and that the people do not want any different treatment. If I carry this motion, the result will apply by and by to Regina and to other places.

Mr. MULLOCK. You in Regina have had enough money to pay.

Mr. DAVIN. If we had not the opposition of the hon. member for North York, no doubt we would be able to deal with them all. The hon. member for Winnipeg says he does not see why the Government should not pay taxes, and he declares that at the present time if the Government lands were sold we would get practically nothing for them. It so happens that these lots would fetch something at the present time. But look at the argument of the hon. gentleman. These lots, whether they are saleable or not at the figure, are valued at a certain rate, and you have to pay taxes there and in Regina at a certain rate. If the Government were obliged to pay taxes they would soon be glad to give them up. I have been paying taxes on town lots in different parts of the country, and I would be very glad to be able to give them up—or at all events, to be able to sell them at anything like a figure, for I do not like carrying them.

Mr. MULLOCK. You would sell them at the same terms as is proposed in regard to these lands.

Mr. DAVIN. Yes, I would. The hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin) criticised my motion as most unreasonable. He said he did not believe the people of Moose Jaw would sanction the proposed motion. Well, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin) understands the people of Moose Jaw better than I do, I am somewhat surprised, and at any rate I will give him an opportunity of voting on this question. In regard to the courage of an hon. member in this House, I want to say something. I am not conscious that my career in this House has shown a want of courage, and if there was a spark of generosity in the bosoms of hon. gentlemen on the Opposition benches, who have seen the course I have pursued, they would know that during the whole time in 1890-91 I was fighting with my own Government, trying to get legislation carried—all of which I had carried in 1891—and that I did all this dead against my own interests. I knew Sir John Macdonald, few men in the House knew him better, and I knew well that he was a leader who resented the least appearance of opposition, on the part of any of his followers, though he could always veil his resentment beneath an urbanity which was all-fascinating. People will read in some so-called independent newspapers, and they will hear from certain critics like

Mr. DAVIN.

Mr. Goldwin Smith that what we want in this country is some independent politician. Let the hon. member for Winnipeg or any of my critics occupy as I did such a position for four or five years in a House like this; with two cast-iron parties, and they will see where they are. Your own friends do not understand you, they look with defiance on you, and the Opposition does not know what to make of you, because they see you are voting or working against the Government for some reason, and yet you are not with them, and the consequence is that the cheers of hon. gentlemen opposite are painful to you, and you are isolated from your friends. And what will such a man get in the independent press? He will get no support whatever. And from the party press he can get none, because his own party papers cannot understand his course, and the opposition papers will not support him because they would be strengthening what might be an enemy in short time. My hon. friend (Mr. Mills) is not merely a politician. He is a literary man, and he knows well that I am speaking here by the book. He knows well that from 1887 to 1891, I played a part of independence in this House, such as has never been played here by any man related to one party or the other. However, the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin); he and his friends think they are making a point by sneering at the course that an hon. member—I do not care whether he be Grit or Tory—may take, in making a motion and then withdrawing it at the suggestion of a member of the Government. Sir, what has the Opposition done up to the present time? Motion after motion has been proposed by them, but have they dared to divide the House? No. They have not dared to show the people how things stand, and what their numbers are. What do they do? They call out "lost on a division" so that it may go out that there has been a division, although as a matter of fact there has been no division whatever. That certainly seems to me to be something of a mockery—I must not say a "cowardly mockery," for I have learned that the expression is unparliamentary.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if the Government could pay taxes, as the hon. member (Mr. Martin) suggests, could they not take steps to bring those representing the interests of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and the interests of the Canada North-west Land Company, together, and say: Let us do our best to get rid of the portion of the town-site in Moose Jaw that now belong to us. Suppose the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Canada North-west Land Company agree to it—and they might easily be persuaded to agree to it—I do not suppose that the towns would be unreasonable. They might surely be persuaded to agree to it, because the Canada North-west Land Company pays taxes, and that is why the Minister of the Interior

said, that arrangements had been made that a quarter of the taxes should be paid. That means, that the taxes covering the quarter owned by the Canada North-west Company have to be paid in consequence of the decision of the courts. The courts decided that the lands that passed into the hands of the Canada North-west Land Company had been alienated and were therefore liable to taxation, and so, a quarter of the land is taxable but there remains three-quarters untaxable. If the Government would submit to be taxed, as suggested by the member for Winnipeg, they could also take steps to call their partners in the town-site together and make a more equitable arrangement, whereby they would allow these townships to really go on unhampered and unharassed in their municipal course.

Mr. LAURIER. My hon. friend from West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) has appealed to me to support this motion. I can assure him—indeed it requires no assurance on my part—that it would always afford me pleasure to give support on the floor of this House to;—what shall I say? Well, to an independent member, as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) is, or at least supposes that he is; whenever he moves a motion which the Government have not been able to adopt. But, I would remind my hon. friend (Mr. Davin) that, if he wants us to approve of a motion moved by him, it is not sufficient simply to move it, but he should give us some information as to the reasons which should impel the House to the course which he suggests. Let the hon. gentleman read the motion which he has laid before the House. It is as follows:—

That the Government should at once take steps to alienate, at any figures obtainable, whatever property it possesses, directly or indirectly, in Moose Jaw, North-west Territories, other than property used for public offices, and in such a manner, that the property alienated shall thereafter be liable to taxation.

Well, there are many facts here which are brought to the attention of the House for the first time; facts of which they have had no information up to the present moment, and of which even now they have very scant knowledge. First of all, here is the assertion: that the Government possesses property in Moose Jaw. I may say I give as much attention as perhaps any man to the business of the House and to the affairs of Government generally; but I was not aware up to this moment that the Government were possessed of any land in Moose Jaw, and I believe that there are many members who are also unaware of the fact. It turns out that the Government are not exactly owners of lands in Moose Jaw, but simply, that there is a trust for the benefit of the Government, of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and of the North-west Land Company which are the owners of some land in that place. I am quite ready to agree with

the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin), that probably this monopoly—for I cannot see that it is anything else but a monopoly—is in all probability very injurious to the people of Moose Jaw. Why it was created I cannot conceive. But, I can very well conceive that any such monopolies—and there are too many of these land monopolies in the North-west—are a great obstacle to the development of Moose Jaw or any growing city. There might be good reason for alienating that land, but the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) must understand, that though I have no particular confidence in the Government, yet after all, it is very difficult for any members, even for those who have no confidence in the administration of the Government as a rule—it is very difficult for any member to come to a decision, to assert upon a motion of this kind—whether there has been no papers laid on the Table of the House—that there is a case made out that the lands held there by the Government should be alienated. This is the first objection to which I call the attention of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin). His motion says:

That the Dominion Government should at once take steps to alienate, at any figures obtainable,—

Well, the hon. gentleman must agree that this is a very strange proposal. If he had said that the lands should be sold at an upset price, or at some regular figure, his proposition would have been more fit for discussion. But, to tell us that we should vote upon this bare motion, that the lands should be sold at any price obtainable, which might be even a single farthing, is a proposition which very few business men would be prepared to endorse. If the hon. gentleman would bring his motion at a later day when the papers have been laid on the Table of the House and when we have some information upon it, for my part I can tell him that I would be very readily disposed to favour it, because as a rule I am much opposed to land monopolies of any kind, whether in the North-west or anywhere else. But at the present time, I am sorry to say that it seems to me, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) has not made out a case upon which he could appeal for support to the Opposition, or to any others in the House for that matter. There is a good deal of force in the proposition of my hon. friend from Winnipeg (Mr. Martin); that all such lands held by the Government in trust, not only for those but for other parties, should be subject to taxation. I quite see the force of the motion of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin). Probably the monopoly which exists is a great obstacle to the development of Moose Jaw. But, at the present time, he has not given us such information as would enable us to give him that support which probably he thinks himself entitled to. If at a later period he brings the matter up, when we are in possession of the necessary information, I can say for my part, that I will give him all the support in my power.

Mr. MULOCK. Mr. Speaker, I would not refer to this matter, were it not that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) alluded to me as one of the persons on this side of the House opposing his views. I do not oppose his appeal for relief, and I am prepared to consider it, even if there are obstacles in the way that are insurmountable. The discussion involves a very simple business proposition, although the hon. gentleman has made it the occasion for ranging far and wide touching his political history, and creed, and consistency, and inconsistency, and so on. It appears that he asks the Government to sell at any price that may be procurable, and which means a nominal price if it means anything, whatever property the Government may own in the town of Moose Jaw, other than property used for public offices. The Government give a complete answer to the motion when they say they have no property. They say that they alienated their property in 1883, twelve years ago. They did what the hon. gentleman wants them to do—alienated all the property which they owned of the character referred to in this motion, joining with the two other owners investing their property in trustees. So that there is now no property to which this motion would apply, even if it were adopted. I would have thought that the explanation offered by the Government would have invited the attention of the hon. gentleman to this point—whether it was wise for the Government to have entered into an arrangement of the kind, placing under the absolute control of three trustees the discretion as to when and how they should at any time break up this monopoly. It is true, this arrangement has not occasioned the whole difficulty, because I believe the Government have only put into the pool their share of the whole estate—one-fourth, I believe.

Mr. DALY. I can give the hon. gentleman the information he asks for. The Government have section 32, township 16, range 26, and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, section 33 of the same township and range. The North-west Land Company have half, I presume, of the Canadian Pacific Railway section. So that there are two sections, or 1,280 acres in the town site.

Mr. MULOCK. I asked the hon. gentleman what proportion of the whole area of the town embraced the lands covered by this trust. The statement he has made harmonizes with the statement furnished to me by the hon. member for West Assinibola, when he stated that he thought the property held in trust would represent about half the town area.

Mr. DAWIN. Originally, all the property was held in trust, but about half of it has been alienated.

Mr. LAURIER.

Mr. MULOCK. I can well understand a great block of land such as has been referred to, in the heart of a town, stopping the progress of the town, and I do sympathize with the property-owners of Moose Jaw, under the circumstances. But the very evil complained of here exists throughout the whole of the North-west and Manitoba, in a greater or less degree, in respect not only of property in towns, but of property in townships. At the time of the creation of the Canadian Pacific Railway contract, the Government assented to a condition exempting the company's great estate from taxation, and this is just one outbreak of the dissatisfaction with that feature. But I would put this question to my hon. friend: Assuming that that trust did not exist, and that the Government were in a position to comply with his request to sell all this property for whatever it would bring, a nominal price, what would be the effect of such a transaction upon the value of property generally in that town? It seems to me that if you slaughtered or gave away a very large amount of property in this town, you would discredit the values of property owned by private individuals there, and thus do serious injury to the property-owners themselves. So that I am afraid, even if it were possible to comply with the hon. gentleman's request, that it would not be to the advantage of the inhabitants of Moose Jaw. I sympathize with them in their difficulties, but those difficulties are not of to-day's creation. They are the creation of ten or twelve years ago, and the only possible relief that is now within the reach of the town is the taxation of a portion of the property. The Government may be willing to have their one-fourth of this estate taxed, but I presume the Canadian Pacific Railway Company will not be willing. How are you going to get over the exemption of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company? I am afraid the people of Moose Jaw must now realize that they have got themselves into this unfortunate position because of the exemption clauses in the grants of land to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company in the initiation of the Canadian Pacific Railway contract.

Mr. FRASER. I would not have taken part in this debate except for the few remarks made by the hon. member for West Assinibola (Mr. Davin). I know it is a method of his, when he has a motion which he knows is not going to carry, to lay a wrong foundation by trying to show that the Opposition are opposed to it, in order that he may utilize that as much as possible and put it opposite to the fact that the Government will not accede to his motion. Now, there is no carping criticism in this case at all—no attempt at it. I am sure the hon. gentleman must have known the facts as brought out by the hon. Minister of the Interior before he made his motion. If so, the motion is senseless—there

is no point to it at all. If he had all the facts before him, there was no need of his offering the motion. So that it would appear that the motion had another purpose altogether than that of gaining the point to which it would seem to be directed. This seems to break the force of the motion. I might as well say that this motion was made in the interests of a land company out there, who wished to get the land in question at a nominal price. I would not say that, but it would be as regular and fair as to say that the Opposition were indulging in carping criticism because we wanted to get at the facts. I think the hon. gentleman might move in a better and larger sphere than this. Nothing can come of this motion. He knows it now, and he ought to have known it before he made it, because he had been in communication with the Minister of the Interior. But there is a monopoly overshadowing the whole of the North-west; and if he would move—and he would find me supporting him—that the Government should take over all the land there held by parties who are not utilizing it for the benefit of the settlers, and thus repossess themselves of the whole territory at fair and reasonable prices, in order that it might become peopled, that would be a motion worthy of the great statesmanlike qualities of my hon. friend from Assiniboia. It would be something broad. It would not be confined to this one town, but it would be so extensive and broad a movement as would make a name for the hon. gentleman. He would have something to which he could apply himself more worthily than defending his reputation against the somewhat caustic remarks of the hon. member for Winnipeg.

Mr. DAVIN. I am glad you suggested that, because I proposed that in 1885.

Mr. FRASER. Why does not the hon. gentleman continue? He says that he has succeeded in everything that he has put his hand to, but he evidently dropped this 1885 matter, for he never succeeded in that.

Mr. DAVIN. I was not in the House then. I proposed it in the "Leader."

Mr. FRASER. He proposed it in the "Leader," but when he came here, and was a leader of a party himself, he would not propose it. It is one thing to propose it in a newspaper and another thing to stand up in Parliament and propose it. If that be the right thing, why, when he is here, all powerful, succeeding in every matter that he takes up and brings before Parliament—why does he not move in this direction? Here is a noble purpose, here is a method by which he will immortalize in the North-west, not only himself, but his family after him. I believe that the whole system of men taking up and keeping land for speculative purposes is not only against the best interests of the country but against every higher law that

men should acknowledge. Therefore, even now, if the hon. gentleman will undertake this noble work, though he may, like Wilberforce, be many years in bringing about a change, I am sure, as he has never failed, he cannot fail in this. He will at least have this advantage, he will have something which will attract men's sympathies. He will have something, not relating only to towns, in which, according to the information given by the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Daly), it is impossible for the Government to accede to his request, but he will have something affecting the country from one end to the other. I sympathize very much with the hon. gentleman in the recapitulation he has given us of the trials of an independent man. They are indeed such as to commend him to the sympathy of every one. And sitting here for the last five years, I could not help admiring how very fairly he has kept his independent position before this House. I trust that many of us will learn what it is to be an independent man and will follow the noble example he has set before us. But I rise simply to ask him that, with his great force and eloquence, he should move in this direction. And if no other person in this House should come to his assistance, I shall support his great skill and eloquence by my avoirdupois, and we will gather round us a party that will relieve the North-west from that incubus which, I believe, more than any thing else, is preventing its settlement. It is a great country. Free it from the shackles that bind it—principally the one I have mentioned by which a man can hold a thousand, ten thousand or a hundred thousand acres of land—and open it to the poor from all lands and allow them to go in there and settle free of restrictions. We will not then have to spend an afternoon in this House discussing a quarter of a section, which three parties have taken up in a town, which would sell for scarcely anything, while millions of acres are lying in the hands of capitalists who will not sell them at such prices as men willing to settle are able to pay.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman has informed us that he belongs, not to this but to the other side of the House. But he also has informed us that he is a very independent man and has been for several years engaged in a fierce contest with those whom he was sent here to support. The hon. gentleman says that on these occasions he has generally been found voting with us, but that, as we are always in the wrong, he does not care to be allied with us. The hon. gentleman's position is very much like that of Hosea Bigelow:

His mind is too fair to lose its balance
And to say which party has most sense;
There may be men of greater talents—
They can sit steadier on the fence.

I am inclined to think that the hon. gentle-

man is not very steady on the fence. I believe the hon. gentleman is on the fence, but he is not the less for that reason a party man. He would be, if he were on the other side of the line, a mugwump; but the mug is always pointing in the direction of the Government. The hon. member has told us how much he has been persecuted, what trials he has endured, how he has had to endure the criticism of journalists that call themselves independent—the adverse criticisms of journals that support the Opposition, and the failure on the part of Government newspapers to come in any way to his relief. He is, indeed, Sir, in this regard, a very singular man, for the hon. gentleman assures us that his own friends look upon him with deaf ears.

Mr. DAVIN. No; I rise to order. The hon. gentleman's own ears evidently were not very acute. What I said was with "défiance." The hon. gentleman does not understand French.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I perfectly understood the hon. gentleman; and if the hon. gentleman had assured us that his friends had looked upon him with blind eyes, why perhaps he might not have been further away from the possibilities than in assuring us that they looked upon him with deaf ears. But the slip was not an extraordinary one under the circumstances, considering the isolated position in which the hon. gentleman stood, without a friend—in that condition of splendid isolation which the Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster) has declared that Great Britain herself occupied. And it was right and proper for us that so distinguished a supporter of the mother country should, like the mother country, stand in so distinguished a position. I will venture to say that we must look to the biography of Abelard and Heloise to find anything which can picture the misfortune which the hon. gentleman is suffering from. Now, it seems to me that the hon. gentleman, in this motion which he has submitted to the House, has asked us to take a certain line of action in respect to matters on which he and the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Daly) are not agreed; because if the facts are as represented by the Minister of the Interior, there will be no object in supporting the motion of the hon. gentleman, and besides that, I do not know whether this House could, if the facts are as the hon. Minister represents them, interfere properly with the private rights of parties secured by a contract to which the Government and Parliament of this country were parties.

Motion negatived on division.

CHARLES CHAMBERLAIN.

Mr. MARTIN moved for:

Copies of all reports to Council and Orders in Council respecting the release of Charles Chamberlain from confinement at Stony Mountain Peni-

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).

tentiary, in Manitoba, on a conviction for perjury in connection with the last Dominion election in the city of Winnipeg.

He said: Charles Chamberlain, as the motion states, shortly after the Dominion election in the city of Winnipeg which took place in November, 1893, was convicted of perjury under these circumstances: Mr. Chamberlain came to Winnipeg from Toronto two or three days before the election took place, and on election day, he appeared at a polling booth in that city, and asked for a ballot in the name of, I think, Matthew Leggatt, a well-known citizen of the city of Hamilton. The deputy returning officer, at the instance of the scrutineer who was acting for me at that poll, administered to Mr. Chamberlain the oath that he was this man. He took the oath and was immediately arrested, and afterwards committed for trial; and, his trial coming on at the next assizes, he was found guilty and was sentenced by Judge Bain to serve three years in the penitentiary. I think a question was reserved under the Criminal Act procedure, and that was argued the following term of the full court, and decided against the contention of Chamberlain's counsel, and he then went to the penitentiary. He was pardoned shortly before two years of his sentence had elapsed; and, in response to a question put by an hon. member this session, the Government have stated that the reason he was pardoned was for valuable services rendered. Now, Mr. Speaker, we were warned at the time of the election to which I referred that a determined effort would be made by the Government supporters to commit a large number of frauds of this kind; that they had taken particular pains to organize a personating gang whom we must be ready to look for at the different polling places of the city; and also that generally they had decided, as a party measure, to gain the election, if possible, by frauds of this kind. As an illustration of that I may say that at one of the polling divisions the deputy returning officer opened the poll about half an hour before the proper time and proceeded, in the absence of the scrutineer who represented me, to fill up the ballot boxes with ballots in the names of persons who had not appeared there at all; so that when my scrutineer arrived at that poll, he found that a large number of persons were marked on the list as having already voted, although the scrutineer himself got there some ten or fifteen minutes before the time at which the poll ought to have opened. This deputy returning officer also was arrested, and, at the same assizes, he was tried and found guilty of this offence against the election laws, and was sentenced to pay a fine of \$500. Having been fully warned as to the intentions of the Government with regard to this election contest, we, on our part, were fully prepared to meet this onslaught upon us. Chamberlain, I believe, in spite

of his statement to the contrary, had not registered more than one vote at the election. When he was arrested he stated that he had already polled sixteen votes in the names of different persons at the several polling places. The Liberal party determined that these two persons should be made an example of, and, at considerable expense to themselves, they pressed the prosecution. They were hampered in every way by the returning officer, who took pains to send in all the papers at once, so that we had very great difficulty indeed in getting the proper evidence before the police magistrate in order to get these two persons committed; for it was necessary to prove the election, the appointment of the deputy returning officer and other matters, which could only be proved by papers in the hands of the returning officer. In spite of all these difficulties, placed in our way by the Government's friends and supporters, we did, at very considerable expense to ourselves, obtain the conviction of Charles Chamberlain, who was sentenced to three years' imprisonment, and of Jacob Holman, the deputy returning officer, who was fined \$500. It was, therefore, Mr. Speaker, with a great deal of surprise that the people of Winnipeg learned that the Minister of Justice had advised the commutation of Charles Chamberlain's term of imprisonment, shortening it by a year. I may say that it transpired during the investigation which took place with regard to Chamberlain, that he was sent up specially as an expert from Toronto by friends of the Government there for the express purpose of attempting to personate a large number of voters in that election. It appeared from letters that were found upon him that the person more particularly connected with sending him up to Winnipeg was Mr. John Small, a former member of this House and supporter of the Government, who is now, I believe, collector of customs, or the holder of some other office in the city of Toronto. It appeared from these letters that Mr. Small and other friends of the Government resident in Toronto, learning that the Government were in dire straits in this election, and were liable to be defeated, deliberately employed Charles Chamberlain to go to Winnipeg for the express purpose of registering a large number of votes against me in that election by means of personation. Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not know what valuable services Charles Chamberlain has performed for the Government, except it was in undertaking this very arduous task of going to Winnipeg for the purpose of influencing that election in the way he did. At any rate, it does seem to me that the Government have taken a great deal of responsibility in deliberately using their power of commutation of sentences, in favour of a party friend of theirs such as Chamberlain was, sent to Winnipeg by party friends of theirs.

one of them an official of the Government, for the express purpose of committing this deliberate outrage and this deliberate fraud. It does seem to me that the Government should have been careful, under these circumstances, not to have shortened this term of imprisonment which, to my mind, was not at all too long, because I cannot imagine any offence more serious than that of deliberately attempting to obtain a judgment from the people, not by means of the bona fide votes of the people, but by means of stuffing the ballot boxes, as the deputy returning officer did, and by personating as Charles Chamberlain attempted to do. For these reasons I am anxious to have the report of the judge, any correspondence that may have taken place, and all Orders in Council and other documents in connection with this case. I would be very glad indeed to learn what these valuable services were. It seems to me the Government were not fair in answering the questions in that brief way. They should have gone further and told the House what the valuable services were for which Mr. Chamberlain was released. Of course I know that in the penitentiaries there are rules and regulations under which convicts are allowed to shorten their terms by good conduct; of course, this would operate without any action on the part of the Minister of Justice, or on the part of the Governor General in Council. What the further valuable services were which entitled this man to be released from the just punishment of his very serious crime, I am most anxious to learn. Sir, I must condemn the Government, and I must express the disappointment of those citizens at Winnipeg who, at their own expense, obtained the condemnation of these two men before the magistrate; I must express their disappointment that the term of imprisonment should have been shortened in favour of one of the Government's own heelers, who allowed himself to be used as a tool by men in the city of Toronto and in the city of Winnipeg, supporting the hon. gentlemen opposite, who had determined by hook or by crook, by fair means or by foul means, to obtain in the city of Winnipeg a verdict in favour of the Government, when they knew that that city, if left to itself, and to the free working of the election law, was prepared to give the verdict which it did give, a very strong disapproval of the conduct of the Government.

Mr. MULOCK. If my hon. friend has no objection, I would like to make the following amendment:—

Also copies of all letters, petitions, or other communications to the Government, or any member, or department, or to His Excellency, and of all letters by or on behalf of any member of the Government, or any department, in reference to the commutation of the said Chamberlain's term of imprisonment.

I hope there will be no unnecessary delay in laying these papers on the Table. There

has been a good deal of interference with the course of justice within the last few years, and I think it is about time that the House should take some decided stand upon the matter. These remarks have no reference, of course, to the present Minister of Justice, for I am sure he would be one of the last to interfere in the slightest degree with the proper course of justice. But when we recollect within the last two or three years, what appeared to the public, to me at least, to have been some unjustifiable interferences with the course of justice, we cannot too soon, I think, as a House, place ourselves upon record. Only last Saturday I was informed—rightly or wrongly I do not know; I state this for the Government's information, they may perhaps deny it—only last Saturday I was informed that not long ago a case of smuggling occurred in which a member of this House was arrested and put in jail. The officer was over-astute, the Government had not intended that they should capture such big fish, and when it was discovered that the prisoner was a member of this House, he was set at large.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. To what year does the hon. gentleman refer?

Mr. MULOCK. My informant did not give me that information. He is a man who supports the Administration, a man in a very high position; and if the late Minister of Justice wishes to get his name, I will try and get permission to give it to him.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I never heard of the case.

Mr. MULOCK. I never heard of it before, either. I will try and get permission of my informant to give his name to my hon. friend. It may not be true, and it may be true. However, I hinge no argument upon that statement, for I am not going to say that it is the case. But we have cases on record now that are beyond question open to public criticism. We have the commutation of the sentence of Connolly and McGreevy, and not one member of the Government has ever defended that act, public opinion has overwhelmingly condemned it. The commutation of the sentence of that unfortunate man Shortis was nothing less than a public scandal. The Minister of Finance shakes his head. The responsibility did not devolve upon His Excellency. We are told that the late Minister of Justice recommended that the law should take its course, and that when the report went to Council—

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member cannot discuss those questions on this motion.

Mr. MULOCK. There is an impression that the inaction of the Government in that case was a public scandal. Now we have the case of Chamberlain, that my hon. friend has referred to, and when early this

Mr. MULOCK.

session I put a question upon the paper. I got an answer from the Minister of Justice that Chamberlain had been discharged because he rendered certain services to the country, that he had given some public service. What these services are, we have no official information. The general rumour is that there was some alteration in a public building, the residence of the warden of the penitentiary, that there was about to be a contract let to make this change, and that Chamberlain, being an expert builder, was able to do the work, in fact gave a hint how it could be done at considerable saving to the country, and that for his services in this way, he was discharged. Now, that is public rumour. It may be true, and it may not be true. The Minister of Justice stated, I think, that the discharge was because of services of a pecuniary character, saving money to the country. But if that was the reason, it will be a very difficult thing to justify discharging prisoners on any such grounds. When I was in the North-west a few years ago I learned of a case there—the Minister of Justice will tell me if it is true—where an unfortunate woman was fined the sum of \$10, with the option of going to jail for a certain length of time, for having written a few words inside a newspaper. She was obliged to submit to the law, nobody came to her relief. I do not remember whether she was put in jail or paid the fine. But here Connolly and McGreevy were liberated after spending a month or so in jail, although they had committed one of the most serious of crimes against the treasury of the country, and against the liberties of the people. It is true that Chamberlain was convicted by a jury in Manitoba, it is true that his offence savoured of politics, public opinion condemning him, a jury found him guilty, and the judge sentenced him to three years in jail. Can there be a much greater crime against the liberties of the people than that a man shall be able to defy the will of the people. When B. L. Fellows was convicted of what amounted to ballot stuffing, which resulted in placing bogus votes on the roll, and was sentenced to eighteen months in jail, did anybody at that time ask that his sentence should be shortened? If I remember history aright, he served every day of the term in the common jail as a common felon, and the result was that his life was blighted and his public usefulness was gone. But hon. gentlemen opposite discharged, after two months' service, the hon. member for West Quebec (Mr. McGreevy), and he now sits in this House. Is it not shocking that public opinion should be so demoralized and that there should be such maladministration of justice as this? I feel that among the many crimes and offences for which this Government is responsible that action which tampers with the administration of justice is the most unpardonable. You invite lawless-

ness by giving support to the belief that prison doors are not strong enough to hold within the walls of a prison a convict who may have a hold upon the Administration, political or other influence. That view is permeating the public mind. I heard the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) on a certain occasion indicate that but for respect for the law—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. MULOCK. I am in order. I have not said when or where. The hon. member for Beauharnois on a certain occasion stated that but for the respect that his constituents had of the majesty of the law, and but for the assurance given to them—

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. MULOCK—that the law would be administered, they would have taken the law into their own hands. The country will see that the time has arrived, is in fact long since passed when these interferences should cease. I have before on the floor of the House expressed my view in strong language, and I await any further comments until after full explanations touching this matter are before the House, and I hope they will be before the House at a sufficiently early date to enable us to say whether or not this case further illustrates improper interference with the administration of justice.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I think the House on consideration will agree with me that it is a deplorable occurrence for a member of this Parliament to rush to such hasty conclusions in the absence of full information. If the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) was disturbed in regard to the administration of justice and so anxious that the stream of justice should run pure, I do not think he would so strongly seek in advance of accurate information, to convince this House and the country that there has been maladministration or any tampering with justice. The hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin) admitted that at this stage he was labouring under absolute ignorance as to the cause of the release of Mr. Chamberlain. He stated that the only reason given was that it was for services rendered, and he construed these services as having been rendered in the electoral contest in Winnipeg. I am dealing with what the hon. gentleman stated, and he does not correct me—that his assumption was that the services were in connection with an electoral contest, outside of which he knew nothing. It is true the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) added that he had heard that those services were services in connection with improvements to the building of the penitentiary. I must assume absolute and entire responsibility for action in this case, for I was Minister of Justice at the time of his release.

Mr. LAURIER. The statement was made by the Minister of Justice that Chamberlain had been released for services rendered.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. member for Winnipeg added that they were services rendered in connection with an electoral contest. For that statement there was no foundation.

Mr. MARTIN. What I said, and the impression I intended to convey was that this man had undoubtedly rendered political services to the Government, and there was that kind of reason for liberating him. I did not wish to convey the idea that the Minister of Justice in answering the question referred to that kind of service; but I want to point out that this was a case in which the Government should not have interfered, because this man was a Government supporter and had been engaged on that kind of work by the hon. gentleman's party friends on the occasion to which I referred.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. However that may be, I assume absolute responsibility for the case of Chamberlain. I consulted none of my colleagues in the Government; I was not bound to consult any one of them. It was one of the cases under the Governor General's instructions where His Excellency is instructed to consult a member of his Government, usually, as the practice is, the Minister of Justice. The reason why, under the instructions, that member of the Cabinet is not expressly referred to is obvious—he may not be available at the moment he is required. But as in the case of the Home Secretary in England, these cases, which are not capital cases, are dealt with by the Minister of Justice of the day, and he is responsible in every sense to Parliament for the advice upon which His Excellency acted. In this particular case I did not even do what I might have done, casually consult with my colleagues. I acted on my own official and individual responsibility. I believe when the papers are brought down, all fair-minded men in this Parliament and in the country, so far as they have looked into the matter, will say that what I did was right and would have been done by any hon. gentleman in my place. The hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin) must remember that there were several petitions; two, I think, at least, from the city of Winnipeg, numerous signed regardless of party; asking for the release of this convict, long anterior to his release. Mr. Isaac Campbell, for instance, is well known to the hon. gentleman. He was his chairman, if I recollect aright.

Mr. MARTIN. No.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. At any rate he was chairman of the convention which received the leader of the Opposition, and he is a man of high standing, and an opponent of the Government. Mr.

Campbell thought this was a case where the clemency of the Crown might properly be shown, and I mention his name because I recollect it very well, as appearing along with the names of others on the opposite side of politics not so well known to me. In Sir John Thompson's time this petition was received, but the Minister of Justice did not think that the time had arrived when the case of Chamberlain could properly be considered, and he made no recommendation. In my time another petition, most influentially signed whether you take the names of Conservatives or Liberals in the city of Winnipeg, was laid before me, and in dealing with it I was considerably bothered. The House will see when the papers come down that though the judge took what might be considered a severe view—it was considered a very severe view by a great many people in Winnipeg—nevertheless under the law of the land it was impossible to say that it was an improper sentence. A person looking at the facts after the trial, and making allowances that perhaps the judge would not altogether entertain, might come to a different conclusion. However, that was no reason to recommend clemency. So, with great regret—I confess it, because from what I had observed, and even from the evidence in the case that I saw, I could consider how this man had perhaps been more sinned against than sinning. I am not going to travel into gossip. I know nothing of it as to who were behind this man, or how it was that he came to do what he did; but nevertheless, he was a man who at this particular time had not been taking very good care of himself. At any rate, he came within the clutches of the law. He was convicted, and he was sentenced to serve three years in the penitentiary at Stony Mountain. Now then, before he was released he had served two years, and if I remember aright, it entitled himself by good conduct from the day of his entry into the penitentiary to the day of his discharge, to something like a remission of four months on the sentence of three years.

Mr. MULOCK. What is the abatement?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The exact number of days I have forgotten, but I think without one bad mark, it would make four months in the two years. I think four months could be earned where there is no misconduct. The exact number of days I have forgotten, but the papers will show.

Mr. MULOCK. May I correct you?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Yes, if you want to.

Mr. MULOCK. I have the answer of the Minister of Justice (Mr. Dickey) here. The sentence began on the 14th March, 1894, and he was discharged on the 21st December, 1895.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. It made a year less, but at all events, the papers will show everything more correctly. In substance my memory is correct for I took a great deal of pains in dealing with the case. No action was taken on either of these petitions, representative and influential as I considered them; and with all the circumstances that I would like to consider favourably, I did not feel warranted in acting favourably upon them, and my advice, which was submitted to His Excellency, will be seen on the record. No action, therefore, was taken and this man stood to serve his full term. Now then, I think it is unnecessary for me to assure the House, that the only reason upon which I was induced to act, and the only consultation I had in connection with that action, was an official one which arose, I think, five months after I had recommended that this convict should not be released. The inspector of penitentiaries on his annual tour went to Stony Mountain, and there he had to deal with a subject that had been before the department. There had been built, some time ago, a very large house for the warden; a large stone building, three or four stories high, and the present warden had been unable to live in it, because, being large and so high, it was impossible to heat the house without burning an enormous amount of fuel which the warden said was more than he could afford. Consequently he was unable to live in the building, although it was within the prison grounds and most convenient for his work. Among the duties the inspector had to perform was to see what could be done in connection with this building, and calling upon the trade instructor, he asked for an estimate for taking off the story that was not required so far as space was concerned, and in that way making it possible to have the building properly heated. The trade instructor made his examination and reported that it would cost some \$3,500 to do this. That was considered an expense, more than the department felt warranted in assuming. There was no appropriation for it at any rate, and it seemed to make any remedy for the case hopeless. The convict Chamberlain, who was a master builder, I believe, approached the inspector, or at any rate was able to tell him, that he believed that if he was given the assistance from the penitentiary which he required, he could do the whole thing for the sum of \$25; he would remove this story, and put the country to no further expense than \$25. I was consulted by the inspector and asked if I would permit the attempt to be made. I saw nothing to lose by it in any way. The building was there, a white elephant upon our hands, and practically useless for the purpose we required it. If this story could be removed it seemed to me to be a most desirable thing. Instructions were given to allow this attempt to be made, and the story was removed, leaving a compact building.

By taking advantage of the prison labour the work was completed for something like \$15 odd. The suggestion at once occurred to me, and I followed it up as the papers will show, as to how it could happen, if we had a properly qualified trade instructor on the penitentiary staff, that a job which he could not handle without so large a sum of money as \$3,500, could be done for the sum of \$25; or as it turned out, for the sum of \$15, using, of course, the prison labour. It turned out that as a trade instructor, we had not, of course, a man with the qualifications in connection with building that Chamberlain possessed, and that this trade instructor, like the trade instructors in other penitentiaries, while very expert in certain trades, was not an expert builder. Now, the inspector made his recommendation in Chamberlain's case on the ground of this service being rendered to the department, and I challenge the contradiction of any man who takes the trouble to look into the administration of prisons either in this country or in England, to point out an instance in which circumstances of that character are not taken into consideration. And so, acting upon the traditional practices in these cases, and upon the inspector's report which will speak for itself. I undertook to advise executive clemency. The papers will show in the main the facts which I have mentioned. I can give my assurance that no other considerations entered into the handling of the case. That, of course, fortifies my position against the unfair insinuations thrown out by the hon. member for North York, in view of my action on petitions that preceded this case by a good many months, if my memory serves me. You, Mr. Speaker, have stopped the debate on subjects that do not relate to the matter in hand. But I think the hon. member for North York would be more wise if, instead of doing what he has done in the case of Connolly and McGreevy—interjecting extravagant language into a debate where the subject does not properly come up—he would found some motion on the case, and test the sense of this House after a regular discussion upon the information which was moved for by that hon. gentleman, was laid before this House, and has never yet been discussed by him.

Mr. MULOCK. Yes, it has.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Once, certainly, and not at all to the hon. gentleman's credit. On a totally different subject, he ventured to say something about it, and the late Minister of Justice, Sir John Thompson, administered to him a most severe rebuke for his conduct.

Mr. MULOCK. That is your opinion, but nobody else's.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. With this statement, I am content to leave the subject at this stage. What was done in

that case, and in every other, was done in every similar case that had come before every Minister of Justice in Canada from 1867 down to that date; and the discussion stopped at the statement of Sir John Thompson, which no hon. gentleman has ever challenged or could successfully challenge. However, I have taken the pains to make good that statement, and I have the record to show that what was done in Sir John Thompson's time in connection with the case of Connolly and McGreevy was done in the time of Blake, Macdonald, Laflamme, and is done in England in every case of this kind.

Mr. MULOCK. There never was such a case.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. When the hon. gentleman says there never was such a case, it only shows the reckless spirit that has taken possession of him.

Mr. MULOCK. Name one. I challenge you to name a case.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Dozens of cases, when the hon. gentleman has the manliness to bring the subject up at a time when it can be fully discussed.

Mr. MULOCK. You cannot name one.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. In the discussion on the case of Shortis, the hon. gentleman had to make the most extravagant statements, although, with the practical consent of both sides of the House, that case is waiting until the full information regarding it is laid on the Table, when I am quite certain the Government will have no difficulty in showing that their action in that matter was perfectly justifiable. I have only to say this, Mr. Speaker, and I claim the right to say it as a member of Parliament. It is a deplorable thing that cases involving the exercise of the prerogative of clemency should come before Parliament at all. I quite agree that it is a desperate thing, in connection with the government of this country, if there are cases which require to be reviewed by this Parliament. I quite admit that; but I want the House to understand, and the Opposition to understand, the grave responsibility that seems to me to underlie their position when they do challenge a case in which the prerogative is exercised. I speak by the book. I do not know what the hon. member for North Essex (Mr. McGregor) wants to say. He has several times interrupted me in an inaudible way. If he wants to say anything to me, I will sit down while he says it.

Mr. MCGREGOR. I have a similar case to that mentioned by the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin), and I cannot get any report about it. I have several times asked for the papers, but they do not come down.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. You will see, Mr. Speaker, how absurd some of these interruptions are. They have nothing whatever to do with this case. I was speaking concerning the practice in England, and the delicacy of bringing these cases before the House. I recognize the responsibility of the executive in these cases, and the responsibility of the individual upon whom rests the responsibility of dealing with them. But there is also a great responsibility upon the House of Commons, and upon hon. gentlemen who feel warranted in bringing these cases up. Unless they are strong cases, in which absolute scandals are perpetrated, which should instantly wreck the Government concerned or the man concerned, there is a weakening of the administration of justice that will have its effect in the country all over. That is the practice in England, and that is the opinion of Parliament there. So that I say that the hon. member for North York, if he is sincere in these matters, should speak with less emphasis at the stage at which he has undertaken to speak to the House. When the papers come down, if they bear out the view he has taken, no language could be too strong to apply to the action of the persons concerned.

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

After Recess.

Mr. MARTIN. The hon. member for Picton (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) said there had been, on two different occasions, petitions presented to him asking for the release of this man, Charles Chamberlain, and he dwelt very strongly on the fact that these petitions were signed by Liberals as well as Conservatives. I understood him later, however, to say that he had refused to act upon the petitions, and that he did not in any way rest his case, in justifying the action he had taken, upon the petitions. If that were the case, then I can hardly see what object the hon. gentleman had in alluding to the petitions at all.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman will see my object was to meet the statement made by the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin), that despite all the difficulty connected with obtaining this conviction, the general impression of the community was that the man had been properly convicted and was averse to any exercise of clemency, and I was endeavouring to meet that point when I said that the desire to show mercy was not altogether confined to one political party.

Mr. MARTIN. It becomes necessary then to refer to the question of these petitions, and I may say, in the first place, that I attach myself very little importance to a peti-

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.

tion in a case of this kind, knowing as I do, how easy it is to obtain signatures of people to petitions of this nature. But in addition to that, in this particular case, I am aware of the circumstances under which the signatures of people in Winnipeg were obtained. The persons who went round with the petitions utterly repudiated any desire to alleviate the condition of Charles Chamberlain. They admitted that he had been justly sentenced, and that there was no excuse at all for any application to get him out of penitentiary on account of any merits he had in himself, but they represented that he had a wife and a large family who were in destitute circumstances, and that it was very hard upon them that he should remain so long in penitentiary. It was upon that plea that people were induced to sign these petitions. So that I do not think these petitions represent in any way the views of the people of Winnipeg with regard to the period of time for which Chamberlain was sentenced, or with regard to the merits of the case at all. They simply show that these persons who signed the petitions were influenced by the strong appeal that was made to them, not on behalf of Chamberlain, but on behalf of his unfortunate wife and family. So that, Mr. Speaker, I think that, for every reason, we can dismiss from our consideration these petitions. The hon. gentleman rather deprecated any discussion of this matter in the absence of the papers. At the same time, he himself fully discussed the question, going very fully into the reasons which had induced him, as Minister of Justice, to recommend the shortening of the period of incarceration of this man by a whole year. I was very anxious to learn the full particulars of the reasons which had induced the Government to pardon this man, and what the valuable services were to which the present Minister of Justice (Mr. Dickey) had alluded, in replying to the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock). We have now, in the explanation of the ex-Minister of Justice (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper), the reason of the Government, or his reason—because the hon. gentleman appears to prefer to take the full responsibility himself for releasing this convict. I must say that I can see no justification whatever for it. As I understand the hon. gentleman, he claims that there was a saving to the country of \$3,500 less \$15, through the ability or knowledge which Mr. Chamberlain possessed as a builder. Even if that were correct, I would certainly dispute the validity of any such excuse for recommending the discharge of a convict. If it be right that a convict should be discharged because he has saved, through the exercise of some skill peculiar to himself, the sum of \$3,500 to the Government, then, on the same reason, would it not be just as right that the Government should release the convict upon payment of that sum? Surely if it is a question of money, if it

is a question of value received, then it would be very much better—

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. And two years' punishment.

Mr. MARTIN. Let us keep the two things separate.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. No.

Mr. MARTIN. Yes, I shall discuss in a moment the question of whether the sentence was too long or short. I did not understand the hon. gentleman to say that he had granted the release upon the ground that the judge had erred on the side of severity, and should only have given two years. The hon. gentleman perhaps did indirectly allude to that, but it was not put forward in reply to the hon. member for North York by the present Minister of Justice (Mr. Dickey) as the reason. The reason given is that this man saved the Government \$3,500. If that be a valid reason, why the Government can do very much better than that with regard to their convicts. I am satisfied that, in many instances, the Minister of Justice will find that convicts are prepared to pay even greater sums than \$3,500 for the purpose of purchasing a shortening of sentence. But when you come to examine the hon. gentleman's contention that this man had saved the Government \$3,500, you find that there is nothing in it. We find that he did not save the Government anything at all. But he was able to show that the Government trade inspector, who had been entrusted by the Government with the task of fixing this building was utterly incompetent to do his work. If the trade instructor had been a competent builder, who understood how to fix this building in the way the Government required, and if he had made a proper estimate showing the cost would be \$3,500, so that we could assume that if the Government called for tenders to do this work, the price for doing it would be to them \$3,500, and if Mr. Chamberlain were the only man in the world who was able to do the requisite work for \$15 instead of \$3,500, there might be something in the hon. gentleman's contention that he had released the prisoner because the prisoner had saved the Government the sum of \$3,500. But that is not so; the Government have not made \$3,500 out of this exercise of clemency. It is very clear from his explanation that any ordinary builder who was competent would have been able to do this work for just as small a sum as Chamberlain was able to do it for, namely \$15. That being the case, the hon. gentleman's excuse fails entirely. It fails in the first place as being wrong in principle. There is no justification whatever for releasing a convict who was justly punished because that convict is able to save the Government money. But, even if that were a sound principle, even if the Government

were justified in using the power of clemency, which they have under the law, for the purpose of saving money, the principle does not apply in this case, as no money was saved to the Government; but, as the hon. gentleman was forced to admit, the circumstances demonstrated that his department had referred the matter to a man who was utterly incompetent to undertake the work, a man who, though, as he says, skilful in some branches of trade and able to instruct in some trades, so far as building was concerned, was quite incompetent and unable to undertake the task. Then the hon. gentleman intimated, although he did not attempt in any way to give it as a reason for this commutation, that public opinion in Winnipeg generally favoured the view that Justice Bain had given an exceedingly severe sentence to this man in sending him to the penitentiary for three years for this offence. I might be inclined to grant that if a man, in the heat of an election, being worked upon by others, committed personation and perjury, and if there were no other circumstances to make his guilt greater, it might be considered a long sentence to send him to the penitentiary for three years. But we must remember that these were not the circumstances in the case of Charles Chamberlain. The hon. gentleman suggested that Chamberlain was more sinned against than sinning. I do not know in what particular. The facts are that this man came all the way from Toronto, fifteen hundred miles away, for the purpose of committing this crime. That was proven before the jury and the judge. The judge might well have thought such an offence, if committed, as I have suggested, by an ardent supporter of the Government in the heat of an election and without due thought of the consequences, might be fairly punished by a year or eighteen months imprisonment. But in the case of a man like Chamberlain, who was furnished in the city of Toronto by the hon. Minister's friends there, including Mr. Small, a high official in their employ and a former member of this House, with a list of 120 or 150 names of persons dead and absent, and was sent, his expenses being paid, all the way from Toronto to Winnipeg, for the express purpose and with the express intention of personating these people or as many of them as he could—in such a case I deny emphatically the hon. gentleman's suggestion that public opinion in Winnipeg thought it was too severe a sentence. I state, and I believe that both Liberals and Conservatives—that is fair-minded Conservatives—felt that the jury in the first place in finding this man guilty, and Judge Bain afterwards in giving him the sentence of three years had done a great deal to prevent in the future such disreputable attacks upon the election laws of this country. I am satisfied that public opinion generally approved the action of the grand jury in the first place, of the petty

jury in the second place, and of Judge Bain in the third place. I may say that on previous occasions in Winnipeg there have been attempts to punish men for election offences, and that, in some instances, where all the circumstances were such as I have alluded to, the offence being committed in the heat of an election and without premeditation, the grand jury have thrown out the bill;—improperly to my mind, but I mention the case as showing the state of public opinion. But in this case the circumstances were entirely different. The man had hired himself deliberately to go fifteen hundred miles for the express purpose of committing this crime. The grand jury had no difficulty in finding a true bill, and no difficulty was experienced in getting a conviction by the jury; and, as I have said before, I am satisfied the judge was quite reasonable in giving this man the sentence of three years.

Under all the circumstances, what are we to think? The hon. ex-Minister of Justice (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) grows very indignant at criticism from this side of the House with regard to the exercise of the power of clemency by the Government; and he refers to the practice in England, and speaks of the delicacy with which this matter is treated in the Imperial Parliament. But, when we find that a deliberate attempt is made, not alone with regard to this matter but by the action of the deputy returning officer to which I referred in my opening remarks—when a deliberate attempt is made by one side in a conflict to use unfair means in violation of the election laws for the purpose of electing to this House a supporter of gentlemen opposite, when a man guilty of the offence is prosecuted at considerable expense to private individuals and is duly convicted and sent to the penitentiary and when we find him let out on the flimsy excuse which the hon. ex-Minister has brought forward here, what are we to think, Mr. Speaker? Are we not justified in coming to the conclusion, which I do not hesitate to say I have come to, that Chamberlain was let out not because he had saved the Government \$3,500, but because influence was brought to bear by those who were more guilty than he was and because of the fact, which has been intimated and which I believe, that Chamberlain was in a position to implicate men whose influence the Government was bound to respect in these notorious transactions. Mr. Speaker, I know that is a very strong charge to make.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. It is unparliamentary, and it is untrue.

Mr. MARTIN. I do not think it is unparliamentary.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Untrue, certainly.

Mr. MARTIN. It is a matter of opinion whether it is untrue or not. The best we can do in a case of this kind is to form our judgment on the facts. I refrained, in my

Mr. MARTIN.

opening remarks, from making any charge against the Government whatever. I expressed my anxiety to know what was the real reason for his release. The reason given by the hon. ex-Minister is that he saved the Government \$3,500, but I think, upon an examination of the circumstances, which he depends upon to justify that statement, he will find that no saving whatever was effected to the Government. Then I come to a conclusion on that fact, and while it may be untrue, possibly it is untrue, all we can do, in a case of this kind, is to form our opinion upon the facts before us, and the facts before me to-day and the facts before this Parliament, I claim, justify the opinion that the excuse given by the Government is too flimsy for reasonable men to accept. The other circumstance that is evident in the case, is that the man committed this offence at the instance of the hon. gentleman's friends. It was stated, I may say, that amongst those who had sent Chamberlain to Winnipeg from Toronto to do this work, was a colleague of the hon. gentleman at that time. I do not know whether that is so or not, but that has been stated in the newspapers. It has been stated in the newspapers that Chamberlain was in a position to implicate that colleague in this most nefarious transaction. Now, I do not know whether that is so or not, but I say that there must be some reason for this gross abuse of the pardoning power, there must be some reason for the release of this man, for cutting down the reasonable sentence of three years to a sentence of two years, while the ex-Minister of Justice has no more reasonable excuse than to say that he was able to expose the incompetency of the trade instructor in the penitentiary at Manitoba, because that is all it amounts to. No doubt if the hon. gentleman had gone into Winnipeg and got any builder and taken him out to the penitentiary, he would have been able, with the assistance of the convicts, to do that work for just the small sum that Mr. Chamberlain did it for, namely, the sum of \$15. Therefore, the excuse is so transparent that we must, as reasonable men, look beyond it and form our opinion upon the surrounding circumstances. Mr. Speaker, the whole matter is most disgraceful. It is not suggested that there are any further facts in the papers which are to come down which will throw any further light upon the hon. gentleman's conduct. He accepts full responsibility for it, he did it on his own behalf, he did it for the reasons he has alleged to-day. Then, I say, when we remember what has been said in the newspapers, when we remember that upon this man, when he was arrested, was found a letter in the well-known handwriting of Mr. John Small, a former member of this House, introducing this man Chamberlain, under an alias of John Ayre, to Mr. A. W. Ross, now representing Lisgar in this House, that another document was found upon him

which stated that Mr. Ross was to be found either at his office at a certain number on Main Street, or at the Leland Hotel, in Winnipeg; and when we find that it has been charged in the newspapers that a colleague of the hon. gentleman interested himself in this matter, then I say the excuse upon which the man was liberated, being perfectly frivolous, being entirely flimsy, people generally, I think, will come to the conclusion I have come to, namely, that in this case, when the ex-Minister of Justice used the pardoning power, he did not use it because it was right, but because it was expedient and in the interest of his political party.

Mr. LISTER. Without imputing any impropriety at all to the ex-Minister of Justice, I think it was unfortunate that that gentleman should have advised His Excellency to extend to this man Chamberlain the executive clemency. I have no hesitation in saying, Mr. Speaker, that the case was eminently one where executive clemency should not have been extended, where no pardon should have been given by His Excellency. What are the facts? An election is going on in the city of Winnipeg, a man belonging to Toronto is sent to Winnipeg with a letter in his possession from a gentleman who formerly was a member of this House, at present collector of customs in the city of Toronto, a supporter of the hon. gentlemen who are now governing this country. That letter was addressed to a supporter of hon. gentlemen opposite, A. W. Ross, of Winnipeg. It was introducing this man Chamberlain, under an assumed name, to Mr. Ross. There can be no question that the object of that man's visit to Winnipeg was to personate and to commit perjury. The evidence, to my mind, is conclusive on that point, for, found upon his person, was a list of names that he was to personate; upon his person was a letter from a supporter of hon. gentlemen opposite, directed to an hon. member of this House. Sir, there can be no doubt whatever, in drawing an inference from these facts, that the object of that man's visit was to personate voters, and to commit perjury. We find him in Winnipeg, a thousand miles away from where he lived, while an election is going on, and he is caught red-handed. He is arrested, he is tried for this grievous offence, he is convicted by a jury of his countrymen, not only of perjury of the grossest kind, committed over and over again, but of personation. The judge, in the exercise of that judgment which the law confers upon him, sentenced him to the very short term, in my view, of three years.

Mr. MUILOCK. He did not deliver sentence for some days.

Mr. LISTER. At any rate, I have no hesitation in saying that the sentence pronounced upon this man was a mild one, indeed, in view of the crime of which he was con-

victed. Who is this man Chamberlain? We do not know. We do know, at all events, the men who were associated with him. We do know the man who sent him to Winnipeg, and we do know the man to whom he was advised to go. The judge, in his discretion, sentenced him to three years imprisonment for the crime, and there is no man in this country, I believe, who is seized with all the facts, who would be inclined to find any fault with the decision of the learned judge. It was supposed that this man Chamberlain had powerful friends. It was supposed, from the first, that a great effort would be made by these friends to secure his release. Sir, I think it is unfortunate for the Government, it is unfortunate for the ex-Minister of Justice, his party being in power, his party being served by this man in his nefarious business, the party who were to gain by what he did—I say it was unfortunate, to put it in the mildest way, that the Minister of Justice should have interfered at all. Whether improper influences were brought to bear or not, I know not. I do not impute impropriety to the ex-Minister of Justice, but what I do say is, that under all the circumstances, in view of the fact that the man convicted was supporting the Government, that what he was doing was for the benefit of the Government candidate, it is unfortunate that this action should have been taken, because it causes a feeling to pervade the public mind that all is not right, and the Government interference gives strength to that feeling.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will allow me to say a word. The hon. gentleman is proceeding very fairly on the lines of the present discussion. Of course, as he must understand, I felt that embarrassment to which he now refers. I think it an unfortunate circumstance; I know that the man belongs to the party to which I belong. But I claim that, while that is unpleasant, if a case were made out, it would not be fair, it would be unfair, in my opinion, to take any other course on that ground; that is to say, I should not show my partiality by being severe on a criminal because he happened to be a Conservative. It is natural enough that suspicion should be aroused; nevertheless I felt bound to ignore it.

Mr. LISTER. I quite appreciate what the hon. gentleman has said, that because this man was a Conservative that was no reason why his case should not be fairly considered by the executive. I agree with that entirely. But I say this was a case where executive influence should not have been exercised, because the evidence itself and everything connected with the case show that the sentence inflicted by the judge was a moderate sentence indeed. In exercising executive clemency certain things must be considered. There are two classes of crimes. There is

the class known as unpremeditated crime, when action is taken on sudden impulse and in a burst of passion, when there is no intent. There is another class of crime known as deliberate crime, which includes forgery, perjury and personation. These are all crimes of deliberation, not committed suddenly but after thought and mature deliberation. Such crimes as these should always be punished severely. The man who knocks another down suddenly in a brawl and kills him should not be considered a murderer, but the man who pursues him as a sleuth hound and kills him should suffer the extreme penalty of the law because that act was premeditated. In the same way a man who deliberately makes up his mind to commit perjury and carries that out, doing it not once, but dozens of times, who has deliberately thought over the act is not entitled to consideration at the hands of the executive. But there is worse than that. There is the man who commits the double crime, not only of perjury, but of personation, which is a dangerous crime in itself, a crime which this legislature and all legislatures in modern days have tried and are trying to put down by the strongest legislation. This man deliberately committed that double crime. It cannot be said that he was forced to do it, that it was done suddenly in the heat of an election campaign in which he had taken active interest, because he had travelled over a thousand miles to do it. He goes to Winnipeg. He not only personates voters in the interest of hon. gentlemen opposite, but he commits perjury in order that those votes may be recorded. What excuse can be made for such a man? What reason can be advanced for the interference of the executive in a case such as that, and the judge, after his conviction, sentenced him to only three years' imprisonment. Two years of the time passed, and he was released. The hon. gentleman knows what influences were brought to bear. While I would not attempt to say that the hon. gentleman would receive improper influences, yet it is reasonably clear that others have been influenced for some reason, and have urged upon the ex-Minister of Justice the release of this man, and the extension of a pardon to him. From the fact that the crime was one for which no excuse can be made, that sentence, under all the circumstances, was a light one, and the hon. gentleman mistook his duty as Minister of Justice when he advised that the sentence should be shortened and the man should be pardoned. This action was in effect flying in the face of public opinion. What was done had the effect of making people believe that these grave crimes are light in their nature and are not to be severely punished. If there is one crime more dangerous to the community at large than another it is the crime of perjury. No man's life is safe, no man's property is safe, so long as the perjurer is about.

Mr. LISTER.

It is a crime difficult to bring home and difficult on which to secure a conviction, and when a fair conviction had taken place it was the duty of the court to sentence the prisoner severely in order that the community at large may be protected and he be made an example of through the country at large. In a case of that kind the ex-Minister of Justice, under those circumstances, should never have interfered, let the influences be what they might to get this man pardoned, and he should never have yielded, because the crime was a great crime against the country at large. The man who would commit the crime of perjury as this man did, should never be at large, he should have been sentenced not to three years, but to thirty years. On one day he took a false oath thirty or forty times in order to advance the election of one of the candidates. Such a man is a danger and a menace to the community. I repeat that the sentence inflicted by the judge was under all the circumstances, a light sentence indeed.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman has referred to influences brought to bear. I hope he will allow me to state that the only argument made with me, or representation, if it can be called such, was the second petition supported by counsel, when they presented the case in the usual way in my office. That I did not entertain. Between that time and my action no representation took place, and no influence was brought to bear on me until the circumstances were officially reported and action was taken for which I take full responsibility.

Mr. MULOCK. When the counsel went before you.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The counsel appeared before me very soon after my taking office as Minister of Justice, about a year ago, the papers will show the date. That was the first time I heard about the case, and the next time was on the Inspector's report after his annual inspection.

Mr. LISTER. Mr. Speaker, it is usual in such cases for the Minister of Justice to correspond with the presiding judge, and to get his opinion as to whether executive clemency should be extended to the convict, or not. My hon. friend (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) has not stated—at least I have not understood him to say whether that course was pursued or not, and what the report of the learned judge was.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The report of the learned judge was not in favour of commutation. Perhaps I am going a little too far, and it is only a matter of a day or two before the papers are on the Table of the House, but I may say, the usual course is to refer these petitions to the judge. That course was followed, and one of my reasons for not acting, was the

report of the judge not supporting the petition for clemency.

Mr. LISTER. Well, I have some little experience in criminal prosecutions, and I have no hesitation in saying that the report of the trial judge should receive the greatest consideration at the hands of the Minister of Justice.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Hear, hear.

Mr. LISTER. The learned judge has seen the accused, he has seen the witnesses, he is familiar with all the facts, he is thoroughly unbiased, he has no motive to wrong the man, and, if the prisoner is guilty he has no reason to recommend his reprieve except in so far as he thinks may be just and right. I repeat that in these cases the opinion of the learned judge is always of the greatest possible consequence to the Minister of Justice in determining whether clemency should be extended or not. And, it is more amazing to me than ever, that this pardon should have been granted, in view of the fact that the trial judge reported adversely to the petition. It does not appear—it is seldom, however—that the opinion of the Crown counsel was asked as to the propriety of extending executive clemency, or not. At all events, we have the fact here, that in this most nefarious transaction, that in the case of this crime without one single redeeming circumstance, a pardon was granted to a convict in the face of the fact that the trial judge reported against the pardon.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That is hardly fair, because on that petition and judge's report no action was taken, in consequence among other things, of the judge's report.

Mr. LISTER. Action was taken ultimately, but not on the first petition.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Yes.

Mr. LISTER. It is a regrettable fact that my hon. friend (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) did not adhere to the decision to which he first came, and determine that that should be final and conclusive. It does not appear that on the second occasion the judge's opinion was asked.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. No; it is never done in a matter of that kind.

Mr. LISTER. His opinion was not asked again; no further communication took place with the judge, and all that was before the Minister of Justice was the adverse report of the judge, and on the second occasion, the petition, and the counsel I suppose who defended the prisoner.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. And the long term of imprisonment served.

Mr. LISTER. Under the circumstances the judge ought to have been the judge of

that. I repeat that all the facts surrounding this case show that it is a case that the executive should never have interfered with at all. There are certain well known rules guiding the Minister of Justice in such cases as this, but in this case there is not one single feature that these rules could be applied to. There is not one ground which should invite the intervention of the executive in this man's case. My hon. friend (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) says that petitions were sent in. As the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin) stated, you can get men to sign petitions for almost anything. Rather than say no, most men will put their names to a petition no matter what it is asked for, if it does not cost them anything, and especially if they think they are going to release somebody. So far as petitions are concerned, therefore, no particular importance should be attached to them. But my hon. friend (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) says, that in addition to the petitions this convict saved the country \$3,500.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I hope the hon. gentleman will allow me again to correct him. I am sure he would not desire to willingly misrepresent my position. I did not ask the House to consider my grounds stronger on account of the petition. I was endeavouring to meet the statement of the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin) as to the public impression, and when I found names on the petition of leading men of all political parties, including that of one particular man, a gentleman of high standing but a great opponent of the Government. I argue from that, not that it was a reason to release the prisoner, but it was a reason that that sentence was not considered a mild one, at least. I was then speaking on another branch of the case. I did not justify my action because of the petition.

Mr. LISTER. My hon. friend says that although certain petitions were presented to him, yet he would not allow them to weigh with him if he thought the circumstances did not warrant it. I repeat that the nature of the crime was such that the hon. gentleman should have disregarded all petitions. It was a crime without one redeeming feature, a crime deliberately committed, a crime that ought to receive a severe sentence, and under all circumstances the sentence was a mild one. I think my hon. friend is unfortunate in invoking as an excuse, the work that this convict did; because the point is well taken by the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin), that any carpenter in the city of Winnipeg or in that part of the country could have done what the prisoner did. If the hon. gentleman lays it down as a principle: that because a convict saves a considerable sum of money to the country, that is to be a reason for his release, then I think he will lay down a very unsafe and unfortunate rule.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The rule is, and it has been acted upon time and time again, that special service in conjunction with good conduct entitles a convict to special consideration. The services vary. For instance, services in defending the lives of the officers, or in saving property, and I think it is hard to draw the line between these special services. In this case the ingenuity of the man did save a great deal of money to the country. I do not think that any person in Winnipeg, as suggested by the hon. member, would be able to perform the work as this man did, at such a small cost. At all events the officers of the prison were unable to find one.

Mr. MARTIN. The hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) has pointed out that the officer was thoroughly incompetent.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Not at all.

Mr. MARTIN. You said so.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Not at all. I have been misunderstood. I am quite sure the "Hansard" will bear me out if it is referred to. I did not reflect upon the trade instructor. I said, that I myself supposed at the outset, that the Trade Instructor ought to have understood that kind of thing, but on inquiry I found it was no reflection upon the trade instructor, because, in our various penitentiaries in Canada we have not a superfluity of these officers, and we take one man instead of many. An instructor may be extremely good in his particular line, good in making boots and shoes and in certain industries, but he may know nothing of house-joining and work of that character. As a matter of fact, this work was a matter for an expert in house-joining, and it was an exercise, as I believe, of extraordinary ability on the part of this convict.

Mr. MARTIN. Does not what the hon. gentleman say show that he was a house-joiner?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I endeavoured to guard against that. I have not reflected on the trade instructor, because I made special inquiry and found that due care had been used at the outset to ascertain his qualifications, and his conduct shows that even on those special qualifications he was still a good man.

Mr. LISTER. I know perfectly well that service in some instances is a ground for releasing convicts. As my hon. friend says, where a convict saves the life of an official of the penitentiary, or saves the premises from burning, or performs any meritorious service of that kind, there is no doubt that the executive consider these things, and give the convict the benefit of them, for manifest reasons—to encourage others, and to maintain discipline in the prison. But I think my hon. friend is going a great length

Mr. LISTER.

indeed when he says that some carpenter work performed by a convict, which probably an ordinary builder or carpenter might have done quite as well, entitles a prisoner to be pardoned. I think that would be carrying the doctrine to a dangerous extent. I feel that it was unfortunate, under all the circumstances, that this man should have been released at all, because it leaves an impression upon the public mind that through his friends, he had a political pull. If the opponents of my hon. friend had been in power, and this man had been released by them, of course, no charge of that kind could have been made. But it is unfortunate that, having been guilty of this crime, he should have been released by the party in power for whom he was doing the work. The public are naturally suspicious, and, without their being anything at all in the charge that improper influences were brought to bear, or that any improper considerations entered into the mind of the Minister of Justice, the public are prone to think that, because this man was backed up by influential friends. Such influences were brought to bear, and that as a consequence he did not suffer the punishment which, if he had been a stranger, and friendless, he would have been allowed to suffer. I think it unfortunate that in this sort of cases the law is not allowed to take its course. I have always thought it was particularly unfortunate that the executive should have interfered in the case of McGreevey and Connolly. They were men who had been convicted of conspiring to defraud the country, and of defrauding it, of many thousands of dollars; and, though men occupying high position, men of great influence and power, a jury of their countrymen convicted them, and a judge imposed upon them a sentence which I consider was mild. Yet, after these men had been in prison only three or four months, it was found that their health was so bad that the executive released them. I have always thought that if ever there was a case—

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman is going too far in discussing that case. He may refer to it by way of illustration, but to discuss the merits of the case is another matter.

Mr. LISTER. I do not propose to discuss the merits of that case further than to say, in illustration of the case under consideration, that I think it is unfortunate where crimes are of a semi-political character that the executive should interfere with the decision of the judge who pronounced the sentence. I can only repeat that the judge who tried the prisoner is the best judge of what is the proper sentence under all circumstances, and so long as that sentence is within reason it should not be interfered with, unless the circumstances are very exceptional, and unless it appears particularly clear that the judge has pronounced a sentence far in excess of the crime which has

been committed. I can only re-echo the statement made by the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin), that under all the circumstances it was most unfortunate that the executive should have interfered at all with the sentence imposed upon this man Chamberlain.

Mr. EDGAR. Mr. Speaker, the more this case is discussed, the worse it looks. I think, Sir, that the crime of perjury, of which that man Chamberlain was found guilty, was committed under circumstances which called for the severest penalty of the law. It was not simply an ordinary case of perjury, involving some rights of property, perhaps. It was a case of perjury against society. It was in support of a crime against society, which every man on either side of this House must resent. We come here every year and pass laws in the interests of the people against such crimes—high crimes, they are, against the people. Was three years an unreasonable sentence for that crime? I would like to ask the Minister of Justice if that was the limit of the possible sentence. The Minister of Justice knows perfectly well that the sentence under the law might have been for fourteen years to the penitentiary, the maximum sentence for the crime of perjury, and this was the most flagrant kind of perjury. The judge might have imposed that sentence, within the letter of the law, and almost within the spirit of it, in this case. The Minister of Justice sits as a high court of appeal, to review the sentence imposed by the judge; and, with the report of the judge in his hands against the commutation of the sentence, the hon. gentleman, because the prisoner has helped to save, as he thinks, a few paltry thousand dollars, decides that two years is sufficient punishment for that high crime. The crime, Sir, was of a most serious character, and the excuse given for the commutation will not, I think, be accepted by the public for one moment as a justification for the release, especially when it is against the report of the judge who tried the case, and when the law provides that fourteen years might be the maximum punishment.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Am I to understand that the hon. gentleman thinks that the judge erred in the discharge of his duty by giving this man only three years, when the law provided for a much heavier punishment—four times as great? I think it is unfair to attack the judge.

Mr. EDGAR. I do not think I wanted to condemn the judge. But I was, as well as I could, condemning the Minister of Justice.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Both together.

Mr. EDGAR. I was pointing out to the Minister of Justice that, if he did not know it before, he will know now, that the judge

could have sentenced this man to fourteen years, but instead inflicted a very light sentence on him.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Too light, you think.

Mr. EDGAR. Well, he inflicted a lenient sentence. It might have been much greater, but the Minister of Justice, who has no political feeling in the matter, of course, ignored the report of the judge, who knew all about the case, and struck a year off the sentence. Does the Minister of Justice defend his course on the ground that this man was a skilled artisan? And if he had been a bungling artisan, would he never have been released? The release evidently was the reward of his skill or education. If a doctor is put in a penitentiary and is allowed to prescribe for a fellow-prisoner and saves his life, how many years would the Minister of Justice take off his sentence? If a lawyer were in a penitentiary and gave legal advice to the Government—if a very skillful lawyer like the ex-Minister of Justice were in the penitentiary and advised the Government on an important case and saved for the Government one, ten or twenty thousand dollars by his advice, how many years would be taken off his sentence? Or better still, if a rich convict says: I can give you \$25,000 for election or any other purposes,—how many years would the hon. gentleman take off his term? That is what it amounts to and the country will not attach the slightest weight to that excuse. In this case, most unfortunately for the ex-Minister of Justice, it was a political crime which had been committed by this notorious political agent, at the bidding of an organized backing in Toronto. He was sent off by them to carry out his system of plugging and telegraphing and personation, fifteen hundred miles away, in the interests of the Government of which the ex-Minister of Justice was then a member. And it was most unfortunate for the hon. gentleman that he cannot find a better excuse than he has given to-night. The hon. gentleman knew perfectly well all about the nature of the crime committed, and that should have made him most careful not to unfairly remit the sentence of a criminal who had got into the penitentiary by trying to serve the political party of which the hon. gentleman is a member, and of the very Government of which he was a member.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES CENSUS.

Mr. MARTIN moved for:

Return of the census of the North-west Territories recently taken by the Mounted Police, showing the number of male and female inhabitants in each division and showing boundaries of divisions.

He said, I understand that the number of persons found in the North-west Territories, under the Mounted Police census which was taken last year, was somewhere in the neighbourhood of 73,000. Now it is suggested in the Speech from the Throne that the Government intend to give to the North-west Territories an additional member. It is somewhat difficult to conceive on what principle the Government propose to take that course. The unit obtained by dividing the population of Quebec by sixty-five, which is the course laid down in the British North America Act, is, I understand something over 22,000 for each constituency. The North-west Territories already have four members, so that it would be necessary for them to have a population of 90,000, to entitle them to their present representation, and to entitle them to a further increase of one, making five in all, they should have a population in there of something over 113,000. Now, I do not desire in any way to oppose the suggestion of the Government that an additional member be given to the North-west Territories. I suppose there is a good deal in the fact that the Territories are very large in extent, and, therefore, although sparsely populated, there may be a justification for increasing the number of members. But I desire particularly to call the attention of Parliament to the fact that since the census of 1891, the population of Manitoba has increased about 40,000, so that if the Territories are entitled to an increase in their representation of one—although they are still some eight or nine thousand short of the population required for their present representation—then Manitoba, whose present representation is based entirely upon its population, is entitled, according to the census of 1891, to seven members, which they will get in the next House. The representation of Manitoba has been figured out and based upon the unit obtained in the manner I have described. Now, the Government has admitted that Manitoba has at present a population of 190,000. As a matter of fact, the local government claim that its present population is 200,000, but for the purpose of obtaining subsidies—a matter of dollars and cents—the hon. Finance Minister has fully admitted that the actual population is 190,000 people, because he is now paying to that province the sum of 80 cents a head for that number. Therefore, I suggest to the Government that it would be eminently fair that they should give to Manitoba at least two more representatives at the general elections, because they are clearly, so far as population is concerned, entitled to nine members. While the Territories are not entitled to an additional member, yet the Government intend to give them that additional member. I do not for one moment oppose the suggestion of the Government. It might perhaps be pointed out that there might be some difficulty, under the British North America Act, in giving

Mr. MARTIN.

this increased representation to Manitoba, but I think that the Government will have to strain the British North America Act and the amending Acts with regard to this question of the representation of the Territories very much indeed to justify them in the course they intend to take. It would be just as easy, as constitutional and as legal to pass an Act giving Manitoba what it is fairly entitled to, namely, two additional representatives, as it will be for the Government to get over the provisions of the constitution which prevent its giving to the Territories any more than their proper representation according to population.

Mr. DALY. I understand the position taken by the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin) to be that he does not object to the increased representation being given to the North-west Territories, but he thinks that in view of the fact that the population of Manitoba has increased in larger proportion than that of the North-west Territories, and of the fact that the province, under the unit of population, would be entitled to nine members instead of seven, the Government should take steps to give Manitoba that increased representation. Well, the hon. gentleman is aware, that even if the Government desired to do so they could not meet his wishes which, no doubt, would be the wishes of the people of Manitoba. The representation of Manitoba is fixed under the British North America Act as is the representation of the other provinces, but the representation in this House of the North-west Territories is entirely in the hands of this House under the British North America Act of 1886. We can deal with the representation of the North-west Territories ourselves, but so far as the representation of Manitoba is concerned, unless we have an amendment to the British North America Act made by the Imperial Parliament, we are not in a position to change that representation. The hon. gentleman may rest assured that when the redistribution took place in 1891, I, along with the other representatives of Manitoba at that time, did our best to get the full representation Manitoba was entitled to under the census of 1891. My recollection is that the unit of population fixed by the representation of Quebec was 22,400. Our population was 162,000, and seven representatives, being an increase of two, was all we were entitled to, and it would be impossible to-day, even if the Government could see their way to do it—if, on account of the population and as a matter of justice they thought they had a right to increase the representation of Manitoba in this House—for them to do so. No person would be gladder to see increased representation here than I would. There is no objection to the hon. gentleman's motion; the papers will be brought down. And, I presume that if a Bill is introduced, as foreshadowed in the Speech from the Throne, the House will

have an opportunity of discussing whether or not it will grant the increased representation to the North-west Territories. Those hon. gentlemen who were in the House in 1886 when the Bill was passed that gave representation to the Territories, will recollect that the right hon. leader of the House of that date stated that, as a matter of fact, the population of the Territories at that time did not entitle them to the representation proposed—that is taking the unit of population in the older provinces. But my recollection of the debate is that there were great interests that entitled the Territories to special representation here.

Mr. MULOCK. And great area.

Mr. DALY. A vast area and large interests, which entitled them to representation even greater than that given to the other provinces. A reading too of the debate will show whether I am right or not; but I think that was the reason stated by Sir John Macdonald for giving the North-west Territories four representatives. The Territories have largely increased in population since that time; their railway development has been very large; their interests have greatly increased; and I think the Government will be able to give good reasons for asking this House to give the North-west Territories another representative in Parliament.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I am rather surprised at the speech the hon. gentleman has made, but the reasons he assigns for the paragraph in the Speech from the Throne which he refers to are the most plausible, perhaps the only reasons why such a paragraph should be there at all. The hon. gentleman will look in vain for such a declaration of principle as that he has stated. I recollect very well the circumstances under which the North-west Territories were given representation in this House, and I wish to call the attention of the House especially to the subject. When it was proposed to give representation to the province of Manitoba and the province of British Columbia, they were given representation on account of their territory beyond what they were actually entitled to on the ground of population. But it was expressly provided at the time that the number of representatives should not be increased until the population warranted that increase, that the principle of representation by population from that time forward was to apply to these provinces precisely as it did to other provinces. When the first Bill was introduced in 1871, in consequence of the position of which Manitoba occupied, it will be remembered by the few who remain in this House from the membership of that time, the Manitoba Act was adopted by this Parliament. I made very strong objection to that, because, in my opinion, this House could not establish under the con-

stitution as it then stood a federal relation between itself and any new province which had its constitution given by this Parliament instead of by an Act of the Imperial Parliament. That subject was taken into consideration by Sir John Macdonald, who was Minister of Justice at the time. A report was made to the Government, and Sir John came down to Parliament declaring that for the purpose of removing any doubt in the matter Imperial sanction would be sought. When the proposition came before Parliament it came in the form of a resolution declaring that Imperial legislation was necessary. Mr. Dorion, who had a seat in this House at the time, Mr. Blake and others insisted that the very words that were intended to be embodied in the Imperial Act amending the British North America Act should be submitted to this House and should be passed by this House as a portion of the address to the Imperial Parliament. That principle was agreed to at that time. In 1886, when it was proposed to give representation to the North-west Territories, Sir John Macdonald proceeded too with a resolution precisely as he had proposed to do in the first instance. The hon. gentleman will see from the report of the debates that I pressed upon the attention of the House the propriety of following the procedure of 1871, and that the address passed by this House asking the Imperial Parliament to empower us to admit representation from the Territories should be embodied in the address sent from this House to the Imperial Parliament. That was not done. The hon. gentleman will find that Sir John Macdonald, then, as leader of the House, read a very brief Bill, which he said was prepared by the law clerk, but was not embodied in the address. And hon. gentlemen who will look at that Bill will see that it is not the Bill which became law by Act of the Imperial Parliament, that, in fact, very important changes were made in and additions made to that Bill. If the interpretation which the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Daly) now puts upon that statute is a correct interpretation, there would be nothing to prevent any government supported by a narrow majority in this House carrying through here a Bill giving to the North-west Territories 50 or 60 representatives wholly regardless of the principle that representation was to be based upon the population. In fact, the representation of the other provinces might be swamped by the excessive representation given by the Government, for political considerations, to the North-west Territories. Before a construction of that sort can be adopted before such a meaning can be attached to that statute, it is very important that this House should look with care to see if it admits of no other construction, for it would be a most preposterous thing for the other provinces to be bound by the rule of representation

by population with a view to securing to the people in every part of the Dominion a fair proportion of representation in this House, if it were in the power of the Government to select any territory or province and, at their own discretion, give to that province or territory, representation wholly regardless of the population that such a province or territory might have. Now, that is the proposition for which the hon. gentleman contends. I deny that such a proposition ought to receive the support of this House, if it were in the power of this House to act upon that rule. It is not compelled to give the Territories more representation than the population of the Territories would entitle them to. If the hon. gentleman were to adopt any other rule, it would be indeed a very unsafe thing for Parliament, because it would put it in the power of any government hard pressed to swamp representation from every other portion of the Dominion by the excess of representation given to the Territories. Sir, I do not think that is by any means the only construction which that statute will admit, and I am inclined to think that the only safe thing for Parliament to do, having given to the Territories representation beyond what they were entitled to by population in the first instance, as this House gave to Manitoba and British Columbia, is to refuse any further increase in the representation of those Territories until such increase is warranted by the increased population that may be found there. I have no objection to the motion being adopted; but I have risen at this moment, not to enter into an exhaustive discussion of the subject, but to warn the Minister that if the course which he has intimated, should be taken by the Government, it will be resisted, so far as I am concerned, and I believe that it will be reprobated in every part of the country, because it will absolutely destroy that security which every section possesses by having regard to the principle of representation by population.

Motion agreed to.

TAY CANAL.

Mr. MULOCK moved for :

Statement in detail of the several properties taken possession or expropriated by the Crown for the purposes of the Tay Canal, the names of all the owners or persons claiming any right, title or franchise in respect of the same, the amounts claimed, the amounts paid to such owners or other persons, the names of any persons claiming damages in respect of any property or franchise injuriously affected by the construction, working or otherwise of the said canal; such statement to give details of the specific property, works, and other assets of the Tay Navigation Company taken by the Government for the purpose of the said Tay Canal, estimates of the value of the same, and statements of amounts, if any, paid therefor, and the names of the parties to whom such amounts were allowed or paid. Also,

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).

copies of all Orders in Council, documents and other papers showing under what authority the said property and works were taken and used, and particularly whether the same were taken and used under the provisions of the Upper Canada Act incorporating the company, 1st William IV., chapter 11, s. 40-42, and copies of the said sections.

He said. I may inform the House and the Minister of Railways and Canals what the object of this motion is, so that the return need not be more comprehensive than desired. I would say that I am informed that the Tay Navigation Company issued debentures upon its undertaking many years ago, which debentures are outstanding liabilities yet against that company, and that the present Tay Canal Company has been constructed over somewhat the same property, and has become successors to the franchise and properties of the old Tay Navigation Company. It is on that assumption I make the motion. It happens that some of these debentures became the property of the old province of Canada in trust for the University of Toronto, and are outstanding and unpaid, and it is for the purpose of investigating the claim in connection with that matter, that I make this motion. The university has been moving in the matter and they have to obtain permission from the Ontario government to institute proceedings against, either the Dominion of Canada or the province of Ontario, with regard to this and other claims, and it is for the purpose of obtaining information in connection with that application and movement, that I make this motion.

Motion agreed to.

THE SUPERANNUATION FUND.

Sir JAMES GRANT moved for :

Return of—1. The names of all officers in the service of the Government of Canada on the 30th June, 1895, contributing to the Superannuation Fund, as established prior to the passing of "The Civil Service Superannuation Amendment Act, 1893."

2. The names of all officers in the said service who contributed to such fund and who prior to the said 30th June, 1895, ceased to be officers in such service, but who did not receive a retiring allowance or a gratuity under the Superannuation Act.

3. The date of appointment of each such officer.

4. The salary of each such officer at the time of appointment.

5. The number of years' service of each such officer.

6. The gross amount contributed by each such officer to the Superannuation Fund up to the 30th June, 1895, or up to the date when he ceased to be an officer in the said service, as the case may be.

He said: The chief object in bringing this subject before the House is to have it carefully considered. These officers form a very influential body in this city, and many of them think that their rights are not properly

protected. When the facts are fully presented that class in this community will see that the Government have every intention to guard their interest in the affairs of this country.

Motion agreed to.

RETURNS ORDERED.

Copies of the Order in Council appointing the Hon. Désiré Girouard one of the judges of the Supreme Court of Canada.—(Mr. Tarte.)

Statement showing the work done on the Montreal drill shed since 1st January, 1895; the amount of money paid for such work, and the names of the persons to whom such payments were made.—(Mr. Tarte.)

Copies of Orders in Council in relation to appointments of Senators, made since 1st January, 1896.—(Mr. Tarte.)

Statement showing the number of persons appointed to public offices since 1st December, 1895; the offices to which such persons were appointed; the date of appointment, and amount of salary in each case.—(Mr. Tarte.)

Statement of the sums appropriated by Parliament for improving the navigation of the St. John River, New Brunswick, and its tributaries, during the years from 1887 to 1895, inclusive; also, statement as to what amount of such appropriation was annually expended in such improvements in said river and its tributaries during the same period, together with memorandum as to what points in said river these sums were expended; by whom the same were expended, and the character of the work done in each case.—(Mr. Colter.)

Statement as to what portion of the above appropriation was expended at Gibson's Creek, in the county of Carleton; the amount spent, and the nature of the work done.—(Mr. Colter.)

Return showing the amount of corn and other grain imported by each of the distillers for the year 1895. The total amount of corn imported required for human food.—(Mr. Mills, Bothwell.)

Return showing the amount of money paid to each of the several parties who have received a bounty during the year 1895 from the appropriation to encourage the production of beet root.—(Mr. Mills, Bothwell.)

REPORT.

Annual Report of the Department of Marine and Fisheries.—(Mr. Costigan.)

Mr. FOSTER moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 10.5 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 11th February, 1896.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

VACANCIES.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to inform the House that the Clerk of the House

has received from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, certificates of the election and return of the Hon. Sir Charles Tupper, Bart., for the electoral district of Cape Breton; and of Charles Angers, Esquire, for the electoral district of Charlevoix.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 56) respecting the Montreal Island Belt Line Railway Company.—(Mr. Lachapelle.)

SENATE AND HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Mr. MULOCK moved that Bill (No. 7) further to amend the Act respecting the Senate and House of Commons, be placed again on the Order paper for further consideration of the Committee of the Whole.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Lost.

Mr. MULOCK. I did not suppose that any hon. gentleman would have objected to this motion, and therefore assumed that it was not necessary for me to add anything in recommendation of it. I presume that most of the members know to what the motion refers; but as there may be some members in the House to-day who were not present when this Bill was in Committee of the Whole on the former occasion, and where it was defeated, for their information I would say that it is the Bill having reference to the matter of railway passes to members. I submit the motion and trust it will receive the further consideration of this House.

MEMBERS INTRODUCED.

Hon. Sir Charles Tupper, Bart., Member for the Electoral District of Cape Breton, introduced by Hon. Mr. Foster and Mr. Macdougall.

Charles Angers, Esquire, Member for the Electoral District of Charlevoix, introduced by Hon. Mr. Laurier and Mr. Choquette.

House divided:

YEAS:

Messieurs

Angers,	Lister,
Bain,	Lowell,
Beith,	Macdonald (Huron),
Boston,	Macleon (York),
Bowman,	McCarthy,
Brown,	McGillivray,
Campbell,	McLennan,
Cartwright (Sir Rich'd),	McMillan,
Casey,	McMullen,
Christie,	Mills (Bothwell),
Colter,	Mulock,
Davies (P.E.I.),	O'Brien,
Dawson,	Rider,
Delisle,	Sanborn,
Devlin,	Scriven,
Edgar,	Semple,
Featherston,	Somerville,
Flint,	Sproule,
Forbes,	Stubbs,
Fraser,	Sutherland,
Frémont,	Wallace,
Gillmor,	Welsh,
Ingram,	Wilson, and
Innes,	Yeo.—49.
Laurier,	

NAYS :

Messieurs :

Amyot,	Lachapelle,
Barnard,	Langevin (Sir Hector),
Bécharé,	LaRivière,
Bergeron,	Lavergne,
Bernier,	Leclair,
Blanchard,	Leduc,
Bruneau,	Macdonald (King's),
Burnham,	Macdonell (Algoma),
Cameron (Inverness),	Macdowall,
Carling (Sir John),	McAlister,
Carpenter,	McDonald (Assiniboia),
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	McDonald (Victoria),
Carroll,	McDougald (Pictou),
Carscallen,	McDougall (Cape Breton)
Choquette,	McGreevy,
Cleveland,	McIsaac,
Coatsworth,	McKay,
Cochrane,	McLean (King's),
Cockburn,	McLeod,
Corbould,	Mara,
Costigan,	Marshall,
Craig,	Martin,
Daly,	Mignault,
Davin,	Miller,
Davis (Alberta),	Mills (Annapolis),
Desaulniers,	Moncrieff,
Dickey,	Montague,
Dugas,	Northrup,
Dupont,	Ouimet,
Earle,	Perry,
Fairbairn,	Pridham,
Ferguson (Leeds and Grenville),	Prior,
Ferguson (Renfrew),	Putnam,
Foster,	Rinfret,
Fréchette,	Robillard,
Geoffrion,	Roome,
Gillies,	Rosamond,
Girouard,	Ross (Lisgar),
Godbout,	Smith (Ontario),
Grandbois,	Stairs,
Grant (Sir James),	Stevenson,
Guay,	Tarte,
Guillet,	Taylor,
Haggart,	Tupper (Sir Charles Hibbert),
Harwood,	Tupper (Sir Charles),
Haslam,	Turcotte,
Hazen,	Tyrwhitt,
Henderson,	Vaillancourt,
Hutchins,	Weldon,
Ives,	White (Shelburne),
Jeannotte,	Wilmot, and
Joncas,	Wood.—104.

Motion negatived.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 57) respecting assignment and attachment of salaries of public employees.
—(Mr. Bécharé.)

THE REMEDIAL BILL (MANITOBA).

Mr. DICKEY moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 58) intituled The Remedial Act of Manitoba.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Explain.

Mr. DICKEY. Mr. Speaker, I am afraid any explanation I can give to-day, with the members of the House of Commons not in

Mr. MULOCK.

possession of the Bill, will be very inadequate, and will really not furnish hon. members with any very definite information as to the details of the Bill. The only thing I can say to the House in asking leave to introduce the Bill is to refer to the general lines on which it is drawn. I may say that in drafting it the lines of the old legislation in Manitoba have been followed as closely as possible, in order that while restoring those rights which it was thought desirable should be restored, we should not transgress the lines of the jurisdiction of this Parliament. It has been a matter of very grave difficulty, I need scarcely say, to frame the Bill. The general scheme, I may say, is this: It was found impossible to restore to the Roman Catholic minority in Manitoba those rights which it was thought they were entitled to under the constitution without establishing a system of separate schools. In order to make that workable, a Board of Education is to be established in the province for separate schools, composed of the same number of members as the Catholic section of the old Board of Education. This board will have power with respect to organizing and carrying on the schools. The standard of education to be taught in these schools and the standard of the teachers who are qualified to hold licenses will be not identically the same as in the Public School Act of Manitoba, but of as high a standard. The persons who contribute to those schools, the separate schools, are prima facie to be all Catholics in Manitoba. But the Roman Catholic who prefers that his children shall attend the public schools, and decides that he will contribute to the public schools, has the right to make that choice by giving certain notices, which will be found in the Bill, and he becomes quoad a Protestant, a contributor to the public schools and not to the separate schools. The inspection is to be of a double kind. What I may call the every-day inspection of the schools for the practical working is to be carried on by inspectors to be appointed by the Board of Education, the body to which I have referred. There is a further inspection to be made by inspectors to be appointed or to be authorized in that behalf by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council in the province of Manitoba. These inspectors of the local government will inspect the schools simply for the purpose of certifying to the efficiency of the teaching in them. It was thought desirable that an entirely independent inspection should be had for the purpose of testing efficiency, but, as I have said, the practical, every-day inspection is to be made by what we may call domestic inspectors, appointed by the Board of Education. It is not necessary for me, I think, to go into any further details. The Bill provides for certain powers as to trustees and as to ratepayers and other matters that are essential to the working of any school system, and which are necessarily in the

nature of details that cannot be discussed at the present time. One very troublesome question dealt with by the Bill is the question of school books. That, I may say, gave a great deal of difficulty, but it was finally settled on this basis, that the Board of Education should be able to choose the school books, their choice, however, being limited to this, they should only select school books that have been the choice of the public schools of Manitoba, or the books in the public separate schools of the province of Ontario. That gives a fair range of choice, and it will secure, I think, what will be readily admitted to be a very high standard of books. These are the general lines of the Bill. I do not intend particularly to discuss either the details or the principle of the Bill to-day, because this can be more fittingly done on another occasion. I do not think I need say more to put the House in possession of the lines on which the Bill has been drawn.

Mr. McCARTHY. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will tell the House about the financial aspect of the measure.

Mr. DICKEY. The financial aspect of the measure, is this: The Catholics who become adherents to this school system, or rather who do not dissent from this school system, are allowed to tax themselves for separate schools in the district, and they are exempted from taxation for the public schools of the province of Manitoba. The municipality is enjoined by the Bill to collect the whole municipal taxes over the whole of the property in the municipality, and distribute it for the support of schools in the municipality; by property, in that sense, I mean Roman Catholic property subject to be taxed for the support of separate schools. The subject of a legislative grant was one of very grave difficulty, and the constitutionality of the provisions relating to that will, I have no doubt, be the subject of discussion in the House. But, so far as the Bill is concerned, the attempt that was made by the Government was this. There were two aspects of the question. The sharing of the legislative grant was one of the rights adjudged particularly to the Roman Catholic minority in Manitoba in the Privy Council decisions in England and Canada. That, therefore, was one of the rights to which they were particularly entitled. On the other hand, it was felt that for this Parliament to attempt to interfere directly with supply granted by the province of Manitoba would lead to enormous practical difficulty, besides being of a very highly offensive character, if I may use that term—to the local authorities. The Government did not feel that this House had any constitutional authority to deal practically with the question of the legislative grant, and, so far as the difficulty was considered possible of solution, it is solved in the Bill which I

propose to introduce, by adjudicating that the right to share in the legislative grant be one of the rights and privileges of the Catholic minority in the province of Manitoba, taking it for granted—as I think later discussion will show, we have a right to do—that the province of Manitoba itself, will after the system is established, supply that fund to the separate schools. That, of course, will be a matter of discussion later on. I do not know that I can say anything further just now as to the financial aspect of the case.

Mr. LAURIER. I would like to ask my hon. friend, if he can tell me at this moment, by whom is the Board of Education for the separate schools to be appointed?

Mr. DICKEY. It is to be appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council of the province of Manitoba, and after three months default in making any appointment, the Governor General in Council here is clothed with power to fill vacancies and to complete the board.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. (Translation.) I desire to know from the hon. Minister if this Bill has received the approbation of the religious authorities?

Mr. OUMET. (Translation.) The hon. member may inquire for himself.

Mr. DUPONT. (Translation.) I would like to know from the hon. Minister of Justice, or, at least, from the French Ministers, if the Bill is translated in French?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. (Translation.) It is not yet translated.

Mr. LAURIER. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Dickey), if he is prepared at this moment—this is, of course, a very important measure—to fix a day for the second reading?

Mr. DICKEY. I am not at this moment prepared, but I have no doubt that the leaders of the two sides of this House can agree at a later date.

Mr. LAURIER. I would suggest that some time would be needed for the study of this Bill before the second reading.

Mr. DICKEY. Quite so. I would point out to the hon. gentleman that the Bill is not yet printed in French.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would like to ask, whether it is the intention of the Government to communicate a copy of this Bill to the government of Manitoba, before the second reading; and whether, they will be invited to express any opinion upon this subject?

Mr. DICKEY. I think there would be no objection at all to that course being followed, although I do not know that it would be necessary. If it is considered more courteous it shall certainly be done.

Mr. HAZEN. I wish to ask the Minister of Justice, how many clauses does the Bill contain ?

Mr. DICKEY. There are 112 clauses.

Mr. MARTIN. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say it is printed in English, and will be distributed to-day ?

Mr. DICKEY. No, but I think very shortly. Probably to-morrow or the day after.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

EXPORT OF AMERICAN CATTLE FROM ST. JOHN, N.B.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to refer to a statement in one of the newspapers, I think, of Saturday last, as to a declaration which I made in the House on Friday of last week, with reference to the Order in Council which has been passed in connection with the shipment of American cattle from the port of St. John. The newspaper to which I refer questioned the accuracy of my statement, which was : That when I was asked for the information on Friday the 24th day of January, I could not give it because the Order in Council had not been signed by His Excellency, and I was, therefore, not in a position to communicate it to the House. I wish to state now in the hearing of the House, that the charge made by that newspaper, that I had made a misstatement to the House, was absolutely untrue. I gave the correct information to the House. The Order in Council was not signed by the Governor General when I made this statement to the House, and I deem it justice to myself that I should take the opportunity of making this statement now.

RETURNS.

Mr. CASEY. I again wish to ask the leader of the House, when the return, in answer to my motion regarding the appointment of the High Commissioner, and instructions as to his duties, &c., shall be laid before the House ? When I called the Minister's attention to the matter the other day, he said, the papers would be brought down in a day or two. That was several days ago, and they are not down yet.

Mr. FOSTER. I did say that to the hon. gentleman, and I made inquiries and asked that the report should be hastened. I shall let my hon. friend know before the evening in what state the matter is.

Mr. CASEY. There cannot be a great deal of it.

Mr. FOSTER. There is not a great deal of it.

THE CAPE BRETON ELECTION.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Mr. Speaker, a day or two ago I called the attention of the

Mr. DICKEY.

House to a statement which was reported in the papers as having been made by the hon. member for Cape Breton—I am not quite sure whether I should designate him as the leader of the House or not. The speech was delivered by him, I think, in the town of Amherst, or in some place in the maritime provinces, and it contained a statement to the effect, that in the contest between himself and Mr. Murray in the county of Cape Breton, the sum of \$25,000 had been sent down to buy the seat from under him. Mr. Speaker, from personal knowledge which I myself possess, I gave that statement at the time an unqualified contradiction. Since that, I see by the morning paper, that the hon. gentleman from Cape Breton (Sir Charles Tupper) is reported to have repeated the statement at the reception tendered him yesterday, at the Ottawa railway station. He is reported as having used the following words :—

Money was unquestionably used to secure his (Sir Charles Tupper's) defeat. He spoke of what he knew when he said that \$25,000 were sent down to buy the seat from under him.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I beg to tell the House and to tell the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) that he has been entirely misinformed. The statement made by him is ludicrously inaccurate and absurd. It is without any foundation whatever. I am in a position to know—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds). How much was it ?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) If hon. gentlemen are curious they will hear me out, and perhaps they will accept the offer I propose to make to them. I am in a position to know that attempts were made, on the part of those who believed that it was in the public interest to defeat the hon. member for Cape Breton (Sir Charles Tupper) ; attempts were made to assist Mr. Murray to pay those legitimate expenses which everybody knows have to be made in an election of that kind. I thought myself that the expenses would range somewhere from \$1,000 to \$1,500. I make no scruple in saying, that I attempted myself to assist Mr. Murray in that regard. I tell the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) that his statement that \$25,000, or the one-tenth part of it, was sent, is absurd and is untrue ; and to my knowledge, a sum ludicrously insufficient to pay even the travelling expenses of Mr. Murray and his associates, was sent to Cape Breton. Now, Sir, if the hon. gentleman accepts my statement, I hope he will withdraw the statement he has made here. But if he does not accept my statement, and thinks that I am not fully in possession of the facts, then I ask him to apply for a committee of this House to make an investigation in regard to the moneys which were spent in Cape Breton, which were sent there to as-

sist Mr. Murray, and the moneys which were sent to assist the right hon. gentleman himself. We on our side will offer every facility, Sir, for the appointment of that committee.

Mr. SPEAKER. Does the hon. gentleman intend to conclude with a motion?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I shall, Mr. Speaker, if you think it necessary. We on our side will offer every facility to the hon. gentleman to obtain that committee, and every facility to the committee to procure the information. And when that committee is appointed, I have no doubt the country will be delighted to see what sums of money were contributed, and every true Liberal will be delighted to learn that not a dollar was contributed on our side which could be used for any improper or corrupt purpose. If the hon. gentleman is able to say as much for his side, it will do much to elevate the public life of Canada in the minds of all right-thinking men. To put myself in order, Mr. Speaker, I beg to move the adjournment of the House.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am quite willing, Mr. Speaker, to accept the assurance which the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat has given, that to the best of his knowledge and belief my impression that the amount of money which was sent down to the county of Cape Breton by the Opposition exceeded \$25,000. I am quite willing to accept the assurance of the hon. gentleman that to the best of his knowledge and belief that sum is largely over-stated. In speaking of a thing of this kind, a person can only speak from the best judgment he is able to offer, and I will give the hon. gentleman the grounds for the statement I made, or, at all events, a certain portion of the grounds. In the first place, the candidate, Mr. Murray, who was, I believe, the representative of the government of Nova Scotia in the legislative council, and who resigned his seat in order to contest this election, stated over his own signature in his election address, that he was very unwilling to contest this election, but that it was a great emergency. He stated, as I believe, on arriving in the county—it was so reported—at a meeting which he addressed, that the Liberal party had determined to make this the fight of their life. I think that is a tolerably good ground for supposing that Mr. Murray was not to be left unaided in fighting this battle.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Well, I am able to remind hon. gentlemen that the records of the courts will prove that individual members on the other side of the House admitted that they had expended in a single election \$20,000. When I am able to say that, I think I have given the House the proof that these gentlemen consider an ex-

penditure of a very large sum of money not misapplied in a very important contest. Now, Sir, when I state that Mr. Murray declared that the Liberal party had determined to make this the fight of their life, that this was a vital emergency, that it was a question of life and death, practically, to the Opposition, that they should prevent my election in the county of Cape Breton, the hon. gentleman will, I think, agree with me that I had pretty good grounds for supposing that Mr. Murray was not going to undertake to contest an election which would cover the party with anything but triumph if they could not very materially reduce the majority which my predecessor had had in the county. An election, therefore, was promoted; and, from the county of Ottawa away down to the shores of Cape Breton, gentlemen occupying prominent positions in this House and out of it went to the aid and support of Mr. Murray. After they had canvassed the county for several days, after every portion of the county had been visited by some one of their agents, the Attorney General of Nova Scotia, who had taken a prominent part in the contest, suddenly left the county, went to the city of Halifax, and immediately returned. On the Saturday night preceding the election—which was too late a period to admit of parties being able to affect the election, which was on Tuesday, by any other means than the use of money, he was followed by half a dozen emissaries from the county of Halifax; and when I was informed by persons in whose credibility I have the utmost confidence, that \$20 was freely offered, not for a vote, but to any elector who would stay at home, and that gentlemen occupying positions of considerable influence were offered \$100 for their vote and influence, I came to the conclusion—and I think, from the history of the efforts of hon. gentlemen opposite in the past, as attested to before the courts of the country, that I was warranted in that conclusion—that human devices were not to be wanting in the endeavour to prevent my obtaining a seat in Cape Breton. I can only say at this moment that parties of the highest respectability and intelligence, and with the best means of knowing, assured me that the very smallest sum they could estimate as being sent into the county was \$25,000; and I believe that \$25,000 to have been sent into the county of Cape Breton by the Opposition in Canada, broadcast all over this country, just as firmly as the hon. gentleman opposite believes that it was not sent. Now, I would like to ask that hon. gentleman whether he or I have been in the best position to form an opinion upon this question. I would like to ask whether he, sitting in the Parliament of Ottawa, or I, having gone through the county in this contest, having met those gentlemen, having witnessed their untiring and desperate efforts, and with the knowledge that nothing but a large sum of money could enable them

successfully to contest my seat for the county of Cape Breton, have the best grounds for judging of the fact—whether I have not as good grounds for my opinion, which I restate with the firmest belief that it is well based, and with all the light I could get, as the hon. gentleman has for entertaining a contrary opinion. I do not think it is necessary to say more. I am quite certain my colleague, the senior member for the county of Cape Breton, will be able to give the hon. gentleman further information in regard to this matter if he wants it.

Mr. CASEY. What about the proposal for a committee?

Mr. McDOUGALL. I spent about ten days in the county of Cape Breton, and I have to say that in every section of the county I visited, I had the best possible evidences of the fact that our opponents made a free use of money. I did not go into a district where I did not see strong evidences of the use of money. I know of a district that was visited by an hon. gentleman of the legislative council at Halifax, who went round offering to the people to build a bridge across the river, the building of which, I am sure, would cost a hundred thousand dollars. I was informed on very good authority that \$100 was offered to a man to remain neutral, and I was informed on several occasions that at different places \$10 and \$20 had been offered—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Names, names.

Mr. McDOUGALL. If I did give the names, hon. gentlemen opposite would have difficulty in finding him. We had all those evidences; we had more, we had proof of the statement made by a gentleman, a former member of this House, the Hon. Mr. Jones, of Halifax, that the Liberal party should spend \$100,000 at least to accomplish the defeat of Sir Charles Tupper. There is proof of that statement being made, and of similar statements being made by other people throughout the province. We are aware that one man was telegraphed to in a particular town of Nova Scotia and asked for a contribution of \$100. He was asked for permission to draw on him for \$100, but he replied: I have done that kind of thing too often already, but if you elect George Murray, on election day you can draw on me for \$100. As I said before, we have the best possible evidence that not only was \$20,000 or \$25,000 spent, but a great deal more was spent. The Attorney General for Nova Scotia went back to Halifax after his first visit, and we are informed that after he got there, \$3,000 was made up by the Liberal party in that city. We have the best possible evidence, I believe, that money went to Cape Breton to be used for the purpose of bribing the electors to vote against Sir Charles Tupper. I am glad, however, that not many were bribed. We know that many voters remained at home because they

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

were of the opinion it was not necessary they should take the trouble to go to the polls. They counted on so very large a majority for Sir Charles Tupper that they did not think it necessary to put themselves to any inconvenience to vote for him. And I know of some people who were unwilling to go to the poll and vote against Sir Charles Tupper, but whom the Opposition expected to vote against him, and whom they afterwards paid to remain at home.

Mr. FORBES. Give the names.

Mr. McDOUGALL. We know that money was sent down from Ottawa, and that money was subscribed by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) How much? We will give the figures, if you will give us the committee.

Mr. McDOUGALL. If my hon. friend should get the investigation he suggests, no doubt a great many of his followers down at Cape Breton will be glad to be paid travelling expenses up here. If they cannot get anything else out of the election at Cape Breton, they would like to get that.

Mr. FRASER. As one who took a small part in the election at Cape Breton, I cannot allow the remarks that have been made to pass without simply making the statement that, so far as I am concerned—and I know all about the inner working of the election—the sum mentioned by the hon. member for Queen's P.E.I. (Mr. Davies) is largely in excess of the total amount used in the election at Cape Breton. What is the train of reasoning by which the junior member for Cape Breton (Sir Charles Tupper) arrives at the fact that money was spent? First, that there was a great emergency; second, that there was a battle for life; third, that Attorney General Longley went to Halifax and came back; and, lastly, that there were gentlemen down there from Ottawa and every other place in the country. Well, Mr. Speaker, there were just three members of Parliament and the Attorney General of Nova Scotia, who took part in that election, besides a few who came down on the day of the election to be present at the polling. It is by this train of reasoning that the hon. gentleman arrives at the conclusion that \$25,000 were spent in that election. Verily, this is reasoning according to the best authority. There was no money spent by the Opposition; and if the suggestion of my hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Davies) be accepted, I will guarantee that, even if a commission be sent from here, every witness named by the Government will be brought before that commissior, and subjected to the fullest investigation. The fact is that this statement was circulated by the friends of the Government in order that the shekels of the junior member (Sir Charles Tupper) might be all the more freely called into requisition.

tion. That is the method they used. They set up this story of the Liberals spending so much money in order that they might bleed the hon. gentleman; and I have no doubt that the amount which was thus taken from the hon. gentleman's pocket forms the basis of his opinion as to the amount expended in that election. It is well that this matter has been brought up. Let us have an investigation and the fullest investigation. Mr. Murray did say that this was an emergency, and every man in Cape Breton thought it was an emergency. We were taunted with going down there to run the election. Well, we had a perfect right to go there. It was an emergency; every opening of a constituency is, and this was particularly an emergency, occurring as it did, at this late date of Parliament. And therefore we did what we thought was right in opposing Sir Charles Tupper in that county. But as to spending money, there was none spent by the Liberal party. There was not \$2,000 sent into that county altogether by the Liberal party. I make that statement here, and the Government may take any method they like to make an investigation, and I will prove my statement. Surely we can fight out elections without making statements which are not based upon facts, and I submit that the train of reasoning by which the hon. junior member for Cape Breton (Sir Charles Tupper) arrived at the conclusion he did, without any data on which to form an opinion, is one that cannot appeal to the fair judgment of the people. Now, Sir, I deprecate that kind of thing on either side. I am not going to say that a single dollar was spent by Sir Charles Tupper at that election. I am not going to say that, after we have been defeated, and I would not say it, even if we had won, unless I had the evidence. It is easy to bandy about charges of that kind; but, so far as the Liberal party is concerned, they fought out that election, as they always have fought, and always will fight, for what they conceive, rightly or wrongly, to be true principles, principles worth fighting for, and without the aid of money. The senior member for Cape Breton (Mr. McDougall) says that in every section there was a free use of money. No doubt there was, but the question was by whom. He, I have no doubt, is the best judge of that, but as to \$100 being offered to men, I submit that this is not the method of proving it. We have a law under which every man of that kind can be brought immediately to book. I would suggest to the hon. senior member for Cape Breton (Mr. McDougall) that he should place in his solicitor's hands the names of all these delinquents, for he can thereby, if his statement is well founded, add much to the coffers of the party giving the information. One word more. It is said that Mr. Jones stated that he would spend \$100,000 to defeat Sir Charles Tupper.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I would like to correct the hon. gentleman. I did not say that Mr. Jones said he would spend \$100,000, but that it was reported to me that he had said that the party ought to spend \$100,000.

Mr. FRASER. That is better still. I have not seen Mr. Jones, and if the hon. gentleman says that he has the statement from Mr. Jones, very well. But if he says only that somebody told him that Mr. Jones made such a statement, I submit that, in Mr. Jones's absence, that is not the way to talk. The hon. gentleman knows right well that, if Mr. Jones were here, he would not dare to make such a statement; and I think it exceedingly small to quote such remarks because they have been reported by somebody else. I would ask the hon. member if Mr. Jones made that statement to him?

Mr. McDOUGALL. He did not.

Mr. FRASER. You were simply told it?

Mr. McDOUGALL. I was told it on good authority.

Mr. FRASER. Were you present when that statement was made?

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. FRASER. I have a right to ask the hon. gentleman his authority.

An hon. MEMBER. Through the Chair.

Mr. FRASER. I beg pardon, Mr. Speaker, in my hurry I omitted to ask through you. I would like to ask if the hon. gentleman was present when Mr. Jones made that statement?

Mr. McDOUGALL. I have already told the hon. gentleman I was not present. The statement was not made to me or in my presence, but I was informed on good authority that the statement was made.

Mr. FRASER. Now we have the ground upon which the statement is based. The hon. gentleman says that he was informed that Mr. Jones had made the statement. But we have not the name of his authority. I ask him, in all fairness, is that a fair or right method to deal with men who are not present to answer for themselves? I venture to say that Mr. Jones never made the statement. I myself have heard on very reliable authority that certain statements were made both by the hon. senior member and the hon. junior member for Cape Breton. But I would be ashamed to retail these statements and hold the hon. gentlemen responsible for them. Such methods of controversy must lead to even greater demoralization, if possible, than we have now. Let us carry on our political warfare in better fashion. We of the Liberal party found ourselves in that election confronted with great difficulties in the campaign, and we met those difficulties as best we could, and

we opposed them without the assistance of such as those to which reference has been made. We had not such means, and if we had had them, we could not, and would not, have used them in the county. It is said that this was a fight for life or death of the Opposition. It was by no means a fight for life or death on the part of the Opposition. The holding of a county even by so distinguished—and I will admit at once the rightfulness of using that adjective in this connection—so distinguished a man as Sir Charles Tupper, is not a death-blow to the Opposition. The return of any number of equally able men would not be a death-blow to the Opposition. The Government has simply marked time in a county that has been Conservative since 1867, except once when an opponent of hon. gentlemen opposite got in. If such a result as this is a death-knell to the Opposition, what would their success be? Having taken part in this contest, and knowing the facts, I desire to say, and to make the statement emphatic, that the figures given by the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) are even above the mark. There is a method by which the truth can be arrived at, and if the Government will exert its power in that matter, they will be supported by every man on this side. Every man who took part in the election can be brought to show that there is no truth in the statement that such a sum as has been named was spent on behalf of the Liberals, while it can be shown that the sum named by the hon. member for Queen's is actually above the mark.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. FRASER. Certainly.

Mr. FOSTER. I ask for my own information, and to give the hon. gentleman an opportunity to explain. I recollect reading the reports of a number of speeches by the hon. gentlemen in Opposition, and one particularly from the hon. gentleman in which he formulated some peculiar ideas of ethics. He is reported to have exhorted his hearers somewhat in this form: There is money going; it is in the county; there is plenty of it. Take all you can get. If they offer you \$5, take it; if they offer you \$10, take it; if they offer you \$20, take it; take all you can get but vote for our candidate.

Mr. FRASER. I made no such statement. But I will tell you the statement I did make. I said: It is said we have money, but we have not. If our opponents resort to that sort of business, all I had to say was that let the electors take it, but, in any case, let him vote as his conscience directed.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. FRASER. And I repeat that statement here. I make that statement publicly in this House, as I made it there. Does the

Mr. FRASER.

hon. gentleman object to that style of ethics?

Mr. FOSTER. That is bad political morals.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. FOSTER. Very bad.

Mr. FRASER. I am surprised the hon. gentleman thinks so. I would much rather somebody else had asked the question whose moral susceptibilities are not so exceedingly fine as those of the hon. gentleman. The hon. senior member for Cape Breton mentioned promises. I have but little to say upon that subject. He said that there was a promise of a bridge on the part of the Liberals. The people must be very ignorant if they thought it possible that a bridge costing \$100,000 would be built, when the whole amount at the disposal of the county for bridges, if I remember well, is \$8,000. No such offer could have been made because the Government has not money enough to build a bridge like that. I do know that promises were made—promises of breakwaters, and so on. Why, if I liked to trouble the House, I could show the hon. gentleman a letter to a person in Gabarus to the effect that politics were not in it, that this was a question of a breakwater and extending the time for catching lobsters—and this statement made over the writer's own signature. But I refrain from going into these promises further than to say that they were used—used everywhere. Let us come to an understanding that, except upon evidence, which evidence can be procured if we send for it, no such statements will be made as have been made here this afternoon. If the evidence is gone into it will certainly be shown that we had not a cent except for legitimate purposes and no more than has already been stated.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, there may be doubts, as to what assertions were made by my good friend Mr. Jones, but there can be no doubt as to what assertions have been made and repeated here by the hon. member for Cape Breton (Sir Charles Tupper). Now, Sir, it was a very old habit of a certain old associate of the hon. gentleman, whom I knew well, when he had done any particularly naughty thing to turn round and charge the Opposition with having done the self-same thing. It was his invariable practice. If he spent \$10,000 or \$20,000 or \$50,000 in corrupt practices, the first thing he did was to charge the Opposition with having spent that identical sum, and I have a strong impression, I will not say suspicion, that the hon. gentleman has done precisely the same thing as his old acquaintance. The hon. gentleman refers to the records of the courts. In the province from which he comes, some gentleman had the happy fashion of not getting into the courts. The hon. member for Cape Breton, when

charged with corrupt practices, threw up the sponge, not daring to face the courts. Had there been an investigation, it is not \$20,000 that would have been deemed a high price for a seat in certain portions of the Dominion. For himself the hon. gentleman had easier means, probably. I can recollect the time when the hon. gentleman expended two or three millions in making comfortable seats for himself and certain relatives of his. I can remember when, if I am not mistaken, he told this House that he was going to shorten the route of the Inter-colonial Railroad by five and forty miles for every passenger from east to the west, and for every pound of freight from east to west, and when we came to test the correctness of the hon. gentleman's promises, according to the late Sir John A. Macdonald, if my memory serves me, the five and forty miles had shrunk into four. Sir, it was not a question of life or death to the Liberal party whether the hon. gentleman came back to this Parliament or not, but it was a question of life or death for the hon. gentleman whether he was elected in Cape Breton; and, under these circumstances, we can guess that it would not be a trifle like \$25,000 that would stand in his way. I would not have been surprised if he had thought that \$640,000 or \$640,000,000 would be too little, or—to be more exact, \$58,300,000—I think that is about what the hon. gentleman considers himself worth to the country. Now, my hon. friend has made a straightforward challenge to the hon. gentleman. My hon. friend says here that the Liberal party have been grossly slandered by a statement made by the hon. gentleman. If he believes one word of the statement, let him accept my hon. friend's challenge, and let us have a committee of investigation. There is, Sir, but one course for an honourable man to take, on information such as has been given here, either to retract the slander, or, if he has proof, to prove it. We challenge him to do it, we defy him to give any decent, tolerable, credible evidence of the statement which he has not been ashamed to make in two public places in Canada. That Mr. Longley left the county and went to Halifax, and came back there, appears to be the only substantial evidence the hon. gentleman has that \$25,000 was spent. He may be perfectly aware that \$20 were paid men to stay at home; he may be perfectly aware that \$100 were paid men to vote; but it was not for the Liberal candidate they were asked to vote, or paid to stay at home. Sir, let us apply the rule that I have laid down. Remember the course of these hon. gentlemen in times past; remember that whenever they have done things of which they ought to have repented and been ashamed, they straightway turned round and charged their opponents with doing the same. Now, if the hon. gentleman has one particle of evidence worth presenting—I do not say to a court

of law, because he would never dare submit it to a court of law—but before a committee of this House, on which a majority would be his own friends, a majority chosen by himself, and only the minority chosen from among my hon. friends; let him come forward and do that, or let him stand convicted by my hon. friend (Mr. Davies) of having made assertions in which there was not one particle of truth. Sir, I had hoped better of the hon. gentleman. He comes back to us now under—what shall I say? Certainly under episcopal auspices; and, considering who is his political god-father, I had hoped better things of the hon. gentleman. Sir, let him go back to the gentle and pious prelate to whom he is indebted for his seat, and not to the electors of Cape Breton in the proper sense of the term, and I am sure that worthy man will tell him that he never would have encouraged him, whatever else he might do for him, in bringing slanderous witness against his opponents; and I trust he will repent it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not challenge the right of the hon. gentleman who raised this question to do so, or the mode in which he has done so. He brought it forward in a very gentlemanly manner, and he was quite within his rights.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman cannot speak the second time.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I only desire to speak with the assent of the House; I do not wish to violate the rules.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Go on.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I may say, in justification of my repeating here the statement which he says I made before, that I have this ground for doing it. I made the statement which he has challenged, that \$25,000 had been sent down into the county of Cape Breton to endeavour to buy the seat from under me. I made the statement three times in the presence of the Attorney General of Nova Scotia, who did not challenge its accuracy, and the Attorney General of Nova Scotia was the man who engineered the contest against me.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) May I ask the hon. gentleman a question right here? I am informed, not directly by the Attorney General of Nova Scotia, but by a friend of his, that he solicited the privilege of answering the hon. gentleman, and that privilege was denied him.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I have no hesitation in telling the hon. gentleman that he has been entirely misinformed. Had the Attorney General of Nova Scotia asked the privilege of addressing the electors at any one of the three meetings where he listened to the very statement that has been challenged, I should have obtained a hearing for him at once for that purpose. This is

the first intimation that I have had of anything of the kind. I deliberately made the statement in the presence of the Attorney General of Nova Scotia, who engineered the campaign on the part of my opponents, and its accuracy was not challenged by him.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Did he speak at all?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Now, Mr. Speaker, having made this statement in his presence, it having gone unchallenged by him, and his not having asked an opportunity of controverting it, I ask whether I was not warranted in coming to the conclusion I did? Not only that, but I state that when he came back from Halifax he was followed by half a dozen young gentlemen who went into the county with him.

Mr. MULLOCK. What has that to do with it?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It meant this, it meant that, having canvassed the county and having come to the conclusion that money would buy the seat, Mr. Longley went down to the city of Halifax and was accompanied back on Saturday, the election taking place on Tuesday following, by half a dozen persons to be sent over the county, as I believe they were sent, to distribute money.

Mr. DEVLIN. It is hardly possible for me to retain my seat since the Secretary of State has mentioned the fact that I went down into Cape Breton, when he said that a gentleman from the county of Ottawa had taken part in that contest. I did. I did so with much pleasure. I did so out of a sense of public duty, believing that the interests of our country required that the Secretary of State should not take his seat here to-day. I will take up the last word mentioned by the Secretary of State, when he said that Mr. Longley had an opportunity of answering the charge in regard to the \$25,000. It is within my personal knowledge that the Hon. Mr. Longley sent a telegram to the Secretary of State, challenging the Secretary of State to meet Mr. Longley at a public meeting in the town of North Sydney, on Saturday night, that is a few nights previous to the election, if I mistake not, and the answer from the Secretary of State was to the effect that he, Mr. Longley, could not do so, but that he might send a member of the local legislature to that meeting. More than that, I know that Mr. Longley approached Mr. McKeen on the day of the Liberal convention, and requested that he might have an opportunity of attending the Conservative meetings called by the Secretary of State, and that Mr. McKeen then told him that no such arrangement could be made. I think it is proper that this explanation should be made now. With regard to the statement that some \$25,000 were sent down from Ottawa to that constituency, all I can say is this: I took a considerable part in the fight—

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

Mr. McDOUGALL. At French Bay?

Mr. DEVLIN. I will attend to you in a moment. I am here to defend anything I have done in that contest, whether at French Bay or elsewhere. I was only too anxious to meet that hon. gentleman who has interrupted me now, but he had not the courage to meet me on the platform, face to face. He is here to-day, and I am glad to meet him, and I am not afraid to discuss with him any question that came up in that contest. I was going to say with regard to this \$25,000 that it is all a mystery to me. Personally, I know not that one dollar was expended in the campaign. I went down at my own expense; I came back at my own expense, and I received not a dollar during the campaign, after the campaign, or to this day, having borne my own expenses. I know, as a matter of fact, that the Liberal party had no funds in that campaign.

An hon. MEMBER. Or a special car.

Mr. DEVLIN. No, they had not a special car. But I do know of a special train that was put on the day of the convention which chose the Secretary of State as the ministerial candidate in the county of Cape Breton. The train should have started at eight o'clock in the morning from Glace Bay, but it did not start. It passed at ten in the morning. The train had a very large number on board, hundreds of them being supplied with free tickets.

Mr. McDOUGALL. The hon. gentleman is misleading the House. The railway is not a Dominion railway, but it is a railway belonging to the coal company.

Mr. DEVLIN. I am not misleading the House because I never said it was a Government railway. If the hon. gentleman would open his eyes and ears perhaps he would understand what is being said. It was the Dominion Coal Company's Railway, a company directed by whom? By the hon. gentleman, who thought he could hand over the county in his hat. Since the hon. gentleman is up, I will attend to him immediately. He spoke of promises made on behalf of the Liberal party, and among others that a bridge was to be constructed. I should like to ask the hon. gentleman if he ever heard the promise of a railway made. Was not the promise of a railway made by a very prominent gentleman in his own ranks? That was the current rumour. With respect to the question put by the Minister of Finance, that speakers on our side told the people: take all the money that is going, it is a good time for it, now is the moment—I will answer him by saying that I never heard that charge made. But I know this, that I heard that an hon. member belonging to the party opposite told some people to take all the money that was going. That statement I make, and that state-

ment I make with a thorough knowledge, namely, that now is the time for them to take the money. We know perfectly well how the campaign was conducted. The senior member for Cape Breton, as I am informed, stated—and this was one part of his plan of the campaign—that I slandered the clergy. He made that statement, I believe, down in Cape Breton. I am here to defend myself in respect to that charge, made in that county, and I should like any man here to make good that statement. I say that if the hon. gentleman made that statement—and I believe he did—he made one that was incorrect in every respect. I never slandered the clergy. We know the influences that were brought to bear in this election, we know the pressure used in the county. We know, as a matter of fact, that the influence of the clergy was largely exercised in behalf of the Secretary of State, and all I said was that certainly I was a Roman Catholic, I had studied my catechism, and had read it twenty years ago, but having doubt on a certain matter I had reviewed it the day before, and I did not find the name of the Secretary of State in the catechism. That was all the slandering of the clergy I did, and, in fact, I do not see that it was any slander at all. It is true I went a little further, and said that it was exceedingly strange that at almost every election in Cape Breton there was very great danger to our holy faith. I made that statement, I admit; but I did not slander the clergy. I am sorry the hon. Postmaster General is not in his seat. He has an organ in Ottawa, "Le Canada," and a very precious organ it is, and in last night's issue it says:

M. Devlin est tellement trompeur en cette affaire, et sa fourberie a été si apparente aux yeux de Mgr Cameron, à Cap-Breton, que ce digne prélat s'est décidé à écrire une lettre pastorale pour mettre les catholiques de son diocèse en garde contre "des hypocrites soudoyés par l'enfer."

This statement means that I was the reason why Mgr. Cameron wrote a pastoral letter to the electorate of Cape Breton. Bear in mind, I did not say that he wrote a pastoral letter; it is the organ of the Postmaster General that states that His Grace Bishop Cameron wrote a pastoral letter to the electorate of Cape Breton, warning them against my tactics. Now, His Grace, if I understand the matter correctly, did not write a pastoral letter; but here is the organ of the Postmaster General telling His Grace that he did. I wish to contradict this item at once; I wish to say that every line of this is unfounded, inaccurate and entirely in keeping with Tory tactics in this country. I did not slander the clergy, but they were slandered by some hon. gentlemen opposite, by the ex-Controller of Customs a couple of years ago. The Bishop of Nicolet was slandered. The Postmaster General was silent. The hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. McDougall) was silent, being afraid

to say a word, as he is every time when any question, national or religious, is brought up. The hon. gentleman had not the courage to deny that slander; he might lose a few votes in the county, he thought. But on every occasion, I stood up and defended the bishops and the clergy, and I have testimonials from them that I have done my duty, and when the hon. gentleman says that I have slandered the clergy he makes a statement which is without foundation.

Mr. WALLACE. In regard to the statement made by the hon. member for Ottawa County (Mr. Devlin), I may say that I never slandered the Bishop of Nicolet, but that I quoted a statement which he had made. I quoted from his own document, and when occasion requires I will quote again.

Mr. DEVLIN. Yes, but the hon. gentleman's conception of slander is different from mine. That is all the difference.

Mr. WALLACE. I am glad my conception is not the same as that of the hon. member for Ottawa County. I repeat that when occasion demands I will again quote statements made by the Bishop of Nicolet and make any comments justified by the contents of the document itself.

Mr. DEVLIN. I will be ready to answer you.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. gentleman who has just returned to this House with such a flourish of trumpets on his own part and on that of a few of his friends, has taken up his old habits of dealing with facts, exactly at the point where he left them off on the last occasion that he left us. He has been absent many years, but every once in a while he has returned, when the health of the party seemed to need medical aid, but his habit in dealing with matters of fact appears to have sustained no change in the meantime.

In regard to the matter we are discussing, he has put himself completely in the wrong, and the senior member for the same county (Mr. McDougall) has proven that he was in the wrong in the statements he made. The Secretary of State and High Commissioner—for I suppose we must address him by his double title in this House—has made the statement that he knows of his own knowledge that \$25,000 was sent into Cape Breton and spent by the Liberals there. Mark you, not that it was raised in Cape Breton, but that it was made up and sent there from outside for the purpose of killing the hon. gentleman. He appears to be carried away with such an impression of his own importance in the eyes of the Liberals that he thinks we made a desperate effort to defeat him and raised all the money the Liberals possess, but it was not so.

In the words of a strong Conservative, a member of this House, to me—I should not have said a member of the House, because I am not at liberty to mention his name—but

a strong Conservative, said to me: "The Government will pay out their last dollar in Cape Breton, for it is a matter of life or death to them to elect Sir Charles Tupper there." Members of the party have themselves stated by the mouths of Ministers that Sir Charles Tupper is the only man they possess who is capable of leading a Government, that he is the only possible saviour of the Conservative party, and that they imported him for that purpose. Of course it was vital to them to get him elected, but as for us, our experience of his presence in this House has not been such as to lead us to fear him in the way in which he seems to think we do. We are inclined to think he will play the part of a "hoodoo" to the Conservative party, than of their saviour, and we are well content that he should return here and exercise his magic arts for the revivification of the party.

Sir, the Minister of Finance and his six associates, amongst others the son of his Secretary of State, have done all they could to ruin the Conservative party in Canada, to ruin the Conservative Government in Canada, and to ruin the old true-hearted worthy leader of the Conservative party in this country. They did not succeed, but we on this side of the House, have great hope, that the new importation will be successful, and that he will accomplish the ruin of the party, and of the Government to which he belongs. We had not the desperate interest that the Conservative party had, to spend money in order to alter the result of this election. We knew this was a Conservative county, we knew that even a gentleman on the back benches, like the senior member for Cape Breton (Mr. McDougall) or like Mr. McKeen who has resigned, was able to get elected by seven or eight hundred majority at the general election. We knew that in 1887, that constituency had been carried by the Conservative party by, I think, twelve or fifteen hundred majority.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). No.

Mr. CASEY. We knew that in 1878 it had been carried by about 2,000 majority.

Mr. McDUGALL. Oh, oh.

Mr. GILLIES. You are all wrong.

Mr. CASEY. Well, I am not sure of the figures in 1878, but the others are correct.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). You are wrong in both.

Mr. CASEY. I may be out a hundred or so, but I am not so far out as the hon. gentleman (Mr. McDougall) was in one of his statements, which I will refer to later on. We knew that this was an overwhelmingly Conservative county. We knew that the Secretary of State went down there with the prestige of being the only saviour of his party. We know that almost as a matter of course he ought to be elected, but without money, and with nothing but reason and

Mr. CASEY.

argument to back us, we found before that campaign was over, that there were very strong prospects indeed, that the only great one would be defeated in that specially Conservative county—and it was then that the talk arose about money being sent from here, and then that the pretense was made, that \$25,000 was sent to Cape Breton.

Now, when the Secretary of State is made, on the floor of Parliament, to face the mis-statements he has made on the public platform, what does he say in support of his position? He does not pretend that he had that personal knowledge in regard to the matter which my hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Davies) had, but he does pretend that, because he was in the county, he knew more about what the Liberals spent than does my hon. friend from Queen's. Mr. Speaker, it is absurd, and it is insulting to the House, for the Secretary of State to talk that way. He knew all about what he spent himself, but how could he know as much about what was spent by the Liberal party as does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davies), who himself has told us that he did his best to collect some funds and send them down?

My hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Davies) makes his manly and straightforward statement across the floor of the House, but what does the Secretary of State do? Does he accept it? No, Sir, it is not in his line to accept a straightforward manly statement. He will not accept that statement as being correct, and he will neither withdraw his charges, nor will he take up the challenge of my friend from Queen's (Mr. Davies) to have a committee to investigate the whole question. So long as the Secretary of State does not accept that challenge, he stands convicted by his own attitude, of having said what he knows he cannot prove. I am not prepared to say, that the Secretary of State has said what he knows to be false, because I do not suppose he knew anything about it, but he has stated what he knew he could not prove, or he would have accepted the challenge.

The result of this first little skirmish which has arisen since his return to this House, is to establish that he is still in the habit of making statements that he cannot prove, and statements which he himself probably knows to be very dubious. Sir, it is very hard to criticise these statements in parliamentary language; but there is one phrase sacred to his special use by long precedent in this Parliament; a phrase which occurs time after time on the pages of "Hansard;" a phrase which exactly describes the situation, and that is: that the statement of the hon. the Secretary of State is nothing but a flagrant Tupperism. "A flagrant Tupperism," Sir, is the phrase sacred to his special use. He is, like the Minister of Finance, credited with the origin, although in a different way, of a remarkable phrase, and he is entitled to all the credit for it.

The reason which the Secretary of State gave for this statement of his was that he thought his opponents were anxious to win, and he thought they would use all human devices. But it remained for him to use devices that were super-human. Why, if he thought that county was so strongly in his favour, did he secure the assistance of those powers which are above the human? Why did he secure heavenly assistance in his campaign—for it is not pretended for a moment that the bishop did not interfere in that election? The bishop himself has not denied that he interfered in the campaign. Bishop Cameron has made a very guarded and peculiarly worded denial of the statement, that he sent around a circular containing the oft-mentioned phrase, "hell-inspired hypocrites." He denies that he sent any such circular or pastoral to the priests of Cape Breton. He says the published statement is a garbled extract from a private letter, marked as "private," which he sent to a friend. But he does not deny the fact, which is asserted by several parties who know the fact, that he sent a similar letter to that, to all the priests in the county of Cape Breton—no doubt marked "private," and not intended for publication, but meant for the personal information and guidance of the priests to whom it was sent.

It is not denied for a moment, that the prelate's influence had a great deal to do with the result of the election, and the Secretary of State has not disclaimed that assistance, and has not disclaimed the sentiments expressed in this private letter of his lordship the bishop. Therefore, the Secretary of State will have to take the responsibility of being elected here on the supposition, that all those differing, in any degree, from the Government, on the question of remedial legislation, are "hell-inspired hypocrites." If the hon. gentleman likes that position he can accept it, and if not, he can declare that he is quite out of sympathy with the bishop's statement in that respect, and so clear his own skirts. It remains to be seen if he has the pluck to do so.

Now, Sir, when I said a few minutes ago, that the senior member for Cape Breton (Mr. McDougall) had disproved the assertion of the junior member (Sir Charles Tupper), in regard to the offering of large bribes to the people to stay at home, I referred to the statement of the senior member. The hon. gentleman (Mr. McDougall) said: That lots of their people—the Conservative voters in Cape Breton—stayed at home, because they expected the majority to be so large, that they did not think it was worth their while to go out to vote. And yet, although the election was so slack, and all the Tories there were so sure of the result that they would not take the trouble to go to the poll, the hon. Secretary of State says that we were offering one man \$20 to stay at home and another man \$100 to go and vote for us! It is a flagrant untruth on

the face of it, on the statement of the senior member for Cape Breton himself. Then, he tells us that he knew about Mr. Jones' promise. My hon. friend from Guysboro' (Mr. Fraser) has dealt fully with that. But I must say that if it were correct that Mr. Jones offered to subscribe \$100, it would be the only \$100 that they have told us of yet out of the whole \$25,000; so that they are within \$24,900 of proving their statement, which is about as close as they generally come to it.

Then, Sir, the hon. Secretary of State, in his second speech, which he was allowed to make by consent of the House, repeated the story about Mr. Longley bringing back what he called "emissaries" from Halifax. I suppose he credits Mr. Longley with having done what he would have done under the same circumstances—with having used emissaries in the opprobrious political sense, for the purpose of buying votes. My hon. friend from Guysboro' disposed of that. He told the House that Mr. Longley went down to Halifax and made arrangements for a number of young men—legal men, I believe, they were—to go to Cape Breton and act as scrutineers in the election. That is what the emissaries from Halifax were doing—trying to see that the law was enforced at the polls; and the Secretary of State's imputation of corruption to them was perfectly gratuitous on his part. I hope, after due consideration, that the hon. gentleman will see what is due to him in the matter of accepting the committee of inquiry which is proposed. If he does not accept it, I hope my hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Davies) will consider the propriety of forcing him to declare himself more clearly on the subject at a later date.

Mr. FLINT. Mr. Speaker, I think it would be only fair, before this debate closes, that reference should be made to a letter published in the press of Halifax, signed by the Attorney General, Mr. Longley, the day after the entertainment given to the hon. Secretary of State. The hon. gentleman had then made the statement which has occasioned the discussion this afternoon. On the following morning the letter to which I allude appeared, I believe, in the Government organ in Halifax, the "Herald." I have sent to the reading room for the paper, but have been unable to obtain it, as it appears to be out. The Hon. Mr. Longley referred to the suspicions which were cast upon him in consequence of the observations of the hon. Secretary of State, which compelled him to publish this letter. He stated very strongly that he knew of no money having been collected or expended in the Cape Breton county election, that his visit to Halifax was connected entirely with private affairs, that neither directly nor indirectly was he connected with or aware of any money being used on the part of the Opposition during that campaign. Now, I think it is very much to be regretted that

this discussion should have arisen to-day, or that the necessity for it should have arisen, because as every hon. gentleman is aware, what is to-day made the basis of a charge against the Opposition, may on another day be made the basis of a charge against the hon. gentlemen opposite, or against any individual member of this House. These charges are very easy to make and difficult to refute—in fact, impossible to refute; and they are as unfair as anything can possibly be. The names are not given of the parties from whom the information has been obtained or to whom the alleged expenditure has been made, and the public are allowed to believe that a large amount of corruption existed which evidently did not exist, at any rate so far as the Liberal party was concerned. Now, Sir, I am in a position to know, so far as the members of the Opposition in this House are concerned, that no contributions were solicited, and none were made, for the assistance of our friends in that district, who were labouring for the defeat of the hon. Secretary of State. It was perfectly proper, as I believe the hon. gentleman will admit, that the Liberal party should oppose his election; and had they been able to defeat him, we all know that the result would have been considered, from one end of the country to the other, as an exceedingly important feature in the history of the Conservative party as well as in the history of the Liberal party. I am not revealing any secret when I state that it was scarcely expected on this side of the House that the hon. gentleman would be defeated. We realized the fact that he had selected the strongest Conservative constituency in his native province. We realized the fact that he was a gentleman of enormous prestige and with an extraordinary political history, and one whose name stood high in the province of Nova Scotia, at any rate, among the leaders of the Conservative party. We also felt that he carried with him the prestige of being a member of the Government, and the expectation, not at all concealed by those who were advocating his cause in the county, that in a very few weeks he would be Premier of the Dominion of Canada. We realized the fact that the gentleman who had resigned his seat, in order to facilitate the re-entry of the hon. Secretary of State into public life, was the manager of the greatest corporation existing in that county. We realized that the whole weight and influence of that corporation and the prestige and influence of the Dominion Government together, with an unlimited supply of means, if they were required, were at the disposal of the hon. gentleman. Consequently, we scarcely expected—I have not met one Liberal member of this House who expected—that the hon. gentleman would be defeated. The most we hoped was that it would be possible to keep the majority down, so that

Mr. FLINT.

the Conservatives would not be in a position to boast of any very great triumph; and in that particular we have succeeded. In that particular our hon. friends who, at a great sacrifice of means and time and personal comfort, fought that contest at this season of the year, deserve a great deal of credit. They bearded the lion in his den, so to speak, and fought, as the hon. member for Ottawa County (Mr. Devlin) has said, without any of the means which were at the disposal of their opponents. I think it is in exceedingly bad taste, after the noble struggle which our friends made, without the improper expenditure of any money, that charges of illegitimate expenditure of large sums of money should be flung broadcast against the Liberal party, without a careful statement of the grounds on which those charges are based. Now we realize the great importance to the country that such charges should not be made without being supported by ample proof. And I think that the indignant denials made here to-day and the lack of proof offered must convince the people that the battle was fought on a square and manly basis, so far as the Liberals are concerned, and that the Liberals who took part in that contest deserve the greatest credit from their fellow-Liberals through the country, when it is borne in mind that they succeeded in keeping down the majority of so distinguished a man as the hon. Secretary of State (Sir Charles Tupper), and also reducing, taking the percentage of the total vote cast into consideration, the majority of the hon. gentleman, as compared with that of his predecessor. This debate will teach all that unless we have the proof under our hands, it is unfair and unmanly to make charges of this kind to besmirch the great Liberal party.

Mr. MULOCK. The debate has taken a somewhat wide range, and I shall not follow the examples of the other speakers, but try and bring myself to the consideration of the simple issue now before the House. It is an issue involving, first of all, the status of the Liberal party in connection with the recent election in Cape Breton; but more important still, it involves the honour of the Secretary of State (Sir Charles Tupper). This House is not a competent tribunal to try this question. The hon. Secretary of State is reported to have said on public platforms, since his election, that the Liberal party had fought him by the expenditure of no less a sum than \$25,000. The statement read by my hon. friend from Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies). I shall read again for the information of the hon. Secretary of State. This statement appeared in the "Citizen" of this morning, one of the Government organs, in the report of a speech made by the hon. gentleman yesterday in public. According to this report, the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) said:

Men were sent from Nova Scotia and money was unstintedly used to secure his defeat. He spoke of what he knew when he said that \$25,000 were sent down to buy the seat from under him.

Now, I believe in men standing up firmly for their principles. I myself am firm in my political convictions, but I deny the right of any man, on whatever side of politics he may be, to wilfully misrepresent the conduct of another, and it is to be deplored that any public man should so far forget his high duty to the country—and the higher his position the higher his duty—as to mislead the public mind. Far be it from me to say how the truth of these statements, these contradictions, should be determined. This is not the tribunal to decide whether the Secretary of State has told the truth or not. He has certainly made a grave charge. My hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Davies) has made a very serious and emphatic statement in reply. These two statements are irreconcilable. Now, let us come fairly and squarely to the proposition of the hon. member for Queen's; and if his proposition does not commend itself as a fair one in order to discover the truth, let the hon. gentleman himself suggest some better tribunal, and I am sure my hon. friend will acquiesce in the suggestion. I do not wish myself, at any time, to commit myself to the defence of anything political, either on my side or on any other side, unless I can do so, conscientiously believing in the justice of the decision at which I have arrived. I have read the statement of the hon. Secretary of State in the public press, and I submit to the hon. Secretary of State, if he has read the public press too—I would submit to him, for his serious consideration, whether he does not owe it to himself to accept the challenge of my hon. friend or propose a better solution, or admit that he is absolutely in error and withdraw his statement. The hon. gentleman is, in a sense, a young member. If this were a rash statement made by a man inexperienced on the public platform, whose tongue might run away with him at times, then we could make allowance, and not hold him so strictly to his words as we can an old parliamentarian, who has so often been described as "the Cumberland war-horse." The hon. Secretary of State must know that in times past, when he was in public life here, it was often charged in the public press that his statements lacked, in many cases, the weight and accuracy that they should have. It was told generally of him that he was less careful than he should be with regard to his statements, but it was hoped—and I trust it will be established by inquiry—that under the influences and the associations which he met in the high position he has lately filled, he had, at all events, learned the importance of guarding himself in his public utterances. And I trust that if this inquiry is granted, the hon. gentleman will

be able to justify the expectations of his best friends in that respect. He is, we understand, an embryo Premier. Will it do to have it said that his re-entry into public life to fill the highest position in the gift of the people of Canada, was marked by a departure from what is strictly true? Sir, he cannot, I submit, accept this high office, he cannot take Her Majesty's commission, until he displaces the cloud which rests upon him to-day. And, Mr. Speaker, let him either admit that he is the old Sir Charles or that he has reformed. Let us determine now which it is. That is the issue. His old record the country does not want. The country does not want a Premier whose statements to the public cannot be accepted as accurate, whether the inaccuracy arises from carelessness of language or wilful misstatement. In either case the public is misled. And I submit that before the hon. gentleman can claim a good title to the position of Premier, he will have to establish the correctness of his statement or withdraw it. I now ask the hon. Secretary of State here, in the presence of this House and of the country, in view of his past, in view of his expectations, whether he proposes to have a judicial inquiry, at which witnesses can be examined and the facts inquired into. I pause for a reply.

Mr. FERGUSON. Go into court yourself.

Mr. MULOCK. I ask the hon. gentleman does he propose to accept this issue or to leave the matter where it is. His silence is proof that he dare not subject this charge to an inquiry. I do not wish to draw any inference, but, Mr. Speaker, how can we avoid it? A fair proposition has been made. There is a conflict of statement—

Mr. IVES. Possibly he might like to have the proposition made by some one higher in the councils of the party.

Mr. MULOCK. Than the hon. member from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies)?

Mr. IVES. Than the cross-examiner.

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. member from Prince Edward Island is duly accredited to make a proposition, I trust.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) At all events he has made it on his responsibility as a member of this House.

Mr. IVES. I was not referring to the hon. member from Prince Edward Island.

Mr. MULOCK. At all events, I am referring to the proposition made by the hon. member from Prince Edward Island. The Secretary of State will compel the public to draw certain conclusions, if he does not adopt this mode of vindicating his honour, or some other mode as good or better. There can be but one conclusion drawn if he now, having got all the advantage, outside, of his statement, now when he is confronted

with his fellow-members in this tribunal, from which he cannot escape, does not either absolutely withdraw his statements or accept the challenge. But, perhaps it is not fair to press the hon. gentleman to a decision now. I would suggest to him that if he is not prepared to give an answer, let him think the matter over and give an answer to the country and to the House tomorrow, what course he intends to pursue in regard to this matter. At all events, the challenge has been made, and the cloud will rest upon his honour unless he adopts the course offered for his vindication, or a better one. If he does not, I fear that the public will regard this as a most inauspicious re-entry on the part of the hon. gentleman, into Canadian public life.

Mr. McMULLEN. I am sure it is very much to be regretted that the hon. Secretary of State persists in sitting still under the repeated challenge for a committee to investigate this whole important subject. The hon. Minister made a statement very boldly. He stated as of his own knowledge that \$25,000 had been spent in Cape Breton to defeat him. He has come to this House and has been introduced, and he has been openly and fairly challenged to verify his statements, and he has been unable to do so. He has partly withdrawn his statement, and partly apologized for it, but he has not made a full retraction. He should do one or the other, either come out plainly and say that he is sorry that, in the excitement of the moment, and elated by his victory—which victory, possibly, he was scared he would not be able to achieve—he had made a statement which he could not substantiate. If he would say he regretted that statement, I am quite sure that the House would accept that, and that we would not have to press for a committee. But, if he is not prepared to withdraw his statement, then I think that both he and the Government should at once accept the offer and the challenge made by the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies), consent to the appointment of a committee and have this whole question investigated. Why, Sir, I am sorry to think that the recent addition to the Cabinet appears to be no better than those who were in it before he came here. Ever since this session commenced, we have had statements and counter-statements, challenges and counter-challenges by one member of the Cabinet to another; we have had bolters; we have had the Premier virtually compelled to say that he was surrounded by a lot of traitors, by men unworthy of the position they occupy, men who were ready to cut his throat, politically; we have had the charges of writing anonymous letters injurious to the reputation of a Cabinet Minister made by one Minister against another, and flatly denied; we have had a row between the ex-Controller of Customs and another member of the Cabinet upon another

Mr. MULOCK.

point, and a repetition of matters that certainly, to say the least, were not creditable to the party in power. And with these matters the time of the House has been occupied. We have now been five or six weeks in session, and it is only to-day that we have the remedial Bill to consider which this session was specially called, and which should have been ready as soon as the House opened. The Auditor General's Report has not yet been brought down. The time of Parliament has been frittered away, and hon. gentlemen opposite are responsible for it. Now the Secretary of State has been introduced, and he has made statements that are not creditable to any hon. gentleman. I had the pleasure of listening to that hon. gentleman years ago, when he was a member of this House. I remember very well when he introduced the Bill to construct the Oxford and New Glasgow Railway. That Bill was introduced with a flow of eloquence that would have been worthy of the most gigantic scheme. He pointed out that the road would be forty-five miles shorter than the existing route, and represented that it would be the means of putting the Intercolonial on its feet, and opening up for it an era of progress and prosperity. We know what the result has been—as the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) said, it saved about four and a half miles, but the grades are heavier.

Mr. IVES. I rise to a point of order. I would like to know if the hon. gentleman's remarks have anything to do with the resolution before the House.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes, Mr. Speaker,—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This is a question of order, and I will explain to the hon. gentleman. There is a question of accuracy of statement—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am speaking to the point of order. The question is as to the accuracy of statements by the hon. member for Cape Breton and my hon. friend from North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) is giving an illustration of it, a remarkable illustration.

Mr. IVES. The adjournment of the House was moved for a specific purpose—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. McMULLEN. I was just proceeding to say that I presume the hon. Minister is now convinced he was wrong—

Mr. IVES. Order, order.

Mr. McMULLEN. I was just going to explain that the hon. Secretary of State has heralded with bursts of eloquence a great many schemes that he has presented to this House, and we would be glad if he would

show the House and the country that in any single case his prophecies have been fulfilled. With regard to the expenditure of money in Cape Breton, I think it has been clearly shown that a very limited amount was contributed for the Liberal candidate. No doubt the friends of the hon. Secretary of State knew that he was, or ought to be, in the position to spend a considerable sum of money in Cape Breton. It seems to me that those who told him about voters being offered \$100 and so on, were, to use a vulgar expression, trying to pull his leg. Looking over the expenditure for the office of the High Commissioner in London for the last six or seven years, they must have seen that the hon. gentleman had drawn something like \$25,000 a year; and when he came back to Canada they no doubt thought he ought to be able creditably to meet all the demands for election funds, and that if any man who should be prepared to fork out the fives and tens, he was that man. No doubt they expected that he would be willing to dole out a certain percentage of his accumulations. I know very well that the hon. Secretary of State regretted that he was called upon to make a great financial sacrifice in taking the position he now holds. I noticed in the first speech he made on his way to Cape Breton that he stated he was making a sacrifice of \$14,000 a year, that in order to serve his country he was throwing away \$14,000 a year. He appeared to make that statement with a considerable amount of regret, he regretted that at his advanced age he should be called upon to make such a sacrifice. But I presume that he entertains strong hope that possibly he may be restored to his old office, and be allowed to draw the salary of that particularly comfortable position possibly for the rest of his life. Now, in order to show that there is a vestige of honour, a vestige of honesty left in hon. gentlemen opposite, politically, I would advise the hon. Secretary of State to get up and frankly admit that he was misled, that he was deceived, that he was thoroughly fooled, and if he would do so, we would be willing to accept his explanation and drop the whole question. If he is not willing to do that, if he still believes that he can prove his statement to be true, why, then, let us have a committee, let us get at the facts. We are not doing anything in this House anyhow, and an investigation could take place in two weeks. It would be time well spent. I am sure if the Secretary of State can prove that the Liberal party made such an unjustifiable effort to defeat him as to spend \$25,000 in Cape Breton, it will be time better spent in the interest of the Tory party, than any time we can possibly spend otherwise. It will afford a very strong argument for the Secretary of State to use in the approaching contest. For my part I do not believe that hon. gentlemen on this side of the

House, and our friends in the country, believe that the defeat of the Secretary of State would be worth \$25,000. I would look upon it as money squandered, I would not contribute the thousandth part of that sum for the purpose. I must say that I am glad to see the Secretary of State back here. We hail his return, because we know very well, judging from his past record, that we will have some fun. I know that we will have a good deal of sport in this House, such as we had when he was here before. We used to listen to his eloquent tongue, and we used to regard with great suspicion the statements that he made before the House. I am very much afraid that now, also, owing to the statement he made with regard to this \$25,000, we will have to measure very carefully every other statement that he makes, just the same as we did in the past. We cannot accept them without a considerable allowance of salt. Now, I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, with all due respect to the Secretary of State, that he should get up at once and manfully say: I am sorry, I regret that in the excitement of the moment I made that statement, and I now withdraw the whole thing. I acknowledge that I was humbugged, and I withdraw the whole of it. But if he is not willing to do that, then, let us have a committee, let us search the charge to the bottom. Either the one thing or the other we are entitled to. Surely, the Secretary of State will consent to a committee. Let us go to work and summon every man who is supposed to have contributed a dollar, who is supposed to have expended a dollar, and put them under oath, and investigate the whole thing. But I do not think hon. gentlemen opposite will consent to a committee. Committees have been very unfortunate experiments for hon. gentlemen opposite in past years. We had a committee on the Curran bridge, and there was an exposure which has stuck to them, and will stick to them for a quarter of a century. We had the Graving Dock Committee, and we proved that \$964,000 of the people's money had been stolen. We have had many other committees of investigation in this House, and every committee we have had has proven conclusively that the skirts of hon. gentlemen opposite were far from being clean. I expect that, if we had this committee, and had an opportunity to subpoena before it the friends and supporters of the Secretary of State, as well as gentlemen on this side of the House, it would be proved that we contributed ten cents to every hundred dollars they contributed. No doubt, there was a considerable amount of money spent by the Secretary of State and his followers. But I should like to have this committee, and let us have an investigation, and let us try and purge the skirts of those men who have been charged with spending such a large amount of money in Cape Breton in order to defeat the Secretary of State. I think he would be surprised to find how

little, after all, was contributed for that purpose. I fancy he thinks that we were so anxious to defeat him that we contributed enormous sums of money, that every man on this side of the House almost pauperized himself to try and defeat him. But it is all a delusion. There was no extra effort made, there was no anxious desire to defeat the Secretary of State at all. He is just as well here as he would be outside. Why, when we had the election in 1891, he came back to this country, travelled through it on fast trains, and heralded the statement that the Government had received an invitation to send a delegation to Washington, after the 4th March, to enter into negotiations for the purpose of making a reciprocity treaty. He said to the people of this country: Now is the time, if you want a reciprocity treaty, now is the time to elect men to support the Government, and, after the 4th March, a delegation will go to Washington, and a treaty will certainly be negotiated. Well, Sir, after the election, when the hon. gentleman went to Washington, what was the first thing he did there? He virtually got down on his knees before Mr. Blaine and acknowledged to Mr. Blaine: All you stated, with regard to the initiation of the negotiations and the interview that is now taking place, was true, and what I stated in Canada was virtually untrue. He wrote to Sir John A. Macdonald that he embraced the earliest opportunity to tell Mr. Blaine that all the statements that he himself had made, and other Canadian Ministers, in regard to that question, were virtually unfounded, and that Mr. Blaine's statement was true. Well, the Secretary of State withdrew that very important statement, and I think now he might as well get up and withdraw this. On that occasion, at Montreal, at Toronto, and all through this country where he addressed the electors on the question of a reciprocity treaty, he told them what he was going to do for them, he told them the reciprocity treaty was going to be secured, and then when he went back to Washington he retracted the whole thing. He had to do so, because Mr. Blaine would not even have given him an audience if he had not retracted at once. Now, it is a grand thing to observe that where men are great sinners, they are good repenters. The hon. gentleman has evidently been a great sinner in the way of making statements that had no truth for a foundation, and he proved himself to be a great repentor when he went to Washington. I think he ought to repent now also and get up and say, I am sorry I made that statement with regard to that \$25,000, I am sincerely sorry that I acted so foolishly. I am quite sure that he regrets now that he has given the Opposition an opportunity to make these extended criticisms over that foolish and imprudent statement. He might have been contented to wear his newly-won laurels that he has done so much to earn in Cape Breton, with-

Mr. McMULLEN.

out turning round and blackening the Reform party by charging them with having expended \$25,000 to beat him. It is to be hoped that he will get up manfully and call for a committee, and I think in 48 hours that committee will prove to his entire satisfaction that there is no foundation whatever for that statement.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I ask the House to be allowed to offer an explanation in regard to the statement made by the hon. member for Ottawa County (Mr. Devlin).

Mr. DEVLIN. I have no objection, provided I have the right to answer the hon. gentleman.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think if hon. members enter into a discussion of that kind there will be no end to the discussion. If the hon. member for Cape Breton has any personal explanation to make, the House, no doubt, will bear with him while he makes it; but if his statement is in regard to anything that has fallen from any hon. member, it would not be in order.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I consider it personal. The hon. gentleman charged me with having made a statement that he had slandered the clergy of Cape Breton, and he said I had no authority for making that statement. I do not remember an occasion on which I made such a statement; but I know I had reason to make it, whether I made it or not. I am going to read to the House the report of the Montreal "Star" and Toronto "Globe" in support of my statement.

Several hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. DEVLIN. So far as I am concerned, I have no objection, provided I have the right to reply.

Mr. SPEAKER. We are not in committee of the whole House, but, as I have already stated, if the hon. member for Cape Breton wishes to make a personal explanation, no doubt the House will indulge him to that extent.

Mr. McDOUGALL. The only explanation I can make, in the absence of being permitted to read the report of the papers to which I have referred, is that I had information from the clergy of Cape Breton, and from several of them, that they were insulted on nomination day at Sydney.

Mr. DEVLIN. If that is all the explanation, it was not worth making.

Mr. EDGAR. The charge which has been made by the Secretary of State against the Liberal party, which has been complained of here by the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) to-day, is in all respects a very serious charge indeed. It is a very serious charge in itself to make, and it is much more serious when made by the Secretary of State. The hon. gentleman's past draws attention to anything that he says of a pub-

lic nature in this country, and perhaps on the other side of the water. The hon. gentleman's present position makes any allegation by him very important, and we all know that the future position which the hon. gentleman has come here to take possession of makes it still more important that we should pay attention to all his statements. Very likely we will see when the English papers arrive that the statement made more than once by the Secretary of State, that \$25,000 have been corruptly used by the Opposition in Cape Breton to defeat the hon. gentleman, has been telegraphed over to England and added to the triumph of this great statesman. And remember, Mr. Speaker, what the effect of that statement is: It is that \$25,000 have been spent in the election for corrupt purposes, against the law of the land, in defiance of the legislation of the country. Is that a legitimate charge to make? The Secretary of State knows perfectly well that in the present position of this Parliament it would be impossible to file an election petition and have the case tried before a general election takes place. Perhaps that will be the excuse of the hon. gentleman; but when he makes this statement, as he has done publicly, when he repeats that statement to-day, as he has done in this House, it is his duty as a public man to demand and insist upon an investigation of that charge. He cannot get it tried before the courts, we know, at this stage of Parliament; and I would have supposed that he would have been the first either to deny it, to withdraw it, or to say I will prove it and ask for a committee of this House. But he has not denied it, he has not withdrawn it, but he has tried to justify it by a lot of loose allegations which do not amount to anything; not only does he not ask for a committee, but when he is challenged to appoint a committee, with a majority of his friends on it, to try the question promptly and vigorously, and investigate his own expenditures at the same time, too, he does not accept the offer and challenge. He lets it go by the board, and lets the slander remain on record without contradiction and without proving it. Why should he not withdraw it, if he is not ready to prove it, when the leader of the maritime Liberals has said that from his own knowledge there was not one-tenth of the sum mentioned expended, when the hon. member for Guysboro' (Mr. Fraser), who was through the whole campaign, and has said he knows all about it, has given his word as a member of this House that not \$2,000 were expended, and when another hon. gentleman who was down in the county added his testimony to the same effect, that there was practically no expenditure? What did the hon. gentleman say? He stated that when Mr. Longley went into Halifax the day before the election he came back with half a dozen young fellows. Do they not have scrutineers at the polls there? Were there not more

than half a dozen polling places in Cape Breton county? I should like to know how many friends of the Secretary of State were brought from Halifax and other parts? I understand that the county was overrun with them, and not only with them but with officials like Mr. A. W. Wright, who is in the pay of the Government here and is investigating the sweating system, and who went down to sweat the money in Cape Breton. We do not know how many local officials of the Government were assisting, but we know Mr. Wright was. The whole position occupied by the Secretary of State to-day, when he is making his triumphant reappearance in this House, is not one that is creditable to a public man occupying the position that he holds. It reflects no credit on any hon. gentleman to make a charge and withdraw from proving it. Why, Mr. Speaker, I have made charges in this House myself, but I never shirked a committee of inquiry. I made a charge against the hon. gentleman who is sitting on the left of the Secretary of State and demanded an inquiry, but the Government emasculated the charges and referred them to a Royal Commission, which they appointed themselves, and even then I will tell you what appeared—

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. You did not appear.

Mr. EDGAR. I did not appear, but the commission examined some witnesses whose names I sent, and even out of the mouths of those witnesses, I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, what did appear.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. You did not.

Mr. EDGAR. I will tell you what did appear. It was proved that in twenty-two counties in Quebec—

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the hon. gentleman is going outside of the subject before the House.

Mr. EDGAR. I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, the point I am about to make. The Secretary of State has accused the Liberal party of squandering money at elections, and I want to tell him the record of his own party in particular cases. In that particular inquiry—but perhaps the Postmaster General does not like to hear anything more about it.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I do not object at all.

Mr. EDGAR. The hon. gentleman is not worse in this particular than the hon. gentlemen around him. It was proved that twenty-two constituencies in Quebec had a fund which was used, amounting to \$112,000, obtained nearly altogether from public contractors, and under circumstances which I need not go into, but which the hon. member for Three Rivers (Sir Hector Langevin) knows. That, Sir, was an average of \$5,000 for each

of these constituencies, out of the corruption fund for that election, over and above everything that was contributed from other sources. I have no doubt we only lifted up a corner of the veil, but if we could see the fund established for the whole Dominion, it would have amounted to over \$1,000,000 at the same rate. Why, Sir, for the constituency of the hon. member for Three Rivers (Sir Hector Langevin), who then occupied the position of Minister of Public Works, there were over \$13,000 drawn out of that fund, and each vote that he polled cost him over \$20. Yet, Sir, the hon. Secretary of State stands up here and throws accusations against the Liberal party in connection with the Cape Breton election. Why, committee after committee of this House have developed the truth of charges we have made in respect to the corruption of hon. gentlemen opposite. There was the case of bridge selling by the hon. member for East Northumberland (Mr. Cochrane), in which he sold out all the bridge positions, and the lighthouse positions in his county, to members of his party.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the hon. member (Mr. Edgar) is exceeding the bounds of parliamentary propriety in discussing these matters in detail. He is quite at liberty to refer to these statements in general, but when he goes into detail I think he is out of order.

Mr. EDGAR. Mr. Speaker, I was merely following on the line of the Secretary of State.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the hon. the Secretary of State (Sir Charles Tupper) made only one reference to the fact that some gentlemen, on the opposite side of the House, had expended as much as \$20,000 in an election.

Mr. EDGAR. Well, Mr. Speaker, I elaborated a little, the same subject, in answer to the Secretary of State. If at any other time when it will be more in order, the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) wishes to go into that subject, we will be quite prepared to meet him. I repeat my regrets, that the Secretary of State—the leader of the House, I suppose he is, and the leader of the Government as I suppose we shall see him in a short time—should set such an unfortunate example to members of this House, as to refuse to withdraw or to apologize for a statement of his, which has been proven to be incorrect.

Mr. McISAAC. Mr. Speaker, I was one of the members of this House who took part in the recent election in Cape Breton, and I desire to say a few words. In the first place, I wish to say that I am in a much better position to speak on behalf of the Liberal party, and the Liberal campaign in that county, than is the Secretary of State, or any hon. gentleman on the opposite side of the House. I have travelled over a great portion of that county during the election.

Mr. EDGAR.

I have attended the committee rooms of the Liberal party in several localities, and I challenge hon. gentlemen opposite to appoint a committee, and to subpoena me as a witness and to put me on oath. I will tell them what the Liberal party did in that campaign, so far as my personal observation went, and I will show that they have done nothing that honest men need be ashamed of. The hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. McDougall) talks about the promise of some person to build a bridge in that county. Let me refer him—and the matter is particularly pertinent now—to promises which were made in another section of the county, where a prominent Tory in Gabarus, wrote a letter to a prominent Dominion official in North Sydney, requesting that official to send the hon. gentleman himself into a district, and to promise in a certain district, a breakwater, and to promise in other districts an extension of the season for lobster catching, but, at the same time to be very non-committal lest there might be "some after claps." "and the devil with the future," to use his exact words in the letter. It was even suggested in that letter that Dr. McKay, M.P.E., should approach a reverend gentleman in that district, and "get him to come out of the cold," for these were the words used in the letter. These were some of the promises made by hon. gentlemen opposite. They talk about the promise of a bridge. Why, those who were in the county of Cape Breton heard many Conservative promises with regard to a certain railway that was to be built in a certain portion of the county. It has been a by-word among the electors, both Tory and Liberals in the neighbourhood of Sydney Mines, where the people were interested in a proposed railroad, and where the Secretary of State in referring to it is reported to have said that the road would start from French River, although there was no such district in the county at all, and that it was to go around the Island of Boularderie to Sydney Mines. That is to say, if the proposed road were built in that way, it would be built on the high seas or on the Bras d'Or Lake. That is one of the extravagant promises which I am told was made by the Secretary of State on that occasion. I do not know very much, and I do not profess to know about the methods of our opponents in that election. I cannot say how much money they expended. Perhaps they expended \$25,000; perhaps more, and perhaps less. I have no evidence, and, therefore, I shall make no observation upon it, further than to say what I do know, and that is, that an hon. member of this House, a supporter of the Government, wrote a letter to an elector in North Sydney in the county of Cape Breton, and wrote it not three weeks ago, in which letter he stated, among other things: Sir Charles is going down to the county now to fight the election, here is a chance for certain people to make money; the old man has lots

of money, and there is an opportunity for certain parties. That letter was sent by a member supporting the Administration to-day and now sitting in this House.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). Name ?

Mr. McISAAC. Do you want names ?

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). Yes.

Mr. McISAAC. The hon. member for Victoria (Mr. McDonald) is the man who wrote that letter, and the gentleman to whom it was addressed is Mr. Tobin, barrister, of North Sydney.

Sir, that is positive evidence. That is evidence of a substantial kind. Perhaps the hon. gentleman from Victoria (Mr. McDonald) was not telling the truth, but I am not responsible for that. Here is one thing absolutely certain, and no gentleman on the other side of the House can make his assertion as clear as I have made this one. This statement came from a supporter of the Government, and let them explain it. Let them say that the hon. gentleman (Mr. McDonald) did not know what he was talking about, or let them say that he was not telling the truth. I do not know whether he was telling the truth or not, but I do know, that he ought to be in a better position to know what funds were at the disposal of the Conservative party in the Cape Breton campaign, than is the Secretary of State to know what funds the Liberal party had at their disposal in that election. I repudiate with scorn the allegation made by the Secretary of State, that he knows the Liberal party had at their disposal \$25,000, in the County of Cape Breton. If he does know it, let him accept the challenge to appoint a committee, let him subpoena me as a witness, or Mr. Devlin, or Mr. Fraser, or any one else who took part in the election in that county, and let him make good his word. A man who in this House or out of it makes an assertion of that kind, without the slightest scintilla of evidence to back it up, is not worthy of the position which the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) occupies in this House, and in this country. It is a base slander upon the Liberal party, and upon the campaign we fought in that county. We fought an open and manly fight in Cape Breton. We submitted to the people the principles of our party. We discussed the issues which separate the two parties. We had no money to buy votes. We had no other means except appeals to the intellects of the independent electors of the county, and we have the proud satisfaction to-day of knowing, that notwithstanding the tremendous odds which were used against us, some 3,000 stalwart electors of the county of Cape Breton, came up like men on the 4th day of February, and voted for the principles of the Liberal party. Sir, that is nothing to be ashamed of. The allegation has also been made by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House

and the Secretary of State, that there were huge frauds in connection with the electoral lists of that county. There is just as little foundation for that statement as for the statement with regard to the \$25,000. Let that be investigated also, and it will be found that the Liberal-Conservatives placed about a thousand names on the lists, and that the Liberals placed only about 600 names. It will be found that the majority of names were placed on the list in favour of our opponents. The fact is, as I gathered in the county, that no objection was heard against the list on one side more than on the other. It appeared that nearly every person who was entitled to have his name put on the lists, on either side, had it put on. The fact is, as I am informed, that all the names in the applications of both parties were put on the list, and there is no substantial complaint that any number of names do not appear on the lists which should be there. So that all these charges are flimsy and cannot be substantiated. If they can be, this is the time and place to substantiate them. Let the hon. gentleman accept the challenge of the hon. member for Queen's, and appoint a committee, and there prove his charges if he can, and for ever confound us. We were told that the election of the hon. Secretary of State was to sound the death-knell of the Liberal party in that county and elsewhere. We were told that the money spent there was lost, and that we lost the county and our character. Let me tell hon. gentlemen opposite that if they are able to prove that, this is their golden opportunity. If they want to take away our character, and prove to the world that we expended corruptly \$25,000, or even \$1,000, let them accept the challenge and appoint the committee; and then, if they can make out their case, they will have the opportunity to do so. Sir, they cannot do it, and they know they cannot do it. They will not accept the committee, because they have not the witnesses to substantiate their charges, and henceforth we will regard them as cowards and slanderers.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member is certainly out of order in accusing hon. members of this House of being cowards and slanderers. The hon. member must withdraw that.

Mr. McISAAC. I take back the words cowards and slanderers, if they are not parliamentary. But I say that if these hon. gentlemen do not accept the challenge and prove the charges, which they have made outside of this House we will hereafter brand them as not being able to make good those charges, and will hurl back in their teeth in this House and out of it the accusations that they were challenged in this House to make good, and that they did not dare even attempt to do so.

Mr. McDONALD (Victoria). I may say that I have no recollection of writing any letter to Mr. Tobin, barrister, of North Sydney, in the words the hon. member for Antigonish (Mr. McIsaac) states. I have known Mr. Tobin to be one of the staunchest Liberals in the county for a number of years, and all his people to be the same. I have been on very intimate terms with him. I have written half a dozen letters to him, and have received answers from him, and I may have said something jocular to him in regard to the election; but I never did so seriously, because I knew him to be one of the staunchest Liberals in the county. I do not know what I may have said to him in a jocular way; but as for saying that the right hon. Secretary of State went down to the county with lots of money, I never said anything of the kind in any letter I wrote to Mr. Tobin—a gentleman whom I have known for the last twelve or fifteen years as one of the most pronounced supporters of the Liberal party in the county, and who has been doing business for me as agent at North Sydney for more than a year.

Mr. McISAAC. In fairness to the hon. gentleman I ought to say that the words he wrote were not the words used by me, but very much stronger words. Therefore, in consideration for him, I did not repeat them.

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

After Recess.

Motion (Mr. Davies, P. E. L.) to adjourn, negatived.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I want to remind the Finance Minister that so far as I know the Committee on Public Accounts has not been called this week. It would be as well that it should be called in order that papers may be moved for. I also want to know if the second part of the Auditor General's Report is ready yet.

Mr. FOSTER. No. That is the reason the committee has not been called. I know that my hon. friends would not be able to work on that committee without the Auditor's Report, but I received a note from the Auditor to-day stating that it is not quite ready yet.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. When may we expect it?

Mr. FOSTER. I think to-morrow.

SUPPLY—THE BUDGET.

The House resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Foster: "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair

Mr. McISAAC.

for the House to go again into Committee of Supply."

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, in rising to take a hand in this Budget debate, I think we should cast our minds back to the promises made at the time the National Policy was first imposed upon the country—in 1878 or 1879. At that time it was said the country was in a very depressed condition. We have been told time and again that the farmers to-day are better off than they were at the time the Government of the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie was in power. Now, I have been a farmer in Canada for the last fifty-two years, and I only wish that the farmers of this country to-day enjoyed the prosperity that we did prior to and up to 1878 or 1879. I only wish we had now the markets we had at that time. Although the Finance Minister tells us that both our home and foreign markets have been increased under the National Policy, the fact is that under the National Policy our markets have been very much circumscribed. Owing to the action of this Government in several directions, we have lost the hold we formerly had on one of the best markets for one of the greatest agricultural industries in Canada. For the scheduling of our cattle in the British market I hold this Government to be greatly to blame. They withdrew the strict quarantine that existed in the North-west for a number of years, and allowed settlers to bring in cattle upon an inspection only. In proof of that, let me say that when I asked the question in this House whether that quarantine had been strictly enforced, the Finance Minister replied that it had been—that an Order in Council had been passed strictly enforcing it; and when, on a Monday, the leader of the Opposition asked when that order was passed, the answer came that it had only been passed the Saturday before. So that I hold that our Government are to blame for our cattle being scheduled in the British market, because they did not stand strictly to the agreement that had been entered into with the Government of Great Britain with respect to cattle coming into the Dominion of Canada. Let me tell the hon. gentleman again, that our sheep have been scheduled in the old country. It is only a year ago when the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Featherston) rose in this House and drew the attention of the Government to the condition of a large number of sheep that were coming in through Canada for transshipment to the old country. He drew attention to the fact that they were suffering from a certain disease. On that occasion I asked the Government to appoint an inspector well versed in the diseases of sheep, and I predicted that unless they did, in a very short time our sheep would be scheduled in the British market. Through the carelessness and negligence of the Government to ap-

point a competent and thorough inspector, my prediction was verified, and our sheep were scheduled in that market.

What other promises did they make? The Government promised that a market would be opened, at our own doors, for all we produced. Not only our butter and eggs, but our cheese, cattle and wheat and all our other produce would find a ready market at home. That promise was made by the late Sir John Macdonald. Has that been fulfilled? The hon. Finance Minister tells us that our market at home for agricultural products has increased in that time, and also the foreign markets. Let me tell the hon. gentleman that it would be very strange indeed if, in a young country like Canada, with such a small population as we then had, our market had not increased to a certain extent at home; but the increase in our home consumption has not kept pace with the increased production, and yet our agricultural industry has increased but very slightly. The hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Powell) showed us that the land was getting into the hands of fewer people in Great Britain. Let me point to a young country like Canada, and, according to the census returns, there were seven thousand fewer farmers in this country in 1891 than there were in 1881, even with all the land that has been taken up. That shows conclusively that Canada has not been in the healthy condition in which an agricultural and a young country ought to be, even if we had commercial depression. We certainly ought to have a larger number of farmers now, in 1891, than we had ten years previously. Such, however, is not the case, which shows that our agricultural industry is not thriving.

We were told that all our industries were in a languishing condition in 1877-78, and that the Conservative Government were going to adopt a policy which would not only stimulate agriculture, but promote all our other industries. Well, Mr. Speaker, the agricultural industry has never been in a more languishing condition than now. Through the mistaken policy of the Government, we have lost some of our products in the best market we ever had, namely, the American market. The Government added to our tariff in 1890 the goods which they had withdrawn from that tariff under pressure. We had promised to reciprocate, in our tariff legislation, whenever the United States should remove the duty from a large number of articles enumerated in our tariff statute of 1879. Whenever the United States took off the duty, or a part of the duty, from those articles, we agreed, under that statute, to do likewise. Well, Mr. Speaker, they took the duty off a large list of articles in 1883, and yet our Government did not reciprocate until 1888: and then, when they did so, they acted under pressure from the British Govern-

ment, because the British Minister at Washington sent a despatch to the Colonial Office in London, and that office communicated with the Government of Canada, asking why those duties had not been removed from our tariff, although the promise to do so was embodied in the Canadian tariff statute of 1879. We were told at first that those duties would not be removed, but by and by they were, and in 1890 they were again imposed. When the McKinley Bill was under discussion in the House of Representatives, Mr. McKinley himself said that while it was not in reality a retaliatory measure, yet they should not forget the action of the Canadian Government in returning to the tariff schedule those articles which had been removed from it in 1888. I hold, therefore, that it was due to this conduct of our Government that we lost the American market for our barley and eggs, two of the most profitable articles that can be raised on the farm. We used to send 9,000,000 bushels of barley per year across the line before the McKinley Bill was imposed, and \$1,800,000 to \$2,000,000 worth of eggs. Now we have lost a market worth six millions to the farmers of this Dominion in eggs and barley alone, through this absurd policy of the Government. Feeling no doubt that they were to blame for the loss of this market, the Government promised to open to us a superior market in the old country than we formerly had in the United States. We can all remember when something like 50,000 bushels of seed barley were brought from the old country and distributed amongst our farmers at a certain price in order that we might be able to raise two-rowed barley with which to supply the English market. But if the Government had been acquainted with the trade of the country, and the result of sending two-rowed barley to the British markets, they would have seen their mistake. I stated at the time it would not be a success, because I tried the experiment twice. It turned out a complete failure, and many of our farmers, who went in for this two-rowed barley, lost large sums. The Government also promised to give us in the old country a better market for our eggs than we had in the United States, but that trade has fallen off to such an extent that our farmers have lost all hope in it. I hold, therefore, that under the action of the Government our markets have been very much curtailed.

Then there were other promises. Sir Leonard Tilley told us, in 1878, that if he had had control when the Mackenzie Government was in power, he would not have required so much money, by at least two millions. Well, the amount spent by the Mackenzie Administration was \$23,500,000, so that if there was any truth in the statement of Sir Leonard Tilley, the Government which succeeded

the Mackenzie Administration should have reduced our annual expenditure to something like \$21,500,000. Has that promise ever been fulfilled? Has the Government of the day, since they took office in 1879, ever reduced the expenditure?

The Finance Minister has told us that his Government has reduced taxation. But where they reduced the taxation upon the one hand to the amount of one dollar they increased it on the other hand to double that amount, and made it bear all the more heavily on the farmers. We have been told a great deal about the duty taken off coal and of the amounts saved to the people of this country, something like forty-six dollars in a given number of years. But when the Finance Minister told us about relieving the people of the burdens of taxation, he neglected to tell us that they had put an extra duty upon cotton clothing. In 1880 the duty on that article was 30 per cent, and in 1890 it was 35 per cent. The hon. gentleman did not make a calculation to show what amount of increased taxation was paid by the people on account of that article. The duty on printed cottons in 1880 was 28 per cent, and in 1889 it was 32½ per cent. The hon. gentleman told us of the amount taken off on account of the iron duties, but here we have some articles of prime importance to the farmers and workmen of the country the duty on which has been increased. On earthenware and stoneware, in 1880 the duty was 30 per cent, while in 1889 it was increased to 35 per cent. The hon. Finance Minister neglected to make any calculation of the amount taken from the pockets of the people on this account, not only that which went into the treasury, but the very large sum that went into the pockets of the combinesters. We believe that the statements made by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) two years ago were true. That hon. gentleman stated that there was not an industry of any importance that was not under the control of some trust or combine, and that all these trusts and combines were taking large sums out of the pockets of the people. I believe that is the case to-day. I saw a statement just before this House met with respect to the cotton factories to the effect that the representatives of the manufacturing industries had met and that the result was a rise of 15 per cent in the prices of cotton goods. They put the price as high as they could while still keeping out the foreign goods. I saw a statement also with regard to the nail manufacturers. Those manufacturers met, but not alone; an expert from the United States sat with them, and it was said that an arrangement had been reached under which the nail manufacturers of Canada were to enjoy the Canadian market while those of the United States were to have the control of those of that country. Shortly after I saw the notice of that meeting there

Mr. McMILLAN.

was a considerable increase in the price of nails. Then we come to the case of agricultural implements. I make now the statement which was contradicted when I made it before, that in 1878 there was a tariff clause providing that agricultural implements brought in by agricultural societies or for the encouragement of agriculture in Canada were admitted free. We could get free all the agricultural implements we needed. In 1880 a duty of 25 per cent was put upon implements; but that was not sufficient, and it was afterwards raised to 35 per cent. When the hon. Minister of Finance gave his figures to show how much taxation had been taken off, he did not make a calculation to show the burden imposed upon the farmers of this country through the increase in the duty on agricultural implements. The duties on iron, I believe, benefited only some of the manufacturers. The manufacturers were able to carry on their business successfully before the National Policy. I think I shall be able to show that before I resume my seat. The hon. Minister did not give us a calculation to show the additional burden placed upon the farmers through these tariff changes. Though the manufacturers of wagons and buggies and goods of that description had a great advantage through the duty, they were given a further advantage by being allowed to import other goods, such as spokes, felloes, &c., of their raw material free. This was quietly put through by Order in Council for the benefit of a few individuals and was not put through this House, while the duty upon manufactured goods, which the farmers had to pay, was kept up. I have stated that the manufacturers of this country were willing and able to manufacture under the tariff in force in 1878. If my memory serves me aright, a committee investigated this matter in 1878, and received a number of reports from manufacturers, and this is what some of them had to say. The first I may mention was a founder with a capital of \$180,000:

No profit on fixed capital last year, owing to bad debts and keen competition; the measure of protection they had enjoyed has unduly stimulated the industry, and the business was overdone.

Here was a manufacturer who said even before the National Policy that they had too much protection and the effect was to unduly stimulate the industry. That, I believe, has been the effect of the National Policy. A hosiery manufacturer established in the west was the next. He reports:

Too much home competition and business overdone; profits last year, 6 per cent.

Another hosiery establishment:

Trade fairly good; profits on capital last year, 8 per cent.

An extensive sewing-machine maker:

Not running full time; satisfied last year with the interest on investment.

Agricultural implement maker in the west, making reapers, harvesters, and various machines :

Exported largely to Great Britain, Australia and South Africa ; export trade rapidly increasing.

Here is a statement by an agricultural implement manufacturer before the National Policy was adopted that the export trade in agricultural implements was largely increasing. But we find that up to the present time, the amount has not been so large, because only \$270,000 of agricultural implements went to the Australian colonies last year, according to the Trade and Navigation Returns, although we heard two years ago that one order for \$300,000 had been given. Here is the report of another establishment, that of James Noxon :

The profits of this company last year, after making ample provision for bad and doubtful debts, were 28 per cent on paid-up capital stock. Our usual profits were over 20 per cent. * * * There was never a more absurd cry than that manufacturers are languishing for want of protection, while the fact is, the manufacturing industries, not including lumber, are to-day more prosperous than any other of the great industries of the country, with the possible exception of agriculture. It may safely be said, generally, that the manufacturers of Canada are more prosperous than are the manufacturers of any country in the world at the present time.

There, Sir, is an important statement from a prominent manufacturer in the west, one who, I believe, told the truth. And I believe that if it had not been for the National Policy, our manufacturing industries would have stood upon a sounder basis than they do to-day. I find that Mr. T. G. Hiscott, lumberman, miller and builder, was interviewed by the reporter of the "Mail :

Our interests are very wide, and extended to many lines of business. We are interested in wood-working, flour-milling, wool-manufacturing, real estate, lumber, &c. An extended market, such as we should gain by commercial union, would benefit every line. I could manufacture to better purposes for 60,000,000 of people than I could for 5,000,000.

That is the opinion of one of the largest manufacturers of the province of Ontario. Let us now take the opinion of a carriage manufacturer :

The iron duties have greatly increased the price of iron, and, consequently, have reduced our profits, there being no corresponding increase in the retail price of the manufactured article. Some of our manufacturers here are not doing well under the protective tariff ; in fact, some of them have failed. Our market is too small and overstocked. We could produce a great deal more than we do without much extra expense or trouble, if we get larger sales for our goods. I think I can face any competition ; I do not know why I should not. If I am not as good a business man as my competitors, why should the public suffer for my benefit ?

Let me now give you the views held by

members of the Farmers' Institute, at a meeting held in 1888 :

That in the opinion of this meeting, unrestricted trade between the Dominion of Canada and the United States would be advantageous to both countries, and we desire that the same may be entered into.

There is the opinion both of farmers and manufacturers with respect to the National Policy. Let me say that I am perfectly convinced that if this National Policy had never been imposed upon the farmers of Canada, they would have been in a far more prosperous condition than they are to-day. A great deal is said with respect to our agricultural implement manufacturers, and others, to the effect that they would all be completely wiped out if the National Policy were abolished, or if the tariff were reduced. Let me say that it would be impossible to wipe it out at one fell swoop. It would be an injustice to most of the manufacturers themselves who have a large stock on hand. They must be allowed time. But let me say that we have manufacturers in Canada to-day who are quite ready to compete with any country in the world, providing they can get their raw material free, and can have the opportunity of sending their goods into other countries. It would be very strange if it were otherwise. We find that last year there were \$663,000 worth of agricultural implements manufactured in Canada and exported. Now if, under the present tariff, those manufacturers are able to export such a large quantity of agricultural implements, would they not be able to export a still larger number if they could get their raw material free, and the duty thrown off coal, and a more extended market ? There is no doubt about it. Let me read the statement of a prominent agricultural implement manufacturer, Mr. Frank Frost, of Smith's Falls :

Mr. Frank T. Frost, of Smith's Falls, the manufacturer, arraigned the National Policy and pronounced it a flat failure. He said that there were just as many manufacturers using pig-iron in Canada in 1878 as there were to-day. They were then a great deal more prosperous than they were to-day, and the wages of moulders and mechanics generally were better. There was more work then than there was now for workmen in this town, Brockville or Smith's Falls. The country had never seen as good times under the National Policy as before, except during the first two or three years after its adoption. There was no foundry in Canada to-day using pig-iron but was paying \$4 a ton duty. Prior to 1878 there was no duty on pig-iron. Besides the duty of \$4 a ton the miner receives a bonus of \$2 a ton, making his protection \$6 a ton. This was not sufficient to enable the iron-producers to produce all that the country needed, so that three-quarters of the iron had to be imported from the United States. With the lower duty on the finished product the Canadian manufacturers were not able to hold their own, and the workmen had to bear the brunt. There was not a greater fallacy than the idea that the National Policy had given the workmen work. When the duty pre-

scribed by the tariff on a certain article had to be met, if there was any squeezing down of the price to meet competition, that squeezing would be upon the workingman. The workmen never had to stand that squeezing under the old tariff of 15½ to 17½ per cent. The Liberal party had never been opposed to the manufacturing industries. It was a well-known fact that there was not an iron manufacturing industry in Canada that was not in existence prior to 1878. At the exhibitions held throughout the country in September it would be found that the men who were exhibiting their goods were the men who had been exhibiting for the last twenty or twenty-five years. There never was a policy so well vindicated in the last sixteen years of the National Policy as the old revenue tariff policy of Mr. Mackenzie. The Liberals had been accused of being opposed to manufacturers. He had no hesitation in saying, as a manufacturer, that this was deliberately untrue. What they were opposed to was the injustice that had been done by the imposition of duties by which monopolists had been drawing money from the people which they had not earned. In five villages of the county of Lanark there was not a factory now that was in operation five years ago. It was simply a case of allowing the combines in Montreal and Toronto to gather in all these small factories and close them up. Mr. Frost repeated, that the National Policy had been a flat failure.

That is the opinion of a gentleman who manufactures implements upon a large scale, and who employs from 120 to 150 men in his factory throughout the year. He is perfectly prepared to compete with other manufacturers throughout the world, provided the duty is thrown off the materials that he requires to use, and that he can get free coal.

Mr. SMITH (Ontario). What was the date of that letter ?

Mr. McMILLAN. It is not a letter, it is a speech that was delivered in Brockville. Here is a statement showing that some of our most extensive manufacturers believe they would be better off provided they could get their goods free from the United States, and were able to send their manufactures into that market. I find a statement in a paper, from the Massey-Harris Company, which I will read :

MASSEY-HARRIS COMPANY.

A despatch was received yesterday from Niagara Falls, N.Y., stating that final arrangements had been made with the Massey-Harris Company of Toronto to locate the United States branch of their agricultural implement factory there, and that building operations would be begun in the spring. Inquiries were made last night, and the officials would not give a denial to the despatch. It was learned, however, that the company had bought a large property adjoining the Michigan Central Railway, and that large orders for the best Canadian hardwood lumber had been placed during last fall with the largest manufacturers of hardwood lumber in Canada for delivery on the American frontier this year.

Let me tell the hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Sproule) that here is the very result that he was anticipating. Here we

Mr. McMILLAN.

find that one of the most important manufacturing companies in this country believe that it would be to their benefit to have freer trade relations with the United States. Letters were read in the House the other night showing that there is a firm in the lower provinces that is going to move a large part of their works from Canada into the United States.

An hon. MEMBER. No.

Mr. McMILLAN. Yes, here is the statement: I have read it. If the Government had accepted the tariff offer of the United States to allow a certain number of implements to go into the United States free, on condition that their goods could come into Canada free, the Massey-Harris Manufacturing Company would have remained in Canada, because it will cost them so much more to move their works and make a fresh start. If there had been free trade in agricultural implements between the two countries, all they would have had to pay, extra, in Canada would have been a little freight, and it would have been a long time before the amount they would have to pay in freight would equal the amount of money that it will take them to move their works and set them up on the other side of the line. The Massey-Harris Company is one of the very largest agricultural implement manufacturers we have in Canada. Let me say, Sir, that Mr. Massey made the statement before the Combines Committee that the duties imposed on iron and steel had caused the firm of which he was the representative, to pay \$30,000 extra in taxes during one year. I would ask, where did these \$30,000 of extra taxation come from? There was no rebate of duties at that time and very little exportation of agricultural implements—the whole amount came out of the pockets of the farmers. I sent a letter to one of Massey's agents, and received a reply stating that it would be impossible for the Massey Company to fill all their orders without an increase of 10 per cent, and then they would almost sell the machines without profit, and they would be obliged to increase the price of their implements to a considerable extent. That shows conclusively that the removal of some duties and the imposition of others was a feat of which the hon. Finance Minister had no reason to boast. It does not require a feat of legerdemain to take off \$1,000 in duties and impose \$2,000, but I consider it a dishonest act in any statesman to state that a large amount had been saved to the people in taxation, while he did not state anything with respect to the extra amount of taxation he had imposed on the people in order to recoup himself for the taxation removed. A great many of our manufactures in Canada are today in a languishing condition, they are not healthy and prosperous. Take the large woollen mill at Markham. I find that no-

tice has been given of a reduction in wages to commence February 1st, to the extent of 25 per cent on wages over \$1 per day, and 10 per cent on wages under \$1. This will mean an average reduction of 17½ per cent all around. Whenever manufacturers find themselves in a tight place and squeezing has to be done, it is always in the direction of lowering the wages of the workingmen. Over the civilized world wherever there is a protective country, the wages of the artisans are cut down almost to the lowest notch. There was a time, when the working-people were not so well educated as they are to-day, that they believed a protective system protected workingmen. In this connection let me read an extract from a newspaper :

The Speight Wagon Company have received an offer from the Chatham Wagon Company to take over the finished or unfinished stock, so that the Speight Company can close down. The company find that with the present competition they are not capable of going on, and they are thinking of removing.

However, I believe a number of friends of the company have taken measures so as to render it unnecessary for the company to remove. There is not the least doubt that both the workingmen and the farmers have suffered grievously through the National Policy.

Some people declare that the farmers of this country are protected. Here is a despatch that was sent by the British ambassador at Washington to Lord Kimberley, with respect to the position in the United States, and I hold that the statements there made will hold good as regards Canada. He says :

The other agricultural products are nominally protected, but as they could not be delivered from elsewhere as cheaply as they can be made at home, the United States farmer cannot be said to enjoy protection, but rather the contrary, as the cost of such manufactured goods as he has to buy is increased by their being protected, thus diminishing the purchasing power of his produce. Owing to the geographical situation of Canada, some agricultural products have been imported thence even under the McKinley tariff, and more would doubtless arrive if allowed to enter free, but prices would not be materially affected owing to their being fixed not here but in Europe.

Whenever the Finance Minister or any member on the Government side of the House claims that protection benefits farmers in the United States, they forget that the market for their surplus products is in Europe, and that the prices are fixed in Great Britain. To a certain extent, perhaps, it would be a great benefit to Canadian farmers if we got our produce into the United States market free. There is another short statement, as follows :—

Protective duties exist, but as agricultural profits depend on the sale abroad of surplus produce, these duties do not serve their purpose.

That is what we have pointed out time and again, that duties on agricultural produce

do not protect Canadian farmers, but on account of the tariff the farmer has to pay an increased price for every article he purchases, and on that account the purchasing power of his produce is very much decreased. We have been told that goods are as cheap in Canada to-day as they ever were. We have been told by the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Powell) that prosperity in the United States dated from the adoption of protection, that under a protective tariff the United States had achieved its present greatness. Let me read some statements of the committee which revised the tariff in 1884, as follows :—

The history of American industry shows that during no other period has there been a more healthy and rapid development of our manufacturing industry than during the fifteen years of low tariff from 1846 to 1861, nor a more healthy or harmonious growth of agricultural and all the other great industries of the country.

That is an admission made by men who were well qualified to judge—the most prosperous period in the United States was the time it had the lowest tariff. The statement continues :

No chapter in our political experience carries with it a more sanitary lesson than this, and none could appeal more strongly to law makers to establish a just and rational system of public revenues, neither exhausting agriculture by constant blood-letting nor keeping manufactures alternating between chills and fever by artificial pampering. In this direction alone lies stability, concord of sections of great industries.

Here is a statement which applies to Canada equally with the United States. I believe in the adjoining republic there is a very strong feeling growing up with respect to the high tariff, and notwithstanding the fact that there was a little reduction made during the last revision ; but no doubt they are on the road to reduce their tariff. The late Senator Beck said :

In adjusting taxation on imports with a view only to obtain revenue or for revenue only, we never thought of discriminating against American industries, or of depriving them of the incidental benefits of the protection a proper revenue tariff would afford.

We have evidence that during a revenue tariff in Canada, when there was an incidental protection of from 15 to 17½ per cent, our manufacturers and farmers were more prosperous than they are to-day. Secretary Carlisle said :

If we were called upon now for the first time to declare a principle or inaugurate a policy upon this subject, I should not hesitate to announce my adherence to that creed which commands the largest liberty in trade. That doctrine which opens the channels of commerce in all parts of the world and invites the producer and consumer to meet on equal terms in a free market for the exchange of their commodities, for I sincerely believe that all commercial restrictions are in the end injurious to the interests of the people.

I believe every right-thinking man in the

world who wishes well of his country is beginning to feel that these restrictions are detrimental to the true interests of the people. Secretary Sherman said :

The measure of protection should extend only so far as to create competition, and not to create home monopoly.

Now, Sir, protection in Canada has created monopoly. We have a monopoly in our cotton manufacture, a monopoly in our iron industry, and we have, we may say, a monopoly in the manufacture of agricultural implements. We have a monopoly in the sugar refining industry, and in almost every great industry in this country. The late President Garfield said :

Duties should be so high that our manufacturers can fairly compete with the foreign product, but not so high as to enable them to drive out the foreign article, enjoy the monopoly of the trade, and regulate the prices as they please.

Senator Sherman, discussing the tariff commission bill in 1883, said :

The measure of protection should extend only so far as to create competition, and not to create home monopoly.

That, Sir, is what is done in Canada to-day. The manufacturers regulate the prices as they please, and not only that, but they are regulating the tariff as they like. The monopolies had their tariff committee appointed, and after deliberating for several days, they prepared their brief and submitted it to the Minister of Finance. He accepted it, and as they themselves boasted afterwards, they revised the tariff to suit the manufacturers of Canada. That state of things should be put an end to at once. If the manufacturers are allowed to regulate the tariff, let them have seats in this House. Indeed, at least one hon. member of this House who has a large woollen mill in Almonte, sat on that manufacturer's committee, and revised the tariff to suit himself.

Now, Sir, agricultural implements there were imported into Canada to the value of \$292,222, which paid a duty of \$70,156, and we exported agricultural implements to the value of \$633,718, or nearly \$400,000 worth more than we imported. But, there is more than that. You are aware, Sir, that the manufacturers interviewed the Minister of Finance, according to their own statements, time and time again. They were not satisfied with the revision of the tariff, but they wanted no duty upon the raw material that entered into the production of their goods, and so, on the entreaty of the manufacturers to the Finance Minister, an Order in Council was passed giving them a rebate of 99 per cent of all the duty of the raw material entering into their manufactured goods, which are exported out of the country. Is it not a great injustice to the Canadian farmer, that implements can be manufactured in this country, and sold in Great Britain, Argentina, and in Australia,

Mr. McMILLAN.

less the cost of duty when they leave the shores of Canada, than the prices they are sold at to the farmers of this country. The farmers of Canada have a right to complain. They have been discriminated against by this Government which has never done anything to assist them, but which has imposed taxation upon taxation on their shoulders. Since the National Policy was imposed, and after it was imposed, this Government have done everything in their power to increase the burdens of the farmers. Now, Sir, in what condition do we find the farmers of Canada at the present day? We find them in a very depressed condition, indeed, and we find them in not at all the same healthy condition that they enjoyed when the National Policy was first inaugurated. The Government tell us that the farmers are well off, but I, as a practical farmer, am in a position to contradict that statement. This present winter, farm after farm is being mortgaged, and since I have commenced to examine the statement of the mortgages to companies in the province of Ontario, I never knew of as many farms held for sale as there are during this present winter. There are many farmers not able to meet their engagements, and their farms will have to be sacrificed. Let me give to the House a statement as to how the farmers of Ontario stood in 1882 compared with 1894 with respect to their income from their farms and the value of their field crops. This statement is given in the report of the Bureau of Industries for the province of Ontario. In making the calculation, I think it is better to give the size of the farm at 100 acres, as it is much more easily understood than if the farm is divided into fractions. In 1882, there were 19,622,000 acres of land, giving 196,225 farms of 100 acres each; there was \$155,000,000 worth of farm produce, giving to each farmer with 100 acres, \$789. That was a fair remuneration for the farmer, but it was nothing extra, and he could not make money very rapidly out of it. Some may say, that after this, the farmer has his stock of cattle; but when we take his produce at its full value and calculate what it is worth, you cannot take that produce again and feed it to the stock. You can only make the one calculation of it, so that all the farmer would have after the agricultural produce would be what little he could make of his pasture. From 1882 to 1889, there were 207,815 farms of 100 acres each, and the average value of the crops during these years was \$114,533,000, or \$551 to each farmer. When we come down to 1893 we find that there was 219,407 farms of 100 acres each in the province of Ontario, and the total value of field crops was \$101,886,000, giving to each farmer a sum of \$464. When I made this statement to the House last year, I said then that from my experience in going over the province of Ontario, that when we got the returns of 1894, they would be very much reduced as com-

pared with 1893. And, Sir, I am very sorry indeed to find that my prediction has proven only too true. In 1894, there were 220,327 farms of 100 acres each, and the value of all field crops was \$94,055,000, or \$426 for each farm. This shows that the return to each farmer in 1894 was \$363, less than it was in 1882. And it must be remembered that out of the \$426 for each farmer in 1894, he must feed a team and provide seed. However, Mr. Speaker, that does not show the sad condition of the farmers to the full extent. In 1887 the amount of mortgages in Ontario with loan and investment companies was \$79,494,963, and that has steadily increased up to the year 1894, when it amounted to \$115,692,809. This is an annual increase of \$5,171,000 of mortgage indebtedness in the province of Ontario held by the loan and investment companies. But that does not at all represent the total amount of the mortgages held against the farmers of that province. I am perfectly convinced that in the locality in which I live, for every mortgage held by the loan and investment companies, there are two held by private individuals; but of these we have no means of judging the extent at the present time, as we cannot go to the registry office in the county and get a statement there. But there is another mortgage which is the last resort of the farmer when his circumstances become very straitened indeed, that is, the chattel mortgage; and in the province of Ontario there has been a very large increase indeed in the chattel mortgage indebtedness. In fact, in some parts of the country to such an extent do chattel mortgages exist, that it is very difficult to know when to buy stock from a farmer and when not to do so, because it is mostly on stock and implements that chattel mortgages are held. The following figures will show the extent to which chattel mortgages have increased in one year:

	No.	Amount.
On December 31, 1894.....	21,759	\$11,220,000
do do 1893.....	19,722	9,333,000
Increase.....	2,037	\$ 1,887,000

This increase in a single year in the chattel mortgages in the province of Ontario shows to an alarming extent how the farmers are going back, though I am convinced that a great many of them are both economical and industrious. This state of things is due to the very low prices they have been getting for their produce, combined with the higher prices they have to pay for almost every article they purchase in the market. Now, Sir, the condition of the farmer, when we compare it with that of the manufacturer in this country, is not a very enviable one. We find the value of farm lands in Ontario in 1882 was \$632,342,000, and in 1894 \$587,246,000, a reduction in

twelve years of \$45,000,000. Besides, during that time we had 2,073,000 acres more cleared, which should be added to the reduction. At \$20 an acre, which is a low estimate indeed for clearing and fencing land in the province of Ontario, this would bring the reduction in the value of land alone up to \$86,575,693 in those twelve years, leaving out of consideration the improvements in draining, in removing rocks and stones from the fields, in digging ditches, etc., which would amount to a very large sum of money. As I stated before, of the 220,327 farmers in Ontario each has an income of \$426 a year. Out of this he has to pay taxes, keep a team and furnish seed. Put his taxes at \$20, the keep of a team at \$40, and seed at \$40, and there is only \$326 left to himself. But very few farmers with 100 acres can do without the assistance of a hired man during the summer. Allow \$125 for that, and what is left to the farmer? The small sum of \$201, without taking into account blacksmiths' bills and wear and tear of machinery. So that the condition of the farmer is not one to be envied. Now, let us compare this with the condition of the manufacturers. We find that the manufacturers had invested in Canada in 1881, \$353,837,000, on which the amount of profit, without deducting raw material, was \$219,463,000. The amount of profit per hand employed was \$596. The average wages paid to each hand was \$272. So that the net profit to the manufacturer, after deducting the wages, was \$324 on each hand he employed, while the farmer's income for his whole year's labour, for himself and his family, is only \$201. If this condition of things should continue for a length of time, I know not what is to become of a great many of our farmers. In a great many cases their farms have gone out of their hands. We have more tenant farmers in Canada to-day than we ever had since Canada was settled, although the National Policy is not the sole reason for this. It is partly due to the restriction upon our market in the United States, which was one of the best markets we had for our produce, and partly due to the large amounts of money we have to pay for all we have to purchase. We have been told time and again that low as the prices are for our grain, they would be lower still if we were not protected against the wheat and oats that would otherwise come in from the United States. I have a statement here for the thirteen years down to the year 1894, showing the prices of wheat and oats in the markets of the province of Ontario, as taken from the report of the Bureau of Industries of 1894, page 107, and the prices of wheat and oats in the markets of the United States, as taken from the "World" Almanac, page 167. The average prices of wheat per bushel in the two countries in those years were as follows:—

	Ontario. Cents.	U.S. Cents.
1882	106	118·5
1883	107	112·6
1884	81·4	106·6
1885	80·6	86·2
1886	72·5	87
1887	78	89
1888	99·3	85·3
1889	88·1	89·7
1890	91·3	83·2
1891	92·9	93·2
1892	67·8	102·6
1893	59·4	79·8
1894	55·5	67·2

Or during the thirteen years, wheat averaged 85 6-10 cents in Ontario, and 92 3-10 in United States. That is what the farmer of the Dominion is protected against—against a market where wheat is generally higher priced than it is in ours. Now, take oats for the same period :

	Ontario. Cents.	United States. Cents.
1882	43	47·6
1883	38	50·6
1884	33 ¹ / ₁₀	30·9
1885	31 ¹ / ₁₀	37·9
1886	32	34·3
1887	34 ⁹ / ₁₀	40·8
1888	40 ¹ / ₂	43·4
1889	30 ¹ / ₂	39·3
1890	41 ¹ / ₁₀	32·9
1891	36 ¹ / ₂	42·6
1892	30 ¹ / ₁₀	40·7
1893	33 ¹ / ₁₀	39·0
1894	30 ¹ / ₁₀	35·2

In other words, during those thirteen years, oats averaged 34 9-10 cents in Ontario and 39 6-10 in United States. These figures are taken from the Ontario Bureau of Industry of 1894, which gives the prices of all those years. These prices given for Ontario are a favourable showing for the Dominion, because grain in the province of Ontario brings more than the average of the price which would be got all over the Dominion. When we take into account, this last year or two, the large quantities of grain raised in Manitoba and the North-west and sold at much smaller prices than in Ontario, it will be seen that if we had the figures for the whole of Canada, they would show a lower average during those years than is shown by the statement I have given. I hope the Finance Minister will give his attention to this and see that his boast that he has been protecting the farmers of Canada against the farmers of the United States has no foundation in fact, but that, on the contrary, the United States market is one of the best markets we could get. I

Mr. McMILLAN.

shall prove this still further when I show the large amount of farm produce that went to the United States before the McKinley Bill and since that Bill was enacted.

Compare the markets of Toronto and Buffalo in 1895. Canada red wheat sold for 63½ cents at Toronto, and red wheat sold at Buffalo for 67 cents. Canadian white wheat sold at Toronto for 63½ cents; and white wheat at Buffalo sold for 67 cents. Barley sold from 27½ to 41 cents in Toronto, and in Chicago from 40 cents to 48 cents. Cattle were selling in Montreal from 2¾ cents to 3¾ cents, and in Chicago from \$3.60 to \$4.50 per 100 pounds. This shows clearly what a benefit it would be to Canadian farmers to have access to the American market. Hogs, on the 4th October, 1895, were quoted in Toronto at \$4.50, and in Chicago at \$4.55 to \$4.60. Sheep were quoted in Toronto at \$1 to \$3, and in Buffalo at \$1.50 to \$3.75. Here is another statement which goes to show that we have not received as good prices for our grains in Canada, compared with the prices running with the United States, since the introduction of the National Policy, as we did before. Take oats in 1877, oats were selling in Toronto at 43 cents, and in Chicago at 31¼. In 1881 oats were selling in Toronto at 39¼ cents, and in Chicago at 37·83 cents. When we consider that oats are only 32 pounds to the bushel in Chicago and 34 in Toronto, oats were as high in 1881 in Chicago as they were in Toronto, just two years after the National Policy was imposed, whereas they were at least 3 cents lower in Chicago than in Toronto two years before the National Policy was imposed.

Large amounts of corn, between 5,000,000 and 6,000,000 bushels came into Canada for consumption in 1877, while in 1881 we only imported 1,500,000 bushels. Take rye during the same period—I have taken my statements from the evidence taken by Mr. Orton's committee, appointed to inquire into the condition of agriculture. In 1877 rye was selling at 77 cents in Toronto and 62½ cents in Chicago, or 7¾ cents higher in Toronto than in Chicago. In 1881 rye was selling at 89 cents in Toronto and 91¼ cents in Chicago, or 2¾ cents higher in Chicago, two years after the National Policy was imposed. Take barley, in 1877 it was selling in Toronto at 73¾ cents while in Chicago it only brought 58 4-10 cents. In 1881 barley in Toronto sold at 91 cents, while in Chicago it was selling at 81 cents to \$1.09, or 16 cents higher in Chicago than in Toronto. Now, I have another statement which goes to show our commerce in a large number of articles. My figures are taken from a statement that was compiled three years after the National Policy had been in operation, and it takes in all wheat, oats, barley, hay, straw, wool, dressed hogs, and eggs. The following is the table :

	20th October.					Average.
	1874.	1875.	1876.	1877.	1878.	
Fall wheat.	\$ 1 00	\$ 1 10	\$ 1 11	\$ 1 25	\$ 0 92	\$ 1 07
Oats.....	0 43	0 39	0 40	0 35	0 32	0 38
Barley.....	0 97	0 92	0 86	0 65	1 00	0 88
Hay.....	23 00	20 00	14 00	18 25	13 50	17 97
Straw.....	16 00	14 00	11 00	15 00	12 00	13 75
Wool.....	0 30	0 24	0 27
Dressed						
Hogs.....	8 50	8 00	6 50	5 25	5 50	6 75
Eggs.....	0 24	0 21	0 22	0 20	0 15	20 2-5c

Making a total average of,\$41 28

This was taken on the 20th October of each year. Now, let us take the three years after the adoption of the National Policy :

	20th October.			Average.
	1879.	1880.	1881.	
Wheat.....	\$ 1 34	\$ 1 35	\$ 1 36	\$ 1 25
Oats.....	0 36	0 34	0 43	0 38
Barley.....	0 72	0 73	0 96	0 80
Hay.....	11 00	11 50	16 00	12 75
Straw.....	7 00	8 50	12 00	9 00
Wool.....	0 20	0 27	0 24	0 23
Dressed hogs.....	6 00	7 00	8 50	7 16
Eggs.....	0 18	0 20	0 25	0 21

Making an average total of,\$31 79½

These figures show that there was a shortage of \$9.49 in the receipts of the farmers for these articles for the last three years, as compared with the five years preceding. And yet these figures do not bring us to the period when agricultural produce was so very low. It is easy to show that 1881 was one of the best years in respect of prices of farm produce for a considerable period. Take the figures on 20th June, and see whether they show the same result as those for the month of October :

	June 20th.					Average.
	1874.	1875.	1876.	1877.	1878.	
Wheat	\$ 1 32	\$ 1 01	\$ 1 14	\$ 1 60	\$ 1 01	\$ 1 21
Oats.....	0 53	0 49	0 34	0 56	0 32	0 45 4-5
Barley.....	0 70	0 60	0 57	0 70	0 55	0 62 2-5
Hay.....	20 00	18 00	15 50	16 00	17 00	17 30 0-0
Straw.....	15 00	8 00	12 00	10 00	12 00	11 40 0-0
Wool.....	0 40	0 35	0 38	0 29½	0 20	0 30 2-5

Average total for the five years.....\$31 28 3-5

Now, compare this with the following table, showing the receipts for the three years following the adoption of the National Policy :

	June 20th.			Average.
	1879.	1880.	1881.	
Wheat.....	\$ 1 01	\$ 1 12	\$ 1 16	\$ 1 09½
Oats.....	0 41	0 39	0 41	0 40½
Barley.....	0 60	0 70	0 57	0 62½
Hay.....	14 00	13 00	11 00	12 66
Straw.....	7 00	7 00	7 00	7 00
Wool.....	0 22	0 38	0 22	0 24

Total average price for the three years.....\$22 02½

The farmers' receipts from these articles, according to the average of the last three years, was \$22.02½, as against \$31.28 3-5 for the five years when the Government of the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie held the reins of power, a falling off for these latter years, of \$9.26. These figures show conclusively that we had, as a rule, better markets before the National Policy was adopted than

we have had since. There is another statement I wish to make in answer to a statement of the Finance Minister. He said :

Experimental farms have been placed in different parts of the country ; and the information which has thus been disseminated by example and by the distribution of the results on those farms to the farming population in the different provinces has introduced better methods of feeding, and has turned the attention of the farmers to more remunerative classes of products than they had formerly devoted their attention to.

Now, I have here a statement showing what it cost the farmers of Ontario, upon an average, during the years 1893 and 1894, to grow an acre of barley, and an acre of oats, and an acre of peas, and also showing what it costs to produce an acre of each of these three grains upon the Experimental Farm at Ottawa. I am not going to take the experimental plots on the farm, I am going to take field plots, which I consider afford a better guide of what is being done upon the farms. I have taken these figures from the Bureau of Industries, giving the value of an acre of wheat, and I have also taken the cost of production from the Bureau of Industries. Then I take the cost of production upon the experimental farm from a statement that is given there, and I take the value of the average produce of oats, barley and peas per acre. Now, I find that in the province of Ontario, in 1893, the value of an acre of fall wheat was \$11.50, the cost of production was \$19, showing that there was \$7.50 of a loss in the cost of production over the value of the crop. In spring wheat the value of an acre was \$6.97, the cost of production was \$15, so that there was a loss of \$8.03 per acre to the farmer. In barley, the value of an acre was \$8.41, the cost of production, \$14, showing a loss of \$5.59. In oats, the value of an acre was \$10.04, cost of production, \$14, showing a loss of \$3.96 to the farmer. In peas, the value of an acre was \$10.36, cost of production, \$15, loss on each acre, \$4.64. In 1894—I will not go over the figures giving the cost of production—the loss upon a field of wheat was \$7.35 per acre ; upon spring wheat, \$6.88 per acre, upon barley, \$4.86 per acre ; upon oats, \$4.77 per acre, and upon peas, \$5.43 per acre. Now one would think that the Experimental Farm must necessarily be of great benefit to the farmers of this country when those who work it are in possession of all the agricultural knowledge that can be gathered from books and other sources, of all the chemical science that can be brought to bear upon agriculture. I may also add that they have spent large sums for manure on that farm. We have been told that they spent something like \$1,500 a year, for four or five years, in placing manure upon that farm, more than they made. We find there were 46 acres of oats, and the average yield was 25 bushels and 20 pounds per acre, which, at 31 cents per bushel,

would give \$8.39. The cost of production will be found in the report of the Agricultural Farm. It shows that there were seven and three-quarters acres of green feed, that cost \$17.97 per acre to produce, and I hold that putting an acre of grain into the barn and thrashing it, will cost as much. Therefore, the loss was \$9.63 upon the Experimental Farm, as against \$7.35 by the general farmer in the province of Ontario. Now, there were only five and a half acres of peas, yielding 22 bushels and 38 pounds per acre, just one field of peas. Estimating the value at 53.6 cents per bushel, which was the average price in Ontario, that would give us \$12.12. The cost of production being the same, \$17.97, there is a loss upon each acre of peas of \$5.85. There were eight and one-half acre of barley, yielding 25 bushels and 13 pounds on an average per acre, which, at 40½ cents per bushel, gives \$10.21 per acre. Estimating the cost at \$17.97, there was a loss of \$7.76. Now, Sir, the case of the general farmer in Ontario, with the average as given in the Bureau of Industries, is not a fair comparison to make with a farm such as the Experimental Farm at Ottawa, because the latter has all possible advantages, first-class agriculture, first-class implements, and a large amount of manure. Let me say that this estimate does not include manure; I have only taken the grain, and on a field of oats there were put 18 tons of manure, which, according to the prices they have hitherto paid for manure upon the farm, would give us something like \$4.50 per acre for the manure, besides the labour of putting it on the land. But I have allowed the manure to go against the straw. Now, how much is the loss upon this 46 acres of oats, eight and a half acres of barley, and five and a half acres of peas? Sir, you will be astonished when I tell you that these 46 acres of oats, according to their own statement, they have grown at a loss of \$442.98. The eight and a half acres of barley have been grown at a loss of \$65.96; and the five and a half acres of peas have been grown at a loss of \$32.17, or an entire loss over the cost of production of \$541. Now, this farm does not show what in reality can be done. There are many farms where oats and barley are raised, and raised at a profit. A farmer to-day that can produce the greatest amount of grain with the smallest amount of labour, and keep his farm in the best condition, the farmer that can produce the greatest amount upon the smallest quantity of land at the lowest cost of production, is the farmer that is the most successful. I hold that if this farm at Ottawa is to be of any benefit to the farmers of Canada, it is not by such teaching as is afforded by these results. I have gone carefully over the report of that farm, and I must say that there is a great lack of information as to what is done with the large amount of money that is spent upon it. Now, what do we find in respect to dairying in the

Mr. McMILLAN.

report of the Experimental Farm? We find that some changes have been made in the cows composing the herd, from time to time. In all 37 cows have been kept. Then the report goes on to say that the total quantity of milk obtained was 59,896 pounds. If all the milk from a 40-acre plot had been manufactured into butter, it would have yielded 3,651 pounds. Let us estimate the value of the butter at 16 cents per pound. Thirty-one cows were milked from 7th July to the fall. Why, Sir, it only gives \$13 per cow for that period; and if we take the other six months and estimate another \$13 per cow, we would only get \$26. I hold that these are insufficient returns for the amount spent on the experimental farm. Plenty of farmers are doing far better than these results indicate; yet the Finance Minister will tell the House that the experimental farm has been teaching our farmers improved methods of agriculture, and how to raise crops that will pay better, and also improved methods of feeding. If these returns show the results derived from improved systems of farming, they confer very little benefit on the farmer. In going over the report of the Central Experimental Farm I have been astonished to find that we do not get a full report of everything that takes place on the farm. There is no statement of the revenue derived. This would be advantageous to the farmer, especially if it gave a detailed statement for every field, the value of the labour expended on it, the amount spent for seed, and so on. Of course, we are all aware that experimental plots never pay. They are conducted for experimental purposes only, and with new varieties of seeds. I observe that thirteen varieties of oats have been taken out of thirty-six varieties. Certainly, the best varieties would be taken, and there should have been a full statement of the results given. We are constantly told that the central farm is for the benefit of the farmer. I have visited three of the experimental farms in the North-west, and I was very well pleased with them, the amount of money spent there being very much less in proportion than here. I have gone over the farm here many times, and I consider we have a right to criticise it, because it is the central experimental farm, and examples of good farming are supposed to be found there. It is supposed to set an example to our agriculturists, but, in my opinion, it is doing nothing of the kind. In the important matter of dairying it is not setting an example to the ordinary farmer in Ontario, because it is not affording much better results than the ordinary farmer obtains. We are well aware that very many of the best farmers are producing from \$35 to \$40 per cow, and some even as much as \$50, when proper care is taken, and proper feeding adopted. Of what benefit is an experimental farm unless it is leading the farmers, showing them improvements in

systems whereby they can secure an increased yield of products. This farm is not doing it at the present time.

I will again refer to some remarks made by the Finance Minister. He said :

But, Sir, if the home market for agricultural products has increased in that time, so also has the foreign market, as shown by the exports of the country. Agriculture and animal products, taken together, were exported to the amount of, in 1890, \$37,000,000, and in 1895, to the amount of \$50,000,000, an increase in this period of \$13,000,000, or of 35 per cent. Let me exemplify by the exports in certain articles, the increase in the agricultural exports of this country, comparing the year 1890 with the year 1895.

I expected to see butter as the first article on the list, but that article is entirely absent. The report does not show what benefit our farmers have derived from the large amount of money spent on creameries for the purpose of making butter by the most improved methods and sending it to the British market. The hon. gentleman shows the increase in cheese. While other provinces may have been benefited by the system which the Government has established of sending the dairy commissioner and some of his assistants to cheese factories in the provinces of Quebec and Prince Edward Island. I hold that Ontario has not been benefited by anything the commissioner of dairying has done. It would have been better for Ontario if we had never bought a single pound of cheese and put it on the British market. If the hon. gentleman doubts my statement, let him take his own report for 1892-93 and examine closely into the sales. Hon. members will remember the splurge made a year ago, when the Government were going to procure large quantities of creamery butter and send it to the old country in order to establish there a high standard for Canadian butter. We have had no reports of the sales. The only statements we have received was from the commissioner of dairying when he came before the Committee on Agriculture last session, when he told us that he had realized 63 shillings per hundred weight, or 13½ cents per pound. We have been told across the floor by the present Minister of Agriculture that there were two sales, one at 16 6-10 cents, and the other 16 4-10 cents per pound. But we have never yet got a correct report of the condition of the butter and the quantity of butter that realized high prices. There was something very peculiar about the sales. A large quantity of the butter was kept in Montreal and sold there, according to the statement made here, at 21½ cents, and 22 cents. Why should we send butter across to the British market to realize 16 cents per pound when we could have realized 22 cents in Montreal? I am as thoroughly convinced as I am of my own existence that butter going to the old country has not benefited Canada. I have here a statement which gives an ac-

count of 271 packages sent to the old country. It is as follows :—

Forty-five, good texture, high-coloured, turnipy, too old ; 211, old, well made, fresh ; 6, variable ; 18, old, high-coloured ; 18, high-coloured, very salty and rany ; 18, old and turnipy ; 6, high-coloured and clean-flavoured ; 11, clean-flavoured and fair ; 34, high-coloured and bad ; 62, good, some old, high-coloured and too salty ; 18, good, some old, high-coloured and salty, and 14, fair, high-coloured, and too old.

That is the class of butter that was sent to the British market to raise the character of our Canadian product, and I am convinced that the very best dairymen in Canada, will not be able, during the next five years, to overcome the injury that has been inflicted upon the creamery butter trade of the Dominion by such butter being sent to England last year. We have creameries in Canada that are, I believe, a credit to the country. I will prove to the House that we have in the province of Ontario, private establishments that will do more for the credit of our Canadian creamery butter upon the British market, than can be done by any action on the part of this Government. Here is a statement respecting a visit to the model creamery, the Black Creek cheese and butter factory, belonging to the Hon. Thos. Ballantyne :

Up to this season all the output was disposed of in Toronto and Stratford, but the output being largely increased this season, a number of shipments have been made to England, with a view to testing the markets there. During Hon. Thomas Ballantyne's visit to England last summer, he thoroughly investigated the butter trade, and found that the shipments of Canadian butter made by the Dominion Government last winter had not only been a financial loss to the Government, but had injured the reputation of the Canadian product.

There is a confirmation of my statement from one of the most experienced dairymen in the province of Ontario, a gentleman who has done more in the interests of dairying in Ontario than any other man I know of, and I have known him for the last thirty years. The report continues :

The butter was bought haphazard in Canada and was made up of rolls, prints and tubs, high-coloured, low-coloured, heavily-salted and light-salted, fresh and strong, and all dumped on the English markets irrespective of the requirements of each. In Manchester, for instance, where the market demands a pale, light-salted butter, put up in packages of 56 pounds (the half of an English hundredweight), he found, among a great variety of other butter, some of his own make, which had been sold to a Toronto firm and who, in turn, had turned it over to the Dominion Government. These tubs were high-coloured and well salted, such as the Toronto trade demands, and, not to speak of the injury done them by being held so long a time, were quite unsuitable for the Manchester markets. The dealers said the people there called the oblong prints "soap bars," and were too suggestive of that article to meet with favour. In London he also found the 56-pound

package to be the popular size, but a shade more colour was demanded than at Manchester.

Acting on the information he then gleaned several shipments have been made this winter to Manchester and London, and with the most satisfactory results. The butter is packed in square spruce 56-lb. packages, which are well steamed and soaked with salt brine before being used, and afterwards lined with parchment paper. For Manchester no colouring is used and only half the quantity of salt that goes into the butter for the Canadian trade. For London about half as much colour as for the Canadian trade and the same amount of salt as for Manchester.

Shipments have been made weekly since 1st December, and the goods have always arrived in prime condition. The prices realized have ranged from 102 shillings to 112 shillings for 112 pounds, only one small lot bringing the lowest price, the average being 109 shillings, which is almost 24 cents, Canadian money. One hundred and twelve shillings a hundred (112 pounds) is exactly a shilling a pound, which, at present rate of exchange, is a fraction over 24½ cents. After allowing for freight, commission, handling, &c., the butter which brought 112 shillings should make the price here a fraction over 22 cents, or 3 cents a pound more than could be realized in Toronto, where the prevailing price for best creamery tubs has been 19 cents. So that it will be seen that for this season, at least, England is the better market for high-class, properly-made and packed butter. Whether it can be counted on in other seasons, when there is no drought in New Zealand to reduce the supply from that quarter, remains to be seen. But the Messrs. Ballantyne are determined to give it a fair trial, and, by establishing a high reputation for their goods, secure for their patrons their best possible prices. The factory charges only 3½ cents for making the butter, so that from the last shipment to Manchester the patrons will realize nearly 19 cents per pound, or 3½ cents more than if the butter had been sold in Toronto.

The advantages of the creamery system over the private dairy are many. In the first place, a larger quantity of butter fat is obtained by the separator from a given quantity of milk of the same average quality than can be got by the most careful manipulation in the ordinary farm dairy. The average amount of butter fat in milk is 4 per cent, and the creamery gets from every pound of butter fat 1 1-5th pounds of butter, the fraction being moisture. The largest quantity got by the farm dairy is 4 pounds. So that, from every 100 pounds of average quality of milk, the creamery extracts four-fifths of a pound more butter than can be got by the hand process—a saving which amounts to almost one-quarter, a very important consideration. Then, the price which creamery butter commands over the dairy article, is very considerable, and these two factors, together with the saving of labour to the farmers' wives and daughters in the making of the butter, and time and trouble in the marketing of it, constitute the winter creamery one of the greatest boons that could be conferred on the farming community. That this is fully appreciated by the farmers in the vicinity of the Black Creek Creamery is made manifest by the very general manner in which it is patronized. The farmers' wives and daughters have been relieved of a large amount of drudgery, which renders to them life on the farm more comfortable and satisfying—and anything which contributes to this end is certainly a public advantage.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is a report of what

Mr. McMILLAN.

can be done in a well conducted creamery by a skilled individual. This is a report which will do more to raise the credit of our butter in the British market, and to increase winter dairying, than has even been done by the Dairy Commissioner of the Dominion of Canada. We have been told that our dairy commissioner has had factories running on the most approved principles, and if so, why did he not take some of their product, and put it in proper condition on the markets in Great Britain. Why did he not ship his consignments once a week, or once every two weeks? He has done nothing of the kind. The only benefit we have derived in that relation from all the money we have expended, is on account of the travelling dairies, that have gone through the country and have educated the farmers to a certain extent in the system of manufacturing butter. So much for the experimental farm and dairying. Now, Sir, we have been told by the Government that the farmers are in a more prosperous condition in Canada than in many other countries. It occurred to me last fall, that if I were to examine my accounts for a number of years, it would be interesting to find what amount of taxes I have paid on certain properties I have held since 1882, and also, what I was obliged to pay for some necessities of life which I purchased for my own use. In 1882 I paid on a piece of property \$93.12 of taxes. That year I was selling wheat at \$1.25 per bushel, so that I paid my taxes with 47½ bushels of wheat. But when I come to 1895 the taxes on that same piece of property was \$93.90, only 78 cents more; but in that year I only get 62 cents a bushel for my wheat; so that instead of paying my taxes with 74½ bushels, it took 151½ bushels of wheat to pay my taxes. And yet we are told that the farmer is prosperous. In 1882 I bought a pair of boots for which I paid \$5. Wheat was \$1.25 per bushel, so that four bushels of wheat paid for my boots. In 1895 I also bought a pair of boots for \$5, but wheat was only 62 cents a bushel, so that it took eight bushels and eight pounds of wheat to pay for those boots, whereas four bushels paid for a pair of boots of the same price in 1882. I bought a suit of clothes in 1882 for \$24. With wheat at \$1.25 per bushel, it took 19 bushels and 12 pounds to pay for that suit of clothes. In 1895 I got a suit of clothes for which, it is true, I only paid \$20; but wheat was only 62 cents a bushel; so that instead of 19 bushels and 12 pounds of wheat for it, I had to give 32½ bushels of wheat for my suit of clothes. This statement shows the large amount of produce it takes to get the ordinary necessaries of life for the farmer. That suit of clothes, which I bought for \$20, would certainly have been got for \$16 but for the National Policy. Now, I stated that I believed I would be able to show that the United States was one of our best markets for agricultural

produce, provided our Government had not locked the gate and lost the key to that market. If a fair attempt were made to get reciprocity with the United States, I have no doubt we could get a reciprocity that would be beneficial to Canada. Now, let us see the amount of agricultural products we sent to the United States, as compared with the amount we send to Great Britain. In 1889 we sent to Great Britain \$3,678,055 worth, and to the United States \$9,125,770 worth, or nearly three times as much, although there was a duty of something like 20 per cent on produce going into the United States. In 1890 we sent to Great Britain \$3,661,000 worth, and to the United States \$7,519,000 worth, showing that but for the tariff wall that exists between Canada and the United States, that country would be the best market for our agricultural products. In 1891 we sent to Great Britain \$5,000,000 worth, whereas the United States took \$7,000,000 worth. We all remember that it was in the fall of 1891 that the McKinley tariff took effect, which accounts to a considerable extent for the increase in the exports to Great Britain and the reduction in those to the United States. But when we come to the year 1892, the year after the McKinley tariff was imposed, we find that \$15,000,000 worth of agricultural products went to Great Britain and only \$4,573,000 worth to the United States. If that much produce could go to that country over a high tariff wall, with 30 cents a bushel upon our barley and 30 per cent upon our cattle and horses, how much more would go there if the duty were removed? In 1894 we sent to Great Britain \$12,431,000 worth, and to the United States only \$2,784,000 worth. It is astonishing that with such a high tariff wall against them any of our agricultural products should go to the United States. Now, what do these exports amount to in percentages? In 1889 while Great Britain took 27 per cent, the United States took 68 per cent; in 1890, while Great Britain took 30 per cent, the United States took 63 per cent; in 1891, while Great Britain took 38 per cent, the United States took 53 per cent; showing conclusively that the United States is by all odds the best market for our produce. With all the many large cities right along the line of the great lakes and along the Canadian frontier in the state of New York, and in the New England States, they furnish the most convenient market the people of Canada could have. We have been told that there is no market equal to the home market; but there are a number of cities in the New England States and in the state of New York, having a combined population equal to the whole population of the Dominion of Canada, and these would furnish a market for our produce if we had reciprocity, and were allowed to enter those markets. Now, Sir, our total exports in 1873, 1883 and 1893 to Great Britain and

the United States respectively were as follows:—

	To Great Britain.	To the U.S.
In 1873.....	\$31,431,030	\$40,554,000
In 1883.....	33,672,000	40,000,000
In 1893.....	58,409,000	37,605,000

I hold that our Government were in a great measure to blame for the high tariff that has been raised in the United States against Canada, because I believe that if they had been in earnest in their professed desire to obtain a reciprocity treaty in 1891, when they appealed to the country under false pretenses, stating that it was at the instance of the United States Government that they were going to Washington to discuss reciprocity, and that they did not want to go with a moribund Parliament at their back, but a Parliament fresh from the people, and therefore dissolved the House—if they had been in earnest at that time, I have not the least doubt that they could have got a fair treaty. When they went to Washington, it is no wonder that they were not warmly received, because of the false statement they had made all over Canada, that it was at the instance of the Government of the United States that the meeting was to take place. But Secretary Blaine, when asked by Congressman Baker whether it was at the instance of the United States, stated distinctly that it was not; and when the hon. gentleman who took his seat to-day (Sir Charles Tupper) went to Washington, he had to admit, before any discussion took place, that the Government here had published false statements all over Canada—that it was not the United States Government who had asked that reciprocity should be discussed, but that it was owing to pressure having been brought to bear on the United States Government by the British Minister at Washington, and on the British Minister by the Government of Canada. We know that when they went to Washington they had a very long journey, but a very short stay. The delegates from Canada were asked how far they were prepared to go, and they replied that they would only enter into reciprocity in natural products. They must have known before they went to Washington that reciprocity would not be entertained if confined to natural products alone. Secretary Blaine, in his letter to Congressman Baker, said positively that the United States would not enter into a reciprocity treaty on the line of the treaty of 1854. But Secretary Blaine and Mr. Foster, of the United States—not the Finance Minister of Canada—were perfectly prepared to discuss reciprocity with the Canadian commissioners, if the latter had submitted a list of manufactured goods along with natural products. The hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Powell) told us that if he were going to inaugurate a tariff policy in any country for the purpose of drawing immigration, and

which, therefore, ought to be in favour of the poor man, he would introduce just such a policy as we have in Canada at present. He argued that the Canadian tariff was in favour of the poor man, and not of the rich man. Well, Mr. Speaker, it is yet fresh in the memory of every gentleman in this House that two delegates were sent out to Canada from the old country, Messrs. Davey and McQueen, to inquire into the condition of the lower provinces as a field for immigration. After they had made investigations and very full inquiries, did they come to the conclusion that the present tariff laws of Canada were such as to make it a desirable field for immigration? Certainly they did not, and I consider their opinion worth that of any ten individuals on either side of this House, who take a party view. What is the reason that the report of Messrs. Davey and McQueen was for a long time hidden from the light? How is it that when it came out to this country, it was immediately sent back to England? The reason was because their report—that of gentlemen who had full experience with respect to tariffs in other countries, and of the effect which a protective system had on the people, specially the farmers—revealed a condition of things which the Government were interested in concealing from the people. What was the report of these gentlemen? Mr. McQueen gave his impression as follows:—

I must now give the conclusions I have formed, from an emigration point of view, of the capabilities and resources of the maritime provinces. Any one reading my report will have some idea of what they are. I may here say, my co-delegate and I held exactly the same views, and came to the same conclusions regarding the state of the country. As many former delegates to Canada and the maritime provinces have given such glowing, and, I think, rather misleading and overdrawn reports of the country, it places me in a delicate and unenviable position to be compelled to do the reverse. I cannot say anything derogatory of the resources and capabilities of the provinces; they are great, and capable of great development, particularly the mineral. But facts prove that agriculture or farming has, for a number of years, but more clearly since the McKinley Bill came into operation, been on the down grade and in a very depressed state. Nearly all the young people are leaving the old folks on their farms and going to the States. Land, consequently, is badly farmed, and getting run down, houses and buildings in many instances falling out of repair. Any number of farms can be purchased at very low figures, often at less than the houses and buildings on them cost. A large number of farms are heavily mortgaged. The output of coal is increasing very slowly, and the iron industry is not developing as it ought to do. The census returns issued some months ago showed that the increase of population in the maritime provinces during the last ten years was very small, not at all commensurate with the natural increase of population and the number of emigrants coming into the provinces. The questions naturally arise: What is the cause of this depression? And can I recommend farmers, labourers, or artisans to emigrate to the maritime provinces? In answer to the first question, from my own observation and from all I could hear

Mr. McMILLAN.

and learn, it is from the want of better trade relations with the United States, the natural market for the surplus produce. Some may say: You have nothing to do with the question—it is out of your province and touches on politics; but I hold it so closely associated with our mission and the object of our report, that we are bound to bring it forward. In answer to the second question, as to recommending emigrants to go to the maritime provinces, until there is unrestricted reciprocity with the United States, so that farmers would have a better market and be able to command higher prices for their produce, I must decidedly say "No." In coming to this conclusion, I may say I went to the provinces unbiassed and unprejudiced, and have endeavoured to give an honest and just report.

(Sgd.) JOHN McQUEEN.

Oakwood, Selkirk, Scotland, 18th Jan., 1892.

The same gentleman sent a letter to the North British Agriculturist, published in Scotland, in answer to correspondence in that paper, and in that letter he said:

I believe that the policy pursued by the Government of the Dominion of Canada will bring the people of Canada into annexation.

Such is the opinion of a gentleman who came to this country, unbiassed and unprejudiced, for the purpose of examining into its conditions as a field for immigration and settlement. I draw the attention of the hon. member for Westmoreland to this opinion and ask him to state whether that opinion bears out his contention that the policy of this Government is in the interests of the workingman? No, Mr. Speaker, it is not even in the interests of the manufacturers. As I have already said, the manufacturers would be better off to-day if it were not for the National Policy. Now, we have been told that England is going in for protection. We have heard of such an inclination being indulged in by Lord Salisbury. Let me read a statement that Lord Salisbury made in London on November 23rd, 1895:

London, 23rd November, 1895.—(Special United Press Cable Letter.)—The cool contempt with which Prime Minister Salisbury, when speaking last Tuesday at the meeting of the National Union of Conservatives, treated the proposals of the protectionists relative to the imposition of a tariff on wheat, oats, barley and hops, has keenly disappointed the agriculturists, who trusted that the accession of the Tories to office would imply some modicum of protection. His explicit declaration that a tariff for protection in any possible form was impossible has not deterred the agricultural interests from making fresh appeals. Yesterday a deputation from the National Association of Hop-growers waited on Lord Salisbury and protested that, unless a tariff was placed on foreign-grown hops, the English hop industry would soon cease to exist. Again the Prime Minister was compelled to speak plainly. He asked the deputation to look closely into the problem of protection. If protection should be granted to the hop-growers, he asked, what would be the feeling of the wheat-growers? They would be envious. Taking as highly practical the demands for a protective tariff, what, if they were granted, would be the feeling of the consumer, at finding the price of bread raised? The Government, he added, had no intention of

placing a tariff on any article of general commerce.

There is the statement of the Prime Minister of England. Now, we have been told, time and again, that the farmers of Britain are protectionists to-day and are calling out for protection. We are told that in the report of the Royal Agricultural Commission which has been laid before the British House of Commons they appeal for protection. I have gone over the whole of that report, and I do not find that it bears out this contention :

Oxford, Gloucester, Wilts and Berkshire.—Grass farmers said : We like the importation of cheap corn ; it is the only thing that saved us last year. Dairy and grazing farmers said : The duty on foreign corn would rather injure than assist them. The commissioner said : The farmers in the district that I visited are in favour of some sort of protection.

Salisbury and Wiltshire.—Some asked for a tax on wheat ; others want wheat free, but a duty on flour.

Suffolk.—A slight duty on imported flour and manufactured articles.

Lincolnshire.—Put a duty on all manufactured goods and agricultural produce.

Somerset and Warwick.—The majority of farmers indicate a tax upon manufactured goods, flour and barley ; wheat free.

Lincoln and Essex.—In favour of taxing foreign meat.

Northumberland and Lancashire.—Chairman of Liverpool Farmers' Club favours a duty on imported flour and manufactured articles. Many farmers advocate fair trade. Put a duty on imported manufactured goods as long as exports to foreign countries are taxed. A number of farmers are opposed to putting a duty on manufactured articles as a whole, but put a duty on barley. Other farmers are opposed to protection in any form. Mr. Foster, of Ruth, says : I pass over protection as something too childish to trouble you with. As long as other nations send their produce here, it shows it is the best market for them, as well as for us.

Dorsetshire.—The question of protection was referred to at three meetings, but only for the purpose of repudiating it. It might be considered to put a small tax on flour. This would give work for millers and others and cheaper bran and offal.

Hampshire and Kent.—Many persons in favour of some sort of protection. Let wheat be free, but put a duty on flour. Some farmers advocate a bounty on wheat.

Kent.—A wide-spread feeling in favour of protection. Many farmers maintain that a return to protection is impossible. One said a tax on horses and cattle, but duty on grain would be injurious.

Dumfries, Kirkcudbright, Wigton and Ayr.—Farmers say nothing about protection, but complain of foreign wheat being sold as the best Scotch.

Roxburgh, Berwick, Selkirk, Peebles, Lindlithgow, Haddington, Banff, Nairn, and Elgin.—Farmers complained of imports being duty free. Some say a duty should be put upon all foreign produce. The number who advocated this were few. They had no expectation that protection would be adopted. Many want the duty removed from foreign import tariffs, and suggest that a retailer of foreign meat should take out a license, and that foreign meat should be sold as such.

Perth, Fife, Forfar and Aberdeen.—Complain of potatoes sent to the United States having to pay a duty, while American produce comes in free. Some suggest that foreign goods directly competing with the farmers' produce should pay an import duty ; that this would raise the price, but it would benefit the farmer only for a short time. At the end of his lease the rent would be raised, and only the landlord would be benefited in the end. The question of adjusting rent to the price of produce lies at the bottom of the agricultural question. Many favour the labelling of foreign meat and the licensing of those who sell it.

Now, Sir, that is a fair statement of the feeling, according to the evidence that has been taken by the committee that was sent out to investigate the condition of agriculture, for I believe that the full report is not in, but that it is only the evidence that has been placed before the British public. We have heard a great deal about Great Britain and about the straitened circumstances in which she is. We are told that she is being driven out of the markets of the world. Why, Sir, I think it was a year ago that the ex-Minister of Justice (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) made the statement that Great Britain was being driven from the markets of the civilized nations of the earth, and that her trade was being confined to the barbarous countries upon whose people she was able to force her goods by strength of arms. I have here the return of the exports and imports between Great Britain and foreign countries and British possessions, from 1879 to 1893. I begin with the case of France, in which there is the greatest falling off in British export trade :

BRITISH Imports and Exports to Foreign Countries and British Possessions, 1879 to 1893.

		1879.	1893.
		£ stg.	£ stg.
France	{ Imports ..	38,405,096	43,685,090
	{ Exports ..	26,558,333	19,795,500
Sweden.....	{ Imports ..	8,392,723	11,986,844
	{ Exports ..	3,928,682	6,125,028
Denmark.....	{ Imports ..	4,675,090	8,936,835
	{ Exports ..	1,984,767	2,971,569
Germany.....	{ Imports ..	21,604,890	26,364,849
	{ Exports ..	29,623,776	27,954,494
Holland.....	{ Imports ..	21,959,384	28,851,490
	{ Exports ..	15,452,752	15,746,028
Belgium.....	{ Imports ..	10,725,739	16,848,979
	{ Exports ..	11,887,442	13,016,450
United States...	{ Imports ..	91,818,295	91,783,847
	{ Exports ..	25,518,789	35,715,274
Total Foreign Countries	{ Imports ..	284,049,237	312,918,724
	{ Exports ..	182,274,391	198,554,958
British possessions	{ Imports ..	78,942,638	71,769,454
	{ Exports ..	66,508,973	78,583,312
Total British possessions and Foreign.....	{ Imports ..	362,991,875	404,688,178
	{ Exports ..	248,783,364	277,138,270

In 1879, the total foreign exports were £248,783,000; in 1893 they were £277,188,000, or an increase of £20,354,000. Now, consider the large shrinkage in the value of goods that took place from 1879 to 1893. The hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Powell) said it amounted to 30 per cent. Consider what that means, in view of the enormous increase in the volume of goods that Britain has sent to other countries, and the enormous increase in her imports, and then consider that during that period, over five millions were added to her population. Farmers in England to-day are no more protectionists, as a class, than they are in this country. They know their position too well. The same argument was used during the agitation for the repeal of the Corn Laws, when they knew well that the only system that could give them redress was one regulating the rents of the country according to the price of produce. Now, we are told that Britain was in a prosperous condition under a protective tariff, which afterwards enabled her to adopt free trade. Let me give you a few examples to show how prosperous she was during the period from 1825 to 1896:

Seven London bankers and sixty-seven country banks stopped payment. The number of bankruptcies in 1826 was nearly 2,600. People mistrusting paper money ran for gold, and the bullion in the Bank of England was reduced to £1,300,000. As somebody said, the country was within twenty-four hours of barter. Immense numbers of working men were thrown out of employment, and the distress was universal.

Now, let me take another statement for 1842:

But what I supplicate for, on the part of the starving people is that they, and not you, shall be the judge of when corn is wanted. By what right do you pretend to gauge the appetites and admeasure the wants of millions of people? Are you prepared to deal even-handed justice to the people? If not, your law will not stand—nay, your house itself, if based upon injustice, will not stand.

1842—While the three great measures introduced by government—the modified corn law, the income tax, and the tariff reform—were in the process of receiving the sanction of the legislature, the condition of the country had undergone no improvement. The distress was deep and universal. From the agricultural as well as from the manufacturing districts, from all the great centres of trade—Manchester, Birmingham, Glasgow and Leeds—there came forth one great cry of agony. Merchants and manufacturers in great numbers succumbed to the pressure, and were driven into bankruptcy. Hundreds of thousands of industrious men were thrown out of employment, and subsisted either by private charity or out of the Poor's Rates, which had swollen into oppressive dimensions.

Sir, I read this as an answer to a statement made by the present Minister of Agriculture last year to show that it was necessary that the people of that country should adopt protection. I could read page after page to show the great amount of distress that

Mr. McMILLAN.

existed in Britain under protection. Since the abolition of her corn laws, no such distress has even passed over Great Britain. Labourers were then getting five, six and seven shillings a week under the protective system, having to support their families on these wages when food and clothing were very much higher than they are to-day. Three years ago when I visited the old country, labourers were getting from 15 to 18 shillings a week. England never suffered under a free trade system as she did during the time she was under a protective system. England has made advances under free trade such as no country, except perhaps the United States, has ever made. Mr. Speaker, I have spoken a long time, I beg leave to thank you for your indulgence, and I will now resume my seat.

Mr. McINERNEY. Nothing affords me greater pleasure than to listen to the broad Doric accents of the hon. member for Huron (Mr. McMillan); and considering, as I have been led to understand, the early opportunities that hon. gentleman enjoyed, he appears to me to be a wonderful speaker, indeed. But, Sir, the most mellifluous accents and the most nicely worded phrases begin to pall upon one's ear at 11 o'clock at night, and we have been listening to them for nearly three hours. I wish to add that with many of the statements of the hon. gentleman, I have not much fault to find; but there are some of his statements so obviously fallacious, that I must enter my protest and my dissent to them, before I go any further. The hon. gentleman has said that there was no time in the history of the United States of America when that country was more prosperous than during the time when they had the lowest tariff. Now, Sir, I think that a man must have read American history in vain who can coolly and deliberately make such a statement as that. Every one of us who has read the history of the United States, and who is acquainted with recent events in that country, must certainly come to a conclusion opposite to that at which the hon. gentleman has arrived. We all remember that when the reform tariff party headed by President Cleveland, gained a recent victory in that country, what a panic seized upon the industries of the United States. Banks failed, business houses collapsed, industries of every character underwent a terrible depression. Coxey's army, representing the highest possible type of depression, marched almost across the continent to Washington. At no time in the history of the United States had that country come to such a deplorable financial pass as during the time when the party pledged to the reform of the tariff, held power for the last time in Washington. Why, Sir, the United States had been rapidly paying off their national debt under protection, but we find now that, under the reform tariff policy of President Cleveland and the Democratic

party, the gold surplus in the vaults of the United States treasury has almost entirely disappeared. Only the other day Mr. Carlisle, the Secretary of State, had to make a bond issue of two hundred million dollars in order to bring back to the treasury the gold that had been taken from it during the depression. I claim therefore that the hon. gentleman is obviously wrong when he states to the House that at no time in the history of the United States was that country so prosperous as during the time when the tariff was lowest. Again, the hon. gentleman has stated what appears to me to be obviously wrong, that the farmers of this country derive no benefit at all from the National Policy, and that they are the only class in the country who derive no benefit at all from it. I am prepared to show that there is no class of the population of this country that has derived greater benefits from the protective tariff than the farmers of Canada, which I will endeavour to show later on from the few notes I have prepared on that subject. Does my hon. friend from Huron think it fair, in discussing a question of this nature, to compare farm prices in 1878 and previously, with farm prices in 1896? When he shows, as he easily can, that the prices of farm products have in that period fallen to a certain extent, does he think that that points a moral, or that it makes a conclusion in favour of his argument? I rather think not. My hon. friend, with his knowledge of farming, knowing the large amount of agricultural implements and the low price at which they can be bought, with the cheapness of labour, with the large farming areas that have been lately brought under cultivation, and which have access to the markets of the world—my hon. friend should know that it is no argument whatever for him to say that because the value of the farm products are less to-day than they were 20 years ago, therefore the farmer is not in a prosperous condition. I will endeavour to show that the farmers derive more benefit from the National Policy than any other class of the population of Canada.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. McINERNEY. I have made my statement, and if I fail in demonstrating the proposition laid down, it will be so much better for hon. gentlemen opposite. I state the proposition, and I will at the proper time undertake to prove it. I apprehend, Mr. Speaker, that the Budget debate offers an occasion for the discussion of the financial standing of the country, that it is rather a stock-taking time, in which we look at the means we have on hand and judge so far as we are able of the result of the plunge we may take into the future. But the hon. gentlemen on the Opposition benches have during this debate entered into a discussion of nearly every subject under the sun. They have talked about the divisions

that have taken place in the Government ranks. One hon. gentleman even dropped into poetry on that occasion, and with him the wish was father to the thought when he said that when the brains were out—meaning that the hon. gentlemen who had left the Cabinet were the brains—he thought the Government would die. The hon. gentleman was quoting, I think, from a very wonderful production by the greatest poet of any age. But he should have finished the quotation. The hon. gentleman was quoting from the great play of Macbeth, and like Macbeth, the hon. gentleman's wish was father to the thought, that when the brains were out the man would die. The hon. gentleman should have continued further in the wonderful scene in which Macbeth sees Duncan rise before him, and with a stricken conscience, being the cause of his death, he says :

The times have been that when the brains were out.

The man would die, and there an end,
But now they rise again—
And push us from our stools.

The hon. gentleman will find that the reconstructed Government, like the ghost of Duncan, will trouble him in his dreams, and push him from the fancifully erected throne that he has established for himself. I wish during the remarks I intend to offer to the House to direct my attention to the different subjects which I think legitimately come within the four corners of this discussion. For what I have to offer I do not claim any particular originality. The statements I have to put before the House have often been placed on "Hansard" and delivered in this Chamber, but like many an old story, I think it is well that such well known truths should be dinned into the ears of the people, and now particularly, when the two great parties in this country are going to ask a verdict from the electors of Canada. But I intend proceeding on the main lines of the financial state of the country, to institute a comparison between the regime of hon. gentlemen opposite and the regime of the Government which I have the honour to support; and in doing that I wish to call the attention of the House to the public debt, to the interest paid on the public debt, to the public credit, the annual expenditures, to the several deficits we have had and to the trade returns for the different years since 1873. I wish to institute a comparison between the periods from 1873 to 1878, and from 1878 to 1896, and I think I shall conclusively show to every unbiassed mind, to every fair-minded man in this country, as I shall show to every fair-minded man who reads what I say, that by the record, and by their fruits we should judge them, the party of hon. gentlemen opposite stands condemned before the bar of public judgment, and the party of my friends stand before the bar of public judgment deserving of the verdict of the people of Canada. We

have heard very much about the public debt, and I admit that for a population only amounting to about five millions we have a large debt; but not a debt larger than the resources of this country, than the hopes in the great future of this country justify. But how has that debt been incurred? To hear hon. gentlemen speak, one would imagine that all that debt was incurred by the Conservative party. That is very far from the truth, and still in every schoolhouse in the country where hon. gentlemen opposite get an opportunity of addressing the people they constantly ring the changes upon the immense debt of the country and upon the fact that the Conservatives have incurred this tremendous debt in Canada. The debt down to June 30, 1895, amounted to \$253,074,927. That debt was made up in the following way. The provincial debts we assumed in 1867 amounted to \$77,500,000. In 1870 we took in Manitoba, in 1871 British Columbia, in 1873 Prince Edward Island, and with the readjustments made during those several years we assumed the debts of the provinces amounting to \$20,452,340. In 1884, 1885 and 1886 there were further adjustments, adding \$11,477,808 to the debt. So that the total public debt arising from the provincial debts which we had assumed at Confederation and the readjustments that took place subsequently amounted to \$109,430,148, leaving otherwise incurred a debt of \$143,644,779. Of that we incurred for the purchase of the North-west Territories \$6,043,294, for the Intercolonial Railway about \$50,000,000, for the Canadian Pacific Railway \$63,000,000, for our canals and river improvements \$42,000,000, or a total of \$161,043,294, exceeding the amount as given before by about \$18,000,000, paid out of the accumulated surpluses of the different years when the Conservative party have been in power. I wish to compare the increase of the debt. The debt increase from 1890 to 1895 was \$15,544,880, and to hear hon. gentlemen opposite speak one would suppose that no improvements had been carried out of any nature that was for the benefit of the people. Of that sum there was expended, as follows: On canals, \$11,319,378; Intercolonial Railway and connecting roads, \$4,919,781; for the Canadian Pacific Railway, \$754,142, or in all, \$16,993,301. In railway subsidies we paid during the five years \$5,867,748. And, Sir, I claim that the improvement to the country, in affording cheaper and quicker transportation both for freight and passenger traffic, amply justified the increase in the debt during that time.

But, let me come to a comparison between the years while hon. gentlemen opposite were in power, and the years while this Government have been in power; comparison with regard to the increase of the national debt. I wish to compare the years from 1878 to 1896 with the years from 1873 to 1878. On the 1st of July, 1873, the net debt of Canada was \$99,848,461, but on the

Mr. McINERNEY.

1st of July, 1878, that debt had increased to the then enormous figure of \$140,362,069, or an increase during the years from 1873 to 1878, of \$40,513,608, being a yearly increase during that period of \$8,102,721. Now, what are the facts with regard to this matter, between the years 1878 and 1896. In these eighteen years the increase of the national debt has been \$112,712,858, or, during the eighteen years, an annual increase of \$6,261,825, as compared with a yearly increase during the Liberal regime of \$8,702,121. In the last six years, from 1890 to 1895, we have added to the debt, an increase of \$15,544,880, or an annual increase of only \$2,590,814, as compared with an annual increase of over \$8,702,121, between the years 1873 and 1878. Sir, having finished with the debt, and having, as I think, conclusively shown that on the record, as far as our debt is brought before the public, the Conservative party stands in a much better position than the Liberal party of this country; having proved that, I wish to proceed to the next subject I have to deal with, namely, the interest on that debt.

In 1887-88 the interest paid on the public debt per annum was \$8,891,288, and the average interest from that time down to the year 1895 was \$8,784,542. The per capita interest paid in 1887-88 was \$1.90, while the per capita interest paid in 1894-95, was \$1.83, or a reduction of 7 cents per capita between the years 1887 and 1895. The per capita interest paid in 1873 was \$1.31, and in 1878 it was \$1.58, or an increase between 1873 and 1878 of 27 cents per head of the population. Therefore, whilst from 1887 to 1895 the per capita payment of interest decreased 7 cents per head, the increase per capita during the years of the Liberal regime from 1873 to 1878 was 27 cents. The rate of interest in 1878 was 3.68 per cent, but the rate of interest in 1890 was only 2.89 per cent.

Having left that branch of the subject, I come to speak of the credit of the country, and, after all, the debt of a country cannot be large, when it can, as this country has done at a recent date, put a loan upon the market at such a wonderfully fine figure. The credit of Canada stands pre-eminently fine in the markets of the world. In 1894, the present Finance Minister put a loan of £2,500,000 sterling upon the London market, and that loan was taken up at 3 1-6 per cent, and very much more than the amount of the loan was subscribed by the capitalists of Great Britain. Now, Sir, hon. gentlemen on the Opposition side say: We admit that it is true, but the price of money has fallen in late years throughout the world, and it is not due to the Conservative party that the credit of Canada is higher now than it was some years ago, but it is rather due to the cheapness of money at present. That argument finds its answer in this statement, that almost immediately after our Finance Minister had placed that

loan of £2,500,000 upon the London market, the United States, with a population of over sixty millions of people, and with all the resources which hon. gentlemen in opposition are never tired of advertising—the United States put a loan of sixty millions upon the market, and, Sir, what did they get for it? That United States loan was taken up at 3½ per cent, while ours went at 3 1-6 per cent.

Let us compare the loans that have been put upon the market during the Liberal regime in this country, with the loans that have been put upon the market by the Conservative Government, and I will do that in order to establish a fair comparison between the credit of the country during the years from 1873 to 1878, and the credit of the country during the years from 1878 to 1896. In 1878, Sir Richard Cartwright, then Finance Minister, floated a loan in London at 4¾ per cent, and, in 1894, Mr. Foster, the present Finance Minister, floated a loan at 3 1-6 per cent.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). Would you allow me to ask you a question. How were these bonds of the United States to be paid?

Mr. McINERNEY. It is true that the United States bonds that were issued at that time were on the face of them to be paid in silver.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). Hear, hear.

Mr. McINERNEY. I thought the hon. gentleman (Mr. Macdonald) would laugh, but the hon. gentleman has laughed too soon. Sir, the hon. gentleman should not forget this, that while upon the face of it the bond was payable in silver, President Cleveland and Mr. John Sherman, at that time the greatest financial authority in the United States, and the leader of the Republican party in opposition to the President, both these gentlemen made statements—President Cleveland under his own hand—that these bonds would be redeemed in gold. It was, therefore, known to financial men throughout the world that the United States would redeem these bonds in gold, and it makes little or no difference, consequently, whether, upon the face of them, they stated they were to be paid in silver, because, if the credit and the standing of the United States in the financial markets of the world were to be maintained, the bonds would have to be redeemed in gold, as was stated by President Cleveland and by John Sherman, the leaders of the two great parties in that country. I think, therefore, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Macdonald) cannot take much comfort out of the interruption that he made.

Now, Sir, in 1879, Canada 4 per cents were worth from 89 to 91 per cent, and in 1895, Canada 4 per cents were worth from 110 to 112, or an increase of 21 per cent in the values of these bonds. Similar bonds of the United States increased, during the same

period, 13 per cent; similar bonds of the colony of Victoria increased, during the same time, only 10 per cent; and similar bonds of New South Wales increased, during the same time, only 13 per cent, as against an increase of 21 per cent in the 4 per cent bonds of the Dominion of Canada. Now, Sir, having shown, as I think, conclusively, that the credit of this country has not only been maintained, but considerably advanced by the Conservative Government under the present Minister of Finance, I propose to take up the annual expenditure. We are told by the Finance Minister, from what he knows and estimates, that the expenditure to the end of June, 1896, will amount to \$37,000,000, and the estimated revenue to \$37,000,000. So that we shall have no deficit for the present year. In 1878 we had an expenditure of about \$24,000,000, so that there has been an increase in the annual expenditure since 1878 of \$13,000,000 a year. That has arisen fairly, I think, from increased interest and sinking fund, \$4,600,000; increased subsidies paid to provinces, \$830,000; additional amounts spent on railways, canals and post offices, \$4,000,000; an amount spent on the Experimental Farm, which did not exist in 1878; an additional amount spent on the Administration of Justice of \$205,000; the government of the North-west Territories, for which there was no expenditure in 1878, \$258,000; additional fishery bounty and protection, \$280,000; the inspection of food, \$19,000; the inspection of steamboats, \$12,000; Indian management, \$450,000 additional; penitentiaries, \$138,000; superannuation, \$156,000; militia and defence, \$480,000; and mounted police, \$166,000; or, taken altogether, \$11,594,000. Add to that an increased expenditure for improved lighthouse service, geological surveys, immigration, Dominion lands, Dominion police and legislation, and you will find that you have made up the total amount of \$12,000,000 of increase in the annual expenditure from 1878. Now, Sir, let us compare the increase in the expenditure from 1873 to 1878 with the increase from 1878 to 1896. The Liberals, when they came into power in 1873, found the expenditure \$19,174,000. When they left office in 1878, they left the expenditure at \$24,488,000, or an increase in the five years of over \$5,000,000, or an increase of over \$1,000,000 a year. Let us compare that with the Conservative record from 1878 to 1896, and what do we find? The Conservatives, when they came into power in 1878, found the expenditure at \$24,488,000. In 1896 it had increased to \$37,000,000, or an increase in those eighteen years of \$12,512,000, or two-thirds of a million dollars a year, as compared with an increase of over \$1,000,000 a year during the time the Liberal party were in power. Now, I would like to ask hon. gentlemen opposite a question which they have been asked before, but which they have never yet answered. They were

asked the same question the other evening by the hon. member for Pictou, the ex-Minister of Justice (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper); they were asked it last year by the hon. Minister of Railways (Mr. Haggart); I asked it two years ago in a speech which I made on the Budget: and from that time to this it has never been answered, either in this House or in the country. The question is: upon what particular items would the hon. gentlemen, if they got into power to-morrow, economize and reduce the expenditure of the country? Before they talk of economy, which is at all times a very popular cry in the country, and which may be a misleading and unfair cry, let them state to the House and to the country, if they wish to get an honest verdict from an intelligent people in their favour, on what particular items of expenditure they intend to economize when they do get into power. Will they economize by reducing the fishery bounties paid to the hardy fishermen on the coast, as part of the award which was got at Halifax?

Mr. FORBES. By a Liberal Government.

Mr. McINERNEY. I care not by what Government it was obtained. It was not obtained by a Liberal Government. My hon. friend is wrong there again. It was obtained by a Conservative Government on Conservative plans.

Mr. FORBES. No.

Mr. McINERNEY. My hon. friend is perfectly ignorant of the matter if he says it was obtained under a Liberal Government. The gentleman who was defeated in Northumberland the other day always took the credit of having obtained that award. He said he prepared the plans for it.

Mr. FORBES. Does the hon. gentleman know the year in which it was obtained?

Mr. McINERNEY. I do not know exactly the year. Will the hon. gentleman tell us?

Mr. FORBES. Yes, by the Liberal Government which was in power in 1878.

Mr. McINERNEY. In 1878?

Mr. FORBES. In 1877.

Mr. McINERNEY. The hon. gentleman had better stick to one figure or the other. He first said 1876, then 1878, and now he says 1877. The hon. gentleman reminds me—or rather he does not remind me—of a witness I once knew who, when he came on the stand, was bound to stick to what he said in the first place. He was asked the height of a horse, and he answered that it was seventeen feet high. On cross-examination he said the horse was seventeen hands high. "But you said seventeen feet," the cross-examiner told him. "Did I say seventeen feet?" he asked. "Yes." "Well," he said, "if I said seventeen feet, by George, I will stick

Mr. McINERNEY.

to it." If the hon. gentleman said 1876, he should stick to it, and not say 1878, and then go back to 1877. The hon. gentleman perhaps thinks that he knows more about this than any other gentleman in this House, but that does not count. We may form an estimate of what the hon. gentleman knows from what knowledge he shows, not from what he thinks he possesses. If hon. gentlemen opposite get into power, would they reduce the militia expenditure? The hon. leader of the Opposition and the hon. member for South Oxford have both committed themselves in favour of largely increased militia expenditure for the present year, so that in that item they cannot very well effect a decrease. Will they decrease the amount expended for the postal facilities of the country? They ought to know, and they do know, that the country is increasing in population and improving in intelligence.

Mr. McSHANE. Not increasing in population.

Mr. McINERNEY. There my hon. friend is wrong again. If the hon. gentleman would read the census returns, he would find that the population of the country very largely increased during the last decade.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, decreased.

Mr. McINERNEY. Well, I cannot account for the wonderful lack of knowledge and information evinced by these hon. gentlemen. They will hardly undertake to reduce the amount granted as railway subsidies to the different railway enterprises in the country. They will hardly undertake to reduce the grants for public works, immigration, lighthouses or the expenditure on the Experimental Farm. Let me again call the hon. gentlemen's attention to their record in regard to expenditure. A few years ago a number of Liberal Premiers from the different provinces of Canada met at Quebec under the leadership of Mr. Honoré Mercier, and there committed themselves to a resolution, each and every one of them, which was subsequently subscribed to by the hon. leader of the Opposition. That resolution would have taken out of the exchequer of this country every year \$1,721,476. Mr. Peters, the Premier of Prince Edward Island, who has laid a direct tax on every acre of land in that province, has boldly stated that of that increased amount he would obtain from Prince Edward Island over \$70,000 a year. Now, I would refer to what was said all through the West on that wonderful mission undertaken by the hon. leader of the Opposition and some other gentlemen who accompanied him. I should like to refer to what these gentlemen said at different places along their line of travel as to the way they intended to reduce the expenditure. At Medicine Hat, Mr. Laurier said:

I am not a Puritan or a saint, but simply a man, and I do not hesitate to say to you, that in the west you need public works.

Mr. Gibson at Medicine Hat, said :

In the North-west the requirements are many. Your constituency has not got all it should have. You need a bridge.

At Vancouver, on 13th September, 1894, that hon. gentleman said :

He would say that the Liberal party was just as much in favour of legitimate public works as the Conservatives were. Any one sailing from Vancouver to Victoria could see where public money might be spent in improving the approach to the Terminal City's magnificent harbour.

Mr. Laurier, in his speech at Vancouver, said :

I agree with my friend Mr. Gibson, that perhaps there is something to do for this city yet. Perhaps it would be well to encourage and assist the energy of the people, and that the harbour of Vancouver might be improved with some public money. I can only reiterate what has been said by Mr. Gibson ; That, when we have a Liberal Administration at Ottawa, it will be the duty, it will be the pleasure of that Administration, to favour any public work that is for the credit and benefit of the Canadian people, and it would certainly be for the benefit of Vancouver, and for the whole of Canada.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. McINERNEY. I do not suppose he is to do it for any other purpose. I do not wish to asperse his character by saying that it would be done for any other purpose

—and that the harbour of this fair city should be made as accessible as it is possible to make it.

Mr. Laurier at New Westminster said :

Great works are required up on the Fraser River.

Mr. Laurier, at Winnipeg, on 6th September, 1894, ("Globe" report) said :

Mr. Laurier, in reply to a question from Mr. James, a prominent Patron of Industry, stated that, because of the insufficiency of information, in his possession, he had formed no opinion as to the feasibility of the Hudson Bay route, but he would favour the voting of considerable money in favour of a thorough investigation.

I have read these extracts from the different speeches pronounced in the west by the leader of the Opposition and his lieutenants to show—and, I think, they conclusively show—that whatever doctrines they may announce in this House, when they go abroad among the electorate, they certainly announce that when they get into power the people generally may look out for a golden shower from the treasury.

Leaving that branch of the subject, I wish for a few moments to discuss the deficits under the different regimes of the two parties. From 1873 to 1878 there were four deficits. While the hon. gentlemen opposite were in power, it was only the first year, 1874-75, that they ever had a surplus at all. And I wish here to call the attention of the House to the statement made by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cart-

wright) the other evening. In speaking of the deficits, the hon. gentleman said that those that occurred during his regime resulted from the responsibilities that were laid upon the shoulders of the Liberal party by the Conservative party which had previously been in power. Now, it is passing strange that the facts do not carry out any such contention, because if the responsibilities that were laid upon him by his predecessors were the cause of all the deficits that he had, how comes it that, in the very first year after he came into power, he had a surplus and that every subsequent year he had a deficit ? How is it that the responsibilities laid upon him by his predecessors resulted in giving him a surplus the first year he came into power, and that his own blundering—if I may use the term—resulted in giving him deficits in the succeeding years ? I have here a record of the deficits during the different terms when the different parties were in power and the surpluses in the different years they held office. I will first take up the years when the Liberal party were in power :

GRIT YEARS.

	Surpluses.	Deficits.
1874-75.....	\$935,644	
1875-76.....		\$1,900,785
1876-77.....		1,460,027
1877-78.....		1,127,146

So that during these four years there was to the debit of the Liberal party a balance of \$3,551,314. I leave out of account the year 1878-79, for which perhaps both parties are somewhat responsible. I come now to the years under the Conservative regime. In those years, the account stands as follows :—

CONSERVATIVE YEARS.

	Surpluses.	Deficits
1879-80.....		\$1,543,227
1880-81.....	\$4,132,743	
1881-82.....	6,316,351	
1882-83.....	7,064,192	
1884-85.....	754,255	
1885-86.....		2,240,058
1886-87.....		5,834,571
1887-88.....	97,313	
1888-89.....		810,031
1889-90.....	1,865,035	
1890-91.....	3,885,893	
1891-92.....	2,235,742	
1892-93.....	155,977	
1893-94.....		1,210,332

And I do not take from that, as the hon. Finance Minister did, the amount that went into the sinking fund of over two million dollars last year. So that there is a total of deficits during the Conservative regime of \$15,692,094 against a total of surpluses of \$26,507,501, or a surplus to the credit of the Conservative party, from 1878 to 1895 inclusive, of \$10,815,407.

I may say that the deficits in 1894-95 accompanied decreased taxation. The remission of duties on sugar alone, according to the statement of the Finance Minister, and

as the Public Accounts clearly show, amounted last year to \$5,475,000. The duties on glass and anthracite coal and sugar since 1890, which were remitted, would have amounted in that time to over \$25,000,000, or sufficient to have wiped out all the accumulated deficits and left a very large surplus in the treasury. Hon. gentlemen opposite say that the revision of 1894 took nothing at all from the revenue of the country. but, as has been clearly shown, over \$1,500,000 at that very time was taken out of the treasury of the country yearly by the large reduction that was made all along the line. The deficits under the Liberal regime, on the contrary, accompanied increased taxation.

In the different branches of the subject I have taken I have endeavoured to show that there is much to be said to the credit of the Conservative party and much against the administration of the Liberal party on those very subjects. I come now to a test which, I think, is absolutely correct as to the condition of the people of this country financially during those several years. I allude to the savings of the people. From 1874 to 1878, the savings of the people, as shown by the savings bank returns, decreased \$353,057, or over 4½ per cent. From 1890 to 1895 the savings increased \$45,000,000, or over 22 per cent. I think that is a gratifying statement and a conclusive proof that from 1890 to 1895, the people of this country have, from their different avocations amassed a large sum of money and put it to their credit in the banks far beyond what they did from 1874 to 1878.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Will the hon. gentleman excuse me if I ask a question. Do I understand him to say that from 1890 to 1895, the deposits in the savings banks showed an increase of \$45,000,000 ?

Mr. McINERNEY. Yes ; total savings in banks.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Is the hon. gentleman sure of that ?

Mr. McINERNEY. These are the figures that I have, and they show an increase of 22 per cent. The next thing I turn my attention to is the failures that occurred from 1874 to 1878, and from 1890 to 1895. Now, in 1874, the failures, that occurred in Canada, according to Dun, Wiman & Co., represented a total of \$7,796,000. In 1878 the failures amounted to \$23,908,000 or an increase in that time of 310 per cent. In 1890 the failures amounted to \$18,000,000, in 1894 they were \$17,600,000, and in 1895 they had fallen to \$15,800,000, a decrease of 11 per cent. So that, while the failures among the business men of Canada from 1874 to 1878 had increased 310 per cent, from 1890 to 1895 they decreased by 11 per cent. I have here a general comparison of these two periods which, if it would not weary the House, I would like to read :

Mr. McINERNEY.

1874-79.	
Exports fell.....	\$18,000,000
Imports fell.....	18,000,000
Duty collected decreased.....	1,400,000
Per cent of duty rose, 4 p.c.	
Debt increased.....	40,000,000
Net interest on public debt increased	1,500,000

1889-94.	
Exports rose.....	\$28,000,000
Imports rose.....	28,000,000
Duty collected decreased.....	4,500,000
Per cent of duty fell, 4½ p.c.	
Debt increased.....	10,000,000
Net interest on public debt increased	100,000

I think that that is a statement that should be of some interest to the people of this country, if they would only take the trouble to study it. Now I come to the customs duties levied in these two periods. In 1888-89, the customs duties levied amounted to \$5 per head, while in 1893-94, they were \$3.82 per head. The percentage of imports dutiable and free in 1888-89 was 21.65 per cent, and in 1893-94, 17.13 per cent. The duties collected in 1889 amounted to \$23,726,784, while in 1894 they had fallen to \$19,119,000. Now, Sir, there is another subject to which I would like to call the attention of the House—the banking returns during these periods. The following are the figures for the Cartwright period, as it is called :—

	1874.	1878.
Note circulation.....	\$ 27,904,000	\$ 20,475,000
Total deposit.....	77,113,000	70,856,000
Discount to people.....	131,680,000	113,485,000
Assets	187,921,000	175,450,000

When the circulation and discounts decline, denoting shrinkage of commerce ; when the deposits fall off, showing loss of resources, and the bank assets diminish, no further comment is required to prove the embargo which the country's policy at that period placed against prosperity.

If we take the same facts for the past five years, the substantial success of the present policy is illustrated.

THE LAST FIVE YEARS.

	1889.	1893.
Note circulation.....	\$ 32,207,000	\$ 33,811,000
Total deposits.....	134,650,000	174,776,000
Discounts to people....	140,958,000	205,623,000
Assets	253,789,000	302,696,000

So that the banking returns of the country during these periods teach a very important lesson. Now, with regard to the trade of the country, perhaps the best barometer of that trade is the freight traffic.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Would the hon. gentleman excuse me. Before he passes to that, I would like to find out whether I understood him aright as to a matter he touched upon previously. Either I misunderstood him or I have misread the public accounts, and I wish to understand the matter.

Mr. McINERNEY. You refer to the figures to which you called my attention before. I must say, Mr. Speaker, that, when I read it, it seemed to be a large figure. But I took it from an authentic source.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman said that the increased deposits in the savings banks was \$45,000,000.

Mr. McINERNEY. Yes ; total savings.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) If the hon. gentleman will consult public accounts he will see that there is not \$45,000,000 since 1867.

Mr. McINERNEY. The hon. gentleman may state that and—

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) If the hon. gentleman will take up the public accounts he will see that the total figure for last year is \$3,400,000.

Mr. McINERNEY. The hon. gentleman may be correct, but I—

Mr. FOSTER. What my hon. friend means, no doubt, is the total in the savings banks of the country.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) All the banks ?

Mr. McINERNEY. I said all the savings of the people in the different banks. I know I have taken the statement from an authentic source. It may be that I am wrong. I do not vouch for the exact correctness of all these figures. But I say that until the hon. gentleman quotes me something that shows I am wrong I will stick to the figures I have given.

I was proceeding, Mr. Speaker, to deal with the freight carriage. I was going to say that railway corporations do not carry freight for fun, and the extent of traffic is a pretty good indication of the extent of internal trade. In 1875, the first year of which we have a record the railways carried 5,670,836 tons of freight. In 1878 that had increased to 7,883,472 tons. In 1893 the figures had rolled up to the enormous quantity of almost 23,000,000 tons carried by the railways of Canada. Now, I wish to refer to the foreign trade. In 1878 our foreign trade was \$173,000,000, and in 1894 it had increased to \$241,000,000 :

FREIGHT CARRIED BY RAILWAYS.

	Tons.
1878	7,883,472
1893	22,003,599

BANK DISCOUNTS.

1878	\$119,682,659
1893	199,773,000

TONNAGE SEAGOING AND INLAND VESSELS (EXCLUSIVE OF COASTING).

	Tons.
1878	12,054,890
1893	18,539,534

COASTING TRADE.

1878	11,047,661
1893	24,569,123

Now, look at the growth of the postal business of the country. In 1873 there were 53,500,000 letters carried, and in 1893 there were 137,000,000 carried. The National Policy has, therefore, proved a most effective destroyer of the hopes of our Liberal friends. I now come to the total trade of the country during the two periods. In 1874 it amounted to \$217,000,000. In 1878 it fell to \$173,000,000, or a decrease of \$44,000,000. In 1895 our total trade had gone up to the large sum of \$240,000,000, or an increase during the Conservative regime of \$87,000,000 as against a decrease of \$44,000,000 during the regime of our hon. friends opposite. I will now give you a tabulated statement showing the difference in our total trade between the five years of our Liberal friends, and the last five years under protection :

LIBERAL FIVE YEARS.

1874.....	\$217,565,510
1875.....	200,957,262
1876.....	174,166,781
1877.....	175,203,355
1878.....	172,405,454

LAST FIVE YEARS, UNDER PROTECTION.

1890.....	\$218,608,490
1891.....	218,384,934
1892.....	241,369,443
1893.....	247,638,620
1894.....	241,000,000

In 1894 Canada shipped to Great Britain from the port of Montreal alone 87,604 cattle and 130,663 sheep, against 15,963 cattle and 31,841 sheep in 1878. Cheese shipments increased from 38,054,294 pounds to 133,946,365 pounds ; the value of hog meats exported rose from \$998,409 to \$2,052,471 ; the value of apple exports to Great Britain increased from \$168,000 to \$2,247,482. Now I come to the export of agricultural products from the country. The exports of cheese, bacon, hams, apples, wheat and flour, horses, sheep and cattle, amounted, in 1890, to \$22,071,000 in value, and in 1895, to \$36,387,000. In pork, the imports decreased from 1889 to 1893. Sir, there is no greater lesson of the beneficial effects of the National Policy as regards the farmer than is to be found in the Trade Returns regarding the exports and imports of pork in the different periods. In 1889 we imported into Canada the enormous amount of 27,000,000 pounds of pork ; in 1893 that had fallen to 4,000,000 pounds ; and in 1895 to less than 4,000,000 pounds. Well, Sir, while our exports of pork only amounted to 4,000,000 pounds in 1893, it had grown to over 20,000,000 pounds. That shows conclusively that putting a duty on American pork brought into Canada, resulted in shutting out 23,000,000 pounds of American pork that formerly came in. The Canadian farmers have more than raised the difference between the two figures, because the exports of pork, after providing for the wants of the country, so far as they could, rose from 4,000,000 pounds in 1889 to over 20,000,000 pounds in 1893. I

may say, in addition, that the exports of cattle in 1878 amounted to \$1,500,000 in value, and in 1895 the cattle exported amounted to the enormous sum of \$7,120,000. Now, I have here a statement which I think my hon. friends opposite will not say is taken from a very friendly source, it is taken from a pamphlet published by the Department of Agriculture in the United States, called "The World's Markets for American Products," and shows the agricultural production in Canada for the years indicated. The pamphlet was issued at Washington by the Government printing office, in 1895, and from that pamphlet I take the figures I am now about to read to the House. The figures refer to the agricultural products of Canada for the different years indicated. The hon. member for Huron (Mr. McMillan) said there was a falling off in everything produced by the farmers, that land values had decreased, that the products of the farmer had decreased, not only in value, but in volume, that all along the line, so far as the farmer was concerned, the National Policy had been a curse and a blight to him. Now, Sir, let us see how the declaration of the hon. gentleman accords with the figures given by this high and independent authority I now cite. The amount of wheat raised in Canada in 1880 was 32 million bushels; in 1891 it had risen to over 60 million bushels.

Mr. MULOCK. What had the National Policy to do with that ?

Mr. McINERNEY. I am not saying the National Policy had anything particularly to do with that, but I am answering the statement of the hon. member for Huron that the value of the products of the farmers of Canada had decreased under the National Policy. These figures show that the wheat product of Canada had increased from 1880 to 1891, had more than doubled in that period. Of barley, we raised 15 million bushels in 1880, and over 21½ millions in 1891. Of oats, we raised 70 million bushels in 1880, and 117,700,000 bushels in 1891. I have here figures, to about the same effect, of different other products grown in Canada, showing that from 1880 to 1891 the products of the farmers of Canada had materially increased. Sir, in face of these facts, I cannot understand how it is possible that a man engaged in agriculture, a man as intelligent as my hon. friend from Huron appears to be, and undoubtedly is, with such figures before him, can stand on a platform, or in an intelligent assembly like this, and make such declarations as he made to us this evening. Now, Sir, from that book I also take a statement with regard to the ratio of cattle owned by the farmers of Canada, as compared with those in the United States of America. It must be admitted that the United States is a rich country, it has had a great start ahead of us, it has had pro-

Mr. McINERNEY.

tection for a much longer time, and has an immense population. In view of these facts it will be something wonderful to find that the farmers of Canada, per head, possess almost as many cattle and horses as the farmers of the United States, the great market of which hon. gentlemen opposite are continually boasting, and to which they ask us, from time to time, to turn our eyes. Why, Sir, Canada is one of the few countries, as regards the ratio of live stock to population, that do not present a strikingly unfavourable contrast to the United States of America. The following table shows the number of farm animals to every one thousand inhabitants in the United States, on June 1st, 1890, and in Canada, on April 6th, 1891 :—

Animals.	Canada.	U.S.
Horses	298	239
Milch cows.....	378	264
Other neat cattle.....	462	557
Sheep	520	574
Swine	352	917

I also find that the number of farm animals in the Dominion of Canada, according to the census of 1891, were : Horses, 1,441,037; working oxen, 127,987; milch cows, 1,829,375; other neat cattle, 2,103,300; sheep, 3,513,977; swine, 1,702,785. These figures, taken from this authoritative source, show that there has been an increase in the number of swine of 495,166 in the past decade; in the number of horses, 381,679; in the number of milch cows, 233,575; and in other neat cattle, 396,912. Yet, Sir, there are hon. gentlemen engaged in the farming industry in Canada, men who have seats in this House, who will stand up, and, in the face of these figures, which clearly show the prosperity of Canada, will declaim against the National Policy, and say that it is responsible for the falling off in values and in volume of the farm products of Canada. Now, there is another thing to which I wish to draw the attention of the House, and that is with regard to the coal trade. During the fifteen years that protection has been in operation in Canada, the sales of Nova Scotia coal aggregated 21,973,399 tons, which was over five million tons more than the total sales of the whole previous ninety-five years. These figures are taken from the report of the Nova Scotia Department of Mines for 1894, at page 62. During the much vaunted period of reciprocity with the United States, which hon. gentlemen opposite are always asking us to advert to, Nova Scotia coal sales increased, it is true, from 217,416 to 558,528 tons, an increase of 341,112 tons for the whole thirteen years of the reciprocity period; while in one year after the adoption of protection that increase jumped from 688,000 tons to

954,000 tons, and has steadily increased until now 2,000,000 tons a year are raised in that country. So that whatever may be said of reciprocity, this can truly be said of protection, it has enhanced to a very large extent the volume of coal taken out of the coal mines of Nova Scotia.

There are other subjects to which I intended to advert this evening, but it is getting very late. I intended to call attention to the argument made by hon. gentlemen opposite in regard to the census. Hon. gentlemen say: you may find figures to tell you the trade of the country has increased in this line and in that line, but we tell you that the census returns of 1891 prove conclusively that the population of Canada did not increase in a ratio as it should have increased in that time. Well, I think a fitting answer to any such argument is an answer taken from the mouths of those very hon. gentlemen themselves. Those hon. gentlemen in 1881 claimed that the census then taken was not a fair census, that it was a census which added a number of people to the population of Canada for which we should not have credit, but if we proceed on the basis of the census of 1881 we have added a much larger number of people than Canada was entitled to, and it cannot fairly be taken by them now as the basis of comparison with the census of 1891, which hon. gentlemen did not attack with respect to the population having been improperly increased.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We did.

Mr. McINERNEY. With respect to the population?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Certainly. If the hon. gentlemen will look at the statements made by the hon. member for Queen's, he will see it was attacked on very serious grounds indeed.

Mr. McINERNEY. Hon. gentlemen, no doubt, did in one or two localities raise the question. I have understood, however, ever since I came here and from my reading before I came here, that the principal point of attack by hon. gentlemen on the census has been the industries reported, and not the population of the country. I never knew before that hon. gentlemen had attacked the census of 1891 with respect to the population. But if the hon. gentleman says it has been done, I am prepared to take his word for it. Whatever may be said of any attack on the census of 1891, I have the words of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) as to what he said about the census of 1881. The hon. gentleman said:

Now, I want to call the attention of the House to this. During the taking of the preceding census, we, from this side, called attention to the manifestly fraudulent intention with which it was taken. The result of that census has been that we have paid \$500,000 for a document as to which we only know this, that it does not con-

tain one single statement that can be relied upon; that in the very first statement, the most important of all, the statement of the number of people who are now in the Dominion of Canada, that census had been deliberately and fraudulently falsified, and falsified for a purpose.

The hon. gentleman further stated:

But, whatever may have been the object, whatever may have been the purpose, the fact remains that we have a census that cost us \$500,000, if not more, and of that census no man who takes the trouble to analyse it, to scrutinize its tables, can affirm with certainty any proposition except that in the most important part of all, it exaggerates by thousands of people the number of persons supposed to be resident in Canada.

Not only did my hon. friend say that, but an hon. gentleman who stood high in this House as an authority on that question, and in fact on every subject, Mr. Blake, made similar statements. He said, alluding to the census of 1881:

In some cases they have counted every person who belonged to a house, even though that person had been for a very long time resident in foreign parts, unless the head of the household would say he was quite sure the person was not coming back. In other instances, men who had been absent eight, fifteen or twenty years, have, as I am informed by persons in the locality who were familiar with the circumstances, been counted.

Again, Mr. Blake said:

It is entirely uncertain, then, under the circumstances, what our population numbers. Nobody can tell by this mode of taking the census the actual number of our Canadian population.

There were other opinions expressed by hon. gentlemen high in authority on the Liberal side of the House which I might quote to bear out that criticism of the census of 1881 uttered by hon. gentlemen opposite. But I turn from that criticism, which I think is on a par with the criticism of the census of 1891, to the statement of the number of industrial establishments in Canada and their increase from 1881 to 1891, according to the census. I find as follows:—

INDUSTRIAL INCREASE ACCORDING TO CENSUS
1881 AND 1891.

—	1881.		1891.	
	No.	\$	No.	\$
Number of establishments..	49,923		75,768	
Capital invested		165,302,623		353,836,817
Number of employees.....	254,935		367,865	
Wages paid.....		59,429,002		99,762,441
Cost of raw material.....		179,918,593		255,983,219
Value of products.....		309,676,068		475,455,705

That would be a sufficient answer to any hon. gentleman who asks the question, have the industrial establishments of Canada increased during the decade from 1881 to 1891?

Mr. McDONALD (Huron). Do you believe the correctness of those figures?

Mr. McINERNEY. I believe they are reasonably correct. I do not state that they are specifically correct, and correct in each and every instance; but I say the census of 1891 was taken on a more proper basis than that in 1881, and in that I agree with hon. gentlemen opposite. But I claim that there is no higher authority to which we can go than an authority which has been prepared and paid for out of the earnings of the people of Canada and the work carried on under the directions of public officers.

I wish to say a word or two about the fisheries. I come from a county in which the fishing interest is one of the most important. My county has an extensive line of coast, and it is very important that not only the attention of the Department of Fisheries, but the attention of the whole Government should be turned to that very important branch of industry; and before I advert to any figures I wish to say this, that so far as the fishermen are concerned, as well as the farmers, they should lift up both hands in praise of the National Policy of Canada. The fisherman's rope, hooks, lines and everything that enters into consumption in his trade is free of duty. So the fisherman is well treated by the protective tariff as we have it at the present time. The fisheries of British North America are among the most extensive and important fisheries in the world. They produce a value yearly of over \$30,000,000 and they engage a population of about 110,000 people. In 1893, the total reported value of the production of the deep sea fisheries of the Dominion of Canada was \$17,945,637, and of that quantity \$2,737,024 worth were fresh water fish. To that must be added the value, estimated at \$2,000,000, of the fish taken by Indians mainly in the rivers of British Columbia making a total of nearly \$23,000,000, from the fisheries for that year.

There is one other statement that I wish to make, and that is with regard to the wealth of the people of Canada. Gentlemen in opposition say, that this is a poor country, that the people here are poor, that in comparison with other countries they are ground down by taxes, and that they are in a deplorable state. Well, Sir, the records, and statisticians of authority do not bear hon. gentlemen out in making such statements. I refer to one of the most eminent statisticians, Michael G. Mulhall, and he computes that the wealth of Canada is nearly \$5,000,000,000. He computes that the value of lands in Canada amounts to \$1,500,000,000, that houses and furniture amount to \$955,000,000, that railway and shipping amount to \$785,000,000, that cattle amount to \$400,000,000, and sundries to \$1,350,000,000. That is an average of \$980 to each inhabitant as compared with an average, says Mr. Mulhall, of \$1,050 for each

Mr. McINERNEY.

inhabitant of the United States. Not a bad showing, Mr. Speaker, for Canada, after all these years of protection, and after all these years of desolation that hon. gentlemen in opposition have so often referred to. Now, Sir, I have been asked several times during the course of my remarks, as to whether I give all the credit, of the great increase in each line I have indicated, entirely to the National Policy. Sir, there are conditions in the country, that are independent I suppose of any policy; but I claim that the National Policy is to be credited with a very large amount of the increase of the products of Canada, of the increase in the industrial establishments of Canada, and of the increase of the prosperity of Canada from 1878 to 1896. Sir, I shall now for a few moments touch upon the relative merits of protection and free trade. I cannot do better than to refer, on this subject, to the authority of one of the greatest political economists of the age. I refer to John Stuart Mill. He says:

In the case of a young nation, protective duties were defensible on principles of political economy, when they were imposed "in hopes of naturalizing a foreign industry in itself perfectly suitable to the circumstances of the country."

Again, he says:

The whole question of the applicability in a particular nation of free trade or protection, must be studied out in accordance with the facts of the case.

So that, as I have stated before in this House, the question of free trade and protection is not an academic question. It is a question that must be taken into consideration with the situation surrounding you, when you apply it to the circumstances of any country. In addition to the opinion of Mr. Mill, I have other opinions of a later date; opinions which ought to have considerable weight in this country. I have an opinion given by John Charlton, at present a member of this House representing North Norfolk, and a member of this House when this opinion was delivered. He is a gentleman who stands high in the councils of the Liberal party of Canada, a man who ever since he delivered that speech, and before it, was a member of the Liberal party. I have his opinion as to what protection is and as to what may be derived from it. Says Mr. Charlton in a speech delivered in 1875:

It may be safely assumed that no nation has attained to greatness in commerce or manufactures without having, in the course of its history, imposed exactions and restrictions, notably the case of Great Britain. When industries are adapted to the land, it is the duty of the government to protect them.

And again:

I believe the agricultural interests of the Dominion would be promoted by protection, and that the manufacturer, being brought to the

door of the farmer, would afford a market for a great many articles of produce that would not be saleable if the market were three thousand miles away. With a home market established by protection to manufacturers, the farmer can benefit his soil by a rotation of crops.

I wonder what the hon. gentleman from Huron (Mr. McMillan) would say to that, since he has given us his opinion, that protection has injured and ruined the farmer of Canada. Mr. Charlton went on to say :

They had heard a great deal said about protection vs. free trade, but that was not the issue at the present time. The issue was as to the relative degrees of protection it would be proper to afford our industries. We have now what some considered an efficient protection, and what others claimed to insufficient.

I have here under my hand, the opinion expressed by another gentleman, high in the councils of the Liberal party. Mr. Paterson, the member for Brant, speaking in 1878, said :

I hold that the position is impregnable : that there is a duty other than the collection of revenue devolving on a Minister of Finance. Let us look for a moment at the article of boots and shoes. Within my own recollection almost all these goods were imported from the United States and I remember that, when the tariff was raised to 10 per cent, a great stimulus was given to that branch of our industry, which now finds employment for tens of thousands of persons. I am not one of those who believe in erecting a wall so high that you cannot trade with any other country, but I must admit I am in favour of a defensive policy. I cannot view with complacency what we see in this country.

And, Sir, what he, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Paterson) could not see with complacency, was the policy that had been adopted and kept up by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). Now, Sir, in addition to that, I might quote the opinion given, in his green and verdant days as he said himself, by the hon. the leader of the Opposition ; but I will let that pass, as it is so long ago that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Laurier) does not want to be held responsible now for his utterances then. But, if I remember aright, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Laurier) said : that in order to establish an industry in Canada and keep it here, he was willing to go so far as to put on a prohibitory tariff. To-day the hon. gentleman (Mr. Laurier) takes different ground. He looks forward to free trade ; he is an out and out free trader. At that time, Sir, when he was expressing the sentiment of his heart, when the sentiments of his heart were coming fresh from his heart, when perhaps he had not any political ambition to gratify ; at that time, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Laurier) was a protectionist pure and simple. Now, Sir, I rise from the opinion that I have just read to the House, to the opinion of one of the greatest men that ever lived upon this continent : the opinion of Daniel Webster. It has been

said that Daniel Webster made one very strong free trade speech, and the Democratic tariff tinkers in the United States, are very fond of reverting to that speech which they say was delivered in 1843. But, in 1846, Daniel Webster, spoke as follows in the United States Senate :—

The interest of every labouring community requires diversity of occupations, pursuits, and objects of industry. The more that diversity is multiplied or extended the better. To diversify employment is to increase employment and to enhance wages. And, Sir, take this great truth, place it on the title-page of every book of political economy intended for the use of the government, put it in every farmer's almanac, let it be the heading of the column in every mechanic's magazine, proclaim it everywhere, and make it a proverb—that, where there is work for the hands of men, there will be work for their teeth.

Where there is employment, there will be bread. It is a great blessing to the poor to have cheap food, but greater than that, prior to that, and of still higher value, is the blessing of being able to buy food by honest and respectable employment. Employment feeds, and clothes, and instructs. Employment gives health, sobriety and morals. Constant employment and well-paid labour produce, in a country like ours, general prosperity, content and cheerfulness. Thus happy have we seen the country. Thus happy may we long continue to see it.

There, Sir, is an utterance in favour of protection from the greatest man, I think, this continent has ever produced. Now, Sir, I go from that speech to a speech delivered, it is true, by one of the greatest of protectionists, but also one of the greatest Americans ever born. I refer to Henry Clay's speech in the United States Senate in 1832. It is a long time ago, but economic principles are true for ever. He says :

When gentlemen have succeeded in their design of an immediate or gradual destruction of the American system, what is their substitute ? Free trade ! The call for free trade is as unavailing as the cry of a spoiled child in its nurse's arms, for the moon, or the stars that glitter in the firmament of heaven. It never has existed. It never will exist. Trade implies at least two parties. To be free, it should be fair, equal and reciprocal. But if we throw our ports wide open to the admission of foreign productions, free of all duty, what ports of any foreign nation shall we find open to the free admission of our surplus produce ? We may break down all barriers to free trade on our part, but the work will not be complete until foreign powers shall have removed theirs. There would be freedom on one side, and restrictions, prohibitions, and exclusions on the other. The bolts and the bars and the chains of all other nations will remain undisturbed.

In that speech there is a very remarkable quotation made from a speech delivered shortly before by Lord Goderich in the British Parliament. Lord Goderich had alluded to the violation of the Treaty of Methuen, and went on to say :

It was idle for us to endeavour to persuade other nations to join with us in adopting the principles of what was called "free trade." Other nations knew, as well as the noble lord

opposite, and those who acted with him, what we meant by "free trade" was nothing more nor less than, by means of the great advantages we enjoyed, to get a monopoly of all their markets for our manufactures, and to prevent them, one and all, from ever becoming manufacturing nations. When the system of reciprocity and free trade had been proposed to a French ambassador, his remark was, that the plan was excellent in theory, but, to make it fair in practice, it would be necessary to defer the attempt to put it in to execution for half a century, until France should be on the same footing with Great Britain, in marine, in manufactures, in capital, and the many other peculiar advantages which it now enjoyed.

Sir, I could point to numbers of authorities from eminent men, to prove that for a young country protection is a much better policy than free trade. But, Sir, before I sit down, I wish to try and illustrate the argument I have been making in favour of protection as against free trade by one or two examples. I hold that protection is amply vindicated and justified by results when it brings about three things: if it keeps the home market for the industry of the country, if it reduces the price of the article or keeps the price down, and if it enables the manufacturer to go abroad on the open markets of the world and compete openly there with the manufacturers of other countries, then I say protection stands fully justified and vindicated. We had a discussion some time ago with regard to the duty on agricultural implements; and this evening the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McMillan), before taking his seat, endeavoured to show that the duty on agricultural implements was against the interests of the farmers of Canada. But we find, with regard to agricultural implements, that the tariff has brought about these three things of which I have spoken: it has reduced the price of the article, it has maintained the home market for the manufacturer, and it has permitted the manufacturer in Canada to go into open competition with the manufacturers of other countries in the open markets of the world. How is that proved? The latter part of the proposition is proved conclusively by the Trade and Navigation Returns, which show that in 1895 the manufacturers of agricultural implements in Canada exported \$663,718 worth to the open markets of the world. But the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), touching upon that, said, Wasn't it a crime to allow the manufacturer of agricultural implements in Canada to receive a drawback for the implements he sent to meet with competitors in Argentina and other countries? The hon. gentleman, if his facts had been correct might have been all correct; but what will he say in regard to the fact that we sent last year to the open market of Great Britain \$300,000 worth, while we sent to Argentina only \$40,000 worth, or less than one seventh the amount sent to Great Britain.

Mr. McINERNEY.

and to Australia \$136,000 worth? Now, the question was asked the other day, and it was asked again to-day by the hon. member for South Huron: if protection conserves the home market, reduces the price and allows the country manufacturer to go into competition abroad, particularly if it reduces the price, why do you keep up the duty? It seems to me very easy to answer that question. Just reverse it and ask: if the reduction of price is obtained by protection, what benefit would be obtained by taking the duty off? I cannot see that you would receive any.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). We ought to have kept it on sugar, then.

Mr. McINERNEY. The same thing does not follow at all. This is not a sugar-growing country; but in this country we can manufacture agricultural implements just as well as they can in any other country. There are things on which it is not right to keep protection, and sugar is one of these. But if the requirements of the revenue demand a duty on sugar, I would say put a duty on sugar. Now, Sir, I must ask the House to pardon me for the very long time I have taken in making the remarks I have been allowed to make in the very incomplete way in which I have made them. I have endeavoured, in as concise a manner as possible, to place before the House the figures in which lie a fair comparison between the years 1873-78 and the years 1878-96; and I draw from these figures in every line the one conclusion, that from 1878 to 1896 the country has advanced in prosperity, whereas from 1873 to 1878 the very opposite was the case. Now, if we are to have a fair contest in the next appeal to the people, I think it will be on such a question as this that that contest will be carried on. But hon. gentlemen opposite will from time to time try to destroy the peace and harmony of this country on various other cries. Until they get into office, there will be no peace in this country. As a poet in the Atlanta "Constitution" has lately said:

There'll be peace in all this country
From the mountains to the sea,
And the rivers will go singing
Jest as merry as kin be;
And the mule will pull the plow-stock,
And the crows will all be killed,
And the mortgage will be lifted
When the offices are filled.

But not till then. But, Sir, for such a dishonourable peace, purchased at so dear a price as the filling of the public offices by our friends opposite, I think the intelligent people of this country, if rightly called upon, will not be willing to give their consent.

Mr. McDONALD (Huron). Instead of entering upon a regular speech to-night, I shall confine myself to referring briefly to some of

the arguments brought forward by the hon. gentleman who has just sat down (Mr. McInerney). He said, among other things, that the productions of the country were much in excess now of what they were in 1878. No doubt they are. We have acquired half a continent since then in the North-west, and have to-day no less than 192,000 people now in Manitoba, the bulk of whom have gone into that province since that year. These people produced last year no less than 30,000,000 bushels of wheat and 30,000,000 bushels of barley, peas and other cereals, all of which is an increase on what we raised in 1878. But I cannot, for the life of me, see what connection there is between that increased production and the National Policy. I do not see what the National Policy has had to do with this production of wheat and other cereals in Manitoba. Out in that province the people believe it is due to their skill and labour and to the blessing of divine Providence in giving them favourable weather; but evidently, according to the gospel of hon. gentlemen opposite, anything good which takes place in the country must be attributed to the influence of the National Policy, though ordinary mortals fail to see the connection between the two. I certainly fail to see what the National Policy has to do with our production of cereals, either in the North-west or elsewhere.

Again we are told that in the United States the disturbance caused by the passage of the Wilson Bill was the source of every evil which has since afflicted that country. I am really sorry that the hon. gentleman who preceded me and who advanced this theory, did not investigate the question a little deeper. Why, Mr. Speaker, he even went so far as to attribute the march of Coxey's Army from west to east to the disturbance caused by a slight reduction of the American tariff. If 30 per cent duty has added to the prosperity of this country to the extent hon. gentlemen opposite say it has, how comes it that a 42 per cent protective duty on the other side has been the cause of Coxey's Army marching from west to east? The whole thing appears so absurd that I am occasionally lost in wonder that men sufficiently intelligent to be representatives of the people should take up the time of this House stating such absurdities which no intelligent man can believe.

We are also told that the cheese industry of Canada has been benefited largely by the National Policy. Now, this industry began long before the National Policy was in existence; and if any hon. gentleman can explain to my satisfaction in what way, directly or indirectly, the National Policy has stimulated the cheese industry, he will certainly be gifted with no ordinary persuasive powers. As was stated by an hon. gentleman who preceded me, this cheese industry was stimulated by the Hon. Oliver Mowat, who established a Central Farm to teach the people how to manufacture cheese and

sent out a large number of experts to give instructions in that branch of industry, long before the Experimental Farm at Ottawa was ever thought of. And I remember well how I used to contend against Tory abuse on the public platform when they attacked Sir Oliver Mowat for this policy. The fact is that our farmers have found it more profitable of late years to go into the dairy business than in times past, and they have found that by raising cows and manufacturing the milk into cheese and marketing the same in the old country, they could make more money than by raising cereals. It was their own common sense which told them that it would be better that they should change their mode of farming, and instead of raising grain, go into the dairy business; and the National Policy has had nothing to do with it at all. If the National Policy stimulated the cheese industry, why has it not stimulated the butter industry? In 1878 we exported from Canada 14,000,000 pounds of butter. Butter has now a higher protective duty, and yet last year we exported less than 7,000,000 pounds. It must indeed be a very one-sided policy which will stimulate the cheese industry and utterly fail to stimulate the butter interest. Now, in the United States, instead of their having a 3-cent protective duty on cheese, they have a 4-cent duty; and yet in 1878 they exported 16,000,000 pounds of cheese, while in 1894 they exported less than 8,000,000 pounds. Is not the working of this protective policy something fearfully and wonderfully strange? You cross an imaginary line over to a country which stimulates the cheese industry to such an enormous extent and the exportation falls off. And on this side, where the protection is less, the reverse is the case. How can this be explained by these gentlemen who make it a point to urge that the National Policy is good for everything? Their whole argument appears to me so absurd, that I sometimes have hardly the patience to discuss it.

We are again told that the deposits in the savings banks are an indication of the prosperity of the people. Now, Mr. Speaker, you know, as a business man, that that is not the case at all. You know that when we are prosperous, we undertake business enterprises throughout the length and breadth of the country and keep our money in circulation ourselves instead of depositing it in the savings banks. And that is the very argument which was used by hon. gentlemen opposite a few years ago when they sneered and laughed at the very idea that large deposits in the savings banks were an indication of prosperity.

Now, my hon. friend drew a comparison between the expenditure of the Mackenzie Government and the expenditure under this precious Government, which has been in power for the last seventeen years. The hon. gentleman misquoted many of the figures and I propose to set him right. One

of the planks of our policy is economy. We believe that the Conservative party has been thoroughly extravagant and so we inserted this plank in our platform :

We can but view with alarm the large increase of public debt and of the controllable annual expenditure of the Dominion and the consequent undue taxation of the people under the governments that have been continuously in power since 1878, and we demand the strictest economy in the administration of the government of the country.

Now, if the statement made by the hon. member who spoke last is true, that plank in the Liberal party's platform is not true. But I am going to show that it is true and that the figures he has used and the comparisons he has made were not fair ones. Let us make a few comparisons before I come to the figures to which the hon. gentleman made reference. Let us take the interest on the debt in 1878 and 1895. But before I go into that I will move the adjournment of the debate, if the hon. leader of the House will permit.

Mr. FOSTER. I think my hon. friend must go on with his speech for a reasonable length of time.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It was distinctly agreed with the leader of the Opposition that—

Mr. FOSTER. I beg my hon. friend's pardon ; it was not distinctly agreed that we should adjourn—

An hon. MEMBER. Mr. Laurier said so.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That is the understanding.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It was only on that understanding that the hon. gentleman went on.

Mr. FOSTER. We should go on until one o'clock, at least.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No, I—

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I have moved the adjournment of the debate, and it is in the hands of the leader of the House. I do not think the leader of the House will make anything by insisting upon a longer sitting.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friends must be a little fair. What we proposed was to have three days each week for the Budget debate until it was disposed of. Hon. gentlemen took the whole of this afternoon, that is from the time we met until six o'clock, when the House rose. It is of the greatest moment that we should get on with the business and it is certainly not unreasonable that we should sit here until one o'clock. We must make up our minds to sit later.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I must point out to the hon. gentleman that the
Mr. MACDONALD (Huron).

business of the House from three to six was not delayed by us, but by a scandalous misstatement of the Secretary of State. The hon. gentleman had the option to withdraw it or to grant a committee, and so had the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster). But they did neither. They are responsible for the delay from three to six. I do not wish to have any unnecessary wrangle with the hon. gentleman for it is good neither for him nor for us. We were distinctly informed that it was understood—and that is the reason why we went on—that the House was to adjourn, and that that was the agreement that had been come to between the hon. gentleman and the leader of the Opposition.

Mr. FOSTER. There was no distinct agreement. The leader of the Opposition wished to adjourn at half past twelve, and I said that the hon. gentleman who was speaking ought to go on and make his speech. But the leader of the Opposition demurred to that. I was not at all determined that the hon. gentleman should make his whole speech, but I wanted to go until two o'clock. Still, I was willing that we should adjourn at one o'clock, and I think that is not unreasonable.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There is nothing in the world to be gained by remaining until one o'clock. My hon. friend from Huron (Mr. Macdonald) cannot possibly finish his speech by that time. I have had the pleasure of looking through his notes, and I know very well he cannot get through. To go on will simply mean a lot of repetition when he resumes his speech. We have to meet in committee tomorrow, as the hon. gentleman knows, at half past ten or eleven o'clock. Now, I have been here from three o'clock until now—half past twelve—that, I think, is an honest day's work.

Mr. FOSTER. So have I.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Quite so. And I think, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. gentleman's health is too valuable to be trifled with. I should loath to see the hon. gentleman used up ; it would add to the length of the session. There can be no possible use in sitting later. Look at the House now. I doubt if there are twenty men in it. There may be, but that is as many as there are. It is really unreasonable to ask my hon. friend from Huron, who is not disposed to waste time, to go on now when he must repeat on resuming what he will say to-night.

Mr. FOSTER. I would be sorry to have the hon. gentleman repeat himself.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. He will have to do it, because of the nature of his argument.

Mr. FOSTER. It is certainly not unreasonable that, on Government days, we

should ask the House to sit later than twelve o'clock. We have been in the habit often of sitting here very much later than that.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). But never made any progress by it. The leader of this side, before he left here, informed us distinctly that he had an understanding with the hon. leader of the House that the debate should go on, and that the House should adjourn at half past twelve.

Mr. FOSTER. I am sorry for that. I would not like to have even the appearance of a misunderstanding between the hon. gentleman and myself, but he is mistaken if he understood me to say that the House should adjourn at half past twelve. It certainly was a mistake, and I am sorry that he so interpreted what I said, and informed his side of the House.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. He most decidedly made that statement to us; and I think that, under the circumstances, the hon. gentleman would do well to adjourn. It will not in the slightest degree add to the length of the debate now, and it will give him the opportunity to get home at reasonable time. There is no use in keeping us for the purpose of hearing what, as I have said, must be repeated when the debate is resumed.

Mr. FOSTER. I feel that there is some force in this, that the leader of the Opposition went away believing that the House was to adjourn at half past twelve o'clock. But hon. gentlemen inform me that he had that understanding.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). He informed me before he left that that was the agreement between himself and the hon. gentleman.

Mr. FOSTER. That was a misunderstanding. He pressed for that and I pressed for the other, and we did not reach a conclusion. But I would be sorry to have the House or hon. gentlemen on that side think for a moment that I would go back on an agreement made with the hon. gentleman. I would not do that; it would not be honest or fair. Rather than give an impression of that kind I am willing to let the House adjourn half an hour earlier than I would have pressed for, but on that account and on that account alone. But I must tell my hon. friends that we must make up our minds to sit later and get through with the business, or else make up our minds to draw the Budget debate toward a conclusion. I had some conversation with the leader of the Opposition on that matter and came to a partial conclusion as to when this debate should be closed. And I would ask hon. gentlemen to take that into account in order that we may get through this Budget debate as soon as possible—certainly I should think not later than Tuesday of next week.

We shall have Thursday and Friday and the following Tuesday, and I think we should try to draw it to a conclusion on Tuesday night. That is the line of my conversation with the leader of the Opposition, and, that being the view held the more it inclines me to give way on this occasion and to allow the debate to adjourn.

Mr. MULOCK. I think it would be very inadvisable that the hon. gentleman should agree to a motion for the adjournment of any understanding that,—

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not understand the hon. gentleman says there is any understanding.

Mr. MULOCK. No; but he suggests that he agrees to this motion now in view of the hint that this debate must be brought to a close on such and such a day.

Mr. SPEAKER. The motion is on the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. MULOCK. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am aware of that. But the hon. leader accompanied that with the remark that he agreed to the motion in view of the conversation he had had with the leader of the Opposition, and threw out a hint as to the early termination of the debate—next Tuesday if possible. Now, I for one object to the motion to adjourn if the Opposition is to be bound by any hint of the kind. I say we should be perfectly free to discuss when this shall terminate, without regard to shortening the debate to-night.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

Mr. FOSTER moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 12.35 a.m. (Wednesday.)

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 12th February, 1896.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

BY-ELECTIONS SINCE 1st JANUARY, 1895.

Mr. DAWSON asked :

What are the names of electoral districts in which by-elections of members of this House have been held since 1st January, 1893? Date of polling in each election? Names of candidates nominated and number of votes cast for each?

Mr. FOSTER. In reply to the hon. gentleman I beg to say as follows:—

STATEMENT of by-elections held since 1st January, 1893.

No.	Date of Election.	Name of Electoral District.	Province.	Names of Candidates.	Number of Votes Polled.	Remarks.
1	Jan. 5, '93	L'Islet	Quebec	J. Israël Tarte	1010	
				J. A. Dionne	974	
2	Jan. 10, '93	Terrebonne	Quebec	Pierre Leclair		By acclamation.
3	Mar. 22, '93	Middlesex, S. R.	Ontario	Robert Boston	1894	
				Alex. Gray	1257	
4	April 12, '93	Vaudreuil	Quebec	Henry S. Harwood	1054	
				J. A. Chevrier	863	
5	May 2, '93	Vancouver	British Columbia	Andrew Has ar.....		By acclamation.
6	Nov. 22, '93	Winnipeg	Manitoba	Joseph Martin	2196	
				C. H. Campbell	1771	
7	Dec. 7, '93	City of Ottawa	Ontario	Sir James A. Grant		By acclamation.
8	May 5, '94	Gloucester	New Brunswick.	Theotime Blanchard	1768	
				L. R. Doucet	1488	
9	July 4, '94	Hastings, W. R.	Ontario	Henry Corby		By acclamation.
10	April 17, '95	City of Quebec, West- ern Division.	Quebec	Thomas McGreevy	895	On recount.
				R. R. Dobell	888	
11	Jan. 15, '95	Cumberland	Nova Scotia	Hon. Arthur R. Dickey		By acclamation.
12	Apr. 17, '95	Verchères	Quebec	Christophe A. Geoffrion	1106	
				Frs. Joseph Bisailon	1005	
13	Apr. 17, '95	Haldimand	Ontario	Hon. W. H. Montague	2015	
				J. A. McCarthy	1421	
14	Apr. 17, '95	Antigonish	Nova Scotia	Colin F. McIsaac	1469	
				J. A. Chisholm	1351	
15	Aug. 24, '95	Westmoreland	New Brunswick.	Henry A. Powell	3754	
				Amasa E. Killam	2900	
16	Dec. 12, '95	Ontario, North Riding.	Ontario	John A. McGillivray	2181	
				R. C. Brandon	1411	
				F. J. Gillespie	1125	
17	Dec. 24, '95	Cardwell	Ontario	William Stubbs	1501	
				W. B. Willoughby	1275	
				R. B. Henry	544	
18	Dec. 30, '95	Jacques Cartier	Quebec	Napoléon Charbonneau	1821	
				J. A. Descarries	1265	
19	Dec. 27, '95	City of Montreal, Cen- tre Division.	Quebec	James McShane	3395	
				Sir Wm. H. Hingston	3059	
20	Jan. 6, '96	Victoria	British Columbia	Hon. Edward G. Prior	1567	
				Wm. Templeman	1460	
21	do 14, '96	Huron, West Riding..	Ontario	Malcolm C. Cameron	1909	
				D. Weismiller	1719	
22	do 27, '96	Charlevoix	Quebec	Chas. Angers	1602	
				Simon Cimon	1417	
23	Feb. 4, '96	Cape Breton	Nova Scotia	Sir Chas. Tupper		No complete return received yet, but Sir Chas. Tupper elected by large majority.
				— Murray		
24	do 6, '96	Northumberland	New Brunswick.	— Robinson		No complete return received yet, but Mr. Robinson's election assured.
				Peter Mitchell		

FISHERY OVERSEER, COUNTY OF KENT.

Mr. CAMPBELL asked :

Who is the fishery overseer for the River Thames district, in the county of Kent, Ontario? How many licenses have been issued during the past year, and to whom were they issued? How much was received for each license? What is the salary of the said overseer?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Theodore Pelletier, of Dore, south, and John Crotty, of Bothwell,

Mr. FOSTER.

are the two officers appointed at a salary of \$150 each per annum. There were twenty-three licenses issued by one officer, one of which was cancelled, and for which was received \$230, or \$10 each. The following are the names of the persons to whom licenses were issued by this officer:—

Thomas Merritt	\$10
Julius Crow	10
John Glasscow	10
Frs. Cartier	10
Wm. H. Williams	10

Thos. Sullivan.....	\$ 10
Geo. McKinley	10
Alf. F. Stevens.....	*10
Claude Reaume	10
Bernard Daly	10
Anthony Edwards	10
Anthony Reaume	10
Mrs. Jos. Jubenville.....	10
Samuel Bagnell	10
Wm. Dequindel	10
John Bagnell	10
Wm. Dughett	10
Alex. Peltier	10
Frs. St. Amour.....	10
James Bradley	10
James Hamilton	10
Noah Peltier	10
Chas. Bassett	10
Total.....	\$230

*Cancelled.

The other officer issued the following licenses :—

Robt. Gregory	\$ 1 50
Chas. Allen	10 00
Alex. Everingham	10 00
Robt. McRoberts	10 00
Philip McDonald	10 00
Adorn Everingham	40 00
John Vogler	10 00
Alex. Sussex	3 00
James McRitchie	3 00
Kennedy Snake	1 00
John Marcus	2 00
Nelson Stonefish	3 00
Moses Stonefish	1 00
John Sussex	1 50
Alex. Everingham	3 00
John Murray	1 50

In all, there were thirty-nine licenses issued, the total fees amounting to \$340.50.

ROYAL CANADIAN INFANTRY.

Mr. O'BRIEN asked :

When and by whom was Sir Charles Tupper, as High Commissioner for Canada, directed to place a Regiment of Royal Canadian Infantry at the service of the Imperial Government, to be maintained by Canada, as stated in an article in the February number of the "Canadian Magazine" intitled : "The Navy Question and the Colonies, by Sir Charles Tupper, Bart." ?

Mr. DICKEY. Sir Charles Tupper as High Commissioner for Canada was instructed to place a portion of the Regiment of Royal Canadian Infantry at the service of the Imperial Government for garrison duty. As the instructions were conveyed by an informal telegram of the then Minister of Militia, the exact date cannot be accurately fixed at present.

CREAMERY BUTTER—THE ENGLISH MARKET.

Mr. McMILLAN asked :

How many pounds of creamery butter purchased by the Government in the winter of 1895 for shipment to the English market were actually shipped to that market ?

What was the net price per pound at Montreal realized for the whole shipment, after deducting expenses from the time of leaving Montreal ?

What was the highest price per cwt. realized in England, and how much brought that price ? What was the lowest price per cwt. realized in England, and what quantity was sold at that price ? What quantity was sold in Montreal as not suitable for the English market ? How much did it realize, and what was the average price per pound of sales in Montreal ? Has the collection of the proceeds of all such sales been finally made ? If any, how much remains unpaid ?

Mr. MONTAGUE. 57,748 lbs. of creamery butter were shipped to Great Britain under the Government advance of 20 cents per lb. The average net price realized in Montreal for the whole shipment, after deducting all expenses from Montreal outwards, was 14.38 cents per lb. The highest price realized in Great Britain was 90 shillings per cwt., for 12 packages from the Government dairy station at Lennoxville, Que. The lowest price realized in Great Britain was 63 shillings per cwt., for 6 packages. 14,683 lbs. of butter was the quantity sold in Montreal as being in unsuitable packages for export to Great Britain. It was sold in Montreal at an average price of 21.34 cents per lb. After deducting the freight charges and selling commission in Montreal, it realized an average net price of 19.87 cents per lb. The proceeds of all sales have been paid and deposited to the credit of the Receiver General.

SHIPMENT OF AMERICAN CATTLE FROM CANADIAN PORTS.

Mr. CASEY asked :

1. Is the Honourable Minister of Agriculture aware that a copy of an Order in Council concerning the shipping of United States cattle from a Canadian port was published in some of the morning newspapers of Friday, 24th January ?

2. Has the Honourable Minister since heard that the said Order in Council was given to the press by the Premier, and when did he hear it ?

3. Has he since heard that said Order in Council was communicated to and approved and signed by His Excellency before it was given to the press, and when did he hear it ?

4. Are the statements referred to in the last two questions correct ?

5. If so, how did it happen that he knew nothing whatever about such dealing with an Order in Council specially concerning his own department ?

6. Does he still think the course he took then was the correct one under the circumstances, in not producing the Order in the House when asked for ?

7. Does he still feel that the resentment of the honourable gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) because the Order was given to the press, is joined in most heartily by himself ?

8. Is he still astounded, and pained, and humiliated, that the said Order in Council was not given to this House before it was given to the press ?

Mr. MONTAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I answered that question in my statement made to the House yesterday.

COST OF COLD STORAGE.

Mr. BAIN asked :

What was the expenditure by the Government for cold storage on ocean steamers for the shipment of butter to the English market during the season of 1895 ; giving each month's expenditure separately, and if by different steamship lines, their names and the amounts paid to each ? The quantity of butter in pounds shipped each month, and by each steamship line separately ? The amount paid to the Grand Trunk and the Canadian Pacific Railways, respectively, for cold storage car service in each month, and the quantity of butter, in pounds, carried by each to Montreal or other port of shipment ?

Has the cold storage been used in either ocean or railway mail service to any appreciable extent for transport of cheese, or for any other purpose ? If so, for what, to what extent, and with what results ?

Mr. MONTAGUE. Ten ocean steamships were fitted up with cold storage compartments, six on the steamers on the New Dominion SS. Line from Montreal to Avonmouth, and four on the Allan Lines. The expenditure for fitting up the ten steamships was \$6,732.03. The amounts paid to the New Dominion SS. Company for cold storage service, and the quantities of butter and cheese carried were :

	Amount Paid.	Butter. Lbs.	Cheese. Lbs.
July	\$ 436 84	362,742	
August	1,249 85	535,933	124,700
September	730 16	835,733	
October	691 02	824,238	26,284
November	436 68	439,570	122,270
	<u>\$3,544 55</u>	<u>2,998,216</u>	<u>273,254</u>

The Allan SS. Company have not yet rendered their account, and nothing has been paid to them. The amounts paid to the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway for cold storage car service each month were :

	Grand Trunk.	Canadian Pacific.
June	\$	\$ 17 62
July	323 21	387 92
August	513 99	480 91
September	222 07	396 43
October	380 71	47 07
	<u>\$1,439 98</u>	<u>\$1,329 95</u>

The quantity of butter carried by the railways does not appear on their accounts. It can be ascertained if required. Cold storage service on ocean steamships was used for four shipments of cheese to Great Britain. The shippers and receivers expressed the opinion that the cheese arrived in better condition than by ordinary storage on board steamships.

HOSPITAL DUES.

Mr. McSHANE asked :

1. Has the Government from time to time received memorials from the Montreal shipping in-

Mr. MONTAGUE.

terests and board of trade, praying for the abolition of the tonnage tax known as hospital dues ?

2. Is the Government aware that the imposition of this tax in the ports of Quebec and the maritime provinces has led to a retaliatory tax being levied on Canadian tonnage trading with ports in the United States ; that under the laws of the United States now in force, their retaliatory tax will cease to be levied so soon as Canada ceases to levy her tax ; but that a Bill is at present before Congress repealing this standing offer of reciprocal freedom from taxation, thereby making their tax a permanent one ?

3. Under the circumstances, and in view of the fact that this tax is peculiar to Canada, and that sick seamen are cared for in all other countries without the imposition of a tax, will the Government consider the advisability, by legislation or otherwise, of freeing the St. Lawrence route from the taxation at present levied on its shipping in the form of hospital dues ?

Mr. COSTIGAN. 1. Yes ; such memorials have been received from time to time. 2. The Government has no evidence to show that the imposition of sick mariners' dues has led to a retaliatory tax being levied on Canadian tonnage trading with ports in the United States. The Government is, however, aware that the President of the United States has power, by proclamation, to suspend the collection of so much of the duty imposed on foreign vessels as shall exceed the amount collected on American vessels by a foreign country. The Government is not aware that there is a Bill before Congress making the tonnage tax a permanent one. 3. The tax is not peculiar to Canada, as marine hospitals are maintained in the United States out of tonnage dues. There is no tax imposed for care of sick seamen in Great Britain, and such seamen are not cared for by Government. The Government does not consider it advisable to free the shipping of the St. Lawrence from payment of sick mariners' dues, as the tax is only sufficient for the care of sick seamen, and should it be abolished such seamen would be a charge on the ships to which they belong, or become objects of public charity.

COMMISSIONER ON THE SWEATING SYSTEM.

Mr. CASEY asked :

1. Has the Government appointed a commissioner or commissioners to investigate the sweating system ? If so, at whose request, and whom, and on what date ?

2. What instructions were given to the commissioner or commissioners as to places where they were to conduct inquiries ; and parties from whom they were to get information ?

3. What time was given for the investigation ?

4. What progress has been made with the investigation, and what places visited ; and have the employed as well as the employers, been asked to give information ?

5. Was A. W. Wright a commissioner for the above purpose ? Is he so still ? If not, when did he resign ?

6. Did he leave Ottawa lately with the alleged purpose of visiting Halifax to collect information? Was he directed by the Government to go there?

7. Did he take part in the late election in Cape Breton county, Nova Scotia?

8. Is he the A. W. Wright who spoke on behalf of Sir Charles Tupper at Boularderie and other places during said election?

9. When will the commissioner or commissioners report?

Mr. FOSTER. Acting upon a suggestion contained in a resolution of the Dominion Trades and Labour Congress, at its meeting in London, Ont., in September, 1895, Alexander W. Wright, of Niagara, Ont., was appointed such commissioner on October 29th, 1895. He was instructed "to inquire whether, and if so, to what extent, the sweating system is practised in the various industrial centres of the Dominion; and also, so far as may be necessary, to procure information respecting the kindred question of wages, and any other matters affecting the employment and conditions of life and labour among the industrial classes." Ninety days was allowed for the investigation. The commissioner's report has not yet been received. Mr. Wright is not now commissioner. The time allowed him expired on the 29th January. No special instructions were given him by the Government as to the points at which he was to make his inquiry. It was to be a general inquiry. He is the A. W. Wright who spoke on behalf of Sir Charles Tupper at Boularderie, if any A. W. Wright spoke there during the election; but at that time his period of commissionership had expired, and he was not under pay. The report is expected in a week or so.

Mr. CASEY. Was it after January 29th that he spoke there?

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose so.

Mr. CASEY. I doubt it.

COUNTY OF RICHELIEU VOTERS' LIST.

Mr. CARROLL (for Mr. Bruneau) asked:

What has been the total cost of the last revision of the voters' list for the county of Richelieu?

Mr. FOSTER. For the last revision of the voters' list for the county of Richelieu there was paid to the reviser, Mr. Justice Gill, according to the Auditor General's Report of 1895, page J-26, \$736.02; add the total cost of printing—see Queen's Printer's statement, \$210.33; making a total cost of \$946.35.

REVISION OF VOTERS' LISTS.

Mr. LEGRIS asked:

1. What has been the total cost of the electoral lists for the Dominion of Canada, made in 1894-95?

2. Does the said amount comprise the value of the printing done at the Government printing office?

3. What is the total sum paid to E. M. Chapedelaine, Esq., revising officer for the electoral district of Maskinongé, in connection with the preparation of the last lists for that county?

Mr. FOSTER. The total amount of allowances to revising officers (see Auditor General's Report for 1895, page J-28) was \$168,150.36; the cost of appeals from revisers' decision (page J-28) was \$175.03. Adding these together you get the total amount of \$168,325.39. The cost of printing given by the Queen's Printer was \$67,071.58; making a total cost of \$235,396.97. The total cost includes the value of printing in the bureau. The total sum paid to Mr. Chapedelaine, revising officer for the electoral district of Maskinongé in connection with the preparation of the last list for that county was \$672.75, as will be seen by the Auditor General's Report of 1895, page J-25.

LEANDRE HOUDE.

Mr. LEGRIS (translation) asked:

1. What position is held by Léandre Houde, of the parish of St. Maurice, in connection with certain works which the Government have had done, or are actually carrying on, on the upper St. Maurice? 2. What is his salary? 3. How much has he been paid by the Government since 1891?

Mr. OUMET. (Translation.) The position held by Mr. Léandre Houde is that of overseer for the Government works, between the Grandes Piles and LaTuque. He receives as salary \$2 per day's work. Since 1891, he has been paid the sum of \$1,458.48.

QUEBEC NORTH SHORE RAILWAY.

Mr. RIDER (for Mr. Devlin) asked:

Does the Act of 1894, authorizing the Governor General in Council to pay on demand the principal sum of the Quebec North Shore Railway subsidy of 1884, amounting in all to \$2,394,000, make the Dominion liable for that amount?

Mr. FOSTER. The Act of 1894 made the Government liable for the payment of interest upon a certain amount as a capitalized railway subsidy. The Act of 1894 provides that the Quebec Government may ask for the payment of the capitalized amount. That Act is simply permissive. When the Dominion Government, on the request of the Quebec Government, agrees to the payment of the capital amount instead of the payment of the subsidy, as the Act of 1884 provides, it will then become a liability as capital, and will have to be paid.

GOVERNMENT SHIPMENTS OF BUTTER.

Mr. McMILLAN asked:

At what date was the last sale in England of creamery butter shipped by the Government in 1895, and what was the quantity?

Mr. MONTAGUE. Four hundred and thirty-three boxes of creamery butter, containing 24,248 pounds were shipped from Montreal on December 23rd, 1895. They were sold in Manchester on January 18th, 1896. The proceeds have been deposited to the credit of the Receiver General.

FISH ISLAND, P. E. I., LIGHTHOUSE.

Mr. YEO asked :

Has a lighthouse keeper been appointed at Fish Island, P.E.I., in place of the late Angus McLellan? If so, who, and when was the appointment made? If not, who has charge of the lighthouse?

Mr. COSTIGAN. A lighthouse keeper has not been permanently appointed at Fish Island. D. R. McLellan, son of the late keeper, is at present in charge of the light.

MADUXNEKEAG, N.B., FISHWAY.

Mr. COLTER asked :

What was the cost of the fishway at the mouth of the Maduxnekeag, in the county of Carleton, New Brunswick? Have any repairs been made? If so, what has been the cost of such repairs?

Mr. COSTIGAN. The cost of the fishway was \$190.57. No repairs have been made, but the fishery officer was authorized to expend a sum not exceeding \$150, in the construction of a pier to protect the fishway from ice.

UNITED STATES ALIEN LABOUR LAW.

Mr. CASEY asked :

Did the Government, or any of the departments, carry on or authorize any negotiations with the authorities of the state of New York, or other parties, in regard to a reciprocal relaxation of the Alien Labour law, on one side, and the fishery laws, on the other, in the Thousand Islands or elsewhere on the St. Lawrence? If so when, and who was appointed to negotiate, and what was the result of negotiations?

Mr. COSTIGAN. During the past year, representations were made to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries through Mr. W. H. Thompson, secretary of the St. Lawrence Angling Association, of Alexandria Bay, United States, and the Hon. Senator Mullin, of Watertown, N.Y. The object was to make the Thousand Islands an international summer resort, to be limited on the United States side between Cape Vincent and Ogdensburg; and on the Canadian side between Kingston and Prescott, and the proposition with a view to promoting the above suggestion was the suspension of the enforcement of the United States Alien Labour Act, with regard to Canadians within the United States limits above described, for a compensating or equivalent concession within Canadian limits above described, as to United States citizens, of

Mr. McMILLAN.

freedom from the fee charged on angling permits. Assurances were given by the Hon. Senator Mullin on behalf of the United States, and arrangements were made for a meeting at Alexandria Bay between the appointees of the state of New York and the Canadian representative Dr. Wakeham, who is also one of the joint commission appointed by Her Majesty's Government and that of the United States, for the consideration of the much larger and more comprehensive question of international regulations in contiguous waters, and in waters commonly resorted to by the fishermen of both countries. A meeting took place at Alexandria Bay, 16th August, 1895, between Dr. Wakeham and the commissioners appointed by the Senate of the state of New York, together with Senator Mullin, and several members of the St. Lawrence Angling Association. Subsequently, 19th August, the members of the Senate committee came to Ottawa, where, in the absence of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, they were received by the Hon. Sir Adolphe Caron, Hon. J. F. Wood, Dr. Bergin, M.P., Dr. Wakeham, and the deputy Minister, being introduced by Mr. Geo. Taylor, M.P. The question of fishing rights as distinct from the inauguration of an international park, formed the subject of discussion, the question of a park not coming within the jurisdiction of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, and a set of mutual regulations submitted conditional upon such modification, restraint, or interpretation of the United States Alien Labour Act, being arranged and guaranteed authoritatively, as would admit British subjects, acting as guides or boatmen plying their calling and seeking engagements in the United States waters and along the shore and among the islands within the points specified above, as freely and as securely as the same may be done by United States boatmen in the corresponding Canadian waters. The respective representatives are at present corresponding regarding the date of an early meeting to discuss the question of whatever legislation is requisite to effect such arrangements.

FISH WARDEN—BIDEFORD, P.E.I.

Mr. YEO asked :

Has a fish warden been appointed at Bideford, Prince County, Prince Edward Island, in place of George Sharp, deceased? If so, who, and when was the appointment made?

Mr. COSTIGAN. No, but a special fishery guardian has been employed as occasion required.

FISHING WITH POUND-NETS IN BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Mr. MARTIN asked :

Whether any persons or corporations are allowed to fish with pound-nets in any British Col-

umbia waters except under the Order in Council of the 20th March, 1894? If so, who are those persons or corporations, and under what authority are they so allowed to fish, and for what reason is such authority given?

Mr. COSTIGAN. No permission has been granted by the Department of Marine and Fisheries to fish pound-nets in the waters of British Columbia except under Order in Council of 20th March, 1894.

BRIDGE AT NEPEAN POINT.

Mr. RIDER (for Mr. Devlin) asked :

Is it the intention of the Government to extend some suitable measure of aid during the present session towards the building of a combined highway and railway bridge at or near Nepean Point, in the city of Ottawa, and joining the two provinces of Ontario and Quebec?

Mr. FOSTER. The matter has been brought to the attention of the Government and is now under consideration.

POSTMASTER AT GRANDE-GREVE, COUNTY OF GASPE.

Mr. GUAY (translation) (for Mr. Choquette) asked :

Whether the postmaster at Grande-Grève, in the county of Gaspé, has resigned? If so, why, and who is his successor?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. (Translation.) In reply to the question put by the hon. member, I may say that the postmaster, at Grande-Grève, has not resigned.

POSTAL DELIVERY SYSTEM.

Mr. BOWERS asked :

How many towns and cities in the Dominion have the postal delivery system? The names of such towns and cities?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Twelve, namely: Halifax, Hamilton, Kingston, London, Montreal, Ottawa, Quebec, St. John, Toronto, Vancouver, Victoria and Winnipeg.

REMEDIAL BILL—MANITOBA.

Mr. CASEY asked :

Was a draft, or synopsis, or other indication of the contents of the Remedial Bill shown to any one not a member of the Cabinet before the introduction of that Bill in the House? If so, to whom?

Mr. DICKEY. No draft, synopsis or other indication of the contents of the Remedial Bill were shown to any one not a member of the Cabinet, except confidential officers of the Justice Department, after the Bill was submitted to Council for consideration and before the introduction of that Bill into the House. In drafting the Bill for submission to Council a number of persons were consulted as to details.

NEW MEMBER.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to inform the House that the Clerk of the House has received from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, a certificate of the election and return of James Robinson, Esq., for the electoral district of Northumberland, N.B.

MEMBER INTRODUCED.

James Robinson, Esq., Member for the Electoral District of Northumberland, N.B., introduced by Mr. Costigan and Mr. Foster.

CAPE BRETON ELECTION.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I regret, Mr. Speaker, to be obliged to move the adjournment of the House to-day, but I do so in order to be able to make a statement which I deem of very great importance arising out of certain allegations made yesterday. The House will remember that yesterday certain addresses were made with regard to the election in Cape Breton, challenging the accuracy of certain statements which had been made by the Secretary of State in reply to the statements I made yesterday.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member is out of order in moving the adjournment of the House for the purpose of referring to a past debate—

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I do not make this motion for the purpose of referring to a past debate. My intention is to call attention to an inaccurate statement made in the debate yesterday, and I think I am—

Mr. SPEAKER. That would clearly be referring to a past debate. It is to refer to statements made in the debate of yesterday that the hon. member proposes to move the adjournment of the House to-day. That would certainly, from my point of view, be a direct reference to a previous debate, which, under the rules of this House, cannot be made.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Then I shall not refer to the debate of yesterday. I shall refer to a statement made by Sir Charles Tupper, Secretary of State, on his arrival in Ottawa, when he was presented with an address by the Conservative Association in Ottawa, to the effect that his election had been won notwithstanding money subscribed by the Liberal party and sent into the county. At the same time he stated that the Attorney General of Nova Scotia had gone to Cape Breton, and after taking charge of the contest there on behalf of the Liberal party, finding himself unable to win the county for his party by argument, had gone to the city of Halifax to obtain money to corruptly buy the county. Now these statements, if made by an ordinary person might be allowed to pass unchallenged, but we cannot forget that the Secretary of State,

has for many years, occupied a very distinguished position in London, and that from the very fact of his occupying that position so long, statements made by him affecting the honour and integrity of public men in Canada are likely to be accorded more weight in Great Britain than they would be if made by a person not so distinguished.

Mr. DICKEY. I would ask the hon. gentleman on what authority he bases that statement?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I base that statement on the authority of Sir Charles Tupper himself.

Mr. DICKEY. When was the statement made by Sir Charles Tupper?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It is not necessary for me to say when the hon. gentleman made the statement; but he made it in my presence.

Mr. DICKEY. I rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman is debating a ruling you have made, Mr. Speaker, and is discussing what took place in this House in a past debate.

Mr. SPEAKER. I was not aware whether the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) was referring to a statement made by Sir Charles Tupper on his arrival, or to a statement made upon his taking his seat here yesterday. If the hon. member is now referring to what took place in the debate yesterday, he is clearly out of order.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I have informed you, Mr. Speaker, that I would drop that matter and would call the attention of the House to a statement made by Sir Charles Tupper in Ottawa, before he took his seat in this House—

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). Which you heard?

Mr. DICKEY. Then I challenge the hon. gentleman to produce any proof of his assertion.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) You can do that afterwards. What I am going to do now is to put on record in this House a statement handed in to the press and signed by the Attorney General of Nova Scotia in which he declares the inaccuracy of the statement made by the Secretary of State. That statement reads as follows:—

Sir Charles Tupper, I am informed, on the night of the election in Cape Breton, said that the Liberal party had raised large sums of money, not less than \$25,000, to corrupt the electors of Cape Breton. I heard him repeat this statement at Antigonish the next day, and again at the banquet on Thursday night. This statement, I am in a position to say, is absolutely untrue. No such sum was raised or spent, indeed, any large sum whatever.

An hon. MEMBER. How much?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)—

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

The Liberals are not able to contribute such sums, and having been actively engaged in the election from beginning to end, I say most positively that this statement of Sir Charles Tupper is without foundation, and made without a shadow of proof.

He also publicly stated, so I am informed, that I went to Halifax during the campaign to get more money, and came back with a large sum. On this point I am able to speak with personal knowledge. The statement is an unmitigated falsehood, uttered without responsible authority, and I regret to be compelled to say, made wilfully and recklessly. I did not go to Halifax to get money for the campaign. I did not discuss the subject of money for Cape Breton with any person during my absence; I did not ask or receive one dollar for that purpose, nor did I take or spend one dollar except for my personal expenses.

Sir Charles Tupper claims to be a statesman, and has occupied many distinguished positions here and in England. It is certainly not creditable that he should fill his speeches with false and ridiculous assertions of this kind, which would scarcely be worthy of the lowest type of ward politician.

(Signed) J. W. LONGLEY.

Now, the hon. gentleman asks me how much money was spent. Yesterday we proposed that a committee of this House should be appointed to investigate how much money was spent on both sides. I told him, having a pretty good knowledge of what was spent by the Liberal party, that I could state it was not over \$2,000 including everything—personal expenses and all. And I asked the hon. gentlemen yesterday if they were prepared to give a committee of the House to examine into the expenditure of both parties on that occasion. If hon. gentlemen are ready to do that, we are ready to facilitate the inquiry by every means in our power. If they are not so prepared, I insist, Mr. Speaker, that the false and vile charges which have been made against the Liberal party and against such a distinguished man as the Attorney General of Nova Scotia shall be withdrawn in this House. And if hon. gentlemen will accept neither alternative, then I give them notice that, at an early day, I, myself, will move in the matter in the most formal way, demanding in the only way in which a member of Parliament can demand it, that such a committee shall be appointed and that the fullest inquiry shall be made into the expenditures of the candidates on both sides and by their friends in that contest. I tell the hon. gentlemen opposite that the Liberal party is not prepared to submit, and will not submit, to foul charges of this kind. We do not propose to carry elections by means of bribery and corruption.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Hon. gentlemen may smile. They have the best opportunity to prove the falsity of my statement if they accept my challenge. Let us know what Sir Charles Tupper and his friends spent, and what Mr. Murray and his friends spent,

and then the public will be able to judge which side have been guilty of corruption and wrong-doing in that election. Sir, the statement made with reference to the expenditure of that money, and the proof offered, that the Attorney General of Nova Scotia went to Halifax to get it, and come back with half a dozen young men in his train to spend it—the statement is false from beginning to end. That statement has been characterized by Mr. Longley in the strongest language he could possibly use, as without a shadow of foundation; and I ask you, in face of that denial, whether it is fair or right for a man occupying the distinguished position that the Secretary of State does in this country, and has occupied in London, to persist in statements which, Sir, are not only untrue in themselves, but are a libel upon the great Liberal party of Canada.

Mr. DICKEY. The hon. gentleman to-day has again pledged his personal honour as to the amount of money spent in the election in Cape Breton. I do not know what means of knowledge the hon. gentleman has; I only know that if, in a legal trial, a witness were rash enough to pledge his oath to a thing that he could not possibly know, he could be found guilty of perjury. The hon. gentleman has pledged his honour, whatever that may be worth, to a thing—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. I am inclined to think the hon. gentleman's expression was an imputation, which is not parliamentary.

Mr. DICKEY. If so, I withdraw it at once. The hon. gentleman has pledged his personal honour to the truth of a statement as to which he cannot possibly know whether it is correct or not. The hon. gentleman has ventured to assure this House positively, upon his honour, about a thing as to which he possibly could have no knowledge.

Mr. MULOCK. He is willing to submit it to a test.

Mr. DICKEY. Exactly, the hon. gentleman is willing to submit the question to a test. That is a fair proposition, but I say that any hon. gentleman who gets up here and makes a statement the truth of which he cannot know, and pledges to it his personal honour, is very little in order when he speaks of reckless statements made by other gentlemen. Well, Sir, the hon. gentleman seems to intimate, as the Attorney General of Nova Scotia seems to intimate, that the Liberal party never spends money in elections, or that the moneyed men of the Liberal party take so little interest in the principles of that party, that they will not subscribe money freely to elections. The hon. gentleman himself could not succeed in raising enough to pay even the travelling expenses of the gentlemen who went down

to take part in the contest in Cape Breton. Now, the hon. member asked for a committee of the House. A committee of the House, for what purpose? To investigate the truth of a statement, made outside the House, by a gentleman who was not then a member of the House. I ask whether any hon. gentleman can cite a precedent for that.

Mr. CASEY. Repeatedly, in the House.

Mr. DICKEY. The hon. gentleman must not refer to a past debate. The hon. member for Queen's submitted to a ruling of Mr. Speaker, and, therefore, did not refer to a past debate. We must take that for granted. The hon. gentleman wants a committee of the House. He knows perfectly well, no man in this House knows better, that this House voluntarily divested itself years ago of the function of inquiring into the illegal expenditure of money in elections.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Not at all.

Mr. DICKEY. The hon. member for Bothwell is perfectly correct. We have the power, and we deliberately laid down that function and handed it over to the courts, and the hon. gentleman wants us to take it up. For what purpose? The hon. gentleman knows that the Liberal party in Cape Breton can inquire into the expenditure made by Sir Charles Tupper by filing an election petition, because Sir Charles Tupper was elected. He knows that we cannot file a petition against Mr. Murray, because Mr. Murray was defeated. Therefore, we cannot institute an inquiry into a charge of personal bribery, we cannot make an inquiry legally. The hon. gentleman proposes to shirk the inquiry, which the courts offer him, into the expenditure of money by the Secretary of State, and asks for a committee of this House, a procedure which was abandoned long ago, as I have said, and a procedure which, in the instance of the Secretary of State, would be directly usurping the functions of the courts. So far as the Government is concerned, and so far as I am concerned, I would certainly not consent, upon this occasion, to resume that authority which we laid down years ago. The hon. gentleman cannot escape this option, that the courts are open to him to prove anything he likes with regard to the Secretary of State. He can have his inquiry, not before a committee of the House, but before a judge, and he can bring evidence there; whereas the Conservative party is not in that position. I do not know what was spent in the Cape Breton election. I would consider myself a most reckless man if, without any knowledge whatever, I pledged my word that \$25,000 were spent there, or any amount was spent there. I do not believe that that is the proper way to conduct business matters in this House. Statements that are made in this House upon personal honour,

had better be founded upon personal knowledge, and therefore I make no statement upon the matter whatever. Sir, so far as the expenditure of the Secretary of State is concerned, the courts are open to the hon. gentlemen opposite, or to anybody else who desires to make an inquiry; but so far as the Government is concerned, they would not be willing to violate the well established rule that the courts are the proper authority to inquire into such matters.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). We have a new rule of parliamentary law laid down by the Minister of Justice. He tells us that because we have a right to inquire through a judicial proceeding into corrupt practices at an election for the purpose of unseating a candidate, or for the purpose of disqualifying a candidate, this House has no right whatever to exercise the general powers with which it is invested to inquire into a charge of this kind.

Mr. DICKEY. I did not deny it.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman says practically that we have surrendered the right. Now, I deny that altogether. We have practically surrendered the right for a specific purpose, but we retain that power to be exercised for every other purpose, on every other occasion, when the exercise of that power is appropriate. Why, if the hon. gentleman's rule were correct, and an alien were returned to this House, and a petition were not filed against him to unseat him, this House could have no power to protect itself against a disqualified party from continuing to sit here as a member. Has the hon. gentleman forgotten all the inquiries that took place with reference to Mr. Parnell, and with reference to other parties? Is this House not qualified to protect itself against parties who are unworthy to hold seats in this House, by an inquiry in this House, unless such an inquiry is made within thirty days after the return of a particular candidate? Why, Sir, we have no such rule. My hon. friend has challenged hon. gentlemen opposite to appoint a committee to inquire into certain charges made against the Liberal party, laid against members in this House by the Secretary of State. These charges were made in the constituency. They were repeated in this city at the city hall, and they were made and repeated for the purpose of damaging hon. gentlemen on this side of the House. We say those charges are without any foundation. Those charges are not proved, and the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) has challenged the Government who wish to profit by those charges, has challenged the Secretary of State who made those charges to call for a committee or accept a committee appointed by this House for the purpose of investigating them. The Minister of Justice has said that if we wish to unseat Sir Charles Tupper for corrupt practices there is a proper mode

Mr. DICKEY.

of proceeding. No one is proposing to take action against the Secretary of State for that purpose. It is not in our power. That is a power which belongs to the electors of the constituency to exercise. But do hon. gentlemen opposite pretend to say that the whole of the rest of this Dominion is absolutely helpless to protect itself simply because some members of the constituency will not take the initiative. I deny altogether such a proposition. Parliament is not in that helpless condition, and is competent to protect itself, and the proper way of protecting itself against unfounded charges and maintaining the character and reputation of members here, is by an inquiry conducted by the House itself, and by no other party. The hon. gentleman has said that members of the Opposition have been liberal subscribers to a fund of \$25,000 for the purpose of corrupting and debauching the constituency. If that charge were true, the truth would be a disgrace to members on this side of the House. If an hon. gentleman were to bring against an hon. member on the other side of the House the charge that he was a felon or a burglar, does the hon. gentleman pretend to say that an inquiry could not take place because there was not any election petition filed. The moment a charge is made against the character and standing of a member as to whether he is fit to be a member of the House, that is a proper subject for inquiry, and the charge made by the Secretary of State, if true, would discredit the men against whom it was made, and they have a perfect right to ask this House to name a committee to vindicate themselves and clear themselves from the aspersions cast on them. There is no rule of law or rule of Parliament more clearly settled and established than the rule that if a discreditable charge is made against a member of the House, it is his right as a member to ask for a committee to vindicate himself. The Secretary of State has made such charges. The hon. gentleman has refused to withdraw those charges, to recede from his position, or to establish the charges. What was done in England when similar charges were made against an hon. member in the House, and the hon. member refused to ask for a committee? Why, a committee was appointed. The hon. gentleman was asked to appear before it, and when he refused, the committee found the charges were unfounded, and that the accused was not guilty of the accusations brought against him. Sir, I do not know any case where an hon. member has a better right to ask for a committee than in the case now before the House. The hon. member for Queen's stated that he knew no such sum of money was sent down to Cape Breton. If the hon. gentleman were the medium through which moneys were sent for election purposes, would he not know it?

Mr. FOSTER. Is he such a medium ?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Is the contribution to elections of thousands of dollars such an ordinary transaction, one of such an every-day occurrence that a man can speak with no confidence on the subject ?

Mr. DICKEY. How could the hon. member for Queen's know what took place in Halifax, Montreal, Toronto, and other centres ?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman did not pretend to say what took place at Halifax.

Mr. DICKEY. He did. That was the point.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Let the hon. gentleman grant a committee. The Secretary of State thought there was something in the charge or he would not have made it. The Secretary of State made the charge for a purpose, and that purpose was to asperse the men against whom the charge was directed. The hon. gentleman says, you must lie under the charge, and shall not have an opportunity of vindicating and clearing away the aspersions cast upon members on this side of the House. I deny that proposition, and I say that the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) is within his rights in asking that a committee be granted.

Mr. WELDON. The question which was brought before the House by the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) yesterday has assumed an importance to-day, largely through the speech of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) that it does not deserve. How the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I., could reconcile his action to himself, how he could think it compatible with the dignity of this House to make a charge against the Secretary of State on no other ground than that which he himself stated, is certainly not easy to understand. The most he could possibly say in that matter was that he did not know that the Liberals of Cape Breton expended large sums of money corruptly ; but he went further, and said that he knew that the Liberals did not spend large sums. No man could state and prove that.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I was referring to the statement that sums were sent down.

Mr. WELDON. From where ?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) From here—from the upper provinces.

Mr. WELDON. "Hansard" will decide between us, but in my recollection no such statement was made. The hon. gentleman did not confine himself to sums sent from Ottawa.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) From the upper provinces.

Mr. WELDON. Even if the hon. gentleman spoke of sums sent from Ottawa, he could not possibly know that other sums were not sent from here or elsewhere. The hon. member for Bothwell raised this question to an importance which it did not deserve. He laid down a constitutional rule which does not conform to the established practice of this House. The old law and the authorities may be as he has stated, but there is no hon. member of this House belonging to the legal profession who is not aware that an important part of constitution law is the usages and conventions of the constitution. In that memorable case from my own province regarding the election in Queen's, N.B., in 1887, which came up in this House for exhaustive consideration and discussion, the decision given confirmed the practice of earlier days, and has governed the practice since. It has established the practice, which we are certainly competent to make, that when time is open to file a petition, aggrieved parties cannot come to this House and ask it to inquire into charges of electoral corruption. And this is so because the courts of justice are open to the parties, seeing that Parliament, in 1874, threw on the courts a duty which it formerly did discharge by committees of this House. Then there was another reason why it was not necessary to invoke and revive a latent power in the House, because, two years ago, Parliament passed a law for the prevention of corrupt practices, placing it within the power of a small number of men, by putting up a small sum of money, to send a commissioner down into the county and have the charge tried. He can do whichever he likes. He can take the Act of 1894 or the Act of 1874, and he can search out whatever he wants to know. I would not have spoken, Mr. Speaker, were it not that I wish to declare against this false doctrine which the hon. member is trying to put upon the records of the House.

Mr. EDGAR. Mr. Speaker, I certainly was very much surprised indeed, that the Minister of Justice and the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon), who have just spoken, had not expressed, before they sat down, regret that the Secretary of State made such an assertion as he made in the city hall in Ottawa, the other day.

Mr. WELDON. If the hon. gentleman will allow me for one moment. I say, I do express regret, and I think it was an unfortunate statement.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. EDGAR. I am very glad to hear that. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am perfectly willing to sit down and let the Minister of Justice have an opportunity of getting up and expressing the same opinion as the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon). The Minister of Justice does not do it.

Mr. DICKEY. Yes; if the statement is incorrect it was a most unfortunate statement.

Mr. EDGAR. I am afraid I can hardly congratulate the hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Dickey) upon his candour. An apology of that kind is very much like the unfortunate innuendo which he made in reference to my friend from Queen's (Mr. Davies), and which he had to withdraw a few minutes ago, at the direction of you, Mr. Speaker. The Minister of Justice spoke of my hon. friend (Mr. Davies) making a statement here upon his honour which he did not know the truth of. That statement he had to withdraw. Now, I will read the statement which was made by the Secretary of State (Sir Charles Tupper) at the City Hall on Monday last, and as reported in the daily "Citizen," he said:

Men were sent from Nova Scotia, and money was unstintedly used to secure his defeat. He spoke of what he knew, when he said that \$25,000 were sent down to buy the seat from under him.

Did the Secretary of State not speak on his honour, or had he no honour to pledge to his statement? Is that the distinction to be drawn? He says he spoke of what he knew, and he must surely have been stating upon his honour as a man that he knew it. And, Sir, when he is confronted with that statement in the House, it appears from his own lips that he knows nothing at all about it. The Minister of Justice (Mr. Dickey), and the member for Albert (Mr. Weldon), contend that the creation of an election court, takes away from the jurisdiction of this House, the right to try an election petition. Very well, without going into an argument on that point I would like to ask the Minister of Justice, if, supposing an hon. member outside of the House made a slanderous statement and was confronted with it in this House, would he have no opportunity of asking the right to prove it, when it related to a great political party and to public transactions in an election? Would such an hon. gentleman not have an opportunity to ask the House for a committee to vindicate his statement, and his honour in making it? When attention was drawn to the statement made by the Secretary of State, he should have been the first man in the House to ask for a committee to prove his statement, or else, he should withdraw it. Not only did he not ask for a committee, but we on this side proposed a committee, asked him to take a committee, urged it upon him, entreated him to have a committee to prove the truth of the words which he must have pledged his honour to. And what does the honour of the Secretary of State (Sir Charles Tupper) come to, if he will not avail of that opportunity to vindicate it. The less said by the Minister of Justice about pledging the honour of hon. members in this House to statements, the better. So far as that is concerned, do not

Mr. EDGAR.

we all know that the member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) has special reasons for knowing about this election. He is the leader of the Liberal party in the maritime provinces, and no doubt he has general control over elections there. He has had communications with all the leading men of these provinces. Before he made his statement here to-day he had an opportunity of communicating with the Attorney General of Nova Scotia, who took an active part in the Cape Breton campaign, and he knows from the Attorney General of Nova Scotia that money was not spent there. He has had an opportunity of communicating with the member for Guysboro' (Mr. Fraser), who took an active part all through that contest, and he knows from him that money was not spent there. He has had an opportunity of communicating with the member for Ottawa County (Mr. Devlin), who took an active part in that campaign, and he has ascertained from him that no money was spent there. He has had an opportunity of communicating with the hon. member for Antigonish (Mr. McIsaac), and in fact with all the Liberal speakers who took an active part in that election, and the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davies) has ascertained from them, what he states to be a fact, that money was not expended in that election to the extent of \$2,000. Now, Sir, in the face of that, the Secretary of State has not seen fit to withdraw his words; but I am glad at any rate, that one member on the other side of the House has got up in his place, and told the House that he was ashamed of the statement made by the Secretary of State.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Edgar), being a lawyer, ought to know that this House has no power to grant a committee to investigate the expenditures of Mr. Murray. This House may have the right to grant a committee to inquire into the standing of the members of the House; but in my opinion, and I think in the opinion of other legal gentlemen in this House—

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Hear, hear. "Other legal gentlemen" is good.

Mr. TAYLOR. Hon. gentlemen may laugh, but before I sit down the laugh will be on the other side. I will make a proposition, a proposition that this House can deal with, and I ask hon. gentlemen opposite to accept it. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) has put words into the mouth of the Secretary of State, which the Secretary of State never uttered. The hon. member for Bothwell has charged the Secretary of State with having said that the Liberal members of this House contributed to that fund to the extent of \$25,000. The hon. the Secretary of State never referred to the subscription of a member of this House. The only one who did refer to the Liberal members in this House having sub-

scribed, is the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies), who said he knew about the fund, and he knew how much was made up here among them, and it did not exceed \$1,500 all told.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I did not say any such thing.

Mr. TAYLOR. That is your statement in "Hansard" of yesterday.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman is wrong. I never spoke of \$1,500 being subscribed here. I never said any such thing. I never intimated that it was \$1,500, or the half of \$1,500.

Mr. TAYLOR. Well, I make the statement, and the statement made by the hon. member for North Ontario (Mr. Edgar) proves, that the Secretary of State has never preferred a charge against an hon. gentleman on that side of the House of having contributed one cent towards the expenditure in the Cape Breton election. There is, therefore, nothing for the Secretary of State to withdraw. He has not charged anything against any member in this House, and why should he offer to accept a committee to investigate something which he never stated. But, the Secretary of State did say that \$25,000 was sent down by the Liberal party from all over the country, and that it was expended in Cape Breton. The hon. gentleman may ask for a committee of inquiry into the standing of an hon. member of this House; but I am authorized, on behalf of nine hon. gentlemen besides myself, to make a proposition to the hon. gentleman. Let us leave the matter to three judges. We on this side will select one, hon. gentlemen opposite will select one, and these two will select a third, and let them inquire as to which party contributed and expended the larger amount of money. We on this side of the House will pay the expense of the inquiry if it be proved that our side have expended the larger sum of money; and if, on the contrary, it is found that hon. gentlemen opposite have contributed and expended the larger sum, they shall pay the expense. So that the country will be put to no cost for the inquiry. Or, take the proposition submitted by the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) a few moments ago.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Has the hon. gentleman authority from any judge to say that he will accept such an appointment? And will the hon. gentleman undertake to get a statute passed in this House giving these judges power to take evidence under oath?

Mr. TAYLOR. I have this to say. We will have two judges as arbitrators, and they will select a third to act as referee, and make the inquiry.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Under oath?

Mr. TAYLOR. Then this House has no right to grant power to any committee to take evidence under oath. But this whole matter is a piece of bluff on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite, just to affect the country. Let them accept the proposition I make, which is something reasonable and something that is common-sense, instead of giving us a piece of bluff to go to the country, charging the Secretary of State with having made statements which he never made. He never said that an hon. member of this House had contributed a cent to that election; but the hon. member for Queen's did say that hon. gentlemen opposite had contributed to the extent of about \$1,500.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman is inaccurate again. I did not make that statement.

Mr. DAVIN. I rise to order. All this is discussing a previous debate.

Mr. SPEAKER. It seemed to me at the outset that the whole discussion had reference, although no direct reference was made, to the debate of yesterday; but I was bound to accept the statement of the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) that he was referring to a statement made in the city hall in Ottawa.

Mr. MULOCK. Yesterday I made a few remarks touching this matter.

Mr. DAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to order. This is a direct reference to a previous debate.

Mr. MULOCK. I have not referred to a previous debate. I said that yesterday I spoke on the subject. Now, I am going to speak to the proposition of the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor), that this matter should be referred to a tribunal of three persons. For one, I will assent to that proposition if those three persons are to be properly empowered to make the inquiry. It is essential that they shall be clothed with the power of examining witnesses under oath, sending for persons and papers, and thoroughly ascertaining whether the Secretary of State was correct in the charge he made or not. Any tribunal that can exhaustively deal with the subject ought to be accepted.

Mr. TAYLOR. At the expense of the Conservative and Reform parties of the country.

Mr. MULOCK. Yes; and I for one—I do not know whether this will commend itself to my hon. friends on this side of the House—am content to let the hon. gentleman name the three judges, provided they are members of this House. Then we can create them a committee, and clothe them with power, under the Act of 1894, to take evidence under oath.

Mr. TAYLOR. We have no judges in this House.

Mr. MULOCK. We have 214 members of this House, and I am willing that the three judges to test this question should be chosen by the hon. gentleman, and chose from his own side. It is the evidence we want.

Mr. TAYLOR. My hon. friend makes a proposition to have three political judges taken from this House, and leave me to select them. I make the proposition that we shall take three judges from the bench and make them referees. If I selected three members of this House, taking two from this side and one from that side, the chances are that there would be a majority report and a minority report; and then our friends on the other side would say that it was a whitewash. Let us have three judges.

Mr. MULOCK. My hon. friend from West Ontario (Mr. Edgar), a few minutes ago, read from a Conservative journal the words said to have been uttered by Sir Charles Tupper. Now, I desire to bring the debate back to where it ought to be. The question is whether Sir Charles Tupper, a coming Premier of Canada, has, on his re-entry into public life, made a statement of a reckless character, which is untrue in fact, or which he ought to have had some evidence about before he made it. I have in my hand the file of the Toronto "Daily Mail and Empire," which purports to give a verbatim account of Sir Charles Tupper's speech at Ottawa on February 10th, on the occasion in question. He he is reported to have stated:

I speak of that which I know when I say that \$25,000 were sent down by the Liberal party into the county to buy the seat from under my feet. (Cheers.) The Liberals are, unfortunately, in this position, that they staked their all on the desperate throw of a ruined gamester, and they have lost. They have not only lost the seat, but they have lost their money and their character, too.

That is the statement to which we take exception. I entirely concur in the remarks made by the hon. Minister of Justice, that no one should make a positive statement on matters that he cannot have absolute knowledge about, and that observation is expressly applicable to the unqualified assertion of the Secretary of State. I am not at all afraid of the honour of the Liberal party. I do not think the country will attach much importance to the utterances of the Secretary of State casting any discredit on the Liberal party under these circumstances. But, Sir, I am concerned for the honour of our public men; I am concerned for the honour of a Minister of the Crown; I am concerned for the honour of a man who aspires to be Premier of Canada; and I say here that that gentleman cannot expect ever to fill a position of honour until he comes

Mr. MULOCK.

like a man before the country, and either withdraws that statement or attempts, before a proper tribunal, to make it good. It is disreputable that public men can trifle with the truth, and still occupy places of public trust. What is demoralizing Canada and public opinion to-day? Truth in high places is trifled with. Virtue is deposed, and hon. gentlemen are usurping the honour that is due to virtue; and here we are expected to condone an offence like this in the presence of the country, and allow the Secretary of State not only to retain his position, but to secure higher honours if possible. That is the issue. It is not a question as to whether his assertion has any weight with the country or not. I acknowledge that we should be charitable towards those who make assertions even more positive than the facts warranted; but when the matter has been brought to his attention on a former occasion, and is still before the country, there is only one course for an honourable man to adopt, I submit, and that is, to make good his statement or withdraw it, or show that he had reasonable and probable cause for making it. I can understand a man making a misstatement and not intentionally telling an untruth. If the hon. gentleman was misled, then he can be acquitted of intentional misstatement, as he lacked the intention to mislead. If he had good and probable cause for making the assertion, I would, for one, relieve him of moral responsibility. But he cannot remain in his present position, allowing, by his silence, the charge to be reasserted and affirmed. He is too unmanly to have an investigation and make an effort to prove his charge. He stands to-day arraigned before the bar of the public of having made a statement which he cannot know to be true, and which he dare not try and prove to be true, and yet which he is unwilling to withdraw. Mr. Speaker, I submit that that is not the action of a gentleman. I submit that no man is animated by proper gentlemanly instincts who will intentionally trifle with what is true. We may have our strong views, but no gentleman is warranted in trifling with the truth.

Mr. SPEAKER. I am afraid the hon. gentleman is going too far in the expressions he is making use of. The expressions which he is applying to a member of Parliament are certainly very strong.

Mr. MULOCK. I apologize, Sir, for having used these expressions. I have said all I need say with regard to that; but, speaking in the abstract, all hon. gentlemen will agree with me that we are entitled to expect from every member of this House that he will, in discussing public matters, have a proper respect for the facts. It is quite possible for us to be mistaken, but there is a duty cast upon us which we should not shirk. It is our duty to respect

the truth; and those who will not respect the truth, the country will not respect.

Mr. DAVIN. The hon. member has given us a historical picture—truth trifled with, virtue deposed, and the hon. member for York (Mr. Mulock) weeping deciduous tears over the pair. Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member who has just spoken (Mr. Mulock) and the hon. gentleman who introduced this subject to-day (Mr. Davies) have made, in my opinion, a very great mistake. First, they have made the mistake, as hon. members of this House, of trifling with the time of this House; and, in the next place, they have made a mistake, as members of the great Liberal party, because by wantonly and foolishly, and without adequate motive, as I shall show, attacking the hon. baronet, the Secretary of State (Sir Charles Tupper), they have shown that they are greatly afraid of that hon. gentleman. They have shown that they are determined, with or without adequate motive, to attack him; and in taking that course, they are certain to rally round that hon. gentleman the Conservative party of Canada. Now, what is the question before the House? The question introduced by the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) and the speech with which he introduced it, were on a par and germane to each other, because that speech was in the hon. gentleman's platform style. It was violent, and we know that when he speaks from the platform, he speaks in the King Cambyses vein. But when my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) spoke, he tried to raise the question to a higher plane. He discussed it from a high constitutional standpoint, and as long as you forgot what the real question before the House was, you listened to the hon. member for Bothwell with interest and respect, because he was laying down perfectly just principles. But the proposition that should have been behind, but was not behind, that constitutional speech of the hon. member for Bothwell, is that the hon. Secretary of State had accused members of this House of contributing to the funds of the election contest in Cape Breton. That is the proposition which should have been behind the speech of my hon. friend from Bothwell. If the hon. baronet, the Secretary of State had accused any member of this House of contributing to an election fund in Cape Breton, the argument of my hon. friend from Bothwell would have been perfectly to the point, but the hon. Secretary of State did not do anything of the kind. All he did say at the city hall, as my hon. friend from Ontario has just pointed out, was that \$25,000 had been spent to buy the seat from under him. He did not say that it had been spent or contributed by any member of this House, and in order to bring the matter within the purview of this House, and to justify taking up a moment of this House in discussing it, it was essential to show that the hon. baronet had charged members of this House

with having subscribed to this fund; neither in the city hall, where I heard him, nor elsewhere, did the hon. baronet say a word to that effect. Therefore, in vain was expended all this righteous indignation on the part of the hon. member for Queen's and all the learned lore of my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills), and all the nondescript eloquence of my hon. friend from York (Mr. Mulock)—all his great indignation about truth trifled with—the delicate truth for the honour of which he is so zealous, and then virtue deposed for whose restoration and crowning the hon. gentleman insists. The hon. gentleman appeared so earnest as he posed like a dignified embodiment of all that is virtuous in humanity, weeping over dethroned justice and trifling with truth. Why, Sir, it is a touching picture, but it has its ludicrous side. It is a picture that may well try our patience, when we consider that the very moment you go beneath the surface, you find no logical basis for the discussion we have had. The hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) has been guilty, from the point of view of parliamentary conduct, of a grave misdemeanour in bringing forward to-day this subject. He has taken up the time of this House without any justification whatever. What is to happen, if this House is to become the receptacle for the wild and windy rhetoric of the platform? What is to happen if we are to review every utterance sent forth from the hustings? Suppose that every time the hon. member for South Oxford declares that the Tory party is made up of all sorts of corruptionists and boodlers, we take these assertions seriously and ask the House to give us a committee to investigate into their truth or falsity, why, we should have no time for legislation, we should have no time for the questions that are dear to hon. members, and our private day would disappear completely. My hon. friend from Queen's, who introduced this question, unfortunately for his party and unfortunately for his own reputation as a parliamentarian in this House—he knows that this is private members' day—

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) You are taking up the time of this House.

Mr. DAVIN. When an hon. member so demeans himself, as the hon. member for Queen's has done, by exhibiting a complete departure from the position that should be taken by a gentleman of his standing in the House, when we have propositions placed before us and demands made which are an insult, in my opinion, to parliamentary traditions, we must refute these propositions and demands, but the responsibility for any expenditure of time thus taken up lies at the door of my hon. friend. If the hon. member had brought this forward on a Government day, he would be carrying out the tactics which are now almost avow-

ed. But here to-day my hon. friend (Mr. Flint) has a motion on the paper in which a large number of members of this House are interested and in which a large number of men in the North-west are interested, a motion about the liquor traffic, which stands first on the Order paper. And what prevents that being brought forward? What has prevented our making any progress here to-day? Tactics on the part of, literally, the same gentlemen who last year practically burked the motion of my hon. friend.

An hon. MEMBER. No.

Mr. DAVIN. Somebody says "No." Only to-day I was looking at the division list on that motion, and I found that some twenty-four leading Conservatives, including the leader of the House, stood by my hon. friend, and ten leading Liberals headed by the leader of the Opposition, and including my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills), and, I think, my hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Davies) against.

Mr. SPEAKER. I am afraid the discussion is becoming irrelevant.

Mr. DAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I think not.

An hon. MEMBER. Take it back.

Mr. DAVIN. No; I bow, of course, to your decision, Mr. Speaker. But if you would permit me I will show that I am pointing out—

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. DAVIN. I am told by my hon. friend here (Mr. McCarthy), who is an older parliamentarian, that I must not argue the question of order. Therefore, I will merely say that I certainly greatly regret that a very important question that we are all deeply interested in has not been reached to-day, and the reason is a discussion which, so far as it has been taken part in by the hon. gentlemen opposite, is a wanton waste of the time of this House. Neither my hon. friend from Queen's, who brought this matter up, nor my hon. friend from York (Mr. Mulock) has given any ground for their action in provoking and prolonging this debate. I wish to point out clearly that the Secretary of State, neither at the city hall nor anywhere else made a charge against any member of this House. That being so, we are in no position to investigate anything that he said about the Cape Breton election. There is no principle upon which we could undertake such an investigation except one which would lead us to inquire into every statement made in regard to their political opponents by gentlemen sitting in the House, even during an election or immediately after an election. The hon. Secretary of State, when speaking at the city hall had just come from a fierce contest in which he had won a great victory. He had been received with unbounded enthusiasm—

Mr. DAVIN.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. DAVIN. Yes, unbounded enthusiasm. The procession of carriages extended, to my certain knowledge, from the station right to the Parliament Buildings here.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. DAVIN. Yes, the procession of carriages extended from the club to the Canadian Pacific Railway station, and at every corner it passed the utmost interest was shown and there was great cheering for the hon. member. When we got to the city hall, it was almost impossible for anybody to get inside. Why, Sir, what is more natural than that enthusiasm should attend the reception of a gentleman who has just come from a great victory? Why, I have had a few victories in my life over the friends of hon. gentlemen opposite, and I know how a man feels who has won a great victory. And we must not weigh in the nice scales of the apothecary all that is said under these circumstances. I grant you that if anything had been said against a member of this House, it must be taken up. I agree with the hon. member for Bothwell that this House is the guardian of its own honour, and we are in a position to bring the offender to the bar of this House and make him answer for the breach of privilege. But no case whatever has been made out for the proposal either of the hon. member for Queen's or for the proposal of my hon. friend from York. And I will say that I could not agree with my hon. friend (Mr. Taylor) who suggested that three judges should sit on this case. I could not agree with a proposal to go to the least trouble to inquire into the question at all, because, though \$25,000 is a larger sum than \$10,000 and \$10,000 larger than \$5,000, the whole discussion that has taken place here to-day or at any other time, has been an attempt to make a mountain out of a molehill, and to use the time and opportunities of this House, not for the purpose of furthering the business of the country, but for the purpose of throwing dust in the eyes of the public outside and of making electioneering capital.

Mr. FRASER. Nothing, I am sure, could bring out better the varied talents of the wandering bard of Assiniboia, the hon. member who has just taken his seat, than the remarks he has just made. Again and again, Mr. Speaker, he returned to the question of how the time of the House was being spent. And so careful was he of the time of the House that he actually wandered so far that it was necessary for you, Mr. Speaker, to call him to order—so frugal was he of the time, so careful lest any moment of precious time of the people of this country should be unnecessarily taken up. And then, methinks, when he speaks of not weighing words used after a victory in the nice scales of the apothecary, I suggest that no scales are large enough—or it may

be small enough—to weigh his own statements. Then he wandered off into this immense procession. Why, even the hon. junior member for Cape Breton, or any other member of this House, can hardly plume himself upon his reputation for exaggeration after the hon. gentleman's statement concerning the procession stretching from the station to the Parliament Buildings.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). And up to the top of the tower.

Mr. FRASER. I do not know about that, but I do know that in olden times men were sent to the tower for saying less than the hon. member for West Assiniboia has said. The hon. gentleman was very anxious that the discussion of the motion standing in the name of the hon. gentleman for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint), should go on. I admit that that was a good argument, particularly as coming from one who can so well claim a position on this question and whose whole life is an example of that. Now, what is the state of the case? The statement is made that \$25,000 was spent by the Liberal party in a certain election. If there is good ground for making that statement it ought to be investigated as a matter of public policy. The hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon), whom I do not now see in his seat, and the hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Dickey), spoke about going into the courts. But the case could not be reached before the general election comes off. It would be a nice thing to be called upon to put up \$1,000 for a case that would not be heard. The hon. member for Albert said that according to the Bill of last year, a certain number could go into the courts on paying \$500. Why will his own friends not accept that? They made the statement that this large expenditure was made. Surely, in the interest of good government and purity of elections they should take the necessary steps to inquire into this expenditure by the Liberals of \$25,000. Let them do it, and we will facilitate the investigation in every way. If the process is put in operation, and if it is shown that one-tenth of the amount was expended, I will guarantee that the whole of their costs will be paid by hon. members on this side of the House. If that is not a fair proposition—

Mr. McALISTER. If a tenth is proved, you mean?

Mr. FRASER. If it is proved that a tenth was expended, I think that is a fair proposition. Now, I want to reiterate what was said by an hon. member, that this information can be easily obtained, and if there ever was an occasion on which Parliament should grant a committee of inquiry, when you take into consideration the standing of the gentleman who made the statement, I think this is the time. How else are we going to get the information?

An hon. MEMBER. How much did you expend?

Mr. FRASER. I will give the hon. gentleman the figures, I have got them here, every cent I expended.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). Let us have them.

Mr. FRASER. The hon. gentleman for Inverness had better not ask the question, or he will receive the same reply he did yesterday, one not entirely to his satisfaction—I mean the reply he received from the hon. member for Antigonish (Mr. McIsaac). I say that what money was expended, was legitimately expended, and they know it. I only want to repeat what I said before, namely, that this is brought up by the opposite side, the statement which was made by them, and attempted to be sustained in this House, just because they knew very well, or somebody knows, that when the statement was first started it had the effect of freely bleeding, and now they turn round and, finding that the money passed into the hands of middlemen, and that the bleeding process was much more effective than they expected, they want to make it appear that there must have been an equal sum spent on the other side, or else the result would have been different. Now, why will not the Government accept our challenge? I think the Minister of Justice admitted that it could be done. He did not for a moment contend that Parliament had given up all its authority in this respect. Now, let it be done, and that will end the matter. If that had been understood yesterday, there would have been no discussion to-day. Let us get at the facts. Surely no one ought to fear the facts, and when the facts are got at, there will be no further discussion in this House on this point. For one, I am ready to bear the results of the fullest investigation when that is made.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). I think it is very unfortunate that a statement has been made that \$25,000 have been expended in the Cape Breton election, and I think it would be more unfortunate still if that large amount of money has really been expended. It appears to me that our hon. friends opposite show a great deal of virtuous indignation at the expenditure of such a large amount of money. We are not in a position to say exactly what amount of money has been expended by either party, but we are in a position to say, on the authority of a gentleman whose truthfulness will not be doubted by hon. gentlemen opposite, that a considerable amount of money has been subscribed to that election. That hon. gentleman says:

I am in a position to know that attempts were made, on the part of those who believed that it was in the public interest to defeat the hon. member for Cape Breton (Sir Charles Tupper), at-

tempts were made to assist Mr. Murray to pay these legitimate expenses.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. member is reading directly from a debate.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). I am reading from a statement made by an hon. gentleman in regard to this question.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Yesterday.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). I did not say yesterday.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). In a former debate in this House.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). I am reading from a statement made by an hon. gentleman whom I am sure every hon. member of the Opposition will credit.

Mr. SPEAKER. If the hon. member is quoting from the "Hansard," of course, he is out of order. If he is quoting from a statement made by the Secretary of State outside this House, he is in order.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). I am not quoting from a statement made by the Secretary of State, but I am quoting from a statement made by an hon. gentleman, possibly in this House. If it is out of order, I will desist, for I would be the very last person to quote anything that would be out of order. I only regret exceedingly that hon. gentlemen opposite seem to be afraid of hearing an acknowledgment made by an hon. gentleman on that side, one of themselves. But the fact is clear. It is well known to the public that the Liberal party contributed a considerable amount towards the election expenses of Mr. Murray in Cape Breton. The hon. member for Guysboro' says that it was not more than one-tenth of the amount stated by the Secretary of State outside this House.

Mr. FRASER. I said it was less.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). Well, if it was wrong to spend \$25,000, it was also wrong to spend \$2,500. I think it is a great pity that a discussion on this question should be pressed on the House by hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. FRASER. I said no such thing as that \$2,500 was expended. I said that the sum mentioned by the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) was much less than the amount mentioned, namely, one-tenth of the \$25,000 said by the junior member for Cape Breton to have been spent.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). Then a large amount of money has been subscribed, but it was not expended?

Mr. FRASER. I did not say so.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). I do not think the hon. gentleman is improving his own position to any extent.

Motion (Mr. Davies, P.E.I.) to adjourn, negatived.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness).

PROHIBITION OF THE LIQUOR TRAFFIC.

Mr. FLINT moved :

That, in the opinion of this House, the manufacture, importation and sale of intoxicating liquors, except for medicinal, sacramental and mechanical purposes, should be prohibited by law.

He said : The resolution before the House is an old friend of hon. members, and I trust that before the discussion concludes, the points at issue that are raised by this resolution, will be fully and thoroughly considered. Last session a similar resolution was brought forward, but the discussion was unfortunately cut somewhat short by an amendment which was proposed. That amendment was one that I think I am not out of place in characterizing as one of delay. It asked the House to suspend judgment upon the main principle of the prohibition of the liquor traffic, until something else should be done in another place. I am confronted by more than one difficulty in discussing this subject, and perhaps the principal one, from a parliamentary standpoint, is that arising from the character of the resolution passed last year. That resolution was :

Whereas there is now before the Judicial Committee of the Imperial Privy Council the appeal against the decision of the Supreme Court of Canada on the jurisdiction of the provincial legislatures to prohibit the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors ; the further consideration of this question be deferred until this appeal shall have been decided and the report of the Judicial Committee thereon received.

I did not at that time attack, as I might have attacked, the amendment, and the reason for doing so was this : the session was approaching its conclusion, the debate would have been necessarily somewhat lengthy, and it would have been quite in accordance with parliamentary precedents that the debate should have been adjourned. In that event, the question could not possibly come to a vote during that session. Consequently, those of us interested in dividing the House on the question at issue, preferred that the vote should be taken that evening to continuing the discussion on a side issue. Unfortunately the amendment was adopted. I think it might not have been adopted if a full and fair discussion had been had on its terms. We are now in the position that the decision of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council has not been rendered. Why this decision has not been rendered, no one at the present time seems to know. It appears that the time which has elapsed since the date of the argument has been unusually long, and the motives which have influenced the noble lords in refraining from publishing their decision is unknown to the public ; at any rate, we are without a decision upon the points involved in that appeal. But

I contend, and I think every one in Parliament will admit, that the fact of the non-publication of the decision at which the noble lords have arrived is no reason for inaction on the part of this House. It will not be proper to lay down the rule or to submit to the rule for one instant, that we are to lay aside our own duties, that we cease our responsibilities in consequence of the action or inaction of the Judicial Committee or a court or any other body whatever. I think this Parliament has the right and duty to approach and decide this question on its merits, and upon the opinion this Parliament may form as to its duty in the premises. I call the attention of the House to another matter in connection with the amendment adopted last session. It will be noticed that the question referred to the decision of the Supreme Court and of the Judicial Committee, was not one as to the powers of this Parliament. The resolution itself admits as much. It speaks of the jurisdiction of the provincial legislatures to prohibit the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors, while the resolution before the House is one which presupposes and assumes the power of this Parliament to prohibit without any reference whatever to the power and jurisdiction of the provincial legislature. It can easily be seen that had discussion taken place on that point during last session the argument must have been entirely in favour of the main resolution, because, admitting there were questions, as it must be admitted there are questions of great importance and intricacy regarding the jurisdiction of the local legislatures in enacting prohibition or the most stringent legislative restriction on the sale and traffic in intoxicating liquors, none of these questions could prevent Parliament dealing with prohibition in the fullest sense of the word. In fact, I defy hon. gentlemen, whatever views they may take of this question as to its propriety, practicality or constitutionality, to point out in the decisions of the courts, in the constitution of the country or the argument of any jurist any doubt as to the power of this Parliament to pass a prohibitory liquor law. We have the dictum of some of the ablest judges in Ontario and of the Supreme Court of Canada, that the power to prohibit lies solely with the Parliament of Canada, and all the questions which have been agitated in the courts since the commencement of the discussion of this question and cognate questions—as the cases of *Russell vs. Queen*, *Fredericton vs. Queen*, *Hodge vs. Queen*, and *Huson vs. South Norwich*, and the present case now in appeal before the Judicial Committee—all these cases have been argued and all these matters have been discussed in relation to the powers of the local legislatures to deal with this question. In one of these cases it was held that an Act passed by the Parliament of Canada dealing with licenses was 'ultra vires' of the jurisdiction

of the Parliament of Canada and came within the jurisdiction of the local legislatures under the British North America Act. That this Parliament has the sole power and jurisdiction to enact a prohibitory law is quite apparent from the Act constituting the confederation. Mr. Justice Taschereau, in the case of *Fredericton vs. the Queen* laid down this dictum:

And it may well be, notwithstanding what was said in this court, in the case of *Fredericton vs. the Queen*, that, if Parliament has the power to prohibit the liquor traffic in the whole Dominion, it is not at all under the words "regulation of trade and commerce," of section 91 of the British North America Act, that it gets it.

The jurisdiction of this Parliament, then, arises under the general statement as to the powers of this Parliament. The powers of this Parliament are settled by section 91, as follows:—

It shall be lawful for the Queen, by and with the advice of the Senate and House of Commons, to make laws for the peace, order and good government of Canada in relation to all matters not coming within the classes of subjects by this Act assigned exclusively to the legislatures of the provinces; and for the great certainty but not so as to restrict the generality of the foregoing terms of this section, it is hereby declared that (notwithstanding anything in this Act) the exclusive legislative authority of the Parliament of Canada extends to all matters coming within the classes of subjects next herein enumerated.

One of these subjects is the regulation of trade and commerce. It is not solely, then, that the power of this Parliament is defined under "the regulation of trade and commerce," and obtains jurisdiction in regard to that traffic in intoxicating liquors, but it is in view of the fact that the Federal Parliament absorbs within itself not merely the power to make laws for the peace, order and good government of Canada, but because it possesses all the sovereign powers of the Dominion not exclusively assigned to the legislatures of the various provinces. When exclusive jurisdiction is given to the provinces it is defined in section 92, and this Parliament absorbs within itself all the remaining and undefined powers of sovereignty; and consequently, while prohibition is not in terms stated in the British North America Act, it is included in the powers to make laws for the peace, order and good government of the Dominion, and in connection with that for the regulation of trade and commerce. Consequently, I think we are justified, without going into any elaborate argument—and it would be unfair to this House to occupy its time with a constitutional argument, even if we had the material at hand to make it—upon that point. We will leave the matter as assumed for the basis of this argument, that the powers of Parliament are complete and unquestioned as to its jurisdiction to legislate in favour of the prohibition of the liquor traffic. Assuming

this to be a fundamental principle, the question then arises: Is it advisable that Parliament should exercise that power? Have circumstances been proven to exist which might induce this Parliament to exercise the power committed to it, for the peace, order, and good government of the Dominion? That strong claims can be made and have been made upon Parliament to so exercise that power, is undisputed. Almost ever since the organization of the Government after confederation, this Parliament has been appealed to by large classes of the most intelligent and patriotic citizens, to so legislate. They have pointed out from time to time, in petitions, in memorials, in the reports of public bodies, in the statements of jurists, the terrible evils of the traffic in intoxicating liquors. They have shown the demoralization which that traffic has occasioned, they have shown its bad results in almost every phase of our social and domestic life, and, from time to time, Parliament has been so moved by those appeals and by those representations, that it has taken steps to verify them by official action. The history of this question is one of considerable interest, and if time allowed, it would be valuable to run over the various attempts that have been made here to concentrate the attention of Parliament upon it, and to induce a favourable verdict in this House on the representations of those who have favoured the establishment of a prohibitory liquor law. The first elaborate attempt to induce Parliament to act was made in 1873. In that year petitions numerous signed from all portions of the Dominion, petitions from church courts and ecclesiastical bodies representing large numbers of people, and of great importance, flooded Parliament, covered the Table of the House, and induced Parliament to appoint a committee to deal with this whole question. A committee of the Senate was appointed as well as a committee of the Commons. The Senate committee took the matter into its consideration on two or three occasions and made reports to that body, which have been frequently referred to in prohibition discussions here. These reports were certainly as strong in their character as any that have ever been made to that body. They denounced in the strongest possible terms the liquor traffic, as represented to them by the various persons whom they examined upon the subject, and they appealed to Parliament, as the result of their investigations, to pass a law to prohibit the importation, manufacture, and sale of intoxicating liquors. In order to give merely a sample of the language used I will quote from one of the reports made to the Senate in the year 1873;

Your committee are fully convinced that the traffic in intoxicating liquors, in addition to the evils already mentioned, is detrimental to all the true interests of the Dominion, mercilessly slaying every year hundreds of her most promising

Mr. FLINT.

citizens, plunging thousands into misery and want, converting her intelligent and industrious sons, who should be her glory and her strength, into feeble inebriates, her burden and her shame, wasting millions of her wealth in the consumption of an article whose use not only imparts no strength, but induces and leads to insanity, suicide and murder, thus diverting into a hurtful channel the capital that should be employed in developing her resources, establishing her manufactures and expanding her commerce—in short, it is a cancer in the body politic, which, if not speedily eradicated, will mar the bright prospects and blight the patriotic hopes of this noble Dominion.

The committee added:

And concurring in the opinion of the legislative assembly of Ontario, as expressed in their petition, that a prohibitory liquor law such as prayed for by the petitioners would be most beneficial in its results to the Dominion, would respectfully recommend that the prayer of the petitioners be favourably entertained.

During the same session of Parliament, the matter was brought before this House, and, after a very animated discussion, in which almost every phase of the question was laid before, the committee to which the matter was referred, in a very able and interesting report, concluded their observations as follows:—

In view of these facts, the committee would most respectfully submit to your honourable House the importance of speedily removing the evils complained of, by the enactment of a prohibitory liquor law; that is, a law prohibiting the importation, manufacture and sale of all intoxicating liquors except for medicinal, manufacturing and mechanical purposes, to be regulated by proper safeguards and checks.

That was the opinion of Parliament, or, at any rate, of a committee of Parliament, as far back as 1873. The result of the agitation of that period subsequently impressed itself upon Parliament, and resulted in the Canada Temperance Act. In 1875, this question was brought up and the motion of the Hon. Mr. Schultz, who asked the House to accept this proposition:

That, in the opinion of this House, a prohibitory liquor law is the only effectual remedy for the evils of intemperance, and it is the duty of the Government to submit such a measure at the earliest moment practicable.

Now, it will be seen here, that the Hon. Mr. Schultz went a step further than I do, in the proposition now before the House. Candidly I do not think it would be fair to the Government of the day to throw upon them the sole burden of bringing in a prohibitory resolution. At any rate, I do not think it would be proper, for one who is in general opposition to the policy of the Government on trade and other questions, to attempt to make a question of this kind one of partisan policy. It has been my endeavour, since I have had the honour of a seat in this House, to keep this question as far as possible from assuming a partisan character; because I think it is eminently

desirable, in the interest of good government, which this legislation aims at, that it should be sustained and supported by a union of all the various political elements of the country, in order that it may be made successful. And I am convinced that no greater injury could be done to the cause of prohibition than to make it a weapon of party attack or party defence. So strongly entrenched in financial strength are the practical opponents of prohibition, so difficult is it to destroy the traffic, that it will require the combined influence of all the elements of every political party that are opposed to this traffic, to uproot it and to render it innocuous for the future. Parliament at that day took the same view, and passed a resolution with that feature eliminated, defeating a resolution the object of which was that the Government should exact prohibition as a party measure. One excellent result of the agitation and discussion at that time was the adoption of the Canada Temperance Act; and here I may be permitted to say that that Act was a great advance, so far as the whole Dominion was concerned, upon anything that had preceded it. It was, in fact, a prohibitory measure made applicable in such communities as felt themselves strong enough to support it. It enunciated the power and jurisdiction of Parliament to enact a prohibitory law; but it conceded so much to public opinion in various localities as to ask the aid and assistance of the localities in enforcing the measure, if it suited their local ideas. The Act was attacked, of course, as it naturally would be, in the courts, and was sustained upon the ground that it was within the jurisdiction and power of the Dominion Parliament, being a prohibitory measure, while it did not necessarily attack the exclusive jurisdiction of the local legislatures over the various matter assigned to them, in consequence of its being made a question of local option. The Canada Temperance Act, however, has not been an unqualified success in practice; and I think this Parliament is somewhat to blame for that fact. The law as originally enacted was perhaps as perfect in its terms as any law that has ever been passed by this Parliament. But we are all aware that in the administration of a law which is quasi criminal, difficulties are always encountered, as difficulties were encountered in the administration of this law. But, unfortunately, either in one branch of Parliament or the other, there was not that disposition to amend the law, as difficulties were found to exist, that has been manifested by Parliament in reference to many other subjects of legislation; and the Canada Temperance Act, and I say it sincerely and distinctly, has been very much injured in its operation by the unwillingness of Parliament to accede to such amendments as have been from time to time requested by those interested in carrying out the law.

Consequently, while the failures in the administration of that Act in various localities are indicated to us, I think all those failures can be seen to fall under one of two heads: either in the locality the temperance sentiment has not been sufficiently strong to enforce the Act as it stands, or Parliament has been remiss in its duty in amending the Act in such a way as to make it more workable. However, in many localities the law has worked very well. It has worked to advantage, and has been and is still held in high popular estimation. Not long ago, in the constituency represented by my hon. friend from Westmoreland (Mr. Powell), an attempt was made to repeal the Canada Temperance Act. I am not aware of the difficulties which arose in that district, and consequently cannot speak with confidence as to the reasonableness or unreasonableness, from an outside standpoint, of those who asked for its repeal. But, with all its faults and all the difficulties of administering it, it appears from the returns made that a very substantial majority of those who voted, still thought the Act very beneficial in the interests of the temperance cause, and in the promotion of order and good government as affected by the restriction of the sale of intoxicating liquors. They felt that the Act was working very satisfactorily, and by a substantial majority they declined to repeal it. But in many portions of the Dominion the Act was repealed, and Parliament was again appealed to, to strengthen by direct legislation the hands of those who thought the liquor traffic an evil and only an evil. The question was brought up here by my hon. friend the Finance Minister (Mr. Foster) in 1884, in a resolution similar in terms to that at present before you. It contained a preamble in which were strongly set forth the evils of the liquor traffic, and the great injury it was to all the interests of the state, and for these reasons asked that this legislation should declare that the most effectual legislative remedy would lie in the enactment and enforcement of a law prohibiting the importation, manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors. My hon. friend on that occasion addressed the House in a speech which I have read frequently with interest and profit, and the power of which I think has lost nothing by time. I think every argument he stated there is as strong and as sound to-day as it was then; and I would commend the study of that speech to any hon. member who has not had the opportunity of perusing it. The resolution, however, was not accepted by the House; but it was amended by the addition of a proviso that this House is prepared, so soon as public opinion will sufficiently sustain stringent measures, to promote such legislation, so far as the same is within the competency of the Parliament of Canada. This resolution was adopted by a substantial majority. In 1888 the matter

was again brought up, but the resolution did not reach a vote. In 1889 the matter was brought forward again by Mr. Jamieson, now a judge. On that occasion, unfortunately an amendment proposed by the present Controller of Customs (Mr. Wood) was tacked upon the resolution, and the resolution was not adopted, but was replaced by a resolution favourable to prohibition when the public opinion of the country was ripe for its reception and enforcement. The exact terms of the amendment of the hon. gentleman I shall read :

That in the opinion of this House, it is expedient to prohibit the manufacture, importation and sale of intoxicating liquors, except for sacramental, medicinal, scientific and mechanical purposes, when the public sentiment of the country is ripe for the reception and enforcement of such a measure of prohibition.

Consequently the House is in the position of having twice accepted substantially the principle of prohibition, subject to the proviso that public opinion should be strong enough to sustain its enforcement. In 1891 an amendment to a similar resolution was adopted, which resulted in the appointment of a royal commission, whose report I shall briefly refer to before I take my seat. In 1894 I had the honour of presenting a resolution similar to that now before you, but unfortunately it did not reach a vote. We have the House committed, at any rate, thus far on numerous occasions. It was admitted that the liquor traffic was a great evil, that it was the duty of this Parliament to deal with that evil, that it was in the power of Parliament to suppress that evil, that it was desirable that Parliament should act in that regard, but that public opinion was not sufficiently strong to support such a law, should such a law be enacted. Now, this proposition is one which appears very plausible and one which substantially is a correct proposition, but I contend it is one which, from the very nature of the case, can never be actually demonstrated. It will be useless for any number of hon. gentlemen to stand up in this House and express their confidence that such a public opinion does exist. It would be useless for any large number of those to whom the country looks for advice and suggestion, to whom the country looks with confidence in their various capacities, as jurists, legislators, legal advisers, or as men of eminence in any walk or profession, to declare that, in their opinion, such a public sentiment does exist, because after all that would simply be the opinion, better founded or more poorly founded, of a larger or smaller body of men. What we are to take, in settling a matter of this kind, is our knowledge, not only of the general trend of public sentiment, but of the character and the disposition of the people of the Dominion at large to obey and submit to the legislation of the country. Is this question

Mr. FLINT.

asked in relation to other matters of legislation that come before us? I have used the argument before, and I use it again with confidence, because I have never seen it met—the argument used by our hon. friends on the other side of the House, when they defend the National Policy on the ground that it was demanded by public sentiment. Great numbers of our most intelligent men denied that statement. They asserted, on the contrary, that public sentiment did not demand the enactment of this protective policy. In fact, so confident was a great political party that public sentiment did not demand it, that they staked their political existence upon their opinion; and as the result of the election did not carry out their belief, the policy of protection was wrought into a legislative enactment. There was no appearance of any public sentiment demanding a protective policy. That policy was brought forward by the public men who favoured it, upon the assumption that it would be so manifestly beneficial in its effects, that its enactment would continually sustain them in power. If there was one evidence in favour of the National Policy, previous to its being brought forward as a legislative measure, we have a thousand evidences of public opinion in favour of a prohibitory liquor policy. I think the signs throughout the country pointing to the fact that the people generally favour a prohibitory liquor law, are stronger than those in favour of any other legislation ever brought forward. We have before us every session important subjects for legislation, and no one ever raises the question as to whether public opinion will uphold these measures, if made statutory. And no one raises the point, with regard to these matters, that if Parliament should enact the law desired, the country will oppose its being carried out. No one will venture to say that if we placed upon the statute-book a well adjusted law prohibiting the traffic in intoxicating liquors, that law would not be as effectually supported as any other of a quasi criminal character ever enacted by the Canadian Parliament. There are other reasons for taking this view. Suppose there would be in any locality a strong opposition to the idea of such legislation. We know that the law would have on its side, not only the general weight of public favour, but in almost every locality it would have able and enthusiastic popular advocacy. The argument that public opinion is not strong enough to enable such a law to be carried out is not well founded. The law-abiding character of our people is sufficient guarantee that such a law would be effectively and successfully administered. We have furthermore positive evidence, which we have not always had in connection with public questions, that popular opinion is largely favourable to a measure of this kind. In the first place, there is the evidence given

to us by the popular action which impressed itself upon the various local legislatures throughout the Dominion and compelled them to pass enactments looking to a vote of the people. Unless there was a strong public opinion pressing upon the various local legislatures they would not have taken the trouble and borne the expense involved in taking these plebiscites. The various local legislatures to which I shall allude, asked the people their opinion at the polls on this question removed from conflicting and personal questions as to the feasibility of a prohibitory law, and the results show that a strong degree of popular favour is behind that proposed law. In previous debates the numbers have been alluded to, but I think it would be proper to refer to them again in order to press upon the House the favour with which it has been received. In 1892 Manitoba declared in favour of a prohibitory law by a majority of 11,592. In the same year the province of Prince Edward Island declared by a majority of 7,226 in the same direction. The province of Ontario, by a popular majority—leaving out of account about 10,000 votes of women who, under the Dominion Franchise Act are not qualified to vote—of 71,527 declared that it also was in favour of the enactment of a prohibitory law. The province of Nova Scotia gave a large majority of 31,400 of the voters in that intelligent province in favour of prohibition. In New Brunswick a plebiscite was not taken; but so strongly was the legislature of that province convinced of the popular wish in that direction that, by a unanimous vote, it declared the sentiments of the members as representing their constituents in favour of the prohibitory liquor law. The only large province not included in this category is the province of Quebec. As to the exact state of public opinion there, we are not prepared, of course, to speak with confidence. But I think that no student of the social and political conditions in the province of Quebec can arise from the study of those conditions without being strongly convinced that a prohibitory liquor law would be received in that province with a great deal of favour. The people of Quebec, so far as my acquaintance with them goes, and from my acquaintance with their representatives here, are strongly in favour of the principle of temperance, many of them showing themselves warmly in favour of it so far as personal practice is concerned. I think that the taking of a plebiscite in the province of Quebec would result in a majority in favour of prohibition. At any rate we have fair reason from analogy for believing that they would not be behind their fellow-citizens in other provinces in favouring a measure so well calculated to contribute to the peace and prosperity of the whole province.

Now, Sir, viewing the matter as one covering a great deal of ground it would be mani-

festly impossible within reasonable limits to debate before this House all the grounds upon which a prohibitory law is urged. The evils of intemperance are admitted; they require no discussion or illustration here. In fact many who are not convinced that a prohibitory liquor law could be effectually operated and many who would, perhaps, dissent from the principle of prohibition on constitutional or other grounds, agree that intemperance is one of the great evils of the country, one that it is desirable by all reasonable and fair means to diminish. The social evils of intemperance are also admitted. The pauperism, disease and crime due to intemperance, the immense loss caused to the people of the municipalities throughout the country through the traffic in intoxicating liquors have been dwelt upon at too great length to require repetition here. The House placed it within the power of the Government to appoint a commission to ascertain, as far as possible, the extent of these evils and suggest some possible remedy. The result of that commission it will take a long time for the public to thoroughly consider and study. I believe, and I think, many strong temperance advocates believe, that the commission undertook a task covering too much ground, and that had it undertaken less it might have accomplished more. However, at great expense to the country the commission has accumulated, for the information of the people, an enormous mass of statistical and other matter. I must say that the sources of information that have been tapped by the various members in their advocacy or opposition to prohibitory legislation and have been made use of by these commissioners, are very numerous and very valuable. We have the result in a bulky volume which very few of us, possibly, have had time since its publication, to study at all thoroughly. I trust that the time is not distant when some careful analysis of this very bulky report may be prepared by some competent person. It covers too much ground to be studied as a whole in detail. It is not arranged so well as it might have been arranged for careful study. I think, however, on the whole, from a very cursory examination of it, that the commissioners have placed within our reach almost all the information which it is desirable to have at hand for the careful study of this question in all its bearings. Unfortunately, however, the commissioners have not been united with their recommendations. The portion of the report made by the dissenting commissioner is much more in line with the method and spirit of previous reports, and with the view of the House, than the report signed by the majority of the commission. In the absence of opportunity for careful collating the opinions of the majority of the commission, I desire to call the attention of the House to some of the more salient features of the report of the minority. And here I desire to pay a tribute to the

patience and skill with which the Reverend Dr. McLeod has marshalled the facts brought before him in support of the proposition which I now desire to lay before the House. So complete are they that I shall offer no apology for quoting at some length from the observations he has made.

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

After Recess.

SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 56) respecting the Montreal Island Belt Line Railway Company.—(Mr. Lachapelle.)

PERSONAL EXPLANATION—CAPE BRETON ELECTION.

Mr. DICKEY. Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like, for the purpose of personal explanation, to refer to some words used by me in debate this afternoon, that you ruled were out of order. I think I should do more than withdraw the words. They were used in the heat of debate, and without intending any imputation whatever against the personal honour of the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies). As I say, I think I should do more than withdraw them, and that I should express my sincere regret to this House and to the member for Queen's for having used them. I do not wish, however, either the member for Queen's, or the House, to understand that I modify in the slightest degree, or wish to withdraw in any respect, the arguments I used, or the view I took of the particular statement he made. But I think there is quite enough acerbity already in the debates of the House this session, and certainly I do not wish to be the means of introducing any more.

ADULTERATION OF FOOD, DRUGS, &c. (HONEY.)

Mr. SPROULE moved third reading of Bill (No. 10) further to amend the Act respecting the Adulteration of Food, Drugs, and Agricultural Fertilizers.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Did this pass through committee of the House?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am sorry to say I was not present. Did the Minister of Justice give it a character?

Mr. FOSTER. We put it in very good shape.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This is our last opportunity. I am strongly with the hon. gentleman, I may say, in desiring to punish the adulteration of food as severely as he can possibly wish, especially if the adulteration is of a character which would injure the health of the consumers

Mr. FLINT.

of the food. I will go with him, or with the Minister of Justice, in making it a felony without benefit of clergy, I may say. Are there any penalties attached?

Mr. SPROULE. There are two classes of penalties, \$5 the lowest, and \$30 the highest, in one class; and \$5 the lowest and \$50 the highest in the other class.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is too little punishment of an offence against the health of Her Majesty's lieges.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think this Bill is with reference to feeding sugar to bees. I do not suppose that the hon. gentleman would undertake to maintain that this is a Bill in respect to the adulteration of food which affects the health of the people of all.

Mr. SPROULE. No.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The object, I understand, is simply to prevent a fraud being practised upon the purchaser; it is to punish the vendor or proprietors of bees for offering for sale an article purporting to be honey which is really not such. It seems to me that if the Bill had provided that an article of this sort might be put upon the market, but being marked and showing what its character was, the hon. gentleman would have gone as far as we ought to go. It seems to me that it is going a long way to say that an article which is harmless as an article of food, and which is used as an article of food, when sold under another name, should subject the party under all circumstances to penal consequences. I think it is right and proper to inflict a penalty where an article is put upon the market which purports to be what it is not, and by which the purchaser is induced to pay more than he otherwise would have paid, or induced to purchase when otherwise he would not have purchased. I think if we had compelled the party to indicate what the real character of the article was, we would have gone as far as we should go. For instance, if a party represents a horse to be a sound animal when it is not such, the law makes provision for punishing the party; but if a man relies upon his own judgment, there is no such protection afforded. I am inclined to think that without doing any substantial good in the form in which the Bill is now, you will subject the party, under certain circumstances, to severe penalty. You can regulate, and sometimes regulate with success, where you cannot prohibit with success at all.

Mr. McMULLEN. I understand that the Minister of Finance made a very important amendment to this Bill, and it has not been reprinted. Would the Minister state what was the amendment that he did make? I know he made a suggestion with regard to an amendment.

Mr. FOSTER. The amendment I suggested was embodied in the Bill.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But we have only got the Bill before us as originally introduced.

Mr. SPROULE. It was distributed as reprinted.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It did not reach me.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the third time and passed.

CIVIL SERVICE SUPERANNUATION.

Mr. McMULLEN rose to move second reading of Bill (No. 19) to abolish the superannuation system as applied to the Civil Service of Canada.

Mr. SPEAKER. I want to point out that this is almost an exact transcript of the Bill I ruled out of order last year. This Bill, however, has a different title. Last year it was "to amend the Superannuation Act"; this year the Bill is intitled "An Act to Abolish the Superannuation System as applied to the Civil Service of Canada." If the hon. gentleman proposes only to repeal the Superannuation Act, then it will not be out of order; but the Bill contains a provision that involves a charge on the public revenue, and such a Bill can only be introduced on the authority of the Crown by resolution.

Mr. McMULLEN. I eliminated the clause that affected the revenue of the country. This is not exactly a reprint of the Bill of last year. The clause to which you, Mr. Speaker, took exception last year has been altered, so that it now rests with the Governor in Council to say whether they will allow interests on the sum deducted from the civil salaries of the civil servants or not.

Mr. SPEAKER. I find that in this Bill the second clause reads:

2. Any person now in the permanent Civil Service of Canada and having contributed to the superannuation fund, shall be entitled to elect whether he shall retain his right to superannuation under the provisions of the said Act or abandon the same and accept in lieu thereof the provisions of this Act; but such choice shall be made by each civil servant now a contributor to the superannuation fund within twelve months after the passing of this Act.

Then the Bill goes on to say at clause 3:

Any person now in the Civil Service of Canada, or any person so appointed after the passing of this Act, shall, upon his retiring from the public service, or, if he dies when in the service, his legal representatives shall upon his death be entitled to the repayment of the whole amount of the deductions from his salary under the provisions of the said Act.

That would be clearly imposing a charge on the public revenue, which is not provided

for under the Superannuation Act as it stands at present. It is here provided that any person in the Civil Service shall upon his retirement from the public service or upon his death when in the service, his legal representative should be entitled to the whole sums deducted from his salary under the provisions of this Bill. As I understand the Superannuation Act as it is at present, if a member of the Civil Service dies in the service his legal representatives are not entitled to anything. So it seems to me that this clause clearly imposes a charge on the public revenue.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I submit that this Bill simply regulates the moneys that belong to parties which moneys are in the hands of the Government. Take, for instance, clause 3. It provides:

Any person now in the Civil Service of Canada, or any person so appointed after the passing of this Act, shall, upon his retiring from the public service, or, if he dies when in the service, his legal representatives shall upon his death be entitled to the repayment of the whole amount of the deductions from his salary under the provisions of the said Act.

These are moneys held in trust, not moneys that belong to the Crown; they are not moneys which are the property of the Crown but they are the property of these individuals, and my hon. friend proposes by this Bill simply to determine in what direction these moneys which are held by the Crown in trust for certain persons shall be disposed of, which I think is a very different matter from imposing a charge upon the public revenue. If the moneys were the property of the Crown, then any charge made upon them would be a charge on the revenue of the Crown; but moneys held in trust by the Crown for individuals are not moneys over which bring the Bill within the rule to which you, Mr. Speaker, have referred. The same observation will apply to section 2. In both cases my hon. friend by his Bill is undertaking to deal with a residue of the salaries which the parties have earned, and which residue is still in the possession of the Government. That residue or salary is, I think, open to any hon. member to deal with or submit a measure regarding it. It stands in a wholly different position from that of any charge on the public revenue.

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not at all coincide with the proposition laid down by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills). In my opinion when these moneys are paid into the Receiver General they become part of the moneys of the Crown just as much as any other moneys paid into the Receiver General, and they can only be paid out under the provisions of the Act as it now stands on the statute-book to such persons as are retired from the Civil Service under the Superannuation Act. But this Bill proposes that these moneys shall be paid to

any servant upon his retiring from the public service, and there shall be paid the whole amount of the deductions from his salary—which has been paid into the Receiver General. It also provides—and this is something not contemplated under the present Superannuation Act—that the moneys paid by the civil servants into the public revenue shall be repaid to his legal representatives. I am clearly of the opinion that if this Bill proposes to go further than to repeal the Superannuation Act it is out of order,—at all events those provisions to which I have referred.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But those provisions could be struck out.

Mr. SPEAKER. No doubt.

Mr. FOSTER. They should be struck out before the Bill is proceeded with.

Mr. McMULLEN. I have no objection to bring the Bill within the power of this Parliament, for, of course, I have no desire to legislate beyond the powers of the House. This is the second year I have introduced the Bill for the purpose of remedying an evil, which is a growing one, and with your permission, Mr. Speaker, I will proceed to point out my objections to the present Superannuation Act, and the objectionable clauses in my Bill can be eliminated when we go into committee on it. There are some provisions that are certainly within the competency of any private member to move, and with these I have a right to deal.

Mr. FOSTER. It does not seem to me to be practicable for the House to assent to the procedure proposed. If we did so, there would be practically no bar to an hon. member introducing any Bill. An hon. member could introduce a Bill, with the design that he would strike out the clauses which affect the revenue if objection were taken. The hon. gentleman could make the plea: well, I am quite willing to forego those clauses when we come to committee. In this way he could proceed with his Bill. It seems to me that regular and orderly proceeding will be entirely disobeyed if an hon. gentleman is allowed to introduce a Bill of which objectionable clauses form a generic part, and proceed and afterwards state that he will be willing to throw those clauses to the wind when the Bill goes into committee. I should like to have your ruling on this point, and it seems to me that such a proceeding would cause great disarrangement of business.

Mr. SPEAKER. Yes; still I do not think it is out of order to introduce a Bill because it contains objectionable clauses, provided it contains clauses that are within the scope of a private member. If this Bill proposes simply to abolish the present Superannuation Act and makes no further provision, it will be in order, and the hon. gentleman might proceed with the second reading. If

Mr. SPEAKER.

he proposes to go beyond that, the Bill will not be in order. I point out that the first clause makes this provision:

1. Notwithstanding anything therein or in any other Act contained, so much of the "Civil Service Superannuation Act" chapter eighteen of the Revised Statutes, as provides for the granting of a superannuation allowance or of a gratuity, shall not apply to any person now in the Civil Service of Canada, or appointed after the passing of this Act to a permanent position in any branch of the public service of Canada.

If the hon. gentleman had stopped there, the clause would have been perfectly in order, but he goes beyond that and says:

And except as hereinafter provided by this Act.

So that it seems to me unless the latter part of this clause is struck out, the whole Bill is out of order.

Mr. McMULLEN. If I cannot have all the provisions of the Bill, I am quite willing to accept that portion of it which it is within the power of an humble member of this House to introduce. I am ready to accept such of the provisions of the Bill as the House will allow me, and I shall proceed to point out why I consider it prudent that this Bill should pass. Since it has been my privilege to occupy a seat in this House, I have given considerable attention to the question of superannuation. I have shown that from the inception of this Act down to the present time, it has entailed a very great loss upon the country. For the first few years, after the adoption of the Act, the contributions of the civil servants made up for more than the amount given to those who were superannuated. But, three years after the Act had been in existence, it was amended by Sir Leonard Tilley, and 50 per cent of the sums deducted from the salary of civil servants, was struck off, so that afterwards the contributors paid only one-half what they paid for the first three years. From that time up to the present, the superannuation system has become an ever-increasing drain upon the resources of this country. Had the Act remained as it was when first passed, and had it been honestly and economically administered, there would be now in the Dominion treasury, a considerable sum to the credit of the superannuation fund. But, unfortunately, hon. gentlemen opposite found it to be a very convenient means of removing from office, civil servants who were in many cases in the prime of life, not because they were inefficient, not because they were in bad health and unable to perform the duties, but simply because the Government wanted their position for relatives or friends. We know that the Superannuation Act has been used for political purposes, and as a result of this, we have on the superannuation list to-day, 540 retired civil servants, who are drawing \$265,000 a year. The contributions to the superannuation fund amount to from \$63,-

000 to \$65,000 a year, so that the country is actually losing about \$200,000 a year by the operation of this Act.

Now, Sir, I have no feeling of hostility whatever to the civil servants of this country. I do not for a moment say but that we have, in a great many cases, in fact, in the majority of cases, a very efficient civil service staff, but I do say that I believe that many of those men who are now walking our streets in perfect health, and thoroughly capable of performing the duties assigned to them when they were in the service, are so relieved, not because they were in bad health, but because the Government wanted to put others in their places. Not only has the Superannuation Act been abused in that respect, but it has been abused in other ways. There is a provision in the Act that the Government can grant a gratuity to any civil servant on retiring from office. I have gone carefully over the Return laid on the Table of the House recently, in order to find out to what extent the money of the people of this country had been given away under the operation of this clause 91 of the Act. Since 1880, the Government have granted in gratuities, the sum of \$48,636.31. A civil servant who had put in a few years in the service, and who possibly was discovered to be incompetent, got a gratuity on retiring. That civil servant was probably placed in office by some member of Parliament, or by some member of the Cabinet in the hope that he might be able to work out a living in some department, but, being found totally and absolutely incapable of discharging the duties, the Government not only paid the salary they agreed to pay him, but they also gave him a gratuity when he left. On the 1st of January, 1895, we had 539 superannuated officers, and of that number, the present Government, since

last election, superannuated no less than 244. In five years they superannuated 244 officials, and of that number, thirty-two have died, leaving 212 at present on the superannuation list who have been superannuated by the Government since last elections. Since the Conservative Government took office, in 1879, they superannuated 494 clerks out of the 539, so that there is to-day only 45 on the list who were superannuated by all previous Governments. Forty-eight clerks per year have, on an average, been superannuated by the Conservative Government since 1891.

Now, there is another feature of the Superannuation Act that I wish to draw the attention of the House to. Under the provisions of the Act, where any person is possessed of technical knowledge, the Government has power to add to his years of service. I can easily conceive a case where a man engaged to perform some very important duty, might possibly be possessed of certain technical knowledge, and during the time he was acquiring it, of course he was growing in years. Such an one would not be able to serve the number of years that would entitle him to draw the maximum superannuation of thirty-five fiftieths of his salary, and, under these circumstances, the Government is empowered to add a certain number of years to his service. Sir, I find that this provision of the Act has been grossly abused. I hold in my hand a list of the names of those who have had years added to their term of service. Those persons whose names I shall read to the House have yearly drawn sums in excess of what the Act provides for, and they are enabled to do this on account of a term of years being added to their service, presumably because they were possessed of some particular technical knowledge.

Name.	Salary.	Date of Superannuation.	Years Added.	Yearly increase.	Total.	Years Drawn.	Total Extra Amount Drawn.
	\$			\$ cts.	\$ cts.		\$
F. P. Austin.....		May, 1883.....	4 years.	34 00	136 00	12 years.	1,632
E. D. Ashe.....		do 1883.....	2 do	28 00	56 00	12 do	672
W. F. Bowes.....		April, 1888.....	3 do	20 00	60 00	8 do	480
R. W. Baxter.....		July, 1891.....	2 do	40 00	80 00	5 do	400
E. H. Cunningham...		Nov., 1884.....	5 do	10 00	50 00	12 do	600
J. B. Cherriman.....	4,000	Aug., 1885.....	10 do	80 00	800 00	11 do	8,800
H. J. Chaloner.....		Sept., 1889.....	10 do	48 00	480 00	6 do	2,880
B. Chamberlin.....	3,200	Nov., 1891.....	5 do	64 00	320 00	5 do	1,600
C. J. Campbell.....	3,000	May, 1895.....	10 do	60 00	600 00	1 do	600
E. Dagnault.....	1,000	do 1880.....	3 do	20 00	60 00	16 do	960
P. Dezois.....	400	Dec., 1887.....	2 do	12 00	24 00	9 do	216
J. Dodd.....	1,500	July, 1893.....	5 do	30 00	150 00	5 do	750
J. Flinn.....	2,000	Nov., 1880.....	7 do	40 00	280 00	16 do	4,480
J. T. Fox.....	1,200	July, 1880.....	7 do	24 00	168 00	16 do	2,688
J. Ferguson.....	1,000	Aug., 1888.....	3 do	20 00	60 00	8 do	480
J. A. Green.....	1,800	Feb., 1883.....	2 do	36 00	72 00	13 do	936
B. Grenier.....	500	Oct., 1885.....	3 do	10 00	30 00	10 do	300
W. G. Gouin.....	500	Sept., 1894.....	10 do	10 00	100 00	2 do	200
S. Howe.....	1,900	July, 1887.....	10 do	38 00	380 00	9 do	3,120
J. W. Hogan.....	900	do 1888.....	5 do	18 00	90 00	8 do	720
J. F. Hilton.....	1,800	Aug., 1891.....	3 do	36 00	108 00	5 do	540

Name.	Salary.	Date of Superannuation.	Years Added.	Yearly increase.	Total.	Years Drawn.	Total Extra Amount Drawn.
	\$			\$ cts.	\$ cts.		\$
C. W. Jenkins.	1,800	July, 1882.	10 years.	36 00	360 00	14 years.	5,040
G. M. Jarvis.	1,400	do 1891.	1 do	28 00	28 00	5 do	140
John Kidd.	2,350	June, 1882.	10 do	47 00	470 00	14 do	6,580
J. Lesslie.	3,500	Mar., 1879.	5 do	70 00	350 00	17 do	5,950
C. Lamothe.	4,000	Feb., 1891.	8½ do	80 00	680 00	5 do	3,400
E. A. Meredith.	3,600	Nov., 1878.	3 do	72 00	216 00	3,879
F. Measam.	1,800	do 1887.	4 do	36 00	144 00	7 years.	1,008
F. H. Mickleburgh.	800	April, 1888.	2 do	16 00	32 00	8 do	256
H. J. Millar.	1,400	Aug., 1889.	4½ do	28 00	119 00	6 do	714
T. Malone.	300	do 1894.	10 do	6 00	60 00	2 do	120
H. McMillan.	1,200	Nov., 1877.	10 do	24 00	240 00	18 do	4,320
J. A. McDonald.	1,200	do 1880.	5 do	24 00	120 00	16 do	1,920
J. O'Hara.	1,000	April, 1888.	3 do	20 00	60 00	8 do	480
J. Poupore.	2,600	Sept., 1889.	10 do	52 00	520 00	7 do	3,640
F. P. Rubidge.	2,400	July, 1871.	1 do	48 00	48 00	25 do	1,248
W. Selly.	1,900	do 1887.	10 do	38 00	380 00	9 do	3,420
R. A. Scott.	2,000	Oct., 1888.	10 do	40 00	400 00	8 do	3,200
J. A. Torrance.	2,275	July, 1886.	5 do	45 50	227 50	10 do	2,275
J. Tomlinson.	2,500	Aug., 1886.	10 do	50 00	500 00	10 do	5,000
J. Travis.	3,000	Mar., 1887.	10 do	60 00	600 00	9 do	5,400
B. Trudel.	1,500	July, 1889.	10 do	30 00	300 00	7 do	2,100
Total.							92,844

All these names I have mentioned are the names of parties who were superannuated by hon. gentlemen opposite and had years added to their term. These people have drawn \$92,844 of the public money, to one cent of which they were not entitled. I should like the Finance Minister to tell me on what principle Mr. Lamothe, the postmaster of Montreal, who had a salary of \$4,000 a year and had enjoyed his office for sixteen and a half years, was given an addition to his term of service of eight and a half years. What particular technical knowledge had he that entitled him to this addition? None whatever. The only reason there was for making this addition to his salary was this: Mr. Dansereau, the very prominent and bosom friend of Mr. Chapleau, who is now Lieutenant-Governor of the province of Quebec, wanted to get the position of postmaster of Montreal. The incumbent was, I presume, in perfect health and vigour and did not want to retire; but no doubt the inducement was held out to him that an addition would be made to his term of service. The Government added eight and a half years to his term, and in this way increased his annual grant \$880. This gave him 25-50 of his salary as his retiring allowance, namely, \$2,000 as long as he lives. Mr. Dansereau now has the office at \$4,000 a year. That rule will apply to every one of the cases I have cited with scarcely an exception. In almost every case, years have been added, as an inducement to these men to quietly and peaceably retire, in order that their positions might be given to particular friends of the Government or members of Parliament. The

Mr. McMULLEN.

result of this prostitution of the Superannuation Act has been that the country has lost hundreds of thousands of dollars. We have lost \$2,500,000 altogether. But over and above what we would have been called to pay strictly according to the Act, if no additions had been made to the superannuations, we have lost hundreds of thousands of dollars by these additions to terms of service. Last year I asked for a return of the operations of this Act, from its inception down to the present. The hon. Minister of Finance loaded down that return by an amendment which he proposed himself. That amendment was proposed no doubt, for the purpose of preventing that return coming down last year. At least it could not be got down in time last session, and this year it has been laid on the Table. No doubt it has cost considerable trouble to produce this return; and it is well, now that we have it, that we should make use of it by ascertaining how far the system of superannuation has been abused. Had it not been abused, the system would not be in the unfortunate position in which it is. As the case stands, our people have been called upon to contribute, out of their hard-earned means, a large sum for the retirement of a considerable number of superannuated officers which they would not have had to contribute, if the Act had not been abused in the way I have been pointing out, with the results I have indicated.

I shall give some cases of those who have been superannuated under the Act, to show that the statement I presented to the House last year was about correct.

SUPERANNUATIONS.

Name.	Date of Appointment.	Amount of Salary at time of Appointment.	Number of years in the Service.	Amount of Salary at time of Superannuation.	Date of Superannuation.	Number of years added to length of Service.	Amount of Annual Retiring Allowance Granted.	(Gross Amount Paid into the Superannuation Fund up to 6th July, 1895.)	Gross Amount Drawn up to 1st July, 1896.	Age at time of Superannuation.
		\$ cts.		\$ cts.			\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	
Austin, E. P.	April 1, 1857.	700 00	26	1,700 00	May 1, 1883.	4	990 00	427 33	12,045 00	53
Ashe, E. D.	June 11, 1850.	1,400 00	33	1,400 00	do 1, 1883.	2	980 00	443 33	11,677 94	69
Anderson, C. E.	July 1, 1860.	2,600 00	26	2,400 00	July 1, 1886.		1,248 00	436 00	11,232 00	70
Ashworth, J.	Oct. 28, 1843.	700 00	45	2,400 00	Oct. 1, 1888.		1,671 25	343 75	11,280 87	64
Benoit, Ulric.	Aug. 5, 1852.	400 00	27	1,100 00	July 1, 1879.		588 00	242 38	9,408 00	48
Bélanger, J. A.	Dec. 10, 1853.	400 00	32	1,600 00	do 1, 1885.		991 92	454 0	9,919 20	52
Beatty, J.	Oct. 1, 1861.	500 00	25	1,200 00	June 1, 1887.		624 00	407 00	5,044 00	58
Bowes, W. F.	Jan. 1, 1856.	400 00	32	1,000 00	April 1, 1888.	3	700 00	372 00	5,016 38	52
Bureau, E. E.	July 1, 1861.	800 00	27	900 00	Jan. 1, 1889.		486 00	333 00	3,159 00	55
Balland, J. F.	Aug. 20, 1863.	500 00	26	700 00	July 1, 1889.		384 00	248 22	2,304 00	45
Bolduc, J. E.	Nov. 21, 1864.	400 00	35	1,400 00	Jan. 1, 1890.		980 00	598 89	5,389 56	62
Baillaigé, G. F.	Sept. 1, 1844.	800 00	46	3,200 00	do 1, 1891.	2	2,240 00	632 00	10,79 64	65
Baxter, R. W.	Feb. 16, 1858.	800 00	33	2,000 00	July 1, 1891.		1,365 00	774 50	5,460 00	55
Bucke, P. E.	Jan. 1, 1856.	540 00	35	1,800 00	Oct. 1, 1891.		1,260 00	618 00	4,725 00	60
Carmichael, J. C. E.	July 1, 1841.	600 00	40	800 00	July 1, 1881.		500 00	215 46	7,838 88	60
Cox, George.	June 1, 1854.	400 00	27	1,600 00	Sept. 1, 1881.		828 00	395 20	11,384 60	60
Cherriman, J. B.	July 1, 1873.	4,000 00	12	4,000 00	Aug. 1, 1885.	10	1,760 00	960 00	17,452 88	63
Corke, Alfred	April 1, 1856.	400 00	30	1,200 00	Oct. 1, 1886.		720 00	436 02	6,300 00	61
Chaloner, H. J.	Oct. 1, 1882.	2,000 00	7	2,400 00	Sept. 1, 1891.		816 00	328 54	4,760 00	65
Chamberlin, B.	June 6, 1870.	2,000 00	21	3,200 00	Nov. 1, 1891.		1,664 00	1,080 00	6,068 68	64
Campbell, C. J.	July 1, 1883.	3,000 00	12	3,000 00	May 1, 1895.		1,320 00	698 66	188 07	75
Dixon, J. D.	Nov. 1, 1855.	800 00	26	800 00	Dec. 1, 1881.		416 00	230 66	5,649 58	62
DeGaspé, A. A.	do 21, 1854.	400 00	30	1,000 00	July 1, 1884.		600 00	242 26	6,600 00	53
Duff, Alexr.	May 1, 1851.	650 00	35	1,200 00	Sept. 1, 1886.		840 00	349 66	7,420 00	66
Doré, F. F.	Jan. 11, 1860.	1,000 00	27	2,500 00	July 1, 1887.		1,350 00	705 50	10,799 37	56
Dupont, C. J.	June 5, 1843.	700 00	25	2,200 00	do 1, 1887.		1,100 00	710 19	8,799 81	50
Dewe, John	Oct. 1, 1845.	400 00	46	2,800 00	do 1, 1889.		1,960 00	548 00	11,759 89	68
Elliott, R. N.	July 1, 1849.	400 00	15	700 00	April 1, 1881.		210 00	150 17	2,992 50	55
Emery, Michael	May 1, 1846.	300 00	42	2,000 00	do 1, 1891.		1,400 04	590 24	5,950 17	66
Forbes, Henry G.	July 1, 1875.	1,400 00	34	850 00	May 1, 1880.		578 00	201 17	8,765 12	66
Flint, John	do 10, 1852.	300 00	5	2,000 00	Nov. 1, 1880.	7	456 00	140 00	6,688 00	47
Fox, J. T.	June 18, 1855.	400 00	28	1,200 00	July 1, 1882.	7	840 00	222 00	12,600 00	62
Foot, Thomas	Jan. 1, 1861.	400 00	27	2,400 00	do 1, 1888.		1,228 50	533 55	15,969 72	44
Ferguson, James	Mar. 25, 1868.	400 00	20	1,300 00	May 1, 1888.	3	600 00	338 99	4,350 00	54
Forsyth, John	April 1, 1860.	1,450 00	30	1,800 00	do 1, 1890.		504 44	451 10	3,614 58	52
Finlaison, C. S.	Mar. 22, 1854.	400 00	27	1,100 00	June 1, 1881.		1,080 00	539 94	5,580 00	67
Gordon, S.		400 00	27	1,100 00	June 1, 1881.		594 00	284 55	8,366 42	66

SUPERANNUATIONS.

Name.	Date of Appointment.	Amount of Salary at time of Appointment.	Number of years in the Service.	Amount of Salary at time of Superannuation.	Date of Superannuation.	Number of years added to length of Service.	Amount of Annual Retiring Allowance Granted.	Amount Paid into the Superannuation Fund up to 1st July, 1895.	Gross Amount Drawn up to 1st July, 1895.	Age at time of Superannuation.
		\$ cts.		\$ cts.			\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	
Graham, Richard	July 18, 1851	300 00	30	1,000 00	June 1, 1881		600 00	198 83	8,450 00	73
Green, James A.	June 1, 1850	600 00	33	1,800 00	Feb. 1, 1883	2	1,200 00	539 66	15,645 00	53
Grant, G. W.	do 26, 1868	400 00	15	1,600 00	Aug. 1, 1883		450 00	306 16	5,249 52	31
Griffin, W. H.	April 23, 1831	1,000 00	57	3,200 00	July 1, 1888		2,240 00		15,679 53	76
Graham, John	do do 1, 1859	600 00	31	3,000 00	Jan. 1, 1880		1,860 00	930 00	10,230 00	64
Hart, D. W.	July 1, 1859	1,200 00	20	1,200 00	do 1, 1880		460 00	296 00	7,129 38	59
Hinsworth, Fred. H.	June 1, 1847	600 00	33	1,750 00	Mar. 1, 1880		1,122 00	375 00	17,204 00	56
Hood, H. A.	April 1, 1861	700 00	22	1,400 00	Aug. 1, 1883		616 00	350 26	7,340 19	67
Higgins, Moore A.	Oct. 1, 1837	600 00	47	1,800 00	July 1, 1884		1,260 00	170 00	13,860 00	64
Howe, Sydenham	Feb. 14, 1865	600 00	22	1,900 00	do 1, 1887	10	1,216 00	583 84	9,729 08	44
Hamley, Hon. W.	Jan. 1, 1859	3,800 00	31	3,800 00	Jan. 1, 1890		2,356 00		12,957 78	72
Huddal, Henry A. R.	Aug. 18, 1846	400 00	45	1,500 00	April 1, 1891		1,050 00	346 02	4,462 50	63
Jenkins, C. W.	Dec. 17, 1867	1,200 00	15	1,800 00	July 1, 1882	10	900 00	459 00	11,700 00	66
Jordan, F. G.	April 1, 1844	400 00	39	2,400 00	Jan. 1, 1883		980 00	350 00	12,249 00	75
Johnston, Samuel	Sept. 2, 1853	400 00	31	1,150 00	Oct. 1, 1884		692 28	335 11	7,442 01	65
Johnson, James	Aug. 1, 1857	600 00	35	4,000 00	Mar. 1, 1892		2,800 00	1,424 15	9,533 20	76
Kidd, John	July 1, 1858	600 00	24	2,350 00	June 1, 1882	10	1,564 00	492 50	20,461 76	61
Kavanagh, Henry	Aug. 14, 1839	2,000 00	52	2,000 00	May 1, 1891		1,400 04	800 00	5,833 50	73
Leslie, Joseph	April 16, 1849	400 00	30	3,500 00	Mar. 1, 1879	5	2,450 00	688 98	40,132 12	65
Labossiere, Edouard	do do 14, 1847	200 00	34	415 00	Jan. 1, 1881		282 12	63 11	4,090 73	61
Leprohon, J. P.	Jan. 1, 1847	600 00	35	2,205 56	June 1, 1882		1,543 92	494 00	20,199 62	60
Laperrière, A.	June 1, 1850	400 00	35	1,800 00	Dec. 1, 1885		1,260 00	575 50	12,075 00	56
Leahy, Mrs. Mary	May 1, 1861	200 00	25	550 00	May 1, 1886		420 81	169 00	3,857 70	48
Low, H. G.	July 1, 1872	700 00	14	1,300 00	Aug. 1, 1886		376 00	172 00	3,210 00	49
Lamothe, Guillaume	Jan. 1, 1875	4,000 00	16½	4,000 00	Feb. 1, 1891	8½	2,000 00	1,324 61	8,832 98	67
Meredith, E. A.	May 20, 1847	2,433 33	32	3,600 00	Nov. 1, 1878	3	2,520 00	653 22	42,000 00	62
Mingaye, W. R.	do do 1, 1854	500 00	33	3,800 00	Mar. 1, 1887		2,508 00	748 66	20,900 00	63
Measun, F.	Aug. 3, 1866	700 00	21	1,800 00	Nov. 1, 1887	4	894 48	561 13	6,857 68	57
Miller, P.	June 1, 1852	600 00	37	1,200 00	Aug. 1, 1889		840 00	388 41	4,970 00	58
McKae, W. H.	Sept. 1, 1859	1,940 00	14	1,940 00	Sept. 1, 1873		505 18	6 46	11,028 62	39
McCrae, W. F.	May 1, 1853	400 00	21	850 00	Nov. 1, 1874		431 52	124 66	8,378 34	60
McColl, E.	Feb. 12, 1852	400 00	28	750 00	Nov. 1, 1879		415 80	132 84	6,479 55	72
McDonald, J. A.	Jan. 9, 1869	1,200 00	12	1,200 00	Nov. 1, 1880	5	408 00	163 48	5,984 00	58
McKay, H. B.	Dec. 15, 1863	1,000 00	19	2,600 00	Jan. 1, 1882		912 00	224 67	12,351 23	59
McDonald, D. A.	Jan. 1, 1866	400 00	16	800 00	Feb. 1, 1882		176 00	126 05	2,316 28	38
McKay, Murdock	May 1, 1847	306 00	35	450 00	Dec. 1, 1882		315 00	18 50	3,963 75	64
McCaffrey, F.	July 10, 1857	365 00	27	500 00	May 1, 1884		270 00	104 14	3,015 00	50

McDonald, D. A.	Oct.	1, 1834	800 00	55	1,600 00	July	1, 1889	1,120 00	6,719 65	72
McNutt, C.	July	1, 1858	1,200 00	31	2,000 00	Aug.	1, 1889	1,280 00	7,572 87	74
O'Hara, James	Jan.	1, 1865	400 00	23	1,000 00	April	1, 1888	520 00	3,769 73	52
Prendegast, James	May	1, 1844	700 00	28	725 00	June	1, 1872	365 40	8,804 44	48
Pouliotte, Joseph	do	2, 1861	400 00	12	640 00	Feb.	1, 1873	138 24	3,190 08	50
Perkins, T.	Dec.	1, 1856	550 00	25	600 00	May	1, 1882	360 00	4,740 00	66
Patterson, James	July	1, 1867	700 00	14	850 00	July	1, 1881	237 22	3,319 68	50
Pope, Hon. J.	do	1, 1848	600 00	35	1,800 00	do	1, 1883	1,260 00	15,120 00	80
Peachy, J. W.	Feb.	18, 1855	1,000 00	30	2,400 00	May	1, 1885	1,440 00	14,640 00	58
Poupre, James	Sept.	1, 1882	2,400 00	7	2,600 00	Sept.	1, 1889	337 35	5,156 20	72
Powell, Grant	May	1, 1839	400 00	50	3,200 00	Dec.	1, 1889	2,240 00	12,506 24	70
Powell, Israel	Sept.	1, 1872	1,500 00	17	3,000 00	Oct.	1, 1889	1,020 00	5,423 51	52
Phillips, Edward	Dec.	2, 1853	1,500 00	36	1,500 00	July	1, 1890	1,050 00	5,250 00	62
Purcell, J. P.	Sept.	1, 1855	1,300 00	36	1,600 00	Aug.	1, 1891	1,120 08	4,386 98	66
Rubidge F. P.	May	1, 1837	800 00	34	2,400 00	July	1, 1871	1,512 00	39,312 00	65
Reed, A.	Sept.	30, 1835	400 00	38	580 00	do	1, 1873	377 64	8,874 48	57
Ranney, G. W.	do	1, 1847	500 00	26	730 00	do	1, 1873	356 88	7,830 49	63
Romaine, C. F.	Aug.	1, 1863	1,200 00	16	2,200 00	Aug.	1, 1879	680 00	10,822 06	59
Russell, Lindsay	July	1, 1869	2,600 00	15	3,200 00	July	1, 1884	1,556 00	17,048 98	43
Radcliffe, R.	Sept.	25, 1855	400 00	30	700 00	do	1, 1885	420 00	4,200 00	47
Roberge, O.	Dec.	1, 1853	500 00	33	700 00	do	1, 1886	462 00	4,158 00	51
Ross, Thomas	Nov.	9, 1839	630 00	47	2,600 00	Mar.	1, 1887	1,820 00	15,014 36	66
Risley, Samuel	July	27, 1857	1,200 00	32	1,800 00	Oct.	1, 1889	1,752 00	6,024 00	67
Ritchie, James	May	19, 1860	700 00	29	1,600 00	Aug.	1, 1889	928 00	5,490 43	53
Scott, F. G.	Feb.	1, 1854	1,000 00	17	1,400 00	Mar.	1, 1871	380 76	9,265 61	49
Stalker, C.	Oct.	1, 1860	480 00	13	480 00	Nov.	1, 1873	116 04	2,504 53	68
Stephens, Chas. L.	April	6, 1859	400 00	22	1,000 00	do	1, 1881	440 00	6,012 24	40
Seely, Wm.	July	1, 1864	600 00	23	1,900 00	July	1, 1887	1,254 00	9,927 50	73
Scott, P. A.	Mar.	7, 1871	1,800 00	17	2,000 00	Oct.	1, 1888	1,080 00	7,289 96	72
Story, John D.	Jan.	1, 1871	300 00	19	1,400 00	Jan.	1, 1890	519 36	2,856 48	37
Thomas, G. W.	April	1, 1865	400 00	14	550 00	Aug.	1, 1879	261 36	3,985 74	63
Torrance, J. A.	do	1, 1866	1,200 00	20	2,275 00	July	1, 1886	1,112 40	10,011 60	68
Tomlinson, J.	May	5, 1870	2,000 00	16	2,500 00	Aug.	1, 1886	1,300 00	11,591 28	70
Travis, Jeremiah	Sept.	1, 1885	3,000 00	1 ¹ / ₂	3,000 00	Mar.	1, 1887	720 00	6,021 42	52
Thibault, Charles	do	1, 1880	1,600 00	9	2,000 00	Sept.	1, 1889	760 00	4,433 10	49
Tilton, John	Nov.	21, 1867	1,400 00	24	3,200 00	Dec.	1, 1891	1,536 00	5,504 00	55
Vincent, Oliver	July	1, 1836	400 00	35	600 00	April	1, 1872	378 00	9,628 62	62
Vanderburg, Henry	Jan.	1, 1868	600 00	17	1,200 00	July	1, 1885	408 00	4,080 00	60
Vallée, Joseph	Aug.	9, 1861	450 00	25	960 00	Sept.	1, 1886	480 00	4,240 00	54
Viets, Botsford	Sept.	16, 1853	750 00	35	800 00	June	1, 1888	560 00	3,966 10	78
Vankoughnet, Lawrence	Feb.	13, 1861	730 00	33	3,200 00	Oct.	1, 1893	2,112 00	3,690 20	57
Watson, John	April	3, 1851	264 00	20	234 00	do	1, 1871	93 60	2,982 41	66
Webber, Augustus	do	2 ¹ / ₂ , 1867	500 00	16	1,070 00	do	1, 1883	313 60	3,683 88	58
Winslow, Alex	Sept.	1, 1868	456 00	15	342 00	Aug.	1, 1883	102 60	1,222 65	62
Weaver, W.	April	1, 1852	360 00	35	538 00	Nov.	1, 1887	976 60	2,886 66	67
Wallace, Robt.	Jan.	1, 1874	2,200 00	14	2,400 00	Jan.	1, 1888	672 00	6,839 62	56
Weatherley, H. S.	Nov.	3, 1853	800 00	35	1,800 00	July	1, 1888	1,260 00	8,820 00	53
Walsh, T. J.	July	1, 1854	195 00	35	1,500 00	do	1, 1889	1,050 00	6,300 00	53
Whitney, H. A.	Oct.	1, 1872	720 00	20	3,200 00	Nov.	1, 1892	1,280 00	3,413 20	58

I may say, with regard to Charles Thibault, that he was superannuated in violation of the terms of the Superannuation Act, because he only served nine years, and no man is entitled to a superannuation allowance unless he has served ten years. The Government did not even add the year to his time of service to make his superannuation legal. For the satisfaction of the hon. Finance Minister, I am glad to say that I have reached the end of the first part of my speech and am quite willing to adjourn and give the balance at another time. But before doing so, I want to draw to the hon. Minister's attention this fact, that every one of those names are the names of parties who have been superannuated by hon. gentlemen opposite. The present Government, since 1880, are responsible for every name on the list, with the exception of forty-eight who were superannuated, not by the Mackenzie Government, but by the Administration which preceded Mr. Mackenzie's. Only two in the whole list were retired by the Mackenzie Government, so that hon. gentlemen opposite stand responsible for all the rest. I have presented these cases to the House in order to show that the Act has been positively abused. It has been used in a way to make openings for men, who no doubt were pressing their services on hon. gentlemen opposite, and for whom there was no possibility of providing comfortable situations with lucrative salaries except by creating vacancies through this abuse of the Superannuation Act.

Mr. FOSTER. I see that my hon. friend's vitality is somewhat diminished, and perhaps it would be well to move the adjournment of the debate. It is my desire to have the hon. gentleman in the best trim for his work.

Mr. DEVLIN moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

REPORT.

Report of the Department of the Interior for the year 1895 laid on the Table.—(Mr. Daly.)

AUDITOR GENERAL'S REPORT.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We were promised the balance of the Auditor General's Report to-day.

Mr. FOSTER. All I can do is to bring down the report as soon as the Auditor General has completed it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The law declares that on the 31st of January and not later we are to have the Auditor General's Report. The Auditor General or the hon. gentleman is breaking the law.

Mr. FOSTER. It must be the Auditor General.

Mr. McMULLEN.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am afraid the hon. gentleman is an accomplice before the fact. He did not give the Auditor General the means to do his work.

Mr. FOSTER moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 10 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 13th February, 1896.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

MONTREAL HARBOUR.

Mr. McSHANE asked :

1. Has not the Government, in the interests of shipping, expended very large sums of money on harbours and harbour works of one kind and another in ports and places all over the Dominion ?

2. At the port of Quebec do not the Government outlays, in principal and interest, amount to about \$5,000,000, in respect of the Princess Louise Basin, and to about \$1,000,000 in respect of the Lévis Graving Dock ?

3. Is it not true, as regard the port of Montreal, that no Government money has been expended on the harbour proper, all responsibility for construction and maintenance in connection therewith having been laid on the Board of Harbour Commissioners without financial aid from the Government or Parliament ?

4. Is it not true that the appropriation made by Government to reimburse the Montreal Harbour Board for their expenditures prior to 1860, in connection with the twenty feet channel through Lake St. Peter, proved insufficient by the sum of \$295,471.10, and that in connection with the Nearer Channel improvements, the Government exacted from the Harbour Board interest on expenditure during the construction of the works, which levies amounted in the aggregate to the sum of \$794,027.95, so that in effect the Government is at present in pocket of harbour moneys to the extent of over a million dollars ?

5. Is it the intention of the Government to place in the Supplementary Estimates a sum sufficient to reimburse the Montreal Harbour Board for this outlay of theirs in connection with the Lake St. Peter channel ?

6. Is it the intention of the Government to place the Montreal Harbour on the same financial footing as other harbours are placed throughout the Dominion ?

Mr. OUIMET. The answer to the first question is "Yes." The answer to the second question is as follows:—No direct Government outlays were made in connection with the harbour works at Quebec, but loans of sums authorized by Parliament were made from time to time to the Quebec

Harbour Commissioners, amounting to \$3,975,000. As regards the Lévis Graving Dock, it is Government property, and the total cost was \$910,000. The answer to the third question is "Yes." In answer to the fourth question: The question itself is a pretty fair statement of the contention of the Montreal Harbour Board. When the settlement took place in 1888, this was not recognized in the settlement, and has been a standing claim since. As to the fifth and sixth questions: They will be answered later on when the Supplementary Estimates are brought down.

WHITEHEAD CANAL, GUYSBORO', N.S.

Mr. FRASER asked :

1. Does the Government propose finishing the Whitehead Canal, in the county of Guysboro', for which fifteen hundred dollars have been spent already during the present year? Will an amount sufficient for that purpose be included in the Supplementary Estimates?

2. Have the Government sent an engineer during the past year to make surveys at St. Francis Harbour, in the county of Guysboro'? If so, what was his name? Has he given in his report? What amount will be required to complete the proposed work? Will a sum sufficient to complete the work be included in the Supplementary Estimates?

Mr. OUMET. The answer to the first question cannot be given now. It will be given later on when the Supplementary Estimates are before the House. As to the second question the answer is: Instructions were sent to Mr. Milledge, and survey made by Mr. Bernascone, one of his assistants. The chief engineer submitted, on the 16th January last, a report in which he states that a sum of \$1,300 will be required to do the necessary work, which consists in deepening the channel and protecting the base of the bank with crib-work. The Supplementary Estimates will answer the latter part of the question.

SOREL ILLICIT WHISKY CASE.

Mr. BRUNEAU asked :

Whether Frédéric Lahaise, of Sorel, was recently charged before Magistrate Charles Dorion, with unlawfully manufacturing whisky? If so, did his trial take place, and what was the verdict? Were other complaints entered against other persons in Sorel, in relation to the same offence, and as accomplices of the said Lahaise? If so, what has been the result?

Mr. PRIOR. Frédéric Lahaise was convicted of running a still in a cellar below the Brunswick Hotel, Sorel. He was fined \$100 and sentenced to one month in jail, and a further month, if the fine is not paid. Copy of judgment and evidence has been written for in order to know what justification exists for further prosecutions.

LONDON CUSTOM-HOUSE.

Mr. FORBES asked :

1. Have any charges of dereliction of duty or other nature been made to, or received by, the

department during the years 1895 or 1896 against any official or officials of the London Custom-house?

2. If any, what was the nature of such charges?

3. Against whom made?

4. By whom made or from whom received?

5. By whom investigated?

6. Were such charges proved or disproved?

7. What was the decision of the department regarding such charges?

Mr. WOOD. I beg to say, in answer to the question, that no such charges have been made.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Before the Orders of the Day, I would again call the attention of the Minister of Finance to the fact, that we are now in the seventh week of the session, and the Public Accounts Committee has not held one single meeting, except for the purpose of organization. It may be correct enough to say that the Auditor General's Report is not down in full; but there is quite enough down to enable papers to be moved for; and I think it is not treating that important committee properly not to summon it before this time. While on my feet, I may as well point out to the Minister of Finance that it is very desirable that some member of the Government should be present at the meetings of important committees like the Banking and Commerce Committee. I did not see one there to-day. Questions arise there on which the committee ought to be instructed as to what the policy of the Government is. Although I cannot allude to it further, we had such a question up to-day, and we had no luminary on the Government side to guide or advise us. We were left to our own discretion entirely. I do not think that should be.

Mr. FOSTER. I am glad my hon. friend thinks that Ministers are necessary for advice on that important committee. He is quite right, I have no doubt, and some Minister is generally in attendance. I myself was very busy this morning, and was unable to be present. However, that matter will not be lost sight of. With reference to the Public Accounts Committee, it is organized, and the chairman will, I suppose, take immediate steps to summon a meeting. I am glad to hear my hon. friend say that a part of the Auditor General's Report will be sufficient in order to commence work on the Public Accounts Committee. I hope he will be of the same opinion when we come to the Committee of Supply.

IMPORTS FROM AUSTRALIA AND NEW ZEALAND.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell.) I gave notice to the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Ives) that I would like to put a question to him, and as it is a matter of importance, I would like to get an answer as soon as possible:

What are the various kinds of articles imported into British Columbia from Australia and New Zealand since the 1st of July, 1895? What are the names, quantities and values of the various articles imported?

The hon. gentleman may be able to give me the information now.

Mr. IVES. I am not able to give the information at the moment; but I gave orders this morning to have it prepared, because the hon. gentleman spoke to me last night, and I think by the first of the week I shall be able to give him the information.

INQUIRY FOR RETURNS.

Mr. CASEY. I beg again to call the attention of the leader of the House to his promise of a very early return to the order of the House for correspondence with the High Commissioner at London, who is also now Secretary of State, in regard to his leaving London and coming to Canada on the last occasion, his leave of absence, and so on. It is a very small return: it cannot comprise more than two or three documents. I also wish to inquire about a return of the correspondence with the High Commissioner in regard to his duties and his appointment, which has not already been laid before the House. I reminded the hon. gentleman once before of those returns, and he promised to have them at a very early date.

Mr. FOSTER. I beg to inform my hon. friend that I am writing a note now in reference to them.

Mr. CASEY. And when does the hon. gentleman expect to get them?

Mr. FOSTER. As soon as I can.

SUPPLY—THE BUDGET.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Foster:

That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go again into Committee of Supply.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). Mr. Speaker, in rising to continue the debate on the Budget, I feel that there is a difficult task before me. However, I will endeavour to use my strength carefully, so that I may be able to continue the discussion for some time. In listening to the debate for the past two weeks, I have arrived at the conclusion that the hon. members who support the Government are in doubt as to what the Liberal policy in regard to the trade question is. They have said that we have no consistent policy. They say sometimes that we are in favour of continental free trade, and at other times that we are in favour of free trade as we find it in England. It is evident that in reference to this question a great deal of ignorance prevails that should not prevail, since our policy has been so definitely stated. In 1893 one of the largest and most influential

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).

conventions that ever met in Canada met in the city of Ottawa for the purpose of considering the condition of this country and formulating a policy which, in the opinion of the delegates, would be in the interests of Canada. After sitting and meditating no less than two or three days on this question, the convention formulated a policy. That policy was put in plain English, and has been placed before the people of this country. So that there need not be any difficulty or doubt as to what the real policy of the Liberal party is. I object, Mr. Speaker, to the party in opposition to us formulating a policy for the Liberal party. They are at liberty, so far as I am concerned, to formulate a policy of their own, and to put their own construction upon it. But I, as a humble member of the Liberal party, object very strenuously to their formulating a policy for us, and putting their own construction upon it. We believe, from the policy which they have adopted for many years, and from their preconceived Tory ideas, that they are not exactly in a position to lay down the broad policy that will exactly suit the present circumstances of this country; and I am of opinion that the sooner the Liberal party are in power, the better it will be for the general interests of the country. In this day, as in all other days, Liberal views are broader and sounder on trade and other national questions than the views entertained by the Liberal-Conservative party. Therefore, you might expect that our policy would be broader and more in the interests of Canada than any policy our opponents have adopted. Now, in order that there may be no mistake on this matter, I want to place on record the first plank of the Liberal policy, and then I will show you that it is based upon truth:

We, the Liberal party of Canada, in convention assembled, declare:—

That the customs tariff of the Dominion should be based, not as it is now upon the protective principle, but upon the requirements of the public service;

That the existing tariff, founded upon an unsound principle, and used, as it has been by the Government, as a corrupting agency wherewith to keep themselves in office, has developed monopolies, trusts and combinations;

It has decreased the value of farm and other landed property;

It has oppressed the masses to the enrichment of a few;

It has checked immigration;

It has caused great loss of population;

It has impeded commerce;

It has discriminated against Great Britain.

In these and many other ways it has occasioned great public and private injury, all of which evils must continue to grow in intensity as long as the present tariff system remains in force.

That the highest interests of Canada demand a removal of this obstacle to our country's progress, by the adoption of a sound fiscal policy, which, while not doing injustice to any class, will promote domestic and foreign trade, and hasten the return of prosperity to our people;

That to that end, the tariff should be reduced to the needs of honest, economical and efficient government ;

That it should be so adjusted as to make free, or to bear as lightly as possible upon, the necessities of life, and should be so arranged as to promote freer trade with the whole world, more particularly with Great Britain and the United States.

We believe that the results of the protective system have grievously disappointed thousands of persons who honestly supported it, and that the country, in the light of experience, is now prepared to declare for a sound fiscal policy.

The issue between the two political parties on this question is now clearly defined.

The Government themselves admit the failure of their fiscal policy, and now profess their willingness to make some changes ; but they say that such changes must be based only on the principle of protection.

We denounce the principle of protection as radically unsound, and unjust to the masses of the people, and we declare our conviction that any tariff changes based on that principle must fail to afford any substantial relief from the burdens under which the country labours.

This issue we unhesitatingly accept, and upon it we await with the fullest confidence the verdict of the electors of Canada.

Now, that plank of the Liberal policy is very plain, definite and distinct from the policy enunciated by the Liberal-Conservative party, and, therefore, there is a line of demarcation between the two, clear and distinct. We accept the issue, and propose to demand the support of the people on the ground of our policy. The Liberal party condemn the principle of protection, as you will see, Mr. Speaker, from what I have read, as an unsound principle, unjust to the great majority of the people.

Having discussed the evils of protection in various ways during the last number of years, and having shown from actual facts and conditions that this policy is unsound in principle, unjust in practice, and deleterious to the best interests of this country, I will, instead of going into the various arguments which I formerly used, give you the conclusions at which I have arrived after a complete investigation into the whole question. This is one of the conclusions at which I have arrived, and I shall give it in the language of one of the ablest statesmen of the century :

That protection is a legal robbery, and not a whit more respectable or justifiable because the state is the culprit.

I think when we look over the records of this country, when we see the operations of the protective principle during the last seventeen years, we must, if we put aside our political bias and reason out the question as candid, intelligent men, come to the conclusion to endorse this statement.

My second conclusion is as follows :—

Protection is a promise given by the Government to dear production to shield it against the competition of cheap productions.

My third conclusion is this :

Protection is a power given to dear production to exact from the consumer a price which he would not otherwise pay.

My fourth conclusion is as follows :—

Protection shields the products of labour from competition on equal terms, and puts the labour itself upon the free list.

It is evident to everybody that however much you can protect the products of labour there has been no demand in this country for the protection of labour itself. While marts are full of men perhaps crying at the pores for labour, we are inviting men from other parts of the world to come in and compete in the labour market with our own people, and this we are doing, as part of our policy at the very time we are preventing the products of labour in outside countries from coming in to compete with the products of labour in this country. We are giving protection to the manufacturer and withholding it from the workingman.

Another conclusion at which I have arrived is that protection protects only from 10 to 20 per cent of the people, and the balance are compelled to sell their products and labour in the competitive markets of the world, and while they are compelled to do that, they are compelled to buy the products which they need for their own use in the dear protected markets at home.

Another conclusion at which I have arrived is this :

Protection renders millions of money non-productive which is now being used in the process of distribution.

Let me illustrate this. Suppose one man undertook to distribute all the coal oil which came from abroad. The value last year was \$437,000 and the duty \$430,000. You see he would require nearly \$900,000 to purchase the product which he was distributing. Then he would require some working capital. Now, if there were no duty, all he would require would be \$437,000 to pay for the oil and the other \$430,000, which now goes in duty, would be let loose for employment in other industries of the country. That \$430,000, which under our protective system, must be thus used in the distribution of coal oil, might be used for the purpose of building up manufacturing industries in the various centres and giving employment to a large number of men. Now, under our policy of protection, there is no more work done with the \$900,000 capital, than there would be with the \$437,000 capital without protection, because in the one case it requires just as many men to distribute the 6,000,000 gallons of oil as in the other. So that you see there is a large waste of capital. If you multiply that by all the businesses in the country, you will find that there are hundreds of millions of money now wrapped up in the distribution of products required by the people, which could be set free and invested in other sources, giving employment

to a large number of hands and stimulating our industries.

Another conclusion at which I have arrived is this :

Protection prevents people from investing their capital in the way they consider most profitable to themselves, and, therefore, it is an interference in the opinion of most able writers, with the most sacred rights of the citizens of any country.

Again, protection is the parent of combines, trusts, guilds and monopolies. So much so in Canada, that both parties combined some years ago to pass an Act to prevent, if possible, those combines, guilds and monopolies from fleecing the people. If this protective system has such an effect, we should at least modify it to suit the necessities and wants of the country and establish a system by which that protection would be withdrawn when necessary in order to prevent combines among manufacturing industries.

Another conclusion at which I have arrived, after investigation, is this :

Protection enables manufacturers, by the means of combines, to unload a glutted market by selling what they unload in the competitive markets of the world, it may at a loss or a lesser profit than they obtain in the protected home market, and then they recoup themselves by selling at heavier prices to the people who consume the goods manufactured at home, and who give them protection.

This was the position which the cotton combines took two or three years ago. You will remember, Sir, that the Canadian market became glutted with cotton goods. And the manufacturers of cottons sent to Japan and China no less than a quarter of a million dollars worth of cotton, thus unloading the Canadian market ; and, having accomplished that, they charged 15 per cent more for Canadian cottons sold to Canadian people, thus making the Canadian people pay not only a reasonable profit on what they used, but enough to recoup the manufactures for the loss sustained in the foreign market. Those who support the Liberal-Conservative party most strongly were enabled to fleece people in this fashion.

Another conclusion at which I arrive is :

Protection compels the farmer to furnish the banquet for the protected manufacturing class ; and, when the banquet is ready, the farmer is allowed to wait upon the table, and all that he receives for his work is the smell of the viands.

This is the only dividend that I can find, after full investigation, to be actually received by the farmers. It is a poor dividend for the money which they contribute to help make rich the manufacturers engaged in protected industries in Canada. There is another conclusion at which I arrive :

Protection centralizes the capital of the country, it draws a capital away from the rural districts and centralizes it in the manufacturing districts.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron).

In the United States the nine north-eastern states own 25 per cent of the value of the entire United States ; and it is estimated that 25,000 individuals in the United States actually own one-half the value of the entire country. There is thus the tendency to build up a privileged ruling class at the expense of the toiling masses. There is another conclusion at which I arrive—that

Protection is always introduced to raise revenue during depression and hard times, because it is found that the popular mind under these conditions can be made to believe a lie and a fraud which, in more prosperous times, it could not be brought to believe.

Another conclusion is that the manufacturers, feeling the power and influence that the Government have given them, take the Government by the throat, just as the manufacturers of this country took the Government by the throat, and present to them the alternative of political death or continued protection. In reality we may say that the country reaches a condition in which the manufacturers acquire such tremendous influence and power that they control the government. This is exemplified in the history of this country. You will remember, Mr. Speaker, that last year the manufacturers' association had a large meeting in the city of Toronto and congratulated the members upon the power and influence they had with the Government. They went so far as to say in the report of the secretary that the words that were employed by the association to describe what they wanted were the very words employed by the Finance Minister to carry out their wishes. More. They went so far as to congratulate themselves upon their success and prosperity as manufacturers, under the benign influence, as they called it, of the National Policy. Need you wonder that, having the Government, as they believe, by the throat they demand the continuance of the protective policy which fills their pockets at the expense of the people ?

Now, Mr. Speaker, I come to another conclusion :

Protection tends to decrease the price of farm lands, as it prevents the farmer from making the most of his product by compelling him to sell in the competitive markets of the world, and buy in the protected market of Canada.

I have gone to the trouble of working out a calculation based upon official documents to prove the truth of one paragraph in this item of the Liberal policy. The figures I shall give show very distinctly the effect of this policy on the farm lands of the province of Ontario. As you are aware, Mr. Speaker, the promoters of the National Policy promised that that policy would increase the price of real estate by increasing the prosperity of the farmers. The greater the prosperity of the farmers, they said, the greater the demand for farms, and conse-

quently the higher the price for them. Many of the farmers of the country believed these promises, I am sorry to say, and, in 1878, they forsook their former allegiance and supported the Liberal-Conservative party in the election, returning that party to power, to the sorrow and regret of the country to-day. It may be said that the value of farm lands in England and in other countries diminished, and, therefore, the National Policy is not responsible for the depreciation of farm values in Canada. There may be a good deal of force in that contention. That is, virtually the same argument that we used in 1878. But it was denied then by our opponents, who maintained that they could increase the value of the land by introducing this policy. The leaders of the Liberal-Conservative party promised that the home market would be so increased that the demand would raise the prices, and, the products being increased in value, the land behind the products would also be increased in value. Let me point out how their prophecies signally failed. Many isolated instances might be given of lands selling since the inauguration of the National Policy at a much lower price than before that time. But, instead of confining myself to isolated sales, I shall base my calculations upon the total figures in official documents, which will bring forcibly before the House the fact of the reduction in value of farm properties under the National Policy. I take as a basis of calculation, the reports of the Bureau of Industries for 1883 and 1894. These are official documents published by the legislature of Ontario. I find that the value of farm lands in 1883 was, in round numbers, \$655,000,000. In 1894 the value of farm lands was \$587,246,000. This was a reduction from 1883 to 1894 of \$67,754,000. But there are other things that must be considered in making the calculation. Between 1883 and 1894 land to the extent of 1,760,000 acres was cleared in Ontario. At the ordinary price for clearing land of \$20 per acre, and you have a total of \$35,200,000, that should have been added to the value of lands in 1883. Again, in 1883, there were 213,000 farmers in Ontario, and in 1894 there were 243,000, an increase of 30,000 farmers. It may be said that this increase shows the growing prosperity of the country. You know, Mr. Speaker, that a number of our farmers went into the Rainy River settlement, the Port Arthur district and Bruce Mines and Algoma. In that way they have taken up Government lands which were in the hands of the Government, previous to 1883, but they passed since that time into the hands of those farmers, and should be added to the value of the lands given in 1883. Now, if we take all these three items together, we find that \$132,954,000 indicates the amount of the depreciation of farm property in the province of Ontario during those ten years.

Now, if the National Policy had any power whatever to do what they promised it would do, we should not have this state of matters to-day. In addition to this, I could reasonably add several other items of much importance. There has been permanent improvement made upon farms during the last eleven years, by the removal of stone, in many cases, by the clearing up of swamp lands, by building better fences, by under-draining and open draining, which has added millions more, so that in reality you may say that the real depreciation in the value of the lands, has been at least \$150,000,000, or about 25 per cent of the whole value of lands in 1883. As I said before, we are told to-day that the National Policy is in no way responsible for this. If not, I am sure the Government and their supporters owe an apology to this country. They know very well that they placed this prospect before the country in 1877-78, and impressed upon the farmers that it would increase their land values. Now, they may deny that, because they said it seventeen years since, and they may think that I cannot put my finger upon any speech made by their friends which will bring back to them the remembrance of the promises they made. I am going to quote from a speech delivered by the late Sir John A. Macdonald, the great leader of the Conservative party, a speech delivered in the amphitheatre of St. James Street, Toronto, in 1878. The hon. gentleman then spoke as follows:—

If you desire this country to prosper ; if you desire this country to rise out of the slough of despond in which it has sunk ; if you desire to see manufactures rise ; if you desire to see labour employed ; if you desire the emigration of our young men stopped ; if you desire to bring back those who have emigrated ; if you desire to see the value of land rise ; if you desire prosperity, you will support the National Policy.

Now, here is a series of promises that were made by the leader of the party, by the father of the National Policy, who went before the people of this country, in many places, and announced such a doctrine as contained in these few sentences I have quoted from his speech. We were told that not only the land would rise in value, but that the price of the products of the farmer would be increased. The home market was dwelt much upon. The farmers were led to believe that when they had the home market, when those smoke stacks would be so numerous in the different towns and villages throughout the country—which I have not, as yet, seen—they could sell their eggs, their butter, their cheese, and a hundred and one other articles, near at home, and realize a higher price for them than they could realize in any foreign market, and therefore, the higher prices coming to the farmer would be a compensation, to a large extent, for what he would pay in taxes to support the manufacturing industries of the country. The present Minister of Railways

and Canals made a speech in this chamber in 1878, as reported in "Hansard," page 706. He said :

The farmers would benefit from the adoption of a protective system, owing to the increase in the price of commodities they have to sell that this policy would certainly bring about.

Now, here is a promise made by one of the Ministers that the products of the farm would be increased in value under the National Policy, and I have also quoted you the promise made by the father of the National Policy that the price of lands would rise, and that our people would be kept at home, about which I intend to speak further on. Now, were those prices kept up? That is a reasonable question to put. Let me give you a few figures. They are official, because they are taken from the statistical record of 1894. They compare the price of several articles in 1883 and in 1895, as exported from the city of Montreal :

	1883.	1895.
Horses.....	\$125 45	\$108 25
Sheep.....	4 50	3 57
Potatoes.....	0 43 per bush	0 36 per bush
Barley.....	0 71 do	0 44 do
Oats.....	0 45 do	0 38 do
Oatmeal.....	4 19 per brl.	3 52 per brl.
Bacon.....	0 11 7 per lb.	0 10 5 per lb.
Butter.....	0 21 do	0 19 1/2 do
Cheese.....	0 11 1/2 do	0 10 do
Wheat.....	1 02 per bush	0 66 per bush
Eggs.....	0 16 3/4 per doz.	0 13 3/4 per doz.
Hams.....	0 12 per lb.	0 10 1/2 per lb.

Now, if a farmer sold one of each denomination of these articles I have mentioned, he would realize, by the export price of 1895, \$19.67 1-10 less than he would for the same articles in 1883. So you see that the promise made by the Minister of Railways and Canals was made without any knowledge, or if he had knowledge, then he made it without due consideration as to the effect the National Policy might have. A farmer with an ordinary crop of the value, say, of \$700, under the latter prices, would realize \$100 less than he would in 1883, eleven years before, although the National Policy has been extolled from time to time as largely increasing the prices to the farmer. But we are now told that the Government cannot increase the prices. I have heard an hon. gentlemen opposite discussing this question upon a public platform, when he said it was really absurd for any person to suppose that the Government could increase the prices, that the prices were fixed largely by the demand in the markets in which we sold, and as those markets were foreign markets, beyond our control, neither he nor the Government could by any possibility increase those prices. That was the

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron).

position taken by the Liberal party in 1878, and every one of them who was old enough to take any part in the contest at that time, will remember, if he was in public life then, that the leaders of the Conservative party told the farmers directly that the Government had power, by act of Parliament, to increase the prosperity of the people. Sir Charles Tupper, speaking on this question in this House in 1878, as reported in "Hansard," page 451, said :

The hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) ought to know, that, if governments are good for anything, they are good to increase the prosperity of the country by Acts of Parliament.

If that be so, the present Government has committed a great crime by permitting the present depression to come over the country and to continue so long, casting its dark shade over the Dominion. But it is well known that the country has been struggling for years under financial depression. Indeed no later than last session the Minister of Railways in an eloquent speech delivered in this House, stated that the country was in a splendid condition, that its financial condition was first-class, that the people were prosperous from one ocean to the other, that not a murmur was heard from any class in regard to depression. And one method the hon. gentleman took to show how prosperous the people were was to state the amount of money they had deposited in the savings banks and other banks of Canada. The hon. gentleman said that the people had put their money in the banks—and the hon. gentleman enumerated the number of millions that the people had deposited; and then he boldly challenged any hon. member to deny the soundness of the position he had taken. The hon. member for St. John, speaking in this House, made the same statement, that the deposits in the banks of Canada afforded an indication of prosperity. I always thought it was the contrary. I think the Conservatives in 1878 thought it was the contrary. The leaders of the Conservative party in those days spoke exactly opposite to what the leaders of that party are speaking now. They were in the habit of going on public platforms and saying something like this: When you find the people placing money in the banks and realizing only 3 and 4 per cent, it indicates that the sources of investment are being dried up, that the manufacturing industries are languishing, that building operations are not going forward, because if those industries are prospering, then the money was drawn out of the banks and placed in those different investments. That was the argument used generally by the Conservatives in 1878. In that year the hon. member for South Lanark spoke on the question. He was then called John G. Haggart; he is now the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals. Here is what he said, when speaking in this House that year, as reported in "Hansard" at page 703 :

The hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) had alluded to the large amount of money in the banks as proof that the country was now prosperous. But, on the contrary, that was always evidence of depression in commerce and in manufactures. When commerce was active and manufactures were prospering, the people did not deposit their moneys in the banks, but invested them in manufacturing and other industries. Consequently, the argument of the hon. gentleman was true in a sense opposite to what he intended.

This was the contention made in 1878 by one of the Ministers of the Crown to-day, but last year that hon. gentleman made a statement entirely the opposite. How is it possible to keep these men in line and make them consistent in their arguments? It is well known by every person who has given this subject consideration that when there are large deposits in the banks at 3 per cent, that fact is an indication that outside investments have dried up, and the people have put their money in the banks because they have no use for it outside. It is impossible to keep hon. gentlemen opposite along the line of consistent argument: political exigencies interfere and make them act in a ridiculous manner in the eyes of the country, arguing one thing to-day and another thing to-morrow.

There is another charge made by the Liberal party against the policy of the Liberal-Conservatives. As the House will remember when I read from the speech delivered by Sir John Macdonald in 1878, he said that those who would support the National Policy and were prepared to put it in operation would prevent the people going to a foreign land to find employment which their own country denied them, and that if they wish to prevent that and bring back those already gone, they should certainly support the National Policy which would secure both these results. It is well to investigate and see if this promise made by the Government has been carried out. Sir Charles Tupper, speaking in this House and making reference to the Canadian Pacific Railway as a great immigration agent, said, as reported in "Hansard" of 1877, page 150, as follows:—

We, therefore, took up the Canadian Pacific Railway as a means by which we could extend and continue a policy having for its object the prosecution of a public work which has been found to be successful in our country, and by means of which \$100,000,000 of foreign capital would be drawn into the country and hundreds of thousands of immigrants annually brought into the country, which would develop our trade.

Of course, that is a Tupperism, and we must discount it to a large extent. Hundreds of millions of capital have not come in, and every one will acknowledge that hundreds of thousands of immigrants yearly have not arrived. It was a great stretch of imagination on the part of the hon. gentleman, for which, indeed, he has a reputation. A few of the cities have increased in population, but those cities have increased at the expense of the

towns and villages in the rural sections of the country. Let us examine the population that came into this country, and what have we? One of the annual reports of the Minister of Agriculture gives the following statement as to the number of immigrants who came in between 1881 and 1891, and expressed their intention of remaining in Canada and making Canada their home. That number, as given in the report, is 886,000. We spent during those ten years no less than \$3,000,000 on immigration, and, therefore, we would naturally expect a large number of immigrants to come in. Now, I would just ask: when we get 886,000 people into this grand country of ours, which presents to immigrants so many features of prosperity, why do they not stop here? We have a beautiful climate, a magnificent soil, and any quantity of it, open to settlement. Consequently, when 886,000 persons left their homes and came to Canada with the intention of remaining here, it would be reasonable to expect that the free lands and the fertile farms which we were able to give them would cause them to remain with us, unless, indeed, there was some other element operating to the contrary. In addition to this immigration, we must add the natural increase of population, which we would expect. We had in the year 1881, according to the census, a population of 4,325,000 in round numbers. The natural increase for the decade, based on the United States returns, would be 14 per cent, or 605,500 souls. If you add the immigration and natural increase together, you should have 1,491,500 people more in 1891 than in 1881. Did our population increase that amount? If not, why not? Well, let us see. In 1891 census commissioners were appointed who could in some cases almost see double. They went through this country counting every man, woman and child, once at least, and sometimes twice, but after their reports were put in the hands of the Government and counted up, it was found that in Canada we had only 4,833,000 inhabitants all told. Now, if the immigrants and the natural increase that we should have had were added to the population of 1881, the population in 1891 would have been 5,816,000. But sad to say, we were 983,500 short of that. I would ask any hon. gentleman who follows me in this debate—and I think I know who is to follow me—and I would bring to his mind this fact, and I hope he will seek to give an explanation how it has occurred. How is it, that the census commissioners could only find in all Canada 4,833,000 people in 1891, a number which was 983,000 less than there should have been if we add the immigration and the natural increase to the population of 1881. There must have been an average exodus of 98,350 each year, and why should there be? Remember, that this alarming exodus occurred under a policy which Sir John Macdonald said would keep

our people at home and bring back a large number of those who were said to have gone away under the Liberal regime. What does the National Policy platform say with regard to that matter? I will read a paragraph from it:

That such a policy would retain in Canada thousands of our fellow-countrymen now obliged to expatriate themselves in search of the employment denied them at home.

Now, Sir, in view of the complete and absolute failure of the National Policy to keep the people at home, what reason have we to support the National Policy at this late year of the century. What reason have we to suppose that its pledges have been fulfilled, and that our people are kept at home. Not only did the National Policy promise what I have quoted, but Sir Charles Tupper, while discussing this question, also made some remarks in regard to the effect of the National Policy in keeping the people at home. Speaking of the National Policy resolution in 1878, as recorded in "Hansard," p. 470, Sir Charles Tupper is reported as follows:—

This policy—

That is, the Liberal policy—

This policy which the Government has pursued has had the effect of depopulating this country. It has sent away the most skilled and intelligent labour, and the finest sons of Canada, to a foreign country, to find employment there which their own country denied them.

Now, Sir, is it not fair for me to argue that if the Liberal policy had sent away a large number to the United States to find a home there, if that was the result of the revenue tariff of 1874-79, how are we to criticise the results of the National Policy which has sent away two-and-a-half times more people out of Canada than left us under the policy of the Liberal party. If, on the other hand, it is argued now by Government supporters that the National Policy is not responsible for sending our people away, how did the leaders of the National Policy scheme in 1878 argue that the policy of the Liberal party was the cause of sending so many away. If the argument in one case is good, certainly the argument in the other case is good.

Now, Mr. Speaker, with regard to another point. If under the National Policy our country only increased in population 11.66 per cent, would it not be well to return to the revenue tariff policy of the Liberal party, under which our population increased 18 per cent. Why, the argument used by Sir Charles Tupper in 1878, proves that the National Policy has been a great failure to keep our people at home or to bring back those who have gone away. The statement was made by Sir John A. Macdonald in 1878, as reported in "Hansard," p. 859, as follows:—

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron).

Let any man visit any of the manufactories of the United States, and there he will find the Canadian artisan toiling and doing well, and, therefore, not coming back; when, if Canada had a judicious system of taxation, they would be toiling and doing well in this country.

Hon. gentlemen will remark how Sir John Macdonald used the word "judicious." Well, Sir, this judicious system of taxation was established, and it has continued for the last seventeen years, and we find to-day that a larger number is leaving the country than under what Sir John Macdonald termed the injudicious system of taxation adopted by the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie. The Conservatives at that time charged that the policy of the Liberal party was depopulating the country. Now, let us compare the population during the two decades, and we will find by that means which policy was the better calculated to keep our people at home.

From 1871 to 1881 Nova Scotia increased her population 52,772, or 13.161 per cent. That was under the so-called injudicious taxation of the Hon. Mr. Mackenzie, or the greater portion of that period was under his Government. Now, under this judicious system of the National Policy, which Sir John Macdonald spoke about, Nova Scotia increased from 1881 to 1891 by 9,951 souls, or only 2¼ per cent. New Brunswick increased from 1871 to 1881 by 35,639 persons, or 12.48 per cent; but between 1881 and 1891, under this "judicious" system of taxation, New Brunswick increased only 61 souls, or 2-10ths of 1 per cent. Prince Edward Island increased in the decade, during the larger portion of which the country was under a revenue tariff by 14,870 souls, or 17.9 per cent. Prince Edward Island increased, under the National Policy, only 197, or 0.18 per cent. Quebec increased in the decade from 1871 to 1881, 167,511, or 14.05 per cent. Under the National Policy, Quebec increased 129,559, or only 9.53 per cent. Ontario, the banner province of the Dominion, a province which increased 306,070 under the regime of a revenue tariff, or 18.88 per cent, increased under this benign system of judicious taxation, as the manufacturers would call it, 186,067, or only 9.65 per cent, a little more than one-half the increase which took place in the preceding decade. The whole increase in these provinces from 1871 to 1881, was 638,214, or 17.31 per cent, as compared with an increase of 504,601, or 11.66 per cent under this blessed National Policy. The hon. gentleman who is going to succeed me, be he who he may, can point out how the National Policy has failed to realize the promises made by the leaders of the party, made by the father of the National Policy resolution, and made by themselves throughout the whole of the last decade, that the census of 1891, when made, would show their predictions and expectations to be thoroughly and completely

fulfilled. Can you give me the reason for that failure? Now, Mr. Speaker, according to the highest estimate made, the exodus during Mr. Mackenzie's time, is put down at 42,000, whereas, the exodus under the National Policy is over 96,000, showing that the National Policy had not much to do with the exodus, and that the revenue tariff existing in Mr. Mackenzie's time had not much to do with it. But the hon. gentlemen opposite claimed that it was the revenue tariff of Mr. Mackenzie that was driving the people away, and promised that the National Policy would bring them back. Therefore, they are responsible for that promise; and in view of the fact that the people of this country accepted their promise and had confidence in it, now that that promise has failed, the people will withdraw that confidence from them; and there will be a change of parties sitting on the respective sides of this House. Those 98,000 people not only went away from the country, during these eleven years, but they took away with them no less than \$10,000,000 worth of household effects, reducing the value of this country in that one particular to that extent. There is no record of other articles which those people took away with them, but we are easily within the limit if we say that over \$20,000,000 of the property of this country was picked up in the various households where they were living, and carried across the line to add to the wealth of the United States.

The present Minister of the Interior (Mr. Daly) when he was a private member sitting on the back benches, was particularly anxious that the Government should adopt a vigorous immigration policy. He was continually urging, on behalf of Manitoba and the North-west, that the Government should spend more money and bring in a policy to populate that country. Since that time he has become Minister of the Interior, and we have been expecting him to inaugurate such a policy. Has he done so? He has not inaugurated a single policy in regard to immigration into the North-west. The result is that for some years past, the number of people going into that country has not been as large as it was previously. I hope there are not as many leaving as there were in the last decade. Now, I am sorry to see such statements as have lately appeared in the English journals in regard to Canada. I am a Canadian, and I love Canada. I think she is the best country that the sun of heaven shines upon. I believe the energy and push and industry and capacity of the Canadian people are equal, if not superior, to those of any other people in the world. I believe, also, that if this country had been governed by a reasonable policy, adapted to the circumstances of the Canadian people, and calculated to increase the prosperity of every class, instead of by a policy of class legislation such as we have to-day, this country would have made far

greater progress in every way than it has under the policy in vogue during the last seventeen years. I was particularly sorry to see the following article in regard to Canada in one of the leading London journals:—

While America is filling up, and brimming over, and increasing its population by millions, Canada, if not exactly stationary, is increasing very slowly indeed. The men who were born in Canada and should become citizens of the Empire, grow and die under the Stars and Stripes. Whether we like it or not, Canada is not doing well, and has not been doing well for some time past.

I suppose that meant the last seventeen years; but it is not so stated, and I will not impute motives to the writer of the article. At that rate of progress, I would like to know when the rosy expectations of the Finance Minister will be realized. Speaking on the Budget the other day, he boasted of a large increase in the population of Manitoba and the North-west Territories. Referring to an article which he had read in the "Nineteenth Century," in reference to the ability of the British Empire to feed itself in case of a war which would cut off the supply of food to Great Britain from hostile nations, the hon. gentleman exultantly exclaimed with pride—and I hope he will listen to his words as I repeat them:

The Empire feed itself! Yes. That article said that 100,000,000 bushels of wheat were necessary to England, other than what the colonies afforded her at the present time, in order to feed the people of the Empire there. One hundred millions of bushels of wheat! Why, fifty thousand Canadian farmers, with 100 acres each, in wheat, and raising thirty bushels to the acre, would produce 150,000,000 bushels of wheat for export to Great Britain. And, what is fifty thousand farmers cultivating five millions of acres compared to the number of millions of acres of good wheat land in Manitoba and the North-west Territories, which has not yet been scratched by the plough?

Now, that was a very pretty picture, but I tell the Finance Minister that if he lives to be as old as Methusaleh, at the rate at which the population of that country has increased during the last seventeen years, he will not realize the expectation he held out that Manitoba and the North-west would feed Great Britain with wheat; 50,000 farmers! not half the number in that country now. For seventeen years, they have been endeavouring to get people in there, and there is not half the number he expected to raise wheat, even at thirty bushels to the acre. But then he was going to place there 50,000 more farmers for the purpose of raising cows, butter, cheese and milk for the soldiers of Great Britain. He said:

And, as to butter and cheese, fifty thousand farmers, owning fifty cows each, amounting to 2,500,000 cows, would supply butter and cheese enough to meet the demands of Great Britain for such supplies. And with the vast lands of the

North-west, that is not an estimate which cannot be reached, if means are taken by which it could be reached.

I hope that England may not become engaged in war until the Finance Minister is ready with his butter, eggs, flour and cheese to feed her soldiers. It would be interesting and profitable if the Finance Minister had given us an idea of what those means were which he was going to employ. If he had any means, would it not have been judicious to announce them to this Parliament, and more particularly to the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Daly), who has so thoroughly and effectually failed to get people in there. He said: "If the proper means were used"—now, a great statesman like the Finance Minister should take the opportunity of explaining what means he would employ in order to accomplish the end he had in view. And now that they are reorganizing and fixing up the Cabinet, would it not be well to dismiss the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Daly) and appoint the Finance Minister in his stead, so as to give that hon. gentleman the opportunity of bringing into operation those means by which he was going to fill up that country, so that we might have there 50,000 farmers raising wheat, 50,000 farmers raising cows, and 50,000 more raising beef, mutton and pork for the people of Great Britain. Each of the 50,000 farmers would have to raise 24,000 pounds of meat, to supply England with all the meats she requires in one year? Each cow of the 2,500,000 would have to produce 116 pounds of butter and 102 pounds of cheese per cow, to feed the people of England in one year? As soon as the hon. gentleman gets those 150,000 farmers into the North-west, we will give him all the credit due him for the extra benefit he has conferred upon this country. But if peace on earth and good-will towards men is to continue until the results which the hon. Finance Minister predicts will be accomplished, I think we are at present entering upon the dawn of the millenium.

From this I turn to another plank in the policy of the Liberal party. I wish to impress upon hon. gentlemen opposite that this is our policy and that they need not put themselves to the trouble of endeavouring to foist on us continental union, commercial union, free trade as it is in England, and the hundred and one things they impute to us—all they need do is to read up the policy of the Liberal party, as formulated by the great convention of 1893. This is the second plank in that platform:

That, having regard to the prosperity of Canada and the United States as adjoining countries, with many mutual interests, it is desirable that there should be the most friendly relations and broad and liberal trade intercourse between them;

That the interests alike of the Dominion and of the Empire would be materially advanced by the establishing of such relations;

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron).

That the period of the old reciprocity treaty was one of marked prosperity to the British North American colonies;

That the pretext under which the Government appealed to the country in 1891 respecting negotiations for a treaty with the United States was misleading and dishonest and intended to deceive the electorate;

That no sincere effort has been made by them to obtain a treaty, but that, on the contrary, it is manifest that the present Government, controlled as they are by monopolies and combines, are not desirous of securing such a treaty;

That the first step towards obtaining the end in view, is to place a party in power who are sincerely desirous of promoting a treaty on terms honourable to both countries;

That a fair and liberal reciprocity treaty would develop the great natural resources of Canada, would enormously increase the trade and commerce between the two countries, would tend to encourage friendly relations between the two peoples, would remove many causes which have in the past provoked irritation and trouble to the governments of both countries, and would promote those kindly relations between the Empire and the republic which afford the best guarantee for peace and prosperity;

That the Liberal party is prepared to enter into negotiations with a view to obtaining such a treaty, including a well-considered list of manufactured articles, and we are satisfied that any treaty so arranged will receive the assent of Her Majesty's Government, without whose approval no treaty can be made.

That sets out, in a very concise and complete manner, the policy of the Liberal party on the reciprocity question. We are bordering upon a country with which it is of great importance that we should be on the most friendly terms. We are bordering upon a country which produces many articles that we require for the consumption of our own people, and we produce on this side many other articles which are required for the wants of the people on that side. And if we can establish a reciprocity treaty, based upon sound and equitable principles, which would result to the advantage of both countries, that would be a benefit in many ways, and therefore, on the whole, it would be advantageous to the commerce and industries of this country. At present, under the action of two hostile camps, we are dealing very largely with that country. We are frequently told that it is not the proper market for Canadian products, and that if we had free trade or modified freedom of trade, no great advantage would result to us. The interest, I believe, of the Dominion and of the Empire would be mutually advanced by having larger trade relations with our neighbours to the south. They would be benefited by our cultivating, not only commercial but social and friendly relations. This is of absolute necessity to us, lying as we do along the border of such a large and powerful state. Our trade and commerce with the United States, previous to the old reciprocity treaty, was very largely hampered by the tariffs of the two countries. In 1848 there was a good deal

of dissatisfaction in Canada. Many good citizens thought that we would be better off if annexed to the United States, and therefore there was a feeling prevailing in favour of annexation, in those years, as some of the older members in this House will recollect. In fact, so far did that feeling in favour of annexation go, that 136 of the leading men of Montreal, among whom was the late Sir Alex. T. Galt, signed a manifesto which was to be presented to the English Government, asking for a peaceful dissolution from that country and annexation to the United States. But shortly after that, there was an agitation set on foot for reciprocity with the United States, and after a few years of negotiations, a treaty of reciprocity was consummated in 1854. That treaty remained in force for twelve years. And during the successful operation of that convention, all the feeling in favour of annexation passed away, owing largely to the prosperity which the treaty brought to this country. As you know, Mr. Speaker, people who are prosperous think very little of the form of government under which they live. Make us prosperous and we will be satisfied under almost any government, so long, of course, as we have civil and religious liberty. Hon. gentlemen opposite argue that reciprocity, by making closer our social and trade relations with the United States, would wean us from our allegiance to the Empire. I hold that it would have a contrary effect, as it had in the days of the reciprocity treaty. When we look at the trade that was done in those twelve years, we cannot but see how advantageous a treaty along similar lines would be to this country now. Our aggregate trade with the United States from 1846 to 1853, inclusive, amounted to \$113,846,000, an average of \$14,231,000 a year. Now, see how, with leaps and bounds, that trade increases under reciprocity. From 1855 to 1866, inclusive, our aggregate trade with the United States was \$655,447,000, an average annually of \$54,651,000 as against \$14,231,000 a year for the seven years previous. These figures prove beyond a doubt that a reciprocity treaty would be beneficial to us if it could be got on fair and equitable terms. In fact, so strongly impressed was the Government of the day, the Macdonald-Dorion Government, with the importance of this treaty that, when the United States gave notice of the cessation of that treaty at the expiration of the time, a Council meeting was held in this city and the Council adopted a minute which received the sanction of the Governor General on the 19th February, 1864. That minute of Council was sent to England urging England to use her influence and good offices to secure the continuance of that treaty. Permit me to read that minute to the House:

It would be impossible to express in figures, with any approach to accuracy, the extent to which the facilities of commercial intercourse,

created by the reciprocity treaty, have contributed to the wealth and prosperity of this province; and it would be difficult to exaggerate the importance which the people of Canada attach to the continued enjoyment of these facilities.

Now note this, Mr. Speaker:

Nor is the subject entirely devoid of political significance.

Under the beneficent operations of the system of self-government which the latter policy of the mother country has accorded to Canada, in common with other colonies possessing representative institutions, combined with the advantages secured by the reciprocity treaty and of an unrestricted commerce with our nearest neighbours, in the natural productions of the two countries, all agitation for organic changes has ceased—all dissatisfaction with the existing political relations of the province has absolutely disappeared.

Now, Sir, had that reciprocity treaty a tendency toward annexation or to cause a breach between us and the Empire? On the contrary, it reconciled us to our own political institutions—political institutions which, in my opinion, are better than those the United States can offer. All we wanted was reciprocity so as to make our trade more prosperous, to bring more money into the pockets of the hard-working masses of Canada and to increase the price of lands which had been depreciated in value. And when this source of prosperity was open to this country, all agitation for organic changes ceased and we became far more loyal to the motherland than we were before. And I am of opinion that, if we had a reciprocity treaty with the United States to-morrow and the country became more prosperous through its operations, if our farmers were raised out of the slough of despond, every heart in this country would beat still stronger with love and devotion to the British flag.

But, Sir, it will be answered that we cannot obtain a treaty similar to the one we formerly had.

Mr. DAVIN. Hear, hear.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). My hon. friend from West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) says "hear, hear." I am not sure that we can obtain such a treaty. I fear that the Government has allowed the opportunity to pass. But if the Government had been honest when, in 1891, they declared to the country that they were going to Washington for the purpose of negotiating a treaty, not on their own motion but by invitation from the government of the United States, if they had then done their duty in the interests of the country, we should have had such a reciprocity treaty as would have greatly extended the trade relations between the two countries and greatly increased the prosperity of the Dominion. That opportunity has passed. But I believe that, even yet, there is a possibility, that the Liberal party if returned to power will have

an advantageous treaty negotiated. The United States are not willing to give us more than they receive. But if we go there with the purpose of doing what is right, ready to make concessions in return for concessions made upon their side, I am satisfied that, if the Liberal party is returned to power, we shall have a reciprocity treaty upon the statute-books within three years that will redound greatly to the advantage of this country. But when the three commissioners went to Washington in 1891, they did not go there with the intention of making a treaty. They were told repeatedly that no treaty could be negotiated with the United States on the same lines as the treaty of 1854, but that the United States were willing to include natural products if also a well selected line of manufactured articles was included. But the commissioners, Sir Mackenzie Bowell, Sir John Thompson and Hon. G. E. Foster, went there not ready to include one single solitary item of manufactured articles. In order to put that right I will read the minute of the negotiations, which I think it is well this House should consider, and which I think should be on record. I have here a document called: "A message from the President of the United States in response to a Senate resolution of February 24th, 1892, relative to negotiations for reciprocal trade with Canada." The Senate passed the following resolution:—

Resolved, that the President be requested, if, in his opinion, not incompatible with the public interest, to inform the Senate of the proceedings recently had with the representatives of the Dominion of Canada and of the British Government, as to arrangements for reciprocal trade between Canada and the United States.

In answer to that, Secretary Blaine, who was the commissioner who conferred with the three commissioners from Canada, sent the following to the President so that he might lay it before the Senate. It is dated at Washington, April 15th, 1892, and addressed to the President of the United States.

The Secretary of State, to whom was referred the resolution of the Senate of 24th February, 1892, requesting the President, if, in his opinion, not incompatible with the public interest, to inform the Senate of the proceedings recently had with representatives of the Dominion of Canada and the British Government, as to arrangements for reciprocal trade between Canada and the United States, has the honour to submit the following report:—

In the month of October, 1890, Hon. Robert Bond, Colonial Secretary of Newfoundland, visited Washington for the purpose of conferring with the Government of the United States respecting the commercial relations between Newfoundland and the United States. He was presented to me by the British Minister in this city, Sir Julian Pauncefote, and, after various conferences, continuing through the months of October and November, a draft of a reciprocity convention between the United States and Newfoundland was framed and forwarded to London for the action of the British Government.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron).

This fact having come to the attention of the Government of the Dominion of Canada, a strong protest was forwarded by it to the British Government against the ratification of the action of the Colonial Minister of Newfoundland, and this was followed, in December, 1890, by a proposition initiated and made to me by the British Minister in Washington, for the opening of formal negotiations in this city for a treaty embracing commercial reciprocity with Canada, the fisheries and other unsettled questions with the Dominion Government. I declined to open formal negotiations, but stated that I would be willing to have a full and private conference with the British Minister and one or more agents of Canada, and consider with them every subject connected with the relations of the two countries upon which a mutual interest could be founded, with a view to formal negotiations, should the proposed conference indicate a probability of agreement on any of the subjects discussed. This basis was accepted by the British Minister and the Dominion Government, but, for various reasons of convenience to the members of the proposed conference, it did not take place until 10th February, when the British Minister presented to me, at the Department of State, Sir John Thompson, Minister of Justice, Hon. George E. Foster, Minister of Finance, and Hon. Mackenzie Bowell, Minister of Customs, as commissioners on the part of the Government of the Dominion of Canada, to participate with him in the conference.

Now this brings me down to the conference:

At the first conference, on 10th February, the commissioners stated that they were authorized by the Canadian Government to propose the renewal of the reciprocity treaty of 1854 (which was terminated in 1866 by the action of the Congress of the United States), with such modifications and extensions as the altered circumstances of both countries and their respective interests might seem to require.

In answer to an inquiry, the commissioners stated that the modifications or extensions contemplated in the schedules of articles should be confined to natural products, and should not embrace manufactured articles.

The commissioners were informed that the Government of the United States would not be prepared to renew the treaty of 1854, nor to agree upon any commercial reciprocity which should be confined to natural products alone; and that, in view of the great development of industrial interests of the United States, and of the changed conditions of the commercial relations of the two countries since the treaty of 1854 was negotiated, it was regarded of essential importance that a list of manufactured goods should be included in the schedules of articles for free or favoured exchange in any reciprocity arrangement which might be made.

The commissioners then inquired if the Government of the United States would expect to have preferential treatment extended to the list of manufactured goods of the United States on their introduction into Canada by virtue of a reciprocity treaty, or whether it would regard the Canadian Government as at liberty to extend the same favours to the manufactured goods of other countries not parties to the treaty, on their introduction into Canada.

The reply given to them was, that it was the desire of the Government of the United States to make a reciprocity convention which would be exclusive in its application to the United States

and Canada, and that other countries which are not parties to it, should not enjoy gratuitously the favours which the two neighbouring countries might reciprocally concede to each other for valuable considerations and at a large sacrifice of their respective revenues.

Upon receiving this reply, the Canadian commissioners asked that the further consideration of the subject be adjourned till another conference, to enable them to consult as to the course which they would adopt in view of the foregoing declaration.

In the conference of the 11th, the Canadian commissioners stated that they had given careful consideration to the suggestion that manufactured goods should be included in the schedules of articles for exchange in a reciprocity convention, and to the desire expressed by the Government of the United States, that such American goods on their introduction into Canada should be accorded preferential treatment over similar goods from other countries; and they announced, with an expression of regret, that they did not consider it possible to meet the expectations of the Government of the United States in these respects. In the first place, they encountered a serious obstacle in the matter of revenue. If any considerable list of manufactured goods of the United States should be admitted free into Canada, it would entail a material loss to the Dominion treasury, and, if the same favours were likewise extended to the merchandise of other countries, the loss of revenue would be much greater. They felt that they would not be able to recoup these losses by other methods of taxation. In the second place, it seemed to be impossible for the Canadian Government, in view of its present political relations and obligations, to extend to American goods preferential treatment over those of other countries. As Canada was a part of the British Empire, they did not consider it competent for the Dominion Government to enter into any commercial arrangement with the United States, from the benefits of which Great Britain and its colonies should be excluded.

The announcement of these conclusions of the Canadian commissioners was accepted as a bar to further negotiations on this subject.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to ask you, and this House, in view of the negotiations that were going on and described in that minute, did the Government of this country show the least desire to say to the Government at Washington, let us consider a list of manufactured articles? There are about 100 articles we import from the United States, very few of which we import from the old country, and therefore a large list of manufactured articles could be embodied in a treaty, without discriminating against Great Britain to the extent of one dollar. But, Sir, they did not want to give to the United States, in compensation for what they were to receive in return, any better position in the Canadian market than they were going to give to other countries. Do you suppose that any country, with the intelligence of the United States, would enter into negotiations to carry out a treaty based upon such a principle as that? What advantage were they to get in the Canadian market for their goods, if other countries, without compensation, were to get equal advantages in the Canadian market? Then

our commissioners made excuse that the revenue of the country would not stand it. Sir, the revenue could be very easily raised in this country if the people were prosperous. Give them plenty of work, give them more trade and commerce with other countries, give them greater freedom to trade with each other, whereby they may make more money upon which a revenue can be raised in a hundred and one ways to meet all the necessary expenditure for carrying on the Government. Now, Sir, I want to say to you that in 1874, when the Hon. George Brown went to Washington to negotiate a treaty, not only natural products were included as being part of the treaty, but there were over 100 manufactured articles included in that treaty. I do not suppose that among those 100 articles, there were five articles that we imported from Great Britain at all. That basis of treaty in 1874 was accepted by this Government, and it was accepted by the English Government, and had the Congress of the United States accepted it, it would have been made a treaty between this country and that country, and over 100 manufactured articles would have been included in it. Why did not the three commissioners who went to Washington succeed? Why did they not say, let us go over these matters, let us see what articles can be introduced into each country with profit with each other, and if we find that there would be great discrimination against Great Britain, then it may be justifiable to refuse to enter into a treaty. But we see there was no desire on the part of the commissioners to enter into negotiations with a view to arriving at a satisfactory conclusion.

Mr. SPROULE. Why did not George Brown succeed, when he offered so much both in regard to manufactures as well as natural products?

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). We might not have been able to have succeeded in negotiating a treaty, but there was nothing to prevent an effort being made to secure one, and the minutes of the conference show that the representatives of the United States were willing to enter a number of articles on the list. At all events a draft treaty might have been framed so that it might have been submitted to the Senate of the United States, as was done before. But the commissioners who went down to the United States did not think so. Mr. Blaine announced that he was willing to enter into a discussion of a draft treaty, but so soon as it was announced by our commissioners that no articles were to be included other than natural products, that ended the matter, as it had been announced from time to time, that the Americans would never give a treaty based on the same lines as that of the treaty of 1854.

I want to point out some of the advantages that would arise to this country under an equitable reciprocity treaty with the United States. We have peculiarly close relations with the adjacent republic. We have bordering on this country, east, west and south no less than nine states, containing a population of 26,500,000. If a line could be drawn from the north part of Minnesota to the north part of Maine, Toronto would fall 300 miles south of that line; so hon. members can see the advantage which Toronto would possess as a distributing centre if we secured the markets of the United States. Our people would be able to reach any city in those states within a few hours, and would be able to market Canadian produce in the large cities. So when we speak of a home market, where is there a better home market than could be found among those 26,500,000 of people who can be reached from Toronto within 18 hours? Speaking of home market within those nine states, there are 68 cities, not one of which has a less population than 10,000, making 6,500,000 people centred in those cities within 18 hours railway travel from Toronto. And the farmers north, east and west of Toronto could market their products within a few additional hours. But here I shall be met with the assertion, that those cities and those localities themselves, produce more agricultural and other products than they need, and, therefore, those cities and states would not afford a market available to our agricultural produce. Is it so? Why did we spend so many millions to open avenues of communication with the United States? It is well known that we have spent millions on railways, on building bridges across rivers between the two countries, in digging tunnels in order to break down the trade barriers between Canada and the United States. Yet, now we are told that all the results which have been accomplished by the investment of millions of Canadian capital must be minimized by tariff policies arrayed against each other.

Let me now take up another point,—and I am glad the Controller of Inland Revenue is in his seat as representing that part of the country to which I am about to refer. If British Columbia should ever see a day of prosperity—and I hope she will—she will see prosperity under free trade or reciprocity with the United States, for nearly all the products of her gold and silver mines and coal mines go to the United States. The large proportion of timber taken from the sides of the mountains and carried down through her water-stretches, goes to the United States. It is only through the development of those great natural resources that British Columbia can ever take that position among the provinces of the Dominion which we wish her to hold. So a reciprocity treaty with the United States, based on equitable conditions, would

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron).

be a bonanza in giving her facilities to get her products into the market to the south of her. Let me give a few figures to impress this on the minds of hon. gentlemen opposite. British Columbia trades with eighteen countries. Of the products of the mines sent to all countries to the value of \$4,660,000, she sends to the United States no less than \$4,567,859, only \$100,000 of products of her mines going to any other country. Does this fact not prove beyond a doubt to hon. gentlemen opposite that if the tariff walls were broken down between those two countries, she would be facilitated in sending her products to those markets? Do not hon. gentlemen know that out of \$650,000 worth of coal mined on Vancouver Island and sent to foreign countries all but the value of 20,000 tons goes to the United States? When 75 cents a ton is paid thereon as duty it represents about half a million dollars. This might be utilized in improving the properties, and instead of being taken out of the capital of the operators, would be retained to increase the number of hands, to develop trade and increase the prosperity of the province.

Mr. PRIOR. How much does the hon. gentleman say was the duty per ton on coal going into the United States?

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). 75 cents. I am talking about the American duty, because it is that you have to overcome. Now, that province sent of the products of our fisheries, to all countries, \$3,254,500 worth, and of that only \$93,800 was sent to the United States. England is a large consuming centre for British Columbia fish, but still a proportion is sent to the United States, and more would be sent to that country if there were freedom of trade. The fish of British Columbia, in the cold waters of the north, are much superior in quality to the fish caught in the warmer waters further south; and therefore if it were allowed freedom of entry into the American market, the British Columbia fish would command the highest price. British Columbia exports, of the products of her magnificent forests—and I was proud to see them when I was out there—to the value of \$500,000. Some of that lumber was sent as far as Africa, India and Japan, and to the United States she exported \$144,057 worth of lumber. You will find, Mr. Speaker, that the lumbering industry has been vivified and stimulated by the free trade in lumber which was allowed by the United States a year or two ago. The lumber dealers with whom I had communication when I was in that country, all bore testimony to that. Of animals and their products, British Columbia sends to all countries \$454,618 worth, and to the United States she sends \$252,057 worth, so that actually one-half of the exports of animals and their products from British Columbia is sent to the United States.

a country which we are frequently told has more of these products than she needs. Over that high protective barrier, British Columbia is forced to send one-half her total exports of animals and their products. The returns published by the Government show that the minerals of British Columbia find their way into the American market, and that a large proportion of the agricultural products also go there, and, Sir, if a reciprocity treaty on an equitable basis was negotiated with the United States, British Columbia would flourish and be prosperous to the extent that she has never experienced during her existence. Her population would increase. There would be a boom in the mineral interests of British Columbia and Vancouver Island, and in her mountains and her forests. Surely, all must see that reciprocity with the United States would be of vast advantage to that province. I believe that a majority of the British Columbia people are to-day either in favour of free trade or much free trade with the United States.

Let us now, Mr. Speaker, see how reciprocity would benefit Manitoba. If the Finance Minister wishes to accomplish his great idea of having 150,000 farmers in our western country within a reasonable time, he will commence by advocating greater freedom of trade between Manitoba and the United States. Manitoba products would then find a market in the United States, notwithstanding that the United States produces a large surplus of the various articles which are produced in that province. Manitoba and the North-west Territories have large fields of very good coal, whereas, immediately to the south, there is a large section of the United States which has no coal at all. The state of Montana is rich in minerals of almost every kind, but it has no coal, and so, if a reciprocity treaty were established between the two countries, the coal industry would be greatly developed in Manitoba and the North-west Territories. Manitoba sends nearly all her fish into the American market, and if she were permitted to send this fish free of duty, you would find our fish every morning on the breakfast tables of Minneapolis, St. Paul and Chicago, and the fishermen of Manitoba would derive a larger profit from their industry than they do at the present day. Then, again, take the No. 1 hard wheat of Manitoba. That wheat is much superior to the No. 1 hard of Dakota, Minnesota or Iowa. If it had free entry into the United States market, in competition with the hard wheat of those states, it would command the better price, and it would be sold to the great milling industries of St. Paul and Minneapolis at a higher price than any wheat which they can get in their own country. Again, take the cattle raised on the ranches of the North-west and Manitoba. They are far superior for

beef, to the cattle raised in Texas, the Indian Territory, and other warmer climates to the south. Our cattle would be used for home consumption in the western states; the beef would command a higher price because of its superior flavour, and the cattle of the southern and western states would have to find sale in some other market. In this way the people of Manitoba and the North-west Territories would be largely benefited. In addition to that, the people inhabiting our North-west would have freedom of purchase in the United States market, and that would increase their returns each year. Therefore, when we take the profits derived from exports, and the money saved by importing, it would confer a boon on the farmers of the North-west, which would be a great blessing to them. They would accomplish the end the Minister of Finance has in view much quicker than they could accomplish it by any other means that he could employ.

Would reciprocity benefit Ontario? Let us see. It is frequently said upon public platforms that the United States is no market for the products of Ontario. I hope the hon. gentleman who will reply to me will note this, and answer it if he can. I think I have heard him state in this House that it is an impossibility to get a market in the United States for the products of Ontario, because the United States exports more natural products than they have use for, and that therefore if we had reciprocity, it would be just the same thing as sending coals to Newcastle. Is that statement correct? I do not think it is. The statistics prove that notwithstanding the high tariff barrier between the two countries, we trade with the United States to an extraordinary degree. Let me give a few figures to endorse the statement I have made. The province of Ontario does business with thirty-nine countries. Of the products of the mines, she exports to all countries \$916,654 worth, and to the United States she exports of that amount \$908,504 worth. Therefore, Sir, nearly the entire exports of the minerals of Ontario go to the United States. Of the fisheries of Ontario, we export to all countries \$454,552 worth, and of that we export to the United States \$454,244 worth. Of the products of the forests, Ontario exports to all countries \$9,929,683 worth, of which she exports to the United States \$9,861,890 worth. Of animals and their products Ontario exports to all countries \$7,391,449 worth, of which \$2,524,511 worth goes to the United States. Of the products of agriculture we send to all countries \$8,101,863 worth, of which we send to the United States \$2,694,638 worth. Of manufactures we send to all countries \$3,381,156 worth, of which we send to the United States \$141,255 worth. The total exports of Ontario to all countries are \$30,186,271, of which \$18,588,764 goes to the United States. Is it

not strange, Mr. Speaker, that we send to the United States nearly two-thirds of all the manufactured articles exported from Ontario, notwithstanding the high tariff wall which at present exists between the two countries? Does not that indicate with great force that if we had free trade with the United States, that export would increase largely? And if the United States should send manufactured articles into this country under a treaty, there would at the same time be an immense market in the United States for the manufactured goods of Canada. It may be said that the United States have sufficient manufactured articles for themselves, and that we would be sending coals to Newcastle in sending manufactured articles to them. But when we send an article that is in demand, and an article of the best quality, and can sell it there in the face of a tariff of 20, 30 or 40 per cent, we need not fear but that under free trade these articles would be purchased at the highest market price. Do you not think, Mr. Speaker, seeing that we now send our minerals over a high tariff wall, that under free trade, our iron industries in Ontario would receive a great impetus and be stimulated into greater activity than they enjoy to-day? Do you not believe that our vast copper mines to the north of Lake Superior would be more completely developed, and that we would have the sound of industry there, instead of complete silence, as at present? We have better and richer copper ores in Canada than they have in the United States, and yet we find that they take copper ore from the south side of Lake Superior, carry it 1,000 miles on the railways, and have it smelted at Pittsburg. Could we not smelt it just as easily in our own country, where the fuel is found, if we had the advantage of its going into the United States free of duty? But let me show that reciprocity treaty, based upon honourable and equitable principles, would be of great advantage to the eastern provinces. New Brunswick, one of those eastern provinces, trades with 17 countries. Of the products of the mines she exports to all countries \$54,586 worth, of which nearly the whole, or \$53,523 worth goes to the markets of the United States. Of the products of the fisheries she exports to all countries \$620,613 worth, of which \$484,670 worth goes to the United States. Of the products of the forest she sends to all countries \$4,933,000 worth, of which \$2,011,248 worth goes to the United States. Of animals and their products \$112,000 worth are sent to all countries, of which \$77,643 worth goes to the United States. Of agricultural products the total export is \$183,036 worth, of which \$135,142 worth goes to the United States. Out of the manufactured articles of New Brunswick, she sends a total of \$306,872 worth to all countries, of which \$181,933 worth goes to the United States. Out of a total export to all countries of \$6,216,000,

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron).

by New Brunswick, \$2,950,142 is sent to the United States. It will be seen from these figures that nearly 50 per cent of the whole export trade of New Brunswick is with the United States, which fact testifies that it would be of great value to that province to have freer trade with that country, which is already her chief market. Let us take another province, the province of Nova Scotia, and see the advantages of reciprocity to her. Nova Scotia exports to 28 countries. She exports of the product of the mine to all countries \$701,135 worth, of which \$370,000 worth goes to the United States. Of the fisheries she exports \$5,165,000 worth, of which \$1,572,000 worth goes to the United States. Of the products of the forest she exports \$2,035,000 worth, of which \$491,120 worth goes to the United States. Of animals and their products she exports to all countries \$440,000 worth, of which \$36,000 worth only goes to the United States. Of agricultural products she exports \$1,110,000 worth, of which \$89,183 worth goes to the United States. Of the products of her manufacturing industries she exports \$981,000 worth, of which \$251,948 worth goes to the United States. The total exports of Nova Scotia to all countries amount to \$10,433,000, of which she sends to the United States \$2,810,000. It will be seen from these figures what a large proportion of the export trade of Nova Scotia is done with the United States, and if there were greater freedom of trade her prosperity would hardly know any bounds. When such a large trade under the present high tariff restrictions can be carried on, how much would it be possible to enlarge that trade and stimulate the prosperity of the people if those tariff restrictions were removed? But, Sir, there is one more of the eastern provinces to which I wish to refer—the little province of Prince Edward Island, a province which I believe would be benefited more by reciprocity in trade than probably any other province of the Dominion; because a large proportion of the articles which she raises for export have to go to the United States to find a market at all. Of her fisheries she exports \$437,305 worth to all countries, of which she sends \$290,000 worth to the United States market—a market which we are told has at present fish enough of its own; but, as I said before, with regard to British Columbia, the fish caught in the waters further north are better fish, and are selected in the southern markets in preference to their own, and are sold at a higher price, or our people would not be able to send them there at all. Of animals and their products Prince Edward Island sends to all countries—the 14 with which she deals—\$320,000 worth, of which she sends to the United States \$115,950 worth. Of agricultural products she sends to all countries \$251,000 worth, of which she sends to the United States \$68,750 worth. Of manufactures she sends to all countries \$22,508 worth, and of that amount

she sends \$2,189 worth to the United States. Of the total exports of \$1,037,947 worth from Prince Edward Island, she sends to the United States \$476,554 worth, or nearly 50 per cent. Now, there is a particular hardship on that province. Last year she exported 378,000 bushels of potatoes, for which she is unable to find a market either in the province itself or in Nova Scotia, and those potatoes have to climb over a barrier of 15 cents a bushel before they can get into the market of the United States, in which they are sold. Out of the total exports of the Dominion of 1,370,000 bushels of potatoes, the maritime provinces exported 1,030,000, and 777,708 bushels of that went into the United States in spite of a tariff of 15 cents per bushel. Do you not really suppose that if there was free trade in those articles, that would be a blessing to the eastern provinces—a blessing which they cannot enjoy under the iniquitous system of protection. It would bring about a condition of prosperity which would far more than counterbalance any loss of revenue.

I believe that if there was reciprocity in coal, it would be a great advantage to the people of Nova Scotia. These people have an immense market in the eastern states. If there was reciprocity between the maritime provinces, particularly Nova Scotia, and the eastern states, it would give a stimulus to the coal industry which nothing else could give. It would give a stimulus also to the iron industry of these eastern provinces better than anything else could give. You can see plainly that when you have fuel and iron lying in the same neighbourhood as well as the limestone which is used as flux in the making of iron, you have every facility to produce the iron as cheaply as it can be in any other part of the world. If you had freedom of trade, so that you could ship your iron and coal to other markets, you would develop those industries to an extent far beyond any development that can be hoped for in the restricted markets of Canada. These are so restricted that they have a deleterious effect upon the production and development of the iron industry. Nova Scotia has railways running almost among mountains of iron, plenty of ships floating almost in the very neighbourhood, by which to ship her iron products to other countries, and realize larger profits than she can obtain under any restrictive policy. Therefore, it is wholly to her interests to have reciprocity with the United States.

Now, I shall pass on to another question. I come to another plank in the policy of the great Liberal party—a party in which I take the greatest pride; a party that has a history in this country which no other party has; a party that placed in the constitution of this country more fundamental principles than any other party;

a party that is the father of responsible government; a party that is the father of free schools in Canada; a party that secularized the clergy reserves in 1855 and put all churches of this country upon an equal basis, and distributed the proceeds of those clergy reserves among the municipalities of the country; a party that has brought about representation by population, whereby every province of the country receives the justice it is entitled to; a party that was the means of bringing the provinces of the Dominion into confederation; a party of economy and purity in office and out of office; a party which in a few months will come into power. Let me read the third plank in the policy of the Liberal party:

That the convention deplores the gross corruption in the management and expenditure of public moneys which for years past has existed under the rule of the Conservative party, and the revelations of which by the different parliamentary committees of inquiry have brought disgrace upon the fair name of Canada.

The Government, which profited politically by these expenditures of public moneys of which the people have been defrauded, and which, nevertheless, have never punished the guilty parties, must be held responsible for the wrong-doing. We arraign the Government for retaining in office a Minister of the Crown proved to have accepted very large contributions of money for election purposes from the funds of a railway company, which, while paying the political contributions to him, a member of the Government, with one hand, was receiving Government subsidies with the other.

The conduct of the Minister and the approval of his colleagues after the proof became known to them are calculated to degrade Canada in the estimation of the world and deserve the severe condemnation of the people.

I must make good this charge against the present Government. You will remember, Sir, that in 1891 the Quebec Harbour Works were undertaken by the firm of Larkin, Connolly & Co. Robert H. McGreevy was given a large interest in the contract, although he had not one dollar invested, directly or indirectly, in the concern. Why was he given this interest? Because he was thought to have influence upon his brother, the hon. member for Quebec West, and his brother had a strong influence upon the Minister of Public Works of that day (Sir Hector Langevin). He was an intimate friend of the Minister of Public Works, lived in the same house, and it was almost said, slept in the same bed, so intimate and cordial were the relations between the two. Now, Larkin, Connolly & Co. obtained contracts from this Government. They received from 1878 to 1891, \$3,138,334 for the works constructed by them—works planned by the very best engineers in the country, and estimated not to cost a dollar more than two millions. This left

a balance, beyond a reasonable profit for the works, of \$1,138,334. This was an enormous profit; but when we consider the sequel, we find that the profits of Larkin, Connolly & Co. were not so large as they appeared. This firm was compelled to contribute into the bribery and corruption fund no less than \$170,447, as established by the investigation before the Public Accounts Committee in 1891. Robert McGreevy, although he had no money in the concern whatever, and although he ran no risk whatever, received \$187,000 for his influence as go-between—the company on one hand and his brother on the other, his brother having great influence with the Minister of Public Works, from whom this company might receive great benefit at the expense of the people of the country. Thomas McGreevy acknowledged that he received large sums of money as the treasurer of the Conservative party in the province of Quebec; but when pressed for the names of the parties from whom he received the money, he refused to answer in order to prevent exposure. Then to escape the punishment Parliament would certainly have inflicted upon him, he skipped the country. This was equivalent to acknowledgment that there was something wrong with the gift of these large sums. Evidence established that he had given \$25,000 to subsidize the newspaper organ of his friend the then Minister of Public Works. It was in this corrupt way that these extraordinary profits of Larkin, Connolly & Co. were spent, and thus the country was robbed of nearly three-quarters of a million of money that should never have been paid out, and would never have been paid out but that the company was expected to contribute largely to the boodle fund of the Conservative party. So strong was the evidence against the leaders in this case that Sir Hector Langevin, still a member of this House, had to resign his position as Minister of Public Works, and take, as it were, a back bench in this House because of his connection with this affair. Two of the men engaged in these transactions had to skip the country, and both, I think, feared to come back lest the clutches of the law should fasten upon them for their notorious robbery of the people of the country. Two of them were sent for a short time to prison. And let it be said to the discredit of the Government, that they released these two men from behind the bars and left to pine away in the cells hundreds of people more honest, more upright, people of cleaner and more respectable character than these men. There is another charge we bring against the Government, and it is in connection with the beautiful building on the south side of Wellington street in this city, a building which is the admiration of every stranger and the pride of every citizen, but a building that cost twice as

much as it would have cost if it had been built according to honest principles. If Mr. Charlebois, the contractor, had been paid according to his contract, he would have been entitled to only \$355,000; but in order to put larger sums of money into his pocket, an agreement was made between him and the Government containing a clause that is not to be found, I venture to say, in any other agreement, private or public, that ever was made in Canada. I heard the chief engineer state on his oath that it was the first agreement containing such a clause that he had ever seen in the department. Let me read that clause:

The contractors will agree to bind themselves to buy the right of way from the contractor, Charlebois.

That was to enable the chief contractor to exact from those who took sub-contracts—one to build the stairs, another to put in the elevators, another to put in the furnaces, another to furnish the iron cross beams, and so on—25 per cent upon their actual tenders. So when they put in an honest tender for the value of the work they had to add 25 per cent so as to recoup themselves for what they were compelled, under that clause of the contract, to pay this chief contractor what he was not fairly entitled to. And so \$350,000 was taken from the people more than was necessary for the construction of the building. Nor is that all, I wish it were. Let me give you a few items of extravagance besides the two I have already mentioned. There was the Tay Canal. That work was estimated to cost \$132,600, and that was all the work was worth. The canal is only $5\frac{3}{4}$ miles long, passing through a level country, so that no deep cuts were necessary, and having only one lock upon it as it empties into the Rideau Canal. But the work actually cost \$476,000, nearly \$300,000 in excess of the estimates made by the Government engineer. Now, one of two things must be true, either these Government engineers were not worthy of the positions they held, or the Government must have expended corruptly that \$300,000 upon a work which the engineers said would cost only \$132,600. Then, again, there is the Little Rapids Canal. The engineers' estimate of the cost of this work was \$44,000. But as a matter of fact about \$300,000 was spent upon it, or about \$250,000 more than the estimate—actually five times as much spent as the amount of the original estimate. And not a solitary cent of revenue after spending these large sums of money. Need we wonder that the people of this country are heavily burdened with taxation, when they have to pay the cost of such blundering extravagance and corruption? Then, there is the Galops Channel. The estimated cost of that work was \$300,000, and before it was finished the Government had to pay for the work about \$900,000.

000. Were the engineers to blame? If they were, I do not see why the Government should retain them in their positions. If they were not to blame, what is the explanation of these figures. No explanation satisfactory to the people has ever been given of these extraordinary expenditures over the estimates made by the Government engineers. Take the case of another work—the St. Charles Branch Railway. When the Government entered upon that work it was estimated to cost \$136,000. The railway is fourteen miles long. The actual cost was \$1,723,000, or an average of \$123,000 per mile. The Government says that the construction cost only \$822,000, but that the land damages and expenses involved an increased cost of about \$900,000. I fear that fraud, mismanagement and corruption all combined to make up this extraordinary expenditure of the people's money. The people have no redress but to pay the money and defeat this corrupt Government in a few months. I now come to speak of the two bridges which were built in the city of Montreal, across the Lachine Canal. One was for the Grand Trunk Railway, and the other for passenger traffic. The Government, it must be admitted, were compelled to build those bridges at an unfavourable time of the year, which entailed a considerably larger expense than if built later in the season, and that must be borne in mind, if we would be fair. They had to build them at a period of the year when a good deal of work had to be done that would not have had to be done at a more seasonable time of the year. I am willing to give the Government the advantage of every palliating circumstance, and to place this matter as fairly as I can before the people of this country. Sir, I have carefully gone over the evidence taken by the Public Accounts Committee, and I have also carefully examined the evidence taken before the Royal Commission which the Government itself appointed to investigate the frauds perpetrated on it. I wish to place before you some facts that I have gleaned from a careful examination of the evidence. The estimated cost of the bridge, as made by the engineers, was \$175,000, that is, the final cost. The estimate was even less at the beginning, but I understand that the Government deepened the canal and ordered a more expensive construction. The final cost of those bridges was \$394,000, which is the amount of money the Government have already had to pay, but there are still some \$50,000 or \$60,000 in dispute between the Government and the contractors. Now, these are some of the facts which I find in the evidence taken by the Royal Commission, and I give them in order to refresh the memory of the members of the Government, and also to refresh the memory of the people of this country, with the condition in which those bridges were completed, and the carelessness that charac-

terized the officials who looked after their construction. I find that \$4 were paid for foremen, and \$6 a day for foremen for night-work, or overtime. \$5 a day were paid for a team, and \$10 for a team on Sunday. \$2.50 were paid for a derrick, and \$3.50 for a derrick overtime. Now, Mr. Speaker, is it not truly astonishing that so large a sum of money should be paid for the use of a derrick for overtime? How can that be explained upon any principle of justice or right? Then it appears that this derrick had great objections to working on Sunday, and had to be persuaded by doubling its wages, for I find that for Sunday work the derrick cost \$7.50. Now, these are not my statements, they are gathered from the evidence placed before this country by the Government, and taken by the Royal Commission appointed by themselves. Then I find that \$8 a day were paid for foremen on Sunday, and \$12 a day for foremen working overtime on Sunday. Mr. St. Louis, the contractor for the labour, and, I understand, an intimate friend and relative of the Minister of Public Works, put so many men on the works that there were hardly standing room for them; and I am informed that many of them had to leave, and were employed to do private work for the contractors. There was no room on the canal for them to work, but the Government paid them all the same, and the contractors received the profit and put it into their pockets. There were 2,000 men on the works at one time. Of course, many of them were idle and not able to work, because there was no room for them. Again, I find there was no Government time-keeper. What excuse can the Government make for such gross negligence, on a work of that kind, when such large sums of public money were at stake? They knew they had to pay out money on the pay-list submitted by the contractors, and they neglected to appoint a time-keeper of their own, in whom they might have confidence, to certify that the pay-lists were proper, and that the work was actually done before the men were paid. The Government had no supervision over the work, there was no Government officer there to oversee it, and the result was that the whole thing was left in the hands of these rascals who were in possession at the time. They took advantage of their opportunity to defraud the Government, because the Government was evidently neglectful in looking after that public work. Then, there was no Government record of the materials used.

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

After Recess.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). When you left the Chair at six o'clock, I was giving to the House and to the country some of the facts which I had gleaned from the evidence given before the Royal Commission

In connection with the bridges built by the Government in the city of Montreal, and from the evidence taken before the Public Accounts Committee in relation to the same bridges. I will now proceed to give a few more of those facts, showing what I may justly term the corrupt expenditure of the Government in connection with those bridges. Sir, there was no classification of labour. Mr. St. Louis charged for skilled labour where he was not entitled to be paid for it, and this increased the charges against the Government to a very large extent. There were no public tenders for timber, and therefore the timber supplied by those parties was charged to the Government at a cost much in excess of its real value. Had the Government taken the precaution to ask for public tenders for the supply of timber for these bridges, they would have saved thousands of dollars, but instead of doing that, they allowed the contractor to supply the timber, and to make his own price to the Government, which they had to pay. Then again, there was no one appointed by the Government to look after the kind of timber that was supplied, and the result was that an inferior class of timber and lumber was provided for the construction of those bridges; consequently the Government had not only to pay an exceedingly high price, but they had to pay that price for an inferior quality of material. Again, unskilled labour and skilled labour were not defined by the Government, and consequently the contractor for labour was able to charge the Government, in many cases, for skilled labour when unskilled labour was what he actually supplied, and the Government was compelled to pay the price of skilled labour when unskilled labour was provided. There was no check as to the quality of the timber and lumber supplied, and, therefore, as I say, a large proportion of this timber and lumber was of a very inferior quality. Then, Sir, one million feet of lumber was actually stolen from the grounds, of which no account was given for which the Government had to pay. New lumber was taken and cut up, and used for firewood, and for this lumber thus used for firewood, the Government had to pay large sums of money. Government teams were used to haul lumber for some distance which the contractor had already been paid to haul himself; thus the Government had to pay for the teams in the first place, and then they had to pay the contractor for the use of those teams in the second place. I find that \$39,896 were paid by the Government for work which was proved in evidence to be worth only \$6,000. For stone-cutting, which should have cost \$3,000, according to the evidence the Government had to pay no less than \$16,715. Stone was hauled by teams 20 miles along the side of a railway from the quarry to the bridge, and this was done in order to enable the contractor to make large profits upon the

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron).

men and teams which he supplied. If the Government had looked into those matters, they could have easily seen that these parties were defrauding them on the right hand and on the left. But they neglected their duties towards the public they were serving. The result was that these fraudulent transactions were going on every day in the city of Montreal by which large sums of money were being extracted from the pockets of the Canadian people. Sir, there was no excuse for the Government, because they were warned that great extravagance was going on there, that there were too many men on the works, so many that there was not room for them all to be employed. Further, it was intimated that there was irregularity whereby the Government was being defrauded, and notwithstanding that notification and information which came to them through their own engineer, no step was taken for the purpose of preventing the Government being defrauded any further. The Government paid large sums to the contractor, although they were warned of the conduct of the contractor; and, therefore, you can plainly see, Mr. Speaker, and the supporters of the Government can plainly see, and I am sure the people at large will plainly see, that a large proportion of this money taken out of the pockets of the people was paid through negligence on the part of the parties who should have overseen the work. Pending the investigation that was instituted by the Government itself, pending that investigation which was to take place before a Royal Commission, the Government paid the contractor, St. Louis, \$105,000, on an account that the chief engineer discredited, and which he refused to certify. I ask hon. gentlemen opposite, was that an act which should be regarded as in the interest of the country, to pay a large sum of money on an account which their own engineer discredited? It appears to me not only to be an extravagant, but a corrupt act on the part of the Government. After the Royal Commission finished their work, they drafted a report and submitted that report to the Government, and at the close of that document, they reported incompetence, extravagance and fraud. That extravagance was as much on the part of the Government as on the part of the contractor, that incompetence I attribute to those who should look after the public works of Canada and are paid to do so. The Minister of Railways and Canals, although attending here during the session, and making that an excuse for not supervising the work, was only a few hours' distance by railway from Montreal, and, moreover, he had the chief engineer of the Government, whose duty it was to see that this work was properly constructed, and everything carried out with efficiency and economy. The people have lost the money, and they are determined in a few weeks to hold the Government responsible for an expenditure in this way, of over \$230,000.

Mr. Speaker, before taking up the next head of my speech, I want to refer to a little error I made this afternoon while speaking. I do not wish to make errors. In speaking of the duty which the United States charge on coal, I said it was 75 cents per ton, overlooking the fact that in 1894, under the Wilson Bill, the duty was brought down to 40 cents. In speaking of fish, I regarded fish as dutiable, but I find that fresh fish goes in free. Hon. members will see that though I made these paltry errors, they do not affect my argument, and that a reduction in duty would largely benefit parties exporting products to the United States.

Now I come to another plank in the policy of the Liberal party, and it is a very important one, because it bears largely on the expenditure of money in the discharge of public business. It is as follows:—

We cannot but view with alarm the large increase in the public debt and controllable annual expenditure of the Dominion, and consequent undue taxation of the people under the Government that has been continuously in power since 1873, and we demand the strictest economy in the administration of the Government of this country.

The hon. gentleman who spoke the night before last, the hon. member for Kent, N.B., (Mr. McInerney) sought to prove by an array of figures that the Liberal Government was much more extravagant in the expenditure of money than was the Government at present in power. But I think I will satisfy you, Mr. Speaker, and even the hon. gentleman himself, if he is present, that he was altogether in error, and although he did not intend to be in error, still he was so by using the figures which he used. In looking over the expenditures of 1878 and 1895 under special heads, everybody will observe that the Conservative Government has been more extravagant in regard to expenditures. The interest on the debt was only \$7,000,000 in 1878, and in 1895 it increased to \$10,466,000, or 48 per cent increase. The expenditure under civil government in 1878 was \$823,370. That amount rose to \$1,422,000 in 1895, or an increase of 72½ per cent. Under the head of legislation, the cost in 1878 was \$618,035, but it rose last year to \$941,570, or an increase of 52 per cent. Under the head of militia, the expenditure in 1878 was \$618,126, and this year it reached the enormous sum of \$1,574,000, or an increase of 154 per cent. There is no hon. gentleman present, whether he belongs to the militia or not, who will undertake to state that the militia is in a better condition to-day than it was in 1878, for, as I have already stated, the Militia Department has neglected its duty to a very large extent, and allowed the militia to become very inefficient, indeed. I am stating these facts, not from personal knowledge of the state of the militia, but from the knowledge of the most eminent men in the militia, and therefore this tre-

mendous additional expense was, in my opinion, unjustifiable, judged from the fruits of that expenditure. Then the expenditure for Mounted Police in 1878 was \$325,000. Under that head to-day the expenditure is \$646,000, or an increase of 92 per cent. Then, under the head of Indians, we had an expenditure, in 1878, under the regime of Hon. Alexander Mackenzie, of \$421,000, and to-day the expenditure is \$955,000, or an increase of 126 per cent. Under the head of superannuations, the expenditure during the last year of Mr. Mackenzie's Government, was \$106,000, now it is \$265,000, or 149 per cent increase. This increase has been going on while the whole population has only increased about 18 per cent, and the average increase of all these increases will very nearly reach 100 per cent. We maintain, as the Liberal party, that these comparisons show too large an expenditure, they indicate an expenditure under these departmental heads that is extravagant, and the Liberal party, when it comes into power, which they will do in a few weeks, will seek to reduce the expenditures, and bring them to a proper standard compatible with the interests and well-being of Canada.

I will draw another comparison. During the first year of confederation, the annual expenditure on consolidated fund was \$13,456,000; in 1874, when the Liberal-Conservatives left power, it was \$23,316,316. That is an increase in those six years of \$9,830,000, or an annual increase of \$1,640,000. Now, take the expenditure during the last time they were in power. As you are aware, Mr. Speaker, they came into power again in 1878. They began with an expenditure of \$23,503,000, and in 1895, seventeen years thereafter, they ended with an expenditure of \$38,132,000, or an additional expenditure of \$14,629,000, making an average yearly increase of \$860,000, or 62 per cent. In the first period of six years, there was an increase of 73 per cent, and in the second period of the Conservative regime, there was an increase of 62 per cent; and mark you, Mr. Speaker, while these enormous percentages were piling up in the expenditure, our population in that period only increased 18 per cent. We will take the other side of the shield, and we will see what the Reformers did during the years they were in power. When the Reformers took office in 1874, the annual expenditure was \$23,316,000, and when they went out in 1878, the expenditure was \$23,503,000, or a total increase during the five years they were in power, of only \$187,000, or an annual increase of \$37,400, or four-fiftieths of 1 per cent. Now, Sir, during that time, the population of this country increased 9 per cent. During the Conservative period of government, the expenditure increased three and a half times the increase of population, and under the Liberal regime the population increased by 100

times the expenditure. You see by these comparisons which of the two parties were the most economical in the discharge of their duties. There is another method, Sir, by which we can test the economy of governments, and perhaps it is the best method after all. That is to compare the controllable expenditure of the different governments. The controllable expenditure in 1868 amounted to \$3,630,000, and in 1874 it had increased to \$8,324,000. In 1878, after the five years that Mr. Mackenzie was in power, he had reduced the controllable expenditure from \$8,324,000 to \$6,542,000. Now let us see what the Conservatives did during the last seventeen years. They went in, as Mackenzie went out, with a controllable expenditure of \$6,542,000; but to-day it has increased to \$17,500,000. That is nearly 300 per cent of an increase in the controllable expenditure, and this way of comparison tests the economy of government probably better than any other way it can be tested, by the contrast of figures. Therefore, in seventeen years, the Conservatives have increased the controllable expenditure by \$11,000,000.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to draw your attention for a few moments to the charge that was made the other night against the Liberal Government. That charge was, that they increased the debt in larger proportion than the Liberal-Conservatives did. I shall give you the figures which will properly and fairly place this matter before the House, and the country, and let them be the judges as to whether the Mackenzie Government was responsible for a greater increase of the debt, than was the Conservative Government. The debt in 1868 was \$75,000,000, and we need not go beyond that date, because we all know how that debt came about. In 1874 the debt had risen to \$108,000,000, an increase under the Conservatives of about \$33,000,000. The Conservative Government, Mr. Speaker, as you know very well, committed themselves to large undertakings previous to going out of power, and which undertakings had to be assumed by the Liberal Government, on taking office. In fact, the Conservatives had already entered upon some of those undertakings, and the Liberal party had to provide the funds for carrying them on. This is what Sir Leonard Tilley said in his Budget speech of 1873, shortly before his party went out of power, and it will show to you what was in prospect for the Liberals at that time. I read from Sir Leonard Tilley's speech:

We are entering upon new and increased engagements, involving a very large sum of money. We are entering upon work—we have already done so—which will require a large increase of our debt. We have \$10,000,000 on the Intercolonial Railway; we have \$30,000,000 for the Canadian Pacific Railway, and the canal system which has been accepted by the Government, will involve an expenditure of \$20,000,000. These are serious matters, inasmuch as they add \$60,000,000 to our existing debt.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron).

That was the statement made by Sir Leonard Tilley in the last Budget speech he delivered before the Liberals came into power. When the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie took the reins of government, he had to accept these responsibilities thrown upon him, and for the sake of the good faith of the country he had to carry out the promises made by his predecessors. During the Liberal regime, much money was spent upon these works, and as a matter of fact, in 1872 and in 1873, no less than \$8,000,000 of this expenditure was voted by the Conservative Government, but they made no provisions to meet it, leaving to the Mackenzie Government the responsibility of providing for the appropriations passed by them. During Mr. Mackenzie's regime, he spent on canals, \$16,232,000, more than has been spent since he went out of power. He spent on the Canadian Pacific Railway, \$11,362,000. The work was undertaken by the previous Government, and, in fact, both sides of the House were pledged to carrying it out. On the Intercolonial Railway, the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie spent \$10,103,000. The total of these three works, to which Sir Leonard Tilley, the then Finance Minister referred in his Budget of 1873, was \$37,697,000, or within a very little of the entire addition which the Liberal Government made to the debt. And now, these hon. gentlemen who put those burdens upon the Liberal Government of that day, turn around in these late years and say that Mackenzie was responsible for it all. It is plain to be seen by the remarks which I have quoted from Sir Leonard Tilley, that Mr. Mackenzie, in this expenditure, was only carrying out the engagements which were entered into by the previous Government, and out of which it was impossible for him to extricate himself. I do not doubt but that these works were necessary. Every one will admit that. But it is not necessary, nor is it fair, nor is it just, to make the Mackenzie Government responsible for all this large expenditure. Since the present Government came into power last, they have increased the debt by no less than \$113,000,000, and when they are explaining this enormous increase of debt away, they do it in this way. They say: We required so much for such a public work, and so much for such another public work, and so much for such another public work, and there is value to the country for every dollar. That is all very well, but when we come down to deal with the details of the matter it is a very different story. Then we begin to find out about the Curran bridge on which \$200,000 of the money of the people was worse than thrown away, and we begin to find out about the building of the Quebec graving dock, where \$750,000 of the people's money was thrown away. We do not complain that these public works were not necessary, but we do complain that the Government was derelict in its

duty, and squandered money on these works. They expended far more than was necessary on these works. I admit, Mr. Speaker, that much of this \$113,000,000 was needed for public works, but much of it has been extravagantly expended, as I have shown you, and much has been added to our public debt by the corruption and maladministration of this Government.

Now, Mr. Speaker, another question to which I wish to direct the attention of the House and the country. The Liberal Government was termed the Government of deficits. Our hon. friends on the other side of the House are getting a little mild now on that question. Deficit after deficit has been rolled up by themselves, so that now they do not feel so free to make charges of derision against the Liberal Government in regard to their deficits. Now, I want to bring these deficits clearly before the members of this House; and if I am astray, I hope the hon. gentleman who is to follow me, and who is generally keen in debate, who reasons out his points very fairly and well, will take note of the figures I intend to present to the House; and if he finds that they are not correct, no person in the House will be more thankful than I to have their incorrectness pointed out. In 1875-76, with a taxation of \$18,611,000, and with a total income of \$22,588,000, the Liberal Government had a deficit of \$1,901,000. In 1876-77, with a taxation of \$17,698,000, and with a total income of \$22,059,000, the Liberal Government had a deficit of \$1,460,000. In 1877-78, with a taxation of \$17,842,000, and with a total income of \$22,375,000, the Liberal party had a deficit of \$1,128,000. Or, with a total taxation, during the three years of deficits, of \$54,154,000, and with a total income of \$67,022,000, the Liberal party had a total deficit of \$4,489,000. Now, this is the point that I want to bring forcibly before the House, that with an average taxation of \$18,051,000 during those three years, and with an average income of \$22,341,000, they had an average deficit of \$1,496,000. Now let us look at the Conservative deficits; and I would just say here that before you can make anything out of a deficit as being in favour of or against a government, you must take into consideration the amount of money they had at their disposal to spend to carry on the affairs of the country. That is an important point. If the taxation of the country is low, then there is greater chance for a deficit to occur. If the taxation of the country is high, and a deficit follow that high taxation, it is evidence of extravagance or corruption on the part of the Government. In 1879, the first year of the Liberal-Conservative Government, with a taxation of \$18,477,000 and a total income of \$22,518,000, they had a deficit of \$1,938,000. In 1879-80, the taxation was \$18,480,000, the income \$23,308,000, and the deficit \$1,543,000. Now, notice, Mr. Speaker, that in 1884-85, with a taxation of \$25,385,

000, and an annual income of \$32,797,000, they had a deficit of \$2,240,000. In 1885-86, they had another deficit. In that year they taxed the people to the extent of \$25,227,000 by increased duties, and, with an income of \$33,177,000, they had a deficit of \$5,835,000. In 1887-88, with an increased taxation of \$28,178,000 and a total income of \$35,908,000, they had a deficit of \$810,000. In 1893-94, with a taxation of \$27,579,000, and with a total income of \$36,375,000, they had a deficit of \$1,210,000. In the last deficit year, 1894-95, with a taxation of \$25,446,000, and with an income of \$33,978,000, they had a deficit of \$4,154,000. Or, with a total taxation during those seven years of \$168,772,000 and with a total income of \$218,061,000, there was no less a deficit than \$17,730,000 under the present Government. Or, with an average of \$24,110,000 of taxes every year, and with an average income of \$31,151,000, their average deficit was \$2,533,000, as compared with the average annual deficit of the Liberal Government of \$1,496,000; or they had \$1,037,000 more of an annual average deficit, with \$6,059,000 more of taxation, and with an annual income of \$8,810,000 more than the Liberal Administration. In the face of these facts, with such a large taxation on the people, and with an income from other sources that ran up to so large a sum, how can hon. gentlemen opposite claim that they are justified in having greater deficits than the party that taxed the people \$6,059,000 less? Yet the average deficits of the present Government is \$1,937,000 more than the average deficits of the Liberal party. If, then, the Liberal Government, the Mackenzie Administration, had taxed the people during the three years of their deficits as this Government have taxed the people during their seven years of deficits, the Liberal Government, instead of having a deficit, would have had a surplus of \$12,697,000. Or if the income of the Liberal Government, during the three years of deficits, had been equal to that of the Conservative Government during its seven years of deficits, instead of having a deficit, the Liberal Government would have had a surplus of \$21,942,000. Now, I challenge anybody to show wherein this comparison is in error. It is the only true and proper comparison that can be made between the deficits, when you take into consideration the taxation and income. Sir Charles Tupper gave his opinion of the deficits in 1878, as recorded in "Hansard," page 449. He spoke as follows:—

What does he (Sir Richard Cartwright) tell this House? He tells the House now that he does not propose to submit any measure by which this great calamity, this great disaster, this ruin to the credit of the country, shall be averted, although he says that on the 10th of this month (February, 1878), he has a deficit of \$617,610.

If the deficit in 1878 could be described as a calamity, a disaster and ruin to the credit

of the country. I would like to have that hon. gentleman's opinion of the deficit of \$4,154,000 which this Government has. I am sure that the hon. baronet could find no words in his vocabulary—and he has a very large one, full of very strong words—to express his horror at the deficits of his own party, when he had to use such words as “calamity, disaster and ruin to the credit of the country.” in order to express his opinion of the deficit of \$617,000 in 1878. I have only touched upon aggregates, and have no time to go into detail to show how the moneys were spent to purchase influence and corrupt the people.

I now intend to take up another plank of the policy of the Liberal party. And surely it will not be said, after I have done, that hon. gentlemen opposite do not know the policy of the Liberal party. I hope that from this time henceforth and for ever that they will know what is the policy of the Liberal party.

An hon. MEMBER. What is it ?

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). There is one gentleman who does not know it yet. This is the next plank to which I am going to draw the attention of the House. This may be the last time when I shall speak on the Budget, I may be left at home at the coming election, and I want to leave behind me the record of the Liberal party, so that when I meet these gentlemen on the public platform I may refer them to my speech, and then go on in the even tenor of my way.

That the convention regrets that by the action of Ministers and their supporters in Parliament, in one case in which serious charges were made against a Minister of the Crown, investigation was altogether refused, while in another case the charges preferred were altered and then referred to a commission appointed upon the advice of the Ministry, contrary to the well-settled practice of Parliament ; and this convention affirms :

That it is the ancient and undoubted right of the House of Commons to inquire into all matters of public expenditure, and into all charges of misconduct in office against Ministers of the Crown, and the reference to royal commissions created upon the advice of the accused is at variance with due responsibility of Ministers to the House of Commons and tends to weaken the authority of the House over the Executive Government, and this convention affirms that the powers of the people's representatives in this regard should on all fitting occasions be upheld.

That contains a proposition which should be adhered to. It is the undoubted right of Parliament both to make and hear charges and take evidence with regard to them. But in 1892 that was denied to an hon. member of this House, who, in his place in this House, took upon himself the responsibility of formulating direct charges against a Minister of the Crown, and asked this House to appoint a committee, so that those charges might be investigated and

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron).

the honour of Parliament vindicated. The hon. Postmaster General (Sir Adolphe Caron) was charged by the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) with having received from the Quebec and Lake St. John Railway Company a large sum of money for political purposes. The charges which he had formulated, he stated in the House he was prepared to prove, if given a committee. But those charges were changed and put in another shape which could not be accepted by the hon. member for West Ontario, and then the Government appointed a commission of their own to take evidence upon those cut and carved charges instead of upon the charge originally made upon the responsibility of a member of this House. The Postmaster General admitted that he had received some money from the Hon. J. S. Ross, who was president of the construction company that built the road, and who had a very large interest in the road itself. That road was receiving subsidies from this Parliament from time to time, amounting in the long run to about a million dollars ; and while they were begging at the door of Parliament for subsidies, one of the Ministers of this Government, who had been approached by this company to use his influence in getting subsidies, was receiving a portion of those Government grants. That money was received by him and put into the boodle fund for the purpose of carrying the elections in Lower Canada. The hon. gentleman admitted this himself before the royal commission. He was asked :

Q. You say you got these different sums, amounting in all to \$25,000, from the Hon. Mr. Ross ?—A. I did.

Q. Personally ?—A. Personally.

Q. In what form ?—A. In bank bills.

Q. And you took them in that form to Mr. McGreevy ?—A. I drove from his office to Mr. McGreevy's. The amount never left my hands until it was deposited in the hands of Mr. McGreevy.

You must bear in mind that Mr. McGreevy was the treasurer of the Conservative Government election fund, and this \$25,000 was taken out of the subsidies granted to that railway and then carried by the hon. Postmaster General to Mr. McGreevy as treasurer of the fund, and placed in his hands for distribution during election time, to buy up the voters of Quebec. The hon. Postmaster General (Sir Adolphe Caron) boasted upon the floor of this House, in my own hearing, a few years ago, that if he had the opportunity he would do it again. He said he was bound to assist his friends, and that he was perfectly justified in taking this money, notwithstanding that it was part of the money given by the Government to that railway company. He said :

I take the full responsibility for my actions and for assisting my friends, because it was necessary to assist them under the peculiar conditions existing in the district of Quebec, which I was looking after. I am prepared to stand or

fall by what I have done, considering that I have helped my friends to the extent that I considered legitimate. I say, under the circumstances, what I did on that occasion I would do again to-morrow, in order to help my friends.

This hon. gentleman appeared to be more anxious to help his friends than to help the country who paid him his salary. The idea of a Minister of the Crown standing up in this House after having, by his own admission, received such large sums from a company that was in receipt of subsidies from this country, and saying that he had taken this money to assist his friends in the elections of the time. It appears to me it requires more moral courage—or immoral courage—than any other man in the House could show. Now, although the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) refused to go before the commission on the ground that the Postmaster General was not to be tried upon the charges preferred by him—for that reason the hon. gentleman was perfectly justified in refraining from appearing before that commission—still, he gave the names of witnesses he would have called before the committee that he wished to have appointed. And, though the evidence taken was partial in its nature on many points, still it brought home that the Postmaster General had received large sums of money as testified to by himself. So strong was that evidence that the following resolution was moved in this House on the 22nd March, 1893, in amendment to a motion to go into Supply :

That Mr. Speaker do not leave the Chair, but that it be declared that, in the opinion of this House, the evidence taken by the royal commission appointed last session to inquire into certain charges made against the Hon. Sir A. P. Caron, K.C.M.G., M.P., which was reported to the Government on the 24th November last, and is now laid before us, established facts which should have prevented the subsequent appointment of Sir A. P. Caron to be an adviser of the Crown, and also renders it highly improper that he should continue to hold such office.

Of course that resolution was voted down. But I wish to show that even among those on the Postmaster General's own side of the House, there were men, capable and honest men, men who had the practice of a lifetime in hearing evidence and weighing testimony and reaching proper conclusions, who were so strongly influenced by the evidence taken before that commission that they voted for the resolution. One of these was the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), a man of eminent ability. And I believe he had nothing against this hon. gentleman at all, but, upon weighing all the evidence, he was forced to support that resolution condemnatory of the Postmaster General. Another was the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon), whom we all regard as a man of great ability, himself a professor of law and well accustomed to the sifting of evidence. After going through the evidence taken before that royal commission he was

forced to the conclusion that the Postmaster General was guilty of the charges laid at his door, and he manfully rose on the floor of this House in the face of the opposition of the vast majority of his political friends and voted for the condemnation of the Postmaster General. Here are two men whose ability and capacity are well known. We know their fairness also. I believe the hon. member for Albert wishes to be fair in these matters, and it must have taken a good deal of moral courage to rise and vote against the large majority of his own party. He would not have done so but that conviction was forced upon him by the evidence. There was others who voted for the condemnation of that transaction.

Now, I might refer to other charges, but I do not wish to take up the time of the House. If I did wish to take up your time, and if I had the strength, I could stand here from now till morning making charges against the Government and substantiating them by as strong evidence as that which convinced the hon. member for Albert when he voted to condemn the Postmaster General. It is clear that the ancient and undoubted right of Parliament was denied by the majority of this chamber in the case to which I have referred, in order to save their friends from public exposure and condemnation.

Now, I know, Mr. Speaker, that you are a very patient man, and therefore I shall impose a little further upon your patience and that of the House. We have another plank in the Liberal platform to which I would call the attention of hon. gentlemen. It deals with the land policy of the Government :

That, in the opinion of this convention, the sales of public lands of the Dominion should be to actual settlers only, and not to speculators, upon reasonable terms of settlement, and in such areas as can be reasonably occupied and cultivated by the settler.

I suppose all will approve of that plank. No doubt you will understand what it means, because the party had great experience—I must speak to the party through you, Mr. Speaker—in this land business. Only a few years ago they gave away so much land to their political friends that had they continued at the same rate, we should have had very little left by this time. Let me give you an insight into what they did. They have already given away to railways and colonization and ranch companies no less than 44,250,000 acres in Manitoba and the North-west. Over 27,000,000 of this have passed out of the hands of the Government altogether. I do not say that there is none of this land which should have been given away, but I do say that a large acreage has been given away to wildcat schemes, that the land has passed into the hands of speculators, and these speculators hold that land for a rise, and thus prevent the actual

settlers from going in and occupying those lands. You will remember very well, Mr. Speaker, that some years ago land regulations were adopted in reference to Manitoba dividing the lands into certain belts. For the first five miles—I think it was—on either side of the track the land was to be sold at \$4 an acre, in the next belt at \$3, in the next at \$2, and outside at \$1 per acre. Now, there were hundreds of thousands of acres of the outside belt sold for one dollar an acre, in the best parts and the most available sections of Manitoba, for settlement. Take that section through which the South-western Railway runs. It runs through a belt of the most fertile land that can be found in the province of Manitoba, it runs through a belt in which lands were sold by the Government to speculators for one dollar an acre, and the result is that a large section of that country is now held by speculators who are waiting to receive large prices for it, while the actual settlers who would go in there and take up that land for homesteads, are now prevented from doing so because the land is locked up, and they have to pass further to the west. In this way that section of the country is retarded in progress and prosperity, on account of so much of its area lying idle.

By the deterrent influence of the Liberal party in this House, and by the exposures we made of the system of giving large timber limits to the friends of the Administration, the Government has largely refrained from selling timber limits on the same conditions as they did a few years ago. Let it be said to their credit that they took the advice of the Liberal party for once in the interest of the country. Now, let me give you a few examples to show how our public domain was dissipated into the hands of personal friends of the Government. Many will remember Mr. Charles Rykert, formerly a member of this House; Charles Rykert, of scrap book fame, will be well remembered by the older members as a man who got upon the right side of the Government, by some means, and obtained from them a timber limit in the Cypress Hills for which he paid \$250. He held that timber limit for a short time, took in a partner with him, and sold it for \$200,000. There was \$200,000 worth of the timber limits of this country dissipated from the public use, and put into the hands of private individuals, who got rich out of them. Now, I ask the hon. gentleman who will follow me, can he justify the acts of the Government in allowing lands to pass from under their hands into the hands of private parties who make large sums for themselves, thus robbing the young men of this country of the public domain? Then, again, there was an island called Hunter's Island, lying in the disputed territory. A few years ago this Government sold that island to a company for \$7,500. That company kept the land for a short time and sold it to a Chicago syndi-

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron).

cate for \$650,000. Nearly three-quarters of a million of money was about to be realized by the company who received it from the present Government for \$7,500. Did that land go into the hands of the syndicate? No, it did not, because the hon. gentleman whom the late Sir John A. Macdonald used to call "the little tyrant," stepped forward, little as he was, and got the courts to issue an injunction to prevent a transfer of the lands from the company who sold it to the Chicago syndicate, until it was decided in whose territory it lay, and were it not for the steps taken by Sir Oliver Mowat, so far as this Government is concerned, at least, that land would have passed into the hands of a foreign syndicate. Now, let me refer to the large area of timber limits that were given to the St. Catharines Milling Company. Limits that were worth almost a million dollars were given away for the paltry sum of \$5 per square mile yearly, and whatever stumpage dues were to be paid, which were a bagatelle. Millions of feet of lumber were cut and floated down to the river's mouth, and then again "the little tyrant" came forward in the interest of this Canada of ours, and had an injunction issued to prevent the company from moving the logs until it was decided to whom the timber belonged. And did the Federal Government take the side of the province, or did it take the side of the St. Catharines Milling Company? Sir, they went so far as to appeal the case to the Privy Council of England, and the Federal Government footed every dollar of the expense on behalf of the said milling company against the province. But "the little tyrant," as usual, came out on top, and won the case, and restored that property to the province of Ontario, thus preventing those lands from being dissipated into the hands of private parties, and keeping them for the use of settlers. Sir, I now come to another case. You will remember it, Sir, because you were on the floor of this House when this case was discussed, and you will know whether I am correct in my figures. Mr. Robillard, now the senior member for the city of Ottawa in this House, made application to the Government, a few years ago, for a timber limit. He obtained that limit by paying the paltry sum of \$5 for every square mile annually, and by also paying the paltry sum of 75 cents or \$1 for every thousand feet of board measure that was taken off the land. That hon. gentleman had two parties who were acting with him, one of whom was Mr. Riopelle, and the other man's name I forget. That limit, which was purchased for \$315—for that is every cent that went into the exchequer of this country for that limit—was sold by that company of three men, within a few months, for \$50,000. There was \$50,000 worth of timber taken out of the hands of the young men of this country and placed in the hands of three individuals, who mani-

pulated the Government in the first place, and who sold the land afterwards at that enormous profit. Mr. Speaker, I know this much personally about the matter. I was sitting one day at the dinner table, and a stranger was sitting before me, at the time this question was under discussion in this House. He said to me: "Did Mr. Robillard state in the House that he reaped no advantage from that transaction?" I said he did. "Well," he said, "I cannot understand it, for I am one of the company, my name is Riopelle, and Robillard made \$15,000 out of it, which he put into his pocket." Mr. Robillard was not a member of the House at the time, but he afterwards became a member. But was that all this land was worth? Not at all. That land was kept by the company for two years, and after a large portion of the timber had been taken off, it was sold for \$60,000 to another company. The third company worked it for two years longer, and then sold the limit for \$100,000. Sir, the Government were cognizant of these facts, they knew that these timber limits were passing into the hands of private parties who were making enormous profits out of them. Sir, all this was going on, notwithstanding the influence that the Liberal party sought to exert against it, and notwithstanding the exposures made year after year of the enormous dissipation of the timber limits of our country. No less than 112 Orders in Council were passed assigning these limits to friends of the Government. Now, an Order in Council does not mean a license to cut, but an Order in Council gave them the first chance of accepting the limit, if the limit was of any value. Many of them gave up the limits because they found there was not much timber upon them. But the intention of the Government was all the same to part with the public property for the advantage of their friends. Now, Mr. Speaker, I hope that if the Liberal party gets into power we will establish a system of dealing with the public lands of Canada that will be more in the interest of the people, and less in the interest of speculators, boodlers and others. Now I come to speak of another plank in the policy of the Liberal party. I want to draw the attention of the House and the country to one of the most iniquitous Acts ever perpetrated on a free people—I have reference to the Franchise Act, which was placed on the statute-book in 1884, an Act against which the Liberal party protested in order to prevent themselves being politically destroyed by this measure, which would enable revising officers to place on the lists men whose names had no right to be there. Let me read this plank so that hon. gentlemen opposite will not forget it. It is as follows:—

That the Franchise Act since its introduction has cost the Dominion Treasury over a million of dollars, besides entailing a heavy expenditure to both political parties;

That each revision involves an additional expenditure of a further quarter of a million;

That this expenditure has prevented an annual revision, as originally intended, in the absence of which young voters entitled to the franchise have, in numerous instances, been prevented from exercising their natural rights;

That it has failed to secure uniformity, which was the principal reason assigned for its introduction;

That it has produced gross abuses by partisan revising barristers appointed by the Government of the day.

That its provisions are less liberal than those already existing in many provinces of the Dominion, and that in the opinion of this convention the Act should be repealed, and we should revert to the provincial franchise.

I am sure the hon. gentleman who will follow me is as much opposed to this Act as I am. I believe he is of the opinion, if he dare only state it in this House, that the Act has been a complete failure, that it has involved both parties in heavy expense, loss of time, and a great deal of irritation, as well as involving the Government in an expenditure of nearly a million dollars. Every time the lists are revised, the work costs a quarter of a million. The election of 1891 was thrust upon the country on a list three years old, on the list of 1888, which contained thousands of names of persons who had no right to vote in 1891, while at the same time, thousands of young men who had come of age during the preceding period had no opportunity of voting. So there was great injustice done to the young men of the country on the one hand, and to the parties whose names were retained, on the other. The Act was not necessary. There were no petitions presented to this House for a change. The lists were previously better prepared than was possible under this Act, because every one who is at all acquainted with municipal matters knows that the local lists were prepared by parties who are outside of politics. They are prepared by trustee boards, and in towns they are prepared by independent parties for the purpose of voting on by-laws, and these men were interested in having them perfect on that ground, and councillors had an interest in these lists being perfect. For these reasons, these provincial and local lists are better adapted for the election of members of Parliament than any list that can be got up by a revising officer. In view of these facts, upon which I do not intend to dwell at length, I desire to point out that if the Liberal party comes into power, and that is as sure as there is an electric light over my head, within a few months—so hon. gentlemen opposite had better prepare for the inevitable—this Franchise Act will be repealed, to the advantage of the Liberal party and to the advantage of the Conservative party, for there is not a single revision of the list when a candidate or his friends are not called upon to pay \$200 or \$300 out of their pockets. That was the result

of this iniquitous, unfair and unjust Act. If we fall back on the provincial lists it will be to the advantage of every party concerned. As the people in the province of Quebec are opposed to manhood suffrage, that is no reason why it should be withheld from the province of Ontario, where, in fact, we have manhood suffrage at elections for the local legislature. There is no reason why one province should be held back because another is not inclined to advance. What matters it as regards elections for members of the Federal Parliament on what qualification they are elected? A certain number of members are sent here from each province, and that can be efficiently done by using the franchise of the provinces. If one province is not as far advanced as another, that is no reason why we in the west who believe that young men of twenty-one years under our educational system are perfectly qualified to discharge the onerous and important duties of the franchise, should not have a wider franchise. These young men contribute largely to the revenues of the country through articles which they buy and on which duties are levied, and there is no reason whatever why they should not have a voice in the election of members to this House. Again, if they possessed the right of the franchise, they would take a deeper interest in the public affairs than if excluded by this Act called the Franchise Act of the Federal Government. In view of these facts I would convey to the members on the Government side of the House the pleasing information that in three or four months the Act will be repealed and candidates will be relieved from the extraordinary expense now incurred in revising the lists.

There is another plank in the policy of the Liberal party which I wish to impress on hon. gentlemen opposite, and I wish to press it very strongly lest hon. gentlemen should forget it in repeating the charges that we are commercial unionists or annexationists or free traders, as they are in England, or something else. Listen, learn and weigh :

That by the gerrymander Acts, the electoral divisions for the return of members of the House of Commons have been so made as to prevent a fair expression of the opinion of the country at the general elections, and to secure to the party now in power a strength out of all proportion greater than the number of electors supporting them would warrant. To put an end to this abuse, to make the House of Commons a fair exponent of public opinion, and to preserve the historic continuity of counties, it is desirable that in the formation of electoral divisions, county boundaries should be preserved, and that in no case parts of different counties should be put in one electoral division.

I suppose you are aware, Mr. Speaker, that this is the policy of the Liberal party, for when the redistribution took place a few years ago, I myself presented to this House a plan by which all the redistribution of

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron).

Ontario could be made without interfering with any county boundary. County boundaries were effaced and the territories cut and carved to suit the needs of the party in power, so that, as the hon. gentleman properly stated that, looking over the map, it appeared as if the electoral districts had been laid out by chain lightning. What has the Gerrymander Act done for the Liberals? We are represented in this House by a minority. Why are our numbers so small? It is by the operation of the Gerrymander Act, and I will show that conclusively, and in such a manner that no hon. gentleman can answer the argument. How can I do it? The returns of the elections of 1891, corrected by the returns of the by-elections, show that 186,000 Conservatives polled their votes in the province of Ontario, as against 182,000 Liberals, a difference of only 4,000 in that vast number. One would suppose, according to those figures, that out of the 92 members from Ontario, the Liberals should have 45 and a fraction of a member, if that were possible, and the Conservatives, 46 and a fraction. That would be the division. Should not the Liberals have the same power of recording their votes with the same results following, as have the Conservatives? Was that the case? Look at the facts. After that election, the Conservatives returned to this House 59 members on 186,000 votes, and the Liberals with 182,000 votes returned only 33 members. Was that fair or just? In other words, it required only 3,150 votes to send a Conservative to this House, and it required 9,950 Liberal votes to send a Liberal member to the House. In the face of that, is it not conclusively demonstrated that the gerrymander, by which a large number of Liberal voters were hived together, deprived them of their power to return a fair proportion of the members? In this way, a large number of the supporters of the Government here, are in the House by Act of Parliament, and not by the will of the people.

I now come to speak of the Senate, and this is the plank of the Liberal party upon that question :

The present constitution of the Senate is inconsistent with the federal principle in our system of government, and is, in other respects, defective, as it makes the Senate independent of the people, and uncontrolled by the public opinion of the country, and should be so amended as to bring it into harmony with the principles of popular government.

If I had my will—and now I speak for myself—if I had my will the Senate would be abolished altogether. I believe that the House of Commons of Canada has sufficient broadness of mind, and sufficient penetration and capacity, to examine every feature of every law which comes before it, so that the review of another House is not necessary. It is a fact, that a large number of these emi-

gentlemen who occupy the Red Chamber, have passed the age at which they are capable of thoroughly investigating these questions. A large number of them are, like myself, getting well up in years. They have lost the energy of their youth, and they no longer possess that penetration and capacity which they formerly enjoyed. As they get up in years, between the sixties and the seventies, and between the seventies and the eighties, and more particularly between the eighties and the nineties, they have not that energy necessary to criticise and to review the legislation which passes through the hands of younger men. I have every respect for these gentlemen—just as much as I have for myself—but I am looking at the Senate from a Canadian standpoint, and I believe it to be the interest of all parties to abolish that institution, and to have only one Chamber. You know very well, Sir, that the province of Ontario, the banner province of the Dominion, never had an Upper House, and they have conducted their affairs better—I think I can use that word advisedly—than has any other province. If the province of Ontario can do that in connection with their affairs, I think the Federal Government can do it in connection with its affairs. It appears that when the Senate was first instituted, it was established at the instance of the smaller provinces, which supposed that in any case coming up affecting their interest, a majority of the House of Commons might in a party spirit, take advantage of them. The Upper Chamber was, therefore, instituted in order to refer to it any such question. If the smaller provinces are willing to abolish the Senate then we should be all willing, and if they are not willing, then we can continue the Senate and make it representative in its character. This could be done by placing the appointments with the local legislatures, as is done in the United States; or, the senators could be elected by the people from certain districts, as was the case before the present system came into vogue. The Senate has ceased to be a body which can review questions from both political aspects. You know, Mr. Speaker, that every appointment, or nearly every appointment, to the Senate during the last 17 years, has been made from the ranks of the Conservative party, until at the present day, there are only 10 or 12 Liberals in that House. How is it possible that the two political sides of a question can be properly presented. Suppose an important measure passes this House after a discussion from both sides, how can it receive a thorough discussion from both sides in the Senate, when there is actually only one side there. Therefore, the present constitution of the Senate should be so changed as to allow the people to send to it, either a supporter or an opponent of the Government. Suppose the Liberal party came into power to-

morrow, and passed in this House a measure opposed to the views of the Conservatives, the Senate would throw it out; and consequently, a branch of Parliament which did not represent anybody on earth, or in the heavens above, or in the waters beneath, would have the power of vetoing such a Bill, although it was the will of the people that it should become law. These arguments are plain, and they will appeal to the honest convictions of any man who can look upon the question from a non-political standpoint. I am, therefore, in favour of the abolition of the Senate, or failing that, I am in favour of the reorganization of the Senate upon a proper basis, making it somewhat responsible to the people of this country, and decreasing the number.

There is still another plank in the Liberal platform which reads thus:

That, whereas public attention is at present much directed to the consideration of the admittedly great evils of intemperance, it is desirable that the mind of the people should be clearly ascertained on the question of prohibition by means of a Dominion plebiscite.

I do not think it is necessary for me to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that personally I am a prohibitionist. Personally I would like to see a good prohibition measure placed upon the statute-books of the country, and unless we get a good one, I do not want one at all. I want a good prohibition measure with sufficient machinery to carry its provisions into effect, for I believe that without that efficient machinery and without reliable officers to enforce it, the condition would be worse than if there was no such law at all. I believe, Sir, that a thorough prohibition law passed through this House would be endorsed largely by the sentiments of the people. As I said, I believe that officers should be appointed to enforce it, and I do not believe that this work should be left to private individuals in various centres of the country. I believe, Sir, that this is one of the most important questions which can engage the attention of the people of this generation. When we know that the traffic in intoxicating liquors wages war against the very best feelings, against the very highest hopes, and against everything that is sacred in the human breast; and when we know that hundreds of thousands of people are annually incarcerated behind the bars of prison cells, because strong drink has stimulated them to commit crimes they would not commit were it not for drink; when we know all this, we see the importance of effectually stopping the liquor traffic. There are hundreds and thousands of people throughout this country crying to the Parliament of Canada to put upon the statute-book a law that will stem the tide of intemperance which so malignantly intensifies the sufferings of the people of this country. But, Sir, I would not like prohibition to be carried by a party vote. I believe it

should not be carried by a party vote. If it were, then it would become a political question per se, and at every election both parties would be at each other's throats in regard to the maintenance or the repeal of the prohibitory law, so that in a few years, by a snatch vote, it might be repealed, and the system of intemperance would then be wider and stronger than ever. The end we have in view would not be accomplished nearly so quickly as it will be if we move forward and try to have the law carried by the united vote of both parties. I think that is all I need to say on that question. You know my views upon it, and you know the policy of the Liberal party. That party do not bind themselves to pass a law without first consulting the people as to whether it should be passed. If they come into power, a plebiscite will be submitted, so that the people can vote yea or nay on the question, and if the majority of the people of this country want prohibition, the Liberal party are pledged by their platform to give prohibition and to enact a law that will be properly enforced.

Now, Sir, that ends the planks of the Liberal party's policy. Mr. Speaker, you will clearly see, after my speaking to you for nearly five hours, that the issue between us is cleanly cut on those planks, and the line of demarcation is distinctly drawn. The party of hon. gentlemen opposite have accepted the protective system, as they have carried it out for seventeen years, while we on this side have accepted a revenue tariff, with duties so based on the various articles as to press as lightly as possible upon the consumers of the country, and as heavy as need be on those who are able to pay.

Many sections of this country have already condemned the Government and their policy as strongly as I have this afternoon. Nealy all the by-elections have pronounced against them and against their policy. They had an election a few weeks ago in Montreal Centre, a riding which at last general election returned a member here by 1,200 majority. That majority was reversed, and now we have from that riding a Liberal supporting the policy which I have outlined this afternoon, with a majority of 300, testifying plainly that the Government have lost control in Montreal, and have lost the confidence of the electorate of that city. Then, the riding of Antigonish last year went back on the Government, and showed that it was not in accord with their policy. Although so eminent a statesman as the late Sir John Thompson represented that riding in this House, and although one might suppose that for the sake of his memory as leader of the Government, and as a man of great power and capacity, the electors of that riding would have stood by the policy of which he had been the exponent, my hon. friend Mr. McIsaac went in there a comparatively young man, without a dollar in

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron).

his pocket, and defeated the Conservative candidate, and he is here to-day a supporter of the policy of the Liberal party. The county of Verchères, that good old Reform county, which sent here such a noble man as the late Hon. Mr. Geoffrion, who was at one time a member of the Liberal Government, and stood nobly by the principles of the Liberal party for so many years, sent back here his brother to sustain and support the Liberal party in their demands for what is right and just in the interests of the country. Then Cardwell, which has been a Conservative riding for many years, also had an election. The Government sent their ablest men to speak in the school houses and in the small town halls throughout that county, and sent a large sum of money there for the purpose of gaining support of the electors for the policy of the Conservative party, but notwithstanding all the efforts they put forth, a candidate was returned here who is in the main a supporter of the Liberal policy on the trade question, and on many other questions; and I have no doubt that after he has been here a year and hears the arguments on both sides, he will strip himself clean of every shred of the Conservative policy, and come over here as a Liberal. Then, West Huron has been redeemed. The present Lieutenant-Governor of Manitoba, the late Minister of Militia, went to that riding, and by a snatch vote, obtained a majority. He made promises there in my own hearing which brought to him many votes. This is one of the promises which he made at the town of Clinton, on the same platform where I was present to oppose him. He said:

Gentlemen, farmers, I am here to announce this fact. To-day, three hon. members of the Administration at Ottawa have left for Washington to negotiate a treaty; and two things that are going to be put upon the free list are binder-twine and agricultural implements.

That was a statement made by an accredited agent of the Government, running in that riding, and many farmers supported him, believing that the Government honestly intended to negotiate a treaty, and had gone down to Washington to do so. But, Sir, that riding had been redeemed, and now it is represented here by a staunch old war horse in politics who has fought the Conservative party for many years, and who is here standing by his guns and ready to give them the same fight that he has given them for many years past. Again, we have the county of Charlevoix, which in the last general election returned a supporter of the Government; and I do not think he thought a great deal of the Government, though he voted for them. He was a noble man, though not one of strong convictions. But when he died and the by-election was brought on, a supporter of the Liberal party, I am glad to say, was re-

turned to this House, and he is here to-day. Then Jacques Cartier has also gone back on the policy of the Government, and has sent here a supporter of the Liberal programme which I have spread out before you to-day, and which I hope you will never forget. I might also refer to North Ontario. Now, in North Ontario a member has been sent here to support the Government in some things and in other things I understand he is not going to support them. There were seven Ministers of the Crown sent from here into that riding, and the hon. gentleman opposite me (Mr. Costigan) was one of them. It was said that he went round the concessions from door to door asking his people to vote against Mr. Gillespie. However, I am not in a position to prove that and only give it as hearsay. I do not wish to make any charge against any man, but I simply give what I hear as having heard it. Six other Ministers went into that riding and put forth every effort to defeat Mr. Gillespie. It is not very often that you find Ministers of the Crown coming down to address meetings of ten or a dozen people; yet so small were some of these meetings, that the Minister sat down in a chair, crossed his legs, and conversed with his audience. Many an audience of that kind greeted some of the Ministers in North Ontario. Against a total vote polled for the two candidates opposed by the Government, of 2,400, these hon. Ministers succeeded in obtaining a vote of 2,100 in support of their candidate, so that there really was 300 of a majority against the Government. They must perceive that they have lost the support of the people, and they should be prepared to throw up the sponge, and go back to the people and ask for a new verdict. If they do, they will not be returned in their present numbers, but the Liberal party will be returned and form a Government to carry out the principles contained in the planks of the Liberal policy.

Mr. CRAIG. I am sure the House will be very glad to know that I do not intend to follow the hon. gentleman through all the various matters he has discussed. We may congratulate him on having at least good staying powers; and if that is the result of prohibition principles, I think it is a very good argument in favour of prohibition. I am sure the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) must feel like resigning his position and allowing the hon. member for East Huron (Mr. Macdonald) to become the financial critic of the Opposition. However, I will leave these gentlemen to settle that between themselves. I was a little surprised to hear the hon. gentleman refer to the election in Cardwell, but he carefully omitted telling us that the Liberal candidate there lost his deposit. I think that is something on which he might reflect with profit to himself and on which

the whole party may reflect with profit to themselves, and perhaps learn something about their policy. I might also refer them to North Ontario, where, although the Liberal candidate did not lose his deposit, he came within 40 of doing so. So that I think the hon. gentleman and the Opposition need not take much comfort in those two elections.

The hon. gentleman gave us a long speech about four and a half hours in length, and I am very glad that not many members take as long as that to address the House. If they did, I am afraid the speaking would have to be confined to very few. But the hon. member took up a great part of his time, not in discussing the Budget, but in a criticism of all the mistakes he could rake up against the present Government. He referred, I notice, to the gerrymander. Well, I would just advise him to discuss that question with the hon. Premier of Ontario. And I think he might possibly find that while this Government have perhaps done a little in this way, they could learn a good many lessons from the Ontario government. Now, I do not claim that this Government, any more than any other government, is perfect. I do not claim that we have a Government composed of angels who can never make mistakes or of men who know everything, who can see into the future and prevent any mistakes that might occur; but I do claim that the Government administers the affairs of this House as well as we might reasonably expect human beings to administer them. Generally I may say that the affairs of this country are conducted ably and economically, but we claim besides that our policy is the best policy for the country. In the remarks I shall make to-night I intend to advocate that policy, and to show that it is one adapted to a country such as Canada. If I chose to retaliate, I might refer the hon. member to that celebrated letter of Mr. Mackenzie, in which he said that while he was Premier of this country he had to keep the Department of Public Works in his own hands and, to use his own words, he had to sleep on his arms to guard the treasury against the attacks of his own friends.

I intend to discuss the policy of the Liberal-Conservative party. The Opposition do not care to discuss that policy, but they want in every way to divert the attention of the country from it by talking about all other matters and all the scandals they can rake up. In the short time that I shall address this House, for I do not intend to be very long, I want to make a plain statement of facts which may perhaps escape the people as they listen to members of the Opposition. Sometimes these hon. gentlemen talk about free trade, and when they are discussing the subject of free trade, I ask myself, what about the revenue of the country? They forget to tell the people that we must have a revenue, that

the people must be taxed one way or other, if not by customs and excise, then by direct taxation. I do not believe there are any members on either side in favour of direct taxation. Now, what is this money collected for? I notice that in the year ending the 30th June, 1895, the amount collected from customs was \$17,640,000, and excise, \$7,800,000. Sometimes the people imagine that all the money expended last year, about \$38,000,000 was collected from the people by customs and excise, and principally by customs; and when speakers of the Opposition go to the country they make the people believe,—I do not say intentionally—but by their speeches they do make them believe that all this expenditure of \$36,000,000 or \$38,000,000 is taken out of the people by taxes of some sort. This is not the case. In the year ending 30th June, 1895, while the amount expended was \$38,000,000, a great part of that was not what could be called properly expense and was not taken out of the people of the country. A great part of that, amounting to \$8,500,000, was received from railways, canals, post offices, and public works and other ways, and was not a tax on the people of the country at all. I found that the amount required to be collected last year, in order that we might come out square, was \$29,600,000. I mention this fact because a great many people think that the total amount of expenditure is collected from them by customs. And that is the reason they are sometimes led to believe that the taxes are very high and that they are oppressed by them. I repeat that we must have a revenue, and I think that we all agree that the best way and the easiest way to collect that revenue is by customs and excise.

Now, the second statement that I have to make is that the tariff should be as little burdensome as possible. I think we will all agree on that subject also. I heard the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat make a statement very much the same. I wish to show that the tariff imposed by this Government is a tariff of that kind, that it is so arranged as to be as little burdensome upon the people of this country as possible. If we analyse this tariff we shall find that the rich pay the greater portion of the taxes. I hold that this is as it should be. I find that the necessaries of life are, most of them, on the free list, while others are very lightly taxed. Among the articles on the free list which were taxed under the Government of hon. gentlemen opposite, I find, for instance, tea and coffee. These are articles of daily consumption in every home. It has been said sometimes that the workingmen and farmers are oppressed by the taxation imposed by this tariff. If they are oppressed I am sure they do not know it. It takes many speakers on the other side going through the country to induce even some of the far-

Mr. CRAIG.

mers and workingmen to believe that they are oppressively taxed. If they were left to themselves, they would never find it out. We find that the articles used by the great consuming masses are as cheap here as anywhere else. We find that clothing in this country is very cheap; it is simply astonishing at what low prices clothing can be bought. If we compare the prices of to-day with those of some years ago, we find that the National Policy, instead of making clothing dear, has had the very opposite effect. There are large establishments in this country turning out ready-made clothing and selling it at very low prices. And ready-made clothing is made in a vastly different styles from that of a few years ago, and as now made it is good enough for any man to wear. I am satisfied that if any farmer or workingman were asked if he considered that clothing were too dear he would say that he considered it almost too cheap. He might say the same of boots and shoes. Under the National Policy the boot and shoe business has advanced with very rapid strides. Some years ago we were a good deal behind the people on the other side of the line in our styles and methods of manufacture, but to-day goods of Canadian manufacture can be bought just as good in every respect as those of the United States, and just as cheap. I think that no one will complain to-day of the price of boots and shoes in this country: I think I have shown that whoever the tariff may oppress, and I hold it does not oppress any one, certainly the farmers and workingmen have no reason to complain on this account. I have already said that I think it perfectly right that the rich should pay the greater part of the taxes. Those who wish to wear clothing made in England, those who wish to wear American boots, I think should pay the duty on those goods. I think no one will object to that. But the farmers and workingmen, unless they were told it by those who seek to prejudice them against the Government are not likely to feel that they are oppressed by the tariff.

Then the tariff should be arranged so as to encourage the manufacture of goods that can be profitably made in this country. That is what we call protection, and I am glad to say that the Liberal Conservative party does take its stand on moderate protection. We are not in favour of high protection. I know that we are charged with being a high protectionist party, with building a Chinese wall around this country. That is very far from being the case. But we do believe in moderate protection, in the principle that I have laid down that the tariff should be so arranged as to encourage the manufacture of goods that can be profitably made in this country. And as a means to this, we believe that raw materials should be, as far as possible, free. That policy, as a matter of fact, we carry out. Making raw materials free has tended very largely to

encourage manufacturing in this country. I might point to the manufacture of woollens, and to the manufacture of cottons, which has grown to such large proportions mainly through protection upon the finished goods and the admission of the raw materials free. There is one respect in which I believe the tariff could be advantageously amended. There is machinery necessary to the manufacture of woollen goods, boots and shoes and leather, which is not made in this country, and which never will be made in this country, at least not for the next twenty-five or fifty years. I think machinery of this kind, which if allowed to come in free would tend to cheapen many articles of clothing, ought to be admitted free. That would be the means of encouraging the manufacture in this country of goods that can profitably be produced here; and I hope the Government will take the matter into consideration. Looking over some debates of many years ago, I find that Sir Charles Tupper, in 1876, criticizing the Mackenzie Government, said:

I do not think there was much protection in taxing machinery that, for the purpose of fostering industries, we had allowed to come into our country free.

I think that this is a matter it would be well for the Government to consider. But we ought not only to have raw materials free and machinery that cannot be manufactured in this country free, but we ought to have a moderate protection on goods that can profitably be made here. And I wish to emphasize again that we wish moderate protection and to disabuse the minds of the people of this country of the idea that we advocate high protection.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Rice, for instance.

Mr. CRAIG. Sir, there may be one or two cases of what might be called high protection. But I defy hon. gentlemen opposite to prove that, generally speaking, the tariff is a high protection tariff. In many cases, I believe, the tariff is too low. It is charged that the Finance Minister, in revising the tariff, made a great many changes and then put the articles back to their former duties. I am able to deny that. I know that the protection on many articles was reduced at that time, and that to-day the protection is not what it ought to be, and I shall be very glad personally, though I do not expect it to have the protection on some of these articles increased again.

Now, Sir, I wish to advance an argument in favour of protection which I believe will have some force with hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House. I intend to quote a speech—delivered a long time ago, it is true, in 1876—by an hon. gentleman who is still a member of this House. I refer to the hon. member from South Brant (Mr. Pater-

son). The hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson) made a speech in 1876 discussing the financial depression. At that time the financial depression of the country was so great, while hon. members on the other side of the House were in power, that a committee was moved to inquire into the subject to see if they could find out the causes of this depression. Now, in order to be fair, I do not wish to say that the depression was caused entirely by the Administration of hon. gentlemen opposite, but I do say, as was said by some of their own supporters at that time, that they did not take any means to remove that depression; that when the causes of that depression were pointed out to them by members of the Opposition, and by members of their own party, they refused to take any steps to remove those causes. I intend to read an extract from a speech delivered on February 17, 1876, by the hon. member for Brant, which showed that at that time he was in favour of moderate protection, although the Government which he supported, and the Finance Minister of that Government, were entirely opposed to protection in any case. This is what he says:

It is well known that we pay a cash bonus to the inhabitants of other countries to come to Canada and settle in our midst. It is a fact that some of those who have been thus induced to emigrate to Canada, have been compelled, from want of employment to which they have been accustomed, to go to the United States. I believe by a defensive tariff—

He said he was not a protectionist, he did not believe in protection, but he said at that time that he was in favour of a defensive tariff, which I hold is just what we advocate to-day.

—I believe by a defensive tariff you would not have to pay to bring those men here. Adopt it, and you will find the steam-whistle of our factories will be a call for them to come.

The other year, the Finance Minister, in revising the tariff, gave some encouragement to our industry which it never had before. The result was that a thousand men, who were engaged in that industry in Germany, were literally transported by the change in the tariff to Canada, and set to work here. The cost of the article was not increased one iota, and Canada got all the benefit. The middlemen suffered a diminution of profits; but for them nobody seems to care much, the producer and consumer receiving all the sympathy. It is inevitable that a like result would flow to other manufacturers under the same policy.

Sir, I do not think that any stronger argument can be used than is used in these words, that a moderate protection is a benefit to a country situated as we are. Now, there is another subject about which I will say a word, and that is drawbacks of duty on manufactures exported. I find that members on the other side of the House make great objection to this. They make it a

criticism against the Government, they attack the Government because they allow a drawback of duty on articles that have entered into manufactures exported to other countries. Well, Sir, all I can say is this: I consider that it is a policy which is beneficial, not only to the manufacturers themselves, not only to the workmen who are employed, and who would otherwise not find employment at all, but I hold it is beneficial to the farmers themselves, for whom a larger market for their produce is created by the workmen who are engaged in these manufactures. The argument is used especially in regard to reaping machines which are exported, and it is said that they are sold cheaper in foreign markets than they are to our own farmers. It is said the drawback of duty is allowed on those which are exported to foreign countries, and that on those sold to our own farmers, no drawback is allowed. Well, Sir, I think in doing this the Government are encouraging manufacturers to make these machines for export which otherwise would not be made in this country at all, but which would be made in the United States; and I ask whether it is not better that drawbacks should be allowed so that the machines might be made here, and employment given to our workingmen, and a larger market created for the produce of our farmers, than that they should be made in the United States. I have a few figures here which I shall read, showing the increase in Canadian industries from 1881 to 1891:

	1881.	1891.
Capital invested.....	\$165,300,000	\$353,800,000
No. of employees.....	255,000	368,000
Wages paid.....	\$ 59,400,000	\$ 99,762,000
Cost of raw materials....	180,000,000	256,000,000
Value of products.....	309,676,000	475,455,000

INCREASES.

Capital	\$188,500,000
Employees	113,000
Wages	\$ 40,330,000
Raw materials.....	76,000,000
Product	165,769,000

Sir, I think a statement like that alone is sufficient to justify the National Policy in this country. I think an increase of wages of over \$40,000,000 is enough to show the workingmen of this country that the National Policy is for their benefit, and I shall add as well, that it is enough to show the farmers of this country that an increase in wages of \$40,000,000, which was almost entirely spent on farm produce, is proof that the National Policy has benefited the farmer as well. Now, I am going to give one or two more quotations from the debates of 1876, and I shall quote now from another member of this House, the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton): At that time he adduced a very strong argument in favour of protection, although he was connected with a party that was not in favour of protection, and he closed his speech by say-

Mr. CRAIG.

ing that he was still going to maintain his confidence in the Government. But I have not the least doubt that in what he said he expressed his real sentiments. On February 29, 1876, the hon. member for North Norfolk, speaking of the United States, said:

It has been charged that protection has prevented the extension of foreign commerce in that country. That may be true; but it is estimated that the domestic commerce of the United States last year reached the enormous proportions of 200,000,000 tons, valued at \$10,000,000,000. What is the foreign commerce of that country compared with the vast domestic trade that goes on increasing without the fluctuations or risks of foreign trade? Look at the progress of the cotton trade in that country. Previous to the import duties on foreign cottons, in 1824, British manufactures crushed out all efforts to establish factories in the republic; but the imposition of 25 per cent duty on foreign cottons had the effect in a few years, not only of building up manufactories, but led to the production of an article better in quality and lower in price than the Americans received from British manufactories before their own industries were established. In 1860 the United States were exporters of cottons, exporting nearly 10 per cent of the whole amount manufactured. The same way with the iron trade.

I think this is a subject in which we are vitally interested. We find in some parts of this country a great deal of criticism on the iron duty. Now, the hon. member went on to say:

All attempts to establish iron industries were crushed out by foreign competition, and high prices were maintained at intervals—higher, on the average, than the percentage necessary to produce them in the United States at a profit. But, when a protective duty was imposed, iron manufactories were established, and in a short time the price of iron was brought down several dollars per ton, and it is now sold cheaper than the British iron ever was offered for on that market.

Sir, I hope that we shall see the same result in this country, I believe we shall see the same result in this country. I believe that while it is admitted that the duties on iron are comparatively high at the present time, we shall see the same results flowing from the duties on this article as were mentioned by the hon. member for North Norfolk. I believe that we shall see iron reduced in price by competition among manufacturers in this country. I am sure that hon. members were all pleased to see that an iron smelting furnace was established in Hamilton lately. That is a testimony to the National Policy. I feel satisfied that if it were not for the National Policy, and that the Liberal-Conservative party is in power that furnace would never have been established. I have another quotation to read to the House. Mr. Devlin, at that time member for Montreal, speaking on the same day in 1876, said:

Look at our position to-day: look into the great metropolitan city of the Dominion and see the condition of her artisans, labourers and others, who have, many of them now to depend

on the soup-kitchens and the charity of the citizens of Montreal to save them from starvation.

I wish the House to remember that this gentleman was a Liberal, he was not speaking against the Government as an enemy, because he was a friend of the Government, but he was pointing out the condition of the country caused by their policy, and he was asking them to introduce something to relieve their distress and to alter their policy, but he asked in vain. He proceeded to say :

Similar distress exists in other cities of the Dominion, and what is the cause? Surely, there must be something wrong in the Government, when, with all our natural advantages, and with the wonderful products of our soil, thousands of workmen are in a state of destitution. It is all very well for hon. gentlemen to entertain free-trade opinions and give expression to them in this House, but they will have very little weight with men who have wives and children who are starving, and are told to wait and suffer a little more until the policy of the Finance Minister has been more fully developed.

Sir, I do not think we need ask any stronger criticism of the hon. gentlemen who were in power at that time; I do not think we need ask any stronger criticism of their policy at the present day, because they have not altered it at all. To-day, they claim that if they came into power they would adopt and follow the same policy, and I am a little afraid they would produce results such as are stated in the quotations I have read. But while the tariff should encourage manufactures in this country, I believe it should be arranged to encourage agriculture. It is sometimes said to the farmers that the manufacturers get all the benefit of the National Policy, it is sometimes said to the farmers that we are the enemies of the farmers, that we are building up bloated manufacturers, men who are rolling in wealth, while the farmers are struggling, toiling and making nothing and paying a heavy toll for the benefit of the manufacturers. I hold that this is very far from the truth. I believe that our tariff is arranged so as to encourage agriculture. The Liberal-Conservative party are the true friends of the farmers of this country, and the farmers of the country know it.

What protection have the farmers? I have prepared a list of some of the articles on which the farmers are protected, which I will read to the House. It is as follows :

DUTIES ON ANIMALS AND AGRICULTURAL AND ANIMAL PRODUCTS.

Animals, living, n.e.s.	20 per cent.
Live hogs.	1½c. per lb.
Salt beef, in barrel.	2c. per lb.
Fresh meats, n.e.s.	30c. per lb.
Hog products.	2c. per lb.
Canned meats.	25 per cent.
Fresh mutton and lamb.	35 per cent.
Lard and cottolene.	2c. per lb.
Tallow.	20 per cent.
Butter.	4c. per lb.
Cheese.	3c. per lb.
Condensed milk.	3c. per lb.

Apples.	40c. per brl.
Beans.	15c. per bush.
Pease.	10c. per bush.
Potatoes.	15c. per bush.
Rye.	10c. per bush.
Hay.	\$2 per ton.
Fresh vegetables.	25 per cent.
Barley.	30 per cent.
Corn.	7½c. per bush.
Cornmeal.	40c. per brl.
Oats.	10c. per bush.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Can the hon. gentleman tell us why corn should be taxed 7½ cents and oats 10 cents, corn being a dearer article?

Mr. CRAIG. I will not discuss that point at present.

Oatmeal.	20 per cent.
Wheat.	15c. per bush.
Wheat flour.	75c. per brl.
Fresh tomatoes.	20c. per bush. & 10 per cent.
Canned corn.	1½c. per lb.
Blackberries, strawberries & Cranberries and plums, and quinces.	2c. per lb. 25 per cent.
Apples, dried or evaporated.	25 per cent.
Grapes.	2c. per lb.
Peaches.	1c. per lb.
Honey.	3c. per lb.

I have made out this list to show the members of this House who have not looked into the question and the farmers that if any men are protected the farmers are, that protection is not arranged for the manufacturers alone, but is arranged just as well and more fully for the farmers. I wish to refer for a moment, as I said the Liberal-Conservative party are the true friends of the farmers, to what they are doing for the farmers to-day. I will not spend much time on this point, but I will mention the experimental farm. While the experimental farm is the subject of criticism by some members of the Opposition, I believe the farmers know and appreciate the experimental farm. I think they appreciate the work done on that farm. I believe the work done there is of great value to farmers, and that its value is increasing every year. There is no doubt that farming to-day is not what it used to be. It has become scientific. Farming was formerly considered a very simple matter. Fields had to be ploughed, seeds sown, and the crops reaped. To-day all that has changed. Mixed farming is to be done in this country. The opening up of the great wheat fields of Manitoba have entirely changed farming in the older provinces, and I hold that the work done at the experimental farm and the experiments carried out result in great benefit to the agricultural class. I am sure we all appreciate, and I am satisfied the farmers appreciate very highly the labours of the dairy commissioner. I do not know any man to-day who is doing more for the farmers of this country than is Professor Robertson. I consider the money spent in paying his salary and expenses is among the moneys most

profitably expended in this country, and further, that the money spent on the experimental farm and in connection with the Department of Agriculture is the best expended public money. I realize that the farmers are the foundation of all our success: we must have successful farmers in order to have a successful country. I need not refer to what has been done in the article of cheese: that is known to all of us, as is also what is being done at the present time in butter. We lead the world in cheese, due in a great measure to the efforts of the Government and of Professor Robertson, but in butter we have not reached as high a standard as that which we will attain. We are endeavouring to attain that standard, and I believe with the encouragement of this Government, we will be able to place our butter in the same position as that which our cheese has attained. I think our farmers are beginning to learn that in order to hold the British market they must send nothing there but the very highest grade. That is a lesson which needs to be impressed on them constantly, that nothing but the best must be sent there, and if the best is sent there we will get our full share of the market. I will now read a few figures showing our exports of agricultural products, and how they have increased from 1890 to 1895, not a very long period, and yet the increase is marvellous:

is doing for them. When we find that in five years the import of meats decreased 26,575,000 pounds, I think that argument is quite sufficient to convince the farmers that the Government which protects them, is the Government they should support. It is my belief, Sir, that the tariff should be arranged with reference to the different sections of the Dominion, or in other words, that it should be a Canadian tariff. Sometimes people in the western part of the Dominion criticise the duties on coal and iron; while at the same time, people living in the provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, criticise the duties on wheat and flour. I would remind these people, that in a country like this there must be a compromise; and that while it may be possible that the people of Ontario would prefer not to have a duty on coal, yet the people of the lower provinces would prefer not to have a duty on flour. But the duty on coal benefits the maritime provinces, and the duty on flour benefits the farmers in the west. We have thus a reciprocity among ourselves, and by this tariff an interprovincial trade is built up which would not otherwise exist. Now, if there were no duty on flour what would be the result? The result would be that all the flour going to the lower provinces would come from the United States, and our farmers would lose that large market for their wheat, and our millers would lose that large market for their flour. I lay it down as a proposition, which I think will be accepted by the country: that the tariff should be arranged with reference to the different sections of the Dominion, and that it should not, and cannot, be arranged entirely to suit any one part of the Dominion.

I wish to say further, Sir, that the farmers, the manufacturers, and the workmen of this country are all partners. The Opposition in this House frequently endeavour to convince the farmers, that the manufacturers are their enemies, that the two classes are in opposing camps, that the manufacturers are trying to see how much they can get out of the farmers, and that the farmers are trying to see how much they can reduce the profits of the manufacturers. I hold that this picture is entirely a false one. I believe that the interests of the farmers, the manufacturers, and the workmen of this country, are identical. I hold, Sir, that the home market is the best market for all; manufacturers, workingmen and farmers alike. And, if we seriously consider the question for a moment, I believe we need no arguments to convince any reasonable man of the truth of my proposition. We all admit that the more the farmers are worth in this country, the greater the home market is for the manufacturers, and as a consequence, the more employment there is for the workingmen. I have heard it argued by an hon. member in this House, that we ought all be farmers. Let me ask him this question: If such were the case where

EXPORTS OF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS.

	1890.	1895.
Cheese	\$ 9,372,000	\$14,253,000
Bacon	608,000	3,546,000
Hams	23,600	260,000
Apples, dry.....		250,000
do green	997,900	2,072,000
Wheat and flour.....	910,000	6,298,000
Horses	1,936,000	1,312,000
Sheep	1,274,000	1,624,000
Cattle	6,949,000	7,121,000
	\$22,070,500	\$36,736,000
		22,070,500
Increase.....		\$14,665,500

I wish to show the decrease in the imports of meat for home consumption, during the same five years, namely, from 1890 to 1895. The following are the figures:—

IMPORTS OF MEATS FOR CONSUMPTION.

	1890.	1895.
	Lbs.	Lbs.
Bacon and hams.....	4,350,000	827,000
Salt beef (in barrels).....	6,440,000	2,012,000
Pork	17,180,000	3,200,000
Lard	4,880,000	236,000
Total in pounds.....	32,850,000	6,275,000
do value	\$1,730,000	\$400,000

In addition to this I find that in 1890 we imported 135,000 barrels of flour, and in 1895 we imported only 47,890 barrels.

Now, Sir, a study of these figures will show the farmers what the National Policy

Mr. CRAIG.

would we sell our products? It would all have to be exported, and we could not send it to the United States because of their high duties. It is true that sometimes gentlemen opposite tell us that we should have reciprocity, but they have never yet told us how to get it. They say that if they were in power they would obtain reciprocity, but what guarantee have we of that? We have none whatever, Sir. We have to take things as they are, and if we were all farmers in Canada, we would have to sell all that we produce outside of the Canadian market. Whatever farming may be to-day, it would certainly be an unprofitable business under such circumstances, for I hold that the home market is our best market. As was well said by the member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), in that speech of his to which I called attention a few moments ago: The home market is not fluctuating, is not changeable, is right at our doors, and affords a market for articles which would otherwise have to be sent a long way for sale. I go further and say: The more prosperous the farmer, the more prosperous is the manufacturer and the workingman; and I might reverse that and say: The more prosperous is the manufacturer and the workingman, the more prosperous is the farmer. Why, Sir, farmers know very well that in buying a farm, the farm near a good manufacturing centre is more valuable than the one more remote. I can point to a town not two hundred miles from Ottawa, which on Saturday is crowded with farmers disposing of their produce; and these farmers will admit that it is one of the best markets they can find. If that town were not there, do you mean to tell me that the land within a few miles of it would be worth as much as it is to-day? Do you mean to tell me that the farmers there would be as prosperous as they are to-day? I might remark incidentally in passing that while we hear a great deal about the farmers in Canada not being prosperous, I can re-echo the words of the Premier of Ontario. Although I do not agree with him in everything, I do agree with him when he said: That the farmers of Ontario—he spoke of that province because it is the province with which he is immediately connected—that the farmers of Ontario were as well off and as comfortable as any farmers on the face of the earth. I believe that statement to be true as regards the farmers of Ontario, and I believe it is equally true of the farmers of the other provinces. It is all very well for members of the Liberal party to try and make the farmers believe that they are not prosperous, and to try and make them believe that if they had some other conditions they might be prosperous; but, Sir, I believe, that while there are farmers who are not prosperous, yet as a whole they are just as prosperous as men in any other walk of life, and they are just as prosperous as are the farmers in any other part of the

world. Sir, the farmers know that farms near a good manufacturing centre are valuable, just because they are near the home market. That is a proposition which cannot be disputed. It is a proposition which all farmers will admit, and all farmers know that if anything was said to the contrary it would be devoid of common sense.

This, Mr. Speaker, is a great argument in favour of the National Policy being a benefit to the farmers, because I hold that these towns would not be manufacturing centres were it not for the National Policy. A great many manufactures in this country have received protection from the Liberal-Conservative party—it is the policy of the Liberal-Conservative party to protect them—and if that protection were removed, these manufactures would become bankrupt, or would be compelled to remove from Canada and go elsewhere. A very amusing incident occurred not long ago in Ontario. The leader of the Opposition was making a tour in the western part of the province, and he came to a certain manufacturing town, which all hon. members have heard of, the town of Berlin. The Liberal candidate there announced that he was a protectionist, and stated, that he knew and admitted that protection had done a great deal in fostering the industries of that town. He was wise in saying that, and he was truthful as well. However, I was a little surprised, that notwithstanding this candidate was a protectionist, and avowed his principles so plainly, the leader of the Opposition was quite ready to receive him into his arms, and to take him as one of his free trade party. Sir, I cannot understand how such a gentleman could join the Liberal party which is entirely opposed to protection, unless, indeed, he hopes at some future day, he might possibly convert the leader of the Opposition to his own view. Now, Sir, I have already quoted from a speech delivered by the hon. member for North Norfolk in 1876, and I have another very short quotation from the same speech, which expresses the opinions I hold better than I could do it myself. Speaking at that time, and I have no doubt speaking his honest opinions—and this is a point to which I call the attention especially of those members of the Opposition who argue that protection is not good for the agricultural interests of this country—he went on to say this:

But, although it may be conceded that protection is to the advantage of manufacturers, unless it can be shown that it is also an advantage to the other classes of the community and the nation at large, all arguments in favour of protection fall to the ground.

Sir, I agree with him in that; I am willing to stand or fall on that sentiment. I would not advocate protection if it was good only for one class of the community. He goes on to say:

It must be shown that the agriculturists are to be benefited by protection before it is incumbent on the Government to adopt a protective policy. * * * I believe that the interests of the nation at large would be forwarded by judicious protection; I believe that the agricultural interests of the Dominion would be forwarded by protection, and that the manufacturer, being brought to the door of the farmer, would afford a market for a great many articles of produce that would not be saleable if the market were 3,000 miles away. With a home market of this kind established by protection to manufacturers, the agriculturist can benefit his soil by producing a rotation of crops.

Nothing could be plainer than that, and I call the particular attention of the farmers of this country to it. I am satisfied that the hon. member at that time was stating his honest opinions, and I am satisfied that he was stating correct opinions—opinions which I believe would be admitted to be correct by all who are not prejudiced by their attachment to their party. Now, Sir, what is the policy of the Opposition? Their policy, we are told, is reciprocity. They blame this Government for not endeavouring to get reciprocity. They say that when the Government stated that they were endeavouring to get reciprocity, they were only pretending to get it. Well, Sir, I claim that the Government were perfectly honest in their endeavours to get reciprocity; but I claim this as well, that the Government were not willing to get reciprocity unless they could get it on terms that would be fair and equitable to this country. I admire them for that stand. Sir, I am satisfied that the country would not back up any Government in obtaining a reciprocity which was not equally favourable to this country as to the United States, and when the Government found that it was impossible to obtain a reciprocity which was fair to this country, and which would be as beneficial to this country as it was to the United States, then, Sir, they abandoned the attempt. I might remind the members of the Opposition, if I wished to do it, of what was said by the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie when he was in power, and when he was asked what attempt he was going to make to obtain reciprocity. He said he was going to make no attempt. He said that he had done all he could, and that if the United States wanted reciprocity, they could ask for it. I might remind them of the statement of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), at that time Finance Minister of the Mackenzie Government, who, when asked the same question, said they were going to make no further attempt; but he went on to say—and I admire him for the stand he took at that time—“We have men and we have ships, and we should carry the war into the enemy's country; we should carry our trade into other channels.” What he suggested should be done, this Government have done. They did not cease their efforts to extend our trade because the negotiations for reciprocity failed. If those nego-

tiations had been successful, then the British markets would not have been worked up as they have been by the present Government. Those markets, which, after all, are the best markets for most of the farm products of this country, would not have been developed as they have been by the present Government. But, Sir, we stand ready to-day to make any fair reciprocity treaty with the United States. I have always been in favour of that. I am in favour of it to-day, and I believe the Government are favourable to it. But if we are to have reciprocity, it must be a fair reciprocity between the two countries.

Another policy of hon. gentlemen opposite is free trade. Whatever they mean by that I do not know. They sometimes say free trade as they have it in England. The leader of the Opposition, when he went to Manitoba, said he was in favour of free trade as they have it in England. I am afraid, Sir, that if we had in Canada free trade as they have it in England, the farmers of this country would find very soon that a great mistake had been made. Then, Sir, they talk about a tariff for revenue only, without any element of protection. Well, Sir, I would ask them this question: Do they mean to remove all protection, or do they not? They sometimes say they do; and then, when we pin them down to that statement, they say they do not. But I think we may gather, from the statements of the financial leader of the Opposition, the hon. member for South Oxford, that he at any rate is opposed to all protection. At any rate, he is opposed to all protection on farm products. I have been surprised to hear other members of the Opposition who speak for the farmers say that the protection the farmers receive is no good to them at all. I am afraid that they will find that the farmers of this country do not agree with them in that. It is sometimes argued that this protection to the farmer does not increase the prices of farm products in this country. Sir, I am satisfied not to argue that question myself, but to leave it to the farmers themselves. I would ask the members of the Opposition this question: Do they intend to remove all protection from the farmers of this country, or do they not? If they do, let them say so plainly, so that the farmers may know when these gentlemen get into power all the duties levied on farm products will be swept away, and there will be entire free trade as far as this country is concerned, whatever the United States may do in the matter. I wish our hon. friends would take that position, because I know what answer would come from the farmers of this country. I know that whatever these hon. gentleman may say, the farmers of this country are in favour of a moderate protection. We find that some farmers even who advocate doing away with protection on manufactured goods, do not wish to have the protection

which they receive wiped out. Then, Sir, do the Opposition intend to remove all the protection on manufactures? Do they intend to remove the duty on coal? Sometimes they say one thing on that point, and sometimes another. Do they intend to remove the duty on iron? If they do, let them say so plainly. But when we ask them to give a plain answer to these questions, not to this party, but to the country—for the country has a right to know—they equivocate and say, when we get into power we will tell you all these things. Sir, I am afraid the country will want to know what their policy is before it allows them to get into power. The country is not willing to take them on trust, but it wants them to say definitely what they are going to do in these matters. It will want them to say whether they do or do not intend to remove protection from farm products or from manufactures, which includes protection to the workingmen of this country, or from coal, or from iron. What is their policy? Have they any definite policy? In studying up this matter, in reading their speeches, I find that in Montreal they have one policy for the manufacturers and workingmen. What is that policy? They say they will lower the duties, but that this will be done so gradually that it will be almost imperceptible, and that the workingmen and manufacturers will not perceive it at all. That is their policy when they go to Montreal, but when they go to the farmers in Ontario and Manitoba they advocate free trade. There they say we will remove the duties on manufactures. They do not say anything about the duties on farm products. They keep quiet about them but they are quite willing to sacrifice the manufacturers. These hon. gentlemen do not give the people of this country credit for much common sense or intelligence. If they think that by making one statement in Montreal and a different one in Winnipeg, they can hoodwink the people they will find themselves very much mistaken. Our people are a reading people, they read both sides of the question; and when they read and consider, they will prefer to have a party in power which has some definite policy rather than one whose policy is all things to all men. Sir, the policy of the Liberal-Conservative party is a definite policy. It is not a changing policy, it does not change from Cape Breton to Manitoba. It is the same in Halifax as in Winnipeg, in Montreal as in Toronto, it is the same in all parts of the country. What is the policy of this country? It is moderate protection to the men who pay the expenses of the country. We do not believe in opening this country freely to foreigners, who pay nothing towards our public works and the expenses of governing the country, and who spend all their profits in another country. We do not believe in letting all the profits go to men who

pay nothing towards our expenses, but in giving these profits to men who are building up this country, who are paying for our public works, who are building up our cities and who are cultivating our fields. The policy of the Conservative party is to protect our farmers and our manufacturers and the workingmen. We know no class, we have no class legislation, we are sometimes accused of such legislation, but I defy hon. gentlemen opposite to prove that charge. On the contrary, I have shown—I do not know that I have shown to the satisfaction of hon. gentlemen opposite—but to the satisfaction of all fair-minded men that our policy is for the advantage of all classes in this country, that we are all bound up together in this country, that the prosperity of Manitoba is the prosperity of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, that the prosperity of Ontario is the prosperity of Quebec, that the prosperity of our farmers is the prosperity of our manufacturers and workingmen, and that the prosperity of our manufacturers is the prosperity of our farmers. What Canada wants is a Canadian policy—a policy for Canada and not a policy for the United States—not a policy to encourage the manufacturers and farmers of the United States, but a policy to encourage the people of this country; and the way to have such a policy is to sustain the Conservative party. Under that party Canada is becoming a self-reliant country. The return of this party to power at the next election will, I confidently anticipate, give proper confidence to capital and employment to workingmen. Sir, there is nothing more required than stability in this country, and I hold it is most unfortunate that while the people of this country have endorsed in every election, since 1878, the policy of the Conservative party, the Opposition still keep endeavouring to overthrow that policy which has benefited the country so much, and still keep trying to make the people believe that if they were in power they would have some great policy which would give the people greater prosperity. They do not tell what that policy is because they do not know. I guarantee that you could not find a dozen of them who have the same policy. I have confidence in the country, and I confidently anticipate that when the issues are fairly placed before the people, and when the people see, as they will see, when the question is placed before them, that the Conservative party is the one which would lead this country on to still greater prosperity, they will cast their votes for this party which has done so much for this country.

Mr. SEMPLE. I agree with my hon. friend from East Durham (Mr. Craig) when he says that agriculture is the foundation for the best interests of the country. I agree with him also when he says that if the farmers are prosperous, the manufacturers and merchants are prosperous also, but when he said that when the manufac-

turers are prosperous the farmers are likewise in that condition, I beg to differ from him. It is true that a certain class of manufacturers in our towns and villages are a necessity for the farmers who do business with them, and when farming is prosperous, they always reap the advantage. I must say that during the debate on the Budget I was more surprised than at any time during a similar previous debate. When the hon. Minister of Finance was delivering his Budget speech, very little attention was paid to him and there was an absence of cheering which must have had a very chilling effect on the hon. gentleman. No doubt when he was not in a position to proclaim, amidst a storm of applause, as on some other occasions, that there was a large surplus, but had to declare that there was a deficit, was no doubt the cause of the silence on the other side. At all events the deficit in 1894 was \$1,210,332, and last year \$4,153,875. We do not blame the Finance Minister on that account, because deficits are caused by not levying sufficient taxes, and it is not a very good time to levy taxes when the people are in a condition the reverse of prosperous. Now, the hon. gentlemen opposite have charged different members of the Opposition with having contradicted themselves by making speeches in 1876 which are at variance with those made to-day. But I must say that the speeches made at the introduction of the National Policy in 1878 were very plausible. I remember one of the apostles of that policy speaking to an assemblage of farmers and asking them whether it would not be better for them to pay a little more for what they bought, if they got more for what they had to sell. That seemed a very reasonable proposition, but the farmers to-day have the sad experience of having more to pay for what they must buy and receiving less for what they have to sell. At all events, I notice that the Finance Minister has announced that there will be a further increase in the estimates amounting to \$1,316,548 and that there will be besides other supplementary estimates, so that we hardly know what amount of money may be asked for during the coming year. The Minister of Finance, no doubt, will resort to the old practice of going to Great Britain and borrowing more money, and we shall have all the more interest to pay annually.

Mr. Speaker, figures are not a very interesting portion of a speech, but I shall be obliged to quote a few figures in order to impress one or two points upon the House. Only by the use of figures can we understand the state of affairs in this country. We find that the increase in the public debt in 1894 was \$4,501,989, and in 1895 it was \$6,891,897, a total increase in the two years of \$11,393,886. The total debt of the Dominion in 1895 was \$318,048,754, and the net debt, after allowing for doubtful assets, was \$253,074,937. The inter-

Mr. SEMPLE.

est on the public debt was \$10,446,294. Now, the census returns of 1891 show an average of 5.2 persons in each family. From the census returns and comparisons it is estimated at present that the population is 5,083,424. So that there is resting on each family a net debt of more than \$250. But in studying the subject as presented in the Public Accounts it is found that there are charged to capital account the following items:—

Canals	\$44,161,311
Canadian Pacific Railway.....	62,653,745
Intercolonial Railway	45,294,029
Other public works	7,023,755
Dominion lands.....	3,668,903
Public buildings, Ottawa.....	2,163,544
North-west Territories.....	3,798,656
Subsidies to railways granted exclusively of the C.P.R. (of which \$11,710,382 is paid).....	15,116,058

For this purpose of railway subsidies a further sum of \$4,659,160 was granted in the session of 1894. Now, let us consider the annual expenditure. In 1867-68 it was \$13,486,092; in 1873-74 it was \$23,316,316; in 1877-78 it was \$23,503,158; in 1878-79 the expenditure was \$24,455,381; in 1893-94 it was \$37,585,025; in 1894-95 it was \$38,132,005. Now, Sir, in view of the facts it is evident that the country needs an economical Government that will study the best interests of the people which the present Government have proved themselves incapable to do. They have squandered the public resources, they have shown themselves ready to spend money upon public works, such as bridges, post offices, canals and railways, if by so doing they are likely to gain votes and keep themselves in power. And, from the remarks of the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper), it is quite evident that the old policy will be followed unless they are checked in their mad career by the electors at the polls. I will quote the language of the hon. member for Pictou when addressing this House. Referring to a remark of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), he said:

That is the language of the member for South Oxford, but it is significant to observe that from the beginning to the end of the speech, this statesman was not able to tell this House or the people of Canada just about the sum that Canada could be properly governed for, just the amount of money which he, for instance, would undertake to do the job himself, just what the growing necessities and the development of this young country demands, and that, after all, is a very important consideration. I think I can ferret out and can put my hand upon some of the reasons why the hon. gentleman has not done that. I am firmly of the opinion, and I believe the majority of the business men of this country are of the opinion, that it is simply child's play to pretend that in a country like Canada, in a country with Canada's ambition, with Canada's plans, aye, with Canada's preparations for the future, it is within the possibility of human knowledge or human genius, to govern this country successfully for one dollar a year less. As a repre-

sentative of one of the constituencies of this country, I take the responsibility of saying that whether my party or the other party be successful at the next election, I have not the slightest doubt that the expenditure of this country will increase instead of diminishing; and I will go further and say that, provided wisdom presides over the system of management and expenditure, I hope, and devoutly hope, that the expenditure will increase instead of diminishing. This country as it grows, this country as it successfully develops, certainly this country as it accumulates a larger population, will and must require a larger amount than \$40,000,000 a year for its government. We might as well look the thing in the face, we might as well realize, too, the strength of our position. The people of this country are in no wise discouraged by the growth of expenditure by the Government, as long as they get something for the money.

So the farmers who wish the country well, and who wish not to be loaded with heavier burdens of taxation need not be surprised to hear the statement of the hon. member for Pictou that if he and those associated with him are left in control of public affairs, the public expenditure will be greater than it has been. But we might expect that, while the public debt was increasing so rapidly there would be a great increase in the business of the country. On consulting the Trade and Navigation Returns, I find that the total exports and imports of Canada in 1873 amounted to \$217,104,516. In 1895 the total was \$218,891,314, an increase in 22 years of only \$1,586,793. It is true that in the year following 1873 the trade decreased about a million dollars, and in 1893 we had the largest import and export trade ever known in this country, amounting to about \$240,000,000 in round numbers. So that taking 20 years, from 1873 to 1893, the utmost that can be said is that the trade of the country increased by barely \$23,000,000. And this notwithstanding about \$3,000,000 was spent in promoting immigration and also immense sums spread broadcast over the country in building railways, canals and public works. The trade of Canada is mostly with Great Britain and the United States and to that I wish to make reference. Now, let us consider some details of the amount of goods entered for consumption. In 1895 the amount entered from Great Britain was \$31,131,737, and from the United States, \$54,624,521. There were \$23,502,784 more paid to the United States than to Great Britain. In considering where the goods the produce of Canada were exported during 1895, I find that exports to Great Britain amounted to \$61,856,990; to the United States, \$41,297,676. \$20,559,314 more in cash was received from Great Britain than from the United States. In the interchange of goods with Great Britain, Canada received \$30,752,253 more in cash from the produce sold than the amount paid for the goods bought. In the interchange with the United States Canada paid \$13,336,840 more to the United States for goods bought than was received

for goods sold. Is it not therefore ludicrous to talk so much about loyalty and yet do so little to give the British people a practical illustration that we mean what we say? Actions speak louder than words, and doubtless the British people form a due estimate of all such loyal protestations. During a session of this House, it will be remembered that the hon. member for Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies) moved this resolution:

Inasmuch as Great Britain admits the products of Canada into her ports free of duty, this House is of opinion that the present scale of duties exacted on goods mainly imported from Great Britain, should be reduced.

This received the support of every Liberal member in this House, and every Conservative voted against it. But opinion has changed somewhat in this respect, even among Conservatives. I shall now read an extract from a Conservative paper, whose editor has been a life-long Conservative, and has no leanings towards the Liberal party. He says:

Our present tariff on goods imported from Great Britain runs anywhere from 25 to 45 per cent and upwards. With this duty reduced to an average of 15 or even 10 per cent, we would raise more revenue than we do now, because our importations would be larger. With such a reduction, too, the cost of a bill of goods for which a farmer or mechanic now pays \$25, would be cut down to \$20 or \$15. The expense of living in this country would be very much lessened, and the exports of Canadian butter, cheese, meat and flour to Great Britain in payment for the goods bought from that country would be enormously increased. Under such a system our farmers would prosper amazingly. The cost of their table cutlery, hardware, woollens, cottons, and sugars would be lessened, and the demand for their farm products taken in exchange for these articles very greatly enlarged. And, with increasing prosperity, for the farmers would come greater prosperity for us all. But, more important even than this, the extended commercial relations between the Dominion and the mother country would add the link of material interest to the bond of sympathy and sentiment now binding them together.

Another extract from the same paper says:

Tax British goods to the very highest point and sing "God Save the Queen," is the queer policy of the men who have at one time boasted of their loyalty to the British Empire.

These extracts are taken from the "Orange Sentinel," a paper which, it is a well known fact that the editor has no sympathy with the Liberal party. Now, in 1894, when the Finance Minister, delivered his Budget speech, considerable alterations were proposed in the tariff. Their consideration, however, was delayed for a time, and the manufacturers came from all parts of the Dominion to this House asking for changes in their interest. The Manufacturers' Association, at Toronto, considered the subject fully, and at a meeting they instructed their secretary to ask that certain changes be made in the duties; and in many cases where an ad valorem duty was charged,

it was changed to specific. So ready and agreeable did they find the Government that it was said by their secretary that the Finance Minister accepted their brief and gave them great thanks for their pains, accepting their suggestions almost in the very words in which they were written. This fact shows conclusively that this Government frames its tariff policy chiefly in the interests of the manufacturers. Now, we wish to see all classes prosperous, but there are many manufacturers who are not prosperous, and who receive no benefit from the National Policy. Take, for instance, these small industries found in most of the towns and villages of Canada, such as grist mills, oatmeal mills, saw-mills, those of the blacksmiths, carpenters, wagon-makers, carriage makers, bakers, tailors, dress-makers, &c. All this class of manufacturers receive no benefit whatever from the National Policy. It is when the farmer prospers and enjoys good times that these small manufacturers are able to sell what they produce, and the farmers are able to buy from them. Let me read a few more figures from the census, showing the condition of the manufacturers. Doubtless these figures have been quoted before, but I wish to make a different application of them. The census of 1891 shows that the manufacturers are truly a favoured class. In that year there were 75,768 manufacturing establishments: capital invested, \$353,836,817; number of employees, 367,865; wages paid, \$99,762,441; cost of raw material, \$255,983,219; wages paid and cost of raw material together, \$355,745,660; value of finished products, \$475,455,705; profit after paying labour and raw material, \$119,710,045. The profits were 33 per cent annually for ten years, and to each employee, \$270, or 89 cents a day. These large profits are drawn from the consumers of Canada. The manufacturers cannot make money through the National Policy except drawing it from the consumers of this country. The farmers know this, and I will read their opinion, as well as the opinion of others who are not themselves farmers, but who are able to judge. At the annual meeting of the Dominion Grange, 1892, Master Workman Goffatt said:

Nearly every important interest in the country is enjoying the benefit of helpful legislation, whilst the farmer is handicapped and discriminated against by railway monopolies and by an unjust system of taxation.

During the session of 1893, representatives of the Patrons of Industry waited upon the Government to urge consideration of grievances set forth in a petition presented to the House, signed by 27,000 Patrons of Industry, which commenced as follows:—

“That the agricultural interests of the country are not in as prosperous condition as we would desire; that tariff legislation for the purpose of assisting the manufacturing interests of the country has been taken advantage of by such manufacturing interests so as to unduly enhance the prices of many such articles as are indispensably

Mr. SEMPLE.

necessary to farmers in carrying on their business.”

The Central Farmers' Institute, at its annual meeting in Toronto, on 9th February, 1893, adopted a series of resolutions, including the following:—

“That, whereas the farmers of Canada, during the last thirteen years, have largely supported a protective policy for the purpose of establishing and building up the manufacturing interests of this country; and whereas such manufacturing industries as are suitable for the country have received such assistance for a period long enough to enable them now to withstand fair and open competition; and whereas the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, at its annual meeting, held in Toronto, 7th February, declares and re-affirms its determination to support and perpetuate the high-tariff policy; be it therefore resolved, that this meeting hereby declares and affirms that to continue and perpetuate such a high-tariff would be detrimental to the vital interests of the agricultural community.”

Again, the industrial brotherhood of Canada on 1st of October, 1892, passed the following resolution:—

Resolved, That the fiscal policy of our country is a farce in so far as it purposes to benefit the masses; that it increases the cost of living, decreases the purchasing power of the wage labourers of all classes, is eating the vitals out of the Dominion, scattering the members of every family, so that the fathers and mothers are forced to see their sons and daughters leave home—leave home and kindred—that a few may roll in superabundance; that every lawful means be used to rectify the wrongs created and maintained by the present system.

Again, the Council of the Board of Trade of Winnipeg passed the following resolution:—

That the customs duties on goods coming into Canada should be reduced to the lowest point, consistent with a revenue tariff;

That all specific rates of duty be abolished, and that all duties be levied on an ad valorem basis;

That the Government be empowered, upon evidence given of the existence of a combine to maintain or increase prices, to lower or abolish by Order in Council the import duty on articles affected by such combine;

The council maintains that the increased importations at lower rates of duty than now prevail would tend rather to increase than diminish the revenue derived by the Dominion; many of the duties now in force are absolutely prohibitive and, therefore no revenue now accrues to the Government.

The council submits that manufacturers of many lines of staple goods in Canada have formed combines, and based their prices, not on the cost of manufacture plus a fair profit, but on the value which similar goods from abroad cost laid down in Canada duty paid. This being the case, the consumer pays an excessive price for his goods, and the Government does not secure a revenue; the manufacturer being the only gainer.

Rev. Principal Grant of Queen's University said, in 1893:

The right principle is free trade, modified only by revenue requirements or national conditions. We, however, have fostered protection until it has become a virus in the blood. It must be purged away.

In a series of political papers written in November, 1893, Principal Grant wrote as follows:—

A low tariff means increased imports as well as steady and normal trade, and in all probability there would be no deficit. * * There are certain lines of manufactures for which Canada is fitted and these would be benefited. We have given all others plenty of time to get on their feet, and those that are still unable to stand had better stand from under.

So although the hon. member for East Durham has been speaking for the farmers, it is evident that when they assemble and deliberate in their own representative bodies, which include the most intelligent farmers, they arrive at altogether different conclusions from those stated by the hon. gentleman. When the National Policy was brought into force in 1878 it was specially intended to benefit manufacturers. However, knowing very well that farmers constitute nearly one-half of the population, in the Year-Book the estimate is 45 per cent of the population, it was felt that they could not be disregarded, and therefore it was resolved to make a pretense of giving them protection, which was only a pretense, and done no perceptible good. We hear a great deal about the home market. It is true there is a limited Canadian market to be found in every village, town and city. But the buyers are only buying like middlemen, their object being to ship to the old country and make a profit after paying freight and expenses. In addition to supplying the home market during 1894, there were exported as follows:—

	Value.
Horses	\$ 1,261,942
Cattle	7,112,101
Sheep	1,624,589
Butter	697,476
Cheese	14,253,002
Eggs	807,990
Wool	1,049,450
Meats	319,702
Apples	1,821,463
Barley	720,718
Beans	425,283
Oats	320,458
Bacon	3,546,107
Peas	1,622,919
Wheat	5,359,109
Hay	1,539,691
Clover seed	767,806
Vegetables	118,449
Potatoes	527,379
Oatmeal	276,310
Wheat flour.....	839,112
Poultry	45,848
Grass seed.....	55,253

These are exports to Great Britain. This trade can in no case be viewed as a result of the National Policy, but it represents produce of farms sold in the markets of the world where it had to meet competition from every country that sells in that market. I listened to the figures given by the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Craig)

in regard to the amount realized from products sold in Great Britain and in the Canadian home market. I find as follows:

EXPORTS—AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS.

	1890.	1895.
Cheese	\$ 9,372,212	\$14,253,002
Bacon	607,495	3,546,107
Hams	23,584	260,602
Apples (dry)	250,320
do (green)	997,922	2,071,783
Wheat and flour	910,244	6,298,221
Horses	1,936,073	1,312,676
Sheep	1,274,347	1,624,587
Cattle	6,949,417	7,120,823
Total	\$22,071,294	\$36,387,801

Taking these items, they total in this way: \$22,071,294 exported in 1890; \$36,387,801 worth exported in 1895. The reason I consider that the Americans sometimes have taken advantage of the Canadian market is this: on the goods that come from the United States there is a lower rate of freight than on the same articles transferred from one portion of the Dominion to the other. That is the reason why the Americans can bring their wheat and flour and bacon into this country. But I do not think the imports of produce from the United States has hurt the country any. In 1890 bacon to the amount of \$607,495 and hams to the amount of \$23,558 were exported to Great Britain, while in 1895 there was bacon to the amount of \$3,546,107, and hams to the amount of \$260,602 exported to Great Britain. Therefore, there were \$3,175,630 more received for bacon and hams in 1895 than in 1890. The reason of that increase is that in the year 1895 it was more profitable for the farmers to raise pork. I know very well from experience that if there was a suitable price Canada could export annually \$10,000,000 worth of bacon and ham: and it is because the price has been low that there has not been a larger export from this country.

Mr. SPROULE. It would improve the price to take the duty off.

Mr. SEMPLE. Well, I do not think it would hurt it any. If the duty was off, and prices higher in the United States than in Canada, there is no danger of the duty doing any harm.

Mr. SPROULE. That is not the case now.

Mr. SEMPLE. I will quote for your instruction the prices which I have taken from the papers to-day. The "Mail-Empire" gives the following market prices:

Cattle, in Toronto, \$2 to \$3.25 per 100 pounds; hogs, \$3.75 to \$4 per 100 pounds; lambs, \$4 to \$4.25. In Buffalo: Hogs, \$4.50 to \$4.55 per 100 pounds; butchers' cattle, \$2.65 to \$3.50; lambs, \$4.75 to \$5. In Chicago: Beef steers, \$3.20 to \$4.65 per 100 pounds; hogs, \$4.05 to \$4.22½ per 100 pounds; lambs, as high as \$4.65 per 100

pounds. In New York, lambs, \$5.50 to \$5.60; hogs, \$4.50 to \$4.80.

As was mentioned by the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McMillan), who went into figures very thoroughly, in Ontario for the last thirteen years the average price of wheat was 85.6 cents, and in the United States the average price was 92.3. The average price of oats in Ontario during the same period was 34.9, and in the United States 39.8. Oats and wheat were about 5 cents a bushel more in the United States than in Ontario. I have remarked for a number of years, in regard to pork, that when the price was high in 1894, it was much higher in Buffalo than in any part of Canada. I remember reading in the papers that when the McKinley tariff was in force, and there was a duty of \$1.50 on each hog sent to the United States there were often eight and ten cars going over the Suspension Bridge to the United States daily, and the shipper was making a handsome profit. I have seen in that year when the prices were constantly fluctuating, that probably you would get 50 cents or \$1 per 100 pounds more one week than you would get another. The scale of prices was constantly going up and down, and I myself honestly believe that at the present time there is more injury done to the farmers by the combine among the pork packers than there would be if American pork came into this country free of duty.

Mr. SPROULE. Let me give the hon. gentleman the market prices. As quoted in the Toronto "Globe," on the 6th of this month, mess pork in Toronto was \$13.50; in Montreal, \$15, and in Chicago, \$10.30. Wheat in Toronto was 85 cents; in Duluth, 61 $\frac{3}{4}$, and in Detroit, 75 cents. Oats in Toronto were 28 cents, and Detroit, 19 $\frac{3}{4}$.

Mr. SEMPLE. I have given the figures for February 12th, a later date than is mentioned by the hon. gentleman, and he can verify them both in the "Globe" and in the "Mail."

Mr. SPROULE. Here is the "Globe" if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Semple) wants it.

Mr. SEMPLE. You can verify the figures. I have given, and I guarantee that they are correct.

Mr. SPROULE. There is no question about that, because I have the paper right here, and you can get the exact prices if you believe what the "Globe" says about them.

Mr. SEMPLE. The farmers sell live hogs and not pork. It is the pork packers who produce the barrel pork, and when supplies are large they reduce the price of live hogs in order to make large profit to themselves, much to the loss and injury of the farmers and do them more injury than if the United States were selling pork free in this country. On account of this combination, the papers can tell a week in advance when

Mr. SEMPLE.

the price of live hogs will go up and when it will go down. If there is a large quantity in the market the price is lower, and if there is a small quantity the price advances. It is this fluctuation in price that makes the production of pork so unsatisfactory to the farmer.

Now, Sir, it has been said by some hon. gentlemen opposite that the experimental farm has been a wonderful benefit to the Canadian farmers. In my opinion it is more benefit to the professors and the men working there, than it is to the farmers of the country. According to the Year-Book, the cost of that farm of 500 acres was \$62,956, and the cost of buildings to June 30th, 1895, was \$167,313. Last year the amount spent for the maintenance of the farm and dairying was \$104,700, while the receipts from all sources amounted to only \$5,027, made up as follows:—Agassiz Farm, \$408.68; Brandon, \$600.99; Indian Head, \$1,231.66; Nappin, \$599.13; Ottawa, \$2,186.56. The following were the sources of revenue at the Experimental Farm, Ottawa: Berries, \$161.65; cattle, \$204; pigs, \$718.19; eggs, \$242.49; milk and cream, \$273.44; butter, \$209.53; vegetables and small fruits, \$265.18; rent, \$60; poultry, \$36.49; small trees, \$5.75; grains, \$1.20; total, \$2,267.82. If there is one thing profitable on the farm it is the raising of poultry. There is not very much cost in the management; not very much ground is occupied, and a great deal of money is received out of that important industry. In 1888, when there was no duty there was no less a sum than \$2,119,000 received in Canada from the sale of eggs alone. There was more money received from eggs that year than from wheat and oats; and in the last year that eggs were on the free list, 1889, no less a sum than \$2,156,725 was received for the egg product alone. So that I consider that a very important part of the operation of the Experimental Farm, is in experimenting on the different breeds of fowls, and instructing the farmers what are the best breeds to raise and how best to take care of them. There is one thing, however, that I do not approve of. I have observed that two or three acres of land at least is devoted to the cultivation of berries. It is all very well to have a small portion of land devoted to testing the different varieties, but so much as has been done in that line is not necessary when the revenue is so small, amounting only to eighty dollars after paying for picking, and besides it seriously interferes with market gardeners in the vicinity. Potatoes do not appear to have received very much consideration, although I notice that an address has been delivered on that subject before what is called the Central Experimental Farm Club. Here is a report of it in a paper:

The Central Experimental Farm Club listened to a most interesting and instructive talk by W. T. McCoun, one evening this week. The sub-

ject was "Potatoes." The cultivation of potatoes as a farm product, if properly carried on, he claimed, has been proved to give as good profit as any class of farming. He said an acre of potatoes will yield an average of 200 bushels, and would cost the farmer \$34.11, including rent, cultivation, spraying, digging and marketing, and when sold at the rate of 30 cents per bushel, leaves a margin of \$25.89 of clear profit.

I would agree with him if that price could only be obtained; it would be a fair remunerative price, at which potatoes would be a profitable crop; but I know that at the present time some of the best potatoes that can be found in the world can be bought for about nine cents a bushel at the railway station. If you calculate how much 200 bushels would bring at that rate, you would find that a farmer who had raised an acre of potatoes, would be \$14 out of pocket by the transaction, allowing \$34 for the cost of the land, the marketing, the spraying and other attention. It is well known that when the farmers really need something the Government is found wanting. It is not too much to say that it was partly owing to the carelessness of the Government in not having a proper inspection of American cattle coming into and through Canada, that an embargo was put on Canadian cattle going to England, entailing a loss of from \$5 to \$10 on every head of cattle sold in that market in 1894. Last year the loss was not so great, as cattle were allowed to be shipped from American ports during the months of March, April and May; so that so large a number were not placed on the British market at one time. This advantage, I believe, has been brought about through the intervention of the railway companies, and has proved to be a great advantage to the farmers. Now, I think it is needless to expect that the embargo will be removed in Great Britain, and it is clearly the duty of this Government to facilitate as much as possible the shipment of cattle by way of the United States, which can be done at any season of the year, whenever they are exported to Great Britain. This was done last year, when the farmers received a much larger price than they did in the previous year. When the embargo was put on, it was known that our cattle were mostly shipped from Montreal. They had to be shipped commencing about the 24th May, when a large number of cattle arrived in the British market at one time, which caused a stagnation in the trade, and resulted in great loss to the farmers. Many who had expected to make good sales lost their all. Now, Sir, what is most objected to by the farmers is that they have to stand competition in the markets of the world, while at the same time they have to pay about one-third of the value of nearly every article they buy to the protected manufacturers. That is what the farmers complain of, and what they consider is not fair. The only true way to check combines, trusts, rings and monopolies is to take off the duty. Without

the duty it is very hard for them to exist. The Minister of Finance gave his experience of them during a trip he took to Manitoba. He showed that combines existed there to an alarming extent in lumber and other materials used for buildings. I will quote his own words. He said:

With reference to woods, logs and round, unmanufactured timber, not specially enumerated or provided for in this Act; firewood, handlebolts, railroad ties, ship timber and ship-planking not specially provided for in this Act, and other woods as mentioned in the schedule, are free. This is a special concession, and I hope will prove a useful one in Manitoba and the North-west. There was not one feature of our examination into the condition of things in that part of the country, which impressed itself so forcibly on my mind as the combine which existed for the distribution and sale of lumber. Every town was parcelled out. One or two men were selected, to whom was given the monopoly of selling in each place. The prices were fixed, and if they sold a fraction of a cent under the fixed prices, their privilege was taken away and given to somebody else. That monopoly bore heavily on the people in that country, where lumber is so essentially necessary in the making of barns and houses, and I came to the conclusion that if possible help would be given by putting lumber upon the free list, and that has been done.

So, in regard to another branch of manufactures, stoves, I am credibly informed that at a meeting of the manufacturers, they fixed the prices at which stoves were to be sold, and the prices fixed cannot be departed from under a penalty upon the manufacturer who has transgressed the understood law of the association. There is nothing that would benefit the farmers in this country more than reciprocity with the United States, or freer trade, and it cannot be got except through the Liberal party, hence every farmer should wish them success at the general election not far distant. Every farmer who has studied the question, knows that to be a fact. There are many things which he can hardly sell anywhere else. Notwithstanding the duties that have been imposed for a number of years on lambs, almost the only market for them is the United States. In 1891, the Government dissolved the House on the ground that a proposition had come from Washington in favour of reciprocity, and the Government wished to be able to enter into negotiations with the strong support of a new Parliament at its back. When our farmers read this in the "Empire," they were exceedingly rejoiced at the prospect. Sir John Macdonald knew at the time that there was nothing which would suit the farmers so well, and after the House was dissolved he made a faint effort to procure a treaty. Members of his Cabinet went to Washington but they achieved nothing. It is evident that the United States will not negotiate a treaty confined to natural products alone, but only one which will include a certain number of manufactured articles also.

We know that when the late Hon. George Brown went to Washington for the purpose of negotiating a treaty, an arrangement was entered into which covered natural products and a certain number of manufactured articles. This was satisfactory to the British Government, it was satisfactory to the Colonial Secretary of State at the time. It passed the Congress of the United States, but was defeated in the Senate. However, we know that the Senate has since changed, and while they would not favour a treaty at that time they might favour it now, if fair terms were offered. But we know that as long as this Government is in office, nothing of the kind can be done, because our manufacturers hold the Government under their entire control. And if the Government desires to put a number of manufactured articles on the free list, they dare not do so. They are under the control of manufacturers who no doubt will say to the Government you must not do this, because there will be a large number of manufactured articles coming in from the United States, we will not have so much profit, and therefore it is against our interests that any treaty should take place. We hear hon. gentlemen opposite say continually we do not want to do away with some monopoly, because if we do, a much greater monopoly will take its place. It is well known that the Government is partly responsible for the McKinley tariff being brought in force. When that Bill was before Congress, this Parliament met. The hon. Finance Minister delivered his Budget speech, and increased the duties. He put duties on fruit trees, small fruits, and increased the duties on beef and pork, and added 25 cents per barrel on flour. So that there was a lever in the hands of members of Congress who wanted to have the McKinley tariff pass. This Government most effectively helped the McKinley Bill, and the result is well known. The last year before the McKinley tariff went into force we received in cash from the United States no less a sum than \$6,400,000 for barley, over \$2,000,000 for horses, and \$2,156,725 for eggs, so that although there was a small amount gained by the farmers by our shutting out a certain amount of American pork, that was more than offset by what they lost, they made ten cents, when they certainly lost a dollar.

There is another question which has engaged the attention of this country to a very large extent, and that is trade with Australia. That trade will be absolutely in manufactured articles, which will be very little consolation to the farmers for the large amount of money that is paid in subsidies. I will just read an article on this subject. There had been a discussion in North Ontario during the time of the election, on this subject, and the Government candidate declared he did not believe any imports of Australian meats and other cheap supplies were coming to this country from

Mr. SEMPLE.

Australia. The article thus describes the reply :

His answer soon came, however, for cans of Australian mutton were produced at meetings a day or two later, and with them a letter from a large Montreal firm, offering to fill any number of orders with many similar supplies. The hon. Minister of Finance came on then and explained it all away by telling the farmers that the \$125,000 a year extra tax all went to bonus ships to take freight to Australia, and not to bring anything back ! This nice distinction between tweedledum and tweedledee was declared to be quite satisfactory to some Tory farmers present ! Of course, if it just happened that these ships were willing to carry return freights very cheap, in consequence of the big bonus, or free of charge for ballast, what had that to do with the question, anyway ?

At that time we showed, from the Trade and Navigation Returns of 1894 that large quantities of such supplies had been imported for home consumption in Canada. Since that time the Government returns for 1895 have been published and here are the facts of the imports from Australasia for home consumption during the last fiscal year :

	Lbs.	Value.
Butter	40,291	\$ 6,458
Lard	2,146	187
Beef, salted.....	4,612	202
Canned meats.....	121,536	10,319
Extract of meat.....		265
Mutton, fresh.....	16,052	576
Poultry, &c.....		96
	184,637	\$18,103

The duties imposed and collected, it will be seen, amounted to over 25 per cent of the entire value of the imports. The National Policy works both ways in this case : the people are taxed \$125,000 a year for a bonus to open up a traffic, and then the importers and consumers are taxed over 25 per cent in order to prevent competition with home products. It will be seen that the fresh mutton thus imported was valued at but little over 3 cents per pound after all freight and other expenses had been paid of landing it on Canadian shores ; the butter about 16 cents ; the lard, 8½ cents ; the salted beef, a little over 4 cents ; and the canned meat, cans included, but little over 8 cents. All the after expenses was added by the import duties imposed. Would any other country tax its farmers some hundreds of thousands of dollars to help cheapen transportation for competition in its own markets ?

Hon. gentlemen opposite have spoken about the trade of Great Britain and of the attempts to introduce protection into that country. It would be very surprising if every member of the British House of Commons held the same opinion regarding tariffs. There are some there as in Canada who would like to be made rich by Act of Parliament, or get anything that is going wrong with their business made right by Parliament. It is not unreasonable to suppose that the farmers in Great Britain would profit through protection when it is known that Great Britain annually imports 100,000,000 bushels of wheat, or its equivalent, to supply the manufacturers and artisans, it is not to be surprised that

the farmers there would like protection. But I would like to ask how the farmers of this country would like it if a tax was put upon their horses, their wheat, their oats, hay, apples and every other article exported to Great Britain. No doubt protection would be a help to the farmers of Great Britain and it would be a help to the treasury of Great Britain. But the statesmen there look to the interest of the great masses, and Lord Salisbury, in making his speech clearly indicated that he had no faith in protection. And Sir William Harcourt in an address he delivered the other day, said :

He was glad the Ministry had not thought of introducing protection into the country or of tampering with the currency.

So although there may be a few in Great Britain who favour protection, as we might expect there would be, they are not numerous enough to receive any great consideration, still less have they any prospect of forming a government. And, Sir, it would be a dark day for Canada if a duty were levied on the goods we send to Great Britain as duties are levied on those we send to the United States. But hon. gentlemen on the other side, by their eloquent speeches in favour of protection, are doing what they can to educate the British minds to believe that protection is something to be desired. People in Great Britain read Canadian papers just as people in Canada read British papers, and there is no doubt that some of the brilliant speeches delivered in this House in favour of protection will be used in the House of Commons in Great Britain for the purpose of having it introduced there. Preferential trade with Great Britain would no doubt be a benefit to farmers in Canada, but to believe it will be carried out is only a delusion. I would like to read a few extracts from the report of the colonial conference to show the opinion that is held by certain eminent men upon this subject. The book from which I quote is "The Report of the Hon. Earl of Jersey, G.C.M.G., on the Colonial Conference at Ottawa with the proceedings of the conference" :

As has been remarked above with reference to an earlier stage of the discussion, there was no general anticipation that, under present conditions, Great Britain would consent to put a tax upon foreign produce, in order to favour colonial produce. The trade of Great Britain was acknowledged to be increasing. It was, indeed, alleged that this increase is due solely to the colonial trade ; but Mr. Ferrest corrected the statement by pointing out that the foreign trade of England has increased proportionately with the colonial trade. Mr. Fitzgerald observed :—" We know that in the matter of wheat England would never give us any advantage, for the simple reason that by doing so she must increase the cost of the food of her people." * * * Mr. Lee-Smith argued, that on no account whatever " must we do anything in this room which will in the slightest possible manner hamper Great Britain in her trade relations with the world at large. Great Britain is a free trade country ; it must necessarily continue to be a free trade coun-

try, if it is going to preserve that pre-eminent position which it already holds and which I hope it will always hold in the commercial affairs of the world." * * * It is an obvious consideration that the proposals would involve a fundamental change in the financial policy of Great Britain. A remission of duties in certain cases is, of course, easily effected in colonies which possess a heavy customs tariff, as, for instance, when 25 per cent is the ordinary charge ; and it is proposed to reduce this in certain cases to 20 per cent. But in Great Britain the institution of a differential tariff would involve the special creation of a customs tariff against all foreign powers in respect of the articles, whatever they might be, which would have to be favoured on importation from the colonies. The proposal, in short, means in the colonies the remission of existing taxation, but in Great Britain the creation of a new taxation : not a mere variation in the existing machinery, but the introduction of a new system.

But, though this change of policy in Great Britain may be neither necessary nor practicable, under present conditions, it may be said that the general feeling of the conference was that the question will assume a different shape as the population and commerce of the countries increase. * * * At present the consummation seems far off. I quoted certain figures which showed that the North American colonies contribute only 2.7 per cent of the trade of Great Britain : Australasia, 7.5 per cent, and South Africa, 2.2 per cent. Our imports from foreign countries in 1893 amounted to £313,000,000, or 77 per cent, whilst from the British possessions the amount was £92,000,000, or 23 per cent. We find a market for two-thirds of our exports of British produce in foreign countries and for one-third in British possessions ; i.e., £146,000,000 to £72,000,000. British possessions in these figures include India. The imports from and exports to Australasia, in round figures, stand at £30,000,000 and £15,000,000, respectively.

This expression of opinion by the delegates who were here shows that there is no likelihood of Great Britain changing her fiscal policy. Sir, there is no sentiment in trade and commerce. Although the Americans adopted the McKinley Bill which was prohibitive on the British manufacturers in many instances, they did not discriminate against that country. And it seems to me that from the way Canada has put up a high tariff in the endeavour to get all she can out of the mother country and to bonus the manufacturers, she cannot expect to get any special privileges in the markets of Great Britain. There will have to be a great change in the feelings of the British Parliament before anything of that kind occurs. Imperial federation has been talked about for years, but a celebrated statesman in Great Britain said it could be regarded only as a dream. The colonies are so far separated from each other that, in many cases, trade cannot be carried on profitably between them. It is to the country south of us, when common sense prevails, that we shall look to have our trade extended, and if we can get freer trade relations with that country, it will be of more benefit to the farmers of this country than anything else that could be done for them.

As Mr. Haycock, the leader of the Patron movement, said, the Wilson Bill did more for the farmers of Canada than all the tinkering with the tariff in 1894; and I believe it. It may be said that on account of the war bluster that recently occurred in the United States, it would be difficult to negotiate a trade treaty, but that was no doubt a political move, and these things very soon pass away. The best element in the United States deprecated the war talk, and considered that a war between that country and Great Britain would be an immeasurable evil to humanity. Governor Morton, of New York State, said :

Any disturbance of the existing friendly relations between the United States and Great Britain cannot fail to have a serious effect. Because of the possible baleful consequences of such disturbances, I feel myself justified in making this reference to the larger affairs of the nation in which we feel such a peculiar and vital interest.

I cannot believe that the relations between our country and Great Britain will be ruptured or seriously impaired by the misunderstanding now existing between that country and Venezuela concerning the proper location of the boundary line of their possessions in South America. Arbitration affords a simple, humane and honourable method of determining national disputes; and it is scarcely conceivable at this period of the world's history that any great nation is willing to take the responsibility of the needless sacrifice of human life and the wanton destruction of property which would be the inevitable result of an armed conflict.

Mr. Bayard, American Ambassador to England, and who was Secretary of State in Mr. Cleveland's first Administration, said in a recent speech :

He expressed pleasure in being admitted into the personal sympathy of the English people, when he recognized the community of sentiment existing between his country and theirs, he felt that crossing the Atlantic was merely a change of faces, not a change of hearts.

Their language and feeling did not need to be translated. They meant one and the same thing. What ought to be easier than to maintain friendship in such a transparent truth? Yet some persons might possibly contend that aspirations of honest men here and there were different. He did not believe it.

If there was a difference, it was artificial. No form of words or exchange of sentiments was necessary. Only let human hearts speak to human hearts, and it would be found that all differences could be arranged.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, it is my opinion that it is certainly an unnecessary expense to the country for the Government to call Parliament together at the present time. They should have followed the example of Sir John A. Macdonald, who, when he contemplated introducing a reciprocity measure, said he did not wish it to be passed by a moribund Parliament, but by a Parliament fresh from the people. I cannot understand how this Government can justify their conduct in calling this House together at this

Mr. SEMPLE.

season of the year, and causing such a large expense to the country. What they intend to do this session might have been done last session, but they put it off last session in order that they might hold on to power a little longer. Now, I will read an extract from a Conservative paper called the Toronto "Star." It is an independent Conservative paper, the writer is a free lance, and he expresses his opinion freely. For that reason he is able to give an unbiased opinion better than some others who are against the Government, or who are out and out supporters of the Government. He says :

The seventh Parliament of Canada has been an extraordinary one.

During its existence four Premiers have been at the head of the Government, and before it closes we are likely to have a fifth. It is now in its sixth session, and it was stated in the House of Commons that it is the only parliament under the British constitution that has held that many sessions.

The constitution, precedents and everything else connected with parliamentary government have been strained to the utmost limit.

The disorganized Government, with its fourth Premier, who has barely escaped political assassination at the hands of his colleagues, at the end of the sixth session, which never should have been called, are preparing to do the most extraordinary thing in the history of this extraordinary Parliament.

At the last general elections Sir John Macdonald was Premier. The main, if not the only point at issue was the trade policy. The Conservative party was united and triumphant; the leader of the Government was a dictator, wise and experienced, as well as the idol of his party.

Since then Sir John Macdonald and two of his successors have been buried. Times have changed; the electorate has largely changed; according to the by-elections the desires of the people have changed; the policy of the Government has changed; the fiscal policy is no longer the main issue; remedial legislation overshadows everything else.

Yet the electors have not been consulted either in a general election or a convention of the supporters of the Government.

Yet this dying Parliament, which should have been dead months ago, having been long estranged from the people, with a Premier who is politically dying, and would have been officially dead weeks ago, if his Cabinet could have killed him off, is about to coerce one of the seven provinces of the Dominion, though the electors of that province have almost unanimously refused even to consider, let alone accept, the coercive Bill.

Such legislation as is proposed is not of the ordinary, but of the most extraordinary sort. It is not the class of legislation for which parliaments ordinarily meet, and, if this seventh Parliament had just come from the electors, the majority thoroughly instructed to make such a law as is proposed, it might well pause and consider whether, for once, the people had not been wrong.

A dying Parliament has no business to consider extraordinary legislation, no matter whether it is good or bad. Beaconsfield declared such conduct to be politically immoral, and refused to legislate on a very much less important matter without first consulting the people.

The seventh Parliament of Canada is pursuing the opposite course. It is holding an extra ses-

sion around its own death-bed, with a deliberate intention of violating the wishes of the electors that it dare not face.

Its conduct is not only indecent and dishonest, but it is tyrannical, scandalous, and strikes at the very root of constitutional government.

This is not responsible government. Since Sir John A. Macdonald died, the Government has been degenerating, until it no longer has even the semblance of pretending to care for the people or to follow constitutional usage.

Unhindered by any fear, except the rebellion of his mercenary Ministers, the Premier of Canada, who is not the choice of the electors, but the accident of a funeral, is a dictator holding the life, property and liberties of the Canadian people as completely in his hand as if he had the powers of the Czar of Russia.

Though Canadians are being treated as if they were serfs, when an opportunity occurs, they will show the present Government, if it persists in its course, that the people of this country are too well educated and too long accustomed to the rights of British subjects to tolerate any such tyranny.

Now, Mr. Speaker, an hon. gentleman, speaking last evening, asked what the Liberal party would do if they came into power. No one can charge against the Mackenzie Government that scandals occurred in the Public Works Department. One would have thought that the investigation into the McGreevy affair in 1891 would have proved a lesson to the Government, and that similar transactions would not again have occurred. But it had no effect on hon. gentlemen opposite, for only a year ago when the Curran bridge was constructed the grossest corruption prevailed, and the bridges cost over twice the amount of the original estimate. It is evident that this Government is followed by a lot of boodlers who occupy what they consider to be a rich field, and who do their utmost to continue the present state of things.

In conclusion I desire to read an extract from a speech delivered by a celebrated politician in Nova Scotia, for I know of nothing that better describes the present situation. He said :

If he consulted his own interests or his own inclination he should decline the honour ; but this is a trying moment in the history of Canada, and not the time for patriotic men to think of their own interests, a time for sacrifice and a time for duty. "We have now in power," he said, "a Government which has held office for nearly eighteen years, a Government which has been convicted of every form of corruption and peculation in the public service. This Government had dragged down the fair name of Canada until it has become a reproach in the eyes of the world. It has used public funds to maintain itself in power, and received moneys from contractors to debauch the manhood of the country. It has lost its leaders, and within the past year it has degenerated into a weak and helpless concern. A few weeks ago half the members of the Government resigned, and gave the reason that the Premier was incapable. The Premier responded by declaring the bolters were guilty of the blackest treachery, and yet the bolters are now serving under this incapable Premier, and the Premier is sitting at the Council table with

a nest of traitors. So hopeless and despised had the Government become that the country began to pronounce against it from all quarters, when suddenly Sir Charles Tupper appeared upon the scene, and has assumed the reins of government. Without wishing to be offensive, I can only say Sir Charles Tupper has exerted an evil influence in politics from the moment he appeared 40 years ago. His aim in life has been purely selfish, and his means have always been corrupt. His return to active public life is hailed with joy by boodling contractors and unscrupulous ward politicians ; right-minded men regard his appearance with dismay. The best elements of both parties feel that his capacity for mischief is unlimited, and unless checked will drag down the country and cover it with dishonour. The only hope under these circumstances is an appeal to the honest manhood of the country. You have called upon me to be the standard-bearer in this county. Gladly would I shrink from the task. Any member of the Commons would be glad to leave his seat to obtain the office which I have so long held. But if duty calls, self must be disregarded. I give up all and accept the call. I ask those who believe in honest government to make sacrifices. I hope the spirit which animates this county will burn in every part of Nova Scotia and Canada as well until we shall be able in a few months to record a splendid victory over corruption and favouritism, and secure an honest, capable and progressive Government under the leadership of Mr. Wilfrid Laurier. Let every man do his part, and soon we shall see the downfall of Tupperism and all it represents.

These are the remarks of the Attorney General of Nova Scotia in a speech recently delivered, and exactly describes the present political situation.

Mr. SPROULE moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 12.45 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 14th February, 1896.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

OFFICIAL REPORT OF DEBATES.

Mr. LARIVIERE presented the second report of the Select Committee appointed to supervise the Official Report of the Debates, as follows :—

The Committee recommend that Mr. J. A. Bernard be appointed on the staff of translators of the Official Report of the Debates to replace Mr. O. Boisvert, whose delicate state of health in-

capacitates him from discharging his official duties, and that for this session the sum of \$1,000, which Mr. Boisvert would have been entitled to receive had he been able to continue to perform his share of the work, be divided equally between the above-mentioned parties.

CHIGNECTO MARINE TRANSPORT COMPANY.

Mr. McINERNEY moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 59) respecting the Chignecto Marine Transport Company (Limited).

Mr. LAURIER. Explain.

Mr. McINERNEY. This Bill is merely to enable the company to complete, maintain and operate the works authorized under the Act of 1882. It continues the company's franchises which it obtained under that Act and the amending Acts. It also provides that unless the work is completed within five years after the passing of this Act, the company, so far as the work to be done in the future is concerned, shall lose all rights in connection with it.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 60) respecting the Thousand Islands Railway Company.—(Mr. Taylor.)

Bill (No. 61) to incorporate the Toronto Hamilton and Niagara Falls Railway Company.—(Mr. Bennett.)

Bill (No. 62) to incorporate the Ontario Peat Fuel and Railway Company.—(Mr. Boyle.)

Bill (No. 63) to amend the Act incorporating the International Radial Railway Company.—(Mr. McKay.)

Bill (No. 64) to incorporate the Imperial Life Assurance Company of Canada.—(Mr. Coatsworth.)

Bill (No. 65) to incorporate the Manitoba and Nelson Valley Railway Company.—(Mr. Davis, Alberta.)

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS.

Mr. COATSWORTH moved :

That the Public Accounts of Canada for the fiscal year ending 30th June, 1895, and the Report of the Auditor General for the same year in part, be referred to the Select Standing Committee on Public Accounts.

THE REMEDIAL BILL—MANITOBA.

Mr. LAURIER. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would call the attention of the hon. Finance Minister to the fact that the Remedial Bill, which appears to have been printed in English, has not yet been distributed to the members of the House.

Mr. FOSTER. That is a matter, which, of course, the House has by its officers un-

Mr. LaRIVIERE.

der its own control entirely. As soon as the Bill is introduced, the clerk and officers of the House take it under their control, and the leader of the Government has no more power in the matter than the other members. I understand, however, it is being expedited.

SUPPLY—THE BUDGET.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Foster :

That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go again into Committee of Supply.

Mr. SPROULE. In resuming the debate upon this motion, I take occasion on this, the closing session of the present Parliament, to review somewhat the management of the country in the last sixteen or seventeen years during which the Conservative party have been in power, and to compare their management with that of the previous five years during which the Reform party were in power. At the outset, I may say that I congratulate the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster) for his very clear, concise and businesslike statement with regard to the affairs of the country during the time he has been in the position he so creditably fills. I am sure that it must be satisfactory to the people to know that the cloud of depression which has hung not only over our country, but over the whole continent of North America, as well as many European countries during the past few years, is showing signs of rising and there are evidences of returning prosperity. No doubt many would regard the data given as insufficient to satisfy them that there are evidences of returning prosperity in the country to-day. But I am quite sure that if the question be examined from every standpoint—whether from the standpoint of the industrial pursuits of the people or the financial condition or development of the country, or otherwise, there is no fair-minded man who will not come to the conclusion that we are making fair progress. I must, at the outset, acknowledge with regret that, in my part of the country at least, we are passing through a period of depression,—a period of depression, however, which was not the result of the management or mismanagement of the Government but the result of two very bad crops in succession. Our last crop was almost a total failure in our part of the country, but I am glad to know that this failure was confined to a comparatively local area and portion of the province of Ontario, and that in other sections the bad harvests, from which we have suffered during the past two years, have not been experienced. I regret exceedingly that the nature of the past season has been such that in our part of the country at least the crop on which we depend for the maintenance of our stock was almost a total failure. Not one farmer, perhaps, out of twenty had as much as a ton of hay this

last season in my part of the country, and the grain and other crops were only about one-quarter to one-third of what they should be. Remembering this and remembering that the previous season we had not more than half a crop, we can understand that the farmers in that part of the country feel somewhat the depression of the times; but we are glad to know that in other portions of the Dominion a different condition of things exists, and that by the improved means of communication and transport, which have been furnished through the policy and administration of the present Government, every section of Canada is able to-day to obtain food and other supplies it requires from other sections. This we could not have done sixteen years ago. Thanks to the administration of the Government, we are enjoying a happy condition of things which enables one portion of the country to supply another. Where want is felt in any one section, a supply is available from another, by means of the rapid communication and transport which enables the products of the country to be distributed according to the wants of the different sections. But what has been the progress of the country in those lines that make up the industrial, financial and commercial development of the country? In the first place, the great requirement of any country is employment for the people. If the people are not employed, their condition must be a very unfavourable one; if they are employed and receive a fair return for their labour, then the condition of the country is not so bad. I apprehend, I need scarcely ask the question, are the people employed to-day or are they not? For, if we take the public papers in any part of Canada and examine them, we must come to the conclusion fairly, I think, that the people are employed, for the simple reason that we have no great outcry from the large towns and cities in our country, even in this winter season, the season above all others, when, if the people are not employed the pinch of want is most keenly felt and the strongest demands are made upon the charitable public. There is no great evidence to-day in any part of Canada that any considerable number of our people are out of employment, or in a condition of want, calling for the distribution of charitable gifts to support them. But if we recall the past, we know that from 1875 to 1878, that was not the condition. In every large town and city in the Dominion, especially in 1876, 1877 and 1878 the demand upon the charity and hospitality of the people was so great that the country was not able to supply as much as was needed. Then, if we travel through the country and enter the homes of the people in any part of the Dominion, do we find indications of want or poverty, of the lack of the comforts or necessaries of life? If we regard the people as to their appearance, as to their dress, we cannot but see that they are very much

above want, and that they are able from their earnings to supply themselves with at least the ordinary necessaries and comforts, and, in many cases, with many of the luxuries of life as well. Then, so far as my knowledge has enabled me to judge, the people have enough to keep them from poverty, hunger or starvation. Go into the homes of the people, among the farming community especially, and you can get a good meal, if you reach there at meal time, and you can see evidences of comfort and in many instances, evidences of prosperity. Then, if we consider the number of young men and young women attending our colleges, high schools, collegiate institutes and other educational institutions where they receive the benefits of a liberal education, we find unmistakable evidences of the prosperity of the country, for, over and above what is required to keep them from the pinching of want, they are enabled to lay by sufficient to give themselves that higher education which fits them for the duties of life, for the responsibilities of statesmanship or for their places in the professions, in commerce, in mechanical or industrial life, or any other. If we look at the country from these standpoints, we must fairly confess that it is not in as bad a condition as some would have us suppose. The hon. ex-Minister of Finance (Sir Richard Cartwright), in dealing with this question, drew a very unpleasant picture of the condition of the country. I listened to his speech with a good deal of interest and curiosity, because it was the speech of a gentleman who, for a long time, had controlled the financial affairs of the Dominion. I endeavoured to gather from his remarks his estimate of the condition of the country to-day compared with what it was during the time he was Finance Minister. Like many other members, I am sure, I listened to him with great interest, expecting to hear something new, fresh and enlightening, something which would enable us to understand better the principles of political economy which ought to obtain in this country. But I confess that I was disappointed. When the speech was finished I found that we had had what might fairly be called the sixteenth annual edition of the same speech in two volumes, the first not very large, but the second an exhaustive one. It was revised by the original author and embellished with the addition of strong adjectives and bitter invective. Its contents and summary included comments upon political economy, the exodus of the people, the population of the country growing less, shrinkage in values, reduction in wages, want of employment, high taxation, unbearable burdens of debt. The hon. gentleman divided the people into two classes, legalized robbers and paupers, Millionaire manufacturers on one hand, and mendicants, mere hewers of wood and drawers of water, on the other. The Government was represented as

stupid, ignorant, extravagant and corrupt. The people were said to be deceived, deluded, corrupted and demoralized. If one formed his opinion of the condition of the country from the speech, he could not but come to the conclusion that the country was in a deplorable condition. The hon. gentleman said :

Every single solitary promise which was made by the hon. gentlemen opposite, or rather by their predecessors, to the people of Canada in 1878, has been utterly and signally falsified.

I need not deal at length with that statement now. I need only remind the hon. gentleman that the promises which were made in 1878 or 1879, when the party now in power took control of the affairs of the country, were that a new tariff would be introduced, designed to protect the interests of the Canadian people, intended to raise a revenue for the country, and intended to give employment to the people and improve their condition. I was struck with one statement made by the hon. gentleman to the effect that the management of the country under the Conservative party was largely instrumental in depopulating the country. And, as illustrating what was happening in this country, he quoted the case of Ireland as a country above all others affording an example of the condition of things in Canada. He said that owing to the protective tariff in Ireland that country had been depopulated and impoverished, that its best men had left it, and that it was much in the position of Canada to-day. Now, for fear the hon. gentleman might think that I misrepresented him, I will read his own words. After reading the historian Lecky's account of Ireland, he proceeded :

Sir, ten times greater curse to Ireland, ten times greater source of evil to Ireland, than even Cromwell's sword or Strongbow's either, was that vile system of protection which, for the sake of propitiating a small number of English manufacturers, stamped out ruthlessly and crushed every attempt which the people of Ireland made to raise themselves in the scale of nations and humanity. Protection was the curse of Ireland as it is to-day the curse of Canada.

And therefore, protection was the cause of depopulating Ireland. In looking over the history of Ireland I was struck with the fact that Ireland increased in population up to the time that free trade was introduced in England. The greatest population Ireland has ever maintained was 8,295,067, and that was in 1845, about the time free trade was introduced in England. Ireland's greatest development was made up to that time, and it was during the protective period that woollens, cottons and flax products were most largely manufactured in the country. In 1841 the English Ministers introduced free trade measures as the best remedy for the existing evils afflicting the English people at the time. The corn duties were repealed in 1846, and the navigation laws in 1847. And what was the result ?

Mr. SPROULE.

Trace the history of Ireland from that time down to the present, and we find that to-day, instead of having 8,295,000 of a population, she has only 4,584,434 souls, and that appears to be all she is able to support, giving them the comforts of life. Now, I say what inference must be drawn from this ? While I do not hold that the introduction of free trade was the sole and only cause for the depopulation of Ireland, I do hold that it was the most important cause, that it was the principal one, and above all others the cause which reduced Ireland to the condition she is in to-day. When the destruction of her flax industries was brought about, when the destruction of her cotton and woollen industries were brought about, the people who had been engaged in those manufactures, had to go to other countries to find employment, while the remaining few were compelled to live by agriculture, and the country was not able to support the large number that she was able to support before that time. Then I say that if the hon. gentleman intended, in that argument, to prove that our country was being cursed by the same influences which depopulated Ireland, he is most unfortunate, taking that as an example, and drawing the deductions which he did at the time. Now, Sir, in examining into the condition of the country, there are several ways by which we may test it, namely, the wealth of the country as represented by the deposits in the banks, life insurance, the commerce of the country, its development by railways and canals, the debt of the country, the actual taxation of the people in comparison with other countries, the cost of living, the development of trade and industry, and the growth of manufactures. Let me give a few of the results which I find in our official records. I will take first the wealth of the country as represented by deposits in our banks, and will compare the period during which the present party have controlled the destinies of Canada, with the preceding period during which time the Reform party were in power. I think it is only fair to take the whole time, because then it cannot be said that you have selected a period where the argument might be most in your favour. Take first the deposits in the chartered banks of the country. In 1874, when the Reform party came into power, there were \$63,453,682 deposited in the banks ; when they left power in 1878, there were \$16,013,756 ; or in other words, during that period there was an average yearly increase of \$604,018. Then I take the deposits in the chartered banks. In 1878 they amounted to \$66,013,756 ; in 1895 they had reached the sum of \$182,688,227 ; or in other words, the average yearly increase had been \$6,863,204 for every year of those seventeen years ; while in the previous period it had only been \$640,000. Sir, does that not indicate increased prosperity ? It

surely does, so far as the savings of the people are concerned. Then I take the deposits in the post office and other Government banks of the country, and I find that during the four years from 1874 to 1878, the average yearly increase was only \$26,728. I take the following years, from 1878 to 1895, and I find that whereas the deposits in the banks in 1878 were only \$14,128,185, in 1895 they were \$57,578,981, or an average yearly increase of \$2,555,928 as against \$26,000 in the preceding five years. This showing covers the whole period, and it cannot be said to be unfair. Now, if you can take a period in the history of a country when a people lay by two millions dollars a year, against another period when they can only lay by only \$26,000 a year, you can easily understand which period is the most prosperous in the history of the country. Then I will take fire insurance. The amount of risks in 1874 was \$306,844,219; in 1878 the risks were \$409,889,701; or a yearly average increase during that period of \$25,763,870. Then I take the following period of fifteen years, and I find an average yearly increase of \$26,635,469, as against \$25,000,000 in the previous period. Then I take life insurance, and I think if there is one line more than another which indicates that the people are able to lay by a portion of their earnings, it is the business of life insurance, because it is only those who have money to spare who are able to insure their lives. In 1874 I find the amount of life insurance was \$85,716,323; in 1878 it had been reduced to \$84,751,937, or an average yearly decrease during those five years of \$241,097. Then I take the succeeding seventeen years, and what is the result? In 1878, as I have just said, the life insurance amounted to \$84,751,937, but in 1895, it was \$308,161,436, or an average yearly increase of \$13,963,033; while in the previous five years there was a yearly decrease of \$241,000. Now, surely that must be an evidence of the increasing wealth of the country. I will now take the value of the exports of the country as indicating what the people are able to send away and for which they get money in return. Between 1874 and 1878 the exports were \$354,963,602, or an average yearly export during the five years of \$70,992,720. Now, I take the period from 1879 to 1895, and I find that the total amount of exports reached the enormous sum of \$1,466,895,092, or an average during those seventeen years of \$86,287,946. During all those years the increase was going on rapidly. I take next the freight carried in the country. It will be understood by every one who is within the sound of my voice, that the freight carried by the railroads and the transportation companies of our country, is an evidence of the business which is being done, because if goods are not manufactured or produced, they cannot be carried, and if they are carried and transported from one part of the country to the other, they are either being

distributed, or taken to the markets of the world where they are sold. I take the tons of freight carried by rail, and I find that between 1875 and 1878 there were 26,745,861 tons, or an average of 6,686,465 tons annually. I take the period from 1879 up to 1895, and I find there were 281,675,302 tons carried; or during those seventeen years an average of 16,569,135 tons, as against six millions in the previous five years. Now, it cannot be possible that the people are able to produce and have carried sixteen million tons of freight a year, and yet be in a worse condition than they were when they were able to produce and have carried only six million tons a year. This I say must be regarded as an evidence of the development of the country and of increasing prosperity.

Taking the canals, I find the tonnage carried comparatively stationary, because there is a change as regards transportation by canals. It is now carried by railways. But I take the vessels on the inland waters between Canada and the United States, and what do I find? From 1876 to 1878 there were 6,453,018 tons, or an average for the three years of 2,151,021 annually. From 1879 to 1895 there were 46,051,214 tons carried, or an average during those seventeen years of 2,708,895 tons.

I take the vessels engaged in the coasting trade, and it will be understood that the coasting trade represents the carriage of the produce of the country from one part to another. Where manufactures or agricultural products are produced in one place and required in other places they are carried by railways, canals and steamboats, and these facilities enable us to distribute the products from points of production to the points of distribution. The coasting trade from 1876 to 1878 amounted to 20,211,642 tons, or a yearly average of 6,737,214 tons. Taking the seventeen years from 1879 to 1895 the total was 216,761,152 tons, or a yearly average of 12,750,656 tons. This is twice as much per annum as during the previous period. Accordingly, the people must have produced twice as much, and it has been distributed in our country by the action of the National Policy in keeping out the products of other countries.

I take sea-going vessels, and this statement represents what we are sending abroad. From 1876 to 1878 our sea-going vessels carried 13,192,000 tons, or an average of 4,364,397 tons a year. From 1879 to 1895 they carried 88,968,938 tons, or an average of 5,233,467 tons; I give this as evidence that this country is still progressing.

It is asked what has been the result of the increased mileage of railway. I reply that it has reduced the cost of freight for the benefit of the manufacturers and producers who must transport their products to that part of the country where they are sold. The average rate of freight in 1878 was \$1.57 per ton, the average rate in 1894 was \$1.45. I give this as evidence of the advantage which the country enjoys from the ad-

ditional railways which have been built and the increased transportation facilities that we enjoy.

I now come to the condition of the people, to the commercial side of the country, and I ask what has been the result on commercial life in Canada, what has been the number of failures and the amount of the failures represented by those two periods? I take Bradstreet's table, and find from 1874 to 1878, five years, there were failures representing \$111,487,000, or a yearly average of \$22,297,400. From 1879 to 1895 the failures represented only \$14,081,580 annually. This statement must be accepted as evidence that the condition of the country was better from 1879 to 1895 than it was from 1874 to 1878.

I take the development of the country with respect to railways. Ours is a new country and it has not yet reached anything like the maximum of development. We require transportation for the produce of one part of the country to another part, and also for our trade with foreign countries, and there is a very urgent demand for railways in every part of the Dominion. I take the railway mileage in 1875 and 1878. In 1875 it was 4,856 miles, in 1878 it was 6,143 miles, or an increase of 429 miles a year. That represents the number of miles of railway built during these years when the Reform party was in power. In 1878 I say the mileage was 6,143, in 1895 it was 15,627 miles, or 600 miles a year as against 429 miles a year. This increased mileage affords the means required by the people for the distribution of their products.

I take post offices as representing the conveniences of life. The number in 1874 was 4,706 in 1878 it was 5,378, or an increase during the year of 168. In 1895 the number was 8,832, or an increase yearly of 203 as against 168. This Government cannot be blamed for not giving the people postal conveniences and facilities for carrying on their private and business correspondence in the various lines of life in which they are engaged.

I take the amount spent on canals and railways and on public buildings. We expended from 1874 to 1878 on railways \$19,294,227, a yearly average of \$3,858,000; on canals we expended from 1874 to 1878 \$13,302,217, or an average of \$2,664,044. On public buildings from 1874 to 1878 we expended \$3,732,405, or a yearly average of \$746,438. On other public works we spent from 1874 to 1878 \$3,811,291, or a yearly average of \$762,258. Our total for these years from 1874 to 1878 for railways, canals, public works and public buildings was \$40,158,140, or a yearly average of \$8,031,622. In the years between 1879 and 1894 there was spent on railways \$82,442,994, or an average yearly of \$5,152,687, as against a yearly average of \$3,858,000 while the Liberal Government was in power. We spent on canals, during that same period, \$29,292,728,

Mr. SPROULE.

or an average yearly of \$1,832,795. During that time we spent on public works \$11,050,322, being a yearly average of \$690,000. On other public works we spent, during that time, \$18,147,488, or a yearly average of \$1,134,218. Taking our expenditure on these lines during the last seventeen years, I find that it averaged yearly \$8,808,345, while in the preceding period it was \$8,031,624. I have shown you, Mr. Speaker, that during these seventeen years of Conservative Government there was, on an average, a much larger number of railway mileage built every year, a greater development of our public works, and more money spent on these public works and on public buildings. Therefore, I am correct in stating, that the people received a far greater advantage for the amount of money spent during these seventeen years, than they did from the money spent under the Mackenzie Administration.

Now, Mr. Speaker, with regard to the public debt of Canada. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) told us that our people were burdened under an immense debt; that the present Government were responsible for running up that debt very rapidly, much more rapidly than their predecessors, and, therefore, that this Government were unworthy of the confidence of the people of this country. He told us, also, that the people of Canada would shortly be unable to provide for the debt, if it continued to grow much larger. Sir, the facts of the case do not bear out that statement of the hon. gentleman. The average yearly increase of the debt from 1874 to 1878, during the period the Reform party was in power, was \$8,009,276. As against that I take the net debt of Canada during the last seventeen years, while the Conservative party have been in power, and I find that the increase during that period was annually only \$6,630,136, as against over \$8,000,000 a year under the Liberal regime. Therefore, if the debt of Canada is very heavy to-day, I contend that the Reform party is more responsible for increasing the burden during their time in office, than is the Conservative party under their administration. But, Sir, the only burden that the people of this country feel in connection with the debt is the taxes they pay in customs and inland revenue. The people of Canada, in this generation, or the next generation, or in the third generation, are not expected to pay the national debt. It is true, we pay the interest upon that debt and the sinking fund, and we do that by the customs and inland revenue duties principally. The other receipts going into the treasury from public works and post offices, do not represent a tax upon the people, because they get value in return for this service. Virtually, the tax upon the people is fully represented by the receipts from customs and inland revenue. Now let us look at the customs revenue for the past seventeen years, and let us see how it compares with the customs revenue when

Mr. Mackenzie was in office. In 1878 the customs per capita tax was \$3.13, and in 1895 it was \$3.47, a very slight increase indeed. In 1878 the inland revenue tax was \$1.19 per head of the population, and to-day it is \$1.54 per head. In 1878, customs and inland revenue together represented a tax of \$4.32 per head, whereas to-day it is \$5.01 per head. That is but a small increase, considering the great development which has taken place in our country from 1878 up to the present time, considering the increased population, which has to be looked after, and considering, also, the extensive country which has been opened up since then, necessitating railways, post offices and other conveniences of civilization to meet the requirements of the inhabitants. It has been said by the hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright), that our taxation is so heavy that the people of Canada cannot bear it. Perhaps the best way to answer that is to compare our taxation with that of other countries, and, when we do that, we find that Canada stands in a very favourable light. One year ago, when hon. gentlemen opposite were campaigning all through the country, they told the people what they would do, if they were entrusted with the management of the affairs of the Dominion. They told the people of Canada that their platform was "free trade as they have it in England," but they took mighty good care not to tell the people what "free trade as they have it in England" would mean to the people of Canada. Those hon. gentlemen opposite came back to Parliament the following year, but we do not hear one of them to-day mentioning anything about "free trade as they have it in England." They have given up that platform, and they turn to resolutions passed by a conference held in Ottawa in 1893, and they announce those resolutions as the platform of their party.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us see what "free trade as they have it in England" means to the people of Canada. If it means reduced taxation, then it would be an advantage; but does it mean that? The customs taxes raised in England in the year 1895 amounted to \$97,893,000, or \$2.50 per head of the population of that country. Now, the inland revenue tax raised in England in 1895 amounted to \$284,894,666, or \$7.24 per head of the population. Add these two together, and you find that the English people are taxed to the extent of \$9.74 per head from customs and inland revenue alone, under "free trade as they have it in England;" whereas the Canadian people, under our present system, are taxed to the extent of only \$5.01, a very considerable difference indeed in favour of our system. Is the system of taxation in England a system which the Canadian people should accept in preference to their own? Would it likely be adopted by the Canadian people, or, if adopted, would it be more advantageous to them than the system under which our taxes are raised to-day? It would not, Mr. Speaker. It would necessitate, in

many instances, direct taxation, and, if it should turn out, as is the case in England, that the people would have to pay \$9 per head, instead of the \$5 they pay in Canada, the people of this country are not very likely to be much elated by the English system. Let me compare the taxation in the United States with the taxation in Canada. In 1893, the Customs taxation of the United States was \$3.04 per head of the population, and the inland revenue tax was \$2.41 per head of the population, or, together, these taxes amounted to \$5.45 per capita, while in Canada they only amount to \$5.01. If the Canadian people are heavily taxed, or over-taxed, this comparison does not show it. Other countries have to raise money to carry on the affairs of the state, as we do, but they raise it in different ways; but the figures I have given show that they do not raise it in better ways than we do.

Now, what is the development of our country in connection with our export trade? If our exports are increasing, we must be prospering in some measure, whether small or great. I take up the returns, and what do I find? Of animals and agricultural products, in 1878, we exported \$33,729,066 worth. Now, we are told that the farmers are suffering from the National Policy more than any other class in the community. If that were so, you would expect to find that they were exporting less to-day than they did before the National Policy was introduced. But we find, on the contrary, that in 1895 they exported, of animals and agricultural products, \$50,106,898 worth. Fifty millions as against thirty-three millions—is that an evidence of retrogression or of progress, which? I think no person could prove to the farmers of this country that they are not better off as the result of that great increase in their exports. The hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McMillan) told us the other night that the farmers of the country were decreasing in number—that they were crowding into the towns and cities. He said that we had 10,000 farmers less in 1891 than we had in 1881. Well, if with 10,000 farmers less we can export nearly \$20,000,000 worth of produce more a year than we did before, these people must be better off; and you cannot convince any farmer that he is not better off. Now, I will divide the exports into their different lines, and what do we find? The farmers of the country are changing their lines of production, and to-day they export more of animals, and their products than they did a few years ago, when the bulk of their exports consisted of agricultural products. In 1878, of animals and their products, they exported \$14,100,604 worth; but in 1895 they exported \$34,387,770 worth. Of agricultural products they exported, in 1878, \$19,628,462 worth, and in 1895, \$15,719,128. They exported less agricultural products in 1895 than in 1878, because they are turning their attention more to dairying and meat producing instead of

to grain raising. Then, we take the products of our mines, and we find that in 1878 we exported \$3,082,900 worth, whereas, in 1895 we exported \$6,983,227 worth. In that case, our exports more than doubled. Surely that is not an evidence of decreasing wealth; it must be an evidence of a larger return to the people of the country. Of the products of our fisheries we exported, in 1878, \$6,928,871 worth, and in 1895, \$10,692,247 worth, or an increase of over \$4,000,000. Take the products of our forests, and you find the same thing. In 1878 we exported \$13,261,459 worth, whereas, in 1895, we exported \$23,891,166 worth, an increase of over \$10,000,000. I say that those engaged in this industry must have bettered their condition to the tune of \$10,000,000 over what it was in 1878. Now, take the manufactures of our country. We are told by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) that notwithstanding the National Policy, which was intended to protect the manufactures, we have done little in the way of developing that line of industry. I do not say anything now in regard to the great increase of the manufactured products for home consumption, to replace what was formerly imported from abroad. But, take the exports of the country, over and above the requirements in our own country, and we find that in 1878 we exported \$2,700,281 worth of manufactured goods, whereas, last year our exports increased to \$7,768,875 worth. That is a notable increase, and it must be taken as an evidence that the development of our manufactures is going on in a way that indicates that the country is prospering fairly well. If we take the totals of all these exports, we find that in 1878 we exported, in round numbers, \$60,000,000 worth, and in 1895, \$102,000,000 worth. Therefore, I say the people of Canada have bettered their position to the extent of \$42,000,000 at least, which must be accepted as an evidence of the increasing wealth of the country. But I wish to deal now particularly with the products of our manufacturing industries. It was said by the hon. member for South Oxford that every promise made to the people by the Conservatives in 1878 were falsified in every respect. As I have said, one of these promises was that the people were to get better employment. Our manufacturers were to increase their output, better wages would be paid, and a more valuable product would be turned out, after the introduction of the National Policy. What has been the result? I take the capital invested in manufactures at three different periods to show that the country is really growing richer in that line. In 1871 we had \$77,000,000 invested in the manufactures of the country; in 1881, \$158,000,000; and in 1891, \$329,000,000. Surely that is an evidence of the progress of the manufacturing industries of the country. Now, take the number of hands employed. It was

Mr. SPROULE.

said that the National Policy would afford more employment to workingmen. In 1871 there were 187,942 hands employed in manufacturing industries in the country; in 1881, 244,293 hands; and in 1891, 343,030 hands, an increase in 1891 over 1871 of 155,000 people who find employment in manufacturing industries, who could not have found employment before, because the manufactories were not in existence to employ them. But the hon. member for South Huron said the other night that the tendency to protection in every country was to reduce the wages of the people. Is that really borne out by the figures given here? I take the census returns, and what do I find? The wages paid in 1881 over 1871 increased 39.3 per cent, and the wages paid in 1891 over 1881 increased 63 per cent.

Mr. GIBSON. What in?

Mr. SPROULE. In manufactories.

Mr. GIBSON. Not a cent.

Mr. SPROULE. The wages that were paid in 1891 as compared with 1881 show an increase of 127 per cent. There is no denying that fact because the figures are there, and no one up to the present has dared to dispute their accuracy. On the face of that no person can claim that the tendency of the National Policy has been to lower wages. It has been the reverse. It has increased wages. Because by the increased development in manufacturing industries, the machinery turns out more products, the wage-earners become more expert, and consequently receive greater return in wages for their labour. They turn out more money value per man, and, therefore, get more wages and the result is what we find to-day.

Mr. GIBSON. Is the hon. gentleman aware that machinery displaces skilled labour?

Mr. SPROULE. Allowing for that, there is the undeniable fact that 112,000 more people were employed in 1891 than in 1881. That cannot be denied, notwithstanding the fact that machinery displaces labour. But what labour it displaces in one line it gives employment to in another, because the manufacture of the improved machinery entails the employment of additional labour to make it. The hon. gentleman is only strengthening the argument I have advanced. The improved machinery requires labourers to produce it, and these labourers have to be paid good wages. Taking the wages paid, I find that in 1889 they amounted to \$59,429,002, whereas in 1891 they amounted to \$99,762,441. And as a further evidence of the development, I give the raw material brought into this country and used up by our manufactures. I only go back the last ten years. If I were to go back to 1871, the comparison would show a still greater development. The raw material used up in 1881 by these factories represented \$179,918,593 in value, but in 1891 it represented \$255,983,219, showing

an increase of \$76,000,000 in those ten years. Now, this increase of \$76,000,000 worth of raw material brought into the country gave employment to more hands and enabled them to turn out more products at greater wages. Take the value of the product, and what does that show with regard to the increased wealth of the country? Why in 1881 the value of the products in round figures was \$309,000,000. What was it in 1891? It was \$475,000,000, or an increase in ten years of \$165,769,637, or 53 per cent. The value of the product manufactured in Canada brought back to the people in value \$165,000,000 for their labour more in the year than it did ten years before that time. Is it fair to say that the country is not prosperous?

Now, we are told that our manufacturers cannot compete with foreign countries, that, notwithstanding protection, we are still unable to do much in that direction. I have here some of the lines they produced in competition with other countries, and I shall only give a few of the lines where I consider the development is fair.

Mr. GRIEVE. We say they can compete with other countries.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) said it was folly for us to suppose that they could compete with foreign countries, but another hon. gentleman gets up and declares that they can. The hon. member for South Oxford says that on account of our limited area and climatic conditions, being a narrow strip of country, we cannot compete, while others of his friends say we can. What is the fact? I take agricultural implements, which may be accepted as a fair criterion, because in the manufacture of these implements we use up the iron and wood of our country and give employment to labour. Now, we keep out the agricultural implements which foreigners used to send us under the tariff of 1879, and we supply the wants of our country to the amount of hundreds of thousands of dollars, and in addition to that, we export \$663,718 worth.

Mr. DEVLIN. Were they sold cheaper abroad than here?

Mr. SPROULE. No.

Mr. DEVLIN. That is the question.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. member for Huron (Mr. Macdonald) said the other night that we were selling agricultural implements to the farmers in Australia cheaper than to the farmers in Canada. He only showed how little he knew. Why, Sir, our implements are sold there at twice as much as they are sold to Canadian farmers. We are told that we are giving a drawback to our manufacturers to enable them to sell cheaply to the farmers of Australia and enable the products of Australia to be sold in this market in competition with our own. That is not the case. These implements are not sold cheaper abroad, but very much dearer.

But when they are sold out of the country, the Government think it wise to give a drawback on the raw material that goes into their manufacture, so as to enable the manufacturers to give employment to more labour, because by giving employment to more labour, they use up more raw material and produce a better home market for the consumption of the products of the farm in this country. In this way, it is beneficial to the farmers. In 1879 we exported only \$79,811 worth. What did we export last year, after the National Policy had done its work? Instead of \$79,000 worth, we exported \$663,718 worth. Having manufactured all that was required at home, which represented a very large quantity, and which formerly we purchased from abroad, we exported besides \$660,000 worth.

Then I take cotton. Now, we bring in raw cotton in very large quantities. In 1878 we manufactured and exported \$1,418 worth. How much did we export last year? We exported \$546,168 worth, or in other words, an increase of \$544,750 worth. What did that do for the Canadian people? It gave employment to labour, and this labour furnished a consuming market for the benefit of the farmers and thus gave our farmers better return.

Take leather. In 1878 we exported \$268,975 worth of leather. How much did we export last year? If the manufactures of our country cannot be developed by the National Policy, you would expect that the exports would not have increased. How much did we export in the last year? Instead of the \$268,000 worth exported in 1878, in 1895 we exported \$1,283,451 worth, or an increase of \$1,000,000. Is that an evidence of development or otherwise?

Then I take household furniture and manufactures of wood. In 1879 we exported \$300,000 worth. In 1895 we exported \$988,804 worth.

The increased output of these few lines I have given, exported from the country in 1895 over 1879, amounted to \$3,131,837. Now, is it not the rule all over the world, asked the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Macdonald), that protection does not give employment to labour, that it reduces wages, and does not enhance the wealth of the country. I think the arguments I have given prove the very reverse of that.

Has the National Policy helped the farmers of the country? We are told that above all other classes, the farmers have not been helped by the National Policy. I have already given you the fact that the farmers exported over \$50,000,000 of produce in 1895, as against \$33,000,000 worth before the National Policy was adopted in 1878; and this was in addition to supplying a home demand which had been supplied by imported products up to that time. I have some returns here showing the exports of the products of the farm. I have already given the figures in gross; let us consider a few details. Montreal is the port from which we send out the great-

est quantity of agricultural products, and the returns of that port represent fairly the progress that is being made in the export trade of goods produced by the farmers of the country. The first item I take is cattle. In 1878 we exported from Montreal \$1,300,738 worth. In 1895 we exported \$7,303,556 worth, an increase of over \$6,000,000 in that time. It cannot be denied that in this respect the farmers are doing better than they did before the National Policy. Of horses we exported in 1878 \$497,375 worth, and in 1895 \$1,544,838 worth. The value of sheep exported from Montreal in 1878 was \$217,868, and in 1895 it was \$1,738,049. Our exports of pork in 1878 amounted to \$63,529, and in 1895 \$21,397. Of bacon and hams we exported in 1878 \$57,195, and in 1895 \$801,123. The value of eggs exported in 1878 was \$32,730, and last year \$357,583. Then, I take the item of cheese. In 1878 the value of cheese exported at the port of Montreal was \$2,345,536, while in 1895 we exported actually \$10,966,189 worth. Remember, Mr. Speaker, these figures show only what was exported from the port of Montreal. Our total cheese exports last year amounted to \$14,000,000. Of apples we exported in 1878 \$96,706, and in 1895 \$413,311. Take the total of these exports and what do we find? In 1878 we sent through this port, of the products of the farm, about \$6,000,000 worth: 1888, \$14,000,000; in 1893, \$21,000,000 worth; in 1894, \$23,000,000 worth, and in 1895, \$24,000,000 worth—and this last figure does not represent the full year. And we are told that there are 10,000 farmers less in Canada than ten years ago. Can it be successfully contended that the farmers in Canada are producing less than they did, that they are not as well off as they were, that they receive less for their labour than they did before the National Policy? These figures prove the very contrary to be the result. Not only did the farmers export this large quantity of their products, but they supplied a home consumption which was made of benefit to them by the National Policy, a benefit of which but for the National Policy would have been lost to them. The National Policy was expected to keep out the products of the American farmer, which were being brought in to feed the Canadian mechanic, the Canadian labourer, and even the Canadian farmer, in many instances. I have a few figures showing the effect of the National Policy in keeping the home market for our home producers. I take some lines of farm produce—mutton, pork, bacon and hams, beef, meats, lard and tallow for home consumption. In 1878 the imports of these articles into Canada amounted to 16,486,780 pounds. In other words, we brought in \$1,220,223 worth of these lines before the National Policy was adopted. A duty was put on pork, but we found that still the western states could produce more cheaply than the Canadian

Mr. SPROULE.

farmer, and the result was that western pork was still coming in. But in 1889, when this was increased to such an extent as to become an actual menace to that branch of our trade, we induced the Government to increase the duty. In 1889 we brought of these lines 32,993,761 pounds, or \$2,285,073, to feed the Canadians, while the Canadian farmer was obliged to send his products to the foreign market and pay the cost of taking it there. As I have said, the Government raised the duty. And what was the result? Last year we brought in only 8,433,802 pounds in these lines. In other words, we kept out 24,000,000 pounds of American products which had formerly been brought in to feed the Canadian people. Instead of bringing in \$2,000,000 worth of the products of the American farmers to feed the Canadian people as in 1889, by reason of the protective tariff we brought in only \$585,361 worth. Will any one tell me, then, that the Canadian farmer is not benefited by the National Policy? When you gave the Canadian farmer the home market, you enabled him to produce more, and, as a result, he was able to export more, and this accounts for the increase of our exports from \$33,000,000 to \$50,000,000. Then, take the items of wheat, oats, pease, corn, cornmeal, oatmeal and flour. In 1878 we brought in of these \$13,224,046 worth. And how much did we bring in last year? Only \$2,393,361. What kept these foreign products out? Why, it was the tariff of 15 cents a bushel on wheat, 75 cents a barrel on flour, 10 cents a bushel on oats and 7 cents a bushel on corn. The result was that the Canadian farmer benefited to the extent of nearly \$2,000,000 worth of a market at the time. That is how the National Policy has helped him. Then I say it cannot be successfully claimed that the National Policy has done no good. I have shown you that the country has been developed, I have shown you that the Conservative party, while they were in power, have built more mileage of railway, they have spent more money on public works, they have bought the conveniences of life to the people much better than was done in the preceding period. There are a larger number of post offices, we have improved the transportation facilities, thereby reducing the freights of the country, and by improving transportation and reducing freights, we have given a large return to the producers. The Canadian farmer, above all others, benefits by these improvements. Sir, to-day we are told that there is extravagance in every line, and we are asked to economize. We are told by the hon. member for South Oxford that this Government is a very extravagant one. Because they propose to expend some \$37,000,000 next year, he says that the country is being run into debt to an extent it cannot bear. I will take his own words. This is what he said:

For my own part, I do not hesitate to tell the Minister of Finance that I consider a yearly expenditure of \$40,000,000,—

He had only exaggerated it \$2,000,000.

—or \$38,000,000, altogether too large for the present resources of Canada. I say it is a disgrace and a shame to the Government that have been entrusted with our affairs, that they come down to us and ask for an expenditure of \$38,000,000 a year for federal purposes.

He said: What we want is retrenchment to-day, what we want is economy, what the people want is a reduction in the expenditure, and if they will elect the Reform party we will effect that economy, and we will give you the retrenchment that is not given you by the Conservative party. Now, let me say here a few words with regard to the economy of the Conservative party. While I admire any man for practising economy where economy can benefit, either the individual or the country, I equally admire the man who expends almost extravagantly when such extravagant expenditure is turned to useful account. We are not living in an age of the world, and in a country, where no development is expected. We have many millions of acres of land to be settled and to be developed, and we require, for years to come, a greater development than anything that has taken place during the last seventeen years. If our country is to be settled up, if we are to increase it from a population of five millions to one of sixty millions, like our neighbours to the south of us, with no more territory than we have, can we stand still at the present time? Can we economize, or can we go back? Is it necessary for the development of the country that we should spend more, or should spend less? I say in all frankness, it is necessary that we should spend more. If the country to-day is suffering from one thing more than another, it is from want of conveniences to carry on the trade of the country. In our harbours, our vessels cannot get to the docks on account of the shallowness of the water, and yet the economy that has obtained for the last two or three years has been so great that these necessary improvements have not been made, which we believe the country demands, and the country expects. Those people who are living hundreds of miles from a railway, require railway facilities just as much as the people in the older settled parts of Quebec and Ontario who have railways built with Government aid. Then, can we stand still? If our country is to stand still, then we may continue to practice economy. But if we are to develop in the future, as in the past, we must, in the nature of things, increase our expenditure. If we are to bring more people to this country, if we are to become a population of fifty millions, we cannot give them the conveniences of life with an expenditure which has only been sufficient for five millions. Were I in the position of a Finance

Minister, or a member of a Cabinet, and were I endeavouring to shape and control the affairs of this country for the next few years, I would propose a much larger expenditure than is proposed by the Estimates now before the House. The country requires it, the country demands it, and the country will support the Government that gives it. If our country is to be developed as she ought to be developed, and we are to give the people the conveniences of life that they ought to have, we must spend more money year after year. The burdens of taxation are not great. I have shown you that they are less than those of the United States, in comparison to population, and they are still lower as compared with England, and they are lower as compared with every other country in Europe. Then why should it be said that the people are burdened by federal taxation? They are not burdened by taxation. Their present taxation is only represented by what they raise to pay the interest upon our debt, and to carry on the affairs of the country, and that we raise by a customs revenue, and by inland revenue. As we bring more people into the country, they will pay more taxes. Now, we are told that the debt of the country is too heavy, that it has been increasing rapidly. I say it has not been increasing out of proportion to the increase of population, and the development of the country: it has not been increasing rapidly. Even though we were obliged to borrow money to expend for the purpose of developing the country, we would be justified in doing so. But we are told that we have a very heavy deficit this year. Yes, we have a heavy deficit, and why? Because we have taken taxes off the people in the last two or three years. In 1891 we took off \$3,500,000 in taxes on sugar alone. It is true, we added taxes to the amount of \$1,500,000, but still that left a reduction of \$2,000,000 in one year. Sir, I say we should not have reduced the customs revenue to that extent: in other words, we should have raised that money, and had we done so, we would have an ample amount of revenue to-day, as we had up to the time when we reduced the customs taxation, and we would not be in the position we are in to-day of having a deficit. We would have been able clearly to demonstrate to the country that the National Policy did what was aimed at when it was given to Canada. Until then, it raised a revenue sufficient for the wants of the country. Though we were expending, according to the needs of the country, the National Policy raised the necessary revenue. Now, if we had not taken off that taxation three or four years ago, what would have been the result, provided we had not imported any more during the last three years than we did in the previous three years? On sugar alone, what would have been the result? We would have had \$8,000,000 more than we have to-day. If we had had that \$8,000,000,

we could have wiped out these deficits entirely, and still have more money to expend for the wants of the country. Last year we again took off \$1,500,000 by a reduction in the tariff. I say that the condition of the country did not require it, it rather required that we should allow those taxes to continue to be raised. Now, the question is, in what shape shall we raise taxes? Shall we raise them by the present system, or shall we raise them by what the Opposition call a revenue tariff? I do not understand what they mean by a revenue tariff. Between 1874 and 1878 they had, I presume, what they called a revenue tariff. It was a 17 per cent tariff all round, a 17 per cent tariff that taxed the absolute necessities of life, such as tea, sugar and coffee. Then the Conservative party came in, and that tariff was raised a little higher, to about 19 per cent. It was raised, practically, on the same lines, but with the consequence that the rearrangement of the tariff protected the Canadian people, it was done for the purpose of protection. If the Reform party came into power, would they say that a 19 per cent tariff protected the Canadian people? The hon. member for North Brant (Mr. Paterson) said the other day: Our platform and our policy is to levy only such taxation as is necessary to produce sufficient revenue, and so to levy it that it will not have in it an element of protection, even incidental protection cannot be found in the tariff which we propose to introduce. Then it must be said of them: Well, you must raise a revenue, and you could rearrange the tariff in such a way that you could give protection to the Canadian farmer, you could keep out the American pork which is being consumed in Canada, you could keep out the American wheat that is being brought in to feed Canadians, you could keep out the American flour which is brought in to feed Canadians—you could do this, but you will not do it. You set your faces stubbornly and obstinately in favour of the obsolete principle of a tariff for revenue only. Does the Canadian farmer want men to control the destinies of Canada who would raise a tariff for revenue only—not protect them though he could if he would—or does he want a tariff that would protect his own interests at the same time that it raises a revenue? They tell the Canadian people that they would not do it if they could. They say: No matter whether we could do it or not, we won't do it. Now, if they came in tomorrow, they would have to raise a revenue. I suppose they would try to raise it on the same line they did between 1874 and 1878; we may fairly assume that they are not likely to change that system very much. But I believe the Canadian people will be very much more likely to trust the men who have protected Canadian interests, who have kept Canada for the Canadians, who have raised a revenue, who are developing the country, and who are still desirous of

Mr. SPROULE.

doing, in the future, as they have in the past. If they had taken my advice, instead of reducing the tariff they would have left the duties as they were, they would have raised additional revenue, they would have improved our harbours so as to facilitate navigation, they would have increased our railway mileage and brought the conveniences of life to the people in every part of the Dominion, making transportation for them easier and cheaper. So development has proceeded, and any Government that is not in harmony with it will not be promoting the best interests of the people. The Conservatives say, raise a revenue, but do it with custom duties. The Reformers say, raise a revenue, but while doing so, duties must not protect our manufacturing and other interests. I say the Canadian people do not want to adopt that mode of raising the revenue. Free trade as it is in England, we were told a year ago, was the panacea for the ills of the Canadian people. To-day we hear nothing of free trade. I have already told the House what it means, that it represents \$9 per head instead of \$5 per head levied on the people. It would represent direct taxation, instead of raising a revenue by means of customs.

Has the tariff raised a revenue? I need say very little more on this point, because I have proved that every year during the period up to three years ago, and last year we raised more than was needed for the wants of the people. The overplus during several years enabled us to put away a large amount for sinking fund, and meet other requirements of the country, until, three years ago, when the tariff was reduced, and reduced more, in my opinion, than it should have been. Has it given the Canadian farmer the home market? I have given figures which, in my opinion, unmistakably prove that it has given the Canadian farmer the home market, that it has been beneficial and protected him, and that to-day he receives the results of that protection. Has it reduced the cost of living to the people? I need not point to the fact that the necessities of life, so far as regards manufactured goods, are 45 per cent cheaper than they were in 1878. The National Policy is not responsible for all of this, but increased manufacturing and increased competition have followed as results of the National Policy, the increased development of manufacturing being largely the direct result of protection, and we find that, accordingly, prices of cotton, woollens, fabrics of all kinds are reduced in price, until to-day the people of Canada buy these goods, which represent their wearing apparel, at 45 per cent less than in 1878. Then, I ask, why should we discard this policy for some effete theory, or, at all events, some theory which belongs to another country? Has the National Policy given employment to the people? I have already furnished figures which prove that it has. Which party is likely in future to govern this coun-

try, which party will be chosen by the people to administer its affairs? In my opinion, the people will select the Conservative party, which, during seventeen years has developed the country as regards railway mileage, and in every other direction, the party which has given protection, which has given the home market to the Canadian people, which has protected the Canadian farmer, the Canadian manufacturer, the Canadian artisan, and the Canadian labourer. I have misjudged the people if they do not place their confidence in the Conservative party, if they do not accept the party that has given protection and developed our Dominion, and reject the Liberal party, which has put forward, as its platform, free trade, unrestricted reciprocity, or whatever else it may be termed. The people will select those who have governed this country so well in the past.

I desire, for a few minutes, to offer some remarks with respect to statements made during this debate. The hon. member for East Huron (Mr. Macdonald) said it would be of great advantage to Canada if we had the freedom of the American market for our fish. Some hon. members laughed, and wished to know how we would lose the American market. This occurred before six o'clock; but during the recess, some of the hon. gentleman's friends told him that we had already freedom to send our fish into the American market, and the beautiful argument which the hon. gentleman had carefully built up before six o'clock was demolished after that hour.

Mr. BOWERS. Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that we have the freedom of the American market for our fish?

Mr. SPROULE. Yes, for fresh fish. The hon. member for East Huron (Mr. Macdonald) was speaking of exporting fresh fish from the great lakes and Manitoba, the hon. gentleman pointing out the great benefit that would accrue to the Canadian people if we had the freedom of the American market for that fish; but we have that freedom now. Then the hon. gentleman said: Put the Liberal party in power and I guarantee that within three years Canada will have secured reciprocity with the United States. That was an assertion ventured without furnishing any proof or any reason for the belief that this prophecy would be fulfilled. What reason is there to believe that the Reformers could get reciprocity with the United States any more than the Conservatives could secure it. Hon. gentlemen opposite were in power five years, during which time they made one effort, and it resulted in failure, and they went on conducting public affairs on the same lines. The Conservatives have tried many times to secure reciprocity, but they have failed. Nevertheless, this country is being steadily developed. Then the hon. gentleman who represents one of the Wellingtons (Mr.

Semple) said it would be a great advantage if Canadian farmers had to-day the benefit of the American market for their grain. He further declared that the National Policy had done no good and that it was of no advantage to the Dominion. Why? Because he said grain was always higher on the other side of the line, and that this was the case with all agricultural products; and the hon. member for East Huron (Mr. McMillan) gave figures to prove the prices on the American side were nearly always higher than in Canada. At the very moment the hon. gentleman was giving these figures, I looked over the Toronto "Globe," of February 6th, and found the price of wheat in Toronto as 85 cents. This was the highest price, but it was not the same quality of wheat, because it was not No. 1 Manitoba hard. The price at farmers' wagons was 85 cents. At the same date, the quotation for No. 1 hard at Duluth was 61 $\frac{3}{4}$ cents. It was quoted at Detroit at 75 cents, or 10 cents less than in Toronto, and the cost of transportation between the points would not exceed 1 $\frac{1}{2}$ cents per bushel at through rates. If there was not a duty of 15 cents per bushel on wheat, this country would be flooded with the American wheat. Only a short time ago such wheat was 18 cents lower on the American side of the line than at Canadian points. The price of oats in Toronto was 28 cents per bushel, compared with 19 $\frac{3}{4}$ cents at Detroit. What great benefit would the American market give to the Canadian farmer for his oats when he could only get 19 $\frac{3}{4}$ cents in the States, as against 28 cents in his own country? The hon. gentleman further stated that if our farmers had not the National Policy to contend with they would be better off in their own market. It is impossible to see how the Canadian farmer could thus be benefited. On that day, mess pork was selling in Chicago at \$10.30, as against \$13.50 in Toronto, and \$15 per barrel in Montreal. Remember the price was \$15 per barrel as against \$10.30, and with such prices what would be the use of the American market to Canadian producers? Lard was sold in Toronto at 8 $\frac{3}{4}$ cents a pound, and in New York, on the same date, it was sold at 6 $\frac{1}{2}$ cents per pound. What benefit would it be, I ask, to the Canadian farmer if he had the American market in that line?

I have little more to say, Mr. Speaker, in this debate. I listened to the very lengthy speech of my hon. friend from Huron (Mr. Macdonald) last night. It extended over four and three-quarters hours, or nearly five hours. I was somewhat amused at it, because the hon. gentleman referred to me as the member who was likely to follow him, and he asked me to take a note of what he was saying, and endeavour to answer it. Well, it would be a herculean task indeed for any one to travel over the same ground, and to attempt to reply to him. I thought to myself that life was too short, and time

too valuable, and the cost of the Canadian Parliament too great on the country, to assume the task he invited me to. That hon. gentleman (Mr. Macdonald) dealt with many subjects, and he mixed them up in every possible way. He spoke of the National Policy and free trade, the Curran bridge and the Franchise Act, the gerrymander and the Tay Canal, reciprocity, the Reform platform and Tory corruption, the Reform party and the duty on fish and eggs. In fact he wandered over the whole field of literature, politics, arts, and economy, and endeavoured to embellish his speech with a great deal that was in the field of romance, which was neither valuable or entertaining. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Macdonald) is a medical man himself, and after hearing his speech I came to the conclusion that it must have brought to his mind the illustration sometimes given in answer to the question: What is chemistry? A medical student, a new beginner, who did not understand a great deal about the subject, once asked a professor: What is chemistry, and the answer was: The best explanation I can give you of chemistry, in a few words, is: You take an effervescent, add a deliquescent: there will be a precipitation, that is a conglomeration, and amounts to a demonstration, that is chemistry. That is about like the speech of my hon. friend (Mr. Macdonald). You take it, and you add all these together, and you mix it up, and it amounts to a conglomeration, but not a demonstration. I do not think that, in the estimation of the House, it can lead to any value, either as to conclusions, or as to a proper understanding of the condition of the country. The hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McMillan) ground us out a speech of very great length. He was laborious and assiduous, and I believe, in his own estimation, he was presenting fair arguments to the House; but it struck me, that if the hon. gentleman (Mr. McMillan) could set his speech to music and present it to the House, it would be much more attractive; or, if he had put it in a hand organ and ground it out, it would have saved him a great deal of labour and would have accomplished the same result. Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I wish to say, that in my opinion the hon. the Finance Minister gave to the House and to the people of this country a very intelligent, concise and business-like statement of the affairs of the country. I am sure that the judgment of this country will accord to him a meed of praise for what he and his party have done in the interest of Canada. I am in accord with him in every line he has presented; but as I have already stated, I think, that if the expenditure of his Government was a little more lavish it would be all the better for the progress of the country. I hope he will take a note of this expression of opinion, and be guided by it in the future. I am fully assured that the country will again return the same party to power, be-

Mr. SPROULE.

lieving that it is the best party to govern Canada, the best party to conserve and protect our interests, and the best party to develop our country. I have no doubt in my mind that the Conservative party will again control the destinies of this nation in the next Parliament of Canada.

Mr. LISTER. I recognize in the speech of my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) a very old friend indeed. The hon. gentleman and myself came into the House, I think, in 1883, and every session since that we have had this speech with additions and statistics up to the time of its delivery. The only variation, Sir, has been the very excellent anecdote with which my friend wound up his speech to-day. The hon. gentleman tells us the old story. It does not appear that in all these years, the hon. gentleman has learned the first elements of political economy. It is the old story: the National Policy has done everything for the people of the country, not only as regards its imports, but it has aided and stimulated the exports as well. My hon. friend tells us that the great necessity is, the employment for the people, and he asks himself the question: are the people of this country employed. I would ask my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) to go to any village, to any city, including the city of Ottawa, and to ask that question of the working-people. He will find, Sir, that the answer is emphatically "no." Why, Sir, the working-people of the city of Ottawa look with delight when a snow storm comes, because that is the only means that hundreds of them have to save themselves from starvation and want during the long winter. My hon. friend congratulates himself upon the fact that if you go to the homes of the farmers of this country, there is no poverty to be found; but I ask him to go to the registry office of any county in Canada, and I venture to say without hesitation, that three-fourths of the farms, even in this very province of Ontario, are mortgaged to-day. And, Sir, all that the hard-working, industrious farmers of Ontario can do, is to make both ends meet at the end of the season. The hon. gentleman says: go to the farm houses and you will find they have sufficient to keep them from hunger and starvation. Is that all we have at the end of seventeen years, after the promises made by hon. gentlemen who control the Treasury benches, and have occupied them for these long years? Is that all they can say to-day: that after seventeen years, if you go to the farmers throughout the country, you will find that they have sufficient to keep them from hunger and want?

My hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) talks about free trade in Ireland, and says, that free trade in Ireland was the cause of the people leaving the country. He simply ignores the fact that that took place some fifty odd years ago. He ignores the fact, that in Ireland they have no coal, they have no iron,

and they have not the essentials for carrying on manufactures at all, and that whether free trade had been inaugurated in England, or not, the Irish industries so far as the linen and woollen trades are concerned, were bound to come to an end. Sir, the free trade policy of England did not ruin Ireland. The free trade policy of England has built up Ireland. It has given to her people cheap living, and it has enabled the people of Ireland to produce what that country is fitted to produce, namely, cattle, and other products, which find a ready sale in the near by markets of England and Scotland. As evidencing the prosperity of Canada the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) pointed to the deposits in the banks. I deny that that is an evidence of prosperity. I assert here unhesitatingly, that excessive deposits in the banks of the country show that there is no profitable employment for the investment of the money otherwise. That is always so. Where you find trade stagnant, where you find people unemployed, where you find men wanting employment and not able to get it, you find the surplus capital of the country in the banks, earning two or three per cent, instead of being invested in industrial enterprises which under other circumstances would produce a much larger return. It was so in Ireland in the days of the famine. Never before had Ireland so much money in her banks as she had at that time. The reason was that the industries of the country were paralyzed. There was no employment for capital, and it found its way into the vaults of the banks. So, it is in Canada. Go over this country from one end to the other, from the smallest villages to the largest cities, and the smokeless chimneys, the silent machinery, the idle workmen, will prove to you that this policy has brought about a condition of affairs which men who had a knowledge of political economy predicted years ago would be the certain result. What are the stages of protection? It is true, when first introduced, it appears to cause a prosperity—a false prosperity. That is the first stage—the stage of preparing to manufacture. The second stage brings the slaves of intense competition, which gives to the people of the country cheaper goods for the time being; but the inevitable result is that the industries are ruined, and the capital put in them is wasted. The third stage comes after the wasting of the capital, and is marked by the absorption by richer concerns of the various manufactories throughout the country; and, after their absorption, the closing down of many of them, the limiting of production, and the fixing of prices to the consumers throughout the country. These are the stages, the inevitable stages, of a protective policy; and, Sir, we are to-day in the third stage—the stage where the capital invested in manufacturing industries has been utterly destroyed and lost—the stage where the richer manufacturers have combined together and absorbed the smaller

concerns from one end of the country to the other. Workmen have been thrown out of employment, doors closed, machinery shut down. Need I point to you New Glasgow? Need I point to you Hamilton? Need I point to you Dundas? Need I point to you hundreds of other places throughout this country where factories have been closed down and are to-day in the hands of monopolists and combinesters, who limit the output and compel the people of the country to pay a price only limited by what the tariff will permit them to charge. That, Sir, is the condition of affairs in Canada to-day, and that is always bound to be the condition of affairs under the working of a protective system. It never can be anything else. And when hon. gentlemen talk about returning prosperity, they talk about something that cannot be constant, because the circumstances that produced the condition we are now in will recur at ever shorter intervals. Over-production means the closing down of factories, the discharge of workmen, the paralysis of trade; and we can never be an exporting country so long as we have a protective tariff. Hon. gentlemen say that we have increased our exports. True, they have been increased to a small extent. But we can never be an exporting country so long as we have a protective tariff, because trade must be mutual—you cannot sell unless you buy. The cotton manufacturers of this country may export a few hundred dollars worth of cotton goods, to get rid of the surplus product which they cannot sell in the Canadian market. But that is no healthy sign; that is no indication that we are building up a foreign trade that is worthy of the country. My hon. friend says that the deposits in the savings banks have increased during the past number of years. He compares the deposits at present with the deposits in the period between 1874 and 1878. Surely, Mr. Speaker, this country has not been standing still for seventeen years. Surely we have made some advancement, in spite of the obstacles which have been put in our way by the Government. It is but natural that in the course of nearly two decades there should be some advancement. Deadening as this system may be the powers of our people, still, it would be absurd to say that a people such as we have in this country, would not make any advancement at all during those seventeen long years. The hon. gentleman points to the increase in the amount of life insurance since 1878, which he says has been enormous. Does not the hon. gentleman know that forty years ago people did not insure their lives at all—that only one here and there happened to be insured? Does he not know that even twenty-five years ago it was not a common thing to have insurance on one's life? Is it not a fact that the custom of insuring one's life has become very general within the last fifteen or sixteen years? Insurance associations

and friendly societies have grown up everywhere; and the very difficulty of making a living in this country, much less of saving anything, compels a man, if he wants to make any provision for his family, to have an insurance on his life, or else to run the risk of leaving them paupers. This condition of things did not exist some years ago. Then men were able to make money and save money and make some provision for their families. But to-day the struggle for life is so terrible that men cannot hope to make any provision for their families except by means of life insurance. The hon. gentleman talks of the post office savings banks. Does he not know that it is only within the last few years that the post office savings banks have become a favourite place for the deposit of money? Does he not know that it was in the early stages of that system that the Mackenzie Government was in power in this country? Then, he says, look at the freight carried. The hon. gentleman seems to forget that during the last seventeen years the freight carrying of the country has been greatly increased. He seems to forget that all that has been paid for by the people of this country. He seems to forget that a great percentage of that is American freight, coming from the western states and finding its way to the seaboard through the Dominion of Canada. Then he points, with apparent delight, to the number of bankrupts since 1878 as compared with the number previous to 1878. Does not the hon. gentleman know that in 1874 a bankruptcy law was passed in this country? Does he not know that there were tens of thousands of bankrupts who up to that time could get no release from their liabilities unless their creditors were willing to discharge them?

Mr. SPROULE. It was not in 1874; it was in 1864.

Mr. LISTER. 1869, I mean. From that time up the people of the country took advantage of the bankruptcy law for the purpose of ridding themselves of the liabilities which they could not otherwise get released from. The year 1864 was before confederation. When my hon. friend talks about the increase of the public debt, I often wonder, in listening to this speech for the past thirteen years or fourteen years, that the Finance Minister has not taken up the figures of the hon. gentleman and given them to the House and to the country as the correct condition of affairs, but, strange to say, he seems to prefer his own figures and to ignore those of the hon. gentleman. Now, the hon. gentleman tells us that during the four years Mr. Mackenzie was in power, the debt was increased \$8,000,000 per annum. That is correct, I believe. He tells us that in the seventeen years of protection the debt of the country has been increased on an average of six million dollars a year. There he stops. Frank, honest individual

Mr. LISTER.

that he is, he would have the House believe that he was fairly stating the condition of affairs. Does not the hon. gentleman know—student that he is and lecturer of other people—that when Sir John Macdonald was defeated in 1874, he left fourteen million dollars of liabilities and not one dollar in the treasury to meet them? Why does not the hon. gentleman come out and be honest in his statement? Why does he make arguments and statements calculated to mislead the public? The public debt under Mr. Mackenzie was contracted to meet the obligations of the Administration that preceded him—men who had piled up the debt millions of dollars, and whose successors in policy and principles he wants to-day, in the face of the impoverished condition of the country, to be retained in office, in order that they may go on adding to our debt. And the hon. gentleman tells the people: Never mind, let them go on increasing it, you will never have to pay the debt. Why, they might go on increasing it by billions instead of by millions, if the hon. gentleman's argument was correct. Let us see what was the financial condition of the country as stated by Sir Leonard Tilley, when the Government of Sir John Macdonald went out of office and was replaced by the Mackenzie Administration. Sir Leonard Tilley said:

We are entering upon new and increased engagements which will require a very large amount of money, we are entering upon works which will require a large increase of our debt. We have \$10,000,000 to expend on the Intercolonial, \$30,000,000 for the Canadian Pacific Railway, and the canal system, which has been accepted by the Government, will involve an expenditure of at least \$20,000,000. These are serious matters, as they will add \$60,000,000 to our existing debt.

That was the speech of Sir Leonard Tilley, the Finance Minister of the Government which preceded the Mackenzie Administration. That was the state of affairs at the time Sir John Macdonald's Government went out of power. These were the liabilities which the Mackenzie Administration was called upon to meet, and remember, Sir, that when Sir John Macdonald left power he had cleaned out the treasury. There was not one dollar in it. And yet this frank individual, this honest member, the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) gets up and tells us that the Mackenzie Administration added \$8,000,000 per year to the debt, as against \$6,000,000 per year added by the Administration he now supports. The hon. gentleman seems to have an obtuseness that one can hardly explain as being consistent with complete frankness.

He takes remarkable credit from the fact that the exports of this country are increasing, and that the great factor in that increase is the National Policy. What, in the name of common sense, has the protective duty on imports to do with increasing our exports? Why, it has no more to do with

it than anything you can imagine. The exports of a country are regulated by the demands of foreign markets, and unless you levy a duty on exports, you cannot affect them by your tariff in any way. But the exports of the country show that our farmers are able to grow more products than our own country requires, that our own home market can consume, and consequently they send them abroad, and with the money they get in return, they have to buy the goods which they require at increased prices owing to the tariff imposed on our imports. Therefore, by your protective policy you reduce the profits of the farmers by enhancing the cost of everything they require for their own consumption.

Then the hon. gentleman talked about the export of cattle, the export of minerals, the export of timber. Again, I ask him, what has our protective tariff to do with our exports? Absolutely nothing. Our exports furnished no argument at all in favour of our tariff, because our tariff does not affect the price we get for them one way or the other. It affects the prices of our imports to the consumer by increasing their cost, but does not procure for him any additional price for what he has to export.

My hon. friend says that wages have increased. With unctuous voice and look, he turned up the old census of 1891 and figured from that, and he asked whether anybody could deny the figures he gave. Wages in Canada have increased, he said, on account of the National Policy. Why, the hon. gentleman is ignorant of the most elementary rule of political economy. Does he not know that labour is free to travel from one place to another? Does he not know that wherever wages are high, workmen will flock for employment. Does he not know that labour regulates itself? And labour cannot be higher in Canada than in the United States, because if it were, labourers would come from the United States to compete for employment here at higher wages, and the result would be a fall in the price. It is utterly impossible to increase the price of labour by protection. Have wages increased in Canada? I leave hon. gentlemen to answer for themselves; but I would ask if there has been an increase in Canada, has not there been an increase throughout the whole world? Have not wages increased in England during the last seventeen years? in Germany? in the United States? in every quarter of the world? So that, so far as the increase of wages in Canada is concerned, if such an increase has taken place at all, it is only in keeping up with the wage market throughout the whole civilized world. I state again that wages have not increased, that the labourers of this country are not employed, that to-day there is more destitution in Canada than people have any idea of, that it is more difficult for a labouring man to-day to make a living for his family than it has ever been in the history of the country before.

But, my hon. friend says, here is an evidence of the prosperity, here is an evidence of the great National Policy—we have been exporting agricultural implements away off to Australia; we have exported some hundreds of thousands of agricultural implements, and he compared the exports of these articles with the export of this class of goods in 1878. Sir, does not the hon. gentleman know that this policy has worked out the ruin, the absolute ruin, of almost every agricultural implement manufacturer in the Dominion of Canada? Does he not know that throughout the province of Ontario we had some 17 or 18 of these implement manufactories in 1879? In almost every small town was to be found an establishment for the manufacture of agricultural implements, employing from ten to twenty-five or thirty men. And, to-day, every one of these factories, I believe, without a single exception, are closed up, and the whole business is done by one great concern, the Massey-Harris Company of Toronto. To-day, that trade is in the hands of a monopoly because the policy of the Government has destroyed utterly every other concern of a similar nature throughout the country. This one stands alone, and it has absorbed the others, and is supplying the whole country with whatever agricultural implements may be required. Again, take the cotton industry of the country. In 1879, and for some years before that, we had cotton mills in various places throughout the country—in Hamilton, Dundas, Brantford, Montreal, and many other places. Hundreds of thousands of dollars were invested in these industries, the money of people many of whom were ill able to afford the loss of it, people who depended upon the income derived from their investments in this industry. Why, Sir, every dollar, every shilling of that money was lost to the original investors, and every one of the establishments, with one exception, I believe, is now under control of one company. That exception is the factory of Mr. Gibson, in Marysville. Many of the factories throughout the country are closed up, and all that are working, with the exception I have stated, are worked by the combination, which limits the production so that they may be able to charge every single cent the protective tariff will allow. Almost every industry of any importance throughout the country has been brought to this condition of monopoly by the resistless and inevitable working of this so-called protective policy, which is, and must ever be, a force for the destruction of the small manufacturers by their absorption of the larger and the formation of combinations by those who are able to hold out, with a view to limiting production and fixing prices at the highest figures, to the heavy cost of the consumers of the country.

Now, my hon. friend pointed out, with apparent satisfaction, the fact that we had increased the export of eggs. This was, no

doubt, gratifying to him. His argument would go to prove that in 1879 the hens were not doing their duty. But, so far as this item of export is concerned, what I have said as to the tariff affecting exports, applies with equal force to it as to others. Then, the hon. gentleman says that our farmers supplied the home market. This home-market reasoning is wholly fallacious. If the farmer does not supply the goods to the home market, if he does not supply the articles for consumption in the neighbouring town, he will only have the more for the purpose of export. And he receives no greater price at home than he would for export, because the ultimate market fixes the price, and the price in the neighbouring town is the price in the British market, less the cost of transportation. Then he follows this up with the old argument, that goods are cheaper than they were in 1879. Admitted, Mr. Speaker; but what makes them cheaper? Is it because high protective duties are levied upon these goods? Is it not, rather, because of the fact that we have been steadily advancing, that mechanical ingenuity has devised new means to produce what we require, and produce it more cheaply than before? Never in the history of the world were goods so cheap as they are to-day; never were there such great facilities for manufacturing. And for these reasons prices must necessarily fall. Why, Sir, so great are the facilities for manufacturing that it is inevitable throughout the world that periods of depression must frequently come round, for over-production must frequently take place, and the result of that must be stagnation and paralysis of trade until consumption overtakes production.

Hon. gentlemen opposite are very fond of stating—but they state it in the country more frequently than here—that the real difference between the Liberal and Conservative parties in the next election is the question of free trade and protection. Sir, that statement cannot be contradicted too often, for that is not the real issue dividing the two parties. That cannot, under the circumstances, be the real issue, and it is improper to mislead the public upon that question. The real issue between the parties is, whether we shall continue to have a protective tariff, or whether we shall adopt a revenue tariff, a tariff bearing heavily upon luxuries and as lightly as possible upon the necessaries of life.

Mr. DAVIN. Is that the issue?

Mr. LISTER. That is the issue, Mr. Speaker; at least, that is the greatest issue. The position of the Liberals is fairly set forth in the platform adopted by the convention held in the city of Ottawa. But, in spite of that, hon. gentlemen opposite continue to tell their people throughout the country, that the question between us is the question of free trade and protection, and they will go on saying, as my hon. friend from East Grey

Mr. LISTER.

did, that, if the present system is abolished, those on this side of the House would be bound to favour a resort to direct taxation, and that the people will have to pay double the taxes they do to-day. How the hon. gentleman works that out, is more than I can understand. But we have this fact—that a revenue tariff is the easiest way of collecting the money necessary for governmental purposes. We have the further fact, that this is the way the revenue of the country has been raised for many years. And we have, still further, the fact, that the people of the country probably feel a customs tax less severely than they would any other tax, because they really do not know how much they have to pay in the form of taxes. The question, therefore, is not a question of free trade versus protection, it is a question of a revenue tariff versus protection. The hon. gentlemen would have the country believe that the policy they have been worshipping for the last seventeen and a half years is so perfect that it is impossible to improve it, is so perfect that any interference with it would have the effect of disturbing seriously the trade of the country. Hon. gentlemen know, and it is an open secret, that a protective tariff was adopted by Sir John A. Macdonald and his followers, not because they believed in the principle of protection, but because they believed the country was in such a position at the time that protection would take with the people, and in that way they would ride into power. Sir, it is well known that Sir Charles Tupper, who was the Opposition financial critic at that time, believed that in 1878 the hon. member for South Oxford intended to increase the tariff. It is well known that he sat in this House prepared to make a free trade speech against the proposition of the then Finance Minister; but when he found that there was to be no increase in the tariff, he asked for an adjournment, and he appeared in the House afterwards and made a protectionist speech. We have the evidence of Mr. Galt, the Finance Minister of the Conservative Government in those days, in which he speaks strongly against a protective tariff, and in favour of reciprocity with the United States. This is what he said:

Take the interests of the several provinces. Take, for instance, the interests of the province of Ontario. Can any one desire anything else than that their white wheat, their barley, sawn lumber, cattle, and a vast variety of other things should go free into the United States, their best and most convenient market? Can any one say that it would be less advantageous to Ontario that such should be the state of things rather than what obtains now? Certainly it must be that free access to the American market would be better, and, pro tanto, what would be better for Ontario would unquestionably be so for the other provinces. The province of Quebec has felt these restrictions upon trade more than any other province. The productions of Quebec are not of a character that will bear export to Eu-

rope, and the interests of that province are unquestionably in the direction of a restoration of free trade with the United States as early as possible.

That, Sir, is what Sir Alexander Galt, the Finance Minister of the Liberal-Conservative party in those days, says, that the restoration of free trade with the United States, as early as possible, was most desirable.

I therefore ask the members from Quebec to consider very deliberately whether they are pursuing a wise policy in sustaining the Government in anything that will have a tendency to excite the animosity of the people on the other side of the line, and thereby postpone the restoration of free trade relations, which the interests of this province most strongly demand. New Brunswick and Nova Scotia have the same interests in the question. There is the very important question of the employment of the shipping, the sale of fish, and the production in the case of Nova Scotia of coarse grains to a very considerable amount that have found their way to the United States in former days, and of coal and sawn lumber. Well, Sir, under the circumstances, I think there can be no doubt as to the desirability of having free trade with the United States, and I contend that with these considerations before us, we should not take any course that will tend to postpone free trade beyond the earliest possible day; and I tell hon. gentlemen that any change in the policy of this country in regard to duties upon American produce, anything in the way of retaliation, is a most unwise and unstatesman-like policy to adopt.

Those are the words of Sir Alexander Galt, the then Finance Minister of the Conservative Government, and those words are as powerful to-day as they were the day on which they were uttered. I have stated that neither Sir Charles Tupper nor Sir John A. Macdonald were protectionists; and I have also stated that when they supposed that it was the intention of the Liberal Government to increase the duties upon imports from 17½ to 20 per cent, Sir Charles Tupper had prepared, and was ready to make, a free-trade speech in opposition to the proposal of the Government; but when he found that that was not the proposal of the Government, and being bound to oppose the Government under any circumstances, he appeared in the House and made a protectionist speech, laying down the policy of protection, and going to the country upon that policy, and carrying the country by it. From that time forward, hon. gentlemen like my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) have never been tired of praising the beauties of the National Policy. Even the leaders of the Government of to-day pretended to be in favour of reciprocity in 1891. We have had this protective policy up to 1891. At that time, distress prevailed in every section of the country. The people believed, as the fact was, that enormous sums were being extorted from them, not only by the Government, but by certain protected manufacturers in the country. An agitation pervaded the

country from one end to the other in favour of finding new markets, in the hope that those new markets would relieve the congested condition of affairs, and restore prosperity to our industries. Then, Sir, in order to keep power, the Conservative Government of that day, in a characteristic way, said: We are prepared to go in for reciprocity with the United States. This, remember, although they had denounced it year after year, although their followers had said that they did not want reciprocity with the United States, the Government made a sudden turn and announced to the country that representations had been made by the Secretary of State of the United States Government, to this country, with a view to negotiations for reciprocity, when, as a matter of fact, no such negotiations had ever been entered into by the United States Government. At all events, in 1891, the Government went to the country—upon what principle? Upon what question? The whole question at that election was the question of reciprocity. It was not protection, it was not free trade. We had been in favour of reciprocity for years and years; we had advocated it upon every platform; the people believed in it; the Government saw they would be defeated, and so they adopted the policy of the Liberal party. They turned round from being protectionists and became, in a sense, free traders, or reciprocity men, and they went to the country upon that question. Why, Sir, my hon. friend from North Middlesex (Mr. Hutchins)—just to show you how that election was worked—was only returned by some forty odd majority. He printed a lot of little slips that he sent from his mill to everybody, saying: If you want \$20 more for your horses, if you want 10 or 15 cents a bushel more for your barley, if you want more for your oats, vote for Hutchins, the candidate of a reciprocity treaty in this country. Upon every platform throughout the country, these men advocated reciprocity. They came forward and said: Why, we are in favour of reciprocity, we have dissolved Parliament for the purpose of negotiating a treaty with the United States, and giving to the Canadian farmer the markets of the United States for his products. And, Sir, many Conservatives were prepared to believe that. They also said to the people of the country: Why, if you put these Reformers in power, your cattle will be scheduled in the home market. They threatened the farmers, they made them believe that they were honestly endeavouring to secure what the people wanted, and on that ground they received thousands and thousands of votes which they would not otherwise have got. I have no hesitation in saying that if the Government had not resorted to that device in 1891, they would have been defeated, they would have been defeated at the polls upon the question of reciprocity with the United States.

But, as I say, upon every platform they met us with this statement: We are in favour of reciprocity; vote for the old man; it is the last time you may ever have a chance of giving him a vote. His policy and the Grits' policy is the same; vote for him and his Government will give the people reciprocity. Sir, as a matter of fact, they never made any negotiations with the United States, but they did send a commission to Washington for that pretended purpose. As a matter of fact, they grossly deceived the electorate of this country from one end to the other. Sir, that shows that these men are not honest when they say as my hon. friend said a few moments ago: Why, we do not want reciprocity with the United States, we do not want this Government to reduce the duties, we want to keep them as they are. I blame the leader, he says, for reducing the duties in 1892. But, Sir, we had Sir Charles Tupper in 1877 a free trader, and the Government went to the country in 1871 on the question of reciprocity, claiming to be the party of reciprocity, the party that could give the people of the country a reciprocity treaty with the United States. Then they found this beautiful figure, this magnificent structure called the National Policy, perfect in all its parts, if we are to believe the statements made by hon. gentlemen opposite. In 1892 Sir John Thompson said that we must lop off the mouldering branches. We then had for the first time the statement made by the Government, which had always previously been denied by their followers, that a protective tariff was a tax. They had always claimed that it was no taxation and no burden on the country, but we got them to admit that by taking off certain duties they reduced taxation to the people. By their statement they admitted in plain terms that the duty they had imposed was taxation. In the election of 1891 these men were compelled to promise that they would take the duty off sugar. When they came to Parliament they took off the duty. Why? Because sugar was nearly double the price here it was in the United States, and so strongly had the feeling become in the country that the Finance Minister was compelled to come before Parliament and strike the duty off that article. While they were pretending to be reducing and taking off what they admitted were burdens, the Finance Minister and hon. gentlemen opposite will remember what occurred. The hotels of this city were filled with delegations from every section of the country, every interest was represented here, every influence that could be brought to bear on the Government and their followers was brought to bear in the most striking manner. The Government were threatened that unless they agreed to the wishes of these men they would withdraw their support and would no longer furnish funds to the Government for election purposes. Every threat was made by

Mr. LISTER.

the different interests, and when the Finance Minister pretended to reduce the duties on certain articles he came down to the House the very next day and said the reductions were mere clerical errors, and the duties were restored. I venture to say that the result of the so-called tariff revision was that the duties were left higher than they were before.

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

After Recess.

NELSON AND FORT SHEPPARD RAILWAY.

House resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 26) respecting the Nelson and Port Sheppard Railway Company.—(Mr. Mara.)

(In the Committee.)

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Where is the promoter of the Bill? I want some information.

Mr. FOSTER. I move that the committee rise and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I object to the committee proceeding with any Bill—

Mr. FOSTER. I have already moved that the committee rise.

Committee rose and reported progress.

ST. LAWRENCE AND OTTAWA RAILWAY.

House resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 25) respecting the St. Lawrence and Ottawa Railway Company.—(Mr. McLeod.)

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I should like to obtain some information in respect to this Bill.

Mr. McLEOD. This Bill is one respecting the St. Lawrence and Ottawa Railway Company. The Canadian Pacific Railway has a lease of this road with its property, and there are some lots of land in Ottawa that are not productive. The company simply desire leave to sell those lots and appropriate the proceeds for improvements on the road, and substituting iron for wooden bridges.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

SUPPLY—THE BUDGET.

Mr. LISTER. When the hon. gentlemen who now occupy the Treasury benches were in opposition, and seeking to obtain posses-

sion of the comfortable places which they now hold, they represented to the country that the Government of Mr. Mackenzie was extravagant and corrupt.

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. LISTER. My hon. friend says "hear, hear," and no doubt he believes that the charges then made were correct. Sir Leonard Tilley, supposed to be an estimable man, then Finance Minister, iterated and reiterated these charges throughout the country, and pledged himself that if the people would return the Conservatives to power, he would reduce the public expenditure by at least \$1,000,000 a year. You will remember, Mr. Speaker, that at that time our annual expenditure amounted to about \$23,500,000, or, in other words, Mr. Mackenzie during his five years term of office had increased the annual expenditure by about \$200,000. Sir Leonard Tilley then pledged himself to the country, that the Government which he was opposing was extravagant and corrupt, and that if the people would endorse Sir John Macdonald and his colleagues, he would reduce that expenditure to \$22,500,000. Sir, seventeen years have passed since then, and from the moment these gentlemen opposite took office, up to the present, the expenditure has gone on increasing year after year, until to-day we are confronted with the enormous annual expenditure of \$38,000,000. And, Sir, the ex-Minister of Justice had the effrontery to stand up in this House and tell us, that this enormous burden of taxation could be borne by the people, that in fact it was not enough, and that it was the intention of the Government to increase that expenditure to at least \$40,000,000 a year. That statement is of the most alarming character. The people of this country are now crushed down by taxation: the property of this country, from one end of it to the other, is depreciated, and I only state the fact when I allege, that farm property in Canada has depreciated by at least 40 per cent of the value of what it was six or seven years ago. Why, only a short time ago in the city of London, a widow was placed in the witness box to give testimony as to the value of her farm, bought twelve years ago for \$6,000. Her husband had been killed in a railway accident and the property was sold, and she swore, that after cultivating the farm as well as the old homestead had been cultivated, and after having the place well kept up in every particular, that property sold last spring for \$3,000, the amount of the mortgage upon it, and that was the highest price obtainable. That is but one instance of the condition of affairs all through the province of Ontario. Take the great city of Toronto, if you will, and I say here confidently, that the depreciation of property in that city is more than 40 per cent of its value seven years ago. Go, if you will, to the city of London, go to every town and village throughout this land, and

the same story is to be told. Take the farming districts and the same condition of affairs exists there, in face of the fact that these hon. gentlemen opposite told us that the National Policy was to restore good times, and that bad times would never come again while that policy was in force. We were told by these hon. gentlemen opposite, that the National Policy would not only restore good times but that it would keep them good; that it would give to the labourers and mechanics of the country work; that it would have the effect of establishing large manufactories in every village; that it would have the effect of attracting large immigration to this country; that it would have the effect of increasing the price of products to the farmers of this country, and in fact, we were told, it would have every beneficent effect that it was possible for the ingenuity of these men to promise to the people. Sir, what a change has come over the spirit of their dreams. While such men as my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) tells us about the effect of the National Policy upon the farmers and labourers and mechanics of Canada; we have the statement of the Finance Minister himself, that in spite of all the Government can do, cycles of depression will come round. That was the first time such a statement was made by hon. gentlemen opposite; the first time that they ever admitted that they were powerless to stem the tide of bad times. If, then, the National Policy has not restored good times and maintained good times, of what possible benefit can it be? If we are to be enormously taxed for the purpose of retaining this policy, and if it is not profitable to the people of the country, what object can there be in keeping it on the statute-books? When my hon. friend (Sir Richard Cartwright) was Minister of Finance, he stated frankly the fact, that it was in the power of no Government to give the people good times by legislation, and that the only thing that could be done to benefit the public at large, was to leave as much money as possible in their pockets, and to take as little as possible for the public needs. He told the people that it was impossible to restore good times by a statute, and that cycles of depression would appear from time to time, in Canada, as in every other country. We all know that in 1877 and 1878, the depressed condition of affairs was not peculiar to Canada, but was experienced also by the United States and by the countries of continental Europe. In the face of all that, these hon. gentlemen opposite said, that they, the wizards of the north, could, by raising their wand, in the shape of a statute, and swinging it over their head, bring back good times to the people of Canada. They have been singing that old song ever since, notwithstanding the fact, that we have to-day the most disastrous condition of affairs in this country that I believe we have ever

had since we were a Dominion. Who are the flies on the wheel now? Why do you not bring back good times? What do you complain about? If you were able to do it in 1878, why do you not do it now? Why do you not bring up the value of farm lands? Why do you not get the labourers of this country employment at profitable wages?

Some hon. MEMBERS. So we do.

Mr. LISTER. Why do you allow the citizens of Ottawa to pray that the snow may fall every day, so that they may get the job of cleaning it away in order to get bread for their families? Why do you allow workingmen in Toronto to go all the year round without being able to get employment? Pass an Act; swing your wand; bring back good times if you can; if you cannot, you are fakirs. Why, Sir, when the hon. member for Cape Breton (Sir Charles Tupper) was in opposition, and the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) said it was not in the power of a Government to restore good times by legislation, what did he say? He said: No man is worthy of the name of a statesman unless he can give back to the people good times, profitable employment and a prosperous condition of affairs. Where is that worthy now? Or was that one of his stretches of imagination for which he has become so famous? If he could do it then, we ask him, we conjure him, to do it now, and prove that he is the power he pretended to be away back in 1878.

These hon. gentlemen have been throwing dust in the eyes of the public. They would have the people of this country believe that they, with their magic wand, have something to do with the exports of the country. We have the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) getting up and telling us, with magnificently rounded sentences, how tremendously the exports of this country have increased during the last seventeen years. Why, Sir, the exports of the country depend upon the industry of the people of the country; and the Government have no more power to interfere with them than a man in the uttermost part of the earth. The workingmen and the farmers are the men who are entitled to all the credit; and it comes with bad grace from these gentlemen—because it looks as if they were trying to deceive the public—to suggest that their policy has anything whatever to do with the exportations of the country. What have they to do with the exports of cheese? It is the farmers throughout the country who make the cheese and send it to the best market. The only thing these hon. gentlemen could do, and perhaps they will do it yet, is to put an export duty on cheese. They put an export duty on saw-logs, and they may put one on cheese and eggs. That is the only way they could influence the price of these articles to the disadvantage

Mr. LISTER.

of the people who have to export them. What has their legislation to do with cattle? Cattle are raised by the farmers of the country, and are exported to the country that will pay the highest price for them. If in the face of your policy, injurious as it is, the country is reasonably prosperous, and is making some progress, you are not to be thanked for it, because you have placed every possible obstacle in the way of the advancement and prosperity of the people of this country.

Sir, there seems to be nothing which these hon. gentlemen will not resort to for the purpose of carrying their point. In 1891 they went before the country on the cry of reciprocity with the United States. If they succeeded then, it was on the policy of the Liberal party which they took up, and because they told the people that if they were returned to power they would secure reciprocity; and there are men sitting in this House, dozens of them, now supporting the so-called National Policy, who went on the platform and told the people solemnly that the Conservative Government were pledged to secure to the farmers and the people of this country reciprocal trade with the United States. They were returned upon that cry, and if they had not taken it up, they would have been overwhelmingly defeated at the polls. They came back to this House with a majority of 25 or 26 or perhaps more; but, Sir, they put their tongue in their cheek and laughed at the men they had deluded. They made no honest effort to get reciprocity. The statement they made before going to the country was false in every particular, as was admitted by Sir Charles Tupper himself confessing that the statement of the Secretary of State of the United States was true, namely, that there had been no approach by the Government of the United States to this Government with a view to reciprocal trade.

Then, Sir, in addition to all that, they pointed out to the farmers of the country what a magnificent trade had grown up between Great Britain and Canada in the matter of cattle; and they said: "Allow these Liberals to get into power, and Great Britain will schedule your cattle, because American cattle will be allowed to come into Canada on certain terms; but retain us in power, and we pledge ourselves that the facilities and privileges you now have for shipping your cattle to the English market shall be continued." Sir, in three short months after these gentlemen were returned to power Great Britain scheduled the cattle from Canada, and Canada to-day occupies the same position that the United States does in the British market.

Sir, the Government of this country sold the great farming and industrial population of the country—the labouring classes and the mechanics. They sold them to their masters. The great National Policy could not be disturbed, because their masters said that it should not be; and rather than re-

fuse them, rather than do justice to the great mass of the people of the country, they failed to carry out what they had promised, and yielded to the dictation of the men who had dictated the tariff which was adopted a few years ago. In olden times, Mr. Speaker, there was a despot who imposed tyranny upon the people, and called it liberty. This Government impose upon the people of this country a crushing taxation, and they call it protection. There is no man who gives the matter a moment's consideration, I think, but must confess that the imposition of taxes is a burden. The less the taxes are, the less the burden is; the higher the taxes are, the more the burden is. We admit that we must have taxes. It is admitted by all that the country must be governed, and for the purpose of carrying on the governmental machinery, it is necessary that the people of the country, who are protected in life and property by the laws of Parliament, should contribute for the purpose of meeting the expenses of government. That, Sir, is admitted; but I claim that we should take from the people of the country as little as it is possible to take. If you take from the people of the country a dollar where half a dollar should be sufficient, you are taking out of circulation, and depriving the individual of a certain proportion of the money that should be used for the purpose of carrying on his individual business. In other words, you are appropriating to yourselves, without consideration, without anything being given in return, a certain amount of money from every individual in the community. That, Sir, is wrong; that cannot be justified. I take it that there is no man who will contend that taxation should not be as light as possible, although hon. gentlemen opposite say that the effect of their taxation is not to increase the prices of products—not to burden the people; but that its effect is to give them employment, and that they are more than compensated by the employment given to the labouring and artisan classes, and by the reduction in the prices of manufactured goods. These are two statements that are not correct, because, as I attempted to point out before recess, the effect of protection was to tempt individuals who saw their neighbours making larger sums by reason of the tariff to invest their money recklessly in like enterprises, and the result has been simply disastrous. As a protected country cannot be an exporting country, the result, further, is that production overtakes consumption and causes stagnation and paralysis of business. All through this country are monuments, in every village, town and city, showing how men have been deceived, showing that millions of dollars have been utterly destroyed, which might as well have been thrown into the lakes. Families and fortunes have been wrecked, and any property remaining from this vast expendi-

ture has fallen into the hands of a few men who were able to stand the storm, and who took advantage of the tariff by manufacturing sufficiently for the wants of their local markets and fixing the price so as to bring it within or quite up to the tariff mark. Only the other day a gentleman who supports the hon. gentlemen opposite told me he had been informed in his town that cotton in this country was cheaper than it could be imported for from England. For the purpose of testing this, he sent over to England for two bales of cotton of superior quality such as were shown to him. He paid the duty, and it cost him two-pence halfpenny a yard cheaper than he could buy it from the cotton agents in Montreal. If you take that for an example, and go the whole round, you will see that in the case of almost every article, the price is fixed according to the amount of duty charged.

I charge the Government with having been extravagant. The public expenditure of this country has been going upwards by leaps and bounds. There has been no restraint exercised by the Government on the public expenditure at all. They seemed to think that it was necessary, in order to secure themselves in office, to expend vast sums out of the treasury of the country. Let me give you some idea of the amount collected in taxes in this country. In 1878 we collected \$22,375,000. In 1894 we collected \$36,374,000, or nearly fourteen millions more than in 1878; and in addition to the enormous expenditure of last year, we have the further fact that its receipts do not come within \$4,500,000 of meeting its expenditure. And in addition to all that, we had, as we do every year, to go to the British market and become borrowers. Our public debt is rolling up from year to year. Our fixed charges for interest are increasing from year to year, and yet the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) tells the people of this country that that is no burden on the people, inasmuch as they will never have to pay the debt. Will they not have to pay the debt? If they will not, they certainly have to pay the interest every year. And it is an alarming fact that we are paying to-day in interest nearly one-third of our total receipts. Millions of dollars are going out of the country from year to year to pay to the English bondholders the interest on the debt which we have created. One-third of the total taxation nearly of this country, is expended in the payment of interest alone, or over \$10,000,000. In 1878 the expenditure was \$23,500,000; in 1895 it was \$38,132,000, or an increase of \$15,500,000 in the public expenditure since 1878. If this country were increasing in population, if we were drawing population from the older countries of the world, there might be some excuse for it. But when we remember that in the last ten years, the increase of population was a beggarly 500,000, there can be no

justification for the enormous increase in the expenditure of the country. Look for a moment at the public debt. In 1878 it was \$174,957,000; in 1895 it was \$317,048,000; that is to say, an increase in seventeen years of \$143,191,000. Take the net debt if you will. In 1878 it was \$140,000,000, and in 1894 \$253,000,000, or an increase of \$102,722,000 during those years. What does that mean? It means a debt per head on every man, woman and child in this country of \$49.03, while the debt in the United States per capita is only \$23.93, or our debt per head in the Dominion is \$26.10 more than it is in the United States; and yet these men have the audacity to get up and try to persuade the people that Canada is a prosperous country, the most prosperous under the sun. In 1878 they called Sir Richard Cartwright a mixer and muddler of figures. They said: if you return us to power you will find no more deficits, your income will always be sufficient to meet the expenditure, there will be no ugly deficits to explain. Well, these men have been in power, and the largest deficit this country has ever seen occurred in a time of profound peace, and when they said the country was in a prosperous condition, namely, the year ending the 30th June, 1895. That one deficit was nearly as large as all the deficits that took place during the time of the Mackenzie Administration. Or, in other words, these men have had during these years \$15,000,000 of deficits, and heaven only knows how much they will have in the future. It seems to me that we are not at the end. My hon. friend the Finance Minister boasted in the House that he had reduced the people's burdens by taking the duty off sugar more than it had ever been taken off at one time by any one Government, but within a couple of short years he restored the duty, not before, however, a great many of his friends had succeeded in getting in many hundreds of thousands of pounds of sugar.

The interest on the public debt in 1878 was \$7,048,883, and in 1895 it was \$10,466,294, although, as a matter of fact, the rate of interest has been largely reduced. We know that in 1878 the rate of interest was much higher than it has been in recent years; but in face of this fact, comparing a high rate of interest in 1878 with a low rate in 1894, we find that the interest upon our public debt has increased from \$7,048,000 to \$10,466,000, and it absorbs nearly one-third of the revenue of the Dominion. We know that in 1878 the rate of interest was much higher than it has been in recent years. But, notwithstanding this, we find that the interest charge upon the total debt has increased from \$7,048,000 to \$10,466,000. It is nearly one-third the total revenue of Canada. And the rate of taxation per head in Canada is \$5.49, as against \$4.11 in the United States. The ex-Controller of Customs (Mr. Wallace), in one of his meetings

Mr. LISTER.

in the country, stated that the people paid duties of only 20 per cent, while under Mr. Mackenzie they paid 17 per cent. Sir, the rate of taxation upon dutiable goods in this country averages almost, if not quite, 33 per cent. In 1891 hon. gentlemen opposite were very eager, indeed, for reciprocity. In 1892 and subsequent years, their zeal seems to have relaxed to some extent. We hear nothing now about reciprocity, we hear nothing about any efforts being made to secure the markets of United States for Canada. In fact, when hon. gentlemen opposite speak upon the subject at all, they are rather opposed to having anything to do with the Americans. It would almost seem as if it were an unpatriotic thing to send our goods to the United States. They seem to think they can make some arrangements with Great Britain whereby she will put taxes upon the products of other countries and allow our goods to enter her markets free, we giving her certain compensating advantages. Now, let us look, for one single moment, at the position of this question. We exported to Great Britain last year, \$61,856,000 of the products of Canada, made up principally of fish, products of the farm, timber, lumber, and so on. During the same time we exported to the United States, \$41,297,000. While our exports to the United States were less than our exports to Great Britain, it must not be forgotten that in some years our exports to the United States make up the larger figure. But even on the figures I have given, we find that we exported to the United States, even with a high tariff, within about \$20,000,000 of what we exported to Great Britain, with no tariff at all. If we could have sold that \$41,000,000 worth of goods in Great Britain to greater advantage than we sold them in the United States we would have sent them there, for we could have done so without meeting any tariff obstacles. But we sent \$41,000,000 worth of goods to the United States because we could get more for them than we could in England or in any other country. Some may say it may be true that you exported these goods to the United States, but the Yankees paid the duty upon them. I contend that our exports to the United States are of that class of goods upon which the importers do not pay anything like the whole duty. I contend that the Americans pay but a small percentage of the duty, if any at all. And why? Because we export to the United States, articles which they produce in sufficient quantities to meet their own wants. Therefore, in order to get the goods from Canada into that country the Canadian exporter must pay the way into the markets. Talk to a man who exports lambs or with a man who exports lumber to the United States, and he will tell you that but for the duty he would receive so much more for the goods he sends over. So, if we could get into that market free, it would mean an

enormous saving to the people of this country on the great exports which they send to the United States, and an amount four or five times greater than we send to all the other countries in the world, except Great Britain. Therefore, I say, as Sir Alexander Galt said, that that market is of the greatest importance not only to Ontario, but to the maritime provinces. Now, let us look at the imports. We imported for consumption from Great Britain, \$31,131,000, while from the United States we imported for consumption, \$54,634,000. That shows the enormous trade carried on between the United States and Canada, a trade which might be increased enormously, as it was under the reciprocity treaty which formerly existed between these two countries. They want certain products which we can sell to them, and it pays us to send them to that market. As my hon. friend from North Middlesex (Mr. Hutchins) said in his campaign in 1891; If you want 20 per cent more for your horses, if you want more for your barley, more for your oats, vote for me, because I support the Government that is in favour of reciprocal trade with the United States. Sir, the total trade between Canada and Great Britain is \$92,987,000, while our aggregate trade with the United States is \$95,931,000, or \$2,944,000 more than it is with Great Britain. Is there any man who will consider this question intelligently who will say that if we could strike down the barriers between the United States and Canada to a greater or less extent, it would not be of incalculable benefit to the farmers and to all classes in the Dominion of Canada? But, Sir, we set that to one side, and we take up visionary ideas and give the go-by to those reforms that will bring genuine benefit to the people of Canada. We subsidize steamship lines to Australia for the purpose of helping the trade of Canada—steamship lines running to a country that produces the same things that we produce, and produces them at cheaper prices. We subsidize fast lines—at least we intend to do it—to run between Canada and Great Britain, although we have abundant shipping upon the seas to do all the carrying that is to be done. We have all kinds of schemes involving enormous expenditure, instead of husbanding our resources. Instead of giving the people of the country a chance to restore themselves as fast as it is possible, to a condition of prosperity, we keep on with the bleeding process, drawing away their strength, day after day, month after month, year after year. And these deluded people supporting the Government of the day, listen when they are told that they are not hard up. They are told, your lands are not mortgaged. You do not find it hard to make a living, you are not hard up. It is all a mistake to suppose you are.

And so the people submit to further bleeding. But now the friends of the ex-Minister of Justice say, why, it is not nearly enough yet, we must have at least \$40,000,000. Sir,

let us look again at this wonderful system which the hon. gentlemen have inaugurated. They told us that it was to bring prosperity to the country; they told us that our trade was to be extended. They simply ignored entirely to elementary principle that a protective country can have but a limited foreign trade. You cannot sell unless you buy. To show that fact beyond any question, look at the blue-books of the Government as to our shipping industry. Why, Sir, in 1878, the tonnage of vessels built in Canada was 106,976; in 1895 the tonnage was 18,728, or a falling off of 88,248 tons. It is practically extinct. Upon the upper lakes of this country, vessels that were built twenty years ago are the only vessels now sailing, except the Beattie Line and the Canadian Pacific Railway boats. In every harbour you find old vessels rotting to pieces, but no new ships upon the stocks. That is the condition of affairs to-day, the policy of this Government has virtually extinguished the shipping industry of this country. Sir, their own blue-books tell a story that cannot be denied, a story that no Canadian can hear but with the deepest possible regret, a story which can be accounted for by one reason alone, and that is that you have placed barriers against the trade of this country, you have prevented the world from trading with us, and you have prevented us from trading with the world. You have granted subsidies to build railways, you have granted subsidies to build tunnels, you have granted subsidies to build bridges, you have done everything that can be done to unite the United States and Canada, but you have erected a tariff wall that renders all these works useless. Our people are isolated, our trade is diminishing, our shipping is practically gone, the country is in a condition of distress such as it never was in before. Let hon. gentlemen talk as they will, let them preach where they like, the facts are as I have stated, and as every one knows them to be. Every man who lives in this country from Vancouver to Prince Edward Island can testify that the statement I make here to-day is true. People are unemployed, farmers are not working at a profit, lands have depreciated in value; in hundreds and thousands of instances, they are not to-day of sufficient value to pay the mortgages upon them. Our trade has not grown as it should have grown. It is a paltry increase, talk as you will. To think that after seventeen years the total trade of Canada is very little more than it was in 1878, is a commentary on the policy of those hon. gentlemen, stronger than any words can express. Now, Mr. Speaker, this system of protection has been in existence for some seventeen years, and we cannot shut our eyes to the fact that during that time interests have come into existence under that tariff which have obtained a certain vested right. Remember, Mr. Speaker, that in every protected country, in the United States as well as Canada, when

a protective tariff is introduced, its supporters say: All we want to do is to foster industries and get them started; the time will come when they will be able to stand alone, and then we will wipe off the tariff. But, Sir, these infants never obtain their majority. Election after election, decade after decade, they come forward and say: We are not able to stand alone; strike down the tariff wall, and you destroy the industries which have been built up. They always think that it is necessary that a high tariff should be imposed for the purpose of keeping them in existence. Be their contention right or wrong, they believe it. They have acquired, in their minds at least, a vested interest; and I say, pernicious as this system is, we cannot fail to recognize the fact that to suddenly destroy a protective system and to go back to sound economic principles might have the effect of disturbing trade for the time being. Although the return to sound economic principles might be justified, although it might be in the interest of the manufacturers themselves, as it certainly would be in the interest of the public at large, a sudden change of system might have the effect of disturbing trade. Therefore, I say that no Government, no intelligent men who might take office, could suddenly go from a high tariff to a revenue tariff. The process must necessarily be slow, a wise judgment must undoubtedly be exercised, the interests of every class in the community must be thoroughly considered. Sir, slow though it may be at first, that is the only possible way to bring back the country to sound economic principles. The Liberal party of this country are not enemies of the manufacturers of Canada, they want them to prosper, they are their friends. We believe that the policy of the Liberal party is a policy that will best advance their interests, and we believe that a high protective policy works an injury to the manufacturers. We believe that a revenue tariff, allowing raw material to be brought in free, would be an advantage to our manufacturing industries. We believe that a heavy tariff has the effect of multiplying industries to the injury of business where the market is a limited market, but there is no such danger where the tariff is a revenue tariff. Sir, this policy of the Liberal party, as I said a moment ago, must be pursued with moderation, must be carried out by business men, according to the dictates of wisdom; all classes of the community must be considered. I am sure I am voicing the feelings of the Liberal party when I say that any sudden change might possibly create a disturbance of the business of the country. Sir, I say this Government has imposed upon the country a system which I contend is pernicious in the extreme; I say they have been guilty of the grossest extravagance in the expenditure of public money; they have taken from the people enormous sums of money unneces-

Mr. LISTER.

sarily; they have added enormously to the public debt, much of it expended on useless public work; the whole governmental machine in the city of Ottawa is saturated with corruption. Hon. gentlemen may complain when we charge them with being guilty of corrupt acts, but the facts are before the world, and they cannot be repeated too often for the sake of those who are to come after them. Why, Sir, we have the fact that an hon. gentleman now occupying a seat in this House, was convicted of conspiring to defraud his country out of hundreds of thousands of dollars. We have the fact that that man, a close friend of the then Minister of Public Works, a man deep in the secrets of the political party to which he belonged, was sentenced to imprisonment by the judge, and we find the Government of this country, after two short months, upon certificates procured, no one knows how, pardoning criminals who have taken from the country hundreds of thousands of dollars. While to-day languishing in the prisons of Canada from one end to the other are to be found convicts who have been convicted of stealing trifling sums or committing trifling crimes, and they are serving their full time, and they will be disgraced for ever afterwards. The men with power and influence use it in some way, and the result of it is that on the pretense of ill-health these men have been released. Why, Sir, I venture to say that there are convicts throughout Canada who are dying through sickness, yet the appeals of those men perhaps are never listened to by the Government. We have in this country voted subsidies to railway companies and construction companies of which members of this House have been members, receiving from the Government of which were members thousands and tens of thousands of dollars, the company handing back money received from the Government to an agent for the purpose of corrupting the electors of this country in order that Canada may continue to be cursed by the Government which now holds office. We have it in evidence that Sir Hector Langevin swore to his election expenses at \$917, while as a matter of fact those expenses amounted to \$13,150, paid to him and borne by the "reptile fund" raised by public contractors and others throughout the country. In other words, every vote cast for Sir Hector Langevin cost \$20—\$20 not of his money, if it came out of his pocket I would not complain so much, corrupt though it be, but what we have is a member of the Government receiving from public contractors, or his agent receiving from public contractors large sums for the purpose of corrupting the constituency, and that very identical money paid out of the coffers of Canada into the hands of an agent used for the purpose of returning that Minister to power. That is but one instance.

In this country public money has been ex-

pended for useless public works, it has been squandered for the purpose of securing seats for members supporting the Government. Need I go further. What do we find? The Minister of Railways when charged with having advocated a plan for the building of the Tay Canal, his defence was not that it was required in the public interest, but he said that no money had been expended in his county and he thought some ought to be expended there. There was the answer of the man. Why was it expended? It was expended there for the purpose of influencing the electors of that county to return the hon. gentleman to this House. There was as much use for that canal as there would be for a ditch off this hill to a point below. The canal was not wanted, there was no use for it; canals such as that are out of date in these days of railways, but something had to be done to expend money. What do we find? The Government undertook the construction of the Tay Canal from the Rideau Canal. They constructed it to Perth, and in order that the member should have more benefit they extended it to his own mills, in order that his mills should have connection with the Tay Canal. That canal cost \$476,178. It costs to keep it up \$2,486 a year, and the total receipts from that magnificent waterway up to 1st January, 1894, were \$135.76. No boat runs on the water except a little boat called the "John Haggart." As a matter of fact the net cost of running that canal is \$2,360 over and above all receipts. Then if you add to that sum the interest on the investment at 4 per cent, you have \$19,045 more, and the cost of maintenance is \$2,486, making a yearly charge on this country of \$21,531.14. The receipts, as I said a moment ago, amounted to \$135.76, and there is a net loss to Canada every year and for all time of \$21,395 annually. I say this is but a type of the waste and extravagance of this Government.

Then we have a lamentable condition of affairs in the county of Northumberland. What do we find there? It is with a feeling of astonishment, surprise and regret that I think in any county in this country there could be found men who would take the position that was taken in that county. We find a committee was appointed to sell positions of keepers of bridges and lighthouses, and an hon. gentleman supporting the Government—I do not say that any part of the money has gone into his pockets—issued certain promissory notes for his own election expenses. The committee was appointed to sell positions in the county for the purpose of paying indebtedness contracted for his election expenses. What do we find? A poor devil named Simpson paid \$200, Gcodrich, Clouston, Brown, May and Fitzgerald paid from \$125 to \$250 each for those positions. They got them. These men who were in such a position in life as to be willing to take positions worth \$200, \$300 or

\$400 a year, were taxed \$250. Sir, no man with any proper feeling can be found who will not resent such a condition of affairs. In the nineteenth century, in an intelligent constituency there have been found men who will use their positions for the purpose of selling public offices with a view to paying election expenses. It is drawing the thing down to a fine point when an hon. gentleman can get elected without any cost to himself, when the Government is good enough to recognize the nominations made and appoint nominees, the nominees giving a quid pro quo such as I have stated. Every department of this country has been proved to be corrupt. A Minister of the Crown appointed Mr. Senécal to the Printing Bureau of this country. For months and months Mr. Senécal demands and receives from everybody who sells to the department a tax on the purchase, thus robbing this country, because it was robbing it—and we did not attempt or pretend to get at the bottom of it—of over \$50,000. Every man who sold to that Bureau and paid the tax could have sold his goods for that much less to the Government if that tax had not been exacted. Then, Sir, we have wasteful extravagance going on everywhere. No supervision, and nobody apparently to look after anything. Take the Wellington and Grand Trunk Railway bridges, commonly known as the Curran bridge: original estimate, \$122,000; actual cost \$430,000. Here are some of the facts about the Curran bridge: timber and lumber was certified for at 1,000,000 feet more than could have been used, stone cutting on the Wellington bridge should have been \$3,000, when it cost \$16,700. The Grand Trunk Railway bridge was worse. \$12 was paid for work there by the Government, when the contractor paid only \$4.50, and \$20 was paid for other work while the contractor only paid \$3.75. There was altogether in that business a clear steal of nearly, if not quite, \$200,000. And, Sir, after the Government had noticed that these things were going on, instead of at once investigating and stopping payment to the contractors, they paid the contractors over \$100,000.

Then, Sir, we have the Fredericton bridge, in the county where my hon. friend the Minister of Finance has gone to. The company was incorporated in 1885 with a capital of \$20,000; the Government loaned them \$300,000; they gave them a present of \$30,000; the company bonded for \$50,000, and the interest, amounting to \$74,000, the Government paid one year's interest out of the money it paid to these people. In other words, the Government gave them \$330,000, and the company gives back to the Government the sum of \$12,000 for the payment of interest. That is to say, these individuals have received from the Government and elsewhere \$34,414 more than the structure ever cost. And, Sir, I venture to say, that although this matter was brought

before Parliament last year, there has not been one single dollar of interest paid on those bonds since 1895, although it was promised that the matter would be looked into. My hon. friend the Minister of Finance goes down to the county, and is a candidate in that county, and in order to show his gratitude to the electors of that county, he has promised to give the little town of Marysville a post office that will cost \$30,000 or \$40,000. Refusing it to towns like Woodstock, large business centres in the country, my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) suddenly sees that that little town of Marysville, owned by Mr. Gibson, bonded for \$400,000, mortgaged to secure the bonds: he sees that little town should have a post office at the public expense. Why, Sir, every little village in Canada is entitled to the same consideration.

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose my hon. friend (Mr. Lister) would not mind if I recall his attention to the statements he has just made, so that I may be sure that he reiterates them. One of his statements is, that the town at which Mr. Gibson lives is bonded for \$400,000 under mortgage, and the other statement is that I promised them a post office to cost \$30,000.

Mr. LISTER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) has in the Estimates this year a sum of \$8,000 for a post office in Marysville. We know, Mr. Speaker, how this thing is worked. We know that they commence with a little sum, and that in the Estimates year after year there is a further sum to continue the post office. There is finally a sum to complete it, and if you go through the various public buildings in the nature of post offices throughout the country, I will venture to say you will find very few of them that did not cost from \$20,000 to \$30,000, and a great many of them in the smaller places from \$30,000 to \$50,000.

Mr. FOSTER. But I do not understand that my hon. friend (Mr. Lister) reiterates what he stated a moment ago, that I went down and promised a post office worth \$30,000?

Mr. LISTER. I did not say that.

Mr. FOSTER. You did not say that?

Mr. LISTER. No, I did not.

Mr. FOSTER. My ears very much deceived me then.

Mr. LISTER. They must have.

Mr. FOSTER. The "Hansard" will not deceive you to-morrow morning.

Mr. LISTER. I would go and get an ear-phone, if I were you.

Mr. FOSTER. The "Hansard" will have a surprise for you in the morning.

Mr. LISTER. My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) promised them a post office.

Mr. LISTER.

Mr. FOSTER. That is better.

Mr. LISTER. Whether it costs \$20,000 or \$30,000 or \$10,000, the place is not entitled to a post office. Neither its magnitude, its population, nor its business, afford any reason whatever for giving that town a post office, when large towns throughout the country are denied it. We know my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) of old. He is afraid to run in his own county. When he did run in his own county, what did he do? The first thing he did was to get a little post office for Sussex, and he actually got a bell put on top of it afterwards.

Mr. FOSTER. Is my hon. friend willing to vouch for either of these statements?

Mr. LISTER. Is there not a post office at Sussex?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. LISTER. Did you give it?

Mr. FOSTER. I did not.

Mr. LISTER. Is there a bell on it?

Mr. FOSTER. You said so.

Mr. LISTER. Did I?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. LISTER. There is a nice little tower on that post office.

Mr. FOSTER. Is there a tower on it?

Mr. LISTER. And there was a grant for a bell for that tower.

Mr. FOSTER. Does my hon. friend say there is a tower on that post office and a bell?

Mr. LISTER. Is there a post office there, eh?

Mr. FOSTER. You are pretty wild.

Mr. LISTER. Well, now, it makes very little difference whether there is a bell on it or not.

Mr. FOSTER. Not much difference.

Mr. LISTER. Sussex has a post office.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. LISTER. And Sussex got that post office from my hon. friend (Mr. Foster).

Mr. FOSTER. I am sorry to say it did not.

Mr. LISTER. It did not; not since the hon. gentleman has been in Parliament?

Mr. FOSTER. No, it happened to get it before I came.

Mr. LISTER. Before you came? Very well, we won't hold you responsible for the Sussex post office, but I think you are responsible for the bell.

Mr. FOSTER. If the bell is there, I will take the responsibility for it.

Mr. LISTER. Then, we have another hon. gentleman sitting in this House, the hon. member for Montmorency, Arthur Joseph Turcotte. I think the Minister of Finance voted to whitewash him, if I am not mistaken.

Mr. LANGELIER. Yes, he did.

Mr. LISTER. Mr. Arthur Joseph Turcotte was a member of Parliament. His firm had a contract with the Government, in which he was undoubtedly beneficially interested. Turcotte & Provost were the partners. The contract was made with Provost. The receipts went to the firm and were deposited in the firm name. Provost went out and assigned the contract to Larose, Turcotte's book-keeper. Turcotte received the cheques. They were placed to his credit in the bank, and yet, Sir, when arraigned before a committee of this House on the charge, and when these facts were all established. Mr. Turcotte was whitewashed, and it was declared by a majority of the House that he had not violated the Independence of Parliament Act. Mr. Joseph Turcotte could not be convicted, of course. Mr. Turcotte was the lieutenant of the Postmaster General in the city of Quebec, and he seemed to be quite indifferent about the charge from the first time it was made, although the evidence established beyond peradventure that the contract was held for his benefit, that he had received payment from the Government and that the money was placed to his credit in the bank.

Now, my hon. friends opposite did not want any more investigations. They had enough, apparently, and in a moment of weakness they consented, in the early investigations of 1891, that the witnesses should be sworn. But in 1894 a change had come over them, and they made up their minds that no witnesses should be sworn, and that only the statements of witnesses not under oath should be taken. Mr. Mulock moved, on the 19th of April, 1894:

That the witnesses should be examined under oath.

And the ex-Minister of Justice moved in amendment:

That the House would grant permission when it appeared to the House that by doing so the committee would be aided in the examination.

We did not succeed in getting that for some considerable time after the 19th of April. It meant this, that it depended on the wish and the will of the majority of the committee whether any witnesses brought before that committee should make their statements under oath or not. The Liberal party in the committee and in the House brought the matter before the attention of Parliament over and over again, and in the end it was conceded. The ex-Minister of Justice withdrew his objections, and it was finally declared by this House that all the witnesses who should appear before the Public

Accounts Committee should be examined under oath. Sir, that incident only shows the Government's refusal first and their hesitancy afterwards; it only shows how desperately afraid they were of investigations taking place; it only shows how eager they were to keep control of the committee. Why, Sir, did they object to have the evidence taken under oath? What possible reason could there be for it? The reason, Mr. Speaker, and the only reason, is the one that must suggest itself to your mind, and to the mind of everybody else who has given the matter any consideration.

Mr. Speaker, it is now seventeen years since all the promises of prosperity were made to us by the gentlemen who then occupied the Treasury benches. It is seventeen years since they told us that the expenditure of the Liberal Administration had been extravagant and corrupt. Yet we have to-day, the spectacle of the public debt of Canada enormously increased and the public expenditure of Canada \$14,000,000 a year more than it was then. We have the fact that the trade of the country is very little more than it was in 1879. Our people are to-day suffering under the burden of an enormous taxation. During those years the Government have squandered the public lands of the country through their friends. They have parcelled out the timber lands of the country to their camp followers. They have given away the natural wealth that belongs to the people of Canada and their posterity. They have expended fabulous sums upon useless public works—works that could return nothing to the country, either in money or in anything else. Fraud, speculation and maladministration have characterized their administration of public affairs. The people of Canada to-day are placed in the hands of monopolists and combinations, with no hope of extricating themselves while this Government is in power. The Act we passed against combinations is in fact a dead letter. Although it is well known that there are in this country to-day trades controlled by certain combinations, there has been no effort whatever made with the object of enforcing the law or relieving the people of the burdens which those combinations have cast upon them. Over \$10,000,000 a year is required to pay the interest on our public debt. Deficit after deficit year after year stares us in the face; and besides what we have been able to wring from the taxpayers, we go every year to the English market, and borrow money from the English people to meet the ordinary expenses of the country. There has been no increase in our population to speak of—a beggarly 500,000 people in ten years. Our farm lands have decreased in value at least 40 per cent. Business is to-day in a condition of paralysis. Go where you will—go to any town you like in the province of Ontario, and there is but one story—that the people are making nothing. They are discontented and dissatisfied; there seems no light for them; there

is nothing to awaken in them a feeling of hope. The Government says to them: You are prosperous. The Government say an expenditure of \$38,000,000 a year is not enough; we ought to make it \$40,000,000. How long will these brick-makers stand this condition of affairs? How long before they rise up in their might and power and drive out of office those who have thus misgoverned them and brought them to this deplorable condition? Our people are driven from the country, because there is no employment for them here. The best blood of Canada are leaving it in thousands every year. Our young men are seeking homes in the south, in the west, and everywhere except in their native land. Go to the city of Chicago and you will find thousands of Canadians, many of them occupying leading positions. Go to St. Louis, to Buffalo, to any of the large cities of the western states, and you will find Canadians there. Go to the great plains of the western states, and you will find many of the sons of our farmers helping to build them up instead of our own western prairies—driven from the country because there is no field for them here. And what have the Government given us in place of those people to whom we have lost? A subsidy of \$750,000 a year for a fast line; which means that 250 of the best farms of Ontario are required every year to pay the subsidy. They have given a subsidy to a line to go to Australia, and they say they are going to establish a trade there. Why, Sir, the trade with Australia is the merest bagatelle; it is of no account whatever. That country produces the same kind of products that we produce, and much more cheaply than it is possible for the people of Canada to produce them; and you are only subsidizing ships to bring products into the country to enter into competition with the products of our own people. A few years ago the Minister of Finance took his little carpet bag and went to the West India Islands to make a treaty there. What has become of it? He has subsidized a steamer to run from Halifax to the West Indies, and it is true there has been a little increase of trade, but what is it compared with the increase of trade between ourselves and the great nation to the south? It is the merest bagatelle. The hon. gentleman seeks to establish a trade with every country except the people who want our products, who are our largest buyers, and of whom we are the largest purchasers on this continent. Sir, such is the condition of affairs in this country. But I venture the prediction, whether we go to the country sooner or later, that the verdict of the people of Canada will be in condemnation of the Government and its policy, and in favour of the restoration to power of the party which governed the country so wisely and so well during the four years from 1874 to 1878.

Mr. RIDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to intercept the vote on the motion that you do

Mr. LISTER.

now leave the Chair. I feel that the occasion is altogether too important to allow it to pass by without entering my protest against the way in which the affairs of the country have been conducted during the last seventeen years. We are on the eve of a general election, and, therefore, it is important that we should calmly and seriously consider the present condition of our affairs. We were told that, by adopting the policy which hon. gentlemen opposite have been pursuing for the last seventeen years, this country would go on increasing in wealth and in population. We were told at that time that our industries were languishing, that Canada was being made a slaughter market for the benefit of foreign nations, particularly the United States. Now we have had seventeen years of this policy. The National Policy is a misnomer; Canada has always had a National Policy. It is not so much the policy as the administration of the affairs of this country under this policy, of which we have a right to complain. The hon. Finance Minister realizes that Canada is at present in a desperate condition. The commerce of the country is disturbed, and the financial condition of the country is also in a desperate condition. As a business man, I can say that I have never, in all of my twenty years' business experience, had so much difficulty in the collection of debts as I have had this past fall.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). That is the case of all politicians.

Mr. RIDER. Well, there is a cause for this. We were told in 1878 that one of the evils from which the country was suffering was extravagance and corruption on the part of the Mackenzie Administration. We were told that the expenditure, which was then in the neighbourhood of \$23,000,000, was excessive, that these hon. gentlemen would, if they were placed in power, maintain the efficiency of the service and at the same time pay off the national debt. What has been the result? We find to-day that not only has the annual expenditure been increased by about \$14,000,000 annually—and this to come from a population very little increased in numbers—but we find also the net debt has been increased about \$113,000,000. Now, what does this mean. They try to lull us into a false security with the illusion that the debt is nothing. Why, they say, look to the mother country, a country deeply in debt, and in her debt consists her strength. But let us compare the conditions of the two countries and see how different they are. The debt of England is owned by English capitalists who are interested in each other's welfare, but the debt of Canada is due to foreign bankers, and it requires an annual withdrawal in cash from this country of \$10,000,000. Is Canada in a financial condition of wealth to stand this drain which is seriously crippling the busi-

ness of the country? I maintain not. Because the withdrawal of \$10,000,000 per year does not decrease the principal or debt but merely goes to pay the interest, and when that much is withdrawn from circulation, the country parts are being drained almost to the white.

The Minister of Finance realizes that the country is in a desperate condition, but still he hoped that perhaps he could satisfy the country that he could repair this terrible state of affairs. He gave a long list of articles to show that he had really decreased the burden of taxation resting on the people. In his financial statement he mentions the following as being articles upon which he has reduced the duties, and he also gave a list showing where there had been increases. For the purpose of comparison, I selected a few of those articles on which there are reductions of duty as compared with 1893-94:—

Ale, beer and porter.....	\$ 16,047
Earthenware and china.....	59,860
Fancy goods.....	41,023
Butter, cheese, lard and meats....	42,513
Silk goods.....	66,979
Spirits and wines.....	295,857

In the articles upon which there are increases are the following:—

Rice, &c.....	\$ 66,641
Carriages.....	54,515
Cotton goods.....	70,752
Coal and coke.....	33,732
Leather goods.....	29,566
Sugar, all kinds.....	222,313

The hon. Finance Minister was inclined to take credit for having relieved the people of Canada of taxation. This relief, he claimed, was brought about by the reduction in the customs duties. There was a time when, in placing these duties upon goods, he said it was for the benefit of the country; but now when he pretends to remove them, he says the removal is for the benefit of the country. But what are the facts? At the last revision of the tariff, the tax was placed upon sugar, the consumption of which the hon. member for Pictou has estimated at 345,000,000 pounds. This means a tax that will fall upon the consumers of Canada at present to the extent of \$3,923,000. Let us analyse this, and see what effect it will have upon the consumers of Canada. As I have said, the consumers of Canada will, by the action of the Government in placing the duty on raw sugar, be taxed nearly \$4,000,000 extra; but while this much comes out of the people's pockets, the refiners will get \$2,208,000, and the treasury only \$1,715,000. Now, I wish to call your attention to an item in which I have always taken considerable interest, as it is an article that is

largely produced, not only in the county which I represent, but also throughout the province of Quebec, and that is maple sugar. The Minister of Finance, in revising the tariff in 1894, was inclined to place a duty of 20 per cent on maple sugar, for what purpose it was impossible to ascertain, as we import little or no maple sugar and export a considerable quantity. I warned him of the danger of placing a duty upon that article because the United States were engaged in a revision of their tariff, and I feared it might result disastrously for the sugar interest. That hon. gentleman, however persisted in putting on this 20 per cent duty. This was done early in June. In August following the United States Congress met that by placing a duty of 40 per cent on maple sugar, thus seriously crippling a profitable industry in the province of Quebec. We were told that population was increasing under the benign influence of the National Policy. Well, as I said before, I have not so much fault to find with the National Policy as with the administration of hon. gentlemen opposite. I believe that, as far as the National Policy is concerned, if the National Policy were all right and the amount of taxation levied by duties—I claim it is not—adjusted properly to bear equitably on all classes, and if the amount collected by the Government in excess of what was collected in 1878 had been used in the extinction of our public debt, then it would not have been so bad. As the electors are soon to be called upon to decide to whom they will give their confidence, I think it is my duty to place before you a statement of how the affairs of this country stand at the present time. I would like to call your attention to some figures relating to our population. In 1871 the population of Canada, according to the census of that year, was 3,689,257. In 1881 the population was 4,324,810. In 1891 the population was 4,833,239. Between 1871 and 1881, which is generally regarded as the revenue tariff period, the increase of population was 635,553, or an increase of 17·23 per cent. Between 1881 and 1891, which may be called the National Policy period, as the National Policy has been in full force during the whole time, the increase in population was 508,429, or 11·75 per cent. On looking into the details, I find that between 1871 and 1881 there was a decrease in population in twenty-seven electoral districts throughout the country, while in the period between 1881 and 1891 there was a decrease in eighty-four electoral districts. Why, Sir, if the promises made in 1878 had been made good, we should not have had a decrease of population in any county. I will give a summary of the returns taken from the census of 1891, showing the changes in population in these two periods:

DOMINION OF CANADA.

Year.	Population.	Comparative Increase.	Percentage of Increase.
1871	3,689,257	1871 to 1881 = 635,553	17.23
1881	4,324,810	1881 to 1891 = 508,429	11.25
1891	4,833,239		

CENSUS BY PROVINCES

	Population.	Comparative Increase.	Decreased by Counties.
British Columbia—			
1871	36,247	1871 to 1881 = 13,212	
1881	49,459	1881 to 1891 = 48,714	Decreased in 1 county.
1891	98,173		
Manitoba—			
1871	25,228	1871 to 1881 = 37,032	
1881	62,260	1881 to 1891 = 90,246	
1891	152,506		
New Brunswick—			
1871	285,594	1871 to 1881 = 35,639	Decreased in 2 counties.
1881	321,233	1881 to 1891 = 30	Decreased in 8 counties.
1891	321,263		
Nova Scotia—			
1871	357,800	1871 to 1881 = 52,772	
1881	440,572	1881 to 1891 = 9,824	Decreased in 8 counties.
1891	450,396		
Ontario—			
1871	1,620,851	1871 to 1881 = 306,071	Decreased in 13 counties.
1881	1,926,922	1881 to 1891 = 187,399	Decreased in 39 counties.
1891	2,114,321		
Prince Edward Island—			
1871	94,021	1871 to 1881 = 14,870	
1881	108,891	1881 to 1891 = 187	Decreased in 1 county.
1891	109,078		
Quebec—			
1871	1,191,516	1871 to 1881 = 167,511	Decreased in 12 counties.
1881	1,359,027	1881 to 1891 = 129,508	Decreased in 27 counties.
1891	1,488,535		
Territories—			
1871	18,000	1871 to 1881 = 7,515	
1881	25,515	1881 to 1891 = 41,284	
1891	66,799		
Unorganized Territories—			
1871	30,000	1871 to 1881 = 931	
1881	30,931	1881 to 1891 = 1,237	
1891	32,168		

Now, Sir, this goes to show that the National Policy, so-called, has had a most blighting effect upon the prosperity of the country, if its effects is to be measured by the increase in population. The Finance Minister, after giving a partial account of the difficulty in which we now find ourselves, thought he saw a gleam of hope in what he alleged to be the fact, that there was an increase of our exports over our imports. He claimed that for the second time in the history of our country our exports exceeded our imports by something over two million dollars. Now, Sir, I do not accuse the Finance Minister with intending to mislead the House or the country; but I find, in looking over the Trade and Navigation Returns ending 30th June, 1895, that such is not the case. The balance of trade is not yet in our favour, and that makes, it seems to me, the future of our country look still darker. When we are called upon to send annually ten millions of dollars of our circulation out of the country, how can we ever expect to get it back, with the balance of trade against us, except

Mr. RIDER.

by the same old process of the past seventeen years, hiring the money and thereby increasing our annual obligations? We must bear this in mind, that while we are piling up the national debt by leaps and bounds, the money is not being expended in a way that adds to the value of the country. Judging from the depreciation in the value of real estate which has taken place throughout the country, we cannot but come to the conclusion that when our country is indebted to the extent of hundreds of millions of dollars to foreign capitalists, our real estate is really worth that much less. Now, in looking over the Trade and Navigation Returns for the period mentioned, I beg to call your attention to page 520, giving a statement of our exports. We find there that our exports of goods, the produce of Canada, including coin and bullion, amounted to \$99,794,922. On page 356 we find that our imports for the same period, of goods entered for consumption, including coin and bullion, amounted to \$105,252,511, making an excess of imports over exports of \$5,467,589. I find in looking further on in the

Trade and Navigation Returns, which I suppose are made in the Department of Trade and Commerce, that they estimate the amount of shortage in the returns of the inland ports, at \$3,300,090. I am sorry the Finance Minister is absent, because I would like to know upon what he bases this estimate. There is no doubt that there is a large amount of goods that go out of Canada of which we have no account, goods that go out by the underground railway, but from my knowledge of border traffic, I believe that where one dollar goes out in this way, more than five dollars come in, and if there be any estimate made of the shortage between imports and exports, the amount should be trebled, at least, when we take into consideration the amount of our imports. Now, Mr. Speaker, the Finance Minister sought to leave the impression on the House that in the revision of the tariff of 1894, there really was a reduction made to the extent of the duties. To convince myself upon this point, I have taken the trouble to go over the Trade and Navigation Returns, from which I made the following extracts of some of the principal items of import, showing the value of the goods imported, the duty paid, with the rate per cent :-

	Value imported.	Duty paid.	Rate.
	\$	\$	p.c.
Ale, beer and porter.....	126,066	50,247	40
Books, pamphlets, chromos, &c	788,02	208,161	26
Rice, cleaned.....	98,849	73,466	74
do uncleaned.....	190,620	68,933	34
Indian corn.....	751,233	111,452	15
Carriages, buggies and farm wagons.....	277,139	84,744	31
Bicycles and tricycles.....	494,616	121,387	30
Cement.....	271,326	81,068	32
Farm tools.....	159,319	48,453	35
Carpenters' tools.....	216,873	75,781	35
Pipe, iron or steel for boiler-makers.....	86,257	6,471	7½
Pipe for petroleum refineries do farmers and builders..	20,053	4,011	20
Plants and fruit trees.....	156,508	83,939	54
Butter, cheese and meats.....	91,509	29,406	32
Clocks.....	658,480	190,237	28
Currants, dried.....	105,014	26,254	25
Raisins.....	111,944	56,283	50
Nuts, walnuts and peanuts.....	353,631	119,500	34
Coal, bituminous.....	215,111	99,887	46
Clothing, cotton.....	3,321,387	866,968	26
Socks and stockings.....	327,390	106,412	32½
Prints, coloured fabrics.....	7,300	33,825	44
Cotton goods, all others.....	2,290,868	687,17	30
Buttons.....	1,516,936	373,467	25
Combs.....	135,772	37,588	20
Collars and cuffs.....	79,342	27,770	35
Earthenware and china.....	51,578	26,334	51
Clothing, woollen.....	547,935	165,458	30
Socks and stockings, woollen.....	810,967	279,174	34
Woollen goods, all others.....	402,594	165,641	41
Carpets.....	6,719,934	2,082,749	33
Kerosene.....	84,679	19,403	30
	414,420	400,000	98

Imports, 30th June, 1894.	Imports.	Duty.	Per cent.
Dutiable.....	\$62,77,182	\$19,379,822	32
Free.....	\$50,314,801		
Imports, 30th June, 1895.			
Dutiable.....	\$58,537,655	\$17,887,269	32½

It will be seen that many of these articles are those which the farmer is obliged to use, and they are as much raw material to him as are wool and silk to the manufacturer. Take, for instance, kerosene. It is an article on which the people of this country depend for their light, and yet there is a duty on it at the present time of nearly 100 per cent. I claim that a revenue tariff, while less burdensome on the people, would, at the same time, produce probably more revenue to the treasury, if the duty on kerosene were reduced to a moderate duty, say 25 or 30 per cent, or 2 cents per gallon. I think the revenue would suffer but slightly, and farmers would have less cause to complain; but, at the present time, there is not enough kerosene or refined coal oil produced in this country to satisfy the demand. We imported last year no less than 6,000,000 gallons of oil. That is the Government's correct book-keeping, as shown in the Trade and Navigation Returns. But, as the Minister of Trade and Commerce is aware, probably half as much more comes into the country on which no duty is paid, and this is not giving fair play and doing justice to the people, because those living on the boundary line have this advantage, while those living twenty-five miles distant are compelled to pay the full price and the duty. The Minister of Finance gave this House to understand that the burden of taxation on account of the last tariff revision was really lighter, or, at all events, not so high as before the revision in 1894. What are the facts? Comparing the past with 1893-94, I find that upon dutiable goods imported in 1894 the rate of duty averaged 32 per cent, while during the past year it was 32½ per cent, showing that taxation has been increased by the revision last year. I wish to call attention to the item of wool in order to show how hon. gentlemen opposite endeavour to pull the wool over the eyes of the farmer. Wool is the finished product of the farmer, just as much as tweed or woollen cloth is the finished product of the manufacturer. What is the treatment meted out to the farmer in this case? Wool is placed on the free list. The farmer is brought into competition with the markets of the world, and the price has dropped to such a point that it hardly pays to care for it. While wool is to be considered as the finished product of the farmer, on which there is no duty, it is the raw material of the manufacturer of woollens and tweeds, and the duty is 33 per cent. On a suit of clothes made by a Canadian tailor from tweed manufactured in Canada there is a duty or a protection of 67 per cent. The duty on clothing averages 34½ per cent. If the tailor purchases his tweed in the Canadian market it will cost him nearly all what he has gained, so the tailor is in about as ridiculous a position as is the farmer under the operation of this tariff. We find the total amount of woollen goods imported as follows :-

WOOLLEN GOODS IMPORTED.

	Value.	Duty.	Per cent.
Cloths	\$1,458,456	\$473,099	= 32½
Coatings	600,821	200,043	= 33½
Tweeds	383,463	122,182	= 32
Clothing	814,879	279,174	= 34
Woollen goods, all others	4,675,876	1,453,066	= 32
	<u>\$7,933,495</u>	<u>\$2,527,564</u>	

These figures are so clear that they do not require any comment from me. I have no doubt that the farmers of Canada already understand full well how they have been treated under the operations of the tariff. Why, they were told that these duties were levied to aid the manufacturing industries which would give the home market to the farmers for their products. We find according to the census returns of 1891, that in all Canada there were 39 woollen mills. This includes every little woollen mill throughout the country employing one hand or more. In all these mills there were employed: men, 587; women, 542; boys under 16 years of age, 117; girls under 16 years of age, 164; or in all 1,392 men, women and children found employment in the manufacture of tweeds and other woollen goods. And, for the benefit the Canadian market was to receive from this industry, the people were called upon to pay a tax to the manufacturers of \$2,527,594.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I beg to call your attention to plank No. 2 of the Liberal platform, adopted at the Dominion Liberal convention held in this city in June, 1893. It is as follows:—

ENLARGED MARKETS—RECIPROCITY.

That, having regard to the prosperity of Canada and the United States as adjoining countries, with many mutual interests, it is desirable that there should be the most friendly relations and broad and liberal trade intercourse between them;

That the interests alike of the Dominion and of the Empire would be materially advanced by the establishing of such relations;

That the period of the old reciprocity treaty was one of marked prosperity to the British North American colonies;

That the pretext under which the Government appealed to the country in 1891 respecting negotiations for a treaty with the United States was misleading and dishonest and intended to deceive the electorate;

That no sincere effort has been made by them to obtain a treaty, but that, on the contrary, it is manifest that the present Government, controlled as they are by monopolies and combines, are not desirous of securing such a treaty;

That the first step towards obtaining the end in view, is to place a party in power who are sincerely desirous of promoting a treaty on terms honourable to both countries;

That a fair and liberal reciprocity treaty would develop the great natural resources of Canada, would enormously increase the trade and commerce between the two countries, would tend to encourage friendly relations between the two peo-

Mr. RIDER.

ples, would remove many causes which have in the past provoked irritation and trouble to the governments of both countries, and would promote those kindly relations between the Empire and the republic which afford the best guarantee for peace and prosperity;

That the Liberal party is prepared to enter into negotiations with a view to obtaining such a treaty, including a well-considered list of manufactured articles, and we are satisfied that any treaty so arranged will receive the assent of Her Majesty's Government, without whose approval no treaty can be made.

This brings me to consider the condition of the trade between Canada and the United States. We were told by gentlemen opposite in 1878, that Canada was being made a slaughter market, as though the manufacturing industries of this country were being drowned out by goods brought in from the United States and other countries, and sold at a sacrifice. I would like to know, Sir, who would receive the benefit in such a case as that? If goods were being sold in Canada at a lower rate than the cost of production, would the advantage not be in favour of the consumers of this country? But let us take these hon. gentlemen upon their own grounds, and what are the facts? We find that in 1895 we imported from the United States \$54,634,531 worth of goods, and in 1878 we imported only \$48,631,729 worth, so that for the past year we imported \$6,000,000 worth of goods from the United States, more than we did in 1878. Now, if Canada was a slaughter market in 1878 owing to the conditions of the tariff, how are we to consider it at the present time. Surely these figures show that it has not been improved in that respect. Then let us consider the state of our exports. Our exports to the United States during the past year amounted to \$32,303,773, and in 1878 they amounted to \$25,244,898. It seems that we have increased our exports to the United States by \$7,000,000 since that period. This you will see, Sir, has been done in spite of all the difficulties and restrictions that have been placed by both nations in the way of trade between the two countries. It proves also that the natural market for many of our productions is the market to the south of us.

I wish to direct your attention, Sir, to the national debt of Canada. We were told by the Conservatives in 1878, that one of the advantages to be derived from a change in the Administration, was that the affairs of the country would be so ably and economically managed, that not only would there not need to be any annual increase in the charges to maintain the efficiency of the service, and to give the public all the improvements that were necessary; but that the debt would be reduced as well. Against that promise, held out by the men who now adorn the Treasury benches, or rather, by the men who are now adorned by the Treasury benches, let me place before you the actual

condition of affairs at the present time. The net public debt of Canada in 1878 was \$140,000,000 in round numbers; while at the end of June, 1895, according to the statement of the Finance Minister, our net public debt had grown to the enormous sum of \$253,074,927, making an increase under the Administration of the present Government of \$112,712,858, I find, Sir, that during the past seventeen years of the National Policy and the administration of the present Government, they have added an average annual increase of debt of over \$6,500,000, while they have increased the annual expenditure in even a larger proportion. It seems to me that this is a matter which should cause grave apprehension to every man who has an interest in this country. Why, Sir, if we cannot pay our way in time of peace and prosperity, when can we ever hope to discharge our national debt. How can we confidently face, even rumours of war, not to speak of war itself. A few days ago, when the cry went forth that there was a possibility of war, the loyalty of the people prompted them to willingly give the administration any reasonable expenditure to improve the defences of Canada. When the thing blows over and we are brought face to face with the actual state of affairs, how can the people of this country place their trust in the hands of an Administration under whom, in time of peace, and they say, prosperity, we cannot pay our way? If we cannot pay our way in times of peace and prosperity, there must be something wrong in the administration of the affairs of this country. What good reason can be advanced why the per capita debt of this country should be larger than that of the United States? The debt of the United States was caused by a most cruel and expensive civil war. We have had nothing of the kind. The United States, in time of peace, like the mother country, have been annually reducing their debt, while Canada, in time of peace—and, if we are to believe the statements made by hon. gentlemen opposite, in time of prosperity—has been adding to its debt at an alarming rate; and the end is not yet. Why, Sir, the hon. Finance Minister acknowledges that for the past two years he has increased the public debt by over \$11,000,000. What does this signify? It signifies that the increase of our debt for the last two years has actually wiped out the wealth of three average counties of Canada, just as if they were sold out under the hammer of the sheriff, according to the municipal valuation.

Now, Sir, I beg to place before you another table. I do this for the purpose of giving the people of the country an opportunity of knowing how the tariff of Canada is arranged—people who have no opportunity of finding out in any other way. I will first give you a list of the raw materials imported for the benefit of manufacturers, duty free:

Articles.	Value.
Diamonds, unset.....	\$ 239,057
Grease, in the rough.....	283,778
Hides, raw	1,950,530
Silk, raw	124,294
Wool	1,129,389
Sugar, raw	6,703,359
Tobacco, unmanufactured.....	1,362,985
Cotton for manufactures.....	3,608,519
Nets, seines and hooks, for use in the fisheries	518,891
Rubber, crude	488,566
Wire rods for wire-makers.....	567,032
Steel rails for railways.....	838,144
Metals, N.E.S., for manufactures.....	1,905,154

I think that in this case, comment is unnecessary. You will look over this list in vain to find an article, the importation of which, duty free, is in the interest of the farmer. Now, let us turn to the other side of the shield, and consider, for a moment, the articles imported on which there is a duty—some of which I will mention, and many of the articles are such as cannot be produced in Canada, and on which a duty is simply a tax and an oppression, without even accomplishing anything in the way of aiding or encouraging manufacturers:

Articles.	Value.	Duty.
	\$	\$
Spices	162,707	26,706
Soda and baking powder.....	138,798	28,714
Rice	298,469	142,400
Currants and raisins.....	465,575	175,833
Nuts, all kinds.....	215,111	99,887
Oranges, lemons, grapes, &c.	1,915,102	496,000
Earthenware and china.....	547,935	165,458
Clocks	109,600	27,405
Books, maps, cards, &c.....	788,020	208,161
Carriages, all kinds.....	681,755	206,131
Agricultural implements.....	291,222	70,158
Window glass.....	256,365	51,275
Cement	251,918	81,068
Rubber goods.....	410,609	123,458
Curtains	262,021	78,604
Cotton goods.....	4,218,168	1,200,820
Woollen goods.....	7,952,932	2,527,564
Coal, bituminous.....	3,376,517	877,625
Kerosene	414,420	400,000

I find, in estimating the average duties paid, that the duties paid in 1895 have been slightly more than those paid in 1894. Now, I beg to call your attention to our total exports of home produce for the year ending the 30th June, 1895, as made up from the following sources:—

The Mine.....	\$ 6,983,227
“ Fisheries	10,692,247
“ Forest	23,891,166
“ Farm	50,106,898
Manufactures	7,768,875
Miscellaneous articles.....	85,938

Total..... \$99,528,351

From this you will see that the farmers contribute towards the volume of exports over \$50,000,000, or over half the total

amount. Yet, Sir, I looked in vain to the tariff to find where the farmers have an advantage or where they are considered in any way. Goods which to the farmer would be raw material are taxed and taxed highly in every case. And yet the farmer is doing more towards building up the industries of the country than all the other classes together. What would manufacturers or business men depend upon were it not for the farmer? We find that the farmers are the best distributors of national wealth. When they are realizing good prices for their products, they are making local improvements, they are adding to the permanent wealth of the country; and why should not they be encouraged as well as others? Farmers are, in a sense, as much manufacturers as the manufacturers of woollen goods, of implements, of carriages, or any other class of industry, and the farmer is put to a greater expense. He has to depend more upon the results of the future than any other class; and it seems to me that when we consider the share that the farmers contribute to our export trade, they should be considered in every way possible, for their benefit. And about the only thing which this Government can put before the people to show that they have done something for the farmers in our Experimental Farm. Why, if a farmer tells the Finance Minister that wool is his finished product, the Finance Minister tells him: Why, see what we are doing for you. see what amount of money we are expending annually upon our Experimental Farm to help you—and the money all comes out of the farmers' pockets.

Now, in conclusion, I believe that it will not be necessary for me to make a recapitulation of the many facts which I have placed before you. I believe that the people appreciate, as they never did before, the state of affairs, and they realize that their only hope and salvation is in a change. This Administration has been tried quite long enough. They made in 1878 very seductive promises: and if these promises had been carried out, no doubt it would have been much better for Canada. The people realize that this country cannot be in debt to foreign capitalists without the property of the people suffering. They realize that \$10,000,000 drawn out of the resources of the country to pay the annual interest on our debt, must be drawn at the expense of the business interests of the country, and a depreciation of all real estate follows as a consequence. I believe the people fully realize the consequences of the immoral Administration during the past seventeen years, and that when they once can have an opportunity of declaring their opinion, they will show to the men who now occupy the Treasury benches that they consider wilful waste means woeful want, and that, in the end, they are the ones who have to pay the bills and meet the extravagance of the Government. If the money of the country had been expended in

Mr. RIDER.

an efficient and honourable way, we would have far less to complain of to-day. Although we have some very important public works, we have not one which has not cost from two to five times what it should have cost, and a young growing country like Canada is not in that position of wealth to stand any such extravagance. Why, last year, in discussing the Estimates, the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Ouimet) undertook to explain the increased expenditure necessary in the construction of the St. John's custom-house. The Estimates were largely exceeded and what was the excuse he gave? Why, he said, after the estimate was made, the Government decided to change the plan and make the building fire-proof. He gave that as a justification for the great increase of the actual over the estimated cost. That seemed very plausible indeed, and no one would have disputed it, but when we study the bills paid in connection with the re-building of that work and find that over 600,000 feet of lumber had been used in the construction of that fire-proof building, we come to the idea at once that lumber forms an important item when there is a deal on hand. When we come to the Curran Bridge we find not only excessive extravagance so far as the help is concerned,—a derrick getting three times as much pay per day for work done on a Sunday as it did on any other day—but we found a million feet of lumber disappeared and the Government have not yet been able to get any clue as to where it went. A million feet of lumber is a large pile and it seems to me evidence of the grossest neglect on the part of the Government, for which they can plead no excuse. Let me call your attention to a canal known as the Haggart Ditch, about three hours' ride from this place, upon which the country has expended about a half million dollars. Figure that as you may, the interest and the cost of maintenance will not come far short of \$25,000 yearly charge on the revenue of Canada. And what are the results? Why, according to the statement of the Government, the total revenue received from that work was \$146 a year. How then can the Government be justified? How can they be trusted with the construction of other important works, when they have shown such gross neglect and such wanton extravagance on these? The people are aware how the affairs of the Dominion have been mismanaged, and are only waiting for an opportunity to make a change, and they understand what a change will mean. They know that the affairs of the country are in a desperate condition; they know the debt of the country is increasing yearly; they know that the men who are now occupying the Treasury benches, administering the affairs of the country, are not able, in times of peace and prosperity, to make ends meet and pay their way. How can the Government plead for a continuance of confidence

under such conditions? Can they believe that the people are so blind that they will continue giving them their support? No, Sir; I believe that the people have already come to a conclusion that a change must be made, that a change cannot be worse, but must in every way better the condition of the country, and they will confide the management of their affairs in the coming five years into the hands of the Hon. Wilfrid Laurier.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). I have a good deal of sympathy with my friend from Stanstead who has just resumed his seat. He complains that he has a great deal of difficulty in collecting his debts in the fine county of Stanstead. But I doubt if that is a strong argument against the National Policy, because he will find that that is the experience of all politicians while they remain in politics. I would recommend him to retire from politics, and he will then find it very much easier to collect his debts in Stanstead. The hon. gentleman refers to the exodus from the Dominion. I am one of those who believe that the exodus has little or nothing to do with the National Policy, as the National Policy has little or nothing to do with the exodus. The exodus from Canada commenced long before the National Policy, and it was equally as great during the regime of hon. gentlemen opposite as it was before or as it has been since. There is a class in this country who are strongly opposed to the National Policy, and they are opposed to it for what appears to them sufficient reasons. I refer to the importers of goods on which duty is collectable, and I am here to state that, according to my personal experience much of the agitation against the National Policy is owing to this class. A few years ago there was a very strong agitation against the duty on coal oil. That agitation commenced with the importers of that product. The duty on coal oil was reduced to the extent of 50 per cent. It is a most useful article for the poorer class in this country. But, though the duty was reduced 50 per cent, what has been our experience? It has been just the same experience that we have had with regard to other articles upon which the duty has been reduced—although the importers gained largely by the reduction, they did not reduce the price to the consumers by even so much as half a cent a gallon. The same is nearly always the case with goods consumed in this Dominion. Only a few years ago there was an agitation in Canada and particularly in Ontario in regard to the duties on anthracite coal. The argument was used, that as anthracite coal was not produced in the Dominion, the consumer unquestionably paid the duty upon it. From a revenue tariff point of view there should have been no objection to that duty. But although the 50 cents a ton previously imposed was taken off, our experience has

been that anthracite coal has been sold in Canada just as high since the abolition of the duty as it was before. This proves conclusively that it was the middleman and the carrier who pocketed the profits of nearly half a million dollars a year since the abolition of that duty. In the case of coal oil it was the importer who benefited by the reduction, and this class benefited last year to something in the neighbourhood of \$123,000, while the consumer did not benefit to any extent whatever. The policy of the Opposition appears to be, as my hon. friend from Lambton (Mr. Lister) stated, free trade as against protection—free trade as they have it in England, I assume. In Great Britain they have free trade as nearly as practicable, and Britain is the only country on the face of the globe that has adopted free trade as a policy. But, notwithstanding the name, we find that they impose customs duties and excise duties besides a direct tax. In customs they collect about \$100,000,000 a year and in excise about \$130,000,000 a year. By direct taxation, under many forms, they collect no less than \$270,000,000. In free trade Great Britain, therefore, we find that while by customs and excise they only collect \$230,000,000, by direct taxation upon the people in various ways they collect \$270,000,000 a year. Now, if that be the policy our friends opposite adopt, I have no hesitation in saying that the people, who have judged them fairly well in the past, will judge them fairly well in the future, and that they will have no such policy as that imposed upon them. In 1879, at the instance of the Conservative party, Parliament adopted the policy of protection. It matters little to the people of this country how much we import or how much we export. I do not see that that enters into the question, as our friends opposite would mislead the people into believing. I think the question for us is to ascertain what duty we have to pay on goods exported from Canada into the United States and other countries. My hon. friend from Lambton stated to-night that the people who export products from Canada to the United States pay the American duty on them. If that is true, is it not equally true that the people of the United States who export their products into Canada must pay the Canadian duty? Our people are, therefore, unquestionably interested in the tariff which the United States have adopted. But it would be idle for any one to say that the people of the United States ever consult the interests of Canada or any other country in regulating their tariff. They simply adopt the tariff which, in their opinion, is in the best interests of the United States. But, while that is the case, we in Canada feel that the tariff which they impose upon the products of which we have a surplus and for which we must find a market is of very great interest to us. It is not only of

great interest to us to have the tariff of the United States as low as possible, but it is also in our interest that the tariff of other countries to which we export our products should be low also. But we find that other countries pay but little attention to our interests; therefore, the wise policy for us would be to pursue the even tenor of our way and adopt a tariff which, in our opinion, would subserve our general interests best, without any regard to the policy adopted by other countries. The object of a tariff is to raise a sufficient revenue. We know that in Canada no less a revenue than \$40,000,000 a year will be required to serve our interests as efficiently as they should be. It is idle nonsense to say that the interests of the Dominion today do not require more revenue than they did from 1874 to 1878. As the country develops, a greater amount of revenue will be necessary to construct public works throughout the length and breadth of this Dominion, besides maintaining the public services of the country. Now, I hold that the people of the United States pay but little attention to the interests of the Dominion of Canada when they adopt a tariff policy; yet, as I have already said, it is to our interest to ascertain what their tariff is, because in that market, as in other markets of the world, we are bound to find a place for the surplus products of our country. We find that agricultural products are very heavily protected in the United States. We find that animals are protected 25 per cent. They tax the products of the soil, of the mines, of the forest and of the sea, to a much greater extent than we tax their products of those classes. The object of the National Policy was not so much a reciprocal free trade, as a reciprocity of trade. The object of the National Policy was more to have a reciprocal tariff than to have reciprocal free trade. It is idle now to say that if the people of the United States continue to impose a high tariff on the products of this Dominion, it would be a wise policy on our part to abolish the tariff on the products of that country which come into competition with those raised in our own. The National Policy tariff, we are told, does not protect the farmer, is of no benefit whatever to the farmer. Now, I think I can speak from my own practical experience when I say that there is no industry in the Dominion of Canada so highly protected as the farming industry; I say, besides, that there is no industry in the Dominion of Canada which deserves protection to such an extent as the farming industry. Hon. gentlemen opposite seem to smile. The manufacturers are protected, each one in his own line, but the farming industry is protected in all the lines. Not only the products of the soil are protected, but the products of the perfecting of beef and pork, which are incidental to the farming industry, are also protected. Let me call the attention

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness).

of my hon. friends opposite to the protection which is given to the farmers by the National Policy, and I would like to know a farmer on either side of the House who would dare to advocate here, or in the country, the abolition of protection thus given to the farmers of Canada. Let me read several articles:

- Animals, living, n.e.s., 20 per cent ad valorem.
- Live hogs, 1½ cents per pound.
- Meats, n.e.s., 2 cents per pound when in barrel, the barrel to be free.
- Meats, fresh, n.e.s., 3 cents per pound.
- Canned meats and canned poultry, and game, extracts of meat, and fluid beef, not medicated, and soups, 25 per cent ad valorem.
- Mutton and lamb, fresh, 35 per cent ad valorem.
- Poultry and game, n.o.p., 20 per cent ad valorem.
- Lard, lard compound and similar substances, cottolene and animal stearine of all kinds, n.e.s., 2 cents per pound.
- Beeswax, 10 per cent ad valorem.
- Candles, n.e.s., 25 per cent ad valorem.
- Soap, n.e.s., pearline and other soap powders, pumice, silver and mineral soap, sapollo and like articles, 35 per cent ad valorem.
- Soap, common or laundry, not perfumed, 1 cent per pound.
- Castile soap, mottled or white, 2 cents per pound.
- Glue and mucilage, 25 per cent ad valorem.
- Feathers, undressed, 20 per cent ad valorem.
- Feathers, n.e.s., 30 per cent ad valorem.
- Eggs, 5 cents per dozen.
- Butter, 4 cents per pound.
- Cheese, 3 cents per pound.
- Condensed milk, 2 cents per pound.
- Condensed coffee, 30 per cent ad valorem.

I might go through the whole category of articles produced on the farm, directly or indirectly, to show that they are more heavily protected than the products of any other industry in the Dominion. Let me read another list:

- Beans, 15 cents per bushel.
- Buckwheat, 10 cents per bushel.
- Peas, 10 cents per bushel.
- Potatoes, 15 cents per bushel.
- Rye flour, 50 cents per barrel.
- Hay, \$2 per ton.
- Vegetables, when fresh, or dry salted, n.e.s., 25 per cent ad valorem.
- Barley, 30 per cent ad valorem.
- Indian corn, 7½ cents per bushel.
- Dutiable breadstuffs, grain, and flour and meal of all kinds, when damaged by water in transit, 20 per cent ad valorem upon the appraised value, such appraised value to be ascertained as provided by the Customs Act.
- Buckwheat meal or flour, one-fourth of one cent per pound.
- Cornmeal, 40 cents per barrel.
- Oats, 10 cents per bushel.
- Oatmeal, 20 per cent ad valorem.
- Rice, uncleaned, three-tenths of one cent per pound.
- Rice, cleaned, 1¼ cents per pound.
- Rice and sago flour, and sago, 25 per cent ad valorem.
- Rice, when imported by makers of rice starch, for use in their factories making starch, three-fourths of one cent per pound.
- Wheat, 15 cents per bushel.

Wheat flour, 75 cents per barrel.

Biscuits of all kinds, 25 per cent ad valorem.

Macaroni and vermicelli, 25 per cent ad valorem.

Starch, including farina, corn starch, or flour, and all preparations having the qualities of starch, 1½ cents per pound, the weight of the package to be in all cases included in weight for duty.

And a large number of other products. There is a large number of such products. In fact every product of the soil is protected, and every other product indirectly produced on account of the farming or agricultural industry, is protected as well. And yet we are told that the farmers of Canada are not protected. When the question was submitted to them in 1878, in 1882, in 1886, and in 1891, they decided that their products are more heavily protected than any other products in this Dominion, and in 1896, I believe, they will give a similar decision. I say that the farmers who toil and labour, and who are the backbone of our country, should be protected, as they have been under the National Policy. But this was not the policy which hon. gentlemen opposite pursued while they were in power. We are told by one speaker after another that it was not the intention of the Liberal party to have free trade, pure and simple, all at once, but it is the intention to get free trade as they have it in Great Britain, by degrees, so as not to disturb trade to an alarming extent. They say they will pursue the policy which they followed between 1874 and 1878. During that time, the farmers were not protected, and if the Liberal party obtained power, we will find that the same policy pursued between 1874 and 1878 will again be pursued by them. In fact it seems to me to be the settled policy of the Opposition to restore the tariff which existed in Canada during that time. In that case the farmers of Canada will not be protected to any extent whatever. The products of the United States will come in competition with Canadian products free, while the people of the United States will pursue the course hereafter that they pursued when they were in power between 1874 and 1878. Notwithstanding the fact that the Liberal party in 1874 abolished the duty on all products of the farm coming in from the United States, the people of the United States did not reduce the duty on the products of the farm of this country. In that way the people of Canada, particularly the farmers, were placed in a false position, and were compelled to compete very unfairly with the people of the United States along the line. It is not only the farmers who will be prejudicially affected by the abolition of the National Policy. During the period the Liberals were in power between 1874 and 1878 they imposed a duty upon many articles in which the fishermen of Canada are very much interested. They imposed a duty on ships' materials, binnacles, bunting, cables, hemp or

like goods, compasses, cordage, dead lights, deck planks, pumps, sail cloths, and many other articles required by the fishermen of the maritime provinces particularly, and in fact by fishermen all over the Dominion. The duty was abolished on all those articles by the National Policy; and in the interest of the labouring classes as well, the duty was abolished on tea, coffee, sugar and molasses and many other articles which were heavily taxed during the regime of hon. gentlemen opposite. I should be sorry indeed to find the policy of this country changed in such a way as is proposed by hon. gentlemen opposite. There was a convention held in Ottawa in 1893, one of the grandest conventions ever held in Canada. At that convention a policy was formulated, and as was said by the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson):

It is amusing to hear a gentleman of the intelligence of the hon. member for Pictou rising in this House and saying that he is not able to understand what that resolution means. Why, Sir, to make that declaration is to rank himself as having less comprehension than is bestowed upon the great majority of the people of Canada. There was no trouble about understanding it in that vast convention that adopted it, as was evidenced by the acclaim with which it was greeted. And yet hon. gentlemen opposite take out of this, that the policy of the Liberal party is to raise the revenue of the country by direct taxation and wipe out the Customs tariff altogether.

The platform of the Liberal party, as adopted by this convention in 1893, was read by hon. gentlemen opposite one after another, and notwithstanding the fact that this was done not one attempted to explain any feature of it. In fact the very reason why it has been so acceptable to the Opposition is simply that it reflects very clearly indeed the policy of deception, slander and scandals which have been adopted by the Opposition from 1878 up to the present time. Let us see the first paragraph of it:

That the Customs tariff of the Dominion should be based, not as it is now, on a protective principle, but upon the requirements of the public service.

That is a proposition which may mean anything. It is a proposition which may be defined in Ontario as meaning protection to the manufacturers and to the farmers. It may be defined in the maritime provinces as meaning anything else, and in this way the stump orator may continue misleading the people to believe that under the Liberal policy they can buy in the cheapest market and sell in the dearest, and in this way make a fortune for themselves. But they seem to forget the fact that it is necessary to raise a revenue. They must not forget the fact that it makes no difference which party is in power in Canada, a revenue of not less than \$40,000,000 annually must be raised. Unless it is raised by customs, excise and other taxation which exists at present, the balance must be made up by direct taxation. But the

merit of the first paragraph in the policy of the Opposition is how it can be utilized, not only in each province of the Dominion, but in every constituency. When canvassing in Cape Breton they may mislead the people to believe that it is not their intention to abolish the duty on coal. In Ontario they may tell the farmers that they will not abolish the duty on wheat. The millers of Ontario will be told that they will not abolish the duty on flour because it was not their intention to abruptly destroy the principle of protection, and it must be done by degrees. In this way they can cajole all the industries in this country to believe that notwithstanding that all other industries would be deprived of its protection that particular industry in the locality in which the stump orator speaks would be safe in the hands of the Liberal party.

The next paragraph in the platform is this :

That the existing tariff, founded upon an unsound principle, and used, as it has been by the Government, as a corrupting agency wherewith to keep themselves in office, has developed monopolies, trusts and combinations.

If any person cannot understand that he must be very dull of comprehension indeed. To my mind it is as clear as mud ; any person can see towards the centre of the earth just as clearly as he can see through this paragraph of the Liberal platform. But if it is analysed it will be found exactly to correspond with the policy of misrepresentation, the policy of slander, and the policy of scandals upon which the Liberal party obtained power in 1874, and on which they intend in the near future, unless they should be disappointed, as they have been in the past, to float into power again. I have a great deal of confidence in the intelligence of the farmers. I am unable to believe that they can be duped or fooled into believing that their interests are not protected. I know that in Quebec and Nova Scotia the farmers cannot be fooled into such a belief. There are some industries of manufacturers who fatten animals on the products of the farm, which are not protected as well as they desire. There are bloated monopolists amongst the farmers as well as among other manufacturers. There are those who perfect the products of cattle and hogs, and who are interested in having the raw material for their particular line of manufacture imported free. They therefore advocate strongly in this House and in the country, to have corn and oats from the other side of the line, admitted free, in competition with these products of our own country, while they know that the high tariff wall which exists between the United States and Canada, prevents any exportation from our country to that country in similar lines of products. There is no enemy in Canada so seriously alarming to the intelligent agriculturist, as he who fattens his cattle by

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness).

the fifty pair, or his hogs by the hundred, or engages in other lines of perfecting products of that kind. Then the Liberal platform goes on to say :

It has decreased the value of farm and other landed property.

The National Policy has, they say. Is there any hon. gentleman opposite who believes that the National Policy has decreased the value of wheat ?

Mr. FORBES. Yes.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). How ? I pause for an answer.

Mr. GRIEVE. Has it increased it ?

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). If the price of wheat has not increased, was that owing to the National Policy ? Does it follow as a cause and effect ?

Mr. GRIEVE. It was going to in 1878.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). Any person who said it was going to do it in 1878, did not calculate that demand and supply always regulated the price, and that, when the supply was largely increased, the price of a commodity fell. It would be idle to tell the people of this country that the National Policy, which prevents the importation of United States wheat, without paying 15 cents a bushel, will reduce the price of wheat in Canada. It would be idle to tell them that the duty imposed upon pork, will cause a reduction of the price of pork in Canada. Surely hon. gentlemen opposite do not believe that the farmers of this Dominion are so ignorant, as not to realize the fact that the National Policy which protects heavily all the lines on which they are engaged, is not the cause of the reduction in the price of these commodities. And it is asserted again by the great Liberal convention :

That it has oppressed the masses to the enrichment of the few.

That is a statement which not one in the convention believed himself. It is a statement in line with the policy pursued by the Liberal party in the past. The next statement in the Liberal platform is :

It has checked immigration.

Any person who will examine the tidal wave of immigration from Canada will realize at a glance that this statement is sheer sophistry. If it has checked the tide of immigration, it must have turned it in the direction of some free trade country. But the fact is, that the emigration from Canada has been mostly to the United States, which is a more highly protected country than Canada itself. How, therefore, could the protective tariff check emigration into Canada ? If there is any sound deduction from that statement, it is this : That the only way to restore immigration into Canada from the United States is to increase the

tariff, and in this way the tide of immigration might flow backwards into this country. If there is any value in the reasoning of the Liberals, that would be the inevitable result. Here comes another statement:

It has caused great loss of population.

I suppose this assertion is dependent upon the preceding one. The National Policy may have caused a large increase in the potato bug, and in small-pox and other influences which cause great loss of population, but there is otherwise no relevancy whatever in this assertion in connection with the National Policy. Again, they say :

It has impeded commerce.

Well, Mr. Speaker, our Trade and Navigation Returns prove that this is not a fact, and that the contrary is true.

It has discriminated against Great Britain.

This assertion has often been made in this House by hon. gentlemen opposite, and it has been as often disproved. They say :

In this and in many other ways it has occasioned great public and private injury, all of which evils must continue to grow in intensity as long as the present tariff system remains in force.

Well, Sir, I can well understand that those who are engaged in fattening hogs and cattle can realize that it has caused "in many other ways," great private injury. I can well imagine that those who are interested in the importation of coal oil, free of duty, also suppose they are injured by the National Policy. In fact, all importers, and all manufacturers who desire to have the products of the United States, which they use as a raw material, imported free, fancy that it is a great loss to themselves that these products are not admitted free of duty. But the poor agriculturist of Canada will realize that it is not in his interest that those who require his products should have the products of the United States, free of duty. Another assertion made by the great Liberal party in convention in Ottawa was :

That the highest interests of Canada demand the removal of this obstacle to our country's progress by the adoption of a sound fiscal policy, which, while not doing injustice to any class, will promote domestic and foreign trade, and hasten the return of prosperity to our people.

This is a grand idea. It is in line with the idea that the people ought to be allowed to buy in the cheapest markets and sell in the dearest, in view of the fact that there is no civilized country on the face of the globe that ever adopted that policy, that ever intended to adopt that policy, or that ever will adopt that policy, while a revenue is required to maintain the various industries of the country and to maintain its government.

There is another assertion made :

That to that end, the tariff should be reduced to the needs of honest, economical and efficient government.

This may imply anything. It may imply that it will be necessary to raise a revenue of \$100,000,000, or a revenue of \$23,000,000. It depends altogether upon what the needs of honest, economical and efficient government may be. In the history of the past the great advocates of economy, when they obtained power, were the most extravagant ever known up to their period. This has been the history of Ontario ; it has been the history of Quebec ; it has been the history of New Brunswick, and of Nova Scotia, and of Prince Edward Island, and of Manitoba as well. The Liberal party who obtained power in the several provinces of the Dominion, obtained power by professions of economy. They deluded the people to believe that when they obtained power, they would be economical ; but as soon as they obtained power, they were more lavish in their expenditures than their predecessors ; and if we can judge the future by the past, the Liberal party of Canada, when they obtain power, will follow the example of the Liberal party in the several provinces of the Dominion.

Another assertion that is made is :

That it should be so adjusted as to make free, or to bear as lightly as possible upon, the necessities of life, and should be so arranged as to promote freer trade with the whole world, more particularly with Great Britain and the United States.

Now, there is a grand idea underlying this declaration, and they can utilize it in very much the same way as they have been utilizing their policy in the late election contests throughout Canada. The necessities of life are now free to the people of this country. Every article that is useful or necessary for the existence or comfort of the labouring classes of this Dominion is free.

Mr. GRIEVE. Is sugar free ?

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). Sugar is free.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). It is practically free, and so is flour, because Canada produces a very much greater quantity of that article than is necessary for the consumption of the people of Canada ; and, as long as demand and supply regulates the price, it will be free to the consumers of this country. In no other country on the face of the globe can the poorer classes live as cheaply as they can in Canada ; and they can live that cheaply simply because the National Policy has stimulated the manufacturing industries of this Dominion to such an extent that it has created competition among them, so that not only all the articles which are useful or necessary for the poorer classes of this country are free, but all other lines which might be classed as luxuries can be purchased by them cheaper than they can in any other part of the world. But is it not idle to tell the people that they can be

rid of taxation altogether—that is, rid of customs or excise duties under a fiscal policy that can be adopted in this or any other country? It is simple delusion to mislead them to believe anything of that kind; but their intelligence is such that they cannot be deluded by such deception as the history of the past has conclusively proven.

There are a few other assertions made in that inexplicable fiscal policy that was adopted by the Liberal party in convention at Ottawa, the object of which is to deceive the people in the future as they were unfortunately deceived on one occasion in the past. It is based to a large extent on the idea that the people can be fooled to believe that they can buy in the cheapest market and sell in the dearest, that this country is ruled by a corrupt Government, that we are afloat in scandals, and that they themselves will be the paragons of perfection that they profess to be when they obtain power. But this is not the history of the past, as I think I can show from the utterances of one whose word will not be disputed by hon. gentlemen opposite. While the Liberal party was in power between 1874 and 1878 there were many scandals of the same class at that time as have been magnified by hon. gentlemen opposite during the past few years into political scandals.

Mr. GRIEVE. Name them.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). But the Opposition party of that day did not attempt to ride into power on such scandals. Their policy was well defined. They did not slander their opponents. The leader of the Opposition of that period defined his policy without maligning the character of his opponents. It was clear and thoroughly understood by the people of this country then, and it is clear and will be thoroughly understood by the people of the country hereafter. This is what the policy of the Opposition of that day declared in 1888:

That the welfare of Canada requires the adoption of a National Policy, which, by a judicious readjustment of the tariff, will benefit and foster the agricultural, the mining, the manufacturing and other interests of the Dominion; that such a policy will retain in Canada thousands of our fellow-countrymen now obliged to expatriate themselves in search of the employment denied them at home, will restore prosperity to our struggling industries, now so sadly depressed, will prevent Canada from being made a sacrifice market, will encourage and develop an active interprovincial trade, and moving (as it ought to do) in the direction of a reciprocity of tariffs with our neighbours, so far as the varied interests of Canada may demand, will greatly tend to procure for this country, eventually, a reciprocity of trade.

That was a manly, straightforward policy. It did not malign the Government of the day. But we might refer to the scandals which existed previous to that time, under that regime, but I am not going to follow up the example set by hon. gentlemen opposite. I will simply quote an authority which no

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness).

doubt they will approve of as one that cannot be disputed. It shows clearly whether scandals did exist during that period. It was written by the Premier of that day, and reads as follows:

Ottawa, 27th April, 1875.

My dear H—,—I have your note regarding C. I will endeavour to employ him within a few days at Thunder Bay on the commissariat staff, though I fear he is rather old, especially as his chief, B.'s father, is older.

I would like much to be relieved of the Public Works Department, but I cannot see my way to that at present. It is the great spending department, the possible great jobbing department, the department that can make or ruin a government at such a time as this, when \$25,000,000 are in the power of its head to spend on public works. Friends (?) expect to be benefited by offices they are unfit for, by contracts they are not entitled to, by advances not earned. Enemies ally themselves with friends, and push the friends to the front. Some attempt to storm the office. Some dig trenches at a distance and approach in regular siege form. I feel like the besieged lying on my arms night and day. I have offended at least twenty parliamentary friends by my defence of the citadel. A weak Minister here would ruin the party in a month, and the country very soon. So I must drudge on as best I may, and carry out the experiment of doing right whatever happens, and trusting to have a majority in the House to sustain me, and when that falls, I will go out cheerfully, if not joyfully.

I am, yours faithfully,

A. MACKENZIE.

It appears that he failed and retired from the position of Premier of the Dominion. It ill-becomes those of whom their leader thus wrote to continuously claim that they are the party of purity, and in this way hope to mislead the people into imagining that their only safety is to depose the Government and place these gentlemen in power.

Mr. GRIEVE. Is that the statute you are referring to?

Mr. CAMERON. Well, it appears he felt there were very grave scandals in the Dominion. These scandals preyed upon his mind, and my poor old venerable friend, under the high pressure that was imposed upon him, pined away and died.

The National Policy is fulfilling its mission. It has protected the agriculturists of this Dominion by giving them the markets of Canada to as great extent as possible. It has in this way kept a very large capital in circulation in Canada, which would otherwise have found its way across the line. It has protected the manufacturing industries of this Dominion, and in doing so it has given an increased market to the agriculturist. It has fostered the fishing industries of this Dominion. It has given the fishermen the articles required by them for the prosecution of their arduous toil free. It has given the fishermen their bread free, their tea free, their molasses free practically, their sugar free, their coffee free. Everything that they require for the main-

tenance of life and for the prosecution of their industry is practically free, but during the regime of the Opposition many of those articles were taxed heavily, and a very large proportion of them 5 per cent. Besides this protection given to the fishermen, the sea coast and inland fisheries have been protected at a very heavy expense. Besides this, a bounty has been given to the fishermen of the maritime provinces, which is also a great protection to that industry. If the Liberal party should come in power, no one can doubt that they will restore the policy which existed from 1874 to 1878, with very slight modifications, which will be very seriously injurious to the agricultural industry and the fishing industry as well. The same may be said of the mining industry. The mining industry is protected by the National Policy, and if the Liberal party should obtain power, no doubt they will pursue the same policy with regard to that industry as they did during their term of office from 1874 to 1878. The poorer classes during that time were out of work, soup kitchens were the order of the day, and if they restore the policy of a revenue tariff which existed from 1874 to 1878, the fishermen will suffer, the farmers will suffer, the miners will suffer, the manufacturers will suffer—and while all those industries suffer, will any one deny that the labourers and artisans will proportionately suffer as well? In view of all these circumstances, I have no fear with regard to the result of the contest which is pending in the near future. Those who advocate free trade as they have it in Great Britain, or commercial union, or unrestricted reciprocity, or a revenue tariff, will be weighed in the balance, as they have been during previous elections, and I have no doubt they will be found wanting. The people of this Dominion are too intelligent to be misled by empty speeches in this House. They are too intelligent to be misled by resolutions passed at a convention at Ottawa, which, from beginning to end, is misleading and inexplicable, except in so far as it enables a public speaker to deceive each section in this Dominion to which he addresses himself. The people, therefore, as a whole, are contented and happy in this Dominion. I have no hesitation in saying that in no country on the face of the earth are the labouring classes so well fed, so well clothed, and so contented as in this Dominion. That may or may not be the result of the National Policy. I believe it has been the result of the wise and judicious readjustment of the tariff which gave employment to our people and which has created as great a degree of prosperity as is practicable within reason. I feel that the people as a whole will be very loath indeed to go back to the revenue tariff policy which existed between 1874 and 1878. The result of the election lately in various constituencies

is not a criterion by which to forecast the result of a general election. Verchères was carried, as I believe, under false pretenses. So was Antigonish, and Montreal Centre may be placed in the same category.

Mr. McISAAC. What were the false pretenses?

Mr. CAMERON. With regard to the School Bill. Of all the great questions that agitate the public mind to-day, the foremost is the School Bill. That was the first plank in the platform in Antigonish.

Mr. McISAAC. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if the Bill introduced is the one promised to the electors of Antigonish by the Minister of Justice?

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). Practically the same Bill, and a very satisfactory Bill. My hon. friend from Antigonish (Mr. McISAAC) assured the people there that remedial legislation would be as safe in his hands and in the hands of Laurier, the leader of the Opposition and a Roman Catholic, as it could possibly be in the hands of Mr. Chisholm and Premier Bowell, who was an Orangeman. I have no hesitation in saying that such utterances had the desired effect with a few of the electors of Antigonish. I would ask my hon. friend if he is now disposed to oppose remedial legislation to which he was pledged during that contest?

Mr. McISAAC. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to interrupt him? The Bill introduced is not the Bill promised by the hon. gentleman's friends in Antigonish. It is no approach to the Bill promised by the Conservatives in that county. There is where the false pretenses come in.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). So you are prepared to vote against it. We shall see. The same argument was used in Verchères, and in other places. It was unreasonable for a Catholic constituency to believe that remedial legislation would not be as safe in the hands of the hon. gentleman who now represents Antigonish and the leader of the Opposition as it could possibly be in the hands of the present Government, led by an Orangeman. But, if the people were deceived and misled, transpiring events will convince them of that fact, and we shall expect a different decision from the people of Antigonish, Verchères, Montreal Centre and other constituencies to which an appeal has lately been made. It is, therefore, unfair to judge popular feeling in the country by elections that have lately taken place, particularly in Catholic constituencies. But the Remedial Bill is now before the House and judgment must be passed upon it. Each member will be placed upon record; no one can remain any longer within the line of Torres Vedras. The record will show to the people the convictions of every man on that

question and every one will be responsible for his decision. In view of all these facts I have come to the conclusion, and I have no doubt that a large majority of the people of this Dominion have come to the conclusion, that it would be unwise to depose the present Government, notwithstanding the many difficulties with which they have had to contend with of late, and replace them with men who proved incompetent to manage the affairs of the Dominion when they were in power. The leaders who then directed the fiscal policy of the Dominion are the very men upon whom their party depend to mould the fiscal policy in the future. It is, therefore, clear to an intelligent public that they would be making a great mistake by such a change. The School Bill having been decided upon, that obstacle removed, it would be a grave mistake to abandon the National Policy and the party that has carried it out so successfully for the last seventeen years. And I have no hesitation in saying, what has often been said in this House in the past, that hon. gentlemen opposite will never obtain power in this Dominion until they adopt the National Policy. They cannot again float into power on a sea of scandals. That happened once in this Dominion. But the sore experience which the people had of the unfortunate effect of that snap victory is fresh in the public mind, and it will not be repeated. Therefore, let hon. gentlemen opposite console themselves with the knowledge that the Liberal-Conservative party will continue its fiscal policy, the National Policy, and that they will rule Canada many years yet.

Mr. DAVIN moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 66) respecting the debentures of Loan Companies—(from the Senate).—(Mr. McDougall.)

Mr. COSTIGAN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.50 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 17th February, 1896.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

ADJOURNMENTS.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON moved :

That when the Speaker leaves the Chair at six o'clock, the House stands adjourned until tomorrow at three o'clock.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness).

Sir ADOLPHE CARON moved :

That when the House adjourns on Tuesday it do stand adjourned until Thursday next at 3 p.m.

Motion agreed to.

OFFICIAL REPORT OF DEBATES.

Mr. LARIVIERE moved :

That the second report of the special committee appointed to supervise the official reports of the debates of this House be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

LINDSAY, BOBCAYGEON AND PONTYPOOL RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. FAIRBAIRN moved that the House resolve itself into committee on Bill (No. 27) respecting the Lindsay, Bobcaygeon and Pontypool Railway Company.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The practice has crept in of scarcely ever explaining any private Bills in the House when read. They are referred to a committee and discussed in a committee, and no doubt are all perfectly regular, but I think the practice is rather a mischievous one, and that we ought to have a fair explanation given of each of these Bills, at some reading or other, before they pass the House.

Mr. HUGHES. The Bill is not in my name but I know all the circumstances in connection with it. The reason for asking this extension is that the president of the road, who had it in charge, has been ill and obliged to go to England. The whole matter has had to be handed over to a new organization owing to the ill-health of Mr. Boyd, and for that reason the extension is asked.

Mr. MULOCK. Why did you not do any work ?

Mr. HUGHES. Owing to Mr. Boyd's ill-health.

Bill considered in committee, reported, and read the third time, and passed.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 26) respecting the Nelson and Port Sheppard Railway Company.—(Mr. Mara.)

Bill (No. 37) to confirm a certain lease and agreement between the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada and the St. Lawrence and Adirondack Railway Company.—(Mr. Bergeron.)

Bill (No. 40) respecting the South Ontario Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Sutherland.)

Bill (No. 30) respecting the Guelph Junction Railway Company.—(Mr. Masson.)

Bill (No. 39) respecting the St. Lawrence and Adirondack Railway Company.—(Mr. Bergeron.)

Bill (No. 47) respecting the Brandon and South-western Railway Company.—(Mr. Davin.)

INDEPENDENT ORDER OF FORESTERS.

Mr. MCGILLIVRAY moved that the House resolve itself into Committee on Bill (No. 29) to amend the Act incorporating the Supreme Court of the Independent Order of Foresters.

Mr. EDGAR. I do not know whether this Bill has been reprinted as amended in committee. The amendments there were very considerable, and really at this early stage of the session, I should think it would not delay the Bill at all dangerously to wait till the amendments are reprinted.

Mr. FOSTER. I think it would be more convenient for the House to proceed with the Bill reprinted. I think my hon. friend will not object to its going over for a day or two in order to get it reprinted.

Mr. EDGAR. That is all I wish.

Mr. MCGILLIVRAY. That is satisfactory to me.

Mr. FOSTER moved that the debate be adjourned.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 59) respecting the Chignecto Marine Transport Railway Company.—(Mr. Powell.)

NUMBER OF FARMERS IN CANADA.

Mr. GRIEVE (for Mr. Dawson) asked :

1. Number of farmers in Canada according to the census of 1891 ?
2. Number of agricultural labourers or farm hands employed ?
3. Value of land owned by farmers ?
4. Value of buildings ?
5. Value of farm implements and machinery ?
6. Value of live stock ?

Mr. FOSTER. The number of farmers in Canada, according to the census of 1891, was 408,738, and of farmers' sons, 240,768. The other questions cannot be answered from the census, as no questions were asked about values.

SUPERANNUATIONS IN DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE.

Mr. CARROLL (for Mr. Bruneau) asked :

Have certain employees of the Department of Agriculture been superannuated recently, or notified that they were soon to be superannuated ? If so, what are their names ; what are the grounds for superannuation ; how many years have they been in the Civil Service, and what is the age in each case ?

Mr. FOSTER. Certain employees of the Department of Agriculture have been superannuated, or notified of superannuation. Mr. H. B. Small, chief clerk and secretary, has been superannuated on account of age, and to promote efficiency and economy in the service. He has been twenty-eight years in the service and his age is 65. Three clerks, Louis D'Auray, Joseph Ferreol Dionne and Auguste Levêque, are under consideration for superannuation. The times which they have served, respectively, are, 24, 28, and 22 years. Their ages are 47, 61, and 46.

CAPE BRETON RAILWAY.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness) asked :

What quantity (1) of solid rock ; (2) of gypsum rock ; (3) of loose rock ; (4) of borrow pit ; (5) of earth ; and (6) of "hard-pan"—so-called—respectively, was excavated on section from station 210 to 250 whilst Messrs. Sims and Slater and their sureties conducted the work on the Cape Breton Railway, east of the Grand Narrows, in 1887 ?

Mr. HAGGART. There was excavated on the section of the Cape Breton Railway under contract with Messrs. Sims & Slater, between stations numbers 210 and 250, during the time they and their sureties conducted the work :—Solid rock, nil ; gypsum rock, nil ; loose rock, nil ; borrow pit, 581 cubic yards ; earth, 1,240 cubic yards ; hard-pan, 3,821 cubic yards.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness) asked :

What quantity (1) of solid rock ; (2) of gypsum rock ; (3) of loose rock ; (4) of borrow pit ; (5) of earth ; and (6) of hard-pan—so-called—respectively, was excavated on section from station 328.60 to station 592.80, being from 18th to 22nd mile, inclusive, east side Grand Narrows, whilst Sims and Slater conducted the works on the Cape Breton Railway, east of the Grand Narrows, between 5th May and 17th August, 1887 ?

Mr. HAGGART. There was excavated on the section of the Cape Breton Railway under contract with Messrs. Sims & Slater, between stations numbers 328.60 and 592.80, whilst they and their sureties conducted the work :—Solid rock, nil ; gypsum rock, nil ; loose rock, 2 cubic yards ; borrow pit, 10,269 cubic yards ; earth, 36,721 cubic yards ; hard-pan, 7,055 cubic yards.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness) asked :

What quantity (1) of solid rock ; (2) of gypsum rock ; (3) of loose rock ; (4) of borrow pit ; (5) of earth ; and (6) of hard-pan—so-called—respectively, was excavated on section from station 2.98 to station 108.58, being from 24th to 25th mile, inclusive, whilst Sims and Slater and their sureties conducted the work on the Cape Breton Railway, east of the Grand Narrows, in 1887 ?

Mr. HAGGART. There was excavated on the section of the Cape Breton Railway under contract with Messrs. Sims & Slater, between stations numbers 2.98 and 108.58, during the time they and their sureties con-

ducted the work:—Solid rock, 52 cubic yards; gypsum rock, nil; loose rock, 189 cubic yards; borrow pit, 1,270 cubic yards; earth, 27,675 cubic yards; hard-pan, 2,098 cubic yards.

GRAIN STANDARDS IN THE NORTH-WEST.

Mr. DAVIN asked :

Whether the hon. the Controller of Inland Revenue has received a petition from one or more of the Farmers' Institutes of Manitoba, containing the resolutions set out below and passed at a regular meeting of the Souris E. D. Farmers' Institute held in Melita, 22nd November, 1895:—

That whereas by a "Dominion Act" certain regulations are set forth whereby the grain standards of Manitoba and the North-west Territories are adjusted by a grain standard board each successive season, the conditions being such that a great injustice may be done to farmers of this province and territories. Said Act provides that No. 1 hard wheat shall be sound and well cleaned, weighing not less than 60 pounds to the bushel, and shall be composed of not less than two-thirds hard red Fyfe wheat.

And whereas the standard board so long as they do not conflict with the above conditions of the Act may make and frequently do make the grade of No. 1 hard wheat to weigh much over 60 pounds to the bushel, and to contain much more than two-thirds bushel red Fyfe wheat.

And whereas we are told that said standards are based upon collection of samples made each year from various parts of Manitoba and the Territories, we hereby suggest and do believe that the collection of such samples, being largely in the hands of the dealers and purchasers of said wheat, may be, and we believe frequently are superior to the average and beyond, this season for example, the general conditions.

Such variation of standards and uncertainty resulting from such conditions year after year is to the farmer a source of very great dissatisfaction and suspicion and must also cause confusion in the English or other outside markets as to what our standards really are.

And inasmuch as the Duluth wheat standards which regulate the grades of wheat grown in Dakota and Minnesota, where No. 1 Duluth weighs only 58 pounds per measured bushel and mostly hard red Fyfe wheat, where the average conditions are similar to our own, are of a more permanent character and remain practically the same every year, being regulated by an Act of the state of Minnesota, and give general satisfaction to both producers and handlers.

Therefore, be it resolved, that owing to conditions herein set forth, we the members of the Souris E. D. Farmers' Institute desire to express in the strongest terms possible our condemnation which makes it possible for such a manipulation of the grain standards as will not give us even-handed justice.

And be it further resolved, we are strongly of the opinion that the grain standard boards should be abolished and that all grading should be done under the Act, and that one hard wheat should be the same every year as now specified, 60 pounds to the bushel and two-thirds hard red Fyfe wheat, and that all other grades should be such as would meet the average crop conditions. We are also of the opinion that the lower grades, including rejected, should be capable of absorbing all frosted grain, instead of making frosted

Mr. HAGGART.

standards as now, and that all such grades should be made as permanent as possible.

Whether the Government has decided to have a standard not varying, but the same from year to year as suggested?

Mr. PRIOR. There is no record in the department of any petition from the Souris E. D. Farmers' Institute respecting the mode of erecting grain standards for Manitoba. I may say, however, that the department is now considering the whole matter, and is inclined to view the methods dictated by the Inspection Act, as quite open to improvement, especially those bearing upon the annual establishment of grain standards.

IMPORTATION OF TEA, COFFEE AND SUGAR.

Mr. GIROUARD asked :

1. How many pounds of tea, coffee and sugar were imported into Canada in 1878?

2. What were the duties levied on those several articles?

3. What was the quantity of tea, coffee and sugar imported into Canada during the year 1895? And what were the duties levied thereon?

4. What would have been the duties levied on the said articles, had they been subjected to the rates of duty that existed in 1878?

Mr. WOOD. 1. The following is a statement of the number of pounds of tea, coffee and sugar imported into Canada during the fiscal year 1878:—

	Pounds.
Tea	11,019,231
Coffee	1,831,800
Sugar	105,223,279

2. The duties levied on the several articles respectively, amounted to the following sums:—

On tea	\$ 611,313.65
“ coffee	37,273.75
“ sugar	2,515,655.84

3. The quantity of tea, coffee and sugar imported into Canada during the fiscal year 1895 is:

	Pounds.	Duty.
Tea	20,610,733	\$ 6,132.70
Coffee	3,433,470	7,464.83
Sugar	354,707,312	244,544.20

4. The duty that would have been levied on said articles, had they been subject to the rates of duty that existed in 1878, would have amounted to the following sums, respectively:—

On tea	\$1,133,420.42
“ coffee	100,526.87
“ sugar	5,457,338.62

TIGNISH POST OFFICE.

Mr. PERRY asked :

What is the amount of revenue derived from the post office at Tignish, Prince Edward Island, for the six months ending 31st December, 1895?

What salary was paid the postmaster at Tignish for the six months ending 31st December, 1895 ?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The revenue derived from the post office at Tignish, P.E.I., for the six months ending 31st December, 1895, was \$411.42. The salary paid the postmaster during the same period was \$170.

DUTY ON COAL OIL.

Mr. RIDER asked :

1. When was an import duty first put on kerosene and refined coal oil ?
2. Was it specific or ad valorem, and how much per gallon calculated on the basis of the imperial measure now in force ?
3. Was there an excise duty when imposed, and how much per gallon imperial measure ?
4. When did a reduction in the import and excise duty first take place, and to what rate was it reduced ?
5. What would have been the equivalent rate of duty ad valorem, if the import duty had been collected in this way according to the import of kerosene in the year 1878 ?

Mr. WOOD. At the date of confederation there was a specific duty on coal oil of 10 cents per wine gallon, which would be equivalent to 12 cents per imperial gallon. An excise duty was first imposed on 29th April, 1868, at the rate of 5 cents per wine gallon. In July, 1876, this was changed to 6 cents per imperial gallon. On 20th February, 1877, the customs duty was made 7 1-5th cents per imperial gallon, and on 21st February, 1877, the excise duty was repealed. The equivalent rate of ad valorem duty, based on the total value of imports and total collections, in 1878, would have been 32.7 per cent, and in 1895, 93.4 per cent, which is accounted for through the average price in 1878 being 20 cents per wine gallon, or 25 cents per imperial gallon, while the average value of coal oil in 1895 was 6 3/4 cents per imperial gallon.

THE TAY CANAL.

Mr. PERRY asked :

What was the cost of maintaining the Tay Canal during last season, including pay for keeper ?

What amount of revenue was derived for toll, &c., last season ?

What is the total cost of the work up to date ?

Mr. HAGGART. The cost of maintaining the Tay Canal during last season, including pay for keeper, was \$3,188.60. The amount of revenue derived for toll, &c., last season, was \$119.94. The total cost of the work up to date is \$476,877.38.

MAILS TO MAGDALEN ISLANDS.

Mr. LANGEЛИER asked :

Has the Government, or any member thereof, received any petition or letter praying that the steamship "Stanley" be ordered to take the mails to the Magdalen Islands during the winter

months as often as the weather and ice would permit it ?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. On 21st June, 1895, Mr. T. E. Kenny, M.P., inclosed to this Department a letter from Messrs. Wm. Leslie & Co., of Grindstone Island, in which they ask that a trip be made to the Magdalen Islands during the coming January. As the proposal mentioned the steamer "Stanley" as suitable for such a service, the question was referred to the Department of Marine and Fisheries, which controls this steamer ; and a reply was received, to the effect, that the steamer might be sent as far as Magdalen Island post office, but, owing to its drawing so much water, the steamer could not go to the Grindstone Island. This reply was communicated to Mr. Kenny, M.P., with a request that he would say whether this would be satisfactory ; but no answer was received from him, and the matter dropped.

Mr. LANGEЛИER asked :

Is it true that the instructions given to the captain of the steamship "Stanley" to carry the mails to the Magdalen Islands were countermanded ? If so, at whose request and why ?

Mr. COSTIGAN. No instructions were given to the captain of the steamer "Stanley" to carry the mails to Magdalen Islands.

MAILS BETWEEN PICTOU, N.S., AND MAGDALEN ISLANDS.

Mr. LANGEЛИER asked :

Is it the intention of the Government to grant a bi-weekly mail service between Pictou, Nova Scotia, and the Magdalen Islands during the season of navigation ?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. This subject is now engaging the attention of the department.

GRAIN DUTIES.

Mr. CAMPBELL asked :

1. Did the firm of James Richardson & Sons, of Kingston, Ont., import from Buffalo, N.Y., during the year 1895, a quantity of about 50,000 bushels of Manitoba wheat for consumption in Canada ?

2. How much duty did they pay upon the said wheat ?

3. Have the Government refunded any portion of the duty, and if so, how much was refunded ?

4. What were the reasons which induced the Government to refund the said duties ?

Mr. WOOD. Messrs. James Richardson & Sons, of Kingston, Ont., imported 49,253 bushels of Manitoba wheat during the year 1895, by way of Duluth and Buffalo, N.Y. Duty was exacted to the amount of \$7,387.95. The amount of duty so paid has been refunded. Remission of duty was made upon the Canadian identity of the wheat being fully established.

IMPORTS OF ALCOHOL.

Mr. RIDER asked :

Has there been any alcohol imported into Canada during the year 1895 on which a rebate of duty has been allowed? If so, how much and by whom has it been imported? From whence, through what port or ports, and how much through each port, and what portion of the duty has been rebated?

Mr. WOOD. There has been no rebate of customs duty allowed on alcohol imported into Canada during the year 1895.

THE TAY CANAL.

Mr. MULOCK asked :

What amount of revenue was derived from the Tay Canal during the season of navigation in the year 1895?

What amount of money was expended during the year 1895 for maintenance and management of the Tay Canal?

What is the total amount expended on the Tay Canal for construction, expropriation of land, damages, maintenance, repairs and all other accounts, and what has been the total revenue from the canal?

Mr. HAGGART. I have answered that question.

Mr. MULOCK. Only the first two questions.

Mr. HAGGART. No.

Mr. MULOCK. Excuse me. The third question asks :

What is the total amount expended on the Tay Canal for construction, expropriation of land, damages, maintenance, repairs and all other accounts, and what has been the total revenue from the canal?

The hon. gentleman did not answer that—

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. MULOCK. Well, the hon. gentleman asked me what the question is.

Mr. HAGGART. I gave the total amount expended on the Tay Canal construction, expropriation, land damages, maintenance, repairs, and all other accounts.

Mr. MULOCK. You only gave the revenue for one year.

Mr. HAGGART. The only answer I got was the one which I gave to the question.

Mr. MULOCK. Well, it had better stand over.

Mr. HAGGART. I have got the answer here to another question. The total revenue from the canal is \$884.34.

Mr. MULOCK. The question is not all answered. The hon. gentleman has not given the total expenditure of all kinds.

Mr. HAGGART. The total expenditure on the Tay Canal amounts to \$488,470.98.

Mr. WOOD.

ST. LAURENT WHARF—PHILIAS FILLION.

Mr. LANGEЛИER asked :

1. Is the Government aware that in 1891 a bale of oakum, furnished by it for repairs to the pontoon of St. Laurent wharf, on the Island of Orleans, was taken and kept by Philias Fillion, of the said parish, and sold by him to the boat-builders?

2. Is the Government aware that in the same year 1891, a piece of timber fifteen feet long and twelve inches square, and a chain furnished by the Government for the gangway of the St. Laurent wharf, were appropriated to his own use by the said Philias Fillion?

3. Had the said Philias Fillion purchased these articles, at what price, and has he paid for them?

Mr. OUIMET. Fifty pounds of oakum, at a total cost of \$3.75, was supplied to Mr. Philias Fillion, and used by him to caulk the pontoon of the slip of the St. Laurent wharf during the summer of 1891. Mr. Fillion has always enjoyed the reputation of being an honest, respectable and faithful employee. If the hon. member for Quebec Centre (Mr. Langelier) will supply the department with the information upon which he has thought proper to make such a serious imputation as the one contained in his question, I shall at once order an investigation into the matter. The answer to the second question is, "No."

Mr. LANGEЛИER asked :

1. Is the Government aware that in 1891, a person named Philias Fillion, of St. Laurent, Island of Orleans, caused to be sawed and kept for his own use a portion of the timber furnished by the Government to make fenders for the wharf of the said parish?

2. Was the said timber sold to the said Philias Fillion by the Government? If so, for how much, and has the price therefor been paid?

Mr. OUIMET. The answer to both questions is, "No," but if the information is given, and the name of the informer, I will have an investigation made.

Mr. LANGEЛИER asked :

1. Were repairs made to the St. Laurent wharf, on the Island of Orleans, in 1888?

2. If made, were they made by contract or by day's work?

3. If by contract, who was the contractor, and how did he obtain the contract; by private contract or under award as the lowest tenderer?

4. If by day's work, who superintended the works, and what were his wages, and what is the total amount paid him?

5. How much timber was purchased by the Government for these works; was any left, and what has been done with it?

Mr. OUIMET. 1. Repairs were made to the St. Laurent wharf, on the Island of Orleans, in 1888. 2 and 3. These repairs were made by day's work. 4. The work was done by day's work; the superintendent of the work being Mr. Philias Fillion; his wages being \$2.50 per day; and the total amount paid him was \$50. 5. Five

hundred and seventeen pieces of timber were purchased by the department for these repairs, at a cost of \$98. The whole of it was employed in the work.

Mr. LANGELIER asked :

1. How much did the shed built on the St. Laurent wharf, on the Island of Orleans, cost ?

2. Were the works done by contract or by day's labour ?

3. If the works were done by contract, who was the contractor ; and did he obtain it by private contract or under award as the lowest tenderer ?

4. If done by day's work, who was the overseer of the works, and what were his wages ?

5. Was there any timber or other material belonging to the Government left, after the full completion of the works, and what has been done with it ?

6. What was the cost of the sheet-iron roof on the said shed ?

Mr. OUMET. 1. The shed on the St. Laurent wharf cost \$450. 2. Work was done by day's labour. 4. The overseer of the work was Philius Fillion ; his wages were \$2.50 per day. 5. No material was left after the full completion of the work. 6. The iron roof cost \$77.

BONDED WAREHOUSE BETWEEN NEW BRUNSWICK AND MAINE.

Mr. COLTER asked :

Have the Government bonded warehouses, on the international boundary between New Brunswick and the state of Maine, been abolished ? If so, when ? If not, is it the intention of the Government to abolish them, and if so, when ?

Mr. WOOD. The answer is, "Yes." The collector at Woodstock, N.B., was instructed to close these warehouses by the 1st November, 1895.

PUBLIC MONEY INVESTED IN CERTAIN SECURITIES.

Mr. MULOCK asked :

1. What amount of public money of Canada is invested in securities of, or loaned to the Albert Railway Company, the Fredericton and St. Mary's Railway Bridge Company, the Quebec Harbour Commissioners, and the Three Rivers Harbour Commissioners, respectively ?

2. Has default been made in payment of interest on all or any of such investments ? If so, in which, and how long has such default existed, and what are the respective amounts of such arrears of interest ?

3. What security does the Government hold in respect of such investments ?

4. At what amounts are such investments valued in the official statement as to the net debt of Canada, as appears on page xxx of the Public Accounts for the fiscal year ending 30th June, 1895 ?

5. Has default been made in payment of interest on any other assets which according to said statements are deducted from the gross public debt ? If so, what are the particulars of such default ?

Mr. FOSTER. The answer to the first question is : Albert Railway Company, \$14,725.56 ; Fredericton and St. Mary's Railway Bridge Company, \$300,000 ; Quebec Harbour Commissioners, \$3,748,519.62 ; Three Rivers Harbour Commissioners, \$81,760.97. The answer to the second question is : Default has been made in all. Albert Railway Company—No interest collected since 31st December, 1887 ; arrears of interest to 30th June, 1895, \$6,613.71. Fredericton and St. Mary's Bridge Company—No interest collected since June, 1889 ; arrears to 31st December, 1895, \$78,000. Quebec Harbour Commissioners—Very little interest paid ; arrears to 31st December, 1895, \$930,463.06. Three Rivers Harbour Commissioners—They paid \$15,000 under Act of last session, and after deducting this amount, the arrears of interest and sinking fund to 31st December, 1895, amounts to \$26,924.90. The answer to the third question is : Mortgages in the case of the Railway Company and the Bridge Company, and debentures in the other cases. The answer to the fourth question is : To the extent of the principal in each case, as given in answer to question. The answer to the fifth question is : Nothing has been paid for some years on account of Grand Trunk Fourth Preference Stock, \$121,739.65 ; and nothing at all on the Quebec Turnpike Trust Board, \$20,000 ; Upper Canada Bank Stock, \$750 ; and Earl of Selkirk, mortgage, \$13,900.

ST. PETER'S CANAL, CAPE BRETON.

Mr. FRASER asked :

What amount was spent on the St. Peter's Canal, Cape Breton, during 1895 ? How long was the canal closed to navigation during the same time ? Is the work on the said canal finished ? If not, when will it be ? What amount does the Government expect to get from the contractor or contractors for failure to finish the work ?

Mr. HAGGART. The amount spent on the St. Peter's Canal, Cape Breton, in the year 1895, was \$43,389.95. The canal was closed to navigation from the 16th December, 1894, to the 8th November, 1895, about eleven months. There is the work of rebuilding the east retaining wall required to be done to maintain the canal. No appropriation has yet been made for renewing that retaining wall. The Government have the matter under consideration as regards the contractors' failure to finish the work.

PROHIBITION OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS.

On the Order,

That, in the opinion of this House, the manufacture, importation and sale of intoxicating liquors,

except for medicinal, sacramental and mechanical purposes, should be prohibited by law.

Mr. FOSTER. It was understood that Mr. Flint's motion should stand over until the next private day. Mr. Craig, who was to have seconded it, is absent. Mr. Flint has a sore throat.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). He will have to take something for his throat.

Motion allowed to stand.

THE NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES.

Mr. DAVIN. Mr. Speaker, the motion which I have on the paper is one that I hope the House will regard at this time as specially appropriate :

That it is necessary to (1) the prosperity and progress of the North-west Territories, important to the stability and progress of the Dominion, and of great moment to the Empire that the North-west Territories shall be treated on a different footing from that heretofore ; (2) That the self-respect of the people of the North-west, not less than the material interests of those vast territories demands that the Territories shall not be treated on a plane of inferiority ; (3) That the climate, soil and conditions generally of the North-west are different from those of other parts of Canada, and a policy specially adapted to its needs and resources is called for in order that the settlers shall be rendered prosperous and immigration policies be made effective.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That is a vote of want of confidence in the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Daly).

Mr. DAVIN. My friend the member for Bothwell says this is a vote of want of confidence in the Minister of the Interior. I beg to say that it is nothing of the kind.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The vote has not come yet.

Mr. DAVIN. Mr. Speaker, in the earlier clauses of this motion I refer to our treatment of the North-west Territories ever since we had anything to do with them. I consider that we shall have to take the North-west Territories more seriously than we have done. We have seen in the papers—and it has even been brought before the attention of the Empire—evidence of the readiness of the authorities at Washington, on occasion, to put on, or pretend to put on, their war paint. A short time ago we had a reference made to the attitude of the people of the United States and to the position of England, and that reference has attracted widespread attention. When the people of the United States talk about difficulties with England, they are not thinking of petty disputes connected with bickering republics in South America. They are thinking of Canada, and when they think of Canada, they are thinking of the North-west Territories and of Manitoba. We have had, as I have stated in this House before, visits to the North-west from prominent American statesmen ;

Mr. HAGGART.

and the impression these vast territories, with millions of arable acres, has made upon them, has been such as to wake them from the indifference with which they have regarded Canada generally, especially the North-west. A Mr. Thompson has published an essay in one of the American magazines in which he gives an account of a visit he made to the Territories in 1895. He stopped at Regina, stopped at Calgary, went up to Edmonton, and made, if I may say so, a literary survey of the country ; and what did he do when he went back ? He quoted official utterances on the part of the United States officials as to the unimportance of the North-west Territories and Manitoba, and told his countrymen, through this magazine, that they were entirely mistaken—that Canada had more than half of North America, and had to-day fertile regions stretching over the North-west Territories equal to seven or eight or nine of the greatest and most fertile states of the Union. Mr. Speaker, in the "Evening Journal," published in this city, there appeared on the 15th instant a leading article, the writer of which copied a long letter from an American doctor, I think in Philadelphia, which appeared in the London "Times." This gentleman argues that it is for the good of humanity generally, especially for the good of this continent and its peace, that the United States should wake up from their indifference and take Canada in hand. Now, the same writer, Mr. Thompson, points out that the waste lands of the United States have all been taken up. They are no longer these vast extents of fertile territory which that country formerly had ; there are no longer fields for their restless spirits to go to, and they are becoming anxious ; and there cannot be the least doubt that it would be a solution of one of the most difficult problems that concern the United States at present, if, by any possible arrangement, they could get hold of the vast territory which we possess. The reason why I give so wide a bearing to this question is my belief that the future of the Dominion, and perhaps the strength of the whole Empire, is involved in our treatment of the North-west Territories. I say that the prosperity and progress of the North-west Territories demand that they be treated differently. They have been treated too much on this line—that all you had to do was to open up the country, send railways in there, dot it with post offices, give it telegraph and postal communication, and give it a large share of provincial government, and that would be sufficient. I do not think that that has been sufficient in the past, and I am certain that it is not at present. There is one feature of our dealing with the North-west Territories which we shall have, in my opinion, to revolutionize. I mean the feature of immigration into these territories. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) has said that this is a vote of

want of confidence in my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Daly). When that hon. gentleman took charge of the Interior Department, he told us that he was going to give us a vigorous immigration policy; and some people, both in the newspapers and out of them, have charged that the hon. gentleman's policy was not as vigorous as he promised and as we desired. But, Mr. Speaker, I am bound to say that the Parliament of Canada did not give my hon. friend the means of prosecuting such a vigorous immigration policy as we expected.

Mr. DEVLIN. Yes, but he has a majority in Parliament.

Mr. DAVIN. My hon. friend from Ottawa County says that he has a majority in Parliament, but if he will look back to the debates in this House he will find—I do not know whether he was guilty in that particular or not—that hon. members on the opposite side have always denounced the amount of money that was expended on immigration.

Mr. MARTIN. Because it was wasted.

Mr. DAVIN. That is a point into which I cannot go just now; but I have heard criticisms in this House on immigration expenditure that did not bear on the question of waste at all, but were confined to the proposition that the amount put down in the Estimates was altogether too large a sum for such a purpose. What we want therefore—and I should like to know if my hon. friend from Ottawa County (Mr. Devlin) will support me in this—is to have a far larger sum spent on immigration. My hon. friend the leader of the Opposition has frequently denounced the millions which he said had been spent within the last fifteen years.

Mr. MULLOCK. But the more millions you spend, the less immigrants you get.

Mr. DAVIN. No, immigration is a business like any other. If you put capital into it and manage that capital properly, you will have results.

Mr. LAURIER. It has been very badly managed, then.

Mr. DAVIN. I shall not go into that just now, because that would belong to more properly to a motion dealing with the administration of the vote for immigration, and that is not my purpose here.

Mr. McMULLEN. Nor anywhere else?

Mr. DAVIN. My hon. friend from Wellington (Mr. McMullen), who has been very quite this session, remarks that it is not my purpose to do so anywhere else. I hope that we shall hear from the hon. gentleman in this debate. He has been very quite. I rather think that his financial critical sphere has been narrowed by his leaders this session lest he might prove too injurious

to them. Suppose we go on in the North-west as we have been going on. Suppose we only increase there in the ratio we have increased; the result will be that ten or twenty years will pass, and yet the North-west will not have its farms of 160 acres each, each containing a family, and what would be the result? It would be that the North-west Territories will not be the strength to Canada that they might be otherwise, nor the strength to the Empire which they should be. I lay stress on this. I say that if you are to fill up these Territories with an English, a Scandinavian, a Scotch and an Irish population, let us have them filled rapidly, and any vaporings about annexation may be laughed to scorn. In fact, I believe that any such vaporings may be laughed to scorn to-day. But, Sir, there is a great opportunity before our Parliament and Government at present with regard to out North-west Territories. That opportunity is this. The English people are thoroughly awake just now to the importance of the colonies. The opinion which obtained some twenty-five years ago, that the colonies were of little importance, is now at a discount, the English people are thoroughly awake to the importance of their colonies, and the notion of an Imperial Zollverein has undoubtedly made considerable progress. I believe that in the mood in which England is at present, you ought to be able to get the statesmen of England to join with the statesmen of Canada in a great immigration scheme. If you do this, if you turn the tide of immigration to the North-west Territories, if you do not confine yourself to the stray efforts made by charitable associations and the scanty efforts that can be made on the small sums hitherto voted by Parliament, we would get a considerably larger immigration from England than we have had in the past. Then, Sir, if a larger scheme be entered into, we ought to be able to get a larger immigration from Scandinavia than we have had, and a far larger immigration from Germany; and under those circumstances, I think that the first part of my resolution should commend itself to the House, namely, that it is of great importance to the stability and progress of the Dominion, and of great moment to the Empire, that the North-west Territories be treated on a different footing from that which has obtained heretofore. In 1891, or perhaps in 1890, I brought before this House a scheme for irrigation. Since that time, my hon. friend (Mr. Daly) has passed an admirable Bill—he was not then Minister of the Interior—dealing with irrigation, and the settlers of Alberta have made use of it. When I brought forward that scheme, I remember the then Minister of the Interior complained that I was casting doubt upon the North-west Territories as a fertile country. I need hardly say there was not much likelihood of my casting any doubt upon the North-west Territories as a

fertile country. But what I said, and what has since been proved in Alberta, and what has been proved up to the handle in the United States was that you can get no better result from any land in the world or by any system of cultivation than you get from that soil than by means of irrigation. Irrigation makes you independent of the variations of the seasons. In other parts of the North-west, in all parts of Assiniboia, wherever we have had a partial failure of the crops, it has been due to drought. There is no part of the Territories where an abounding crop cannot be secured, year after year, if you have sufficient moisture. In India, among other systems, they have in the dry parts, far from rivers, a system of irrigation by means of wells. These wells are found to produce an enormous amount of fertility. In some parts of the United States, also, a system of irrigation by means of wells, has been introduced. Windmills are employed to pump up the water all the time, the water being distributed in troughs, and thence, through smaller troughs, to all parts of the land. The proposition I made in 1891 was this—that the Government of Canada, which had great advantages because it had complete power, should take into its own hands the providing of means of irrigation where it was known that the land was fertile, but where it was also known that the rainfall was not sufficient. There are parts of Assiniboia where we have farms, the occupants of which have to go great distances for water. Now, I hold that money appropriated for irrigation purposes could not be better spent than by providing water for these farmers, not exactly at their doors, but contiguous to their farms. If this were done, on every farm you would have a man sending letters abroad telling of abundant crops year after year, and of a condition of things enabling him to despise the mutations of the seasons. There is another point, one that, probably, would not commend itself to free traders or revenue tariffists, but that would commend itself to those of us who believe in protection, and who are not afraid of the sneers against "paternalism." I believe that there are parts of the North-west Territories where we ought to aid the farmers, through helping little bodies of farmers in establishing creameries where they are not able to do so themselves. Some assistance should be given, but not exactly in the form I suggested before. Some assistance was given some years ago in one part of my own district, and the result has been most gratifying; it has been such as to justify the Government in the course they took at that time. The second clause of the resolution is this:

(2) That the self-respect of the people of the North-west, not less than the material interests of those vast territories demands that the Territories shall not be treated on a plane of inferiority.

Mr. DAVIN.

I think it was in 1880 that I proposed that we should have full responsible government for the Territories; and what was done then was to pass a Bill—my late illustrious leader, the Right Honourable Sir John A. Macdonald was leading the Government, and it was his Bill—which gave us a small advisory board. And now we have a financial committee, which has not the right to advise the governor on any subject but finance. The powers of the North-west Territories are, I think, with the exception of one or two items, coextensive with those of a province. But, for what reason, I never could make out, we hesitate to give full responsible government to the Territories. The result of giving full responsible government would be to set that giant, the North-west Territories, upon its mettle. It is just as important, for instance, as British Columbia—much more important from one point of view—

Mr. PRIOR. Query.

Mr. DAVIN. From one point of view. My hon. friend may be quite certain that I would not disparage the importance of any part of Canada to Canada at large. I know full well the importance of that magnificent province of the Pacific. But what I say is that there is no part of Canada so important at this hour to Canada as the North-west Territories, with their boundless fertile acres awaiting the plough of the immigrant. If provincial government be good for the provinces, why should it not be good for the North-west Territories? We have a population—again to refer to the Pacific province—as large as that of British Columbia. That is shown by the last census. And we have more fertile land than any province or any two provinces in Canada. We have vast resources, mineral and agricultural, as well as resources of the forest, and the fishery. The same principle that leads us, as federalists, to give power to the province to deal with its own affairs, should lead us to give similar powers to the North-west Territories. Local self-government is based upon the principle that if you have Ministers on the spot who are closely interested in the local affairs, and have much better opportunities to manage those affairs wisely than persons at a distance, things will in a large sphere of civil government be better done. There is also the principle of the division of labour. We divide the work of the government in this country. We find that the provinces can do the purely provincial work better than it could be done here in Ottawa, and, of course, we are able to do the work that is allotted to us better than if it were scattered over five or six departments, in five or six different parts of Canada. What we want, therefore, in my opinion, and in the opinion of the most thoughtful people in the North-west Territories, is that the last link be given; we

want to have the additional power that is necessary to cover the whole field of provincial functions, and we want to have the Ministers, as we virtually have at present. We have my friend Mr. Haultain, who is called the Premier; he is chairman of the executive. He has got another colleague, paid as much as a Minister, and he is a member of the executive. These, with two other gentlemen, are a committee of the House chosen by the House, to advise His Honour on financial questions. The result is, that instead of having a little executive responsible to the assembly, and responsible to the people of the North-west, you have a committee appointed to spend the money that we give them, a committee appointed by the assembly really to spend that money, as it is directed by the assembly. And what is the consequence of that? The consequence is, that the system of log-rolling still prevails. Now, Mr. Speaker, my friend Mr. Haultain, who is chairman of the executive, promised that he would get out of that; he promised that he would certainly give that up, and a step has been taken in the way of focussing the responsibility. But I cannot think that you can have the expenditure of money, say, for public works, placed in a satisfactory position, unless you have men as a body responsible to the assembly, and who shall hold that responsible position in face of the electors of the country. Under these circumstances, the result will be that you will have what seems to be necessary to our system of government, you will have the politicians, the people who take an interest in the affairs of that country, divided into parties. Nobody is more sensible than I am of the evils that can gather around party government. But all things are capable of degenerating into abuses. We cannot find anything in our human affairs that cannot be abused, and I cannot see how it is possible to work our constitution without having parties. In fact, we see, from the management of affairs up there, that, probably, there would be an economy, there would be a real economy, if there were an opposition, if there were parties in the House, a regular ministry, and an opposition to criticise the conduct of that ministry, and criticise its expenditure. I may say, in passing, that I do not see why we should not, in the theory of our constitution, acknowledge parties. It may be a useful thing to recognize what the writers call fiction. But, Sir, no fiction that has become an absolute fiction can be useful; in the nature of things it must cease to be useful. On the other hand, any real fact, anything that is a controlling fact, as party is, in the government of a country, it seems to me to be a great affectation on our part to refuse to acknowledge. Here we are, framing a constitution, and all the time ignoring one of the great wheels by which the country is governed. The third clause of this resolution is:

That the climate, soil and conditions generally of the North-west are different from those of other parts of Canada, and a policy specially adapted to its needs and resources is called for in order that the settlers shall be rendered prosperous and immigration policies be made effective.

Now, I forget who it was, when this motion was read—I believe it was my hon. friend from Queen's, P.E.I., (Mr. Davies)—who seemed to think the last part, especially, was a reflection on the immigration policy of my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior. What I meant was this: That, if you want to make your immigration policy effective, you must have the farmer in the North-west shaking hands, so to speak, and co-operating with your agent in England. If you do that, then, in my opinion, you will make that circle which will be one of the most effective and potent powers to secure your object. Not that I condemn in any way the immigration policy of this department, for I say that, so far as I have been able to judge, my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior, with the means at his disposal, has done as well in securing immigration as any Minister could possibly do. But, when I speak of making it more effective, I mean that whatever efforts are put forward by the immigration function of his department, should be seconded by a contented and prosperous yeomanry in our North-west Territories. Now, Sir, to effect all this you will have, in my opinion, to make a new departure. In fact, the peculiarities of the conditions in the North-west Territories are such that you may gain immense results, almost immeasurable results, if you only adopt a wise, paternal policy. Such are the peculiarities of that country, and so different is it from most European countries, that it is not a country into which you may invite people accustomed to other conditions, and then leave them there without any further attention. Some of them will succeed when brought in in that way; but what I say is, that the true policy would be to exercise an interest in the settlers that go into the Territories, to devise schemes for the amelioration of their condition, and, above all, to see that the conditions are supplied that will fit the land they settle on, that will fit it year after year for producing, to a certainty, a good crop. Now, Mr. Speaker, a great bugbear against the North-west Territories used to be the frost. Well, I lay this down, that the frost is a comparative trifle in the North-west Territories. Give moisture, have moisture any year you like, have moisture in any part of the country you like, and, no matter how severe the frost, you will have results that will enable the farmer to prosper, that will enable the farmer to make money, that will enable the farmer to have his bacon, and his pork, and his flour, and to have all the conditions that are necessary to a contented and prosperous farm life. Well, how is it to be done? I have indicated one scheme

that is, in my opinion, of absolute importance, and that is a scheme of irrigation by means of wells. That is not new in this House. I proposed it before, but it fell on deaf ears. In fact, the suggestion of irrigation at all, when I proposed it in 1889 or 1890, raised a certain amount of resentment in the minds of some of my hon. friends. I suggested at that time that we should have artesian wells. All parts of the country are not fit for artesian wells, but these parts fit for artesian wells can be irrigated in that way most successfully. I remember I gave an instance of what I have seen in Dakota. I was riding, and saw what seemed to be a lake. From the conformation of the country it was like the driest prairie country we have, and I galloped up to where the lake was, and said to a lad who was attending some cattle: You have a fine lake of water there: where does it come from, and where does it empty? He replied that it was purely artificial, that it was from an artesian well, and he directed me to where the well was. I rode there, and saw a pipe emptying water into a vast tank, the overflow passing down the side of the hill and in one of the hollows making a fine lake, useful for the watering of cattle and also for purposes of irrigation. These are the courses which I think should be pursued. Let me make a general proposition. In the North-west Territories we have, according to the last census, as large a population as British Columbia; we have an area transcending that of any province of the Dominion by many multiples: we have that which at the present time is one of the most important possessions a country can possess, and that is vast fertile plains; we have a population that man for man will compare with the population of any province of Canada. What we say is this, and we feel very strongly about it—we do not want to be treated on any other footing than that on which the provinces are treated. We do not want, for instance, to have this kind of feeling: Well, we can treat the North-west in a different way from Ontario, Quebec, British Columbia or Nova Scotia. The North-west wants the same consideration, the same means of asserting itself in the federation, the same means of making its importance felt, and it wants also to be treated with the same respect, to have its citizens, the men who have thrown in their lot with it and identified their lives with its development and progress, treated precisely on the same plane as the men are treated who live in the older provinces. A wholly different sentiment from that pervades the minds of all eastern politicians, I do not care whether they belong to the Liberal or Conservative party, a sentiment that the North-west can be treated differently, and that something will do for the North-west that would not do for British Columbia, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Ontario or Quebec. We entirely object to that attitude, we entirely object to that state of

Mr. DAVIN.

mind. We say that is not respectful to us, on the contrary it is quite offensive to us: and we say moreover, although that may be construed as a social or a civic sentiment merely, it is closely related to the material progress of those vast Territories on which so much can be built, out of which so much can be made for the Dominion of Canada, and out of which so much can be made for the Empire too. We say it would be a dangerous and bad thing, vicious in every possible way, if the people of the Territories, now when public opinion is being formed there, were deprived of those conditions for the production of the sense of dignity which exist in other parts of the Dominion. The view too much taken in the past has been, and it is the view taken in this House—hon. gentlemen cannot make any party capital out of this—it is the view that has obtained in this House, and probably obtains here yet—is what I would call the greengrocer view, the view of trying to make so much out of it. When I hear hon. gentlemen speak about the amount spent on the North-west Territories and speak of the debt incurred for the North-west Territories, they speak as though the Territories were not part of Canada, and that if the Territories have been brought into existence, and are now a great factor in the wealth of Canada, the North-west owes that to the Dominion; but I say here that Canada owes more to the North-west than the North-west owes to Canada. Eastern Canada, Ontario, Quebec and other provinces, have opened up the country, and we thank them for that. And whom have we mainly to thank for opening up the country? I think a good deal of thanks is due to the present Government, in regard to which it is said that this is a motion of want of confidence. But let it be considered for one moment as to what has been the result of the expenditure on railways going into that country, what has been the result of the expenditure in opening up that country. You have at the present moment a return of over 50 per cent to the wealth of Canada for every \$100 spent in that country. Take Winnipeg to-day. The assessed value of property there is over \$22,000,000, the assessed value of Brandon is \$5,000,000 or \$6,000,000, then there is the assessed value to Moosomin, Qu'Appelle, Wolseley, Regina, Moose Jaw, Medicine Hat, and Calgary right along the line, and leaving altogether aside the value of the farms, you have in the wealth brought into existence in these towns more than 50 per cent of the amount that has been spent in opening up the North-west. You talk about the debt. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) talks about debt, as though going into debt was some great evil. Going into debt and spending the money that has been obtained is no evil. Spending such money wastefully or squandering would be a great evil, it is true; but if you can borrow money at 3½ per cent and invest it so as to yield 10, 15, 20 or even 50 per cent,

as some of our investments are yielding, this is one of the most advantageous results in the way of statesmanship the Government can accomplish. Let me say this about the debt, that if you will take the debt of Canada—and I will make this general statement as bearing on the North-west—for the time usually taken for purposes of comparison, sixteen or seventeen years, if you take the difference between the debt at that time and the net debt to-day, and then take the amount of capital that has been brought into existence by the expenditure of that debt. I venture to say that the whole increase will be wiped out as with a sponge, and a large asset will still remain. All that is true in every detail in regard to the North-west. I must not refer to a past debate, and I need not do so; but in the press and in other quarters I have seen some statements about the odd sections in the North-west Territories and I have been asked why I did not take up a question like the settlement of the odd sections of the country. As early as 1885, before I was a member of the House, I proposed a plan to the Government. It is on record in the Library, and hon. members have only to go there and they will see my plan. I proposed that the Government should buy back all the land alienated to the Canadian Pacific Railway and open all those lands to settlement. The six million odd acres that were brought back, were, I think, bought back at \$1.50 per acre. Now, suppose that same price were given for what remains.

Mr. MULOCK. What quantity remains?

Mr. DAVIN. I expect there are about 7,000,000 or 8,000,000 acres still remaining, probably more. I maintain that you cannot do better than to buy back these odd sections and open them for settlement. Here is my point: Suppose you open them for settlement, and a farmer comes in, and brings in his family of four, and they eat and drink and travel; the railway company, instead of losing by alienating the lands which it was holding, at \$3 or \$4 an acre, would be the gainer. I must say, however, for the Canadian Pacific Railway, that they have been selling lands at a very low figure, and no complaint can be brought against them on that head. But, however low, or however high they have been selling, they cannot get such a good return for their lands, as the return they would get by having a farmer settled there, whose wife and children and friends would travel, as well as himself. On the other hand, the Government could not invest money better than by buying back these lands, because they would have the revenue swelled by the indirect taxation on the farmer. Besides that, if every settler is worth \$1,000, then every family of three or four on a farm, would add considerably to the wealth of the country.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I proposed this in 1885, and if my friend from Guysborough (Mr.

Fraser) were here, I would suggest to him that he should remember that. I cannot recollect that any member of the Opposition took the matter up when I spoke of it before; but a thing has occurred within the last two years that I am very glad of, and which has made a great change and a great improvement in the temper of this House. The hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition has visited the North-west Territories, together with my hon. friend from Lincoln (Mr. Gibson), and my hon. friend from Oxford (Mr. Sutherland), and a number of leading men in the Reform party. The result of that visit has been most gratifying, and, in my opinion, most useful. In their speeches, whether in or out of this House, these gentlemen take a wholly different tone in regard to these Territories from what they were accustomed to. The fact is, that before visiting these Territories, they did not realize what they were; and I have never met a politician, whether of my own political thought or not, who would say that he had any idea what these Territories were until after he had visited them. But after visiting there, he never again has any doubt as to what a significance these Territories have for the people of Canada. He knows well that the battle of our national life will be fought and won, and that there, also, the greatest battle for the Empire can be fought and won. We are all of us—at all events in the party to which I belong—we are all of us in favour of what is called preferential trade within the Empire. That is nothing more than an Imperial Zollverein. Now, Sir, that idea was suggested, I forget how long ago, by Mr. Justice Byles, who, when he wrote his book, the "Fallacies of Free Trade," was not, I think, then on the bench, but was a thoughtful, able barrister, in London. Justice Byles pointed out how absurd it was for England, and how absurd it was for the colonies to remain apart, when by an Imperial Zollverein they could do the greatest possible good to themselves, commercially, aye, and especially for England, politically, as well. I say here, that if Canada is to be to the Empire what Canada is capable of being, those Territories must be filled up. If they are not populated, Canada cannot be the right arm, as she is capable of being, to the Empire. After all, Mr. Speaker, Manitoba and the North-west Territories should be looked at as one. If you go to the Lake of the Woods, and run a diagonal line right up to the Yellowhead Pass, you will find that all south of that you have got a vast region of fertile land, and from five miles on this side of the Rockies, right to the foot of the Rockies, you have coal fields that are themselves potentialities to the Empire. We have the finest coal beds in the world in the North-west Territories, we have the finest lands in the world and the greatest amount of them in the North-west Territories, and these are greatly needed for the develop-

ment of Canada. In fact, they are the great conditions to the development of a country like this.

Mr. GILLMOR. And you have them.

Mr. DAVIN. We have them.

Mr. GILLMOR. That is right.

Mr. MULOCK. Why do not the people go there to develop them?

Mr. DAVIN. That is a very important question, and let me say in regard to that "why," if my hon. friend (Mr. Mulock) had visited those Territories as I visited them, in 1882, and wandered around those fertile fields, and dug down eight feet in the richest loam,—

Mr. GILLMOR. Eight feet?

Mr. DAVIN. Yes, eight and nine feet of the richest loam you could dig there.

Mr. GILLMOR. It would never exhaust you in the world.

Mr. DAVIN. It would not be exhausted for many a year.

Mr. GILLMOR. You could not plough that?

Mr. DAVIN. In the course of years you could.

Mr. GILLMOR. No, you would have to dig the top off before you could plough it.

Mr. DAVIN. My hon. friend employs words differently from what I do. I like to hear my hon. friend (Mr. Gillmor) speak. Unless when he speaks on the tariff, he is a man of a cheerful turn of mind, but when he speaks on the tariff, he is the Mrs. Gumidge of the Reform party. My hon. friend from York (Mr. Mulock) asks the question: Why are not these lands populated? What I say is this: If you had visited these Territories in 1882 you would have thought, as we all thought, as I dare say my hon. friend from Winnipeg (Mr. Martin) thought, that these Territories were going to fill up; in fact, that the population would flow into them. That was our opinion, and we were perfectly certain of it. And now take the calculations that were made by the hon. baronet, the Secretary of State, when he was Finance Minister. These calculations have been quoted here as though they were some reproach to him. Take the calculations made by my late right honourable friend Sir John A. Macdonald, as to how that land would fill up, how many thousands would be there in 1891, how much money would be got, and so on, and which calculations are quoted in the Liberal newspapers, and elsewhere as against the Conservative party. Sir, I say that the mistakes of calculation that were made were mistakes that were inevitable, looking at the conditions of the country at that time. No man, I do not care

Mr. DAVIN.

how pessimistic he was, how gloomy may have been his mental liver, how prone he may have been to take a jaundiced view of things—no man could visit those Territories in 1882 without believing that, in the course of ten or fifteen years, there would be millions of people there. As the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin) and the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Cameron), who visited the Territories at that time, know, you could not visit any part of the world where the conditions promised more comfort or more prosperity for the farmer. Was it not natural, then, that sanguine men should make the calculations they did? The attitude of mind that was shown by Sir John Macdonald, and by others, at that time, was a natural one. It was sincere. They thought what everybody else thought. What made us go up there and invest what money we had in farm property? We thought people would crowd in, homesteads would fill up, and then they would come and buy from us the railway lands we had bought. Men like Sir Charles Tupper, the Secretary of State, and Sir John Macdonald, men of sanguine mind, naturally made calculations roseate with hope. Now, let me say this. There was more power in such calculations—aye, and more truth—than in the gloomy and despairing views taken by the hon. gentlemen who opposed them. There were two things in those calculations. There was, first, power—steam—go-ahead; in the next place, they were more true to what has taken place since. I heard Mr. Blake, I think when he was a member of this House—I certainly heard him out of the House—calculate that the Canadian Pacific Railway, as it was built, was an impossibility. We know how, at Aurora, he spoke of the impossibility of getting through the "sea of mountains." I say there was more consonance with the ultimate fact in the calculations of Sir Charles Tupper and Sir John Macdonald than in the somewhat gloomy vaticinations of those who opposed them. But, Sir, what form did the adverse criticisms upon their policy take? Their opponents went about, saying that the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway would ruin the country. What was the answer? The answer was: You will have such and such wealth in return; lands will be sold; and, as Sir John Macdonald pointed out—in 1891, I think it was—every cent of the cost of the Pacific Railway will have been paid. Well, Sir, every cent of the cost of the Pacific Railway has been paid, but not in that way.

Mr. LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIN. My hon. friend laughs. I did not expect anything else. They belong to the spirit that denies. They are a party wanting in faith. They are a party of political unbelief. They have no confidence whatever in the future of anything, and they can only realize that it exists when it accu-

ally comes before them. Well, Mr. Speaker, what I want to say is this, that the attitude taken by Sir John Macdonald, in consequence of these criticisms, continued too long. I remember when it was determined—I happened to be here in Ottawa at the time—determined, not by Sir John Macdonald, but by another gentleman, to close up the mile belt, and to close up Southern Manitoba; and a man whom we all honoured greatly, and whose memory we honour in this House, the late John Henry Pope, who was then Minister of Agriculture, told me of this, and said he thought it was a very serious step. I thought so, too, and I went to the Acting Minister and tried to argue him out of it; but I failed to do it, and Southern Manitoba and the mile belt were closed. It was a very bad policy. I commenced at once to attack the policy; and in the papers down in the east I was attacked for attacking the policy of the Department of the Interior of that day. To his honour, be it said, the late Sir John Macdonald, my leader of that day, wrote to me: "Don't mind these attacks upon you; you express the opinion of the country where you are, and it would be a most disastrous thing if you expressed the opinion of Ottawa; I have the utmost confidence in you—go on and express the opinions of the country where you are." And, when Sir John Macdonald was again taking charge of the Department of the Interior, I wrote to him in this language: "In the history of human ineptitude, there never was such a damnable—"

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. DAVIN. Yes, that was the word I used—"such a damnable act of policy as closing up Southern Manitoba and the mile belt." We got them opened up, and I went and saw Burgess. I said, "Burgess, I think the old chief must have resented the language of the letters I wrote to him."—I wrote in strong language. He said, "Not at all. He brought out the letter in which you spoke of the damnable act of folly, and he said, 'Burgess, when Davin speaks in that way, something is wrong.'" I had broken away from my conventional and inveterate reticence, and I had talked in the large language of the earlier gods. What I say is, that the party and the government that I support have piled up such great services to this country that they can afford to have mistakes of this or that man referred to. The result of their closing up Southern Manitoba and the mile belt, in the teeth of the advice of the late John Henry Pope and myself—against my persistent protest—was, as everybody knows who has lived in Manitoba, that there was a great deal of discontent and a great deal of retardation in the country. The results of that act linger with us to-day. Now, why was that done? The gentleman who closed them up spoke to me in this wise—and it illustrates what I want to strike. He said: "What is the value of land in Southern

Manitoba to-day?" I said, "I believe it is worth about \$7 an acre; but what do you mean by asking me that question? Do you mean that you would regard it as a private person would? There is the greatest possible difference between a trading corporation or a private individual and a government. The government, by holding lands at \$7 an acre, may make a stroke of policy most foolish, but an individual or a corporation, the more they get for their lands, the more money they gain. The proper way for a government to treat districts, lands and territories, is to consider the country as a family, and to consider that all which makes for the wealth and advancement of each part of that family adds so much to the wealth of the family. What I want, therefore, is to rid hon. gentlemen of the idea of looking to the North-west with the view of making money out of it, or of getting an income out of it. The proper way to regard the Department of the Interior is not to regard it as a department from which to obtain income, but as the means of filling up the country with immigrants. The view of getting so much income out of the country is an entirely mistaken one. I hope that in these few remarks I have made my meaning clear. I mean that the development of these Territories is of vital importance to Canada and the Empire; I mean that they should be treated on the same footing of dignity as the other parts of the Dominion.

Mr. MULOCK. What do you propose to do?

Mr. DAVIN. I suggest that a very small change be made and that the local legislature be placed precisely on the footing of a provincial legislature.

Mr. MULOCK. Have it made into a province?

Mr. DAVIN. Have it made into a province. I am glad my hon. friend referred to that. Now is the time to do it. We see the folly of having small provinces down by the Atlantic. We do not want petty provinces—

Mr. MULOCK. No reflections on the maritime provinces.

Mr. DAVIN. I make none. But every statesman from the maritime provinces, with whom I have discussed this subject, has admitted it would be a good thing to have Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island all in one. It would be foolish to look forward to Assinibola, Saskatchewan and Alberta being made into separate provinces. The only persons who will clamour for that are people who have moneyed interests in certain towns. You will get a few people in Calgary to clamour for making Alberta a province, a few people in Regina to clamour for making Assinibola a province, and a

few people in Prince Albert to urge that the Saskatchewan district be made a province. Everybody knows that you cannot expect to have in those Territories, for many a year, such a dense population as would justify the existence of three or four provinces there. I do not want to enter into particulars. I merely point out the way in which the North-west expects to be treated. Everybody understands how undesirable it is that I should particularize, but in every way we expect to be treated on a footing with the other provinces.

Mr. MULLOCK. I ask the hon. gentleman to particularize to the extent of telling us what his proposed remedy is, and in what way the Territories are now treated different from the other provinces.

Mr. DAVIN. Mainly this. At present the money voted is practically under the control of the assembly. Practically, the assembly controls it, although not technically. After this Government has handed it over to the assembly, the assembly is allowed to control it. Although this Government hold a certain control, yet that is never fully exercised. At present there are four gentlemen there, who are called the executive of the assembly. These gentlemen advise the Lieutenant-Governor as to the expenditure, and they are chosen by the assembly. What I propose is that we should have a small local government, just as they have in Prince Edward Island. It will not cost more than the executive costs at present. Mr. Haultain and Mr. Ross will draw a salary as large as two Ministers will in Prince Edward Island. I propose that they should be in a position to take a responsible course as do the Ministers in other parts. I propose, also, that all high officials, now chosen elsewhere, should be chosen from the Territories. But I do not dwell on that, because that follows as a mere corollary. That is what I mean by saying that we should be treated on an equal footing with the other provinces. The subject is one which should be treated in more detail and at more length, in order to do full justice to it. But I think I have sufficiently explained my views in order that we should take practical action. A very slight change in the law would be sufficient, but, of course, I do not expect anything to be done this session. The matter would require more careful consideration and a carefully prepared measure, so that I do not expect anything to be done this session. All I desired to accomplish was to give expression to the opinion of my constituents, and of the whole Territory, as to the matters I have brought before the House. I have ventured to make a suggestion that will entail some more expenditure. My remarks on that particular may, I hope, influence my hon. friend the Finance Minister, when preparing supplemental Estimates. There are certain practical things that may be done for the Ter-

Mr. DAVIN.

ritories in those supplemental Estimates. But what I wanted especially to clear from the minds of this House and of the Government is that the North-west Territories have in any way failed to give a good return for the outlay we have made there. The North-west at present, with its developed wealth, has so added to the assets of Canada that the amount of money spent in opening it up is a very minor matter, in my opinion, indeed. If once we accept the view that the North-west has paid its way, that it has no large debit against it, then, when the Council come to consider the proposals of expenditure, they will not be so unlikely to take an illiberal view as they would if the notion that somehow money had been spent there which had not met with an adequate return.

Mr. DALY moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

RETURNS ORDERED.

Copies of all letters, petitions, correspondence or documents of any nature whatsoever, asking the Government to take the necessary steps to secure the ownership of the Baie des Chaleurs Railway, with a view to making it a branch of the Intercolonial Railway.—(Mr. Joncas.)

Return of copies of tenders received during the year 1895 for the conveyance of the mails between the 168 Mile House, British Columbia, and Horseshy, with the amounts in each case. Any correspondence had between the post office inspector (Mr. Fletcher) or the department, and the members representing Cariboo or Yale in relation to the conveyance of the mail over the said route. The copy of the contract now in force, its amount, and the party with whom such contract has been made. Copies of the tenders received during the year 1895 for the conveyance of the mails between the 150 Mile House and Keithley Creek, showing to whom was the contract awarded and for what amount, and whether such contract was transferred to any one, and if so, to whom, and on what terms.—(Mr. McMullen.)

Contracts made, or in force, with the British Columbia Express Company, for the conveyance of Her Majesty's mails in British Columbia, since the year 1882; showing the conditions of such contracts, the routes travelled and the distances; the amounts paid for such services in detail; the name of the party who signed such contracts on behalf of the company, and copies of tenders put in by any other parties for any of such service.—(Mr. McMullen.)

Return showing the details of expenditure in British Columbia from the entry of that province into confederation to 30th June, 1895, for ordinary land conveyance of mails, giving the different mail routes; the names of contractors and amount paid each year; the dates of each contract and period during which in force; showing whether contracts let after tender, and if so, names of tenderers and amounts of unsuccessful tenderers. In case of no tenders, reasons for not asking for tenders, and any other particulars which the accounts disclose.—(Mr. Martin.)

Copies of all petitions, correspondence and reports relating to any charge or charges made, during the years 1895 or 1896, against any employee or employees of the Customs Department at London, Ont.—(Mr. Forbes.)

Statement showing amount of each claim made by the Government for damages alleged to have been occasioned by vessels navigating the new Welland Canal from the date of its first opening up to the 31st December, 1895, giving names of the respective vessels and owners thereof; the nature of the damages and how each claim was settled, whether by being paid in whole or in part or not at all, and if any such claims are still unsettled. Statement showing amount of each unsettled claim, and name of each vessel (with names of owners) in respect of which any such unsettled claims exists.—(Mr. Gibson.)

Copies of all papers and correspondence with the officials of the Indian Department, and with other parties relating to the purchase, surrender and conveyance of any portion of the Walpole Indian Reserve, in the St. Clair River.—(Mr. Mills, Bothwell.)

ADJOURNMENT—THE REMEDIAL BILL (MANITOBA).

Mr. FOSTER. I move the adjournment of the House. My hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) had a question to ask the Minister of Justice the other night, and I asked him to wait till the Minister of Justice was present. He can ask the question now.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). At that time I had a disposition to complain of what seemed to me to be a breach of the privileges of the House in furnishing copies of Bills to the newspaper press before these Bills were placed at the disposal of members of the House.

Mr. DICKEY. Of course I am in the judgment of yourself, Mr. Speaker, and of hon. members of the House, as to whether a breach of the privileges of the House was committed. The fact is that the Remedial Bill, as to which a great deal of public interest was known to exist, was read the first time, and was put into the hands of the Clerk. As I understood the matter, any pressman was then entitled to inspect the Bill, and to make such copies or extracts from it as he thought proper. I had a number of copies over, about fifteen or sixteen, and I certainly did give those Bills to the members of the press, so far as they would go round. I also propose to say now that until you or the House rebuke me, I should follow the same course on a similar occasion, unless it be a breach of the privileges of the House, in which case I should be the last man to do it. Hon. gentlemen on both sides, of course, know the disposition which I made of the other copies of the Bill—it is not worth while for me to speak of that. I do not know that the fourth estate has any legal rights, but I would remind the hon. member for Bothwell that the estates of the realm that come up latest, generally get the greatest power—Kings first, then Lords, then Commons, and we do not know what the powers

the fourth estate may turn out to be, constitutionally. It was simply for the convenience of the press that I gave out those Bills, and because I thought the members and the public would thereby more quickly become acquainted with the contents of the Bill.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would rather make a summary for myself, and be the judge as to the presentation of that summary than to have any one else do it for me. The hon. gentleman will see that it places it in the power of the press of the country to mould public opinion, before there was an opportunity of any member having a chance to form a judgment upon the subject. It does seem to me that the duty of the Government is first towards this House; and if the members of this House are to receive a Bill after it has been placed at the disposal of everybody else, why, I think we will have to make important alterations in our practice. My impression is that the hon. member owes it to this House first to place the measure at its disposal, and to give to every member of the House an opportunity of perusing it, which has not been done.

Mr. FOSTER. I would ask my hon. friend, how he would suggest a member of the Government should act? Is not the duty of a member of the Government fulfilled when he submits a Bill to the House and lays it on the Table, at which time it becomes the property of the House, and is in charge of the officers?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman will see that he went very much beyond that.

Mr. LAURIER. It is quite possible that, owing to the importance of the fourth estate, which is increasing, the rule may have to be deviated from, but, so long as the rule is what it is at the present time, my hon. friend (Mr. Mills) is right, that communication should be made to Parliament before the distribution takes place. Until that rule is rescinded, it should be adhered to.

Mr. OUIMET. Where is that rule to be found?

Mr. LAURIER. I do not know that it is written, but a great many rules in the British constitution are unwritten, although they are very well known. I am surprised the hon. gentleman should have any doubt in regard to it. I have another reproach to make the Government. I called the attention of the Minister of Justice to the fact that, on 17th February, the Montreal "Gazette" published a synopsis of the Report of Penitentiaries. When it was published, the report had not been laid on the Table of the House.

Mr. DICKEY. I think the hon. gentleman has got me there. I brought the report down to the House, with a view to present it. It was, however, too late before I had an opportunity of doing so, and I left it in my

desk for the Minister of Finance to present, but, being called away on public business, I forgot to mention the fact to him. I presented the report on the following day.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman should not forget the House in that way, and I suppose he will not sin any more.

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 18th February, 1896.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

EXPORT OF SAW-LOGS.

Mr. MACDONELL (Algoma). Before you pass to the Orders of the Day, Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the House to the fact that I had on the paper a notice of motion which, in yesterday's Order paper, appeared third on the list. To-day that motion has disappeared from the list. I only wish to say that, in the first place, I put that notice of motion on the paper so that the subject might be discussed, and asked the Government to allow it to stand until the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), who is interested in the question, should be in his seat. I understand that he has been ill, and has not been able to be in the House so far this session. I would ask to have the motion reinstated on the Order paper in the same place it occupied before.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order. The hon. gentleman is going into a discussion. I may say for the information of the hon. member that the order was dropped yesterday on being reached, in accordance with an arrangement made a few days before. If put upon the Order paper again, it cannot have its original place.

Mr. MACDONELL (Algoma). If you will pardon me a moment, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that the order was placed on the paper—

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

CORRESPONDENCE WITH THE GOVERNMENT OF MANITOBA.

Mr. LAURIER. I would like to call the attention of hon. gentlemen opposite to the fact that the papers brought down this session covering the correspondence between the Government and the government of

Mr. DICKEY.

Manitoba have not been printed. They ought to be printed in time for the discussion of the Bill.

Mr. FOSTER. I think there is no doubt they should be printed; but that matter is entirely in the hands of the Printing Committee.

Mr. LAURIER. With the permission of the House, then, I would move:

That the papers brought down this session containing correspondence between the Government and the government of Manitoba be forthwith printed, and that rule 94 be suspended.

Mr. FOSTER. Very well.

Motion agreed to.

REPORT.

Report of the Auditor General on Appropriation Accounts, for the year 1894-95 (second and concluding part.)—(Mr. Foster.)

INQUIRIES FOR RETURNS.

Mr. MARTIN. I would like to ask the Government when I may expect a certain return which was ordered by this House in 1894. I made inquiries about it some fifteen or twenty times in the session of 1894, and each time received a promise that the return would be down in a day or two. I inquired, also, several times in the session of 1895, and each time was assured that it would be brought down. The return I refer to is one covering the details of the expenses of Canada at the Columbian Exposition in Chicago in 1893. I desire again to renew my inquiry of the Government, when I may expect this often-promised return.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I beg to say that I will give immediate attention to the hon. gentleman's question, and will get information as to the matter he refers to.

Mr. McMULLEN. The Controller of Customs stated that he would lay on the Table yesterday or to-day, the return with regard to the quantity of corn brought in to be ground for human food. I would like to know when that return will be laid on the Table.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will allow that to stand until the Minister of Customs is in his place.

SUPPLY—THE BUDGET.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Foster:

That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go again into Committee of Supply.

Mr. DAVIN. Mr. Speaker, no one can have listened attentively to this debate without feeling that it is regarded, as at least by hon. gentlemen opposite, the preliminary skirmish in the great im-

pending battle which is to decide whether the Conservative party shall control the destinies of this country, as they have controlled them for seventeen years, or whether hon. gentlemen opposite shall be allowed to apply some of their nostrums for any of the real or supposed ills of the country; whether the principles which have governed for these seventeen years, and under which the country has made unparalleled progress shall be the principles to guide the country in the future, or whether the principles that hon. gentlemen opposite announce here and elsewhere, and into which it will be my duty briefly to examine, shall be adopted—principles, I may say, which prevailed from 1874 to 1878, a period not looked back upon with very great enthusiasm by Canadians. Now, Mr. Speaker, it is equally certain that hon. gentlemen opposite mean to win by a series of resolutions that were proposed at a convention which took place here in 1893, and of which they are so enamoured that one hon. gentleman after another has read them, so that they might be, to use their own classical language, “embalmed on the pages of ‘Hansard’”; and the hon. gentleman from King’s, N.S. (Mr. Borden), made it a peroration of his speech to read ‘in extenso’ all these resolutions passed at that convention. Sir, that convention was not an ordinary meeting of a great party; it was not one of the recurring meetings of a party at which the leading men connected with it take counsel together. That convention was a meeting at which all the wisdom of the Reform party was convened, and where they propounded certain theories; nay, Sir, it was a conclave, not made to elect a Liberal pope, because a leader had been selected some time before, but to issue a political syllabus denouncing Tory heresies, and laying down anew conflicting doctrines, calling largely on credulity and forbearance. Now, I propose, first, to examine very briefly these resolutions. I shall then take up what may be called the Liberal bible, a pamphlet containing all these resolutions, and the speeches delivered in 1893; and I shall go briefly through the speeches delivered and printed, and embalmed in that pamphlet, and sent round with authority, and I shall show that the programme is incongruous, that the speeches are incongruous, that the policy is incongruous, that the party is incongruous. Then, Sir, I shall take the pamphlet that was also sent out and distributed last year when it was thought an election was intended, distributed widely throughout the length and breadth of Canada, a pamphlet entitled “Principles, policy and platform of the Liberal party.” So important is it considered that there is a note signed “Alexander Smith, secretary of the Ontario Liberal Association,” in which the reader is told that “this pamphlet is not for general distribution,” it is only to be dis-

tributed to the faithful. Sir, there was a very good reason for that, because the same tactics precisely were adopted in these pamphlets that were adopted in 1882, when we had three or four programmes sent forth by the Liberal party, these three or four programmes conflicting with each other, some meant for circulation in the cities, and some for circulation amongst the farmers. Then, Sir, I shall inquire into the views, and I shall ask this question—because it is still necessary to ask it—I shall ask the question for my own behoof, and for the behoof of Parliament, and for the behoof of the country; I shall ask what are the views of the Liberal party in regard to the trade question? I shall want to know what their policy is on fiscal matters? Then, Sir, I shall take up some ordinary questions, such for instance, as the accusation that the Liberal party are guilty of harbouring annexationist sentiments, and I shall try, as best I can, to break a lance on their behalf and defend them, if it be possible, against the charge. Then I shall refer briefly to the progress Canada has made, as a reply to statements in these programmes, and statements in the speeches. Now, Sir, let me call the attention of hon. gentlemen to the programme. The first resolution refers to the tariff, and the second refers to reciprocity. These are the two great resolutions. Then we have one on purity, and I shall refer briefly to that, because I know how strong in virtue the party opposite is. Then we have one in regard to economy; then we have one in regard to land for the settlers, and it is the only thing in either programme or speeches that holds out any hope to the North-west that the other party will do anything for that section of the Dominion; and when I come to deal with that I shall show that they display the most profound ignorance on the land question. Then, Sir, I shall have to deal very briefly with the position they take up here on some minor matters. But the two main resolutions are the things that call for special attention just now. Now, the first one says:

That the customs tariff of the Dominion should be based, not as it is now upon a protective principle, but upon the requirements of the public service.

Well, Sir, I confess I think that, in limine, I have a right to complain of that in the interest of the people of Canada. This programme is intended for the people at large, and I say that it is tainted with one of the greatest vices with which a programme could be tainted; that words are used in it in a non-natural sense, and that the propositions in it cloud up fallacies, roll up fallacies, with a view, apparently, I do not say with a conscious view on the part of the prominent men of the party, but it certainly looks as if it was done with a view of deceiving the people. Now, you will observe that the proposition there assumed is that the pro-

protective principle is opposed to, and antithetic to, the requirements of the public service. Well, then, the seventh paragraph states that the protective principle has impeded commerce. With the customs returns in their hands, with the Year-Book in their hands, with the statistics of Canada in their hands, how can it be shown that the protective policy has impeded commerce? Then, we come to the eighth, and I call special attention to this :

It has discriminated against Great Britain.

And in this connection I would point to the second resolution, which is headed "Reciprocity." Can any honest man say, will any candid man on that side of the House say, that you can have reciprocity with the United States without discriminating against Great Britain? There is an implied censure here on the Conservative party for discriminating against Great Britain. Yet that is not the greatest sin committed by this little paragraph: the great sin is that the word "discriminate" is used, as men of the education of those who composed that resolution must have known, the word "discriminate" is used in a non-natural sense. The ordinary meaning of the word "discriminate" would be to frame a tariff that, in its construction would discriminate against Great Britain; it would not mean a constructive discrimination, which is the only discrimination which can have been in the mind of those who framed that paragraph. That is a very grave offence, because it goes to the very root of the sincerity of hon. gentlemen. Then, we have No. 10, which says that the way to help Canada over certain ills that it is supposed to suffer from, or was supposed to be suffering from in 1893, is to bring the Liberals into power, and this would hasten the return of prosperity to our people. Well, Mr. Speaker, the elections did not take place in 1894. A couple of years have elapsed, and if you will read the report of the Board of Trade of Toronto, and if you will read the bank reports, which were mentioned by the hon. Minister of Finance, and if you turn your eyes abroad and keep your ears open, you will find that prosperity has returned to Canada without the aid of hon. gentlemen opposite. Prosperity has returned, so that is not necessary. However, that is merely by the way. Then comes No. 12 of the first resolution that was adopted.

That it should be so adjusted as to make free or bear as lightly as possible upon the necessities of life, and should be so arranged as to promote freer trade with the whole world, more particularly with Great Britain and the United States.

And then we have paragraph 6 :

That a fair and liberal reciprocity treaty with the United States would develop the great natural resources of the country.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what is the meaning of suggesting that they would bring in a policy

which would look for freer trade with England and with the world at large, and yet they want a reciprocity treaty with the United States. So much for these resolutions, of which I may say this, and it is the only terrible thing about them, that they are like thunderclouds, and carry within them the secret of their dispersion.

Most of us, I suppose, attended the fancy ball last night—that magnificent series of tableaux, that grandiose piece of living tapestry—and we must have been interested as we saw period after period illustrated by dance after dance. But, while my grateful imagination was instructed by delighted heart, and I felt this, that their Excellencies might have made even what seemed so perfect, yet more complete, if they had given us a modern dance, if those two august ladies, the Conservative party and the Reform party, had been there, with their respective courts, and if we had had Prime Minister Sir Mackenzie Bowell with his Conservative banner, and my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition with his Reform banner. But, under those circumstances, the Conservative party would have cut a comparatively humble figure, because the banner which Sir Mackenzie Bowell would have raised would be a comparatively plain one, for, under the Imperial and Canadian signs and emblems, there would be but one device, but the banner of the Reform party would be blazoned with many a policy and with many a device; and, while the steps—I do not know whether the Minister of Finance would have done anything in that way—with which the leader of the Conservative party would lead would be very humble and simple, the steps of the leader of the Opposition and of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), and the waltzing that would be indulged in by the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin) and the hon. and graceful member for Guysboro' (Mr. Fraser)—the display under these circumstances made by the Reform party would be very striking, and not only striking, but varied, indeed.

Hon. gentlemen opposite complain, in doleful tones, of misrepresentation. They complain that we misrepresent them; they complain that we say at one time they are revenue tariffists, at another time that they are reciprocityists, at another time that they are free traders, and I heard the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Macdonald), on Thursday, make that complaint in doleful and lugubrious tones. But the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister), on Friday, appeared in a new character in this House in making his complaint as to misrepresentation. That hon. gentleman is not a man, in my opinion, used to the melting mood; he is cast in too stern a mould. But on Friday, at the beginning of his remarks, the tears seemed to course down his cheeks, while he complained that we accused him of going for free trade as it is in England, and that we accused him and his colleagues of wanting recipro-

city, and, after turning a corner, very sharply and very deftly, where protection and coal oil and Liberal principles jostled, he said, and laid it down in his bandit style, that it was a scandal and a shame—and he was indignant and vigorous as usual, so far as was consistent with the lacrimosity of which I have spoken—that our policy is a revenue tariff, and the issue is between protection and a revenue tariff. We will inquire into this. As I say, we have this pamphlet here, and we have other pamphlets, and I will turn first to the pamphlet described as “Principles, policy and platform of the Liberal Party.” Here is what I will first read to the House. Something is said about the tariff, and other questions are mentioned, such as temperance, the superannuation of public officers, the abolition of Government House—on which the Liberal party has ranged itself in opposition to certain lines pursued by the Conservatives—and it is stated, “No doubt, the views of the Liberal party, as expressed by their leader in Parliament, will yet prevail.” I put it to you, Mr. Speaker, I put to every honest man who will read that statement, whether it does not suggest that the Liberal party has put upon its banner the abolition of Government House? Yet the leader of the Opposition, and no man on that side will dare to come forward and propose the abolition of Government House. The way it is put there is far worse than if it were absolutely stated that they had arrayed themselves against it, because it is adroitly and dishonestly suggested here. “The conclusion of the whole matter, briefly is this, that the Liberal party is a party of hope.” I have always known that of the Liberal party. Since I first began to study politics in Canada, I have found the Liberal party full of hope. I knew the Hon. George Brown, when he was leader of the party. I liked the late Mr. Brown very much; he was great and he was grotesque. But hope was the main element of his character, and hope has been the main element in the character of the Reform party for the last seventeen years, and hope will continue to be one of its main elements; but I would remind them that hope has often told a flattering tale. This is what the Liberal party does. “It grows on the decay of the principles opposed to it—its leaves have always the freshness of spring about them.” This indicates a growth of a fungus character, because it is not a party whose principles grow out of the root, having a vigour of its own and an organic life of its own, but it grows on the decay of the principles opposed to it. Then, “It appeals to the heart and conscience of the people for support.” “It seeks office”—and I ask attention to this phrase—“only to advance public interests.” “It levies taxes only for the interest of the taxpayers.” Here it is suggested that somebody else imposes taxes for somebody else’s interests. It asks for new legislation only that constitutional

government may be strengthened, and the rights of citizenship may be enlarged. And then, this is the advice given to the readers of this pamphlet:

Keep to reason, to the sense of justice and the consciences of men. Appeal to this great, and in the long-run, unerring tribunal.

And the way they keep to a sense of justice, is by such ambiguous methods as I have described, and the way they appeal to the consciences of men, is by something that may fairly be branded with insincerity. I have said, Sir, that this party was an incongruous party, but I did not describe, as I should have, one of the main characteristics of the first pamphlet. The main characteristic of it, is the note that runs through it, and that note is a note of “Little Canadaism.” In this very pamphlet which is sent through the length and breadth of the land as the bible of the Reform party, the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) speaks of Canada as being a small country. Sir, we will not hear of our Dominion being described as a small country. Twenty-three years ago the then leader of the Reform party, the Hon. George Brown, said to me: Canada is one of the richest countries on the face of the globe. Since then it has made great progress, and its incoherent wealth is not equalled by the incoherent wealth of any country in the world. Now, Sir, something occurred in connection with that conclave of the Reform party that was of interest. It was presided over by Sir Oliver Mowat, who is a great man. At that very convention he was described by the hon. member for L’Islet (Mr. Tarte) as a very great man. And, Sir Oliver Mowat tells us, that in his opinion Canada is a prosperous country, a country which utterly transcends what the United States was when it had a population of the same number. Sir Oliver Mowat takes the railways we have, he takes the number of post offices we have, he takes the amount of our bank capital, he takes all the elements of wealth we have in Canada, and he shows that the United States when it set up for itself, and when it had the same population as we had in 1893, had nothing like our conveniences of civilization and our facilities for prosperity and progress. In fact, Sir Oliver describes Canada in 1893 as a most prosperous country. I lay it down, Sir: that the prosperity of a country depends on its fiscal policy. I see that my hon. friend (Mr. Davies) seems to doubt that. I lay it down: that the prosperity of a country depends upon its fiscal policy. And, if my hon. friend (Mr. Davies) is doubtful about that, I can tell him that the leader of the Opposition lays down, in this very book, the same proposition; and not only that, but he says, he agrees with every word of the great Reform magnate and leader who presided over that convention. But when we analyse what the leader of the Opposition said, we find that he disagrees with Sir Oliver Mowat,

although he is not at liberty to fight or quarrel with what was done at that meeting, because at page 23 of the pamphlet, his own description of the convention is :

It is a convention not to ratify cut and dry resolutions, but anxious that the policy adopted should come from the people themselves who are here represented.

In the very same breath my hon. friend (Mr. Laurier) says that our ideal should be the fiscal policy of England, that our ideal should be free trade, and yet he declares for reciprocity. And of course he (Mr. Laurier) differs from the speech of Sir Oliver Mowat, and indeed that speech of Sir Oliver Mowat's, comparing it with all the other speeches instinct with what I will call little Canadaism, was as a grand Corinthian gateway leading to a little terrace of two-story tenement houses.

The hon. leader of the Opposition received a telegram from the Liberals of British Columbia, and my hon. friend the Controller of Inland Revenue (Mr. Prior) will be interested to know what the Liberals of British Columbia telegraphed on that occasion. They seem to be in as great a fog as Liberals elsewhere in Canada. This is what they telegraphed :

Sentiment here favours a policy of freer trade relations with Great Britain and her colonies, especially Australia, and reciprocity of trade with all other nations.

Now, Sir, it is hard to say what this means. It is absolutely void of sense, unless it means a pan-Britannic Zollverein. Reciprocity of trade with all nations outside the Empire must mean a tariff arrangement of reciprocal duties ; and freer trade relations with Great Britain and her colonies, would mean something closer. As that is the only meaning that can be rationally given to it,—if you suppose that a rational sense dictated the telegram,—then, Sir, that telegram instead of favouring the views put forward at the convention, is opposed to them. The leader of the Opposition denounces the tariff as a servile copy of the American system, and yet, in the same breath, he declares himself in favour of reciprocity, which would give us the American system, and which would give us a higher tariff for whatever carefully compiled list of articles we included in a reciprocity treaty. But, Sir, not only that ; but the leader of the Opposition denounces protection as fraud and robbery, and yet he tells us that it will be continued. At page 33 of his pamphlet, he indicates that if the Liberals get into power, he really would not alter this fraud and robbery at all. He says :

Nothing is more difficult—that is one of the evils of protection—than to wipe away protection, because under it interests have been established which every man who has at heart the interests of all classes must take into consideration. It is always easy to increase the tariff because by doing so you increase the private

fortunes of certain individuals, but whenever you decrease the tariff, it has always to be done with careful consideration, and I am sure that when the Liberals are in power they will not be indifferent to this primary truth.

The primary truth is : that it is very difficult, if once you have a protective tariff, to alter it. It is very difficult he says, to get rid of the fraud and robbery, and so as the Montreal "Herald" assured us : if the Liberal party came into power, we should still have the fraud and robbery perpetuated. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Laurier) also says : We have stolen his thunder. Well, Sir, that phrase "tariff reform" is not a phrase that would be used by the Liberals. What they want is tariff revolution. Tariff reform is a phrase which would be used by men who believe in protection, and as a fact, it was a protectionist who used the phrase first, and it was then adopted by hon. gentlemen opposite. Mr. Speaker, let me ask : What can you make of such gyrating as that ? He wants a fair and liberal reciprocity treaty. He says our ideal fiscal system is the British system of free trade ; and then he says in a reciprocity treaty you have to have a well-considered list of manufactured articles. Then, what are we told on page 34 ?

Our immediate aim is a tariff for revenue only.

Now, are hon. gentlemen opposite in a position to complain of us if we do not know where they are ? Are they in a position to go to the country a few months hence and say that they have put a plain and square issue before the country, when a careless free trader might read these programmes and fancy the party were in favour of free trade, a revenue tariffist might think they were in favour of a revenue tariff, and a reciprocity might think they were in favour of reciprocity ? Well, Sir, I may say that I have watched with amusement for seven years the strenuous and steadfast manner in which hon. gentlemen opposite have nailed their weather-cock to the mast. Now Mr. Speaker, in regard to this inconsistency, I want to call attention to what the sub-leader of the Opposition, the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), says, and let me say here in passing, that no one is to be condemned for changing his opinions. If opinions are changed from conviction, no one is to be condemned for that. To change opinions is the law of human progress. But, Sir, when you find that a great party seems at one time to cry out for reciprocity, at another time for free trade, and at another time for a revenue tariff, at the same time professing a high standard of moral virtue, I think you must come to the conclusion that you are somewhat in the atmosphere of the witches, described in Macbeth, where false is true, and foul is fair. The hon. member for South Oxford tells us, on page 44 of this pamphlet :

Liberty and protection are a contradiction in terms.

There is another instance of the non-natural use of the word liberty. He knows very well that that is not the meaning, as a rule, attached to the word liberty. But, Sir, he is not the only sinner. At Winnipeg, the hon. leader of the Opposition declared :

Protection was slavery, a bondage of precisely the same character as southern slavery.

There, again, is the non-natural use of language. It is pure rhetoric, and no one on analysing it would attach the least importance to it. Then, Sir, at page 43 the hon. member for South Oxford says :

Free trade, as far as our position allows us to adopt it.

And then at page 45—and I entreat your attention, Mr. Speaker, because it is really laughable—he is in favour of :

A decisive reform strictly on the line of a revenue tariff.

Then, at pages 46 and 48 we are told :

The Liberal party have always advocated—

And, of course, they advocate still—

Reciprocity with the United States in order, first, to destroy the protective system, and secondly, to obtain free access to the markets of the United States.

Now, Mr. Speaker, how can you make out the least consistency in such utterances as these by the hon. member for South Oxford within the space of a quarter of an hour, and within a few pages of this book, which is circulated as the Reform bible? Some explanation is due here. The hon. member for Charlotte (Mr. Gillmor) declares, in a speech, that Canada is in a most deplorable condition, and he tells us that he heard with the greatest delight the speeches that had been made. At page 54, he says :

I am delighted with the speeches I have heard to-night. Our leaders propose to follow the example of England in trade matters.

That is the impression left on the mind of an enlightened member of Parliament, who was a member of that convention, after hearing the hon. leader of the Opposition and the hon. member for South Oxford. Yet, Sir, the same leaders, in the speeches referred to, declared that they were in favour of reciprocity, in order to get free access to the American markets, while everybody knows that you cannot get free access to the American markets except by adopting a tariff that will be much more

protective than any we have ever had. Then the leader once more came forward and proposed a resolution. Amongst other things he did what I am going to refer to later—he compared the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte) to St. Paul. In that speech, which you will find at page 73 of the pamphlet, the leader says :

I leave it to the workingmen if protection is anything else but slavery.

The very same sort of wild rhetoric that fell from the hon. member for South Oxford. Then we have the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I., (Mr. Davies) making a speech, and proposing the second resolution. He says :

We have advocated a reduction of the tariff and such freedom of trade as is consistent with the raising of the revenue necessary for carrying on the government of the country.

But on page 80, he says :

They are willing to negotiate a reciprocity treaty.

Then he becomes indignant, after his usual manner, and denounces any persons who ever hinted that the Liberal party were in favour of any other kind of reciprocity than a limited reciprocity. He says :

They were willing to negotiate a reciprocity treaty, and it was never understood that the tariff of the two countries should be uniform, or that Canada's control of fiscal questions should be interfered with.

Then how is the hon. member for South Oxford to get the goods of Canada into the United States free? So that we find that not only are the speeches of the two principal leaders inconsistent with themselves, but the speeches of one leader after another are inconsistent with the speeches of those of other leaders, and inconsistent with themselves. What does the second resolution say? We want a fair and liberal reciprocity, including a well-considered list of manufactured articles.

A well-considered list of manufactured articles will, I suppose, include some of our leading manufactures. If it does, what will happen? You will have free trade in these matters with the United States, and you must have a tariff the same as theirs. You cannot get over it. I cannot see how such a policy can be worked out, and I should be very glad if hon. gentlemen would go into it in detail. They ought to go into it in detail. Take one item, "Braces, suspenders, and parts of these." We import \$71,000 worth of these articles, and we receive a duty of \$24,000. Open a market with the United States, and we shall have to put on 45 per cent, instead of 35 per cent, and lose

in duty some \$10,000, and so on with other articles coming in now in part from Great Britain and in part from the United States, on which we will have to levy the Washington tariff, until we lose some five or six million dollars. Then, we must make an arrangement whereby so much will be allowed to the United States on our part, and so much allowed by them to us on their part. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) seconded the motion, and his remarks are most interesting. He said that he was in favour of throwing down the barriers. I am sorry the hon. gentleman is not in his place, I am certainly sorry for the reason which compels him to be absent. He wanted to throw down the barriers between the two countries and give the people of Canada access to their natural market. He said :

We propose to give you the market for ducks as well as everything else—

But we may feel sure, Mr. Speaker, that his market for ducks, like everything else he proposes, is a "canard."

We propose to throw down the barriers of trade between these two countries and to give the people of Canada access to their natural market.

He then explains by amplifying :

In brief, my friends, the policy that is foreshadowed and described by this resolution will benefit the agriculturist ; the miner ; it will give a market for our iron ore, for structural material, for all this natural wealth in our mines which to-day is almost without value. It will give prosperity to our lumber trade ; it will benefit our fisheries ; it will benefit all the great industries of this country, except, possibly, some lines of manufacturing industries.

This is really very explicit. What it means is, that Canada would become a donkey-engine for the United States : the fireman to be the Yankee engine-driver. He sees, of course, that this would entail discrimination against England ; the adoption, in fact, notwithstanding loud-mouthed professions in favour of free trade and revenue tariff, of a much higher protective tariff than we have at present in Canada ; he anticipates the charge of disloyalty to Great Britain, and says he is not concerned with this. All he wants to ask : "Is it loyal to Canada ? Will it promote the interest of Canada ? Britain is looking after her own interests, and we may look after ours." And yet at the same meeting he voted for a resolution, charging the National Policy with discriminating against Great Britain. As we should shut out all the manufactures which we now receive from England, and which pay duty, which we could bring in from the United States free, we should, of course, lose some millions of dollars. And this is what the hon. mem-

Mr. DAVIN.

ber for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) says as to the way he would meet this :

It is said that this policy will deprive us of a large amount of revenue. If it increases the prosperity of the people, it will increase importations and this will tend to make up the revenue. We can raise up \$3,300,000 of the loss from sugar by raising the duty one-fifth of a cent. Other increases and savings would easily make up the rest of the loss.

Of course, by putting a duty on tea, coffee, and the like, considerable revenue could be raised. What they are bound to show us is, what we shall gain as a compensation for the sacrifice. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) does not say positively that we shall gain anything. He said :

If it increases the prosperity of the people, it will increase importations, and this will tend to make up the revenue.

Why, marry come up ! This is statesman-like with a vengeance : "If it increases the prosperity of the people." But, suppose it doesn't ? He admits that we shall lose revenue, because we cease to import from England. But he thinks we shall grow so rich that over the high tariff we have imposed we shall bring in rare and costly articles which will add to the revenue. But how are we going to grow rich ? He himself admits that we shall have injured some lines of manufacturing industries. That is, some factories will either grow weaker, or shut down, and the officers and men go across the line, to be employed there. There will be so much less wealth in the country ; there will be so much less production ; there will be so much less demand for raw material ; our population will have decreased ; there will be fewer mouths to eat the farmers' bread, pork, eggs, roots, fruits, garden stuff. We are, as Sir Oliver Mowat showed, a prosperous people ; yet we are young as compared with the United States, and all our industries will have to go through an ordeal of slaughter-market competition from which only a few will emerge. Such cities as Montreal, Hamilton, Brantford, London, Guelph, Galt, Chatham, industrial centres in every province, from Halifax to Esquimalt, will feel the pressure ; some will succumb ; what shall we have gained ? Are the articles the farmer uses cheaper in the United States than with us ? Let us suppose it has happened. We have raised a still higher wall against England, and we have lost millions of revenue ; but what have we gained ? Take the classes Mr. Charlton enumerates as likely to be benefited. How has it helped the agriculturist ? The corn-fed pork has been brought in competition with the pork of the Canadian farmer—to take one item. Has that been of advantage to him ? I have here a table which shows the effect of the tariff, as regards the staples of the farm :

Quantity and value of certain articles imported from the United States into Canada, 1876-95.

(HOME CONSUMPTION.)

YEAR.	PORK.		†BACON AND HAMS.		BUTTER.		CHEESE.		LARD.	
	Quantity.	Value.	Quantity.	Value.	Quantity	Value.	Quantity	Value.	Quantity.	Value.
	Lbs.	\$	Lbs.	\$	Lbs.	\$	Lbs.	\$	Lbs.	\$
*1876.....	Not separated.....				138,985	36,107	84,474	12,386	2,479,854	312,208
*1877.....	do.....				178,689	40,770	57,681	9,293	2,515,489	265,696
1878.....	10,204,237	637,845	2,806,557	219,293	100,451	22,279	63,684	10,217	2,330,903	211,949
1879.....	8,020,663	373,890	2,556,710	183,999	95,639	20,858	60,452	8,001	1,516,139	118,554
1880.....	12,449,444	660,962	2,367,362	179,336	124,518	26,979	83,128	8,532	1,606,788	123,012
1881.....	13,295,039	896,652	2,317,125	221,591	142,349	37,390	56,257	8,783	2,509,846	247,140
1882.....	13,610,254	1,168,547	3,483,381	400,854	111,547	29,645	42,026	6,914	2,459,967	292,314
1883.....	12,717,301	1,718,013	3,670,084	487,132	403,428	86,156	83,056	13,302	3,252,727	385,019
1884.....	13,707,084	931,292	4,447,079	438,374	279,752	67,305	79,816	12,963	3,694,205	337,458
1885.....	13,455,033	856,604	4,882,405	486,194	341,693	73,375	72,897	11,919	3,039,341	230,647
1886.....	14,283,340	644,818	3,557,744	284,178	323,590	64,830	60,569	9,776	3,061,537	192,706
1887.....	9,658,172	489,308	2,363,950	215,546	243,272	51,733	62,878	10,567	3,386,216	224,652
1888.....	9,944,883	652,995	2,135,399	197,081	145,340	37,716	48,436	9,459	6,232,902	423,421
1889.....	15,205,972	992,423	3,653,758	335,159	492,482	77,228	55,479	11,209	8,283,026	635,425
1890.....	17,161,592	830,015	4,344,200	323,513	376,890	61,027	91,946	16,201	4,879,111	300,749
1891.....	11,085,111	594,197	2,564,044	207,150	318,592	74,759	75,761	14,496	988,999	68,949
1892.....	9,492,965	483,773	1,008,068	93,802	244,869	50,013	94,402	16,851	690,766	50,554
1893.....	3,856,746	271,977	664,950	75,143	223,061	46,331	89,437	15,761	145,773	12,518
1894.....	4,611,874	343,655	392,345	44,252	642,632	120,977	129,357	19,848	148,701	14,115
1895.....	3,262,823	208,801	821,670	85,266	231,988	37,657	106,735	14,829	184,131	14,192

* Meats, all kinds, fish, salted or smoked, imported from United States in 1876, 12,316,175 lbs., \$1,191,894.
do do do 1877, 12,825,240 lbs., \$1,082,450.

† Including shoulders and sides.

CANADIAN TARIFF.

	Pork.	Bacon and Hams.	Lard.
1876.....	1 cent per lb.	1 cent per lb.	1 cent per lb.
1877.....	do	do	do
1878.....	do	do	do
1879.....	do	2 cents per lb	2 cents per lb
1880.....	do	do	do
1881.....	do	do	do
1882.....	do	do	do
1883.....	do	do	do
1884.....	do	do	do
1885.....	do	do	do
1886.....	do	do	do
1887.....	do	do	do
1888.....	do	do	do
1889.....	do	do	do
1890.....	½ cent per lb.	3 cents per lb	3 cents per lb
1891.....	do	do	do
1892.....	do	do	do
1893.....	do	do	do
1894.....	2 cents per lb	2 cents per lb	2 cents per lb
1895.....	do	do	do

Speaker, were this duty to be taken away, the farmers would lose that home market which we have for those important articles. What has been the result? Let us now talk in the historical tense, of the change. It has been useful to the lumbermen, but it has hit the pork-raising farmer hard. Wheat has been sent to Canada across the line in train loads, as well as agricultural produce of all sorts, including butter and cheese, and the Canadian farmers' home market is gone. Then come the remaining classes which will benefit,—the miner, the lumber trade and the fisheries. I am not at all sure that these would be such large gainers. But suppose they would. First, they can well take care of themselves under a protective tariff, they are a small portion of the community, and, from what I can learn, they are not calling for a change. Can any rational man suppose for a moment that we should get any increase from importation? We should lose from five to ten millions or more, and instead of being independent, self-contained, with a national life of our own, we should become dependent. But to talk once more in the historical tense; let us assume that the change has taken place and that reciprocity, which is dear to the heart of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) has become a

These tables are very instructive as showing the effect of the tariff on staples in which farmers are interested; and, Mr.

fact. Many of our importations will come via New York, and importations for the United States will come via Vancouver. We must make some arrangement for distributing the taxation, or else either Canada or the United States will have an advantage, and neither of these countries will submit to that. What then will happen? Why, our Finance Minister will have to wait upon the action of his financial boss at Washington before he can do anything; all the members of this Parliament, on the night when the tariff is being made at Washington, will hang around the telegraph office outside to know what is being done at Washington. Why, Sir, a man would rather be a kitten and cry "Mew!" than be the Finance Minister of Canada or even a citizen of Canada, under such a condition of affairs. And suppose they have arranged a tariff in such a way as to be unpleasant to us, and we have appealed, and our appeal has been treated with contempt. We have objected again, and no notice has been taken of it. And somebody says: Appeal once more. For a moment the lion's blood in our veins, which has not been wont to run in the weak and sluggish current of submission, flames up, and we are ready to cry: "Appeal!" But a moment of reflection shows us that, at the bidding of greedy and mistaken politicians, we have sold our birthright for worse than a mess of pottage, and, in the language of Marino Faliero, we sigh:

But thou sayest well—we must be humble now.

When I look through the speeches of hon. gentlemen, look through their speeches here in this very book, I cannot but feel that, even while professing loyalty, they almost sneer at it. They say it "does not exude from our pores." That is the language of the hon. leader of the Opposition. And the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies), the other day in Toronto, sneered at professions of loyalty. I hope he has read the article that appeared in the "Journal" of this city on the subject. Sir, when I read these speeches, when I hear such utterances on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite, I would to God that I could put in words that could not die the shame, the rage, the scorn, of all that is young and generous in this Dominion of Canada at these false cries of mistaken economics, and these craven utterances of irrational, and unpatriotic, and unfounded fears. Now, Mr. Speaker, let me ask a question in regard to reciprocity. Hon. gentlemen opposite all assume that they could get it. I remember once being at St. Mary's, when a Liberal meeting was being held in the theatre there, and a gentleman came in and said to me: You ought to go across; they are pitching into you. So I thought I would go across, and hear what they were saying. They had ceased pitching into me, but they were setting forth all the great advantages that would accrue from the reciprocity treaty. And I was asked to go

Mr. DAVIN.

up on the platform. After some demur, I went up, and said to the people: I have no doubt that the speakers, before I came here, have been telling you of the advantages that would accrue from a reciprocity treaty; and, no doubt, after I leave the meeting, they will tell you of the advantages that would accrue from a reciprocity treaty. But, I said, ask them this question: Can you get it? And, if they say, We can, ask them: Why did you not get it when you were in power? You were in power from 1874 to 1878; why did you not get it then? They may say, We tried. So they did try. They sent their ablest man, the late Hon. George Brown. He went to Washington and offered reciprocity, which included a carefully-prepared list of manufactured articles. But, Mr. Speaker, the very moment he came to that, he struck a diplomatic snag, and no progress could be made. And I believe that the Government of that time—the hon. member for Bothwell was a member of it, and will be able to tell me whether I am right or wrong—passed an Order in Council, or made a ministerial note, that England could not be discriminated against; and that was in consequence of the strong cry throughout the country. And the moment they decided that they could not discriminate against England, the Washington negotiators said: Well, good-bye; we cannot talk with you. They cannot discuss reciprocity with us except upon the preliminary condition that we shall be ready to discriminate against England. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, all this talk—to use a word I have heard used by hon. gentlemen opposite—is mere buncombe, unless they can show the people how they are going to get reciprocity. Have they an abler man than George Brown was? Can they go further with the United States than they could in his time? At that time, as I was well aware, there was the most devoted feeling of loyalty to England; but, Sir, strong as was that feeling of devotion to the mother country then, at this moment it is still stronger. What chance, therefore, have you of being able to discriminate against England? Why, Sir, the very suggestion was sufficient to arouse a flame throughout the length and breadth of this land. And the bare fact that the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) cannot refrain from these statements that he makes about reciprocity, these incautious statements that cause so much confusion and unpleasant feelings in his own party, is merely a proof that, like the Bourbons, he can learn nothing and forget nothing. Though he is one of the ablest men in Canada, he is really the greatest barrier to the success of his party; he is, in fact, the rogue elephant of the Liberal party of Canada, and they do not know what to do with him.

But, Sir, what are the evidences, even if you could get a reciprocity treaty, it would do you all this good? You must remember that the reciprocity treaty existed from 1854

to 1866, a peculiar period. For more than half that time you had a great war and the effects of a great war. If, even without any reciprocity treaty, you had at this moment a great internecine war going on below the international boundary line, the effect upon the prosperity of this country would be very great indeed. But times have greatly changed. Our trade with our neighbours has greatly increased since 1866; and the ratio of advantage, which was with them during the time of the reciprocity treaty, is really with us. And, then, let me put this problem to the thoughtful man, to the hon. member who is looking at me so intently now, the hon. member for Charlotte (Mr. Gillmor)—The total value of imports from Canada during the eleven and a half years of a reciprocity treaty was \$247,095,709. Now, taking the same articles which we exchanged with them during that time, what is the exportable surplus in those commodities of the United States to-day? In the very commodities of which our whole trade during eleven and a half years was only 247 millions, the exportable surplus in that single year is \$335,600,000. What chance, under those circumstances, is there that in those articles, with an exportable surplus of 88½ millions more in one year than the whole volume of trade during eleven and a half years—what chance is there, I say, that even if we had a reciprocity treaty, we should gain any advantage? Would not the bare fact that they have that surplus, and that Canada presents the lines of nearest advantage, force their goods across the line to us, instead of giving us a market for our goods? Now, those articles may be divided into three classes. First, there are articles which the United States now produce in such a large exportable surplus that a reciprocity treaty would open our markets to the United States rather than those of the United States to Canada. Then there are articles in which there would be an exchange because of convenience; and then articles in which the likelihood is that Canada, under the present conditions, would find a good market without exchanging the same articles. In wheat, wheat flour, oats, oatmeal, and all other breadstuffs, the yearly average import from Canada by the United States during the reciprocity treaty, was \$9,628,472 worth, while the United States exported to all other countries, \$42,350,077 worth. The value of the exports of the United States in those articles, during 1894, was \$165,579,522. You have only to do a sum in proportion in order to see that instead of doing a trade of \$9,628,000 worth when the United States had only an exportable surplus of \$42,351,000, now, when they have an exportable surplus in those articles of \$165,500,000, why the probability is that you would only do a trade with them of \$2,500,000. All this talk about reciprocity is very easy.

First, you ask them: Can they get it for you; and next you may ask: Suppose they can, what is the value of it? Now, Sir, let us return from this reciprocity episode to the utterances of gentlemen at this conclave. Mr. D. McRae, of Guelph, Ontario, when speaking to the second resolution, which gave such pleasure last week to my hon. friend from King's, N.S., says, page 90:

I believe, therefore, that it would be for the benefit of our farmers if a policy were adopted which would give us free access to the United States markets.

A most naive remark. Can any one doubt it? The more markets we have the better. But suppose we had to pay too much for it. And, then, with still greater naiveté, he says:

I am glad that this is the second and not the first plank in the platform.

He sees the inconsistency, and he seems to prefer the first. He adds:

We have already adopted a resolution in favour of free trade with Great Britain.

He sees there is some inconsistency, there is some difficulty here. He says: We have adopted a resolution in favour of free trade with Great Britain; how, then, are you going to get access to the markets of the United States? The second resolution being in favour of reciprocity, and the first in favour of free trade with Great Britain, how are you going to reconcile the two? Why, Sir, it is like a man, at nine o'clock swearing loyalty to the British flag, looking up at that piece of bunting which has performed such wonderful things in the course of centuries, declaring that he is ready to live under it, and to die for it; and then, at three o'clock, changing his accents, and changing the Queen's English in his mouth, and pointing to "them Stars and Stripes," swears that he is ready to live under them, and die for them. The inconsistency is just as great in the one case as in the other. My hon. friend, the leader of the Opposition, in the course he is taking in sending out those pamphlets, full of contradictions, and with these contradictory principles in his own mouth, and in the mouths of his leading colleagues, is proceeding into this battle the embodiment of a monstrous inconsistency. Why, Sir, he outdoes Don Quixote, and if he could succeed, would throw into the shade all the marvels of the Arabian Nights. With free trade for his talisman, and with reciprocity for his spellword, he thinks that by the magic of a revenue tariff he is going to chase the Tory cohorts. Why, Sir, a man who should declare to you that at noon-day he could fuse the sunbeams of the vanished mornings with the moonbeams of nights yet to come, would be a trifle of inconsistency and audacious pretension, compared with the hon. gentleman. Why,

Sir, if he could do this in a rational world—and I think Canada belongs to that sphere—if he could do what he thinks of doing, while talking in one second of a revenue tariff, and in the next, of free trade, and in the next of reciprocity, if he could get a rational people to entrust to him their destinies, he would be more astonishing than the magician who, by waving his wand, could present to you the arctic bear, sailing on icebergs, under equatorial suns, or the frosts of a torrid June nipping the rosebuds of an arctic December. Now, I have tried to put his inconsistency in as clear a light as I could, but I know what a herculean task I undertake, and I am not at all sure that I have done full justice to the extraordinary bearing, and the extraordinary versatility of opinions of the hon. gentleman. Well, Sir, Mr. McRae goes on and says :

I had the honour, during the past winter, of attending a gathering of representative farmers in the city of Toronto, the Central Farmers' Institute of Ontario, at which a resolution was unanimously adopted declaring in favour of an immediate reduction of the duties on British goods.

This is very instructive. This Mr. McRae is not a highly educated man like the leader of the Opposition; he is not an eminent lawyer like the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies), he is not a kind of half financier and half sophist, like the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). He is a plain man; but you see, after he has listened to their speeches, the impression left on his mind is such that he quotes with the utmost innocence, this resolution as a general declaration in favour of an immediate reduction of the duties on British goods. And they want reciprocity. Why, Mr. Speaker, I have compared that convention to a conclave. A conclave, we know, is a very solemn assembly that meets on very solemn occasions, and I have made some suggestions of comparison. But, looking at their work it was, after all, more like a vast political Dorcas society engaged in the manufacture of a patchwork political quilt, varied with all sorts of colours, and all sorts of stuff. Now, Sir, we have a Mr. Wise, to whose views I would like to call attention. But, before doing that, I should like to direct attention, by way of relieving the tension of the tariff question to what the hon. leader of the Opposition said of his associates at that meeting. The leader of the Opposition, if I may say so, may be likened to Hecate coming down to the witches in Macbeth, the hon. member for South Oxford, the hon. member for Brant, the hon. member for Queen's, and their supporters and colleagues, and as Hecate said to the witches that they will share in the gains, he suggests that they will be rewarded, and he mentions each one by name. "Sir Richard Cartwright, a man whose mental qualities are well known to

Mr. DAVIN.

you all, but whose qualities of heart are well known to me also." They are not known to any member of the party—that is a recondite virtue, they are well known to me. "Mr. Paterson, who is a power whenever he chooses to be a power." "Mr. Davies, a brave of the brave." "Mills, who knows everything and has read everything." I do not know whether it would be fair to add, digests nothing. "Mr. Charlton, whose commercial knowledge is eulogized." "Mullock, young in the House, but effective as a debater." And last, "our friend Mr. Edgar, whose qualities are well known to you." The hon. gentleman is afraid to particularize them; he finds that Mr. Edgar is the 'ne plus ultra' of moral interest his party affords. He must know the hon. member for Wellington better than I do, he must be able almost to apply the cathode rays to the hon. gentleman; indeed, the hon. leader of the Opposition must know his friends so clearly that they must prove an interesting study, but he has not helped us to get at the moral conscience and peculiar mental build of the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar). He simply says "our friend Edgar, whose qualities are well known to you." A little earlier the leader of the Opposition dealt with a great man in his party, who, he tells us, is to be a Minister of the Crown, the member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte), and compares him to St. Paul. Sir, I am not so sure that it was not an instructive comparison. No comparison can be supposed to go entirely on all-fours, but the hon. gentleman compared the hon. member for L'Islet to St. Paul. And why? Because he had changed his opinions. But, Mr. Speaker, in this very pamphlet the hon. member for L'Islet says that he has not gone back on his past. But St. Paul went back on his past. Yet there is a singular similarity, I grant you, between the hon. member for L'Islet and St. Paul. We know the Apostle Paul had, and we know that the hon. member for L'Islet is a thorn in the flesh. The Apostle Paul, too, at a certain time described himself as ready to be offered, and that the time of his departure was at hand. I have no doubt, from all I hear, that the hon. member for L'Islet could say with truth that he was ready to be offered, or was about to be offered; and that the time of his departure was at hand. But when we go back and look at the mental and moral peculiarities, I am afraid we cannot see any strong foundation for the comparison. I have referred to the fact that hon. members spoke as though they were going to win. While reviewing the hon. gentlemen, who were his colleagues and his fellow-leaders, in the very same convention when some of them said he would soon be Premier, and Senator Power, in giving eloquent voice to the hopes that were throbbing the Reform party, said: I came down here because they said the Reform party was dead, and I wanted to see whether it was

dead or not, but I find that there is life in the old dog yet—and that is all he could say. What was the note of the leader? At that meeting, where it should have been a call to victory, what were the words of a call to victory, what were the words used by the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier)? Though he said—his mounting courage dashed with the pale cast of thought—"we hoped for victory, still, you know, that victory does not always come to those who expect it." Too true; and, as the hon. member for Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) would say:

The earth hath bubbles as the water has,
And these are of them.

I wish for a moment to call the attention of the House to some statistics, and I will do so very briefly, as offering a reply to the statement made that the policy of the party with which I act has impeded commerce and kept back the country. We have the debt referred to as having increased. Well, if I may refer to a debate that took place yesterday, or rather repeat what I said yesterday, I pointed out that if you borrow money at three or three and a half per cent, and so invest it as part of the assets and capital of Canada that it realizes 10, 15 or even 50 per cent, one of the best things you can do is to borrow money, and one of the best transactions you can engage in is to go into debt. Since 1879 the gross debt of Canada has increased by \$118,000,000. The capital invested in the Canadian Pacific Railway system is over \$315,000,000; practically the whole of it has been invested since the National Policy was brought into operation. During the ten years since 1881 to 1891 the capital invested in manufactures was \$189,600,000. These sources, Canadian Pacific Railway and manufactures, make up \$504,600,000 in round numbers. Thus, in those two investments, the National Policy gave opportunities for developing the estate of Canada by \$396,000,000 more than the increase in our public debt, to say nothing of other chances of profitable investment created or enlarged by the operation of the National Policy. Take the advance since 1861 in our wealth, and look at the growth of our towns in consequence of the debt. According to the census of 1891, we have in Canada cities and towns with a population of 100,000 and upwards, two, Montreal and Toronto; with 25,000 and less than 70,000, seven including Winnipeg. Of places with 10,000 population, and less than 25,000, eleven, including Vancouver and Victoria. Of places with 5,000, and less than 10,000, there were twenty-six, including New Westminster. There were forty-six towns with a population between 3,000 and 5,000. And if you look at the growth of the industrial interests of this country, what do you find?

The number of establishments in 1881 were 49,923, and in 1891, 75,768.

The capital invested in 1871 was nearly \$78,000,000; in 1881, \$165,500,000; and in 1891, \$354,000,000. The number of employees in 1871 was 188,000; in 1881, 255,000; and in 1891, 368,000.

The wages paid in 1871 was \$41,000,000; in 1881, \$59,500,000; and in 1891, \$99,750,000.

The cost of raw material in 1871 was \$125,000,000; in 1881, \$180,000,000; and in 1891, \$256,000,000.

The value of products in 1871 amounted to \$221,500,000; in 1881, \$310,000,000; and in 1891, \$475,500,000.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in the face of such progress as that, I do not very well understand how hon. gentlemen opposite can say that our policy has impeded commerce and development. In the year ended on the 30th June, 1894, the total export and import trade of Canada amounted to \$241,000,000 as against a total in 1868 of \$131,000,000. It must be remembered that values have fallen since 1868, something like 33½ per cent, and on the basis of values of 1868, the Trade Returns for 1894 would stand at some \$305,000,000. The increased volume of trade may thus be inferred. At the present day, 1895, the following is the estimated population of the principal towns, villages and cities, along the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and its connections in Manitoba, the Territories, and British Columbia. Of places with a population of over 300 to 1,000, nine. Two thousand to 5,000 population, fifteen. The present estimated population of Winnipeg is 30,000; New Westminster, 9,000; and Vancouver, 20,000. The assessments are as follows:—Calgary, over \$1,500,000; Vancouver, \$19,000,000; New Westminster, \$7,500,000; Winnipeg, \$22,000,000; Brandon, \$6,000,000; and North Bay, Sudbury, Fort William, Rat Portage, Regina, Moose Jaw, and a dozen other places have made great advance. Of the thirty-eight chartered banks of Canada, no less than ten have branches in Winnipeg; three in Brandon, Calgary, Edmonton, Vancouver, New Westminster; and at all other places along the line of any consequence, such as Regina there is a branch of a chartered bank. In Winnipeg it was found necessary, in 1893, to establish a clearing house, making the fifth in Canada, and its recorded transactions for the first half year amounted to \$4,750,000. The transactions of the five clearing houses in Montreal, Toronto, Halifax, Hamilton and Winnipeg, amounted for the year 1895 to \$981,000,000. Now, Sir, I referred to what the Board of Trade in Toronto has said, and let me just quote one or two sentences from that very weighty publication. The report of the Toronto Board of Trade contains the following:—

It is pleasing to note from the bank returns that the county is making progress; slow, no doubt, yet evidently gradually getting wealthier. In 1890 the bank deposits were \$138,000,000, in

1895 they are \$198,000,000. In Government savings banks, in 1890, \$39,000,000 ; in 1895, \$44,000,000. The policy of the banks has been of a conservative character, and this has had its effect in largely assisting to bring the business into a sounder condition. Let the banks adhere to the policy of lending all the money possible for sound business engagements—and none whatever for purely speculative enterprises.

And in at least half a dozen parts of this important publication, it is stated that Canada is recovering from the depression ; and

the great progress that has been made by Canada is pointed out. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call your attention and the attention of the House to what is of great interest to me, namely, the progress that has been made in the North-west. I have in my hand a tabular statement of the exports of cattle, sheep, and hogs, shipped from Manitoba and the North-west Territories to eastern points during the five years from 1891 to 1895. That statement is as follows :—

STATEMENT of Manitoba and North-west cattle, sheep and hogs shipped to Eastern points during five years—from 1891 to 1895 (both inclusive).

Year.	Live Stock.	Manitoba.		North-west.		Total.	
		No. of Cars.	No. of Head.	No. of Cars.	No. of Head.	No. of Cars.	No. of Head.
1891.....	Cattle.....	283	5,426	294	5,286	577	10,712
	Hogs.....						
	Sheep.....						
1892.....	Cattle.....	259	4,650	179	3,136	438	7,786
	Hogs.....						
	Sheep.....						
1893.....	Cattle.....	270	4,674	647	10,584	917	15,258
	Hogs.....	36	3,213			36	3,213
	Sheep.....						
1894.....	Cattle.....	504	9,179	1,000	17,361	1,504	26,540
	Hogs.....	62	6,778			62	6,778
	Sheep.....	20	3,296	11	1,828	31	5,124
1895.....	Cattle.....	717	13,074	1,559	27,044	2,276	40,118
	Hogs.....	40	4,022			40	4,022
	Sheep.....	4	610	74	12,426	78	13,036
Totals.....	Cattle.....	2,033	37,003	3,679	63,411	5,712	100,414
	Hogs.....	138	14,013			138	14,013
	Sheep.....	24	3,906	85	14,254	109	18,160

I am sorry to say that in these years there were no hogs exported from the North-west Territories, and more shame to our farmers, who ought to engage in that profitable industry. Now, Sir, I want to point out, and I do it in no spirit of rivalry, the great increase of the export of cattle from the North-west Territories, as compared with the export of cattle from Manitoba. Owing to our far larger ranches, and to other causes, you see that in the exportation of cattle, whereas, in 1891, the North-west Territories exported just about the same number as Manitoba, yet in 1895 the North-west Territories exported double the quantity, namely, 27,044, that was exported by Manitoba, showing, of course, a very great percentage of increase on a comparison with Manitoba, and an immense percentage of increase on the showing of the Territories themselves, in 1891. What it means is this, that the cattle trade in the North-west Territories is on the road to a development that will give us from year to year an ever-increasing exportation. The North-west Territories will not disappoint even the most sanguine hopes. But, as I have ventured to point out yesterday, the country has peculiarities of its own ;

and before ranchers or farmers can succeed in it, they have to understand the country and its peculiarities of climate and soil, which require a special course of action. The quantities of wheat, barley and oats, in bushels, exported from the North-west Territories, so far as we know in the years 1891 and 1895, were as follows :—

	Wheat.	Barley.	Oats.
1891.....	970,238	6,045	306,335
1895.....	1,884,552	7,669	187,947

In 1891 the North-west Territories exported 1,282,618 bushels of grain, and in 1895, 2,080,168 bushels, or an aggregate for those two years of 4,160,326 bushels. In opening this debate, the Finance Minister referred to an article in the "Nineteenth Century" on this subject : "Can the Empire Feed Itself ?" the writer of which, Mr. Laing, goes very fully into the question. Mr. Laing had visited the North-west, and in his article he demonstrates that nothing is easier than for the Empire to feed itself. All the Empire has to do, as was pointed out in the "Saturday Review," quoted by the hon. baronet in his speech before the board of trade at Montreal, is to direct its attention to sending

Mr. DAVIN.

emigration to Canada, and to the other colonies of the Empire, to Canada especially. Instead of emigration to go whither it lists, to grow up in families antagonistic, probably, to the Empire, let the British Government co-operate in an emigration policy with this Government, and nothing is easier than to put 50,000 farmers upon farms in the North-west Territories, as Mr. Laing suggested, and get the millions of bushels of wheat necessary to feed the Empire. He calculates for only twenty bushels to the acre to produce that result. Now, Sir, the hon. members of the Opposition who have spoken in this debate, and who have spoken in this pamphlet, although they contradict each other on the trade policy, one and all speak as though they were on the eve of coming into power. They sometimes say it in faltering tones, but it is quite clear their minds are full of the idea. Now, Sir, one question that will have to be asked, in addition to the question of preference as to the two policies, will be as to the men. The Apostle Paul of the party would be a Minister if that party came into power. I am told that he would get the Department of Railways and Canals. Well, from what we are told of his achievements in connection with railways, that would of course be very welcome to the people of Canada. Then, I am told, that the hon. member for King's, N.S. (Mr. Borden), would be the Minister of Militia. That hon. gentleman, when speaking here the other night, of that programme, although I believe he thinks highly of it, could not help showing that the reason he read it 'in extenso' was that he was rattled. Now, I do not think the country wants a rattled Minister of War. And the hon. member for Queen's, N.S. (Mr. Forbes), I am told, is to be Minister of Marine and Fisheries. Well, Sir, I have no doubt that if ever that occurs, not only all the shrimps in what Æschylus calls "the streams of ocean," will forget that silence is not only golden but crustacean as well, and will break into a paean of triumph because of the promotion of their intellectual congener. Then, Sir, the hon. member for Guysboro' (Mr. Fraser) wants, I believe, to be Solicitor General. And then, Sir, the Department of the Interior—that department which above all others requires an original mind, a man of resource, and still more, an honest man—that is to be handed over to—I will not breathe his name, I will not tell his dwelling place, I will not state his constituency; that is to be handed over to the Knave of Spades. When the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin) becomes a Minister at the head of the Department of the Interior, I have no doubt he will find himself in a peculiar frame of mind. We are having so many historical allusions at present that I cannot keep from them. I was at the ball last night, and historical allusions are in the air. The leader has compared the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr.

Tarte) to the Apostle Paul, and I cannot help thinking that there will be conflicting mental emotions in the mind of the hon. member for Winnipeg, something like those in the mind of Wolfe on the eve of the glorious battle in which he fell. You remember that that gallant general, on the night before the battle, was in a pensive mood. He was thinking of the woman he had left behind him in England, and loved and intended to make his wife; and while in that pensive mood he sat down and wrote:

Two passions, strongly pleading,
My anxious heart divide;
Lo, there my country bleeding,
And there my weeping bride.

Well, Sir, the hon. member, if he becomes Minister of the Interior, will find himself—still pursuing the historical allusion—he will find himself, as Paul says, in a strait betwixt two conflicting emotions—the interests of the North-west Territories pulling one way, and all other interests pulling the other way. And he will parody the lines that Wolfe wrote:

Two passions strong beguiling,
Deprive this heart of rest;
Lo, there the Jack-pot piling,
And there the boundless west.

Of course, my hon. friend the member for Quebec West (Mr. Laurier) would be the Prime Minister, and I must say, that, if he held proper principles, and if he were associated with capable men, if he had a capable Finance Minister, if he had, in fact, a great number of things which are wholly impossible, I should not object to see my hon. friend arrive at that high position. But, with such principles—I do not care which one of them; I do not care whether he nails his weathercock to the mast in the shape of a revenue tariff, or whether he nails it to the mast in the shape of free trade, or whether he nails his weathercock to the mast in the shape of reciprocity—whichever one of them he would stick to in coming into power—I know well that none of them is as good for this country as the National Policy of the Conservative party.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Oh, oh.

Mr. DAVIN. I see that my hon. friend, the Æsculapius of the Liberal party, has come to life again. Under the stirring influence of a prospective conflict, his somnolent intelligence has woke up—and my hon. friend, he too, is to have a portfolio. In fact, I believe it is the determination of the hon. leader of the Opposition to create a special portfolio for my hon. friend that will be consonant with his amiable and interesting peculiarities. But, when I have to consider further, that it is not only an issue between the policy of the Conservative party and ours, but an issue also as to the men in each party—an issue between the composition of the one party and that of the other—and

when I see the Opposition that I have been looking at here now in this House from the floor for eight years, and have been observing for the past seventeen years, and when I see that that Opposition is really made up of incompetent material, from which you could not expect anything like homogeneity—it is only a unit in name, it is only the name of the Reform party that keeps it together—I find that it has all the qualities of an interesting menagerie, and I cannot see how such a conflicting aggregate, weak in men and conflicting in principles, could possibly present itself in a favourable light to the electorate of this country. I cannot see how my hon. friend from Quebec West (Mr. Laurier) could possibly, under the circumstances, give a good and strong Government; and I agree with what was said by the Finance Minister in this respect. I say, that never was there a time when the country ought to demand of any party that has its confidence as strong a Government as now; never was there a time when any party that has the confidence of the Government, could be guilty of so great a crime, or misdemeanour, if it does not give the country a strong Government. But, Sir, when I come to register my vote, or to counsel others how to vote, I will have to do it with the feeling that the principles—the contradictory principles to which I have alluded—could not possibly be brought into operation, and could not possibly entitle the party opposite to support, especially when contrasted with the policy which has obtained under the guidance of the Conservative party. The Liberal party offers no guarantee, no chance, no likelihood of giving a strong Government to the country. It offers no likelihood of giving such a Government as would challenge the confidence of the country; and, if the country wants a strong Government, it will have to look, not merely for a sound policy, but for a strong Government, to the Conservative party, as it has done since 1878.

Mr. BAIN. The issues that are before us to-day, it strikes me, have been hardly fairly presented by the hon. gentleman who has just sat down. I do not propose to attempt the flights of eloquence which have graced that hon. gentleman's address, nor do I propose to criticise my political opponents as men unworthy of consideration, who are nailing their platform of hypocrisy to the mast and presenting it to the public. Sir, we are here to deal with the practical issues of the day. The question of all questions for us in the one question: Is the country progressing at this moment satisfactorily under the administration of hon. gentlemen opposite? And this brings to my mind a quotation which is exceedingly relevant. A few days ago, a customer went into a merchant's shop in Toronto and asked whether business was improving. The merchant answered: We

Mr. DAVIN.

read that it is, in the newspapers, and are told that it is by the politicians, but I do not see it in the till. It is the till that is the practical test whether our business is a success or not, and not the eloquent phrases and the sneers that my hon. friend (Mr. Davin) has so freely flung across the House to-day with respect to that large political party—for, I say, it is a large party—represented by the Liberal leader. Let him look back to the votes cast at the general election in 1891, and ask himself how many votes did his party carry the election by, and let him then take back his sneers and insinuations with regard to the party represented by the Liberal leader. I want to say to that hon. gentleman that the party with which he is associated has never yet dared to call together their friends in Canada to consult as to what platform they shall present to the electorate.

Mr. DAVIN. Will the hon. gentleman excuse me. Sir John Macdonald did it twice—in Toronto, in Shaftesbury Hall.

Mr. BAIN. How long ago? I think my hon. friend is drifting back into ancient history. He is going back to the period when the great political leader Sir John Macdonald, who is no more, controlled the destinies of that party. It was subsequent to his leadership, I think, that my hon. friend from Assiniboia complained upon a certain occasion of the incapacity of those who administered our affairs, and declared that he could not afford any longer to furnish brains to run the Cabinet. But since the great leader passed away from the political arena, when has their policy ever been submitted for consideration of their supporters? I thought, when I listened to my hon. friend endeavouring to fasten the charge of inconsistency upon the political party with which I am associated, when he elaborated that idea that reciprocity as it is advocated in this country was inconsistent with freer trade relations with the mother country to which we are attached, and to which, I am bound to say without regard to political party, the great mass of the people of Canada are loyal to-day—I thought when I heard him that I should like to ask him, upon what did they carry the elections of 1891? What was it but reciprocity with the United States? The party with which the hon. gentleman is associated owes its success in 1891 to the presentation to the people of this Dominion of a platform of reciprocity. It was not then inconsistent with the maintenance of British institutions and British connection; but it was presented to the people as the one panacea for our troubles and our ills, and the National Policy was allowed to sink into oblivion for the time being. And yet, with the spirit that characterizes those who are inconsistent themselves, the hon. gentleman spurns the very policy to which his leaders owe their seats upon the Treasury benches to-day. On that occasion the great

leader of their party anticipated the expiry of the term of Parliament by at least a year. Hon. gentlemen opposite, a year ago, stopped the printing of the public records and every other business to rush through the voters' lists and get ready for an election—and then they concluded they had better not. And so, since then, how have those hon. gentlemen appeared to the electorate of Canada? Have they had one consistent policy throughout? Have we not rather seen a series of strikes on the part of Cabinet Ministers, one after another going out and, after a time, coming back into the line again? And was there ever in the history of the Dominion of Canada such a pitiable exhibition as that witnessed when this House was assembled for this sixth session, when seven Ministers went on strike after the House had met and the Speech from the Throne been delivered by the Governor General? And yet we are lectured by this hon. gentleman for our inconsistency and for having a policy that they cannot understand; and we are told, forsooth, that all the wisdom and all the administrative ability is gathered into this Cabinet—a Cabinet that could not hold together even after having presented a programme to this House. Sir, the hon. gentleman with his classical reference and poetical allusions—and they are very beautiful—does not touch the practical questions that are at issue to-day. He occupies the same relation to the House and to the public as the man who is spoken of by a great writer some twenty-four hundred years ago upon a public occasion: "And lo thou art unto them as a very lovely song of one that hath a pleasant voice, for they hear thy words, but they do them not." Whoever heard of the hon. gentleman succeeding in carrying any of his propositions through to a conclusion? Why, Sir, only yesterday we listened to his eloquent words with respect to the special treatment the North-west Territories should receive at the hands of this Government. And in past sessions we have listened to earnest pleas for the easing of the burdens of the community by changes in the tariff. But when it comes down to the practical part of the question, his speech may be anywhere, but his vote is solid with the Government.

Now, Sir, before I proceed to deal with the general issue now before the House, I wish to draw the hon. gentleman's attention to one thing which I hope I shall never be guilty of in dealing with questions before this House. I refer to his treatment of this pamphlet which was issued by the political leaders of the party with which I am associated. He read: "This pamphlet is not for general distribution." And then he stopped right there. But, though he stopped quoting, he went on to insinuate that the reason that the pamphlet was not for general distribution was that it was not in harmony with other utterances from the same source. But, Mr. Speaker, he took tremendously good care to leave us to accept his

dictum, for he did not dare to present one iota of evidence in substantiation of that charge. Why? Because he knew he could not find within these two pamphlets the contradiction which he insinuated was there. The facts are simply these: This is a pamphlet in which the campaign issues are dealt with at greater length than is desirable for circulation to electors generally, as a matter of cost. For, Mr. Speaker, I wish to remind you that we have no contractors to draw upon when we want money to spread the political principles of our party. When we wish to raise money, we must put our hands into our own pockets and spend our own money; and, therefore, we must be economical. But, Sir, I dare the hon. gentleman or anybody else to find one contradiction between the pamphlet called "Facts for the people," and the larger pamphlet that my hon. friend meanly insinuated was intended for circulation in the country and not in the cities. Sir, I believe in a fair fight. The interests of the country are broad enough and valuable enough to all of us to have them fairly discussed. The hon. gentleman took occasion, in the course of his arguments, to utter some very cutting sarcasms with respect to the political leaders on this side. I do not propose to go over the whole record in connection with that matter, but there are one or two statements that I think require attention at my hands. For instance, he went on to quote from somebody out in the country—and I shall have occasion before I am through, to quote the speeches of Ministers out in the country which may not be quite so pleasant to the hon. gentleman—with reference to the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte) and said that he resembled St. Paul.

Mr. DAVIN. I did not quote from any one in the country, but I quoted from the leader of the Opposition. The leader of the Opposition says it in the pamphlet.

Mr. BAIN. I was under the impression that the hon. gentleman quoted from Mr. McRae.

Mr. DAVIN. No, it is in a speech delivered by the hon. member for Quebec West (Mr. Laurier) at the convention. I can give you the page, if you like.

Mr. BAIN. I do not dispute the hon. gentleman's statement. We will correct it, and say that he was quoting from a speech of the leader of the Opposition. Then the hon. gentleman proceeded, with his ordinary mode of criticism, to deal with the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte). Mr. Speaker, I do not presume that the hon. member for L'Islet sets up to be a saint, any more than the rest of us in this House, but I want to say to this House, and to the people of Canada, that, whatever may have been the history of the hon. member for L'Islet in the past—and I remember when he was the trusted leader of my hon. friend opposite,

and there was not a word said against him then—whatever his reputation for veracity and honesty may be in the future, it will stand on its own merits, as will that of every other man here. But I say this House and this country owe a debt of gratitude to the hon. member for L'Islet, if for nothing else than unearthing all those scandals with respect to the Langevin-McGreevy contract. What are the facts—facts which were brought out in a committee a majority of whom was hostile to that gentleman, hostile, because he had left them recently, and was exposing some matters of their domestic history that they were exceedingly anxious should not be brought before the public. Yet, Sir, in face of those difficulties, what were the net results of that investigation? I speak within the hearing and knowledge of hon. gentlemen who can correct me, if I am wrong—was not the net result of that Quebec Harbour business just this, that they executed \$2,000,000 worth of work, that they received for that work \$3,138,000, and that their books show that \$170,400 of that money had been contributed for political purposes to aid hon. gentlemen opposite? Is that a just and equitable mode of handling the people's money? We know some results, in addition to that, which did not depend on a parliamentary committee. We saw one gentleman, who stood in the position of first successor to the leadership of the great political party opposite—and I have never denied that they were a great political party, and that it was a laudable ambition in any man to aspire to occupy the position of leader of the great Conservative party. Sir, am I not correct in saying that that gentleman lost his chance of succeeding to the leadership, and passed from public life, degraded and discredited by the result of those revelations of iniquities that had occurred in the administration of his department? We saw two other gentlemen condemned to Her Majesty's prison, and they were released because of the leniency of the Minister of Justice, who said that it was bad for their health to let them remain there any longer. And, Sir, they got a light sentence, because the judge said he believed there were greater criminals behind them that had escaped. I leave the records of the hon. member for L'Islet in the hands of a discerning and discriminating public, who, I am satisfied, will give him credit in these matters. Now, any one standing by and looking at the discussions for the last twelve months in the journals that support hon. gentlemen opposite, will begin to ask himself: Well, who is running the Government of this Dominion? Have we not heard lectures from those hon. gentlemen about what the Opposition policy is and what they would do. Who do we pay for administering the affairs of this Dominion, I would like to ask? Is it the leader of the Opposition, or is it the men who

Mr. BAIN.

draw salaries from the public till with careful regularity every month, whom we pay to look after and administer our public affairs? And yet, if we were to listen to those hon. gentlemen opposite, and to their statements, we would believe that the leader of the Opposition was the man who was responsible for the conduct of public affairs in this country? When the Cabinet is fully equipped, we have five members from Ontario, four from Quebec, two from Nova Scotia, two from New Brunswick, one represents Manitoba and the North-west, another represents Prince Edward Island, and British Columbia has one—altogether, we have sixteen members of the Privy Council. They are not all of uniform standing. A couple of them used to stand on the doorstep under the name of Controllers. They have moved inside now, and have the same status in the Privy Council as their brethren who draw \$7,000 a year, and they draw \$5,000. We pay a Premier \$8,000, we pay eleven Ministers each \$7,000 a year, and we pay two Controllers each \$5,000. We used to have a Solicitor General, but he saw a storm coming that my hon. friend is so anxious about, and he quietly scuttled into shelter and left the Cabinet, and now he has found a comfortable judgeship. My hon. friend talked about public sentiment, and he glories in the belief that his political party is solid with the country. I just ask him to look at the trade metropolis of Canada, and look at the seat that that gentleman vacated, and ask himself, how this Cabinet stands with the business men of the city of Montreal. Why, Sir, when the Solicitor General carried that seat at the general election in 1891, he had over 1,300 of a majority. At the by-election the Government selected for their candidate a gentleman who stood high in the city of Montreal for personal integrity and honour. I do not say one word of the character of the gentleman who opposed him, but I say this, that if he is half as dark as he is painted by hon. gentlemen opposite, his election was one of the most scathing denunciations of the policy of the Government that my hon. friend supports, when we remember, that, whereas his predecessor was elected by 1,300 of a majority, my hon. friend who now represents Montreal, on our side of politics, was elected by 300 of a majority over a man with the highest personal reputation. Incidentally, let me say this, while I respect Sir Wm. Hingston's personal character, it is a discredit to the Government, and tends to lower the standing of the Senate in Canada, that even that gentleman, with his reputation and respectability, was placed in that chamber within two weeks of the election—a man whom the people had rejected, and yet he was appointed here to legislate whether the people wished it or not. Yet we are asked to respect a Senate created under these circumstances. Let it be remembered that I

do not say one word derogatory to the personal reputation and character of that gentleman, but I protest against the conduct of the Government in wilfully setting at defiance, public opinion.

We have heard from the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) a good deal about our country, and he endeavoured by insinuation to convey to the public the impression that the party with which I am associated and the leader under whom we are acting has always sought to decry and depreciate this Canada of ours. Sir, I hurl back the insinuation, and I tell the hon. gentleman, through you, Mr. Speaker, directly and straightly, that the charge is unfounded and is untrue.

Mr. DAVIN. I rise to order.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. Bain) is aware that it is unparliamentary to characterize any statement of an hon. member as untrue. I am sure he will withdraw that word.

Mr. BAIN. I have no wish to transgress the rules of the House. I recognize the fact, Mr. Speaker, that you have sufficient difficulty with members during ordinary discussions, and I accept your decision and withdraw the word untrue. But I may be allowed to say that the statements that have been sedulously made by hon. gentlemen opposite in regard to the position of the Reform party, and wealth, resources and development of Canada have been unfair and unjust to the great political party to which they are opposed. I will not take a back seat with even the most ultra-Conservative in this House as regards my belief in the resources of Canada and the great heritage we possess. I am satisfied that in the northern portion of this hemisphere we have as splendid a territory, with as vast natural resources, both partially developed and undeveloped, as can be found in any country on the face of the earth, without any exception. Not only so, I believe that the undeveloped resources of this country are untold in wealth as compared with anything we have yet touched. I believe, further, that in the great plains which my hon. friend (Mr. Davin) is so proud to represent, we have an immense area of country where the finest wheat, that which commands the highest price in the world's markets, is produced, and produced, as it was last year, in profusion and abundance. I believe that when our animal products are put on the market—I need not refer to our cheese, because it speaks for itself, and the reputation it has acquired leaves nothing to be said—when our animals are put on the English market, fattened as Ontario farmers know how to fatten them, and as the natural grasses of the great plains of the West make them without that supplementary feeding which Ontario farmers have to use, they are not inferior to any in the world.

Moreover, I have no hesitation in saying that our farmers are just as energetic, manage their business just as well, and are equally as well entitled to enjoy a share of the luxuries and comforts of this life as are any other men who labour under the sun. In fact, our protectionist neighbours to the south of the line have built up a high tariff wall to protect the United States farmers from the competition of the Canadian farmers north of the boundary. What do the heavy duties imposed over there on the agricultural products of this country entering the United States mean, if they do not mean that? What does the tariff which we have built up against the United States mean if it is not that we are not going to permit unfair competition by American farmers? It puzzles the ordinary citizen to understand how both of these propositions can be correct, and I leave the problem to hon. gentlemen to deal with. It does not occupy any place in our programme, and we are not called on to explain it. It was simply an expedient to throw dust in the eyes of the farmers and make them believe they were protected when somebody else was getting the real article and they were obtaining only the semblance of it. If the National Policy means anything, it means that one class of citizens is taxed to make the business of another citizen profitable. That is the primary principle of protection and the National Policy, and we say we do not propose to take money out of one man's pocket and put it into another man's pocket, and make his special business profitable. We propose to give the other citizen all the protection that it is necessary so far as regards the revenue required to conduct our public affairs, meet our obligations and pay one hundred cents on the dollar. But we say further, that the great mass of the toiling community of Canada are being taxed for the benefit of a limited few under the National Policy, and we propose to keep up the agitation until that injustice is withdrawn.

Hon. gentlemen opposite have had a good deal of trouble in understanding the political platform of the Liberal party. I want to draw the attention of the House to this remarkable fact, that since the last general election in 1891 two new political parties have grown up in this Dominion, presenting two new platforms to the people. Let me ask if there is not some reason for objecting to the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite, when both these new political parties that are bidding for support from the electors repudiate entirely the protection plank which hon. gentlemen opposite are so careful to present as the basis of their action.

Now, Sir, let me refer for a moment to the platform of the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), who maintains to-day that he is not a Liberal so far as the Reform party is concerned, that he has no association with them, and has no sympathy

with them; in short, that he is as strong a Conservative to-day as he was in the good old days when he supported the Government now in power. And yet, here is a man trained in Conservative associations, possessing still Conservative sympathies, refusing to be allied with the political party that follows the leader in front of me (Mr. Laurier), and what does he say upon the trade question? I quote from his platform, as promulgated in 1893:

To promote tariff reform, such as will relieve the consumers, and especially the agricultural and wage-earning classes from the burden of taxation that they are now bearing, in consequence of excessive protection.

And again, he says:

To effectually and speedily accomplish the downfall of the combinations and trusts which have been created among many manufactures, whereby competition is prohibited and monopolies flourish.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are two statements diametrically opposed to the policy of the party to which the hon. gentleman was associated, and to which he claims he still belongs. How was it that his independent researches led him to believe that it was not in the interests of Canada that protection should exist as in times past?

There is another political party which has appealed since the general election of 1891 for the public support of the electorate of this Dominion, and, Mr. Speaker, that party received a great many flattering intimations of the kindly feeling that gentlemen opposite had towards them in the last Ontario elections. Why, Sir, what has been the result of the independent researches of the Patrons of Industry in this Dominion? I quote from their platform:

Tariff for revenue only, and so adjusted as to fall as far as possible upon the luxuries and not upon the necessaries of life.

Mr. TAYLOR. They got that from your platform.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). Is there any protection in that, may I ask, Mr. Speaker; and yet, that is the party that my hon. friend who now speaks (Mr. Taylor) took assiduous pains to cultivate in the last Ontario general elections, and he then thought they were a splendid party. Here is the result of their investigations, and here is the platform they present to the public and upon which they appeal to them for their support.

Now, Sir, I had occasion to say that the National Policy had never been presented to the electorate on its merits in any one general election since it was inaugurated, because the Conservatives took very good care always to encumber that policy with some other preliminary, in a way that gave them a certain advantage over their political opponents. Once they dissolved Parliament a year in advance of the period of

Mr. BAIN.

dissolution, because, as they said, there was so much capital waiting to be invested in the industries of Canada under this National Policy, and in order that it might not wait another year, they said: We will dissolve at once and make sure to get that capital to come into Canada. Did it come? No. Every candid man will say that it has not come. At another time we were presented with a redistribution of the constituencies, and with this remarkable effect, that there were a great many changes accomplished that tended to strengthen their political party, and tended to weaken the political party with which I am associated. Again, in 1891, the National Policy did not figure at all in the contest. The cry was reciprocity of trade with the United States. Sir, let me present you the evidence. I quote from the manifesto published in the "Empire" of February 3rd, 1891, on the morning when the first announcement was made to the public of a dissolution of the House, and the bringing on of the general elections. The "Empire" had this statement:

Acting on the advice of his responsible Ministers, His Excellency the Governor General has been pleased to dissolve the House of Commons and issue his writs for a new Parliament.

Then they go on to recite reasons for that appeal:

In view of the foregoing statement the question will naturally be asked: What are the reasons which have induced the Government to appeal to the country at the present time? It is understood that the Dominion Government have, through Her Majesty's Government, made certain proposals to the United States for negotiations looking to the extension of her commerce with that country.

There was no protection in that, but the plea was for the extension of our commerce.

These proposals have been submitted to the President for his consideration, and the Canadian Government is of the opinion that if the negotiations are to result in a treaty which must be ratified by the Parliament of Canada, it is expedient that the Government should be able to deal with a Parliament fresh from the people rather than with a moribund House.

The Government do not think so now. I am inclined to think, Mr. Speaker, if I expressed a candid opinion, that if this Government was able to hold on to office, and if the constitution did not make them dissolve the House, they would stay until the Archangel's trumpet sounded, before they would bring on a dissolution. Further, the "Empire" goes on in this fashion:

It is understood that Canada will send a delegation to Washington after 4th March, the day on which the life of the present Congress expires, for the purpose of discussing informally the question of the extension and development of trade between the United States and Canada, and the settlement of all questions of difference between the two countries.

That was the time that they made the three minute visit to Washington.

This delegation will visit the United States capital, it is said, as a result of a friendly suggestion from Washington.

Appended to that, Mr. Speaker, must be some reflections that cannot be comfortable to the present Secretary of State, if he looks back to the part that he played in connection with the statements about these negotiations. But what I want to draw your attention to is this: the question to be discussed then was not protection, but the extension and development of trade between the United States and Canada, and this was the single reason assigned for the dissolution of the House. A few days after that there was a great public meeting held in Toronto and the Premier was announced to be there to tell the people about his policy. When the time came he was not able to be present, but he sent up the then Minister of Justice, Sir John Thompson, and the present Premier announced that he would not deliver himself upon the policy, but Sir John Thompson was loaded up with all the facts in this matter.

I find in the "Empire" of the next day his statement of the reasons for the necessity of the appeal. After reciting the preliminary negotiations with Mr. Blaine, he goes on to say:

In the meantime, Sir, what would our position have been if we had not appealed to the country. It would have been said that in the very last hours of the existence of our Parliament we were endeavouring to make a treaty which would entirely change the business of the country and when we went to Washington we would have been comparatively weak in the hands of the men with whom we were negotiating, because they would know that instead of being there with the confidence of the country behind us we had to ask the assent of a Parliament which had already spent its last session before the negotiations had practically commenced. * * *

What we propose is that if you and the people of Canada accept the policy that we put before you now we will go to Washington with a Parliament behind us and we will be able to treat with Mr. Blaine with the assurance that the Premier of the country has the renewed confidence of the people of Canada.

My respected friend from Centre Toronto (Mr. Cockburn), whom I do not see in his seat, was at this meeting, and this is how the "Empire" records his introduction to that audience:

There were loud cries for "Cockburn,"

And he was reported as saying this:

I am sure we have enough of truth and fact in these speeches to enable us to keep firing volley after volley into the enemy until there is not a man left standing. We have been shown that the poorer we get the richer we become. We have been shown that as blue ruin stares us in the face, strange to say the capitalists of Europe were so simple-minded that with all their acuteness they lent us money at 3 instead of 5 per

cent; and I am only in hopes that as the blue ruin continues we will be able to borrow our money at 2 per cent, and our Finance Minister instead of a surplus of three millions, will be able to hand us over a surplus of over ten millions—

But that, Sir, is only the introduction to the climax:

—and, in fact, to remit taxation altogether.

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

After Recess

Mr. BAIN. Before recess, in referring to the election campaign of 1891, I had quoted from addresses delivered at Toronto, by the late Premier, Sir John Thompson, and by one of the Toronto members. On that occasion it will be in the recollection of the House, the Secretary of State, who was at that time our High Commissioner in London, visited Canada, and took an active part in the election contest. A few days after the occurrence of the meeting at Toronto, the "Empire," of February 8th, 1891, thus chronicles a public meeting held at Kingston, in which Sir Charles Tupper was announced as taking part. The heading was:

Sir Charles Tupper opens the battle in Kingston. The old war horse in fine fettle. The first public address of Sir Charles Tupper since his arrival from England.

And this is Sir Charles's statement with reference to the basis upon which the election campaign was carried on:

I have read with astonishment a denial that the United States is prepared to discuss the question of reciprocity with us. Well, you have all seen the announcement made by Sir John Macdonald in the most unmistakable terms. You have seen the despatch sent by Lord Stanley to Lord Knutsford that Canada is prepared to take up the discussion of reciprocal free trade—

Reciprocal free trade—

—with the United States. The policy announced is a sound policy and one that cannot fail to have a widely beneficial effect upon the commercial interests of the two countries. After the 4th of March, the United States government will be prepared to go into consideration of this question and ascertain what reciprocal trade relations can be carried forward. Her Majesty's government, moreover, looks with entire favour on the proposition; and I have it out of Lord Knutsford's own mouth that he would be delighted to see an arrangement of this kind with the United States on the lines of Lord Stanley's despatch.

The hon. gentleman who preceded me to-night was troubled with serious doubt as to how the Liberal policy of reciprocity of trade with the United States could be carried out consistently with the nature of our relations as a colony of Great Britain, and without discriminating against the mother country, while at the same time raising a revenue for the Dominion. And he said a

good many hard things as to the impossibility of the various parts of the policy hanging together. Sir, I hand the hon. gentleman over to the leader of the House. I have read you the words of that hon. gentleman on February 7th, 1891. It is not for us, it is not for my leader, to reconcile these things, it is for the gentleman whom my hon. friend now recognizes as his leader, to show that there is nothing inconsistent in reciprocity of trade with the United States and the maintenance of our relations with the Empire.

Now, Sir, coming down to the practical application of these matters to our daily life—for I believe in being practical—I wish to draw the attention of the House for a few moments to the effect of application of the principles of the National Policy to the agricultural industry in certain respects. Let me draw your attention first to the position taken by the Government to the farmers of Canada in respect of the butter and cheese industry. I need hardly say, Sir, that so far as the development of the dairy interest is concerned, I am decidedly of opinion that at least within the bounds of the province of Ontario, the government of that province have anticipated everything that has been done by this Government that has been really effective in developing these industries. Hon. gentlemen tell us, for example, that they have given the farmers protection in respect of butter and cheese. The records of this House show that in the old days of the revenue tariff, in 1867, when the Dominion was formed, when there was no thought on the part of either political party of establishing a protective policy, a duty of 3 cents a pound was imposed upon cheese, and a duty of 4 cents a pound upon butter, for purely revenue purposes. To-day the duty is exactly the same as it was then. To listen to these hon. gentlemen one would think nothing had been done for that industry before they took the matter in hand. They tell us—well, I shall not give my own words for what they tell us, but I shall read the Minister's own language with respect to one branch of this industry. You remember, Mr. Speaker, that there was a very keenly-fought election in North Ontario. Never in the history of Canadian politics, I believe, did so many Ministers swarm into a county to exhort the people vigorously and persistently as to their duty, than in an election. It was a triangular fight. One of the new political parties entered the field to do battle for the cause they believed sound, and I am bound to say that they put up a splendid fight. On that occasion, the Finance Minister (Mr. Foster) was extremely anxious to show the farmers how kind and how benevolent the Government was, and how careful of the farmers' interest. And this is the way the "Mail and Empire" reports his statements to the farmers at Sunderland. I quote

Mr. BAIN.

from the "Mail and Empire" of December 10th, 1895:

It was thought desirable to turn the energy of the farmer into other directions, and the production and export of a good, uniform quality of butter was considered one of the most profitable. With that object in view, butter was purchased at 20 cents a pound, and advertised and marketed by the Government. What was the result? The Canadian article ranks now with Danish butter in the English markets, which formerly led the van; and every dollar of \$20,000 expended had gone back into the treasury, and our reputation has been raised—

Where?

—to the top notch in that market. (Applause.)

Then the paper goes on to say that it was intended to pursue the same policy in regard to other articles. A day or two after the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Montague), whom illness, we all regret to learn, has obliged him temporarily to leave this House, delivered a speech in that campaign. Again I quote from the "Mail and Empire," this time of the 11th December, 1895, in its report of a meeting at Beaverton, at which, it says, the Finance Minister and Dr. Montague were present. Toward the close of the doctor's address, when he was enlarging upon the blessings they had conferred upon the farmers:

"What about butter?" shouted a man in the audience.

In response, Dr. Montague told how the Government had established the Canadian butter trade upon a firm basis by means of a bonus and cold storage, and without the loss to the country of a single dollar. And the report adds that amidst cheers, the meeting was brought to a close after the doctor's telling speech.

Now, I admit that the metaphors are a little mixed there, but as I am reading from the report of the meeting, I am not responsible. But I want to draw your attention, Sir, to the actual facts. A few days ago, in reply to a question from the hon. member for Huron (Mr. McMillan) this reply was given with respect to the promoting of the butter trade:

In reply to a question by Mr. McMillan, Hon. Dr. Montague said that 51,748 pounds of creamery butter were shipped to Great Britain under the Government advance of 20 cents per pound.

The average net price realized in Montreal, for the whole shipment, after deducting all expenses from Montreal, outwards, was 14.28 cents per pound.

The highest price realized in Great Britain was 50 shillings per cwt., for 12 packages from the Government dairy station at Lennoxville, Que.

The lowest price realized in Great Britain was 63 shillings per cwt., for 6 packages.

Fourteen thousand, six hundred and eighty-three pounds of butter was the quantity sold in Montreal, as being in unsuitable packages for export to Great Britain. It was sold in Montreal at an average price of 21.34 cents per pound. After deducting the freight charges and selling

commission in Montreal it realized an average net price of 19·87 cents per pound.

Mr. Speaker, I think it would have been financially in the interests of Canada if the whole of that butter had been sold in Montreal, and if not one pound of it had gone on to the English market, and I fail to understand how realizing 14·38 cents for the shipments to England can have established the character of Canadian butter at the highest notch, and made it rank alongside Danish butter in the English markets. Sir, that cannot have been done, because the elements to establish the statements of the Finance Minister are not in the transaction, and he must have been drawing upon his imagination for his facts when he was dealing with the people in Sunderland, or else the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Montague) has failed to return the correct figures of the sales of that butter in the English markets. But if anybody wants to see the grade at which that butter stood in the English market, let him turn to the address made in this House by my hon. friend from South Huron (Mr. McMillan), and he will find there a detailed report of the condition of that butter when it appeared in the English market; and I will venture to say that the report does not justify the boasting in which members of the Government indulged when they went out to Cannington to pull the wool over the eyes of the farmers in that butter country. Before the Government entered into this transaction, the Dairy Commissioner had presented his views to the Montreal people, and I find in the annual report of the Montreal Board of Trade, the opinion of that body on this matter. As my hon. friend who spoke before me has certified that they are good and wise and true business men. I content myself with quoting their opinion on the action of the Government in going into the shipping of butter. You will find it in the report of the last annual meeting, and it is this:

The action of the Dominion Government in agreeing to pay advances at the rate of 20 cents per pound on creamery butter of finest quality, made between the 1st of January and the 30th of March, 1895, when for shipment to the British market, was strenuously opposed by this association, notwithstanding the full explanation of its objects and anticipated working given by Prof. Robertson, dairy commissioner, at a meeting held on February 18th. This protest was not successful in inducing the department to alter its course.

The result is that we shipped 51,700 pounds to the English market, which cost us 20 cents at Montreal, and we sold it there at a little over 14 cents. How it turns out that we did not lose a dollar by the transaction, as the Finance Minister claims, I fail to understand.

Mr. FOSTER. A slight mistake in the figures, that is all.

Mr. BAIN. This is a matter of considerable importance for the people of Canada,

because I hold that the vice of the system inaugurated by the hon. gentlemen opposite is this, that it has encouraged everybody to look to the Government, and the public treasury, for aid in anything they undertake, and I will venture to say that that butter transaction would not have been gone into last spring were it not for the fact, as announced by the journals in the confidence of the Government, that the Government were getting ready to have the general elections not later than the month of May. I have said that the tendency of a protective system was to induce parties to apply to the treasury for help, instead of helping themselves, and that is one of the reasons why I object to it. It takes the manhood, it takes the incentive to independent action out of the people of this country. When our people go from home, when they go to the United States, they are able to hold their own against anybody. But it does seem as though the effect of this system was to demoralize the independent action of the people, and lead them to creep up to the treasury for the purpose of getting help every time they want to do anything. Now, I want to draw your attention to a short article that anybody interested can find in one of the newspapers on the files of the House—and it is not ancient history, either. I am quoting from the Stratford "Beacon" of the 1st of this month, February, and it is from a sketch made by their reporter, of the Black Creek creamery, out in Perth county, which is owned and operated by that veteran dairyman, the Hon. Thomas Ballantyne, and this is what the reporter said that he found when he visited that creamery:

They are handling this winter about 60,000 pounds of milk a week, from which about a ton of butter is manufactured of such a fine flavour that it commands not only the highest price on the Toronto market, but the highest for colonial butter on the English markets. Stratford and Toronto has been the market heretofore, but the output being largely increased this season, a number of shipments have been made to England to test the best market there.

The butter is packed in square 56 pound packages which are well steamed and soaked with salt brine and afterwards lined with parchment paper.

Shipments have been made weekly since the first of December, and the goods have always arrived in prime condition. The prices realized have ranged from 102 to 112 shillings for 112 pounds, only one small lot bringing the lowest price, the average being 109 shillings, which is almost 24 cents here. After allowing for freight, commission, &c., the butter which brought 112 shillings, should make the price here a fraction over 22 cents per pound, or 3 cents per pound more than could be realized in Toronto where the prevailing price for the best creamery butter has been 19 cents per pound. So that for this season, at least, England is the best market for high class butter.

Now, Sir, there is a case of individual enterprise, a man who went into the business himself, shipped on his own responsibility,

and did not come to the Government and ask for help to get his goods on the English market. He looked at his market, he adapted his goods to the wants of that market, and the smallest price he realized was 109 shillings for 112 pounds, and from that up to 112 shillings. Just compare that with the operations of the Government as a trading company. The best they realized on their shipments was 90 shillings, and some were sold at 63 shillings for 112 pounds. When they got through they realized a little over 14 cents a pound, while Mr. Ballantyne realized to his customers here, 22 cents; and after they paid 3½ cents for making the butter they were still in a better position than the local market would have given them. But the reporter puts in this note of warning, and I commend it to the hon. gentlemen opposite when they go out into the country and tell the farmers that the English market is open to an unlimited quantity of Canadian butter. The reason that the price was higher in England this season than usual, was that our sister colony of New Zealand had had an excessively dry season, and the result was that her shipments to the English market were rather less than usual. Sir, I submit under these circumstances that the announcement of the Minister of Agriculture, in the early part of this session, that they would not go into the butter business any more, is justified by the financial exhibit, and that exhibit did not justify the statement the Finance Minister made in the country. Now, we have heard a good deal with respect to the development of the Danish creamery and hog product business. Any gentleman interested in that business, if he will take the trouble to look up the last page but one of to-day's Montreal "Gazette," will find one of the most interesting statements it has been my lot to read for some time, concerning the mode in which the Danish farmers are combining to put their hog products on the English market to the best advantage. Let me say, Mr. Speaker, that notwithstanding all the talk of these hon. gentlemen about the Government encouragement of the butter and hog trade of Denmark, the Government never did encourage that business. It was conducted by private enterprise, and all the Government ever did was to offer some cash prizes as premiums at the exhibitions for the best qualities of butter and cheese. Now, the substance of the article in the Montreal "Gazette" to which I refer is simply this, not that the Government are building big factories to cure hog products to the best advantage to be put upon the English market, but that the Danish farmers are combining to create by their personal credit a fund to erect a packing establishment where their hogs will be cut up, packed and shipped to the English market under the most favourable conditions. After providing for the expense of cutting, shipping and packing, the net result

Mr. BAIN.

is distributed to the farmers who have contributed, after taking out the working expenses of the operation of the scheme. The people themselves are developing this industry by co-operative establishments similar to other independent establishments here and elsewhere. They did not creep up to the Government for aid in their enterprise and the Government is not mentioned as having anything to do with it at all. I commend that to these men who believed that nothing can be accomplished for the community unless the Government dip into the public treasury for the purpose of helping them. Now, one word with respect to the cheese industry. Let me glance back for a moment at the history of that industry as regards the province of Ontario. I grant freely that the development of the cheese industry in the province of Quebec, and in the maritime provinces, and in the west, has been very large of late years. I grant freely that the dairy commissioner of the Dominion Government is entitled to a share of credit for that development; but I want to say that the Government are not entitled to the entire credit for the large development and improvement of the cheese industry in Quebec and the other provinces. In all these eastern provinces the officers of the local government have co-operated actively, and energetically, and successfully with those appointed by the Dominion Government for that purpose. I have no wish to place any of those parties in a disadvantage or unfair position. We are open here to discuss these questions on their merits, and the truth stands longest under any circumstances. But let me glance backwards for a moment at the industry of cheese-making, because the orators of this Government in the country are never tired of telling the farmers that the Dominion Government did all this thing for them. In 1872 the Dairymen's Association was incorporated by the provincial legislature of Ontario, and to aid them in establishing their enterprise, they gave them an annual grant of \$700 to start with. From that time forward this industry has been steadily prosecuted by the energy of the people themselves. In 1888, when the Dairymen's Association met, both at Listowel and Peterborough—for by this time they had divided up into two branches—they adopted a scheme of having efficient cheese and milk inspectors visit their factories. At that time there were 707 factories in active operation in Ontario, and the returns show that 438 visits were made to 152 factories in that year. For a couple of years previous, those pioneers of the cheese industry in Ontario, men who are still actively engaged in it, men such as Mr. Ballantyne of Perth, McPherson in the eastern counties, Caswell of Ingersoll, and several others, had advocated and urged this mode of improving the quality of their product and placing their dairymen in a position where they could produce the best quality of cheese. In 1894

their Agricultural College in Guelph put a creamery into operation for the purpose of giving practical illustration of the mode of manufacturing creamery butter and training parties in the manufacture of that article. Where was it started? It was started in a building which, among those conversant with the locality, is known as the old cheese factory, and that was back in 1884. The cheese factory was in operation to give practical training in the manufacture of cheese, taking the milk in and making it up in the presence of those who attended for the purpose of acquiring the details of the operation. To-day what is the fact? A portion of the training of the Agricultural College is steadily devoted, year by year, to instructing parties in the manufacture of both cheese and butter, and the class which is taking advantage of the training has grown so large that only last week there was opened up a branch establishment at Strathroy, for the western part of the province, to relieve the pressure of the attendance at the Central College at Guelph, and give the people in the western district the benefit of thorough and systematic training. Under these circumstances, need we wonder that the development of the dairying industry in Ontario has been large and active. Let me quote from the words of the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McMillan). Speaking some years ago on the development of the cheese industry, which was carried out under the auspices of the Ontario government long before the Dominion Government ever thought of appointing a Dairy Commissioner, the hon. gentleman is reported to have said:

The cheese interest in Ontario derives great benefit from the work of Professor Arnold, who was employed by the Ontario government, who went from factory to factory, giving notice of his visit in advance and invited all the cheese-makers round to attend; took the milk from the wagons and put it through the various processes in their presence.

He goes on to say:

The advantage specially derived from that was that they got rid of what was popularly known at that time as leaky cheese, which very much interfered with the quality of our cheese in the market.

This work has been done by the enterprise of the people of Ontario. Need we be surprised that before the Dairy Commissioner was appointed at Ottawa, the development of the cheese industry went forward after this fashion: In 1870 there were 323 factories, and the output was 12,500,000 pounds; in 1880 there were 551 factories, with an output of 48,000,000 pounds; and in 1891 the business had grown so that there were 838 factories, with an output of 80,900,000 pounds. I am reading from the Ontario returns. Surely when the Dairy Commissioner was appointed in 1890, when the first vote was given

for his salary, it will not be claimed that it was on account of his magic influence that the output rose to 81,000,000 pounds? No; the fact was that owing to the energies of our people, together with the systematic aid furnished by the provincial government, we had developed that enterprise, no thanks either to the National Policy or the Dominion Government.

We have heard a good deal from the Finance Minister in his Budget speech about the blessings of the home market that the National Policy had created for the farmer. These are his words:

Passing from these to the agricultural interests of the country, it is not saying too much, Sir, to say that from 1891 to 1895, these have shown a gradual, a continued, and a healthy advance. The home market has been constantly increasing. The increase in population itself from 1890 to 1895 has added to that home market. The increase of urban population which gathers in cities, and towns, and villages, and largely gathers there from the planting in these places of industrial establishments of different kinds, has largely increased. And, Sir, every thousand of the urban population is so much of the healthiest and best increase to the markets of the farmers of this country, for it affords a market near to them for products which would not carry to foreign markets, many of which are perishable in their nature, and for which a home market is absolutely essential.

How does the hon. gentleman pretend that the home market continually increased and that he gave the farmers a greater consuming population from 1890 to 1895? Here is the schedule of agricultural exports, and it shows that in 1890, of the articles of cheese, butter, potatoes, horses, sheep and cattle, &c., the value of \$22,000,000 in 1880 were exported, while in 1895, we had to export of the same agricultural products \$36,000,000 which we were not able to eat up at home. Does that mean an increase in the home market from 1890 to 1895? If I understand the object of the National Policy it was to create a home market; and yet, here the Finance Minister coolly argued that because in 1895 we had to find a foreign market for \$36,000,000 in value of agricultural products, while in 1890 the value of the same articles exported was only \$22,000,000, therefore the home market was increasing. I want to know at that ratio when the time will come when the home market will consume the agricultural products of Canada. If we travel backward at that rate, then hon. gentlemen opposite had better quit "booming" the home market, which they claim to have created, because if we have protected industries with heavy duties and at the same time tell the farmers that we are giving them a home market, and yet we are sending more agricultural products out of Canada, then when are the blessings for the farmers ever going to arrive? The Finance Minister rejoices in increased exports, and so do I, because when the National Policy was inaugurated in 1878

it did not improve the situation until the enormous crop with which the farmers were blessed in 1880 came to be put on the market the following season, and the money received for it began to find its way through the avenues of trade, the treasury began to realize there was any benefit in the National Policy. It was simply that Providence blessed them with a heavy crop, there was a large surplus, they had more money to spend and the farmers spent it. What does the National Policy do towards growing those 80,000,000 bushels of grain in the North-west which the Finance Minister has announced was the product of the Territories? What has it done to stimulate the production of the crop of grain? Has it made any one article which the farmer buys cheaper than it would have been if those enormous duties had not been imposed? What was it that led the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) the other year to be so anxious to have the duty on agricultural implements reduced to the farmers of the North-west? Was it not to lighten the burdens the National Policy imposes on the farmers? And when the people are called upon to pay high duties on everything they have to buy, I agree with the statement of the hon. member that it is a condition too grievous to be borne. But let me draw attention to the opinion expressed by an hon. gentleman who I think all parties will admit is capable of expressing an opinion on this subject, who is a practical farmer himself—I will quote from the manifesto or hand-book of the Patrons. This is the statement:

The cheese industry has grown rapidly in Canada, and protectionists say gleefully: "Yes, cheese is protected 3 cents per pound." In the States it is protected 4 cents. On protectionist principles it must be dearer there than here, so that our duty is useless. Practical cheese men, like Mr. D. M. Macpherson, Patron, M.P.P. for Glengarry, say with truth that if our duty had never been imposed at all the industry would have thriven with no less vigour. The natural conditions existing here, the climate, soil and water, coupled with the energy of the factory owners and the farmers, who had to resort to some other staple when wheat became unprofitable, have made the industry what it is.

These are the words of a man who does not draw \$7,000 a year in a public office here in Ottawa, but he is a man who is engaged in the occupation like the Hon. Mr. Ballantyne himself. It continues:

Protection simply handicaps it. There were over a thousand factories in operation in this province in 1894. In each the machinery, piping, cloth, thermometers, curd knives, &c., are taxed; the duties on coal and iron increase railroad rates, the tariff on imports increases ocean rates, while the farmer who supplies the milk is taxed right and left. Altogether Mr. Macpherson calculates that protection does the farmer out of about a cent per pound on all the cheese made in the country, and out of half a cent or so on all the butter.

Mr. BAIN.

I sympathize with the view expressed by the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) when he wanted the burdens taken off the backs of the farmers of the North-west, and which burdens were imposed upon them by the National Policy. Take, for instance, the extra cost that is imposed upon the farmers by the iron duties. Where does \$4 a ton on pig iron that cost less than \$11 a ton when brought into this country: where does that prove any blessing to the farmers. And so, on the wrought iron and steel, that under the tariff inaugurated in 1887 by the Secretary of State (Sir Charles Tupper) which imposed 50 per cent by the actual returns of the trade of the following years, on bar iron, that is a prime necessity in the ordinary operations of the farm. And these gentlemen opposite tell us that by increasing the output of the factories and enabling them to ship their goods out of Canada and sell them cheaper to farmers of other countries that compete with ours: they tell us they are conferring a blessing on our people by doing so. They give the manufacturers a drawback of 99 per cent on all the duty that is taken on the material that goes into the exported reaper, and under the blessings of the benign National Policy they collect every cent of that out of the farmer when he lives in Canada and uses that article. Why, Sir, what benefit has these blessings been to either the farmers of Canada or the United States? Last year we had to find a market in other countries for fifty million dollars worth of our farm products, after we had fed every man, woman and child that the National Policy had brought to Canada. We had to ship that surplus off to the world's market, and compete there with farmers who produced under cheaper and more favourable circumstances. Were the American farmers any better off? Look at the trade returns of the United States last year, and you will find that \$67.50 out of every hundred dollars worth of the exports of the United States were the agricultural products of the farmers of that country. They had fed all the operatives that their protective tariff had procured for them, and they shipped out of the country \$67.50 worth out of every \$100 worth of surplus products that were produced in that country and sold. Now, Sir, in both these cases it is simply preposterous to tell us that the National Policy has been any benefit for the farmers. Let me draw your attention for one moment to the kind of competition that our farmers have to face, after they pay these high prices for their implements. They have to compete with the farmers of the world in the markets of the world, and against men who buy their implements less that cost imposed upon us. Let me read to you just two or three lines from the report of Mr. Peel, the secretary of the British Legation at Buenos Ayres. I want

to draw your attention to this fact, that it is not a matter of two or three years ago, but it is a matter that occurred some time in the month of May, 1895, so that it is an up-to-date quotation, and it shows the competition we have to meet at the present time. He says :

No other country in the world can produce wheat more cheaply than Argentina. The actual cost of producing and delivering at the station, with the hiring expenses of the family, bags, threshing, and carriage, in a good year, is not over 9 shillings per quarter, and turned into our money means about 28 cents per bushel.

To raise the wheat, bag it, and ship it, and get it to the port of shipment for Great Britain, it costs the Argentine farmer less than 30 cents a bushel. Let me tell you, Mr. Speaker—and I regret that it is so, as compared with our own position—while our magnificent wheat fields are unfortunately far away from the port of ocean shipment, a large proportion of the surplus wheat of Argentina is raised almost in sight of the ocean vessel that carries it to the English market. Now, I say, that when our surplus wheat products of the North-west go to England, they are handicapped by a long and expensive railway transit before they can get into the position of the products of the Buenos Ayrian farmer who raises his wheat within two or three hundred miles of the ocean vessel that carries it to the English port. Sir, Argentina has been boomed like many another country with vast natural resources, but it has been in financial distress for some years, and I point a warning finger to the Government here, and tell them that we had better go more moderately in increasing our debt and rolling up our public burden year after year, for fear we shall find our credit by and by ranking alongside the credit of the province of Buenos Ayres, and the other Argentine provinces. Sir, as long as our credit is good it does not take much statesmanship to get behind four millions of dollars in one year and borrow it in the English market. But, Sir, it comes back on the taxpayer of the country, and every dollar that is wasted unnecessarily comes out of the pockets of the people of this Canada of ours. It is for the producing population I plead: the wealthy can take care of themselves. I say that the man who has to earn his money by the sweat of his brow should not be handicapped for the benefit of somebody else, who drives in his carriage. Need I say that the development of Argentina, under these circumstances has been very marked. In 1883 they had six hundred thousand acres in wheat; in 1888 it had risen to two million acres; in 1892 to over three million acres; and in 1893 to five and a half million acres in wheat. It is, I say, cruel to handicap our Canadian farmers when they are obliged to face such competition on the open markets of the world.

Now, Sir, my hon. friend who preceded

me said a good deal to us about the blessings which protection had conferred upon the Canadian farmer in respect of the heavy duties which had been imposed upon American agricultural products coming into Canada. He told us that one result was that we had shut out a large quantity of American products that would otherwise have competed successfully against the surplus products of Canada, and he quoted to us the quantities of pork and other products that had thus been shut out. Now, Sir, I want to read to you the actual facts of the situation at the present time. I quote from the Montreal "Gazette" of Friday, the 14th of February, and I commend to these gentlemen the prices ruling at the present moment when they talk so eloquently about the benefits of protection. Take, for instance, the Montreal hog market :

Live hogs were scarce, for which there was a good inquiry, and prices advanced $\frac{1}{2}$ c. per lb., the only lot on the market being sold at $\frac{4}{8}$ c. per lb. live weight.

Now take the quotations in Chicago as given by the telegraph on the same day: Hogs, \$3.65 to \$4.25 and \$3.95 to \$4.22 $\frac{1}{2}$. I would like to ask how you are going to pay $\frac{1}{8}$ c. per pound live weight of duty, and transfer these hogs from Chicago to Montreal and make the business pay. There is no protection there. Now take the quotations in the Montreal markets for beeves :

Good beeves sold at $\frac{3}{8}$ c. to $\frac{3}{4}$ c.; fair, 3c. to $\frac{3}{4}$ c.

In Chicago common to extra steers were quoted at from \$3.20 to \$4.65, and Texans from \$2.35 to \$4.10. And yet hon. gentlemen stand up and tell us that our tariff protects our farmers from the competition of the Americans; and these quotations are those at the centre of the American continent, and I give you the quotations at Montreal, our port of shipment. There can be no answer given by these hon. gentlemen. We ship our Canadian pork to England, and it has established a good reputation there, because it is of a quality and grade that exactly suits the English market. That is the secret of the development of our trade, and we have steadily increased our output and placed it on that market, while the Chicago market has averaged higher than ours; and yet hon. gentlemen tell us that it is the duty that keeps out the American product.

But I want to draw attention to another feature of the protection they promised for the agricultural population of this country. The Minister of Finance tooted very loudly about the development of our trade with Australia. Now, let me tell you how this Australian trade strikes one of the new political parties recently organized. I will quote, not from a Grit campaign sheet, but from a pamphlet issued by the Patrons of Industry, and this is the view they take of the development of the Australian trade :

In 1894 (Auditor General, S-4), a subsidy of \$121,700 was paid to a steamship line running between Australia and Vancouver. The exports to Australia amounted to only \$20,000, so that the cost to the taxpayer of selling goods was nearly 40 per cent. Of the \$20,000, only \$770 represented Canadian farm products. The items were:

Canned fruits.....	\$113
Canned vegetables.....	110
Animal produce.....	646
	—
	\$770

I think I have heard of canned Australian meat being sold in the Canadian market. We are sending out canned fruits to Australia, and the extent to which we sent them that year was \$113 worth.

There is not much, therefore, for the Canadian farmer in the export trade to Australia, to which such a large bonus is paid. The imports from Australia in 1894 were \$142,000, and, if the bonused steamships are maintained, are likely to grow. Official returns, later than the regular trade returns, show that butter, tallow, canned meats, frozen mutton, fruits, etc., are being landed at Vancouver and Victoria. The frozen mutton landed at Victoria (Return from July 1st, 1894, to February 1st, 1895), was worth 3½ cents a pound laid down there, the butter 17¼ cents. The total imports of farm products at these two places during the seven months amounted to \$10,000. Is a protectionist government justified by protectionist principles in bonusing ships to bring foreign competition upon the home farmer in the home market?

If I were to judge by the actions of my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), who preceded me, he does not believe that this is right, because on the Order paper of to-day I see a notice of a motion that the duty on butter should be increased from 4 cents to 6 cents a pound—for what reason? He says himself, manfully, to enable the North-western farmer to compete with the Australian farmer in the British Columbia market. Sir, I do not know how it strikes you; but it strikes me as supremely absurd to first bonus a steamship line to fetch Australian butter over to Vancouver, and then bonus Canadian butter from the western plains by an extra 2 cents a pound to enable it to compete with this butter which we bonus the steamship line to fetch in to compete with ours. I cannot comprehend that sort of thing. It is about as great a puzzle to me as the reciprocity policy of the hon. Secretary of State (Sir Charles Tupper) is to my friend the hon. member for Assiniboia. The Patrons go on to say further:

Of the exports to Australia, manufactures constituted nearly one-third, and the principal item was implements, \$79,000.

I think I have heard some orator here say that about \$90,000,000 was paid for labour by the factories in Canada under the benign influence of the National Policy. How long would all these operatives be employed by an export trade of \$79,000 to Australia?

Mr. BAIN.

And yet hon. gentlemen opposite tell us that it is a benefit for us to have an export trade, because it helps to keep the operatives employed, and the manufacturers will be able to sell cheaper to us at home. Sir, they will sell to us at home for just exactly the amount of the duty added to the price at which the article from the outside can be brought into Canada, and for no less than will just enable them to keep the market. You cannot do anything without employing an agent to go out and attend to it. Take, for example, this Australian business. The present First Minister (Sir Mackenzie Bowell) made a trip out there a year or two ago, and it cost the country \$2,745 to enable him to go out there and look after this trade. Then he had a gentleman who was formerly a Canadian manufacturer, but whom the National Policy had ruined—and no doubt they thought it desirable to give him a job—and Mr. Larke was employed as our agent and sent out there. I am not saying a word against the energy and ability of Mr. Larke as an able business man, but we have had to provide his salary and expenses, and last year, from the 25th August, 1894, to 3rd June, 1895, he cost this country the neat little sum of \$5,600. Then we established a Department of Trade and Commerce to look after this foreign trade, and the Auditor General's Report shows that that department cost last year, right here in Ottawa, for the salary and expenses of the Minister and his staff of officials the sum of \$17,900. That has to be charged to this foreign trade. Then we have the subsidy paid last year for a trip once a month, of \$121,600, solid Canadian cash, paid to encourage that trade. And our total trade was \$530,000 both ways, and our total revenue \$7,248 duties collected on that traffic. Now, the reason I object to all this is just this. That every dollar of that comes out of the pockets of the producing population of this country. And the return of the Statist, according to Bulletin 18, I think it is, of the occupations and the people of Canada, shows that only 19 out of every 100 are engaged in manufactures. And I will venture to say that the half of that 19 are engaged in industries that never were benefited by the National Policy. You do not mean to tell me that the blacksmith out in the country who repairs the farmer's wagon and does his ordinary work, or the girl who manufactures dresses and millinery in the small places throughout the country or anywhere else, is ever benefited by being protected against the competition of American blacksmiths or milliners or any one else. And yet, according to the showing of the Government Statistician, out of every 100 people, 81 have to feel in their pockets for their proportion of this money that benefits only the other 19. I say it is a crying shame, and that is one reason why I object to that branch of the National Policy. Now, the hon. Minister told us in glowing terms

about another branch of our trade. Not to do him any injustice, I shall quote his own words :

Take the line to the West Indies and to South America, which, seven or eight years ago, was projected in this House, which received the assent of Parliament, and which was carried into execution. Every one knows with what opposition it was met by the leader of hon. gentlemen opposite and by his party. What has taken place? Why, Sir, with reference to the West Indian trade, whereas, in 1887, our total trade was but \$4,000,000, in 1895 our total trade with the West Indies amounted to \$8,500,000, an increase of about 112 per cent in our trade with those islands in those few years. And to-day, Sir, the West Indies, in its aggregate of trade takes the fourth or fifth place in the list of countries with which Canada is carrying on business. Is not that a magnificent showing? We have doubled our trade; we have raised it from \$4,000,000 to \$8,500,000, and at that the Opposition sneers.

Sir, I want to go below the surface for a minute or two, and ask whether the Finance Minister was not somewhat disingenuous when he put that trade in that form, and I ask the attention of the House to the details. He claimed that in 1887 our total trade was but \$4,000,000, and that in 1895 it had risen to \$8,500,000. Sir, I will not take the benefit of the development of the trade for the years up to 1887. I will go back to the good old days when we depended on the energy of our population, and when our trade was driven with the West Indies by our own people, without bonus, help or encouragement. Sir, the official trade returns of 1878 show that we sold to the West Indies \$3,464,000 worth of the products of our own population. In 1895, we sold them only \$3,377,000 worth. That was the market which this policy found for the surplus products of the people of Canada. We shipped to them, \$3,464,000 by our own energy; and then we encouraged the trade and reduced it to \$3,377,000. We imported in 1878 \$1,033,000 worth, and on that we collected a duty of \$341,000. In 1895, we imported \$4,804,000 worth, and on that amount of imports we collected just \$351,000. Sir, if these figures prove anything, they prove the very contrary of what the hon. Minister has stated, and I will tell you why. Where was the development of our trade? The Finance Minister is never done telling us about the blessings he conferred on us when he took the duty off sugar in 1891. In 1895, we imported from the West Indies 150,000,000 pounds of sugar valued at \$3,325,000, and we did not collect a cent of revenue on it. The effect of the Government's policy was this, that we did not find a market for any increase of our own products and we stimulated the import trade by taking the burden off that trade. And in addition I draw your attention to the fact that the largest part of that trade was done with the Spanish West Indies, and that the Island of Jamaica alone, which is the larger of our West Indian colonies,

sold last year to the United States five and a half million dollars worth, and bought from the United States \$4,000,000 worth. And they were kind enough, when they made a reciprocity treaty with the United States, to put us on exactly the same footing, and did not discriminate against us, and yet we have not been able to gain that trade. Let me ask, what it cost us to increase that import trade in free sugar? In 1878, we had the trade, and it cost us nothing. In 1895, what is the position? The Finance Minister made a trip to the West Indies in 1890 to look up that trade, and we paid \$1,300 for the expenses of himself and his secretary. My respected and genial friend who now occupies a Government berth in the post office in Hamilton, Mr. Adam Brown, was our commissioner to the Jamaica Exhibition, and it cost us \$5,000 for his expenses. At the Jamaica Exhibition we spent \$22,000. For five years back we have spent from \$80,000 to \$97,000 a year in steamship subsidies. In addition to all this, we have to have five consular agents, to whom we pay \$250 per annum, a total of \$1,250. I say, without hesitation, that the presentation of the case by the Minister of Finance was not a fair presentation of the facts, and that, when you look under the surface, you find that the more you do of that kind of business, the more money you are out of pocket, and the greater loss has to be borne by the taxpayers of the Dominion of Canada.

Now, Sir, let me look for a few moments at the nature of these four pages of reductions in the tariff that the Finance Minister has paraded in his Budget speech this session. Here is the statement given by the hon. gentleman :

In 1894 a general reduction of the tariff was made all along the line.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. I thought I should evoke one of these pleasant exclamations from my hon. friend, and I had hoped to provoke another from the leader of the Opposition. But perhaps he will favour me with it yet. For both these hon. gentlemen, not on one, but on many occasions, have taken upon themselves to inform the country that in 1894 the Minister of Finance came down with good intentions, offering to reduce, considerably, the duties levied upon articles which entered into the consumption of the country, but that when we got before the House, the manufacturers scared him off, he ran his pencil through the reductions, and next to nothing was done at all.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Less than nothing.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman says, less than nothing. His statement is just as extreme as they always are. In that general reduction in 1894, it is estimated that \$1,500,000 taxation was taken off the people.

And then he goes into four columns of reductions that were made in the tariff of 1894. I propose, for a few moments, to examine into the details of those reductions. I con-

fess, Mr. Speaker, that my experience with some of the statements of the Finance Minister, with respect to various fiscal matters, leaves me to feel a little hesitation in trusting the lucidity and fairness of his attempts to expound to us the actual facts. Let me go back for a year or two, and recall to the House the circumstances previous to the revision of the tariff in 1894. I remember, Mr. Speaker, and so do you and other members of the House, that, in the session of 1893, there was a remarkable disposition among gentlemen on the other side to attack the National Policy piecemeal. One had a difficulty in connection with corn; another had a grievance about binder-twine; another was in trouble over agricultural implements. There was a feeling abroad that, to use the words of the late leader of the House, there were a lot of mouldering branches on the tariff that must be lopped away, in order to bring it into a healthy condition and make it more suitable for the requirements of the community. The Order paper was beautiful to behold in the early days of that session, bristling, as it was, with notices of motion by supporters of the Government, attacking various portions of the National Policy. Something had to be done to meet this difficulty, or there was trouble ahead for the National Policy. That is the reason why the Minister of Finance took up the question in his Budget speech of 14th February, 1893. He had promised his friends, that, if they would be quiet, and behave themselves, an investigation would be made into the facts and the duties would be cut down a little later on. He said:

If in the course of that investigation which is now going on, and which will be continued for some short time yet before a conclusion is reached, it be found that protection has been given to some industries which have no prospect at all of ever becoming fairly rooted in this country, it will become a question with this Government, whether or not it is not best to drop hot-house protection and give simply the reasonable and sufficient protection which is necessary in order to establish industries which, when established, will give some assurance of permanency and continued prosperity.

These, then, are the present lines. To lighten the scale of taxation, in so far as possible, and in doing that, we must make up our minds to pare down, as far as we possibly can, all expenditures that are not absolutely necessary for the service of this country; to refuse expenditure on works which it would not be proper for a wise and economical Government to set on foot and continue in the country; to, as far as possible, adapt the scale of protection to legitimate industries and to what is reasonably necessary in order to establish and protect them; to use the raw material of the country, in so far as it can be used, and to extend the free list as far as possible, consistent with the revenue requirements of the country, in order to bring about this lessened taxation and this lessened scale of protection. Information will be gathered during the next year; that the Minister of Trade and Commerce and myself, with two level-headed business men who control the Customs and the Inland Revenue, propose during the coming year

Mr. BAIN.

not only to listen to the complaints and the pleas of people who come to Ottawa to see us, but we propose to supplement that by a personal inspection and investigation of the various industries of the country. We propose to go further. We propose that it shall not be said that only one class has the ear of the Government, but that every class, the agricultural, the artisan, the manufacturing, the producing, or any class, shall have abundant opportunity to make out its case before the Government or some member of the Government.

That was the preliminary announcement with respect to what they were going to do in the way of easing the burdens off the community, and lightening the tariff on a reduced scale of protection. Now, I have said that the Minister told us that the estimated reduction of 1894 was \$1,500,000 of taxation taken off the people of Canada. On page 13 of the first part of the Trade and Navigation Returns for 1895, will be found a comparative statement of the duties on goods entered for consumption in 1894 and 1895, and the amount of the various imports and the duties collected thereon. The new tariff came into force at the end of March, 1894, and our financial year closed on the 30th June, so that it is the best comparison available at the present time, in fact, the only comparison to test the correctness of the statement that there was a reduction of the burdens on the people in reduced duties to the extent of \$1,500,000. Here are the official figures. The total dutiable goods imported in 1894, in round numbers, were of the value of \$62,779,000; the duty collected thereon was \$19,380,000. In 1895, we imported of dutiable goods, \$58,557,000, and we collected in duties \$17,887,000. The percentage of the duties collected on the dutiable goods imported in 1894 amounted to 30.86 per cent. In 1895, a similar investigation shows a duty collected of 30.54 per cent, or a decrease of .32 per cent. It means that in 1895, as compared with 1894, the actual reduction of duties on the same relative values paid, was just \$177,700, instead of \$1,500,000. I put the official statement of the Trade and Navigation Returns against the unofficial statement made by the Finance Minister, with respect to his reduction. Both of them are important statements, and I leave the Finance Minister to settle the question with the Trade and Navigation Returns, and ascertain whether they are wrong, or whether he is not wrong himself. But he says that he put a large quantity of free goods, that were formerly dutiable, in the free list. Did he? If he did, Mr. Speaker, we did not import them, anyway; so that there was no economy for our people in the matter of free goods. Take the free goods imported for consumption, taking out coin and bullion. In 1894, we imported \$46,000,000; in 1895, we imported \$42,600,000, or a decrease of \$3,400,000 of free goods; so it is plain that, if more goods were made, we did not import them; and in dutiable goods the decrease in imports was over \$4,000,000. There, Mr. Speak-

er, was the secret of the Minister of Finance's difficulty with his deficit of over \$4,000,000. He was exactly in the same position as my hon. friend from South Oxford in 1878, when the people's purchasing power was reduced through the pressure of hard times, and they bought less goods and paid less duty thereon. But I want to draw your attention to this important difference, that whereas in 1878 the duties were largely ad valorem, and the decreased values and the decreased imports decreased more rapidly the revenue of the Finance Minister, the Finance Minister of to-day had a better clutch on the throats of the people of Canada. He knew a thing or two better after his experience in the protective field for the last seventeen years. Now, what do we find? Let me quote to you a statement of the imports at the port of Montreal, as contained in the official report of the Montreal Board of Trade. This is what they say in the report of their last annual meeting, held a few days ago, speaking of imports at the port of Montreal:

While the imports decreased in value \$5,000,000, the revenue from duty thereon was \$400,000 in excess of that collected in 1894.

Sir, that is perfectly astounding. They imported \$5,000,000 less goods, and yet the revenue was \$400,000 more upon that reduced importation. Sir, the Finance Minister had got the consuming population of Canada by the throat, he had got them where they could not help themselves, and that was the difference between his position and the position of the hon. member for South Oxford when he was Finance Minister. There was just this difference, that, whereas then the people saved nothing, now it has been wrung out of them to the utmost farthing, and there have been deficits over and above. Who was it that invented the term "flies on the wheel?" They said a Government was no good that could not stop the deficit and the decrease in revenue. Who is the fly on the wheel to-day? With a deficit of over \$4,000,000 in revenue, this Government cannot stop it, although they are able to extract \$400,000 more of revenue out of a decreased import of \$5,000,000 at the port of Montreal alone last year. Now, Sir, I want to pursue this investigation a little further. The hon. gentleman told us a little more about this transaction. After enumerating four pages of reductions, showing the old tariff and the new tariff, and the amount of saving effected, he says:

This list includes all the articles on which reductions have been made, and shows there was an important and significant reduction.

I leave him to settle that with the author of the Trade and Navigation Returns, which say there was \$177,000.

And hon. gentlemen must take into account this fact—that this reduction in tariff was made at a time when reduction of the tariff was accompanied with the greatest difficulties. It was

made at a time when prices were lowering in the United States, in Belgium and in every great manufacturing country; not only when prices were lowering as quoted in the regular markets, but when hard times had made it necessary for manufacturers to sell, if they could get cash, even if they had to sell at cost or less than cost.

The Montreal Board of Trade has a word to say about that part of the business, and they assign this reason for the increased revenue on decreased imports:

The low value of all staples in the past twelve months with reduced quantities imported. (2) Duties being largely specific, reduced value does not affect the amount of duty collected thereon, and a large increased duty off sugar imported that was formerly free.

There is the secret of it. They put it on to the article, and you had either got to do without it or pay the penalty. Now, if these reductions were made, that in the aggregate amount to \$1,500,000, calculated by themselves, there is just this other alternative, that the hon. gentleman replaced those reductions—because I credit him with making a fair statement of the reductions. But he forgot to give us the other half of the statement, that is, the places where the increases were taken back or replaced, because, if our actual net payment of duties on the goods imported for consumption was only \$177,000 less, there must have been large increases on other lines. Sir, I leave it to the opinion of any merchant who has during the last year imported a mixed invoice of goods, and he will say that on the invoice in the aggregate he paid a higher duty than he paid under the old tariff, because if the duties were reduced on certain items they were increased on certain others; and I submit it is not an ingenuous mode of stating the facts to the people to tell the reductions and leave out of account the increases, which come out of our pockets at the same time. Let me analyze the comparative statement which appeared on page 13 of the Trade and Navigation Returns last year, because it shows a number of the leading articles on which changes were made. The reductions on leading articles were in this ratio: on carriages the rate was reduced from 30·9 to 30·2, or 7-10ths of 1 per cent. It will be remembered farm wagons were made free. That was the ratio, 7-10ths of 1 per cent—that was the benediction bestowed on the farmers by the carriage reduction. Iron and steel were reduced from 28 to 26, a reduction of 2. Hon. gentlemen will remember how the Finance Minister talked to the House about the blessings he was conferring by taking the duty off window glass. Window glass was taxed in 1894 at 27, in 1895 at 26·8. So that is the net result of the reduction of duty on window glass, 2-10ths of 1 per cent. On paper and manufactures of, the reduction was from 32 to 31, or 1. Wood, and the manufactures of wood, secured a sub-

stantial reduction, from 26 to 22. The reduction on fancy goods was equal to 2-10ths of 1 per cent; and on the long schedule that contains the list known as unenumerated goods, the duty on those miscellaneous articles show, in 1895, a reduction of less than 1 per cent, as compared with 1894.

Now we come to increases. On carpets there was a very substantial increase, from 26.6 to 30. The cotton duties were beautifully readjusted. I admire, and can never cease to admire, the arrangement of the cotton tariff; he was an expert who furnished it to the Finance Minister, and of course he conferred a great boon on the people by giving them reduced duties. In 1894 the average was 28 4-10ths, in 1895 28 6-10ths, or an increase after the reduction of 1-5th of 1 per cent. On woollen goods the Minister was more benevolent. He came down to the House, and stated that the cheaper kinds of shoddy we need no longer shut out, and he therefore modified the specific duty. I venture to say there was some one behind who thoroughly understood the woollen trade. In 1894 the duty on woollen goods imported was 30, in 1895, after the readjustment, it was 31.7. The woollen men knew their business, and the Finance Minister did it for them. On books, periodicals and printed matter, the duty in 1894 stood at 20.6, and in 1895 it was increased to 26, an increase of nearly 6 per cent. So a boy trying to save a dollar with which to buy a book was charged by 6 per cent additional on the price of the little book which had to come into Canada. On two important lines of goods no change was made: on flax and hemp goods and on hats and caps, the duty remaining as formerly at 30 per cent. The net result of all these changes was that of the one million and a half of duties which the Finance Minister said he had taken off, the amount was reimposed, except to the extent of \$177,700. At the same time those burdens are placed on the people, the Finance Minister makes it appear that reductions are made in the interest of the public treasury and the maintenance of our trade and credit.

I do not propose to say one unkind word as regards the manufacturing industries of this country. I know hon. gentlemen opposite have been in the habit of putting words in our mouths, and saying we are hostile to them. The battle of freedom has ever been thus. If you entrench a man with a duty of 50 per cent to protect his industry, he will declare before high heaven that he would die if it was taken off, but I never knew him to die yet. That is not the position which we occupy. We say it is humiliating to a business man to have him placed in the position of other men being taxed to sustain him in business. We favour a fair and equitable readjustment of the tariff, a readjustment of the tariff together with a larger free list of goods, including raw materials for manufactures, and we claim that such a readjustment would

place the manufacturers in a better position and a less humiliating position than they occupy to-day. I disclaim any hostility to the manufacturers of my country. In my daily life at home I rejoice in the prosperity of some of those men when I see them grow up and prosper in Canada; but I did so long before the National Policy was inaugurated. It should never be forgotten that in 1878 we had healthy industries in the country and a large number of successful men engaged in manufacturing, and among the men with whom I come in contact daily I count manufacturers among several of my closest personal friends, and I would be ashamed to say that those men are impure and dishonest in business transactions. But I am here in the interest of the great burden-bearing community, the great labouring, the great farming, the great consuming population, and I ask justice for them, while I do not propose to do injustice to any other class. But that is the net result of all this travelling around the country by the Ministers and Controllers and other parties. They do not decrease the burdens of the people, and just so soon as Providence favours the farmers of Canada with a good crop and accompanies it with fair prices, and we begin to export increased quantities of agricultural products, just so soon will the machinery of the tariff yield its fruits of increased burdens, from which the country cannot escape even by a readjustment made by the Finance Minister. I want to quote from the annual report of the Manufacturers' Association meeting held in February last. They say this:

The Manufacturers' Association held their annual meeting in Toronto on February 27th, 1895. On the 14th of February, 1894, a largely attended meeting of the tariff and executive committees of the association was held in their office. They embodied their views in a communication to the Finance Minister, the receipt of which was acknowledged by him on the 26th.

As to the results of that communication on the readjustment of the tariff of 1894, here are their own words, in their own report:

It is but an act of justice to the committee to direct attention to the large number of changes that have been made in the tariff along the lines suggested in the recommendations, and that in many instances the language used in both is substantially identical. * * * * *

In many instances where the recommendations suggested that no changes be made in the duties upon articles therein enumerated no changes were made.

And they go on to congratulate the Finance Minister after this fashion:

It required the best generalship on the part of Mr. Foster and his protectionist colleagues to withstand the onslaught of the free trade enemy.

Quite a number of amendments were made to the Tariff Bill, and before its final passage it became modified to an extent that gives much satisfaction to the country—certainly to the friends of the Government.

Again, they say :

There never was a time since the formation of this association, 20 years ago, that its influence was stronger or more pronounced than it is to-day.

I am not speaking unkindly of that association. They stood up for their own interests ; but I want to draw the attention of the House to this particular clause in their report :

Quite a number of amendments were made to the Tariff Bill, and before its final passage it became modified to an extent that gives much satisfaction to the country—certainly to the friends of the Government.

Does not that imply, Mr. Speaker, that the Finance Minister did not carry out his first schedule ; that, in short, he took back-water and readjusted his intended tariff, and so "it gave great satisfaction to the country" ; that is, to the Manufacturers' Association. In short, these gentlemen—and I do not blame them—have secured the modifications from the Finance Minister that they wanted, and they congratulate him in the kindness of their hearts, in a corresponding degree. But I ask you, Sir, who stood around to protect the interests of the other eighty-one out of every one hundred of the population ? The Minister of Finance and the Controller of Customs walked around the country and professed to hear the complaints and propositions of the farmers, but the Minister of Finance came back and modified his tariff, and we have the evidence here, that it gave great satisfaction to the nineteen out of every one hundred of the population of this country.

There is one other comparison that I wish to make to-night relating to this tariff. It will be in your recollection, Sir, that we have had, repeatedly, very severe criticism of the statements of the hon. member from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) with respect to the amount of duty that the present tariff imposes on British goods, as compared with goods imported from the United States. Without unfairly referring to any previous debate in the House, I think I may recall, that on repeated occasions, very severe and caustic language has been used by supporters of the Government—notably by the hon. member from Albert (Mr. Weldon)—in criticising the comparison that the hon. member from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) had made. I do not propose to repeat those comparisons, but I do want to take what I believe, and what I think every fair-minded man will admit, is a fair and just test, that is, the imports of dutiable goods from Great Britain and from the United States in the year 1878 and again in the year 1895. I do it for the purpose of ascertaining whether the duties, as imposed in 1878, did or did not discriminate against Great Britain, and for the same purpose, to ascertain whether the duties imposed in 1895 did or did not discriminate against Great Britain, and also to discover what

was the relative burden imposed on the dutiable goods imported from these two respective countries. I do it for this reason that outside of these two countries, the trade of Canada is a mere trifle, a mere drop in the bucket as compared with the business we do with the United States and with the mother country, and I am in the judgment of the House, whether in taking the dutiable goods, I am not taking a fair and equitable test. But, Sir, I want to say this : it is not necessary to put into the tariff that 10 per cent more, or 3 per cent more, or 1 per cent more, shall be imposed upon a piece of goods because it comes from Great Britain, or because it comes from the United States, for everybody knows that the tariff can be adjusted so as to catch the goods that sell cheapest in our markets and compete sharpest with the manufacturers here who are looking for protection. I think that is a fair statement, and I think that if the result of the operations of the tariff shows that we collect more duty on British dutiable goods imported, than we do on American dutiable goods, then we are entitled to say that the National Policy results in discrimination against Great Britain. Now, Sir, let us look at the figures. In 1878, we imported from Great Britain, dutiable goods to the value of \$32,139,000, in round numbers, and the duty collected thereon was \$6,445,000. We imported from the United States in the same year, \$23,468,000 worth of dutiable goods, entered in both cases for consumption in Canada, and we collected upon these United States goods, \$4,794,000. Let me turn to the percentage in both of those cases. The percentage on the dutiable goods imported from Great Britain in 1878 was 20.05, and the percentage on the goods imported from the United States was 20.38. It just amounts to this, Sir, that if we had applied the same tariff to the goods imported from England as to the goods we imported from the United States, we would have collected \$106,000 more off the British goods than we did collect. Now, Sir, let us look at the imports, similarly classed, for the year 1895. Of dutiable goods, we imported from Great Britain, \$23,312,000 worth, and collected thereon a revenue of \$7,006,000. From the United States we imported \$25,795,000 worth, upon which we collected \$6,897,000. Now for the percentages in these two cases. On the British goods we collected an average duty of 30.05 per cent, and on the American goods an average duty of 27.12 per cent. The result is that if we had imposed upon the American goods the same duty we imposed on the British goods, we would have collected, in 1895, \$684,400 more than we did. If that is not discriminating in practice against Great Britain, I do not understand what discrimination means. In 1878, we collected \$106,000 less on the goods we imported from Great Britain than we did on the same value of goods imported

from the United States, whereas, in 1895, we collected \$684,000 more on the goods we imported from the mother country than the same rate would have brought if collected on the goods imported from the United States. Now, Sir, there is another matter to which I wish to call your attention, and it measures the value of the burdens the two governments have imposed upon the people of Canada. Speaking in round numbers, the average duty existing in 1878 was 20 per cent whereas the average duty in 1895 was nearly 30 per cent, one-half more. Sir, need I go any further to show that the practical result of this tariff is to discriminate against the mother country, in spite of the fact that these gentlemen are never done telling us how loyal they are to Great Britain and to British institutions.

Let me draw your attention for a few moments to another feature of the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite; and again I have occasion to quote the Finance Minister:

In 1887 an agitation was raised, which became successful, for taking the duty off anthracite coal, which was supposed, and which did lie heavily upon the western provinces. The duty of 50 cents per ton was taken off, and from that time up to 1895, inclusive, the amount of \$6,044,355 was remitted to the consumers of anthracite coal.

Mr. Speaker, I want to hand the hon. gentleman over to the tender mercies of the hon. member for Inverness (Mr. Cameron), who spoke here the other night. He distinctly stated that when the duty was taken off American coal, the American corporations gobbled up the whole proceeds, and that the removal of the duty had not saved one dollar to the people of Canada. That hon. gentleman is a supporter of the hon. Minister, and I suggest that the hon. Minister and he meet and settle the question. They tell us sometimes that our flag is parti-coloured. I point him to a parti-coloured flag at home that he has perhaps ignored, if the hon. member for Cape Breton is correct. But, Sir, I want to draw your attention to another reason than the desire to relieve the population of Canada, why the duty was taken off anthracite coal; and it becomes necessary for me to refer to a speech made by the hon. Secretary of State (Sir Charles Tupper) when he was Finance Minister in 1887. This is the reason he assigns for taking off that duty; and as he was the Finance Minister who took it off, in my judgment, he knew whereof he was talking a good deal better than the Finance Minister does to-day. This is what he said:

Our present consumption is 250,000 tons of pig iron. To make this here would require 75,000 tons of coal. To manufacture it into puddle bars, merchant bars, and the various shapes and sizes into which it (iron) is made would require an additional 750,000 tons of coal, making a total consumption of 1,500,000 tons. It is on the ground that the development of the iron industry of Canada will tax the coal industry of this

Mr. BAIN.

country to its utmost capacity in order to furnish the additional output that will be required, and with all the advantages of that increased development, that I am enabled to say to the House that although making anthracite coal free will take \$497,000 away from the Government in revenue which we are now receiving—we would be perfectly justified in doing it, because the development of this iron industry would be giving to the coal mining industry a greater advantage and boon than that which would be taken away by the removal of the duty.

Mr. Speaker, there is the reason assigned by the man who took the duty off, and I submit that he knows: and he does not belong to this side of the House. He took it off because he was imposing additional duties on iron for the purpose of developing the iron industry, and he felt that the duty on coal at the same time would be too grievous a burden to be borne. On that occasion he increased the duty on pig iron from \$2 up to \$4 a ton, and the duty on bar iron from \$4.50 to \$13 a ton. These are two of the great staple articles that enter largely into the consumption of the country in every direction, and I care not how poor a citizen is, he cannot escape paying his share of those taxes. Sir, what was that burden imposed upon the people of this country for? For the purpose of developing our iron industry. Sir Leonard Tilley, when he brought down his Budget in 1883, hesitated to put duties upon such a staple article of consumption. This is what he said at that time:

Speaking of iron, it is one of the most difficult questions the Government has to grapple. Because iron used in the large portion of the manufactures of the Dominion to-day is to them a raw material, but the Government consider it so important an industry, that they are resolved to develop it if this can be effected by any legislation or moderate encouragement—as the value of iron when manufactured is mainly in labour—the labour of the country. The Government will submit a resolution that after 1st July next, for three years, \$1.50 per ton will be paid on all pig iron produced in Canada, and \$1 per ton the following three years as a bounty.

That was Sir Leonard's proposition. But Sir Charles Tupper, when he became Finance Minister, took a different view of the matter. He determined on a more vigorous policy. He imposed these heavy duties on the industries of this country, and in doing that he took away from the people far more than had been saved to them in the removal of the duty on anthracite coal. This is the way Sir Charles Tupper spoke of the prospective benefits of the policy adopted in 1887:

We have applied the National Policy to innumerable industries all over Canada with marvellous success. But, Sir, there is a field, perhaps the most important, still untrodden. There is a field still unoccupied that presents greater possibilities and greater opportunities than any other for developing Canadian industry and it lies at the very root and foundation of the National Policy in all countries where it has been adopted. I refer to the iron industry. * * *

Now, Sir, if there is a country in the world to which the iron industry is important it is Canada. And why? Because we possess the coal, and we possess the iron ore, and we possess the fluxes—having everything necessary to develop the great iron industry within our own borders—and yet down to the present moment we have left almost untouched—this enormous, this almost illimitable field for the extension of our National Policy.

After speaking of the central Ontario ores shipped across the lake to Charlotte and Oswego, and other American ports, he continues:

Well, from Oswego and Charlotte on the American side to the anthracite coal fields is only 150 miles. * * * You will have the ships that convey the ore to Oswego or Charlotte or to any of those places from Kingston, Cobourg, and Weller's Bay, bringing back the anthracite coal; and you will have the establishment of blast furnaces at Cobourg, Kingston and Weller's Bay.

Not to be one-sided, he assured the House that charcoal iron would under this policy, like cotton mills, be again established in Carleton, N.B.

Now, the protection of iron will give to the coal industry of this country such a development as will enormously increase the demand for labour in connection with the mining of coal and of ore.

Then he directed his attention to the great North-west. No part of the Dominion was forgotten.

You ask me about the great North-west. We have 50,000 square miles of lignite and bituminous coal there. On Big Island, in Lake Winnipeg, there is a valuable deposit of iron ore and any quantity of timber to make charcoal to convert it into iron. All it requires is the adoption of this policy in order to establish, at an early day, industries for the manufacture of iron in the North-west as well as in the other portions of the country.

And to be equal all round he did not forget British Columbia, but went on to tell that there were vast deposits in that province, also, and they were also given the assurance that their industries would be developed on the spot. Then, taking a glance down the vista of the future, he said:

Well, Mr. Speaker, twenty years ago iron rails were made in Toronto and Hamilton and within the next ten years we will make all our own rails.

That was in 1887. But there was one idea that was practical in all this transaction. While the burden was being imposed on the ordinary citizen, while the ordinary citizen might sweat and toil and pay his duty on every little bit of iron that he had to use in his industry to fix up his cart or wagon or in any one of the thousand odd jobs at home, he had to pay a duty; but the Finance Minister was wise in his generation, and he left the door open. Until such time as the rails were manufactured in this country, he allowed railway com-

panies to bring in their rails free of duty. But he went on a little further to say:

We are only opening up this great question—
But he had an eye to the Canadian Pacific Railway and let in steel rails free.

We are only opening up this great question of developing the great industries of our country, and I have no hesitation—

He never had any hesitation when he was on that line.

—in saying that a more moderate calculation could not be made than the one I shall now offer the House, basing my calculation on the present consumption of iron. Leaving out steel rails, it is equivalent to 250,000 tons of pig iron. To make this you will require 750,000 tons of iron ore, 120,000 tons of limestone and 750,000 tons of coal to produce the first stage pig iron, involving a freight of not less than 1,625,000 tons.

Sir, that was a glorious vision for the railways of this country. Then he went on further to say:

To make it into puddled bars, merchant bars and the various shapes and sizes required would take 750,000 tons more of coal, or a total of 1,500,000 tons of coal.

Then a little further down he goes on to say:

Now, Sir, the result is that by the adoption of this policy you will give permanent employment to an army of men numbering at least 20,000, increasing our population from 80,000 to 100,000 souls, and affording the means of supporting them in comfort and prosperity. Now this estimate of increased population of 100,000 souls does not take into account the manufacture of castings and forgings, cutlery and edge tools, &c., or steel rails. Were we to manufacture these articles now imported, and why should we not progress steadily to that point, the population I have mentioned, of 100,000 souls would be no less than trebled.

Sir, is not the sarcasm of facts somewhat bitter towards the glowing lights of fancy that the hon. Secretary of State indulged in on that occasion. Nearly ten years are past, the people have borne the burdens imposed by that policy patiently all the way through, and what is the net result? Until the other day, when the Americans came over to the city of Hamilton, and after carefully exploiting the city of Hamilton and securing a large bonus from that city, and the donation of a large piece of land, started a furnace, not one single new blast furnace was started on the shores of Lake Ontario or anywhere else in the Dominion. Sir, the irony of facts is bitter towards the flights of fancy indulged in by the hon. Secretary of State on that occasion, when he was Finance Minister. But he was not the only man who soared aloft on that occasion. My respected friend who now reposes in the post office as a Government officer at Hamilton had also a word to say. He was then a member of this House, and endorsed everything that the then Finance Minister (Sir Charles Tupper) said:

Every statement made to-day in this House and ever since the policy has been talked in this House, has shown clearly and conclusively that the man who is most benefited by the National Policy is the farmer. In consequence of the National Policy he is given a market at his own door. If you tell the farmer he does not know his own business you will soon find out that he knows more about it than the hon. gentlemen who seek to teach him.

After stating he represented a city that had large iron industries, he read from a letter from the Ontario Rolling Mill Company, and mentioned the Hamilton Bridge Company and the Hamilton Pipe Company, as follows :—

We think changes made in the tariff will be found satisfactory, and will as intended rapidly develop the iron business. * * * * *
Increased wealth and population are sure to follow.

I suppose they are, but at this time of the day they are following eight years behind, and are not visible yet. How much longer will they have to follow before they come in sight of this, the long-suffering taxpayers of the population of Canada? But Mr. Brown went on to say further :

This bold and courageous policy advocated by the Government, I do not hesitate to say, is the cap stone of the National Policy.

And my respected friend from Leeds and Grenville (Mr. Taylor), who occupies the position of chief whip on the other side, was also carried away by the glowing appearance of things, and he read from the "Globe," this paragraph, dated from Watertown, N.Y., May 16th :

A party of New York capitalists are on their way for an excursion up the Kingston and Pembroke Railway, which runs through the richest iron region in Canada. Their object is to organize a mining company with a capital of \$5,000,000 to develop this region.

And a little later the "Globe" correspondent said, on May 16th, at Kingston :

They arrive here at noon. To-night they hold a meeting to organize, and to-morrow inspect the company's property. Endeavours will be made for the establishment of iron smelting works here in view of the present high protection afforded iron men.

But, Sir, as with some other things the sting of this is in the tail. Here is the humble sentence at the end of the paragraph :

A citizen suggests a bonus of \$100,000 to aid the new industry.

Five millions of dollars waiting to come into Canada, and all that is asked is a moderate bonus of \$100,000 to enable these capitalists to start. All this money is on the way to Canada. It has been eight years on the way, and it has not got here yet. In the meantime we are bearing the burdens. I submit that the prophecies of the hon. Secretary of State have proven delusive, except as to the burdens upon the people.

Mr. BAIN.

But one effect of the policy has been to extract from the pockets of the taxpayers enormous sums of money for which no adequate return has been given. While I do not find fault with expenditure for public works when it is legitimately made, I do say that the expenditure exposed recently by the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte) who earned the eternal hatred and unceasing abuse of gentlemen opposite, by exposing an expenditure of \$3,000,000 for \$2,000,000 worth of work, cannot be too severely condemned. It is time, in the interest of the taxpayers, that the Government which would so mismanage the finances were turned out of office to make room for others. And, if gentlemen on this side of the House do not administer the public revenues better than the present Government has done, turn them out also and let others try what they can do. Let us have honest government in the interests of the people and not government in the interests of a few men who will draw their salaries and sit around and declare the country is prosperous. Mr. Speaker, perhaps I may be allowed to say one word as to the net results of these reductions announced by the Finance Minister as amounting to a million and a half of dollars. Sir, I put the case to you, as a business man. Suppose that your agent came to you and presented a statement to show that he had made reductions of expenditure, and left you with the impression that you had saved a large sum of money. And suppose that a few days afterwards the man who does your banking presented a statement showing the net results of a year's transactions proving that instead of saving a million and a half as represented by your agent the saving had amounted to only \$177,000, what would you do with that manager? Would you not say that he had misled you, even if you did not use a stronger phrase. If such a statement were made of the assets of an estate with so little to justify it, surely the sheriff would intervene. Is the business of this country of less moment than any ordinary business transactions between man and man? I am in the judgment of the House when I say that these hon. gentlemen have not submitted a fair and honest statement of the financial position. I have given the facts; let the people judge.

If I understand the signs of the time, Mr. Speaker, the next thing that will be presented as a boon to the people of Canada is some grand scheme by which we are to be more closely incorporated in the British Empire. Some scheme of preferential trade between the mother country and the colonies is to be brought forth to dazzle the eyes of the electors and withdraw their attention from the National Policy and its practical results. Sometimes a period of steady prosperity and absence of interference from outside prevents a country like Canada, which has been consolidated into one vast dominion, from knowing its own strength or its

own risks or its own feelings towards the mother country that has protected it and endowed it with so valuable a natural heritage, until some question arises that places in jeopardy the relations of that mother country to its colonies throughout the world. I venture to say as a Canadian that nothing has occurred in recent days which has more stirred the hearts of the people of Canada and make them feel how completely they are a portion of the great British Empire than the recent difficulty raised on the United States Monroe doctrine applied to the Venezuela question, when we were threatened with a rupture of the peaceful relations between the mother country and the United States, in which case Canada must have been the theatre of war, and when the Americans could strike at the mother country through Canada as one of her colonies. But what was the result of the feeling abroad in the country when the fact came home to the minds and hearts of our people, that our relations with Great Britain were jeopardizing our standing with the country to the south of us? Did we show a disposition to withdraw from the mother country in that hour of threatened calamity—a calamity that could not be too much deplored—of a war between the two great branches of the English-speaking people? No, Sir. From one end of the country to the other that fact stirred the hearts of our people to depths that had never been reached before. I venture to say that our people did not know till then the depth of their attachment to the mother country and its institutions. This event has quelled for a moment the slanders that have been spoken against the Liberal party with which I am associated that they are disloyal to Canada and to Canada's institutions. In the hour of Canada's need, did they talk to us after that fashion? When we were threatened with rebellion in the North-west Territories and when there was trouble amongst our own people on the plains, it was not gentlemen on this side who administered the affairs of the country, it was the political party who still wield the destinies of Canada. Did they then say to the young Liberals connected with the volunteer corps of this country: You are disloyal; you shall not go out to fight the battles of Canada and put down this rebellion? Did the Opposition in this House say to the Government: We do not believe in Canada, therefore we will not vote the supplies to put down this rebellion? No, Sir. The young men went to the front and offered their lives, some of them lost their lives, in defence of the institutions of Canada. And the Opposition here through their leader, said: We will vote you whatever money is necessary to suppress the rebellion on the word of the Minister that it is necessary, and we will discuss the whys and the wherefores of that rebellion afterwards. But, in the meantime, authority shall be maintained, and that rebellion shall be sup-

pressed. Sir, in that hour of Canada's need, there was no talk of disloyalty, but in the hour when they thought they could take a mean advantage of a political party, when there was no danger in sight, then we find these men sneaking to the front with their charges of disloyalty, and saying to the great Liberal party of Canada: You are not loyal; we possess a monopoly of loyalty in this country. Now, Sir, with respect to our relations with Great Britain. I think the Secretary of State, in his address at Montreal the other day, was correct in saying that this is not a political question. But, Sir, I want to tell you that there will be a good many men behind him on that side who will be extremely anxious to make it a political question before the next campaign is over, if they can make a little capital out of it to help themselves over the stile, and get back to misrepresent the people in this House. That will not be the first time that misrepresentation has been resorted to by them. Now, Sir, do they present us with a scheme by which they propose to bear a share of the burdens? No, they ask the mother country to tax herself for our benefit. They talk grandly about the mother country. I heard the Minister of Finance, and I think I heard the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) to-night, saying how easy it would be for the mother country to transfer 50,000 farmers into the North-west, to raise all the food products that are wanted to supply herself, independent of any other country, just as if, when these farmers were transferred there, the job was done. Why, we have been spending millions of dollars, and we have had half-a-dozen vigorous policies from these men, and we have not been able to get those farmers up there yet, and the mother country will have to do better than these hon. gentlemen have done, if she is to carry out their scheme. Now, I ask you, how is that to be accomplished? Do they propose to lighten the burdens that we impose on the Imperial goods coming into Canada, and thus strengthen the bonds that bind the two countries together? I do not understand that they propose any such thing. I remember a resolution brought up in this House, during the existence of the present Parliament, on this subject. In April, 1892, Mr. Davies (P.E.I.) moved the following resolution:

Inasmuch as Great Britain admits the products of Canada to her ports free of duty, this House is of opinion that the present scale of duties exacted on goods mainly imported from Great Britain, should be reduced.

Did the patriotic gentlemen opposite support that resolution? No, Sir, every mother's son of them got up in this House and voted against it. That was the kind of way they showed their patriotism to the British Empire. They are amongst that class of people who say and do not. Now, I do not think there are two opinions as to the relations

that we should maintain with the mother country. But, if the scheme, as outlined by these gentlemen, means anything, it means that Great Britain in some way shall discriminate against other countries and in favour of her colonies. I do not want to make an unfair statement of the position assumed by these gentlemen. We have heard from hon. gentlemen opposite, especially last session, long statements from Imperial political leaders and public men, tending to create the belief that Great Britain was weakening on her trade policy and was travelling towards protection. You will find it permeates the whole speech made by the Secretary of State before the Board of Trade in Montreal. If you examine that speech carefully, you will find a large number of quotations, with dates and references, going away back to the days when the grand old man, Mr. Gladstone, and Lord Roseberry were administering the public affairs of Great Britain. Those gentlemen whom the Secretary of State quoted, were in opposition, and were, of course, quite willing to foment disturbance for the leaders, and make it difficult for them to keep their hold on the various classes whose interests clash in the matter of the public expenditure. I do not propose to quote to you the statements that were made under those conditions, but I want to draw your attention to the recent attitude of Lord Salisbury and the Chancellor of the Exchequer, not when they were in Opposition, but when they are charged with the administration of Her Majesty's Government, and are held responsible for the administration of that magnificent Empire and the development of its great resources. Sir, at a time when our trade is dull, and our Finance Minister had to admit a deficit of over \$4,000,000 a year ago, and another deficit somewhat less for the present year, notwithstanding that he had rolled on more taxes, what are Lord Salisbury and his colleagues doing in England to-day? They are taking credit to themselves for a surplus accumulated by their predecessors in the development of the trade and industries of Great Britain. While we are struggling along with deficits, they have nine or ten million pounds sterling of a surplus in the treasury. And that is the country that these gentlemen tell us is travelling to destruction, which can only be averted by adopting protection and defending herself against the competition of other protected countries. Sir, it was only on the 11th December last that a deputation waited upon Lord Salisbury at the Foreign Office in London, and any one who wishes to read the original article, will find it in the London "Times" of 12th December, 1895. The deputation waited upon Lord Salisbury with respect to the duty on beer, hops and malt. I may as well give the House a short summary of the position assumed by that deputation, because I want to present to the House a fair statement of the position under which Lord Salisbury's utterances were

Mr. BAIN.

made. The Earl of Winchelsea introduced the deputation that waited upon the Government. The Government were represented by the Premier, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Sir Michael Hicks Beach, and Mr. Long, the Minister of Agriculture, the heads of the three leading departments. The Earl stated that they came as the representatives of the Agricultural Union of Great Britain, that had 500 branches, four rural councils and a central committee, and at the last election their agricultural programme had been accepted by 250 members of the English House of Commons. I draw the attention of the House to this statement as showing the extent and influence of the association that was represented in that delegation. He further stated that he did not ask the Government to make any change in the settled fiscal policy of the country with respect to free imports, but their ground of complaint was this, that increased consumption of sugar and imported barley and hops was seriously interfering with the production of barley and hops in East Anglia, and in Lincolnshire district particularly, where the sheet anchor of the farmer was sheep and barley. They made a statement that in 1891, 52,000,000 bushels of malt were used for brewing, and 1,157,000 hundred weight of sugar, that in 1895, while the malt had increased to 58,000,000 of bushels used, the consumption of sugar had increased to 2,260,000 hundred weight; this increased consumption of sugar in the manufacture of barley had replaced about 9,000,000 bushels of malt. They said moreover that the tax on beer as imposed by the Government amounted to 6s. 9d. per barrel, equal to 18s. per quarter on barley, and that meant a charge on an acre of land in that crop of £3 12s. They proposed that the duty on beer from English products be reduced 1s. per barrel, and that the loss of revenue be made up by imposing, say, another 1s. on foreign beer, raising it to 7s. 9d. per barrel, and thus prevent their lands from going out of cultivation as regards the production of those staples. They particularly guarded themselves by stating that they did not ask for the establishment of protective duties, but for a reduced duty on beer produced from English barley, malt and hops. What was the reply of Lord Salisbury on that occasion, after hearing that statement. He said:

I am glad to hear that your lordship did not pledge yourself to any theory, and as a matter of practical politics you did not urge any departure from the National Policy in respect of free trade. I observe that Sir F. Lockwood has represented me as having been guilty of trifling with the hopes of those who are interested in agriculture by promising protection for hops in a speech at Hastings in 1892, and abandoning that promise the other day. I never promised on that occasion, or on any occasion, any relief by protection, or held out any expectation that there would be a restoration of protection in this country. I distinctly disavowed any advocacy of such

a policy. I was urging a totally different thing, and that was that our principles of free trade should not exclude measures for obtaining reciprocity. (Hear, hear.) There is no comparison between the two ideas of reciprocity and protection. On the contrary, so far was I from urging protection for British producers that I was urging that we should take measures to prevent our foreign competitors from using protection against us. (Hear, hear.) I am sensitive upon the suggestion that I have ever promised or urged upon any audience a belief that protection would return within any period to which this generation can look. I have thought it wise—although certainly your lordship's speech did not furnish ground for any imputation that you were unsound on this point—to reiterate those opinions, so that there may be no mistake, as to the view we take concerning the problem which lies before us, and conditions under which it must be solved.

That was the statement of the Prime Minister of England made on 11th December, 1895, when charged with the responsibility of administering the affairs of the great British Empire. I have to ask how much encouragement it gives to the statement of hon. gentlemen opposite, that England is about to adopt a policy of protection. But the Chancellor of the Exchequer was also present, and he referred to the matter somewhat after this fashion. After he had stated that he did not believe the contention as regards the increased consumption of sugar and malt being replaced by sugar was correct, and expressing his opinion that it would not amount to more than 1,137,000 quarters, the hon. gentleman said :

I am of opinion that no favour should be shown to foreign materials, whether Barley or sugar, in the way in which the duty is levied, and we are now investigating to ascertain if sugar is favoured at the expense of barley. You ask me to go beyond this. You disclaim any idea of protection. * * * * *

Two points, however, occur to me. I think you will have to show that your proposal is not really protection in another guise.

If you are to levy a beer duty, say 5s. 9d. on beer made from British malt and hops, and 7s. 9d. on beer brewed from foreign barley, hops or sugar, it may be alleged that this is protection of British products.

A second point is—you would hold out a temptation to brewers to say they brew their beer from nothing but British barley and hops and claim the lower duty. To prevent this would require a continual inspection of the process of manufacture as would be felt by the brewers to be infinitely worse than anything which occurred under the old system of the malt duty.

That touches the initial difficulty of this whole scheme of preferential tariff on foreign imports in order to build up trade between the mother country and the colonies and I present it as a contribution necessary for the solution of that difficulty. The conditions that obtain in Great Britain are evidently different from here, and this is obvious from the statement of the Chancellor of the Exchequer; and it is apparent that they would have to reorganize the whole fiscal system and impose duties on

imports of foreign goods into Britain and to discriminate in favour of colonial goods, thereby establishing an immense system of Custom-house supervision over trade which would be embarrassing in the highest degree to the British Government, and create a complete revolution in their present fiscal system. Under these circumstances, until hon. gentlemen opposite meet and successfully disentangle these difficulties in connection with the matter, the cause of Imperial federation and the drawing together of the colonies in closer trade relations with the mother country will be found blocked in its initial process, and until they settle that problem it will be only a will-o'-the-wisp wandering around for the purpose of helping some men to get seats in Parliament in constituencies where the facts are not known. Mr. Long, Minister of Agriculture, expressed himself in sympathy with the statement made by the Chancellor of the Exchequer. So to-day the British policy stands exactly as it did in the days gone by, and as Mr. Chamberlain said the other day at a dinner, England was the only country that offered the condition for everybody to come into her ports and trade with her, without burden and without embarrassment. The people of Great Britain will have to abandon that proud boast when preferential trade as proposed by hon. gentlemen opposite shall take place. No man will be more willing to consider a reasonable proposition to draw the mother country and colonies closely together than myself, if the proposition presents any reasonable ground for working it out; but I submit that until the Secretary of State can come somewhere nearer to the facts in looking forward to the future than he did in 1878 when he imposed the iron duties, and gave us that splendid landscape of industries which was to be produced by his policy, we had better go slowly when he invites us to admire this grand panorama of imperial and colonial federation which he proposes to build up between the mother country and the colonies. Sir, we are proud of our connection with the mother country, and Canada has shown recently that she is sound on that question. But, Sir, I deprecate the man who tries to trade on that sentiment to pull himself into office, when his merits won't get him there. Now, Sir, one word and I am done.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Go on.

Mr. BAIN. The hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce laughed. My existence is not dependent on the breath of the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce, I have never owed a cent to him either longer or shorter in my political career, and he can laugh and sneer just as much as he pleases, but it makes no difference, Mr. Speaker, to me.

Mr. IVES. I did not laugh at the hon. gentleman. I do not know why he makes that statement. I was not listening to him nor paying the slightest attention to him.

Mr. LANGELIER. So much the worse for you.

Mr. BAIN. Sir, hon. gentlemen opposite have told us how their policy has developed this country. I shall give one example of how it has developed the province of Ontario. You remember that, after the census of 1881, the late leader of the party, Sir John A. Macdonald, who is the man who got the present Government their majority in this House, for they never earned it for themselves; he brought in his Redistribution Bill, and what was the position of affairs in the province of Ontario then? Under ten years of a revenue tariff our population had so increased that we were entitled to four additional members. I do not need to travel down through the record of the changes that the four additional representatives were made an excuse to make in the readjustment of the representation of that province. After we have had ten years of the blessings of the National Policy, what is the result of the last redistribution? The population of Ontario had changed, I grant you: it had left the rural districts and had flocked into the cities, but our number had not increased. We had not even kept even the natural increase, and the people had gone out of the country, and, instead of getting four additional representatives, as was the case after the redistribution of 1881, Ontario had to have two of her constituencies wiped out to enable the representation to follow the centres of population. Two of the oldest ridings in that province were wiped out, North Wentworth and Monk, in two of the oldest settled districts in the western part of Ontario. These two constituencies had to disappear to enable the representation to follow the changes in the population, and there was no increase of members, as there had been after the previous ten years. What was the story in the province which the Minister of Finance himself comes from? New Brunswick lost two members, and Nova Scotia lost one member. The pretty Island of Prince Edward also lost one, and the progress of our new country in the west, on which we had spent so much money to develop, did not make up for the loss that the older provinces had sustained. Is not that a pitiable position for the National Policy to be in after ten years? Is it not pitiable, when we look at the manner in which the National Policy was heralded forth to the people of Canada, and the promises that were made for it as a great boon to our people? Sir, that is the position to-day, and I leave it to this House, as showing indubitably, that, however we may flourish, according to the speeches of the Minister of Finance, the facts are against him and against his policy. I remember, in the early history of Canada, before I was in politics, when the issues that the Liberal party had to fight were of a different class. I remember, Sir, when our educational institutions were under the con-

trol of a state church, and when the man who did not bow his knee before the altar of that church, had either to go without a higher education or subscribe to the creed of that church; and yet he was a free citizen and, presumably, in a free country. I remember, Sir, when the public domain was set aside for the benefit of a special class in this country, and the rest of the community were excluded from it. I remember the fight our forefathers had to place the people of Canada in respect to religious institutions, and in respect to educational institutions, on one even, parallel line, without regard to their creed or to their complexion. Sir, that was the battle that was fought by the people who, in by-gone days, contended for the rights of the community. To-day, we are face to face with a system which says that one citizen shall be taxed for the benefit of another. I say, Sir, that the battle will go on until that also passes away, and until all citizens are treated free and equal, as they ought to be in the eyes of the community, and in the eyes of the law. And Sir, the battle will never cease, come it early or come it late, until the time is that all Canadian citizens shall be placed on a fair and equitable basis, and shall all be treated alike, as free citizens of a free country having free institutions.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bain), in opening his speech, stated that, in 1891, the Conservative party appealed to the country on the question of reciprocity. I think, if I refresh the hon. gentleman's memory, he will recollect that the policy on which the Conservative party appealed to the people of this Dominion in previous elections, was the policy on which they appealed on that occasion. The policy on which the Conservative party appealed to Canada in 1891 was, as he will remember, the old flag, the old man, and the old policy. Reciprocity has always been a part of the policy of the Conservative party, but we have demanded always that reciprocity shall be had on such terms as must be fair to Canada. No question of reciprocity will be considered, if it is to involve discrimination in favour of the United States and against importations from Great Britain. For many years we have had on our statute-books a statutory offer of reciprocity to the United States. I do not regard the question of reciprocity at the present time as a living question, because I do not believe that the people of the United States have the slightest intention of conceding to the people of Canada or to the people of almost any other country privileges such as some of the people of Canada at the present time would ask. The Hon. George Brown, in 1874, made an attempt, an ineffectual attempt, to secure reciprocity for this country. I do not think that there has been since that time such a change of feeling in the United States as would give us any hope that, even if it

Mr. BAIN.

were desirable, they will consider the question of a reciprocity treaty in a limited form. I do not purpose, as the hour is very late, to follow the hon. member for North Wentworth (Mr. Bain) through his long speech. Had the hon. member been present at the fancy dress ball last evening in the Senate Chamber, I should have said, without any hesitation, that he must have assumed the role of Richard II. To-night he has budded out into a strong financial critic, endeavouring, as it were, to displace the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) on that side of the House. He seems to me a pretty good second; but I think I can say for the hon. member for South Oxford that he would not have wasted so much of the time of this House in repeating old platitudes that have been threshed out over and over again. How often have we been told in this House and out of it that the present tariff discriminates against Great Britain. It is such a simple question that I wonder how such an intelligent man as the hon. member for North Wentworth should have fallen into the blunder of supposing that it does so in a single instance. When any man will point out to me a single item in our tariff where the impost against British goods is higher than the impost upon the same goods coming from the United States, then I shall understand that there is a discrimination against Great Britain. But there is no such thing in our tariff, and it is impossible for hon. gentlemen opposite to show that the tariff is in this respect unfair:

With me protection is a conviction, not a theory. I believe in it and warmly advocate it, because enveloped in it are my country's highest development and greatest prosperity; out of it comes the greatest gains to the people, the greatest comforts to the masses, the widest encouragement for manly aspirations, the best and largest rewards for honest efforts, and a dignifying and elevating citizenship, upon which the safety and purity and permanency of our political system depend.

These, Mr. Speaker, are not my words; they are the words of a man whose name is well-known wherever the English language is spoken. They were spoken by William McKinley, at that time Governor of the State of Ohio. However, I can say with him that I am a protectionist on principle. I believe in protection. With me it is a conviction. I believe it is the only true policy for Canada at the present time—the only policy on which the affairs of this country can be successfully carried on. Were I living in the United States to-day, or had I been there at the time of the McKinley Bill, I no doubt would have been a Republican and would have supported that Bill. As a Canadian, I regret that ever that Bill passed; but the United States have just as good a right to do with their affairs as we have to do with ours. It is not for us to dictate to them, nor will we suffer them for one moment to dictate to us what kind of a policy

we shall adopt. Hon. gentlemen have for years been declaring that the National Policy is a robbery and a fraud. Well, I am not going to quarrel with hon. gentlemen about the terms they use. Perhaps there is some justification for even that charge. In 1878, I admit, the National Policy did rob hon. gentlemen of the Treasury benches, and since then it has defrauded them of the privilege of returning. In that respect, it may have been justly designated by them as a robbery and a fraud; but if we take the verdict of the people again in 1882, in 1887 and in 1891, I think we have the assurance of the great electorate of this country that the National Policy is neither a robbery nor a fraud. Nearly every hon. gentleman on the other side who has spoken in this debate has endeavoured to explain what the policy of the Opposition is. It seems to me that that question is very much simplified from what it was some years ago. As I understand it, and I trust I am not mistaken, it is simply this. Both sides of the House admit that a revenue must be obtained. Hon. gentlemen opposite say that, in arranging the tariff, revenue only must be considered. We on this side say that not only should the question of revenue be considered, but also the question of protection to all the various industries of this country—agricultural, manufacturing, mining, or whatever they may be. Hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House say that the last vestige of protection must be swept away. That is the language of their leader, used in a speech delivered by him at a meeting in Markham some two years ago. If that policy is to be carried out, agricultural protection must be destroyed, and raw materials must be taxed, because the admission of free raw material is a species of protection. Free raw material, to my mind, is an essential in order to give us cheap manufactures. It has been stated in this debate that the free admission of raw material assists, not the consumer, but only the manufacturer. Now, I would ask simply this question: when the duty was taken off raw sugar, was it the consumer or the manufacturer got the benefit? Surely every hon. member of this House will admit that the consumer throughout the country who obtains his twenty or twenty-five pounds of sugar for a dollar, instead of paying the high price which prevailed previously, has received the benefit of the reduction, and not the manufacturer. The policy of hon. gentlemen opposite, when in power, was to tax tea and coffee. We on this side of the House say that articles like tea and coffee, which cannot be produced in this country, ought to be admitted free. In 1894 over 20,000,000 pounds of tea were imported into this country. As compared with the rate of duty that was charged in 1878, there was a saving on that tea of \$1,000,000 to the people of this country. However, I am not sure that hon. gentlemen

on the other side of the House are all quite agreed on their line of policy. The hon. member for East Huron (Mr. Macdonald) told the House, a few evenings ago, that he proposed to make a change of very considerable importance in the constitution of the Parliament of this country. He announced that he was in favour of the abolition of the Senate. I do not wish to discuss that question for one moment, but all I desire to say is that, instead of abolishing the Senate, increasing the Senate, so far as I can understand, is rather the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite. In 1873, when the Hon. Alex. Mackenzie came into power, one of his first acts was to attempt to add six members to the Senate, and since then I am not aware that the policy of the Liberal party on that question has changed. Had Mr. Mackenzie's proposition been carried out in 1873, it would have entailed an additional expense of \$1,100 a year for each Senator, six in number, or \$6,600 yearly, or a total of \$145,000 for these additional members.

But with regard to the question of the tariff, they do not seem to be agreed. Although on general lines they may, yet amongst them we find some who cling to the protectionist principle. If I mistake not the hon. member for North Essex (Mr. McGregor) is still in favour of protection on corn. The hon. member for South Essex (Mr. Allan) wants wine protected. The hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin) a year or two ago—and I presume his policy is the same now—wanted the Government to exercise a paternal affection over Manitoba lambs. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) has always been contending for a duty on canned goods.

Mr. MARTIN. The hon. gentleman is quite incorrect about me. I never advocated protection on Manitoba lambs.

An hon. MEMBER. On mutton?

Mr. MARTIN. No, what I did say was to find fault with the Government for discriminating against the farmers in the North-west while pretending to pursue their policy of protection. I never argued for or supported it in any way.

Mr. HENDERSON. Then I think I was not far astray when I said that the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin) a year or two ago, desired to exercise paternal affection over the Manitoba lambs. I accept his statement. I am not going to say, and I did not say that he asked for any special protection more than is given at present on Manitoba lambs. The hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) I believe, still wants protection on flax fibre. The hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister) is still desirous of having the duty on coal oil, and if I mistake not the hon. member for Queen's, (P.E.I.) (Mr. Davies) is an advocate of protection to pork.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman. I am sure, does not want to misrepresent

Mr. HENDERSON.

me. I am not an advocate of the duty on pork in the abstract, but I said before, and say again, that if you determine to maintain a protective system in Canada we must try,—it is such a vicious system—and make it bear as lightly on the country and equally on the people as possible, and therefore you must extend the same wrong to the maritime provinces that you do elsewhere.

Mr. HENDERSON. I accept the explanation of the hon. gentleman, but I say to the hon. member for Queen's that if he does not want protection on pork, the people of Ontario, whom the hon. gentleman addressed last night, will scarcely want him. In North Waterloo (Mr. Snider) who is the candidate of the Liberal party, has pronounced himself a thorough protectionist. He will not support any government that does not adopt the protection principle although he come out as a Liberal. Only a year ago, nearer to us than North Waterloo, we had the case of Mr. Frost, of Smith's Falls, a Liberal, the brother of a large manufacturer of agricultural implements there, who announced himself a candidate in the riding of South Leeds and Grenville, and issued a manifesto in which he declared himself in favour of the principle of protection, not only of manufacturing goods but of agricultural products—in fact the policy of a regular protectionist. I think it worth while to place on record some of his remarks, which are exceedingly pertinent. He says:

Gentlemen.—At the solicitation of a considerable number of the electors, particularly those belonging to the Conservative party, I have consented to become a candidate at the next general election for the Dominion. As the present Parliament may have another session before dissolution some may consider me a little premature, but the general experience is that when the cause is good the more time the people have to discuss and consider it the more zealously will they rally in its defence.

Hitherto it has been the practice of candidates for parliamentary honours to appeal to the prejudices of the people belonging to their respective parties. In announcing my intention to seek your suffrages for the approaching elections I do not appeal to your prejudices, but to your interest.

My platform is protection—protection for the farmer, protection for the merchant, and protection for the manufacturer. No class stand more in need of protection than the farmers, the mainstay and backbone of our grand Dominion, and it will be my constant care to watch over their interests in that connection, if elected, to the utmost of my ability; and while I cannot protect his crops from the influence of the weather, his pocket against the insinuations of glib-tongued agents of humbug merchandise, or his peace of mind against the designs of crafty lawyers, I can use my best endeavours to make a good market for him where his produce can be disposed of for hard cash instead of promissory notes.

And in similar terms he speaks of protection for the mercantile interests and protection for the manufacturers. I believe, and I feel the more assured in my belief on read-

ing this, that there are more protectionists among the Liberal party to-day and especially among the farming community of the Liberal party than there have been at any time since the introduction of the National Policy.

Now, I would be very sorry to weary the House, especially at this late hour, but I trust you will bear with me a little longer. I desire to speak somewhat of the agricultural production of this country. Hon members on the other side have claimed that the farmer is not protected. I desire to show that he is. I feel assured there is no class of men in Canada to-day who have better protection and more satisfactory protection than our agriculturists. Let us make a list of the articles on which duties are paid on goods which are a product of the farm :

Animals, living, n.e.s.....	20	p.c.
Live hogs, per lb.....	1½	cents.
Meats, n.e.s.....	2	do
do fresh, per lb.....	3	do
Canned meats.....	25	p.c.
Mutton and lamb, fresh.....	35	do
Poultry and game.....	25	p.c.
Lard and compounds per lb.....	20	p.c.
Tallow.....	20	do
Beeswax.....	10	do
Feathers, undressed.....	20	do
Eggs per dozen.....	5	cents.
Butter per lb.....	4	do
Cheese per lb.....	3	do
Condensed milk per lb.....	3½	do
Apples per barrel.....	40	do
Beans per bushel.....	15	do
Buckwheat per bushel.....	10	do
Pease per bushel.....	10	do
Potatoes per bushel.....	15	do
Rye per bushel.....	10	do
Rye flour per barrel.....	50	do
Hay per ton.....	82	do
Vegetables.....	25	p.c.
Barley per bushel.....	30	do
Indian corn per bushel.....	7½	cents.
Buckwheat meal per lb.....	4	do
Cornmeal per barrel.....	40	do
Oats per bushel.....	10	do
Oatmeal per lb.....	20	p.c.
Wheat per bushel.....	15	do
do flour per barrel.....	75	cents.
Tomatoes, fresh, per bushel.....	20	do
do corn and beans in cans, per lb.....	1½	do
Pickles.....	35	p.c.
Malt per bushel.....	15	cents.
Hops per lb.....	6	do
Small fruit per lb.....	2	do
Peaches per lb.....	1	do
Fruit in cans per lb.....	2½	do
do preserved in spirits, per gallon.....	82	do
Jellies, jams, etc., per lb.....	3½	cents.
Honey per lb.....	3	do
Maple sugar.....	20	p.c.
Cider refined, per gallon.....	10	cents.

A very good list, in my humble opinion. Nearly everything that is produced on a farm has a protective duty to prevent competition from abroad in these articles. On the other hand, there are a number of articles that are imported by farmers that come in free of duty. Here are some of the articles admitted free :

- Animals for improving stock.
- Bees.
- Bones, crude.
- Domestic fowls to improve stock.
- Guano, bone dust and other animal and vegetable manures.
- Indian corn for ensilage.
- Oil cake and similar feeds.
- Rennet, raw or prepared.
- Sawn lumber, not dressed, or on one side only.
- Laths, palings, fence posts, &c.
- Seedling stock for grafting.
- Locust beans and meal for feed.
- Tea and coffee, and sugar up to No. 16 Dutch standards up to 1895.

So the farmer is protected on what he produces while what he needs to import largely comes in free of duty. I desire to make a reference to a number of these articles. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, made special reference to the hog product of this country. I wish to say something upon the subject, because, if there is one instance in which it can be plainly shown that the imposition of a higher rate of duty has benefited the farmer it is that of the additional tax put upon hog products about five or six years ago. The duty as it stands is : Live hogs, 1½ cents per pound ; mess pork, 2 cents ; hams, bacon and lard, 2 cents. Prior to 1890, in the province of Ontario, the industry of raising hogs was rather unsatisfactory. The importation of pork into this country was extremely large. It was then that the Government took the matter more fully into consideration and granted an increase of duty. The result of this increase was marvellous. In 1889 there were 835,469 hogs raised in the province of Ontario, but in 1894, nearly five years later, the number was increased to 1,142,133, an increase of 306,664, in value, over \$2,000,000. This, let it be remembered, is for the province of Ontario alone. Now, let us go further and consider the effect of the duty upon the entire Dominion. In 1890, the imports of pork and pork products into Canada for consumption were as follows :—

	Pounds.
Pork.....	17,185,794
Bacon and hams.....	4,353,653
Lard.....	4,881,786
Total.....	26,421,233

The value of these imports was \$1,458,286. This was an enormous import of hog products into a country which ought to raise, and has since raised not only the amount of hog products it required, but a very large amount for exportation. Then, the duty was increased to a rate sufficient to afford protection and to give the farmers courage to go into the industry of raising hogs very extensively. In 1894-95, according to the Trade and Navigation Returns for the year ending 30th June last, there was imported into Canada for consumption, pork products as follows :—

	Pounds.
Pork	3,203,023
Bacon and ham.....	826,882
Lard	190,921
Total	4,220,826

The value of these imports was \$309,436. So that in 1895 the importation of hog products into this country was only about one-sixth of what it was in 1890—the direct result of the better protection that was given to this very important industry. But that is not all. Not only have we succeeded in supplying our home demand, but the impetus that has been given to this industry by the increased protection has resulted in an export very largely in excess of that of 1890. In 1890 our exports of Canadian hog products amounted to 7,730,971 pounds, of a value of \$645,360. But in 1895 these exports had increased to the enormous amount of 41,930,348 pounds, value, \$3,943,275—another of the results of the protective principle as applied to this important industry. It is a well-known fact that in the province of Ontario to-day and I fail to understand why the same should not be true of the province of Manitoba and the Northwest, nearly every farmer raises a considerable number of hogs. This has become one of the most profitable investments on the farm. And I may say that there is abundance of room yet in the markets of Great Britain to develop this industry, and I hope that the protection that has been afforded to the farmers for a few years past may long be continued and enable them to go on and develop the industry to a very much greater extent. But that is not the only result to be obtained from the increased protection that has been given for the past few years upon hogs and hog products. That protection has created an industry in this country in the slaughtering and packing of hogs. Buildings have to be erected and labour is employed in erecting them. Material had to be furnished, and thus further employment is given. Then a large staff of men must be employed continuously in slaughtering the hogs and packing the pork. Such an industry gives employment to a large number of people and provides a larger market for the farmers of this country, and helps in every way to benefit the farming community. The following are the figures showing the quantities entered for home consumption in three provinces in the year 1894-95 :

Ontario	\$83,736
New Brunswick	61,151
Quebec	45,519

Hon. gentlemen will see that these were chiefly in the lumbering districts—mess pork for the use of lumbering men. On 10th February, 1896, only a few days ago, mess pork was quoted at \$10.10 to \$10.15 in Chicago ; in New York, on the same day, it was \$10.75 to \$11, and in Toronto, on the same day, the price was quoted at \$14.50 to \$15.50 ; a clear

Mr. HENDERSON.

\$4 a barrel in favour of the Canadian producer of hogs and hog products. Surely, as I stated before, protection has benefited the farmer in this respect. Now, I desire to give you a statement made by a gentleman who, for some years, has been giving some attention to the prices of agricultural products, especially wheat, oats and pork—I refer to the president of the Lake of the Woods Milling Company. On the 1st January last, he was asked by a reporter of the Montreal "Gazette" his opinion with regard to the duty of pork, and he said :

Now let us have a talk about the pig. Canadian mess pork is worth from \$11.50 to \$12 per barrel—

That was in January ; it is much higher now.

—while American mess is quoted to-day in Chicago at from \$7.35 to \$7.49 ; so I ask you what kind of a figure the Canadian producer would cut if it were not for the import duty of \$4 per barrel.

Of course, continued the president of the Lake of the Woods Milling Company, free trade in pork and oats would benefit the millionaire lumbermen, to whom we have handed over the greater part of our forests—the birth right of the people—for almost nothing. However, this is no fault of the lumberman ; but I cannot believe that the Canadian farmer will endorse a policy that would practically enable the lumbermen to import their supplies to his great disadvantage.

Such a record, I think, testifies to the wisdom of the Government in inaugurating a policy such as I have referred to. With respect to live hogs, I am aware that it is contended that they are not much higher in this country than they are in the United States. I examined the "Globe" newspaper of 10th February, 1896, and I find there that heavy packing hogs were quoted at \$4.05 to \$4.25 in Chicago ; fed hogs in Montreal, \$4.25. But on 13th February, Chicago heavy packing and shipping hogs were quoted at \$4 to \$4.25, and Montreal live hogs were, as quoted by the hon. member for North Wentworth, \$4.75. Now, the hon. member for North Wentworth propounded a question of which I could scarcely see the force. He said : How could you ship hogs from Chicago to Montreal, if you paid \$4.05 in Chicago and sold them at Montreal at \$4.75 ? The beauty of it is, that we do not want to ship hogs from Chicago to Montreal. The object of the tariff of 1½ cents a pound is to prevent the hogs of the United States, of which they raised in 1894 the enormous number of 44,165,000—I say, to prevent that enormous surplus of hogs being shipped into this country and breaking the market that is intended for our own farmers I need scarcely say anything with reference to the duty of 3 cents a pound on meat. That question has been discussed over and over again. Years ago, meats were imported into this country from Chicago, train loads were passing through the province every day, distributing cargoes in every town and village

along the line, robbing the farmer of this country of the market to which he was fairly entitled for his butcher's cattle; but the present duty of 3 cents per pound absolutely prevents that. The value of the importation of fresh meat in 1894-95 was only \$15,529; so that we have effectually obtained the Canadian market for fresh meat. It is a well-known fact that these train loads of meat are to-day, every day of the week, in fact, passing through over the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway. It is not the little wire that seals the door that prevents this meat from being unloaded in the various towns and cities along the line of railway, but it is the law which compels the man who sells that meat to pay 3 cents a pound before he is permitted to unload a pound of it, that gives the market to the people of this country. In reference to mutton, the importation from Australia is so small that it is scarcely worth attention, \$576 worth being the entire import last year, and on that we collected \$201.60. On canned meats there is a duty of 25 per cent. That includes canned meats, canned poultry, and canned game. The hon. member for North Wentworth, to-night, in quoting the imports for canned meat, poultry and game, stated they amounted to \$143,000. In this, I think, he made an error, as I find that for home consumption the total imports were \$119,909, and of these imports of canned meat, poultry and game, only the value of \$10,319 came from Australia. Now, I desire to draw attention to this matter, because a good deal has been made of the importation of Australian canned mutton into the city of Montreal, and it has been made to appear in some of the recent by-elections, that a very large amount of meat indeed was imported across the Pacific Ocean from Australia into this country. Now, the amount of \$10,319 is credited to Australia for canned meats, poultry and game. When you take into consideration the price of canned mutton in Montreal, we can scarcely believe that any considerable quantity of it ever reached that city. According to the price-list of grocers in Montreal, Australian boiled canned mutton is sold at 14 7-12th to 18 3/4 cents per pound; roast canned mutton, 16 3/4 to 20 5-6ths cents; corned ditto, 16 3/4 to 20 5-6th cents per pound. We cannot conceive for a moment that any considerable quantity of canned mutton is consumed either in Montreal or in any other place in the Dominion of Canada at such prices as these. We know, however, that of this amount of \$10,319, only a portion could have been mutton. In Australia there is an immense number of rabbits. So annoying have these pests become that years ago the Government of New South Wales offered a reward of \$125,000 for a method of exterminating them. It costs nothing scarcely to can them, beyond the labour and tin; the animals themselves cost nothing beyond the trouble of killing. They are canned as other

meats, and are shipped as game. From 100 to 200 tons per week, in the colder weather, are shipped to the city of London to be used as food, and large amounts are shipped into the Western States. Now, taking into consideration the fact that Australian canned mutton in Montreal ranges from about 15 to 20 cents a pound, and that game, which is included, and which is a part, no doubt, of the \$10,319, is so cheap, the meat being obtained for nothing beyond the canning and the price of the cans, I think it is reasonable indeed to assume that a very large part of that \$10,319, instead of being Australian canned mutton, is simply canned rabbit. If, however, the contention of the hon. gentleman is correct, that mutton is not sufficiently protected in this country by the imposition of a duty of 35 per cent on fresh mutton, or a duty of 25 per cent on canned mutton, then, the remedy is in the hands of the Government to place a higher duty upon that article, and secure for the Canadian farmer the entire market of the country. However, as I said before, I think that market has now been pretty well secured, as well as we could reasonably expect, when the total imports from Australia of fresh mutton last year was only \$576.

Mr. MARTIN. The hon. gentleman is quoting from the returns of two years ago.

Mr. HENDERSON. I took the returns for 1894-95.

Mr. MARTIN. I think not. I think the hon. gentleman took them for 1893-94. I admit the difference is not very great. Imports of mutton and lamb fresh, 1894-95, were 57,845 pounds, of the value of \$3,097, for home consumption.

Mr. HENDERSON. I have given the returns for 1894-95. If I find I have given them wrongly, I will correct them in "Hansard." With respect to butter, a good deal has been said to-night, and I confess I was somewhat surprised at many of the remarks made by the hon. member for North Wentworth (Mr. Bain) with respect to the encouragement given to this country by the Dominion Government. The hon. gentleman does not seem to be in touch with the Government in this matter; he seems to prefer that no encouragement whatever shall be extended to an industry, which if cultivated along the line of the cheese industry will doubtless before very many years constitute one of the great industries of this country. I am sure it is important that the Government should lend all the aid in its power to develop this industry, and if possible secure our share in the market for butter in England, to which we are entitled by the high standard reached by Canadian butter. The imposition of the duty of 4 cents per pound seems to me to be quite sufficient to prevent the flooding of this market at the present time with butter from the United States. On February 13, 1896, New York quo-

tations gave New York state creamery butter as 13 to 16½ cents, while creamery butter in Montreal was 20 to 21 cents. If there was not a duty of 4 cents per pound, it would be quite possible to send the creamery butter of New York state to Montreal, and prevent the sale there of our creamery butter, or at all events reduce the price from 20½—21 down to about 17 cents. Western dairy was quoted in New York at 10—14 cents; in Montreal butter of a similar quality was 14—15 cents.

As regards apples, the duty of 40 cents per barrel seems to afford fairly good protection, but I would not approve of any reduction. This is a growing industry in this country. No doubt in some years early apples are imported, but in the later part of the year we have no need whatever for American apples, and I would strongly favour the continuance of the duty of 40 cents per barrel.

With respect to barley and corn, it will be remembered that we have a statutory offer to the United States, that when the Americans are prepared to admit both corn and barley from Canada free of duty, we will admit both grains into Canada free of duty. I think that is a fair kind of reciprocity, and I feel assured that it is one of the best solutions which can be had to the vexed question of barley and corn.

With respect to the oat crop of this country, it may be contended that 10 cents per bushel is a very high duty, it being equal to 50 per cent at the present time. It may, however, be high at one time and not so high at another time. No doubt it appears to be high at the present moment. But if we take into consideration the fact that in 1894 the United States produced 662,000,000 bushels of oats, while Ontario produced only 70,000,000, and in 1895, 84,000,000, the disproportion being so great, and the quantity produced in the United States so large compared with what is produced in the provinces of Canada, it seems to be necessary to maintain this high duty in order to prevent the surplus of the United States from entirely destroying the market of the farmers for oats in this country. I desire to show how prices vary in different parts of the country. On Feb. 10, 1896, the price at Chicago was 19¾ cents, in New York, 25½ cents, in Toronto, 27-28 cents, and in Montreal no doubt a shade higher. If one-half of the crop of Ontario were to be sold at about half the difference between the Chicago and Toronto prices there would be the enormous gain of \$2,100,000 secured to the people of Ontario.

I propose now to say something with respect to the wheat question. Hon. gentlemen opposite state from time to time, and in fact it is almost a part of every speech delivered on that side of the House, that the Conservative party in 1878 declared that under the National Policy they were going to raise the price of wheat. I think there is very little difficulty in showing that the

Mr. HENDERSON.

National Policy has succeeded in raising the price of wheat relatively.

Mr. MULOCK. Why does it not raise it a little higher?

Mr. HENDERSON. Hon. gentlemen are so much opposed to the present tariff that it would be almost dangerous to attempt to raise it higher. In 1894-95 we imported for home consumption only 499,212 bushels of wheat, showing that we have almost entirely secured the Canadian market for the farmers of Canada. 350,000 bushels of wheat came into Ontario, and 147,000 into the province of British Columbia; but we exported during that time the very considerable quantity of 8,225,689 bushels. Practically then I say we have secured the market of Canada for the wheat grown in Canada. A comparison of the prices of wheat in different countries and in different parts of the United States, also in the old country and in Canada at the present time is very interesting indeed. I regret the hon. member for South Huron is not in his seat at the present time, because I should like to draw his attention to quotations for wheat in Ontario from 1892 to 1894, as quoted by him in the House a few evenings ago. I do not suppose the hon. gentleman intended to deceive the House in any way, but undoubtedly in some way, in comparing the prices of wheat in the United States with those of Ontario, he made a mistake and took the prices of wheat in New York. There is a decided difference between the average price of wheat in the United States and the average price in New York. The market price of wheat in Ontario is obtained by the Ontario Bureau of Statistics from twenty-nine different markets for the whole year or for six months, and so an average is obtained, which appears to be a very fair system indeed. In 1894 the average price of wheat in Ontario ascertained in that way was 55 cents per bushel. In the United States the average price on the same basis, that is at the point of the farmers' delivery, was 49.1 cents, or about 6 cents below the average price per bushel in Ontario. The hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McMillan) in giving us the quotations of the United States markets from 1882 to 1894, inadvertently gave the quotations for the city of New York, which, of course, are much higher. As the hon. gentleman from South Huron has put on record the wrong quotations, I propose to-night to give the House the average prices of wheat for Ontario and for the United States during the last thirteen years:

Year.	Average price, Ontario.	Average price, U. S.
1882	\$1.01	88.2 cts.
1883	1.05	91.1 "
1884	80.5	64.5 "
1885	81.5	77.1 "
1886	73.6	68.7 "
1887	78.4	68.1 "

Year.	Average price, Ontario.	Average price, U. S.
1888	\$1.02·4	92·6 cts.
1889	88·4	69·8 "
1890	94·2	83·8 "
1891	95·1	83·9 "
1892	70·7	62·4 "
1893	59·9	53·8 "
1894	55	49·1 "

This table shows the average price per bushel in the United States as compared with the average price per bushel in Ontario at the points of farmers' delivery.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If my hon. friend would permit me, I would like to call his attention to the fact that Ash Wednesday has begun, and we have conscientious scruples about sitting on that day.

Mr. FOSTER. Oh, my. I think we had better let the hon. gentleman (Mr. Henderson) disburden himself of his speech, because he wishes to keep Ash Wednesday also.

Mr. HENDERSON. I am obliged to the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). I may say I have no conscientious scruples myself against sitting on Ash Wednesday, but I would not like to interfere with the rights and privileges of any other member. I do not suppose the hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) is particular, and I wish to continue what I have to say to-night, so that I shall not be called upon again.

As I stated before, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, the Conservative party have redeemed their pledge when they said that under the National Policy the price of wheat would be increased in this country. The enormous increase of the growth of wheat throughout the Dominion of Canada is, I think, something to be thankful for. During the last six years, as quoted in the report of the Ontario Bureau of Statistics, where they collect carefully all these facts from the returns of other countries, I find that the increase in the world's production of wheat from 1889 to 1894, amounts to 413,800,000 bushels. In Argentina alone, the increase during these six years was 64,000,000 bushels, and the increase in Canada during the same time was 12,000,000 bushels. According to the records, wheat sold lower in England on the Liverpool market in the year 1893, than it had done for 125 years previously. The causes of the reduction in the price of wheat are varied. Increased production probably is the greatest cause. In 1892 the world's production was 2,372,000,000 bushels; in 1893 the world's production of wheat was 2,389,000,000; and in 1894, the world's production of wheat was 2,588,000,000 bushels, showing a gradual increase from year to year, or, as I stated before, an increase from 1889 to 1894, of 413,800,000 bushels. Another cause of the low

price of wheat in this country, and in all other countries throughout the world, is the largely increased production of low-priced labour countries such as Argentine, India, and Russia. So much is this the case that in the month of May, 1894, wheat from La Plata sold in England on the London market at 64 cents a bushel. Another cause of the decrease in the price of wheat must be attributed to the reduced cost of handling, improved machinery, elevators, and increased facilities for transport. Another cause is that substitutes have been found for wheat, and some countries are using something else instead of it. For instance, in Austro-Hungary the consumption of wheat per capita is 3·9 bushels; in Germany, 2·5 bushels; in Russia, 2 bushels; in Scandinavia, 1·4 bushels; whereas, in Canada, the consumption is 5·5 bushels, and in Great Britain, 5 bushels. From these causes we can readily discover the reasons for the largely decreased price of wheat the world over. Now, in 1882 the average price of wheat in London was 36 cents over the average price in Ontario; in 1884 the average price in London was only 18 cents a bushel over the price in the province of Ontario. In 1890 the average price of wheat in the city of London was 3 cents over the average price in Ontario; and in 1889 the average price of wheat in London was 1½ cents per bushel over the average price in the province of Ontario; and in 1888 the average price in Ontario exceeded the average price in London by 6 4-10 cents per bushel. On February 14th, 1896, only a few days ago, wheat sold on the Toronto market at 85 cents per bushel, and on the Liverpool market the same day the price of winter wheat was 83½ cents, or 1½ cents per bushel lower than it was selling for in the city of Toronto. Now, let us look for a moment at the price of wheat in the United States. The average price of wheat in the United States on June 5th, 1895, was as follows:—In Chicago, from 77 to 78 cents; and in Toronto, \$1.04. On February 10th, 1896, wheat sold in Duluth at 60⅞ cents for No. 1 hard; at Milwaukee, wheat sold for 62¾ cents; at Chicago, wheat sold for 65 cents; at Toledo, wheat sold for 73¾ cents; at New York, wheat sold for 73¾ cents; at Detroit, wheat sold for 74¾ cents, white No. 1; at Oswego, wheat sold for 75 cents; in Liverpool, England, wheat sold for 83½ cents, and in the city of Toronto, wheat sold for 85 cents a bushel. Therefore, I say, comparatively speaking, that wheat in the province of Ontario is not only higher than it is in the United States, but higher than it is in the old country. We are told continually that the Liverpool market is the standard by which all values have to be gauged. Now, if the price of wheat in Ontario to-day is higher than the price in the Liverpool market, and the price in Liverpool in 1882 was 36 cents in excess of the province of Ontario, I think surely we have come to the time when we can fairly

claim for the National Policy that the pledge of the Conservative party has been redeemed and that the price of wheat has been increased.

Now, I propose to deal as briefly as possible with another phase of the question. It is contended that the effect of the National Policy is not only to impose upon the people of this country a tax which goes into the Dominion treasury, but also to impose a tax of similar amount which never reaches the treasury. We have been told that the additional amount of taxation is \$30,000,000 annually, and that in the seventeen years since the Conservative Government has been in power it has amounted to the enormous sum of \$500,000,000. Now, I may say that for the last five years I have listened as carefully to the debates in this House, I think, as any hon. gentleman in it, and I have watched carefully for a single argument to establish the statement that the price of an article is of necessity enhanced to the consumer by reason of a duty being imposed upon it. Let me give you an instance where that is positively not the case. Last summer salt was quoted in Michigan at 60 cents a barrel; the duty on salt is 25 cents; but the price in Canada at that time was 50 cents a barrel. I would like to know how much of the \$30,000,000 was made out of salt. In 1893 a factory in Brantford commenced the manufacture of binding twine. The necessary capital for carrying on the business was furnished by the farmers. They sold 800 tons throughout the province of Ontario. Apparently they were unable to manufacture all they required. Of the 800 tons which they sold they manufactured at the factory at Brantford 380 tons, they bought from the Ontario Government 180 tons, and from the Consumers' Cordage Company of Halifax 234 tons. Now, Mr. Speaker, it is perfectly apparent that the Brantford Company, which was organized exclusively for the purpose of giving farmers binding twine at first cost, and which was carried on with cheap money subscribed by the farmers themselves, must have reached the lowest possible price in the manufacture of this twine. It is not to be presumed for one moment that in the Central Prison any profit was to be made upon the twine manufactured there. Certainly the price of that was not enhanced by reason of the duty, any more than the price of the twine manufactured at Brantford was enhanced by reason of the duty. Now, the Brantford Company buy from the Consumers' Cordage Company at Halifax the large amount of 234 tons, at the ordinary rates and on the usual terms, and they sell this same twine to the farmers at the price at which they had sold their own—a proof conclusive to me that the Consumers' Cordage Company had made the twine cheaper than the company at Brantford and cheaper even than the Central Prison, because the company at Brantford claimed that a profit of

Mr. HENDERSON.

15 per cent had been made on the business that they proposed to carry on without profit. Let me give another evidence that the price of an article is not enhanced by reason of there being a protective duty upon it. The hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) last year, in addressing this House, to his own satisfaction apparently, fully demonstrated this matter. He said:

There are, they say, no taxes paid on woollens and cottons, and the other lines manufactured here. I wish to show that such statement is not correct. Last year, 1893-94, we imported manufactured cotton, \$4,001,618. On that import we paid a duty of \$1,139,068. The estimated consumption of cotton in Canada is \$9,000,000 a year. Take the average duty of 30 per cent on \$9,000,000, and you will find it will amount to \$2,700,000. Now, we collected in duties on the manufactured commodities imported, \$1,139,068, leaving a balance of \$1,560,132, which went into the pockets of the cotton manufacturers.

To my mind, this is an extraordinary course of reasoning. The hon. gentleman simply assumed that there was 30 per cent paid on the \$9,000,000. After having assumed it, he asserts it, and after having asserted it, he believes it, and he asks us to believe it. Where is there a tittle of evidence in that statement to demonstrate to any man that the price of cotton goods made in this country was enhanced one fraction of a cent by reason of the duty imposed on cotton goods coming into the country. Those who know anything about cotton goods know that the printed cottons manufactured in Canada to-day are of the very finest quality. I mean with regard to wear. We have not the fancy patterns, because our limited market would not admit of the manufacturer securing all the patterns necessary to produce fancy cottons. But it is known to every Canadian woman that the Canadian prints are the best goods for wear and for washing that can be obtained. They are the goods used by the masses, and they are cheaper than any of the goods of a similar kind that can be imported from Great Britain or the United States. The same remarks will apply to flannellettes, Oxford shirtings and domestic cottons. I assert, from my experience, and from all I can gather from the business men and importers of this country, and I believe it to be a fact, that to-day the keen and cutting competition of the cotton manufacturers of this country has not only given us an article cheaper than the imported article, but has had the effect of forcing down the importers' prices; so that the importing of cottons to-day is not as profitable a business as it was before the introduction of the National Policy. So that not only have we cheaper Canadian cotton goods, but cheaper imported goods, simply because we have a protective tariff in this country. The hon. gentleman from North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) took up the matter of starch and elaborated it in the same way. He says the consumption is 5,000,000 pounds

and that the duty on the whole at $1\frac{1}{2}$ cents is \$75,000. We imported, in 1893, 44,000 pounds, on which we collected a duty of \$14,475, leaving \$60,527 in the pockets of the manufacturers. He simply assumed that that was the case, and then used that assumption as evidence that it was the case. I do not think that is the kind of material with which to convince the people that starch, either for laundry purposes, or for food, is dearer by reason of the National Policy; and it is a well-known fact to every family which has occasion to use those commodities that they are cheaper now by a great deal than they ever were previous to the introduction of the National Policy. An ounce of experience will go much further in this way than a pound of assumption. It seems to me absurd to suppose that, when there is only one pound out of every 114 pounds imported any such result could be obtained as the hon. gentleman seems to deduce from this.

But he seems to make the same illustration with regard to sugar. He says, take sugar, and demonstrates the whole thing to his own satisfaction. He has proved that the \$30,000,000 tax which does not go into the treasury is not a myth, but a reality:

We imported, he said, in 1893-94 303,789,800 pounds free and 2,823,448 pounds on which we paid a duty of \$22,230.66, which showed that the manufacturers sell the product refined up to the price at which it can be imported.

I would ask any hon. gentleman if it shows it? Is there an ounce of reasoning in the matter which would convince any man that the simple fact, as there stated, shows that the price is enhanced by a cent? It shows nothing of the kind. It will not bear that construction. In 1894-95 we imported from Germany sugar to the amount of 4,572,123 pounds, valued at \$127,807. Now, if we assume that this was all hard sugar, and that it was all of the same value, it would be an even price of \$2 80 per 100 pounds, but to that we must at least add 40 cents for freight from Germany, insurance, &c., which, I think, would be a reasonable allowance, delivered in Toronto, and that would make German sugar, which we all know is an inferior sugar that the people will not buy for ordinary purposes, but which may be used by confectioners, and others, if they can cover it up, laid down in Toronto, cost \$3.20 per 100 pounds. The duty then was 64 cents per 100 pounds, which would make \$3.84 for German sugar, an inferior article, not at all equal to the Canadian refined. What could you buy Canadian refined at then? You could buy it at Toronto, delivered into localities outside, at \$3.40 per 100 pounds, or 44 cents less than the price of German sugar, showing that our refiners were keeping fairly within the limits, and were not, as hon. gentlemen opposite continually tell us,

taking the full advantage of the duty, and enhancing the price of the article in accordance with it. If such were the case, why would it happen that in New York, granulated sugar, on the 13th February, was quoted at 4 15-16, when in Montreal—not in Halifax—on the same day, it was quoted at $4\frac{3}{4}$ to $4\frac{1}{4}$, so that it was cheaper in Montreal than in New York. There is no one who will disagree with me, when I say that in all our tests, Canadian refined sugar is superior to the ordinary brand of sugar in the United States. Speaking on the sugar question in this House, during the session of 1876—this is a little bit of ancient history which I will read for the benefit of some of those new members like myself who had not the honour of a seat in the House at the time—Mr. A. G. Jones, Member of Parliament for Halifax, and who was afterwards taken into Mr. Mackenzie's Cabinet, said:

Refineries have been closed. If they could work under the present system, no application would have been made for a change; but it was impossible to keep open refineries in the face of the bounty allowed by the United States government. The Canadian Government have placed a duty on the raw material of 50 per cent, while there is only a duty of 40 per cent on the refined article, thereby giving the foreigners a very strong advantage; and he urged the Government to impose on refined sugar a duty at least equal to the bounty granted to refiners by foreign governments. He was willing to trade with the United States on fair terms, but if by a bounty system they tried to control our market and utterly ruin our interests, it was the duty of the Government to levy such duties as to at least place the Canadians on an equal footing with the foreigners. He pointed out to the Government that the men directly or indirectly connected with this business, which had been ruined, numbered thousands of people, and unless a duty such as we asked was imposed, it would be no use trying to do anything.

In the same speech Mr. Jones said:

The effect of the closing of the Canadian sugar refineries has been an advance of $1\frac{1}{2}$ cents a pound in the price of sugar in the Canadian market.

But the hon. gentleman (Mr. McMullen) is not through with his illustration. He says the same thing applies to binders. He says that by reason of the imposition of a duty of 35 per cent on binders, the manufacturers are enabled to take from the farmer a duty of 35 per cent, less possibly the amount of duty on raw material which goes into the composition of the machines. Now if such were the case, if the farmers of this country had paid \$35 more for each machine, when the duty was 35 per cent, than they would have paid if they were free then, when the duty was reduced to 20 per cent, they would have paid only \$20 more.

This would be a reduction of \$15. Now, I ask any farmer in this House, I ask any hon. gentleman in this House, whether, since the duty was reduced from 35 to 20 per cent, there has been any difference in the price of binders?

But possibly one of the greatest questions of the present day and one that has caused as much agitation as almost any other is the rebate that is granted to manufacturers on machines that they export to other countries. The Massey-Harris Company of Toronto,—although every other concern had the same privilege—exported in 1894, 3,385 self-binding machines. They received a rebate of duty on the raw material so far as they purchased foreign material which entered into the composition of these machines. On exporting the machines to Australia—I think that is where they were sent to—the Government allowed a drawback of the amount of duty they had originally paid. In this way the Government lost nothing; the country lost nothing. We collected \$2.98 for each machine exported, and when the machine was exported we paid back the \$2.98. But the country was the gainer in this that a large number of men were employed in making those machines and a large amount of money was circulated through the employment of the men. These men, while making these machines were consuming the products of this country and their presence gave so much of an extra market for the benefit of the farmers. Hon. gentlemen opposite tell us that by this reduction of the rebate we give foreigners an advantage over us in the sale of wheat, in the markets of the world. They tell us that the Australian farmer, being able, by reason of this rebate to get the machine \$2.98 cheaper than they otherwise would, they are able to sell their wheat cheaper in the markets of the world than the Canadian farmer. And if the Massey-Harris people send machines to Argentina, the farmer in that country will have the advantage of us by \$2.98 in consequence of the drawback. Now, Sir, the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) is an adept at figures, and I have no doubt he will be able to make for me a calculation showing just how much the price of a bushel of wheat in the Liverpool market will be affected, considering that the product of the world in 1894 was 2,558,000,000 bushels, by reason of the \$2.98 drawback having been allowed upon one machine used in cutting some of that wheat. It would be something terribly small. A grain of sand compared with the highest mountain would not be in it. And yet, Sir, that is one of the strongest arguments that hon. gentlemen opposite are able to bring against the National Policy to-day. In order to make the matter a little more clear, for so much

Mr. HENDERSON.

capital has been made out of this drawback, I desire to refer to the matter a little more definitely. I have here an extract from a newspaper that is not always friendly to the Government. The question was up last year a day or two after I asked the question of the Controller of Customs the reply to which gave the information as to the drawback and the number of machines exported. This is what this newspaper said:

It was brought out in the House of Commons yesterday that the Massey-Harris Company had, during 1894, exported 3,385 self-binding harvesters, and that the average drawback on account of the duty paid on raw material allowed and paid by the Government on each harvester was \$2.98—two dollars and ninety-eight cents on a machine which is sold here for \$110. Two dollars and ninety-eight cents represents the sum total of the tax on iron, on paint, on varnish, on wood, on steel, on nails, on screws, on bolts, on every mortal thing imported to make a self-binding harvester! Two dollars and ninety-eight cents is the enormous "tax" which the Grit papers have been agitating and sweating about all this time:

That two dollars and ninety-eight cents would be a mere bagatelle to the Canadian purchaser of one machine, even if he paid it—which he doesn't—but it enabled the Massey-Harris Company's employees to earn wages last year in the construction of no less than 3,385 self-binding harvesters. Put the amount paid for labour at \$50 a machine, and it is found that that little drawback of \$2.98 enabled the employees of the Massey-Harris Company to put nearly \$170,000 into their pockets—not a penny of which could have been earned had it not been for the drawback.

A policy which during its infant year, enables Canadian mechanics to earn \$170,000 more than they could earn without, and which does not add one cent to the price, in Canada, of the articles made, is entitled to be considered sound.

Well, Sir, I propose now to be a little more practical, if possible, in showing the actual effect of the working of the National Policy. We have heard, during the last few weeks, a great deal of theory. I think if we could bring some of the practical results to bear upon this argument it would tend to bring us to a proper conclusion. Results are what we are after, and if results are satisfactory I think we should all approve of the policy. I have the honour of representing a county, which, I think, can fairly be said to be one of the most industrial counties in the province or perhaps in the Dominion. I do not know of a county that, for its size, has so many industries—I mean of course, apart from the agricultural industry. I will enumerate some of these industries to show to what extent they really prevail. I give the figures from the census of 1891. In almost all cases the output is very much larger now than then:

SOME OF HALTON'S INDUSTRIES COMPARED WITH OTHER RURAL ELECTORAL DISTRICTS IN THE PROVINCE OF ONTARIO—CENSUS 1891.

Industries.	Output, Halton.	Output, Province of Ontario.	Relative position.		
			Province of Ontario.	Dominion.	
	\$	\$			
Gloves and mitts.....	189,600	563,945	1st.....	1st.....	33 per cent of output of province.
Tanneries.....	874,078	4,390,000	1st.....	2nd.....	20 do do do
Lime kilns.....	78,380	478,530	1st.....	2nd.....	16 do do do
Washing machines and wringers.....	35,000	157,000	1st.....	2nd.....	22 do do do
Terra cotta works.....	95,000	151,000	1st.....	1st.....	60 do do do
Basket making.....	17,050	122,112	2nd.....	2nd.....	14 do do do
Hosiery factories.....	31,500	499,290	2nd.....	3rd.....	6 do do do
Paper mills.....	113,500	1,029,500	4th.....	9th.....	11 do do do
Boots and shoes.....	57,145	5,017,476	5th.....	10th.....	in rural districts.
Pumps and wind mills...	14,902	513,073	5th.....	7th.....	
Carding and fulling mills	7,000	194,423	6th.....		
Fish curing.....	8,325	376,000	9th.....		
Carpenters and joiners...	48,685	2,964,014	9th.....		
Sash, doors and blinds..	89,500	3,522,544	9th.....		
Knitting factories.....	13,900	926,000	11th.....		
Dress making and millin- ery.....	79,160	7,000,660	12th.....		
Woollen mills.....	108,000	5,873,000	14th.....		

Now, Sir, it is no wonder that the hon. leader of the Opposition, when addressing the electors in the town of Oakville, in this county, in 1888, in opposition to myself, speaking of the United States just across the lake, he said :

The United States is just at the end of my hand. Moreover, we have the same tariff, as it were. We have a protective tariff, and for many years to come we must have a high tariff. The hon. gentleman, in the county of Halton, would not have ventured to make any other statement than one favourable to the

principle of protection. Now, in order to give you an idea of the value of the industry of the county of Halton, I proceed to make a comparison, and I want to be fair in this comparison. I will take my own county as the central one, and I will take the county of Wellington on the north, the county of Peel to the east, and the county of Wentworth, represented by my hon. friend who just addressed you, to the west. Here is a group of four counties. Now the following table will show how they compare with respect to industry :—

MANUFACTURING INDUSTRIES COMPARED—WAGES PAID AND VALUE OF OUTPUT, 1890.

Electoral District.	Persons Employed.	Wages Paid.	No. of Families.	Value of Output.	Output per Family.
		\$		\$	\$
North Wellington.....	1,314	268,472	4,638	1,521,160	
Centre do.....	1,346	265,866	4,562	1,576,548	
South do.....	2,312	788,161	4,805	3,669,039	
Total.....	4,972	1,322,499	14,005	6,766,747	483
North Wentworth.....	971	271,487	2,933	1,411,848	
South do.....	620	138,829	3,207	553,136	
Total.....	1,591	410,316	6,140	1,964,984	320
Peel.....	943	254,599	3,090	1,253,839	405
Halton.....	2,097	501,060	4,344	2,915,512	671

South Wellington includes the city of Guelph, which is scarcely fair to the county of Halton, because the city of Guelph has a population, I dare say, of about 12,000, and has some very important industries. But, notwithstanding that, I will allow Guelph to be thrown in with Wellington in the comparison against Halton. Let me repeat, the county of Wentworth, \$320 per family; county of Peel, \$405 per family; county of Wellington, which includes the city of Guelph, \$483 per family; and the county of Halton, \$671 per family, a very much larger average indeed than the counties either to the north, west or east of Halton. Now, let us see what effect that has upon the farmer, because this seems to be the question of the day. I have shown you that in the county of Halton, the output of the industries, and of necessity, the wages paid, are greater by reason of the large amount of industries that are fostered by the National Policy. If farm values are better retained in Halton than in other counties, I fail to be able to attribute it to any other fact than that we have among us larger industries, distributing money, week by week, which goes into the hands of labouring men, who immediately distribute it among the farmers and others, in purchasing supplies, thereby improving the farmers' market. Farm values in Wellington county, between 1892 and 1894, decreased \$399,584, according to the statistics of the Ontario Bureau. I now refer to farm values, including land, buildings, implements and live stock. In the county of Wentworth, the decrease was \$604,696; in Peel, the decrease was \$1,135,666; but in Halton, where the average output of the industries is very much larger than in the adjoining counties, instead of decrease in farm values, there is an actual increase of \$173,862.

The hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McMillan) stated to this House that chattel mortgages were the last resort of farmers, and he argued that the number of chattel mortgages in the country showed that the farmers were going back. I will point out this with respect to chattel mortgages. In the county of Wellington there is one chattel mortgage to every 39 ratepayers, in the rural districts, most of whom are farmers. In the county of Peel there is one to every 39; in Wentworth, one to 47, and in Halton, one to every 48, showing again that the large circulation of money by reason of the industries, such as are fostered by the National Policy, acts in the interest of the farmers. The hon. member for South Huron, in making his comparisons, was, I thought, scarcely fair. He said:

But there is another form of securities, which is the last resort of the farmers and is resorted to when circumstances become very extreme—that is the chattel mortgage, and in the province of Ontario there has been a large increase in chattel mortgages. In fact in some parts of the province the system prevails to such an extent

Mr. HENDERSON.

that it becomes difficult for the farmer to say when he should buy stock and when he should not, because the chattel mortgage general includes stock and implements.

After giving a statement, the hon. gentleman said:

This increase in a single year in chattel mortgages in Ontario shows the alarming extent to which our farmers are going back.

I take the statistics of the Ontario Bureau, and I find that of the total chattel mortgages of Ontario, farmers gave in 1890, 61 per cent in number, 39 per cent in amount; in 1891, 58 per cent in number, 36 per cent in amount; in 1892, 57 per cent in number, 33 per cent in amount; in 1893, 54 per cent in number, 32 per cent in amount; in 1894, 53.7 per cent in number, 30.7 per cent in amount; these statistics not bearing out what the hon. gentleman said, namely, that they would show that our farmers are going back.

Mr. MULOCK. Mr. Speaker, I hardly think there is a quorum in the House.

Mr. HENDERSON. With respect to another question raised by the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McMillan), the valuation of farm property, that hon. gentleman contended and argued, that farm values were decreasing. I am not disposed to waste much time on that matter. The hon. gentleman quoted statistics largely to bear out his contention; but I may say that, taking New England, Maine, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, New York, New Jersey and Pennsylvania, the decrease from 1880 to 1890, according to the statistics of the Ontario Bureau, was 9.4 per cent, whereas the decrease in Ontario was only 1.83. The value of live stock in the same states between 1880 and 1890 increased by 9.7 per cent, while the increase in Ontario was 16.2 per cent. The value of farm implements and machinery in the same time showed an increase in those states of 8.7, and in Ontario of 18.1. I think, therefore, we have nothing to complain of in this matter, that our values are well maintained, compared with those of the markets of the United States, with a population of 65,000,000, with which hon. gentlemen opposite are very desirous we should enter into negotiations. I propose to submit a few statements with respect to the value of the crops in Canada, as a means of testing the figures given by the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McMillan) the other night, when he stated that the receipts of farmers from their farms in Canada were constantly decreasing. I take the statistics of 1891. The number of tons of field crops in 1881 was 11,576,317; in 1891, 15,092,227. Dividing this amount by the number of farmers, we find there were 18 tons of field crops for each farmer in 1881, as compared with 23 tons in 1891, the average value in the former period being \$20.41, as compared with \$18.18 in 1891. This would give the value of the field crop alone of each farmer in 1881 as at \$360,

and in 1891 as \$430, an increase of \$70 per farm in 1891 over 1881. Besides, the farmer has his beef, pork, butter, cheese, poultry, and, in fact, animals of all kinds and their products. I fear, Mr. Speaker, that possibly I may not be treating the House fairly at this late hour. It is not my intention to occupy their time very much longer, and the time that I do occupy I shall devote to another question. It has been stated that the population of this country has not increased as rapidly as it ought to have done. Many calculations have been made by hon. gentlemen opposite, to show that the people who ought to have been in this country have gone away and are somewhere else. I have before me a statement which is an old one, made some years ago by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), and I propose to put it on record, in order that the people of the country may be able to read it, and to judge of what its merits really are. The hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) then said :

The population of Canada in 1881 was 4,325,000 ; the natural increase at 2¼ per cent per annum would be 1,100,000 ; the immigrants arrived, according to the Government report, 865,000 ; the natural increase of immigrants 110,000. The population as it should have stood in 1891, 6,400,000 ; but as it actually is, 4,830,000 ; missing 1,570,000.

His argument was, that one and a half millions of the population which ought to be in Canada in 1891, were missing, and had gone to the United States or somewhere else. Some other hon. gentleman made another calculation upon the same principle. I know it is familiar to every hon. gentleman in the House, but I desire to repeat it, in order that we may examine what I might term the absurdity of the results which would flow from such a calculation. Let us make a calculation in the same way for the United States, and we arrive at this result :

Population of the United States in 1880	50,155,783
Natural increase	12,733,262
Immigrants arrived per government returns	5,246,613
Natural increase of immigrants.....	667,199
<hr/>	
Population as it should have stood in 1890	68,802,857
As it actually is.....	62,622,250
<hr/>	
Missing	6,180,607

What became of the 6,000,000 more people that ought to be in the United States, in 1890, according to the calculation made by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) ? We have not discovered whether they have gone to free trade Britain or not, but it seems to me that his calculation is so absurd that it requires no disproof. It contains its own refutation. The fairest way, to my mind to inquire into the growth of the country, is to take a longer period than a

simple decade. Rome was not built in a day, and nations are not evolved in two or three decades, but it is the work of centuries. Now, let us look at the census of Canada for, say, fifty years, and let us examine the census of the neighbouring states of the Union equally favoured and equally well situated. We find the following results :

American Census.	1840.	1890.
Maine	501,793	661,086
New Hampshire	284,574	376,530
Vermont	291,948	332,422
Massachusetts	737,699	2,238,943
Rhode Island	108,830	345,506
Connecticut	309,978	746,258
<hr/>		
Totals	2,234,822	4,700,745
Increase in fifty years, 2,465,923 = 110 per cent.		
<hr/>		
		1891
Upper Canada, 1840	432,159	2,114,321
Lower Canada, 1844	697,084	1,488,535
Nova Scotia, 1838.....	202,575	450,396
New Brunswick, 1840.....	156,162	321,263
P. E. Island, 1841	47,042	109,078
<hr/>		
Totals	1,535,022	4,483,593
Increase in fifty years, 2,948,571 = 192 per cent.		

We have here an increase in the older provinces of Canada of 192 per cent in fifty years, as against an increase of 110 per cent in the New England States for a similar period. That is to say, the old provinces of Canada increased from 1,500,000 in 1840, to 4,500,000 in 1890, or three times the population of 1840. The New England states from a little over 2,250,000 in 1840, increased to nearly 4,750,000 in 1890, or two and one-tenth times only in the same fifty years. The province of Ontario increased in fifty years by 392 per cent, and the increase of New York state for fifty years was only 142 per cent. Ohio, another equally well-favoured state increased its population in fifty years by only 142 per cent, while the province of Ontario increased its population by 392 per cent. From 1790 to 1890, a period of 100 years, the population of the United States increased 18 fold, while in the same period the population of Canada increased 22 fold. Judging from these statistics, we have nothing to be ashamed of in Canada as regards the increase of our population. These figures show conclusive that the increase in the population of Canada has been far in excess of the increase of the population of some of the most favoured states of the union, and certainly far in excess of the New England states which were settled earlier, and which had a larger population than Canada, at the time from which I have taken the comparison. In the "North American Review" of 1887. Mr. Gladstone had an article upon the United States entitled "Our Kin Beyond Sea," and in it he spoke in glowing terms of the advance the United States were making in material wealth, giving it as his opinion that they would soon surpass England

in this respect. From an article in the same review of May last year, by Mr. Michael G. Mulhall, on "The Power and Wealth of the United States" it would appear that Mr. Gladstone's prediction has been already signally verified. Mr. Mulhall is one of the first authorities in England, that is to say in the world, on statistics; and the conclusion to which he comes is that "If we take a survey of mankind in ancient or modern times as regards the physical, mechanical and intellectual force of nations we find nothing to compare with the United States in this present year 1895, and that the United States possess by far the greatest productive power in the world." According to his figures the average annual increment of the United States from 1821 to 1890 was \$901,000,000, and he asserts that "the wealth added during a single generation—that is in the period of thirty years between 1860 and 1890—was no less than \$49,000,000,000, which is more than the total wealth of Great Britain." This statement is truly astonishing. That the United States should in the last thirty years have accumulated more wealth than England can command altogether is the most striking exemplification that could be given of the tremendous strides of that nation in material prosperity. The interest for us Canadians in the subject lies not only in the fact that we have a rational curiosity as to everything affecting the great nation across the border and the British Empire, but also in the reflection that some of the causes to which American progress is attributed are to be found in qualities and conditions that we possess ourselves in as great, if not greater, degree than our neighbours. Mr. Mulhall calls special attention to the intellectual power of the great republic as seen in the fact that 87 per cent of the total population over ten years of age are able to read and write. "It may be fearlessly asserted," says he, "that in the history of the human race no nation ever before possessed 41,000,000 instructed citizens." It is largely to this fact that it is due that an ordinary farm hand in the United States raises as much grain as three in England, four in France, five in Germany, or six in Austria. In Canada we have a people whose primary education is not surpassed anywhere in the world, and whose physical stamina and intellectual vigour are certainly not inferior to those found in any section of the United States. By these qualifications we have the promise and potency of greatness, and the result is already to be seen in the marvellous strides made by our people in wealth, commerce and manufactures, in the means of transportation and in everything else that tends to bring power and prosperity to a nation. The United States policy is "their own market for their own people." Ours should be "Canada for Canadians." Whilst the United States have made such wonderful progress, we in Canada who have so much that is common

Mr. HENDERSON.

to both can make no mistake in pursuing along similar lines a policy that for them has done so much.

Mr. LEGRIS moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

Mr. FOSTER moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 1.15 a.m. (Wednesday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 20th February, 1896.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

THE CASE OF VALENTINE SHORTIS.

Mr. SCRIVER moved :

That the papers laid on the Table of this House respecting the Shortis case, be printed for the use of members, and that rule 94 be suspended in relation thereto.

Motion agreed to.

DAIRY PRODUCTS ACT, 1893.

Mr. FOSTER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No.67) to amend the Dairy Products Act, 1893. He said : This Bill is to amend the present Dairy Products Act, which was passed in 1893. It amends it in two particulars only. One is to prevent the misrepresentation of dates, that is, that no person shall, by any marks on his cheese, say to the buyer that that cheese has been produced in a certain month if it was not produced in that month, either by marking on it, by branding, or by representation otherwise. The Bill also provides for the registration of cheese factories and creameries, whereby each factory or creamery may, by application to the Department of Agriculture, obtain registration. This is only to apply to cheese or butter which is intended for export, and is not intended to apply to that which is intended for sale in Canada. These certificates of registration are to be issued by the Department of Agriculture, through one of its officers, who is designated; and then it will become illegal for any person to sell, offer, expose or have in possession for sale, cheese or butter intended for export which was produced in a cheese factory or creamery in Canada, unless the word "Canadian" and the registration number of the factory are placed upon it. It provides, of course,

that the registration number is not to be removed after it has once been placed upon it. Then there is a provision by which registration may be extended from an individual creamery or factory to a district, under certain regulations. That will give to an organized district the advantage of registration and branding, when its product is fairly uniform, and when the district is under the same supervision, and is made up by the co-operation of a number of factories or creameries. These, I think, are about all the new points that are introduced.

Mr. MULOCK. Are there any charges for registration?

Mr. FOSTER. No, I think not.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would like to inquire whether the Dairymen's Association, or the officers thereof, have been conferred with in reference to this Bill. The hon. gentleman is aware that in Ontario, and I think also in the other provinces, there is a large body of dairymen who are associated together, who have executive officers, and who take naturally an extreme interest in these matters. Has this measure been communicated to them?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, I am informed that this legislation is in harmony with the general desire of persons who are engaged in the business, and who are representatives of their associations.

Mr. MULOCK. In response?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, really in response.

Mr. EDGAR. The Minister of Finance has told the House that this Bill would apply to butter or cheese for export. Surely that cannot be the case with respect to the first clause, which provides against misrepresentation. I suppose misrepresentation as to date of manufacture and character of cheese must apply to cheese for domestic as well as foreign manufacture.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, that is so.

Mr. McMULLEN. This is unquestionably a very important Bill. This industry is in a fairly flourishing condition, and I honestly hope that any legislation which the Minister will introduce will not hamper in any way or interfere with the progress and growth of this very important and desirable industry in the country. While the Bill apparently provides that cheese sold by factories for export is to be stamped, with the month placed upon it, that rule is not to be enforced against men who purchase from the factory and afterwards export for themselves, unless it can be shown that the factory sold the cheese for export, and the cheese afterwards passed into the hands of a second party. I understand that this Bill will only apply to the factories. This provision is one that should be very carefully scrutinized when the Bill is in committee, so that the interests of

this important industry should be guarded as regards cheese when in the hands of any party, and not merely confined to the factories. However, when the Bill is printed and brought before the House we shall have an opportunity of reviewing its different provisions; but I must be permitted again to express the hope that it will not restrict or interfere with the progress of such a desirable industry, one which has grown without any substantial aid of any kind either from this House or hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. FOSTER. The object of the Bill is quite opposed to hampering the growth of this great industry, and when it is before the House, hon. members will have an opportunity to discuss it.

Mr. McLENNAN. Does the Bill provide for the date of manufacture being placed on the cheese?

Mr. FOSTER. There is a difference of opinion as to whether the date of the month in which the cheese is made should be put on it or not. The Bill, as presented to the House, will not contain a provision making marking compulsory. We can discuss that question when the Bill is before the House, when it will be open to hon. members, after a full discussion and expression of opinion, to take what course may seem to be the best course at that time; but at the present time, the Bill does not include a compulsory clause of that kind.

Mr. McLENNAN. We consulted the manufacturers throughout the country, the manufacturers of Ontario and Quebec, and we found that 90 per cent wanted the date placed on the cheese, and the English purchasers, upon whom we have to depend for our market, also made a similar request. In my opinion, without the date placed on the cheese—and I have taken a great deal of trouble to inquire in this matter—the Bill is worthless. This is the whole ground of complaint in Great Britain, and it is the grievance which manufacturers of cheese in this country feel, because misrepresentation is made in regard to the date cheese is placed on the English market. I am aware, from inquiries made, that in October there were 600,000 boxes of cheese in cold storage, of the value of \$3,000,000, and this cheese was all of early make. I believe June, July, and the early part of August, it being stored with a view of placing it on the English market in the fall and representing it as September make. This cheese, of course, had been long out of the hands of the farmers and manufacturers, and they could not possibly reap any benefit from the cheese being held over. It was sold by them at the current rate of the month in which it was manufactured and left their hands, and they ask that this marking should be compulsory. There are a few speculators, making money out of the cheese industry,

who wish to prevent the date being marked on the cheese which is placed on the English market, though its largest and most respectable dealers are favourable to the branding of the date, and, no doubt, the small price received in the spring is largely due to the enormous quantity placed there late in the season. When this Bill comes before the House, and we consider its details in committee, I trust hon. members will insist on the date of manufacture being placed on the cheese, for if it is not marked, in my opinion, and I think I may say in the opinion of those most interested, whose opinions I have taken the trouble to ascertain, and 90 per cent of whom favour marking, the Bill will be useless. When such a large proportion of people want such legislation I cannot see why they should be prevented from having it, for, I repeat, it is most important that the date should be stamped on the cheese. When I introduced my Bill, this was the principal point covered by it, and the Minister of Agriculture promised me that the date would be placed on it, and so I did not think it necessary at the time to press my Bill in the House; and I have the statements of the newspapers that the hon. Minister declared it was his intention to carry out the principles of my bill in its entirety. I had also a promise from him personally in connection with the Bill I introduced, and relying upon this promise, I have been willing to wait and see what would be done, but now I will insist on my Bill being put before the House, and I will take the sense of the House as to whether the date should be placed on the cheese or not. If it is not placed on it, then I for one, and I think the majority of the House, will declare that this Bill now as introduced amounts to nothing.

Mr. MULLOCK. The hon. gentleman has mentioned that the opinions of 90 per cent of those engaged in the industry favour stamping cheese with the date. Will the hon. gentleman tell the House what is the significance as between June and July cheese? I suppose you would have a margin of one month?

Mr. McLENNAN. The question was thoroughly discussed in our committee. It was claimed that there was a prejudice in Great Britain against July cheese. Some of our people and our manufacturers say that July cheese is better in some seasons than September cheese. It is put forward as an argument by the parties who are against stamping the cheese with the date of manufacture that there is a prejudice against July cheese. We say, however, that the way to do away with this prejudice is to stamp the cheese. The idea is to place our cheese before the people of Great Britain fairly, squarely and honestly, and I do not think either the Government or this country would lose anything by dealing with the people on whom we depend for our

Mr. McLENNAN.

market honestly. Hon. gentlemen are no doubt aware that the United States, owing to some of their cheese being filled and other frauds committed, have to a large extent lost the British market. I do not think our people, in dealing with this large and most important industry, can afford to place anything upon the English market except products they are prepared to back up and declare that it is just what it is represented, and that it is not cheese the product of any other month than the month it is claimed to be. If we want to be fair in this matter, there cannot be any wrong committed in stamping the month of manufacture on the cheese before it is placed on the English market. It is our duty, and it is the duty of those interested in the welfare of our cheese industry, to make every effort to pass legislation which will place the products on the market fairly and honestly, and do away with any suspicion that the English people may have in regard to Canadian cheese.

Mr. McSHANE. I did not hear distinctly the remarks made by the hon. member for Glengarry. Do I understand that the hon. gentleman stated that 90 per cent of our merchants engaged in the cheese trade have asked that cheese should be branded?

Mr. McLENNAN. I said the men who made the cheese, and the men who owned the factories, and the farmers who are interested in the matter, asked that the cheese should be branded with the month of its manufacture. Not only 90 per cent of these, but more than 90 per cent were in favour of the proposal, because a great many who answered this communication were presidents and secretaries of companies who represented their directors and shareholders as well as themselves. Therefore, I can safely say that more than 90 per cent of the people directly interested in the production of cheese, have asked that legislation should be passed to provide that cheese should be marked with the month in which it was manufactured. The manufacturers and farmers throughout the country believe that the speculator is using the cheese to his own advantage, and to their detriment. I can tell you more than that, Sir. The speculators who get the ear of this Government, and of this House, and who have more power and influence than the honest farmer who is not so forward in pressing his claims as strongly as the men who are making money under the present system at his expense. These speculators wish to keep things as they now are. The draft of this very Bill which is introduced to-day was prepared by Professor Robertson, during last session of Parliament, but it does not provide that the cheese should be marked with its proper date. I will answer the hon. gentleman from Montreal (Mr. McShane) again. I say that this legislation is de-

manded by the farmers who furnish the milk, and by the manufacturers who make the cheese. We pass laws to punish the farmer, criminally, if he supplies milk of an inferior character, and I contend that when that same farmer asked for legislation to protect him in his industry, this House should back him up in his demand. I am fully confident, Sir, that the House will do so.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, it is not only the cheese-makers and the farmers of Canada who have asked for this legislation, but a demand for it has been made, also, by the boards of trade of the city of London and the city of Bristol, England, both of which issued circulars to the cheese-makers of Canada, stating that it would be in their interest to have their cheese branded with the month and date of manufacture. As my hon. friend (Mr. McLennan) has stated, there were 500 circulars sent out, and of this number, 370 answered in favour of the day of the month being placed upon the cheese in the factory; there were twenty answers indefinite, and only eight or nine opposed to it. Of this I am perfectly certain, that the Dairymen's Association which met in Stratford last year, or the year before, were unanimously in favour of having the cheese branded. And, Sir, in consequence of the feeling in England that there is a fraud perpetrated by representing cheese other than what it is in reality, we in Canada ought do everything possible to remove the impression that we are attempting to commit a fraud by putting July cheese on the market as September cheese. One of the dealers from Montreal stated before the Agriculture Committee that he owned a cold storage in Montreal, that cheese went into that cold storage, and that when it went out it was not branded with the name of the month on which it was made, but it was branded as being made a month later. It is the duty of the Government to have this provision embodied in the Bill. I am very much of the same opinion as my hon. friend from Glengarry (Mr. McLennan), who has taken such a deep interest in this matter, that without this provision the Bill would be perfectly valueless so far as the farmers are concerned. As a farmer, and as one who is interested in cheese factories and creameries, I say it is of the utmost importance that the month and the date should be placed on the cheese.

Mr. McSHANE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to object to the remarks made by the hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. McLennan). I am speaking for the merchants of Montreal—

Mr. SPEAKER. I thought the hon. member had already spoken.

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. gentleman only asked a question.

Mr. McSHANE. I desire, Sir, to say, on behalf of the cheese merchants of Montreal—the men who really built up that business—that they never lent themselves to any trickery in the trade, or to anything wrong in connection with it. The hon. gentleman from Glengarry (Mr. McLennan) may be correct in applying his statements to other parts of the Dominion, but I can most decidedly say that they do not apply to Montreal. I am here to speak for the merchants of Montreal who are engaged in that business, the men who do the cheese trade of this country, and on their behalf, I say, that they have never shipped any cheese under false pretenses, nor branded it with any other brand than was represented to them by the factories from which they purchased it. When the hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. McLennan) speaks of merchants as being guilty of trickery, I hope he does not include the merchants of the city of Montreal.

Mr. COCHRANE. They admitted it themselves.

Mr. WELSH. I am fully in accord with the statement made by the hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. McLennan) and the hon. member for Huron (Mr. McMillan). I would also suggest that the name of the province from which the cheese comes should be marked on it, as well as the name of the month of manufacture. Although I come from a very small province, yet we take very considerable pride in our cheese, and it is a very important industry with us. I rose to make the suggestion that the cheese should be branded with the name of the province.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

THE WINDING-UP ACT.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell) (for Mr. Geoffrion) Bill (No. 68) to amend the Winding-up Amendment Act. He said: The Bill is for the purpose of extending the time at which the Winding-up Act may be brought into operation. This measure was required to cover the case of the Banque du Peuple, and I have been asked to move its first reading in the absence of the hon. member for Verchères (Mr. Geoffrion). That hon. gentleman will no doubt give further information when the second reading is reached.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

WEAVER SETTLEMENT, N.S., POSTMASTER.

Mr. BOWERS asked:

1. What is the annual salary of Wm. Weaver, postmaster of Weaver Settlement, Digby Co., N.S.?

2. Has his salary been paid to 31st December, 1895?

3. If not, why not?

4. Does the Government intend to pay his salary up to date?

5. Has he tendered his resignation to the Government?

6. If so, has it been accepted?

7. If not, why not?

8. Does the Government intend to appoint a postmaster to fill his place?

9. If so, when will the appointment be made?

10. Have the Conservative committee of Digby Co. recommended any person to this lucrative position?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. 1. The annual salary of the postmaster of Weaver Settlement is \$12. 2. No. There is salary to the amount of \$11.83 due to the postmaster up to the 31st December, 1895. 3. The salary is withheld at the Post Office Inspector's office, Halifax, as security for the credit supply of postage stamps of \$9, the postmaster having resigned on the 18th March, 1894. 4. The salary will be paid as soon as the postmaster pays for the credit supply. 5. Yes. 6. Yes. 7. It has been. 8. Yes. 9. As soon as a suitable person can be found to fill the vacancy. 10. No.

INSTRUCTIONS TO LIEUT.-COL. WILSON, R.C.A.

Mr. GODBOUT asked :

1. What instructions were issued to Lieut.-Col. J. F. Wilson, Royal Canadian Artillery, when proceeding to England in 1895?

2. For what period of time was he to remain there? For what length of time did he remain?

3. What amount of money was advanced to him to pay his expenses? What is the total cost of his trip?

4. Was Lieut.-Col. Wilson recalled? If so, why?

5. Did Lieut.-Col. Wilson fully carry out his instructions to the entire satisfaction of the Imperial authorities, and the Department of Militia and Defence?

6. Has the Department of Militia and Defence received any report from the Imperial authorities concerning Lieut.-Col. Wilson whilst he was in England? If so, its nature?

Mr. DICKEY. 1. To go to Hilsea on arrival, to be attached to field artillery till 20th May. (b.) To go to Shoeburyness on 21st May for senior officer's course, till 1st June. (c.) To go to Okehampton to be attached from 5th to 30th June, during practice of 2nd division. (d.) To go to Aldershot about 1st July, to be attached to cavalry and infantry, and, if possible, undergo examination for tactical fitness to command. 2. The time necessary to complete the course of instruction, as detailed above. Under instruction from 17th April to 1st August. 3. Amount of money advanced, \$500. Total cost, \$600. 4. He was not recalled. 5. It is not usual to receive a report from the Imperial authorities in such cases, and no report has been received. He carried out his instructions to the entire

Mr. BOWERS.

satisfaction of the Department of Militia and Defence. 6. The only report received is as follows:—

(War Office to Colonial Office.)

War Office, Pall Mall, S.W.,

5th July, 1895.

Sir,—I am directed by the Secretary of State for War to inform you that Lieut.-Col. J. Wilson, Royal Canadian Artillery, passed the tactical test as to his fitness for command, under paragraphs 40-43, Section IX, and Appendix VIII, Queen's Regulations, 1894, at Aldershot on the 10th ultimo.

I have, &c.,

(Sd.) G. LAWSON.

The Under Secretary of State,
Colonial Office.

No other report was necessary. It is not customary to receive any other report, and one is not expected. The Major General says:

I was exceptionally satisfied with all that Lieut.-Col. Wilson performed while in England.

I.C.R.—OFFICIAL INTERFERENCE IN AN ELECTION.

Mr. MIGNAULT asked :

Whether the Government are aware that Mr. Augustin Laverdière, agent for the Intercolonial Railway at Lévis, made use of the name of Mr. Pottinger, Superintendent of the Intercolonial Railway, in order to influence the votes of the employees of the railway, at the last municipal election held at Lévis? If not, will they make inquiry into the matter? And what means will they adopt to prevent a repetition of the abuse?

Mr. HAGGART. The Government is not aware that Mr. A. Laverdière made use of Mr. Pottinger's name in order to influence the votes of the employees of the railway at the late municipal elections at Lévis. Inquiry will be made. Not being aware of any abuse having occurred, it has not been necessary to consider any steps being taken.

CAPE BRETON RAILWAY.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness) asked :

Between what stations and on what miles of railway on the contract of Sims and Slater on the Cape Breton Railway, east of Grand Narrows, was the amount of \$7,709.20 paid to sub-contractor D. T. McDonell, of McDonell & Cameron, for excavation of "hard-pan," by the Railway Department, in 1895?

Mr. HAGGART. The amount of \$7,709.20 was paid to Messrs. McDonell & Cameron for excavation of hard-pan on Sims & Slater's contract on the Cape Breton Railway, east of the Grand Narrows, between stations 35 and 107-45 on the first, second and third miles.

FREE TRANSMISSION OF NEWS-PAPERS.

Mr. DEVLIN asked :

To what, if any, newspapers in Canada has the privilege of free transmission by post been re-

fused during the last three years? Is it not the case that such privilege is enjoyed by and granted to newspapers generally in Canada? Is it true that the privilege in question was refused to "Town Topics," a newspaper published in the city of Montreal? If so, why?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. This department has not recorded the names of the publications to which free transmission is refused, but only of those to which free transmission has been granted. Free transmission is granted to papers complying with the statutory provisions. The privilege of free transmission was not granted to the paper entitled "Town Topics," the reason being that it did not comply with the statutory requirements, the publisher being unable to produce a list of subscribers.

SOULANGES CANAL—SECTIONS FOUR, FIVE, SIX AND SEVEN.

Mr. CASEY asked :

1. Who is the contractor for sections 4, 5, 6 and 7, Soulanges Canal?

2. Has he, as stated in the last Report of the Minister of Railways and Canals, practically abandoned the work, after doing the easiest parts of it?

3. Has he made claims against the Government, arising out of such contract? If so, of what nature and amount?

4. Were these claims disputed by the Government, in whole or in part, and to what amount?

5. Has the Government engineer reported on such claims, favourably or the reverse, in whole or in part; and what amount, if any, does he recommend should be paid?

6. Has the Minister of Justice been asked to report on such claims? Has he done so, favourably or the reverse, in whole or in part? What amount, if any, does he recommend should be paid?

7. What decision has the Government or the Minister of Railways and Canals arrived at, in regard to paying such claims, in whole or in part? What amount, if any, has been paid?

Mr. HAGGART. 1. Mr. George Goodwin is the contractor. 2. The superintending engineer reports the work practically abandoned upon the ground that, latterly, the work has not been prosecuted with the same vigour as was previously the case. 3. Yes, he has made a claim arising out of the contract. 4. The claim is in connection with the forming of water-tight embankments. 5. The claim would probably amount to \$100,000. 6. Yes, the claim was disputed in its entirety. 7. Yes, the Government engineer has reported unfavourably on the whole claim. 8. The Minister of Justice has been asked to report on the claim. 9. He has reported favourably to the contractor's contention in full. 10. The Minister of Railways, in the interpretation of a contract has to be governed by the advice given by the Justice Department. 11. No part of the claim has been paid.

CHIGNECTO MARINE TRANSPORT RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. EDGAR asked :

1. Is the Government aware whether the directors of the Chignecto Marine Transport Railway Company (Limited) have issued any of their first preference mortgage bonds authorized by 55-56 Victoria, chapter 37? If so, to what amount?

2. Have this company paid to the Government any, and if so, what portion of the monthly penalty of \$5,000 for each month during which their works remained uncompleted, as provided by chapter 4 of the Statutes of 1888?

Mr. FOSTER. It is understood that the company has issued all of the first preference mortgage bonds of \$300,000 at par. With reference to the second question, the Government has no power to enforce penalties which have been repealed by chapter 12, section 2, of Act passed in 1891.

THE QUEEN VS. ST. LOUIS.

Mr. Edgar asked :

Has a decision been given by the Supreme Court in the civil action brought by the Government against Mr. St. Louis, the contractor in connection with the Curran Bridge?

What was the amount claimed by the Government?

What is the effect of the decision of the Supreme Court as regards the claim of the Government or any claims of the contractor?

Mr. DICKEY. No judgment has been given by the Supreme Court in the civil action brought by the Government against Mr. St. Louis.

The amount of the claim is \$91,902.

This is a legal question, and as such is a matter of opinion.

THE VENEZUELAN QUESTION.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to call the attention of the Government to the fact that we have in the Library here several old maps—some French and some Dutch—which give the boundaries of the Spanish and Dutch possessions in South America, and, according to which the boundary line drawn is at least as extensive as the present claim of the British Government. Now, these maps may be in the Foreign Office of England, or they may not, and it seems to me, that it would be a proper thing, and in the public interest, if the Government were to order copies of those maps and have them placed at the disposal of the Foreign Office. There is a map of Mr. Delisle, who was first geographer of the King of France, of 1722; there is also a map of Popple and Mitchell, dated 1774, giving the boundaries of Venezuela, or Andalusia and Surinam; also an atlas of the whole continent of America from 1680 to 1838; Danville's

map of the north part of South America, 1776; and also Mortier's map of 1740. There is also a map of Robert de Vaugondy, who was geographer to the King of Poland, bearing date 1771.

All of these extend the boundary of Dutch Guiana as far west as the mouth of the Orinoco River, and some of them follow up that river for a considerable distance. It seems to me, it would be a proper thing to have copies of those maps made and sent to the Foreign Office. If the Foreign Office is already in possession, of course, no harm is done; if not, they will be a valuable addition to their collection.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I desire to thank the hon. gentleman very much for drawing the attention of the Government to this very important matter, and to state to him, that the Government will at once communicate with Her Majesty's Government, to ascertain if Her Majesty's Government has these maps in its possession. If not, copies will be made and forwarded without delay.

FIXING GRAIN STANDARDS.

Mr. MULOCK. I would ask the hon. Controller of Inland Revenue (Mr. Prior), if he will lay before the House the papers in connection with the fixing of the standard of grain last year, and also verbatim report of the meeting held in Winnipeg, which was made, I understand, by a Government stenographer. I make this request on behalf of some people who have written to me and who are interested in the grain trade.

Mr. PRIOR. In reply, I would say that I shall inquire in the department, and find out whether the reports are there, and the evidence; and if so, I shall lay them on the Table.

OFFICIAL REPORT OF DEBATES.

Mr. McMULLEN. I want to call attention to a matter which, I think, should be clearly understood. I notice that a number of tabulated statements appear in the speech of the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), which were not read to the House. Now, it has been understood that nothing should be printed in "Hansard" but what is delivered before the House. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), last year was, refused permission to hand a tabulated statement to the "Hansard" reporter, as read, and had to proceed and deliver it.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the hon. member is going too far. He must not make a speech, but confine himself to putting the question.

Mr. GIBSON moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. McMULLEN. I want to have this matter clearly understood in the House.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).

Members of this House, in past years, have desired to be granted the privilege of putting in the "Hansard" tabulated statements, without reading them, and which they wished to include in their speeches, but their request was invariably refused. I think it is quite right not to allow this privilege. Certainly, we do not want our official reports to be burdened with speeches and statements not delivered, as is the case with our neighbours across the line. In their legislatures, very often, whole speeches are printed in the official reports and sent out as the utterances of members, which were not delivered at all. I do not think we should permit any such practice here. It is better that we should have an understanding that, unless in some special cases, nothing should be printed in our "Hansard" which has not been delivered by the member addressing the House. I quite admit that, in the case of a Finance Minister, when delivering a very long speech which will, of necessity, contain quite a large number of tabulated statements, an exception might be made, but in no other case should an exception be allowed. No private member should be allowed to have printed in "Hansard" tabulated statements that he did not read to the House. I hope that the "Hansard" Committee will decide as to the course to be adopted in future. If that privilege is to be granted to every member in this House, we may fully expect that it will grow enormously in size. It is desirable that we should keep it within proper limits, and also avoid exposing the staff to the enormous amount of work which this privilege will entail, if it be allowed to degenerate into common practice. Whatever may have been done in the past, I think that now we ought to be ready to express an opinion on this point. If this privilege is given to any member of the House of handing in statements and having them printed, we should let it be understood, and should allow all the members to share the privilege, even if it does result in making a "Hansard" that a man will have to bring a wheelbarrow in order to take home with him. I think the House should make it understood that this privilege is not to be granted in any case except that of the Finance Minister who has such a long statement to make involving, necessarily, long tables of figures.

Mr. FOSTER. It would have been all right if it had been on superannuation.

Mr. McMULLEN. No; when I made my speech on superannuation I read every figure that appears in "Hansard."

Mr. DAVIN. In my speech as it appears in "Hansard," there is a tabulated statement with the following title:—

Statement of Manitoba and North-west cattle, sheep and hogs shipped to eastern points during five years—from 1891 to 1895 (both inclusive).

It occupies altogether the space of about

three-quarters of a column. Of that statement I read four items—four extended items—and after doing so I said that with the permission of the House I would hand the statement to the reporters. I did that because I have observed that it is the custom in this House when members have long tabulated statements to present—

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. DAVIN. Allow me for a moment. I say I have observed that. It may not be invariable; but I have observed that it is done, and that when the House does not object, the statement appears though not read in full. Of course the House sometimes does object and calls for the reading of the statement. Of course it is only a way of asking the House whether they would have the tabulated statement read. It is not so very large a table in this case, but my hon. friend—

Mr. McMULLEN. Is that page 1975?

Mr. DAVIN. You mean 1985.

Mr. McMULLEN. No; 1975.

Mr. DAVIN. The remark I made first refers to that. I read four items in that tabulated statement, which statement would make a single column of "Hansard." In regard to this other statement, I read all that is there about the cattle from 1891 to 1895, and connected the lines concerning 1892, 1893 and 1894. As to the other statistics that appear, I read them in full. Now as to the Debates Committee, of course no member of that committee has any privilege distinct from or superior to those of any other member of the House. I had no conversation with the reporters on this subject, either with the head reporter or with any subordinate reporter. I handed in the statement as I said I would. If my hon. friend from North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) had objected at that time and had said "read," I would have read the whole tabular statement. But if I remember, Mr. Speaker, the occasion when this question was really seriously important was that an hon. member had a long series of tables to read and wished to place them on "Hansard" without reading them, and the House objected. I am within the hearing of several of my colleagues on the Debates Committee, and I am sure they will agree that that committee would never give the least privilege to any of its members that was not enjoyed by other members of the House.

Mr. LAURIER. This is a question of some importance to the House at large and it has not come up for the first time. We have had similar discussions on two or three occasions to my recollection, and the rule that has been generally understood to apply was that the "Hansard" reporters should take notice of nothing except what actually falls from the lips of hon. gentlemen who addressed the House. There was, however,

an exception made in favour of the Minister of Finance who, in his financial statement, must bring forward long tabular statements which it would be wearisome for the House to listen to and for him to deliver. Under the circumstances the privilege has been extended to him in handing in the financial statement to the reporters. But, with this exception, I think we should impress upon the members of the House the necessity of adhering closely to the rule that "Hansard" should contain nothing but what is actually said in the course of debate. Of course there may be temptation to depart from the rule; but when it is brought to the attention of the House, I think we should take occasion to re-assert the rule and see that it is adhered to.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There is no doubt that the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) when he was addressing the House called attention to this statement and said that he would hand it to the "Hansard" reporter. It is within my recollection that, on many occasions that has been done. At the same time, I entirely agree with the view stated by the hon. leader of the Opposition that we should confine the "Hansard" to reports of what actually falls from the lips of the speakers in debate.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think there has never been an occasion, except in the case of the Minister of Finance, when a proposition of this sort has been made to the House and has not been objected to. On several occasions, members, instead of reading detailed statistics which they had prepared, have proposed to hand them into the "Hansard" reporter, objection has been taken. And when my hon. friend from West Assiniboia, the other day, said he proposed to hand in these statistics, I myself objected, because I thought it was not good to adopt such a rule. If once we permitted that sort of thing, we might increase the size of "Hansard" indefinitely, to the disadvantage of the public.

Mr. FOSTER. I am sorry to find that I have not been living up to my privileges. All hon. gentlemen seem to agree that an exception was made in the case of the statement of the Finance Minister. I have never understood that such was the case, and I have never asked such a privilege except during the last Budget speech, when I proposed to hand in a long list of articles upon which the tariff had been reduced, and some hon. gentleman objected; and so I read it through. I have always submitted to the rule made for members generally.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Before this motion is withdrawn, I would like to know what we are going to do about this tabular statement that has been put in. It has crept in in an abnormal, or, at least, unusual way; what are we going to do with it? If it remains

it will stand as a precedent for others to go and do likewise. While I am willing to extend every privilege to the hon. member for Assiniboia, because he speaks but seldom in the House, I do not know what we should do with him on this occasion. If he reads it now, I presume it will be allowed to remain; if not, it will go where a great many of his other speeches go.

Motion to adjourn, withdrawn.

MAIL COMMUNICATION WITH PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

Mr. YEO. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I desire to draw the attention of the Government to the irregularity with which mails to and from Prince Edward Island have been transmitted for the past two or three weeks. In some instances the people of the Island have been three or four days without receiving a mail. I wish to know whether the agent of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, or the Post Office Inspector of Prince Edward Island, have full authority to act on their own judgment in forwarding the mails, or whether they are authorized to employ boats not in the service of the Government, when there are not sufficient Government boats to convey the mails. I have understood that in some instances there have not been enough Government boats to carry the mails, and although the boats are available, they have not been employed.

Mr. COSTIGAN. From all the information that I have in connection with that service, I am sure no blame is to be attached to the officers conducting it. Of course, we know this has been a remarkably rough season, and unusual quantities of ice have to be met.

INTERCOLONIAL ARBITRATION.

Mr. EDGAR. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I desire to ask the attention of the leader of the House for a moment. During the session before last, a motion was unanimously adopted in this House, which I had the honour of moving, seconded by the present Minister of Justice, and supported by Sir John Thompson, in favour of approving, on the part of Canada, of a resolution which had been passed by the Congress of the United States, and also passed by the House of Commons in England, in favour of settling disputes between those two countries, as far as possible, by arbitration. I would like to know from the Government whether that motion has been communicated to the two countries who are referred to in that motion. At this time particularly, I think it would be interesting to know what has been done.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will obtain the information and communicate it to the hon. member.

Mr. LANDERKIN.

INQUIRY FOR RETURNS.

Mr. CASEY. Before you pass to Government Orders, I wish to inquire again about a certain return that has been promised me for some little time. I moved for two, one in regard to correspondence with the High Commissioner as to his present visit to Canada, which I have got; and the other, in regard to correspondence between the High Commissioner and the Government concerning his duties, &c., which has not yet been laid before the House, and which I have not yet got. The one I have received is so interesting that I shall take an early opportunity of pointing out its peculiarities; and I hope we will get the other, which may prove to be still more interesting, at as early a date as possible. Perhaps the Secretary of State might know something about this correspondence with the High Commissioner.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I presume there will be no difficulty in laying that on the Table. My attention has not been drawn to the last correspondence mentioned. I think the hon. gentleman said he had received an answer to the first order; the other will be brought down very shortly.

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND TUNNEL.

Mr. PERRY. I desire to ask the Finance Minister when we may expect to have the map showing the boring across the Straits of Northumberland, as promised more than a month ago.

Mr. FOSTER. I would ask my hon. friend to put a notice of motion on the paper, and it will be passed when we go through the Order paper with unopposed motions. The map will then come before the House, and will be a matter of record in the House. Otherwise, if brought down privately, it might get lost.

THE POSTAL SERVICE.

Mr. DEVLIN. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask the Postmaster General, if it is the intention of the Government to persist in refusing to extend the ordinary privileges of transmission by mail to the paper called "Town Topics"?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I can only tell the hon. gentleman what I have already said. The transmission of these papers is regulated by statute, and, until the proprietor of the paper complies with the requirements of the statute, I cannot break the law and make an exception in favour of that paper, when several others have been refused on the same ground.

Mr. DEVLIN. The Postmaster General knows that the law is constantly broken in that respect.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Well, I am not going to break it this time.

SUPPLY—THE BUDGET.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Foster :

That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go again into Committee of Supply.

Mr. LEGRIS. (Translation.) Before this motion is adopted, Mr. Speaker, I hope I may be allowed to offer the House and the country a few remarks. My arguments may not have the merit of novelty, rising as I do to address the House after so many eminent gentlemen, on both sides, who have taken part in this debate, within the last few days. But as this is the most favourable opportunity for members expressing their views on all questions in connection with the general policy of the country, I could not remain a silent spectator on the battle-field, when the future destiny of the country and the millions of the people are at stake. These are very extraordinary circumstances, and the hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches are also in a very extraordinary position. We are passing through a period of acute commercial depression. Distress is also prevailing, to an extraordinary degree, in the rural districts. Now, the hon. gentlemen who administer the affairs of the country, have, for some time past, adopted a very extraordinary attitude. The way these hon. gentlemen quarrelled between themselves, is still within the vivid recollection of this House. The House also remembers that the Ministers who had left the Cabinet, the bolters, as they are known in common parlance and in the press of the country, accused their leader of lacking the necessary pluck and vigour, and declared him unfit to retain his high position in the Ministry. The hon. Prime Minister, is also on record as having, in reply to those accusations, qualified his colleagues as traitors to their country and to their chieftain.

Owing to the circumstances I have just related, the Government find themselves placed in a very extraordinary position : and, in order to extricate themselves out of that difficulty, it is now easily understood what means they resorted to. As they perceived that the power was about to escape them, they contrived to call back from beyond the sea a gentleman who had been, in the past years, a powerful fighter in the active politics of the country. They thought that the presence of the High Commissioner among them would restore order within the ranks of the party. And we have been witnesses to a very moving spectacle, indeed, when the hon. gentlemen, who had vied with each other in reciprocating insults and abuse, were seen, one fine morning, during the crisis, shaking hands, and I would almost say hugging each other. Sir

Charles Tupper's return to Canada has been surrounded with a certain mystery, but, owing to the indiscretion of the Conservative press, it finally transpired that Sir Charles Tupper had come back to Canada to take the leadership of the Conservative party. Now, this powerful man, this heaven-fallen saviour, was to be the new cement destined to bind together the party that was going to the dogs. It behooves us then to devote our attention to him, and in that connection I may be allowed to quote an editorial from a journal which was and still is the leading Conservative organ, although its name has somewhat been altered since these lines were published. I quote from the "Mail" of Toronto, of June 9, 1891 :

There can be no doubt that the wires are being actively pulled for Sir Charles Tupper at Ottawa by his son, with his other special adherents in the Cabinet, as well as by members from the eastern provinces, to which as a reward for their loyalty to him in the late contest he has promised "even more than justice" in the division of the spoils. His professed withdrawal from Canadian politics has deceived nobody, at all events since his proceedings in the late election.

The paper goes on to say :

Of the system which Mr. Blake deplores, Sir Charles Tupper has notoriously been the chief agent : all that is worst in it and has tended most to debase the national character is familiarly connected with his name, which may be said to be a household word of corruption. Nor has he like his late chief succeeded in convincing the people that except when he is doing the dirty work of a political party his hands are clean ; or that, if he governed the nation, its honour, while it might be in danger from such exposures as that of the Pacific Railway scandal, would be secure against a deeper stain.

His name is at this moment unpleasantly connected with a suspicious commercial affair in England. He will protest his innocence, of course, but his word, unhappily, is that of a man whose veracity is much impugned, and who does not scruple to use stolen letters. It is too evident what sort of scene would be enacted by his accession to power. He is the prince of political cracksmen, no doubt, but he cannot afford to purchase ability, even of so rare a kind, at such a price as that of continued and increased demoralization.

The appointment of such a man at the head of the state would be not merely the inauguration of violence and corruption, unredeemed by any true wisdom or statesmanship ; it would be the signal for a disruption of the community and for a moral civil war.

This editorial is certainly significant, coming as it does from the "Mail," which, on the day following the death of Sir John Macdonald, thus characterized the political career of the hon. gentleman who has since that time, been installed in London, and has lived there, in high style, at the expense of the country, and who has now come back from England to the rescue of the Conservative party, at the very moment the people are repudiating that party. But, this opin-

ion, of the great Conservative organ is by no means a solitary one. Let me quote from another Conservative journal, published in Dartmouth, Nova Scotia. This paper, in its issue of the 12th January, contained an editorial from which I extract the following :—

During the past six years we have had some of the most revolting political atrocities which have ever blackened the fair fame of any country, and that too in a country where there is no excuse for impure politics.

There never has been a time when honest men were more needed than now. The Tory party has again brought to the front one of the ablest men that Canada has ever produced. Sir Charles Tupper, Bart., is a man of indomitable will, able and unscrupulous. He can, without doubt, do much to carry the Tory banner onward to victory, but is he worthy of it? No man in public life in Canada has so often been called upon to defend himself from the attacks of his enemies or to answer to his friends. To-day, the attack against him is entirely on the lines of his corruptness and utter lack of sound principles.

Is the Conservative party so lacking in honest men or men of ability that it cannot present a cabinet of upright men worthy of the honour and confidence of a great people? We think not.

The series of disreputable and blackguardly squabbles which have disgraced this country during the past few days ought to bring a blush of shame to the face of every honest elector. It is full time the Carons, the Haggarts, the Montagues, and men of such ilk were relegated to obscurity. They should never have been in the Cabinet, and having once resigned, they should never have been taken back.

To place Sir Charles Tupper at the head of the Canadian Parliament with such men supporting him would be a crime before high heaven.

Such are the terms in which this paper hails the advent of the heaven-sent-fallen saviour of the Conservative party. So also spoke of him, a few years ago, the Toronto "Mail," which warned its readers beforehand that Sir Charles Tupper would protest his innocence, of course, but that his word, to quote the very words of the Conservative organ, was that of a man whose veracity was much impugned. This House, the other day, was a witness to the fact that the hon. gentleman could indeed protest his innocence. Hardly had he been presented to the House, hardly had he taken his seat, when he felt conscious of the tremendous weight of the unbridled corruption and bribery resorted to in his favour at the recent election contest in Cape Breton, and fully understanding that he would be arraigned before the House of his opponents, he made up his mind to face the storm. After coming back in triumph from the electoral district which he now represents in Parliament, he hurled against his opponents the charge that in the contest between him and Mr. Murray, the sum of \$25,000 had been sent down to buy the seat from under him. When, after the hon. gentleman had taken his seat, the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies), brought up the question before the House and asked to apply for a committee of this House to make an investigation in regard

Mr. LEGRIS.

to the moneys which were spent in Cape Breton, and to prove that the statement had no foundation whatever, the Government declined to comply with the hon. member's demand, and the hon. Secretary of State (Sir Charles Tupper) accepted the statement and the assurances of the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies), but in the same breath, suggested that his statement was well based. Whence I infer that what the "Mail" stated a few years ago proves perfectly true. Scarcely had the hon. gentleman taken his seat in this House, when he began by protesting his innocence, and not only that, but he attempted to exculpate himself by throwing back upon his opponents the charge laid to his door both by one of my hon. colleagues on this side and by public opinion in the country. He had brass enough to state on the floor of this House that the unbridled corruption and bribery practised during the electoral contest at Cape Breton had been resorted to, not by his own friends, but by the Liberal party. Now, Mr. Speaker, I ask you, is there a man who will believe that the Liberal party is in a position to incur such heavy expenditures for the purpose of carrying an election? The Liberals cannot command the resources which the men in power have at their disposal, the more so as the Liberal party is now controlled by as scrupulous men as ever were at the head of the party. Even supposing that the Liberal party were inclined to resort to bribery, where could they find the necessary money for such purposes? You, Sir, are well aware that, with nothing but private subscriptions to depend upon in carrying on an electoral contest, a party can only raise a sufficient sum to pay legitimate expenses. How then could the Liberal party have raised such considerable sums as that mentioned by the hon. Secretary of State for the purpose of fighting this battle and preventing the election of this would-be saviour of the Conservative party, a party doomed to ruin. Plain common sense tells you, Sir, that such an assumption is baseless. We have read the statement made by the hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, who have taken part in the contest. They have stated that this charge was utterly groundless; still, that did not deter the hon. Secretary of State from re-stating his charges and attempting to substantiate them. The hon. gentleman, who has just been recalled from London, was very costly to the country while in England. For my part, I would not feel sorry for his having been called back here, were his return to the country to result in relieving the public exchequer from the enormous expenditure incurred through his playing the part of a "petty king" on the other side of the Atlantic. It may perhaps prove of interest, in that connection, to see how much he has cost us. In the first place, he drew from the coffers of this country

\$10,000 a year, and in addition to that, a bonus of two thousand dollars a year. Last year the contingencies of the office amounted to \$8,687.72, and he had full control over all those expenses. We paid for two first class clerks, \$3,500 ; for a second class clerk, \$1,100 ; for two third class clerks, \$1,250 ; and, in addition to that, \$1,000 for messengers, or a total of \$28,887.72 for the fiscal year. An hon. friend makes a remark to the effect that the hon. gentleman is going now to cost the country much more than he did heretofore. I beg to dissent from his view in that respect, for I am of opinion that he will not be very long in power. In 1889, the hon. gentleman drew from the public coffers \$33,789.90 ; in 1890, \$31,434.17 ; in 1891, \$42,044.83 ; in 1892, \$28,872.42 ; in 1893, \$29,388.56, and in 1894, \$28,887.72, or a total for six years, of \$194,357.90. So, I was warranted in saying that it was a capital idea to have recalled the hon. gentleman, as he may possibly henceforth cost less to the country, the more so as I am under the impression that he cannot very long keep afloat the Conservative party, which is already touching bottom. That the hon. gentleman's arrival was surrounded with mystery, Sir, it is still within the recollection of this House. We were told by his friends that as a matter of form he was sent for by the Premier to discuss the East Atlantic Service, the Pacific Cable, and other schemes of a similar nature ; that is why, we are told, it was deemed necessary to send for the hon. gentleman to come over to Canada. Now, Sir, I have very good grounds for the opinion that the hon. gentlemen did not tell us the truth, when they said that Sir Charles Tupper had come over here on such an errand. No, Sir, it was not on diplomatic grounds that he was sent for, but he came over here at the request of the bolters, of the traitors, as the Premier called his colleagues. He came over to Canada for the purpose of taking a hand into a conspiracy, the upshot of which was to make him the leader of the Government. I must confess, Sir, that I am no great admirer of the Prime Minister ; and although, on the main, in his official capacity, I have nothing but praises to bestow, still, it is the political man and his party we are called upon here to judge. The hon. Premier and his party will soon step down from power, and the sooner the better for the country in general. Now, Sir, if I recite these facts, it is simply to show that our Ministers are not truthful, or that they tell the truth only in as much as it suits them to speak it. In spite of all his loud-mouthed professions, I say that the hon. Premier will be unable to ward off the storm which is going to sweep him and his party from power at the next elections, for public opinion gives no uncertain sound on the matter. As to the main object of the hon. Secretary of State in returning to Canada, there is no room for doubt. Some of the

Premier's colleagues wanted to throw him overboard in view of the impending elections, and the hon. gentleman was sent for to take the leadership of the party, as I am going to show. When the Cape Breton election was over, the Secretary of State stopped at Halifax, where he was tendered a banquet by his political friends. The president of the banquet was a member of this House, the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Stairs), who, when eulogizing the member elect, stated that Sir Charles Tupper was not only a member of the Government, but he further hailed him as the leader of the Conservative party. On reaching the city of Montreal, the same incident occurred, when Senator Drummond, the president of the banquet, announced in a formal manner that the Secretary of State was the leader of the Conservative party, and that to his keeping was to be intrusted the future of that party. And within a few days from that date, did we not hear the son of the Secretary of State, on coming out of Rideau Hall, after a banquet, exclaim, as reported by the newspapers :

My father did not come over here simply to be a Cabinet Minister, but to be leader, and he will be at once.

Should those facts prove correct, I am perfectly warranted in the conclusion that Sir Charles Tupper, when coming over here, and intriguing with some of his colleagues, stated that he was merely here on official business, he deceived the country ; for, the plot had been hatched before he came over to this country, and he was brought over here to supplant the Prime Minister. Now, I shall pass on to another question, which was discussed at great length by all the hon. members who have taken part in the debate. Some hon. gentlemen opposite have endeavoured to show that the country had enjoyed great prosperity under the National Policy. But I think it has been conclusively demonstrated, in my opinion, that far from deriving from the National Policy the benefits which its framers so loudly proclaimed at the outset, the country has been less and less prosperous under it, and that the promises made to the people were falsified in every respect. I have already had the opportunity of stating my views on that subject. I think protection may be useful and even sometimes necessary, to foster new-born industries in a country, just as you help a child's first tottering steps, so it may be necessary to lend a helping hand to infant industries which are being introduced into a country. But time and again have I protested, and still do I protest, against the protective system now in force. Under fallacious pretenses, this system is made use of to favour a small class of our population, to the detriment of the masses. From the last census the capital invested in the manufacturing industries of the country amounted to \$354,620,750 ; and the value of the products, to \$476,258,886. As the

cost of the raw material was \$256,119,042, and that of labour, \$100,663,650, if you add up both sums, you have a total of \$356,782,692, and by deducting the latter sum from the total value of the manufacturing products, it will be seen that the manufacturers of the country have realized, in one single year, the sum of \$119,476,194, or about 33 per cent of profits on the invested capital. I gather, moreover, from the census that 367,000 workmen have found employment in the industrial establishments of the country; now, from the figures I have just quoted, it would appear that the manufacturers realized a profit of \$273 on each workman. Now, when the agricultural classes, when the labouring classes, feel the pinch of want, if not of actual destitution, is it fair to maintain any longer a system which operates in the interest of the few, to the detriment of the people in general? And I may have asked the hon. gentleman who knows something about agriculture whether, under the best and most favourable circumstances it gives a yearly return of more than 4 or 5 per cent on the invested capital? I unhesitatingly declare, speaking from my own experience, as an agriculturist, that in ninety cases out of a hundred, it does not pay over 3 per cent. Being an agriculturist, by profession, I may claim to be pretty fairly posted up about the actual position of the farming community, the yield of the lands, as also about the depressed condition of the farmers in the country. Therefore, I say it is unfair, nay, it is legalized robbery to maintain a protective system which favours only those who least than any feel the need of protection. But in order the better to size up the true state of affairs, and the actual results of the National Policy among the farming classes, let me quote the returns of the last census in connection with the movement of our population. From these official data, it will be seen that in the province of Ontario, out of 92 counties, 38 have lost in population; in the province of Quebec, out of 65 counties, 28 show a decrease. In New Brunswick, out of 15 counties, 8 have lost in population; in Nova Scotia, 8 counties, out of 19, show a decrease, while Prince Edward Island, with 3 counties, shows a decrease in 1 county. These are not evidences of returning prosperity, because the prosperity of a country is gauged by the increase of its population. Whenever a locality is progressing, it is evident by the increase of its population, and the same criterion applies to the country in general. Where, then, from the official returns of 1891, it is shown that our rural communities have lost in population, this is incontrovertible evidence of a want of prosperity, brought about by a vicious fiscal policy. During the late elections, we, on this side of the House, Sir, have had to do battle for the cause we believe sound, and every time

Mr. LEGRIS.

I had occasion to be present, I heard the Conservative candidates and their friends loudly proclaim that they were in favour of tariff reform. They also advocated a tariff which would help us to gain free access to the markets of the United States. But, granting they were in earnest, I say they will be powerless to prevail upon the Government to grant to the agricultural classes what they themselves believe to be in the interest of agriculture. The Government, Sir, well understood the necessity of reforming their tariff policy, as was evidenced by their efforts to lop off the mouldering branches, two years ago. We have all been witnesses to the attempts then made by the Government in this House at tariff revision. It is within the recollection of this House that the Finance Minister brought down a new tariff which introduced a number of important changes, and that the lobbies of the House were filled with delegations of influential manufacturers from every section of the country, who came down here to watch over their own interests. I do not find fault with them for that, as they are business men and bound to take that course. Still, the members of this House who represent the rural constituencies of the country should have helped us to prevail upon the Government to maintain the proposed changes in the tariff. I just stated, a little while ago, what to me seems to be a fair and rational proposition, when advocating protection to a certain extent in favour of new-born industries. But it is quite the reverse that now takes place. To begin with the sugar industry, we are all aware of the fact that the millionaires who monopolize it, were enabled, under the existing tariff, to realize profits amounting to hundreds of thousands of dollars yearly, and even of one million dollars, over and above the reasonable profits they could realize, were not the protective policy in force. When we see long established industries, as perfectly equipped as the sugar refinery industry is, enjoying as it does as good a position as it can possibly command, in any country, owing to the best facilities afforded by railway and water communications, when we see, I say, such industries in the hand of millionaires who have built fortunes for themselves out of the profits realized therein, I ask, Mr. Speaker, whether it would be unfair to readjust the tariff in connection with that industry from a revenue standpoint, as laid down in the platform of the Liberal convention? I come now to another industry, the flour industry. As everybody in this House knows, there is a duty of seventy-five cents a barrel on flour. Do flour-mills still require protection? Were they not extant, previous to the inauguration of the National Policy? We are in a position to compete successfully in that line on the markets of the United States and of the world. We have great transportation facilities, we have cheaper

labour here than they have in the United States, and the difference in the price of labour could secure sufficient protection to the millers and sugar refiners of the country. They no longer need protection, nor any special favours at the hands of the Government. The Government, in maintaining those duties, merely wish to favour their friends, and speaking for myself, I may say that I could never help thinking that these were so many favours bestowed on political friends and handsomely redeemed by the latter at election times. And when the hon. the Secretary of State told us that \$25,000 were spent in the Cape Breton election, that was probably the basis of his opinion as to the amount expended by his party. Enough has transpired within the last few years to give us an insight into the enormous sums that have come out of the pockets of the people, under the cover of protection. The hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson), a Conservative, told the House the other day that the National Policy had raised the price of wheat in the province of Ontario. I never entertained the least doubt about this fact, and I have over and again openly stated my views in that respect before the electors of the province of Quebec. I have always maintained that protection had for effect to raise the price of the articles on which duties were placed, and should the hon. member for Megantic rise again in his seat and tell the House that he is selling groceries cheaper this year than he used to sell them before the protective policy was inaugurated, he will delude no man of sound sense to believe that protection does not result in enhancing the price of the articles on which duties are imposed, and no business man will accept his statement. The protective system cannot make a nation prosperous in general, but I contend that it tends to raise the value of nearly all the articles upon which duties are imposed. Now, I say that when you place a tax of 64 cents per hundred pounds of refined sugar, the refiners are not so stupid as not to avail themselves of that duty, and know very well how to pocket 55 or 60 cents more on their sugar. Those gentlemen, the sugar refiners, have enjoyed long enough this privilege, and we want to relieve the people of this tax. We want the tariff to be so adjusted as to benefit the public treasury instead of protecting the monopolists in the country. As I said previously, I am of opinion that a protective tariff may sometimes be useful, in order to foster and prop up new born industries. I am sure the hon. member for Montcalm (Mr. Dugas) coincides with the view I have expressed, so far as the tobacco-growing industry is concerned. I am aware that the hon. gentleman on several occasions, has advocated that view on the floor

of this House, in the interests of his constituents and that he has, as well as several other gentlemen, advocated some measure of protection, in order to encourage the growing of leaf tobacco, and to induce the agriculturists of the country to engage in that kind of industry which, through protection, would become more paying. The hon. gentleman is quite aware of it, but the Government do not see what benefit they could derive from protecting in that way the farming classes, and the hon. member for Montcalm and the other members who support his views are still waiting for what, in their opinion, and rightly so, I believe, would tend to protect the farming interests, not only in his constituency, but throughout the country. Tobacco holds to-day a considerable place from a commercial standpoint, and the Government, while allowing foreign leaf tobacco to enter this country duty free, interferes with the growing of our native crops; whereas, should an import duty be placed on foreign leaf tobacco, as it has already been suggested, such action would result in checking the importation of the foreign article and fostering the cultivation of the Canadian tobacco, through the inducement offered to our manufacturers to use the native leaf, thus opening a market to our tobacco growers. That would, of course, result in further developing our native industry, and the growing of tobacco which is a comparatively easy industry. This is an infant industry to which might judiciously be applied the protective system. But I regret, with my hon. friend, that the Government so far turned a deaf ear to the voice coming from the rural districts, asking for a small measure of protection in favour of our domestic grower and of our native industry. In 1878, the hon. Secretary of State, addressing this House, spoke as follows:—

The hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) ought to know that, if governments are good for anything, they are good to increase the prosperity of a country by Acts of Parliament, or to meet difficulties in which a country is placed from time to time, and which require legislative interference.

Now, have the Conservatives increased the prosperity of the country through their policy? I have shown, on the contrary, on pretty good grounds, that the country to-day is in a more critical condition than it was a few years ago. Then, the hon. gentleman goes on to say:

We say, moreover, that you may thus not only give them the means of paying the taxation, but you may bring people into the country to assist in paying, and retain those who would otherwise be driven out of it.

Let us see whether that prophecy has been fulfilled. According to the census our population has increased in the following ratio:

	Increase.	Per cent.
1871-1881..Nova Scotia	52,772	13
1881-1891.. do	9,951	2¼
1871-1881..New Brunswick	35,639	12½
1881-1891.. do	61	..
1871-1881..Prince Edward Island	14,870	17
1881-1891.. do do ..	197	0.18
1871-1881..Quebec	167,511	14
1881-1891.. do	129,559	9½
1871-1881..Ontario	306,067	19
1881-1891.. do	186,067	9½
1871-1881..The five provinces..	638,214	17½
1881-1891.. do ..	504,601	11¾

We all know, Sir, that the last decade was noted for the enormous expenditure of millions of dollars which have flowed out of the public treasury for the construction of considerable works undertaken by the Government. Such was also the case with our provincial governments. Our municipal governments have also incurred a considerable expenditure. If, therefore, we find, in 1891, that the country, although favoured with this enormous expenditure of public moneys, has not progressed as rapidly as it had during the previous decade, it may reasonably be inferred that there is something rotten in the actual system. True, the province of Manitoba and the North-west Territories have somewhat progressed, though that progress has fallen far below our expectations and the promises made by the Ministers of the day. It is on record that Sir John Macdonald repeatedly declared that in 1891, the population of Manitoba would number one million inhabitants at least. It is also on record that Sir Leonard Tilley boasted that enough money would be realized out of the sale of our public lands in Manitoba and the North-west Territories to reduce the public debt by one hundred millions of dollars in 1891. It is also on record that Sir Charles Tupper reckoned on a yearly yield of one hundred millions of bushels of wheat, in Manitoba and the North-west Territories. Now, what is the result, up to date? The population, far from being 1,000,000, only numbers 346,391 inhabitants. Our public debt, far from being reduced, as promised, shows an enormous increase, and the sale of public lands scarcely meets the expenditure incurred, while the yield of 100,000,000 bushels of promise, boasted of by Sir Charles Tupper, scarcely amounts to 18,000,000 bushels. Such are the results of this policy of deception, and it is but right that the facts should be put on record, and that the people should know whether they are warranted in reposing, in the future, any confidence in the men whose promises have been so egregiously falsified in the past. In 1878, Sir John Macdonald, referring to the National Policy, in this House, spoke as follows:

That such a policy will retain in Canada thousands of our fellow countrymen now obliged to expatriate themselves in search of the employment denied them at home.

Mr. LEGRIS.

And Sir Charles Tupper, addressing this House in the same year, spoke as follows:—

The policy the Government has pursued has had the effect of depopulating the country. It has sent away the most skilled and intelligent labour, the finest sons of Canada, to a foreign country to obtain employment their own country denies them.

These comments were levelled at the Government of the day, when these gentlemen, of course, tried to point out that the Liberal party had not managed the affairs of the country with intelligence, but that they, if returned to power, would bring back the golden age, stop the exodus, reduce the public debt, and make of Canada a land of plenty. We find to-day, Sir, that all these promises have been falsified and that never have the agricultural classes been less prosperous than they are now. The people of this country want a change of policy and other men, honest men, who understand better the requirements of the country. You remember, Sir, that the Liberal party, in June, 1893, met in convention in this city, and agreed upon a policy which was endorsed without a dissentient voice by the Liberals of Canada, through their representatives at that convention. These resolutions read as follows:

We, the Liberal party of Canada, in convention assembled, declare:—

That the customs tariff of the Dominion should be based, not as it is now upon the protective principle, but upon the requirements of the public service;

That the existing tariff, founded upon an unsound principle, and used, as it has been by the Government, as a corrupting agency wherewith to keep themselves in office, has developed monopolies, trusts and combinations;

It has decreased the value of farm and other landed property;

It has oppressed the masses to the enrichment of a few;

It has checked immigration;

It has caused great loss of population;

It has impeded commerce;

It has discriminated against Great Britain.

In these and many other ways it has occasioned great public and private injury, all of which evils must continue to grow in intensity as long as the present tariff system remains in force.

That the highest interests of Canada demand a removal of this obstacle to our country's progress, by the adoption of a sound fiscal policy, which, while not doing injustice to any class, will promote domestic and foreign trade, and hasten the return of prosperity to our people;

That to that end, the tariff should be reduced to the needs of honest, economical and efficient government;

That it should be so adjusted as to make free, as to bear as lightly as possible upon, the necessities of life, and should be so arranged as to promote freer trade with the whole world, more particularly with Great Britain and the United States.

We believe that the results of the protective system have grievously disappointed thousands of persons who honestly supported it, and that the country, in the light of experience, is now prepared to declare for a sound fiscal policy.

The issue between the two political parties on this question is now clearly defined.

The Government themselves admit the failure of their fiscal policy, and now profess their willingness to make such changes; but they say that such changes must be based only on the principle of protection.

Could, Sir, a more appropriate, a fairer policy be formulated than the one I have just partly quoted? It is laid down in that programme that we want to readjust the tariff so as to promote free trade with the whole world, more particularly with Great Britain and the United States. Were Great Britain to close the doors of her markets to our dairy products, under some pretense, as was the case with the export of our live cattle, it is easy to conjecture what crisis this state of things would bring about, and the depressed condition our farming interests throughout the country would pass through. The English market is our natural market and to secure, in the future, this market, which has proved so beneficial to our farming interests, should be the aim of a wise and sound policy. The Liberal party, in their convention of 1893, advocated any measure in that direction, and those also were the views expressed by the motion brought down by the hon. member for Queen's P.E.I. (Mr. Davies). As to our trade with the United States, although it is not quite so large as that we are carrying on with Great Britain, still it may be said that it is of very great importance to us. From the tables included in the Trade and Navigation returns for 1895, I gather that while we have exported to England \$61,856,990 worth of goods, our exports to the United States amounted to \$41,297,676; that we imported from England \$31,131,737 worth of goods, and from the United States \$54,634,521 worth of goods, from which it is easy to size up the value of our trade with both countries. Our trade with Great Britain, amounted to \$92,988,727 worth of exports and imports; and as to our trade with the United States, in spite of all the difficulties and restrictions which have been placed in the way of trade between the two countries—and I say so unhesitatingly—difficulties which have been largely thrown in our way by the fiscal policy of our Government—in spite of all the barriers which block the way to our products, our trade with the United States has reached a total of \$95,932,197. The province of Quebec exported to Great Britain \$38,401,518 worth of products, and imported from the same country \$13,882,688 worth of goods. The same province exported actually to the United States \$9,279,156 worth. They imported actually \$19,430,150. According to the official returns, the total trade of Quebec with Great Britain amounted to \$52,284,206, and with the United States, to \$28,700,306. Our trade with the United States is quite important and we are perfectly aware that the United

States is a first class market, where we can find an outlet for many products which we cannot export to Great Britain. Could such a desirable state of things be brought about, could we secure freer trade with the United States, even somewhat to the detriment of our trade with Great Britain and of certain industrial classes, I have no hesitation in saying that our country would be enormously benefited by it. When distress prevails among agricultural classes, then the business men we meet in cities tell us that money is scarce and trade paralyzed. Is it not a fact that the leading merchants in our cities, before giving large orders, ascertain first whether prosperity prevails among the farming community. Merchants draw their information from the country, and they rely mostly upon the farmers. Before giving their orders, they first consult the requirements of the farming community and they take no important steps in their line of trade, which is not grounded on their forecast as to the purchasing power of the farming community. So with the manufacturers, and I find only one case where a different state of things prevails. I mean the present Government. The poorer the Government are, the more expenses they incur, and the larger are the deficits, as I soon shall prove. Our friends, the Conservatives, have one standard argument to oppose us, when told that far from there being prosperity, distress is prevailing in every section of the country. The argument I have met with on several hustings is to the effect that the savings banks overflow with money, and there is not a single member on the other side who does not believe he has gained his point when advancing that argument. Let me quote the very words uttered by the hon. Minister of Railways (Mr. Haggart), in the House of Commons, in 1878, in answer to Mr. Oliver:

The hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) had alluded to the large amount of money in the banks as proof that the country was now prosperous; but on the contrary, this was always evidence of depression in commerce and in manufactures. When commerce was active and manufactures were flourishing, people did not deposit their money in the banks, but instead, invested it in the manufactures.

Gentleman of the Conservative party, such is the answer given by one of your leaders, by one of the Ministers, to the standard argument resorted to by all the stump speakers of the party. When the country is prosperous, people do not deposit their money in the banks. There are quite a number of industries in the country which are in jeopardy, through the want of capital invested in them. The hon. gentlemen like to boast of the immense mineral wealth of the country; they talk of the immense territory not yet opened up to settlement; and where there is plenty room for all kinds of enter-

prises. But, Sir, if fear did not prevail through the country, if confidence in the future existed, the millions deposited in the chartered banks, to quote the words of the Hon. Mr. Haggart in 1878, would be invested in the manufactures, and in commercial enterprises. Conservatives often tell us that they do not understand our policy, and what we mean by tariff reform or revenue tariff. Well, Sir, I am going to answer them in the very words of one of the leaders of the hon. gentlemen opposite, one who enjoyed the greatest authority and prestige in the party, Sir John Macdonald himself. In connection with this very plank of our policy which they pretend not to understand, listen to what Sir John Macdonald said, in addressing the House, on the 7th March, 1878 :

The hon. the First Minister very truly said, some years ago, that they, the then Opposition, were not called upon to find a policy for the country ; that the responsibility of finding such a policy rested with the Ministry of the day ; and that the constitutional duty of Her Majesty's Opposition, the constitutional duty that was thrown upon them was to criticize the administration and legislation of the Government, to hold them in check, to warn them when they were going wrong, to censure them when they had gone wrong, and generally criticize and observe upon the course of administration and legislation. If the Opposition chose to take a further step, they might do, certainly, but it is not forced upon them, and it is not forced upon them in reference to any subject. It is not forced upon the Opposition to find a new policy with regard to matters of revenue, and tariff and expenditure ; they could not, of course, because they have not the power to do so.

As far as matters of tariff are concerned, it is impossible for the Opposition to enter into details or explain before the House and the country their policy ; they have not the material ; the Government alone have the opportunity, and the only opportunity, of collecting the facts upon which a tariff can be formed.

This language is clear and explicit enough to warrant me in saying that those who, through party interest, pretend not to understand the Liberal policy on that vital tariff question, must admit that Sir John Macdonald has amply answered for us. I have already shown, on the very authority of the hon. gentlemen who sit on the Treasury benches, that their previsions and statements when in opposition all tended to point out to an era of returning prosperity, should they come into power. Allow me to show you, Sir, to what extent they have redeemed their pledges. The data I am going to quote are taken from the report of the Department of Agriculture, and shows the expenditure incurred for immigration purposes, and also the number of immigrants landed in this country, since 1882 :

Mr. LEGRIS.

Year.	Expenditure on Immigration.	Number of Immigrants landed in this Country.
1882	\$215,329 24	112,458
1883	373,957 71	133,624
1884	511,608 83	103,824
1885	423,860 90	79,169
1886	257,384 93	69,152
1887	341,236 39	84,526
1888	244,789 09	88,766
1889	202,499 26	91,600
1890	110,091 96	75,067
1891	181,045 28	82,165.

In 1892, we made an expenditure of \$177,604.82. Here I may remark that the system has been altered. The report of the Minister of Agriculture no longer mentions the number of immigrants landed in Canada, that branch having been transferred to another department ; and I must confess that the report is so mixed up that I could not unravel it ; so I shall content myself with giving approximate figures. In 1883, our expenditure for that purpose amounted to \$180,677.43 ; in 1894, to \$202,232.52 ; in 1895, to \$195,688.97. For the last four years, the approximate number of immigrants landed in Canada was 150,000. The sum total of immigrants, above mentioned, amounts to 1,070,351. According to a calculation based on the natural increase of our population, and which I deem pretty accurate, we should add to the number of immigrants, eight hundred thousand inhabitants. On adding up the number of immigrants to the natural increase of our population, that gives a total of 1,870,350 inhabitants. If you add up that number to that of our population in 1881, that should give a total of 6,924,810 inhabitants, while, according to the census returns, and by adding up an increase in the same ratio for the preceding years, we have a population amounting but to 5,337,189. We have therefore lost the considerable number of 787,971. For a country like ours, where there is room for a hundred million people at least, that is a most deplorable state of things. Such a state of affairs is evidence that there is something wrong somewhere. I have already had the opportunity of protesting against the expenditure incurred for immigration purposes, a policy, which, to my mind, far from favouring our interests, is directly opposed to it. The Government have expended large sums of money to assist the passage of new-comers, having an imperfect knowledge of our manners and laws, often picked up the lower strata of European towns, while we have allowed the exodus to take away our farmers, the

backbone of the country, to the United States. I challenge the Government, I challenge any member of this House to point out a single fact, a single act that has been done, in order to prevent our fellow-citizens from migrating to the United States. What inducement has been given them to go and take up lands in Manitoba and the North-west Territories? Has any movement been set on foot to send settlers to the North-west either from the province of Quebec or from any other province, at a time when our young men go and work in American manufactures? Have any means been devised to stop the exodus and keep our fellow-countrymen in Canada? Have any inducements been offered them, such as those offered the pauper immigrants picked up in the streets of the great European capitals? Have any of those inducements been offered those of our farmers who were forced to leave the country and go to the United States? Has any attempt been made to settle them in the immense prairies of the North-west? No, Sir, while our compatriots were allowed to leave the country, we had an army of salaried officials charged with recruiting immigrants, to take the place of our own compatriots. So, the immigrants recruited abroad by our agents slipped through our fingers, and we lost at the same time a considerable number of our citizens. How is it, Sir, that we did not yet stop that stream of immigration? In this connection, it may not be out of place to recall what the hon. gentlemen said on the subject in 1878, and particularly the truly sensible language fallen from the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals in 1878. How is it that the hon. gentleman who has occupied a seat on the Treasury benches for so many years has never tried to prevail upon his colleagues to give up that foolish immigration policy; a policy which has cost the country millions of dollars, sums amounting, from 1881 to 1895, to \$4,617,590.23, for the purpose of enticing here strangers, while the Government allowed the country to be slowly bled to death by the loss of so many of our compatriots who kept swelling the ever-growing stream of the exodus. The Hon. Mr. Haggart, on the 1st of March, 1878, addressing the House of Commons, spoke as follows:—

The Government ought to abandon their immigration policy of spending large sums of money—about \$200,000 annually—in inducing a class of immigrants to come to this country, such as had no comparison to the class we were losing every day. Their efforts should tend to the directing of our young men to that region; and the money that was spent on Mennonites and Icelanders could be more profitably employed in assisting them to that country. They could not understand why foreigners had money advanced to them to pay their passage, were looked after and directed the whole way, while there was not even an arrangement made by which they might be in any way assisted to the same destination.

He hoped to see the sum heretofore voted for that purpose dropped from the Estimates.

The hon. Minister, when in the ranks of the Opposition, gave expression to his hope to see that item dropped from the Budget. How is it, then, I ask the hon. gentleman, through you, Mr. Speaker, that he has not yet succeeded in prevailing upon his colleagues, now he is a Minister, to cut off that expenditure? Why did he not speak to them the very same language he used, when in the Opposition? The views expressed by the hon. Minister and the truly sensible remarks uttered by him at that time ought to furnish ample food for thought to those who are aware of the extravagant expenditure incurred by the Government under the pretense or for the purpose of directing immigrants towards Manitoba and the North-west Territories. All fair minded men will admit that the Minister then spoke the language of common sense. And when we arraign the Government for the policy they have been pursuing up to this day, we are warranted in taking such a course, owing to the fact that the policy is now applied on a much larger scale. In view of the increasing expenditure in the other departments of the civil service the Government ought to drop entirely the sums wasted on immigration. I come now to another question, which is not without its importance. I want to point out to the House in what proportion the Government have let the expenses increase in the different public departments.

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

After Recess.

Mr. LEGRIS. (Translation.) When you left the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I was about showing the House that the Government have increased the expenditure in the various public services in a way not at all consonant with the progress made by the country in various respects, and especially in reference to population. In 1878, Canada had a population of 4,133,347 souls, in 1895, having regard to the proportional increase according to the results stated by the census, the population should have numbered 5,377,189 souls, which is an increase, from 1878 to 1895, of 24 per cent. The following table shows in what proportion the various public services were increased from 1878 to 1895:

	Cost.	Increase.
	\$	Per cent.
Civil government in 1878..	\$23,370	
do 1895..	1,422,000	72
Legislation in 1878.....	618,035	
do 1895.....	941,570	52
Mounted Police in 1878....	325,000	
do 1895....	646,000	92

	Cost.	Increase.
	\$	Per cent.
Indian Affairs in 1878.....	421,000	
do 1895.....	955,000	126
Superannuations in 1878.....	106,000	
do 1895.....	265,000	149
Militia in 1878.....	615,000	
do 1895.....	1,574,000	154
Net debt in 1878.....	140,362,069	
do 1895.....	253,064,927	82
Gross debt in 1878.....	174,957,268	
do 1895.....	318,048,754	82
Interest in 1878.....	7,048,883	
do 1895.....	10,466,000	48

The total increase is over 100 per cent.
Population only increased 24 per cent.

Now, according to these figures, we may estimate the net debt per capita, in 1895, at the sum of \$47.06, and the gross debt at \$59.11 per head of the population, men, women and children included. Now, if we take a family of ten, which is not an uncommon thing among our country folks, we find that such a family is indebted, thanks to this Government, in the sum of \$591. Politicians meet this with the statement that this debt will never be paid. It is quite possible, but, nevertheless, there is one thing sure, and that is that the people of this country are most positively and certainly burdened by the interest on this debt. The expenditure in 1895 amounted to the enormous sum of \$38,132,005, which lays on our population an expenditure of \$7.09 per head. Now, with the system now in force, with the men who are governing us, can we have any hope to see a little more wisdom prevail in the management of the business of this country? I do not believe it. It would be unreasonable to believe it, and there is positively nothing upon which we might ground an opinion likely to give us any hope that the general management of the affairs of this country would be better carried on in the future. If we wish for a change, if we are anxious to have more wisdom in the management of our affairs, we must change the men who form part of the present Government and replace them by able men. We have had for a long while the opportunity to show this House and the country that the hon. gentlemen opposite are unable to withstand the pressure brought to bear upon them by their friends, and we know that the nearer the elections, the stronger is the pressure. It is therefore impossible to believe that they would withstand this pressure and prove wiser in the future. Moreover, we have constant evidences of the contrary. A simple glance thrown at the reports published in the "Canada Gazette" shows that the expenditure and the public debt of the country are steadily increasing. The January issue of the "Canada Gazette" gave \$321,898,871.90 as the debt of the country. It is a large increase over the official statement of the year ended on the 30th June,

Mr. LEGRIS.

1895. At the rate the gentlemen opposite have been going, the ordinary expenditure since 1879 has increased annually by the enormous sum, I might say, of \$860,520 per annum, and if we only take last year, it is easy to find that during the year 1894, the expenditure has exceeded that of 1893 by the sum of \$770,962.62. This year, 1895, it exceeded that of 1894 by the sum of \$546,975.53. At that rate, it is difficult to foretell when we are going to stop. The hon. gentlemen opposite have shown an extraordinary propensity to push on the Government into that direction, and if we look at the Budget we are called upon by the Government to vote, it is easy to find the same tendency, the same course, the same progression in the increase of the ordinary expenditure. This increase which forms a large sum, is composed of expenses that might be controlled by the Administration. For instance, we find that in the interest on the public debt, there is an increase of \$250,983.60. It is plain that this item cannot be controlled. But it is the result of the Government's extravagancy. As long as the credit of a man is good, he may borrow; but he must not forget that at the end of each year, he will have to pay the interest, if he cannot repay the capital. The Government are just in the same position. The loans they are steadily raising without any reason and without increasing their prosperity are the cause that the amount referred to with the interests bear more heavily upon the people. A closer consideration of the Budget which the Government are about asking this House to vote this year shows a large increase in money items. Thus, in the civil government, there is an increase of \$9,000 over last year. The administration of justice will cost us, this year, \$3,765 more. The penitentiaries, \$11,539.70. I do not know whether the Government intend to continue to send to the penitentiary the people whom they should send to the gallows, and at the same time to treat them like lordlings. But I wonder why the Government should not be able to meet the expenditure on account of the penitentiaries with the same sum as that appropriated for that service last year. The superannuations show this year the large increase of \$37,000. I will have later on an opportunity to make a more extended reference to this. As regards the militia, they are striking deadly hard. The increase this year will be \$372,716. Are we to understand that the Government intend promoting militarism here as they do in European countries? Are we to understand that the Government hope, with such an increased expenditure, to make the militia more efficient without, however, taking the means to improve the officers and the leading people themselves? For it is to the knowledge of the country that the militia officers are not equal to their position. And how could it be otherwise when, for several

years past, the Ministers at the head of this department are only transitory in the department? How can we expect that these Ministers could force the reforms required and likely to make the militia efficient? After all, in this part of America, what is there to threaten us to such an extent as to induce the Government to impose upon the people such heavy charges for the militia? It seems to me it is better to take peaceful means and continue to live in favour with our neighbours. It is better to manage the public affairs with more wisdom than was shown prior to 1885, so as to avoid having recourse to arms to put down a revolt in the country. The Department of Railways and Canals will cost us, this year, \$80,540 more than last year; the Public Works, \$247,270; the lighthouses and coast service, \$23,640; the inspection of steamboats, \$1,300; the fisheries, \$7,600; the Geological Commission, \$22,000; the Indians, \$80,263.52; the Mounted Police, \$30,000; and under the item "Miscellaneous," \$4,389.11; the Customs, \$25,095. It seems to me it would have been an easy matter to make a decrease in this department as, for several years past, it is to the knowledge of any one that the position of Collector of Customs, in Montreal, was vacant. However, no one ever heard that the service had suffered by it. It proves that it would be an easy matter to curtail the expenditure since, the chief officer being away, the collection of customs was made in a satisfactory way for the Government and the public. The inspection of weights and measures and electricity will cost us \$1,150 more this year. For the Public Works there is an increase of \$4,750; and the Post Office will cost us the trifling additional amount of \$240,780.

Mr. SPEAKER. I would remind the hon. member (Mr. Legris) that he is not in order in discussing the Estimates, item by item, on a motion to go into Supply. I speak with a great deal of hesitation as I am not familiar with the French language, but I understood the hon. member to be referring to different items in the Estimates.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman did so, but I do not think he specially referred to them with a view of discussing them. He is merely showing the increased expenditures this year, as compared with last year.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I might observe that the hon. the Minister of Finance himself went over a great many of the items of the Estimates in his Budget speech, in comparing the expenditure for this year with the expenditure for last year.

Mr. FOSTER. At least the hon. gentlemen opposite ought to be courteous enough, if they will not allow us to discuss the Estimates in the Committee of the Whole, not to discuss them themselves.

Mr. LEGRIS. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I am the first to bow to your ruling, but I think your interference now is due to the fact that you have not quite understood the point I was making. I am discussing no item of the Estimates; I merely refer to the items as to which the Government are asking us an increased expenditure, in order to point them out to the attention of this House. It seems to me that after the deficit we have had last year, the Minister of Finance should have been wise enough not to increase the ordinary expenditures, as is shown by the Estimates brought down. According to the figures I have given, we come to the conclusion that the Government had a deficit for the year 1894 amounting to \$1,210,332. He reached the end of 1895 with another enormous deficit of \$4,153,875. At the end of 1896, according to the present prospects, he will have another large deficit. I have listened very closely to the hon. the Minister of Finance and I easily understood that he merely grounded his calculations upon the hope that the receipts will be larger. But we must bear in mind that we are on the eve of a general election and politicians know that there is no popularity to be won by a Government going before the country with such a deplorable financial position as the one we are in now. This is why the hon. the Minister of Finance made a great effort to have it believed that he is hopeful. He has heaped large deficits from year to year, which would not have been the case had the Government acted with good judgment and looked at the position from the standpoint of the interests of the country. Having regard to that and for one conversant with the ability of the Minister of Finance in handling figures, it is easy to understand that the year 1896, according to his own anticipations, will balance by a deficit, and a rather large one at that. This is certainly no bright position for the Government nor a very encouraging one for the country. And, in order to show that the position in which the Government now stands requires a prompt remedy, I will quote what the hon. Secretary of State himself (Sir Charles Tupper) said in 1878. We find the following statement which I am going to read, at page 448 of "Hansard" for that year:

But I want now to invite the hon. gentleman's attention to what he has just said. What does he tell the House? He tells the House now that he does not propose any additional taxation; that he proposes to submit no measure by which this great calamity, this great disaster, this ruin to the credit of Canada, shall be averted, although he shows that on the 10th of this month he has a deficit of \$617,610.

Such were the words uttered in 1878 by the man whom the hon. gentlemen opposite have called from London to try and bring back the stray sheep to the fold, the man who has come from London under the pretext of

a diplomatic mission, the light which has crossed the ocean at their request to lead the Conservative party to a new victory. He considered as a great calamity, as a great disaster, as a ruin to the credit of Canada, the fact that the Government, in 1878, had a deficit of \$617,000, and now these hon. gentlemen strut on the Treasury benches and are pleased with their good management when they have a deficit of four million dollars and over in a single year. I say, Mr. Speaker, it is an alarming position for the country, when it is considered to what extent we have gone in the matter of taxation. During that time, while the Government reach the end of each year with a deficit more or less large and ranging in the millions, has the public debt remained stationary? No, Sir, since in 1893 it has increased by \$549,605.17, in 1894, it has increased by \$4,501,989.87, in 1895, it has increased by \$6,895,897.61. Is that not a nice balance-sheet, and what will the hon. Secretary of State now say? Will he remember his big words of former years? Will he say that it is a great calamity, a disaster, a ruin to the credit of Canada? I now wish, Mr. Speaker, to call your attention to another point. The hon. members will remember quite well, that the Government imagined and put under consideration a few years ago, the project of a line of fast steamers between Canada and Great Britain. To promote the enterprise, we all know that a large bonus was granted to any company that would carry it out. Now, the scheme has not yet materialized. If it was necessary, we could accept it, for, when a thing is necessary, one may make sacrifices to secure or realize it. But, if we look at the Trade and Navigation Returns, we find that, in the year just ended, 1895, 10,335 loaded vessels and 3,383 unloaded vessels, that is, under ballast, entered into the ports of the Dominion. The arrivals at Halifax were 901 loaded ocean steamers and 29 under ballast; at Quebec, 229 loaded vessels and 115 under ballast; at Montreal, 296 loaded vessels and 41 under ballast. 1,164 loaded vessels and 12 under ballast cleared from Halifax; 251 loaded vessels and 3 under ballast from Quebec; 381 loaded vessels and 5 under ballast from Montreal. Why should they attempt to establish by dint of money a new line of fast ocean steamers if not for the sole purpose of allowing a few people to receive the bonus which the Government are willing to grant, which is set at \$750,000 per annum during five years, and \$500,000 during the next five years, making the trifling sum, should the scheme succeed, of \$6,250,000 which the people will have to pay for that wild scheme. The wants of the country do not require such a service. Do they think they can establish between Canada and Liverpool a line of fast steamers likely to compete with those that ply between New York and Liverpool? We

Mr LEGRIS.

have not yet reached such a stage. We are not in such a financial position as to be so lavish of our money. And governments, as well as individuals, must govern their expenditures according to their resources. I say, therefore, it is not wise, it is even bad management on the part of the Government to throw to the winds and upon the ocean the millions of the people without any necessity. I now wish to refer, in order that the Ministers might hear my remarks, to another point that well deserves the attention of this House. The hon. gentlemen are constantly besieged by their friends, and in order to win the favours of certain influences, they like to please their friends whenever it is possible. I have no objection to that, but we have reached a point where it would be wise to put a check on it, even though the Minister of Finance had himself to mount guard around the Treasury. I do not intend to review all the departments, but I may be allowed to begin with the head of the party. For some years past, we have indulged in the luxury of eighteen Ministers to manage the affairs of a population of about five million souls. I would see no harm in that if it did not cost us so much. Is it possible, indeed, to believe that a small country like ours cannot be wisely governed without our having this nice family of eighteen Ministers seated on the Treasury benches? If we look at the other civilized countries, we can find no such thing anywhere else. For instance, Great Britain, with a population of thirty-nine millions, has only ten Ministers. France, with a population of thirty-nine millions, has likewise but ten Ministers. Germany, with forty millions, is governed by twelve Ministers. Italy, with a population of 28,500,000 souls, has only eleven Ministers; Spain, eighteen millions, 9 Ministers; Japan, forty millions, 12 Ministers. European Russia, whose population numbers eighty-five million souls, and its dependencies, twenty-eight millions, making altogether, one hundred and thirteen millions, has only twelve Ministers. The United States, with a population of about seventy millions, is governed by eight Ministers, who receive the same salary as ours. For we pay here \$9,000 to the Prime Minister and \$8,000 each to twelve others, and then we pay \$6,000 a year to each of three more, who are possibly apprentices. It is true we have two Ministers without portfolios, which make the number of eighteen, to govern a population of five million souls. I now wish to call your attention to a state of affairs which has often been demanded by my hon. friend the member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen. I refer to this host of former civil servants who are now state pensioners. Allow me to say, Mr. Speaker, that whenever I referred to this before the electors, they found the system such an odious one that sometimes they would not believe me. The fact is we have

here a superannuation system which is inconceivable and intolerable, even by those who are supposed to profit by it. This system is odious. I am going to give you a few figures to show its imperfections. It is not even popular among the public employees, for they are compelled to pay, as long as they are employees, a percentage on their salaries, and when they die they have nothing to leave for the support of their families. That is particularly unjust and intolerable in many cases. But what is still more reprehensible is the abuse the Government have made of it, and every government is supposed or liable to make abuses. Every civil servant ought to do what common people do, they ought to think to their old times and take their precautions by saving something in order to provide for their wants when their time of superannuation will come. How few are the citizens in this country who can say to themselves that at a given time, ceasing all work, they could rely upon a pension, whatever it be, if they have not saved while they were able to work! This system does not even receive the approval of the officers of the civil service. After their death it does not provide in a sense the way for the wants of their families. Moreover, it is very dangerous to place this superannuation fund into the hands of the Government. It is the present Government who have chiefly contributed to make this system intolerable by the way they have carried it on. To evidence it, I have only to quote the list of the superannuated civil officers list which appears in the Public Accounts and the Auditor General's report for the year 1895. According to that list, we find that there were, in 1895, 560 superannuated civil officers. Of this number, and in order to show the abuse which was made of the system, I will mention the fact that there were 94 who had received each over \$5,000, 62 over \$10,000 and 45 over \$15,000. W. R. Mingaye, who at the end of his 34 years of service had reached the handsome salary of \$3,800 a year, was superannuated eight years ago with an allowance of \$2,508, and he has already received \$20,900. J. P. Leprohon, who received a salary of \$2,205.56, has been superannuated for thirteen years with an allowance of \$1,546.92, and he has already received \$20,199.62. John Kidd received a salary of \$2,300 a year, he has been superannuated for thirteen years with an allowance of \$1,564, and he has already received \$20,462.33. P. LeSueur, who received a salary of \$2,400, was superannuated seventeen years ago with an allowance of \$1,195.04, and he has received until now \$20,215.68. René Kimber, who received a salary of \$2,400, has been a state-pensioner for twenty years. He has an allowance of \$1,047.80, and he has now received \$21,150.80. S. M. Passon, who received a salary of \$2,200 a year, has been a state-pensioner for sixteen years, with a yearly allowance of \$1,540, and he has now received \$24,260. John Howe had a salary

of \$2,000. He has been a state-pensioner for nineteen years, he receives the modest sum of \$1,399.86, and he has now received \$26,597.34. A. Woodgate received a salary of \$2,400. He has been a Government pensioner for twenty years, with a yearly allowance of \$1,552.32. He has now received \$31,501.40. John Leslie who received a salary of \$3,500, has been a state-pensioner for fifteen years, with \$2,449.92, and he has received the trifling sum of \$37,667.52 in way of allowances. F. P. Rubidge received a salary of \$2,400 a year. For twenty-four years he has been a state-pensioner, with a yearly allowance of \$1,663. He has now received the trifling sum of \$39,916.60. E. A. Meredith, who had a salary of \$3,600 a year, has been for sixteen years a state-pensioner, with an allowance of \$2,520. He has also received the trifling sum of \$42,000. John Langton, who died during the year, had an allowance of \$2,716.44, and he had received in this way \$46,000. I have given these informations to this House in order to show the abuses which were made of the Superannuation Act. Must we believe that the Ministers have waited till these civil officers were in an advanced age in order to superannuate them? No, Sir, they superannuated them when they want to place a friend, which is a frequent occurrence. In order to show that age is no consideration for superannuation purposes, we find that on the list of this year, there were 175 officers superannuated under sixty years, 71 under fifty years, twenty under forty years, and we find some who were superannuated in a still less advanced age. Thus we find that Honoré Ferguson was superannuated at thirty-five years; E. A. Pelletier at thirty-four years; Jos. Osborne at thirty-two years; G. W. Grant at thirty-one years; J. T. McCaffery at thirty years, and Jos. Bradbury at twenty-nine years. But we find cases even by far more interesting than these. In the province of Quebec, the good party, the party with good principles, need to send from time to time a missionary to preach the good doctrine; they confide that care to a man named Charles Thibault, a pensioner of the Dominion. They send him where he is rather unknown, for as a rule he is worth nothing when he goes twice successively in the same place. My hon. friend the Minister of Public Works knows that quite well. The Conservative party use Mr. Thibault to work for them. You see, it is so good a party, a party with good principles, and Mr. Thibault is the advocate of these good principles of the Conservative party, principles of honesty, fairness and loyalty. They have only to sign to Mr. Thibault and at any time he is ever ready to sacrifice himself. Mr. Thibault was appointed on the 22nd December, 1880, secretary of the Dominion Board of Arbitration. It was nothing more than a sinecure, and I am sure Mr. Thibault, during the nine years he held that position, did not give anything tantamount to a month's work.

It was a real sinecure to encourage this gentleman, who had the gift of the gab, to go and preach the good doctrine in the rural districts for the Conservative candidates and against the Liberal candidates. During nine years, Mr. Thibault received a salary of \$2,000 a year, for doing nothing. He has therefore received an amount of \$18,000. During that time he contributed \$286.79 to the superannuation fund. The Government having found out, some fine day, that this useless commission had already cost enough to the country, decided to do away with it. With it went likewise the salary of Mr. Thibault, but thanks to the Administration, he was made a pensioner of the Dominion at the age of 49 years. He is now sure for his lifetime—and he looks as if he was going to live long—of a yearly allowance of \$759.96. I need not say that such a favour has not lessened his zeal and that whenever some one has to be sent to preach the good doctrine, if they think Mr. Thibault is not too well known in the place, they have only to sign to him and he goes. Another very interesting case is that of Mr. Vankoughnet. This gentleman was superannuated against his will, as shown by a letter that is to be found in the "Hansard" of 1894, page 3748. He was only 57 years old, in good health and more able to discharge the duties of his office than the gentleman who succeeded him. He is now living in England with a yearly allowance of \$2,112. But they had to find a place for Mr. Hayter Reed, who now earns a salary of \$3,200 a year, in the place of Mr. Vankoughnet. Another interesting case is that of Mr. John Tilton, Deputy Minister of Fisheries. He was only 54 years old when he was superannuated. He lives here in Ottawa, in good health, and I am even told that he attended the ball given this week by His Excellency the Governor General and that he still does well. This gentleman will receive during his lifetime \$1,536 a year of the people's money. Let us also see the case of Mr. Gustave Lamothe, postmaster in Montreal, superannuated four years ago with an allowance of \$2,000. This gentleman was able to discharge his duties for a long time yet, but they had to place Mr. Arthur Dansereau, who had well earned his grade. I do not blame him for having accepted that position, but I blame the Government for having abused a law that should no longer be in our statute-book. It is to our knowledge that, on the 14th June, 1894, the hon. member for North Wellington introduced a motion for the repeal of the Superannuation Act, but the Government, with their compliant majority, voted against it and it was lost. A few days later, the then Prime Minister, Sir John Thompson, introduced a resolution to allow the judges of the Supreme Court, whenever they would like to get superannuated after a certain length of service, to receive an allowance equal to

Mr. LEGRIS.

their salary. We know that these gentlemen receive a large salary. The Chief Justice receives \$8,000 a year, and the other justices \$7,000 a year. Well, the Government wished a principle to be accepted which went further than the existing state of affairs, by guaranteeing the judges an allowance equal to their salary. This resolution received the support of all the Ministerial members, with the exception of the hon. members for Bagot (Mr. Dupont) and Laprairie (Mr. Pelletier). This superannuation system has led to the following results:—In the year 1895, the receipts were \$67,670.64; the expenditure for the same time was \$265,385.77, or a net loss of \$197,715.13. From 1871 to 1895, the contribution of the civil officers to the Superannuation Fund amounted to \$1,306,764.72, and the state disbursed, during the same period, \$4,036,349.27, or a loss of \$2,729,574.55. Have we not the right to accuse the Government who allow such an unjust and burdensome law to remain in the statute-book? Let the civil officers do as common people to secure their living in their old age. They are not a privileged class. The salaries we pay them each year are certainly enviable, as evidenced to the Ministers at every day. When a vacancy occurs, they know better than I do by what a lot of claims they are besieged. Then why should they impose a new burden upon the country by making that superannuation secure for the employees who no longer work for the state? It prevents them from saving and spending with discretion. In my initial remarks, I quoted the first part of the platform of the Liberal party adopted in the convention of 1893. I will now continue to give further extracts of this platform which deserves, in its entirety, the support of the people of this country. The second resolution has reference to commercial reciprocity with the United States, the third condemns the corrupt actions of which the Government for several years, was guilty. Is it not a cause for humiliation, Sir, for a patriot to think of the boodling that has been going on under the very eyes of the Government? From the disclosures made before a committee of this House in 1891 to the building of the famous bridge called Curran up the river, it is a humiliation for the country to find that amongst us and under the supervision of the responsible Ministers, such gigantic boodling as that exposed these last years has been committed. No one can deny that enormous sums were stolen away from the public treasury through various public works which the Government caused to be made. I will not go into details which are sufficiently known to this House and this country. I only refer to this by the way in order to show how wise, fair and reasonable in every way is that section of the platform of the Liberal party. The fourth resolution calls for a curtailment of the administrative expenditures. It is none too soon for this curtailment to

be made. I have shown already how the Government have from year to year increased the expenditures. I have shown that this increase is a large one in the various departments controlled by the Ministers. I have no doubt whatever that a business man, a commercial firm who would manage the affairs of the country as they manage their own, I say I have no doubt that such a man, such a firm would curtail the expenditures by several millions every year without in no wise lessening the efficiency of the public services. The fifth resolution of the Liberal platform condemns the reference to Royal Commissions of charges preferred against a Minister. We have been witnesses to such farces in this House, and it is plain that if a Minister, taken in the deed, as was the case in recent years, is allowed to refer his case to the decision of his friends, if he has all the control in his own hands, if he is allowed to choose himself his judges and even choose the counsel for his accusers, as the case has happened already, there is no doubt that the expediency of a reform is not to be discussed, and that a royal commission in such conditions is merely a farce played at the expense of the public. Through such means the Ministers can always cause themselves to be exonerated, as the case has happened a few years ago. Through such means they can escape the sentence they deserve. The sixth resolution condemns the Elections Act. It is nothing short of a gigantic inconvenience in the making of the electoral lists. It is perfectly useless. Before it was passed, the federal elections were held under the lists made by the municipal council in each municipality. There was no complaints, at least, there could be no serious ones, against the lists made by the municipal councils. This system gave more facilities, and was a good deal more fair than the one we now have. It was more just and wiser. It did justice to the public and to the voters, which the present federal lists do not. The fact is, we are on the eve of a general election and it will be held under lists two years old already. A great many people, since the lists were made, would be qualified to vote at the next election, but they will not be able to do it because their names are not on the lists, and a great many others will vote without being entitled to vote, having lost their qualification since the lists were made. And then, what a lot of work the making of these lists entails to the candidates! To what frauds are we not exposed, we who belong to a party adverse to the Government! Should another government come into power and allow the same lists to continue in force, the same frauds could be perpetrated against the adverse party. This only illustrates the more the imperfections of this Act and of these electoral lists. And that is why the platform of the Liberal

party condemns the Elections Act. The Liberal party expressed a desire to return to the old system of lists made by the municipal councils. We must not forget, moreover, that these electoral lists are a very heavy charge on the finances of the country. The last lists have cost the enormous sum of \$235,396.97. By going back to the lists of the municipal councils, we would escape this expenditure, to say nothing of the inconvenience and frauds which are now perpetrated. The seventh resolution condemns the gerrymandering as done by this Government. Here is another electoral device which deserves the severest condemnation. To give an idea of it, I will mention a single fact. After the census of 1881, the necessity arose to readjust some counties in the province of Ontario. Then, what did the Government do? They made that readjustment from the sole standpoint of the interests of a political party, and what was the result? The result was that, at the last general election, the Conservative candidates received in the province of Ontario 186,000 votes, and that number returned 59 members of this House. The Liberal party received 182,000 votes, and these voters only returned 33 members. Now, here is the conclusion: It required 9,950 votes to return a Liberal member and 3,150 to return a Conservative member. Is that just? Is that the intent of the Constitution? Is that, Sir, what was expected of this readjustment? The Government, I fancy, is well satisfied with the result, for we know that at the last session, they considered for a long while a Bill to gerrymander anew the counties of the province of Quebec, and, I suppose, of the other provinces as well, and I do not know by what fear they were prevented from introducing it in this House. Mr. Speaker, we want the electoral body to declare themselves in all equity and fairness with respect to the questions that are agitating the country. The eighth resolution of the platform of the Liberal party calls for a reform of the Senate. It is a serious matter, but I have no hesitation in saying that the public opinion in the Dominion is against the Senate as now constituted. The Senate no longer represents anything except the interests of the political party which appointed the Senators, who compose the other House. If we want the Senate to have its *raison d'être*, if we want the people to believe in its efficiency, we must at least reform that institution by giving the various bodies in the country the right and advantage to be represented in that honourable House. The Senate must not be a tool in the hands of the Government. I know the statement I now make will likely be used against me, as there are still some places in the country where they believe that the Senate is of divine institution, the same as they believe that the legislative council in Quebec to be of divine

institution. And I am not living far from certain places where they believe that. This is why I say that I am now possibly laying myself open to criticism; but I make the statement through conviction, and if there should be any doubt about it, we have only to look at what is going on in the other House. We will merely see there is a body willing to forward the interests of a political party, the ruling party. There are, no doubt, exceptions, but they are scarce, and it cannot be otherwise since the Government choose in their ranks the most zealous supporters of their actions, good or bad—especially the bad ones—those who have earned their grades in the battles they fought for the party. Can any one believe that a politician is able, from one day to another, to put off the old man and forget the political party that has installed him in a senatorial chair? No. The politician who leaves the House of Commons or any other part of the Dominion to go into the Senate deserved that honour by the services he has rendered to his party. He is a true partisan, willing to do anything for the support of his party. We are therefore right when we call for, if not the abolition, at least a reform of the Senate. Let me quote a quite recent case to show to what extent such a reform is urgent. We have just had in Montreal, the commercial metropolis of the Dominion, an electoral contest which was vigorously carried on by both the political parties. We know the result of it, we have the pleasure, we of this side of the House, to have amongst us the choice of the Montreal voters. The man who deputed the hon. Mr. McShane that mandate to the Commons is a thorough gentleman, of a respectability beyond any reach. But the people did not approve of the course he was supporting. This gentleman is a prominent physician who never indulged in politics; therefore his candidature caused a general surprise. Suddenly caught by the desire to serve his country, he offers his services to the electors of Montreal who decline them because of their want of confidence in the Government. Now, what has happened? The day following that election, Sir William Hingston is made a Senator. Can we help suspecting that there was an understanding between him and the Government? This gentleman, who was rejected by the people, is installed in the Senate to revise the actions of the hon. Mr. McShane who was elected by the city of Montreal. This is nonsense, and I say more, such an anomaly is not consistent with the spirit of the constitution. There are in the Senate about a dozen Senators only who are not willing to support this Government. Suppose there was a change of administration and these gentlemen were firmly bent on—they say the old man is sometimes obstinate—suppose they took a fancy to overthrowing the Administration which should not be that of their predilections, could not they do it? Surely they

Mr. LEGRIS.

could. Now, these hon. gentlemen would be in opposition with the people. They would prevent a government, the choice of the people, from administering the affairs of the country. I say such a system should be tolerated no longer and that a reform of the Senate is now a commanding issue. I consider I cannot better show that the platform of the Liberal party deserves a universal approval than to quote the last resolution adopted by the great convention. It is the eleventh resolution, which reads as follows:—

That this convention desires to express its entire confidence in the leadership of the Hon. Wilfrid Laurier, and its administration of his brilliant eloquence, his endearing personal qualities, and his broad and statesmanlike utterances upon the public questions of the day.

Such is, Mr. Speaker, the last article of our platform and does not the difference strike you between that which exists in our ranks and that which exists in the ranks of our opponents, the hon. gentlemen opposite? See what confidence we all have in our chief, and that confidence is unanimously shared by our friends of the other provinces who belong to a different race. There he was sincerely recognized by the Liberal party as the unquestionable and unquestioned chief of this great party. There we have stated that we praised and recognized his wants. We feel well satisfied that the ship of state, under his able direction, could not be steered otherwise than in the right course and for the greatest benefit of the Dominion. Our leader is a man worthy to command that ship. We are united because we recognize in him the power to govern us. We are united and there is the guarantee of a great triumph. We will succeed because we have in our leader a man having the strength required for the government of a great party. If on our side there are no conflicting opinions, no internecine strife, if we are not witnesses to such quarrels as we have seen a few days ago among our opponents the hon. gentlemen opposite who, but yesterday, were wrangling one with the other, and calling themselves traitors on the one hand and old silly men on the other, as has happened to the great horror of the country, it is because we have a leader whom we love and respect. Our party is not composed of men ready to wrangle one with the other. We have confidence in our leader, and this is the ground for our belief that we will carry the next general election. We believe that the Canadian voters share our views and we trust them, they will show their confidence as we show ours, and notwithstanding the firm will of our opponents to stay in power, this very power will slip away from them. This is why we will go before the people with the utmost confidence that we will see the ship of state confided to the care of our able leader. Lastly, we have reason to believe that the harmony which

prevails in our party will continue so in the future and prepare the destinies of this country.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I wish at the outset to dispel any fears of hon. gentlemen that I propose to make a long speech by announcing that I am not able to understand nor speak the French language, and I am precluded from replying to the hon. gentleman who has just preceded me. Now, Sir, in this very long debate which has lasted for a number of days a great deal has been advanced on both sides relating to what to-day is the great question which is before the country, I refer to the fiscal policy of the Government and the fiscal policy of the Opposition. I do not propose, at this late stage of the debate, to enter into this question at any length. However, I am pleased to be able to know that hon. gentlemen opposite have placed themselves on record in this debate as still giving allegiance to the old principles of the Opposition, in every form and shape to the National Policy as enunciated by the Government. Not only has the statement of the leader of the Opposition, announced by him through the province of Ontario last summer, been assented to and applauded by hon. gentlemen opposite, but it has been intensified more than last summer. On the part of the Government and the Administration there has been a fixed adherence to the principles of the National Policy, namely, that it should have a protective bearing on every industry in the country, and that every industry susceptible or capable of being fostered and nurtured should have a friendly hand extended to it. In this debate great attention has been paid to the agricultural interests, and for a short time I propose to devote myself to that aspect of the case. It cannot be denied that in the province of Ontario, likewise in the province of Quebec, agriculture is a great calling, if I may so term it, and in the constituency I have the honour to represent, such is particularly the case. I do not believe the agricultural interests of the country can be advanced altogether by legislation, although the legislation enacted by the Government since 1878 has had a most salutary effect on the agricultural interests of the country. I am totally at variance with the principles of hon. gentlemen opposite, when they intimate that every vestige of protection must be eradicated and abolished root and branch. I am averse to the principle enunciated last year by the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Edwards), that he was in favour of the total abolition of duties on pork, and on oats and other productions of the field and on other products which farmers largely produce in which they are greatly interested. But while I believe our agricultural interests have been fostered by the policy of the Government, still I believe there are other ways in which the farmers can be assisted, and that is by bringing the markets of the old

world, which are, after all, the markets of the whole world, closer and more in touch with the people of this Dominion; and in that connection I propose to touch somewhat at length on the advantages of water-borne freights as being advantageous as compared with those carried by rail, and more particularly as this subject very much interests the people of the riding which I represent.

The principle of the advantage of carrying freight by water is an old one, and as far back as seventy years ago we find the United States were projecting waterways for opening up the country, and with that end in view they constructed what is to-day known as the Erie Canal. To-day we find that canal, which is, comparatively speaking, only a ditch, paralleled by half a dozen railways, with the great metropolis of New York as its terminus, which carried to it over 100,000,000 bushels of grain last year, carried 50 per cent of that freight. We find further that the people of the state of New York of their own free will last year voted \$11,000,000 to be expended in enlarging and bettering that canal. So to-day it is an important question in the United States that with the growing trade of the western states, growing to such an extent that they believe the Erie Canal and the railway system will not be capable of transporting it to the seaboard, it is now proposed to extend the Illinois Canal from Chicago to reach the Mississippi River, and by erecting vast elevators at the mouth of that river make that canal a rival of the Erie Canal. So we find that in Canada propositions are made from time to time in regard to carrying grain by water. We find that years ago it was projected to construct what is now known as the Trent Valley Canal. We find, too, the people of this city and this neighbourhood projecting a canal by way of French River to the shores of Georgian Bay; and that in years gone by the Administration of that time saw the absolute necessity of connecting Lakes Erie and Ontario by means of what is now known as the Welland Canal. But the point I wish to impress on the House is this, that not only in the construction of canals for trade to connect large bodies of water as Lakes Huron and Superior, but wherever there are stretches of water that can be made available for the carriage of freight of various kinds, then and there an attempt is made to utilize those water-stretches. I have no fault to find with some of those progressive enterprises, but looking at the magnitude of the public debt, for it is a large debt, it is evident that a very economical course should be followed and every economy and care exercised in projecting these public works. I propose to refer to the project for enlarging the canals so as to make them available from fresh water to salt water. A few years ago the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Denison), whose absence in the House

every hon. member sincerely regrets, particularly as the cause is serious illness, introduced a motion to the effect that the deepening of the St. Lawrence Canal was advisable, and that the Government should undertake the enlargement of the canal system through the St. Lawrence and by way of the Welland Canal as a means of connection with the upper lakes. In the discussion that ensued it was made quite plain that the expenditure necessary for the purpose would amount to \$100,000,000, a sum which is utterly impossible for the Dominion to incur for such a purpose. Against the advocacy of deep waterways there are many reasons why it is an impossibility for this deepening and extension work ever being carried out. I contend that even if to-day the work were undertaken and completed and were to day in a finished state it would not be possible for large vessels, constructed as vessels are and equipped as they are for ocean freight vessels, to ply on our canals. When one considers the immense cost and capacity of those vessels it will be seen that they cannot be taken up the canals by way of the Sault and on to Port Arthur and Duluth and take in grain cargoes, because it is well known by experience that it does not pay to load ocean-going vessels with freights except they be of a mixed character. So the question of the construction of the canal to the depths suggested with a view to the traffic of ocean-going vessels is out of consideration. In regard to the other plan which has been supported by the people of Ottawa, namely, water communication by way of the Ottawa and French Rivers to Georgian Bay, that scheme would cost \$16,000,000, according to the figures submitted by gentlemen composing the delegation which waited on the Government the other day. In that connection I have this further to say, that the line of this canal would be through a country which is not by any means an agricultural district, and the great distance involved in passing would be a grave difficulty to its efficient operation. As to the other proposition which I have broached, the construction of the Trent Valley Canal, that is a project which I believe demands the serious consideration not only of the counties which border upon that canal, not only of the western part of the province of Ontario, but of the whole Dominion. That waterway, or rather the utilization of the water-stretches of the Trent Valley Canal, has been before the people for the past seventy-five years. The Imperial Government, seeing the necessity of having a waterway from the upper to the lower lakes, took upon themselves this construction then, and to that end part of the work was undertaken. Year by year portions of it have been constructed, and to-day the result is that we have received, as a result of applications to the Government of the day, fairly large appropriations, and while those who are interested in and represent constituencies along the line of the canal are thank-

Mr. BENNETT.

ful to the Government for what has been done, still they contend that larger grants should be made in order to push forward the work. Let us look at the map of Ontario, and glance over stretches of water running from Georgian Bay to Lake Ontario, and what do we find? We find that commencing near Orillia a canal would have to be built from Lake Simcoe to Balsam Lake; from there by way of the lakes and utilizing the river navigation we could have water communication through to Lake Ontario. Now, making a comparison of distances. If you take a vessel leaving Port Arthur, passing down Lake Huron to the Welland Canal, and going thence to Kingston, in the course of that trip she has accomplished a distance of 782 miles; while, on the other hand, by way of the Trent Valley Canal we find that the vessel, when discharging her cargo at Kingston, would have only traversed a distance of 535 miles. We look hopefully forward to the settlement of the great North-west. We view with pride and admiration the strides she has taken. We know that in the past year 60,000,000 bushels of grain were raised in that country and that the major portion of it was exported. And yet we have seen, to the discredit of Canada, ay, Sir, even more than the discredit of Canada, that 75 per cent of that grain which should have been carried in Canadian boats and exported from Canadian ports, and which should be a trade all our own, passed out of the port of New York. Why is that so? It is simply because we have not the system of canal communication which we should have, and the construction of which is only a question of money. Transportation is, and has been, and always will be, the question, and that is the question which to-day stares the people of this Dominion in the face, if they hope ever to make a success of the great North-west. Now, Sir, let us take the computation that there was exported from the North-west Territories that large amount of grain last year, and no one can prophesy what will be exported in the next ten years. Are things to continue as they have been in the past? Are we to have the mortification of seeing American vessels carrying our grain from the port of Duluth and from Port Arthur to Buffalo, then to be transhipped in American barges and carried on to New York? Here is a proposition, which if carried out in its entirety would result in this: the carriage by Canadian vessels from Port Arthur and from Duluth to the port of Midland, and the placing of that grain in Canadian barges, thence passing through to Montreal. It may be contended, and it may be thought at first sight, that the port of Montreal would be at a disadvantage by reason of climate, compared with New York, but it must be remembered that all the grain moved from the North-west is dependent upon the opening of navigation upon the upper lakes, and so as soon as navigation closes upon the upper

lakes, so soon is the port of New York closed to that trade as well as the port of Montreal. Now, Sir, what does it mean, apart and aside from its national importance, because I contend it is a matter of great national importance to know and to feel that the millions and millions of bushels of grain that are grown in the North-west which may be brought either to Port Arthur or may be brought by the American lines of railway that are now connected through to Manitoba and the North-west to the port of Duluth. The result, as I said, would be this: the carriage of grain from Duluth and Port Arthur to Midland and the carrying forward from there in grain-laden barges through to the port of Montreal. That means not only the employment of Canadian labourers upon these vessels, but it means also the investment of a large amount of money in Canadian shipping. But it is not only the national importance that the construction of the Trent Valley Canal appeals to us. It has a mission outside and beyond that, and that is that having a coast line of 1,500 miles along the numerous rivers and lakes which it travels, the result would be the opening up of that country and its progress and development. Every bushel of grain that is forwarded must have deducted from it a certain amount of cost for freight and every cent that is lessened on the carriage of the grain places so much money in the pocket of the farmer. Thirty million bushels a year would, I contend, be a low estimate for carriage through the canal, and the saving on that alone should the saving be only two cents a bushel, would mean the enormous amount of \$600,000 saved in a single year. But it is not only in respect to the grain trade that the Trent Valley Canal appeals to the people from a Canadian standpoint. We must also remember that it would be a lively competitor to the Erie Canal itself. Bear this in mind, that for every three trips a vessel can make from Port Arthur or from Duluth to Midland, she can only make one trip to the port of Kingston. For every two trips that are made to Kingston three can be made to Buffalo, and the result is, that Canadian vessels, instead of being employed in the trade of transporting grain from Port Arthur and from Duluth, and there transshipping it into barges, content themselves with carrying it to Buffalo, and the Canadian grain thus carried is then hurried on by way of the Erie Canal. Look at the immense quantities of lumber that are exported from Canada. I think I am within a conservative estimate when I say that 100,000,000 feet of lumber per year are exported from the northern shores of the Georgian Bay, and from points along the routes of this canal. When I say that that enormous quantity of lumber can be carried at a much less expense by water-borne freight than otherwise, then it appeals to thinking men that the construction of the canal should at once

be accomplished. Why, Sir, the completion of that canal means this: not only that we have a waterway to Montreal, but a glance at the map would show this freight could be carried from the port of Trenton on Lake Ontario, across to Ogdensburg, to Oswego, and to other points which have connection and communication with the Erie Canal, and thence to New York. But it is not only in respect to the out-borne freight that the canal could be used to a very great extent, because it would also be of great service and accommodation in the matter of import freight. Along the line of the canal there are many towns of great importance, such as Peterborough, which is quite a manufacturing centre; Orillia, Barrie, and others I could mention. These towns to-day are compelled to bring in by lines of railway every article they import. Every ton of soft coal, every ton of hard coal now brought into these towns is carried at very high rates by the railways. Sir, the construction of this canal would mean that barges after having delivered their cargoes of grain at Montreal could in turn be laden with Nova Scotia coal, and taken back to these different towns along the line of this canal. Again, in turns these barges passing through to the American side and discharging their cargoes of lumber or their cargoes of grain, could bring back hard coal, and necessarily the result of the double freight would be the lessening of rates each way.

Now, Sir, I am not going to find fault with the action of the Government in the past in reference to the canal, and particularly their action for the last year or so, because very fair appropriations have been made for the work; but I do say that this Government should stand committed to the construction of the Trent Valley Canal at the very earliest opportunity. I contend that, although other propositions are projected, these other schemes should not be undertaken until at least we have in view the almost completion of this national work.

There is another matter which I shall ask the indulgence of the House, while I deal with it for a little while. It is by no means a new question. I refer to an export duty being levied on pine saw-logs. I regret that the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), whom I am pleased to see in the House to-day after his serious illness, is not at present in his seat. This question has long been before the people of Ontario, and before the people of the whole Dominion. During the whole course of the long discussion that has taken place on this question in the House, and outside the House too, there has not been a newspaper, nor has there been any hon. gentleman in Parliament who has risen to defend this iniquitous principle of permitting the exportation of saw-logs from this country to the United States; save except the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton).

And his reasons have been plainly manifest, and his reasons have been plainly advanced. I do not blame the hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton), as he had a perfect right to act as he has done in that regard. But I make this statement, which the facts have shown to be correct, that in every year during the last eight or nine years, there have been exported from the shores of the Georgian Bay to the United States, from 300,000,000 to 400,000,000 feet of saw-logs. I say this more, Sir, that there has been a direct and most violent attempt on the part of those exporting the saw-logs to suppress the truth of the returns. That has been amply shown during the past year, when two or three vessel-owners have been promptly fined by the Customs Department for making undervaluations of the quantity of logs they have exported. I ask, what does all this mean? The export from this country every year of 300,000,000 feet of saw-logs means that a large number of mills are working on the other side of the line, the owners of which, if deprived of those Canadian saw-logs, would be compelled to come to Canada and have the lumber manufactured here. I am going to read for the benefit of the House a short extract headed Bay City, to prove the truth of the statement I make of the quantity of logs exported. This statement is made by Mr. Thomas Pitts, the head of the firm of Pitts & Co., exporters of saw-logs:

Between 250,000,000 and 300,000,000 feet of logs are annually imported from Canada. An export duty would compel us to go to Canada to manufacture our lumber. Along this coast from Saginaw to Cheboygan it would turn 20,000 men out of employment that earn annually in the neighbourhood of \$5,500,000.

That is a startling statement—that the Government of Canada, by their policy of permitting the export of logs from this country, are depriving 20,000 men of employment in Canada. By the National Policy, the Government have imposed high protective duties in order to foster certain industries in this country; and yet here it is pointed out by an American lumberman that the Government of Canada, by their suicidal policy—because it is a suicidal policy in this respect—are depriving this country of the employment, annually, of 20,000 men. The statement I have read amply proves that I have not over-stated the quantity of saw-logs exported; and if better proof were wanted, I could refer to the Customs returns, which show that from one port alone, some 150,000,000 feet were exported last year. Now, I have brought this matter before the House time and again. No hon. member has ever risen to defend the practice. The Government have promised consideration of the question time and again. I have presented indignant protests from the people of the Georgian Bay district. But the result has been the turning of a deaf ear to all our representations.

Mr. BENNETT.

I can tell the leader of the Opposition that he could carry every county on the Georgian Bay if he would announce that he was in favour of imposing an export duty on saw-logs. But I am sorry to say that among the hon. gentlemen behind him are to be found those who are the fiercest in denouncing an export duty. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) has, throughout all these negotiations, acted in the most shameful manner, and I regret that he is not here to-night—

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. BENNETT. Well, Mr. Speaker, I withdraw that word. The hon. member has acted in a manner that I would be ashamed of. He has acted in a manner that I think would not redound to the credit of any Canadian. I would not make any statements to-night relative to that hon. gentleman were it not that what I say I have stated in his presence on previous occasions. Two years ago, when the United States Government were offering to the people of Canada free lumber and the opportunity of having the most preferential privileges with respect to all articles in the wooden schedule, it was only by the action of the hon. member for North Norfolk, in connection with that very memorable letter which was written at the time, that those privileges were prevented. I admit, to-night, that the hon. member has never acknowledged in this House that he was the writer of that memorial. He has put upon myself the test of proving that he was the writer. At the time I expressed the opinion that the hon. gentleman was the writer. But I will do the hon. gentleman the credit to say that I heard him publicly announce in the recent campaign in North Ontario that he was not the writer of that memorial, but that it was an unwarranted use of his name, if his name was used in that connection. Well, Sir, I have only this to say, that, coming after two years, the denial seems rather late. But perhaps it is right and fair to accept his positive denial made on that occasion, and to express my regret that any injustice should have been done to him in attributing to him the authorship of that letter. If the hon. gentleman has only seen fit, at this late stage, two years after date, to announce that he was not the writer, I think he stood very much in his own light in failing to make the denial two years ago. Now, I have only this to say to the hon. Minister of Finance, that this matter of the suppression of the export duty should receive more serious consideration at the hands of the Administration than it has received in the past. I hold in my hand to-night a protest from the town of Penetanguishene, a town which is largely interested in the manufacture of lumber, also a memorial from the county council of the county of Simcoe, also a letter from a prominent saw-mill owner in

the town of Penetanguishene, Mr. C. Beck, all praying that an export duty be levied on saw-logs. Now, it may be asked, in the face of the fact of this wholesale exportation of logs from the country, the fact that so many men have been driven out of the country, and the fact that so many men could be attracted to the country were the manufacture of saw-logs into lumber required to be carried on in Canada, why the Government do not interfere and abate this evil. Well, I have only to say this, that I believe the inaction of the Government in the matter is due to the influence exercised by the lumbermen of the Ottawa Valley. That must be the reason, because those gentlemen who are interested in the export of lumber to the United States are opposed to an export log duty being levied by reason of their fear that there would be a return to the payment of \$1 per thousand, of duty on lumber exported from this country to the United States. In answer to that, I have this to say: At a time when the state of Michigan was cutting a great deal of lumber from American logs, at a time when no Canadian logs were being sawn there, at a time when they were not depending, to any great extent, on Canada for their lumber, there was a duty of \$2 a thousand against Canadian lumber entering the United States; and we did not hear of the saw-mills of this country being closed then. On the contrary, the saw-mills of both the Ottawa Valley and the Georgian Bay were running; and to-day, with the Americans still more dependent on Canadian logs for the manufacture of lumber—in Michigan almost wholly so—how could it be detrimental to Canadian lumbermen if even \$2 a thousand were imposed upon it? I am not going into the abstract question of those who does or who does not pay the duty. That is a very large question. But I have this to say, and it appeals to every man's common sense, that when a purchaser must have an article, it is the purchaser that pays the duty, and not the seller. Now, I trust that the hon. Minister of Finance will bring this matter before his colleagues, and that in the coming summer we shall not have the mortification of seeing millions of saw-logs carried away from this country; that the men who have been driven out of this country will be given the opportunity of returning and earning thousands of dollars in this industry, under the stimulus of a patriotic policy.

As I stated at the outset of my remarks, I do not propose to discuss the trade question as a whole. I have spoken of the two questions which particularly concern the constituency I have the honour to represent, and to these two questions I trust the Government will give their most serious consideration. On the trade policy, as a whole, I have only this to say, that, judging by the experience of the past, I believe the people are favourable to the National Policy; I

believe that they will, as they have already done on several occasions, evince their firm and abiding faith in a policy calculated to build up our manufacturing industries, and will not show themselves recreant to that policy, when the appeal is made to them to pronounce upon the issues of the day. No doubt, in the campaign which must take place now in a very few months, a most unfortunate cloud has loomed up on our political horizon, which hon. gentlemen opposite hail with the greatest acclaim and delight. Having been foiled in the fight on the fiscal policy so often, having been foiled in 1887, when they made an appeal to race and religion on the Riel question, they are, to-day, trying the same tactics, and making a similar appeal; but I believe they will be foiled again, when the time comes for the electorate to pronounce their verdict. I believe that, when the smoke from the Manitoba school question shall have rolled away, the people will be prepared to pass judgment on the great question of the day, namely, what fiscal policy shall predominate in this country for the next five years to come; and I am confident that they will again give a verdict favourable to the men who have administered the affairs of the country during the past fifteen or eighteen years, honestly and faithfully and to the best of their ability, in the interests of the whole people. I am confident that, despite the protestations of hon. gentlemen opposite, despite their charges of dishonesty against the Conservative party, the people of this country will be kind to the faults of the Conservative party, such as they have been, and, endorsing the fiscal policy of the Government, will return the present Administration for a further term of office.

Mr. MARTIN. I shall not endeavour to make any particular answer to the address of the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, so far as he dealt with the two particular questions in which his constituency is interested. But I might just say this about the Trent Valley Canal, that I remember very well hearing a deputation address the Government from some of the counties lying along the route of that canal, a year or two ago, and urging that the canal should be built; and I remember very well hearing the then Premier of the Dominion, Sir John Thompson, telling the gentlemen who were asking for an expenditure of public money upon this canal, that it would depend very much on the kind of support which the Government got from the territory through which this canal would go. There had been some allusions in the interview to moral support; but Sir John Thompson said that that was not very satisfactory, the Government required something more tangible than merely moral support; so that, probably, the Government will not be able to decide on any very vigorous policy as to the completion of the Trent Valley Canal, as a part of our

inland water communication, until this question of what kind of political support the territory is prepared to give the Government, has been decided.

As to the question of the export duty on logs, the hon. gentleman has certainly made a very strong statement against the Government. He has made the statement that no one in this House supports the refusal to place an export duty on logs; but, in spite of that, in spite of the fact that he and others representing the Georgian Bay district and supporting the Government in the House, had shown most conclusively, session after session, that the imposition of an export duty upon logs would be a great advantage to Canada, and would be no disadvantage to any part of it, the Government have refrained from adopting that policy. Well, I certainly do not feel inclined to defend the Government in that matter. The hon. gentleman has made his case against the Government; and I certainly agree with him that it is very strange indeed that, while there is an hon. member on this side who is prepared to give, and does give, reasons which to him appear satisfactory, and which, I must say, to me appear quite reasonable for that policy, the Government themselves have never come out and given their real reasons for adhering to a policy which the hon. gentleman has so effectively condemned time and time again. So much for what the hon. gentleman has said.

As he said, he did not make any lengthy reference to the questions which are really being considered in this Budget. I intend, briefly as possible, to allude this session, as I did last session, to the speech to which the hon. Finance Minister, in pursuance of regular custom, treated this House, with regard to the financial policy of the Government and the financial condition of the country. And, Mr. Speaker, I have again, this session, as I had last session, to complain of the Finance Minister, that, on examination, a great many of the statements given by him to this House as accurate, turn out, upon examination, to be very incorrect indeed.

In the first place, I shall allude to the statements made by the hon. gentleman with regard to the question of excise. It is rather difficult to understand the statement as made by the hon. Finance Minister. He appears to be endeavouring to obtain some glory for the Government in connection with the increase in the amount of money that has been obtained by the Government in excise duties. And he endeavours to contrast the policy of the Government in this matter with that of the Opposition, without in any way pointing out where the policies differed, but simply taking for granted that whatever the Government's policy may have been, the policy of the Opposition was the reverse.

Taken in connection with that, and illustrating to a certain extent the difference that exists between the two Administrations in the collection of revenues as regards the incidence of taxation,

Mr. MARTIN.

this may be noted—that the excise revenue is now nearly twice what it was in 1879-80.

It is very difficult, indeed, for me to understand how the Liberal party can possibly be held responsible for what occurred in the year 1879-80. When we look at the facts, we find reason for the hon. Minister of Finance selecting the year 1880 to compare with the year 1895, rather than selecting the year 1878, which was the last year during which the Liberals were in power. The year 1880 was nearly two years after the time when the hon. Minister's predecessors left office. The reason he selects it evidently is that the excise of 1880 was only \$4,253,424, while the excise for 1878, the last year of Liberal administration was \$4,867,401, an excess over the other of \$613,977. Well, Mr. Speaker, surely, if the hon. gentleman desires to contrast the two administrations with respect to this matter, it would be much more reasonable and much fairer that he should take the year 1878, for which the Liberals are responsible, than the year 1880, as to which the Liberals have no responsibility whatever. So we find that in this case his calculations fall short a matter of over \$600,000. Then he goes on to say:

As this excise taxation is, to a large extent, what may be called voluntary taxation, its higher rates and the larger amount accruing from it, are to be considered, together with the fact that the rate of customs taxation has been, at the same time, reduced, as I have stated, attaining the low figure which it did in 1894-95.

Surely, Mr. Speaker, it is a bold contention of the hon. Finance Minister, in contrasting the policy of the two Administrations, that the Customs taxation had been falling in Conservative times, as compared with the times of the Liberal Administration. No other meaning can be taken out of what the hon. gentleman has said, for he goes on to say that these two facts taken into consideration together show the difference in taxation of the two Administrations. Now, what low figure did the customs taxation reach in 1894-95, as compared with that of the Liberal Administration in its last year, 1878? Taken on the basis of free and dutiable goods, the rate in 1878 was 14·03 per cent; in 1895, it was 16·99 per cent, an increase of nearly 3 per cent. On the basis of dutiable goods, it is still worse. In 1878 the rate was 21·39 per cent; and in 1895, instead of falling, as the hon. gentleman claimed, in this paragraph, it had risen to 30·54 per cent. Now, of course, the hon. gentleman knew that perfectly well; he is, in fact, much better aware of what the real figures are with regard to these matters than I am. What I object to is the attempt that is made in statements such as this to prejudice the case, and lead the people of the country, who have not the opportunity to investigate these facts and learn the truth of the matter, to believe that there had been an

increase in the excise duties during the period of Conservative administration, and, at the same time, a large decrease in customs duties. The Finance Minister's speech is the campaign document of the Conservative party; it is printed at the expense of the country, and sent out in large numbers as an authoritative statement of the real state of the country's finances. But we find, all through, attempts such as this, to several of which I shall have to refer, at what seem to me deliberate misstatement of the facts. What must we say, Mr. Speaker, when the hon. gentleman says, as I have already quoted:

As this excise taxation is, to a large extent, what may be called voluntary taxation—

What he means by that it is quite beyond me to understand.

This higher rate and the larger amount accruing from it, are to be considered, together with the fact that the rate of customs taxation has been, at the same time, reduced, as I have stated, attaining the low figure which it did in 1894-95.

Now, the hon. gentleman was not comparing the state of affairs in 1890 or 1891 with the state of affairs in 1894-95, as to which, possibly, he might have shown some slight fractional decrease of customs duties; but he was comparing the finances of the Liberal Administration with the finances of the Conservative Administration, and he makes the plain statement that while the excise duties have been increasing, the customs duties have been decreasing. Further on in his speech the hon. gentleman refers to the fact that since 1888 the expenditure of the country had remained practically stationary. He seems to have come to the conclusion that an expenditure of thirty-seven millions of dollars on account of consolidated fund is a normal expenditure for this country, and he congratulates himself, the Government, and the country, that since 1888 the expenditure had remained practically the same. But we have the fact, as shown by the public records, that for the year which we are now considering, 1894-95, the expenditure rose to \$38,132,000, or \$1,132,000 more than what the hon. gentleman himself says is our normal expenditure. This is a rather striking commentary upon the very large promises that the hon. gentleman made us in his Budget speeches of 1894 and 1895, when he declared that was the intention of the Government to meet the difficulties with which they were confronted, through the falling off of importation and of revenue from customs, by living within our means. The hon. gentleman proposed to avoid these ill-visaged deficits, as to which he had so much to say when he was able to speak of the deficits of his opponents, by keeping the public expenditures within the public revenue. The answer of the colleagues of the hon. gentleman to these promises, made in 1894 and in 1895, is the fact that the expendi-

ture for 1895 was \$38,132,000, or \$1,132,000 more than the hon. gentleman lays down as a fair average expenditure, and the one which he says was the average from 1889 to 1895. It seems very hard to understand, if the hon. gentleman's principle is a correct one, that the expenditure should remain moderately stationary, as he claims it has done, from 1888 to 1895, how is it that the expenditure in the last year of the Mackenzie Administration was only \$23,500,000, and has now risen to over \$38,000,000? The fact is, that in 1886 the expenditure jumped up suddenly on account of the rebellion in the North-west Territories, and this was an expenditure for which the hon. gentleman's party was entirely responsible. But, apart from that view of it, taking it as an exceptional matter, taking it as a matter that is not likely to happen very often, we could fairly deduct the increase over the natural expenditure for these two years, 1885-86, caused by the North-west rebellion, in order to get at what was the real expenditure of the Government for those years. But we find that, while the expenditure in 1886 was largely increased by the payments of debts incurred on account of the rebellion, the Government seemed to have tasted blood in the expenditure of that money, and they have never yet been able to reduce it from the point which it reached then, because, while it jumped up then, it never went back, for the hon. gentleman takes the expenditure of 1888, two years later, and a larger sum than it was in 1886—he takes that as the normal expenditure of the Government. The hon. gentleman's friends having had the pleasure of spending so much money, were never able apparently, to get back to the figure they had indulged in prior to that date. So we find that, from 1878 to 1888, the date the hon. gentleman selects as the one since which he has been able to keep the expenditure stationary, the gross expenditure had risen from \$23,508,158 in 1878, to \$36,718,494 in 1888, a period of ten years, making a total increase during those ten years of \$13,215,336, or an annual increase every year of \$1,321,533, or, as the House will notice, just about the sum by which the hon. gentleman himself, during the year just closed, exceeded his ideal expenditure of \$37,000,000. In other words, in spite of the promises on the part of the Minister of Finance, in spite of the good resolutions on the part of that hon. gentleman, the Government of which he is a member finds it impossible to meet the ideas of their friends, finds it impossible to administer the affairs of the country, without steadily going from bad to worse, and continually spending more and more money, increasing the annual expenditure, as I have shown, in the ten years prior to the date he has alluded to, by \$1,300,000 every year. He still goes on, even at the present time, in face of the present difficulties, and in the midst of hard times, after his strong promises to this

House made in his recent Budget speeches—he still goes on in 1895, and makes an expenditure of just about that sum, \$1,300,000 more than he did in 1894. Now, I have to allude to another inaccurate statement of the hon. gentleman. He is always talking about his reduction of the sugar duties, and the large sum of money he has saved to the people of this country by taking the duty off sugar. In that speech he tells us that the sugar duties for 1895 would have been \$5,475,000. I have endeavoured, Mr. Speaker, to check the hon. gentleman's figures on that point, but I find it quite impossible to tell what the sugar duties would have been, taking the importation given in the Trade and Navigation Returns, because the sugar duties, as they were when the hon. gentleman abolished them, were upon a sliding scale, according to the polariscope test, and, unless we have the imports shown according to that sliding scale, how is it possible for the hon. gentleman to tell what those sugar duties would have amounted to in 1895? I find, in looking back over the years prior to the time the duties were taken off sugar, that the importations and the different kinds of sugar were not at all uniform—they varied a good deal from year to year. The only way I can see to arrive at a fair estimate of what the sugar duties would have been, would be to take the total amount of sugar imported, say, in 1891, the last year of the sugar duties, and take the revenue that that number of pounds produced, and, if you calculate the sugar duties in that way, instead of producing the sum of \$5,475,000, as the hon. gentleman claims they would have done in 1895, the amount of sugar duties in that year would have been \$4,977,750, or, an error in the hon. gentleman's calculation of \$497,245. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have to notice this strange thing indeed. Of course, it is quite possible that an hon. gentleman, even of the great ability of the Finance Minister, in making these calculations, should occasionally make an error; but it is a strange thing to notice that, in every case, the error, when discovered, is always in the hon. gentleman's own favour. He never, by any chance, makes an error in giving too small a sum where a large sum is to his advantage, or giving too large a sum where a small sum is to his advantage. In this matter he makes an error in his own favour of just about \$500,000. The next matter to which I wish to refer in the hon. gentleman's speech is his reference to the post office. There has been an agitation in Canada, more or less influential, in favour of the reduction of the postal letter rate to 2 cents, in conformity with the rate adopted by the United States. The hon. gentleman, however, tells the House that the day when any reduction can be considered in this department of the Government is a long way off, and he starts out with the information that the deficit in the Post Office Department last year was \$800,000. I find that state-

Mr. MARTIN.

ment to be quite incorrect, because the deficit of the Post Office Department in 1895, instead of being \$800,000, as the hon. gentleman stated, was really \$1,060,389. In arriving at this deficit the hon. gentleman has taken the revenue of the department and deducted that from the expenditure, as shown in the Public Accounts under the head of post office. But the hon. gentleman has taken no account of the very considerable item of \$259,542, which he would have found referred to in the Auditor General's Report as that portion of civil government which is chargeable to the Post Office Department, that is to say, the salaries of the Postmaster General, of the Deputy Postmaster General, and the long list of clerks and employees which the department in Ottawa pays under the head of civil government instead of post office, but which is entirely an expenditure in connection with the Post Office Department, and which would not be incurred if the Government did not carry the mails. So that surely if we are going to determine what the loss to Canada is in connection with the Post Office Department, we must take the actual expenses for all purposes in connection with it, and deduct the actual revenue received from it. If we do that, we find that the total expenditure charged in the Public Accounts to Post Office is \$3,593,649, the net revenue is \$2,072,789, leaving the deficit to which the hon. gentleman referred, namely, \$800,857; but adding to that the portion of expense of civil government which is entirely chargeable to post office, namely, \$259,543, we get really an actual deficit of \$1,060,389. I think it is a matter of fair complaint in behalf of this House that the Finance Minister on a simple point of public accounts like this should have made a very inaccurate statement, that the deficit in this department was only \$800,000, whereas, in fact, it is over \$1,000,000. Then the hon. gentleman tells the House that the postal rates cannot be reduced because of the great expenditure necessarily involved in carrying letters and papers in the North-west and other parts of Canada. The inference to be drawn from that is that in my part of the country, that is to say in the North-west, the expense of carrying on the Post Office Department's work is so great on account of the scattered population that there is where the whole difficulty comes in. But that is not where the deficit comes in. It is caused by the reckless extravagance with which that department is managed, the large number of persons employed, persons not needed by the department; and in support of that statement allow me to call the attention of the House to the accounts of the Manitoba division. That division comprises Manitoba and the Territories, the country to which I understand the hon. gentleman referred. The expenditure of that division is as follows:—For ordinary mail conveyance, \$81,245; salaries, \$51,719; railway service,

Canadian Pacific Railway, exclusive of the main line, \$29,964; main line, Canadian Pacific Railway, about 1,100 miles at \$105 per mile, \$115,500; Alberta Railway, \$276; Manitoba and North-western, \$4,516; Northern Pacific Railway, \$5,815; post office inspector, contingencies, \$1,466; Winnipeg post office, contingencies, \$1,893; Winnipeg salaries, \$39,324. The total expenditure of the Manitoba division was \$331,718. Deduct from that the net revenue, after deducting allowance for salaries, \$50,000 odd, which amounts to \$145,911, there is a deficit for Manitoba and the Territories of only \$185,807, out of a total deficit of over \$1,000,000. So the attempt made by the hon. Minister to fasten the responsibility for the deficit on the expense incurred in the North-west is not successful. In addition to what I have said about the great extravagance and recklessness of the Government in the management of this business, I may draw attention to a few matters which have undoubtedly added to the deficit of the department. In British Columbia and in the North-west Territories the hon. Minister is paying for carrying the mails fully double the amount that need be paid, if the Government were to take the ordinary precautions that business men would take under similar circumstances. Let me refer hon. gentlemen opposite to the cost of carrying the mails from Battleford to Saskatoon. This service is done by the firm of Leeson & Scott, under a contract entered with that firm without any tender whatever, at the price of \$7,049. This contract has been held by the firm for ten or twelve years, and no attempt has been made to get the work done at a less rate, although at one time a gentleman, understanding that tenders were desired, undertook to do the work for \$3,120. That is one of the largest sums, but I may say that almost all the contracts in connection with the post offices in Manitoba and the North-west are not let by tender, but are given for periods of four years to favour the friends of hon. gentlemen opposite, and parties who charge \$7,000 instead of \$3,000 for work done. I find that the same thing occurs in the province of British Columbia. In that province a large sum is paid for the carrying of the mails from Ashcroft station to the Cariboo mining district. For many years the British Columbia Express Company have been receiving from that contract \$24,000 a year, and I am told, that this sum paid for one year's work would buy out the whole British Columbia Express Company; and would equal the value of all their capital and all their stock. I am told also, that if tenders were ever asked for, and if the Government gave other people an opportunity to compete for this contract, other institutions would be very glad indeed to do it for one-half the price which this favoured company receives. The trouble does not arise from the question of the rate of postage, but it arises from the manner in which the affairs

of the department are administered, as is the case with all the other departments which are under the control of this Government.

I have to complain of the hon. the Finance Minister departing from what appeared to me to be the plain facts of the case. He made very elaborate comparisons as between his Government, and the Government led by Mr. Mackenzie from 1874 to 1878. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) stated what is perfectly true: that during the years of the Mackenzie Government in office, there was a very serious period of depression in the country, and he claims that during the years from 1890 to 1895, the same depression was experienced in Canada. I dispute that entirely. I say that until the year 1893 there was no serious depression in the world's business; at all events, not upon this continent. The year 1892 was a particularly prosperous year, as is shown by the reports of commercial agencies, and by all the evidences we can have at hand. Late in the year 1893 the crisis came, and as has been pointed out by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) and by his friends in the House, it was some time afterwards, as is usually the case, before the effects of the depression were felt in Canada. The year 1891, so far as business generally was concerned, was a prosperous year, and the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) takes 1891, 1892 and 1893, and he claims that they were years during which Canada was suffering from a depression, not arising from anything connected with the fiscal policy of the Government, but arising from matters extraneous to Canada and her fiscal policy. In support of the statement which I make that these years were not years of depression similar to the years of the Mackenzie Administration, I shall quote from the expressions which hon. gentlemen opposite themselves, put in the mouth of His Excellency the Governor General in each of these years. In the year 1890, the House met on the 16th of January, and His Excellency said:

I may fairly congratulate you on the continuance of the progress and prosperity of the country.

In 1891, the House met on the 29th of April, and His Excellency said:

The season in which you are assembled has opened auspiciously for the industries of our people.

In the year 1892, the House met on the 25th of February, and His Excellency said:

It affords me much gratification to meet you at the commencement of the parliamentary session, and to be able to congratulate you upon the general prosperity of the Dominion, and upon the abundant harvest with which Providence has blessed all parts of the country.

In 1893 Parliament met on the 26th January, and His Excellency spoke as follows:—

In meeting you at the commencement of another session of Parliament it affords me plea-

sure to congratulate you on the continued progress which the history of the past year unfolds with regard to Canada. The increase in trade, as illustrated by the exports and imports during the period for which the official returns have been prepared, has been most gratifying, and that increase has continued down to the present time with promise that the volume of trade during the current year will exceed that of any year in the history of the Dominion.

That was on the 26th January, 1893, and yet the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster), soberly and seriously in his Budget speech which goes forth through the country as a campaign document on behalf of his party, claims that the year 1892, as to which these remarks were made, was a year in which Canada was suffering from the same kind of world-wide depression which it suffered from in the years 1875 and 1876, during the Mackenzie Administration. Then when we get down to 1894, we see nothing in the Governor General's speech as to the effect upon Canada of the crisis which had occurred in the fall of 1893. The House met on the 15th of March, 1894, and His Excellency said :

My predecessor was able to express gratification to you last year on the increase in trade and on the continued progress of the Dominion. It is gratifying to me to observe that the expectation which was then formed—that the volume of trade during the then current year would exceed that of any year in the history of the Dominion—has been fully realized, and that Canada's progress continues with every mark of stability and firmness.

The crisis had taken place in the fall of 1893, and we see from the Governor General's speech of 1894 that at that time there was apparently no sign in Canada of any effect of the hard times. But, when we come to the year 1895, last session, we hear from His Excellency as follows on the 14th of April :

The depression in trade which has prevailed throughout the world—

Not a word of it before, so far as Canada is concerned, in any of the previous Speeches of His Excellency. But in 1895, in reference to the year 1894, when, for the first time, some effect was felt in Canada from the depression that occurred in the United States, we find His Excellency saying :

The depression in trade which has prevailed throughout the world for the past few years has made itself felt in Canada, but fortunately to a less degree than in most other countries.

In further proof of what I say, the hon. Finance Minister himself quotes from a speech made by the retiring president of the Toronto Board of Trade, Mr. Stapleton Caldecott, in which that gentleman said :

The year 1895 has been for the most part a year of quiet recovery from the depression of 1893-94.

Mr. MARTIN.

Not of 1890, 1891 or 1892, all of which years the hon. Finance Minister included in the series of calculations with which he regaled this House in his somewhat lengthy Budget speech, but the depression of 1893-94.

The restoration of trade has not been quick, but has gradually been getting better.

And so on. It may be said that during those years—and the same might apply to the years prior to 1890—the Liberals had been claiming that trade in Canada was not as good as it ought to be. That is quite true. Ever since the National Policy was introduced, the Liberals have pointed out continually that the effect of that policy has not been what was claimed for it by its advocates. But that is a very different proposition from the other proposition, that trade in Canada was depressed, not on account of the National Policy, but on account of a world-wide depression, more particularly the depression in the United States. The hon. Finance Minister undertakes to show that in 1891, 1892 and 1893, we were suffering in Canada from a depression over which we had no control ourselves; and his reference to the fact that during those years the Liberals were pointing out in this House and out of it that the National Policy had not had the effect in Canada of improving times, as it had been promised to do, but rather that it had the effect of making times worse than they otherwise would be, is no proof whatever of the hon. gentleman's assertion that in those years the depression we were suffering from in Canada had come upon us from the outside, as was admittedly the case during the whole time of the Mackenzie Administration. So that, if I am correct in that, the hon. gentleman's whole long list of comparisons, filling page after page of "Hansard," in his endeavour to show how much better the Conservative Administration had withstood a period of hard times in Canada as compared with the Liberal Administration, falls entirely to the ground. On the other hand, if we take the facts as they really are, and take those years when depression from the outside had its effect on Canada, the years 1894 and 1895, we shall be quite willing to compare the effect upon Canada of the hard times in those years with the effect of the hard times in the period from 1874 to 1878; and we can also challenge comparison of the manner in which the Government of that day met the serious hard times which they had to deal with and the manner in which hon. gentlemen opposite met the crisis they had to deal with. Let us look at the trade returns. In the period of the Mackenzie Administration, the total trade of the country fell off from 1874 to 1875, \$16,500,000; from 1875 to 1876 it went on getting worse, falling off \$27,000,000; from 1876 to 1877 it recovered \$1,000,000; and from 1877 to 1878 it fell off \$3,000,000. As showing that the period of hard times was still affecting Canada,

even under hon. gentlemen opposite, in the following year, from 1878 to 1879, it fell off worse than ever—\$19,000,000. These figures show—and I fancy the statement is not disputed by the hon. gentleman, because he starts with it—that during the whole of that time, from 1874 to 1878, there were outside influences affecting our trade. The state of commercial matters in the United States was influencing the state of trade in Canada. But when we come to look at the years to which the figures in the hon. gentleman's comparison refer, we find that from 1890 to 1891 the total trade was about the same. But there had been an increase in trade from 1889 to 1890, of \$14,000,000. That increase remained from 1890 to 1891, about the same. From 1891 to 1892 there was an increase of \$23,000,000. Does it look as if we were suffering from a world-wide depression—from trouble in the United States—taking these two facts—that the United States had a prosperous year, and that Canada had an increased trade of \$23,000,000. From 1892 to 1893 there was a total increase of trade of \$6,000,000. But from 1893 to 1894 when the hard times did affect Canada, we found a falling off of \$6,500,000 in the total trade, and from 1894 to 1895 we had a falling off of \$16,500,000. These were the two years when the depression in the United States did affect Canada, and the two years which it is fair to take in making a comparison with the five years during which the Mackenzie Administration were in power. Now, let us see how matters were under the two parties, and how the two parties dealt with an occasion of that kind. Mr. Mackenzie's Government had deficits during their whole period amounting to \$4,488,000, and a surplus in one year amounting to \$935,000; so that in the five years they had a net deficit of \$3,553,314, or an average of \$700,000 per annum. Now look at the two years, when the same influences came to bear upon Canada, under the auspices of the Conservative party and the National Policy. In 1894 the deficit was \$1,210,332; in 1895 it was \$4,153,875; or in the two years the deficit amounted to \$5,364,207, making an annual deficit of \$2,700,000 during the two years of hard times under Conservative Administration, as compared with an annual deficit of \$700,000 in the five years of hard times of the Mackenzie Administration—\$700,000 as compared with \$2,700,000, or only about one-quarter as large. That is a comparison I can fairly make, and one which shows in favour of the Liberal party, so far as it shows anything. I refer to it because the hon. Finance Minister has, year after year, made it a point that the amount of the deficit of a government was a fair test of its financial ability. I deny that, I take no stock in it, I say that there may be circumstances under which a deficit is more to the honour of a government than a surplus. It certainly was wise on the part of the Mackenzie Government, met as they were by this period

of hard times, instead of increasing the taxation largely, as they might have done and thus obtaining a surplus, despite the falling off in customs importations—it was a wise thing for them to submit to deficits rather than unduly increase the taxation of the people. Making a comparison on the basis on which the hon. gentleman himself has insisted so often, we find that during the Mackenzie period the average deficit was only \$700,000 per year, while during the two years of similar hard times under hon. gentlemen opposite, their deficit was nearly four times that amount.

Take it the other way, and a much fairer way, take it on the ground of expenditure. What did Mr. Mackenzie and his Government do, in so far as expenditure was concerned, when they found that they had to face difficulties over which they had no control, difficulties brought upon them by the world-wide depression and the commercial crisis in the republic to the south? They held a firm hand on the expenditure and only increased it during the five years they were in power by \$200,000. This Government, on the contrary, when they met hard times, instead of reducing their expenditure, as they had a very good opportunity to do, increased it from \$23,000,000 to nearly \$37,000,000. They actually increased it in 1893-94 \$770,973, or four times as much in one year as Mr. Mackenzie did in five years; and going on from 1894 to 1895, they increased it by \$546,980; or in the two years \$1,300,000, or over seven times as much in the two years of hard times as Mr. Mackenzie did during his whole five years hard times. Now, the hon. gentleman does not like a deficit. He holds that it is a sign of very inferior financing, a sign of great financial weakness in the party. Unfortunately he had a deficit in 1894, a very respectable one. He had a deficit in 1895, the largest but one in the history of Canada, and everything points to his having a very respectable—even more than a respectable deficit in 1895-96. Then how does the hon. gentleman get rid of it? By a calculation the hon. gentleman does away with the deficit which he is going to have this year of about \$3,500,000. He does away with it, because he says that from the 20th of January to the 30th of June, there is going to be a sufficient increase in customs importations to do away with this \$3,500,000 deficit, which he will certainly have if his imports do not increase; and I cannot help admiring the extreme exactitude with which the hon. gentleman is able to calculate the exact sum which he is going to derive from the customs importations. Although that must necessarily be a pure matter of guess, the hon. gentleman tells us that he expects to get from the 20th January to 30th of June a customs revenue of \$17,439,826. It really is most amazing that the Finance Minister should be able to figure down these receipts to the very dollar; it is a wonder he did not furnish us with the number of cents as well.

If he took the importations at the same ratio as from the 1st July, 1895, to 20th of January, 1896, we might allow him to make a calculation of that kind, but he does not do that. He makes the importation a largely increased one from 20th January to the 30th June, and he is then able to calculate exactly to the dollar how much customs he is going to have from this increased importation. Then the hon. gentleman dealt with the question of Estimates, and he told us that there are increases this year in the Estimates, but that those increases are in the case of the items which last year were decreased. Now, we had very great doubt on this side of the House last year, when the hon. gentleman brought in his Estimates, showing considerable decreases in certain departments of the Government. We suspected then that these decreases were made with the view of having the elections which, it was then expected, would take place before another session was called, and we find that our anticipations in that matter were quite correct. Because, when we look at the Estimates of this year, we find that these decreases have disappeared, and that, in every case, except possibly in the case of immigration, they have been made up. And I fancy, when we get the Supplementary Estimates for 1895-96, we shall find that the decreases proposed for 1895 and indicated in the Estimates for that year, have wholly disappeared. When the Supplemental Estimates of this year come down—and the hon. gentleman has promised to bring them down shortly—I think it will be seen that the Government, having decided that it was not in their interest to bring the elections on at the time when they first intended, have lapsed into their old system of extravagant expenditure. I fancy we shall find that the departments have gone on and spent the money, and that the Government will come here with Supplemental Estimates, and ask to have that money appropriated, after it has been spent. I think, Mr. Speaker, that discussions in this House, session after session, as to how much money Parliament will vote for the Government for each department are, to a large extent, a farce. It seems to me the Government pay no attention to the appropriations. They come down and ask for a certain department so much. A discussion takes place as to the reasonableness of the amount, and the appropriation is made. But the Government pay no attention to the appropriation, but go on and spend what they see fit, and, after the money is gone, they come here before the financial year has elapsed and ask for authority to spend it. So that, under the practice we have in financial matters in this Parliament, the old idea that the representatives of the people hold the purse-strings and control the expenditure of the country, is entirely departed from, and Parliament only sets its seal upon expenditures incurred by the Government without any au-

Mr. MARTIN.

thority from the House, and, in fact, in defiance of the authority given by the House.

One of the increases to which the hon. gentleman referred in his remarks, is the increase in the Post Office Department of \$240,780. I think that other members of the House, perhaps, on both sides, will agree with me in saying that there was comparatively little new information in the Budget speech of the hon. Finance Minister this year. But, it seems to me, that, if the hon. gentleman had desired to give interest to his speech, he had an opportunity to do so in discussing this item, by giving to the House and the country information as to how much the Canadian Pacific Railway Company's grant for mail service has been increased since last session, and under what circumstances that increase took place. We should like particularly to know, whether it is true, as stated in the newspapers, that no sooner had Parliament been prorogued last year than the Government, without any authority from this House, proceeded to increase largely the grant to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for mail service. The hon. gentleman vouchsafed us no information whatever upon this subject. He was quite well aware that the Liberal press generally has commented vigorously upon the action of the Government in this matter. He must have been well aware also that the hon. Postmaster General had made several statements to the press on the subject not consistent one with the other. But, while he tells us that the item for the Post Office Department has been increased by \$240,780, he gives us no information upon this matter to which I have referred, which would have been of the greatest interest to the House and to the country. However, when we get into the Estimates, we shall, perhaps, be able to find out something from the Government as to what was done in the particular matter.

The hon. gentleman has told us that, in conformity with long-established practice, there would be, this year, some supplemental Estimates. I remember very well that last year the hon. gentleman undertook to reform this old practice. In his Budget speech, he made the announcement—an announcement, I may say, which was very well received by the House and, I think, by the country—that there would be no supplemental Estimates that year, that there, in the Estimates which the House had to consider, were to be found all the Government's demands for the year. The hon. gentleman, it is true, was not able to adhere strictly to his promise in this case. But I think that the House and the country would be inclined to forgive him for that, for it was certainly a radical departure, it was certainly a departure in the right direction; and, if the hon. gentleman was not able entirely to control his colleagues and subordinates, at least he had declared himself on the right side. But we find that in this matter, as in others, the hon.

gentleman's attempt to reform his own party has had to be abandoned. And this year, in an off-hand manner, he tells us that, in conformity with the old practice, we are to have supplemental Estimates. I can hardly congratulate the hon. gentleman upon his attitude, and I would have been much better pleased, and, no doubt, the country would have been much better pleased, if he had made a second attempt, which might, perhaps, have been a successful one, to carry out the policy which he announced last session, of having no supplemental Estimates. When we consider that the Estimates that we discuss in this House, especially in a session like this, when we meet at a reasonable and proper time of the year, are for a period commencing six months ahead and ending eighteen months ahead, and the Government have all the recess to prepare, they ought to be able to come into the House and say: Here are our Estimates of what will be necessary for the public requirements of this period. And the hon. gentleman's experience in the office of Finance Minister seems to have convinced him that that is a proper policy and a proper way to treat this House. But the hon. gentleman has not been strong enough to control the policy of his party in this matter, and we find that this year he abandons his position. I fear that we shall find this session, as we have found in other sessions, that the principal Estimates, the Estimates which require the most consideration, the Estimates which require the most careful watching on the part of the House, will be those Estimates which will come down as Supplementary Estimates, and which are nearly always brought into the House at such a late period that they do not and cannot receive the careful consideration of members of this House. Why, we found in 1894 that railway subsidies, amounting to four or five million dollars, which should have been in the original Estimates, according to the hon. gentleman's own ideas—an idea which, I am happy to compliment him upon, and to support—were brought down after many, probably a majority, of the members had left, wearied with the length of the session, and had gone to their homes. Parliament was compelled to hand over to the Government that large sum of four or five million dollars for the purpose of subsidizing railways, without giving them any practical consideration, without getting any further explanation from the Government as to what these expenditures were for, why they were granted. I say, Mr. Speaker, that this state of affairs is bad, that the Government, in this respect, is not treating either Parliament or the country fairly. I regret very much, indeed, that the hon. gentleman's very fair attempt, and, considering all the circumstances, fairly successful attempt, of last session, to make a reform in this matter, and to treat the House better, and to conduct the Estimates upon a more business-like

principle, has not been endorsed by his party. I am afraid, Sir, that the lapse from virtue in this respect is not altogether unconnected with the fact of the arrival in Canada of the Secretary of State, with the presumed intention of revivifying the great Conservative party. I am afraid that his ideas as to finance are radically different from those of the hon. gentleman who holds the office of Minister of Finance at this time. I am afraid that the hon. gentleman who holds that office has not been successful in convincing his party of his own ideas in this respect, and that this falling back into the old system of supplemental Estimates, is to be attributed to the greater strength in the party of the hon. gentleman, whose advent has been heralded with so much gusto by hon. gentlemen opposite. Now, in 1894, the Minister of Finance made another announcement to the House in connection with the finances of the country. He seemed to regret that during his administration, and the administration of his Conservative predecessors, the debt of Canada had been very largely increased, and he endeavoured to palliate that increase by referring to the large number of valuable public works which had been added to the assets of Canada; and upon the whole it seemed to be abhorrent to his ideas that this debt had been allowed to go on piling up, year after year, and he announced that it was the intention of the Government to call a halt. He told us that the great public works of the country were practically completed, the Sault Ste. Marie Canal was about done, the other canals had been practically completed, the expenditure in connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway was over, the Intercolonial Railway capital expenditure was at an end; and he congratulated himself and his party, and the country upon the fact that we could now rest upon our oars, and stop this continual addition to our debt. Well, I have no doubt that was the idea of the hon. gentleman, I have no doubt that the hon. gentleman himself, with some ideas upon finance, with some ideas, probably, of economy, with some desire, probably, to put a brake upon the reckless manner in which his party had, during their seventeen years of office, ran up the public expenditure from \$23,500,000 to over \$38,000,000, and increased the public debt over \$100,000,000—I have no doubt the hon. gentleman was sincere when he made his Budget speech in 1894 and promised that he was going to put a stop to this kind of thing. But how has it turned out? Has the hon. gentleman succeeded? No; because we find that in 1894 there was an increase in the public debt of \$4,501,987—keeping up the old record, going the old pace, the hon. gentleman's ideas all right, but the ideas of his party not in unison with his own—in 1895 an increase of debt amounting to \$6,891,897, or an increase of debt, after the hon. gentleman's statement, of over \$11,000,000. That does not

show that the hon. gentleman's anticipations were correct. Of course, some of this was attributable to the deficits; but the hon. gentleman, when he made his speech, knew about the deficits, and anticipated them; yet he was going to stop adding to the public debt. He was not able to carry out his anticipation in that respect, but was obliged, by the course of circumstances, by the extravagant character of the party with which he is connected, who are always talking about the money they have spent, the development of the country, and all that kind of thing, ideas which apparently the Finance Minister himself does not entertain—he was obliged to yield to the demands of his party. He seems to have some conservative ideas in this matter, he seems to have some notion of the terrible burden which an increase to the public debt causes to a new country like this. It is not the mere spending of money, it is not the mere question of adding four and a half millions in 1894, and nearly seven millions in 1895, as the Finance Minister well knows; but it is the large increase to the annual charge for interest which this causes to the country, which makes it difficult for a Government, no matter how economical they are inclined to be, and impossible, so far as this item is concerned, to effectuate a reduction in expenditure. When the Liberals come to power they will be confronted with that difficulty, in 1896, as they were in 1874. They will again be confronted with the difficulty that they will have to provide money to pay for the excesses and reckless extravagancies of their predecessors in office. I regret very much that the sound ideas which the Finance Minister personally seems to entertain with respect to matters of finance are not the ideas of the party to which he belongs. I regret for the sake of Canada and for the sake of the Liberal party, because when that party assumes the burden of governing the Dominion they will regret that his ideas had not more play, for instead of our having an increase of \$100,000,000, nearly doubling the debt in seventeen years, a very much less increase under economical management and under honest management would have given to this country even better public works than this administration has been able to give it for this largely increased debt, because the money has not gone to increase the assets of Canada. A large portion of it has been wasted, a large portion has been stolen through the maladministration, the carelessness and worse of hon. gentlemen opposite; at all events, the money borrowed has been spent, and while we may not be alarmed, and may not consider it necessary in our time to repay the principal, we are compelled month after month to meet the excessive annual interest for this largely increased debt, which increased interest amounts to a very large sum indeed. If there was one thing more than another on which the Finance

Mr. MARTIN.

Minister complimented himself it was in regard to the sugar duties and the great saving he had been enabled to make to the people by removing those burdens. But we find even on that matter the hon. gentleman has been obliged to modify his position. The sugar duties are equal to 23 per cent as against 42 per cent under Mr. Mackenzie's regime. Even in this matter, which I think has occupied from 15 to 20 per cent of the space in the hon. gentleman's Budget speeches for the last five or six years, space occupied in congratulating himself and praising himself through his party for the tremendous benefits conferred on the people by removing the sugar duty, he has been obliged to impose $\frac{1}{2}$ cent a pound on sugar, and this on account of the low price, amounts to about 50 per cent of the duty imposed in Mr. Mackenzie's time. There is one little matter in the hon. gentleman's speech with which I was very much taken, and it was that the hon. gentleman was able to show an increase in the export of manufactured articles. The hon. gentleman seemed to be quite delighted to find that the National Policy had increased the exports of manufactured goods. One would have imagined that that would have been one of the principal results of seventeen years of the tariff, and that he would long ago have been able to congratulate the country on a large increase in the export of manufactured goods, which this policy was adopted to foster. The hon. gentleman seemed to have that idea in his mind, that he should be able to congratulate the country on the great success of the National Policy in this particular, and he told the House that the export of manufactured articles in 1890 amounted to the value of \$5,741,184 and in 1895 it had risen to \$7,768,875. The hon. gentleman might have gone back to 1878, and he would have found that without the National Policy, designed to foster exports of manufactured goods, the value of such exports was \$4,127,755. So after twelve long years of taxation, of protection and of National Policy, the hon. gentleman was enabled to announce increased exports of manufactured goods by a little over \$1,000,000. But the hon. gentleman was afraid to go back very far, and so he selected the period from 1890 to 1895, in which he found there had been an increase of about \$2,000,000. I could take the tariff, and if we were not very much pressed for time, and if we were not necessarily brief in our remarks on the Budget, I could take item after item and show the amounts taken out of the pockets of the people and put not into the public treasury but into the pockets of manufacturers, and not to the amount of \$4,000,000, not to \$7,768,875, but more, much more, during the past seventeen years. I could give such a list as would occupy two or three hours, these being cases in which money was taken from the pockets of the people and placed in the pockets of the

manufacturers. The hon. gentleman apparently thinks that the exports of manufactured goods are large, but such is not the opinion of any independent man who will look at the subject from a business standpoint, especially remembering that the National Policy was introduced for making by a hothouse process Canada a manufacturing country, by changing this Dominion from its natural position as an agricultural, mining, fishing and lumbering country with a fair proportion of manufactures, into a purely manufacturing country. The National Policy was instituted for the purpose of setting aside nature and converting Canada into a purely manufacturing country at the expense of the other great industries, agriculture, mining and lumbering. Yet we find this to be the result, that while the Mackenzie Government without a National Policy was able to export of manufactured goods the value of over \$4,000,000, this Government, with a National Policy which has been in force seventeen years, is only able to export manufactured goods to the value of \$7,500,000. I have no hesitation in saying that if the Liberal policy had been continued, the value of exports of manufactured articles would have been very much beyond the present value, because that was a policy which was not intended to establish manufacturing industries by hothouse process, but was a policy under which manufactures adapted to the country grew strong and vigorous, developed naturally and were able to send exports abroad because these industries were well settled in the country and not because they were supported by a prohibitory tariff. All through I find the hon. gentleman making most inaccurate statements. He cannot even make an incidental reference to a matter of current commercial history without exaggeration. He tells us that the smelter at Hamilton has been completed, and that the proprietors had spent \$400,000 upon it. Just as I heard that from the hon. gentleman's lips, I read in a newspaper that it was part of a bargain between the smelter company and the city of Hamilton, that in order to get a bonus of \$50,000 from the city they were bound to expend \$400,000. But on account of their having only spent \$300,000, they were making application to the city to be relieved of the forfeiture of bonus incurred in that way. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) converted the real post office deficit of \$1,000,000 into a deficit of only \$800,000, but it was very peculiar that in a matter which seemed to be in his favour, he figures out \$100,000 too much. He could by no possibility say it was \$200,000 or \$250,000, but he had to go \$100,000 beyond the mark. The hon. gentleman made the following peculiar statement:—

But, Sir, if the home market for agricultural products has increased in that respect, so also has the foreign market as shown by the exports of the country.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the exports show that Canada has been supplying the foreign market; but surely the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) won't claim that his policy has increased the foreign market. I heard the hon. member (Mr. Henderson), from my native county, seriously tell the House the other night, that the National Policy had increased the price of wheat, and I understood that his remarks applied to the province of Ontario. When the National Policy was introduced, it was promised by the friends of hon. gentlemen that it would increase the price of wheat for the farmers; but during the last five years the difficulty in the North-west and Manitoba is that the price of wheat has been steadily getting less all the time, and the Conservative orators up there tell us that it is quite impossible to increase the price of wheat, and that the Government of this country has no control over the foreign market. But the Minister of Finance seems to dispute that, and I judge from his statements that he has increased the foreign market. Well, Sir, if the National Policy is able to increase the price of wheat in Ontario, as the hon. member (Mr. Henderson) says, what defect is there in the National Policy that it will not increase the price of wheat in Manitoba? I asked the Finance Minister to bring his great abilities to bear on that question. Surely if the National Policy increases the price of wheat in one province its influence should be Dominion-wide, and it should increase the price in another province. The late Secretary of State (Mr. Montague) told us last session that the National Policy did increase the price of wheat in Manitoba, but the unfortunate part of it was that at the time the price had increased the Manitobans had no wheat to sell. The hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson), in the course of his remarks, referred to Mr. Meighen, president of the Lake of the Woods Milling Company, as a great authority on political economy and the National Policy. Well, Mr. Meighen is a great admirer of the National Policy, and he is quite pleased with a fiscal policy that will increase the price of wheat at a time when the wheat has all left the farmers' hands and gone into the hands of Mr. Ogilvie and himself. I am rather inclined myself to agree with those Conservative speakers in Manitoba, who for five years past have been telling us that the National Policy has no effect whatever upon the price of wheat.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Except to lower it.

Mr. MARTIN. I do not know whether it lowers the price of wheat or not. I hope not. There is something lowering the price of wheat, but whether it is the National Policy or not, it is very hard for me to say. We find from the Trade and Navigation Returns that the export of wheat from this country to Liverpool has very largely increased during the past few years, and we

heard from the hon. member (Mr. Bennett) that Manitoba and the North-west produced 60,000,000 bushels of grain this year, and that most of that grain had gone out of the country. If 60,000,000, or anything like it, has been exported this year via New York—as the hon. member (Mr. Bennett) told us very regretfully—surely the price obtained for that wheat in Liverpool could not have been influenced in any way, shape or manner by the National Policy. From my experience, I can point out one way in which the National Policy has lowered the price of wheat. Very often, in Manitoba and the Territories, we have considerable frost. It has been considered more or less unpatriotic to acknowledge that; but there is no use denying it. Along with Dakota and Minnesota and the great North-west generally, we are subject, and always will be, I fancy, more or less subject to frost. It has not been at all serious in recent years; but every year a certain percentage of our wheat is touched with frost, and very considerably damaged. Now, Mr. Speaker, there is always a better market for damaged wheat in the United States than there is in any part of Canada or in the old country, and, year after year, we have found ourselves unable to send our frozen wheat into the United States, in consequence of the existence of their duty upon wheat; and, so far as that duty is caused by a retaliatory tariff on this side, to that extent the National Policy tends to reduce the price of damaged wheat in Manitoba. The reason why damaged wheat has a better market in the United States is that there is a large poor class in the large cities who will buy inferior flour made from inferior grades of wheat which can hardly be sold at all in Canada. So that we are placed at a disadvantage, at any rate, by the National Policy of the United States, which is closely linked with ours.

The hon. gentleman, in his speech, dealt considerably with the question of protection to agriculture. I have noticed that hon. gentlemen opposite all have a good deal to say about that; and, possibly, in some parts of Canada, in very small sections, where there is a local market, there may be some advantage derived from agricultural protection. But that advantage is entirely offset by the great disadvantage it is to other communities in those sections. We find that exemplified very well in British Columbia. In certain portions of British Columbia, where there is agricultural land, the agricultural protection is an advantage to the farmer; but it is certainly a great disadvantage to the development of the country. Take the Kootenay mining district, a new district which is being opened up, and which is dependent almost entirely on the United States for everything. It is found a great disadvantage to the development of that district that the people have to pay a large duty on everything that is brought in. While the agricul-

Mr. MARTIN.

tural protection may be of some slight advantage to a small section of agricultural land which communicates at some distance with that mining district, the disadvantages to it and to the development of British Columbia as a whole, depending so much as it must on its mining industry, must be apparent. And it seems to me that it works even against the farmers indirectly, because, unless the mining interests and the country generally are developed, the farmers cannot expect a market for their products.

Now, I have to deal with another statement of the hon. gentleman—that in 1894 he decreased the duties by \$1,500,000; and I would ask the time of the House to read his statement and his proof of that statement:

But I want to ask the hon. leader of the Opposition, and my hon. friend opposite me (Sir Richard Cartwright)—the latter of whom said, in 1894, the reductions in the tariff were less than nothing, the former declared that they were next to nothing—I want to ask them whether or not it is possible for them to revise their opinion, and whether they propose or not to put before the House statements which will place the matter clearly in the eyes of the country, so that the people may judge whether hon. gentlemen opposite or I have made the correct statement. I propose to submit a list of the articles on which reductions have been made, showing the extent of the reduction on each article, and this list extends over the whole range of imported goods. It is as follows.

That is offered as a proof of the hon. gentleman's statement that in 1894 he reduced the taxation by \$1,500,000. Now, how would a person naturally expect to find him going on with the proof? One would naturally expect that, in giving each item, he would give the old rate of duty, the new rate of duty, and the reduction, as he has done. Then I would have expected to find another column showing how much the actual reduction was—how much of the \$1,500,000 was reduced on horned cattle, how much on the next item, how much on the next item, and so on; and I would have expected at the foot of this table to find that all the reductions added together, amounted to a sum much larger than \$1,500,000; and then I would have expected him to go on and give the items on which he had increased the duty in 1894, and figured them out in the same way, and that then the difference between the decreases and the increases would have amounted to the sum of \$1,500,000. That is, if the hon. gentleman was going to prove his statement in the way he started out to prove it. But the hon. gentleman does nothing. He simply says, "Here is a list of items on which I have reduced the duty; therefore, there was a saving to the people of \$1,500,000." He makes no reference whatever to the fact, a most patent fact, that there were large increases in that very same tariff revision. Now, Mr. Speaker, at some trouble to myself, I have endeavoured to supplement the hon. gentleman's table in the direction I have pointed out, and, when I have gone through this table, we

shall see whether there is the reduction he claims. It is very hard to believe it possible, because, when we take the dutiable articles in 1895 and the amount of duty obtained from them, and compare that with what it was in 1894, we find that there was not any reduction at all, the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) pointed out, but that there was a slight increase. So that it is very hard to tell where this \$1,500,000 comes in. Therefore, I have gone to the trouble of going through the list which the hon. gentleman has given, and finding out how much the reduction has amounted to on each item, and I shall be able to point out very clearly the real effect of the protective tariff in many instances by referring to the decreases and the increases which the hon. gentleman made in the year 1894. Take the first item, animals, living. On horned cattle, the reduction is 10 per cent, and the amount, \$3,560. Take the amount of duty that was obtained from this article in 1895, the first year when the hon. gentleman's tariff came into force, namely, \$7,129, and, as the hon. gentleman just took off 10 per cent, there was a saving of half that, or \$3,560. On sheep, the reduction was 10 per cent, or half the amount collected under the 20 per cent tariff, which was \$12,000, leaving to the hon. gentleman's credit, \$6,000. On hogs, \$524 duty was collected under the higher rate, and the reduction of one-half cent a pound gave \$175. The hon. gentleman was very careful to say he did not put in everything, but he gave us some very small amounts, and I do not know what he left out. He did not leave out hogs, which came to the large sum of \$175. With regard to those three items—horned cattle, sheep and hogs—it seems to me this reduction in duty is a direct violation of the hon. gentleman's policy of protection for agricultural interests. If the policy of protection be so good that hon. gentlemen talk about so much, how is it that the very first three items the hon. gentleman selected in 1894 on which to reduce protection were these three items of horned cattle, sheep and hogs, which the Conservative party claimed so much credit for protecting. I really hope that Conservative speakers will not put me down, after these few remarks, as advocating protection on horned cattle, sheep and hogs, because, surely I am at liberty to point out to hon. gentlemen opposite that they are violating their own ideas, without being responsible myself for those ideas. I wish it to be distinctly understood that I am not inviting an increase of duty or protection on these three articles, but I am pointing out hon. gentlemen opposite in one breath blow themselves up to the skies for having given protection to the agricultural industry, and then in another breath point out the great services the Conservative party has performed to Canada by doing exactly the opposite, reducing the duty on these agricultural products. The next item is

baking powder. I regret very much not being able to give the hon. gentleman credit for anything in taking in baking powder, although no doubt he is entitled to something. He reduced the duty from 8 cents to 6 cents a pound, or 25 per cent, on packages less than one pound, but, unfortunately, in the Trade and Navigation Returns there is no discrimination as to baking powder in packages of less than one pound, and I have not been able to find out how much the hon. gentleman saved to the country on baking powder, and therefore my calculation will be wrong to that extent. The hon. gentleman will be entitled, on giving the information, which, no doubt, he can get, to any of the benefits from the reduction in duty on this article. The next item is bells. The hon. gentleman reduced the duty on bells, except for churches from 30 to 25 per cent, making an annual saving to the country, in 1895, equal to \$930. Then comes brass and manufactures of, nails and rivets, and burrs, reduced from 35 to 30 per cent, and saving \$155. Wire, which was 15 per cent, the hon. gentleman reduced to 10, and thus saved to the people, on that item, \$260, in 1895. The next item is sweetened biscuits. There is another item where I am not able to give the hon. gentleman credit, because in 1894 all kinds of biscuits were at 25 per cent, and in 1895 sweetened biscuits were 27½, and it was only sweetened biscuits that were reduced in 1894; and as the Trade and Navigation Returns do not discriminate between sweetened and not sweetened, I have not been able to find out how much the hon. gentleman is entitled to credit for in this item. The next item is macaroni and vermicelli, on which the duty was 2 cents per pound, now reduced to 25 per cent ad valorem, making a total saving of \$1,360. Barley was 15 cents per bushel before, now it is 30 per cent, making a reduction of \$520, and this is another violation of the hon. gentleman's policy of protection to agriculture. British gum, dextine, sizing cream, and enamel sizing, reduced from 1 cent per pound to 10 per cent, ad valorem, gives a saving to the country of \$2,895. Brooms, the hon. gentleman reduced from 25 to 20 per cent, making an actual saving to the country of the large amount of \$45 on the importation of 1895. The whole importation is \$224, and the saving in duty, \$45. All through the tariff, we will find instance after instance, where the hon. gentleman has been able to make very much larger reductions and still have practically no effect on the importation at all, because there is no importation worth speaking of. The next article is buttons, of vegetable, ivory or horn, on which there is a saving by the reduction of duty of \$2,380. Then on buttons of hoof, rubber, vulcanite or composition, there is a saving of \$230, and on all other buttons, n.e.s., a saving of \$4,115. On candles, paraffine and wax, there is a

reduction of duty amounting to \$195, and on cane or rattan, split or otherwise manufactured, the reduction amounts to \$1,060. Carriages, formerly 35 per cent, now 25 per cent, total saving, \$4,780. There is some difficulty in making this out because there is a sliding scale, but the amount I have given is the result of the closest calculation I can make. Cases for jewels, saving, \$805; clocks, saving, \$10,500. One of the few of what I call substantial savings in the hon. gentleman's tariff is in this item, because clocks are an important matter and the hon. gentleman has reduced them from 35 per cent to 25 per cent. Clothes wringers, formerly \$1 each and 30 per cent, now 25 per cent each and 20 per cent. Importation, 1,997; saving, \$3,000. Taking the value of each machine as not less than \$2 the present protection on clothes wringers is 32½ per cent. The old protection was 80 per cent. I have looked into this matter somewhat because it is a case that illustrates the hon. gentleman's tariff. In 1893, the importation was 384; in 1894 it was 709. In 1895, when the hon. gentleman made a substantial reduction in his tariff, the importation was 3,941. Now, I think a fair estimate of the number of clothes wringers used in Canada each year is 100,000. At \$2 apiece this would represent a total value of \$200,000. The duty, if all were imported, would be \$65,000. There actually went into the treasury in the form of duty on clothes wringers in 1895, \$1,997. Allowing \$3,000 to allow a good margin, we have a total of \$60,000 taken from the pockets of the people through the duty on clothes wringers if my calculations are right. The actual amount of duty collected was about \$2,000, so that there was over \$60,000 taken out of the pockets of the people of Canada for wringers and put not into the treasury but into the pockets of the manufacturers of clothes wringers. Tar and coal pitch, now free, saving, \$2,195; cocoa mats and matting, saving, \$355; cocoa-nut dessicated, saving, \$1,635; coffee, extracts of or substitutes, saving, \$720; coffee roasted or browned, not imported direct, saving, \$775; coffee, roasted, ground and substitutes, n.e.s., \$595. On these preparations of coffee the present duty is 75 per cent. I would like the advice of the Finance Minister, if he would give it to me in a case of this kind. This is a specific duty. According to the hon. gentleman's statement in his speech, respecting roasted and ground coffee the duty is reduced from 5 cents a pound to 3 cents a pound, but on extracts of coffee not roasted and ground 2 cents a pound and 10 per cent. Now, there is apparently a reduction in duty, but when we come to translate the specific into an *valorem* duty, we find that, while the duty in 1894 was 23 per cent, the duty in 1895 is 75 per cent. What am I to do in a case of that kind? As a matter of fact the hon. gentleman has increased the *ad valorem* duty from 23 per cent to 75 per cent, but he has decreased the

specific duty, so that according to this calculation he is not entitled to the reduction. I have, however, solved the difficulty by giving the hon. gentleman full credit for his reduction, viz.: \$720 in one case, \$775 in another, \$595 in another. The real fact was, however, that the result of the duty was to increase the burden of taxation upon the people of Canada by \$800. Collars of cotton and linen, xylonite and celluloid, saving, \$2,305. The present duty is just about 50 per cent on that article, showing that the great bulk of the protection goes into the pockets of the manufacturers and not into the treasury of the country. Copper and manufactures of nails, rivets, and burrs, saving, \$70; copper, old and scrap, saving, \$325; copper in pigs, saving, \$1,305; copper, seamless drawn tubing, saving, \$2,840; copper, ignots, sheets, plates and sheating, not planished or coated, saving, \$345; copper in bars, rods and bolts. Here is another item I was not able to find. The hon. gentleman is entitled to whatever reduction there is in that case. Cordage, cotton, saving, \$930; cotton clothing, including corsets, saving, \$8,185; cuffs of cotton, &c., saving, \$270. The duty on cuffs is still 54 per cent; and, as the importation only amounts to 3,015, it is apparently prohibitory. Dressing harness, leather and shoe, saving, \$1,770; drugs, dyes, chemicals and medicines, saving, \$1,675; sheet glue, saving, \$11,415; liquid glue, saving, \$500; liquorice paste, saving, \$4,420; liquorice in rolls and sticks, saving, \$2,160; yeast, compressed in bulk or mass of not less than 50 pounds, saving, \$3,385. In the case of yeast in lots of less than 50 pounds and yeast cakes, the duty runs from 4 cents to 8 cents a pound. The total import is only \$29 worth, showing that the duty is prohibitory. In fact on lots of less than 50 pounds the duty is 70 per cent. But yeast of the value of \$84,162 is imported in the mass, on which the hon. gentleman made his reduction. The hon. gentleman has evidently made this reduction in order to help the bakers. So far as the general public is concerned, he left yeast, or yeast cakes, and small lots of yeast, still at the very highest specific duties, running from 4 to 8 cents a pound, because the whole amount of yeast imported into Canada was only \$29 worth. Earthenware and china, brown or coloured, \$730; decorated, printed or sponged, \$8,200; white granite, \$9,700; manufactures of earthenware, n.e.s., \$315. Feathers, ostrich or vulture, \$5,250. Fertilizers, \$1,900. Blackberries, gooseberries, raspberries and strawberries—this is another case that I do not know what to do with. The hon. gentleman decreased his specific duties, and increased the *ad valorem* duty, according to the great fall in the price of fruit. According to his own claim, there would have been a saving of \$6,310; but the actual rate of duties *ad valorem* translated into the *ad valorem* of

1893, was 29 per cent, while in 1895 it was 27 per cent. Plums, \$1,135. Furniture, \$13,165. The whole amount of furniture imported was only \$263,254, showing that the duty on furniture was almost prohibitory, because \$260,000 worth of furniture is only a very small part of the amount of furniture used in the Dominion. Glass, etc., flasks and phials, of eight ounces capacity and over, insulators and so on—it is difficult to find out exactly what the saving is, because the Trade and Navigation Returns are not the same in both years; but taking 1893 as a basis, when there was an importation of 150,000 dozens, it would be \$7,500, and I give the hon. gentleman credit for that amount. Silvered glass, bevelled, \$360. Gunpowder and other explosives, gun, rifle and sporting powders, \$2,430; gun, rifle and pistol cartridges and cartridge cases, \$3,835; gun wads and percussion caps, \$830. Gutta percha and India-rubber belting, \$830. Writing ink, \$1,660. I am taking the items just as the hon. gentleman gave them in his speech, and I give the hon. gentleman credit for the exact amount, as near as I can figure it out, of the saving on each of these items. Iron and manufactures of iron—agricultural implements, binding attachments, \$90. This is one of the great reductions from 35 per cent to 20 per cent. Drills, seed grain, \$2,370; harrows, \$2,310; harvesters, \$12,315; mowing machines, \$7,210; ploughs, \$4,470; reapers, \$150, or a total of \$28,915 that the hon. gentleman saved to the country by his reduction from 35 per cent to 20 per cent on a certain class of agricultural implements last session. Iron, bar and round and galvanized, \$15; bar iron, rolled and hammered, \$14,955. The duty is still 29 per cent. Cast iron pipes of every description, \$5,305. In 1893 the duty on these was 63 per cent; in spite of the hon. gentleman's reduction it is still 44 per cent. I may say that these pipes are an article in which the hon. gentleman would do well to make a much further reduction. His reduction was from \$12 a ton and not less than 35 per cent, to \$10 a ton and not less than 35 per cent. Iron pipes are very much in use in British Columbia for the purpose of hydraulic mining, and I think a duty of 44 per cent upon an article which is so much required for developing a growing industry in that new province can be denominated by no less strong a term than an outrage. In justice to a new province like British Columbia, where there are prospects of great wealth on account of minerals and deposits of auriferous gravels which can only be developed by means of hydraulic mining, it would be well if the hon. gentleman and his Government were really interested in the produce of the western part of Canada, to remove the duty upon these iron pipes, which is found to be a serious impediment to the progress of the mining industry in British Columbia. Engines, other than fire, and locomotives, \$755; hard-

ware, builders, hardware, \$8,765; iron and steel sheets—now, Sir, I would like to draw the attention of the House to this item. The hon. gentleman reduced the duties from 12½ per cent to 5 per cent. 12½ per cent does not appear to be a very large duty, but apparently it was practically prohibitive, because we find that in 1893, when the duty was 12½, there was only \$35,258 worth imported, and the duty realized was \$4,407. When the hon. gentleman reduced the duty from 12½ to 5 per cent in 1895, the imports rose from \$35,398 in 1893, to \$707,974 in 1895, realizing a duty of \$35,398, and the saving to the country was one and a half times that much, because the old duty was 12½, and the new duty was only 5. I have been able to give the hon. gentleman credit, in this calculation, on the item of iron and steel, to the amount of \$53,045. I think that item illustrates in a forcible manner the contention of the Liberal party that a large reduction in the duties could be accomplished, and a corresponding increase in the revenue obtained at the same time. There is no doubt many other items such as this where, by reducing the duty from 12½ to 5 per cent, the hon. gentleman has been able to increase his revenue from \$4,407 in 1893 to \$35,398 in 1895. You will find item after item like that, if you go through the tariff list where there is a reduction of that kind. Iron is a heavy article, and by reason of distance of carriage and freight rates 12½ per cent is practically, so far as this class is concerned, almost prohibitive. By reducing the duty to the reasonable rate of 5 per cent, the hon. gentleman has made one of the heaviest savings in the whole list; and as I say, we are able to credit him on this item alone with over \$53,000. Iron in slabs, blooms, puddled bars, etc., \$15,730. The old duty was 50 per cent, the new duty is less than 30 per cent. The hon. gentleman would have been able, by making the reduction in duty to secure a saving to the people of \$15,730 on that one small item. Locks of all kinds are still 32½ per cent; saving \$1,665. Portable steam engines, \$865; threshers and separators, \$640. There is still a duty of 30 per cent on these machines, which is practically prohibitory, and yet it is an article for which the people of the North-west are obliged to pay a large sum out of the proceeds of their crops. Sewing machines, which also go into almost every family, pay a duty of 30 per cent; the total saving was \$1,675. Type-writers, which still pay a duty of 27½ per cent, \$1,115. All other machinery showed a saving of \$24,755. Malleable iron and other castings, \$10,820. Nails and spikes, composition, \$300; nails and spikes, wrought and pressed, \$1,700. There is still a duty of 30 per cent on this item, which is practically in use in every household in Canada. Nails, and spikes, cut, \$1,070. There is still a duty of 36 per cent, it be-

ing formerly 48 per cent. Nails, wire, \$1,875, the duty is 46 per cent, formerly it was 92. Foreign cut and wire nails, even under the reduced tariff, are kept out of Canada. Plough plates, and other plates for agricultural implements, \$1,465. Pumps, \$3,325. Railway fish-plates, \$4,355, the duty is still 42 per cent. Here is an item on which the hon. gentleman should make a reduction, light rails for tramways. The hon. gentleman allows heavy rails for ordinary steam roads to come in free, but these light rails which are used for tramways for carrying ore, are heavily taxed. Safes and doors, \$215. Screws, iron or steel, commonly called wood screws, \$245. The duty has been reduced from 6 cents to 3 cents per pound, but it still is equal to 35 per cent, and is absolutely prohibitory. Formerly it was 70 per cent. Screws of one inch, and less than 2 inch, have been reduced from 8 cents to 6 cents per pound, \$235; the duty is now 52 per cent, formerly it was 69 per cent—it is, at all events, prohibitory. Screws of less than one inch have been reduced from 11 cents to 8 cents, making the duty 49 per cent against 67 per cent formerly. The saving is \$100. All these duties on wood screws are prohibitory. These screws, however, are used in almost every family, and the duty, with the exception of a few dollars, goes into the pockets of the protected manufacturers. Scales and balances and weighing beams are 30 per cent, formerly they were 75 per cent, \$1,095. Skates, \$1,830. Stoves, are 27½ per cent, although they are used throughout the country, \$925. Swedish rolled iron nail rods show a saving of \$1,065; boiler tubes, of \$3,235; other wrought iron tubes, \$7,405, the protection being 53 per cent, as against 58 formerly. On barbed-wire fencing the duty, which was formerly 70 per cent, is now 35, but it is still practically prohibitory. The saving was \$3,195. In 1893 there was no barbed-wire fencing imported into Manitoba, but in 1895 there was an importation of \$621, at 35 per cent. Wire, covered, \$2,535. Surgical and dental instruments, \$1,935; steel ingots, \$3,115. Saws, \$2,200. Manufactures of iron and steel, not classified, \$14,080, although the duty is still 27½ per cent. On the whole of the iron schedule the duty collected in 1895 was \$1,507,864, or a rate of 29 per cent. If that had been brought down to a reasonable revenue tariff or 20 per cent, which is a fairly high tariff on manufactured iron, there would have been saved to the people \$500,000, besides all the money that goes into the manufacturer's pockets. There is an opportunity for the hon. gentleman actually to get somewhere near \$1,500,000. If the hon. gentleman had gone right along with the iron schedule, he could, by reducing the rate of duty from 29 to 20 per cent, have made a wholesale saving of \$500,000. I give the Finance Minister credit, however, for intending in

Mr. MARTIN.

his original proposition to make a considerable reduction in the iron schedule; but the Manufacturers' Association got together, prepared their brief, sent a deputation here, and when the hon. gentleman got through with the iron schedule, he was only able to make a paltry saving, instead of saving half a million. Then we come to jellies, jams and preserves, on which there is a saving of \$6,320, although the duty stands at 34 per cent. Lead pipe and lead shot, \$155. Leather, sole, \$3,210; calf kid, lamb and sheep skins, \$8,345; upper leather, dressed or glazed, \$4,725. Japanned, patent or enamelled leather, \$765, and other leather and skins, \$540. Then there is manufacturers' leather harness, on which there is still a duty of 30 per cent, \$2,000. Leather belting, \$1,075; Manilla hoods, \$75; gas, coal oil and electric light fixtures, \$1,295; still 27½ per cent. Milk, condensed, sweetened, \$1,010. Plumbago, \$125; black lead, \$700; plumbago, manufactures of, \$820; mucilage, \$310. Oils—Now, Mr. Speaker, here is another case in which I do not know what to do. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) reduced the duty on kerosene oil from 7½ cents to 6 cents, and, according to his claim in his Budget speech, he would be entitled to count that as a saving, but the difficulty is the ad valorem duty. In 1893—I take 1893 for comparisons of this kind because 1894 was a broken year, and partly under the hon. gentleman's new tariff and partly under the old. In 1893 the ad valorem duty was 93-3-10th per cent, and in 1895 it was 93-4-10ths per cent, or 1-10th of 1 per cent more, ad valorem, than it was in 1893. The Finance Minister is not entitled to any thanks for his decrease on coal oil on the ad valorem basis. However, in order to be entirely fair to him, I have given him credit for the whole reduction, which amounted to the large sum of \$77,455, although we still have the enormous ad valorem duty on coal oil of 93-4-10ths per cent. With regard to the products of petroleum, I am again in a difficulty. Apparently, on the specific reduction the Finance Minister would be entitled to a credit of \$4,580; but the ad valorem duty on these products in 1893 was only 67 per cent, while the ad valorem duty in 1895 was 103 per cent. Hon. gentlemen will understand why it is that, while there has been a reduction of the specific duty, there is an increase in the ad valorem duty, arising from the fact that there has been a very large fall in the price of the article.

Mr. CLEVELAND. No.

Mr. MARTIN. Yes. The hon. gentleman will see that my figure is right. If you take the ad valorem duty of 1893 on the products of petroleum, you will find it amounts to 67 per cent, whereas the ad valorem duty in 1895 amounts to 103 per cent, or nearly 30 per cent increase. While the Finance Minister did, as a matter of fact, reduce the

duty from 7 1-5th to 6 cents per gallon, the ad valorem duty has increased. However, I have been generous with him, and I have given him credit for the \$4,580, although, as a matter of fact, he ought to be debited with that amount. The Finance Minister also claimed that there was a saving to the people on essential oils of \$3,000, and lubricating oils, \$8,700. Paints and colours, \$5,600; putty, \$290. Manufactures of paper bags and sacks, \$1,460. The hon. gentleman took credit in his statement for ruled, boarded and boxed papers, but I find, on referring to the tariff, he made a mistake in that. For there was no decrease at all, and the duty still remains at 35 per cent. However, I will give him credit for it, as it only amounted to \$370. Again, strawboard, \$1,625. Paraffine wax, \$1,640; it is still 30 per cent, and was formerly 45 per cent. Lead pencils, \$2,900; pocket-books, and purses, \$2,875. Lard, tried or rendered, \$1,915. Meats.—

Now, here again we come across the hon. gentleman's agricultural products. He made a very large reduction in meats, and still he considers that agricultural protection is a prominent quality of the National Policy. It is about the only thing in connection with the National Policy that hon. gentlemen opposite are not prepared nearly to admit has been entirely exploded. They still think they can persuade the farmers that there is something in agricultural protection, although, as a matter of fact, the market of the farmers is determined by conditions entirely beyond the control of the National Policy. However, on meats the hon. gentleman, so far as bacon, hams, shoulders, and sides are concerned, is entitled to \$8,270; canned meats, \$3,725; dried and smoked meats, \$1,300; other meats, salted, \$510. Sand-paper, &c., \$3,225. Sauces and catsup, in bottles, \$5,500. The present duty is 35 per cent, although the former duty was 51 per cent. Sauces and catsup, in bulk, \$600. The entire importation of these commodities amounted to \$409. The present duty is 35 per cent, and the former duty was 91 per cent, but the present duty is still entirely prohibitory, as the importation shows. The amount imported in 1893 was \$827, and, although the hon. gentleman reduced the duty, the imports only increased \$1,171, showing that this duty, so far as a matter of revenue was concerned, is a farce, a delusion and a snare. It is entirely a duty for the purpose of giving the manufacturers of sauces and catsup in Canada so much additional profit. Soy—the hon. gentleman saved to the country \$350 on soy. Former duty was 58 per cent, and the present is 35 per cent, which is also prohibitory. Flax-seed, \$1,170. Soap, laundry, \$5,700; harness soap, \$80; soap, perfumed or toilet, \$13,000; powders, pumice, &c., \$6,445. Preserved ginger, \$125. Sugar candy, \$4,810. Glucose, or grape sugar, \$5,510. Spirits of turpentine, \$3,925. Binder-twine, \$3,000. Cotton twine—another article I cannot find in

the returns. Twine of all kinds, \$1,200; manufactures of twine, hammocks, and lawn tennis nets, \$575. Varnish, japans, dryers, &c., \$3,265. Tomatoes, fresh, \$1,310; tomatoes and other vegetables, in cans, \$2,055. Wood and manufactures of, including: barrels containing petroleum, \$7,825; caskets and coffins, \$330; plain mouldings, \$150; gilded mouldings, \$1,080; hubs, spokes, fellos, \$130; shingles, \$125; show-cases, \$560. Present duty 35 per cent, former duty 57 per cent. Woodenware, pails, tubs and churns, \$635; picture frames, \$1,540; veneers of wood not over 16½ inches thick, \$1,475. These are all the decreases the hon. gentleman claims credit for in his speech. He says he overlooks some, but as I find items as small as \$45 in his savings, I do not think the items he overlooked amount to very much.

Now, I have prepared a statement of the increases the hon. gentleman made at the same time, and I find, overlooking some of the smaller increases, the following amounts to be charged against him:—Feathers, n.e.s., increased from 25 to 35 per cent, \$1,660. Cocoa shells and nuts, chocolate and other preparations of cocoa, n.e.s., which were free, put at 20 per cent, \$12,700. Spices, unground, increased from 10 to 12½ per cent, \$2,815. Albumenized paper, increased from 25 to 30 per cent, \$1,800. Printed books, increased from 15 per cent to 6 cents per pound, \$15,345. Acid, acetic and pyroligneous, now 165 per cent, formerly 84 per cent; imports fell from \$8,987 to \$4,154, about one-half; increase, \$3,320. Olive oil, increased from 20 to 30 per cent, \$1,750. Scrap iron, increased from 15½ to 31 per cent, \$33,990. Sugar above No. 16, ½ cent per pound, \$45,915. That was in 1895, and while I give it here, I take it off at the end, so as to get at the increase in 1894. Sugar below No. 16, \$1,726,680. Molasses, \$9,040. Velvets, velveteens and plush fabrics, 20 to 30 per cent, \$16,780. Elastic webbing, formerly free, now 20 per cent, \$14,360. All fabrics composed wholly or in part of wool, worsted, &c., former duties; value of 10 cents or under, 22½ per cent; from 10 cents to 14 cents, 25 per cent; over 14 cents, 27½ per cent; present duty all round, 30 per cent; average of old duty in 1893, 27 per cent; making a total increase in these articles, which everybody uses, of \$86,920. Socks and stockings, wool and cotton, 10 cents per pound and 30 per cent, increased to 10 cents per dozen and 35 per cent, or, translating it from specific to ad valorem, formerly 33 per cent, now 41 per cent, an increase of \$38,255. Carpets, increased from 25 to 30 per cent—Brussels, \$16,155; tapestry, \$18,570. Ready made clothing, formerly 10 cents per pound and 25 per cent, now 5 cents per pound and 30 per cent, or an increase from 32 to 34 per cent ad valorem, \$16,295. Spirits, 12½ cents increase in 1895, \$103,000. Taking off the sugar, molasses and spirits as belonging to 1895, the increase of duties

which the hon. gentleman managed to impose on the country by his reduced tariff of 1894, figured out in this way, amounted to \$326,630, while the decrease he made amounted to \$614,890, or a net reduction in duties in 1894 of \$288,260 in actual fact, as against the hon. gentleman's statement, unsupported by a single iota of proof, of \$1,500,000. That is as near as the hon. gentleman can get, and I would like to point out that even on that we have fairly to take off all the tax on coal oil—on which as I have pointed out, there was no decrease—amounting to \$77,455, which makes his net decrease, in his much wanted tariff reduction of 1894, after months had been spent by himself and his colleagues in going through Canada from one end to the other inquiring where the reductions could be made, amounts to a paltry \$210,805. And he had scarcely got that tariff into force before he was obliged to come down here and make increases in the duties on sugar, molasses and spirits, amounting to \$1,838,720, doing away entirely with his decrease of 1894, and making a net increase of \$1,550,460 in the two years. That corresponds a great deal more nearly with the calculations we get in looking at the total amount of the dutiable articles, and taking the duty upon that, although they do not exactly correspond, and the reason is plain—because it does not follow that there is relatively the same importation each year. In one year there will be a larger importation of articles, upon which a higher duty is placed, because when we calculate it, we will find that the duty on dutiable articles in 1893 was 30·3 per cent, in 1894, 30·8 per cent, and in 1895, 30·5 per cent. So that taking the average of duty, calculated upon dutiable goods all through, and comparing the year 1893, when the old tariff was in force, with the year 1895, when the new tariff was in force, we find that for this decrease of \$614,890, the hon. gentleman is not really entitled to credit, because there has been a general increase in the average of duty which wiped that out. But the hon. gentleman says it is not fair to calculate the duties upon the dutiable goods alone, but that you must take the free goods. The hon. gentleman credits himself with having made a large increase to the free list in 1894. That is one of the favoured boasts of the hon. gentleman and his organs. Let us examine that for a moment, and it will not take long, because the additions to the free list practically amount to nothing. The hon. gentleman gave the different items in his speech which he added to the free list. The first is coal tar, on which there was a duty of 10 per cent and which is now free. In 1893 the duty amounted to \$21,932, and the saving would thus be \$2,193. The next item is copper, formerly 10 per cent, and now free. The duty amounted to \$166,694, making a reduction of \$16,694. The next item was flax seed, formerly 10 cents per bushel, and now

Mr. MARTIN.

free. The duty amounted \$12,637, and the amount saved is \$1,171. The next item is hubs, spokes and felloes, on which the duty was formerly 15 per cent, amounting to \$877, and the saving \$131. Then we have manilla hoods, on which formerly the duty was 20 per cent, and the amount collected \$392, making a reduction of \$78. Shingles, on which the duty was 20 per cent, and the amount of duty collected \$1,631, giving a reduction of \$326. The total amount in duties thus remitted by putting these articles on the free list is \$20,593. That is all that free goods matter amounts to. Those six items are the only ones in 1894 which the hon. gentleman took off the dutiable list and placed on the free list, and the entire saving was \$20,593. While it is true that if the hon. gentleman takes the whole amount of importations in 1895, he gets a lower rate than he had in 1893, it arises not from the fact that he took any articles of any account off the dutiable list in 1894 and put them on the free list, but from the accidental fact, which is just as likely to go the other way in 1896, that in 1895 there happened to be a larger amount of free goods imported than in 1873. This is a matter which varies from year to year, over which the hon. gentleman has no control, and which does not depend in any way on the course he took in 1894.

I have not much more to say. I intend to allude briefly to some very extraordinary calculations which I imagine the hon. gentleman borrowed from his newly arrived colleague from England, with regard to farming operations in the North-west. The hon. gentleman proceeds to tell us, alluding to the question of preferential trade, how he would make up 100,000,000 bushels of wheat for the English market. He told us that 50,000 farmers with 100 acres each, raising 30 bushels to the acre, would produce 150,000,000 bushels, and could send that over to England. Now, I do not think that the farmers in Manitoba and the Territories now can be said to cultivate 100 acres each. It would be a large average, indeed, to give to each farmer 50 acres instead of 100, so that to treat all accurately we have to divide the hon. gentleman's number of acres into half. Then he takes 30 bushels to the acre. Well, in 1893, in Manitoba, we grew 15 6-10 bushels to the acre; in 1894 we grew 17 bushels to the acre; and in 1895, the bonanza year, when we had one of the finest crops we ever had, we produced 25 bushels to the acre; and I can say from actual knowledge, having been in that country some 14 or 15 years, that the average in Manitoba will fall considerably under 17 bushels to the acre. Then we have to consider that we cannot export all our wheat. We must keep enough for seed, about 2 bushels to the acre, and enough to feed the people, so that on the whole the hon. gentleman's 30 bush-

els to the acre will have to be divided into half. Instead, therefore, of 50,000 farmers being able to raise that amount of wheat you will require four times that amount. It will require, not 50,000, but 200,000 farmers, and that would require a population, at any rate, of 2,000,000 people. The actual population in Manitoba and the Territories, after all these years of expenditure, after all the millions of dollars the Government have expended in developing that country, and in spite of the promise of the Secretary of State with regard to this 640,000,000 bushels of wheat and the wiping off by the proceeds from the sales of lands of the cost of the Canadian Pacific Railway, amounts to 200,000. So that the hon. gentleman, in order to accomplish his estimates, would have to increase that population by 1,780,000, and according to the speed at which he is going, it will take him just 130 years to do this, although he says he is able to do it practically at once, because, he says, there are 50,000 farmers, and they will not be beginning to touch the agricultural land, they will be just beginning to nibble at it with 100 acres each. Fifty thousand farmers you could get in no time; and yet when we come to examine the hon. gentleman's facts, we find that at the rate of progress which Manitoba and the Territories have made since 1878 up to to-day, it would take 130 years to accomplish the hon. gentleman's estimate.

Then the hon. gentleman told us how the butter and cheese industry would be stimulated. They require butter and cheese in the old country. Why, he said, we would have 50,000 farmers, with 50 cows each. Has the hon. gentleman the slightest idea how many farmers there are in the North-west who have 50 cows each? I do not think there is one. I do not think there is a bona fide farmer in Manitoba or the Territories that has 50 cows producing butter and cheese. And yet, by a mere wave of his hand, the hon. gentleman is going to bring into existence 50,000 farmers, each of them the owner of fifty cows. These 50,000 farmers must be in addition to the other 50,000. If the hon. gentleman is going to accomplish that he has got a very big job on hand, because as I say, I do not think there is a single farmer who has got fifty cows or even half that number. I do not suppose there are 100 farmers in the country having twenty cows apiece and using them for the purpose of producing milk and butter. We should have to add another 130 years, making it 260 years before we could accomplish any such thing as that. The hon. gentleman would show much better judgment and much better taste, it seems to me, if instead of making absurd calculations such as I have referred to, which ignore the conditions of the country and the real state of affairs, he would consider what has happened in the North-west since he came into power, and base his judgment upon what has actu-

ally occurred there within the last sixteen or seventeen years. If he did so, he would be obliged to consider the action of his party with regard to that country. The progress of that country has been most disappointing, not only to the people up there, but to the people of Canada generally who have looked to that part of Canada to increase rapidly in wealth and population, and add to the ability of Canada to pay its immense national debt. Hon. gentlemen opposite have done everything in their power to retard the progress of that country. They began with the most incapable and most imbecile administration of the land laws, changing the regulations at short intervals. We have heard members supporting the Government denounce in the very strongest language the manner in which the Government administered the land laws during that period in the history of the North-west when public attention was so generally directed to it, and when immigration was setting towards it. At one time they had a pre-emption of 160 acres, then they made it 80 acres; then they did away with it altogether. At one time they allowed a man to take a second homestead, then they withdrew that privilege. They closed up the most available parts of the country, including the mile-belt, thus preventing settlers going close to the railway. They drove settlers out in thousands, creating discontent everywhere. Then, when they came to deal with the question of railways, they tied the country up under a great monopoly. They not only gave the Canadian Pacific Railway a monopoly in the North-west Territories, over which they had control, but they undertook to fasten that monopoly on the province of Manitoba, over which they had no control; and it was only after years of agitation, after great political unrest in Manitoba, that that province was able to get back its rights in respect of chartering railways from any point in the province to any other point within the province. The hon. gentlemen have themselves to blame for much of the retardment that that country has suffered, as it was caused by their unfortunate, their stupid policy of encouraging railway monopolies there. It was not alone the actual damage to existing railway lines, the main evil was the feeling among the people that they were under the heel of a huge monopoly, thus preventing development and retarding enterprise. Further, in the management of the land, hon. gentlemen opposite have used the public domain, not for the purpose of encouraging settlement, not for the purpose of increasing immigration, but for the purpose of helping their friends by allowing them to speculate in the public domain, creating colonization companies and chartering railway companies to which land grants were given. They have not learned, in spite of all these years of disappointment, in spite of these years of retardment of the country, for very recently

we saw the Government handing over to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company all the odd sections in that magnificent part of the province of Manitoba known as the Lake Dauphin settlement, one of the finest parts of the province and one with no railway in it. The Government deliberately handed over to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company all the odd sections in that country, thus making it impossible, so far as a land grant is necessary, to get a railway into that portion of the country, for the Canadian Pacific Company are not under any obligation to build a railway there. That section is eighty miles from a railway. The settlement is building up; but it is retarded simply because the Canadian Pacific Railway Company were able to bring sufficient influence to bear upon the Government, were able to sufficiently to help the Government in their elections in 1891, to induce them to commit this great wrong upon Manitoba and upon Canada.

Large sums of money have been spent to encourage immigration to that country. I make the statement because I believe it to be true, and I believe I am expressing the opinion of the people there. Conservatives as well as Liberals, that practically all of that money has been absolutely wasted, that it has been spent without any regard to the purpose that should have been kept in view. The only result has been, as I pointed out a year or two ago, the importation of a few pedlars into Calgary. A large number of friends of the Government have been having trips to the old country for the purpose of bringing immigrants, but bringing none. Favourite preachers, such as the Rev. Mr. Benson, of Ottawa, have been sent to deliver lectures there at \$100 each lecture. Large sums of money, running up into millions of dollars, have been appropriated by this Parliament to encourage the development of that country, and this money, instead of being used for the purpose intended has been squandered, has been distributed as a matter of favouritism, without any result so far as immigration is concerned. The Government last session reduced the immigration appropriation from \$200,000 to \$170,000. So far as I am concerned, I would just as soon have had it cut out altogether. I do not believe that it is any good to the country. I think it would be better to save the \$170,000 than to pretend to have a lot of useless political hacks, played-out politicians, pretending to lecture in the old country. I notice in the Auditor General's Report that one of them found it cold travelling in the old country, where there are no stoves in the cars, and he provided himself with a rug, which he charged to the Government. He said he was travelling around on Government business, and so he ought to have a rug. And so they go, spending their salaries, pretending to lecture here and there, giving lime-light pictures, and wasting all this money. Do you wonder, Sir, that, under the

Mr. MARTIN.

circumstances, we have so few people in the North-west? The hon. gentleman talks about getting four million more people, and the result is, that we have only got 220,000. Then, another matter in which the hon. gentlemen are to blame for retarding that country is the position they have put us in with regard to freight rates. We are absolutely at the mercy of the railway that has been built there by public money.

Mr. DALY. The Northern Pacific.

Mr. MARTIN. They got some public money, I admit; they got \$1,750 a mile. They built in Manitoba over 300 miles of railway, and I defy the Minister of the Interior to point, from one end of Canada to the other, to a subsidized railway that was built for anything like that sum. You must remember that at that time the province had invested in that railway \$1,100,000, a railway that was likely to prove unprofitable, that was likely to prove an annual loss, as the Intercolonial Railway does; and this company came along and gave us a check for \$1,100,000, bought our railway from us, and all we had to do was to subsidize it to the extent of \$1,750 a mile, for something over 300 miles. Yet the hon. gentleman has the temerity to allude to the Northern Pacific.

Mr. DALY. It would require your gall to refer to it the way you do.

Mr. MARTIN. Everything I say is true. Sir, right alongside that railway, on both sides of it, to the north and to the south, runs a branch of the Canadian Pacific Railway, which receives from this Government a grant of 6,400 acres a mile for each mile, which land they have been able to sell at an average price of \$5 per acre, making \$32,000 per mile, which the hon. gentleman's Government has given to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for building a branch to the north and another to the south of this line which we got built as a competing line, for a bonus of \$1,750 per mile. The hon. gentleman, after all his subsidy, has left us entirely dependent upon the Canadian Pacific Railway Company with regard to freight rates. We have absolutely no control. The hon. gentleman sent a commission out there, and they inquired into it, and found the rates were reasonable. We knew they would before they went; they were officers of the hon. gentleman. They knew what they were wanted to do, and they did it. The people of that country do not think the freight rates are reasonable, but they have no redress. The Liberal party proposed, when that contract was going through the House, that the Government should take absolute control of the freight rates, as they were practically building the road. It cost Canada over one hundred million dollars, and it was a small thing to put into the hands of the Government the power to say that they should not charge unreasonable freight rates. Why, the people up there consider that the Can-

adian Pacific Railway Company just figure out how much they can live upon, the least starvation wages that the farmers can exist upon, and then they say : You can have that much for your wheat, and we will take the rest. One large farmer out in the Territories had a large crop one year, and he put it into the cars and it made a train-load. Then he said to the Canadian Pacific Railway : Haul the wheat down to the market and take half of it, and give me the other half. But the company would not do it, they wanted more than half. Well, Sir, we can not blame the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. They are a business institution. They put their money into this road as a speculation, they got absolute control of the freight rates, and we do not expect them to settle these freight rates in our favour. When they consider the question of freight rates, they are going to settle it from the standpoint of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. But the people say that the Government made a great mistake when that contract was going through the House, that they did not accept the suggestion formally placed upon the Journals of the House by the Liberal party in the House, that the question of freight rates should be absolutely under the control of the Government. It was a reasonable thing to ask, considering the fact that the Government were really building the railway. Now, Mr. Speaker, in addition to all these things, in addition to their outrageous land administration, in addition to the railway monopoly by which they prevented us for some time from building this Northern Pacific, in addition to the manner in which they have used the public domain for the speculator, in addition to the way in which they have wasted the immigration money, in addition to the fact that they have allowed the company absolute control of the freight rates, not in the interest of the people, but in the interest of the company, as a climax to all these things, is the imposition on that portion of Canada of the National Policy. Whatever argument there may be in favour of the National Policy in other parts of Canada, there never has been the slightest tittle of an argument in favour of that policy in an agricultural community like Manitoba and the Territories. What possible good could it be to that country to have manufactures fostered in Canada ? What possible advantage could Manitoba or the Territories receive from a home market such as was promised to the people of Ontario and the people of Quebec ? We argue that there is nothing in the question of a home market ; but suppose we admit, for argument's sake, that there is, we say that a home market for farmers must be adjacent to the manufactories, if they are to be able to sell their butter, and their garden products, and the various other products of the farm. But it could have no possible effect upon a country like Manitoba, whose market was Liverpool, who send their wheat

to the old country, who send their products out of Canada ; and, therefore, there never was the slightest justification for the National Policy in that country. We have suffered terribly from it. The people went up there, many of them, indoctrinated with Conservative ideas, and, having voted in the east for the Conservative party, they continued for some years to vote in Manitoba for the Conservative party. But they have abandoned that. The Conservative party in Manitoba and the Territories is dead, it is annihilated, it is obliterated. The hon. gentleman and his leader, Sir Mackenzie Bowell, went through that country, and nobody knew they were there. The hon. leader of the Opposition went through that country, and his progress was a triumph. He was welcomed in every part, he was met by admiring and enthusiastic crowds. The Minister of Finance went to Winnipeg, and, I am sure, he has a most disagreeable recollection of the evening he spoke, shivering in the cold, to some 300 or 400 people. The leader of the Opposition came to that city, and there were more people hanging on the roof of the building trying to hear the words of wisdom and eloquence that fell from the leader of the Opposition than there were at the hon. gentleman's meeting : and that was not intended as a personal slight to the Finance Minister, because it is recognized in Manitoba, as I think it is in most other parts of Canada, that the hon. gentleman is probably the ablest man in the Cabinet, but it was an expression of opinion on the part of the old Conservative city of Winnipeg, which never sent a Liberal to Parliament till I was elected there, that the people were done with the National Policy and done with the Conservative party. There is no chance for the Conservative party in Manitoba or the Territories. The only chance they have is that the Patrons and Liberals will be foolish enough to run two candidates—that is the only possible chance for the Conservatives in any portions of the country and for the reasons I have mentioned. Hon. gentlemen opposite have perhaps a little arrangement by which they will be able to steal four constituencies, but that is apart from the question under consideration. The people have come to the conclusion that the National Policy is a mistake in that country. The Board of Trade of Winnipeg, three-quarters of whose members are life long Conservatives, most of whom had never given the Liberal party a vote until they voted for me, appointed a committee to consider the question of the tariff, and the report of that committee, adopted unanimously as it was by the board, is one of the strongest and most logical and conclusive condemnation of the National Policy ever adopted in Canada. So I say for all these reasons the Conservatives of Canada are entitled to the condemnation of the people of Manitoba and the Territories, that the roseate picture and showing of the

Minister of Finance never will be fulfilled in that country under a policy of that kind, not because the country is not capable of attaining the result he has figured out, but because the policy holds back the country, and the people there are only waiting until hon. gentlemen opposite see fit to give us an opportunity of registering our votes to show that the people at last fully realize and appreciate their situation, and that they are prepared at that time to give a lease of power, so far as their votes will give it, to a party whose policy and platform are opposed to frequent changes of land regulations, that is opposed to railway monopolies of every kind, is opposed to the granting of the public domain for the use of speculators, is resolved to expend immigration money purely for the advancement of immigration and not for the purpose of favouring political friends, is opposed to allowing a largely subsidized railway to control the question of freight rates, and above and beyond everything is opposed to a tariff for protection, and favour a tariff for revenue, and for revenue only.

Mr. McDOUGALL moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

Mr. FOSTER moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 1.50 a.m. (Friday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 21st February, 1896.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

REPORT.

Report of the Department of Agriculture for the year 1895.—(Mr. Foster.)

THE REMEDIAL BILL (MANITOBA).

Mr. FOSTER moved :

That Bill (No. 58) the Remedial Act, Manitoba, be made the first order on Tuesday, 3rd March next, and on following days until the debate thereon be completed.

Mr. LAURIER. I am quite ready to agree to this motion. I would suggest to the hon. gentleman that perhaps it would be well to reserve Monday for private business.

Mr. FOSTER. I have no objection.

Mr. MARTIN.

Mr. LAURIER. Then the motion will be amended in that way.

Mr. BRODEUR. When do the Government intend to give us a translation of the Bill. The Bill was presented to the House ten days ago.

Mr. AMYOT. The translated Bill is in the post office.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 69) to incorporate the Hamilton Blast Furnace Company (Limited).—(Mr. McKay.)

Bill (No. 70) respecting the Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Railway Company.—(Mr. McKay.)

Bill (No. 71) to provide for the amalgamation of the Bay of Quinté Railway and Navigation Company and the Kingston, Napanee and Western Railway Company, under the name of the Bay of Quinté Railway Company.—(Mr. Northrup.)

Bill (No. 72) respecting the Montreal Park and Island Railway Company.—(Mr. Girouard, for Mr. Lachapelle.)

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEE.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON moved :

That Mr. Ross (Lisgar) and Mr. Angers be added to the Committee on Banking and Commerce ; that Mr. Robinson and Mr. Angers be added to the Committees on Public Accounts, and Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines, and that Mr. Angers be added to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Motion agreed to.

SUPPLY—THE BUDGET.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Foster :

That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go again into Committee of Supply.

Mr. McDOUGALL (Cape Breton). Mr. Speaker, it is with a good deal of reluctance that I venture to add a few words to a discussion which has already taken up a great deal of the time of this House, and I hope that hon. gentlemen will pardon me for a few minutes. We are accustomed to hear from hon. gentlemen opposite all manner of arguments with regard to the want of prosperity in this country. We are accustomed to hear arguments to the effect that there is no measure of prosperity in any industry in Canada. I was amused and surprised a few evenings ago to hear my hon. friend from Wentworth (Mr. Bain) make a certain statement to this House, and I have taken down his words. He said:

That he entered a business establishment in the city of Toronto where a friend of his was engaged in business, and he asked the question

of his friend: Is business improving? And his merchant friend answered: We read that it is in the newspapers, and we are told that it is by the politicians, but I do not see it in the till. It is the till that is the practical test.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I happen to be possibly unfortunate enough to be engaged in business, and I can speak from experience, which is, perhaps, more than other hon. gentlemen in this House can say. Although I am engaged in business, unfortunately, I cannot see the signs of prosperous times in my business, but, on the other hand, I am willing to admit that that is largely because I do not attend to my business. I undertook to engage in other business. I undertook to come to this House to represent the people of my constituency, at the most urgent request of a great many of them, and when I did this, I took the risk of my business going on. It may be the same with my hon. friend's merchant friend in the city of Toronto. His mind may be running in a direction other than that which would bring money into his till, and he may not be able to give that attention to his business which his business requires. It is not always an evidence of the measure of prosperity in business to find that the money does not come into the till. I say that with the facilities which exist in this country at the present moment for the carrying on of business in a prosperous way, business people should make business a success if they attend to it, but the great misfortune is that, in many cases, people are not satisfied to engage in one business, but they must engage in many lines, and so one or the other must suffer. That may be the case with the merchant friend of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bain), I feel satisfied. I say that most any man, aye, most any fool, reckless and extravagant though he be, can to some extent make his business appear prosperous for a time. But no matter how good or how bad the times are, it takes a wise man to make business a permanent success. I was more than surprised to hear an argument of that kind given to this House by a gentleman, whom I hold in the highest respect, for his intelligence and for the fair arguments which he usually presents. Now, coming, as I do, from a distant part of this Dominion, and coming, as I do, from an isolated—until a few years ago—part of this Dominion, I think that I ought to be in a position to speak as to the measure of prosperity witnessed by the people of my part of the country; and I think I can give satisfactory reasons to this House for attributing it to the policy of the present Administration. In the first place, instead of going to a man's till to obtain evidences of prosperity, I say that the proper places to go for evidences of prosperity in the country are the custom-houses, the railway stations, and the commercial and shipping establishments of the country. There you find the records

of trade and of business, and these to my mind ought to be the best evidences as to whether prosperity exists in a country or not. It is and has been for many years a common custom on the part of hon. gentlemen on the opposite side of the House, more particularly the hon. ex-Finance Minister (Sir Richard Cartwright), to charge the Administration with corrupting the electors in the eastern part of this country, when they have brought measures before this House with a view to the encouragement or the establishment of any industries in that part of the country, or with a view to aiding in the construction of railways or the improvement of the transportation conveniences of the country. It has also, I am aware, been a practice of a number of our Liberal friends from the provinces to the east, to charge the Administration with doing everything for the people of the upper provinces—with doing things for the people of the upper provinces at the expense of the interests of the people of the lower provinces. Those arguments have been used in this House and out of this House, that I shall have to ask the patience of the House for perhaps a little longer time than I otherwise should on an occasion of this kind, particularly when this discussion has taken the long range it has, and has occupied so much of the attention of the House as it has already occupied.

The first effort to establish a trade between Canada and Nova Scotia was made in the year 1825. Up to that period there was no trade between the upper and the lower provinces. A subsidy of £1,500 was granted by the Quebec government and £750 by the Nova Scotia government to a steamer to run between Quebec and Pictou, the steamer being called the "Royal William." The trade in 1866, before confederation, between Ontario and Quebec and the lower provinces amounted to \$2,000,000. In the first year after confederation it had increased to \$4,000,000, of which \$3,000,000 was done through United States ports and by the Grand Trunk Railway. In other words, there was only \$500,000 of that trade done through our own ports and by our own shipping, because at that time we had no railway. The Intercolonial Railway was opened in 1876 down to Pictou and Halifax; the Canadian Pacific Railway was opened in 1889; and the Intercolonial Railway was extended to the town of Sydney, in the most easterly county of this Dominion, in the year 1890. We have developed since that time, and, through those channels of trade which we have established, an estimated east bound trade carried over our railway to the provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island, of about \$28,000,000, and an estimated west bound trade over our railways between those provinces of about \$16,000,000, and about \$1,500,000 carried by the railways of the United States. In all,

including the volume of trade done by the shipping passing up and down the St. Lawrence, we have a trade of about \$60,000,000 done by our own people, the employment in carrying and handling going to our own people, as well as the profits being put in the pockets of our own people. I am of opinion that this statement is a very good evidence of the satisfactory development of trade between the provinces of this Dominion during that period. The imports into the provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island in 1876 were estimated at about \$40 per head of the population of those provinces. A calculation based on the increase of the population of those provinces would give us an importation at the present time equal to \$36,000,000. Deducting the present imports of those provinces, amounting to about \$13,000,000, there remains \$22,750,000 as the consumption of the people of those provinces, the whole, or at least the greater part of which represents the consumption of the products from our own provinces. In the lower provinces we have made advances in our industrial production; but we have not, I am sorry to say, made the same advances as the people of the upper provinces. There are reasons for that. We have only been able to open up our communications by rail and by water within a few years, so that we have not had the time nor the opportunity to develop our trade as rapidly as the people of the upper provinces. I have the record of the business done by the Intercolonial Railway, and I find there that the quantity of freight carried over that railway, consisting chiefly of flour, manufactures and coal, in the years between 1877 and 1878 averaged 477,019 tons. I find that the tons of freight carried in 1879 over the Intercolonial Railway amounted to 510,861, and that the carriage increased in 1893 to 1,388,081, or an average in fifteen years under the Conservative Administration of 1,033,999, as compared with an average of 477,019 during the years 1877 and 1878. The quantity of flour included in this carriage amounted to an average of 44,624 barrels in the two years, 1877 and 1878, as compared with an average of 82,073 barrels during the years from 1879 to 1893. As regards manufactures, we find that in 1877 and 1878 the average tonnage of manufactures carried over the Intercolonial was 92,083 per year, as compared with 239,739 tons during the fifteen years from 1879 to 1893. With regard to coal, we find that the average carriage during those two years of 1877 and 1878 was 100,230, as compared with 369,054, during the fifteen years from 1879 to 1893. I cannot see what hon. gentlemen opposite could look for in the shape of development of trade, if they do not find it in these figures. I say that this development could not have taken place, were it not for the building of our railways and the inaugu-

Mr. McDOUGALL (Cape Breton).

ration of the policy which was inaugurated in 1879, and which has proved so satisfactory to the people engaged in those industries. Now, the shipping employed in the coasting trade, in 1888, in Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island and Quebec, amounted to 10,863,330 tons, which is 1,700,000 tons greater than the tonnage engaged in our ocean commerce, and 2,300,000 tons greater than what passed through the Suez Canal, and 5,730,000 tons greater than passed through the "Soo" Canal. This trade has been developed through the influence of our protective policy. Coming home to the constituency that I have the honour to represent in this House, I find that in 1868 we had coming to the ports of Sydney and North Sydney, Cape Breton, 226 vessels, with a tonnage of 27,343. In the year 1874, and I wish hon. gentlemen to make a note of this, as this was the time when hon. gentlemen on the other side undertook to administer the affairs of this country; they found that the shipping amounted to 1,506 vessels, aggregating a tonnage of 396,725 tons. Well, Sir, after five years' rule of hon. gentlemen on the opposite side of the House, we find that that shipping, instead of increasing, as it did up to the time they took it in charge, and as it did after they left office, decreased in this way. Instead of having 1,506 vessels entering our ports, we only had 1,085; and, instead of having a tonnage of 396,775 tons, we only had a tonnage of 240,324, under their five years' administration. Where was the development our people were looking for? We could not find it. Our people found their trade going down. The Liberal-Conservative party came into power in 1878, and undertook to legislate for the benefit of the people in 1879, and what do we find was the result? We find that, while this tonnage of vessels entering the ports in my constituency was at 240,324 tons, the number of vessels that entered in 1895 those same ports amounted to 4,779, as against 1,085, and the total tonnage amounted to 1,261,721, as against 241,000. Now, where is the hon. gentleman on that side of the House who can look for better evidence of prosperity than this? We come now to the production of flour. I can well remember the time when this House undertook to legislate for the people who produced flour in Canada. I can well remember that a great many people whom I have the honour to represent, and a great many people from the maritime provinces found it very difficult to support a duty on flour in the interest of the people of the other provinces. Well, Sir, during the six years from 1874 to 1879, we had an importation from the United States of a large quantity of flour, amounting to 725,477 barrels, imported by Nova Scotia. The province of New Brunswick imported 340,051 barrels; Prince Edward Island imported 148,356, or an average in four years of 120,000 barrels by Nova Scotia; 56,000 barrels by New Brunswick, and 8,000 barrels by Prince Ed-

ward Island. During the next four years, from 1880 to 1883 we imported in Nova Scotia 209,916, or an average of 52,429, as against 120,000, average during the years our opponents were in power. New Brunswick imported 105,306 barrels, or an average of 26,326, as against an average of 56,675, when hon. gentlemen opposite held office; and we had in Prince Edward Island an importation of 19,335 barrels, or 4,834 barrels per year, as against an average of 8,089 barrels per year and a total of 48,356 during the time our opponents were in power. In the five years from 1884 to 1888, we imported into Nova Scotia, 201,950 barrels, or an average of 40,309 per year; New Brunswick, 60,185 barrels, or an average of 12,037; and Prince Edward Island, 17,297 barrels, or an average of 3,459. During the five years from 1889 to 1893, we imported into Nova Scotia, 37,341 barrels, or an average of 7,446 a year. And I believe that since that time the importations have come down to about 2,000 barrels a year. New Brunswick imported 13,105 barrels, or an average of 2,601 barrels a year. Prince Edward Island imported 3,118 barrels, or an average of only 623 barrels a year, as against 8,089 barrels during the period of administration of hon. gentlemen opposite. What I wish to impress upon the House is this, that while, at the inception of this protective system, we found that this feature, intended for the benefit of the people of the upper provinces, was a hardship, still we felt that by supporting this policy we were giving the people in the upper provinces a market, which, under other circumstances, they could not get, because our communication had been almost entirely with the United States up to the time this duty was imposed on flour. Now, hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House may say that it makes no difference to them where they get their flour, so long as they get it cheap. But I cannot concur in a sentiment of that kind. I hold it is the duty of the people of one province to trade, as far as possible, with the people of the other provinces. It was for that purpose that the people of these provinces entered into the combination which makes the Dominion of Canada. We entered into that confederation with a view to the development of interprovincial trade. We adopted the National Policy with the same object. And I hold that it would be highly improper for any citizen to advocate the carrying on of business with other countries while the several provinces can provide within themselves the articles required.

Now, I come to consider the total trade of this Dominion, before and after the adoption of the National Policy. The total trade of the Dominion for six years before the National Policy, I find to be as follows:—

1874	\$217,565,510
1875	200,957,162

1876	174,176,781
1877	175,203,355
1878	172,405,454
1879	153,455,682

So that the aggregate trade that hon. gentlemen opposite found at \$217,000,000, when they came into power, they left at \$153,000,000 when they retired. And these are the people who complain to-day that the trade of this country is not in a prosperous condition. Now, take the years from 1889 to 1894, inclusive:

1889	\$204,414,098
1890	218,607,000
1891	218,384,000
1892	241,369,000
1893	247,638,000
1894	240,999,000

So, during this period under the present Government, the trade increased from \$204,000,000 to \$240,000,000. Now, let us compare the bank circulation—and I think this ought to be one of the best evidences of the development of business in the country. In 1874, when hon. gentlemen opposite came into power the bank-note circulation was \$27,000,000. When they went out of power, in 1879, it was down to \$19,000,000. I find that in 1894, under the administration of the Liberal-Conservative party, the bank-note circulation has increased to \$31,000,000. Now, what was it that caused that increase? Could it be any want of prosperity or of business development in the country? By no means. Nothing can be a better indication of business prosperity in a country than a large bank note circulation. Another evidence on this point is in the bank discounts. In 1874 the bank discounts were \$116,412,000; but in 1879, at the end of the term of office of hon. gentlemen opposite, they had fallen to \$96,760,000. In 1894, under the policy of the present Administration, I find the bank discounts have increased to \$217,195,000. Is not this clear proof of a large increase in business? We hear a great deal from hon. gentlemen opposite of the taxation the people of this country have to pay. One of the best indications of the amount of our taxation is the amount of net interest we pay. I find that in 1888 our net interest was \$8,891,000; in 1889 it was \$8,843,000; in 1890 it was \$8,704,000; in 1891, \$8,506,000; in 1892, \$8,777,000; in 1893, \$8,656,000; or nearly \$200,000 less than our net interest in 1888.

Instead of our net interest increasing, as hon. gentlemen opposite try to lead the people of the country to believe, we find that, notwithstanding our increased expenditures, notwithstanding that we spend a large amount of money in the development of the various interests of the country, our net interest has come down from \$8,891,000 to \$8,656,000 in the six years. Is that an evidence of higher taxation? I cannot see it. In the face of these facts, I cannot understand how hon. gentlemen opposite can

undertake to indoctrinate the people of this country with the belief that they are more highly taxed year after year. Now, the average duty collected from the people of this country ought to be good evidence as to whether the taxation is growing, or whether it is growing in undue proportion. I find that in 1888 the annual expenditure chargeable to revenue was \$36,718,000; in 1889, \$36,917,000; in 1890, \$35,994,000; in 1891, \$36,341,000; in 1892, \$36,765,000; in 1893, \$36,814,000. Now, Sir, I find that during those six years, notwithstanding the large amount expended by the Government in developing the various interests of the country, in building railways, and in the construction of public works of various kinds—and we hear a great deal about the extravagance of the Government in respect to public works—in face of all that, I find that our expenditure chargeable to revenue under that head has remained practically stationary during the last six years. Now, Sir, our opponents do not attempt to say that our expenditures are stationary. They say that we are increasing our expenditures from year to year, that we are expending a great deal of money to corrupt the electorate, with many other statements of that kind. Now, where does the money come from? Certainly, the people are not taxed to pay it, beyond the figures I have just given. Turning now to another point, that of tariff taxation, we find from the trade returns that so far from there being any trend upwards, the trend, especially of late years, has been distinctly downwards. During the period between 1888 and 1893 the average rates per cent of duty paid on all goods entered for home consumption in Canada were as follows:—

1888	21·57 per cent.
1889	21·65 “
1890	21·21 “
1891	20·06 “
1892	17·56 “
1893	17·38 “

Instead of this rate increasing, it has decreased to the extent of 4 per cent. Now, is that not one strong evidence against the pretensions of hon. gentlemen opposite? I am astonished to hear the kind of arguments given in this House, and outside of this House, by hon. gentlemen opposite. They make their statements without giving any facts, they make reckless statements, and they never give the House or the country any facts to show the correctness of their statements. These figures must tell, they cannot undertake to say these figures are incorrect. I take them from the public records of this country and they ought to be the best authority. Now we come to the subject of free goods. Under what is known as the Cartwright tariff, in 1878, we imported free goods to the amount of \$30,619,000. Now, we hear in this House a great deal, and we see, especially, a good deal in the Liberal press of this country, about

Mr. McDougall (Cape Breton).

the alleged fact that the importation of free goods are not as large as they ought to be. Well, let us compare the importation of free goods during the time they regulated the quantity of free goods that came into this country with the quantities that enter the country at present, including last year. Instead of having \$30,619,000, as we had under the Cartwright tariff, of free goods coming into this country in 1878, we had last year \$50,314,000 worth of free goods. That, I think, is an answer to the charge that we have not the quantity of free goods entering this country that we ought to have. Now, there are a number of articles which enter into the consumption of the great masses of the people of this country that are not of small importance to them. In tea we find that in 1878 we had entered into this country for the consumption of the people 9,772,334 pounds, on which they paid a duty of 5 cents a pound, aggregating \$488,616. To-day they do not pay a cent on tea, and have not for years. Now, we all know that tea is an article of almost universal consumption, and I believe that it is especially used among the poorer classes. In the article of green tea, which does not enter so largely into the consumption of the poorer classes, we find that 9,425,553 pounds came into the country in 1878, which paid duty at the rate of 6 cents a pound, aggregating \$566,133. We find that coffee came in to the amount of 2,965,601 pounds, paying a duty of 2 cents a pound, amounting to \$59,312. During that year we find that 303,793,677 pounds of sugar came into this country, paying a duty of \$2.45 per hundred-weight, aggregating \$7,442,945. We find that coal oil came in to the amount of 6,545,815 gallons during the year, paying 7·15 cents per gallon, yielding a duty of \$471,298. We find that the people of this country paid these large duties on those articles I have enumerated, aggregating \$9,028,304. Mr. Speaker, what do the people of this country pay to-day on these articles? The only article, of those I have just named, which pays taxes to-day, is the article of coal oil, on which we collect \$392,748, as against \$471,298 at the former period. We all know that the article of coal oil is much more largely consumed now than it was at that period, and that possibly it would be safe to estimate the quantity used by our people now as three times as much as it was in 1878. The difference between what comes in to-day, on which we pay \$392,000 duty, and that which came in at that time, on which we paid \$471,000, is manufactured in Canada, in the province of Ontario, and it is for the protection of that industry we pay those duties. I say as one of those who share largely in the payment of that duty, who buys largely that article, pays the duty and disposes and distributes it to customers, that I do not altogether find fault with the Government for protecting the industry. I express that

opinion because there are industries in my own province whose protection I desire, and protection to which was given before I came to this House. If the people of Ontario have an industry which requires protection in the interest of the people engaged in it, I am willing that a duty should be imposed to assist it. If the people of Nova Scotia have an industry which requires protection for its development, we expect the people of Ontario to be willing that protection should be given. So I support protection to coal oil, although some people in my province find fault at being called upon to pay the duty. I think that arises from various reasons. It arises from the fact that they use this argument for the sake of party politics; again, they use it for another purpose, because they are too narrow-minded to give the people of other provinces those benefits which they want for themselves.

The Liberal party argues in favour of free trade. We hear a great many people say that if we had free trade as it is in England, this country would be more prosperous. I propose to give to the House some facts and figures in connection with that policy, and to draw a comparison between the effect of that policy on the people there and the effect of the policy of the Liberal-Conservative party on the interests of Canada. In free trade England taxes were collected in 1893 as follows: the total collections on customs amounted to \$98,000,000. Of this amount \$50,620,000 was collected on tobacco; on tea, \$16,995,000; on coffee, \$865,000; on wines, \$6,346,000. In all \$74,820,000 was collected on those four articles which I have named, out of a total of \$98,000,000. The duty on tea in England is 8 cents per pound, 2 cents higher than the Liberal party here imposed on tea when they were in power. On coffee the duty is 4 cents per pound, 2 cents higher than was imposed by the Liberals. There are other taxes in England, and I wish to point out to the people of this country that were we to adopt the system of free trade, instead of what is known as the National Policy, we should have to adopt similar measures to those resorted to in England for the purpose of raising the revenue to carry on the government. The British customs tax on tea, 8 cents per pound, is the largest single item of customs, with the exception of tobacco. I find that British customs taxation on coffee amounted to \$900,000 a year, on raisins and currants to \$1,500,000. Here we have, then, about \$20,000,000 of British taxation imposed on these two items, which are usually considered necessaries. Then there are the house duties, amounting to \$7,000,000. There are income and property taxes amounting to nearly \$70,000,000, and a man can do no business without meeting stamps at every turn. Every legal document or bit of commercial paper must bear a stamp, varying from one penny to several pounds. A man cannot receive a deed or promissory

note or even give a receipt unless it bears a revenue stamp, which must be paid for. A man goes and pays his quarter's rent, and the receipt given must bear a stamp. So it is that at every turn the people in England have to bear these burdens in order to raise the necessary revenue. I should like to know if hon. gentlemen who advocated free trade for this country,—and there are people in my own province who undertake to advocate free trade,—are prepared to go before the electors and explain the methods by which we would be obliged to raise the revenue of the country under the system of free trade, because if they presented a true representation to the people of Canada there would not be a baker's dozen returned to support the leader of hon. gentlemen opposite. The people prefer to have the taxes levied as they have them levied to-day and as they had them for the last fifteen or sixteen years.

I come to another point, and that is the commercial failures of the country. During the period from 1875 to 1879 the failures in Canada were as follows: In 1875 the failures were in value, \$28,843,000; in 1876, \$25,517,000; 1877, \$25,523,000; 1878, \$23,908,000; 1879, \$29,347,000; or an average of about \$26,000,000 a year. That is the average failures in Canada during the period when hon. gentlemen opposite governed the country. What has been the value during the last sixteen years? The average has fallen from \$26,000,000 to \$12,000,000. Is that evidence of prosperity, or is it evidence of the opposite? Is it a justification of the contention of the Liberal party that this country is not prosperous, or is it a justification of the contrary? No better evidence than these statistics could be given with respect to the country's prosperity, with respect to the change that has come over the commercial interest of Canada during the last sixteen years. I must ask the forbearance of the House for a few minutes longer while I give some evidence with respect to the condition of the people in free trade England. At the beginning of the year 1895, hon. gentlemen will remember that there was considerable distress in free trade England, and it became necessary for the people to engage in a system of investigation into the condition of the poor, and the circumstances which led to this distress. In February, 1895, the London "Times" reports as follows:—

HARD TIMES IN ENGLAND.

Pauperism Greater than at any Period since 1871—Great Distress all Over the Country—Unemployed Number 1,750,000.

The distress among the waterside population of London, says the "Times," especially in the east end, is widespread. All over the country in fact, the long continued hard weather has thrown large numbers of people out of employment, and measures are being adopted in most of the large towns for relieving the consequent distress. In all the large manufacturing towns soup kitchens have been established, and free meals given to

the poor children attending the elementary schools. The ordinary charitable organizations have been very much overtaxed. In London the Mansion House unemployed committee has called a special conference to consider the situation. The Queen has sent to the Metropolitan Visiting and Relief Association, through the Bishop of London, £250, to assist in alleviating the distress in the poorer parts of the metropolis. The Prince and Princess of Wales and the Duke and Duchess of York have sent large gifts of food, clothing and coals to Archdeacon Farrar for distribution among the poor of the parish of St. Margaret's, Westminster.

Increase of Pauperism.

Whitworth St. Cedd writes to the "Times" calling attention to the growth of pauperism in Camberwell. He says: "I believe that the increase in the number of persons applying for relief in Camberwell is out of all proportion to the increase of population. This increase, until the present winter, has not been marked by any sudden fits or starts, but it has been going on steadily since the year of the great dock strike. The number of persons who received relief in Camberwell during the half year ending Lady Day, 1890, was 11,668, and the number of such persons in the half year ending Lady Day, 1894, was 15,731, an increase of 4,063, or at the rate of 34·82 per cent. The sufferings which our poor have had to endure during the recent severe weather defy all efforts of description, and I fear that they are only the forerunners of still greater sufferings in the near future. The Board of Guardians, and the vestry and private philanthropy have done all that it was possible to do towards alleviating the distress, but the doubt arises whether these humane and well-meant efforts may not in the long run aggravate the evil, since they only palliate a frightful national disease which ought to be extirpated. It is not a parochial, but an Imperial affair, which cries urgently for the intervention of the highest statesmanship. The number of persons who received relief in Camberwell during the week ending Saturday last, February 16, was 13,235, whilst the number of such persons in the corresponding week of last year was 7,182, an increase of 6,053, or 84·28 per cent. Prevention is better than cure. The causes of the frightful poverty we have about us is not, I think, far to seek. And if the suspicions that are lurking in the mind of the public can only be turned into convictions, sentiment will have to give way to common sense, the exercise of a little of which would wipe out the greatest blot upon the Christian civilization of the 19th century."

House of Commons Committee.

The select committee of the House of Commons, appointed to consider the prevalent distress and the increase of the unemployed, having elected Mr. Campbell Bannerman, chairman, has begun to hear evidence. The first witness was Sir Hugh Owen, permanent secretary to the Local Government Board, which has oversight of the administration of the poor law throughout the United Kingdom. In Sir Hugh Owen's opinion, the severe weather was the immediate cause of the unexceptional distress prevailing. Before the frost set in the amount of distress did not appear to be exceptional, but after the cold weather began, in some of the working class districts, applications for relief increased to an enormous extent. Pauperism in the metropolis was greater

Mr. McDougall (Cape Breton).

in the first week of February than in the same period in any year since 1874. The Local Government Board had issued a circular to local authorities, suggesting the provision of work for the unemployed when the circumstances of the district admitted of it.

Keir Hardie, M.P., Asks for £100,000.

Keir Hardie, M.P., a member of the committee, was the next witness. He said he desired to correct the impression left by the evidence of Sir Hugh Owen as to the extent to which destitution prevailed. His point was that, outside what might be called the official view of the situation, there was a great deal of distress of which the select committee were specially called to take cognizance. In practically every industrial centre in the country there was an unemployed committee, with whom he was in regular correspondence. The report of the unemployed committee was that in Leeds, exclusive of those in receipt of parochial relief, there were 10,000 absolutely destitute. The secretary of the Dockers' Union in Liverpool, who was also the labour correspondent to the Board of Trade, telegraphed him: "Estimated number unemployed 18,000 destitute men, women and children, about 15,000 apart from poor law statistics." From Glasgow he was informed there were 5,000 destitute families and 8,000 unemployed. The trades council of West Ham undertook a census of the entire borough during January, a large number of workers being engaged in the undertaking, and the result showed that of those visited 44,690 were wage-earners, that of this number 28,383 were in full work, 6,176 were casually employed, and 10,131 were out of work. With the existing state of matters the guardians found themselves unable to cope. All over the country special relief committees were at work. It would, however, be a mistake to assume that when the severe weather passed the distress would pass with it. There would remain a large number of persons unable to find employment, whose lot would probably be worse than in ordinary years in consequence of the charitable funds being exhausted. What he would suggest would be that a sum sufficient to meet the requirements of the case, say, £100,000, should be set apart by the Treasury to supplement local effort.

Mr. J. Wilson (Durham)—What is the sum total of the unemployed, according to your returns?—The returns are not complete yet, but the sum total will not fall far short of a million and three-quarters.

And how far would the £100,000 go in the way of relieving destitution?—According to the rate which relief is now being given, it would probably last out to the end of March, when the spring brings extra employment.

Liverpool Workhouses Overcrowded.

At a meeting of the Liverpool Workhouse Committee a report was read showing that there were 3,792 inmates of the workhouse. This was the highest number ever recorded, and was attributed to the severe weather. The overcrowding rendered it very difficult for the work to be properly performed in every department. Dr. Alexander wrote that the infirmary wards were stuffy and unhealthy. A letter from Dr. Robertson stated that the medical staff was greatly overworked in consequence of the increased number of patients, and two of the medical gentlemen had broken down. He suggested that an additional house surgeon should be appointed,

as these were insufficient to cope with the work. No fewer than seven nurses were off duty ill, and the wards in the hospital set aside for measles were being utilized for medical cases. It was at present impossible to take in measles cases for the corporation. The clerk said he had instructed Dr. Robertson to get additional medical assistance, if absolutely necessary, and, as regarded the nursing staff, all that could be said was to hope that the present state of things would end with an improvement in the weather, as it was impossible to get nurses. At a meeting of the Toxteth Park (Liverpool) guardians statistics presented showed that there were 1,079 inmates of the workhouses, compared with 1,069 last week and 979 at the same period of last year. It was reported to the West Derby (Liverpool) guardians that there were 2,092 inmates in the Walton workhouse, as compared with 2,049 the preceding week and 1,925 in the corresponding week of last year; while there were 361 persons in the Belmont road workhouse, as against 369 last week and 328 in the corresponding period of last year. The Mill road infirmary contained 709 patients, the numbers in the preceding week and corresponding period of last year being 676 and 606. The crowded state of the workhouses in Liverpool and suburbs is the more notable in presence of the exceptional efforts made outside of the poor law to cope with the distress. The city police force has been utilized as a relieving agency, and, with generous help from the public has been enabled to dispense relief in the best manner in the emergency. Many other agencies are also working in the same cause, while there is a great deal of indiscriminate giving.

That is a statement which I think is worthy of the consideration of hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, when, in the face of the conditions that have existed in this country during the last fifteen years under the present Administration, they talk of a change that would bring about such a system of government as they have in the old country, under which circumstances of that kind are published. Nothing could be more wrong than the advocacy by these hon. gentlemen of a policy which would bring us to the brink of the danger of arriving at such a condition of things as is illustrated in that article.

Now, there is one industry in which I take a more particular interest than other industries to which I have made reference, that is, the coal industry. In the provinces of Ontario, Quebec, and Prince Edward Island we have no coal deposits. Practically, our coal properties are limited to the province of Nova Scotia; and the coal properties under development are largely confined to the constituency which I have the honour to represent. We have large undeveloped coal areas in some of the other counties in the province of Nova Scotia, and we have, also, some undeveloped areas in the province of New Brunswick. Previous to the adoption of the National Policy we had practically no market for our coal in the lower provinces, particularly in the eastern portion of the province of Nova Scotia. We had coal mines at Pictou and at Cumberland, which occupied more central positions within the province than the

coal mines of the county of Cape Breton. These coal mines, therefore, had an advantage in our local markets over the coal mines of Cape Breton. In the year 1850, the total production of coal in the province of Nova Scotia, including Pictou and Cape Breton—the coal in the county of Cumberland was not developed at that time—amounted to 180,084 tons, of which 118,173 tons, or about 66 per cent of the total output were marketed in the United States. This sale of coal was made in the face of a duty, at that time, of 24 per cent. That duty was continued for three years. In 1854 we got free access for our coal to the markets of the United States, and, during that year, our sales there amounted to 139,125 tons, while our total production was 234,812 tons. We enjoyed the advantage of that free entry up to 1867, with the result that in 1866 we had increased our sales to the United States to 404,252 tons, and our total production to 558,520 tons. The bulk of our coal was marketed in the United States. In 1867 the United States imposed a duty of \$1.25 a ton on our coal, which practically shut it out of that market. We struggled with the industry up to 1878, when our sales in the United States had come down to 88,000 tons, and subsequently to about 13,000 tons. The duty of \$1.25 was continued till the year 1872, when it was reduced to 75 cents a ton; yet that did not give us any advantage, because the coal industry of the United States had arrived at such a state of development during the time the duty of \$1.25 was imposed against us, that it was impossible for us again to gain entry into the markets of the United States, even with the duty reduced to 75 cents a ton. In 1878, and, if I remember rightly, a year or two previous to that, an appeal was made to our representatives in this House for protection to our coal industry—such protection as would give us a home market within the Dominion, which was then being supplied by the coal mines of the United States. This House, at that time governed by the Administration of hon. gentlemen opposite, refused any concession of that kind to our coal producers. In 1878 the present Secretary of State announced to this House and the people of the constituency I represent, his policy for the protection of our coal industry, and for promoting its development. The hon. Secretary of State (Sir Charles Tupper) addressing a meeting of 7,000 people, largely mining people, in the county of Cape Breton, stated that if his party were returned to power, they would adopt the policy known as the National Policy, which had for its object the protection of the native industries of the country, among them, the coal industry. The people of that county, and the people of Canada, took the hon. Secretary of State (Sir Charles Tupper) and his leader, the late Sir

John A. Macdonald, at their word. The people returned them to power, and on their advent to power they gave us protection on coal. I propose to show the results of that protection. I might say that at that very time I had the honour myself of being a representative, for the first time, to Parliament in the Assembly of my province, and I remember very distinctly that one of the first acts I undertook on behalf of the people of my county was to ask my colleagues in Parliament and in the government to provide some means of coming to the relief of the suffering miners of my county. We had a large number of mining people out of employment, without means and without credit, and we were obliged to seek aid from the government for them, in the distressing circumstances in which they found themselves, owing to the want of that legislation which they had asked this House to provide years before, but which this House refused to provide. The aid was granted in some cases, as shown by the official records. I thought it my duty to ask as little as possible, because the more generally this aid was distributed to our people, the less could any one particular locality be entitled to. However, I was able to get some aid for those who were in most distressed circumstances. Sir, that was the last time I had to ask for aid on behalf of our mining classes. A change of government took place here and a change of policy as well, happily for the country and happily in particular for our coal industries. To-day, instead of those people being in need of assistance, they have money deposited in the banks, they have very comfortable homes, and they live as well as any class of people from one end of this land to the other. I might refer to a circumstance which did make a little difference in the comforts of those people, within the last year or two, to a considerable extent. As hon. gentlemen of this House are aware, the system under which our coal mines are operated underwent a change two years ago. This change brought about a change in many other ways, and as a consequence a few at least of our people cannot call themselves as comfortable or as regularly employed as they used to be from the time that this policy of protection for coal was inaugurated until the change referred to.

Now, in 1878, our total production of coal was only 770,603 tons. We marketed that coal as follows:—

88,475 tons	(largely slack)	in the United States.
61,861	"	in Newfoundland.
83,710	"	in the province of Quebec.
115,245	"	in the province of New Brunswick.
279,172	"	in the province of Nova Scotia.

Well, Sir, after the experience of this policy of protection, we find that our coal mines in the year 1894 were able to produce 2,109,742 tons of coal instead of 770,000 tons which they produced at the inception of this policy and which they had the greatest pos-

Mr. McDOUGALL (Cape Breton).

sible difficulty marketing even then. Well, where did they find a market for this coal? Not in the United States. We find that in the province of Quebec instead of a market of 83,000 tons, such as we had in 1878, we have a market now for 877,743 tons. In New Brunswick we have a market for 221,000 tons; in Prince Edward Island we have a market for 63,000 tons; and in Newfoundland we have a market for 97,000 tons. In the United States we marketed only 79,000 tons; and in Nova Scotia the total consumption has increased from 279,000 to 671,883 tons, and our exports to the West Indies and other countries amount to 7,323 tons. Here is a total production of 2,109,742 tons nearly all marketed in our own country, used by our own people, used for the development of the industries of the country, used for the operation of railways, used in every possible way in which fuel can be used. Well, then, instead of having to go to the United States or any foreign country for a market for our coal, we created by this policy, a market for ourselves, and control it for ourselves to a very large extent. We have, however, coming to this country a quantity of coal still from the United States, and I regret very much that we have that quantity of coal coming into this country. We have coming into the province of Ontario principally the bulk of our total importations, and I would like to point out that it is the duty of this Government, to go a step further in order to give us better facilities for reaching more of our own markets than we can reach now. I refer to the improvement of our canals, to the necessity for deepening those canals at whatever cost, so long as it is within reasonable bounds. Nothing could be done that would tend more to increase the importance and improve the trade volume of this country, particularly between the lower provinces and the upper provinces, than the deepening of our canals and making it possible for our ships from the east to reach the furthest west. I say that the industries of the country are such as to furnish sufficient trade to make it possible for vessels to obtain cargoes going west and return with cargoes going east. With opportunities of that kind, I do not think that there is any object for which the moneys of the people of this country could be better used than for the purpose of creating means by which interprovincial trade could thus be developed. I have no desire to see the debt of this country increased more than is absolutely necessary, but I am quite willing to take the responsibility of supporting any measure of this House which will have for its object the improvement of our natural channels of trade. From the time I occupied this seat up to now, I have given my earnest support to the building of railways from one end of Canada to the other, and I have no reason to regret my course. Whether it be a railway that went

thousands of miles to the west, or one that came past my door, I feel I only perform a duty that I owe to my country and the people, when I support measures brought before this House for the building of railways. We have seen a good deal, within the past few years, of the efforts made by the people of the United States to protect their coal industry. An effort was made by a certain portion of the people of the United States, a few years ago, to obtain free coal, but the number of people who made the effort in that direction was very small. But, when we learn that such a strong protest was made by the bulk of the people of the United States against interfering with the protection of that industry in that country, we should at once see the necessity for making similar efforts to maintain the protection we have upon the industry in this country. Having been able to increase our production from what it was in 1878 to what it is to-day, having increased our production and created a market within our own territory, it is our duty to stand by that industry as loyally as by any other in the country. In the United States the quantity of coal mined is about 180,000,000 tons, an average of three tons for every man, woman and child in the country. In Canada we mine a quantity equal to only about three-quarters of a ton per head of our population. If the United States can mine three tons per head and find a market for that quantity, is that not of itself a reason why we should follow the plan under which they built up that industry? For this industry is one which employs a very large number of people. It employs railways; it employs our shipping; and those who are engaged in mining and transporting coal are in the mass large consumers of the productions of other classes. If the people of the United States have good reason for standing by their own protective policy and preserving their own markets, thereby developing this industry and giving employment to a large number of people, is it not doubly necessary for us to take the same course with regard to our coal industry? We find that last year there were produced in the whole of Canada, including British Columbia as well as the lower provinces, 3,719,170 tons of coal. The exports from the province of British Columbia amount to 908,232 tons, and those from the province of Nova Scotia to 111,731 tons, a total export of 1,019,963 tons, leaving for consumption in Canada coal of our own production to the amount of 2,699,207 tons. We have an import into the Dominion of 1,603,154 tons of anthracite, and 1,500,550 tons of soft coal, a total of 3,103,704 tons. Thus we find that we consume in Canada 2,083,741 tons more than we produce. It becomes the duty of the people, if we are going to adhere to their policy, to adopt such means as will give us the benefit of at least the principal part of that market of over

two millions consumed beyond the amount of production, seeing that they are able to produce three tons of coal for every man, woman and child in their country, while we produce only three-quarters of a ton. But if, as I said before, our channels of trade are improved, we shall be able to send coal into Ontario, and if we do we shall take in exchange from Ontario the products of the industries in which the people there are engaged, and not the products of Ontario industries alone, but the products of those west of Ontario.

Now, I should like to occupy a little of the time of the House in reading a few extracts from statements made by gentlemen in the United States on the subject of trade relations with Canada, in the course of which they made reference to the coal industry. The committee of the United States Senate in 1889 dealt with this question of trade relations with Canada. I find that a gentleman, Mr. J. L. Batchelder, of the Boston Coal Association, was the first witness. He is reported to have said:

The duty on soft coal into Canada is 60 cents per 2,000 pounds, which is about the same as the duty upon Nova Scotia coal imported into this country, which is 75 cents per 2,240 pounds. The Canadians have no anthracite coal, so impose no duty upon such coal, consequently we send there yearly about 2,000,000 tons.

They do not send us 2,000,000 tons, but only about 1,500,000 tons.

If the duties upon coal should be removed it would make no difference in our sales of anthracite coal in Canada, while as regard soft coal, the 30,000 tons that we take from Canada now might be increased to 60,000 tons—

Just imagine, Mr. Speaker, the increase they are willing to allow us with free entry of coal into the United States is only twice as much as their imports of our coal that year or a total of 60,000 tons. During the past year, I think, our sales amounted to between 60,000 and 70,000 tons. They believed that so thoroughly was their coal business developed that we would find it impossible to get into the markets of the United States against their product. He goes on to say further:

With the duty off, Canadian coal landed here would be higher than Pennsylvania coal, for it would not be laid down here so cheaply as can our own coal.

Now, if we adopted a system of free trade in coal with the United States what would be the result? While we have now a market for from 800,000 to 1,000,000 tons within the province of Quebec for consumption in parts of Ontario as well as Quebec, we should lose that market, and should gain only an increased market for 30,000 or 40,000 tons, according to their calculation. This would be the result of the change which so many hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House are so anxious to bring about. An-

other gentleman who gave evidence was Mr. F. H. Odiorne. He said :

The shipments of coal from Nova Scotia have been declining for a number of years, due to the fact that development of mines in this country has so stimulated competition as to reduce the price of coal to a point that cuts off Canadian competition.

The total production of coal in Nova Scotia in 1887 was 1,519,684 tons, and in 1888, 1,576,692 tons. The total shipments in 1887 to the United States were 73,882 tons, and in 1888 they were 30,198 tons. The removal of the duty on coal would doubtless enable them to sell 50,000 tons of coal here in New England. For our iron industry we should get no coal from Nova Scotia, for they have none that can be compared with ours. The Pictou coal alone would be suitable for use in the iron industry, and its use, even with the duty removed, would be impracticable, because of the expense. The removal of the duty would simply lead to reciprocity, and then we should sell more soft coal in Canada.

Well, later on in that investigation, Mr. L. G. Burnham said :

He favoured reciprocity, believing it would be a benefit to the whole country, and that as far as the coal trade is concerned, its sales would be largely increased in that country, while importations of coal would not be increased to any extent. In 1885 we exported from this country to Canada, of anthracite and bituminous coal, 1,900,000 tons ; in 1887 a little over 2,000,000 tons, and in 1888, upwards of 3,000,000. During that time we imported a very small portion, probably about 1,000,000 tons of bituminous coal from the British provinces. Our coal is much better, and has nothing to fear from Canadian competition.

Now, I do not wish to detain the House by quoting many extracts, but I will quote one more, and that is from the evidence of Mr. Jonathan A. Lane, president of Boston Merchants' Association. He gave evidence as follows :—

He thought that commercial union offered the only practical solution of our commercial relations with Canada—

I wish hon. gentlemen on the other side to make a note of this. There was a time when they were interested in commercial union.

—that under such conditions there would result an enormous increase in the trade between the two countries, and that our industries would be greatly stimulated. Under such conditions, too, a vast and magnificent field would be opened to American enterprise and capital, and when it is remembered that Alaska returns a 25 per cent dividend, the possible value of this country (Canada) to our capital can be estimated. To Senator Hoar, Mr. Lane stated that the association for which he appeared represented men of all shades of political predilections, but that in this matter they forgot politics, and regarded the question from a business standpoint only.

It will be seen that Mr. Lane is in favour of commercial union. He is very frank, too, in giving his reasons for desiring such an arrangement. He was even more frank a few hours later on the same day, when,

Mr. McDOUGALL (Cape Breton).

addressing his brother merchants at the close of the Merchants' Week, he then put it this way—and I would like the hon. member from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies) to make a note of it, as he is speaking about relations with the United States :

Speaking of our relations with Canada, he said that that was a part of our country which was unfortunately left out at the time of the revolution. He then spoke in favour of reciprocity with Canada, and said that people had but little idea of the value of its resources to this country. A great deal is heard of forming closer relations with the countries of South America and it is said that it is time for us to push our trade in that direction, but there are many obstacles in the way. There are, however, no obstacles to our gobbling up our neighbours on the north.

Sir, this is the language of Mr. Lane, president of the Boston Merchants' Association, this was his scheme for "gobbling up Canada," this was his scheme for "gobbling up the country to the north" of the United States ; and I presume this House may consider that language a good explanation of the reason why we heard so much in this House, and out of it, throughout Canada, about commercial relations with the United States, and the question of commercial union. However, these gentlemen in their evidence said nothing about unrestricted reciprocity. Now, there is a class of people in this country who use very strong arguments to the effect that the manufacturers and other people engaged in small industries in this country, are affected by the imposition of this duty on coal. Now, instead of giving arguments to this House from our own standpoint, from the knowledge we should have with regard to the consumption of coal in our own industries, I will take the liberty of giving to the House some of the arguments used by people in the United States interested in this industry, when it was proposed that the duty on coal entering the United States should be abolished. I think these arguments should hold good in behalf of our contention. Our coal consumers consist chiefly of our manufacturers, and our railway and steamboat companies. Now, while I admit that our railway people pay the great bulk of the duties that are paid on coal coming from the United States and the lower provinces, I contend, at the same time, that the development of this country which has brought about a condition of trade that provides business for these railways, ought to be a justification for asking these railway people to give some consideration for the benefit they receive ; while a certain portion of our people are engaged in the mining interest, and while that industry should be protected as affording a means of livelihood for themselves, and as a means of investment, it is only fair that those who get the benefit of the development of that trade, of the interchange of commodities that are produced in the various provinces, and the greater part of which

pass over these railways—it is only fair, I say, that these railway people should be compelled to pay their own proportion of the expense of the government of this country in that way. Now, Mr. Wm. Connell, the president of the Anthracite Coal Operators' Association of the United States, believes that the repeal of the duty on bituminous coal will seriously injure the anthracite coal industry, though no duty is now levied on anthracite coal. He is reported as saying :

It is a common delusion that our anthracite industry is not concerned in this matter. Apart from the general fact, upon which the entire protectionist system is based, that you cannot cut off a finger or a toe of the body politic without sending a thrill of pain throughout the entire system, I desire to say that our own community is directly interested. The figures of anthracite production for the past few years show that the present growth is almost entirely confined to the smaller sizes—pea and buckwheat—and more especially buckwheat—are being used more and more for mechanical and industrial purposes. The demand for these sizes naturally comes from the east, from New England, New York, and seaboard area. Put Nova Scotia bituminous coal into these markets at prices underselling the home anthracite shipper, and what do you do? You destroy his market, curtail his opportunities for trade growth, and by just that much inflict a blow upon all those industries and activities that hinge upon the steady operation of our anthracite mines.

If this argument holds good in regard to the removal of the United States duty off coal coming into that country, with how much stronger force must the same argument apply to our position, when we consider that a country that has brought that industry to the state of development to which the United States coal industry is at present, with a total production of 179,000,000 tons, with a home market for every ton of it, with a capacity for yearly increase in production, and a corresponding increase of consumption. Coming again to the argument that certain classes of the people, such as the industrial classes, pay this duty. I find this argument was used in behalf of the coal producers of the United States when this question was being discussed with a view to the removal of the duty on coal in the neighbouring country :

In 1889, the last year for which we have complete statements, 299,559 persons were employed in coal mining. Not another of the mining industries employed 100,000. Iron ore production employed but 38,707, not quite one-eighth as many; gold and silver production together, but about one-sixth, lead not one-tenth, and even the quarrying of all kinds of stone only about one-third. Not a single manufacturing industry employed as many persons. The nearest approach is lumber mills, which employed 286,197; the second manufacturing industry in rank on the basis of employees is foundry and machine shop, the third clothing manufacturing, and the fourth cotton goods. Coal mining employs 100,000 more persons than boot and shoe making, including

factory and customs work and repairing, 200,000 more than furniture making, 150,000 more than iron and steel furnaces and rolling mills, 200,000 more than the manufacture of cigars and cigarettes, 80,000 more than the manufacture of calico goods, 175,000 more than woollen and worsted mills, and 250,000 more than the manufacturing of silk and silk goods.

There is another reason why they demand consideration for this industry in legislation in the United States, which is put as follows :—

We, therefore, insist that in view of its importance as an employer of labour, in view of the large sum paid annually in wages, and in view of the relation between wages at the mines and value of production, in all of which stands pre-eminent among the manufacturing and mining industries of the United States, coal mining demands a consideration that it has not received in framing tariff legislation.

In but five states of the union, viz., New York, Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, Ohio and Illinois, did the total number of persons engaged in all manufacturing industries, and the total wages paid in the industries exceed the total number of persons engaged or the wages paid in the United States in the production of this article that has been contemptuously termed a raw material.

I notice that hon. gentlemen opposite, and more particularly the leader of the Opposition, term coal raw material. A further argument was used, to this effect :

An industry that can make such a showing, that employed 299,559 persons in 1889, and 341,943 in 1892, that paid \$109,130,928 in wages in 1889, and \$138,596,278 in 1892, is entitled to demand that no legislation shall be proposed, much less enacted, that shall in any measure interfere with its prosperity. It insists that it shall not be injured to give sanction to a phrase, "free raw material," and above everything else it denies the right of Congress to injure its multitude of workmen in the interest of any other industry.

Nor should this industry be injured that the coal miners and producers of other countries may be benefited. American producers and American workmen who work and produce in the United States are entitled to our market against all comers, even if those who would enter them are American citizens who choose to invest their capital in other countries. That the capital now invested in Cape Breton mines is largely from the United States is no reason why the protection now given coal should be reduced or removed in order that this coal may take some of our markets. Indeed, in view of the fact that this capital pays a tribute to the government of Nova Scotia on every ton of coal it helps to produce, it would seem just that it should bring something to the government of the United States.

If this argument is good for the United States, why should it not be good for us? As to the cost of fuel in some of those industries, I beg to quote the following :—

Among the chief industries in New England are the manufacture of textiles and boots and shoes. The total value of the manufactures of wool in the United States in 1890 was \$338,231,109, the total value of all fuel used in this production was \$3,894,492, or 1.15 per cent. The value of all cotton manufactures in 1890 was \$267,981.

721, and of the fuel used in this production, \$4,252,088, or 1.58 per cent. In the New England states the total value of all cotton manufactures was \$181,112,453, and the value of fuel consumed, \$3,113,008, or 1.71 per cent, a little above the average. These are census figures and show in these industries, at least, how fallacious is the claim that free coal will or could reduce the price to the consumer.

These figures show the fallacy of the claim that free coal would reduce the price of fuel. I quote the following:—

This can be shown still more definitely. In a brochure on "Free Coal for New England," Col. Wm. Lamb says: "Mr. Galloway C. Morris, of Philadelphia, informs me that the mills of Fall River produced in 1891, 602,850,000 yards of finished material on a consumption of 177,300 tons of coal. Allowing the full duty of 75 cents per ton to be the increase of the cost of this coal to the mills by reason of the duty (which I do not, however, admit), then the additional cost of producing this amount of goods by reason of the tariff is .022 cent per yard.

I might quote opinions on the same lines with respect to the cost of coal, in carpet, woollen, boot and shoe manufactures. This opinion is expressed:

In view of all these facts, is it not absurd to demand free coal in order that cost of manufactured products to consumers may be reduced? Even if the price of coal in New England were reduced by the amount of the duty, and experience shows it would not be, the reduction per unit would be so small as to make it impossible to reduce the retail selling price as a result.

These are facts which I have thought necessary to submit to the House, not only in favour of maintaining our present duty on coal, but in favour of increasing, if possible, that protection, and make it so that our coal producers could command a greater portion of the market within our own country. It is unreasonable for us to expect that we have any chance of getting admission to outside markets. I say, however, that we have a chance of developing our market more than is at present done, and we should have a chance of improving the facilities for reaching our market, and thereby increasing our production, and, at the same time, increasing the demand for the commodities that our people require, and which are produced in other parts of the Dominion to which we look as a market for our coal. It is unreasonable for our neighbours to expect that we will give them free coal and be taxed on articles that furnish them means for carrying on business in this country. With these remarks, with which I am sorry to have detained the House, I beg to say that, from my knowledge of the general condition of business throughout the country, and of the state of development of our various industries, under the present Administration, the people of Canada have no reason whatever to desire a change, to accept any of what appear to be the foolish and absurd propositions which emanate from hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House.

Mr. McDOUGALL (Cape Breton).

Mr. McMULLEN. Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. McDougall) has given the House a very long address, in which he has endeavoured to point out some of the particular advantages of the National Policy to the province from which he comes. The hon. gentleman (Mr. McDougall), in the course of his remarks, suggested that the duty on coal should be increased. Well, I do not know how far the manufacturers of Ontario and the manufacturers of the western part of this Dominion, are prepared to comply with a suggestion of that kind. The present duty on coal tends to increase the cost of manufacturing, and it has been a serious draft upon those who are engaged in many lines of industry. I doubt that they would be prepared to accept further burdens in that line. Of course my hon. friend (Mr. McDougall) is largely interested in the coal question, and I presume he does not feel any sympathy with those who are struggling under the burden of taxation imposed by the present tariff.

Mr. McDOUGALL (Cape Breton). Will the hon. gentleman excuse me a moment. I have not one cent interest in coal, nor never had.

Mr. McMULLEN. The section of the province from which the hon. gentleman comes is deeply interested in coal, and no doubt he would like very much that the duty should be increased in order to shut out any chance of competition there might be, and any chance of our manufacturers getting cheap coal. My hon. friend (Mr. McDougall) referred to the amount of tonnage that passed the "Sault" Canal last year, as an evidence of prosperity. But if the hon. gentleman would analyse the statistics in that connection he would find that about 90 per cent is American tonnage, and that only 10 per cent comes to or from Canada. It is all nonsense to try and base an argument in favour of the National Policy on any such matter as that. The hon. gentleman is a resident of Grand Narrows. He has taken quite an interest in the Intercolonial Railway, and he has commended the vast expenditure of the Government on that line. No doubt the hon. gentleman feels that, because I understand that the operators of the road at the present time are very kind to him. I believe that the train which passes the Grand Narrows stops half an hour there to enable the passengers to visit his hotel and spend their money. That is no doubt a very great advantage to him and doubtless he feels very grateful for the privilege. The hon. gentleman spoke about the net interest we pay on our national debt, and he told us that the per capita burden was less now than it was some years ago. I quite admit that paper and ink can produce almost anything, but the answer to all such arguments is simply this: In 1878, when the Mackenzie Government went out

of power, the total revenue of the country was about \$23,000,000, and taking the population of that time as 4,000,000, this would give a tax of \$5.75 per head. Now, my hon. friend will not deny that our present revenue is about \$38,000,000, and taking our population at 5,000,000, if he figures out that correctly, he will find that our present tax amounts to \$7.60 per head. That is a complete answer to the miscalculation of the hon. gentleman. He talks with regard to free goods, and he says that \$50,000,000 worth of free goods are admitted into Canada. That may be true, but let me ask him, what advantage is that to the people generally? Are not the goods admitted free for the purpose of helping the interests of the manufacturers? Does he not know that a manufacturer can import goods free of duty, but that anybody else importing similar goods is charged a very high duty. Take, if you like, the simple article of window blinds. If a man manufacturing window blinds imports linen of a certain width he gets it free of duty, but if another man wants to import it, not for that purpose, he has to pay the duty. In that way a great many manufacturers are permitted the advantage of having, even manufactured commodities, imported free, not because they are in a raw condition, but simply because they enter into use in connection with some manufacturing concern. This is the reason why there is such a large amount of goods admitted free of duty. It is a benefit to the manufacturers, but what benefit is it to the people at large. The hon. gentleman took credit to his party for having reduced the duty on tea. Well, Sir, the reason they removed the tax from tea was simply because the Americans had removed it, and they found that if they continued it, the difference in the price to the people of this country, as compared with what was paid in the United States, would be such a glaring evidence of the increased taxation to which our people were subjected, that the Government thought it was better to remove that tax on tea. The hon. gentleman spoke of the English Stamp Act, and he says that, if they have free trade, yet they have the Stamp Act in force. Surely my hon. friend is not so ignorant of the history of the Stamp Act as to charge that it was introduced at the same time as the introduction of free trade. England had a Stamp Act long before they had free trade, and it is only a remnant of their old system of taxation which has not yet been wiped out. Then, again, the hon. gentleman told us about failures in this country, and he said that during the years of the Mackenzie Administration there were more failures than during the term of office of the present Government. Well, Sir, if the hon. gentleman looks over the records for the present year he will find that there never before were so many business suspensions in Canada. There never has been greater financial

depression in the country than at the present time, and the best evidence of the fact is that large failures are taking place almost every day throughout the Dominion. The public press of the country will bear me out in that regard. If he wishes for any other evidences of the positive pecuniary difficulties of our people, let the hon. gentleman (Mr. McDougall) go over the chattel mortgages in the different counties and towns and cities of Canada, and he will find that more such mortgages have been filed during the past few months than ever were filed in Canada before. That is a clear indication that our people are suffering from serious financial depression. When a man is driven to the necessity of chattel mortgaging his household furniture and his stock, that is positive evidence that his financial condition is becoming exceedingly embarrassing; and if you look at the files of mortgages, you will find that up to the present time there have been more chattel mortgages in Canada, week after week, and day after day, from midsummer last, down to the present time, than ever there have been before. That is one of the most reliable of proofs that the people of the country are financially embarrassed. The hon. gentleman talked about the poverty of England under free trade. Well, Sir, the record of England under free trade is the brightest this world affords of the progress and prosperity of any nation. When England adopted free trade in 1846, her national debt was £850,000,000, but since that time she has reduced her debt by over \$900,000,000, notwithstanding that she has during the same period paid the cost of all her wars, including the Crimean war, the Indian mutiny, and others requiring immense expenditure on the part of the nation. She has reduced the number of her paupers over 50 per cent. She has reduced the number of prisoners in jails over 70 per cent. She has enormously improved the general condition of the people who were formerly suffering under the heel of the system of protection. The labouring and industrial classes of England—indeed, all classes—were never in a better, or more prosperous, or progressive condition than they are to-day under free trade. The best evidence of that fact is, that you do not find these classes agitating for a return to protection. There is some little agitation for protection amongst the farmers, who fancy that it might do them some good, although the more intelligent of them clearly realize that, if they had protection, it would only be a very short time till the landlords would pocket all the advantages the farmers would gain from protection, by correspondingly increasing rents. The hon. gentleman dealt very exhaustively with the question of coal. He looks upon that industry as a very important one in the section from which he comes, and, I presume, that he advocates the continuation of the duty upon coal simply be-

cause he thinks it would tend to increase the number of miners employed, and generally to improve the condition of the people in the county he represents.

Now, Sir, I wish to deal with a general question, that is, the question of our national debt. I claim that what a debt is to an individual, what it is to a city or to a province, it is also to the Dominion. A man who is suffering under financial embarrassments, resulting from his borrowing large sums of money for which he has mortgaged his property, realizes the same experience that this Dominion is virtually realizing to-day. What is the fact? We have to-day a net debt of \$253,074,927, to which we may add a considerable sum on account of the deficits of last year and the present year. The present Government have increased the debt, since they took office to the 30th June, 1895, by \$15,541,716, or, an average yearly increase of \$3,108,343—an addition for every day the sun rose since they took office of \$8,516. The anticipated increase from the deficiencies to which I have referred, to the 30th of June, 1896, amounts to \$4,250,000. Now, if we refer to the very large amounts of interest which this country has been paying on its national debt, we shall find out, to some extent at least, the reason for the enormous drain of money to which our people have been subjected. In 1891 we paid for interest on our national debt, \$9,584,136.74, and for charges of management \$184,711.47. In 1892 the interest on the public debt was \$9,763,978.34, and the charges of management were \$176,036.62. In 1893 we paid for interest on the public debt \$9,806,888.45, and for charges of management \$212,690.83. In 1894 we paid for interest on the public debt \$10,212,596.13, and for charges of management \$166,444.39. In 1895 the interest on the public debt was \$10,466,294.44, and the charges of management were \$162,590.31. To these sums should be added commission and exchange, but, omitting them, I find that in those five years we have paid in interest and charges of management, \$50,736,377.72. I have given these figures to show how gradually and how certainly our interest charges are increasing from year to year. That sum makes an average payment of \$10,147,273.54 every year for the last five years. Now, the interest on the public debt for the year ending 30th June, 1895, was \$10,466,294.44, the charges of management \$162,590.31, and the premium, discount and exchange, \$116,359.91, which makes a total payment for that year on account of the public debt of \$10,745,244.66, or \$29,439 for every day, or the price of seven farms at \$4,200 apiece. That is the amount it takes every day to pay the interest on our national debt. If an accountant worked ten hours per day, every day except Sunday, he would have to count over to a person on the other side of the counter prepared to receive the interest money, \$3,433 every hour, or \$34,330 every day, to pay the interest on our national debt. This is a very

important matter, when we look at it in this way. When we realize what an enormous drain this is upon the resources of this country, is it any wonder that our people are becoming impoverished? This Government have increased the debt of this country in seventeen years by \$112,712,857.18. At 4 per cent, which the interest amounts to, when you include the cost of management, premium, discount and exchange, this requires \$4,508,514.28 of interest every year. This means that they have increased our interest for every day, of 313 days, in the year by \$14,404, or \$1,440 per hour for every day of ten hours, since they came into office. In 1894-95 the deficit, as I have already said, was \$4,153,875.58. Now, to show where some of this money is gone is exceedingly important, and I will draw attention to some of the things in which it has been largely invested. When the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie went out of power in 1878, the Intercolonial Railway was 744 miles long, the total cost of that line was \$36,091,065.85, and the capital account of that line was then closed. But when hon. gentlemen opposite came into power, they reopened that capital account, and added to the mileage of that road to the extent of 653½ miles. It was understood at confederation that the Intercolonial was a necessity. It was a necessity from two standpoints. First, if possible, to increase the interprovincial trade; and in the second place, to give us an outlet to the sea-board, independent of our neighbours. For these purposes, it became a part of our contract at confederation, but there was no understanding that it should be added to, to the extent to which it has been. If these additions had been lucrative investments, if they had paid the interest which the country is called upon to pay on them, no one would have objected; but, notwithstanding the fact that now there is something over \$55,000,000 sunk in that road, on which the people are paying \$2,200,000 per year interest, for which we do not get one brass farthing in return, it has not yet earned sufficient to meet the annual expenditure in any one year. That is the condition of the road to-day. We were to have one ocean port, but I find we have now no less than six. The total capital expenditure I have already given, and the increase in seventeen years on the mileage and construction of the Intercolonial has added a further expenditure to capital account of \$18,916,873.35; and by the expenditure of that money, there has been added to the interest charge of the people of this Dominion, \$756,674.92 per annum, or \$2,417.50 for every day in the year.

Now, we come to examine into some of the transactions in which the hon. Secretary of State (Sir Charles Tupper) took an active part when he was Minister of Railways. We all remember Mr. Onderdonk and his contract for the western section of

the Canadian Pacific Railway. We know very well, from the records, that that contract was let to Mr. Onderdonk, a Californian contractor, at something like \$226,000 over and above another tender. The objection on that occasion was that the other tender was only marked good for three days, but that point was adjusted. That was made right, but, after all, the tender was awarded to Mr. Onderdonk. After that, the specifications were reduced, so that \$200,000 more in the way of an advantage was given to Mr. Onderdonk. These altogether amounted to \$426,000, which he had the advantage of starting with. Then, afterwards, when we came to deal with him, at the winding up of the contract, under an arbitration that was held, it was declared that we had to take over a certain quantity of rolling stock; and that arbitration awarded Mr. Onderdonk \$72,665 for that rolling stock. But the Government, for some reasons that have never been made plain to this House, and through some influence which they have never explained, allowed the award to be raised to \$202,000. Then, again, the Government paid the Canadian Pacific Railway \$15,000 for transporting the rolling stock to Quebec that was taken over. We were to get twenty-nine locomotives, and 397 flat cars; but in place of that, we only got eight locomotives and 180 flat cars; and in these various ways, a very considerable amount of money was lost on this western division. Take all these figures together:

On the contract	\$ 220,000
Rolling stock award	202,000
Paid Canadian Pacific Railway for haulage	15,000
Award to Canadian Pacific Railway for imperfect work, the work not being done according to original contract.	575,000
Expenses of award	100,000
Total	1,118,000

So that, in all, we wasted, by careless contracting, or by giving to Mr. Onderdonk an advantage he never should have had, and for reasons that have never been explained to this House, the sum of \$1,118,000 of the people's money.

It would take too long to go over all the different items whereby the annual drain on our treasury has been seriously increased, and to point out the sacrifices that have been made in the way of investments; but when we come to compare our country and its condition with the condition of the country across the border, we find that in Canada, where we have had peace, where we have had no war, of any consequence, and no extraordinary expenditure, our per capita tax is over \$6.50, while the per capita tax of the United States is only about \$5.75. And then the taxation of the United States is going downward, while the tendency of taxation in Canada is upward. It is said that in Canada the Do-

minion contributes considerable to each of the provinces, in the shape of a per capita allowance, and that the central Government in the United States pays no such contribution. That is very true, but in the United States the yearly pension expenditure was \$145,086,249. That is something we have not got in Canada, and, besides, they have a diplomatic service which costs them \$1,796,502. We have nothing of this kind, if we except our expenditure in connection with the offices of High Commissioner in London, and our agent in Paris—two officers who, in my opinion, have given no return to this country, whatever, for the money spent in keeping up them and their staff. Since 1869, the Americans have reduced their war debt over \$60,000,000 a year, down to 1891, when it stood at \$841,528,462, or \$12.32 per capita, and interest, 37 cents per head. The net debt of the Dominion is over \$50 per head, and the interest charge over \$2 per head. This shows very clearly how rapidly we in Canada have been running into debt. We have been borrowing money in an exceedingly imprudent manner, and spending it still more imprudently. It has been wasted in enterprises that give us no return, and to-day we find ourselves in this position, that we are paying enormous interest, annually, upon money sunk in public works and improvements that are yielding very little or nothing in return. Since confederation, there has been spent on public works, about \$225,000,000, and about \$60,000,000 on Dominion lands. How much has been wasted in our expenditure on public improvements? Investigation shows that on an expenditure of \$3,000,000, there was stolen or lost, \$964,000, or 33 per cent. Take the value of the lands we have given away, at \$2 per acre, we have given away \$120,000,000. Take cash paid in taxes, or borrowed money, \$225,000,000. This means \$345,000,000 that we have spent, and if we have lost proportionately on all those sums expended what we lost in the McGreevy matter, the country has lost \$115,000,000, which, no doubt, has found its way into the pockets of political sharks, anxious to get money in any shape, by contracts or otherwise.

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

After Recess.

CANADA AND MICHIGAN BRIDGE AND TUNNEL COMPANY.

House resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 42) respecting the Canada and Michigan Bridge and Tunnel Company.—(Mr. Ingram).

(In the Committee.)

On section 2.

Mr. TISDALE moved:

That the clause be amended by adding after the word "bridge" in the second line the words "and its approaches."

This makes it clear that this clause applies to the approaches of the bridge, as well as to the bridge itself.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. INGRAM. Before the Bill is reported, I desire to call the attention of the committee to the fact that a similar Bill is now before the Congress of the United States, and there, I understand, a gentleman representing one of the western states, proposes to introduce a certain amendment. That amendment, I understand, is in this line—to add a clause that the contractors of this work shall not employ any other class of labour but American labour. Having received word of this only this afternoon, I have been precluded from giving notice of an amendment. But, with the consent of the committee, I would like to move the following as an additional clause to the Bill:—

In the event of the Congress of the United States or the legislature of the state of Michigan passing any Act or making any amendment to the Detroit River Bridge Bill compelling the contractor or contractors to employ American labour only in the construction of such bridge on the American side of the river, the said contractor or contractors shall employ Canadian labour only on the Canadian side of the river.

I understand that there are members of Congress who are not in accord with the amendment suggested by the gentleman to whom I have referred, and they are desirous of having an expression of opinion, showing what Canadians think of such a section. So far as I am concerned, and I think I express the view of the majority of this House, and of those present in this committee, I believe Canadians do not appreciate amendments of this kind, especially on work such as this, to be built across an international river, and partly over Canadian waters, and partly over United States waters. It seems to me that a gentleman making such an amendment as that in Congress is entirely overstepping the mark, and I think that the proposal, if carried out, will tend to cause bad feeling between the two countries. I would be glad if hon. gentlemen present would give expression to such an opinion, deprecating any such proposal.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Of course, it is understood that this can be moved only with the consent of the committee, no notice having been given.

Mr. HAGGART. This is a very important amendment, and notice ought to be given of it.

Mr. INGRAM. I should have been glad to give notice had I had the opportunity. But surely the fact that no notice has been

Mr. McMULLEN.

given does not debar hon. gentlemen in this House from saying whether they do or do not believe in the principle advocated by the representative in Congress of one of the western states. If such an amendment is carried, I shall be in a position, at a later stage, to move in this matter, which I intend to do.

Mr. MCGREGOR. I do not think there is any intention on the part of the committee to raise any objection to this amendment. If the Americans refuse to allow Canadians to cross the water and work on that great work, of course we should have the right to keep the work on this side the water for Canadians. I do not see how there could be any objection to that. This is an international bridge, and if they want their own people to work on their side, why should we not have the same right on our side?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Amendment withdrawn for the present.

Bill, as amended, reported, and read the third time, and passed.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 41) respecting the Lake Erie and Detroit River Railway Company.—(Mr. McGregor.)

Bill (No. 29) to amend the Act incorporating the Supreme Court of the Independent Order of Foresters.—(Mr. McGillivray.)

Bill (No. 34) to consolidate and amend certain Acts relating to the Nipissing and James Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. Tisdale.)

CHIGNECTO MARINE RAILWAY.

Mr. POWELL moved second reading of Bill (No. 59) respecting the Chignecto Marine Transport Railway Company. He said: This Bill, in the form in which it is now before the House, will have to be amended. Although I am responsible for the Bill and have it in hand, I may say that I had not read it, although I suppose I should have done so before it was really introduced. The sole object sought to be accomplished by the Bill is to extend the time for the completion of this work. There may be involved in the clauses as they are drawn here—in fact I so mentioned my opinion to the draughtsman of the Bill immediately after reading it—certain other privileges that are not intended at all to be compassed by this Bill. The sole object is to extend the time for the completion of the work, and I will undertake before the House that when the Bill gets into Committee of the Whole, it will be so amended as to meet the sole object its promoters have in view.

Mr. LAURIER. With the explanation that has just been given by my hon. friend, I

would suggest to him that it would perhaps be more advisable to withdraw that Bill, and have it redrafted. The Bill, as it now reads, is misleading; and perhaps the hon. gentleman will better serve the interests he has in charge, if he adopts this suggestion. I understand that no time will be lost by it, that the Bill will hold the same rank as at present.

Mr. POWELL. The only question that arises is that of time. If I am assured that it will cause no additional delay. I will agree to the suggestion.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I suggest that the debate be adjourned till Monday, and that will enable the hon. gentleman to introduce the Bill in the proper form. I make that motion.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

IMPERIAL LIFE ASSURANCE CO.

Mr. COATSWORTH moved second reading of Bill (No. 64) to incorporate the Imperial Life Assurance Company of Canada.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the reason for introducing this Bill? I think this is a new company, and it could be incorporated under the general Act; that, at all events, was our intention when we passed the general Act. What special privileges does the hon. gentleman want to secure by this Bill?

Mr. COATSWORTH. The Bill happens to stand in my name. I have not read it, and cannot give any explanation.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then the debate had better be adjourned.

Mr. COATSWORTH. No; no doubt the Bill is all right—I am satisfied it is a Bill that should go through. The Bill happens to stand in my name, but it is the Bill of the chairman of the Banking and Commerce Committee, and he requested that it should be put in my name. I really do not know what the Bill is.

Mr. LAURIER. So nobody can explain the Bill. I move that the debate be adjourned.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 60) respecting the Thousand Islands Railway Company.—(Mr. Taylor.)

Bill (No. 61) to incorporate the Toronto, Hamilton and Niagara Falls Railway Company.—(Mr. Bennett.)

SUPPLY—THE BUDGET.

Mr. McMULLEN. Mr. Speaker, when you left the Chair, I was going on to point out

the very extravagant expenditures which had been incurred during the last eight or ten years, and the results of those expenditures. I have shown that we have been obliged to borrow money very largely, and the money has been spent in many ways that are not conducive to the interests of the country, and the Dominion is obliged to pay interest on that money year after year, and in this way the demands on the people have, unfortunately, very largely increased. I desire now to make some reference to the annual expenditures. The ex-Minister of Justice stated in his speech a few evenings ago, that it was impossible to conduct the affairs of this country for less than \$38,000,000 a year. I want to point out, in my humble way, how I think very large sums of money could be saved. We have unquestionably increased our expenditures very rapidly, and we have reached a period in the history of this Dominion when the earnest co-operation and assistance of people of all shades of politics is required to reduce the annual expenditure to an amount within the means of the taxpayers. We contend that an expenditure of \$38,000,000 annually is altogether too high. I am now going to point out some ways in which very large reductions could be made, notwithstanding the statement presented by the ex-Minister of Justice.

I find that in the last five years we have expended the following sums on immigration:—

1881	\$181,045
1892	177,604
1893	180,677
1894	202,235
1895	195,652

Or, in all, we have, during the last five years, since the last general election, expended \$937,216 on immigration, or nearly a million of money has been thrown away. We know we have brought to our shores a certain number of immigrants, but we are also aware, from the census taken in 1891 that there is hardly one of those immigrants to be found; we have not retained our natural increase. It is an exceedingly imprudent act, in the present condition of our finances, to continue such an expenditure on immigration, when we are accomplishing nothing thereby. We know from the records laid before the House, from the Auditor General's Report, that we have some forty-five immigration agents in the United States, scattered over different points, trying, if possible, to secure the return of Canadians who have gone to that country, and we know we have had very poor results, indeed, from the very large expenditure in connection with the effort made in that direction.

Another head under which, I think, we could save a large amount, is printing and advertising. Last year we spent the following sums on advertising:—

1891	\$60,201
1892	46,220
1893	41,890
1894	44,690
1895	35,161

Or, in all, we have spent, during those five years, on advertising, \$228,175.

Then I take printing, the expenditure on which, outside of the work done at the Printing Bureau, was as follows:—

1891	\$215,608
1892	190,755
1893	190,409
1894	224,935
1895	188,075

In all, we have spent on printing during those five years, \$1,009,722. Adding printing and advertising together, we have spent since the last general election, \$1,237,889. In looking over the items during the present year, I find that the "Mail and Empire" received \$1,906; "World," \$1,163; Hamilton "Spectator," \$1,731; Regina "Leader," \$1,588. I contend that this expenditure is reckless and unnecessary, in view of the drain on the people's resources, that it virtually amounts to throwing the money away.

I will now take the legal expenses. During the last five years, these expenditures have been as follows:—

1891	\$ 94,055
1892	103,936
1893	141,424
1894	101,076
1895	98,683

Or, in all, we have spent for legal services, outside of the Department of Justice, with all its staff, with a Solicitor General, with a Minister of Justice, and a deputy Minister of Justice, a sum no less than \$539,197, of which one firm in this city was paid, last year, \$18,044. My reason for drawing attention to these sums is simply to point out that, in my humble opinion, very considerable savings could be made, if the Government were disposed to cut down expenses and put a stop to this unnecessary drain upon the resources of the people.

I wish, Sir, to refer to the expenditure on Indians in Manitoba and the North-west. In 1891 we spent in this connection \$833,187.77; in 1892 we spent \$740,072.92; in 1893 we spent \$761,265.80; in 1894 we spent \$776,400.95; and in 1895 we spent \$761,105.22. In these five years we spent in all upon the Indians, \$3,872,032.66. Now, Sir, where has that money gone? We will see. The salaries at Ottawa cost \$58,400 a year; travelling expenses and salaries of officials in the North-west and Manitoba cost \$313,630, or, in all, \$372,030.07 have gone for salaries at Ottawa and salaries and travelling expenses in Manitoba and the North-west, during the last year. Deduct that from the total of \$761,000 expended, and we find that fifty cents on every dollar spent for maintaining the Indians has been applied to paying officials. Now, Sir,

Mr. McMULLEN.

under that item alone a very considerable saving could be made. I know that the Minister of the Interior has told us that the utmost economy has been observed in the expenditure, but I commend this statement to him in the hope that less will be spent on officials in future. I wish now to read an item which is to be found in the Auditor General's Report in this connection. H. J. Wickham, a lawyer, I presume, was paid \$3,031.34 for legal services rendered to the Cayuga Indians, very probably the tribe located in the riding of the Minister of Agriculture. Let me call the attention of the House to some of the items included in this lawyer's bill. It appears he was under the necessity of going to Montreal on a trip. He stopped at the Windsor Hotel and he charged in his bill \$4.50 for the day; \$3.95 for wines, \$2 for extra meals, 75 cents for a fire, and \$1 for cigars. That is a sample of this gentleman's charges for a day's visit to Montreal in connection with Indian affairs.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is that charged to the Indian account?

Mr. McMULLEN. It is charged to the Indian account, and charged in the bill of the Indians.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) By whom?

Mr. McMULLEN. By H. J. Wickham for legal services in connection with the Cayuga Indians. I call the attention of the House to this, because it clearly shows how extravagantly that money is paid out, and that it is virtually squandered in a great many cases.

Now, I am sorry that the Secretary of State (Sir Charles Tupper) has left the House, because I wish to point out to him that there could be a considerable saving effected in the office of the High Commissioner. I have taken considerable interest in that office ever since it has been my privilege to sit in this House, and I have made a calculation in order to ascertain if the country has received an adequate return for the immense sum of money spent in connection with that office during the last five years. In 1891 the High Commissioner drew \$16,442.96. This does not include anything appertaining to the office of the High Commissioner, but is simply his salary and sums connected with his residence in London, such as tax on income, parochial tax and other such items. In 1892 we paid him \$16,050; in 1893, \$16,934.24; in 1894 we paid him \$15,799.15; and in 1895 we paid him \$15,681.48. In these five years we have paid \$80,907.83 for the services of the High Commissioner in London. When we take into consideration the labour performed by the High Commissioner in the service of this country, and when we remember the unfortunate incidents connected with the scheduling of our cattle and sheep, it must occur to every reasonable man that we are paying

this money and getting no return for it. I can well remember when Sir John Macdonald introduced the Bill for the purpose of buying a residence in London to permanently locate Sir Charles Tupper there. Sir John Macdonald then stated across the floor of the House that he expected that when our contract with those who conducted our financial affairs in London ended, he had not the slightest doubt but that we would be able to make use of Sir Charles Tupper as our financial agent, and that we would thus save double the amount which it was going to cost us to send the High Commissioner to London, and keep him in residence there. Well, Sir, we have since had the confession of the Finance Minister that when he was in London he found himself utterly unable to make use of Sir Charles Tupper as financial agent, or in any other capacity connected with the Finance Department. As I said before, in view of the limited services that have been rendered by the High Commissioner, I believe we could well dispense with that office altogether. I admit that he made one treaty. It was called in this House the "little French Treaty," and the Government, for two years, hesitated before they decided to ratify that treaty. In my humble opinion, it would have been better, in the interests of the country, if it had not been ratified. However, the Government chose to ratify it, and that is all the evidence we have of any services having been rendered Canada by the High Commissioner. We find further that the office of the High Commissioner in London, including the items I have already given, costs us as follows:—

1891	\$27,589 19
1892	27,536 38
1893	28,856 59
1894	28,887 72
1895	29,352 55

During these five years we have spent upon the High Commissioner's office, including the money we paid himself, \$142,222.43. Now, Sir, I contend that we could very well dispense with that office and with the High Commissioner. I do not much wonder that the High Commissioner was willing to come to Canada to re-enter the Government, with the hope of keeping in power the party that has kept him so comfortably in London for so many years. I have no doubt that he is looking back very anxiously and very earnestly to the day when he may be reinstated in that office, if the approaching elections should go in favour of the Government. Let me now take, Sir, the amount that has been drawn from the public treasury by the Secretary of State and his family since the year 1889, two years before the last elections. We will include two years before that. In 1889 we paid them \$33,780.26; in 1890, \$31,343.17; in 1891, \$42,044.83; in 1892, \$29,338.50; in 1894, \$28,887.72; and in 1895, \$28,681.48; or, in all, in those years, \$194,166.96, or an average outlay of \$32,361.16 every year. This, of course, included the services of the com-

mandant of the Military College at Kingston. Well, Sir, I know a little about that college, and I feel positively certain that were it not that Commandant Cameron is the son-in-law of Sir Charles Tupper, he would never be kept in that institution. I know from students in the institution that he is not even making an attempt to perform faithfully the duties of commandant to that college. It is one of the duties of the commandant of the Military College to be the personal friend and intimate of every student in the college; but although there are 60 of them there this year, I would venture to stake my sessional allowance that if you put them all in a crowd, he could not pick out 20 of them by name in the whole 60, he knows so little about them. Instead of being called upon to keep officials of that kind, who are virtually national blood-suckers, doing nothing at all for the salaries they draw, I think it is time the country dispensed with their services; and we have had too many such men in Canada.

Now, I want to draw attention to some of the schemes set on foot by the hon. Secretary of State (Sir Charles Tupper) when he was here before. We have a very vivid recollection of many of the schemes of which he was the promoter at that time. We know that he set on all fours, in a very eloquent and forcible way, the scheme for the construction of the Oxford and New Glasgow Railway, which virtually duplicates the Intercolonial Railway. The construction of the main line of the Intercolonial was a necessity, in the interest of the country, and was agreed to by both Reformers and Conservatives; but there was no necessity of duplicating it, especially by a line running through a country that could well afford to contribute its share towards its construction, just as the counties and other municipalities in western Ontario have done. Instead of that, by the influence he exercised, the hon. Secretary of State secured the construction of that road entirely at the country's expense; and to-day the people of this country are paying the interest upon its cost, while it is paying nothing in return.

We know also that the hon. gentleman set on all fours the question of the construction of the St. Charles Branch. That was to cost \$130,000, and before it was completed it cost \$1,740,000, and there are, I understand, still claims to the amount of \$20,000 which have not yet been adjusted.

When the hon. gentleman was here before, he also, in a very eloquent speech, gave a highly-drawn picture of what would result from the establishment of smelting furnaces for the purpose of manufacturing iron in Canada. He asserted that something like two or three millions of money was waiting ready to be invested in the erection of smelting works. He said that this scheme would increase our population at least 200,000, and he promised that we would have smelting works at different

points all the way from the Atlantic to the Pacific. He named several towns, among them Port Hope, Cobourg, Weller's Bay, Kingston and Toronto, where smelting works were to be established. The result was that his followers in the House gave their confidence to the scheme, and the duties on iron were increased, and that increase has been continued to the present day. Yet we have not had a single smelting furnace erected since that scheme was projected, except one which has recently been erected in Hamilton; all the others in the country were in existence before. Now, Sir, that was a very serious change in the tariff for the users of iron. The farmers were struck by it more than any other class. But when the change was made the iron-mongers, the boards of trade and the chambers of commerce of England remonstrated very strongly against it. They sent resolutions and did everything they could to prevent the increase in the duties, which would hamper and hinder the trade in iron between England and Canada. But, Sir, there was no retreat in the policy; the increase went on. I wonder how hon. gentlemen opposite have the face to urge on England concessions in favour of Canada, when the policy they have pursued for the last seventeen or eighteen years has been a direct slap in the face of England, in the matter not only of iron, but of woollen goods, cotton goods and fabrics of all kinds. They talk very glibly and finely about England giving Canada and the other colonies a preference in the British market; but it is a wonder to me how they can make a proposition of that kind after having acted in such a hostile manner towards the mother country for so many years.

Then, when we made the loan to the Canadian Pacific Railway, we know what a glowing picture the hon. gentleman presented of the prospect of opening up the North-west country—what an enormous quantity of grain would be exported from there. I am going to read to the House his utterance upon that particular occasion. In 1883, Sir Charles Tupper read to the House of Commons the following estimate made by the Department of the Interior. He said:

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

The actual amounts received not only from sales, but from pre-emption and homestead fees from 1883 to 1891, as given in official Year-Book, are as follows:—In 1883, \$925,962; in 1884, \$788,136; in 1885, \$288,594; in 1886, \$321,279; in 1887, \$412,318; in 1888, \$404,282; in 1889, \$441,761; in 1890, \$328,141; and in 1891, \$292,254; making, in all, in these years in which we were

Mr. McMULLEN.

to receive \$58,000,000, the sum of \$4,202,727 which we have actually realized. Now, this is pointing out the fallacy of many of the propositions which the hon. gentleman made, when he occupied the very distinguished position in this House before. We earnestly hope that his return may bring with it a fulfilment of some of those prophetic utterances. It would be a grand thing for Canada, if we could get that \$55,000,000 out of the North-west lands now. It would tend very considerably to relieve our depleted treasury; and, if we could turn out the 640,000,000 bushels of wheat which he predicted would be produced by that country in the course of a few years, that would be, indeed, a great boon. But it appears these statements of his, uttered from time to time, in this way, secured the confidence of this House, and the result was, that we went into a lot of gigantic schemes which have resulted in an enormous increase of our debt, on which we have to pay interest, and on which we get no return.

I desire to say something with regard to the policy which has been the subject of discussion in this House a great many years. I refer to the policy of protection. I want to point out, as clearly and distinctly as I can, the manner in which that policy has operated on the consuming masses of the people. While that policy has been discussed both on the stump and in the House, I believe there are thousands and hundreds of thousands in this country yet who have never realized the way in which their money is taken from them under the operation of this protective tariff; and, to-day, they find themselves financially hampered, without being able to understand how it is they are in such a condition. Now, I admit that incidental protection is a pardonable thing. It might possibly exist under a revenue tariff. I admit also, that moderate protection is very plausible. It would catch on with a great many people. It is a tempting policy to consider, but I contend that the kind of protection under which we are suffering has led to anomalies, and is a gross injustice and nothing short of an outrage upon the consuming masses. It is also a prostitution of the governmental power that brought it into force, and keeps it to-day on our statute-book. The Conservative party themselves, we have reason to believe, never had confidence in protection. They have never shown that they had. It was introduced in 1878, and in 1882, the very first time they went to the country after protection, was the year in which all the gerrymandering took place. Then, in 1887, we know very well, because the investigation in the Public Accounts Committee showed it, that very large amounts of money were stolen, and were sent into the different constituencies for the purpose of buying them up, and that object was, unfortunately, only too well accomplished. Then, in 1891, we know very well that the Government did

not go to the country on the question of protection at all, but on the question of reciprocity with the United States, and we know, further, how grossly they deceived the people of this country by the manner in which they presented that question to them. We have frequently discussed in this House the statements that were made by Ministers of the Crown on the stump, with regard to the invitation which they declared they had received to go to Washington and negotiate a treaty. We know perfectly well how the farmers of this country were grossly deceived on that occasion. We know that the Government said they had been invited to go to Washington; but we know that, when Sir Charles Tupper went to Washington, he withdrew that statement and admitted that the position taken by Mr. Blaine with regard to the origin of the whole matter was the correct one. He was forced to admit that the whole business did not originate with the United States, that no invitation was sent by the American Government at all, but that the British Minister at Washington acted under the suggestion of the Government here, which suggestion was made for the sole purpose of accomplishing the end in view, namely, to carry elections on that cry, which they would never have carried otherwise.

The hon. Finance Minister (Mr. Foster) said in this House, that the consumers pay no taxes on home-manufactured goods. He said that the only things on which they pay taxes are the goods imported into this country which are subject to taxation. I want to show that, on the goods manufactured in this country, the consumers pay a heavy tax also. Take, first, cotton goods. The total importation of all cottons, including all kinds, dressed goods, winceys, &c., during last year, as set forth in the Trade and Navigation Returns, amounted to \$4,218,168. The duty paid by the people on those imports was \$1,200,820.75, or an average of 28½ per cent. Now, if you take the Trade and Navigation Returns, page 63, you will find that we imported cottons, unbleached, bleached, and printed and checked shirtings, &c., to the amount of \$2,605,278, on which the duty paid was \$763,711.73, or an average duty of 29½ per cent. Now, the average consumption in Canada of these cottons in a year is about nine million dollars. The statement of the cotton manufacturers will prove that that is about the correct estimate. Last year, their entire manufacture was \$8,451,724. Now, on that nine millions, the consumers in this country pay the duty, because these goods are sold up to the point at which they could import with the duty added. Therefore, the Canadian consumers paid tax in the way of protection on the nine million dollars they consumed, which amounted to \$1.80 per head of the population. Of this nine million dollars, \$6,394,722 worth was manufactured in Canada. The protection on that is 29½ per cent, or \$1,854,469. The treasury got in taxes on cottons imported, \$763,-

711. The people paid, altogether, in duty on the imports and protection on the home manufacture, \$2,518,180, or, out of every \$3.30 taxes on cottons paid by the people, one dollar went into the Dominion treasury and \$2.30 into the pockets of the cotton manufacturers. Now, I give the statement that the manufacturers themselves present in the census. Take the census book C, vol. 3, page 120, and you will find the following statement, cotton mills in Canada:—

	Capital Invested.	Products.
5 in New Brunswick	\$2,733,000	\$1,750,000
2 in Nova Scotia	574,983	426,850
9 in Ontario	3,415,430	2,618,204
6 in Quebec	6,483,906	3,656,170

Now, this makes 22 in all. The entire capital is \$13,208,121, and the entire products of those mills in the year in which the census was taken, amounted to \$8,451,724. The total amount paid in wages was \$2,102,603, and the total value of raw material, \$4,208,253. That makes a total of \$6,310,856. Taking that from the gross product, you have a net profit of \$2,140,868, or 16 per cent upon the invested capital, including buildings, machinery, land, and working capital. But, Sir, we must not forget that a very large percentage of this stock was watered. We know perfectly well that, in some cases, mills were bought for 50 cents on the dollar, or even very considerably less than that, and were put into the combination at full price, and there has been the percentage I have stated paid upon the entire investment. Now, I wish the Finance Minister were here to explain to me where the cotton manufacturers got this money, if they did not get it out of the public. The hon. gentleman says that the people paid no protective duties upon what was produced in Canada. I would like him to explain, then, how it is that these manufacturers themselves report that upon their entire investment they realized 16 per cent, and that upon a considerable amount of watered stock.

Now, let us take the case of sugar. From the 3rd May, 1895, when the duty upon sugar was increased to 30th June, 1895, the end of the fiscal year, we imported sugar entered for home consumption—according to the Trade and Navigation Returns, page 221—to the amount of 36,216,286 pounds, the value of which was \$648,610. The duty collected was \$181,081.78, or 28 per cent. According to the Trade and Navigation Returns, page 280, we imported, of free sugar, from July 1st, 1894, to May 3rd, 1895, 309,302,296 pounds, value, \$6,703,359. Now, 6-10 cent of protection would give \$1,855,813.77. Then, the manufacturers would have at least half of the imported free sugar on hand for the simple reason that very large importations took place immediately before the duty went on. Taking 150,000,000 pounds as the half, then the ½ cent duty put upon that would amount to \$750,000.

That gives a total of \$2,605,813.77. The Government received, in duty, \$181,081.78. So that the people paid, in all, \$2,786,895.55. On the consumption of sugar last year, out of \$16.40 paid in protection, \$1 went into the Dominion treasury, and \$15.40 into the pockets of the sugar refiners. Now, if you will take their own statement, you will find it corroborates mine. I refer to the census of 1891, book C, volume 3, page 323. This shows that there are eight sugar refineries in Canada. Capital in land, \$323,500; capital in buildings, \$1,494,200; capital in machinery, \$1,846,000; working capital, \$2,258,700; a total of \$5,922,400. Now, the wages paid, according to their own report, is \$709,811; raw material, \$15,023,500; a total of \$15,733,311. The value of the entire product of these eight refineries was \$17,127,100. Deducting all charges for raw material and wages, and you have a net balance of \$1,393,789, or 21.8 per cent, say 22 per cent of interest on the investment. Allowing 5 per cent for wear and tear of machinery, there would still be a profit of 17 per cent on the invested capital. Now, what I want the Finance Minister to do is to point out where this money comes from, if, as he says, the people do not pay it. Remember, this is not my calculation; it is their own, as given in the census returns. It is to be found in the census returns, at the page I have given. It will be difficult for the hon. gentleman to show that this money does not come from the consumer.

Now, let us take the case of wall paper, another item of which a considerable quantity is manufactured in Canada. The consumption of wall paper in this country, the Finance Minister says, is about \$500,000 a year. It is about that. I will first give you my estimate of the people's experience in wall paper, and then I will give the report of the manufacturers themselves, as given in to the census enumerators. We imported wall paper to the value of \$6,482, upon which was paid a duty of \$2,268.87. A duty of 35 per cent on \$300,000 worth of wall paper, manufactured in Canada, would make \$105,900. Adding the duty collected, \$2,268.87, would make \$107,268.87 that the users of wall paper, including the duty, virtually paid to the manufacturers of wall paper in Canada. For every \$47 duty and protection paid on wall paper, the Dominion treasury got \$1, and the wall paper manufacturers got \$46. Now take the statement in the census returns, made up from the statements given by the manufacturers themselves to the census enumerators. It is in the same book C, volume 3, page 357. It will be found that we have four manufacturers of wall paper in Canada. Invested in land, \$25,000; invested in buildings, \$58,000; invested in machinery, \$53,050; working capital, \$230,600; a total of \$366,650. The raw material that was used was stated to be \$133,700, and

Mr. McMULLEN.

the wages paid were \$56,600; a total of \$190,300. Take that amount from the value of the manufactured product which, according to their report was \$355,000. Taking that from the amount, it leaves a net surplus of profit of \$164,700, or 45 per cent upon the working capital invested, land and machinery. That is their figure, it is not mine. Now, I contend that the people of this country have paid that enormous sum year by year. That is largely the cause of their poverty, and they are not aware of the fact that they are being bled in this way. Now, I will take the consumption of starch, about which my hon. friend from Halton (Mr. Henderson) said something. I am going to give what the starch factories themselves report to the census enumerators, and I think that will be better authority even than what the hon. gentleman may produce, or what I may produce. The Minister of Finance says that the consumption of starch in this country is about five million pounds a year. One and a half cents a pound protection upon this quantity amounts to \$75,000. The treasury got last year \$15,084.65, leaving a net sum of \$59,915.35. Thus, out of every \$5 in taxes and protection on starch, the country got \$1 in taxes and the manufacturer got \$4. That is the statement with regard to starch. Now, I will see what they say themselves to the census enumerators. On page 319 of the same book we find there are eleven starch factories in Canada. Land value, \$6,300; buildings, \$59,000; machinery, \$71,000; working capital, \$304,200; in all, \$440,500. They say that the raw material costs them \$237,000; wages, \$69,250; value of raw products, \$306,250; total value of products, \$489,850. Deducting the cost of wages and raw material, \$306,250, you have a profit of \$183,600, or 41 per cent on every dollar invested in Canada in starch factories. Well, it may be said that the men who manufacture starch pay duty on the corn. But I want to draw the attention of my hon. friend from Halton to this fact, that they report that the raw material cost them \$237,000. If they import corn, the duty is unquestionably added on that amount. But why should they import corn? What are we encouraging manufacturing institutions for, if not for the purpose of building up the home trade and causing a demand for home products? We have plenty of corn in Canada. Why not manufacture out of Canadian corn? Besides, there is a large amount of starch in Canada that is manufactured out of potatoes and other commodities besides corn. So that there is no argument in saying that they have got to pay a duty on corn, because in their raw material they unquestionably include the duty, and they state under their own hand to the census enumerators in this country that they make on the entire investment 41 per cent. That is certainly a very

handsome profit to make on their money. Any man would be glad to invest money that would give him that profit every year. Now, take spades and shovels. The reason I am giving these items is to show that the statement made by the Minister of Finance is most fallacious. The idea that the consumers in this country pay no duty on the home products will not be borne out, either by the statement of the manufacturers themselves or by the experience of the people. Of spades and shovels we imported, according to the Trade and Navigation Returns, page 114, 6,136 dozen. The duty collected was \$8,923.34, or \$1.45 per dozen. The Gananoque Spade and Shovel Manufacturing Company turn out 9,000 dozen annually. The protection is \$1.45, which amounts to \$13,050. The Dominion treasury got in duty upon spades imported \$8,923.34, which made the gross amount that the people of this country paid on spades and shovels \$21,973.34. Now, where does the money go? Out of every \$2.46 paid by the people of Canada in taxes and in protection upon spades, \$1 went into the Dominion treasury and \$1.46 into the pockets of the Gananoque Spade and Shovel Manufacturing Company. That was the net result in regard to spades and shovels, and the census returns will show that that is the case in almost every instance. Now, we will take the next article, salt. Salt is a commodity that is used by the entire community. We have twenty salt factories in Canada, as you will find in Census C, vol. 3, page 284. Capital invested, \$44,480; buildings, \$111,400; machinery, \$70,500; working capital, \$181,740. That makes an entire amount of \$408,120. Value of raw material, \$119,700; wages paid, \$67,690. These two sums amount to \$187,390. Value of articles produced, \$342,920, leaving a net profit of \$155,530, or 38½ per cent upon the invested capital in connection with salt. Now, take agricultural implements. We had 221 factories in Canada. Capital in land, \$345,948; in buildings, \$980,935; in machinery, \$933,216; working capital, \$6,364,704. All these sums put together make \$8,624,803. Raw material used is stated to have been \$3,126,966; wages paid, \$1,812,050. These two sums make \$4,939,016; value of products, \$7,493,624; raw material and wages deducted therefrom leaves a net profit of \$2,554,608, or 29.6 per cent on the entire investment. Now, this is according to the report given by the 221 agricultural implement factories in Canada to the census enumerators. By that report they admit over 29 per cent interest on their investment. Now, we know very well that this policy has brought about a great many combinations in Canada. For instance, I was reading a note that was published in the "Mail" of April 15th, 1893:

At a meeting of the Cut Nail Association held here to-day, it was decided to maintain the com-

bination in cut nails. Among the firms represented at this meeting were the Pillow & Hersey Co., Peck, Benny & Co., S. R. Foster & Son, Moore & Co., and the Star Manufacturing Co. The Maritime firms were all well represented, and the threatened cut in prices was fully discussed. The secretary accused the Maritime men of having already cut the figures of the combine. The gentlemen from the East explained, however, that they had misunderstood the terms of the agreement, and had no intention of committing a breach of faith. This explanation was accepted, and the manufacturers present unanimously agreed to sustain the existing prices. The combine was then strengthened by the admission of Moore & Foster, of St. John, N.B., and the Star Manufacturing Co., of Montreal, into the association.

This proves clearly that we have a combination on those lines, and that, in almost every line of manufacturing, combinations have been formed, and manufacturers have taken advantage of the consumers with respect to prices, under the decided protection they enjoy under the tariff. We have no quarrel with, nor antipathy to manufacturers. All we want, is to see that the principle of justice is maintained between consumer and manufacturer. We hold that in Canada we have the raw material and all the necessary conditions to produce many commodities we want, and our manufacturing institutions, under ordinary circumstances, should be in a position to produce those commodities as cheaply and as of good quality as any other part of the world. Living is cheap here, and many other things are cheap, and our manufacturers should be willing to compete with any country having a revenue tariff simply. In order to show the results presented by the census, I will quote from the table at page 382, volume 3: Number of establishments in Canada, 75,968; capital in land, \$31,466,342; in buildings, \$60,303,043; in machinery, \$81,401,247; working capital, \$181,451,136. These different items of capital amounted, in the aggregate, to \$354,620,750. The raw material used was of the value of \$256,119,042; wages paid during the year, \$100,663,650; total value of articles produced, \$476,258,886. The value of the raw material and the amount of wages deducted from that sum leaves a net profit of \$119,476,194, or 33½ per cent upon the investments in land, machinery, buildings and working capital. This is the statement of the manufacturers of Canada themselves, embodied in the census of 1891. We find protection works about the same way in the United States as in Canada, and that the people there have been fleeced under the operation of that system, as well as here. Hon. Mr. Springer selected a line of articles, the aggregate importations of which were of the value of \$194,464,758. The domestic products in the same line were of the value of \$2,440,502,649. The duty paid and protection given amounted to \$751,403,395. The

United States treasury got out of that sum \$194,464,758; the manufacturers received \$556,938,637; in other words, the treasury of the United States got 23½ per cent, while the manufacturers obtained 76½ per cent. There is one peculiar feature about protection. On the American side, the protectionists say they impose protection to keep cheap Canadian products out of the United States market. In Canada, our protectionists say that they impose protection to keep out cheap American products from the Canadian market. So, while the Americans are protecting their people against the cheap products of Canada, the Government of Canada is protecting our people against the cheap products of the United States. It is very singular that the same fear appears to actuate the protectionists of the United States and those of Canada, that Canada might be flooded with cheap American products, and vice versa. There was one individual, Mr. Lubin, in the United States who suggested a plan whereby the farmers would be relieved of the gross oppression to which they are subjected under the operation of protection. Mr. Lubin proposed that an export bounty should be paid upon United States wheat and all United States products, the result of the export bounty would be to cause an increase in the price of products on the American side. He would apply his theory practically to last year's wheat crop in this way: the crop was about 545,000,000 bushels. About 145,000,000 were exported, at an average price of 60 cents per bushel. An export duty of 20 cents per bushel would have cost the Government \$29,000,000. But it would have raised the selling price of all the wheat in the country 20 cents per bushel, and thus would have put \$109,000,000 more in the pockets of the farmers than they actually received. This policy was proposed as a relief to the farmers. What is the result? Although some of the Grangers approved of the proposition, as well as many other farm organizations, it is needless to say that his plan was pronounced by economists and manufacturers as utterly impracticable.

I am glad to see the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) in his seat, because on one occasion lately, when speaking, he put a question to me, and I promised to answer it, and I am going to give him the answer to-night. I am going to speak on the question of reciprocity. Canada ships to the United States products to the value of \$33,777,000, and to the British Isles, \$57,500,000. I am going to answer the hon. gentleman with bald, bare facts, abstracted from the Trade and Navigation Returns, with which he will, doubtless, be satisfied, and, if the facts are not correct, I promise him an apology. Our exports of animal and agricultural products to the United States last year amounted to \$8,276,236, and we paid duty to get them there as follows:—

Mr. McMULLEN.

	Value.	Duty.
Horses.....	\$510,765	20 per cent.
Cattle.....	19,210	20 do
Sheep.....	346,746	20 do
Poultry.....	36,574	3c. per lb.
Bones.....	27,853	20 per cent.
Eggs.....	275,827	20 do
Pease.....	352,321	50c. per brl.
do split.....	5,616	20 per cent.
Wheat.....	10,258	20 do
Flour of wheat.....	10,706	20 do
Hay.....	979,914	\$2 per ton.
Hops.....	8,884	8c. per lb.
Malt.....	4,479	35 per cent.
Maple sugar.....	8,082	30 do
Clover seed.....	95,134	20 do
Grass.....	20,320	20 do
Trees, plants.....	7,732	Free.
Potatoes.....	238,977	10c. per bush
Vegetables.....	103,599	10 per cent.
Lime.....	75,058	10 do
Wool.....	1,046,726	Free.

I would call the attention of my hon. friends opposite to these figures. They will see that in every case where an article is free of duty we export very large quantities of it to the United States. Just look at the amount of wool we exported, for instance. Do they not see some significance in that fact?

Mr. WELDON. Would my hon. friend forgive me if I interrupt him for a moment. I assure the hon. gentleman that I am very unwilling to interrupt him. My question was a very specific one, but the hon. member misunderstood me. It was this: Whether, if his party were returned to power he would use his influence with Sir Richard Cartwright, the Finance Minister to be, to strike off, or to largely lower, the duties on wheat, and oats, and beef, and butter, and pork, and the like, coming from foreign countries?

Mr. McMULLEN. I say in reply to my hon. friend that in my humble opinion, and I believe it is shared in by nine-tenths of the intelligent farming community of our province, the brightest and best days the farmers of our country ever saw would be seen, if they had a renewal of the old reciprocity treaty they enjoyed from 1854 to 1866.

Mr. WELDON. Answer the question.

Mr. McMULLEN. I would like to ask my hon. friend—

Mr. WELDON. Answer the question.

Mr. McMULLEN. I am answering the question. I would like to ask my hon. friend: If the party that he supports did not go to Washington and offer to renew that reciprocity treaty?

Mr. WELDON. Answer.

Mr. McMULLEN. Did they not offer to renew that treaty ?

Mr. WELDON. Answer the question.

Mr. McMULLEN. You are not prepared to answer that question, and you dare not deny the fact, because you know they did, and we all know they did. As far as I am concerned, I am prepared to say here : That the farmers of this country are ready to exchange natural products with the people of the United States. We are perfectly willing to exchange with them if they will exchange with us.

Mr. WELDON. The hon. gentleman (Mr. McMullen) has forgotten the assurance he gave me. I cannot refer to a past debate, but I may say, the hon. member promised me to answer the question, and now he will not answer it.

Mr. McMULLEN. Mr. Speaker, I have given my hon. friend (Mr. Weldon) the answer. I am prepared, if he turns up the debate and reads the question he put to me, to give him the answer, because I want to deal honestly with my esteemed friend, and I am dealing honestly with him. I am telling him the feeling of the farmers of Ontario, and I am quite certain that my statement is correct. We know very well that hon. gentlemen opposite did offer the United States reciprocity in natural products. But, when they found they could not get it, they came back and said to the people of this country : Well, it would not do you any good, it would injure you. Sir, it is a very singular thing that all the men of ability and wisdom which our country has brought forth, have been in favour of reciprocity with the United States. I would like my hon. friend from Albert (Mr. Weldon) to name a single distinguished man in the history of Canada who was not in favour of extended trade relations with the United States. Can he name one who was opposed to reciprocity ? I heard him mention, a short time ago, the name of Hon. Joseph Howe. Well, Joseph Howe was a pronounced advocate of reciprocity all his life. I have a long list of distinguished names here, and I find that Sir A. T. Galt was a pronounced advocate of reciprocity ; Sir John Rose was a pronounced advocate of reciprocity ; Sir George E. Cartier was a pronounced advocate of reciprocity ; the Hon. George Brown, all his life advocated extended trade relations with the United States ; Sir John Macdonald was in favour of reciprocity ; the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie, one of the ablest statesmen Canada ever had, an honest man among a thousand, he was in favour of reciprocity ; and I am glad to be able to say that my esteemed friend (Sir Richard Cartwright), an experienced parliamentarian, has always been in favour of reciprocity. I fail to find a man in the galaxy of our distinguished countrymen who has not been an advocate of reciprocity ; and my esteemed leader,

Hon. W. Laurier, is also an advocate of reciprocity with the United States. That fact is reliable evidence that reciprocity would certainly be an advantage to the country. I admit that the present Minister of Agriculture is disposed to say that reciprocity would not be of advantage to Canada. Well, Sir, I am quite willing to place the opinions of the distinguished statesmen I have named, in opposition to the views of either the Finance Minister or the Minister of Agriculture, and to let the country draw their own conclusions.

Mr. WELDON. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to read "Hansard ?"—he appealed to "Hansard." The question I put to him was this :—

Will the hon. member bring it about that the duty on farm products shall be struck off, and that there shall be free trade in these articles ?

The hon. member answered :

I say to the hon. gentleman that the debate on the Budget will be the proper time to discuss this question, and I will answer him then.

Will the hon. gentleman answer ?

Mr. McMULLEN. I will answer my hon. friend by saying, yes. Is that satisfactory ?

Mr. WELDON. Yes, that is an answer.

Mr. McMULLEN. I say the farmers of our country are ready and willing to-morrow to have free trade with the United States in natural products. The hon. gentleman knows perfectly well that the Government of which he is a supporter professed that they were going to get that ; and there was nothing they promised the people of this country which they so sincerely regretted that they did not accomplish as reciprocity with the United States. But, Sir, I believe we made a very great mistake in ever attempting to get reciprocity through the hon. gentlemen who are now in power. I will read a despatch that was sent from Washington to the Chicago "Daily News" on this very important question ; I think it is worth drawing the attention of the House to it. It was dated 9th February, 1891, the time the negotiations were going on, and reads as follows :—

For the time being a good share of the brains and vigour of Canada's Cabinet has been removed to Washington. The delegation of officials arrived here to-night to take up and attempt to push forward the halting and hitching negotiations toward Canadian reciprocity and the many other questions mutually affecting the United States and Canada. The personnel of the party is not calculated to help the cause, as George E. Foster, Minister of Finance, who is one of the party, has long been one of the fire-eating Tories who has contended against reciprocity and has been intensely hostile to the United States and its institutions. Sir John Thompson, Minister of Justice, and the Hon. Mackenzie Bowell, acting Minister of Customs, the other Cabinet officers in the party, have not been so openly hostile to the United States, although they have long been identified with the anti-American policy which Sir John Macdonald pursued.

Minister Foster has only recently been persuaded to solicit for reciprocity. Less than a year ago he declared that Canada could only be contaminated by commercial or other relations with the United States. "We want nothing to do with the United States," said he, "and Canada's course of wisdom will be to mind her own affairs and see that the United States minds hers." This utterance was on the eve of Mr. Foster's departure for the West Indies, where he expected to inaugurate a huge plan of reciprocity with the southern islands by which Canada would undersell the United States. But Minister Foster's West Indies scheme was a total failure, and he has now concluded to solicit reciprocity from the United States.

Mr. Blaine is fully aware of the anti-American character of the visiting Canadian delegation, and this will probably operate in making the negotiations amount to nothing. Mr. Hitt, of Illinois, who has long voiced Mr. Blaine's views on Canadian affairs, is decidedly of the opinion that if reciprocity with Canada should come at all it will be after the bigoted Tory element having such leaders as Foster is displaced by the growing Liberal party of the Dominion, which makes cordial relations with the United States the chief feature of its platform.

That is the opinion that was entertained in Washington at the time with regard to the visit of those people. In connection with the question that was put to me by the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) I may say that I think it will be fully realized in a few years—I do not know but it is partly realized now—that the very best outlet the North-west could have for its surplus wheat is the markets of St. Paul, Minneapolis, and Chicago. The reason of that is that pretty nearly all the virgin soil in the United States has been taken up, and it is not producing, and will not produce without a considerably increased tillage and manuring, the very excellent crops that they have been accustomed to in past years. The wheat export of the United States is running down year after year, and it will not be very long until that country will be an importer instead of an exporter of wheat. Under these circumstances, there is no country on the face of the earth that could supply the demands for that article more conveniently and satisfactorily than our North-west; and I have no doubt that the people of the North-west will begin to realize before very long that the opening of that market to them for their surplus product would be a national blessing.

Now, Sir, I wish to refer to some remarks that fell from the hon. ex-Minister of Justice (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper). He gave us a very long speech on this very important subject. I understood him to intimate that he was making a campaign speech. I presume he was. He appeared to be pretty well supplied with scraps of all kinds. I presume that there are a certain number of clerks usually appointed to gather these items for hon. gentlemen opposite; and when a man is supplied with a well-prepared brief, it becomes a very easy matter for him to make a speech. We on this side have to do all

Mr. McMULLEN.

that kind of work for ourselves. We are not able to keep clerks at the country's expense to do it for us. Hon. gentlemen opposite are favoured in that respect. The ex-Minister of Justice said something with regard to immigration. He was lauding very loudly the recommendations made by a certain Mr. Thompson, who had visited the North-west, and had given a very glowing account of the resources and prospects of that country. I have been through there myself, and I certainly entertain very high hopes of its ultimate success if it were only properly managed and prudently governed. If the land had been kept for the settler and the money for the Crown, as was suggested by Mr. Blake many years ago, I believe the North-west would now have a great many more settlers than it has. It is very unfortunate that there has been so much muddling and bungling in our entire system of settling up that country. Large tracts of choice lands have been handed over to colonization companies and railway companies, and many men who went there to settle have been driven from one point to another before they could find a desirable location. I have letters in my possession, at present, from people living in the North-west, who complain bitterly of the treatment they have received at the hands of the Government. They complain that in some cases they made homestead entries, and yet, in order to satisfy ranching companies, they were deprived by the Government of their homestead entries, turned out of possession, and their buildings torn down and destroyed. This very unfortunate condition of things shows very clearly how reckless the Government have been with regard to their whole land policy in that country. If the incoming settler had been told: Go and take up your location wherever you like, the only condition is that you must become a permanent resident of the country—such a policy would have doubled the population there to-day, and the country would be now in a much more prosperous condition.

Now, the ex-Minister of Justice (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) drew attention to a Mr. E. A. Thompson, who, he said, had gone through that country for the purpose of investigating its prospects for settlement, and had made a very glowing report of its future. Well, I notice by our Auditor General's Report that this man Thompson was hired by the Government. He was picked up away down in California, and sent from there on a tour at the expense of the Government. All his expenses were paid, no doubt he was sent in a Pullman car, and every attention paid him for the purpose of obtaining from him this glowing report. That is a very poor way of obtaining glowing reports of that country. That country will bear investigation by men who want to go there for the pur-

pose of settlement, and does not require to be boomed up in that kind of style. There is another thing we are doing in this connection. We have some forty-three immigration agents—at least we had recently—in the United States, trying to hunt up men and get them to come back and settle in Canada. I do think that money spent in that way is simply squandered uselessly. The hon. member for West Assinibola (Mr. Davin), in discussing the Government policy the other night, said that the prosperity of a country depended upon its fiscal policy. I was quite pleased to hear him make that statement. I think that if we will now consider the general condition of the people of this country, and apply our present fiscal policy to that condition, and make that policy responsible for the existing state of affairs, our people would not hesitate in declaring that they had too much of protection. The general condition of the people of this country was never, in my humble opinion—and I have been closely mixed up in the business affairs of this country for the past forty years—worse than it is to-day. I do not think the embarrassments of the people, the pauperized condition of all classes, was ever so evident as it is now. Why, we have in all our cities and towns, in this very city of Ottawa, honest labour willing to go to work to-morrow, if they could get work, to earn an honest living, but who can get nothing to do. You will find that that is the condition throughout this country in our cities and towns. I do not remember any period when that state of affairs existed to the extent to which it does to-day, and I hope we are coming close to a period when the people will be no longer subjected to such an unfortunate condition of things. Sir, I contend that this is not time to load down the poor labouring mechanics and artisans with 30 or 35 per cent duty upon the clothing they wear, upon the articles they use, upon the spades and shovels with which they have to gain their living. I say that this is no time to keep up protective duties that constitute such an enormous drain upon their resources. In place of doing that, immediate relief should be given in the way of reducing taxation by giving them every commodity they want for every day's use at the lowest possible price, by collecting from them nothing to support those who are in the manufacturing line, by imposing on them duties only required for the necessities of the country. We ought to return to a tariff that will simply produce the sum necessary to meet the demands upon the Dominion treasury. Such a tariff is, in my opinion, the only honest tariff. I do not think that we have any right by law to take money out of one man's pocket and put it into another's, when you give the one from whom you extract the money nothing in return. A few days ago we passed a loyalty resolution, we pronounced our

loyalty to the mother land. I am glad to say that we did it unanimously. But, Mr. Speaker, if we are so loyal, why should we not imitate the example set by our mother country, why should we not follow her in her fiscal policy and taxation? Let us give British fair-play to all our people within our borders, and to every man justice; let us have British liberty; let us have British freedom and British rights; let us do away with the miserable schemes and intrigues by which the party opposite is endeavouring to hold the Treasury benches of this country against its opponents. Let us have no more gerrymanders—that is un-British; let us have no more graving dock scandals, no more Kingston dock scandals, no more Curran Bridge scandals, no more Printing Bureau scandals—let us have no more cut-throat Governments that are pronounced by the head of the Cabinet as ready to take his political life; and then let us follow out the high and dignified principles laid down by England, and the noble example set us by our mother country, in place of adopting those miserable, truckling disreputable tricks and efforts to hold on to power by schemes and intrigues, and by lavishing the people's money right and left for that purpose. I would like to ask hon. gentlemen opposite if they can point to a single instance in England where public buildings have been peddled round from door to door for the purpose of buying constituencies. Can they point out to a single instance in England, under any Government, where post offices, and other public buildings, are erected in little hamlets, in order to secure the people's vote? Take the record of this Government for the past fifteen years. They have put up public buildings here and there without any regard to their necessity, but simply wherever they thought they would be most calculated to carry a constituency, while places in which those buildings are really needed have to do without them. Take the town of Woodstock. Simply because it happens to be the centre of a very strong Reform district, it has never been given a post office, although the postal revenue there every year runs up to \$16,000, while at Marysville, where the revenue is only \$1,800 a year, and the rent paid only \$60 a year, we are asked to make a grant for a post office, and while in many other places not any more deserving we are called on to make similar grants. I think, on all these grounds, it is high time the people should take hold of this whole question of fiscal policy and the policy of annually keeping up our expenditure, without consideration for the financially depressed condition of the people. It is high time that the people should decide unanimously to put a stop to all these evils, and elect a Government which will administer the affairs of the country honestly and economically, taking as little money out of the

pockets of the people as possible, and giving the people what they are entitled to. I believe that we have a grand country. I have travelled over most of this continent, and I know of no portion whose future, in my humble opinion, is brighter than that of Ontario, or even portions of the North-west and of the province of Quebec. If we had only an honest and economic Administration of our public affairs, which would free the people from the financial trammels to which they are subjected under the present condition of things, which would let them have what they require at the lowest possible price, and secure to them the best and most convenient and most lucrative outlets for their surplus products, I believe that we would rise out of the restricted and hampered condition under which we are now suffering, I believe that we would start once again on the road to progress, prosperity and wealth, and become a great and wealthy country, inhabited by a peaceful, contented, prosperous and loyal people.

Mr. PERRY. I think I may fairly ask the indulgence of the House while I say a few words on this all important question. There is no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that the way by which the Government shall raise the money required for public purposes, and the way they shall expend the money extracted from the pockets of the people is a great question, perhaps the greatest that can come before the people of this country. There is no doubt the Government do collect the taxes. They pass laws to raise the money and are very sharp in the execution of them. But they are not so exact in appropriating the money to the best advantage of the public service. Having the public accounts before us, having the estimates before us, we find that large amounts of money taken from the people are wasted, not to say stolen. For instance, consider the money spent on the Tay Canal. We find that over three-quarters of a million dollars have been spent on this gigantic work, and the revenue collected in a year is \$119. I have taken the trouble to put down the figures showing the amount received by the country in the form of revenue from the Tay Canal. I was in hopes, by the way, that they would change the name and call it the Haggart Canal. In answer to a question asked of the Minister of Railways and Canals, I was informed that the total expenditure on the Tay Canal up to that date, was \$476,877. The cost of maintaining the canal was \$3,188, or, for ten years, \$31,880. The interest for ten years on the above would be \$203,500, or a total of \$712,257. The revenue for ten years has been something like \$1,000, leaving a balance against the canal, of \$711,257. I presume that the cost of this canal is one of the amounts entered as an asset as against the gross debt that now stands at something over \$300,000,000. If this is one of the assets which help to bring the net debt down by twenty-five or twenty-six

Mr. McMULLEN.

millions of dollars, the country can judge what is the value of some of these assets. In the first place, we spent \$476,000, and now, by additions we are paying interest on \$711,257. And still the Government will keep this as an asset against the gross debt of this country. Sir, the net debt of this country is enormous; it is almost more than the people can bear. It stands at something over \$50 per head of the whole population, men women, and children. For a family of ten persons, the debt amounts to \$500, and for a family of five, \$250. The interest paid upon the debt is simply appalling. I find that we are paying interest on sinking fund and debt to the amount of something like \$13,000,000, or more than one-third of the total revenue of this country. We learn from the public records that even last month the national debt of this country was increased by \$2,000,000. And, notwithstanding all this extravagance, notwithstanding all that has been wasted in the Tay Canal and similar works, when I asked the Minister of Public Works the other day if he were prepared to appropriate \$2,000 to repair the Tignish breakwater, his answer was that the Government could not afford to spend the money. The Tignish breakwater has cost altogether something less than \$8,000, and the revenue of the Tignish harbour, which is made by building this breakwater, is something like \$100 a year. And yet they can spend \$476,000 on a work which yields a revenue of only \$119. It looks as if they intended to leave it like the West Point breakwater, to go to pieces and drift away. The reason is that Prince county have declined to send a representative to back up the Government in these, and in other transactions, for it is because the representatives of Prince have been Liberals and the Government—I will not say Tory—have been Conservatives. I would like to draw the attention of the House to the annual waste of money of which these hon. gentlemen are guilty. On referring to the Public Accounts, I find that they have paid for legal advice or legal pleading in the courts, \$223,556. No doubt they had to spend a good deal, because the Solicitor General, who recently resigned, was not under the control of the Government. All done up in Ottawa, I suppose. I find the following names in the Public Accounts of parties who have received over \$1,000 for their services. The amount paid for law practice is altogether, \$98,683. The first name I see here is that of Aikens, Culver & Company, of Winnipeg, \$1,634. Now, it would be amusing to know what services these gentlemen rendered to the Government, what amount of money they realized out of the cases which they pleaded on behalf of the Government. There is Mr. C. P. Angers, from Quebec, \$1,201. I would like to know what services he rendered to the Government. J. A. Belyea, St. John, \$1,277;

F. J. Bisailon, Montreal, \$1,000; Borden, Ritchie & Company, Halifax, \$10,602. Now, Mr. Speaker, what cases were going on in Halifax on behalf of the Government, or against the Government, in connection with which they had to pay over \$10,000 for law advice? Next, I see C. P. F. Conybeare, \$1,327; Drake, Jackson & Company, Victoria, \$1,825; E. E. Gilbert & Sons, \$1,821; J. S. Hall, Montreal, \$4,146. I would like to know what services these gentlemen rendered to the Government of Canada for which they were entitled to the sum of \$4,146. Harris, Henry & Cahan, \$1,077; F. E. Hodgins, Toronto, \$2,474; J. A. Legris, Coteau Landing, \$1,548; O'Connor & Hogg, Ottawa—their fee is so large that I am almost afraid to mention it, \$18,044. Now, in the name of common sense, the least the Government could do would be to lay a statement before this House, showing the services rendered by Messrs. O'Connor & Hogg. E. B. Osler, Toronto, \$2,050; Christopher Robinson, Toronto, \$4,641. Now, this amount of \$98,683 has all been misspent, it has been handed over to the friends of the Government, partisans of the Government, in order to keep them attached to the Government. I am sure the Government are not in a position to satisfy this House that this money has been expended for the public benefit. We have a Minister of Justice, and until recently we had a Solicitor General. I am sure that these two gentlemen ought to be very well able to conduct the law business of this Government. We pay the Minister of Justice \$7,000 a year, and a Solicitor General, I think, \$4,000, for doing this work. But this is not all the gaspillage of which these gentlemen were guilty during the last year. They thought proper to patronize the press all over Canada, and they did it to the enormous amount of \$223,556. There appears in the Public Accounts the names of certain gentlemen who have been in receipt of over \$1,000 for pretended services rendered to the Government during the last year. There is the Halifax "Herald," no doubt, a pet paper on behalf of the Government. It is ready to swear every moment by what the Government says. It has been paid for advertising, \$1,048, and for printing, \$1,874. I find here the St. John "Sun," another pet paper that must be kept on the hands of the Government. It has been paid for advertising \$640, and for printing, \$6,604. Now, I would like to know what this gentleman has printed and published for the Government, what services he rendered to the Government for that great sum of money. I find here the Moncton "Times," another Government paper, a paper that very nearly died not long since, and the Government, feeling that the death of that paper meant the death of the Government around Moncton, came to its assistance, giving it \$191 for advertising—they might as well have made it \$200—and for printing, \$7,506. There is another paper in Moncton, called the

"Transcript," but that received no favour from the Government. Why was not that printing given out by tender? Every gentleman in this House knows well that the Moncton "Times" is not the only daily paper published in Moncton; every gentleman knows well that there is another paper there, and, I must say, a smarter paper than the Moncton "Times." There is the Moncton "Transcript," and all that can be said against it is that it is a Grit paper, it is a paper that will not dance attendance, or go on its knees, to please the Conservative Government of Canada. It is independent, but you will not find the name of the "Transcript" figuring on this account. I find a little further, the Hamilton "Spectator." Well, the Hamilton "Spectator" is a Government paper, published in the interest of the Government. It is a good deal more modest than the Moncton "Times." I suppose it is not quite so barefaced. He got \$1,731 for advertising, and \$112 for printing. The Ottawa "Citizen," which is, no doubt, the mouth-piece of the Government here in Ottawa, has also been very modest; it has only received \$1,467 for advertising, and \$1,457 for printing. The Montreal "Gazette" for advertising has received \$1,057, and for printing, \$868. The Quebec "Chronicle"—I am sorry my hon. friend for Quebec West (Mr. McGreevy) is not in his place, perhaps he could tell us what the Quebec "Chronicle" published, or did, for the amount placed to its name, \$744 for advertising, and \$1,477 for printing. The Regina "Leader"—Where is the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin)? I understood he was the owner of that paper. The Regina "Leader" has received for advertising, \$598, and for printing, \$990. Now, I would like to know what the Government had to do that required this large sum to be paid in advertising and printing in Regina. There is also another paper here, called the Regina "Standard." Whether it is the same paper, I do not know. I presume they are closely connected; they are near relations to each other, and I make no doubt they have divided the spoils between them. The "Standard" is a little more modest in charging for advertising, it only charged \$36; but, when it comes to the printing business, he charges \$4,358.

Mr. DAVIN. I am sure the hon. gentleman would like to be informed that the "Standard" is a strong supporter of the leader of the Opposition.

Mr. PERRY. Well, I am glad to have that information. I really thought that all the people in and around Regina were Conservatives, that they were all followers of the hon. member for Assiniboia. I find some people there, even the editor of a paper, are Liberals.

Mr. DAVIN. I will explain how that is. As a fact the patronage is given to the "Standard," \$4,000; but it is not given by

this Government directly at all. Nor is the patronage of the Regina "Leader," with which I am in no way connected now, given by this Government, but by the North-west government; however, as we have not full provincial powers in the Territories yet, it appears in the public accounts as though this Government gave it all. That may possibly give a point to the hon. gentleman as to how it is that the "Standard," which supports the leader of the Opposition, has such a heavy amount of patronage as compared with the "Leader."

Mr. PERRY. That may be all very well, but if I understand the hon. gentleman aright, it is public money after all, it is money taken from the people by the imposition of heavy taxes. I do not care whether it come out of the pockets of Peter or Paul; it represents money collected under the tariff of the Finance Minister, and some of the money came from Tignish and Miminegash.

Mr. DAVIN. Let me explain to the hon. gentleman. There is no tariff at all in that matter. That sum of \$4,000 paid to the "Standard"—and the "Standard" is a deadly enemy of mine—is given for printing the ordinances. So, as I say, there is no tariff there at all.

Mr. PERRY. I have no objection to allowing the hon. gentlemen to put himself right. He has not, however, improved his case. This is public money belonging to the revenues of Canada. I observe there is a paper called the Yarmouth "Times" which received \$240 for advertising and \$1,300 for printing. The Toronto "Empire" is very moderate; I do not see how it can live with the small amount put down to it, \$1,160 for advertising and nothing for printing.

Mr. DAVIN. It died of inanition.

Mr. PERRY. These are not all the sins of which the present Government have been guilty. The Minister of Finance in the Budget speech tried to make the taxpayers believe that the country was rich, well off, and that the people should be thankful to the hon. gentleman and his National Policy. He is very apt to pride himself on his announcement that there is a balance of \$4,145,806.15, upon which he says interest is apt to be collected on behalf of the Government of Canada, and he puts down the items. We find among them, Albert Railway Company, New Brunswick, \$14,725. I am sorry to find New Brunswick is so much demoralized—I did not expect it. Then there is an item Quebec Harbour Commission, \$3,748,519. I presume this is part of the amount of which McGreevy and Connolly extracted about \$1,000,000, for which we have nothing. Then there is the Fredericton Bridge Company, \$300,000. I see the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is looking at me very earnestly. I suppose he could give me some explanation. Then

Mr. PERRY.

there is an item Three Rivers Harbour Commissioners, \$81,760. I am sorry the ex-Minister of Public Works, who represents that locality, is not here to explain what was done with the money, and whether it is likely to be refunded. These sums were loaned by the Government for these works from which they have not received anything and from which they are not going to receive anything. As to the item of \$300,000 for the Fredericton Bridge Company, the interest has not been paid, much less the principal. The loan to the Quebec Harbour Commissioners of \$3,749,000 has not been returned, nor has payment been made of the interest. What is the use of retaining these accounts; why try and thus blindfold the public? These sums together amount to \$4,145,000, to which may be added about \$750,000 sunk in the Tay Canal, making in all about \$5,000,000, which have been extracted from the taxpayers, which might as well be wiped out as no good can come from retaining these items. I will allow the country to judge these matters. I can feel a little sympathy for the Government for they are on their trial. I feel sorry for a criminal in the box, and I feel sympathy for the Government. They are being tried before a court of lawyers, and some of them are very able lawyers too, but their precarious position will come when they are placed before the jury of the people at the polls. That is the time they will shiver, for their days are numbered. They have failed to do justice to certain portions of the Dominion because the electors there did not see fit to send supporters of the Government to this House, and for no other reason. While they follow such principles, they can never expect to have the support of the people, even their own political friends will condemn them. A great many Conservative electors are possessed of a spirit of justice, and they are not actuated with the spirit that they would like to see every Grit in Canada exterminated. They believe that the Liberals of this country are a useful institution, and that bad as we are off, we would be a great deal worse off were it not for the Opposition in this House. Now, Sir, we find these men opposite boasting of their loyalty to the mother country, but, to my mind, actions speak a great deal louder than words. It is all very well for members of the Government to talk about the old flag, and what they would do, as long as they are behind the bush, and how they would fire a rifle, although some of them perhaps never saw one in their lives. But what have they done during the past eighteen years of their Administration? How do they show their loyalty to the mother country? Why, Sir, I find to-day that the volume of trade between Canada and Great Britain is \$7,000,000 less than it was during the last year of the Mackenzie Administration. Is that loyalty to the mother country? Will they

deny that their National Policy has destroyed the trade between Great Britain and Canada? I say these gentlemen are not loyal. They are not loyal to-day, nor were they loyal two days after Parliament met. At a most critical time, when the mother country was threatened with war by almost the whole world, and when these Cabinet Ministers should have been united and in a position to advise the representative of the Crown, what were they doing? Why, Sir, they were tearing one another, skivering one another, as Paddy says; and trying to kill one another politically. Mr. Speaker, look at the duplicity of these gentlemen. They sat with the present Premier for twelve months, and the people of the country were under the impression that everything was going on smoothly. They called Parliament to meet on the 2nd of January, and when Parliament met His Excellency read a speech which was put in his hands by the Ministers of the Crown. There was no sign of disloyalty in that speech. The second or third paragraph made reference to the remedial legislation which this House was called together for the sole purpose of passing, but three days after the House met half the Cabinet Ministers resigned. They abused their Premier. They said he was no good. that he had no brains, that he was not worthy of their support, and they accused him of everything but treachery. They also slighted His Excellency the Governor General. They never took into consideration that this was a time in the political history of the country when the Cabinet should have remained steadfast and united. How would it be if during that time war was declared on England by Germany or the United States? Where were the Cabinet Ministers to act in that emergency? But, Mr. Speaker, more to their shame, more to their disgrace, and more to the humiliation of this country, these men swallowed the pill and went back to serve under Premier Bowell. They have never explained the reason why they left the Cabinet, and they have never explained the reason why they went back. Gentlemen on this side of the House, and I presume on the other side of the House also, may imagine the reason. It may be that they could not agree on the Remedial Bill, and I have no doubt that that is the case. We were told some time ago that the first Bill framed by the ex-Minister of Justice (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) contained 119 sections, and we know that the present Bill has only 112. I would ask the Ministers what has become of the other seven clauses and what did they contain? Were these seven clauses the only clauses that were put in the Bill to make it effective? Were these seven clauses inserted in the Bill in spite of the seven kicking Ministers, I would like to know? I see two Ministers of the Crown before me, and I suppose they could tell if they liked. I cannot compel them to speak, but as a representative of the people,

I say it is due to this House and due to the country that we should know about these seven clauses. I know that the ex-Minister of Justice (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) has his whole soul in that Bill, and I know that he did not go back to the Cabinet after these seven clauses were struck out.

Mr. DAVIN. Which Bill?

Mr. PERRY. The Remedial Bill. Is the hon. gentleman so far gone that he does not know what Bill I am alluding to? If he is prepared to come to the rescue of the Government, and tell me what has become of these seven clauses, then I will be satisfied. But, Sir, they cannot answer it; it is impossible for them to answer. But the Cabinet Ministers may depend upon it, that when they face the electors at the polls, that question will be asked; and if they are not able to answer it satisfactorily, I can only say, the dear help them. As I said before, the Government can afford to squander money where they have friends; but where they suppose they have no friends, or where the electors do not think as they do politically, the people have no chance of getting any consideration from them. They say we are prosperous—that this country is doing well. Well, Mr. Speaker, it was only the other day that I saw in the Ottawa "Citizen," a paper that is always ready to back up the Government—and I could almost see the tears of the editor on the paper—the statement that there were 1,500 men idle in Ottawa; in the capital of the Dominion, where there are to-day 400 or 500 gentlemen from different parts of this country, sitting here for three or four months, and where one would think everybody ought to be prosperous. At the same time, a little lower down in the same column the editor said, "Thank God, the snow fell; it has given employment to the people." He did not say "Thank God, the Government have sent the snow," and he did not blame the Government for these men being idle; but I do, and I thank God that the snow came in order to give them work to make a living by it. To my knowledge there is worse than that. There are starving families in Ottawa, and in Montreal; in every part of Canada there are men out of work; and what else can we expect when we find the trade of Canada lessening every day under this beautiful National Policy. And still hon. gentlemen opposite tell us that it is the great policy of the day.

Now, Sir, I was a little amused the other day to hear my friend from Inverness (Mr. Cameron) praising the National Policy. In fact, he said that under the National Policy the farmers were well protected. For fear I might misrepresent him, I will quote his words from "Hansard." He said:

I say that the farmers who toil and labour, and who are the backbone of our country, should be protected, as they have been under the National Policy.

Well, I would like to know how the poor farmers are protected under the National Policy. Hon. gentlemen opposite boasted that they were giving a free breakfast table to the farmer. They tax the article of sugar, which I suppose the Minister of Finance would not claim to be a luxury, but a necessary of life to the poor man. The chair the poor farmer sits on at his table is taxed 30 per cent. The little table at which he eats his meal is taxed 30 per cent. The linen cloth that is spread over the table—I presume the members of the Cabinet will not deny the privilege to the farmer to have a linen cloth on his table—is taxed about 35 per cent. The knife and fork and spoon he eats with are taxed 30 per cent. The common earthenware the poor farmer uses—because he cannot afford chinaware—to drink his tea or coffee with is also heavily taxed. Do you mean to tell me that this is the way to protect the poor farmer, by taxing everything he uses? His plough is taxed, his harrow is taxed, his axe is taxed, his scythe is taxed. The nails he uses to put up his building are taxed. The horse nails used for shoeing his horse are taxed. The iron that makes the horse-shoe is taxed. His coal is taxed. Everything else he uses is taxed. I will not say that his beer or whisky is taxed, because he cannot afford these luxuries. By the time he pays his taxes to this greedy Government that can never get taxes enough from the people, to satisfy them, he has very little left. My friend from Inverness went a little further. He seemed to be very much interested in the platform of the Liberal party which was adopted by the great convention held in Ottawa in June, 1893. In fact, when I heard him quoting the planks of that platform, I had an idea that he was going to become a convert to Liberalism; but I am afraid he was not. He said:

The platform of the Liberal party, as adopted by this convention in 1893, was read by hon. gentlemen opposite one after another, and notwithstanding the fact that this was done not one attempted to explain any feature of it. In fact the very reason why it has been so acceptable to the Opposition is simply that it reflects very clearly indeed the policy of deception, slander and scandals which have been adopted by the Opposition from 1878 up to the present time.

I want the House and the country to understand the charges my friend makes against the Liberal party, not while they were in power, but during the time they are in opposition. He speaks of "deception, slander and scandal." Why, Sir, who would have the hardihood to stand up in this House or out of it and accuse the Liberal party of deception? How could we practice deception, even if we were inclined to do it? Where is our power to act? Then he speaks of slander. Well, what is the meaning of slander? I wish I had my dictionary here to find out. Is it that an hon. member of this House made certain charges against

Mr. PERRY.

certain individuals of having misapplied money, and that those charges were brought home and two gentlemen were sentenced to jail for twelve months? Is that what my hon. friend calls slander? Or what does he mean by it? Is it because the Liberal party in this House have the hardihood to stand up in their places and show the misdoings of the present Government? Then he is not satisfied with that charge, but he adds the word "scandals." Can the hon. gentleman point me to one scandal that the Liberal party have been guilty of—one single individual scandal? Even my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) and my hon. friend from Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) could not do it. Is there any gentleman in this House, or out of it, who will accuse the Liberal party as a party of scandal?

Mr. AMYOT. Why not?

Mr. PERRY. I am not speaking of the Liberal party in Quebec. I believe there are a good many guilty of scandal in the province of Quebec, and my hon. friend must not think that his bosom friends in the province of Quebec are so pure and guiltless of scandals as he pretends. My hon. friend has made this accusation, and I say it is right and proper for the Liberal party to place themselves right upon this matter. This charge will go broadcast through the country, and if not contradicted here, a great many people in the country might be inclined to believe it. But, Sir, I do deny it in toto, and I fling it back in the teeth of the hon. member who had the hardihood to make this statement, when he must have known that he was not telling what was actually the facts. Then he is so much in love with the platform of the Liberal party that he quoted one plank in the platform, as follows:—

The customs tariff of the Dominion should be based, not as it is, upon the protective principle, but upon the requirements of the public service.

My hon. friend is not satisfied with that plank. His idea is not to have a tariff for revenue purposes, but a tariff for the purposes of allowing the Government to squander money as they have done during the past eighteen years. Then he went on to say:

There are bloated monopolists amongst the farmers as well as among other manufacturers. There are those who perfect the products of cattle and hogs, and who are interested in having the raw material for their particular line of manufacture. They, therefore, advocate strongly in this House and in the country, to have corn and cats from the other side of the line, admitted free, in competition with these products of our own country.

My hon. friend finds fault with a few farmers well to do. I presume there are so few of them in the county of Inverness that he thinks it is wonderful to see a farmer doing well. But, Sir, there is not a class of the

people in this country that I would sooner see well off than the farmers. They are the bone and sinew of this country, but, to my sorrow, under the administration of the present Government, their welfare has depreciated very much, indeed. Even their land is going down in value. From my own knowledge, I know that their lands have depreciated, under the administration of this Government, one-third in value, since 1878. Then my hon. friend went on to say :

The Liberals claim on every platform that the National Policy has decreased the value of farm and other landed property.

Well, he knows that himself. Every hon. member here knows it to his sorrow. I know it, and am sorry to have to say that such is the fact. Then, a little further on he quotes again from the Liberal platform:

That it has oppressed the masses to the enrichment of a few.

Well, is not that a fact. Have we not millionaires to-day in Canada who have made their millions by bleeding and taxing the poorer classes of the people, the farmers, labourers, and artisans? Why, we know well that the manufacturers to-day in Canada are bleeding the consumers, and here is an admission taken from the Year-Book. Manufacturers and workingmen should give some study to the statistics of the census compiled by Mr. Johnson, who is the Government statistician, and also the statistician for the purpose of protectionists. In order to glorify protection, the figures had to be made as big as possible. What is the result? Read the statistics in regard to manufacturers taken from the Year-Book :

Capital invested	\$353,837,000
Value of product	478,416,000
Cost of raw material	255,883,000
Cost of labour	99,768,000
Number of hands	367,000

I ask the manufacturers if these figures are all right. They are those gathered from themselves by a protectionist Government agent for the glorification of protection. If they are all right, look at what is discovered by them. Deducting the cost of labour and raw material, \$355,746,000 from the value of the product, \$473,416,000, gives an annual profit of \$119,700,000 upon an invested capital of \$353,837,000, or a profit of 33 4-5 per cent per annum. That is their profit, according to the official records of the Dominion Government of Canada, and this is the result which I find. That after the manufacturers have paid everything, they have \$119,000,000 to divide among themselves. Going a little further, I find that the average wages paid is \$272 a year, and that on each man employed the manufacturers made a profit of \$326. Is it any wonder that these working people are so poor? Is it any wonder that they are

getting poorer and that the manufacturers are becoming millionaires? Then he goes on to say, with reference to the charge that the National Policy has checked immigration :

Any person who will examine the tidal wave of immigration to Canada will realize at a glance that this statement is sheer sophistry.

He denies that we have lost population since 1878 in Canada. Every man in this House knows well that, to our sorrow, we have lost population. I have the census returns here, and I will take the province of Nova Scotia, county by county, to show how they are progressing in the matter of population. Annapolis in 1881 had a population of 20,182, and in 1891 the population was 19,350. Antigonish in 1881 had a population of 18,060, which, in 1891 had fallen to 16,114. Cape Breton shows an increase from 31,258 in 1881 to 34,244 in 1891. I suppose, the coal mines there and the floating population has been the cause of that increase. Colchester had a population of 21,720 in 1881, which, by 1891, had increased by 40. In Cumberland in 1881 there were 27,368 people, and in 1891 there were 34,529. There is an increase of 7,161. In Digby the figures are, 19,888 in 1881 and 19,897 for 1891, an increase of 16. In Guysboro' the figures are, for 1881, 17,888, and for 1891, 17,195, an increase of 13. Halifax city shows an increase from 36,100 in 1881 to 36,496 in 1891, an increase of 395. In Halifax county, from 31,817 in 1881 the population increased to 32,863 in 1891. In Hants in 1881 the population was 21,359, and in 1891, 22,052. Inverness, the county represented by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Cameron), had a population in 1881 of 25,651, and in 1891, 25,779, an increase of 128. That is the increase of population in ten years in the county represented by the hon. gentleman. And he still has the face to ridicule the statement that Canada has lost population under the administration of hon. gentlemen opposite. It is time these statements should be contradicted; it is time that the people should understand the true position of public affairs in this country. I have often noticed that hon. gentlemen on the other side, when addressing the electors, as it seems to me, try to keep the people in the dark, instead of telling them the real position in which they stand. Now, it was stated here that the National Policy has impeded commerce; and the hon. gentleman also laughs at that and wants to make it appear that such is not the case. But we know very well that the trade of Canada to-day is less than it was some years ago; we know that the trade of Canada is not improving. He says there are a few other assertions he is willing to let pass, but he says, here is the great platform upon which the Conservative party came into power in 1878, and this is the horse that is to carry them into power again :

That the welfare of Canada requires the adoption of a National Policy—

The platform is not in accord with the National Policy, as it is declared to-day. This was to be merely a readjustment of the tariff. We know that, when Mr. Boyd telegraphed to Sir John Macdonald what he meant by the new policy, and whether it was to be a protective policy, we know very well that Sir John answered that this was to be merely a readjustment of the tariff.

—which, by a judicious readjustment of the tariff, will benefit and foster the agricultural, the mining, the manufacturing and other interests of the Dominion—

I admit that the National Policy has fostered manufacturing; but I deny that it has fostered agriculture or mining.

—that such a policy will retain in Canada thousands of our fellow-countrymen now obliged to expatriate themselves in search of the employment denied them at home—

Has it done that? The census returns prove that between 1881 and 1891, counting the immigrants that came to Canada and the natural increase, we should have had a total increase of 1,700,000 souls. And the same census proved that all we kept to increase our population was something less than 500,000. Is there anything to show that the National Policy has kept population in Canada? Is there anything to show that it has encouraged immigration?

—will restore prosperity to our struggling industries, now so sadly depressed, will prevent Canada from being made a sacrifice market, will encourage and develop an active interprovincial trade, and moving (as it ought to do) in the direction of a reciprocity of tariffs with our neighbours, so far as the varied interests of Canada may demand, will greatly tend to procure for this country, eventually, a reciprocity of trade.

Where are we, so far as reciprocity is concerned? Are we any nearer to it, after these eighteen years of the administration of hon. gentlemen opposite, than we were in 1878? It is true, that in 1890 and 1891, a short time before the general election, the Government took a step toward making an offer to the American people looking toward reciprocal trade relations between the two nations. But we find that the statement they made before the elections, and on which they ran the election, they were going to have reciprocal trade with the United States, was simply a bid for the endorsement of the public. They knew the people of Canada, especially the farmers, would catch at that very quick. The people believed it, and they returned the Government again. But shortly afterwards, in January, 1891, we find that Mr. Blaine wrote a letter to Mr. Baker, in which he says:

I authorize you to contradict the rumours you refer to. There are no negotiations whatever on foot for a reciprocity treaty with Canada, and you may be sure that no scheme for reciprocity with the Dominion, confined to natural products, will be entertained by this government. I know nothing of Sir Charles Tupper coming to Washington.

Mr. PERRY.

Now, there is a flat contradiction by Mr. Blaine; and we know that the Secretary of State, the ex-High Commissioner—I do not know whether he is High Commissioner yet—has never seen fit to contradict that. And here we have the humiliating spectacle of Sir Charles Tupper being obliged to swallow the statement which he made before the people of this country. Now, let me give you some instances of our export trade with the United States:

	1890.	1893.
Horses	\$ 1,887,895	\$1,123,339
Cattle	104,623	10,032
Poultry	105,612	52,114
Eggs	1,793,104	324,355
Wool	235,436	228,030
Flax	175,563	124,082
Barley	4,582,562	638,271
Split peas	74,215	4,214
Hay	922,797	854,958
Malt	149,310	19
Potatoes	303,915	259,176
Rye	113,320	3,302
Total	\$10,453,352	\$3,624,892

Does that go to show that our exports of farm products have increased during those years? These figures are taken from the official statistics, and they show that during these three years our export trade of farm products in the articles I have named has depreciated 300 per cent. Does that show the prosperity of this country? What else but the National Policy has been the cause of this? The hon. gentlemen opposite know well that the American people have built a Chinese wall, but they felt that one wall was not enough, and so they built another, just as high as the American wall. I say, Sir, that instead of building that wall, they should have endeavoured to negotiate a fair reciprocal trade treaty with the American people. We know very well that time and again the American people have told them that they will not reciprocate on farm products alone. The American, Mr. Speaker, is a shrewd man. He knows the value of dollars, and he knows how to make them. He knows when he is properly dealt with, and he knows his own interests just as well as the people of Canada. He knows well that a reciprocity treaty between Canada and the United States in farm products would be opening a market in the United States for the Canadian farmer for all these articles I have read, while not one of them would come into Canada. Therefore, there would be no reciprocity in those articles. But the Government of the United States have made a schedule of manufactured articles, with the natural products of the United States, and they have offered that if these were admitted free of duty into Canada, they would admit our farm products that I have enumerated here duty free from the United States. But the Government of Canada have not thought proper to do that, and that is one of the great reasons why the people of Canada are suffering to-day. Now they say that the tariff does not oppress the

people. Well, Sir, as an illustration, let me refer to the article of coal oil, the duty upon which is the most shameful feature of the tariff on our statute-book. That is the duty which is more felt by the poorer classes of the people, than perhaps, any other portion of the tariff. Kerosene is an indispensable article for the great masses of our people; although the Minister of Finance said a couple of years ago that it was a luxury, and that the poor people could do without kerosene. How did he expect the poor farmer to light his house? Did he expect him to go to the woods and collect some pitch pine and make a torch of it, and keep that burning in his cabin, filling it with smoke? Is that what he expects? Sir, it is the poorer class of the people, the farmers, the labourers and the artisans who have to use this kerosene oil. And yet we find, Mr. Speaker, that there is a duty on kerosene oil all over Canada, of over 100 per cent. It may look astounding, but such is the fact. But the strangest thing I find in connection with this duty, is that the people in every province of Canada do not pay the same amount of duty on kerosene.

	Quantity.	Value.	Duty.	Per- cent ^{ge}
	Galls.	\$	\$	
Ontario	2,064,578	153,797	148,652	96.6
Quebec	783,858	52,655	56,437	107.1
Nova Scotia	1,024,622	59,583	73,772	123.7
N. Brunsw'k	1,010,322	55,984	72,743	130.3
P. E. Island	255,006	11,544	18,360	158.2
Manitoba ..	397,113	20,263	28,600	141.1
B. Columbia	442,203	83,416	31,818	38.1
N.-W. Ter..	2,481	450	178	39.5
	5,980,133	437,692	430,564	98.3

The Government should be prepared to remedy this evil so far as regards Prince Edward Island. There is not a family there which does not use 12 or 15 gallons of oil per annum, for which they have to pay from 24 to 25 cents per gallon, and on this oil they are mulcted in a duty at the rate of 158 per cent. Perhaps the Finance Minister will explain how it occurs that Prince Edward Island has to pay 158 per cent while British Columbia pays only 39 per cent. I have perused the accounts, and I fail to see that the Government expect to receive anything from the McGreevy-Connolly swindle or from the money expended on the Tay Canal, or from the \$4,000,000 squandered in New Brunswick on the branch railway and the Fredericton bridge, and from the \$3,000,000 loaned to the Quebec Harbour Commission. I expected the Government would have submitted some estimate and asked a vote for building a tunnel from Prince Edward Island. Previous to the last elections the Government, which included Sir John Macdonald and Sir Charles

Tupper, promised to carry on that work immediately. Sir John Macdonald wrote to Senator Howlan, who was to be a Government candidate in Prince County, which I represent, a letter dated 6th February, 1891, which was just before the general elections, as follows:—

If, as I believe, the country will continue to give us its confidence, the Ministry will, under my guidance, take the matter up without delay.

I am not here to blame Sir John Macdonald; he did not have the opportunity to carry out his promise, for he died. But there has been a Government here, and this inaction is certainly not due to lack of members of the Cabinet, for there are now, I believe, sixteen Ministers, and the Cabinet, instead of decreasing, has increased since Sir John Macdonald's day. There is no protection to keep men out of the Cabinet—they go in as a free entry. I am sorry the Secretary of State is not in his seat, because I have a little to say to him. On the Saturday previous to the elections of 1891, which took place on 5th March, the Secretary of State was very anxious to get across to the island, for he thought he could do wonders there. He went to Amherst and telegraphed from there to Donald Ferguson, now Senator, who was at that time a candidate for Queen's County. The telegram was dated 28th February, 1891, and ran as follows:—

I regret that it is impossible for me to go to the island, as the "Stanley" cannot cross, and I dare not attempt the capes. I am satisfied myself that a tunnel can be made for \$6,000,000, and you may rely upon all the aid I can give to that important and necessary work.

Could any promise be more solemn than that, or more enticing, or more calculated to induce people to believe the promise. The people feel the want of a tunnel. On two or three occasions this session, six, seven and even eight days have elapsed without even a mail from the island. We have been told by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and by the Postmaster General that they have given full power to the agent of the Marine Department in Charlottetown and inspector of post office, Mr. Brecken, to act as he might think proper. I do not know how they have acted or what powers have been given them, but we are worse used and more abused than we were under the Mackenzie Government, and there is a worse winter service than there was with the "Northern Light," which was abused by the Tories, north, south, east and west. I was in Parliament in 1874-5-6-7-8 under the administration of Mr. Mackenzie, and I never remember being more than two or three days without receiving letters from home. Such is not the case now. What is the reason? The Government have been petitioned to place the "Stanley" on the route from Summerside to Cape Tormentine. I may perhaps ask that these petitions be brought down, but if the Department of Marine is as slow

as the Department of Finance, I shall never obtain them. How long is it since the Finance Minister promised a map of the borings in the Straits. The Finance Minister, by the answers he gave me the other day, showed that he knew nothing about the borings or about how much the Government paid for them. He told us that in 1892 there was no money paid, whereas that is the very year engineer Palmer was engaged by the Government down there. He had a contract for \$12,000 to do the work, but the Government thought that Mr. Palmer was going too fast and that he would give them such information that they could not conscientiously back out of their promises, and so they dismissed him. They kicked him, they scratched him, they robbed him, and he came to Ottawa as a beggar without a cent in his pocket. They spent \$7,000 or \$8,000, and yet the Minister of Finance tells me that in 1892 they did not spend one cent. My question was on the Order paper for a couple of days, and he had full time to prepare an answer to it. How can we believe him in other things when we cannot believe him in that. He said that altogether only \$6,000 was spent on the borings, when I know there must have been in the vicinity of ten or twelve thousand expended. Now, Sir, the Government have no more idea of building that tunnel than I expect this building to fly in the air, unless the great comet that is expected one of these days falls on it. They keep it as a stalking horse for political purposes. They try to delude the people with it on the eve of an election. Well, that duplicity did not work in 1891, and I can assure them it will be a failure in 1896. It is discreditable to them to be fooling, by sending down a few of their friends from Ottawa to pretend they are boring when they are not boring at all. The Minister could not tell me how many borings were done last fall, and still he has the political effrontery to try and delude the people. Why is he not a man and say "yes" or "no" at once? I would give him credit if he did. The bogus estimate made by the Secretary of States (Sir Charles Tupper) that the tunnel would cost \$6,000,000, is nothing but a farce. Is there any man in his senses who believes that a tunnel ten miles long is going to be built for \$6,000,000. We have other tunnels in this country, and we know from past experiences that \$6,000,000 would not look at it. I believe myself that the Secretary of State was not honest, that he was not sincere, and that he did not believe that \$6,000,000 would build that tunnel. With him it is any port in a storm, and anything to beat me in my county. That was one of the means used against me, and there were other means so despicable that I will not refer to them. Now, Sir, this Government has rolled up the public debt to an extent that would frighten anybody. It is a well known fact that the in-

Mr. PERRY.

terest we have to pay on that debt is something over one-third of the total revenue. My friend from Inverness (Mr. Cameron) told us the other day, that \$40,000,000 would be required to carry on the government of the country, and I believe that will be the case if this Government remains in power. I am a little doubtful that they are going to succeed in passing these Estimates, and they do not look to me to have the courage and ability to pass them. It is very unfair for the Government to ask this House to give them supplies up to the 30th June, 1897, and thus to legislate eighteen months ahead. Where is the *bête noire* in that? The Government are very wise in their generation, or they believe they are; and I suppose their idea is that the House will not be prorogued on the 25th of April, but will die out a natural death. Suppose they have their Estimates up to the 30th June, 1897, they may not have an election until July or August, or until whatever time it suits them. They will be defeated at the polls, say in July, and then they will not call the House to meet. They will say: Oh, we are not bound to take what the newspapers say; this man who was put down as Liberal will support the Government; we will wait until the House meets, and so they will not call Parliament until March, 1897. In the meantime they would be spending the public money without possessing the confidence of the people. They will endeavour to bribe some members if they can because they are adepts at that kind of work. Do you mean to tell me that the Opposition are so blind that they cannot see their dodge? Do you mean to tell me that we are going to allow them to pass the Estimates? I am speaking for no one but myself now; I am not speaking for my respected leader, but I say, Sir, that if I have the power, as far as my vote and voice and argument goes, I will endeavour to keep the Government from passing those Estimates. It is unconstitutional for the Government to ask us to give them estimates so much in advance, to squander, and to pilfer, while they do not possess the confidence of the people. There is not one member in the Cabinet to-day who could open his constituency and go to his people. It is true that the Secretary of State was elected the other day in Cape Breton, but who would not be elected under similar circumstances. Why, Sir, a bare pole, or a Chinaman could have been elected in the same way. Let not the Conservatives be overjoyed at the result of that election. They are overrating their success there. Sir, it is no victory. Mr. McKeen himself, who was a very humble member and a very nice man, got a bigger proportion of the vote than the Secretary of State, notwithstanding the fact that the Secretary of State was backed and propped up by all the influences due and undue, that could be scared up in Cape Breton. He ac-

cused the Liberals here of spending \$25,000 in that election, and, when he was brought to book, what did he say? "Some one told me so." Well, Sir, I will tell you what some one told me. Some one told me that the Secretary of State spent \$40,000. And I will tell you what somebody else told me. Somebody else told me that he stated that he had a telegram from the Rev. Mr. Murray, saying that he would vote for him, and endorsing his policy upon the Manitoba school question, and that, when the Secretary of State was brought to book, he had no such telegram. Some person told me that. I do not say it is the case; but I believe that it was proved that it was all bogus. These are the things that were resorted to in order to elect the Secretary of State. We know very well that there are in that county, perhaps, a thousand votes of coal miners, who depend on employment at the mines for their bread and butter. We know that the chief manager of these mines is Mr. McKeen, and we know that Mr. McKeen did all he could for the Secretary of State. I find no fault with him for that, as long as he did it honestly and honourably and above board. The chances are that every one of those miners voted for the Secretary of State, and that would be enough to give him the majority which he very unfairly and unjustly received at the hands of the electors of the county of Cape Breton. The Conservatives also rejoice at the result of the election in Northumberland. But there is not one Liberal in this House to-day who believed, or expected, that the Hon. Peter Mitchell was going to be elected. The people are not so fond of having outsiders to represent them, and that is where Mr. Mitchell made a mistake. He had not been living in the county for about twelve years, and the other man is a young business man who lives in the county and has large interests there, and the people preferred him to Mr. Mitchell. But I believe that, if a Liberal had offered, and all things had been equal between him and Mr. Robinson, he would have been elected very easily. Look at the result of the recent by-elections. Look at the result in Antigonish. Look at the result in Verchères. North Ontario, of course, has returned a Conservative, but it was only through a misunderstanding between the Liberal candidate and the Patron of Industry candidate. What did Cardwell do? It did not return a Government candidate. What did Montreal Centre do? What did Jacques Cartier do? What did Charlevoix do? What did West Huron do? It was not Mr. Cameron the electors voted for. They voted against the National Policy. It was not Mr. McShane the electors in Montreal Centre voted for; it was against the National Policy. Montreal Centre is supposed to be one of the most intelligent constituencies in the Dominion; it is a portion of the commercial capital of Canada. No doubt, the gentleman who opposed Mr. McShane was a man that no person could say

anything against. I have not had the honour of his acquaintance, but, from what I know of him, he is a man of unblemished character. But I have it from private information, that several gentlemen in Montreal Centre voted against Dr. Hingston with great reluctance, because they loved him; but the principle he espoused they looked upon as a curse to the country, and, therefore, they voted for Mr. McShane. The result would be the same in any other constituency that might be opened to-day. The proof of that is in the fact that there are at present three vacancies in this House. There are about 100,000 people in Canada to-day who are not represented in this House. There are vacancies in Missisquoi, in Pontiac and in Soulanges. These three constituencies were all represented by Conservatives, but the Government is afraid to open them. They have the hardihood to deprive the electors of Soulanges, Missisquoi and Pontiac of being represented in this House because they are afraid of losing those constituencies. But it is only a question of time when they will lose them at the general election, when the jury of this country will meet together and pass a verdict on the misdoings of the present Government.

As I said before, the Government have not dealt well with the people of Prince Edward Island. They know that in 1885, when the Island was under a Conservative government, a delegation was sent from there to England to make a demand on the Government of Canada for \$5,000,000 for the non-fulfilment up to that time of the terms of confederation. Lord Granville did all he could; he encouraged the delegates; but the correspondence shows that the then High Commissioner in London, now the Secretary of State here, did all he could to influence the British Government to give the demand of the Prince Edward Island delegates the go-by. They came back, and Lord Granville told the Government of Canada of that day that they were morally obliged to do something to relieve the people of Prince Edward Island of the wrongs that were perpetrated upon them. But the Government of Canada have not thought fit to do it. They have not thought fit even to give us the best winter communication that can be got. Why, Sir, the other day the Government boat left Cape Tormentine, on the New Brunswick side, and went across to Cape Traverse, on the Prince Edward Island side, and it had to leave 100 mail bags, because it had not accommodation at Cape Tormentine to carry them. There were four or five other boats there, but the Government would not engage one of them to carry the mails. A friend who wrote to me about that time, stated that it took seventeen days for a letter to go from Montreal to Prince Edward Island. Is that very becoming, or what the people of Prince Edward Island have a right to expect? Is that the way the Government is going

to create the harmony which it is absolutely necessary should exist between the different provinces? Sir, if it is, I cannot understand it. It is the bounden duty of the Government to promote a good understanding among the different provinces, but what does the Government do to achieve this object? They have been asked to try the experiment of winter navigation between Summerside, one of the finest harbours in Prince Edward Island, and Cape Tormentine, and they have not done it. In fact, they will do nothing to help Prince County. They are helping King's county because that county sends two Conservatives here. I suppose that is the reason that they can find a large amount of money to expend on breakwaters in that county, and I am very glad that they are able to do that much, and I believe they will succeed in making a good harbour there. I find the contract has been let to a firm at Ottawa. I do not know whether it has been let by private contract or after tenders were called for, but we will find that out one of these days. But when I come to look at my county, I find an insignificant amount allowed for all the piers and breakwaters, 30 in number, in that county. Tignish breakwater, alone, requires \$5,000 to make it safe and in fit condition. When I asked the Minister of Public Works to do something for this breakwater, he replied that he had no money; but if he thought he could gain a vote down there, he would soon find the money. If the money were required for some foolish expenditure, if it were required to be thrown into the bottom of the River St. Lawrence, where the contract could be made the means of stealing over a million of dollars; if it were required to throw into the river from the Curran Bridge, where \$250,000 were wasted; if it were required to build the Tay Ditch or the Haggart Ditch, there would be plenty forthcoming. But when it is required to rebuild a wharf at West Point, which the Government have allowed to be carried away by their neglect during the past five or six years, it is not forthcoming, although they paid the island \$5,000 for that wharf and have never since put a stone or a log into it. They begrudge the people of West Point any accommodation. West Point is fifteen miles away from railway accommodation, but while this wharf was in existence it gave the people there great facility for transport of produce by small vessels, loading at this wharf for Miramichi or Shediac. The Government cannot put their hands on their breasts and say we have done wrong and will now do right, but will go on punishing the people of Prince County as much as they can; but the day is soon coming when they will no longer have the opportunity of doing injustice to my constituents. I am sorry that the people of my county have not thought proper to send an abler representative here

Mr. PERRY.

than myself, but if the Government wait before they will do me justice and my people justice until I change my political coat, they will wait, 'per omnia sæcula sæculorum.' I thank you very much, Sir, and the House, and I trust that I have brought home to the Ministers a conviction of the necessity of doing justice to my constituents.

Mr. SMITH (Ontario) moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 12.10 a.m. (Saturday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 24th February, 1896.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON moved :

That Mr. Stubbs be added to the Committee on Agriculture and Colonization.

Motion agreed to.

CRIMINAL CODE—SEDUCTION AND ABDUCTION.

Mr. CHARLTON moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 73) to amend the Criminal Code, 1892, for the purpose of making more effectual provision for the punishment of seduction and abduction. He said: The first section of this Bill proposes to amend section 181 of the Criminal Code in the sense of increasing the age of consent from sixteen years to eighteen years. Section 2 proposes to amend section 183 of the Criminal Code, by making the male liable for the consequences of seduction under promise of marriage, from the age of eighteen instead of from the age of twenty-one years as at present. Section 3 amends section 283 of the Criminal Code by substituting the words "twenty-one" for the word "sixteen" in cases of abduction.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

LIVE STOCK EXCLUSION BILL—IMPERIAL PARLIAMENT.

Mr. GRIEVE. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to call the attention

of the Government to the following article which appears in the Ottawa "Citizen" this morning:—

London, Feb. 22.—The first note of opposition to the Government Live Stock Exclusion Bill comes from the Right Hon. Herbert Gardner, the late Minister of Agriculture, who protests in the "Times" against the irrevocable exclusion of Canadian live stock. The letter will probably arouse hostility to the Bill in the Commons, though the Conservative Ministers claim that Canada does not really object, desiring to develop the dead meat trade.

Has the attention of the Government been called to this article, and if so, does the article express the views of the Government upon this question?

Mr. FOSTER. In answer to the hon. gentleman, I would say, that the attention of the Government has not been called to the article. I read it myself personally.

Mr. McMULLEN. This is an exceedingly important question, and it would be well if the Government would give their views upon it.

SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 63) to amend the Act incorporating the International Radial Railway Company.—(Mr. Masson.)

IMPERIAL LIFE ASSURANCE COMPANY.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Coatsworth for second reading of Bill (No. 64) to incorporate the Imperial Life Assurance Company of Canada.

Mr. McLEOD. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Coatsworth) asked me, in the Banking and Commerce Committee, if I would explain this Bill as objection was made to it. I may say it is just an ordinary Act incorporating a life insurance company. I have looked over the Bill myself and I find it contains only the ordinary provisions.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I would repeat the question the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) put the other day. If this is an ordinary Bill containing the ordinary provisions, why did they not make application under the general Act, instead of coming to Parliament for a special statute? What are the exceptional privileges they want by this special statute?

Mr. McLEOD. I do not know of any general Act. They cannot be incorporated under the Joint Stock Companies Act, because insurance companies are excepted.

Mr. FOSTER. There is no general Act.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

HAMILTON BLAST COMPANY.

Mr. McKAY moved second reading of Bill (No. 69) to incorporate the Hamilton Blast Furnace Company (Limited).

Mr. LAURIER. Explain.

Mr. McKAY. The object of the Bill is to put on a better basis the Hamilton Smelting Works Company, which has recently commenced operations. The original promoters of the enterprise were Americans; but it has lately been put into the hands of a company composed entirely of Canadians, who are citizens of Hamilton.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Was the original charter a special Act of Parliament?

Mr. McKAY. No, it was an Ontario Act. The company wish to carry on their operations all over the Dominion, for the purpose of developing iron mines and for similar purposes. They are going into more extended operations than were contemplated when the first Act was passed, and they now find it necessary to have an Act of this kind.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

BREAKWATER AT COAL MINES, N.S.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness) asked:

Whether it is the intention of the Government to pay for labour performed for ballasting crib-work on breakwater at Coal Mines, Mabou, Inverness, N.S., for M. McFayden, Esq., Government foreman of that work in 1893 and 1894? If not, why not?

Mr. OUIMET. All the engagements made for the department by Mr. McFayden in above years have been discharged and paid for. Some rock ballasting was, however, done at the breakwater at Coal Mine Point, by the Mabou Coal and Gypsum Company, for which the department agreed to pay \$200 to the latter. And this sum was paid to a representative of the company, less \$27, for work not executed by the company. On being informed that the men employed by the company on the work undertaken by them were not paid, the president of the company, in answer to a letter written to him by the department, holds himself ready to pay over the said sum when called upon to do so. The department has taken no responsibility for labour which it has not fully discharged.

THE DOMINION REFORMATORY.

Mr. MULOCK asked:

1. What steps, if any, have been taken for the establishment of the Dominion Reformatory, for which a vote was passed last session?
2. If a site has been purchased, where is the site and what is the amount of the purchase money?
3. Have plans of the building been prepared and approved of?

4. What amount has been spent on any account in connection with the proposed reformatory, and to whom?

5. Have such moneys been paid?

6. Has any arrangement been made with the Ontario government for first offenders, when sent to the reformatory, being kept apart from other offenders? If so, what?

7. What is the estimated total cost of the land, buildings, furnishings, and all other expenses connected with the establishment of the reformatory?

Mr. OUIMET. A site has been purchased, and tenders have been called for, for the construction of one wing. 2. The site purchased is described as follows in the deed of sale: All that certain parcel or tract of land and premises situate, lying and being in the township of Lochiel, Glengarry county, composed of all that part of lot No. 38, 3rd concession of said township, lying south of the highway or public road traversing said lot westerly from the Military Road (commonly called the Fourth Concession Road), containing (said parcel) one hundred acres, more or less. The price paid was \$5,000. 3. Yes. 4. The total amount expended up to date, including the price paid for the farm, is \$6,211.92. 5. Yes. 6. No. 7. As above stated, the cost of the lot is \$5,000, the estimated cost of the wing to be constructed is about \$100,000, and no estimate has yet been made of furnishings and other expenses which will be attended to as the work proceeds, the more so as it is intended that a large portion of the work required will be executed by convict labour.

W. J. POUPORE, CONTRACTOR.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron) asked:

Has one W. J. Poupore, at the present time, a contract with the Crown, as represented by the Department of Railways and Canals, or with the Crown, as represented by the Department of Public Works of Canada?

Is one W. J. Poupore a member of a certain firm of contractors known as Poupore & Fraser, or under any other name, that has a contract with the Crown, through the Department of Railways and Canals, for certain work at Morrisburg or Coteau Landing, or in the neighbourhood of either places, in connection with the canals and locks and other works in said vicinity, that are being constructed at the instance of the Government of Canada?

Has the said W. J. Poupore, or any firm of contractors of which he is or was a member, filed a claim or claims for extras, or any other claim, arising out of any contract, or for the alleged price and value of work and materials, with the Minister or officers of the Department of Public Works, or of Railways and Canals, or against the Crown, as represented by the Minister of said departments, or the officials thereof; and if any such claim has been so filed, what is the amount and nature of said claim, and of every such claim so filed?

If the said W. J. Poupore has not at present a contract, or is not a member of a firm having a contract with either of the departments aforesaid, or the Ministers or officials thereof, or with the Crown, as represented by either of said de-

Mr. MULOCK.

partments, or the Ministers or officials thereof, has the said W. J. Poupore, or any firm of contractors of which he is or was a member, had within the past twelve months any such contract or contracts, and when did the said W. J. Poupore sell or assign his interest in said contract or contracts; to whom was the assignment made, and what was the consideration, if any, and what security did the Crown or its representative exact for the due performance of said contract or contracts, so assigned by the said W. J. Poupore, or in which the said W. J. Poupore assigned his interest?

What sums of money have been paid to said W. J. Poupore, or the firm or firms of which he was a member, on account of Government works on the Rivière du Lièvre, province of Quebec, and at Morrisburg and Coteau Landing, or in the neighbourhood thereof, and what further sums are now being claimed by the said W. J. Poupore, or by firms of contractors of which he is or has been a member, in connection with, or relating to said works; and what further sums of money have been at any time claimed in connection with said works by the said W. J. Poupore, or by firms of contractors of which he is or has been a member, or by any person or persons to whom any such claim has been assigned, and if any such assignment has ever been made?

Mr. HAGGART. Mr. W. J. Poupore and associates have a contract with the Crown, as represented by the Department of Railways and Canals. Mr. W. J. Poupore is a member of the firm of contractors known as Messrs. Poupore & Fraser, who have contracts on the Rapide Plat (Morrisburg) Canal and also a contract on the Soulanges Canal, near Coteau Landing, for works being constructed at the instance of the Government of Canada. I am not aware of Mr. W. J. Poupore, or the firm of Poupore & Fraser, having filed any claim or claims for extras, or any other claim arising out of any contract, or for the alleged price and value of work and materials, except such as have been disposed of from month to month as the work progressed. The amount of money paid to said firm of Poupore & Fraser, on account of the contract for section No. 11, on the Soulanges Canal, is \$79,760; amount paid on sections 1 and 3 of the Rapide Plat Canal is \$802,210; one claim only is in for a further sum. The sum of \$4,000 is claimed for dams on section No. 3 of the Rapide Plat Canal. Mr. Poupore informed me that he had assigned his contract, but the assignment has not been filed in the department.

Mr. OUIMET. In reply to the hon. gentleman, I beg to say: 1. Mr. Poupore has no contract with the Department of Public Works. 2. This question only refers to the Department of Railways and Canals. 3. Yes, Mr. Poupore has filed, in connection with his contract for the construction of a lock and dam at Rivière du Lièvre, a claim for \$60,871.74, in addition to the total amount returned in the department's final estimates. 4. Mr. Poupore has no contract at present with the Department of Public Works. 5. The amount paid to Mr. Poupore and Company, in connection with Government works

on the Rivière du Lièvre, is \$185,873.96. 6. The amount yet claimed by Mr. Poupore, in connection with these works, is, as stated in answer to No. 3, \$60,871.74.

SCHOONER "MARY E. HARLOW."

Mr. WHITE (Shelburne) asked :

Has the attention of the Government been called to the fact of the loss of the schooner "Mary E. Harlow" on the 2nd day of February, and that said loss is said to have been caused by the non-flashing of the light on Little Hope Island? Is it the intention of the Government to cause inquiry to be made into the cause of said loss and into the efficiency of the light at Little Hope?

Mr. COSTIGAN. The attention of the Government has been called to the fact of the loss of the schooner "Mary E. Harlow" by the member who put the question, but no report has yet been received by the Department of Marine and Fisheries in regard to the wreck. Inquiry, however, is being made as to the cause of said loss and into the efficiency of the light at Little Hope.

ST. LOUIS vs. THE QUEEN.

Mr. LANDERKIN (for Mr. Edgar) asked :

Has the Supreme Court given a decision in respect of a claim made by Mr. St. Louis, the contractor, in connection with the Curran Bridge against the Government?

What was the amount of Mr. St. Louis' claim?

Has it been allowed in whole or in part, and to what amount in favour of Mr. St. Louis?

Mr. DICKEY. The Supreme Court of Canada has given a decision in respect of a claim made by Mr. St. Louis, contractor, against the Government, in connection with the Curran Bridge. The judgment was given on the 18th February instant. Amount of Mr. St. Louis' claim was \$63,642.29. The claim has been allowed to the extent of \$61,842.29, with interest and costs.

TAY CANAL—CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron) asked :

1. Have any claims been made by the owners of land in the vicinity of the Tay Canal for damages sustained, or alleged to have been sustained, by them by the flooding of land through or by reason of the construction or maintenance of said canal?

2. If any such claims have been made to the Government or the Minister in charge, what is the nature of the claim and who are the claimants?

3. Have any of the said claims, or any part thereof, been paid out of any moneys voted for that or any other purpose?

Mr. HAGGART. Claims have been made by owners of land in the vicinity of the Tay Canal for damages alleged to have been sustained by flooding, on account of the obstruction and maintenance of said canal. The claims are for flooding of lands and dam-

ages to bridges. The claimants' names are : John Matthews, Richard Booth, W. R. McLean, Jas. Wilson, Robert Wilson, Daniel McKay, George Groom, Daniel McNaughton, John Beveridge, William Beveridge, W. J. McLean, Thomas McVeity, Joseph Moody, Richard Frizell, Richard Bolton, Alonzo Kane, Jas. Kane, William Frizell, W. J. Spaulding, Dawson B. Kerr, J. H. Kerr, Chas. Foster, Jno. J. Armstrong, Jas. Moor, Ebenezer Frizell, William Grimsby, David McLean, Jas. Armstrong, W. J. McLean. None of the said claims, or any part thereof, has been paid out of any moneys voted for that or any other purpose. No part of the appropriation made by Parliament in sessions of 1894-95 or 1895-96, for damages and repairs on the Rideau Canal, has been expended in paying damages, or part thereof, for lands flooded by reason of the construction or maintenance of the Tay Canal.

MAIL SERVICE BETWEEN BANDA AND RAILWAY STATION.

Mr. LANDERKIN (for Mr. Mulock) asked :

1. Has the contract for mail service between Banda and Railway Station been recently renewed?

2. If so, when, for what time, and at what rate and with whom?

3. What was the cost under the previous contract?

4. Were any tenders asked for before such renewal?

5. Has the renewal contract been executed?

6. If renewed, was any effort made to secure the performance of such service at any less rate than that in the former contract, and, if so, what are the particulars of such effort?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. In reply to the hon. gentleman, I beg to say : 1. Yes. 2. On 12th December, 1895, for four years, \$210 per annum, with the present contractor, Wm. Bell. 3. \$210 per annum. 4. No. 5. No. 6. No.

FREE TRANSMISSION OF NEWSPAPERS BY MAIL.

Mr. DEVLIN asked :

Has the "Mail and Empire" newspaper, of Toronto, complied with all requirements of the statutes in regard to free transmission by mail? Did it furnish the Post Office Department with a copy of its list of subscribers? If so, when? If not, why not?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The "Mail and Empire," of Toronto, has complied with all the requirements of the statutes in regard to free transmission by mail. The list of subscribers is inspected by an official from the Toronto post office at least once a month.

Mr. DEVLIN asked :

Has the newspaper "La Presse," of Montreal, furnished the Post Office Department with a copy of the list of its subscribers? If so, when? Is such lists now in possession of the department? Whose names, and how many are upon the list?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. "La Presse," of Montreal, has complied with all requirements of the statutes in regard to free transmission by mail. The list of subscribers is inspected by an official from the Montreal post office from time to time.

JOHN MCGAHEY.

Mr. DEVLIN asked :

Is John McGahey now a member of the Dominion Police Force? Were charges made against him, and, if so, was he given an opportunity of explaining such charges at the time of his suspension or dismissal? Did he ask for an investigation, and, if so, was it granted? If not, why not?

Mr. DICKEY. In reply to the hon. gentleman, I beg to say: 1. No, nor was he ever such. He was employed temporarily on two different occasions, in 1892 for three months, and from January, 1893, to March, 1895. 2. No charges were made against him. 3. He asked for an investigation, but it was not granted. 4. It was not granted because there were no charges to investigate. He was employed from day to day, and his services were dispensed with, when they were no longer required.

SALT PORK IMPORTATIONS.

Mr. BORDEN asked :

What is the value of the total importation of salted pork into Canada during the first six months of the present fiscal year, viz., from 1st July to 31st December, inclusive?

What amount of duty was collected thereon, and what quantity remained in bond on 31st December?

Mr. WOOD. The value of the total importations of salt pork imported into Canada for consumption during the first six months of the current fiscal year was \$132,508. 2. Duty was collected thereon to the amount of \$52,681.62. 3. The quantity remaining in warehouse on 31st December, 1895, was 487,072 pounds.

ALGOMA ELECTION, 1891.

Mr. AMYOT asked :

1. What is the date of the return made by the returning officer for the district of Algoma, at the general elections, in 1891?

2. On what date does that report show that the election of George Hugh Macdonell, Esq., for the said electoral district, at the said election, took place?

3. On what date did the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery receive the said return?

4. On what date was the said return published by the said Clerk in the "Canada Gazette"?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. In reply to the hon. gentleman, I beg to say: 1. The return made by the returning officer for the electoral district of Algoma at the general elections in 1891 bears no date. 2. The vote took place on the 18th May, 1891. 3. The

Mr. DEVLIN.

return to the writ was received by the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery on the 3rd June, 1891. 4. The notice announcing the election of Geo. Hugh Macdonell, Esq., as member to represent that electoral district in the House of Commons, was published in the "Canada Gazette" on the 6th June, 1891.

TIGNISH BREAKWATER.

Mr. PERRY asked :

Has the Department of Public Works received a petition from the inhabitants of Tignish, P.E.I., asking the department to repair the Tignish breakwater, P.E.I., immediately?

Mr. OUIMET. Yes. Mr. Edward Hackett forwarded to the department, on the 3rd February inst., a memorial from the committee appointed at a public meeting held at Tignish, recommending that certain improvements and repairs be made to the breakwater at that place.

THE WRECK OF THE "SAN PEDRO."

Mr. MARTIN. Will the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries answer the question regarding the wreck of the "San Pedro," which was dropped through misunderstanding? The hon. Minister, I understood, agreed to answer without notice.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I brought the answer here, but have not it by me at the moment. I will be ready to answer the question tomorrow.

PROHIBITION OF THE LIQUOR TRAFFIC.

Mr. FLINT moved :

That, in the opinion of this House, the manufacture, importation and sale of intoxicating liquors, except for medicinal, sacramental and mechanical purposes, should be prohibited by law.

He said: On Wednesday, the 12th instant, I made a few observations leading up to the arguments that could be drawn from the report of the commission on the liquor traffic in favour of the adoption of the resolution now before us. As some time has elapsed since the matter was brought forward, I deem it scarcely necessary to apologize for referring briefly to the line of argument taken on that occasion. I endeavoured to show—very inadequately, of course, in consequence of the shortness of the time to which I had limited myself—that in no quarter was there any serious question raised as to the complete jurisdiction of this Parliament to carry out the spirit of this resolution; in other words, that, notwithstanding the vast mass and great variety of legal argument and decision that has been had on the various phases of the liquor traffic, as it might be dealt with, municipally, provincially, or federally, no jurist had seriously contended that

the power of absolute prohibition did not lie with the Dominion Parliament. The matter is now before Her Majesty's Privy Council, and the absence of their decision must be deemed very regrettable. The case, as presented, deals almost entirely, if not absolutely so, with the nature and details of the jurisdiction of the provincial parliaments to regulate or restrain the liquor traffic. It has been contended with some force that the powers of the provincial legislatures in that regard go sufficiently far to effectually prohibit the traffic within each province. It is not necessary for the discussion of this resolution that that line of argument should be taken up here or that that matter should be discussed here. If this Parliament has unquestioned power, then, I hold, this Parliament should act upon that power, and carry out the wishes of the people, or of the majority of the people, if it believes that those wishes are based upon sound constitutional and economic principles. In order to make still more clear this position, I would read one or two extracts from the observations made by the judges upon the case which is now, or recently has been, before the Privy Council, their decision of which we are now awaiting. That case, in the form of three questions, was laid before the Supreme Court of Canada, all of these questions relating to the jurisdiction of the provincial legislature. But, during the argument of that case, and in the rendering of opinion of the judges of our Supreme Court, we find a few observations strongly in the line which I have assumed as the basis of the argument here. His lordship, the chief justice, said :

I answer the third and fourth questions in the negative, because the prohibition of the manufacture and importation would affect trade and commerce, and so must belong to the Dominion ; and further, for the reason that prohibition to that extent would affect the revenue of the Dominion derived from the customs and excise duties.

His Lordship Justice Gwynne, in the course of a more lengthy and thorough argument upon the whole range of these various questions of jurisdiction, summed up so clearly the nature of the decisions in the leading cases relating to this topic, that I make no apology for reading it at some length here. His lordship observed :

The subject which we have now under consideration is the right of absolutely prohibiting the carrying on of the trades of manufacturing, importing and selling spirituous liquors, the right, in fact, of declaring by legislative authority that these trades or some or one of them, shall not be carried on ; that the carrying of them on shall be absolutely unlawful. This subject does not admit of two aspects. Between pronouncing the carrying on of a particular trade to be absolutely unlawful, and prescribing the manner in which, and the persons by whom, that trade, being unlawful, shall be carried on there is a vast difference. *Fredericton vs. the*

Queen (1), and *Russell vs. the Queen* (2), are cases dealing with the former of such subjects—

That is, with total prohibition.

—and *Hodge vs. the Queen* (3), and *Sulte vs. Three Rivers* (4), are cases dealing with the latter.

That is, the regulation and licensing of the liquor traffic.

In *Fredericton vs. the Queen* (1), and *Russell vs. the Queen* (2), the question was as to jurisdiction in the case of prohibition. In the former of those cases this court held that the provincial legislatures had not under section 92 any jurisdiction to pass the Act then under consideration, the purpose of which was to legislate upon that subject ; and that by force of section 91, item 2, the Dominion Parliament had expressly exclusive jurisdiction to pass it. In *Russell vs. the Queen* their Lordships of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, while expressing no opinion as to the applicability of section 91, item 2, held that there was nothing in section 92 conferring on the provincial legislatures jurisdiction to pass the Act in question, the sole purpose of which was in relation to the absolute prohibition of the trade. In *Hodge vs. the Queen* on the other hand they held that the provincial legislatures had exclusive jurisdiction over the regulation of the manner in which and the persons by whom the trade, being a lawful one, might be carried on, a subject-matter as different as it is possible to conceive from jurisdiction legislatively to declare the carrying on of the trade to be absolutely unlawful.

Here, then, we have an illustration of the application of the language of their lordships in the passage above extracted from their judgment in *Hodge vs. the Queen*, namely, if we regard the traffic in intoxicating liquor in the aspect of total jurisdiction of the carrying on of the trade, that is to say, eliminating it from the category of lawful trades, in that aspect the jurisdiction is exclusively in the Dominion Parliament.

His lordship, Mr. Justice Sedgewick, referring to the same phase of the question, reviewed one of these cases in the following words :—

(g.) The cases decided in the Privy Council, in my view, practically conclude the question. *Russell vs. the Queen* (1) decided that the Canada Temperance Act, a prohibitory Act, was such an Act as the Dominion Parliament might properly pass.

And Mr. Justice King, in the same case, made these observations :

The Dominion Parliament, having in 1883, passed a general licensing Act applicable to the entire country, this, with an amending Act of 1884, was held *ultra vires* upon a reference of the subject to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council.

Then with regard to prohibition, the Canada Temperance Act (1) is a local option prohibitory Act.

After describing the Act, he observes :

In the city of *Fredericton vs. the Queen* (2), the Act was held valid, chiefly as relating to the subject of trade and commerce. In *Russell vs. the Queen* (3), it was sustained on other grounds. Their Lordships, approaching the subject from

the side of provincial powers, held that the provisions of the Act did not fall within any of the classes of subject assigned exclusively to the provincial legislatures. It was, therefore, in their opinion, at least within the general, unenumerated and residual powers of the general Parliament to make laws for the peace, order and good government of Canada in relation to all matters not coming within the classes of subjects assigned exclusively to the provincial legislatures.

These quotations sum up in judicial language the state of the case, so far as it has gone at the present time, and for any one who has looked carefully throughout the decisions relating to this subject, there is no reason to suppose that as regards the competency of this Parliament, the anticipated judicial decision of the Privy Council will make any alteration in that matter. It is expected that there will be a more clear and definite decision as to the powers, duties and privileges of the local parliaments. On a previous occasion, when I had the honour of addressing the House on this subject, I alluded to the nature of the popular support which the demand upon Parliament for a prohibitory measure, had received, and, at the time, I endeavoured, briefly, to answer several of the most frequently-repeated objections which are made as to the advisability of Parliament taking any action in that regard. Parliament, however, having approached this subject in 1894, with a desire to ascertain more clearly and definitely than had, up to that time, been officially ascertained, the position of the prohibition question, from economic, historic and other standpoints, acceded to the appointment of a Royal Commission, the report of which, in many volumes, has already been distributed. Although many objected to the appointment of that commission, and none more than myself, yet I am willing to admit that they have, although at great expense, accumulated a large amount of valuable information, which information, no doubt, when carefully examined, will throw a flood of light upon all the phases of this very interesting and important question. The evidence is very voluminous, and it would be impossible, even within any ordinary time, for a person engaged in ordinary occupations, without devoting himself almost solely to the study of that evidence, to analyse it in order to report upon it in a fair and intelligible manner; to sift casual opinions from those opinions which are based upon careful study and reasonable deduction, and in order to classify the various points of evidence brought together in these five bulky volumes. The commissioners, however, have endeavoured fairly and adequately to sum up some of the more salient features of that evidence, in their report. I do not propose to read at any length from this report, because it is in the hands of hon. members, and a great deal of time could be taken up in mere cursory quotations from many of its more

pointed arguments. But it would only be fair to the commissioners who have laboured, I think, conscientiously, to bring forward, in as clear a form as possible, the information which was placed before them, that some reference should be made to that report during the course of this debate. Although the quotations that I may make must necessarily be fragmentary, yet I think they will throw considerable light upon this resolution, and will be found to be altogether in favour of its adoption. Upon page 9, the commissioners, after referring at great length to the quantities of spirits which are manufactured in Canada, covering a number of years, and to the quantity of materials used in the manufacture of liquor, make this pregnant admission:

Deducting from the total of \$2,382,765, the value of the Indian corn, hops and malt imported, the remainder would represent the sum of \$1,596,343, which is a reasonable estimate of the interest of the agricultural classes of the Dominion in the materials made use of annually in, and in connection with, the manufacture of spirituous and malt liquors in Canada.

An argument has always been pressed by those who did not think that a prohibitory liquor law would be beneficial, that in the manufacture of intoxicating liquors, in addition to other interests which are affected, the agricultural interests had a large share, and are in some measure bound up with it. I think this statement will completely dissipate any notions any hon. gentlemen may have had, that the agricultural interests are largely affected by the manufacture of intoxicating liquors in this country. If the sum of about \$1,500,000 represents the interest of the agricultural classes of the Dominion in the manufacture of spirituous and malt liquors used in Canada, then, of course, we can see that the total prohibition of the liquor traffic would have scarcely any perceptible effect upon the interests of the agricultural classes. This is entirely without taking into consideration the disastrous effects which the use of intoxicating liquors have upon such portion of those classes that consume them. The commissioners inform us as to the number of people employed in connection with the manufacturing of spirituous and malt liquors. These figures are interesting and important, because I think the argument to be deduced from them follows largely on the same line. The census returns show that there are employed in connection with distilleries 404 persons, with breweries 1,865, and with malt houses 45. If to those numbers are added the number of people employed in making barrels used in breweries and distilleries, the number being 60, the total number employed is given as 2,374. These figures include office staff, but exclude those engaged in feeding cattle. Consequently we see that, as regards labour, only 2,374 persons in Canada would be directly affected. I am not now al-

luding to incidental labour connected with other phases of the traffic, which will be alluded to later. No one will pretend for an instant to say that of the number of 2,374 persons thus injured, the large majority would not be immediately re-engaged in some other employment more profitable to the community at large, more beneficial to the general interests of the state and not less conducive to their own personal welfare. The commissioners on page 11 sum up the total amount paid for Canadian products of all kinds which they think would be included in the manufacture of spirituous and malt liquors. The total amount is said to be of the value of \$5,039,506. From this is deducted \$1,028,671 for imported materials, leaving \$4,123,500 as the sum paid for wages, fuel, transportation, taxes, and so on. So we have the interest, not of the agricultural class, but the interest of all other classes combined that are connected directly with the manufacture of spirituous and malt liquors in Canada summed up by the majority of the commissioners, who are not favourable to a prohibitory law, as involving \$4,000,000 per annum. No hon. gentleman can seriously argue that the complete loss of this expenditure of money would do any material injury to the people of Canada at large, when he takes into consideration the fact that a large proportion of this amount would be immediately made use of for some other purpose or in some other occupation more beneficial to the general interests. Statistics given in respect to the amount of capital invested in brewing and distilling establishments are as follows:—Capital invested in distilleries, \$7,064,000; breweries, \$8,311,453; malt houses, \$223,500; total, \$15,588,953. This represents a total amount of capital invested in distilleries, breweries and malt houses in Canada, placed at fifteen and a half millions, a large sum taken by itself, but compared with the general industries of the Dominion one of comparative insignificance. Even assuming that the liquor traffic was not admitted to be injurious in almost all its direct and indirect effects, and that it was innocuous, the amount of capital invested, fifteen and a half millions, taken by itself might seem large, and he who would strike down, or those who would legislate its destruction might seem to be striking at an important industry of the state which would materially affect its general prosperity. But let us compare this capital with the capital invested in some other of our trades, and we will see that it is comparatively unimportant. In books and stationery in 1891 the capital invested was \$10,000,000; in vegetable foods alone, over \$31,000,000; in animal foods, nearly \$43,000,000; in furniture, houses and buildings, over \$18,000,000; in leather, boots and shoes, nearly \$19,000,000; in lighting apparatus, gas and electric, \$21,000,000; in machines, tools and implements, nearly \$56,-

000,000; in vegetable preparations, &c., about \$79,000,000; in textile fabrics, over \$43,000,000. Comparing the number of employees and amount of wages connected with the liquor traffic and in these industries I have named, the disproportion in their relative importance seems still as great, if not greater. While the manufacture of spirits and malt liquors requires the employment of 2,374 men, with a capital invested of something over fifteen millions, the number of employees in connection with books and stationery is nearly 10,000, with a wage list of \$3,876,343 per annum; carriages and sleighs, 1,462 hands, with a wage list of \$5,369,946. Chemicals, with only a capital of \$4,000,000, employs 2,845 persons, with a wage list of about \$1,000,000; and so it is with all these various trades with the details of which I will not trouble the House. But we see that the manufacture of liquor, not only as regards its capital but as regards the number of employees and the amount of wages paid, is one of the most insignificant as well as one of the most useless industries in the whole world. Its destruction could not injuriously affect for any long period of time any considerable number of people. The commissioners, on page 35 of their report, afford us some information as to the quantity of spirits and malt used in Canada. These figures have been repeatedly given in discussions in this House, but for the information of those who have not paid special attention to them, and particularly for the information of the constituencies, they will bear repetition. Almost all statisticians, both amateur and professional, agree largely in the correctness of this statement:

Taking an average of the quantities of wine, spirits and malt liquors entered for consumption in the five years ending 1893, but excluding cider and native wines, and taking an average of the retail prices, the calculation shows the sum of \$39,879,854, to be paid for liquor by the consumers. As more than one-half of this amount is paid for spirits to which, it is well understood, a large addition of water is made before they are vended to the public, the total amount paid is probably considerably in excess of the sum just mentioned.

The amount of revenue received by the Dominion Government is also given at \$7,101,557. The commissioners then recapitulate the various items to which they have previously referred, as follows:—

Capital invested in breweries, distilleries and malt houses	\$15,588,953
Value of real estate occupied by vendors of liquors, estimated by the trade to be \$70,000,000, but which is probably nearer	38,000,000
There are in addition, fixtures, &c., estimated by the trade at what seems an excessive valuation, viz.	21,000,000
There is an extensive stock of liquor always on hand in distilleries and elsewhere, and credit to a large extent has to be given to the retail vendor. These conditions probably	

lead to the employment of a large amount additional, temporarily obtained from bankers, of which no estimate has been attempted	
The brewers and distillers disburse, in wages and for material required, payment of municipal taxes, &c., &c., a sum estimated at.....	\$5,039,906
There is paid for imported liquors, including ocean freights, &c.	1,901,897
For federal excise and customs duties, licenses, &c.	7,101,557
For licenses, &c., provincial and municipal	1,353,465
For wages of those engaged in the retail and wholesale trade, a sum estimated at	10,500,000

Commenting upon these figures and upon evidence given by men of intelligence and experience in various walks of life, in regard to the effect of the liquor traffic upon the general welfare; among other observations, the commissioners say:

That many and grievous evils and much wretchedness and misery are caused by over-indulgence in the use of intoxicants, does not admit of controversy. It is impracticable to reach the number of individuals in the community who are guilty of such over-indulgence, and who thereby inflict injury upon themselves and their families, and dissipate means which might and should be applied to worthier objects. Considering, however, the repeated offences committed by those who so offend, the proportion of them to the total population of the Dominion, the undersigned believe to be comparatively small, and probably smaller in Canada than in any other country in regard to which it has been practicable to obtain information.

How much of the crime, poverty, and insanity of the country is to be attributed to the use of intoxicating liquors, cannot be accurately determined from any information accessible to the commissioners.

Here I may remark, that, throughout the commissioners' report, we find the complaint that they are unable to find precise and definite data upon all these various points, and they are obliged, in the absence of these statistics, to rely upon the volunteered testimony of various persons who have studied the question from various stands, point and in their own way. They quote with approval, however, the statements prepared for the United States Census Bureau for 1890, and the statistics of homicide, where they refer to the cause of crime. The commissioners, apparently, approve of this statement, and it is one which with proper modifications might not be disapproved of by the strongest advocate of a prohibitory liquor law. As to the causes of crime, the report of the United States Census Bureau says: Ignorance is a cause of crime; ignorance of a trade is a cause of crime; idleness is a cause of crime; intemperance is a cause of crime. And this report says:

All of these causes, and others which might be named, are in fact only contributory causes whose operation is secondary and indirect. External circumstances facilitate or hinder the commission of crime. They operate as a stimulant

Mr. FLINT.

to the criminal impulse or as a check upon it. But the root of crime is not in circumstance, but in character.

Now, this remark, I think, is open to argument, and I feel that I will be supported by the study and experience of every hon. gentleman who has given this subject thought, when I say that intemperance is not only directly the cause of crime, in itself, but that intemperance is the cause of ignorance; the cause of the ignorance of a trade, and the cause of idleness. In other words, underlying these causes of crime, which are here given as secondary, in every portion of the world where intoxicating liquors are used, and in proportion to the quantity in which they are used, all the secondary causes of crime are brought into operation, and, consequently, if ignorance or idleness is the cause of crime, we should go back of that and find what caused the ignorance, what caused the idleness, what caused the failure of individual character, and what caused the conditions which led to a large amount of crime. I submit it candidly to the House, that the statements of the most profound jurists, and the statements of experienced officials, dealing with the criminal classes, are largely in support of the theory, that, in every civilized country, intemperance is the greatest, the most general and fundamental of all causes of crime. Passing from these phases, with which the commissioners have dealt at considerable length, a large portion of their report is taken up with a review, historic and economic, of the progress of restrictive legislation in the various countries of the world. To follow these would, of course, be entirely out of place here, because they do not lead, superficially, at any rate, to any very definite conclusion. Strong contentions are made in some states that prohibitive and restrictive legislation have been fruitful of benefit, while others have contended, that the laws have been evaded, and that the benefit is more apparent than real. But, I think, a careful and candid study would show, in those states where legislation of the most restrictive character possible within the limits of the jurisdiction of the various states has been had, large majorities of the most thoughtful and best people—those who are generally considered the most devoted to the general welfare—are strongly in favour of supporting this restrictive legislation. The state of Maine is alluded to frequently by some as a flagrant example of the failure of prohibitory legislation, and by others as a shining light to all the world of the grand results of such legislation. At any rate, if the verdict of popular approval is to be taken as any evidence in favour of the adoption of that class of legislation, I think we can see that the people of the state of Maine, who are certainly as intelligent, as well-educated and as public-spirited as the people of any other commonwealth of the same size on this continent, are strongly wedded to the legislation they

have. But, Sir, their legislation is not as complete as this Parliament has the power to enact. Prohibitory legislation in Maine is, in fact, restricted largely by its state character, and largely by the interfering power possessed by the general legislature, which, to a certain degree, hampers the full and efficient operation of the law. At any rate, the traffic there has been driven from publicity; it has been relegated to holes and corners; and the abounding prosperity of the state, by no means blessed with the resources that the Dominion of Canada has, proves that a prohibitory liquor law has by no means injured the general interests of the people. One illustration alone may be given. While the state of Maine, with a population of something under 700,000, if I am not mistaken, has in its savings banks nearly \$60,000,000, the whole Dominion of Canada, with a population of something like 5,000,000, has nothing like as large an amount deposited in its Government savings banks. This taken with other statistics which are easily accessible, proves that, whatever effect a prohibitory liquor law may have, it does not affect the means the people have of securing and storing up wealth.

The conclusion of the commission's report is very weak and very general in its character. They not only do not recommend a prohibitory liquor law, but, so far as I can gather, they recommend very little of anything. They call the attention of the Government to the great lack of precise statistics; they refer to the lack of information accessible to students of this question, and they intimate that they think the claims to compensation on the part of those engaged in the manufacture and the traffic of intoxicating liquors should be considered. Their general remarks simply refer to the necessity of legislation in regard to the treatment of habitual drunkards, and of restrictive arrangements with regard to the licensing of saloons; and they make some moral reflection of a very general nature, but none of which come within the line of duty of this Parliament. Consequently, I think we are forced to conclude, notwithstanding the large amount of evidence accumulated by the commissioners, and the value of the information they have given us, that the conclusions at which they have arrived are very unsatisfactory. At any rate, they recommend nothing that this Parliament can carry out. Their recommendations, if they are worth anything at all, are recommendations to local and provincial parliaments, which must be developed by them within the lines of their jurisdiction. Consequently, so far as this Parliament is concerned, while the facts adduced by the royal commission are of importance as shedding light on this subject, their recommendations are practically that this Parliament should do nothing whatever in connection with the subject.

It is a pleasure, then, to pass from this very vague and inconclusive attempt at settling the question reached by the commissioners, to the strong, well-argued and pointed report of the dissenting commissioner, the Rev. Dr. McLeod. His report is quite lengthy, but it deals clearly and unmistakably with the question of prohibition upon the lines within which this Parliament has power to act. He quotes, on page 530, from Sir Leonard Tilley:

Sir Leonard Tilley, for forty years in public life, a member of the Government of Canada for many years, and for twelve years Governor of the province of New Brunswick, says: "I have been fifty-five years a teetotaler and pretty actively identified with the whole movement, and everybody who has watched it must see the deleterious effects the traffic has, morally, socially, physically, and in every other way upon the people. When we consider the expenditure that takes place for intoxicating beverages, and what should also be considered, the loss of time and other losses indirectly connected with it, the effect upon the human system in weakening and destroying it, and also in the production of crime and poverty, the consideration of the business results is one of secondary importance. For myself, I have never changed my opinion as to the beneficial results that would follow from the prohibition of the importation, manufacture and sale of intoxicating beverages, except to have it strengthened."

No excuse is necessary for introducing the name of that eminent man in this discussion. Sir Leonard Tilley is not only a humanitarian in his feelings, but a practical statesman, and one who has deservedly had great weight in the councils of his country and in the councils of his party; and I think a calm and clear statement from a man of his character must carry great weight with the members of this House and with the people of this country. I quote from another man, eminent in another sphere of life, but one whose words should have great weight with all thinking men. Sir William Dawson says:

My own interest is the most important one to me in Canada. In regard to other interests, I think there are only two that have come under my cognizance which it will be worth saying anything about. One is that to which I have just referred, namely, the interests of the students. I have always felt it my duty, as have other officers of the university, to set an example of total abstinence to students and to do everything possible to prevent them from falling into bad habits in that respect. But we have been greatly hampered by the existence of drinking places within easy reach of the university. That is one point. The other is in regard to pauperism. I have had occasion to institute inquiries in regard to the pauperism of Montreal. I can confidently say that nearly all the want and destitution prevailing in this city is, directly or indirectly, attributable to the liquor traffic.

The dissenting commissioner sums up the loss and the cost to the people of the country at large resulting from the liquor traffic, in a very clear and lucid manner. I will not quote what he says at length, but I

would commend it to all gentlemen who wish to study this question. The cost of the liquors consumed in Canada is estimated at \$39,979,328. He adds to this the other losses—the cost of prisons, the loss of labour, the depreciation of the wage-earning capacity of the wage-earning classes, and the various other items of loss that can reasonably be brought within the scope of the disasters caused to the people by this traffic; following largely the lines of arguments that are frequently made on this subject; and he estimates the total loss to the people of Canada of productive labour at \$76,288,000 per annum, and the total net loss to the country directly and indirectly at \$134,000,000. If the liquor traffic should be abolished, if the habits of the people in this regard could be completely reformed, and capitalized, we would see what an enormous capital wealth there would be placed to the credit of the people of the Dominion, the money expended in this traffic saved and at least—from seventy million dollars to one hundred million dollars per annum, representing an enormous capital, or the interest of an enormous capital, which is now completely dissipated, and worse than dissipated, as far as any benefit to the state is concerned. The dissenting commissioner concludes his views on the subject committed to him by remarks strongly favourable to absolute prohibition, which, I think, will be accepted generally as absolutely correct. The fourth subject of inquiry of the commission was as to the effect which the enacting of a prohibitory liquor law would have in respect of social conditions, agricultural business, industrial, and commercial interests, of the revenue requirements of municipalities, province and Dominion, and also as to the capability of efficient enforcement. He said:

The effect that prohibition would have upon the social conditions of the community, can, to some extent, be inferred from the results that have already been obtained, and from the fact that such prohibition would remove the cause of evils that now exist. The mere "enactment" of a law could not be very effective beyond the educating influence that must be exercised upon the community in reference to evil by the effect of legislation against that evil. Respect for law will also be cultivated by the bringing of law into harmony with right principles.

It is impossible, in face of the facts already set out, to come to any other conclusion than that the effect of prohibition on the social condition of the people would be good, the extent of the benefit conferred by it varying with the thoroughness of the enforcement of the law. * *

The effect that prohibition would have upon agricultural business is not at first sight so clear. The liquor traffic furnishes a market for certain kinds of agricultural produce, and it is frequently assumed that if the traffic were abolished, the agriculturist would suffer. Looking into this, it is seen to be a less serious matter than it is made to appear. * * *

The following results in relation to agricultural business would be likely to accompany agriculture prohibition:—

Mr. FLINT.

1. The first effect would be to impel agriculturists to produce material for export rather than for the domestic manufacture of liquor.

2. The wealth of the country would be increased by the amount of grain accruing from the exportation of this product instead of its destruction.

3. The increased national wealth, being to some extent in the hands of a class of the community now impoverished through intemperance, would be likely to raise the general standard of living, thus leading to an increased home consumption of the finer classes of agricultural produce. This would naturally compel the feeding of this stock upon Canadian produce, which would be a benefit to agricultural interests.

4. If the distilling business were terminated, there would be likely a falling off or a complete stoppage of the importation of foreign grain now used for distilling, and the refuse of which is taken for feeding stock, a large part of which stock finds its way to a foreign market. This would naturally compel the feeding of this stock upon Canadian produce, which would be a benefit to agricultural interests.

5. To the extent to which the agricultural classes are now consumers of intoxicating liquors, that class would be benefited by their savings through the termination of the liquor traffic. Increased sobriety, meaning improved habits, would tell favourably upon agricultural as well as other interests. What benefits the country at large must benefit the farmer.

He deals in the same way with the various industrial interests. He quotes, among others, Mr. George Gooderham, of the firm of Gooderham & Worts, Toronto, whose distillery is the largest in Canada, and who said that his firm employed 150 men. Mr. Gooderham admitted that he did not know of any business in Canada, employing the same amount of capital, and having such an enormous output, which gives employment to so few people.

The effect that prohibition would have, in respect of the revenue requirements of the municipalities, provinces and the Dominion, is an important consideration, though not by any means the most important. He deals with the municipal revenue, the provincial revenue, and the Dominion revenue. And here I may make a remark which is always made, and I think correctly made, with reference to this aspect of the question, namely, that there would be a temporary and immediate loss of a considerable amount of revenue. But if what has been said of the evils and the general character of the evils of intemperance be true, and what can be reasonably argued as to the almost immediate effect of a proper enforcement of a prohibitory liquor law, then we can easily see that the loss of revenue to the Dominion would be rapidly made up. At any rate, you have the authority of many practical men on this point, whose opinions have been previously quoted here. We have the authority of such men as Mr. Gladstone, Sir Stafford Northcote, Sir Alexander Galt, Sir Leonard Tilley, and our present Finance Minister (Mr. Foster), as well as of other publicists and economists

of eminence, all pointing in the same direction, that the loss of revenue will be temporary and trifling, compared with the substantial benefit and the large opportunities for revenue that will be derived from other sources. The dissenting commissioner, of course, from the line that I have briefly quoted, concludes that a prohibitory law would affect all the good results claimed for it by its advocates. The objection that it could not be enforced has been fully disposed of. Those who have faith in the law-abiding character of the people of Canada, those who know that we are not in the habit, in this country, of nullifying laws constitutionally enacted, and who believe that if a prohibitory liquor law were placed on the statute-book, it would receive the support, not only of those who have earnestly and ardently pressed for its adoption, but the support of the vast bulk of the law-abiding community, have faith in the possibility of a practical enforcement of such a law. To believe otherwise, would be to argue that our people are not true to the institutions of their country. We do not believe that. Granted that the legislature, moved by the arguments which have been placed before it by the commission, and from time to time from other sources, should see fit to place, within a reasonable period of time, a judicious and well-considered prohibitory law upon the statute-books, supported, as it must be, by the bulk of the community, we can have no doubt that that law would receive a hearty support. It is, after all, the only logical and adequate remedy. All other laws, beneficial as they may have been in various ways, and viewed from various standpoints, have so far proved ineffectual as a complete remedy for the evils connected with the liquor traffic. Prohibition, then, is the only adequate remedy. And it is in a line completely with our general system of legislation. When we find that certain evils arise which affect adversely the industries of our country, which tend to injure our opportunities for progress, development and advancement, we legislate in such a way as to destroy these influences. And it is along this line we should legislate with regard to the liquor traffic. A prohibitory liquor law would not only be reasonable and in a line with all our principles of legislation, but I believe would be consonant with the general trend of public sentiment. There can be no doubt that the churches, as a rule, are favourable to it. There can be no doubt that their moral and intellectual influence will be strongly cast in its support, there can be no doubt large masses of the community, in various portions of the Dominion, are deeply interested in the passage of legislation of this kind. It is true they are not congregated in any one particular district, but are spread throughout all portions of the Dominion. But they are active and energetic in press-

ing upon the attention of their representatives the vital importance of this question to the welfare of the country. This, Sir, would be a truly remedial measure. We have seen the whole Dominion roused over the question of remedying what may be claimed to be the grievance of a minority in a province. But the grievances of any minority in connection with education are trifling in comparison with the grievances the country as a whole suffers through the liquor traffic, grievances the country is likely to continue to suffer if that traffic is allowed to continue its course unchecked. Let us, then, endeavour to meet the wishes of those who ask for a complete remedy for these great evils, such a complete remedy as would be given by an Act of this Parliament prohibiting the manufacture, importation and sale of intoxicating liquors except for medicinal, sacramental and mechanical purposes. These are purposes that every one recognizes as wise and proper to be conserved. It is only as regards beverage purposes that the advocates of prohibition ask this Parliament to act; and I think that now as Parliament is going before the people, it could not go before them under more glorious auspices than with a resolution such as this, passed not by one party, urged forward not by one party, but by men of all political parties rallying together to show that we wish to remedy this grievance, one of the greatest grievances the country has ever suffered from or is ever likely to suffer from in the future.

Mr. CRAIG. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, the House will not expect me to say anything new upon this question, a question that has been brought before the House session after session for a great many years. I have heard one objection made to this resolution—that the same reason exists for opposing it as existed last year, and that is that the decision of the Privy Council as to the respective rights of the Dominion and the provinces has not yet been given. No doubt that will be, in the minds of some hon. members, an objection. But, whether the resolution is carried or not, I think, perhaps, it may not be amiss that this subject is brought before the House, and, being brought before the House, is thereby brought to the attention of the country as well. Why do I second this resolution, Mr. Speaker? First of all to show where I stand personally. On this question I give no uncertain sound. I do not pretend that I am better than other people because I am a total abstainer; but I am a prohibitionist in my own practice, and I believe that prohibition, if it could be enforced, and if it could be carried in this country, would be a great benefit to the country. And I second this resolution not only to show where I stand personally, but to speak for those who are asking for prohibition. There are some who ask for prohibition who have no votes in the elections for this House,

many of whom have done a great deal of work for this cause. I refer to the temperance women of this country. They have a claim to be heard. While they may feel disappointed that they have not seen prohibition carried into effect, I am sure that they cannot be disappointed when they look around and see the great results of their self-denying labour. I am sure we must all admit that the members of the Women's Christian Temperance Union have done great good in this country. They are earnest, they are self-denying and, though they are subject to a great deal of criticism, yet I am satisfied that those who will consider the results of their efforts must believe that those efforts have been largely blessed.

But, Sir, I speak not only for the women who are working for the cause of temperance but for those women who are suffering from the results of intemperance—women who have drunken husbands, women whose sons have been led away into drinking habits. There are such women all over this country, and they are asking us to-day to pass this resolution, they are asking us to adopt a prohibitory law; they are looking forward eagerly to the time when the temptations of drink will be removed from the paths of their husbands who now spend for the gratification of the passion for drink the money that should go to the support of their families, from the paths of their sons who now cannot go to their employment without being tempted to enter the open door of the saloon. I have said that these women have no votes though there are many people who hold that they should be given votes. But as they have not the power which the vote confers, there is all the more reason that we should give earnest consideration to this question in which they are so vitally interested. While all men are interested in this question the women of this country are far more deeply interested, for, while men may suffer from this evil the women suffer from it far more.

But, Sir, I not only speak for the women who advocate the cause of temperance and the women who suffer from the results of intemperance on the part of husbands and sons, but I speak for the temperance men of this country. I speak for most of the ministers of our churches, men, whom, I am sure, we all respect. I think I may say that I speak for a majority of the bishops and priests of the Roman Catholic Church throughout the Dominion. I was glad to notice that, a short time ago, in the United States, the bishops had taken a strong stand on this question. We know that their labours are constantly put forth to lessen the evils of the great curse of intemperance. I speak not only for the ministers, but I speak for a great many of our best citizens—I may say for the majority of our best citizens. And here let me say that I think great harm has been done by some advocates of temperance who are a little

Mr. CRAIG.

too earnest and go so far as to denounce those who do not see their way to advocate prohibition. I would be the last man to denounce those who do not go as far as I do. There are many men in this country who believe in temperance and practice temperance and yet who do not believe in prohibition. They object to prohibition for various reasons—some of which I hope to refer to before sitting down—and I think it is a great mistake for advocates of prohibition to denounce these men and to say they are not friends of the temperance cause. I myself have seen cases in which the cause of temperance has been retarded by the denunciations indulged by some of those whom I call extremists on this question.

I have spoken of those who favour this proposed law, let me for a moment or two refer to those who object to it. I take first those who are connected with the business. We are not surprised that these men should object to prohibition: it is only natural that they should object, for they are making their living, some of them are making fortunes out of this business. They say that this is a legitimate business. So it is. While I may say that it is a business that works great evil, they do not look at that side of the case. They say: This is a legitimate business and we object to Parliament interfering with it.

Then, I think, perhaps, there is some natural objection on the part of governments. We find that the Dominion Government derives a large revenue from this business, and they naturally object to prohibition because it would take this revenue from them. I suppose any government would take that view, no matter what side of politics would be in power. This is not a party question in this country, and we find that governments always look at it in that light, and are averse to enacting prohibitory laws because they would deprive them of a large amount of revenue. We find that not only does the Dominion Government derive a large revenue from the business, but we find that provincial governments derive a large revenue from it, and we find also that municipalities also derive large revenues. Therefore, we find that there is a large money influence opposed to the cause of prohibition. But, Sir, there are others who oppose it because they have no sympathy at all with temperance. I am glad to think there are not many men of that kind in this country to-day. I am very glad to say that the temperance cause has made great strides, and while we might have found thirty or forty years ago a great many who would say distinctly that they had no sympathy with temperance, to-day there are not many who would say so. But there are some to-day who oppose this proposition, and oppose it very firmly, who have sympathy with the temperance cause, and have sympathy, I may say, with prohibition, but they object to it for various reason. There are some

who say there is no necessity for a prohibitory law, that temperance sentiment has advanced and is advancing rapidly, and that instead of a prohibitory law helping this sentiment and helping the temperance cause, it would tend to retard it, and throw it back. Well, Sir, I have no doubt these men are sincere, but I think they are mistaken. They say that the temperance cause has rapidly advanced, and so it has; but I would ask these men: why has the temperance cause advanced so rapidly in the last twenty or thirty years? I say it is just because of the efforts of those men and women who to-day are asking for prohibition. It is these men and women who have brought about this great increase in the temperance sentiment in the country; and now they say: we have got to the point where we think the country is ready for prohibition. Well, Sir, there are many who do not agree with them, who think that we must continue, as in the past, to work for temperance, to advocate temperance, trusting all the time to moral suasion. Then there are some who object to a prohibitory law on the ground that it is an interference with individual liberty, that it would be trespassing on the rights of the individual for the state to say that a man must not drink certain articles, or that he must not sell them. Well, all I can say is this, that in this matter the state has already interfered. The state does control the liquor business to-day. The state does not allow the liquor business to be carried on the same as the grocery business, or the same as the dry goods business, or the same as any other kind of business in the country. We say the liquor business shall be carried on only in certain hours, under certain restrictions. We do restrict it in many ways, and we believe we have a perfect right to control it. So I think that argument is taken out of the way altogether. And not only does the state control the liquor business in many ways, but in a great many other things the state restricts individual liberty when this restriction is for the good of the community; so I think these precedents take away this argument altogether. But, Sir, others object because of the loss of revenue. Well, I have no doubt there would be a loss of revenue, that has been admitted already by the mover of this resolution. There would be a loss of revenue, I do not know exactly what amount, but I think about \$7,000,000. We have to look that in the face, that must be considered; and I would just say to all those in this country who are advocating prohibition, that they cannot get rid of this difficulty, they cannot throw it lightly aside and say: oh, it will be made up; but they must consider this question, and they must be willing that it should be considered. True, it has been said by men eminent in the financial affairs of this country, by Sir Leonard Tilley, and I believe by the present

Finance Minister, at one time, that this loss of revenue would be made up if a prohibitory law was put on the statute-book. However, there is no doubt that this question must be considered. It is an objection made by opponents of a prohibitory law, an objection that I would not at all minimize. To me it is one of the great objections. It cannot be taken out of the way by merely casting it aside. It must be considered carefully, and it would be well for those of us who advocate prohibition, to try and show in what practical way this loss of revenue could be made up. But there is another objection urged, and that is that the time has not yet come. Now, Sir, this is an argument that will always be urged; this is an argument that, I suppose, can hardly be met in any way by logic, because it can constantly be said that the time has not come. Well, I would ask, When will the time come? It has been said by some that the time will come when the people of this country send men here who are prepared to vote for a prohibitory law. I suppose the time will come then, and I suppose that the time will not have come until the people in this country make up their minds to send men to Parliament who are in favour of prohibition, until they elect representatives to come here pledged to support prohibition. But until that time, whether the country is ready or not, a prohibitory law will not be placed on the statute-book. But, Sir, there is another difficulty urged, and that is that prohibition could not be enforced. Well, I admit there would be a great difficulty in enforcing this law. I admit it would be more difficult to enforce this law than it is to enforce a great many laws. Now, I think the reason is this: we know that if a prohibitory law was passed, making it a crime to sell liquor, and, I suppose, a crime to drink liquor, a great many people would not think it was a crime at all, except in a legal sense. They would think it was perfectly right, if they could get it without being detected. Now, we all agree that stealing is a crime, there is no difference of opinion about that; but all in this country would not agree that drinking liquor, or even selling liquor, was a crime, even though a prohibitory law was placed on the statute-book. A great many men would look on it as tyranny, and it would be a very difficult thing, as has been found under the Scott Act, to find witnesses to prove the crime, and to enforce the law. There is no doubt that it would be difficult, but, at the same time, I believe there would be an immense improvement. It is not argued by those who argue in favour of prohibition that a prohibitory law would entirely stop the traffic. That is not argued, but it is argued that it would stop it in a great degree. I have heard it said that it would put a stop to at least three-fourths of the drinking in this country. If that result were brought about, I think a prohibitory

law would amply repay its passage. If three-fourths of the drinking were done away with in this country by the passage of such a law, then I would be prepared to advocate that law, even although it was difficult to enforce. These are some of the principal objections raised by those who are opposed to the passage of a prohibitory law. Now, why do we advocate a prohibitory law—those of us who are in its favour? I intend to give a few of the reasons. The first reason is this: because we consider that the use of intoxicating liquors is one of the greatest evils of the country, and a great injury to the state. Now, I think that is a proposition that will not be disputed by anybody, even by those who are opposed to prohibition. I think all members of this House will agree that intoxicating liquor is a great curse to this country. I know there are persons who drink moderately, and that many such men say that the liquor does not hurt them at all. But when we look out abroad in this country and see the great evil done by the improper use of intoxicating liquors, when we see that many men are ruined by it, we must all admit that it is a great evil. We cannot deny that it causes a great deal of suffering. I have already referred to women suffering from drunken husbands and sons. That is a matter which appeals to our sympathy—the suffering being caused entirely by intoxicating liquors. Its use is not only the cause of a great deal of suffering, but of a great deal of poverty. The charitable institutions in our cities and towns are called into requisition in a large measure by the use of intoxicating drink, and I am satisfied most of the families that require to be assisted through the winter are brought into that condition by its use. But not only does it cause a great deal of poverty, but it causes a great deal of crime. It is said that 60 per cent of the crime in this country and in all countries is attributable to the use of intoxicating liquors. If by prohibition we could reduce crime by 60 per cent it would amply repay all the inconvenience and loss of revenue that might arise from the enactment of such a measure. Not only does intoxicating liquor cause a great deal of crime, but it also causes a great many accidents. We often find, in perusing the newspapers, that accidents are caused by some man holding a responsible position indulging in drink, and being incapable of performing his duties. Not only for the reasons I have given do I support a prohibitory law, but I hold that intoxicating liquor is a great waste. Not only is it a waste of food, which all admit, because the grain used in making the liquor is not only wasted but absolutely worse than wasted, but there is a great waste of labour in its manufacture. Not only so, but some of the brightest men, who would prove of great service to the country, are ruined by indulging in intoxicating drink. So the

Mr. CRAIG.

use of intoxicating liquor involves great waste of men, of food and of labour.

We do not expect that a prohibitory law would put a stop entirely to the use of intoxicating liquor, but I claim that such a law would remove the temptation from our young men and our boys. I am not so severe on the men engaged in the business as are some other people, because no doubt there are many respectable tavern and hotelkeepers throughout the country; but there are some hotelkeepers, I must say, who abuse the trust reposed in them, who sell liquor to boys, to men already drunk, to men whom they know are spending the last cent they have for the support of their families. I am glad to say that all the hotelkeepers are not men of that kind, but such conduct affords one of the strongest arguments, to my mind, in favour of prohibition. For such men I have no sympathy, they are a curse to a community, and hotelkeepers who sell liquor to boys in their teens are unworthy of any consideration whatever. But I want the temptation removed from our young men. I think it quite possible if a prohibitory law were passed and enforced, we could have a generation growing up in this country that would not be accustomed to strong drink, and from what we know of the subject, and from the teachings of scientific men, the country would be supplied with as many able and capable men as it is to-day, for we are now satisfied that there is no necessity in order to build up a man that he should indulge in this liquor. The treating habit is one of the greatest curses of this country. It is not so bad, perhaps, for a moderate drinker who wishes to take a drink, to go and have a drink alone, but it does seem astonishing that a man should want to take with him half a dozen others, and should even seek to induce men to drink who would not otherwise do so. I reprobate that system most thoroughly, and while it might seem selfish for a man to go and take a drink by himself, if he wants a drink, let him go and do so. The treating habit is undoubtedly one of the greatest sources of intemperance in this country.

I have gone hurriedly over some of the difficulties in connection with this question, and some of the reasons why I advocate prohibition, but I admit that the question is a most difficult one to deal with. I do not think it is one that can be dealt with off-hand. It has been talked over and considered for many years, and a royal commission has been appointed and reported: I do not know whether all the members have read the report of the commission, but I must confess I have not yet found time to go all through it, although, no doubt, there is a great deal of information in it as to the working of prohibitory laws in other countries, and as to the advantages of those laws, and as to their defects. But we must admit, and I admit it frankly, that this

question of a prohibitory law is a most difficult one for any parliament to deal with. I claim that a prohibitory law must have a great majority behind it, not only of those who vote, but of all who have votes in this country. It was a great weakness in the Scott Act that it required for its adoption only a majority of the votes cast. It would have been far better if it had required a majority of the votes of all those entitled to vote, because in some cases very little interest was taken in the elections, and the majority of the votes was not represented. The law must have a great majority behind it to be effective. It is no use placing such a law on the statute-book by a bare majority—in fact, I would be opposed to it. While I am in favour of prohibition, I do not want a law placed on the statute-book unless there is a great majority in favour of it. It is claimed by those who have studied the question, that the great majority of the people are in favour of such a law. The only way to show it is for the people to send representatives here to vote for such a measure. Some of those who are earnest in advocating the adoption of a prohibitory law entertain the idea that it is a simple matter, that all there is to be done is to pass a law containing a few clauses, stating that intoxicating liquor shall not be sold or manufactured. But, instead of such being the case, it is a most difficult question, and the framing of a law is a most difficult matter. People have this idea, because, perhaps, they have not considered the question, and not considered the difficulties. There is one question which must be considered in framing a measure of this kind, and that is the enforcement of the law. Some of those who want the law forget this altogether; they think the law would enforce itself; they say that all to be done is to put the measure on the statute-book and it will enforce itself. I do not agree with that view. There would have to be arrangements for enforcing the law, or it would be a perfect farce. It may be said that the provinces would enforce the law. But if the provinces did not, where would the prohibitory law be? Then it would be altogether ineffective, and would become the laughing-stock of the community. So, in framing such a law in this Parliament, we must make some provision for the enforcement of the law, and that is a subject that would require a great deal of consideration. Then Sir, another question which will have to be considered, is the time at which this law should come into force. Some believe that this law should come into force immediately after it has passed; some think it should come into force three years after its passage, and some believe that it should not come into force until five years after. All these contentions would have to be carefully considered, I have no opinion to offer upon that point, but when the law is before

the House, no doubt we will have a thorough consideration of that question. But, Sir, there is one question which I have considered a little, and that is the question of compensation. I know that some advocates of prohibition utterly scout the idea of compensation. Well, I must say, I do not agree with them. I have said in this House before, and I repeat again—because I do not wish to be misunderstood, and I do not wish to claim credit for any opinion I do not entertain—I believe that there should be compensation. How it is to be done, I do not know, but I lay it down as my opinion that a prohibitory law will never be carried in this Parliament unless the principle of compensation is embodied in that law. I believe that it should be a fair compensation. I believe that these men who are engaged in this manufacture, are engaged in a legitimate business. They are engaged in a business from which the state derives considerable revenue. They have their capital invested and locked up in plant, and buildings, and other things connected with the trade, and I hold it would be a most unfair thing to wipe out their capital entirely, for the good of the country, for the great good of the country as we claim, without our being willing to pay something for it. I am reminded just now of what was done in Great Britain when slavery was abolished in the West Indies. Compensation was given to the slave owners, although a great many of course would not think that was right. As we all believe, and as is universally believed now, slavery was entirely wrong, but yet, compensation was given to the slave owners for the loss they sustained by the passage of the Anti-Slavery law. So, Sir, if the time ever does come, and I hope it will come, when a prohibitory law shall be passed in this Parliament, I for one shall advocate compensation, and I think the general sense of the community when they examine into the question, will decide that compensation should be given to those engaged in this business. Of course, how far that would go will be a matter for consideration, but I am merely laying down the general principle. There is another point which must be considered in framing this law. The resolution excepts the use of liquor for medicinal, mechanical and sacramental purposes. Now, Sir, as the mover of this resolution (Mr. Flint) has said, we all agree that these exceptions should be made, but at the same time, these exceptions would have to be carefully safeguarded in any prohibitory law. If they were not carefully safeguarded, the question of manufacture might be left quite open. A great deal of liquor might be disposed of under the head of medicinal and mechanical purposes, if precautions were not taken to prevent it. My object, Sir, is to show all those who are in earnest in advocating a prohibitory law, that it is not a simple matter. It is not merely necessary to draft a law, saying that this traffic shall be prohibited, to

cause the whole matter to be accomplished by writing out a few clauses ; but there are a great many things to be considered in drawing this Bill. There are a great many questions to be considered with regard to its enforcement, and with regard to the exceptions that would have to be made.

Let me say in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, that I would like to see prohibition brought about. I believe it would be of great benefit to this country, but, Sir, I want to see it done intelligently. I want people to do it with their eyes open. I want it to be done with a proper guarantee that it will be enforced. I want it to be done with a due consideration of all the objections that are urged against it. I hold that it would be a great evil, and that it would retard the progress of the temperance cause for many years, if a prohibitory law were passed in one Parliament and repealed in the next. In order to prevent that, I wish that careful consideration should be given to this matter. As I said before, it should be done intelligently, and above all, it should be done with a great majority of the people behind it. If it is done in that way, and if the Bill is drawn carefully, and with a due regard to these considerations, then, Sir, it will be a success. I hope to see the day when such a prohibitory law will pass this Parliament ; but unless it is such a law as I have indicated, I am not anxious to have a prohibitory law at all.

Mr. CHARLTON. I desire to say a few words, Sir, upon this question which has been so ably presented by the mover (Mr. Flint) and by the seconder (Mr. Craig). This is a question of very great importance ; one that should engage the earnest attention of this House, but one, I fear, that does not engage the attention of the House to the extent it ought to do. We know that the question has received wide and serious consideration in the country, and that the mind of the public is alive to the importance of the prohibition of the traffic in intoxicating liquors. When the ideal society of the future exists, we shall no doubt have a society where intemperance and immorality will be unknown, and it is the duty of this House to provide laws which will conduce to the welfare of the inhabitants of the country. No evil exists in Canada or in the civilized world of the magnitude of this evil of intemperance ; no evil does so much to sap the foundations of society, and to render men miserable ; no evil does so much to promote vice as the evil of intemperance. The question, it is said, is hedged and surrounded by difficulties. It is true that no question of public policy is of such transcendent importance as the one which the House is considering at this moment. It is said that difficulty exists with regard to the loss that would be inflicted upon the revenue of the country by the abolition of this traffic. It is true that such a loss would be inflicted upon the

Mr. CRAIG.

revenue, but, Sir, it is a matter well known to statisticians, that over forty millions—probably fifty millions—of the money of the people of Canada is annually squandered in intoxicating liquors. Surely, if a large proportion of the entire amount of this sum can be saved to the country, it will be an easy matter to provide for the loss of revenue that would be entailed by the operation of a prohibitory liquor law.

A still more serious consideration is the fact, that from three to five thousand men annually go down to drunkards' graves in this Dominion, and that is a matter of infinitely more importance than the loss of revenue. The seconder of this motion (Mr. Craig) tells the House that we want to proceed in the matter slowly. I suppose that he fully realizes the difficulties that would surround the framing, the passing, and the enforcing of a law of this kind. We certainly have proceeded slowly thus far. The Government understand perfectly well the policy of going slowly. When the discussion of this question of prohibition had reached a stage in this House, where it was necessary for the Government to say "yea" or "nay," when it was necessary for the Government to take some definite action, what was the course that my hon. friend the Minister of Finance, and his colleagues took ? It was to refer the question to a commission, a dilatory motion, a motion for the purpose of securing delay. Month after month and year after year passed, while we waited for the report of that commission—a report that is perfectly useless, a report that had no bearing on the question the people will be called upon to decide. No man requires a commission to inform him whether whisky is an evil or not, whether the consequences entailed upon the people of the country by this vice, are evil or not. It does not require a commission to inform the country whether or not it is desirable to put an end to the ravages of this monster. But we had the commission, and the commission has reported. It has reported just in time to save the Government the necessity of taking definite action on this question. The seconder of this motion tells us that we want to go slowly. He tells us that he is in favour of compensation—that will be one of the aspects of the question to be considered. He is in favour of very careful provisions. He is in favour of having everything done intelligently. He is in favour of a law backed up by the great majority of the people. He is right in all these positions except the one with regard to compensation, which is open to debate. Now, what is the position at the present moment of the two great parties in this country in regard to this question ? It is admitted that we cannot have legislation this session. My hon. friend, who is a supporter of the Government, realizes fully that we must proceed slowly in this matter. We all

recognize the great evil which this legislation seeks to cope with. How is it to be met? What party in this country is to be entrusted with the task? What may we reasonably expect from the party now in power, if they are elected to fill the Treasury benches again—the party who gave us the royal commission? They have staved off action on the question time and again. The party who are represented on the Treasury benches by a former advocate of prohibition, who has now not a word to say, who is completely dumb on the question? We have nothing to expect from the party at present in power on the line of prohibition, if they are returned to power again. What is the position of the other great party on the question? That party is pledged, not to grant a prohibitory law, but to submit the question of granting a prohibitory law to the people of this country. They are pledged to ascertain, in the first place, whether the majority of the people of Canada are in favour of such a law or not—a perfectly proper course to take; an indispensable course to take, if we hope to pass a law which will be effectively enforced. Let the people of this country judge of this matter on its own merits, isolated from every other political issue. Let them take into consideration the question of compensation, the question of the loss of revenue, and all the other difficulties that surround it; let them know all the consequences of a prohibitory law; and then they will be able to decide on the matter intelligently. If they then decide in favour of a prohibitory law, we shall have a majority of the people standing back of the law, and that will secure its enforcement. Until we ascertain whether a majority of the people are in favour of such a law or not, we shall be proceeding, if we do proceed to legislation, in advance of the steps we ought to take. So far as I am concerned, I will vote in favour of this resolution. I will vote for prohibition at any time. I am in favour of prohibition. But I take this view of the case, that we want to proceed cautiously and intelligently. We want to lay the foundations securely; we want to ascertain whether public sentiment backs us or not; and, when we find that public sentiment does back us, then let us proceed according to the mandate of that public sentiment and pass a law which the Government will be justified in enforcing. This resolution calls for an expression of the opinion of this House. As a member of this House, I am ready to express my opinion. My opinion is, that the liquor traffic is a great evil. My opinion is, that prohibition should be enacted by this House. It cannot be done this session, I suppose. If the Government introduce a prohibitory law, I will vote for it; but I do not expect they will ask us to vote one way or the other. It is my opinion that such a law should be passed. It is my opinion that such a law will one day be passed, and passed by a party that will deal honestly with this question,

and not as the party now in power have done. If the electors place in power at the coming elections the party who are pledged to submit to the people for their mandate the question whether a prohibitory law should be passed or not, then the question will be in the hands of the people, and, if they decide that a prohibitory law should be passed, then it will be placed on the statute-book. I repeat, that I will vote for this resolution, and I will vote for prohibition, whenever it is submitted; but I reserve the right to my opinion as to the best course to take to secure a law that will be supported by the people and will be effective.

Mr. LACHAPPELLE. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, it has been said every time the question under discussion was brought up before this House—and, if my memory serves me, I think this is the fourth time it is brought up before Parliament—it has been said that the people of the province of Quebec were hostile to prohibition. I am not here to-day to speak on behalf of the province of Quebec, and if I rise now, it is only to give my own personal opinion on the question, an opinion which agrees presumably with that of the province of Quebec. No doubt, Mr. Speaker, everybody admits the alarming increase within the last few years of the evils of which the drink habit is the cause. No doubt we all look upon intemperance as the greatest scourge that ever desolated humanity. It is a very serious evil and it is our duty to do everything in our power to check the ravages caused by that plague. We all grant that, and we all desire to take the necessary means to abate the existing evil, and to apply a remedy to so serious an evil. The only thing is that we are not agreed as to the means to be adopted. Thus, on the one hand we see hon. gentlemen, who, like the hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint), brings down for the third time, I think, a motion which tends to have enacted by the House a complete prohibition of the drink-traffic, as a means of uprooting the evils caused by drunkenness, or to prevent the excessive use of alcoholic liquors. Such is the remedy the hon. gentleman proposes for our adoption. On the other hand, we see a great many citizens, philanthropists and legislators who hold quite a contrary opinion, and declare that prohibition cannot be the most efficacious remedy against the terrible evil of alcoholism. No doubt, Sir, there is, on both sides, the same sincerity and the same desire to find out a solution for this social problem, the most important problem which has ever required the attention of well-meaning men, a problem which takes the precedence over all other questions. All those who have at heart social reform, have given this question their most serious consideration. Such is, to my mind, the best way of explaining the differences of opinion mentioned. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, it can hardly be expected that this House will be

a unit on the question now under discussion. It is not to be wondered at, Sir, if some hon. gentlemen are not ready to agree that prohibition is the most radical and the best remedy for the evils of alcoholism. I am going to undertake, Sir, to give the different grounds of my hostility to prohibition as a remedy for the evils of drunkenness, and I know that my views on the matter are shared by a large number of citizens. And in order the better to define my position, I purpose to take as exhaustive a view as possible of alcoholism. Alcoholism, it must be remembered, is a disease of quite modern growth, and till the year 1850, it was practically unknown, in the modern acceptation of the word. Alcoholic liquors were then largely used and the indulgence in those liquors was not looked upon as physically injurious, and was even considered as somewhat conducive to human health, so much so that a celebrated school of philosophers, that of Salerno, taught as one of its maxims that it was good for the health to get tipsy once a month. It is idle to say, Sir, that such a doctrine would not, nowadays find many supporters, and that another school might also say that the rule laid down by the school of Salerno is rather stringent.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. (Translation.) What is your opinion, as a medical man?

Mr. LACHAPELLE. (Translation.) I will give you my opinion later on. Till 1850, Mr. Speaker, alcoholism was not looked upon as a danger; the use of intoxicants was not really considered as injurious to public health, because the drink habits had not yet given rise to all the evils, the effects of which are now visible, and because people did not believe that inebriety could produce as pernicious results as those which are now on record. This is accounted for by the fact that the spirituous liquors which were then drunk and retailed consisted of pure alcohol or spirit of wine. Alcohol was then made from wine or manufactured from grapes and other fruits. Whence arise then all the evils which are now on record? They are to be traced back to the change brought about by the manufacture of alcohol. Alcohol of wine is almost fallen into disuse, and there has been substituted for it a chemical product which constitutes a deadly poison. To that cause then, Sir, must be traced back the evils complained of and the very existence of alcoholism, which is the greatest scourge of the community. Those chemical compounds are the main source of all the evils, the visible effects of which are everywhere multiplying themselves and increasing in intensity. One finds on sale now all kinds of strong drinks. They manufacture now quite a variety of alcoholic drinks, which go by the name of alcohol for mechanical purposes. This trade alcohol is not only made use of for beverage purposes; it is also entering into the arts and manufactures and is used as beverages on a

Mr. LACHAPELLE.

footing of equality with pure alcohol, made from fruit. This trade alcohol enters into the manufacture of a variety of drinks, which constitute the common beverage alcohol of commerce. What difference is there, Sir, between this common commercial alcohol and alcohol made from fruit? The difference lies in the fact that the former is highly intoxicant, and constitutes a deadly poison. From practical observation, the effects of commercial alcohol are beyond all comparison more active than those of alcohol of wine. Such is the physiological experience acquired in laboratories, and which medical men avail themselves of in the treatment of that disease. What does experience teach us in that respect? Experience teaches us beyond all doubt that the various trade alcohols are highly intoxicant. Repeated experiments leave no room for doubt on that score. Experiments have been made upon animals, which no longer leave any room for doubt as to whether those alcohols are dangerous or not, and it has been ascertained they are extremely so. Scientists have selected to experiment upon the pig, an animal, it must be confessed, which bears a close resemblance to man. They have intoxicated that animal and ascertained the effects produced upon it by the trade alcohols in question, which are so injurious to human health. They might likewise have experimented upon a frog, a mouse, a rabbit, a hare, but they selected the animal in question on various grounds which it would be idle to mention here, and have ascertained the effects produced by small doses of alcohol injected into its stomach. A very small dose having provoked alcoholic exhilaration in a marked degree; a larger dose brought about the stage of somnolency, habitual enough to that animal, and a stronger dose brought about convulsions, till death took place. From experimental observation, medical men have, therefore, gathered evidence to the effect that the alcohols in question were highly intoxicant. Experiments made with pure alcohol might give somewhat similar results, but the necessary quantity to bring about the same result would be, if I may use a mathematical expression, in the ratio of six to a hundred; that is to say, if six grams of trade alcohol were sufficient to provoke convulsions, it would require one hundred grams of pure alcohol to produce a similar effect. Observation has brought out the conclusion that those products of the laboratory, called trade alcohols were entering into the manufacture of the most part of liquors and were the cause from which sprang that disease, unknown till 1850, which goes now under the name of alcoholism. Inebriety was well known, and when a man drank excessively, it happened, then as now, that he fell into a state of intoxication of more or less intensity and duration. But inebriety, unless it were excessive, hardly left any traces; whilst now, although inebriety be just as

common as formerly, still the prevailing form of disease is chronic alcoholism, which is quite different from inebriety, and is attendant upon an irresistible and insatiable thirst for alcoholic drinks. Such is the disease known as alcoholism; as I said, the indulgence in those adulterated substances, those trade alcohols, which enter into mostly all the beverages, result in the disease known as chronic alcoholism. To those alcohols are chiefly due the evils which the mover and seconder of this motion have denounced on such good grounds. But, in my opinion, it is not so much acute as chronic inebriety which is to be dreaded. Now, from these preliminary notions, certain conclusions may be drawn, so as to allow the legislator to suggest some useful reform. Alcoholism, as clearly shown, resulting from the use of commercial alcohols, which are highly intoxicant, the reform should consist in levying a heavy tax on those chemical products. In my opinion, such a reform is highly desirable and quite practicable, inasmuch as it would prevent those commercial alcohols from entering into the manufacture of liquors, for beverage purposes. Those commercial alcohols are obtained entirely from vegetable substances, from fruit, and their intoxicant properties are so much the more deleterious as the raw material from which they are obtained are less assimilable. For instance, wood spirits or methylic alcohol, which is produced in the distillation of wood, has intoxicant properties a hundred times more powerful than those of ethylic or common alcohol. Now, medical men, conversant with all the phases of the question, have come to the conclusion that the disease known as alcoholism results from chemical products, and that it was unknown, when pure alcohol was retailed. To prevent those manufactured alcohols from being sold to the consumer, is the only radical means of uprooting the evil. It is on such statistics that we rely to say that there is a remedy to be found for this evil, outside of prohibition, and we ask the prohibitionists whether, in their opinion, to prohibit the use of these manufactured alcohols for beverage purposes is not a more efficacious remedy than the prohibition of all liquors, which has been attempted in several places and finally dropped. I am not perfectly conversant with the matter, Sir, but I know that in a number of cases, total prohibition was put into operation. I know several municipalities in the province of Quebec where they tried that system, and where they refused to grant licenses for taverns. They resorted to such a radical proceeding for the purpose of uprooting the evil of intemperance. No good has resulted from it. In all the municipalities where this attempt at coercion was resorted to, the results show that the closing of taverns was no remedy for the evil of intemperance; for, in all those localities, drunkenness has been on

the increase. Therefore, they soon came back to the licensing system. I am in favour of placing the saloons under more stringent regulations. Such, in my opinion, is the object we should have in view in enacting a law. The hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint) spoke repeatedly of social reform. I have looked over all the speeches of the hon. gentleman on the question, and I could not help coming to the conclusion that all the reasons alleged this session by the hon. gentleman carry no more weight with them than they did previously. The hon. gentleman will allow me to ask him whether he agrees with his leader on this question? I do not know whether he is in accord with his leader, but I am rather disinclined to think that the hon. the leader of the Opposition is ready to endorse the opinion of the hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint). At all events, granting these gentlemen agree, would the hon. member for Yarmouth be warranted in coming before this House with a plan of reform as important, as radical as the one he now proposes, without at the same time offering a practical means of putting that reform into operation; because, Sir, in my opinion, it would be extremely difficult to enforce such a reform. Is it the policy advocated by the hon. gentlemen opposite that is going to make up for the loss of revenue which the Government derive from that source? Or are we to look up to a reciprocity treaty with the United States, or to free trade as they have it in England, to find an adequate source of revenue as a substitute for the considerable amount of revenue derived from the duties on spirituous liquors? This question should not come before the House, unless accompanied with the indispensable means of providing a revenue to make up for the considerable loss that might arise, from the carrying out of that reform, which everybody, at any rate, would like to see enforced. What does the motion of the hon. member for Yarmouth propose? It reads as follows:—

That, in the opinion of this House, the manufacture, importation and sale of intoxicating liquors, except for medicinal, sacramental and mechanical purposes, should be prohibited by law.

It strikes me, as it must also strike the House, that the words used by the hon. gentleman, cover an immense ground. Keeping in view the few remarks I made in connection with the manufacture and composition of the various alcohols, it should be taken for granted, Sir, that they are necessary, to a large extent to arts and manufactures, and should be absolutely and entirely reserved for the same. With this understanding, the motion of the hon. member for Yarmouth is quite right and proper, so far as that provision in connection with the arts and manufactures is concerned. Let the trade spirits be exclusively applied to mechanical purposes; that is the construc-

tion I would put on the hon. gentleman's motion. I do not wish to suspect for one instant his sincerity. He is, no doubt, actuated by the best motives ; there is, however, one circumstance which should preclude him from presenting his motion now. He should not forget that it has not been determined yet whether Parliament had any power to legislate on this point. The question is still sub judice. I think it would have been more judicious on his part to wait till the courts have determined whether the Dominion Parliament is invested with the power of a liquor law, or whether that power belongs to the provincial legislatures. The hon. gentleman would do well to postpone his motion, till that point is settled by the courts. I think it is necessary to work out a reform, and to provide a remedy for the evil of intemperance, such a remedy, however, in my opinion, should consist in applying stringent regulations to the liquor traffic. They could do here like in France, where they encourage the necessary use of the light wines and beer, making them duty free, and levying, on the contrary, as heavy a tax as possible on the spirits which are essentially injurious to public health, to the family and to the society.

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

After Recess.

Mr. LACHAPELLE. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, with your long parliamentary experience, I am sure it did not escape your notice at six o'clock, that I had somewhat hastened to bring to a conclusion the remarks I had to offer the House on the motion now before us. I intend now to resume the consideration of the same point. It follows from what I have said so far that prohibition is not the best step leading the way out of the difficulty which confronts us. I have shown that alcoholism is a disease which results from the indulgence in adulterated spirits in over-proof alcohol, manufactured for mechanical purposes, and the peculiar propriety of which is to reach the boiling point at a temperature somewhat higher than that of spirit of wine. The disease known as alcoholism is but the result of those artificial spirits, and was unknown when they did not yet exist. Complaints are heard to-day of the bad effects of the sophisticated spirits in common use. That also explains the fact that the prohibition movement dates back from the last quarter of a century. That agitation originated in the over-indulgence in the use of those liquors. And it is well known, Sir, how noxious those excesses prove to public health, especially over-indulgence in modern drinks. Now, Sir, are those effects sufficient to justify the temperance movement which is seen almost everywhere, and which is brought before Parliament through the ac-

Mr. LACHAPELLE.

tion of the hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint) ? That movement is an attempt at interfering with individual liberty. Is that logical ? No, Sir, and I can draw no other inference than this, and I invite the attention of the House to it. I desire to show that all the evils complained of are to be attributed to the use of adulterated spirits which alone are the cause of all the bad effects noticeable on public health, and which we are trying to remedy. Adulterated intoxicants being the cause, they ought to disappear. Such is the logical inference. But I do not see in that fact a reason why you should pass a measure which constitutes an attempt on individual liberty. Such was the position taken by mostly all the countries which have dealt with the question, and among others, France, which has just placed on her statute-book a legislation on the lines I have just described to the House, before recess. In France, people said : we must do away with commercial alcohol which is essentially noxious to the health. They levied a taxation on those spirits, to an alarming degree for the manufacturers, who turn out this product, but also in a way altogether beneficial to the population ; they then took off all taxation on the milder beverages, wine and beer, the use of which is encouraged as conducive to public health and as free from danger. Such is the course they followed to work out a most important reform. Such are the means they resorted to in order to check intemperance and inebriety ; for, it is the abuse which must be attacked, done away with, uprooted. Now, the legislation to which I have invited the attention of the House is the best remedy that can be adopted. Under that law, the object arrived at will be reached, and I think it could be also beneficially put into operation elsewhere. They ought to take the means of preventing the manufacture of adulterated spirits, the use of which offers so many dangers to public health ; and experience shows that those are the intoxicants which are most in use. But it is quite otherwise with spirits of wine which may be conducive to health. I may be told that it is very strange that a medical man should not feel bound to take a more decided attitude against an abuse which, according to everybody, is physically injurious. Let me be well understood, when I say that pure alcohol is not noxious to health. I shall go still further and say that a certain dose of alcohol is compatible with health, and even hygienic, and when you go beyond the prescribed limits, there begins the abuse and the bad effects resulting from it. Of course, it is impossible for me to determine the hygienic dose, as it may vary with each individual ; but I say that a dose of pure alcohol is quite compatible with health, and abuse begins only where you exceed the prescribed limits. Then the bad effects make themselves felt on the human organ-

ism in such a distressing manner as to draw the sympathy of well-meaning persons who resolve to make the study of inebriety their own work, in order to do away with the abuses. We all know that under the influence of outbreaks of intemperate drinking, a real disease appears, which is called alcoholism and is physically and morally injurious. Therefore, Sir, it is over-indulgence and not simply the abuse of alcohol which leads to bad results. I deem it my duty here to draw particularly the attention of the Government to the necessity of controlling the manufacture and sale of adulterated intoxicants. I shall go out of the trodden path and instead of laying the blame to the door of the liquor dealer, or of the saloon keeper, who are generally held responsible for the excess to which certain individuals are addicted, I shall say that he is not the main culprit. He merely exercises a trade sanctioned by the statute. But I would feel more disposed to arraign my own Government, to hold them responsible for what is going on, because they do not control the sale of alcoholic products which enter, for the most part, into the daily domestic consumption. I find it strange that the Government do not have a strict analysis made of all intoxicants, at the very time when they devote so much attention to the analysis of food. I hold the Dominion authorities responsible for that state of things, on account of their lack of supervision. All alcohols entering into the composition of the different drinks should be strictly analysed. Another method to bring about the social reform in question is that adopted in France. It consists in freeing the lighter wines, in order to help to propagate them. That method aims at substituting as much as possible, the use of lighter beverages to that of intoxicants injurious to public health. It is a well-known fact that in the wine-growing countries, you cannot find a single case of drunkenness; and when we have introduced in this House the French treaty, we aimed at substituting the lighter French wines to the consumption of alcohol. And to those who then criticised our course, as they do now, we replied that the diffusion of a taste for those light wines was an excellent means to decrease intemperance. There is not the least doubt that the admission of French wines into the country, at low prices, ought largely to contribute to diminish the natural appetite for strong drinks. I am, therefore, opposed to the principle embodied in the motion of the hon. member for Yarmouth, on the several grounds I have just mentioned. I may add that, without mentioning the attempt on individual liberty, there is no authority which prescribes such a stringent prohibition. Is the church, which ought to be our supreme guide in those matters, in favour of the principle? I think not. Can the hon. member find any text either in the Old or New Testament, to justify his motion? I

think not. He cannot find a single text, a single phrase in the sacred writers, going to show the necessity of prohibition. On the contrary, I am inclined to think, from what I know of the sacred writers, that the principle of prohibition is unsound. And if I had nothing else but the miracle performed at Canaan of Galilee, I think it would be quite enough to show that prohibition does not meet with any favour with the sacred writers either of the Old or New Testament. There is a last statement to which I wish to invite the attention of the House: it is, that, not to mention the means suggested to attain the very end proposed by the hon. member for Yarmouth, not to mention the higher tax which would be placed upon adulterated spirits, nor the propagation of cheaper wines, nor the scrupulous analysis of the spirits which enter into the general consumption, an analysis which ought to result in excluding all artificial intoxicants noxious to public health, not to mention, I say, all these different means, I think I am warranted in saying that we have within our reach another means, it is the treatment of the dipsomaniacs, who experience an irresistible and unsatiated thirst for alcoholic drinks. I wish to impress upon the House the importance which this treatment should assume in our eyes, both as to its indisputable intrinsic value and as to its well established efficiency in many cases. I do not pretend to persuade the House into believing that in my opinion, that treatment is infallible. But I say that it is exceedingly beneficial and that it should not be slightly examined at a time when the question now before the House is taken into consideration. The evils we have to cure are so great so general, that the constituted authorities should study it; and we are within our right in asking the Government to exercise their solicitude and help us to fight and uproot that evil. It would be idle to enter here into the details of that treatment, but I may add that the Government of Canada, following the footsteps of the Washington Cabinet, ought to give their attention to the treatment in question which is one of the most powerful means of curing even those who are presumed incurable.

Mr. GUILLET. I took the opportunity, on the last occasion when this motion was brought before the House, of expressing the views which I have held for some time, and which I hold honestly and strongly, on this question. I believe there is room on the temperance platform for the advocacy of our different views on this important question. I do not think the spirit of intolerance prevails there, but that a liberal spirit prevails, and that the temperance men of this country desire that this question be discussed in all its bearings, in order that the greatest light may be thrown upon it, and the wisest possible conclusions arrived at.

As I expressed on a former occasion views that were in the direction of leaving this important matter to be dealt with by the local legislatures, I desire to refer again to a few of the arguments by which, I believe, that position is capable of being sustained. I have long thought that it more properly pertains to the duties and responsibilities of the local legislatures and governments to deal with this question. It seems to me that the local legislatures are expressly charged with the development of the manhood and of the mental and physical powers of the people. The local governments, which have to deal with the education of the people in science, in the mechanics, in the industrial arts, in literature and in fine arts, are the governments which should properly consider the bearings of a question like this upon the character, habits and morals of the people. These local governments, which have also to deal with the great interests of health, which are entrusted with the duty of enforcing the observance of the laws of health, which have to deal largely with all questions of charity and philanthropy, and are charged with the police protection of the people, should also possess within their spheres a question involving the great virtues of sobriety, industry, frugality and purity, as these bear upon and pertain to the great principles which those local governments have to deal with. Therefore, I say, if it lies in their power, it more particularly pertains to their duty, to promote a cause of this kind and to enforce laws of this kind. They have, in fact, the administration of all laws in their hands, the powers pertaining to the organization of the courts, the appointment of magistrates, of crown counsel, of inspectors of licenses—all the powers that go to the enforcement of a law like this. Therefore, it comes in their province to enforce a law of this kind, as it is in their province, in my opinion, to enact a law of this kind. It is also reasonable to state here, that it is in the natural progress of things that such a law should be the outcome of the development of increasing restrictions on the traffic, culminating in the power of local option, and finally embracing the power of entire prohibition in the whole province. It is a process of evolution, a natural process, which can only be based on a gradual growth from a small degree of prohibition to a large degree of prohibition. Then, we know very well, that, in some sections of the country, there is not sufficient preparedness for the enforcement of a law of this kind. We know, that in some sections the people have not been educated to that degree which will warrant the enactment of such a law with the assurance that it will be enforced. Now, it seems to me, that there are sections where a law of this kind would be speedily adopted, if the powers of the provinces enabled them to enact a prohibitory law. I can quite understand that in some of the provinces a prohibitory law might be enacted and enforced, but in some

Mr. GUILLET.

others there is not sufficient public sentiment, not a sufficient majority of the people behind it, to warrant such a law being enacted. In such provinces it is not likely that a local government would take its life into its own hands and enforce such a law, where there was not public sentiment behind it to support its rigid enforcement, and, without such public sentiment, the law would become practically a dead letter. Among writers upon parliamentary reform and government, it has long become an axiom of parliamentary government and practice, that it is unwise to enact and seek to enforce legislation upon the people until there is a proper sentiment behind it, until the people are properly educated to receive the law, until the parliament finds that, if such a law be enacted, there will be a proper moral sanction in the conscience of the people to enforce its observance, until there is adequate assurance that the people will give their assistance to carry it out. We know that public men in this Parliament, men of large experience in political affairs, men of judgment and experience in the practical enforcement of such a law, have declared that it requires a very strong and overwhelming public sentiment to enable a law of this kind to be enforced, and I propose to refer to statements of this character that have been made, in order that I may satisfy the House that I am not merely giving the opinion of one who has small experience, but the opinion of men competent to judge in matters of this kind. I refer to the speech which the Hon. Edward Blake made with reference to the enforcement of a law of this kind. Mr. Blake spoke as follows:—

I think no repressive legislation can be profitable or permanent unless there exists a widely-diffused and very strongly-felt and very earnest public opinion at its back. The tone and quality of this opinion are of as much or more consequence than its quantity. It is not from fear of the criminal law that the bulk of the community abstains from crime. The bulk would abstain if there were no criminal law; the conscience of the community would be its law. Laws generally derive their binding effect from this consideration. But for that, even though directed against a few only, they would be of little use. This view has very special application to legislation upon the subject of the general social customs of the people. It follows, then, that it is only this widely-diffused and strongly-felt public opinion which can be properly crystallized into law, and that premature attempts will be abortive failures. Thus conditions of opinion may exist at various epochs of progress under which, usefully, licenses may be required to sell, under which high license may replace low license, under which restricted license may replace freer license, under which local and partial prohibition may replace high and restricted license, and under which general prohibition may replace local and partial prohibition. But in deciding on the legislation to be at any particular time adopted, we must determine whether the country is at that time ripe for the legislation; whether it is reasonable to conclude that it will

be enforced and maintained, else we hurt instead of helping the cause.

Then, speaking of the Canada Temperance Act, he said :

I am for or against the submission of the Act in new localities, according as there is or is not a fair prospect in the condition of local opinion that it will be reasonably efficacious. It is on this consideration that I myself would vote in case it were submitted in a county in which I had a vote. I am against the submission of the Act as a mere test of public opinion, by a vote in the nature of a plebiscite on prohibition, without a firm determination to work it thoroughly if passed.

I consider the Temperance Act itself is on its trial.

I have been anxiously watching its operation in that view, as also to use it as one test, whether there yet exists in Canada such a tone and quality of public opinion as would render further legislation efficacious and permanent. This I regard as a much better test than the mere vote at the polls. I cannot say I think the test as yet justifies the proposed legislation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think I might quote Sir Leonard Tilley's own words, referred to by Hon. Edward Blake, in which he gives the reason why he was opposed to prohibitory legislation until there was a sufficient public sentiment behind it to secure its enforcement. This was spoken in 1883, when Sir Leonard Tilley declared that this country had not arrived at the point in relation to this question when prohibition could be properly enforced :

This is no new idea with me, for I appeal to my hon. friend opposite, whether, when I was occupying the position of Lieutenant-Governor of New Brunswick, and a convention was held in Montreal to consider what steps should be taken by way of legislation in the Dominion Parliament for the suppression of intemperance, I did write a letter, which that hon. gentleman quoted on one or two occasions, expressing the hope which was my conviction in this matter, that if any law were passed by which a vote of the people should be taken, the measure should not be carried by a bare majority. I was willing that the vote should be three-fifths of the whole. That was a letter written when I was in a position to express my views without reference to political and party considerations of any kind, and that is my conviction to this day ; and, therefore, I urged my friends when moving in the Scott Act, only to move in localities in which the public sentiment would sufficiently sustain it. I did so in the interest of temperance. I can appeal to gentlemen present, who have known that when the Scott Act was carried by a majority and not enforced, that it was not in the interest of prohibition and temperance in many cases, and, therefore, the opinion that I then entertained thoroughly, and still entertain with reference to this proposition : That if you wish it to be beneficial to the cause of temperance, and to show that by shutting liquor out of a locality the effect is good, you will do it where the moral sentiment of the people is sufficient to enforce the law. That will convince the people, and they will say that it is a correct principle, and it would extend from one end of the Dominion to the other ; but if you carry it and put it into

operation where the public sentiment is not with you, a reaction will follow, and the people will say : "It is a failure," and abandon the whole principle. This position I have maintained for thirty years and upwards since I introduced into the legislature of New Brunswick a Bill in favour of prohibition, which was endorsed by almost all the men, women and children in the province, and we thought from the petitions received—a carload almost was brought in—we had the public sentiment sufficiently strong in the province to carry it ; but many who signed the petitions the moment it came into force backed down and never lent the least assistance, moral or in any other way, to the measure. And, as "a burnt child dreads the fire," I have always felt since that it is most desirable in the attempt to get prohibition—which I believe will be carried some day in the Dominion of Canada throughout—to educate the people up to it, and to show that its results are favourable and beneficial to the morals and social conditions of the people. * * *

Take the county of Charlotte in my own province. I think that in some sections of that county to-day, there is as much liquor sold as before the Scott Act went into force, it is sold openly. In St. Andrew's there has never been any attempt to enforce it. The moral sentiment of the community is against it ; and, therefore, I am quite sure that it is not better for the cause of temperance—though we all feel that it was a triumph to carry the measure—that it was carried. As a matter of sentiment, I would like to see it carried everywhere ; but we have to look at the matter with a degree of common sense, and to see whether we can carry the principle to success.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have never expressed any doubt as to this Parliament having the power to pass a prohibitory law. But I pointed out on a former occasion, when I moved the amendment which I am now about to move, that it was most desirable that we should ascertain whether the local legislatures had or had not the power to prohibit the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors within their own boundaries. If they have that power, I am convinced that it would be in the interest of temperance, in the interest of prohibition that they should exercise that power, and so bring a prohibitory law into existence where there would be a sentiment to back it, and where the people would enforce it. For it would be to the interest of those who are instrumental in passing it to enforce it. The principle of self-preservation would induce them to do so, in order to justify themselves in passing the measure. And the very fact that the responsibility of enforcing it would be upon them would cause them not to pass such a law until the public sentiment of the province was ripe for it. In this way the sale and manufacture of intoxicating liquors could be prohibited. Of course they would have no power to prohibit the importation, but neither would the importation be prohibited by this Parliament for medicinal, mechanical and sacramental purposes. I believe that in this way prohibition could be more rapidly and surely obtained. Let me illustrate by referring to the case of the

neighbouring republic. Is it not manifest that if the prohibition party there had been knocking at the doors of the federal parliament, instead of trying to pass a prohibitory law in the several states, there would have been no prohibition in those states where such a law is now in force? They would be compelled to wait until prohibition could be adopted for the whole union, either by constitutional amendments, if the power does not rest with the federal parliament, or by general law, if it is seized with that power. They have taken the wise course, and they now have prohibition in a number of the states, and, in two or three of them prohibition has been in force for years. I think that their experience ought to teach us that it is wiser to leave the provinces to deal with this matter. If the provinces are not ready, it is better that a prohibitory law should not be passed here, and if they are ready, all will pass it, and we shall have prohibition everywhere. When the decision of the Privy Council comes, we shall know to what extent the provinces have this power. I am not a constitutional authority, and I do not pretend to say what can be done; but I know that under the Scott Act this Parliament gave the power to counties and unions of counties to pass a prohibitory measure; and, if it is decided that the provinces have not the power already, I do not know any reason why we could not extend similar power to the provinces. In any case, it is wise that we should ascertain to what extent this power rests with the provinces, and then we can take action intelligently; and if we deem it advisable, can give them the power to enact a prohibitory law. I firmly believe that this is the quickest and least embarrassing way to obtain prohibition. Not only would the law be enforced, but in considering its adoption they would not be embarrassed in the local legislature by the loss of enormous revenues which must affect the consideration of it here to a great extent. The provinces do not need to consider how the Dominion Government shall make up the revenue which will be lost; they are not called upon to take the unpopular course of imposing new taxes to which the people are unaccustomed, which must be the case with the Dominion Parliament in the adoption of a prohibitory law. I think it would be wiser for the provinces, who would not be embarrassed with any such considerations, to have the power to deal with the question, and thus the change would take place gradually, and would not involve so serious a wrench upon the financial interests of the Dominion. There is another consideration to which I wish to refer, and that is that the questions which fall within the purview of this Parliament, and are discussed in the federal arena, are of such surpassing importance, and affect, necessarily, interests so great, such as the fiscal policy of the country, indeed, involv-

ing our international relations, and our international obligations and responsibilities, that they must necessarily overshadow any minor question of this kind when submitted to the verdict of the people at the polls. The people are sure to overlook such questions as this, to hold them in abeyance, when they are asked to decide upon the larger questions of national importance with which the federal Parliament has to deal. They will naturally give their chief attention to these larger national issues, and others, although important in themselves, will be thrust into the background, as our experience in the past abundantly proves. Therefore, I say that the local legislatures are the proper places for dealing with questions of this kind. There the question of prohibition would assume its due importance, would become the leading question, would force itself upon the attention of the electors at the poll when the local government submitted its policy for their approval. We know that when federal elections take place, the people naturally will discuss and give their chief attention to those great questions affecting their material interests, their material prosperity, and these questions will overshadow and thrust aside the question of prohibition. We have seen this to be the case often in the past, and it will continue so to be for many years to come. But in provincial issues the temperance question would be a leading question, it would receive proper consideration, the consideration to which it was entitled; and if the question of prohibition were dealt with in the provincial legislatures, it would prove successful far more rapidly than if it were dealt with in the federal Parliament, and certainly such a measure, when enacted, would be better enforced. I believe that the people, upon due consideration, will find that if they wait for this question to be taken up by the Dominion Parliament, and dealt with in the manner they desire, they will have to wait a long time, indeed. Now, with regard to the plebiscite, I have this to say: Several hon. gentlemen in this House have expressed their opinion upon this question; and I believe the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies) stated he would not be willing to pass a prohibitory measure until, not only a majority of the people voting had pronounced in its favour, but until a majority of those entitled to vote had pronounced in its favour; in other words, he is of the opinion that there must be an overwhelming opinion in favour of it. The hon. gentleman is one of the leaders of Her Majesty's Opposition, and his opinion is entitled to consideration in considering the proposition of a plebiscite. We also know that the leader of the Opposition in this House has stated that if his party reached power, he would submit the question of prohibition to a plebiscite of the people of this Dominion, and that he would abide by the

result. Now, let me ask that hon. gentleman, with his well-known views in favour of provincial autonomy, what he would do in case he found that a majority of the people in some one or more of the provinces, were opposed to prohibition, while a majority of the people in the other provinces were in favour of it? Would he not be prepared to say: Gentlemen, I could not think for a moment of enforcing a measure of that kind upon a hostile people, I have too much respect for provincial rights? We must wait until the growth of temperance sentiment has become more general throughout the Dominion, before I would attempt to enforce a measure of this kind upon an unwilling people in any one of the provinces. I can quite understand that the hon. gentleman would very properly and very consistently say that, and that he might act in that way. He said he would be guided by the result, and the result, it seems to me, would not warrant the enforcement of that measure upon any province which was largely hostile to it. That would be the sole result of a plebiscite, obtained, perhaps, at the expense of a couple hundred thousand dollars, that and nothing more. Therefore, I would warn the temperance people not to expect the Dominion Parliament to legislate very soon in the direction they desire. I do not think it would be well for the cause of temperance, or for the cause of prohibition, to force this measure immediately upon the country. It would be better to hesitate, to hesitate, perhaps, even a little too long, than to act precipitately, because the result of going too fast would be pretty sure to cause a serious reaction, and would do more harm than good, in the end, to the cause of temperance. Let us remember that:

Slowly moves the march of ages;
 Slowly grows the forest king,
 Slowly to perfection cometh
 Every grand and glorious thing.

Therefore, I think the cause of temperance will make more enduring progress by moving slowly, by moving surely, by entrenching itself firmly after each successive advance. I think that object can best be attained by relegating the question of prohibition to the provinces rather than by taking it up in this Parliament. These, Mr. Speaker, are my views, and I venture to place them before the House. I move in this matter entirely on my own responsibility, but with a desire to render any assistance in my power to procuring a settlement of this question. If this measure can be dealt with by the provinces at all, it can be dealt with there more effectually than it can be in this Parliament; and, when enacted by the provinces, it can be better enforced than it could be if enacted here. In consequence of this view, I beg to move, in amendment:

That all the words after "That" in the motion be struck out and the following inserted

thereof:—"whereas the Judicial Committee of the Imperial Privy Council of Canada have not yet decided the appeals from the decisions of the Supreme Court of Canada on the questions submitted to ascertain the powers of the provincial legislatures to enact laws prohibiting the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors; therefore, the further consideration of this question be deferred until these appeals shall have been decided."

Mr. CHRISTIE. It is not my intention to occupy the time of the House for more than a very few minutes. I am suffering from a cold and hoarseness, which make speaking somewhat difficult. But I cannot give a silent vote upon this question. I am fully convinced that it is a question of the utmost importance for the prosperity, the well-being and the happiness of the people of this Dominion. I think it is scarcely possible to over-estimate the amount of good that would result from the adoption of the motion in favour of immediate prohibition and its enforcement. It would prevent very great waste of life, of health, of strength, time and money; it would wipe out one of the great sources of demoralization in the country. We all know that the liquor traffic is fraught with sad and terrible evils, that it contributes very largely to poverty, misery, wretchedness, disease and crime, that many of those evils, much of that misery and crime, might and would be prevented by prohibition. I think all are agreed as to the evil, and I am almost convinced that all thorough reformers, all men who have been spending their time and money to promote the cause of temperance, are convinced that prohibition is the only remedy. The only question appears to be as to whether the country is ripe for it or not. We all know that many noble men and many noble women have been labouring for many years, striving to check this evil, doing what they could to disseminate temperance principles throughout the country, and they are all anxiously looking for prohibition. Petitions without number have been presented to this House in favour of it, perhaps more petitions in favour of it than for any other measure that has ever come before this House. Wherever the measure has been submitted to the popular vote in the provinces it has been carried by large and overwhelming majorities. In five of the provinces it has been voted upon, but it has not yet been submitted in the province of Quebec, and, I think, in British Columbia. In view of all these facts, it is clear that the time has come when this House should take some decided steps to meet the wishes of the people to secure prohibition. If the people want it, as I think they do, they should get it; but, be that as it may, I shall have pleasure in casting my vote in favour of prohibition.

Mr. FLINT. Before the question is put, I should like to make a few brief remarks by way of comment on the observations

made by the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Guillet). And here I would call the attention of the House to the fact that the amendment moved by the hon. gentleman was not supported by the line of argument he took as leading up to it. Throughout the whole of the observations made by the hon. gentleman there was a tacit and practical admission that the claims made by the advocates of this resolution were sound; in other words, it was admitted that the liquor traffic should be prohibited by law and a prohibitory measure enacted in some way. That hon. gentleman seemed to indicate that this Parliament should voluntarily, by its own action, divest itself of the duty laid upon it by the constitution and hand that privilege or duty over to some other parliamentary body. Leading up to that end, he asks this House to delay further action until the decision of the Privy Council has been rendered. I contend that his argument is not supported by any facts laid before the House by the hon. gentleman or that can be adduced in support of that line of procedure. I stated in my opening observations on my resolution that there is no question as to the power of this Parliament in the premises, while there are questions going the whole length in opposition to the jurisdiction of the local parliament to enact absolute prohibition. The whole of the decisions which can be quoted all lead up to the point that jurisdiction of the local legislatures ends with regulation, with restriction within each province, and when it comes to the full extent indicated by this resolution their power ceases. There is no occasion whatever for any delay in reaching an opinion by this House. There is no question here of the enactment of a prohibitory law this session of Parliament, all that is asked is that this Parliament express its opinion favourable to the prohibition of the liquor traffic, leaving entirely action to a subsequent Parliament, if it is of the same opinion, to carry that decision into the form of legislation and to crystallize the opinion thus enunciated into law. There have been no arguments adduced for any further delay in reaching a conclusion on this important subject. Parliament has, at considerable expense, obtained the opinion of an able commission on this subject; many of the contentions of those commissioners have been read in the hearing of the House to-day, while the conclusion of the commission leads up to the conclusion enunciated by this resolution. I sincerely trust that friends of the principle of prohibition will not encourage further delay in reaching a decision by the House on the main proposition before us. If the House of Commons is of opinion that there is not a sufficient popular opinion in the country to support the enactment of a prohibitory law, then, of course, those holding that opinion might possibly be justified in antagonizing the resolution because we all agree there is no dif-

Mr. FLINT.

ference of opinion on that point, that a prohibitory law, like any other law on the statute-book, must be supported by popular and general approval, and the very fact that this Parliament has enunciated the proposition will go a long way towards strengthening that popular opinion. As has been said by the hon. member for Argenteuil (Mr. Christie), popular opinion, so far as it has been taken on this question has, not by a bare majority, but by enormous majorities, supported the principle of prohibition, and from our knowledge of human nature and of the people of the country, I consider that if a law of this kind was once enacted it would be thoroughly and faithfully enforced. I therefore trust that the friends of this resolution will vote down the amendment of the hon. member for Northumberland.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I have listened to the hon. gentleman's remarks in reply, and also to the speech which he delivered in moving the resolution, and I must say that I do not agree that the law in respect to this question stands as the hon. gentleman has stated. The first case in respect to this subject was that of *Russell vs. the Queen*, upon the Canada Temperance Act. That case was decided in the Supreme Court here in favour of the jurisdiction of this Parliament, and that decision rested upon the jurisdiction of this House over the subjects of trade and commerce. That case was taken in appeal to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, which held that the jurisdiction rested upon the general residue of power that is vested in this Parliament. Let me for a moment call the attention of the House to the position taken by the Supreme Court here, and to the position of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council upon this same question. If the Supreme Court were right in the view which it took upon that occasion, then this case fell within the enumerated power, the exclusive power of the Dominion; because the subject of "trade and commerce" in its general sense is under the exclusive jurisdiction of this House. When that case went before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, they did not venture to rest their judgment upon that ground, and later in the *Parsons case*—an insurance case—in which the subject of trade and commerce was discussed, the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council pointed out, that the words "trade and commerce" did not admit of that comprehensive construction which some were disposed to put upon these words, and which had been put upon them by the Supreme Court here in this very case. They pointed out that these same words were used in the Act of Union between England and Scotland, and that these words had there been construed, and that they had been given a more limited meaning than the meaning put upon them by the Supreme Court here. But

the Judicial Committee said this : That looking at the arguments which had been presented to us, this case does not fall within the enumerated powers of the provinces, and it is not, in our opinion, within the enumerated powers of the Dominion. Now, as the residue of power is in the Dominion for all that portion of power which is not distributed in express terms, between the provincial legislature and the Dominion Legislature, it necessarily falls under the first portion of section 91 of the British North America Act, to the Parliament of Canada. It was upon that ground they rested their decision in this case. Then there was the case of the Queen vs. Hodge, dealing with the subject of licenses. I may say before that : This Parliament, upon the advice of the Premier, the Minister of Justice and the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), assumed that the logical conclusion to be drawn from the case of Russell vs. the Queen, was, that while the province might have power to determine the amount that should be charged for a tavern or a shop license that as this House had jurisdiction over the subject of prohibition, this House had also jurisdiction over the subject of licenses. They concluded that that was the logical, and the proper legal inference to draw from the expressions which had been employed. That Act was contested. It went from this House to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. The Judicial Committee held, that our legislation was ultra vires, and the opinion of the Council, as indicated during the argument of that case, would go to show that they, to some extent, resiled from the position taken in the case of the Queen vs. Russell. Well, that in a great measure left the matter at sea, and recently my hon. friend (Mr. Flint) said, that there are no judgments calling in question the power of this Parliament to deal absolutely with the whole question. Sir, I do not interpret the judgments which have been delivered by the courts in that way. This question of the power of the local legislatures, was referred to the court of appeals in the province of Ontario. That court considered the question, and it is pointed out in the judgment of the chief justice of the province of Ontario ; (Hon. Justice Hagarty), a judge of great experience, of great ability, and of great legal acumen ; that the interpretation which had sometimes been put upon the words "trade and commerce," was not warranted, and that police powers, and other powers, were possessed by the local legislature, that in his opinion gave jurisdiction ; and that so far as the granting of licenses was concerned, it was in the power of the local legislature to enact a measure of prohibition. Mr. Justice Burton, whose judgment is a very instructive one upon this subject, points out, that the fact that the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council rested their judgment upon the unenu-

merated power of Parliament, would go to show this : That if it could be shown that this subject fell within the enumerated powers, then that judgment in the Queen vs. Russell must fall to the ground, because there could be no jurisdiction under the unenumerated powers of the Dominion Parliament, if it could be shown that there was jurisdiction under the enumerated powers of the province. That was the opinion expressed by Mr. Justice Burton, and he points out, that the case of the Queen vs. Russell was argued by Mr. Benjamin, a most able and distinguished lawyer, a gentleman who had practised at the bar of Louisiana for years before he had gone to England, but who had no knowledge whatever of the municipal institutions of the provinces of the Dominion, and therefore was not in that regard qualified to argue this question satisfactorily before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. Then, the provincial lawyers who represented the province in that matter, were from the province of New Brunswick, where, prior to confederation the municipal institutions could be scarcely said to have an existence. And those large powers that were possessed by the municipal bodies in the province of Ontario and in the province of Quebec before confederation, were powers altogether more comprehensive and more extensive than those exercised in the province of New Brunswick, and which were never brought under the attention of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council at all. My hon. friend (Mr. Flint) says, that the jurisdiction of this legislature is not questioned. In my opinion the jurisdiction is necessarily questioned because the jurisdiction cannot be for the same purpose in both legislatures, except incidentally, that portion of the jurisdiction of the one which overlaps the other, where the power is granted to the Dominion for one purpose and to the local legislature for another and different purpose. Let me take a case as an instance. Take the case of the manufacture apart altogether from the sale. I would like to know what difference there is in principle, between the manufacture of a gallon of beer, and the manufacture or production of a yard of cotton, or any other article. The power of production, the application of industry and capital to production, is a matter of property, and the protection of that is a civil right. That surely is under the jurisdiction of the province. It would only be in a case where that property was delivered over for transportation from one portion of the Dominion to another, and entered, not into the local or provincial market, but into the general market, that it would come under the jurisdiction of this House at all. So that when you raise the question of jurisdiction in regard to the province, looking at the view expressed by Mr. Justice Burton, you incidentally raise the question of jurisdiction in regard to the Dominion. For,

when one section of the constitution says certain enumerated powers shall vest exclusively in the Parliament of Canada, and the province shall have power exclusively to legislate on certain other enumerated matters, the word exclusively means exclusively. It means that the power alone can be exercised by the body to which that power is entrusted. Now, this case is pending before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. Everybody, I suppose, expected that the decision would be given before this House met at all. But the Judicial Committee, perhaps in part on account of the judgments formerly delivered, with imperfect information and after defective argument, and from the internal difficulties associated with the question, have up to this time not delivered judgment. That judgment may be forthcoming any day, and it may assign importations and general traffic to this Dominion, and other matters relating to production or to the local traffic, to the provinces. It may divide the jurisdiction. That seems to be quite a possible thing, and that being so, I said last year to my hon. friend in this House, that so far as public opinion would sustain such a proposition. I was in favour of prohibition. But I have great objections to undertaking to deal with the subject when the question of jurisdiction on this subject is now before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. Under these circumstances it seems to me that the reasonable course to take is to have this debate adjourned. Before the end of this week or the beginning of next week, the question of jurisdiction may be decided by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, and then my hon. friend will be in a position to say precisely what the power of this House is, and to call upon this House to deal with the subject. It does seem to me that my hon. friend is not proceeding in the right way. If I held the view he does, and were as confident as he is upon the question of jurisdiction, I would have asked this House to proceed by a Bill—to do some act that would amount to something, that would have some effect. That being so, I think it is important, as we shall be here for some time longer, that this House should have an opportunity of dealing with and voting on the subject after the question of jurisdiction is settled. I am quite certain, from what has been stated in the newspapers, that the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council must within a very few days give their judgment on this question. That being so, if the matter were forced to a vote to-night, I would be unable to vote for the proposition of my hon. friend, but if the question of jurisdiction were settled, then I would be prepared to consider how far we ought to go with respect to the jurisdiction we have. I would, therefore, move that this debate be now adjourned.

Mr. JEANNOTTE. Mr. Speaker. I was rising to make the same motion, and I will

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).

give you my reason. Dr. Lachapelle, a prominent physician of Montreal and a member of the American Public Health Association, has been charged by that association to prepare a work on this question, and a résumé of that work was published in the press of last Saturday. Dr. Lachapelle does not take the view of the hon. mover of this resolution. However, the American Public Health Association will meet in June next, and will discuss the question, and then we shall have the conclusions of men competent to deal with it, and the House will be in a better position to discuss the question more reasonably than we can at present. I may say that Dr. Lachapelle, in his work, takes the view that prohibition is not a good thing, but that temperance is a good thing. For these reasons I will support the motion to adjourn the debate; but I think it would be better to adjourn it to another session, when we shall have the views of that association.

Mr. FLINT. Mr. Speaker, in objecting to the motion of my hon. friend, I will only say that we have no assurance whatever that the decision of the Privy Council will be rendered during the session of this Parliament; and all experience of Parliament leads me to think that an adjournment of this debate will in all probability mean that we shall not reach a vote on the motion during this session. For these two reasons I object to the adjournment of the debate. The resolution simply asks the opinion of this Parliament upon the abstract question of the desirability of enacting such a law. There is no proposition before the House that the law should be enacted this session. It is the desire of those who favour prohibition that when this legislature is dissolved, it shall dissolve with a resolution of this kind placed upon the Journals, so that popular opinion upon the question shall be strengthened by the sanction of this House to the proposition. Therefore I, as the mover of the resolution, and I believe also the friends of the resolution here, will not consent either to the adjournment of the debate or to an amendment favouring delay.

House divided on motion (Mr. Mills, Bothwell) to adjourn debate :

YEAS :

Messieurs

Bergeron,	Landerkin,
Bernier,	Laurier,
Bowman,	Leclair,
Brodeur,	Macdonald (King's),
Cameron (Inverness),	Macdonell (Algoma),
Cargill,	McDonald (Victoria),
Carscallen,	McDougald (Pictou),
Casey,	McDougall (Cape Breton),
Charbonneau,	McGregor,
Chesley,	McIsaac,
Choquette,	McLennan,
Corbould,	McShane,
Davies (P.E.I.),	Mara,
Delisle,	Mignault,
Desaulniers,	Mills (Bothwell),
Dupont,	Monet,

Earle,
Fraser,
Fréchette,
Girouard,
Godbout,
Haggart,
Harwood,
Hazen,
Hutchins,
Jeannotte,
Joncas,
Lachapelle,

Ouimet,
Pope,
Proulx,
Rinfret,
Rosamond,
Smith (Ontario),
Stairs,
Stubbs,
Tarte,
Tisdale,
White (Shelburne), and
Wood.—56.

NAYS :

Messieurs

Allan,
Angers,
Baird,
Béchar, d,
Belley,
Borden,
Boston,
Bowers,
Boyd,
Brown,
Campbell,
Carpenter,
Christie,
Colter,
Costigan,
Craig,
Davin,
Dickey,
Featherston,
Flint,
Forbes,
Foster,
Frémont,
Gillmor,

Gullet,
Haslam,
Innes,
Kaulbach,
Lavergne,
Macdonald (Huron),
McAlister,
McMullen,
Mills (Annapolis),
Paterson (Brant),
Perry,
Pridham,
Prior,
Rider,
Roome,
Sanborn,
Scriver,
Semple,
Somerville,
Stevenson,
Vaillancourt,
Wilson, and
Yeo.—47.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). The hon. member for South Leeds has not voted.

Mr. TAYLOR. The reason I did not vote is because the Chief Whip of the Opposition is not in his place, and he and I have a standing pair on all questions.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

Mr. FOSTER moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 10 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 25th February, 1896.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

MONTREAL TURNPIKE TRUST.

Mr. FOSTER moved that the House do on Friday next resolve itself into committee, to consider the following resolution :—

That it is expedient to authorize the Minister of Finance to make arrangements with the trustees of the Montreal Turnpike Trust for the redemption and cancellation of the bonds of the trust now held by the Government of Canada, and for replacing them with bonds issued under the Act 59 Victoria, chapter 65 of the statutes of the legislature of Quebec.

Motion agreed to.

STEAMSHIP SERVICE TO FRANCE AND BELGIUM.

Mr. IVES moved that the House do on Friday next resolve itself into committee, to consider the following resolution :—

That it is expedient to further amend the Act respecting Ocean Steamship Subsidies by providing that the Governor in Council may enter into a contract for a term not exceeding five years for the performance of a fortnightly steamship service between a port or ports in Canada and ports in France and Belgium, on such terms and conditions as the Governor in Council deems expedient for a subsidy not exceeding \$50,000 per annum.

Motion agreed to.

THE DEFENCE OF THE DOMINION.

Mr. FOSTER moved that the House do on Friday next resolve itself into committee, to consider the following resolution :—

That it is expedient to authorize the Governor in Council to raise by way of loan such sum or sums of money, not to exceed in the whole the sum of three million dollars, as may be required for the purpose of the defence of the Dominion, such loan to be raised under the provisions of that portion of chapter 29 of the Revised Statutes of Canada relating to public debt and the raising of loans authorized by Parliament, and the interest thereon not to exceed the rate of four per cent per annum.

Motion agreed to.

SUPPLY—THE BUDGET.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Foster :

That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair, for the House to go again into Committee of Supply.

Mr. SMITH (Ontario). Mr. Speaker, in listening to the speeches delivered by some hon. gentlemen opposite in this debate, notably those of the members for Centre Wellington (Mr. Semple), North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), East Huron (Mr. Macdonald), and south Huron (Mr. McMillan), an old and familiar story was heard. It is true, it has been supplemented this year and brought up to date ; but it was the same old story of blue-ruin, distress and suffering among the farmers that we have heard session after session in this House. One almost begins

to wonder if the people of Canada, whom we have been so proud of pointing to in the past, not only as intelligent, but as industrious, and progressive, really exist in our country.

Sir, before proceeding with my remarks on the subject before us, I would like to draw the attention of the House to a statement made the other day by the hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. McDougall), as follows :—

Now, the shipping employed in the coasting trade, in 1888, in Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island and Quebec, amounted to 10,863,330 tons, which is 1,700,000 tons greater than the tonnage engaged in our ocean commerce, and 2,300,000 tons greater than what passed through the Suez Canal, and 5,730,000 tons greater than passed through the "Soo" Canal.

The hon. member for North Wellington, referring to that statement said :

My hon. friend (Mr. McDougall) referred to the amount of tonnage that passed the "Sault" Canal last year, as an evidence of prosperity. But if the hon. gentleman would analyse the statistics in that connection he would find that about 90 per cent is American tonnage, and that only 10 per cent comes to or from Canada.

If I understand the statement of the hon. member for Cape Breton aright, he was showing the amount of trade done in the four provinces named, and was comparing that with the amount of tonnage that passed through the Sault Canal. It made little or no difference whether it was Canadian or American tonnage.

There was also a statement made by the hon. member for South Huron the other day to the effect that the laxity of the Government in connection with the quarantine regulations had brought about the embargo on our cattle in England. Well, Sir, time after time it has been conclusively proven in this House that our quarantine regulations have been of a very strict character. The two cattle which were sent from Pilot Mound in Manitoba, in which evidences of disease were found, were 1,000 miles from the quarantine at Point Edward. But the hon. gentleman says there was laxity in the North-west quarantine regulations.

Well, that too has been denied, and it does appear to me that it has been shown most conclusively that all our quarantine regulations have been strictly enforced.

The hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) made a reference the other day to our public debt, and I should like for a few moments, to deal with that question. Our net debt stood as follows :—

In 1867 our net debt was.....	\$ 75,728,641
In 1874 "	108,324,965
In 1879 "	142,919,188

Now, the Reform Parliament opened 26th June, 1874, and was dissolved 17th August, 1878. During the seven years of the Con-

Mr. SMITH (Ontario).

servative Government, the annual increase of the public debt amounted to \$4,656,618, and during the five years of Reform Government the annual increase amounted to \$6,933,045, and the debt in 1895 amounted to \$253,074,927, or an increase of \$110,084,739, from which, I think, may fairly be deducted \$10,189,521 paid the Canadian Pacific Railway in exchange for 6,793,014 acres of railway lands. Now, although this may be a very good asset in the way of cash, still I think it should be deducted from the increase in the debt from 1879 to 1895. This would leave the amount of the increase \$99,895,218, or a yearly increase during the sixteen years of Conservative administration since 1879, of \$6,243,451. So that whether you compare it with the first period of Conservative rule or the last period of sixteen years, the increase was much in excess during the five years of Reform rule from 1874 to 1879. Hon. gentlemen opposite tell us, however, that the debt was increased during the five years they held office because they had to carry out obligations left them by the Conservative party. True, they had to carry out some of these, but they were obligations which had been incurred by all parties and agreed to by the Act of Confederation.

Now, let me look for a moment at the debt. I admit that \$253,000,000 is a considerable debt for the people of Canada, but a debt may be heavy and not oppressive. We want, in the first place, to see what it has been incurred for; we want to know if the advantages equal the cost. We have a right to know whether it has improved or injured our financial position, and I think we have equally as good a right to compare our debt with that of other countries and see whether it is excessive or not :

Our net debt increase since 1867....	\$177,000,000
Provincial debts	31,000,000
Practical increase.....	\$146,000,000

Now, how has this been incurred ?

The Intercolonial Railway has cost..	\$45,300,000
The Prince Edward Island Railway has cost	635,000
The Canadian Pacific Railway has cost	62,653,000
Our canals	44,161,000
Total	\$152,749,000

Now, on these items alone there have been expended :

On capital account..... \$ 6,749,000

And in addition we have expended :

On Dominion lands	\$3,668,000
Public buildings	2,163,000
Other buildings	7,023,000
North-west Territories	3,798,000
Total	\$23,401,000

Large sums have annually been expended out of ordinary revenue during these years upon public buildings and works which are now of a very permanent character. Many of these may not be very paying investments in the shape of cash returns, but they are valuable contributors to the prosperity of the country, and in fact absolutely necessary, not only on political, but on commercial grounds. The Intercolonial was necessary for the pushing of our interprovincial trade. The hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) said, the other day, that the Intercolonial had been carried too far. Instead of having a little over 700 miles of railway, we had now largely increased that mileage, and he claimed that it was never intended that such large sums of money should be spent on the Intercolonial. But it was necessary for our interprovincial trade that we should find a seaport independent of the United States. These were perhaps two of the principal reasons why it was absolutely necessary that the Intercolonial should be built. And had it not been built we would have probably suffered in this way, that instead of the Canadian people being able to ship in bond as they have been, that would have been stopped by the United States Government, because they have often threatened to do it. I scarcely think that any one will object to the large expenditure on the Canadian Pacific Railway, without which we could not have had confederation with Manitoba, North-west Territories and British Columbia. The lands, it is true, have not made the large return it was predicted they would, in the early days of building that railroad; still there is this to be taken into consideration, in connection with these lands, that there is to be a brighter day dawning when they will make a far better showing. The building of the Canadian Pacific Railway was absolutely as necessary for the interprovincial trade as was the Intercolonial. It was necessary on higher grounds, because we can create by its means a trans-continental trade. We are all proud of the enterprise displayed in the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway; and large as the amount may be which has been expended upon it, there are few in this House and out of it who would abolish the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Our canal system is something which the people of Canada have reason to be proud of. Their enlargement in every shape, the free construction of the Sault Ste. Marie Canal, the improvement of the channel from the head of Lake Superior down to Montreal and its continuance from Montreal down the St. Lawrence to the ocean—all this has had the effect of placing larger vessels upon the route. It has reduced cost of transportation, and in this way not only helped the manufacturer, but the consumer and the

farmer as well. It is often argued that our farmers' produce is taken but very little by the water routes; but every one who has paid any attention to the matter knows that the water routes, during the summer, have compelled the railways to reduce their rates. Why, it is within the recollection of many in this House when the cost of a bushel of wheat from any of our lake ports to Liverpool, was as much as we are getting for a bushel of wheat to-day. It is carried now at from 15 to 18 cents from any of our lake ports to Liverpool, including insurance. Will any one say that that has not helped the farmers, and that the improvement and enlargement of our waterways has not in every way assisted the farmer?

I want to look at the debt of Canada as compared with other countries. Our debt is a little over \$250,000,000, averaging about \$50 per head of the population. But when we take the Australian colonies, New South Wales, Victoria, South Australia, Western Australia, Queensland, Tasmania and New Zealand, we find that their average debt is \$187.61, to \$341.68. Our 3 per cent debentures are worth to-day 101½. In fact they rank next British consols. When we had a debt of about \$75,000,000, our 5 per cent bonds only sold at from 75 to 90 per cent. Now the financial position of the country is not to be reckoned by its indebtedness, by its willingness and its ability to pay. It is true that our debt is a large one; but we believe that it has been incurred for good purposes; we believe that it has improved our financial position; we believe that, compared with other provinces and other countries, our debt is not alarming; and that large as our debt may be to-day, we have behind it not only the willingness upon the part of the people of Canada but the ability to meet every cent of obligation which may be represented by that debt. The hon. gentleman from North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) the other night stated that our taxation had immensely increased; that, instead of being \$24,455,382 as it was in 1878-79, it had increased to \$38,132,005, an increase of \$13,676,623. Now, I am prepared to admit that this increase is a fact; but the statement as presented by the hon. member for North Wellington is somewhat misleading. In 1878-79 we collected from customs, excise and bill stamps, \$18,476,613, and in 1894-95 we collected from customs and excise, \$25,446,199, or an increase of \$6,969,585. Of this increase about \$2,400,000 came excise duties on spirits, beer and tobacco. There are a number of items in the revenue increase in which goes to reduce the increase in expenditure, such as post office receipts, \$1,620,371, railways, \$1,728,540, and so on. I venture to say that no one in this House proposes to abolish the excise duties. But our friends opposite say

that they will reduce the customs duties. The customs duties are about \$4 per head to-day. Gentlemen opposite say that, to meet the reductions in these customs duties which they intend to make, they propose to practice certain economies. The controllable expenditure in this country to-day is in the neighbourhood of \$10,000,000. Take the five years during which gentlemen opposite held office—and they were five years of great depression—and if those hon. gentlemen can point out where they economized in any single department, there may be some reason why we should take their word for it that they will meet proposed reductions in revenue by economy in expenditure. But until they can do that, they must be judged by their record while in office rather than by their words of to-day. I wish to look for a moment at the position our farmers occupy. It is quite true that we have had a period of commercial depression in Canada. But it is equally true that in every grain-growing country in the world there has been a depression; and, while Canada has suffered along with others, she has suffered less than almost any other country under similar circumstances. Let me quote some figures from the report of the Ontario Bureau of Industries—and Ontario is about the only province in which we can get reliable figures. The average area under crop in the eight years from 1882 to 1889 was 7,428,693 acres. In 1894 the area was 8,227,153, an increase of 798,460 acres, or 10·8 per cent. Now, if we look at the market value of the field crops, we find that the average for the eight years referred to was \$114,588,594. But in 1894 there had been an actual decrease in the market value of the field crops, so that that year it was only \$94,055,392, a falling off of \$20,533,202, or 17·90 per cent. The market value per acre during the eight years from 1882 to 1889 was \$15·43 per acre, and in 1894, \$11·44 per acre, a decrease of \$3·99, or 26 per cent. Now, with an increase of 10·8 per cent in acreage, we find there was a decrease of 17·90 in the value of the field crops. Unfortunately, this decrease has not been wholly caused by a decline in prices, as hon. gentlemen on the opposite side say, but has been due to actual decrease in yield, which is proven by the fact that the percentage of decrease in value per acre was much greater than the percentage of decrease in the aggregate value. Let us consider, for a moment, whether protection can do anything for the farmer. I admit that, in ordinary years, it is possible that protection may not be of very much service; but there are many years when it can be of very great advantage to us. There has scarcely been a year since 1879,

Mr. SMITH (Ontario).

when the National Policy came into force, when we have not been able, in one way or other, in some portion of the year or other, we have not been able to reap advantages from it. Now, let me take some figures in connection with the price of wheat, and see whether the National Policy has been of any service to the farmer or not. Let us take the month of October, 1895. I will quote prices for the 1st, 5th, 10th, 15th, 21st, 25th and 31st of that month. These figures, be it understood, are taken from the Toronto "Globe." On October 1st, No. 1 hard wheat in Toronto was 70 cents; No. 2, 67 cents. In Chicago, 63 cents; in New York, 67 cents; and in Liverpool, 5s. 2d. per cental, or 75 $\frac{1}{3}$ cents per bushel. Oats in Toronto were 28 $\frac{1}{2}$ cents; in Chicago, 18 $\frac{1}{3}$ cents. On the 5th October, No. 1 hard, in Toronto, was 70 cents; No. 2—that is the same wheat that is sold from the farmers' wagon—was 64 cents; in Chicago, 61 cents; in New York, 65 cents; in Liverpool, 5s. 3d., or 77 cents. Oats in Toronto were 28 cents, and in Chicago, 18 $\frac{1}{2}$ cents. On the 10th of October, No. 1 hard, in Toronto, was 70 cents, No. 2, 67 cents; in Chicago, 61 cents; in New York, 65 cents; and in Liverpool, 5s. 3d., or 77 cents. Oats in Toronto, 30 cents; in Chicago, 18 cents. On the 15th October, No. 1 hard wheat, in Toronto, was 70 cents, No. 2, 67 cents; in Chicago, 60 $\frac{1}{2}$ cents; in New York, 67 cents; in Liverpool, 5s. 3d., or 77 cents. Oats in Toronto, 28 $\frac{1}{2}$ cents; in Chicago, 18 cents. On the 21st of October, No. 1 hard wheat, in Toronto, was 70 cents, No. 2, 70 cents—a rather remarkable thing that the price from the farmers' wagon was actually the same as for No. 1 hard; in Chicago, 60 cents; New York, 66 cents; and Liverpool, 5s. 4d., or 79 cents. Oats, Toronto, 28 cents; Chicago, 18 cents. October 25th, Toronto, No. 1 hard, 70 cents, and No. 2 farmer's wagon, 72 cents; Chicago, 61 cents; New York, 67 cents; Liverpool, 5s. 5d., or 79 cents. Oats: Toronto, 28 $\frac{1}{2}$ cents; Chicago, 18 $\frac{1}{8}$ cents. October 21st, No. 1 hard, 71 cents; No. 2, farmer's wagon, 74 cents; Chicago, 60 cents; New York, 67 cents; Liverpool, 5s. 6 $\frac{1}{2}$ d., or 81 cents. Oats, 28 cents at Toronto, and 18 cents at Chicago. Now, this is one of the selling months in the year, and I think it is a fair month to take, October, 1895; but in case hon. gentlemen might object, I have in my hand a statement for a number of days in January, 1896; and because it shows that same state of affairs, and because it shows that the duty imposed upon wheat and oats is of great advantage to the Canadian farmer, I propose to read this statement for the month of January:

Year.	WHEAT.				OATS.		
		Toronto.	Chicago.	New York.	Liverpool.	Toronto.	Chicago.
1896.		cts.	cts.	cts.	s. d. cts.	cts.	cts.
Jan. 4....	No. 1, Hard	73	61	67	*5 4½ = 79	24	19
	No. 2, Farmer's wagon	70					
do 10....	No. 1, Hard	75	61	67½	5 6 = 80	29	20
	No. 2, Farmer's wagon	70					
do 15....	No. 1, Hard	77	60	67	5 6 = 80	29	20
	No. 2, Farmer's wagon	72					
do 20....	No. 1, Hard	77	61	69	5 6½ = 81½	28	20
	No. 2, Farmer's wagon	73					
do 25....	No. 1, Hard	77	64	72	5 7½ = 83	28	21
	No. 2, Farmer's wagon	74					
do 31....	No. 1, Hard	81	65	73	5 9 = 83½	28	21½
	No. 2, Farmer's wagon	80					

*Sterling price Liverpool per cental ; currency Liverpool per bushel.

The relative prices in Canada are better than the market prices of any other country to-day. Now, then, the design of the National Policy, I take it, was not only to assist the farmer—

Mr. McSHANE. Would the hon. gentleman allow me to ask him a question? He says that the Canadian market is the best market in the world for Canadian wheat. Is it better than California?

Mr. SPROULE. It is the best all-round market for the farmers.

Mr. SMITH (Ontario). Chicago and New York are good markets for wheat, and the price of wheat is a great deal higher in Canada to-day than in any of these places I have mentioned. I propose to show to you that one of the objects of the National Policy was the encouragement of our manufactures, and increasing the population of the towns and cities, to afford the farmers a home market. I admit it is difficult to get at the value of our home market, but there can be no question that at the time of confederation the trade between the provinces amounted to very little indeed; to-day we know that it has run up into millions of dollars. The National Policy has helped our fruit industry; that is growing day by day and year by year, and has become one of our most important industries. In fresh meats, poultry, &c., the present Administration have put forth efforts in order to de-

velop the trade in those articles, for which I believe the people of Canada are grateful. Now, hon. gentlemen opposite, as I understand their speeches, not only in this House but in the country, say they now have a policy, they now have the policy of free trade such as they have it in England. Others claim that that is not sufficient, and that we must have, as soon as possible, reciprocity with the United States. Now, I desire to say that if we had free trade such as they have it in England, which hon. gentlemen opposite claim will do a great deal for Canada, you can never have reciprocity with the United States, because you will have nothing to offer the people of the United States in exchange for it. Do hon. gentlemen mean to say, after the efforts which have been put forth for the last thirty years, that there is any chance of our getting a reciprocity treaty with the United States? It is possible that you may get it if you give up everything they ask. I admit that Canada wants as many markets as possible, and she wants them free, if possible; but she does not want to have them free by paying too much for them. Now, in connection with this matter, I want to point out that not only the farmers but the people of Canada generally, when they have anything to sell, want to sell it to those who do not produce it. We have found that the British demand is almost illimitable, that they will not only take what we have to

produce, but they will take the surplus of almost every other country. Let me read to you what Great Britain imported in 1894 :

Animals, living, for food	\$ 44,237,455
Dressed meats	110,594,951
Butter	65,489,268
Margarine	14,818,075
Cheese	26,644,708
Lard	13,424,292
Milk, condensed	5,252,277
Poultry	2,340,246
Eggs	18,426,118
Fruits	12,459,594
	<hr/>
	\$313,686,934

Now, hon. gentlemen claim that we could scarcely exist without closer trade relations with the United States, but when we go into the English market we find that our principal competitor is the United States producing and exporting exactly upon the same lines as we do ; and it appears to me that it is in our interest rather to court a market that asks for our surplus, than to go into a market that produces a surplus of the same articles we do. Now, I have a few figures here which I think are very important, as showing that the United States market is of little value to us in connection with many of our articles of export. In 1894 Great Britain imported of butter, \$65,489,268, or 2,327,474 cwts. ; of cheese, she imported \$26,644,708, or 2,266,145 cwts. We sent to them, of butter, 20,887 cwts., and of cheese, 1,142,104 cwts. Now, of cattle, Great Britain imported 475,440 ; and of fresh beef, 2,104,104 cwts. Canada sent them 82,323 cattle, while the United States sent them 381,932 cattle, and 1,775,538 cwts. of fresh meats. Now, hon. gentlemen say that we want reciprocity with the United States, because we want to send our fat cattle there. I am prepared to admit this fact, that in the case of two countries like Canada and the United States, producing many articles alike, it is possible, at certain periods, that we could send them an article produced here, and that they produce, say, in the western states, and that we could sell it just as well in some portions of the eastern states as the western states producer could sell it. But I say that we need not court too much the markets of the United States for cattle, when we find that they send to our common market five cattle to our one. Now, there is another article I wish to refer to, and that is barley. The hon. member for Huron (Mr. McMillan) the other night deplored the fact that we had lost our principal market for barley. It is true that we are not doing with the United States the trade in barley that we did previously to the passage of the McKinley Bill ; but if we examine closely our trade with that country in barley we shall find that it had already begun to diminish before the McKinley Bill was passed, that it had already diminished nearly one-half. Now, then, why

Mr. SMITH (Ontario).

had our exports in barley gone down before the passage of that Bill ? The consumers in the United States are to-day, and were then, using large quantities of Indian corn. I do not say that it is as good as barley, but it makes a splendid substitute. They have increased their area not in the eastern states, but in the western states, and although the quality of the barley in the early years was not as good as it is to-day, we find a great deal raised that will compare very favourably, indeed, with some of our Canadian barley. The brewers' to-day are able to manufacture cheaper than they were at that time, so that they are unwilling to pay very fancy prices for our bright barley. We have lost the trade because they use, as substitute, large quantities of corn, because their acreage of barley has immensely increased, because the quality has improved, and because the brewers' understand their business better than they did a few years ago. Now, what is the fact in connection with barley to-day ? The crop of 1895 was an exceptionally large one, and although quantities were shipped for brewing purposes, there is this fact staring us in the face, that very fine barley is sold in New York at from 35 to 47 cents per bushel. So the Canadian farmers who are still trying to exist by growing barley of the fine qualities, that a few years ago sold at fancy prices in the United States are doomed to disappointment, and the politician, I care not where he may hail from, who urges reciprocity because it may further our trade in barley with the United States is simply deluding the Canadian farmer. There is another matter to which I would like to refer for a moment, and it is in connection with our lumber trade. This is one of the most important industries in Canada and is one in which many of our people are largely interested. I want to show this fact, that even as regards lumber the United States is not our best market. I quote from the speech of His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor of Ontario, delivered a few weeks ago in Toronto. His Honour said :

I regret to say that there has been no marked improvement in the past year in the condition of the lumber trade, the prosperity of which exerts so beneficial an influence on the general business of the province. While sales and prices in the British market have been fairly satisfactory, the market for foreign lumber in the United States has been in a depressed condition owing to the continuance there of business stagnation and financial disturbance.

Can there be any mistake about this language ? It is not my language, but is the language of the Reform Administration as placed in the Lieutenant-Governor's mouth a few weeks ago in Toronto, which language shows conclusively that the English market is far the best for our lumber and very much better than the market of the United States. There is one other point to which I

desire to refer, and it is this. Hon. gentlemen proclaim in the country, and in this House as well, that protection means dear goods. I want to point out that the large portion of the hardware, machinery, glassware, leather, boots and shoes, stationery, drugs, dyes and chemicals are purchased in the United States, one of the most highly protected countries in the world, and it must be remembered that every article I have mentioned was formerly purchased in the British market. This shows most conclusively to my mind that as regards the article I have mentioned protection does not mean increased prices, and it must be remembered that these products of highly protected United States have to come into Canada and meet competition with free trade England. It appears to me that notwithstanding the depression we have had in Canada, notwithstanding some of the troubles which our farmers have had, we have been able to weather the storm a great deal better than our neighbours and the European countries. To-day we are within, as I understand it, easy distance of an appeal to the highest tribunal in this country, the people of Canada; and the Conservative party upon their trade policy need have no fear or hesitation whatever in appealing to the people with a clean, cut, well-defined policy, one that has been tried during the past 17 years, and which has done so much for us, when placed side by side and compared with free trade. The leader of the Opposition has said it is impossible that we can have free trade to-day, but that it may come in thirty-eight or forty years—he was definite on that point, and that is something which does not very often occur—but we have no hesitation, when these two policies are placed side by side, in leaving the issue to the free and independent electors of Canada.

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Speaker, I regret very much that I cannot congratulate the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Smith, Ontario) on his references to men on this side of the House. He has rehashed some very old arguments, and repeated some very old assertions in support of the so-called National Policy. The hon. gentleman also has given to the House sheets of skilfully compiled statistics, so skilfully compiled as to give reason to believe that they were made to order and are being supplied freely to all speakers on the other side of the House. The hon. gentleman rang the praises of the Canadian Pacific Railway and predicted bright days for the North-west, and said that we would soon begin to realize from the sales of lands there. I believe that had the Canadian Pacific Railway followed the route adopted by the Liberal Government instead of traversing the most barren portion of the Territories, we would have realized immense returns from the sale of

lands in the North-west. The hon. gentleman made a very unfair comparison of the debt of Canada with the debts of the Australian colonies. He was not fair enough to inform the House that those colonies have spent immense sums in the construction of railways. They have spent \$450,000,000 in this way; the Government own 13,000 miles of railway, and this investment which adds enormously to the debt of the colony yields a dividend of 3½ per cent per annum. The hon. gentleman failed to tell the House that the Australian colonies own the telegraph lines and extensive irrigation works, and have erected and own such public buildings as court houses and school houses, which are built in Ontario by the municipalities. The hon. gentleman dwelt on the value of the home market, and almost immediately afterwards admitted the great need of enlarged markets. In beautiful language he advised us to cultivate the markets of England which are seeking our surplus products, rather than the markets in the United States, a country which is our chief competitor in the English market. He contended it would not benefit the people of Canada to enter the markets of the United States, but if it is not any benefit to us, if that market is not the market we would like to possess, how is it that in spite of our tariff laws millions in value of our products find their way into that market every year? How is it that the McKinley Bill, harsh as it was, and intended to absolutely exclude our products, failed in its object? Even in the face of that Bill, millions of dollars worth of Canadian farm products entered the United States, and were sold there in competition with the products of the American farmers.

The hon. gentleman (Mr. Smith) spoke of our lumbering industry, and quoted from the speech of the Lieutenant-Governor at the opening of the Ontario legislature. He (Mr. Smith) told us, that the market for lumber was dull in the United States, and, immediately after, he gave us the reason, namely, the stagnation of trade that has prevailed in that country during the past year. Well, Sir, the condition of trade there is rapidly improving, and soon our lumbermen will find the market of the United States attain its normal condition, and become, as it has been for years past, the very best market we have in the world for the products of our forests. Although the speech of our hon. friend (Mr. Smith) was badly impregnated with the virus of protection, yet I believe, that the Premier of this country would have done better to have selected him as Minister of Agriculture than the learned doctor who now occupies that position. We have sixteen Ministers in this present Government, but not one of them is a farmer. The great agricultural class,

for whom hon. gentlemen opposite say so much has been done, has not a single representative in the Cabinet. This Government have no faith whatever in the intelligence, the brains, the knowledge, and the fair dealing of the agricultural classes. They do not wish to trust one of them with a portfolio in that great Cabinet—great in number, if nothing else. I regret that the Minister of Agriculture is not in his place in the House. I am sorry that he is forced for his health's sake to submit to the "remedial acts" of his medical advisers across the sea. However, I hope that, before the end of the session, he will be here to develop to us his wonderful designs for the betterment of the agricultural classes.

Well, Sir, my hon. friend from Ontario (Mr. Smith) stands by his party and by their policy. That I cannot do, and I will give the reasons for my dissent, just as briefly as I can. In the first place, I am proud to belong to the Liberal party. I look upon it as the people's party, the distinguishing feature of which is now, and always has been, a well-founded and deeply-rooted trust of the people. I believe that the Liberal party has done much for the people of Canada. It was they who fought, year in and year out, the battle of responsible government; it was they who, in the past, fought against the Family Compact, which is to-day so closely imitated by hon. gentlemen opposite. It was they who fought against that combination, which was determined to rule this country, with or without the consent of the people. The Liberal party has always waged unceasing warfare against tyranny in any form. The Liberals, who have ruled the province of Ontario for the last twenty-four years, have placed on the statute-book of that province legislation defining the rights of labour and protecting labour against the tyranny of capital. It was they who passed laws defining the relations of landlord and tenant, and designed to protect the tenant from the extortion of the landlord. It was the Liberal party of Ontario who passed laws defining the relations of master and servant, and to protect the servant against wrong and injustice on the part of the employer. Sir, this party, of which I am a very humble member, has incessantly waged war against class legislation in every shape and form. It was the Liberals who overthrew a species of class legislation by their Rivers and Streams Act. Certain of our lumbermen in this country assumed rights which they were not willing to accord to others. Some years ago, some of our lumbermen in the province of Ontario claimed the exclusive control of the streams down which they floated their logs and timber. In the rear of my constituency, the timber limits happened at that time to be owned by a man who made this claim. There were settlers there who owned large quantities of pine, cedar, hemlock, ash, basswood, and other

Mr. DAWSON.

timbers, all marketable and all valuable. The man who owned the limits and controlled the streams, would not purchase a stick of this timber, and neither would he allow any one else to enter his limits to purchase it. I have myself seen vast quantities of valuable timber, logged up and burned out of the way. Thousands of dollars worth were lost to the settlers, thus bringing them, in the years of their early struggles, to the verge of deep distress. Well, Sir, at last a lumberman ventured up into that country and took out some logs, and promptly the courts were invoked, and an injunction issued to restrain him from using the streams. The Liberals, then in power in the province of Ontario, I am happy to say, placed on the statute-books a law called the Rivers and Streams Act, which declared the streams to be free and open to all, on payment of reasonable slide dues. This was a piece of legislation which aimed at class privilege, and so it was promptly disallowed by this Government. It was passed again, and again disallowed; passed again, and only allowed to become law when the highest court of the realm declared that the Liberals in the province of Ontario were right, and that henceforth these streams should remain free and open to all, and that the settlers were at liberty to dispose of their timber to whom they chose.

Sir, the Liberal party denies the right to grant to any man advantages in the matter of trade over his fellows. They wage war against trusts, monopolies and combines. These, Sir, are some of the reasons why I am proud to belong to the Liberal party. And I was never prouder to be enrolled as a member of that party than I was on the 20th June, 1893, when I saw gathered in the largest building in this city of Ottawa thousands of earnest men, come from the east and the west, from the prairies of the North-west, from the provinces by the sea, and from all parts of Ontario and Quebec; men selected by the rank and file of the great Liberal party to represent them in the largest convention that was ever held in the Dominion of Canada. Sir, when I saw these earnest men, come here to discuss the issues of the day, to discuss the best means of governing this great country of ours; then indeed my heart swelled with pride that I belonged to a party which could gather together an assemblage of men so representative and so creditable to their country.

I would ask my hon. friends opposite: When have they dared to call a convention of the rank and file of their party? Never once have they dared to issue the call; never once have the great Liberal-Conservative party been summoned to meet their leaders in a convention in any city in the land. The Government here are self-appointed dictators, and not the chosen leaders of their party. They name the leaders, they dictate

the policy, and, after the manner of the old family compact, they simply command their followers throughout the country to obey. What are the results? The people think for themselves, and to-day we find that great Conservative party divided and split into factions, some following one leader, some following another, and many in open rebellion against all leaders. We see the Cabinet itself unable to hold together. Sir, contrast the condition of the Conservative party with that of the Liberal party to-day. United to a man, enthusiastically loyal to their leader, we stand undaunted before all the forces that the Conservatives are able to array against us.

Well, Sir, this convention assembled, and what for? Was it to adopt a platform ready-made for them? By no means. No leader of the Liberal party ever yet expected an unthinking, unreasoning following or obedience from his followers in the country. Liberals are members of their party, each one in his own right having his own position in it. This convention was called by the desire of our leader, who was chosen by the representatives of the party in this House, who at last yielded to the urgent, unanimous and enthusiastic demand of his colleagues, and accepted the leadership of the Liberals, with all its responsibilities. And, Sir, when I heard the ringing cheers, the tumultuous applause with which his name was greeted by that convention, I knew that he was hailed as the leader of the Liberals of Canada, from the Pacific to the Atlantic. He called that convention together to take counsel with them as to the best platform to be adopted by the Liberals of Canada. As usual, the convention themselves appointed a committee on resolutions, and in due course that committee reported to the convention ten resolutions altogether. These are to-day the planks composing the platform of the Liberal party. There are familiar features in every one of these planks. The Liberal party did not depart one jot or tittle from the principles we have been advocating for many years in this country. Sir, it was said at that convention that its members were grave and sober enough to be a conference of clergymen, or a convention of prohibitionists. They were grave men, met to discuss grave issues. It was an experience, Sir, never to be forgotten—the ringing cheers with which plank after plank of the platform was hailed by those grave men, who stood in their chairs and waved their hats and coats in the air and declared with shouts, their assent to each resolution as it was read to them.

Sir, what is the platform that was thus adopted? The last speaker tells us that he does not understand what the platform of the Liberal party is. I am sorry for him, because we have been endeavouring here, as clearly as possible, to inform him, and

others, what our platform is. Some hon. gentlemen have already read the planks of that platform in this House, and I propose to do the same. We shall soon go to the country, and I do not want hon. gentlemen opposite to misrepresent our position. I do not think they will do it willingly. But, to remove any excuse, I will read the planks of that platform, one by one, with a few brief remarks on each:

We, the Liberal party of Canada, in convention assembled, declare:

1. FREER TRADE—REDUCED TAXATION.

That the customs tariff of the Dominion should be based, not as it is now upon the protective principle, but upon the requirements of the public service:

That the existing tariff, founded upon an unsound principle, and used, as it has been by the Government, as a corrupting agency wherewith to keep themselves in office, has developed monopolies, trusts and combinations;

It has decreased the value of farm and other landed property;

It has oppressed the masses to the enrichment of a few;

It has checked immigration;

It has caused great loss of population;

It has impeded commerce;

It has discriminated against Great Britain.

In these and many other ways it has occasioned great public and private injury, all of which evils must continue to grow in intensity as long as the present tariff system remains in force.

That the highest interests of Canada demand a removal of this obstacle to our country's progress, by the adoption of a sound fiscal policy, which, while not doing injustice to any class, will promote domestic and foreign trade, and hasten the return of prosperity to our people;

That to that end, the tariff should be reduced to the needs of honest, economical and efficient government:

That it should be so adjusted as to make free, or to bear as lightly as possible upon, the necessities of life, and should be so arranged as to promote freer trade with the whole world, more particularly with Great Britain and the United States.

We believe that the results of the protective system have grievously disappointed thousands of persons who honestly supported it, and that the country, in the light of experience, is now prepared to declare for a sound fiscal policy.

The issue between the two political parties on this question is now clearly defined.

The Government themselves admit the failure of their fiscal policy, and now profess their willingness to make some changes; but they say that such changes must be based only on the principle of protection.

We denounce the principle of protection as radically unsound, and unjust to the masses of the people, and we declare our conviction that any tariff changes based on that principle must fail to afford any substantial relief from the burdens under which the country labours.

This issue we unhesitatingly accept, and upon it we await with the fullest confidence the verdict of the electors of Canada.

Sir, in this plank we have not declared for the abolition of all duties. We have not declared for absolute free trade—free trade as they have it in England, or anywhere

else. So far as I am myself concerned, I would like very much, indeed, if we were in a position to go for absolute free trade. I believe in free trade. What is good enough for Great Britain, what has brought prosperity to that country, is good enough for me. But I am aware that hon. gentlemen opposite have so manacled this country, have so loaded us down with enormous liabilities, that it will be impossible for us, for many years to come, to get along without a tariff.

We propose, then, in this resolution, a tariff for revenue, and only for so much revenue as is actually required for the services of our country, honestly and economically administered. Under such a tariff, there will be protection. If there is any tax levied on imported goods at all, that, in the nature of things, must be a measure of protection. To a considerable extent there will be incidental protection. The policy of hon. gentlemen opposite is a tariff for protection. This, if logically carried out, must be a tariff of exclusion. It must be meant to exclude the commodities upon which the taxes are levied. In regard to the article of sugar, for example, it means the absolute exclusion of all refined sugar, with the exception of a very small quantity indeed.

In this plank of our platform, we condemn the tariff policy of the Government, because it has developed monopolies. It has developed monopolies in sugar refining, in cotton manufacturing, in coal, in oil, and in many other lines. I would like, for a few moments, to take up the case of the manufacture of sugar. In 1894, speaking to a resolution moved by the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson), the hon. member for Halifax, whose company, I understand, is largely engaged in refining sugar, said in this House that he believed the Canadian refiners could refine sugar as cheaply as American refiners, at least, so near to it that the difference does not affect the calculation at all. But why is it that they want a little more protection? It is because the market of Canada is not so large.

Now, I interpret this to mean that if the market of Canada were secured to the sugar refiners, they would then give us sugar as cheap as it could be purchased in the United States. During that same session, I read to the House quotations for the months of January, February and March, 1894, of the prices of sugar in Montreal and in New York; and I showed that the difference in price between Montreal and New York was 28 cents per hundred pounds in favour of New York. Thus, on the 250,000,000 pounds of consumption of that year, the refiners of Canada were taking from the consumers here about \$700,000 more than the refiners were receiving for a like quantity of sugar sold in

Mr. DAWSON.

New York. Therefore, they were not giving us sugar as cheaply as it was sold in the United States.

But I see no reason why we should be forced to purchase our sugar in the markets of New York. For my part, I would much prefer purchasing it in England for many reasons. In the first place, England being a large consumer of our products, it is but fair-play and right that we should trade with her as extensively as possible. Then, for selfish reasons, the providing of west-bound cargoes for the ships engaged in our carrying trade means a direct benefit to persons on this side shipping the produce of our farmers to the English market. Senator Drummond, speaking on this sugar question, declared:

As a manufacturer, I say that my preference is distinctly to be placed in the position of a manufacturer of cotton and have my raw material duty free. If that were so, I honestly believe that we could supply the trade and the country with sugar as cheaply as in England; but as a manufacturer, it is perhaps stepping out of my province to suggest.

Well, Sir, up to the 3rd of May last, the refiners had raw sugar duty free, and last session I showed the House by quotations taken from the London "Times" and the Montreal "Gazette" that sugar was sold in Montreal at an average advance on the price of London of 78 cents per hundred pounds, and that on the total consumption this meant a difference of \$2,340,000 a year. Instead of giving us sugar as cheaply as it could be bought in England our refiners charged us \$2,340,000 more for it.

I cannot see why our refiners are not able to refine sugar as cheaply as do the refiners in England. The raw material can be delivered at Halifax or Montreal at practically the same price as at the refineries in England. Of course, now that there is a duty of 50 cents per hundred pounds on the raw material, our refiners must add that to the price of the refined sugar, but they have no right to any more. If they add any more they are then taking from us as a bonus, under cover of the tariff which protects them, whatever difference there may be over and above the prices for which the sugar could be laid down here by the English refiners. If they live up to the promise implied in the remarks of the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Stairs), and the speech from Senator Drummond, refined sugar could be sold here at an advance of 50 cents only on the price in England, 50 cents being the duty levied on the raw material.

Now, I shall give the House quotations, since the duty was placed on the raw material on the 3rd May last, showing the prices of granulated sugar in Liverpool and in Montreal:

Prices of granulated sugar in Liverpool and Montreal :—

Date.	London Times Quotations.		Journal of Commerce.
	Price in Liverpool Lyle's Standard Granulated.		
	Per 112 lbs.	Per 100 lbs.	Price in Montreal per 100 lbs.
	s. d.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.
1895.			
May 9.....	14 3	3 08	4 12½
" 16.....	14 6	3 14	4 25
" 23.....	14 9	3 20	4 25
" 30.....	14 0	3 02	4 25
June 6.....	14 0	3 02	4 25
" 13.....	13 9	2 97	4 25
" 20.....	13 9	2 97	4 25
" 27.....	13 6	2 91	4 25
July 4.....	13 9	2 97	4 25
" 11.....	14 0	3 02	4 25
" 18.....	14 0	3 02	4 25
" 25.....	14 0	3 02	4 12½
August 1.....	13 9	2 97	4 12½
" 8.....	14 0	3 02	4 12½
" 15.....	13 9	2 97	4 12½
" 22.....	13 6	2 91	4 12½
" 29.....	13 9	2 97	4 12½
September 5.....	13 9	2 97	4 06¼
" 12.....	13 9	2 97	4 06¼
" 19.....	14 3	3 08	4 06¼
" 26.....	14 9	3 20	4 06¼
October 3.....	15 6	3 36	4 06¼
" 10.....	16 3	3 53	4 12½
" 17.....	15 9	3 42	4 12½
" 24.....	15 3	3 30	4 12½
" 31.....	14 9	3 20	4 12½
November 7.....	14 6	3 14	4 12½
" 14.....	14 3	3 08	4 12½
" 21.....	14 3	3 08	4 12½
" 28.....	13 9	2 97	4 12½
December 5.....	14 3	3 08	4 31¼
" 12.....	14 9	3 20	4 31¼
" 19.....	14 9	3 20	4 31¼
" 26.....	14 9	3 20	4 31¼
Total, 34 weeks.....		105 16	141 93¾
Average		3 09	4 17
			3 09

Difference in price per 100 pounds in favour of Liverpool 1 08

The average for the 34 weeks was \$3.09 per 100 pounds in Liverpool, against \$4.17 in Montreal, a difference in favour of Liverpool of \$1.08 per 100 pounds.

Now, Sir, up to the 3rd of May last, raw sugar was admitted into Canada free, and the duty on refined sugar was 64 cents per 100 pounds. On the 3rd of May the duty on raw sugar was fixed at 50 cents per 100 pounds, and the duty on refined sugar at \$1.14 per 100 pounds. The difference between the duty on refined and the duty on raw being 64 cents per 100 pounds. This is the protection that is given under the tariff to the sugar refiners of this country. I shall endeavour to show that they avail themselves of the whole of this protection;

that they do not divide it at all with the people of Canada, but simply put it all in their own pockets.

Before the duty was put on raw sugar, on the 3rd of May last, there was a large importation. According to the Trade and Navigation Returns, the imports from the 1st January to the 3rd of May amounted to 154,000,000 pounds, admitted to this country free. One-third of this, at least, if not more, has been sold since that time at the advanced price. Altogether, if the consumption between the 3rd of May and the 31st of December last was as great as the average for the last three years, we consumed during that time some 200,000,000 pounds of sugar. This was sold to the people, as I have shown by the quotations taken from these papers, at an average advance on the Liverpool price of \$1.08 per 100 pounds. This would amount, on the total of 200,000,000 pounds, to some \$2,160,000. That is the amount of money that the refiners of Canada received for the sugar sold during these eight months more than the Liverpool refiner would have charged for a like quantity there.

During that time, however, the Canadian refiners were called upon to pay 50 cents per 100 pounds duty on a part of the sugar that entered into the consumption of the eight months. In reply to a question, as appears by "Hansard" of the 5th instant, I was informed by the Government, that during those eight months the refiners had paid \$650,000 on raw sugar imported into the country. This amount must be taken from the excess charge of \$2,160,000, leaving \$1,510,000, which is the amount after providing for the duty for which our eight months' consumption of sugar was sold here in excess of the prices in Liverpool. At this rate our refineries are charging us for the sugar we consume in Canada some two and a quarter millions of dollars a year more than the same quantity could be purchased for in the Liverpool market, or a difference of 76 cents on every 100 pounds consumed.

Now, my quotations are up to 31st December last. I glanced over the quotations in the London "Times" and in the "Journal of Commerce" for January, and I find that the average price in Montreal during January was \$4.62½, and during the same month in Liverpool, \$3.25 per 100 pounds, a difference in favour of Liverpool for the month of January of \$1.37 per 100 pounds. If we deduct from this the duty on raw sugar, 50 cents we find the net difference, after the payment of duty, was 87½ cents per 100 pounds.

I have said that the Canadian refiners took advantage of every cent of protection given. The difference between the duty on refined and the duty on raw sugar is the protection which the tariff gives them. But, in addition to that, they have the protection of the transportation charges. The protection which the tariff gives them is 64 cents per 100 pounds. The

And his reasons have been plainly manifest, and his reasons have been plainly advanced. I do not blame the hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton), as he had a perfect right to act as he has done in that regard. But I make this statement, which the facts have shown to be correct, that in every year during the last eight or nine years, there have been exported from the shores of the Georgian Bay to the United States, from 300,000,000 to 400,000,000 feet of saw-logs. I say this more, Sir, that there has been a direct and most violent attempt on the part of those exporting the saw-logs to suppress the truth of the returns. That has been amply shown during the past year, when two or three vessel-owners have been promptly fined by the Customs Department for making undervaluations of the quantity of logs they have exported. I ask, what does all this mean? The export from this country every year of 300,000,000 feet of saw-logs means that a large number of mills are working on the other side of the line, the owners of which, if deprived of those Canadian saw-logs, would be compelled to come to Canada and have the lumber manufactured here. I am going to read for the benefit of the House a short extract headed Bay City, to prove the truth of the statement I make of the quantity of logs exported. This statement is made by Mr. Thomas Pitts, the head of the firm of Pitts & Co., exporters of saw-logs:

Between 250,000,000 and 300,000,000 feet of logs are annually imported from Canada. An export duty would compel us to go to Canada to manufacture our lumber. Along this coast from Saginaw to Cheboygan it would turn 20,000 men out of employment that earn annually in the neighbourhood of \$5,500,000.

That is a startling statement—that the Government of Canada, by their policy of permitting the export of logs from this country, are depriving 20,000 men of employment in Canada. By the National Policy, the Government have imposed high protective duties in order to foster certain industries in this country; and yet here it is pointed out by an American lumberman that the Government of Canada, by their suicidal policy—because it is a suicidal policy in this respect—are depriving this country of the employment, annually, of 20,000 men. The statement I have read amply proves that I have not over-stated the quantity of saw-logs exported; and if better proof were wanted, I could refer to the Customs returns, which show that from one port alone, some 150,000,000 feet were exported last year. Now, I have brought this matter before the House time and again. No hon. member has ever risen to defend the practice. The Government have promised consideration of the question time and again. I have presented indignant protests from the people of the Georgian Bay district. But the result has been the turning of a deaf ear to all our representations.

Mr. BENNETT.

I can tell the leader of the Opposition that he could carry every county on the Georgian Bay if he would announce that he was in favour of imposing an export duty on saw-logs. But I am sorry to say that among the hon. gentlemen behind him are to be found those who are the fiercest in denouncing an export duty. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) has, throughout all these negotiations, acted in the most shameful manner, and I regret that he is not here to-night—

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. BENNETT. Well, Mr. Speaker, I withdraw that word. The hon. member has acted in a manner that I would be ashamed of. He has acted in a manner that I think would not redound to the credit of any Canadian. I would not make any statements to-night relative to that hon. gentleman were it not that what I say I have stated in his presence on previous occasions. Two years ago, when the United States Government were offering to the people of Canada free lumber and the opportunity of having the most preferential privileges with respect to all articles in the wooden schedule, it was only by the action of the hon. member for North Norfolk, in connection with that very memorable letter which was written at the time, that those privileges were prevented. I admit, to-night, that the hon. member has never acknowledged in this House that he was the writer of that memorial. He has put upon myself the test of proving that he was the writer. At the time I expressed the opinion that the hon. gentleman was the writer. But I will do the hon. gentleman the credit to say that I heard him publicly announce in the recent campaign in North Ontario that he was not the writer of that memorial, but that it was an unwarranted use of his name, if his name was used in that connection. Well, Sir, I have only this to say, that, coming after two years, the denial seems rather late. But perhaps it is right and fair to accept his positive denial made on that occasion, and to express my regret that any injustice should have been done to him in attributing to him the authorship of that letter. If the hon. gentleman has only seen fit, at this late stage, two years after date, to announce that he was not the writer, I think he stood very much in his own light in failing to make the denial two years ago. Now, I have only this to say to the hon. Minister of Finance, that this matter of the suppression of the export duty should receive more serious consideration at the hands of the Administration than it has received in the past. I hold in my hand to-night a protest from the town of Penetanguishene, a town which is largely interested in the manufacture of lumber, also a memorial from the county council of the county of Simcoe, also a letter from a prominent saw-mill owner in

one institute for the blind and one institute for the deaf and dumb; and the total cost of the maintenance of all these institutions is less than the amount which is extorted from the people of our province by this one monopoly, the sugar refiners.

There are hon. gentlemen in this House who went into every constituency in the province of Ontario and urged the people to hurl from power the Mowat Administration, because, as they alleged, a few eggs, a little jam, some pickles and some catsup were used per head in some of these public institutions more than they thought ought to have been consumed by one healthy man. This was one of the arguments urged against the Mowat Administration. Yet these same gentlemen stand up session after session, and back up and endorse a tariff which enables one industry to wring from the people of that province a larger sum than is paid to maintain the whole of its public institutions, including the jam, the eggs, the pickles and the catsup, which, they said, had been consumed into too large quantities.

We have a magnificent school system in the province of Ontario. Liberal grants of money are made to the poorer schools, so that education may be placed within the reach of all the children in the province, in every township and every county. Well, this subsidy amounts to rather more than \$100,000 a year in excess of the sum spent on education, including the grants to public and separate schools, to our High schools and collegiate institutes, maintained so that higher education may be placed within the reach of all, including the cost of schools of practical science, teachers' institutes and mechanics' institutes, and the cost and maintenance of normal, model and art schools, and the inspection of them all—this whole sum amounts to about \$100,000 less than this tribute we are forced to pay to this one combine, or industry, or monopoly, or whatever you may call it, of the sugar refiners of Canada.

Our contributions to this industry for eighteen months exceeds the whole cost of our parliament buildings in Toronto. I remember well, when the government talked of erecting the parliament buildings, that the people were urged to oppose them, on the ground that they were going to bring the province to the verge of ruin by expending such a large sum of money for that purpose. Yet the amount of tribute that is being paid to this one industry for eighteen months equals the whole cost of these parliament buildings.

Sir, the tribute which this industry exacts is more than the amount which was spent by the Ontario government for seven years in the construction and maintenance of colonization roads. During seven years, the government built 1,200 miles of new road through sparsely-settled portions of the country, opening up township after township

for settlement; they repaired 2,700 miles of road, and they built and repaired 22,000 feet of bridges. I remember the sharp criticism of the items of the expenditure of the Crown Lands Department during the late campaign. There are some hon. gentlemen now in this House whom I heard denounce the government for their extravagant expenditure on colonization roads. But that expenditure for seven years does not equal the amount which these same men have compelled the people of the province of Ontario to pay as bonus to this one industry, the sugar monopoly.

Sir, let me call your attention to what the "Mail" said, in 1891, with reference to protection to the sugar refiners:

Protection is being run to the ground when it is allowed to extend to the sugar refineries the great advantages they now enjoy. It seems that it is possible to have too much of a good thing, and to work the goose-of-golden-egg-notoriety to death.

Well, I would like to see the "Mail-Empire" come out now in the interest of the people of Ontario, in the interest of the people of Canada, and advocate, with all the influence it possesses, the withdrawal from this combine of the advantages which they now enjoy and which they have abused.

Now, with reference to cotton, it is said that that article is as cheap here as it is anywhere else, if not cheaper. When it is sought to show that cotton manufactured in Canada is not as cheap as cotton produced in other countries, samples are shown, and it is at once said that the sample is not as good, and this simple assertion goes down with people whose eyes are blinded by their desire to maintain protection. But this we do know, that the combination that was called into existence in 1891 have been able to lay up enormous profits, according to their own confession. The Dominion Cotton Company was organized early in 1891 with a capital of \$1,500,000; they purchased a number of mills, and went into business. From a statement issued by the company we learn that the profits for the first year amounted to 30 per cent on the whole capital, and for the second year 40 per cent. With such a showing it was impossible to go to the country and pretend that this was a struggling infant industry requiring protection, and so they devised a means of misleading the people as to the exact standing of their company. They concluded to double the stock, issuing shares amounting to \$1,500,000 more, distributing them to holders of the original issue of stocks. They did not by any means propose to charge for the shares 100 cents on the dollar of their face value, but they took from the holders of the original stock 10 per cent of the face value and issued the new shares to them. In this way, while the capital appeared to be doubled, it was simply increased from \$1,500,000 to \$1,650,-

000, by the addition of \$150,000, for which the second issue of stock was sold to the happy investors. The third year, fourth year and first half of the fifth year showed enormous profits. Altogether in four years and a half this company, according to their own confession, earned profits amounting to \$1,982,551, or \$332,551 more than the whole sum put into the industry; they paid off the old stock after four and a half years and had a surplus of over \$300,000.

There may be, and I have no doubt there are, some industries which have difficulty in earning profits on their capital. Tariff restriction enhances the cost of the output of many manufacturers. The raw material of many of them is the finished product of other industries, and the tariff increases the cost of this raw material to them, and so many of them have to struggle as best they can to earn interest on the capital invested. It is my belief that the legislation of hon. gentlemen opposite, which was designed to hand over the markets of Canada to our manufacturers, has not worked well for them. The enormous profits which were earned at first induced over-production. The high prices paid for manufactured goods and the low prices paid for farm products played havoc with the farmers of our country and other great consuming classes. They cannot now purchase as freely as they could at one time, they cannot now purchase freely enough to absorb the manufacturers' output. I believe that a healthier fiscal system would be an untold benefit to all honest manufacturers in Canada. Finding foreign markets closed against their high-priced goods, the home market losing its purchasing power and all the time the output of manufacturers increasing, many of them have been compelled to combine for the purpose of regulating not only prices but the output. How successfully it has worked, I have shown by the facts I have given regarding two of the combines in this country. Other combines are the same in their results. Human nature is the same with all men, and while legislation gives manufacturers advantages and enables them to charge high prices, they will certainly avail themselves of the opportunity. I do not blame manufacturers for their extortion one half as much as I blame the people for permitting them the privilege which they enjoy and which they have abused. Sir, I believe that there is no more true statement in the first plank of our platform than that "it has oppressed the masses to the enrichment of the few."

To-day in every city in our land you will find men out of work, healthy, able, honest, sober and industrious men asking employment which they cannot obtain. Not only in our cities, but in our country places there are men who would be glad to do any kind of honest labour, but they find it impossible to get it. Why is this? It was said by hon. gentlemen opposite that we would never

Mr. DAWSON.

have any unemployed in this happy country when once the National Policy had sunk its roots deep in this Dominion. During eighteen years the National Policy has had an opportunity to sink its roots deep, but to-day there are more unemployed in Canada than at any period in our country's history.

I do not believe a reformation of the tariff would destroy our infant industries. It was said last session by the Minister of Railways and Canals that the adoption of the Liberal tariff policy meant that "the whole manufacturing class would be swept away at one blow," and "with the same blow the capital invested in manufacturing would be swept out of existence." I am afraid the Minister has no faith in Canadians. He has forgotten that from 1871 to 1881 under a revenue tariff, during the regime of the Liberal Administration, when times were said to be so hard, when the manufacturers had no special protection, the capital invested in our industries increased 103 per cent. From 1881 to 1891, with our magnificent National Policy in existence, with protection afforded to our manufacturers, the increase was only 107 per cent. Here is a picture of the condition of our manufacturing industries under a low tariff, as described by Sir Leonard Tilley in his budget speech in 1879, as will be found in "Hansard." Alluding to the budget speech which the hon. gentleman delivered in 1873, he said:

In 1873 I could point with satisfaction to the various manufacturing industries that were in operation throughout the length and breadth of the Dominion—remuneration to the men who had invested their capital in them and giving employment to tens of thousands.

This statement was made at a time when the lowest tariff ever known in Canada prevailed.

Sir, after eighteen years of protection, our exports of manufactured goods make a very pitiful showing. The Trade and Navigation Returns give for the year ending 30th June last, \$7,768,875 as the value of the exports of manufactured goods. From this I think it is but fair to deduct household effects, effects of settlers fleeing from this tariff, the amount being \$991,735; ice, \$4,825; rags, \$63,819, or altogether, \$1,060,379, leaving a balance of \$6,708,496 representing the total exports. This sum includes brick, extract of hemlock bark, charcoal, leather and wood manufactures which are in no sense or way benefited by protection, the total being \$2,700,000. Deducting this sum from the amount of manufactures exported leaves \$4,000,000 as the value of the exports of manufactures during last year, that is to say, of exports in any way benefited by protection. Contrast that with the export of industries which are in no sense protected. Of the products of our mines, we exported

abroad \$7,000,000 worth; of our fisheries, over \$10,500,000 worth; of our forests, almost \$24,000,000 worth; and from our farms, more than \$50,000,000 worth. And add to these, the amount short returned from inland ports, three and one-third million dollars, and we find that our unprotected industries shipped out of Canada, \$95,000,000 worth last year, against \$4,000,000 worth of manufactured goods exported during the same period.

We are told it has been a most auspicious feature in this policy of the Government, the National Policy that we have in this country an institution unknown in any other country, namely, a free breakfast table. Well, Sir, in spite of what hon. gentlemen opposite contend, there are not a few articles which generally appear on our breakfast tables, and which are taxed. I will read you a few of them, and give you the tax which is actually paid by the people, before these commodities find a place on the breakfast table:

Baking powder and soda	\$ 18,337
Yeast	10,183
Mustard	13,688
Spices	17,878
Rice	143,399
Tapioca and arrowroot	6,583
Currants	56,283
Figs	13,526
Prunes	27,082
Dates	7,688
Raisins	119,549
Tea (indirect importation)	6,132
Coffee	7,580
Molasses	68,606
Salt	5,872
Cocoa and chocolate	28,645
Dishes	151,225
Table cutlery	18,000
Macaroni and vermicelli.....	3,403
Rice and sago, flour and sago	3,675
Oranges, lemons and limes	91,840
Sugar, raw and refined, to 31st Dec., '95	710,343
Total	\$1,529,517

Altogether, there is a tax upon our breakfast table of \$1,529,517, paid into the treasury, and, in addition to that, there is \$1,900,000 of the unearned profits extorted from us by the sugar refiners, making a total taxation on our breakfast table supplies, of over three and a half million dollars a year. Now, Sir, if we are content with a very simple breakfast indeed, and confine it to porridge, ham, potatoes, bread and milk, it would still not be able to escape taxation, because we would be obliged to pay duty on salt for our porridge, and mustard for our ham, and our dishes and cutlery are already taxed. Sir, there is no free breakfast table in Canada. We have a tax on soda and yeast, mustard and rice, tapioca and currants, figs and raisins, dates and prunes, cocoa and salt, cutlery and dishes, tea and coffee, molasses and sugar. But why should we complain? In the free list of imports, I find we can take into this country, sand and roots free of duty, saw-

dust and grass, free of duty, horse hair and ice, free of duty, leeches and crude bones, free of duty. Let us not complain. The hungry may be fed, we have a free breakfast table, for are not leeches and crude bones admitted free?

Sir, we have a tax on machinery and tools, on axes and saws, on scythes and hoes, on forks and spades, on nails and bolts, on glass and oil, on carpets and furniture, on sewing machines and stoves, on ropes and iron, on hardware and pumps. All these are taxed, but still we ought to be comforted, because rags are admitted free. Sir, we are taxed to death in this country, and when we die, our friends are taxed on the coffin to contain our bones. But if we flee from the oppression of this poor man's tariff, and happen to die abroad, we can be brought back into this country without any taxation on our friends, for skeletons are admitted duty free.

The National Policy has decreased the value of farm and other landed property.

So this plank No. 1 of the Liberal platform declares. The decrease in the value of farm lands has been admitted on all sides in this House. The hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Cockburn) declared that he believed that the depression of the value of farm lands was not less than 25 per cent. I believe that there are hon. gentlemen in this House who know by their own knowledge and sad experience, that the depreciation in the value of farm lands in Canada is not less than 35 per cent. Why is it that there should be such a decrease in the value of agricultural lands? This country is, first of all, an agricultural country. The cost of living has been increased by the tariff, the cost of production of the crop has been increased by the tariff, the cost of the working expenses of the farm has been increased by the tariff, but the tariff has failed, and completely failed to increase the price at which the farmer's crop can be sold. But, Sir, the depreciation in value has not been confined to agricultural lands only. Our cities depend for their prosperity on the prosperity of the agricultural classes. When the agriculturists of Canada are not prosperous, our cities cannot be prosperous. Under the impetus of the promises made for the National Policy, our cities grew apace. The city of Toronto expanded over the adjoining country; new streets were opened up; large building operations were entered on in the fond belief that the requirements of the country would equal what Toronto so enlarged would be able to supply. Alas for Toronto and the people who invested their money during the boom period, these expectations were not realized, and so, last fall we found a newspaper with page after page, not less than thirty-two columns of advertisements of lands offered for sale in the city of Toronto for unpaid taxes. Not less than 1,248 parcels of property were offered under the auctioneer's hammer, for unpaid taxes. So much

had the land depreciated that the arrears of taxation were allowed to roll up for two or three years, until the city was forced to sell the land to realize the taxation upon the lots.

Sir, this tariff has robbed us of our liberty. It is almost as bad as slavery. What is the difference between slavery and protection? Very slight, indeed. Slavery is a system under which I am deprived of my right to choose a market for my labour, under which I am robbed of my wages, under which my muscles and brains are used to benefit my owner, and under which my life is spent in toil to add to his wealth. Now, what is protection? It is a system under which I am fettered in the choice of a market for the products of my labour, under which I may not exchange the fruits of my labour where I choose, and under which I have got to exchange them by such channels as are provided for me by those who have enacted this iniquitous law, called protection. I am robbed of a portion of my wages to swell the extortionate profits of those who have combined to compel me to pay this tribute to them. Slavery and protection are designed by selfish men to benefit and to enrich the classes at the expense of the masses of the people.

Protection has oppressed the masses to the enrichment of the few. Sir, it is said by hon. gentlemen opposite that this is not so, that we have no people of great wealth in this Dominion, but that the wealth is distributed evenly among all the people of the country. I give in evidence against these hon. gentlemen, the words of the late Hon. Sir John Abbott, who, in speaking in the Senate, 1891, said in the debate on the salary of judges:

I remember when a man could live in this country for one-half the amount he could live on now; when the fortunes which judges in the attempt to maintain their social rank had to compete with, were not one-tenth nor one-hundredth part of what they are now. It is not so long ago when the sight of a millionaire would have attracted crowds in the streets. Now there is not a town in the country where you could not find men who are several times millionaires.

Where did these men get their millions? From the pockets of the people. Who are these millionaires? They are the sugar refiners, the cordage manufacturers, the cotton men, the tobacco manufacturers, the owners of distilleries, and the owners of other protected industries. These are the men who have become millionaires with whom the judges can no longer compete in the attempt to maintain their social position in the land. Under protection, these men have only to sit still, many of them, and wealth will flow in upon them without any effort on their part. Some of them to-day would outrival Solomon in all his glory, and yet they toil not, neither do they spin.

Sir, the Finance Minister declares
Mr. DAWSON.

that the very object of a protective tariff in its initial stages is to give a vantage ground. He says:

The object of a protective tariff in its initial stages is to give a vantage ground, and in giving it I frankly admit that in the initial stages the price will be raised to a certain degree. * * * I say that in the initial years of the National Policy with a protective principle in it that it will have the effect of enhancing the cost of goods, and that at the first the cost of goods will be very closely up to the measure of the protection which was given. If it does not have that effect, why should it ever be adopted at all, and what is the good of it?

These are the words of the present Minister of Finance, in his Budget speech of March, 1894. He says that at first the cost of goods will be very closely up to the measure of the protection that is given. By combination, to-day the manufacturers of our country see that the cost of our goods is kept up very near to the measure of the protection given to them. With this thought in his mind, the Finance Minister proceeded to revise the tariff. He made many changes, and then coolly assured the country that the changes would relieve the people of Canada of many burdens of taxation. This he called tariff reform, and this tariff reform was hailed with delight by many of his followers, who had become sick of the National Policy. But what did it amount to? Did it, in fact, as he said, relieve the people of Canada of many burdens of taxation? The Trade and Navigation Returns of last year tell a very different story. Let us take the average of taxation of three years up to the 30th June, 1894, so as not to single out any particular year. For those three years the dutiable goods entered for consumption amounted to \$201,813,490, and on these we collected in duty \$61,092,006, which is just about \$30.27 on every \$100 worth imported. Now, Sir, if the promise of hon. gentlemen opposite had been honestly kept, the succeeding year after the tariff was amended would naturally show a substantial reduction in the duties collected; but what are the facts? The dutiable goods entered for consumption amounted to \$58,557,655, and the duty collected was \$17,887,269, or just about \$30.55 on every \$100 worth imported—actually more than was charged and collected under the late tariff.

Now, Sir, why was it that the Government did not revise its tariff in the interests of the people? It was simply because there was a power behind the throne which they had to hearken to, and which would not permit them to revise the tariff in accordance with the demands expressed by the people of Canada, both in this House and in the press, from one end of the Dominion to the other, by Liberals and Conservatives alike. The power behind the throne is the Manufacturers' Association. These men control the Government of Canada; they are the masters of the Govern-

ment of Canada. I quote from the report of J. J. Cassidy, secretary of the Manufacturers' Association, read at the annual meeting of the association held in Toronto on Wednesday, February 28th, 1895—that was after the so-called tariff revision. He reviewed the political events since last meeting; commended the efforts of the Premier "to open up new avenues of trade, particularly for our manufacturers"; approved of his Australian trip and the appointment of J. S. Larke as commissioner to that country, and of Hon. W. B. Ives's succession to the portfolio of Trade and Commerce. He continues:

It is gratifying to know that under the newly organized Government the interests of Canadian manufacturers will receive the best consideration.

* * With one of the best friends the manufacturers ever had in the Government as Premier, with Mr. Foster still in charge of the Finance Department, and with Mr. Ives as Minister of Trade and Commerce, manufacturers should experience a feeling of the utmost security and confidence.

In accordance with the usage of this association previous to your last meeting the tariff committee of the association, in the discharge of their duty, entered upon a close and careful examination of all matters brought before it by members of the association relating to the tariff. The situation at that time was critical. An excitement, amounting to a furor, had been worked up by the enemies of protection and some who had previously declared themselves staunch adherents of the National Policy weakened.

It was evident, however, that some changes in the tariff were imperative, and that if they were not inaugurated by the friends of protection the Government could not survive, and that the enemies of protection would come into power.

It was under these circumstances that the tariff committee entered upon their labours, the result of which was the embodiment of their views in a communication to the Finance Minister, which elicited from him a kindly letter, in which he alluded to it as a well-prepared brief, in which all the matters therein discussed had been done full justice.

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

It is also to be noticed that in many instances where the recommendations suggested that no changes be made in the duties upon articles therein enumerated no changes were made. * *

The association has just reason for congratulating itself upon the influence it possesses in assisting to mould public opinion in the matter of affording tariff protection to our manufacturing industries, and in shaping the laws of the country in conformity thereto.

Why, Sir, this Manufacturers' Association are boastful of their power. They believe, and I am not disposed to disagree with that belief, that they have this Government under their thumb—that, in fact, this Manufacturers' Association sent the Government here to enact such laws as they might dictate. The secretary adds:

The brief as prepared by the secretary was presented to the Minister, Hon. Mr. Foster, at Ottawa, on 26th February, 1894, the receipt of which was acknowledged by him as hereinbefore alluded to.

He winds up as follows, addressing the members of the association:

The fortress of protection does not totter to its fall, as its enemies declare, because you and such as you sustain it. There will be no collapse as these enemies predict. * * * * * In Sir Mackenzie Bowell we have a man at the head of our national affairs who is a sturdy and devoted adherent to our existing system, and who will hold his way steadily in the course he long since helped to mark out—

We on this side of the House are disposed to think that he will hold his course steadily in other directions as well, in spite of certain of his followers in the Cabinet and in this House.

—and, as an association and as individuals, no doubt your best and most earnest support will be given to his Government as long as the Government adhere to the principle of tariff protection to Canadian manufacturing industries.

Now, Sir, the Government must take warning. There is a covert threat in this promise. They will give the Government their unalterable allegiance and help just so long as they are willing to adhere to the principles of tariff protection to the industries which this association represents. Mr. R. W. Elliott, past president of the association, read a paper, in which the following paragraph appears:

In every electoral contest in which the principle of the National Policy is involved, every member of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association will fight for the right.

That is, the right of monopoly, the right to take unearned a portion of another man's wealth—rights worthy of the dark ages, when might was right, of the times of the old barons along the rivers of Germany, or of the chieftains in Scotland in ancient times, when it was considered right to take by force tribute from all passing traders.

We have, he said, in the past, and it is to be hoped we will in the future, devote any small surplus of our membership fees to spreading the truth by means of campaign literature and campaign speeches.

We have seen some samples of the campaign literature which the Manufacturers' Association spread during an election contest. They generally take the form of \$2, \$3 and \$5 bills. This is the kind of literature they usually spread, and I have not a doubt but

that they will, in the future, devote any small surplus from the fees of their association to the circulation of such literature.

Now, the Canadian Manufacturers' Association objects to the personnel of this House. They do not think that there are enough manufacturers here. Although the revision of the tariff was admittedly made on the lines suggested by them, even to the extent of adopting their language, so that there would not be even a verbal difference between the tariff as passed by this House and that proposed by the association, they are not satisfied. They find that there are not sufficient manufacturers in this House. Under date of 19th July, 1895, the "Canadian Manufacturer" complains bitterly, that there are not more manufacturers here. It says:

While the manufacturers were compelled to produce the sinews of war in the ever recurring fights to establish and maintain the policy, they were elbowed aside to make room for professional politicians, as has been repeatedly shown in these pages.

The sinews of war—here is a confession, an admission of what occurred—and which we only till then surmised—when the representatives of this association met the old chieftain in the famous red parlour and talked with him over the issues of the day, and decided on the amount of boodle that would be necessary to enable him to carry the different constituencies in the coming campaign. The "Manufacturer" winds up with this declaration:

Sir John and his party could never have attained to power without the active assistance of the manufacturers of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, I have just a word or two more to say on this plank Number one, and then I am done with that plank:

It has checked immigration. It has caused great loss of population.

I admit this with a great deal of sadness, because there can be nothing more deplorable than loss of population in a country like Canada. Sir, when we speak of the exodus under the National Policy, during the ten years from 1881 to 1891, the retort is made, that there was an exodus under the Mackenzie Administration. Well, so there was, but, probably, that exodus did not exceed 32,000 souls a year. The utmost charge was, that 42,000 people left Canada every year during the Mackenzie Administration. The Mackenzie Government was roundly denounced for this exodus. The Opposition of that day declared that it must be stopped, that some desperate remedy must be resorted to to stop this frightful exodus of our young people. In Sir John Macdonald's celebrated resolution—his famous National Policy declaration—he said:

The National Policy will retain in Canada thousands of our fellow-countrymen now obliged to expatriate themselves in search of employment denied them at home.

Mr. DAWSON.

Sir, the people endorsed this policy. By 1881 it had got fairly under way, by 1881 it was pretty fairly planted in the country, and by 1891 we looked for the results, and I can well imagine the sickening sense of disappointment felt by hon. gentlemen opposite, as well as the deep regret felt by hon. gentlemen on this side, when they found the census revealing the fact that the prophecies of hon. gentlemen opposite of a great increase of population had dismally failed.

In figuring up the loss of population during those ten years, I will spare the feelings of hon. gentlemen opposite as much as I can, and estimate the natural increase of population at 14 per cent, instead of 20 per cent, which, I believe, would be a fair estimate of the natural increase of a population so vigorous as ours. Well, estimating the natural increase in the ten years from 1881 to 1891 at 14 per cent, it amounted to 605,000. During these same ten years, there were brought into this country 886,000 immigrants, according to the reports of the Department of Agriculture. These immigrants would naturally have increased also, but, making no allowance for their natural increase, and simply adding the 886,000 to the natural increase of 605,000 in our own population, we should have had an increase of population, in these ten years, of at least 1,491,000. But, as a matter of fact, we found, by actual count, that our population had increased only 504,000, showing that 987,000 people had left Canada during these ten years, or well upon 100,000 souls per year, as against 42,000 per year, which was the most extreme estimate of the exodus during the Mackenzie regime. It is difficult, I admit, to determine accurately the natural increase of any country, but we know that the total increase for the ten years was only 504,000, and we know that the immigrants who came in numbered 886,000. So that, leaving out the natural increase, whatever it might be, and deducting simply the total increase in population of 504,000 from the total immigration of 886,000 in those ten years, and we find we have lost by the exodus 382,000 of that immigration, besides the natural increase, whatever it might be.

Sir Leonard Tilley, who ably advocated the National Policy, thought that it would specially benefit the maritime provinces, and in particular his own province of New Brunswick. How it must have wrung his heart, when the census returns showed that the whole increase in the population of New Brunswick was 63 souls between 1881 and 1891, under the National Policy, and this despite the fact that during that time railways had been constructed in all parts of the province and new country opened up, the country developed in many parts that were undeveloped before, and yet the whole increase was only 63 souls, against 5,639 between 1871 and 1881. Sir, there is one city in New Brunswick whose population increased be-

tween 1871 and 1881 and also between 1881 and 1891. Deducting the population of Moncton from the total population of the province, we find this to be the fact, that the increase, outside of Moncton, from 1871 to 1881 was 32,207, and that the decrease in the population of the province, outside of Moncton, from 1881 to 1891 was 3,703 souls. The National Policy drove out every immigrant that arrived seeking a home in New Brunswick, expatriated every soul of her natural increase, and drove with them 3,703 of a population besides. There is not one of our expatriated sons who does not yearn to return to this country, who would not hail with delight the day when a better fiscal system will enable him to return to Canada with the hope that he will be able to earn his daily bread here, so that he may join in that ever-memorable phrase of the late chieftain, who said: "A British subject I was born, and a British subject I will die."

During these fatal ten years we had done much to open up Canada. We developed the North-west by the construction of main and branch lines pretty well through all the North-west, and we should have an increase of population there by hundreds of thousands, aye, by millions, according to the prophecies of hon. gentlemen opposite. Yet the increase has amounted to a little less than the population in one of our largest cities in Ontario. Sir, in the older provinces of Ontario and Quebec and the maritime provinces, there are vast areas of waste lands awaiting settlement. We have spent vast sums on railway enterprises, opening up the newer portions, and we had every reason to expect a large increase in population in the older provinces. As a matter of fact, the increase from 1881 to 1891 was about 8 per cent. From 1860 to 1870, the Southern States were devastated by the most destructive war the world has ever seen, hundreds of thousands of her sons were killed in battle, millions of acres of fertile lands were laid waste and the country left in ruins, yet we find that, in spite of all that disaster, the increase of population during these ten years was 14 per cent against 8 per cent in our provinces of Ontario, Quebec and the maritime provinces. The effect of this tragedy called the National Policy was worse than that of the sword in the southern states. Though war-swept and famine stricken, they increased their population at a rate almost double that of these provinces of ours. Is it to be wondered at, then, that the Liberals denounce the policy that has brought our fair country to a pass such as this, when she fails to hold our own people here, but instead drives them forth together with those who come seeking a home amongst us in this new land.

Why do they persist in this policy? They say that it is to build up manufacturing industries. Sir, no one more earnestly desires to see the manufacturing industries of Canada prosperous than I do. The pluck, the

energy, the perseverance necessary to establish and carry on one of our industries entitle those engaged in it to consideration; they deserve to have a fair and adequate profit. But is it wise to induce production beyond the power of the people to consume? It is said that the capacity of manufacturers has doubled; and yet our population in all Canada has increased only 12 per cent. Tariff restrictions seem to have had this effect—they have made it impossible for our manufacturers to produce at such prices as will enable them to command a market in foreign countries. The exports of our manufactured goods is about \$4,000,000, as I have shown—about enough to supply 100,000 people; not more than enough to supply the number of people who are annually driven out of our country during this reign of terror, as I may call it, of the National Policy. In the name of the manufacturers as well as the farmers, I say: Stop the exodus. The home market is the best for the manufacturers as it is the best for the farmers. Why drive the people away and force our manufacturers to send their goods abroad to overcome the tariff barriers of other countries and seek a market among our very people who have been driven out by this policy?

The hon. member for Pictou says that we shall increase now in population, because our country has been more fully developed; railway enterprise has opened up our country and, therefore, we may look for a large increase in the population in the next ten years. But the country was more developed between 1881 and 1891 than between 1871 and 1881; and yet I find that the increase in population in that decade, in 1871-1881, was 18 per cent against only 12 per cent in the decade, 1881-1891. Sir, the mother country is alarmed at our failure to attract population here, at our failure to find homes for their sons seeking them in the new world. It wrings her heart to find her eldest daughter, Canada, turning away tens of thousands of her own children as well as tens of thousands from the mother country seeking homes amongst us, forcing them to take up residence under the Stars and Stripes and to spend their energy in building up a nation that is alien to ours. The St. James "Gazette," commenting on the results of the census, said:

While America is filled up and brimming over and increasing its population by millions, Canada, if not exactly stationary, is increasing very slowly indeed. It had been commonly supposed that with the great boom in the North-west, Canada should have shown an increase of at least two millions or three millions during the last decade, and would be well on its way to something like the population of a second-rate European state; but all such hopes have been dashed by the census. The increase of population spills over the border and fills up the Northern and Western States. The men who were born in Canada and should become citizens of the Empire grow and die under the Stars and

Stripes. Whether we like it or not, Canada is not doing well, and has not been doing well for some time past.

And, Sir, it never can do well until we cease paralyzing the country's energies with the virus of protection. Under the Stars and Stripes nearly a million of our compatriots are living. They are men who hunger for the old home here in Canada; they love Canada with a greater love than that they have for their new home under the Stars and Stripes. What class of men go there? On one occasion the hon. member for Pictou declared that none went across the line except craven Grits. I know not what their politics were, but this I know, whether Grit or Tory, cravens they are not. Nobly have they held their own in the land of their adoption. You will find their names first in trade, at the head of vast corporations engaged in transportation, and taking the lead in directing great banking institutions and other financial undertakings in the land which is now their home.

A million of them have gone, including our immigrants, not infants or little children, but stalwart young men and young women, educated and equipped ready for the battle of life. I would like the Minister of Finance to figure out the money lost, through this exodus, to the people of Canada. Take the cost of educating our sons and daughters who are sent into the United States when adults grown. I think that he will find that at a very low estimate the cost of educating the people who have fled from Canada and taken up their abode in the United States well nigh equal in amount to our national debt.

Our population ought to have increased by leaps and bounds. Never in the history of Canada were such large expenditures made upon public enterprises as between 1881 and 1891. According to the Year-Book the Canadian people, through the Government and private corporations spent in railway construction alone over \$400,000,000. Millions more were spent in canals and other public works. Building operations in the cities were the means of circulating tens of millions more. But in spite of all this we find that the exodus continued, and our people departed at the rate of a hundred thousand a year to help build up a foreign nation. And so we denounce the tariff of hon. gentlemen opposite, because it has checked immigration and caused a great loss of population.

We denounce that policy because it has impeded commerce, or rather it has failed to develop commerce with the nations of the world. Our imports for consumption last year amounted to \$105,252,521. Outside of Great Britain and the United States, we buy very little from the nations of the world. From the United States we bought more than half of our imports, or a total of \$54,634,521. From Great Britain and her colonies, we bought \$33,808,642, or a total

Mr. DAWSON.

for these two of \$88,443,163. From all the rest of the world outside we purchased \$16,809,348. There are only four nations of the world that sold us over a million dollars worth of goods each:—Germany, from which we purchased \$4,794,159; Spanish West Indies, \$3,531,292; France, \$2,585,174, and Japan, \$1,567,558, or a total from these four of \$12,478,183; leaving a balance of \$4,331,165 to represent our total import trade with all the world outside of the countries named.

We sold, of the produce of Canada, \$102,828,351. Britain and her colonies took \$62,021,793. The United States took \$35,603,773. All the countries on the earth besides took \$5,202,785 of such goods as we had to sell. Now, of foreign nations, only one purchased from us over a million dollars' worth, and that is the Spanish West Indies, to whom we sold \$1,407,400. Australasia sold us, altogether, \$113,000 worth of goods, and we sold in Australasia \$414,924, made up as follows:—Manufactured goods, \$230,665; products of the forest, \$94,840; products of the fisheries, \$83,601; agricultural products, \$5,804; animals and their products, \$5. To secure this trifling trade with Australia we have subsidized a line of steamers to cost \$122,000 a year.

Sir, we denounce this tariff because it discriminates against Great Britain. Hon. gentlemen opposite deny this, but the facts are against them. The Trade and Navigation Returns prove beyond all doubt that there is an actual discrimination against British trade. Loyal people were urged to support the National Policy because it would increase our trade with Great Britain. Here are the very words of Sir Leonard Tilley, when making his first National Policy Budget speech, in 1879:

Forming a part of that great country—a country that receives our natural products without any taxation, everything we have to send her—apart from our national feelings, I think this House will not object if, in the propositions before me, the duties touch more heavily the imports from foreign countries than from our fatherland.

Sir, it has had the very opposite effect. England takes free all the goods we choose to send her, the products of our fisheries, of our forests, of our mines, and of our farms—everything free of duty. Everything that is sent to the United States is heavily taxed, more heavily taxed during the last few years than formerly. This so-called patriotic policy, you might naturally expect, would produce a vast increase in the whole volume of our export and import trade with Great Britain. Now, as a matter of fact, I find that our trade with Great Britain, exports and imports, from 1873 to 1878, amounted to \$560,000,000, an annual average, when the Liberals were in power, of \$93,500,000. Our total trade, export and import, with the United States during the same period, was \$490,000,000, in round numbers,

an annual average of about 80 millions. Our trade with Great Britain exceeded our trade with the United States by \$13,500,000 a year. Then came the National Policy, and what do we find? The last fourteen years, under the National Policy, our aggregate trade with Great Britain, exports and imports, has been 1,295 millions, an annual average of \$92,500,000 a year, showing a shrinkage of one million a year. Our average aggregate trade for the last fourteen years was one million dollars a year less with Great Britain than it was during the five years of the Mackenzie regime. During the same fourteen years our trade with the United States was 1,290 millions, an average of \$92,140,000, almost equal to that of Great Britain, and an increase of over 12 million dollars above what it was during the Mackenzie Administration. This anti-British, unpatriotic National Policy caused a shrinkage in our trade with Great Britain, where no barriers exist against free trade, and produced an increase of trade with the United States, in spite of their heavy protection barriers.

Sir, there is another striking proof of the anti-British character of this National Policy, and it will be found in the total imports for consumption. From 1873 to 1878, under Liberal rule and a low tariff, our trade with Great Britain amounted to \$310,000,000, an average of \$52,000,000 a year. During the same period our trade with the United States aggregated \$299,000,000, or an average of about \$50,000,000 a year. During the last fourteen years our trade with Great Britain has averaged \$42,500,000, or \$9,500,000 less than our average trade during the Mackenzie Administration. Our trade with the United States averages over 51 millions, or a million a year more than it averaged during the Mackenzie Administration.

Now, Sir, our imports from England benefit her. It is no special benefit to England to send her our goods; she has the whole world to draw upon, and it is not one jot to the profit of the people of England to sell her our goods. But she makes a profit on what she sells to us, and she has a right, therefore, to expect from a patriotic policy, that it will increase her export trade with us. Yet we find that, under this policy, exports from Great Britain have diminished to the extent of \$9,500,000, and have increased from the United States, her great commercial rival. Now, let me quote further from Sir Leonard Tilley, when speaking in 1879:

In the imposition of the duties we are now about to ask the House to impose, it may be said we will receive from the imports from foreign countries a larger portion of the \$2,000,000 we require than we will receive from the mother country. I believe such will be the effect.

But such was not the effect. The amount of duty levied on goods coming from Great Britain, that is, on the whole volume of our trade of last year was 22½ per cent; the

duties levied on goods imported from the United States amounted to 12½ per cent, being a discrimination in the whole volume of our trade of 10 per cent. In the Trade and Navigation Returns we find that our imports from Great Britain, of dutiable goods entered for consumption, in the year ending 30th June last, amounted to \$23,311,911, on which we collected in duties, \$7,006,676.58. In the same year we imported from the United States, of dutiable goods, to the value of \$25,795,538, on which we collected in duty \$6,897,395.04. In other words, 30½ per cent was levied upon dutiable goods imported from Great Britain, and only 26¾ per cent were levied on the dutiable goods imported from the United States, a straight discrimination of 3¾ per cent, a heavier discrimination than we have had in any year before, and this occurred in the year after the hon. gentleman had revised the tariff.

Sir, this is not treating Great Britain fairly. We sold her, the produce of Canada, \$57,913,564 worth, and purchased, of dutiable and non-dutiable goods, \$31,131,737. Besides, to balance the account, we took from her, in cash, \$26,771,827. Contrast this with our trade with the United States. We purchased there of dutiable and non-dutiable goods to the value of \$54,634,521, and sold them of our produce to the value of \$35,603,773, and paid them \$19,030,748 in cash to balance the account.

Sir, the fact of this discrimination has been pointed out in this House, year after year, by hon. gentlemen on this side, but the Government have turned a deaf ear. They revised the tariff, and the discrimination was sharper than ever. The people in England long since saw and objected to the effect of the tariff policy of hon. gentlemen opposite, as is shown in a speech delivered on the floor of the House of Commons, on 27th April, 1888, when the then Minister of Finance, now the Secretary of State, said:

When we took up this question of fostering our native industries, many parties in England attacked me in reference to it and asked: What do you mean by turning your back upon the English free trade policy and taking up the United States protective policy?

And, Sir, it has been recognized by thinking men outside this House. Principal Grant, in an admirable paper, written by him in November, 1894, says:

We must get into the British or American system. At present we are copying the United States, and without intending it, discriminating against our best customers. Let us take the other tack now. The British system is right.

Sir, it has been recognized, as I said, by Liberals in this House, and they have sought to set it right. The hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies), in April, 1892, moved this resolution:

Inasmuch as Great Britain admits the products of Canada into her ports free of duty, this House is of the opinion that the present scale

of duties exacted on goods mainly imported from Great Britain, should be reduced.

This was a practical recognition of what was due to the motherland. Sir, I care nothing for the windy declarations of loyalty which are sometimes heard from our friends opposite. I believe in it when I see its fruits in practical works. When I see these hon. gentlemen discriminate against England and refuse to adopt such a resolution as was submitted by my hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Davies), then I may be allowed to say that I am somewhat skeptical of the depth, quality and extent of their loyalty. This motion was voted down by hon. gentlemen opposite. But they proposed another resolution, a very unselfish one they thought it submitted by the hon. member for North Bruce, as follows:—

That if and when the Parliament of Great Britain and Ireland admits Canadian products to the markets of the United Kingdom upon more favourable terms than it accords to the products of foreign countries, the Parliament of Canada will be prepared to accord corresponding advantages by a reduction in the duties it imposes upon British manufactured goods.

Every Conservative supported this resolution, and it was carried: and if my memory serves me, they rose and sang "God Save the Queen."

England admits all our goods free. We will not reduce the tariff unless she goes further, and taxes the bread of her workmen imported from other lands. When she not only admits our goods free, but gives them preferential treatment, then what? Admit her goods free? Not a bit of it. We will be prepared to yield and submit to reducing the duties on British goods so as to place them on a par with importations from the United States. Sir, I believe it would have been well for our trade and well for our relations with the motherland had the resolution of my hon. friend from Queen's been adopted, and reductions in the duties made so as to wipe out the reproach which rests upon the people of Canada, as seen in our Trade and Navigation Returns, that we undoubtedly discriminate in our tariff against importations from the mother country.

Sir, it has been lately the fashion for hon. gentlemen opposite to decry England. The hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper), then Minister of Marine and Fisheries, made use of most remarkable language. I desire to call the attention of the House to it once again, for we should never forget the words used. Speaking of England he said:

Driven from the civilized markets of the world, steadily and every year finding their output to those markets decreasing, they spend millions on their navy, and millions on their army, to force their wares, and their goods, and their merchandise into the uncivilized markets of the world.

This fashion so set by the hon. gentleman

Mr. DAWSON.

has been followed by his friends in the House and their press outside. It is no uncommon thing to see in Conservative newspapers a column filled with loyal praise of England, and to find her described as "Mistress of the sea," "Mother of Heroes," "Champion of Civil and Religious Liberty," "First of Nations," and side by side a column of gross and palpable falsehood about British trade. British workmen and British affairs, the column being headed, "Free Trade as they have it in England." I will give one statement as a sample of the whole. This assertion was made respecting Leeds: "The town of Leeds, England, has a population of 200,000, and not one workman in the town owns the house he lives in, and this in free trade England." The actual facts are these: Leeds has a population of 400,000. More than 2,000 workmen own their homes. The funds of workmen in their unions, friendly societies, co-operative stores and in savings banks, amount to \$1,250,000. They have undertaken extensive business enterprises, and conduct them successfully on the co-operative plan. The Leeds Workingmen Co-operative Society own a small fleet on the canals and rivers of Yorkshire and Lancashire and engage profitably in the carrying trade. Allow me to add that this is in free trade England.

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

After Recess.

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Speaker, when you left the Chair at six o'clock, I was discussing some of the reckless statements which appear, from time to time, in the Conservative press respecting British trade and the condition of the British workman. The condition of the British workman is nothing like so dark as is painted by the press of hon. gentlemen opposite. I would inform these hon. gentlemen that since Mr. Gladstone introduced the principle of eight hours as a day's labour on Government work, without any law whatever being passed, the system has been very generally adopted voluntarily in many of the largest and most important works in England and Scotland. I may inform hon. gentlemen that John Edward Ellis, M.P., managing director of extensive iron and coal mines in the Midlands of England, has voluntarily adopted the eight-hour system, and Col. Seeley, another M.P., who also manages iron works, employing 25,000 men, has followed his example. This shows that the condition of the unhappy labourer in free trade England is not so dark as some of the newspapers of hon. gentlemen opposite painted it just before the recent elections.

Why, Sir, our Canadian merchants who were in England last fall placing their orders for goods, found that they were unable to

get their orders filled as rapidly as they desired. They found in almost every centre of industry in England factories working overtime, and some of them working day and night wherever practicable, and yet in spite of all this extra effort it was impossible for the manufacturers to overtake their orders.

What has free trade done for England? Mulhall declares that since the adoption of free trade, England has reduced her debt by \$900,000,000; that her population has increased 42 per cent; that the wealth of her people has increased 124 per cent; that her trade has increased 472 per cent, and her shipping has increased 583 per cent. In speaking of this great increase in wealth which has much more than doubled since the adoption of free trade, Mulhall goes on to say:

The ordinary accumulation is £150,000,000 yearly, or about half a million daily. Does this wealth become congested among a small number of people? On the contrary the rich grow less rich and more numerous every year, and the poor become fewer in ratio of population.

One hundred and fifty millions pounds sterling, about \$750,000,000 yearly of our money; well up to two and a half million dollars for each working day, is added to the wealth of England under free trade. England's trade with foreign nations, her export and import trade, has enormously increased under free trade. It was in 1893 almost equal to that of Germany and the United States together, and they have a population three times greater than that of England. The foreign trade of France and Russia, with a population four times greater than that of England, was thirty-four million dollars less. Italy and Spain, with ten millions more people, have together a trade less than one-sixth that of England.

England is to-day the creditor general of all the protected countries in the world. Without English money the protected industries of all the nations of the earth would suffer materially. Her reserve capital supports these industries, supplies them with money and enables them to survive in the countries adopting protection.

But, hon. gentlemen say, that within the last few years England is suffering more severely; that free trade is now getting in its work, and that England is rapidly falling into decay. Dire ruin and misery, they say, is spreading over the land, and her people are unemployed. Well, if that is so, we might naturally look for an increase of poverty and crime, and we would also expect to see her people fleeing from her shores. Let me inform these hon. gentlemen that during the last sixteen years, ending in 1895, the increase of the population of England almost equalled the total population of the Dominion of Canada. It increased from 34,622,930 in 1880 to 39,134,166 in 1895, an in-

crease in the sixteen years of 4,511,236, or about 13 per cent.

We would expect that if the times were bad in England, that the increase in the number of paupers would exceed the percentage of increase in population at least. What are the facts? In the three years, 1880, 1881, 1882, the average number of all sorts of paupers, indoor and outdoor, in the United Kingdom was 1,001,944, while in the three years ending January, 1895, the number had fallen to 966,920, or an actual decrease of 4 per cent. Crime also decreased. In the three years 1880, 1881 and 1882, convictions in England, Scotland and Ireland averaged 15,808 per year, while in the three years ending January 1st, 1895, the average number of convictions had fallen to 12,899, a decrease of over 18 per cent. These statements are taken from the Statistical Abstract of the United Kingdom for the year 1895.

If trade is so bad in England we might expect the Bankruptcy Court to reveal the fact. But on the contrary, I find the following facts set forth in the Statistical Abstract: The number of adjudicated bankrupts and the number of resolutions registered for liquidation by arrangement and for composition with creditors altogether in England and Wales, during the years 1880, 1881 and 1882 was 29,066, while in the three years, 1892, 1893 and 1894 they had fallen to 14,352, or a decrease of over 50 per cent. The amount of liabilities involved during the same period fell from £52,976,044 to £23,458,124, a decrease in the amount of liabilities involved in these failures of 55 per cent. The assets in the three years 1880, 1881 and 1882 amounted to £15,085,324, and in the three years 1892, 1893 and 1894, they amounted to £8,298,228, a decrease in the assets of only 45 per cent. The number of bankrupts decreased 50 per cent, liabilities involved decreased 55 per cent, and the assets decreased 45 per cent; the proportion of the assets to the liabilities being larger in the three last years than in the first three years of the period under discussion.

This does not seem to me to prove that England is in the deplorable condition painted by hon. gentlemen opposite. But when we prove their libels respecting British trade to be false, they say: But what of agriculture, and they paint grim pictures of awful destitution among the agriculturists of England. I have no doubt that many of the English farmers are depressed. I think there is no question about it. The lower prices we obtain in the British market for agricultural products to-day, as compared with, say, twenty years ago, must have an effect upon the agriculturists of that country. But, Sir, if the English farmer cannot live on the price obtainable for his products in England, what is to become of the farmers of Canada who have to look to the English market in which to sell their

goods. With our long winter, with our many disabilities, with the cost of the transportation of products to that great market in England, we have to compete with the English farmer, and if the British farmer is unable to live, how can the Canadian farmer live and contend with these disadvantages.

I do not think that hon. gentlemen opposite will be able to show that the small farmers—those holding a comparatively speaking, small number of acres of land in England—are in a distressed condition. Where the farmers work their own land, with the help of their sons, they are not suffering in anything like the degree the large landholders are who conduct their operations by the employment of hired labour. The agricultural distress in England is caused by the use of hired labour and by high rents.

There is at present an agitation in England for protection, in the shape of duties on agricultural produce, and hon. gentlemen opposite seem disposed to back up that agitation. What would be the effect of protection, so-called, to the distressed agriculturists of England? It would simply increase the value of land and consequently increase the rent the owner of the land would exact from the tenant who works the soil. It is the landowners and not the farmers who are at the bottom of this agitation for the protection of agriculture in England. In proof of that, I will read to the House what was said by the Right Hon. Henry Chaplin, member of Parliament, on the 27th of February, 1891. He said:

One effect of such duties (duties on produce) was undoubtedly to very materially enhance the price of land, and thus to increase its value.

The Right Hon. Joseph Chamberlain is on record as saying:

The owners of property, the men who have privileges to maintain, would be glad to entrap you from the right path, by raising the cry of Fair Trade, under which they cover their demand "protected industry," and in connection with which they would tax the food of the people in order to raise the rent of the landlord.

That is the object of those who are at the back of the agitation for granting relief to the distressed agriculturists in England. The object is to raise the rent of the landlord.

Why do hon. gentlemen opposite decry the motherland? Why do they discriminate against her trade? Are they not loyal? Sir, I believe they are loyal. I believe, in spite of their abuse of England, in spite of their discrimination against her trade, that deep down in their hearts there is a sentiment of loyalty as fervent and as strong as that which swells the hearts of the Liberals of Canada. Should danger menace the Empire, and an enemy invade our land, I know that there is not a man on the other side of the House who would not take his place side by side with the Liberals, and

Mr. DAWSON.

manfully fight for the Empire, and manfully defend our homes. There is not one but would mingle his blood with that of the Liberals in stern defence of our country's flag and all that it implies. The flag, that emblem of our liberties which we on this side deem to be too sacred an emblem to be dragged in the mud of political strife.

2.—ENLARGED MARKETS—RECIPROCITY.

That, having regard to the prosperity of Canada and the United States as adjoining countries, with many mutual interests, it is desirable that there should be the most friendly relations and broad and liberal trade intercourse between them;

That the interests alike of the Dominion and of the Empire would be materially advanced by the establishing of such relations;

That the period of the old reciprocity treaty was one of marked prosperity to the British North American colonies;

That the pretext under which the Government appealed to the country in 1891 respecting negotiations for a treaty with the United States was misleading and dishonest and intended to deceive the electorate;

That no sincere effort has been made by them to obtain a treaty, but that, on the contrary, it is manifest that the present Government, controlled as they are by monopolies and combines, are not desirous of securing such a treaty;

That the first step towards obtaining the end in view, is to place a party in power who are sincerely desirous of promoting a treaty on terms honourable to both countries;

That a fair and liberal reciprocity treaty would develop the great natural resources of Canada, would enormously increase the trade and commerce between the two countries, would tend to encourage friendly relations between the two peoples, would remove many causes which have in the past provoked irritation and trouble to the governments of both countries, and would promote those kindly relations between the Empire and the republic which afford the best guarantee for peace and prosperity;

That the Liberal party is prepared to enter into negotiations with a view to obtaining such a treaty, including a well-considered list of manufactured articles, and we are satisfied that any treaty so arranged will receive the assent of Her Majesty's Government, without whose approval no treaty can be made.

Sir, the natural resources of Canada are very great, and all we lack to properly develop them are three things: Men, money, and markets. Under the National Policy, men have been driven out by tens of thousands. Money has been absorbed by a few, and I am sorry to say that some of those who have succeeded in absorbing much of the money of the people of Canada have seen fit to invest a portion, at least, of their surplus wealth in the United States, in preference to investing it in the development of our latent resources in Canada.

Markets are required. The Chinese policy of isolation, resulting in national stagnation, must be set aside. Our vast mineral wealth is useless to us for lack of men and money, and markets, to develop them.

Our natural wealth, until developed, is as useless to us as a bag of gold would be to a shipwrecked mariner on a desert island. These hon. gentleman say that we need not worry, because we have a vast home market, not perhaps for minerals, but at least for agricultural products. I will give them a few figures in regard to the home market. A home market for agricultural products? Let me tell hon. gentlemen that, according to census bulletin No. 18, which they can consult, 735,207 men are engaged in agriculture in Canada; 320,001 people altogether are engaged in manufacturing and mechanical pursuits. Sir, we had industries before the National Policy was thought of, but after eighteen years of it, let us see what success the census bulletins reveal. We have 320,001 operatives in our manufacturing industries. From this number, I shall have to ask permission to count off those whom the National Policy in no way benefits. Carpenters, coopers, joiners, boat-builders, and saw-mill men, number 67,000. Brick-makers, masons, painters and plasterers, number 26,000. Machinists and blacksmiths number 28,000. Milliners and dressmakers, shoemakers, harnessmakers, tailors and tanners number 70,000. Bakers, butchers, millers, butter and cheese makers, number 20,000. Bookbinders and printers number 9,000. These who are in no way indebted to the National Policy, directly or indirectly, number 220,000 of our industrial population, leaving 100,000 who are in some degree benefited by protection. These 100,000 include all who work in factories, refineries, breweries and distilleries, and some thousands who are put down in the tables as "others." We will suppose that not a soul worked in these industries before, and that the National Policy could claim the whole of them. The National Policy home market, then, would be limited to 100,000 people, and we have 735,000 farmers to supply them. We have the products of seven farms to supply one operative.

Sir, there are not 100,000 operatives to-day, directly or indirectly, benefited by protection. I will give you a list of the establishments that may be more or less benefited by protection, and the number of persons, male and female, employed in them. If there are others, let us have their names. They are as follows:—

Agricultural implements	3,856
Cotton operatives	6,053
Woollen operatives	4,241
Mill and factory operatives (textile)	3,876
Iron and steel workers	2,804
Machinists	9,572
Moulders	4,070
Tool and cutlery makers	964
Wire workers	283
Sugar refineries	1,700
Rope and cordage operatives	412
Oil well employees	344
Starch works employees	62
"Manufacturers and officials"	6,169
Total	44,446

72½

If hon. gentlemen can add to these, I wish they would; but take it at 100,000, and admit the absurd contention that not one of these could have received employment in this country but for the National Policy, and that is the utmost extent that can be claimed for the National Policy home market—100,000 for 735,000 farmers to supply.

Well, we would suppose from the speeches of hon. gentlemen opposite, from the speech of the hon. gentleman who last sat down. (Mr. Smith, Ontario), that they never advocated or desired reciprocity with the United States in any shape, manner, or form. Why, the last Parliament was prematurely dissolved and an election held to secure the people's endorsement of the Government's stand in favour of reciprocity. Clearly during the session of 1890, the Government had no idea of a general election before 1892. They refused in that year to revise the list of voters, and stated that it was not their intention to have general elections before the natural death of Parliament in the year 1892. Here are the words of the then Secretary of State (Hon. Mr. Chapleau):

But is there no other reason why that revision should not take place? We have not yet reached the end of this Parliament. According to law this Parliament will cease in the beginning of 1892. If in July, 1891, the census shows that the representation must be changed, it will become necessary to have new elections soon after the census, and those elections should take place at the beginning of 1892, by the natural death of this Parliament according to the constitution. There is no reason to doubt that a revision beginning in 1891 could be satisfactorily made, and would be ready for the eventuality of elections in 1892.

The lists were not revised, but the election was held on the 5th March, 1891. What reason was given for this change in the plan of the Government? What reason did they give for deciding to hold the elections a year before the date fixed by the constitution? Immediately after dissolution, the following announcement was published by authority in the Government press:

It will naturally be asked what are the reasons which have induced the Government to appeal to the country at the present time. It is understood that the Dominion Government have, through Her Majesty's Government, made certain proposals to the United States for negotiations looking to the extension of her commerce with that country. The proposals have been submitted to the President for his consideration and the Canadian Government is of the opinion that if the negotiations are to result in a treaty, which must be ratified by the Parliament of Canada, it is expedient that the Government should be able to deal with a Parliament fresh from the people rather than with a moribund House.

Sir, they were so red hot for reciprocity that they wanted a brand new Parliament elected at once, so that this golden opportunity would not be let slip. And during the campaign, at Toronto, Sir John Macdonald put himself on record as follows:—

The Government are appealing to the people to grant them authority to send a delegate to

Washington to negotiate trade relations with the United States.

On the same day at the same meeting, Sir John Thompson said :

The Government would endeavour to obtain reciprocity with the United States along the line of the reciprocity treaty which prevailed from 1854 to 1856.

This further statement, dictated by the head of the Government, was published with regard to the alleged negotiations for reciprocity :

Moreover, these propositions were invited and suggested by the Washington authorities. Commissioners from Canada and Great Britain will start for Washington on 4th March, the date of the opening of the new Congress. The result of the Canadian elections will be known on the 6th March, the day the commissioners will reach Washington. In order that this commission may have no uncertain sound the Government has decided to appeal to the people and ask for judgment on these proposals to the Washington authorities.

On these lines, Sir, the elections were run, that is they were so run wherever reciprocity was found to be a winning card. Bills were published, calling meetings in the interests of the Government candidate in Carleton, N.B., headed :

Vote for Vince and Reciprocity.

If you want reciprocity, support the Government.

The Government have been approached by the Washington authorities ; they are in a position to get this boon for the farmers of Canada, and if you desire it you must support them. This was the language with which hon. gentlemen opposite, all through the country, approached the agricultural constituencies. Unfortunately, however, it turned out that the United States Government had not invited a conference, had made no overtures whatever to the Government here ; and Mr. Blaine found it necessary to write Sir Julian Pauncefote, the British Ambassador at Washington, under date of 1st April, 1891 :

I deem it important, since the matter has been for some weeks open to public remark, to have it settled that the conference was not initiated by me, but, on the contrary, that the private arrangement of which I spoke was but a modification of your proposal, and in no sense an original suggestion from the government of the United States.

Shortly after the elections, the hon. Secretary of State (Sir Charles Tupper), then High Commissioner of Canada, who had visited Washington, wrote to Sir John Macdonald, after his return, as follows :—

I told Mr. Blaine that I wished at the outset to recognize the correctness of his statement contained in his letter to Sir Julian Pauncefote, which I had seen, in reference to the initiation of the negotiations regarding reciprocity and trade relations between the two countries.

Mr. DAWSON.

Well, our delegates went there. Sir John Thompson, Sir Mackenzie Bowell and the Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster) conferred with the Hon. Jas. G. Blaine respecting trade relations between Canada and the United States. Let me give you a quotation from a memo. prepared by Mr. Blaine and sent to the President of the United States, giving a summary of what occurred at that conference. He said :

At this conference the commissioners stated they were authorized by the Canadian Government to propose the renewal of the reciprocity treaty of 1854, with such modifications and extensions as the altered circumstances of both countries and their respective interests might seem to require. In answer to an inquiry the commissioners stated that the modifications or extensions contemplated in the schedule of articles should be confined to natural products and should not embrace manufactured articles.

The commissioners were informed that the government of the United States would not be prepared to renew the treaty of 1854, nor to agree upon any commercial reciprocity which should be confined to natural products alone.

Well, these delegates from the Dominion Government went to negotiate a treaty of reciprocity in natural products and failed. Now hon. gentlemen opposite assure us that a treaty would ruin us. The hon. member for South Ontario (Mr. Smith) declared that such a treaty would do our farmers no good because of the similarity of the products, and that the politician who advocated such a policy was deliberately deluding the public. I ask the hon. member for South Ontario what he has to say to these negotiators, the First Minister (Sir Mackenzie Bowell) and the Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster), who went to Washington to try and obtain a renewal of the reciprocity treaty of 1854? Reciprocity in barley, wheat, fish, lumber, cattle, butter, cheese and all other natural products. Does he say that these hon. gentlemen were deliberately deluding the agriculturists of Canada? If he makes that charge against them, I must leave him to their tender mercies.

The hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Masson) said, in this debate, that he feared a deluge of American farm products, if the duties were removed. Well, Sir, when the market in the United States for our barley was lost to us, that hon. gentleman sturdily advocated the cultivation of two-rowed barley for the English market. Some of our farmers did attempt to cultivate two-rowed barley, to their sorrow, loss and keen regret. These hon. gentlemen say that American products American farm truck, American hogs and cattle would displace ours in the Canadian market, in the event of a reciprocity treaty being made. These hon. gentlemen forget that the farmers of Canada beat all the world at the World's Fair in the very heart of the United States. In 1891 the Government thought that our farmers had nothing to

fear. Having since then seen Canada's great exhibit at that World's Fair, I wonder that there is any member of this House who doubts the ability of the Canadian farmer to hold his own in competition with the farmers of any country in the world, and certainly with those of the United States. Let them open their markets to us, with their teeming millions in the great cities almost at our doors—in Buffalo, Cleveland, Detroit, Boston, New York, Brooklyn, Philadelphia and Washington—and let us see what share we shall have in competition for these markets with the farmers of the United States.

Hon. gentlemen opposite failed to get a treaty, and now they say the American market is not of much account, anyhow. Well, Sir, if the American market is of no account to the Canadian farmer, the tariff legislation of the United States cannot have affected our exports to it. Let us see. In 1890, the United States tariff was much lower than it was a couple of years later, after the adoption of the McKinley Bill. Let me read you a table, showing the effect upon our exports to the United States in a few leading articles of farm products, of the increased duties under the McKinley Bill :

COMPARISON OF EXPORT OF FARM PRODUCTS, 1890 AND 1893.

Name of Articles.	1890.	1893.
Horses	1,887,895	1,123,339
Cattle	104,623	11,032
Poultry	105,612	52,114
Eggs	1,793,104	324,355
Wool	235,436	228,030
Flax	175,563	124,082
Barley	4,582,562	638,271
Split peas	74,215	4,214
Hay	922,797	854,958
Malt	149,310	19
Potatoes	308,915	259,176
Rye	113,320	3,302
	10,453,352	3,624,892

Of these twelve leading articles, our shipments fell from three to one. Our exports of cattle, poultry, malt and rye were practically wiped out. Our exports of eggs fell to one-sixth of what they had been. Of barley we exported only one bushel where formerly we exported seven. They simply raised the barriers against us, and immediately we lost two-thirds of our trade. But, in spite of these barriers against us, a large amount of our farm produce continued to find its way into that market. And that, I think, conclusively proves the value of that market to us ?

Gentlemen opposite tell us, that substitutes can be found for this market else-

where, perhaps on the coast of Africa, perhaps in Java, perhaps in Iceland or in Terra del Fuego—anywhere except in the great cities of the country right at our door. I have said that the McKinley Bill was meant to be prohibitory. And, when I say that our exports to the United States, in many lines, under the McKinley Bill, largely exceeded our exports to all the world besides, it must surely prove to hon. gentlemen that that market is of some importance to us. Let me give you a list of articles of export, the produce of Canada, showing what amount of each was sent to the United States, and what to all other countries of the world besides :

Articles or classification of exports the produce of Canada.	1893. United States.	1893. All other Countries.
Products of the mine	\$ 4,756,280	\$ 573,610
Products of the forest ..	13,859,960	12,499,950
Fresh water fish and salt water fish, fresh	1,287,822	4,642
Horses	1,123,339	337,818
Swine	130,093	15,997
Sheep	1,088,814	159,041
Poultry	52,114	9,013
Bones	58,444	10,282
Hides	385,246	7,122
Sheep pelts	66,939	16
Wool	228,030	281
Flax	124,082	
Berries	96,104	115
Fruit, N.E.S.	24,646	1,114
Barley	638,271	306,084
Beans	351,058	4,624
Hay	854,958	597,914
Straw	25,117	932
Maple sugar	48,174	1,477
Trees, shrubs and plants.	11,969	232
Potatoes	259,176	162,782
Vegetables	105,836	10,404
Other articles	27,096	1,577
Fertilizers	7,706	
Furs (dressed)	6,664	2,103
Grindstones	24,754	948
Gypsum	27,091	2,366
Household effects	1,246,085	37,081
Lime	97,898	8,207
Barrels	10,631	6,297
Household furniture	123,872	50,749
Wood pulp	424,253	1,640
Other manufactures	249,752	117,727
Bullion	309,459	
	\$28,132,233	\$14,932,145

Well, Sir, the McKinley tariff is no more. How soon it will be reimposed, no one knows. The Wilson Bill, even as amended, gives some relief, but the burden is still very great.

Now, for a moment let us examine the relative value of the United States and the Australian markets. In spite

of tariff restrictions, we sold natural products to the United States last year to the value of \$32,500,000, consisting of the following products: Of the mines, \$6,271,397; of the fisheries, \$3,025,171; of the forest, \$12,482,969; of the farm, \$7,423,171; altogether, of natural products sent into the United States, \$32,502,707. Now, our exports of natural products to Australia were as follows:—Products of the mine, nothing; products of the fisheries, \$83,610; products of the forest, \$94,840; agricultural products, \$5,804; animals and their products, \$5; altogether, \$184,259 worth of natural products found their way to the Australian market. Sir, I have no desire to belittle the Australian market. What we desire is an outlet for our natural products; but I think that a subsidy of \$122,000 a year is rather too high a price to pay for a market consuming only \$184,000 worth of our natural products. Why, Sir, we have to-day yards full of young beef cattle, but no market. We are barred out from the United States by their quarantine regulations. We have cheese and butter for sale by the million pounds. Of animals and their products, of all sorts, the Australian market took from us, last year, just \$5 worth. Why, Sir, if next year our friends opposite are able to induce the Australians to purchase from us \$10 worth of animals and their products, you will hear orators all over this country declaring that our trade with Australia in this line has increased 100 per cent. If they can induce the Australians to purchase from us \$25 worth of animals or their products, we shall hear hon. gentlemen opposite proclaiming the startling fact that our trade with Australia in animals and their products has increased 500 per cent. And this would be a triumph for the National Policy, this would be the justification for the enormous sum which we pay to develop that market. Why, Sir, when the Australian delegates were here, they told us that they had millions of sheep, they had vast herds of cattle; that they could send ship-loads of mutton, countless tons of beef, an illimitable number of pounds of butter and cheese to our Canadian market. Now, let me say that my opinion is that the farmers of Canada do not object to Australian beef, or Australian mutton, or Australian butter, or Australian cheese, coming here in the natural course of trade, but what they object to is being compelled to pay a large subsidy to a steamship line as an inducement to these people to send these cheap products here. While being compelled, un-

Mr. DAWSON.

der the tariff, to pay exorbitant prices for the commodities which they use in their farming operations, handicapped, as they are, by high taxation for the benefit of combines, they object to being bled to pay this subsidy to a steamship line to induce Australians to dump in our market their cheaply-produced mutton and their bounty-fed butter and cheese. In spite of restrictions, the United States bought of us last year 180 times more of our natural products than Australia, and 1,280 times more of our farm products than we sold in Australia.

I believe, Sir, that an honest effort should be made by this Government to procure a treaty with the United States, and I believe if that effort were made, a treaty could be negotiated which would greatly extend our trade. The people of Canada desire to trade as freely as possible with the United States. We have been doing, and are doing, all that men can do to overcome the natural barriers that exist between these two countries. Why, Sir, our capitalists have built seven bridges across the rivers that flow between us—the Victoria, the Lachine, and the Canada Atlantic over the St. Lawrence; the Suspension, the Cantilever and the International over the Niagara; and the Canadian Pacific Railway over the Sault Ste. Marie. They propose to build five more bridges, one at Montreal, one near Brockville, one at Kingston, one at Niagara, and another at Windsor, all for the purpose of overcoming these natural barriers. They have bored a tunnel under the St. Clair River, and they propose to bore another to accommodate the traffic and passengers going to and fro between these two countries.

Why all these efforts, if we are not to trade with the United States? In years to come, people will marvel when they read of men spending millions of dollars to overcome the natural barriers to trade, and then spending their energies in advocating a war of tariffs whose sole possible object is to prevent trade.

Well, Sir, Canada is interested in many reciprocity treaties now. Unfortunately, many of the countries in whose trade she is interested, are so remote that the treaty is of very slight benefit to us. Let me give you a list of such treaties, containing the names of the countries with which Great Britain has reciprocal treaties of commerce, in which Canada is interested, with the date of the treaty, and the value of Canadian natural products exported to each country in the year 1894-95:

NAMES of countries with which Great Britain has reciprocal treaties of commerce in which Canada is interested, with date of treaty and value of Canadian natural products exported to each country in 1894-95.

Date of Treaty.	Name of Country.	Animals and Farm Products.	Products of Mine, Fisheries, and Forests.	Total Natural Products.
		\$	\$	\$
1825	Argentina	75	445,616	445,691
1876	Austria-Hungary			
1862	Belgium	204,267	21,674	225,941
1840	Bolivia			
1854	Chili		95,960	95,960
1866	Columbia	1,258	9,788	11,046
1883	Corea			
1849	Costa Rica			
1661	Denmark	5,246	9,724	14,970
1860	Saint Domingo	923		923
	France	57,823	241,305	299,128
1865	Germany	338,045	35,976	374,021
	Hawaii	180	23,394	23,574
1845	Liberia			
1865	Madagascar			
1856	Morocco			
1891	Muscat			
1841	Persia			
	Portugal		58,781	58,781
1859	Russia			
1851	Sandwich Islands			
1885	Siam			
1884	South African Republic			
1892	Spain	1,127	32,863	33,990
1826	Sweden and Norway	1,136	2,067	3,203
1855	Switzerland			
1875	Tunis			
1885	Uruguay		44,455	44,455
1825	Venezuela			
	29 Countries—Total	610,080	1,321,603	1,631,683

Sixteen purchase not a dollar's worth of our natural products. Sir, these countries are all thousands of miles away, too far to be of any benefit to us. New York city alone would absorb more of our farm products in a week than the whole of these countries absorbed last year. British statesmanship has been able to secure reciprocity treaties with Russia, Germany, France, Spain, Venezuela, with every one of the other twenty-nine countries I have read; but our statesmen sit here and weakly declare that it is beyond their ability to negotiate a treaty with our cousins in the United States. Let them give way to men who can, to men of courage and faith in Canada, men who will not hide affrighted behind their wretched tariff wall, fearing an inundation of cheap goods, men who believe that Canadians are qualified to try conclusions with any people outside of this Dominion, men who know that our Canadian people can hold their own in a fair field without favour with our American rivals.

There are other reciprocity treaties which have been negotiated by Great Bri-

tain, namely, treaties with Egypt, Ecuador, Greece, Italy, Mexico, Montenegro, Paraguay, Roumania, Salvador, Servia and Zanzibar. In these treaties we have no interest whatever. To those countries we sold of the products of the forest and fisheries and manufactures the value of \$99,020, but not a dollar of farm products, last year. Sir, there are some timid souls who fear a trade treaty in any shape or form. Hon. gentlemen opposite seem to think such a treaty, in some unaccountable way would menace your liberties, and they are afraid to enter into reciprocal treaties with any country in the world. Such stick in the mud patriots are out of place in this age of progress. England is not afraid, that little tiny nation ventures into every sea, and it has negotiated 40 treaties with foreign nations alien in tongue and creed. Although they have those treaties no one in England deems for a moment that they are a menace to Britain, that there is any menace to her or her institutions lurking in those treaties.

"The incapables," as they call each other, who have so long usurped the place of

statesmen on the treasury benches here, knowing their inability to negotiate a treaty with the United States, think to club that country into granting a treaty. They determined on "a reciprocity of tariffs" with our neighbours with the absurd belief that if they waged a tariff war with a nation of 65,000,000, that would tend to procure for this country eventually reciprocity of trade. To pursue this policy of endeavouring to force them into granting us a treaty is the only means that occurs to them of ensuring ultimately a trade treaty with the United States.

Hon. gentlemen opposite say that it is necessary to maintain our high tariff in order that we shall have some vantage ground from which to negotiate a treaty. They forget that England, a free trade country, has been successful in negotiating 40 treaties, although she gives absolute free trade. It is anything for an excuse to continue protection.

There was one golden opportunity missed not long since by the Government of the day, the chance of a lifetime was allowed by them to slip by and be lost by their apathy, or perhaps by the incapacity of their Administration. The Wilson Bill passed the House of Representatives on 1st February, 1894, and it provided that mica, iron ore, bituminous coal and coke should be free. There was no help given to the advocates of the Wilson Bill, no encouragement to help the Bill on its way through the Senate. Nothing was done by our administrators; they sat idly here and allowed the bill to be amended in the Senate, as follows:—

A tax of 20 per cent was put on mica; a tax of 15 per cent was put on coke, and bituminous coal and iron ore were taxed 40 per cent per ton.

Sir, the Wilson Bill provided for a duty of 10 cents a bushel on potatoes and 25 per cent on barley. But as amended this Bill raised the duty on potatoes to 15 cents a bushel, and on barley to 30 per cent. The following were free under the Wilson Bill, as originally drafted, and as it passed the House of Representatives: Beef, mutton, pork, hams, bacon, lard, cheese, eggs, apples (green and dried). At present we have 3 cents a dozen duty on eggs, 1 cent a pound on lard, 4 cents a pound on cheese, and 20 per cent on the other articles I have named. Sir, if this Government had secured for us the American market for even these articles, I believe that an immense trade would have resulted. In the case of mica, \$1 is taken out by the American tax collector from every \$5 worth sent to the United States. We have a vast quantity of mica in different parts of this country seeking a market and finding none, or not a sufficient market in Canada; the natural market has been found in the United States, and it is forced now to cross that tariff barrier, and to pay for the privilege \$1 out of every \$5 worth sent.

Mr. DAWSON.

For iron ore the United States is our natural market. Even if we had all the smelting and iron works that were prophesied by hon. gentlemen opposite, we would not be able to consume one tithe of the ore we have ready to offer for sale in the province of Ontario alone. I can remember when the vast deposits of iron ore in the county which I have the honour to represent were being worked, giving employment to hundreds of men in and around the pits. Prospectors were tramping all over that county finding large deposits, with a view to their future development. We were just on the eve of a great mineral development there. Railways were projected, and other works in connection with this industry of mining undertaken, but then the Americans put on a duty of 75 cents a ton, and that simply wiped us out. The mines shut down, and have not since re-opened. In 1894 the Wilson Bill restored ore to the free list, and if our statesmen had only succeeded in keeping it there, what a development there would have been in the mining industries in Ontario. The Bill, as amended, puts 40 cents a ton on iron ore, and we have no certainty whatever that that duty will not be increased to 75 cents once more.

It was the object of Mr. Wilson to help the manufacturers in the eastern portion of the United States, and he put bituminous coal on the free list to enable them to import it from the province of Nova Scotia. There is an enormous consumption of coal on the eastern coast of the United States, and had Mr. Wilson succeeded in working his Bill through both Houses of Congress it would have resulted in an enormous increase of trade for the coal miners of Nova Scotia, and the output of the mines there would have increased four-fold. What effort was made by hon. gentlemen opposite to assist Mr. Wilson in this Bill; what offer did they make to the American government as an inducement to admit our coal free of duty into the United States? Sir, they sat here idle and allowed this opportunity to slip by. To-day 40 cents per ton is the tax on our coal going into the United States, and it may at any moment be increased to 75 cents. They made no effort in the matter.

They allowed Wilson's proposal of 10 cents a bushel on potatoes to be increased to 15 cents; only 5 cents of an increase, but this means a tax to be paid by the farmers of Canada of from \$10 to \$15 per acre on the crop which they grow, destined for the American market. Beef, mutton, pork, hams, bacon, lard, apples, all might have had free entry into the United States. It was so proposed by Mr. Wilson. What effort did this Government make to help him to get that Bill through the Senate? As a result of their inactivity, as a result of their apathy, there is to-day a tax of 20 per cent on these articles. If hon.

gentlemen opposite say that we can sell none of those commodities in the American market, my answer is: let these markets be open and let us try. There is no market in the world more particular about its food supply, and none more dainty as to quality than the market which we find in the great cities of the United States, where the farmers in the western part of Ontario have at their doors a population nearly equal to that of the cities of England.

Sir, I believe that the products raised upon our farms would admirably suit the American market. The flavours of our Canadian meats is so well known that they are recognized fully in the English market, and according to the observations of hon. gentlemen opposite—and I believe in this they assert the truth—to-day our hams and bacon are rapidly displacing the products of other countries in the British market. If they are of such exquisite flavour as to suit this market, they will also suit the American market, and I believe their quality will ensure a large demand and consumption there.

Eggs are taxed 3 cents a dozen going into the United States. We know what that means. We know that in 1890, when eggs were on the free list, we sent to the United States more than \$1,750,000 worth. Cheese is now taxed 4 cents a pound. Hon. gentlemen opposite declare that we would have no market whatever in the United States for cheese. In that I differ, and differ profoundly, from these hon. gentlemen. The exhibit made at the World's Fair proved the superiority of the Canadian cheese, in flavour and in make, over any thing produced in the United States. The Americans are as fond of good cheese as are Englishmen, and the known quality of Canadian cheese would ensure a large consumption for it in their country if their markets were available to us.

Mr. Wilson desired to put these articles on the free list without any condition whatever. But the Government sat here quietly and planned a subsidy for an Australian line to enable us to send \$5,809 worth of our farm products to that country; less than a small corner grocery would handle in a month. Sir, the Wilson Bill proposed to admit free of duty ploughs, harrows, harvesters, reapers, agricultural drills and planters, mowers, horse rakes, cultivators and threshing machines. The new tariff as finally passed put these articles on the free list, but provides:

That all articles mentioned in this paragraph if imported from a country which places an import duty on like articles imported from the United States, shall be subject to the duties existing prior to the passage of this Act.

Thus the McKinley tariff on these articles was allowed to remain. Our manufacturers, given duty free their raw material, their iron and steel, would and could command a large share of this market. We have—con-

troverting the statements of hon. gentlemen opposite—the evidence of such practical manufacturers as Mr. F. T. Frost, of Smith's Falls, and Mr. F. T. Lavoie, both manufacturers of agricultural implements, both anxious to try conclusions with the Americans in their own market. Our manufacturers are not cowards, nor are they all by any means corrupt. Many of them have pluck enough to pit their energy, their brains and their skill against the Americans. They want fair play, a fair field and no favour.

Sir, we believe that a liberal trade intercourse would promote these friendly relations between the Empire and the Republic which affords the best guarantee for peace. Now, Sir, it is my opinion that were it not for her colonies, England need never become involved in war. Her possessions in Africa adjoin those of France and Germany, and if she is ever involved in war with either of these nations, it will be on account of some dispute respecting these possessions. With Russia she need never have a dispute except with reference to questions affecting India. With the United States war would be absurd except in defence of her first-born colony, Canada. Lying side by side as we do, there are many opportunities for mischief-makers to stir up strife between these two countries—strife which might culminate in that most appalling of all disasters, a war between Great Britain and the United States. Sir, I believe it to be the most solemn duty of every man in Canada to do his utmost to remove every possible cause of friction or irritation between these two countries. It is his duty to cultivate the most friendly relations, and I believe that a war of tariffs is the last possible way of promoting peace between us. Sir, I firmly believe that a fair and liberal reciprocity arrangement between Canada and the United States would tend more than anything else to cement these friendly relations that it is our duty to encourage. Sir, I believe it to be the very essence of loyalty for us to advocate such a treaty, and it seems to me it ought not to require any very high degree of statesmanship to procure it. Sir, if we do our part, the day may not be so distant when the dream of men who know England to be something more than a mere nation of traders will be realized, and the great republic will stand side by side with Great Britain to advance the civilization of the world. A great statesman he will be who will bring about an alliance between these two great Anglo-Saxon nations—not a political union, for that is not desirable, but an alliance born of a treaty of peace. The Right Hon. A. J. Balfour spoke wisely, at Bristol, recently, when he said:

He felt that England and the United States should work together, each in its own sphere, to promote and extend the Anglo-Saxon ideas of liberty. If, he declared, Great Britain was in alliance with the United States, she could fulfil

the duties Providence had entrusted to her, and need not fear a foreign foe or international divisions.

And what more natural than that they should be friends and allies, each working out her own destiny in her own way, but joining together as promoters of the peace of the world? English statesmen are not alone in desiring this alliance. Everywhere in the United States we can find earnest men who think the time has come to bury the hatchet and bring about a permanent treaty of peace between these countries. The wish of many an earnest American heart is expressed by one of their poets. They wish to see the flag of England and the stars and stripes—the Old Glory flag, so dear to all Americans—side by side for the progress of the nations and the liberty of mankind. These words of one of their poets find an echo in British hearts :

Where is the flag of England ?
It waves the throne above,
Where a woman reigns by the grace of God
And a people's boundless love ;
Of all the rulers earth now owns,
However the world may brag,
Not one so calm and so true is seen
As the woman, the mother, the gracious Queen
Enrobed by England's flag.

Where is the flag of England ?
It floats on every sea,
Borne by the hands of the bravest men
And waving o'er the free ;
It leads the way to the battlefield,
And the armies never lag,
For somehow or other they seem to know
England has conquered every foe,
Led on by that wondrous flag.

Where is the flag of England ?
Not yet where yet 'twill be,
Conjoined with "old glory" grand,
The emblem of the free ;
The Stars and Stripes, the Union Jack
These two shall be unfurled
For progress, liberty and right,
And England's fame, Columbia's might,
Shall help and bless the world.

3.—PURITY OF ADMINISTRATION—CONDEMN CORRUPTION.

That the convention deploras the gross corruption in the management and expenditure of public moneys which for years past has existed under the rule of the Conservative party, and the revelations of which by the different parliamentary committees of inquiry have brought disgrace upon the fair name of Canada.

The Government which profited politically by these expenditures of public moneys of which the people have been defrauded, and which, nevertheless, have never punished the guilty parties, must be held responsible for the wrongdoing. We arraign the Government for retaining in office a Minister of the Crown, proved to have accepted very large contributions of money for election purposes from the funds of a railway company, which, while paying the political contributions to him, a member of the Government, with one hand, was receiving Government subsidies with the other.

Mr. DAWSON.

The conduct of the Minister and the approval of his colleagues after the proof became known to them are calculated to degrade Canada in the estimation of the world and deserve the severe condemnation of the people.

Well, Sir, I would not torture the feelings of hon. gentlemen opposite by any extended allusion to their delinquencies of the past, if it were not that they have promised to launch into a very large expenditure. The Order paper to-day contains a notice that the Minister of Finance will ask the House to sanction a vote of \$3,000,000 for important works of defence. Well, Sir, I do not believe it would be safe to entrust this expenditure in their hands. Circumstances might be too strong for them. There are too many contractors in the country to whom they are under obligations of different kinds. These men know too much, and have the hon. gentlemen opposite in their power. I think it would be better for them to step down and out before they undertake this large expenditure. They dare not offend these contractors, who know so much of the inner workings of their party. These men must be kept quiet at all hazards. They might tell what they know, and bring disaster to the party from which it would never recover in the teeth of a general election. Sir, it is our duty to save hon. gentlemen from their friends, by relieving them of power and giving them a rest in the cool shades of opposition, so that they may free themselves from their taskmasters, the contractors of this country.

Sir, those of us who sat here through the session of 1891, inquiring into the Government expenditure on public works, know perfectly well the truth of the first paragraph in this plank No. 3 of the Liberal platform. We remember well the investigation into the Quebec Harbour works, when it was shown that Larkin, Connolly & Co. bagged a profit on those works of \$953,975. It was proven that Robert H. McGreevy was given an interest in the profits of this concern, although he did not put a dollar into the capital. It was proven that he was given that interest simply for the purpose of securing the interest of his brother, then and now the member for Quebec West, and of securing, through him, the interest and influence of the then Minister of Public Works. Well, Sir, although he did not put a dollar into the capital of the firm, it was shown that Robert H. McGreevy drew, from the profits of that work, \$137,800 as his share. It was proven that this firm contributed to the reptile fund of the party \$170,447, and that this money was used in the elections of 1882, 1887 and 1891. Sir, the hon. member for Quebec West (Mr. McGreevy) was treasurer of the party funds. Through him the money was paid out to the candidates and to their election agents to be spent by them in the interest of Government candidates in the Quebec district. The Conservative managers relied largely on the contributions of Larkin, Connolly & Co., of which firm Mr.

Murphy was a member. Mr. Valin, once a member of Parliament, gave this evidence before the Committee on Privileges and Elections :

I applied again to Mr. McGreevy and to Mr. Murphy. Mr. Murphy told me : " We have placed all that is necessary in Mr. McGreevy's hands and we have advised him to help you especially ; apply to him and you will get some." Then, having applied to Mr. McGreevy, he said to me, the elections in the county of Quebec are costing heavily. The Ministers are costing us very heavily and I have no more money to give you. Caron is always after me and I cannot satisfy him with money. We have Sir Hector at Three Rivers, and besides, other counties.

The official list of expenditure for party purposes in 1887 was published and showed that \$112,700 was drawn out and paid on the written order of the hon. Postmaster General (Sir Adolphe Caron) and the hon. member for Three Rivers (Sir Hector Langevin. They had control of this fund, and they distributed it according to a plan carefully prepared before the elections began. It was clearly proven in the courts that Larkin, Connolly & Co. had paid \$170,000 to purchase the favour of the Government and ensure the acceptance of their contract. The hon. Ministers claim that the Government ought not to be held accountable because they were not personally interested in the money, because they only took it to spend in the elections, and because they only received it from these contractors to spend in the interests of the party. Sir, this outrage against popular government is offered by these hon. gentlemen as an excuse for their conduct. How dull their moral perception must be when they consider this as an excuse for their course. They say : We did not spend it on ourselves, but on our friends to ensure their election. And they offer this as an excuse for their conduct. They used the money to tempt men, made poor by their bungling administration, to sell the birth-right our fathers died to win—the right to vote, the right of self-government.

Mr. B. B. Osler, in his address to the jury which convicted McGreevy and Connolly for conspiracy to defraud, said :

It is said that these items were paid out by this firm of contractors to Mr. Thomas McGreevy and others for the purpose of being expended in election expenses. Well, gentlemen, it will be for you to consider whether that circumstance does not aggravate instead of lessen the offence. If these moneys were paid out for the purpose of corrupting electors it is worse, not better, for the defendants. It is a very serious crime for you to consider. If a man by irregular practices obtains public money for his own pocket that is one thing, but if he obtains it for the purpose of influencing the minds of men in exercising their franchise, and that money comes from public contractors, one of the most serious offences against good government and the community that is possible is committed.

The presiding judge, in his charge to the jury, said :

It is no defence to say that this contract was let, or this influence was given, or the service was rendered in consideration of a money subscription being given by contractors to assist any government, any Minister, any member of Parliament in either corrupt or legitimate expenses.

Well, there are other little transactions of the Government which makes me doubtful whether they should be trusted with the expenditure of this \$3,000,000, for which they are to ask next Friday. It is on record that they purchased in the city of St. John, a piece of property for the Intercolonial, in 1892. A year after the sale, the owner swore that its value was \$93,401, and it was assessed by the city assessors at \$66,000 ; but the Government paid \$200,000 for the property. This job was denounced by one of their own followers, Senator Adams, then a member of the House, and a supporter of the Government. On 13th May, 1892, he said in this House :

You are to-night committing a public crime. You are trying to force an expenditure upon the people you cannot justify. There is no evidence to justify this legislature in passing \$200,000 for the purchase of this property. No Grit, no Tory, high or low, from the richest to the poorest, could say that \$200,000 was the actual price paid by common law, prudence or justice. It is simply a job. It stands unparalleled in the history of purchases. I am quite clear that this property had been purchased for three times its value, beyond all question.

In spite of that protest, \$200,000 was paid.

Sir, the Government went into a little improvement on a small river in the province of Quebec, and built what is now known to fame as the Little Rapids lock. They estimated the cost of this work at \$44,000. Well, they have paid in cash, up to date, of this work, the sum of \$260,000, and there are claims pending amounting to \$61,000. The contractor was Mr. W. J. Poupore. He got this contract without tenders, there is no traffic now upon the canal, the lock is not being used, the work is entirely useless, and Mr. Poupore is Government candidate in the county of Pontiac.

The Langevin block cost, in extras, as much as the whole original estimate.

The St. Charles branch of the Intercolonial was estimated to cost \$136,000. Before the Government got through with it, they had spent on the work, \$1,723,000, and there are claims against the Government amounting to \$37,719 more. This railway is fourteen miles long, and runs out from Point Lévis.

The Galops channel in the St. Lawrence is another evidence of the incapacity of this Administration, if not of their corruption. There was a contract let for the improvement of this channel in 1879 by the Secretary of State, then Minister of Railways and Canals (Sir Charles Tupper). It was let to Mr. Denis O'Brien for \$239,750, fourteen-foot navigation. O'Brien withdrew and Davis & Sons got the contract at an

advance. They got it at \$306,600. They assigned to Gilbert & Son, who were subsequently required to make it to 17-foot navigation. Their contract bound them to complete this work by 1881. It was reported to be complete in 1888, and was taken over by the department, and the departmental report states that the channel is open for navigation, 200 feet wide, 3,300 feet long, straight, and from 16½ to 17 foot navigation. In 1894, the Minister of Railways said it was not being used, that \$446,500 had been spent upon it, and that there were claims against the department amounting to \$130,000 more in connection with this work, besides the thousands of dollars spent in surveys, &c. And to-day the old south channel is still being preferred to this straight, deep, wide Galops channel, which has cost the country so dear.

The "St. Lawrence News," published at Iroquois, gave the following account, in its issue of September 15th, 1893, of the wreck of the barge "Huron," drawing 9 feet of water, in this channel:

Since 1879 the Government has been very busy pitching about three quarters of a million dollars into these very waters where this barge struck and what good has it done? A barge strikes, and fastens on a rock. Very fortunately it does not drift into deep water or what would have become of the crew? The next vessel to strike may be the "Empire State" or the "Merritt" with its living freight or pleasure-seeking excursionists. Would they find a convenient rock on which to become shelved until rescue, or would the creamy waves be dotted for a few minutes with the struggling mass of humanity and then hide them as secretly as they hide the iniquities that have cost the nation nearly a million.

Sir, the latest evidence of incapacity, if not corruption, that we have in the Department of Railways and Canals, is in connection with the construction of a public work, of which a few people in this country may have heard—the Curran Bridge, in the city of Montreal. It was decided to construct two bridges there, at Wellington Street, one for road traffic and another for the Grand Trunk Railway to cross the Lachine Canal. This work has resulted in the loss of some hundreds of thousands of dollars to the people. Parliament was told that the total cost would be \$170,000, and that this was considered to be an excess estimate. Parliament was later told that an additional sum of \$40,000 would be required for a 20-foot navigation. This raised the highest estimate made by hon. gentlemen opposite themselves to \$210,000. The amount which they have actually paid to date is \$394,000, and there are about \$60,000 still unpaid. The superstructure of these works was built by contract at a contract price; the work on the substructure—the piers, &c.,—was done by days' labour, by men furnished by Mr. St. Louis; and in the investigation, it was shown that Mr. St. Louis said he gave \$1,500 to the legal partner of the

Mr. DAWSON.

Hon. Mr. Ouimet, the Minister of Public Works, for the Vaudreuil election. These facts you will find at page 344 of the blue-book containing the evidence before the commission. After some \$14,000 had been paid to St. Louis, Mr. Schreiber the chief engineer became suspicious that all was not right and on the 25th April, he wrote to the Minister as follows:—

Dear Mr. Haggart,—As I mentioned to you, I was not a little startled upon receiving from Mr. Parent the pay-rolls and accounts for the month of March in connection with the Wellington Street bridges, which summed up an enormous sum. * * * * * Mr. Parent explains that the excess of expenditure is due to the large amount of ice which had to be cut up and carried away; to the frozen condition of the excavation, to the breaking away of the cofferdam on two occasions, to the solid frozen condition of the crib and other obstructions which had to be removed, and, as I understand him to say, to political interference.

The Minister should have immediately ordered an investigation, and in the meantime, have stopped all payments to St. Louis. But he did not. On the 10th of May the chief engineer wrote again to the Minister urging that a commission of inquiry should be issued. On the 11th May, the day after this letter was written, \$8,393 was paid to this man suspected of fraud. On the 17th of May a commission of inquiry was issued on the grounds that frauds had been committed. On the 27th May, ten days after the issue of that commission \$66,000 was paid over, and on the 6th June, \$39,000 more was paid, or a total of \$105,000 paid to this man after a committee of investigation had been appointed by the Government to examine into these stupendous frauds. Sir, there is not a business man in all Canada who would be guilty of such utter mismanagement of his own affairs. The cause of the enormous amount which the pay-rolls and accounts for March totalled up is said by Mr. Parent to be the removal of ice and frozen earth and other obstructions, all of which was included in the original estimate of cost,—and, he adds, "political interference." This "political interference" has cost the country thus far \$184,000 and, according to the judgment recently given will cost it some \$60,000 more. Sir, we will leave the country to judge whether or not these losses are due to the incapacity of the Minister. The court of inquiry and the Committee of Public Accounts between them showed the following facts:—that the Government paid to contractor St. Louis:

- \$4 a day for a foreman.
- \$6 a day for a foreman for night or overtime.
- \$8 a day for a foreman on Sunday.
- \$12 a day for a foreman on Sunday overtime.
- \$5 a day for team.
- \$10 a day for team on Sunday.
- \$2.50 a day for derrick.
- \$3.75 a day for derrick for overtime.
- \$7.50 a day for derrick for overtime on Sunday.

As an hon. gentleman remarked it must

have been a very sensitive and religiously inclined derrick to require three days' pay for one day's work on Sunday :

St. Louis put on all the men he wished and got paid for them.

There were 2,000 men on the works at one time.

There were many idle.

No Government timekeeper.

No regular count.

No Government foreman.

No Government supervision.

No Government record of men or materials.

No Government classification of labour.

Unskilled labour was paid for as skilled labour.

There was no public tenders for timber.

Inferior timber was supplied.

Carters' delivery tickets for lumber are missing.

There were no checks as to quality of timber and lumber supplied.

Large quantities are missing.

New timber was burnt as firewood, carted away and stolen.

Government teams had to haul lumber that the contractor was to deliver.

\$39,896 was paid for \$6,000 worth of stone-cutting.

\$16,715 was paid for \$3,000 worth of stonecutting on another part of the work.

Stone was hauled by team 20 miles along the railway running from the quarry to the works.

The Government was warned all along of the frauds, but allowed them to continue, and paid the bills as they came in.

When the work was completed the Government issued a commission to investigate.

Pending the investigation the Government paid St. Louis a balance of \$105,000 for wages on an account that the chief engineer discredited and would not certify to.

The commission unanimously reported incompetence, extravagance and fraud.

The people's money was lost.

No one has been held responsible.

It is said in this plank of our platform that the revelations made by the different parliamentary committees of inquiry "have brought disgrace upon the fair name of Canada." This is lamentably true. It is deplored by the English press. The "Graphic-Despatch" says :

The secret of Sir John Macdonald's electoral victories is out. On this side of the water surprise has often been expressed at the patience with which our Canadian cousins submitted to the Tory protectionist rule of that prince of political intriguers. There is now, alas, no difficulty in explaining that curious situation. Sir John's Government rested on a stupendous and all-prevailing system of bribery and corruption. Even Tammany Hall smells sweet and clean in comparison with the huge stink-pot of Sir John's Government.

Sir John Macdonald's Government also rested on gerrymandered constituencies and stuffed electoral lists. The London "Daily Chronicle" says :

It seems to be possible in the Dominion to secure the political support, not only of individuals, but of whole provinces by gifts of money. The locality is bribed as well as the member, and the consequent demoralization spreads through all ranks.

In a late election we find the Secretary of State holding up the map of a proposed railway and telling the electors that on his return to Ottawa he will see that that railway is extended to them. The hon. senior member for Cape Breton (Mr. McDougall) at Gabarus assured the electors that a break-water would be built and that the lobster season would be extended, thus in the midst of an election deliberately offering a bribe if they would support the Government candidate. The London "Times" says :

Here in the mother country there can be only—

Mr. SPROULE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. Now that the hon. gentleman has fully convinced the House that he is a good reader, I would ask your ruling whether the hon. gentleman would not be observing more closely the rules of the House, by making his speech, and whether it is quite in order to read a speech, even so long and entertaining a speech as this.

Mr. SPEAKER. My attention having been drawn to the matter, I must say that the hon. member would not be in order in reading his speech.

Mr. DAWSON. The hon. member is not reading his speech and has not been reading it. I refer the hon. gentleman for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) to the notes of my speech now in the hands of the "Hansard" reporters if he desires to see them. The London "Times" says :

Here in the mother country there can be only one feeling, that of deep regret for the wrong done to the fair fame of the eldest of her daughter nations by the lax morality of her politicians.

I commend this sentence to the hon. member who interrupted me. I ask him to take it home, to sleep on it, and I hope it may improve his political morals. Sir, the day was when we thought our politicians pure ; but now we know that we can no longer look with pitying contempt upon the American politicians, but that ours have been guilty of acts such as could not be charged against Tammany Hall even in its palmiest days. The London "Echo" says :

No country can prosper where public departments are in league with fraudulent contractors, and where Ministers are open to offers.

St. James "Gazette" says :

The existence of an organized system of corruption among public officials in Canada has been conclusively proved, and like everything else on the American continent the bribery has been colossal.

London "Graphic" says :

It is no longer possible to doubt that corruption in its worst form is rampant in a large portion of the Canadian Civil Service.

This was after the revelations proving the facts in connection with Perley and his diamonds ; Arnoldi and his brass dogs, his yacht and tandem harness ; Talbot and his dry goods charged as Government supplies

in departmental accounts. Let me read for the benefit of the hon. gentleman from Grey a quotation from the London "Telegraph," it will interest him, I have no doubt :

Enough, unfortunately, is already known in England to make it clear that only the most resolute and drastic purification can redeem public life in Canada from the taint of corruption, the like of which we have not seen in our country for hundreds of years.

Well, Sir, we have had some drastic purification. The trusted treasurer of the party funds was sent to jail for a year. He was relieved from imprisonment after two months, immediately afterwards was banquipped, and subsequently re-elected by the supporters of hon. gentlemen opposite in his constituency, and sent here to represent them in this House. That is a very resolute and drastic purification. When that hon. gentleman returned here, he was received with acclaim, and was introduced to the House by no less a personage than the chief whip of the ministerialists.

Sir, in our own country the churches have deplored the condition in which the Government is sunk. Rev. W. J. Muckleston, rector of Perth, preached a sermon on this subject in June, 1893, in which he said :

The public scandals of two years ago revealed thieves and boodlers, and the fact that the electors failed to condemn them proved that the public conscience was dulled and that the political morality of Canada was away below that of the mother country.

The following resolution was adopted by the Presbytery of Montreal, in 1891 :

In view of the great public evils prevalent in our country the Presbytery sees great cause for alarm and humiliation before God, and resolves to express its abhorrence of the political corruption which has been revealed by recent investigations, and its dissatisfaction with the failure of Parliament to deal adequately with them in the punishment of the guilty, and therefore call upon the people to express their condemnation at the earliest opportunity at the polls.

Well, Sir, when they have this opportunity they will express their condemnation, and in the by-elections which have been held for the last three years, they have, time and again, expressed their condemnation.

Let me give the hon. member one more extract, this time from the Rev. Dr. Carman, General Superintendent of the Methodist Church, who is reported to have spoken as follows :—

Had we not better spike the doors of our Parliament buildings, shut and cease our vapourings about glorious country, constitutional governments, and Christian civilization? They have no such scenes in Caffraria or Mashonaland. Is not this an awful indictment: "Bribes in the shape of better terms to provinces; bribes both to provinces and single constituencies in the shape of grants for local works; tolls taken for the Government election fund on the illicit gains of contractors; the virtual sale of

Mr. DAWSON.

senatorships for money spent in elections, or in support of the party organ; the capture of societies and churches by doles of patronage distributed to them through their representatives in the Cabinet; the capture of the great distilleries and other powerful interests by special legislation in their favour; the capture of the press by largesse of 'pap', and, above all, the capture of the whole body of manufacturers by pledging to them the commercial policy of the country. Such have been the means by which government since confederation has, with little intermission, been carried on." And what count of it has not been proved with a terrible emphasis? Is a bottomless gulf any too deep or dark for such ruling and governing? It is likely the kind they have there, if they are not too poor for bribery. Is the lake of fire any too sharp a retribution for the men who corrupt our age, blast our freedom, blight prosperity, blacken a nation's name, and wither a nation's hope?

Sir, wherever the probe has been applied, since 1891, it has drawn forth corruption, and yet so dead is the conscience of hon. gentlemen opposite that they immediately whitewashed the culprits when proven guilty of these political crimes. Of one of them who was proven guilty, this statement was made, that if his skirts were not quite clean, they were clean enough to ensure his protection in this House.

Sir, I do not think it is safe to entrust hon. gentlemen opposite with the expenditure of vast sums of money. They have not proven themselves to be good trustees. They must be turned out, boodling must be stopped. Even if they have the will, they have lost the power to stop this reign of corruption. They must give way to men who are determined to put down wrong-doing and the waste of the people's money, men who believe that wrong-doing in public affairs is as indefensible as wrong-doing in private concerns.

4.—DEMANDS STRICTEST ECONOMY—DECREASED EXPENDITURE.

We cannot but view with alarm the large increase of the public debt, and of the controllable annual expenditure of the Dominion, and the consequent undue taxation of the people under the governments that have been continuously in power since 1878, and we demand the strictest economy in the administration of the government of the country.

Sir, in 1878, the net debt was \$140,363,069.91; in 1881 it had risen to \$155,395,780. Sir Leonard Tilley, in delivering his Budget speech in 1882, declared that it would be necessary still further to increase this debt to provide for the Canadian Pacific Railway, and certain public works. He said that \$48,000,000 would be required for these purposes, and that the debt would then be \$203,379,680. He promised distinctly that there would be thereafter no further increase of the public debt, but that instead, the debt would be rapidly decreased. He even gave us the particulars of that decrease, and stated that there would be a surplus in 1882 of \$4,500,000; another in

1883 of \$3,000,000 ; and a surplus of \$1,000,000 a year for the next seven years, all of which would be applied to the reduction of our debt. He promised to provide a sinking fund amounting to \$1,500,000 a year, and stated that by 1890 the surplus and the sinking fund would together reduce the net debt to \$175,000,000. He went further, and declared that between 1882 and 1890, 75 million acres of our Crown lands in the North-west would be sold at an average price of \$1 an acre, and that this sum of \$75,000,000 would all be applied towards the reduction of our debt. Here are his words :

Then our debt would only be about \$100,000,000 instead of \$175,000,000, or less than \$20 per head.

In 1890, the net debt was \$237,500,000 or nearly \$49 per head. It has long passed the \$50 limit. Speaking during the same debate, the present Secretary of State (Sir Charles Tupper) endorsed Sir Leonard Tilley's calculation. Let me recall to the House the very words he uttered :

When the great Canadian Pacific Railway is completed and every dollar of expenditure is provided for, including canal expenditure and everything else, the debt will only be \$203,000,000, and the surpluses with the sinking funds up to 1890 will bring the debt down to \$175,000,000.

He also said Sir Leonard Tilley's calculation to realize \$75,000,000 by sale of lands in the North-west, was beyond question. Said he : " No hon. gentleman, I am sure, will venture to dispute it." Had any doubting Thomas dared to rise in the House and dispute the hon. gentleman, the finger of scorn would have been pointed at him, and he would have been charged with disloyalty to his country for having doubted their ability to dispose of 75 million acres of land during those eight years. Alas for the hon. gentleman's calculations. This mighty prophet declared that the net debt of Canada would be reduced down to 100 million dollars, after that great national work had been provided for. but, Sir, we find the debt was \$237,500,000 in 1890. This sagacious statesman, this far-seeing man, this political prophet is the Aaron whom the despairing Israelites opposite hope will lead them out of the wilderness in which they have been wandering these five years without a leader. Why, Sir, they cannot get out of the wilderness. The elections will soon be on, and they cannot cross that Jordan. Every man of them will die in the wilderness, save two, Caleb and Joshua, of the old guard. These two will cross alive ; because, Sir, they have visited the promised land laid out before them in this platform of the Liberal party, and they have returned to their friends with a true report. But our friends opposite have not believed that report, and hence they must surely die.

politically, when these elections take place.

Instead of being reduced, our debt has gone on increasing, and on 30th June last it amounted to \$253,074,927. This is an enormous sum. Hon. gentlemen, surely, cannot be alive to its magnitude, or they would not so merrily roll it up. Let me help them to realize it—and here let me say I am sorry that the Minister of Agriculture is not present, because I have a little proposition to make to him. We coin no gold in Canada. If we were called upon to pay our national debt in coin, it must be paid off in silver. It would require 7,000 tons. If these were loaded on railway cars, there being 20 tons in each car, the train would be two miles and a half long.

Our foreign creditors, I do not think, would want our silver, at all events not in such vast quantities, they might prefer to take cattle or grain. So the hon. Minister might extend the scope of the Government farms and begin to raise cattle and grain to pay off the national indebtedness. Our creditors might prefer to take payment in cattle alone. He would require to raise 10,000,000 head at present prices. This is a large number. Sir, the Minister of Agriculture, with his limited knowledge of agriculture, may never have seen a herd so vast as this—neither have I. But I will, if possible, help him to realize how vast this herd would be. We will imagine that he has these cattle ready for market. I find it would require a field containing 5,000 acres to hold them, and they would be packed pretty closely then. We will suppose the Minister stationed at the gate of the field to let the cattle out, one by one, to water, and we will suppose that six seconds were occupied in each animal passing through. The Minister would require to remain there ten hours a day for five years before the last unhappy beast got out for a drink. Supposing he had them ready to march to market and had them arranged in procession, eight abreast. He would have a procession which would reach from Vancouver to Halifax, and for hundreds of miles beyond.

We will suppose, however, that our creditors prefer wheat, and will take it at 60 cents per bushel. When the Minister of Agriculture had produced enough wheat to pay our net debt, and had it loaded in cars, 20 tons in each, and the cars formed into a train—that train would reach from Vancouver to Halifax, and five or six hundred miles beyond.

The member for South Ontario (Mr. Smith) dwelt vigorously on the increase of the national debt under the Mackenzie regime. It is quite true that the debt increased during these five years. The increase in 1874 was \$8,476,502 ; in 1875, \$7,683,413 ; 1876, \$8,543,136 ; 1877, \$8,683,794 ; 1878, \$7,126,670, or, altogether, \$40,513,608. Why this increase ? Every dollar was required to fulfil obligations entered into by the preceding Government, to which the honour of

the country was pledged. They had to be carried out, and they were carried out wisely and well, and no scandal occurred in carrying out those obligations, no such scandals as characterized the construction of the dry dock at Quebec, the Curran Bridge at Montreal, and other public works throughout the Dominion. What were those engagements? I will give the House the words of Sir Leonard Tilley in 1873. He said :

We are entering upon new and increased engagements involving a very large sum of money. We are entering upon work—we have already done so—which will require a large increase of our debt. * * * * We have \$10,000,000 to spend on the Intercolonial Railway. We have \$30,000,000 for the Canadian Pacific Railway and the canal system which has been accepted by the Government will involve an expenditure of \$20,000,000. These are serious matters inasmuch as they add \$60,000,000 to our existing debt.

They had already entered on the work in connection with the Intercolonial Railway, the Canadian Pacific Railway and the canal system which had been accepted, and it was in carrying out those works that the Mackenzie Government added to the national debt; but they spent upon them only forty millions and a half, instead of sixty millions, which Sir Leonard Tilley said those works would add to the national debt.

Hon. gentlemen opposite deplored the deficit that occurred during the Mackenzie Administration; they called that an era of deficits. The Secretary of State has expressed strong opinions on deficits generally. His opinion was uttered in 1878. Speaking in reply to the then Finance Minister, he said :

What does he (Sir Richard Cartwright) tell the House? He tells the House now that he does not propose to submit any measure by which this great calamity, this great disaster, this ruin to the credit of the country, shall be averted, although he shows that on the 10th of this month (February, 1878), he has a deficit of \$617,610.

This may not have been a blue-ruin speech on the part of the hon. gentleman, but certainly it was red ruin—disaster, calamity and ruin to the credit of the country. The hon. gentleman thus described the deficit, which amounted to \$617,610. We are aware that he possesses a very large vocabulary, but what has he to say of a deficit of \$4,154,000, which the Public Accounts showed occurred last year? In that era of deficits, covering 1876, 1877 and 1878, we find that they aggregated \$4,489,000, about equal to the single deficit which occurred last year. Let it be remembered, also, that those deficits under the Mackenzie Administration occurred under a low tariff, and were caused by loss of revenue, owing largely to the shrinkage in value of goods imported. The deficits under the present Government occur under high duties, under duties levied largely in the form of specific duties, a system which, it was said, would for ever remove any chance of future deficits. The

Mr. DAWSON.

customs receipts fell from \$14,315,192 in 1873-74 to \$12,900,000 in 1879, a decrease of \$1,500,000. Why this falling off? We have heard much of the hard times during the Mackenzie Administration, and it was said that the volume of imports was largely diminished at that time. Nothing of the sort occurred. The volume of imports was not diminished. The people purchased and used, in 1878 and 1879, as many yards of cloth, as much hardware and cutlery, as much clothing and food, per head, as in 1873. The loss of revenue and consequent deficit is no evidence whatever of hard times prevailing during that period. It was owing to the great decrease in the value of the commodities being imported. In support of this, I will give as my evidence, the words of Sir Leonard Tilley, who, speaking in 1879, in support of the policy of specific duties, said :

It is established by comparative statements that the goods imported into the Dominion have decreased in value to the extent of from 33½ per cent to 40 per cent since 1873.

To leave no one in doubt as to the effect of this shrinkage in value on the revenue, he explains :

Twenty-five per cent in value will not now bring more than 15 per cent did in 1873.

And he gives as an example, the value of cloth. He says :

In 1873 100 yards of cloth at \$1 a yard would produce \$15 of revenue. The same cloth is worth 60 cents per yard now (1878), and it would require a tariff of 25 per cent to produce the same amount of revenue.

And he adds :

The volume of imports has not been diminished. The increase of our debt is out of all proportion to the increase of population. If our debt had increased only in the ratio of the increase of population, there would not be so much cause for alarm, but, Sir, from 1881 to 1891, our population increased 11.66 per cent, say 12 per cent, while our taxation, by customs, increased 27 per cent, our expenditure increased 42 per cent, and our debt increased 53 per cent. Sir, there was a large increase of controllable expenditure. The population from 1878 to 1895 increased, I believe, about 25 per cent—I think that is a fair statement of the increase of the population between 1878 and 1895. During this period the following increases in our expenditure occurred:—The expenditure in Civil Government increased 70 per cent; the expenditure on Public Works (departmental) increased 85 per cent; the expenditure on Mounted Police increased 90 per cent; the expenditure on Excise increased 100 per cent; the expenditure on Indians increased 140 per cent; the expenditure on Arts, Agriculture and Statistics increased 150 per cent; the expendi-

ture on Militia and Defence increased 150 per cent; the expenditure on Superannuation increased 150 per cent; the expenditure on Quarantine increased 280 per cent; the expenditure on Fisheries increased 400 per cent; and the expenditure on the

North-west Territories Government increased 1,500 per cent. Sir, the population increased, during this period, only 25 per cent. I will give the items, as follows, and hon. gentleman can figure out the percentages for themselves:—

EXPENDITURE, CONSOLIDATED FUND, 1878 AND 1895.

	1878.	1895.	Increase.
	\$	\$	\$
Interest on Public Debt.....	7,048,883	10,466,294	3,417,411
Charges on the Debt, Premiums, &c.....	189,566	278,949	89,383
Administration of Justice.....	564,920	755,682	190,762
Arts, Agriculture and Statistics.....	92,365	216,740	124,375
Civil Government.....	823,369	1,422,227	598,858
Fisheries.....	93,262	443,822	350,560
Immigration.....	154,351	195,652	41,301
Indians.....	421,503	955,403	533,900
Legislation.....	618,035	941,570	323,535
Mail and Steamship Subsidies.....	257,534	513,268	255,734
Post Office.....	1,724,938	3,593,647	1,868,709
Militia and Defence.....	618,136	1,574,013	955,877
Mounted Police.....	334,748	646,125	311,377
North-west Government.....	18,199	303,626	285,427
Penitentiaries.....	308,101	449,599	141,498
Public Works.....	997,469	1,742,316	744,847
Public Works (Departmental).....	97,123	151,698	54,575
Superannuation.....	106,588	265,385	158,797
Customs Administration.....	714,527	917,632	203,105
Excise Expenditure.....	215,024	471,864	256,840
Railways and Canals.....	2,375,438	3,704,126	1,328,688
Totals.....	17,774,089	30,009,638	12,235,549

These items totalled, in 1878, \$17,774,089, and in 1895 they amounted to \$30,009,638, an increase of \$12,235,549, or over 60 per cent increase. The total expenditure on Consolidated Fund amounted to \$23,503,158 in 1878, and to \$38,132,005 in 1895, an increase of \$14,628,847, or about 60 per cent increase in these eighteen years; while the population only increased 25 per cent.

I have said the Superannuation expenditure increased from \$106,588 in 1878 to \$265,385 in 1895. The Superannuation Act was passed in 1871 when Sir Francis Hincks was Minister of Finance in the Government of Sir John A. Macdonald. Its objects were to keep back a portion of the salaries of all civil servants, to form a fund out of which allowances would be made to members of the Civil Service who were disabled by ill-health or incapacitated by old age, and were placed on the retired list. This Act provided that 4 per cent of all salaries of \$600, and over, should be kept back, and that 2½ per cent of all salaries under \$600 should be retained. Had these percentages remained at that, with careful management and honest administration, the fund might have been self-sustaining; but, some few years later, when Sir Leonard Tilley was Finance Minister, the amount which the Civil Servants

were required to pay was cut in half. Those receiving \$600 salary, and over, paid 2 per cent of their salaries into the fund, and those receiving under \$600 paid 1¼ per cent. But, Sir, while their contributions to the fund was cut in two, their claims upon that fund remained as they were before. Very soon after this change was made, the amount paid out to civil servants who had been retired and ceased to render any service whatever to the country, exceeded, largely, the amount which they paid in each and every year, and last year, the amount which was paid in by the civil servants was \$63,274.88, but the amount of pensions paid out was \$265,385.77. The people of this country paid the difference, amounting to \$202,110.89. Sir, the following is a statement of the amounts which were paid into the fund each year since 1871, and the amount paid out in superannuation allowances during the same period:

SUPERANNUATION FUND.

Year.	Receipts.	Expenditure
	\$ cts.	\$ cts.
1871.....	49,470 50	12,880 49
1872.....	53,213 80	38,842 81

Year.	Receipts.		Expenditure	
	\$	cts.	\$	cts.
1873	54,757	30	53,026	12
1874	34,620	18	64,442	84
1875	36,678	71	71,371	85
1876	38,476	00	101,627	16
1877	40,890	26	104,826	99
1878	41,856	62	106,588	91
1879	41,959	20	113,531	63
1880	43,531	80	116,391	75
1881	44,995	80	147,362	10
1882	46,426	39	160,319	95
1883	46,372	03	186,236	67
1884	51,882	21	192,692	70
1885	52,701	33	203,636	21
1886	57,075	43	200,655	25
1887	62,600	96	202,285	85
1888	62,945	72	212,743	72
1889	63,031	46	218,933	65
1890	61,513	05	241,764	66
1891	62,824	60	241,110	49
1892	63,862	79	253,679	88
1893	64,433	27	263,710	15
1894	63,974	67	262,302	00
1895	63,274	88	265,385	77

Sir, during this period the expenditure was \$4,036,349.60, and the amount paid in \$1,302,368.96, a difference of \$2,733,980.64, which represents the loss to the country in connection with this fund. During this period of twenty-five years, for every dollar paid in three dollars has been paid out, and the difference between the receipts and the expenditure is growing greater every year. For the last five years the difference is as one dollar paid in to four dollars paid out.

Sir, this fund is not fair to the Civil Service. If a civil servant continues in the service until death, his heirs receive nothing whatever for the amount of money he has paid in. If, however, he is superannuated, he then begins to draw from this fund whatever sum he may be entitled to under the statute. Sir, the Civil Service is not very arduous. He must be a very sick man indeed who cannot discharge the duties demanded of him, and he must be very old indeed when he is incapacitated by old age to discharge those duties. Sir, this fund is made an excuse by the Government for getting rid of civil servants whenever they choose. When a place is wanted for some chosen follower or friend, then the fund is charged with the superannuation of some member of the Civil Service to provide a place for him. Many of these civil servants have been superannuated when young in years and strong in health. They are living yet, and I hope they will long continue to live as happy beneficiaries of this fund. I have no desire to see their days shortened. But I regret very much that the country is deprived of the services of men so strong and healthy as those men must be to have lived so long after their superannuation.

I will mention a few sample cases showing the total amount paid in during the time

Mr. DAWSON.

of service and the total amount paid out to date :

	Paid in.	Drew out.
F. A. Himsworth	\$ 315	\$17,950
Lindsay Russell	832	18,598
J. B. Cherriman	1,120	19,359
G. W. Wicksteed	1,088	21,418
John Kidd	517	21,895
J. M. Passon	352	26,180
W. R. Mingaye	1,216	30,572
J. Lesslie	560	32,247
J. P. Rubidge	48	31,579

Altogether these nine members of the Civil Service, now retired, paid in \$6,048 and have drawn out up to date, \$219,798. They have drawn out 37 times more than the amount they paid into the fund while they were in the service.

Men in good health are superannuated against their will, against their earnest protestation that they are not suffering from ill-health and are not incapacitated by old age, simply to make room for political supporters. A case occurred not long since which illustrates the methods by which this is brought about. I refer to the retirement of Mr. Vankoughnet, who was superannuated in 1893 at the age of fifty six years and while in perfectly good health, and declaring himself to be sound in body and mind. The sole reason given by the Government for superannuating him was that his health was not good, that he had no longer the vigour of intellect once his, and that he was unfit to discharge the duties of his office; but it is known that their real reason for getting rid of him was to provide a position for Mr. Hayter Reed.

Let me read a letter which was received by Mr. Vankoughnet some time before his superannuation. It was the first intimation he received that it was the desire of the Government to dispense with his services, and to add his name to the superannuated list :

Department of Interior,
Ottawa, 28th June, 1893.

Dear Mr. Vankoughnet,—In watching closely the affairs of the Indian Department and the management of its branches for some time past, I have come to the conclusion that some radical changes are needed, and I have contemplated making such changes as will reduce the staff and consequently the expenses. Now, while thinking these matters over, I cannot help stating that I have for some time also noticed that your health is failing and that you have no longer the vigour of intellect which has characterized you in the past. I may say that hitherto, when the question of your superannuation was mooted, I took care to speak of you as you deserved, in as fair and friendly a light as I could, for that you have been a most zealous, faithful officer no one who knows you well can deny; but I am now forced to the conclusion I have come to after a very

calm and full review of the whole circumstances as regards the Indian Department.

Your long services entitle you to full superannuation, and I know Council will willingly grant the same. In making this intimation, I desire to say that our relationship has been most cordial, and I reciprocate your kind offices to me since my occupancy of the position of Superintendent General. I really think that what I now write you is in your own interest, and that, especially from a health point of view your retirement from office will be beneficial to you. I must say that my convictions are firm in this matter, and not arrived at without mature consideration. In stating, therefore, in this friendly and private way that I am prepared to accept your request for superannuation, I am quite sure you will not disturb our cordial relations by refusing to act in accordance with my wishes—a course which would really be of no benefit to you. I also desire to say that I would like you to take the necessary steps in the matter with as little delay as possible, and whatever memoranda to Council are necessary I would be glad if you would have prepared at once. Again assuring you that this letter is not dictated with any hostile feeling or unfriendliness, and trusting that you will regard my request in a right spirit.

Believe me,

Dear Mr. Vankoughnet,

Yours faithfully,

T. MAYNE DALY.

The Minister puts it on the ground of economy, but he also notes that Mr. Vankoughnet's health is failing—that his intellect is not so vigorous as it used to be. Sir, the Minister was as frank in speaking of Mr. Vankoughnet as his colleagues afterwards were in discussing the Prime Minister. From a health point of view his retirement would be beneficial, and he hopes that he will not refuse to act in accordance with the suggestion he makes, that it will not help matters if he does, that they are bound to get rid of him, and he may as well be pleasant about it, is a free translation of the contents of this letter. The next day, the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Daly) received a letter from Mr. Vankoughnet, which proves that Mr. Vankoughnet's intellect was quite as vigorous as that of the Minister himself. Under date, Ottawa, 29th July, 1893, Mr. Vankoughnet wrote as follows:—

Dear Sir,—Yours of the 28th instant, received and contents fully considered.

In reply, I would say that as respects any measures which you may consider it advisable, in the interests of economy, to adopt, in the future management of this department, I shall be happy to assist you.

With regard to your statement that, for some time you have noticed that my health was failing, and that I had no longer the vigour of intellect which characterized me in the past, I have to state that I was never in the enjoyment of better health than I am now, and have been for the last nine months—since, in fact, I returned to my duties last autumn, after absence on sick leave; the latter having been only the second of such absences during the long term of thirty years' service.

The vigour of my intellect is amply proven by the immense volume of work which receives attention at my hands daily, as well as by the nu-

merous reports on important matters made to you, also by the reports made by me for your signature to His Excellency the Governor General in Council; moreover the general management of the department both in the outside and inside service of it, of which I challenge fair criticism, shows that a vigorous intellect must be the possession of the one who is the presiding genius over it.

I am only in my fifty-sixth year as far as age is concerned, being four years short of the age for superannuation.

And as for service, I have had but thirty-two years and four months, being two years and eight months less than the term required by the Superannuation Act.

I could not, therefore, truthfully apply on the grounds of impaired physical or intellectual condition, age, or length of service for superannuation, even if I were otherwise disposed to make such application.

I must, therefore, respectfully decline to comply with your request to do so.

I reserve to myself the liberty of making such use of this correspondence as circumstances may seem to me to justify.

Yours sincerely,

L. VANKOUGHNET,

Deputy Supt. General of Indian Affairs.

Hon. T. Mayne Daly,

Supt. General of Indian Affairs.

Sir, there is a wonderful difference in men. Here was a man, fifty-six years of age, who had to go, on the ground that his age rendered him unable to manage one of the minor departments of the Government. And yet these same hon. gentlemen opposite afterwards send across the sea for the present Secretary of State and make him their leader in the House, a man far advanced in years, a man far beyond fifty-six years of age, which was Mr. Vankoughnet's age. Mr. Vankoughnet is too old to manage the affairs of one department, but the present Secretary of State in the estimation of our hon. friends is not too old to manage the affairs of this country. Mr. Vankoughnet declined to lie at the dictation of the General Superintendent of Indian Affairs, he refused to stultify himself by making a certificate which would be false, and by applying for superannuation on the ground mapped out for him. But, in spite of his refusal, he was duly superannuated. On 30th September, 1893, the present Minister of the Interior (Mr. Daly) wrote him, as follows:—

Dear Sir,—I have to inform you that to-day Council adopted the report of the Treasury Board, passed at its last sitting, and by which report I find you have been superannuated. By the same report and minute of Council, Mr. Hayter Reed, Indian Commissioner, has been appointed as your successor.

As I leave for Montreal early Monday A.M., I thought it only right you should get the information first through me.

I presume the duties of your office ceased to-day.

Yours truly,

(Sgd.) T. MAYNE DALY.

Sir, the true reason for the superannuation

of Mr. Vankoughnet is acknowledged by the Minister. It was this, that he should make place for Mr. Hayter Reed. Therefore, he was superannuated, and is now drawing \$2,112 a year, doing nothing for it, but enjoying it in England, in perfect health and vigour of intellect.

There are a few other abuses of the superannuation system, and I will allude to one or two, with your kind permission. One was in connection with Mr. Dansereau, a leading Conservative of the city of Montreal. Mr. Dansereau desired the postmastership of Montreal, and Mr. Lamothe, who was postmaster at that time, was superannuated accordingly. This happened on 1st February, 1891, just on the eve of the general election. Well, Mr. Lamothe had friends whom it was desirable to keep quiet, so eight years were added to his term of service, and he was superannuated on a pension of \$2,000 a year, and Mr. Dansereau was made postmaster at a salary of \$4,000 a year. So that these two gentlemen receive out of the public chest no less a sum than \$6,000 a year.

Mr. Robert Wallace was postmaster at Victoria, B.C. He strenuously resisted being superannuated. His health was all right and his intellect likewise, but, unfortunately for him, his place was wanted for Mr. Shakespeare, then a member of this House. To quiet Mr. Wallace, eight years were added to his length of service, and he was duly superannuated. After the eight years were added, he was only then entitled to draw \$912 a year. This was considered too little to quiet Mr. Wallace, and so Parliament is asked every session to vote \$240 more to his superannuation allowance, making it \$1,150 a year which he receives, while Mr. Shakespeare is made postmaster at Victoria at a salary of \$2,000 a year.

There are many similar cases, but I will only mention one more, the case of Mr. John Tilton, Deputy Minister of Fisheries, who was superannuated when only fifty-five years old, and who was also in the enjoyment of vigorous health and sound intellect. He was pensioned, I suppose, on the ground that he was sick, feeble, or incapacitated on account of old age, and this strong, healthy, vigorous man, in the prime of life, now receives \$1,536 per year and does nothing in return.

These are some of the reasons why we condemn the superannuation system of hon. gentlemen opposite. I do not intend to go into the details of every item of the expenditure of this Government. I have promised to be brief, and I intend to be brief. I have shown that the total expenditure of the Government has increased well upon \$15,000,000 a year since 1878, and that the increase of our expenditure is over 60 per cent, against an increase in population, in these same eighteen years, of only 25 per cent. No one who cares to think at all, will say that this is safe or wise, and no one will believe that it is not possible to effect large savings

Mr. DAWSON.

in this expenditure. No one in the country will deny that this must be done. So much for plank No. 4 of our platform.

5.—FOR RESPONSIBLE GOVERNMENT.—INDEPENDENCE OF PARLIAMENT.

That the convention regrets that by the action of Ministers and their supporters in Parliament, in one case in which serious charges were made against a Minister of the Crown, investigation was altogether refused, while in another case the charges preferred were altered and then referred to a commission appointed upon the advice of the Ministry, contrary to the well settled practice of Parliament and this convention affirms :

That it is the ancient and undoubted right of the House of Commons to inquire into all matters of public expenditure, and into all charges of misconduct in office against Ministers of the Crown, and the reference of such matters to royal commissions created upon the advice of the accused is at variance with the due responsibility of Ministers to the House of Commons, and tends to weaken the authority of the House over the Executive Government, and this convention affirms that the powers of the people's representatives in this regard should on all fitting occasions be upheld.

There can be no mistaking the meaning of this plank in our platform. No administration that intends to do right with the people's money, will fear to have their acts investigated in the full light of parliamentary inquiry. The House of Commons is more than a mere echo of the Ministers of the Crown. We are supposed to be in the enjoyment of responsible government here. The Ministers can be made, if hon. gentlemen opposite choose, responsible to this House for their conduct. We are the representatives of the people, their chosen trustees, and it is through us in this Parliament that the people of this country are governed and govern. It is our duty, then, to determine the policy of the Administration. But this committee of Parliament, this Government, sitting behind closed doors, frames a policy, and then demands that we support it without question. A policy once adopted, its administration is to be without question. No member of this House must dare to rise in his place and attack the administration or demand an investigation. If he does, the investigation is simply refused. The Government forget that they are not the dictators but the servants of the people, and accountable to them through their representatives here. They must give an account of their stewardship to the people, if it be demanded. To shirk an open investigation leaves on the mind an ugly suspicion concerning the person charged. The Ministers, I should imagine would court open and above-board inquiry into all their acts. If they are innocent, they should be glad to make the fact manifest to the people of Canada.

6.—THE LAND FOR THE SETTLER—NOT FOR THE SPECULATOR.

That in the opinion of this convention the sales of public lands of the Dominion should be to

actual settlers only, and not to speculators, upon reasonable terms of settlement, and in such areas as can be reasonably occupied and cultivated by the settler.

Sir, I know something of what this country owes to the actual settler. I have lived for many years among them. I know all their struggles and their hardships, and I know the heroism they display in overcoming all the drawbacks, incident to the life of the pioneer. There is no finer province in the Dominion than Ontario; no state in the union can compare with it. And it was the early pioneers who made it what it is. Theirs were the lusty blows that transformed this wilderness into the smiling fertile farms that occupy our land. The wilderness areas of our great west now contain the bulk of our undeveloped natural resources. Immense wealth awaits there the advent of the settler. That land can only be made valuable by the labour of the pioneer. These men alone can lay broad and deep the foundations of our nations' greatness and wealth. The land grabber and the speculator are the natural enemies of the settler. Sir, it is a sin against him and against the nation to allow these land speculators in the North-west to stand between him and the land he wants. As matters stand to-day we find settlers taking up homesteads in the North-west where every alternate section is held either by a railway company or by the Hudson's Bay Company. And there are these settlers all alone awaiting the coming of neighbours who are able to purchase these alternate lots. In other townships the settler finds the whole of the lands owned by speculators called colonization societies. The few settlers who first go into these townships purchase their lands on reasonable terms. But after a few have gone in, the price of land is raised. This discourages further settlement, and so the pioneer finds himself toiling on alone, out in the prairie "splendidly isolated," surrounded with land which would make homes for many more, if only that land was made available to the actual settler, awaiting the coming of neighbours to help him by co-operation to build roads, support schools and maintain churches. Lonely, deprived of the society of his fellows, his children growing up without schools, he grows despondent; and many of our settlers in the North-west with its magnificent soil and splendid climate and with promise of great things to come, nevertheless, write home to friends in the old land so despondently as to discourage further immigration.

The land should be sold to the actual settler only and not to the speculator, and then settlement would be rapid and continuous. The colonization schemes of this Government in 1882 actually retarded the settlement of the North-west. Under the Order in Council of that year some 2,295 townships were sold on terms of credit to these colo-

nization societies as they were called. But they were found to discourage settlement rather than to encourage it, and, to-day, the country is suffering from the results of that mistaken policy. In 1882 a motion declaring the land policy of the Liberals to be the land for the actual settler and not for the speculator was moved in this House and was defeated on a straight party vote. Again on the 7th of June, 1894, a similar motion was moved and again it was defeated by the Government majority. Sir, it would be wiser far to encourage dense and continuous settlement, and not to spread our population over vast areas where co-operation amongst the settlers is practically impossible. The practice of granting large blocks of land to railway companies that have built branch lines as feeders to the main line is not in the public interest. Let the people upon these lands, and they would settle the country gradually, and these feeders would speedily be constructed to carry the traffic created by the people who had gone in on the land. Sir, the railway companies, to realize on the lands, sell them out to those who apply first. Speculators buy them up and hold them for higher prices and in this way retard settlement. In the end the railway company suffers injury by keeping the people out of the country. In 1892 the Minister of the Interior declared that 44,000,000 acres were held by the railway companies.

Sir, the promise held out to us was that actual settlers would buy the public lands at a dollar an acre and that the receipts were to amount to \$75,000,000 before 1890. After paying the cost of surveys and management \$69,000,000 it was said, would remain to be applied to the reduction of the public debt. The Dominion lands cost, up to the 1st July, 1894, \$5,288,995, and the receipts from land sales up to that time were \$1,949,905. Instead of having a profit of \$69,000,000, the management of our Dominion lands resulted in an actual loss to the treasury of \$3,328,000.

The timber policy of the Government was madness itself. The policy which prevailed up to 1887 was simply scandalous and indefensible. Limits of the choicest timber were given away to those who were fortunate enough to enjoy the favour of the Government, at a nominal ground rent of \$5 per square mile. It was shown by the returns that 850 square miles of timber had been allotted to seventeen members of this House, some of whom are still here. The scandal which followed the exposure of one of these deals resulted in driving J. C. Rykert from public life. Altogether some 1,600 miles of timber limits have been given away subject to a ground rent of something less than one cent per acre. In 1882, Hon. Edward Blake moved that the system of granting limits was liable to gross abuse and a system of public competition should be adopted. This resolution was de-

feated by the Government majority. Later, in 1891, the Liberals here again condemned the policy of the Government in this respect when the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) moved that these limits should be disposed of by public auction. This also was defeated. Sir, under the Ontario system of selling timber limits we find that in 1892 a bonus averaging \$3,657.18 per square mile was received. That sale was of 633 square miles and on that the government received a bonus, a gratuity, one might call it, of \$2,315,000 or \$1,000,000 more than the cost of the Parliament buildings of Toronto. The same number of square miles sold under the Dominion plan would have brought \$3,165. So the account would stand thus:—Dominion method, receipts, \$3,165; provincial government method, \$2,135,000, for the same area of land. Then again the Dominion timber lands were sold subject to dues of 75 cents per thousand feet, board measure. Provincial timber limits were sold subject to the dues, amounting to \$1.25 per thousand feet board measure. Some of those limits have fallen back into the hands of the Government, because of the utter failure of the Government in attracting settlers to the North-west, and so providing a market for the timber which they had hoped to cut on those limits.

7.—OPPOSE THE DOMINION FRANCHISE ACT, FAVOUR THE PROVINCIAL FRANCHISE.

That the Franchise Act since its introduction has caused the Dominion treasury over a million of dollars, besides entailing a heavy expenditure to both political parties;

That each revision involves an additional expenditure of a further quarter of a million;

That this expenditure has prevented an annual revision, as originally intended, in the absence of which young voters entitled to the franchise have, in numerous instances, been prevented from exercising their natural rights;

That it has failed to secure uniformity, which was the principal reason assigned for its introduction;

That it has produced gross abuses by partisan revising barristers appointed by the Government of the day;

That its provisions are less liberal than those already existing in many provinces of the Dominion, and that, in the opinion of this convention, the Act should be repealed, and we should revert to the provincial franchise.

Sir, there are but few hon. gentlemen opposite who disagree with us in our hearty condemnation of this Franchise Act, if they would speak the secret of their souls. It is weary work to revise the lists under this Act, and it is costly work, as hon. gentlemen on both sides well know.

I know something of the revision of 1891. During an interesting tour through my constituency, we had with us, Mr. Shannon, who is now connected with the "Citizen," the Government organ in this city. He appeared

Mr. DAWSON.

at the court of revision in my county, representing the Conservatives there. He attended from day to day, and had a good opportunity of studying the working of the Act. The revision of that county was not satisfactory to him, the working of the Act he found to be complicated and expensive, and he was not satisfied that it resulted in lists that were at all accurate. On his return to Kingston, he relieved the bitterness of his heart by writing the following letter to his brother's paper, the Kingston "News":

Sir,—At the present time and for six months past the revising barristers have been engaged upon the correction of the voters' lists under the Dominion Electoral Franchise Act, and in every county in Canada many persons have been devoting time and labour to the same object, for the purpose of advancing the interests of the respective political parties. I believe the consensus of opinion among those who have had such experience of the actual operations of the Act will be that it is complicated, expensive and unsatisfactory.

There is reason in the contention that the bases of the franchise should be identified for every part of the Dominion, otherwise a representative might be sent to Parliament from Ontario by the votes of men, who in Quebec or Prince Edward Island would be disqualified were it not for this difficulty. Were Quebec possessed of a municipal system similar to ours, and were the qualifications demanded of voters in municipal elections the same in every province, it would undoubtedly be a measure of wisdom and economy to adopt for federal purposes the voters' lists prepared by the municipal authorities.

Many Conservatives fear the result which might flow from leaving their rights as electors to the tender mercy of the Grit assessor. They believe that their opponents are more bigoted and unscrupulous than themselves, that they carry party spirit into all the concerns of social and civil life, and that when appointed to public office they use their position to forward party ends. This belief may not be altogether without foundation; enough instances might probably be found to point a moral or adorn a tale. Yet there is a sense of fair-play in the breast of the average man which may be confidently addressed, and may be depended upon to prevent him from becoming incorrigibly dishonest. But every one who desires to see impartial justice practised by public servants will commence by himself taking his stand upon high principle when occupying public office, and will make it his own concern to treat friend and foe, Grit and Tory, alike, as sentiment must arise under which a partial and dishonest official will become rare. At all events it would be much easier to watch and prosecute the conscienceless assessors, and take the necessary proceedings for having their mistakes corrected by the county judge, than it is to operate the present Franchise Act.

The statute has, it is true, furnished an approximately uniform franchise, but it has failed to secure to other qualities not less important, namely, simplicity and cheapness. The amount of time, labour and expense demanded for the revision of the list can scarcely be estimated by those who have not been actively engaged in the work, and this cost is but poorly repaid by the uncertain, hurried and haphazard manner in which, at the final revision, the business of the court is despatched without being transacted.

If the obstacles to the adoption of the municipal voters' lists are found to be insuperable it will not in my opinion, be long before Parliament will supersede the present system by the introduction of universal suffrage with an easy and inexpensive system of registration.

R. W. SHANNON.

Sir, he thinks the Grit assessors are worse than the Tory assessors. They are bigoted, he says, and unscrupulous, carrying party spite into all the concerns of life, and yet he would trust these conscienceless assessors to make up the lists correctly rather than trust to the operation of this iniquitous franchise law.

Sir, the National Policy and the gerrymander, plus human devices, saved the Government from defeat in 1882. But the popular conscience was aroused against the gerrymander, and people began to question the wisdom of the National Policy, and in 1885 the Government began to fear defeat in the general elections which they knew must take place in 1887. So to be sure of victory, in spite of the will of the people, it occurred to them to prepare their own lists, to appoint officials of their own, so as to make these lists in such a way as to limit as much as possible the right to vote to their own political friends. This was the object of their Franchise Act of 1885. The elections are now held on lists sometimes two, sometimes three, years old. There are thousands of young men whose names do not appear upon the lists upon which the elections are held. They are deprived of the right to say what Government shall be in power, of the right to condemn, if they feel so disposed, the actions of the Government which is in power.

In the election of 1891 it is estimated that between 60,000 and 70,000 young men were disfranchised under that Act. The general elections which will now soon occur will be held on lists which were revised in 1894. Sir, it is in the highest degree important to hon. gentlemen opposite not to allow the young men of Canada to vote. I believe that if they enfranchised the young men of Canada, they would arise and hurl from power the men who have so long betrayed the interests of this country. The Liberals gave the most determined opposition to this Franchise Act in 1885, and throughout the longest session ever held in this building, they fought against that Act; and were it not for the stand they then took, great as are the iniquities now existing in that Act, still greater iniquities would be found in it. Sir, this expensive Act, this unworkable Act, resulting in defective lists, was put upon the statute-book of this country in direct defiance of the convictions of many hon. gentlemen opposite. I am sure that many of them have always been sincerely sorry that that statute ever found its way among the laws of our country.

Among these men, I believe the late Sir John Thompson was one, and we know that

he earnestly desired its abolition, and a return, practically, to the franchise of the provinces. I will read what he said in June, 1894, when he introduced his Bill:

The question upon which so much difference has arisen in the past as to the basis of the franchise, shall be adjusted by adopting the franchise of the several provinces. * * * * * The number of differences which exist between the provincial franchises and the Dominion franchise as established by our own Act, are so few as not to be worth the contest and the expenses which are involved in keeping them up, and the adoption of a general system which will apply both to the local and Dominion legislatures, has recommendations as regards simplicity and facilities for economy, which cannot exist under a dual system such as we have been keeping up for the past few years.

Also, it is obviously one of the most desirable features in connection with any system of franchise, and to my mind an essential feature, that the system to be adopted will be such that it can be put into operation every year.

That was Sir John Thompson's view, but his Bill never passed. The hon. gentlemen who now form the present Administration, prefer the present law; they were opposed to the changes suggested by Sir John Thompson, and they are to-day in favour of the Franchise Act, knowing it to be in their interest.

8. AGAINST THE GERRYMANDER—COUNTY BOUNDARIES SHOULD BE PRESERVED.

That by the Gerrymander Acts, the electoral divisions for the return of members to the House of Commons have been so made as to prevent a fair expression of the opinion of the country at the general elections, and to secure to the party now in power a strength out of all proportion greater than the number of electors supporting them would warrant. To put an end to this abuse, to make the House of Commons a fair exponent of public opinion, and to preserve the historic continuity of counties, it is desirable that in the formation of electoral divisions, county boundaries should be preserved, and that in no case parts of different counties should be put in one electoral division.

Sir, the gerrymander occurred somewhat in this way: Under the British North America Act the province of Quebec is entitled to send sixty-five members to this House. The population of Quebec, when divided by sixty-five, gives the unit of representation, the number of persons entitled to send a representative here. The population of each province, divided by the unit gives the number of members that each province is entitled to send to this Parliament. When the census is taken, it will show that some provinces have grown in regard to population more than others, and thus arises the necessity of a redistribution of the seats. The proper method of doing this would be to adhere to the county boundaries, and when it is necessary to increase the representation of a province, to do it by sub-dividing some county, keeping within the county boundaries, and, at the same time,

keeping as close as possible to the unit. The plan adopted by hon. gentlemen opposite, openly and above-board, is to arrange the constituencies so as to increase their chances at the polls. Take a strong Liberal county, surrounded by weak Conservative constituencies. The Liberal county may have a few townships with Conservative majorities, and the Conservative counties may have a few townships with Liberal majorities. The Conservative townships are detached from the Liberal county and distributed among, perhaps, several Conservative counties. The Liberal townships are detached from the Conservative counties, and added to the Liberal county. This is what is called "hiving the Grits," and by the deal the chances of the Government in several counties are increased. This has contributed enormously to the maintenance of the Government in office. The result has been to make some fearfully and wonderfully-shaped constituencies. The maps of some constituencies are utterly shapeless. As was said by some one, the map was so changed that it could be safely worshipped as it was unlike anything in heaven above or the earth beneath, or within the thought of man, except under the operation of this Gerrymander Act.

If we add up the votes cast for the Government candidates in the province of Ontario, allowing for the majorities in the constituencies at the general elections electing Government candidates by acclamation, and allowing where any triangular contest occurred the same Government majority as was obtained in the preceding election, we find very little difference in the voting strength of the two parties, even after the by-elections; yet so beautifully does the gerrymander work that the Government is able to count fifty-six followers as against thirty-six Opposition members from this province. To bring about this result, the Government carved up constituencies, regardless of county boundaries or community of interest.

In the redistribution of 1882 the Government departed radically from the principles laid down by their chieftain, Sir John A. Macdonald, in 1872. When the "Redistribution Act of 1872" was under consideration, Sir John A. Macdonald said:

With respect to the rural constituencies, the desire of the Government has been to preserve the representations for counties and subdivisions of counties as much as possible. It is considered objectionable to make representation a mere geographical term. It is desired as much as possible to keep the representation within the county so that each county that is a municipality of Ontario should be represented, and if it becomes large enough, divide it into ridings; that principle is carried out in the suggestions * * * but it is obvious that there is a great advantage in having counties elect men whom they know. Our municipal system gives an admirable opportunity to constituencies to select men for their deserts. We all know the process which happily goes on in western Ontario. A young man in the

Mr. DAWSON.

county commences his public life by being elected by the neighbours who know him to the township council. If he shows himself possessed of administrative ability he is made a reeve or deputy-reeve of his township. He becomes a member of the county council, and as his experience increases and his character and ability become known, he is selected by his people as their representative in Parliament. It is, I think, a grand system that the people of Canada should have the opportunity of choosing for political promotion the men in whom they have most confidence and of whose abilities they are fully assured. All that great advantage is lost by cutting off a portion of two separate counties and adding them together for electoral purposes only. Those portions so cut off have no common interest; they do not meet together and they have no common feeling, except that once in five years they go to the polls in their own township to vote for a man who may be known in one section and not in another. This tends toward the introduction and development of the American system of caucuses, by which wire-pullers take adventurers for their political ability only, and not for any personal respect for them. So that, as much as possible, from any point of view, it is advisable that counties should refuse men whom they do not know, and when the representation is increased, it should be by subdividing the counties into ridings.

I commend these views to hon. gentlemen opposite.

9.—THE SENATE DEFECTIVE—AMEND THE CONSTITUTION.

The present constitution of the Senate is inconsistent with the federal principle in our system of government, and is in other respects defective, as it makes the Senate independent of the people and uncontrolled by the public opinion of the country, and should be so amended as to bring it into harmony with the principles of popular government.

The experience of twenty-eight years has demonstrated that the Canadian Senate, under the present mode of appointment, is an utterly useless, though very expensive, part of our legislative machinery. It is an utter fiction to pretend that appointments to the Senate are made by the Crown. We all know that they are made by the party in power, and that, too often, the appointments are made as a reward for party services, and are given to candidates because they have been defeated in contesting some constituency for a seat in the Commons. We know that the vacancies in the Senate are filled by the party in power from among their party friends, and that, to-day, the Senate is no longer a representative body, and is little better than a political club, whose chief function is to undo the Grits. Sir, these men, rejected by the people when seeking a seat in the Commons, are sent to the so-called higher chamber, there to defeat, if they choose, the popular desire for reform. Well, Sir, these men, when they meet in the Senate, are supposed to revise hasty legislation, but, judged by their acts, one might imagine that they are appointed for the hasty revision of legislation. Every hon. gentleman knows that for weeks

the lawyers in this House, on both sides, worked arduously to prepare the Criminal Code. It required weeks of careful study in this House to promote that Bill through its different stages, but it ran through the Senate in two or three days, and just as fast as they could read clause after clause, they were carried, and the Bill became law.

For myself, and speaking personally, I see so little use for a second chamber, that I would gladly go for its abolition. If it be a power for good, I wish its friends would inform the public when, and where, and how, that power is exercised. It possesses vast power for mischief, and little chance of rendering any equivalent for the money it costs. I believe, Sir, the time for the abolition of the Senate has arrived. But, if this chamber is to continue, I think it should be made elective; and then its members being dependent on the will of their constituents, would have greater regard to the responsibilities of their position.

10.—QUESTIONS OF PROHIBITION—A DOMINION PLEBISCITE.

That whereas public attention is at present much directed to the consideration of the admittedly great evils of intemperance, it is desirable that the mind of the people should be clearly ascertained on the question of prohibition by means of a Dominion plebiscite.

Well, Sir, so far as I am concerned, I believe in prohibition. The first vote which I ever polled in my life was for prohibition, and I have not yet awoken to the belief that that vote was cast in a moment of weakness. When this question was brought up in this House, I voted in favour of prohibition. But I want prohibition that will prohibit. A prohibitory law which would fail would make matters infinitely worse than they have ever been, or ever can be, under a license law. A year or so ago, owing to the enterprise of the "Globe" newspaper, we were able to study the effects of prohibition in the different portions of the United States, where it was law. The one fact which was clearly brought out in that investigation was this: That a popular desire for this reform was necessary to its successful enforcement, and, where such desire was lacking, prohibition was found to be a miserable failure and the conditions were worse than they had been under a license system. The results demonstrated the wisdom of the Reform convention of 1893, in desiring to give every elector in the Dominion an opportunity to express his views upon the momentous question, before this Parliament resorted to prohibitory legislation. The temperance people of Canada are not cranks. They are practical men. They desire a full expression of public opinion upon this very important question. The true friends of temperance desire to have a fair majority of all the electors, before Parliament is called upon to enact prohibitory legislation. An opportunity to pronounce

upon this question will be given to the people. The question can then be ventilated in all its aspects. Everything that can be urged against it may be urged, and everything that may be said in favour of prohibition may be urged in favour of it, and, if the verdict of the people is against prohibition, then, the prohibitionists of Canada must bide their time patiently, awaiting the day when a healthier public opinion will express itself in favour of this great reform. If the majority is for prohibition, and the people thus demand this reform, then, the expressed will of the people will, I believe, be faithfully carried out.

Mr. Speaker, I have one or two more concluding remarks, and, as I say, I will be as brief as possible. So much for the platform of the Liberal party. Now, Sir, a word or two respecting the platform of hon. gentlemen opposite. They have given up tariff reform in despair. They have got back again now to the old National Policy, as outlined in 1878. They say they do not believe that it is a tree having rotten branches which must be lopped off, according to the words of their late leader, Sir John Thompson. They say they believe it is a healthy, vigorous tree, and good enough for them. Well, here is their policy. Sir John Macdonald moved, on the 7th March, 1878, the following resolution, seconded by Mr. Pope:—

That this House is of opinion, that the welfare of Canada requires the adoption of a National Policy, which by a judicious readjustment of the tariff, will benefit and foster the agricultural, the mining, the manufacturing and other interests of the Dominion; that such a policy will retain in Canada thousands of our fellow countrymen now obliged to expatriate themselves in search of the employment denied them at home; will restore prosperity to our struggling industries, now so sadly depressed; will prevent Canada from being made a sacrifice market; will encourage and develop an active interprovincial trade, and moving (as it ought to do) in the direction of a reciprocity of tariffs with our neighbours, so far as the varied interests of Canada may demand, will greatly tend to procure for this country, eventually a reciprocity of trade.

Well, Sir, this policy has not benefited the agricultural interests of Canada. It has raised the cost of the production of agricultural produce; it has failed to maintain fair prices; it has resulted in depreciated land values, and an impoverished agricultural community; it has not retained our population; it has driven tens of thousands out of the country, until there is scarce a home in all Canada but mourns the loss of one or more of its sons. Thousands of honest toilers, grown gray in their warfare of life, are left at home on their farms, robbed of their stalwart sons and thrifty daughters, deprived of their helping hands, left alone to struggle on, patiently awaiting the summons to a world where tariffs are unknown.

The National Policy has destroyed many flourishing village industries all over the land. Under low tariff, villages sprung up all over Canada, in which there were many useful industries, giving employment to the youth of these villages. The young people found profitable employment within easy reach of their father's homes; but, to-day, they are driven out, forced to follow these industries, and, leaving the parental roof-tree in their happy village homes, are compelled to find employment as best they can in the large cities of the land, or leave the country in despair.

This policy has failed to coerce the United States into a reciprocity treaty. People are condemning it all over the country. In by-election after by-election the people have declared against it. Sir, according to the opinion of the Secretary of State (Sir Charles Tupper), this Government should resign, that is to say, if he has not changed his mind since 1877. Why, Sir, he thinks that the terms upon which this Government clings to office are too humiliating. In 1877 a few by-elections went against the Government of Mr. Mackenzie. The general elections were approaching, and, speaking of the situation, the Secretary of State, then in Opposition, took occasion to say:

I say, Sir, that I rejoice to know that however much hon. gentlemen may shrink from that ordeal, they must be more than blind not to see evidence on every side that they have lost the confidence of the people of this country.

Well, Sir, it is true that the Mackenzie Government lost the confidence of the people in a few of those constituencies, but they never for a moment lost confidence in each other. How is it to-day? Has not the Minister of Finance, who for a year was leader in this House, the Premier's trusted mouth-piece in the Commons, the second in command—has not he told us that the Premier is lacking in firmness and prudence, and is incapable of governing the country? Did he not tell us that this Government is neither strong nor efficient, and that the loyal and united efforts of himself and his six colleagues for a whole year had failed to make it so? Did he not tell us, and tell us truly, that the necessity for a strong Government was never greater than now? Did he not assure us that the Premier could not command the confidence of his colleagues? Did he not tell us that the Premier could not satisfy the Conservative party that its strongest elements were at its head? Did he not tell us a truth well known to us, a fact as apparent as the light of day—but one concerning which good taste and party loyalty should have kept him silent—namely, that the Premier could not impress the country that it had a Government which was united and had power to govern? And did not the Premier, speaking of his colleagues, tell us:

Mr. DAWSON.

Had not jealousy and a determination to destroy the usefulness of the head of the Government been firmly rooted in the breasts of those with whom I was associated, I flatter myself that we should have been successful in carrying on the affairs of this country.

Did he not solemnly assure us that he had not received their loyal support?

Sir, in my heart there is a great pity for the Secretary of State. He awakes to political life after a long and peaceful sleep in the sacred shades of the office of High Commissioner of Canada in London. Like Rip Van Winkle he awakes to find the world greatly changed—to find the party with the instinct of government hopelessly divided and the Cabinet in ruins. The sinking crew on the ship of state, frightened at the storm they themselves have raised, in their despair, as a last resort, wake him up and cry: "Save us, or we perish!" He cannot save them; he knows it now. The end of the world is coming. The party which the genius of Sir John Macdonald welded together it split into factions. He sees failure awaiting him on all sides. Sir, I think I can hear him exclaim, in the solitude of his chamber:

"The world is out of joint—oh, cursed spite
That ever I was born to set it right."

But let us return to the hon. gentleman's speech. He went on to say:

I do not intend, Sir, to appeal to them (the Government of Hon. Alex. Mackenzie) and to point out to them that when the Government of England, when the Government of Mr. Gladstone was situated as the hon. gentlemen opposite are situated to-day, when election after election taught them they had power, but not the concurrence of the public sentiment of the country. Sir, one would think he was a Grit speaking of the Government of to-day. Election after election has been teaching our hon. friends opposite that while they have power they lack the concurrence of the public sentiment of the country. Everything favour the candidate of a strong and efficient Government in a by-election. These elections are held one by one. The first one in a constituency having a good, safe Government majority. The argument is that the Government has a big majority in the House, and a change of representation would make no difference whatever; it would not change results to send a member of the Opposition here; and then the sinister suggestion is made that after all it is wise to be on the winning side, and that it would be better for the balance of the Parliamentary term to send a supporter of the Government than a member of the Opposition.

All these things tell in favour of the Government candidate, and I am sorry to say that human nature is so weak that men are at times carried away by such arguments. Then, Sir, the Government have the gang skilled in human devices, to use the expression of the hon.

Secretary of State, and well supplied out of the surplus fees of the Manufacturers' Association with nicely engraved campaign literature consisting of some bank's promise to pay \$2, \$5 or \$10, as the case may be. And with this illustrated literature the gang proceeds to get in its fine work through the byways and the highways of the townships—the streets and alleys in the towns. To hold a riding with an increased majority should be very easy for our friends the enemy; but what has been their record in the recent by-elections? Since January 1st, 1893, nineteen constituencies have been contested. Two of these were Liberal constituencies. One of them, South Middlesex, which was vacated by the death of our esteemed friend Mr. Armstrong, returned our stalwart friend (Mr. Boston) with an increased majority. The other constituency was Verchères, vacated by the death of a friend whom we all regretted, the Hon. Félix Geoffrion. It returned our friend, the present able member for that county (Mr. Geoffrion), despite the appeals of the Minister of Public Works to the electors when they came to vote to forget their party, but to remember their God. Well, Mr. Speaker, they remembered both their party and their God, and voted for a Liberal. The other seventeen of the contested constituencies had been held by Conservatives. Of these the Conservatives succeeded in holding eight, and the Opposition gained nine. The aggregate Conservative majority against which the Liberals had to fight in these nine constituencies was 2,838, and the aggregate majority secured by the Liberals in them was 2,263. These nine constituencies are the following:—

L'Islet, where my hon. friend (Mr. Tarte) put up such a fight as few men in this country besides him could equal; and against all odds—against the most bitter opposition and frantic efforts to defeat him as a punishment for the revelations of the political wrong-doing of hon. gentlemen opposite, made in this Parliament in 1891, he wrested that constituency from the Government.

Vaudreuil, in spite of St. Louis's money, in spite of the Minister of Public Works, in spite of the member for Provencher, in spite of the Solicitor General's appeal to the farmers to remember the great home market they had in the city of Montreal—to all these appeals Vaudreuil turned a deaf ear, and returned the present member (Mr. Harwood) by the handsome majority of 191.

Winnipeg, the gateway of the great Northwest, the centre of its life and energy, which in the election of 1891 had elected a supporter of the Government by a majority of 509, spurned the Government candidate in the by-election, and elected my hon. friend who now represents Winnipeg (Mr. Martin) with the handsome majority of 429.

Antigonish, which was vacated by the death of the late Premier, Sir John Thomp-

son, resisted the pathetic appeals made to the electors to return a supporter of his to finish out the term which he unhappily did not survive to complete, and refused to endorse the conduct and administration of the Government, and returned to this House my hon. friend (Mr. McIsaac) with a handsome majority.

Cardwell was won by an opponent of the Government, the Government majority of 248 being changed to a majority of 226 against them.

Jacques Cartier, with a Conservative majority of 276, where the Conservatives had, according to the declaration of the late member, added to the list 700 more names than the Liberals, which should have rolled up a Government majority of nearly 1,000, went against the Government by a majority of 556.

Montreal Centre, where the Government had a majority of 1,214, they lost by a majority of 336. That constituency, the great centre of trade of the Dominion, with its vast commercial interests and its immense manufacturing concerns, went against the Government of the day, and declared, by electing my friend the present member (Mr. McShane), that they would have no more of the wrong-doing of this Government and no more incapacity in the administration of the affairs of the country.

Sir, West Huron proved the Government's dread of the by-election to be well founded. After long delay, the writs were issued and the constituency was lost to them by a majority of 190, and the war-horse from the west (Mr. Cameron) has come to this House to do valiant battle for truth and righteousness.

Charlevoix resisted the pleadings of both governments, provincial and federal, manfully proclaimed the principles of Liberalism, and returned an hon. gentleman (Mr. Angers) whose welcome by this House, I think, will long be remembered by him.

The hon. Secretary of State proceeded:

When this was the case I say that hon. gentleman (Mr. Gladstone) felt he owed it to himself and to the great party of which he was the leader, that he should not consent to hold office upon terms which he felt so humiliating.

What do hon. friends opposite intend to do now? Do they intend to imitate Mr. Gladstone? Not a bit. They will hold on to power as long as they can. Here we are in our sixth session, for the first time in our history, simply because the Government are afraid to face the electorate. For this reason they hang on to office one session longer than the constitution of our country contemplated. The hon. Secretary of State continued:

Sir, I have no hope that they will follow this example.

Neither have I.

I will not waste words or breath in order to take up the time of the House in making

any hopeless appeals, but again congratulate the people that the day is drawing rapidly near when the independent public sentiment of this country will again have an opportunity of being heard—

Well, when the day does come there will be such a hurling from power of this Government as will teach them, once and for all, that it does not pay in the long run to mal-administer the affairs of the country :

—and that again there is a prospect of a brighter day dawning upon Canada than I regret to say has shone upon it for the last three years.

If we change the three years to eighteen years, this speech will fit the present occasion accurately. The Liberals will soon be returned to power. Then we shall have a return to brighter days and purer and wiser administration and a sounder fiscal system. The lessons of the by-elections are unmistakable, and it was just as well for the Government that they did not open Missisquoi, Pontiac and Soulanges, because, just so sure as they had elections in these constituencies, just so sure would then more men have been returned to vote against them. The elections cannot now be long delayed, and when they come we will find the farmers, the merchants, the labourers, the mechanics, the manufacturers and professional men, all joining together in pronouncing through the polls their condemnation of the present Government.

I would like, before I conclude to say a word more about the hon. Secretary of State (Sir Charles Tupper). That hon. gentleman was discussed by the Toronto "Mail" in 1891. On the 9th June, that paper contained the following editorial:—

After ostentatiously assuming the character of an impartial representative of the whole Canadian people, and their common ambassador to Washington, he proceeds to show his impartiality by the most violent and slanderous attacks on the party in Canada opposed to him, first, in an American, then in an English magazine. His article in the "Contemporary" impudently accusing Canadian Liberals to the British public of conspiracy to subvert British institutions and annex Canada to the United States, considering his position and the nature of his duties, may safely be said to be unique in the history of the public service. The appointment of such a man as the head of the state would be, not merely the inauguration of violence and corruption, unredeemed by any true wisdom or statesmanship,—it would be the signal for a disruption of the community and for a moral civil war.

Well, Sir, he is not head of the state, but if hon. gentlemen opposite have their way he may be soon, and I have no doubt that such an event would mean the inauguration of violence and corruption. Certainly the long black record which that hon. gentleman has left in the annals of his country teach us that his methods will be unredeemed by any true wisdom or statesmanship. But there will be no moral civil war. Sir, the people of Canada will not quarrel over him; he is a back number politically, and the people take but little interest in him.

Mr. DAWSON.

They look upon him as the costly High Commissioner, whose whole career as such is unmarked by any one act benefiting of Canada. But I think he somewhat dreaded the promised "moral civil war." He has never been accused of entertaining a low opinion of himself, he is not disposed to underrate his own importance on the earth, and so doubtless he thought the Liberal party had taken seriously his slanderous attacks on them in 1891, and he attempted to atone for his unjust attacks by what he said in Halifax the other day. To disarm them, he there said :

That the men of all political parties and all our public men, irrespective of politics, are loyal to the heart's core.

Sir, the Liberal party needs no such certificate. They have always treated with silent contempt that hon. gentleman's impudent accusations; but if it ease his remorse at having so vilified his fellow-countrymen to make so complete a recantation, I am very glad indeed for his sake that he made it.

There may possibly be remaining in this House a few who are not yet convinced that the Government is not entitled to the confidence of the Canadian people, and I shall therefore put on record a few reasons why the protectionist party is no longer entitled to the confidence of the electors of Canada.

1.—Because it has increased the net public debt from \$140,362,069 in 1878 to \$253,074,927 in 1895, an increase of \$112,712,858, an average annual increase of \$6,630,168.

2.—Because it has increased the expenditure, aside from capital expenditure, from \$23,503,158 in 1878 to \$38,132,095 in 1895, a difference of \$14,628,847.

3.—Because in the face of falling revenue, hard times, and a deficit for 1893-94 of over \$1,200,000, it appropriated in the session of 1894 over \$4,000,000 for railway subsidies, the object of the grants in the majority of cases being to give aid to its candidates in the coming elections.

4.—Because it has squandered the public lands in the North-west by lavish and unnecessary grants to railway corporations, having granted in this way up to April last 44,242,298 acres, which is twice the quantity of land at present under cultivation in the Dominion.

5.—Because it has squandered public moneys in worthless investments made to serve the purposes of friends, such as the Tay Canal, which cost \$476,128 and last year yielded revenue to the amount of \$136.

6.—Because it has superannuated civil servants in the prime of life to make places for its own retainers, and has brought the superannuation service to that point when the receipts last year were \$63,274, and the payments \$265,385.

7.—Because it has copied the worst features of American political rascality in the infamous Gerrymander Act of 1882.

8.—Because by the "Franchise Act of 1885" it ceased to permit the provincial lists to be used for Dominion elections, and adopted an expensive partisan scheme for making Dominion lists, with power to perpetrate gross outrages; and has given the country but one revision on an average each three years, costing in each instance over \$250,000, besides the vast expense in money and time the people are put to simply to secure

the most cherished right of a British subject—the right to vote.

9.—Because it went to the country at the last general election under false pretenses, professing to be on the point of securing a reciprocity treaty with the United States, when no negotiations were in progress and no prospect of securing such a treaty existed.

10.—Because it has distributed 25,000 square miles of timber limits among its friends and supporters regardless of value and without consideration.

11.—Because it has utterly destroyed the independence of Parliament and secured the support of a slavish majority by gifts to members and their friends of timber limits, railway subsidies and other favours.

12.—Because it makes no attempt to secure purity of administration, but on the contrary is governing the country by the most shameless and corrupt methods.

13.—Because it is not an economical Government but is responsible for a system of extravagance and waste in every department.

14.—Because, when the country is staggering under a burden of debt and taxation, no effort is made to reduce the debt or diminish the expenditure.

15.—Because the tariff is not adjusted for the purpose of securing the revenue necessary for the economical administration of public affairs in the easiest way for the people, but on the contrary is made the weapon of rings and combines through the operation of which they exclude foreign goods and secure the power to charge exorbitant prices for their own wares.

16.—Because the promises made on behalf of the National Policy were foundationless and false. It has neither checked the exodus, nor given a home market for our farm products, nor increased the price of such products, nor secured prosperity for the country.

17.—Because the extravagance of the Government obliged the country to face a deficit of over \$1,210,000 in 1893-94, followed by the largest deficit save one since confederation, namely, \$4,153,875 for the year 1894-95.

18.—Because the buried secrets of peculations, frauds and maladministration in the various departments should be exposed to the light of day, and the accounts and records should be investigated by men who are not interested in concealing facts.

19.—Because Canada is nearly at a standstill and her people are disheartened. Her present rulers are incompetent, and their policy worse than a failure. We want new men, new methods, and the policy of the Liberals.

20.—Because parliamentary inquiry into grave charges made against members of the Government in the Caron case was refused, the character and allegations of said charges changed by the Government to suit its own purpose, and the emasculated indictment thus prepared referred to a commission chosen by itself before which acquittal was foreordained.

21.—Because their policy has led to the scheduling of Canadian cattle in Great Britain and the quarantining of Canadian cattle in the United States.

It would be well for Canada if the electors will consider carefully these reasons, and when the time comes, prove their love for their suffering country and mark their ballots against the protectionist candidates.

Hon. gentlemen opposite have often quoted certain passages from a celebrated letter by

the Hon. Edward Blake to the electors of West Durham. Let me read a few other passages from the same letter :

The Canadian Conservative policy has failed to accomplish the predictions of its promoters.

Its real tendency has been, as foretold twelve years ago, towards disintegration and annexation, instead of consolidation and the maintenance of that British connection of which they claim to be the special guardians.

It has left us with a small population, a scanty immigration and a North-west empty still ; with enormous additions to our public debt and yearly charge, an extravagant system of expenditure, and an unjust and oppressive tariff ; with limited markets for our needs, whether to buy or to sell, and all the host of evils (greatly intensified by our special condition) thence arising ; with trade diverted from its natural into forced, and, therefore, less profitable channels, and with unfriendly relations and frowning tariff walls, ever more and more estranging us from the mighty English speaking nation to the south, our neighbours and relations, with whom we ought to be, as it was promised that it should be, living in generous amity and liberal intercourse.

Worse, far worse It has left us with lowered standards of public virtue and a death-like apathy in public opinion ; with racial, religious and provincial animosities rather inflamed than soothed ; with a subservient Parliament, an autocratic Executive, debauched constituencies and corrupted and corrupting classes ; with lessened self-reliance and increased dependence on the public chest and on legislative aids, and possessed with all by a boastful jingo spirit far enough removed from true manliness, loudly proclaiming unreal conditions and exaggerated sentiments, while actual facts and genuine opinions are suppressed.

It has left us with our hands tied, our future compromised, and in such a plight that, whether we stand or move, we must run some risks which else we might have either declined or encountered with greater promise of success.

Yet let us never despair of our country ! It is a goodly land ; endowed with great recuperative powers and vast resources as yet almost undeveloped ; inhabited by populations moral and religious, sober and industrious, virtuous and thrifty, capable and instructed—the descendants of a choice immigration, of men of mark and courage, energy and enterprise, in the breasts of whose children still should glow the sparks of those ancestral fires.

Sir, it is a goodly land, this country of ours. Vast are her resources. Noble are her sons. And, Sir, in my estimation, and, I believe, in the estimation of all his followers, the first of them all is our noble leader, the leader of the Opposition. A certain portion of the press in the province of Ontario supporting hon. gentlemen opposite, speak of our leader as "the French Mr. Laurier." Not contemptuously, I do not accuse them of that, for I do not believe there is a man in all Canada so dead to all that is noble as to feel less than admiration for a character so unsullied, a mind so broad, a heart so generous as that of the hon. leader of Her Majesty's loyal Opposition. But why then speak of him as "the French Mr. Laurier." Do they intend this as a warning to the people of Ontario, and if so, against what ? Is there a man so

ignorant of the past that he can doubt the loyalty of the French-Canadians, both Rouge and Bleu? Who doubted the loyalty of Sir George E. Cartier, Sir John A. Macdonald's friend and fellow-worker, co-leader with him of the Conservative party, practically joint Premier with him of the Dominion of Canada? Who doubted the loyalty of Dorion, or Taché, Lafontaine, Papineau, or our own beloved colleague in this House, the late Félix Geoffrion? French Canadians, without number, have their names written in the history of our country, whose every act and word proclaimed them loyal to the core.

Do they think we have forgotten the story of our country? Do we not know how nobly French Canadians stood by old England in the days of her danger and refused to join the colonies in their revolt? Had they done so, who will say what might have been? The fate of England, so far as this continent was concerned, was in their hands. Had they yielded then, the Stars and Stripes might to-day be waving from the gulf to the pole.

In 1812, when the young republic, in its youthful self-confidence, invaded our country, where were the French Canadians? At Chateauguay, many of them, standing shoulder to shoulder with the English to resist the invasion and retain aloft the good old Union Jack. And they did it, too. Later, when we were threatened with invasion, in 1866, the French Canadians stood ready to go out and resist the invader. Once more, in 1885, they sprang to arms and sternly fought to maintain intact this broad Dominion from sea to sea.

Never once have the French Canadians faltered in their duty as subjects of the Crown. Sir, the flag of our country is safe in French Canadian hands. They will keep it unsullied, unless, indeed, to dye it a deeper red, as oft before, with their hearts' warm blood shed in its defence.

Our leader has sat in this House for many years. He has travelled from one end of this country to the other, and never yet has any one dared to question his unswerving loyalty to his country and his Queen. I believe that under his wise rule, racial and religious animosities will speedily disappear, that men will learn to love and respect each other although they may bend the knee in reverent worship at different altars. Though different in race, all will join hand in hand in mutual trust and confidence to build up a united Canada, loyally determined to make her, in fact, as well as in name, the brightest gem in Britain's crown. True to Canada and loyal to the Empire, they have helped to build, we can well allow Frenchmen, while rejoicing in the institutions of this land of free men, to dwell in loving memory upon the glories of France. The German's great heart will swell when he thinks of the

Mr. DAWSON.

loved ones far away in the old home in the fatherland. He will tell his children gathered around his knees of the wars his fathers fought to make his country great. The Icelander, proud of his new home on the prairies of the west, surrounded by such comforts as his industry has won, will still yearn for the ice-clad hills his fathers loved so well. Albion's sons, proud of their country's greatness, oft thinking of the hills and dales, of the stately homes of old England, will strive to make Canada well worthy her proud relationship to that greatest and noblest of lands. Sir, my own countrymen's hearts will hunger for another sight of the dear old Emerald Isle, ever first in the affection of her absent sons; yet none more true than they to the land of their adoption, none more loyal to her best interests, none more anxious to see her worthy of her place in England's Empire. Scotchmen will fondly dream of the heather clad hills of the land of Wallace and of Bruce.

The hearts of our people will turn at times to their old homes, yet all will unite to make this country worthy of her place in the world-wide Empire to which they are proud to belong. Working together a united people, they may yet surely be permitted, each thinking of loved ones beyond the sea, to stand altogether and sing:

Should auld acquaintance be forgot,
And never brought to mind,
We'll drink a cup o' kindness yet,
For the days of Auld Lang Syne.

Sir, under the rule of the hon. member for Quebec East, the moral law will be applied to our public life. Fair dealing between man and man will obtain. Cotton combines and sugar trusts will cease to oppress us; Curran Bridges and Tay Canals will become dark memories of other days; a united government, true and loyal to its chief, will rule. Sir, do what they may, this Parliament cannot live for ever. Soon the elections must be held, and when they are over, our beloved leader will take his place as leader of the Government of Canada. The day after the elections, I can imagine the hon. gentlemen who now occupy the Treasury benches, thinking, when too late, of their past misdeeds, of their mutual distrusts and jealousies, sitting around the Council board and mournfully singing:

Ship us somewhere east of Suez,
Where the best is like the worst,
Where there ain't no Ten Commandments,
Tay canals, combines or trusts.

Mr. STAIRS moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT—MR. DAVID McKEEN.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON moved the adjournment of the House?

Mr. LANDERKIN. I would like to inquire of the Government if Mr. David McKeen, late member for Cape Breton, has been called to the Senate?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I will give the hon. gentleman the information to-morrow.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I inform the hon. gentleman that if such is the case, I will give him my opinion of it to-morrow.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 12.10 a.m. (Wednesday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 26th February, 1896.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

LORD'S DAY OBSERVANCE ACT.

Mr. CHARLTON moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 74) to secure the better observance of the Lord's Day. He said: I am sorry that circumstances prevented the earlier introduction of this Bill, and that its place upon the Order paper will not be as favourable as it would have been had I been able to attend in the early days of the session. I desire to say just a few words upon the provisions of this Bill, which are contained in four sections. The first provides that the issue and sale of Sunday newspapers shall be prohibited. The second provides for the closing of the Dominion canals from six o'clock on Sunday morning until ten o'clock on Sunday night. The third section makes provision for the reduction of railway travel as far as is possible at the present time. The regulations go to the extent of forbidding local freight traffic and local passenger traffic, but it does not interfere with through freight traffic or through passenger trains, but contains a provision that when the United States Government prohibits freight traffic on Sunday, then through freight trains from one point on the American border to another point on the American border shall not be permitted in Canada. The fourth section prohibits Sunday excursions by steamer or railway, or in part by steamer and part by railway. This is substantially the same Bill as that introduced last session. It is substantially the same Bill that met the approval of the late lamented Sir John Thompson, the session before last. He supported the first two clauses of the Bill, and it was due to the efficiency of his support that these clauses passed the House.

I am quite conscious, Mr. Speaker, that I am the subject of a good many jibes, some sneers, and no small amount of ridicule because of the position I have taken with regard to this Bill. I suppose the opponents of the Bill think it high time that my persistency in pressing it should cease, and that I should allow the matter to rest. But I am encouraged in the course I have taken in this regard by the success I finally met with in Parliament some years ago with a Bill providing for the punishment of seduction. At first, that Bill was scarcely treated with courtesy by the House. But it finally passed this House. And, after three attempts, it passed the Senate of Canada, and it is now the law of the Dominion. I say that the success I met with in that Bill encourages me to suppose that it is possible that the Bill I now present to the House, which is one of vastly more consequence, and one calculated to confer much greater advantages and blessings upon this country, may also finally become law. I observe that my friends the reporters and editors of the newspapers are sometimes somewhat facetious with regard to my hobby, my fad, as this Bill is termed. Well, Sir, I think the reporters of this country are interested in the matter of having one day out of seven for themselves. If they understood the position of their brethren of the press in the United States, I do not think they would desire to exchange circumstances with them. I believe the life of a newspaper man upon the press which issues Sunday editions is a life of slavery. I am told that the reporters upon the American daily papers which publish Sunday editions have a professional life of about seven years, on the average—at the end of seven years they are played out. I am told, Sir, that the proprietor of the New York "World," with all his energy and devotion to business, has paid the penalty of issuing a great Sunday journal, in addition to a daily paper for the rest of the week, with the loss of his eyesight, and that he now enjoys his success and his wealth in blindness. I believe that the success of this Bill with regard to Sunday newspapers is of vast importance to the reporters and editors of newspapers, and of vast importance to the public. The Sunday newspaper is itself a violation of God's law, and, being a violation of God's law, it is impossible but that it will sympathize with every other violation of that law, and that it will oppose every restriction upon violations of that law. That is found to be the case in the United States. No Sunday newspaper will advocate Sabbath observance, or will stand up for the observance of this day that honours God, and is a blessing to man. The Sunday newspaper is a curse which it is highly desirable, in the interests of Canada, as a whole, should not be allowed to obtain a foothold in this country.

This Bill, moreover, is intended to give to a class of labourers who are now helpless, the protection of the law in granting to them what should be considered a civil right, the right to one day's rest in seven. The labourers upon railways, for instance, are helpless. They must labour on the Sabbath or lose their situations, and unless the law steps in and affords protection to these men, and gives them the right to that rest from labour which God has given them, and which the law should give them, they are powerless. The question of Sunday observance has elicited a great deal of attention in the United States, and I am happy to say it is receiving the support of the most eminent of the Roman Catholic clergy and hierarchy in that country. Archbishop Ireland was one of the most prominent figures at the World's Sunday Rest Congress in Chicago. Cardinal Gibbons furnished a paper which was read at that congress. The influence of that church in the United States is thrown in favour of the cause of Sunday rest reform. This Bill does not propose to interfere with religious rights or religious opinions. It does not propose to say that men shall entertain any particular set of religious opinions, or attend any particular church, or even that they shall attend any church at all. Its object is to secure sanitary blessings, to secure to the labourer the civil right of rest. This Bill is not an innovation; there are many precedents for legislation of this kind. There are thirty statutes upon the British statute-book with reference to Sunday observance. There is scarcely a colony of the British Empire that has not legislated upon this matter, and every state in the American Union except one or two have statutes upon Sunday observance. This Bill which I ask leave to introduce to-day is one which I think should commend itself to the better sentiment of this country, and should commend itself to the sympathy and good wishes of all men who desire to see our institutions made stable and permanent, and to see that prosperity exist which is founded upon public virtue. I beg to move for leave to introduce this Bill, seconded by Mr. Christie.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER—PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, before you proceed with questions to be put by members, I desire to ask the indulgence of the House for a few moments in order to draw attention to a matter which I consider of importance to every member of this House. I refer to an article in the Montreal "Herald," of yesterday, which, with your permission, I will read :

Mr. CHARLTON.

(Special to the Herald.)

Halifax, N.S., Feb. 24.—The "Chronicle" tomorrow will publish the following open letter, which explains itself :—

To Richard C. Weldon, M.P. for Albert County, N.B., and Charles H. Cahan, ex-M.P., Halifax :

Gentlemen,—A considerable number of citizens have been informed by you during the last month that Sir Charles Tupper, Bart., the present Secretary of State, had been guilty of gross malversation of office on a former occasion, when a Cabinet Minister, whereby he dishonestly obtained \$40,000, and that as a consequence of such conduct he has not been entrusted since by the Ottawa Government with any important financial transactions in London, notwithstanding that the creation of the office of High Commissioner was sought to be justified by the plea that he would be available in London to transact such business for the Government.

I, in common with any others, venture to think that, in view of the aspirations cherished by Sir Charles and the tremendous injury to Canada such a man could inflict if given larger control of public affairs, and especially if placed as he undoubtedly desires to be, in charge of one of the large spending departments, you will be but doing a public duty, however distasteful to yourselves it may be, if you give the public the authority for your statement, noted above, which has been made so freely and unequivocally and to so many persons.

Some citizens have asserted that an ex-Minister of Finance, Sir Leonard Tilley, has expressed his willingness to Dr. Weldon to substantiate the charge. Another staunch Conservative, the editor of the "Atlantic Weekly," recently declared editorially that "It would be a crime before high heaven" to make Sir Charles Tupper Premier of Canada, and it is understood that this strong statement was based, in part, on his belief that Sir Charles was guilty of the charge repeated on various occasions by you. Still another Conservative editor, whose name is withheld for the present, has repeatedly made similar statements.

Under all the circumstances, it is manifestly proper, not to say imperative, that the complete facts in connection with this statement should be declared as soon as possible, so that such a grave matter may be dealt with as the interests of the country demands.

Respectfully yours,

ROBERT M'CONNELL.

Halifax, N.S., Feb. 24.

I desire to say to the House, that I have addressed a letter to Sir Leonard Tilley, which had not reached him when this telegram was sent to me by him :

St. John, N.B., 26th February, 1896.

Sir Charles Tupper, Bart.,
Ottawa.

The use of my name in Mr. C. McConnell's letter is without the slightest warrant, as Dr. Weldon can confirm. No statement to Dr. Weldon, or any other person, in reference to the charge made against you, was ever made by me.

S. L. TILLEY.

I have just had the pleasure of receiving the following letter from the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) :—

Ottawa, 25th February, 1896.

My dear Sir Charles :

In reply to your esteemed favour of this day I beg to inclose a copy of a despatch which I have sent to the press.

(Copy.)

You are authorized to say that so far as I am concerned, Mr. McConnell has been imposed upon by false and slanderous statements.

I am,
Yours faithfully,
R. C. WELDON.

The following appears in the Montreal "Herald" of to-day :

Halifax, N.S., Feb. 25.—In reply to the "open letter" published yesterday, from Robert McConnell to Professor Weldon and C. H. Cahon, ex-M.P.P., the "Chronicle" to-morrow will publish the following :—

To the Editor of the "Morning Chronicle" :

Sir,—I wish distinctly to deny having made the statements attributed to me by Mr. Robert McConnell in a letter published in the "Morning Chronicle," of this date, referring to Sir Charles Tupper, Bart., and I challenge you to produce a single individual who ever heard me give utterance to the statements alleged by Mr. McConnell to have been made by me. I may also add that for many months prior to the publication of the article in the "Atlantic Weekly," referred to by Mr. McConnell, I had no communication either directly or indirectly with the editor of that journal or with any person connected therewith.

(Signed) CHARLES H. CAHAN.

Halifax, N.S., 25th February, 1896.

I have only to say, Mr. Speaker, that, holding the position I have the honour to hold in this House, I have felt it my duty to instruct my solicitors to proceed criminally against the publishers of this false and malicious libel.

REPORT.

Report of the Department of Public Works for the year ending 30th June, 1895. —(Mr. Ouimet.)

INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION.

Mr. EDGAR. Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, you will allow me to repeat the question I asked the Secretary of State, across the House the other day, as to whether he has ascertained what was done by the Government in connection with the resolution passed by this House in 1894, on the subject of the settlement of disputes between Great Britain and the United States by peaceful arbitration.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. As I promised the hon. member, I have made inquiry, and find that the resolution does not appear to have been transmitted to the Imperial Government.

Mr. EDGAR. I suppose it will be transmitted ?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am not aware that the House gave any authority or direction for its transmission. I believe that is usual.

CANADIAN COPYRIGHT.

Mr. EDGAR asked :

1. Has Her Majesty's Government yet denounced the Berne Copyright Convention on behalf of Canada, as requested ?

2. Has Her Majesty's Government yet given its assent to the issuing of the proclamation by the Canadian Government to bring into force the Canadian Copyright Act of 1889 ?

3. How much longer does the Canadian Government propose to withhold the proclaiming of the Act of 1889 ?

4. Does the Government propose to abandon to any, or to what extent the assertion of our rights to legislate on the subject of Canadian copyright ?

5. What is the practical result of the conference held since last session between the Colonial Office and a representative of the Canadian Government, in its bearing upon the following points, viz. :—

(a.) The Berne Convention.

(b.) The proclaiming of the Act of 1889.

(c.) The passage of any other copyright legislation by the Canadian Parliament.

Mr. DICKEY. 1. No. 2. No. 3. That will depend upon future events. 4. The Government does not propose to abandon to any extent the assertion of our rights to legislate on Canadian copyright. 5. A report of the conference will be brought down. It is too soon to say what the practical result will be.

ILLICIT STILL AT OKA.

Mr. O'BRIEN asked :

Whether an illicit still for the making of spirits was found by the inland revenue officers, on or about the 4th day of February, on the premises of the Trappist monks at Oka, and if so, was such still seized by them ?

Was any offer made by the monks to settle the case, and if so, what was that offer ? Has it been accepted, or have any, and what steps been taken with regard to it ?

Have any proceedings been taken for prosecuting the offenders if such there be, and if so, of what nature are those proceedings ?

What is the punishment for such an offence as is alleged to have been committed ?

Mr. PRIOR. A still was found on the premises referred to, and seized by the officers of inland revenue. A pecuniary penalty of \$500 has been exacted, and the apparatus confiscated. In case of a corporate body, it would be difficult, in case of a prosecution, to determine where the punishment should most justly fall, and a pecuniary penalty seemed to be the only solution.

SUPERANNUATION OF LT.-COL. MACPHERSON.

Mr. LANDERKIN asked :

Has Lieut.-Col. J. P. Macpherson been superannuated? If so, what superannuation does he receive? What date was he retired, and why? Have any appointments been made to the clerical staff of the Public Works Department (inside service) since the retirement of Lieut.-Col. Macpherson?

Mr. OUIMET. In answer to the hon. gentleman, I beg to say that Lieut.-Col. Macpherson has been superannuated, at \$756 per annum. He was superannuated on 1st July, 1895, to promote efficiency and economy. Three third-class clerks have been appointed since, two of them at \$400 and the other at \$500. Two of the aforesaid third-class clerks have been in the department for some years as temporary clerks, one having been employed since 1887, and the other since 1882.

E. W. BENJAMIN, YARKER, ONT.

Mr. DAWSON asked :

What amount of money was paid to the Department of Inland Revenue by E. W. Benjamin, of Yarker, Ont., from August, 1875, as duties for stamping measures of his manufacture? What was the date of each payment? What was the amount, and name of person to whom paid?

Mr. PRIOR. The department has no means of furnishing the information asked for. No account is kept of individuals in respect of inspection of weights and measures, and the duplicate certificates transmitted to the department for the purpose of checking inspectors' returns, are destroyed after five years.

PUBLIC BUILDING AT PICTON.

Mr. DAWSON asked :

1. What is the frontage on Main Street and depth in feet of the Barker site for the proposed public building at Picton? Is it a corner plot?
2. What is the frontage and depth in feet of the Carter site? Is it a corner plot, and on what streets?

Mr. OUIMET. 1. 170 feet on Main Street, by 120 feet deep. It is not a corner plot. 2. I have not the information in my possession.

PROPOSED BUILDING AT PICTON, ONT.

Mr. DAWSON asked :

Was an inspector or other officer or person sent by the Public Works Department, in 1893, to look over and measure the various suggested sites for the proposed public building at Picton? Did Mr. D. J. Barker, before arrival of said inspector, during his stay in Picton, or soon after his departure, offer to sell a site for the said building? What was the frontage, depth and location of site so offered, and price asked? Did the inspector look over said site? Did

Mr. PRIOR.

he recommend its purchase? Did he look over the Carter site? Did he recommend its purchase? Did he say there would be a commanding view of the whole harbour from a building on the Carter site? Who recommended the Government to abandon the Carter site in favour of the site it is proposed to purchase from Mr. D. J. Barker?

Mr. OUIMET. In answer to the hon. member, I beg to say, as follows:—1. An inspector was sent in 1892. 2. Mr. G. W. Barker informed the inspector, while at Picton, he was willing to sell a site for said building. 3. Frontage, 100 feet in depth, and 100 feet on Main Street. The price asked was \$5,000. 4. Yes. 5. The inspector made no recommendation for the purchase of any lot, but stated it was the most central site offered, and that he was informed that three-fourths of the ratepayers were in favour of this site. 6. Yes. 7. No, he did not recommend the purchase of any lot. 8. No such statement is made in the report submitted by the officer after his visit in 1892. 9. The Barker site could have been purchased originally, had it not been on account of the price, \$5,000, and the fact that there was an undischarged mortgage on the property. The quantity of ground required can now be obtained for \$4,000, and the mortgage has been discharged.

GODERICH HARBOUR.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron) asked :

1. Has any engineer of the Public Works Department made any reports to the said department as to the condition of the Goderich harbour and the piers and breakwater in connection therewith?
2. Who made such reports and when were they made?
3. What is the nature, extent and damage so done?
4. What is the estimated cost of repairing said breakwater?
5. Has the Government taken any steps to repair said breakwater? If not, why not?
6. Does the Government intend this year to repair said breakwater?

Mr. OUIMET. 1. Yes. 2. Mr. H. A. Gray, resident engineer in Toronto. They were made on 4th January, 1894; 17th March, 1894; and 28th September, 1894. 3. The north face of the breakwater is bulging out into the river at three or four different places, varying in length from 150 to 200 feet. The whole of the superstructure is in great need of repairs. The estimated cost of repairs is \$53,000.

CONTRACT FOR MAIL SERVICE BETWEEN LA MALBAIE, ST. URBAIN AND ST. ALEXIS.

Mr. ANGERS (translation) asked :

Whether the contract for carrying the mail between the wharf and the village of Malbaie, has been renewed? If so, to whom has it been awarded? For what time? What is the amount? Were tenders called for?

Has the contract for mail service between St. Urbain and Ste Agnès been renewed ?

If so, to whom has it been awarded, for what time, at what price, and were tenders asked for ?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. (Translation.) In reply to the question put by the hon. member, I may say : (1.) That the contract was renewed. (2.) The name of the contractor is Mr. George W. Bouliannes. (3.) The price is 50 cents per trip. (4.) There were no tenders asked for. As to the second part of the question, there is no postal service between Ste. Agnès and St. Urbain.

Mr. ANGERS. (Translation.) I did not ask whether there was a postal service between St. Urbain and Ste. Agnès, but it was the service between St. Urbain and St. Alexis I inquired about.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. (Translation.) I find that a clerical error has slipped into the latter part of the answer. I will get the information and give the hon. gentleman a supplementary answer.

ASSISTANT HARBOUR MASTER, ST. JOHNS, P.Q.

Mr. LAVERGNE asked :

1. Was an assistant harbour master appointed for the port of St. Johns, P.Q., last summer ? What are the causes which rendered the appointment necessary, and is the said assistant harbour-master still in that position ?

2. Are the Government aware that the harbour master at St. Johns, P.Q., has been an invalid for over two years, and that the duties are performed by another person, who does not act under the instructions of the Government ?

3. Is it the intention of the Government to inquire whether the present incumbent is still capable of doing the duties of the office ? And if not, do they intend to appoint a successor ?

Mr. COSTIGAN. 1. Zotique Bonin was duly appointed deputy harbour master by Order in Council of the 13th June, 1895. The harbour master was unable to attend to his duties owing to ill-health. Mr. Zotique Bonin still holds the position of deputy harbour master. 2. The Department of Marine and Fisheries is aware of Mr. Pinsonneault's state of health, and that he requires assistance for the performance of the duties of harbour master. Mr. Bonin is still deputy harbour master, and as such officer, any work performed by him in his official capacity would be under the sanction of the department. 3. Inquiries will be made to ascertain whether the duties are being satisfactorily performed.

SEED-GRAIN FOR ALBERTA SETTLERS.

Mr. LAVERGNE asked :

1. Whether it is the intention of the Government to distribute seed-grain to the Alberta settlers whose crops were destroyed by prairie fires last fall, and who have not the means of purchasing seed-grain ?

2. Are the Government aware that, apart from those whose crops were so destroyed, many settlers in the districts afflicted had splendid crops, and have grain to sell ; and that all the seed-grain required to be distributed can be furnished to the Government by the said settlers ?

3. By purchasing the seed-grain elsewhere, would not the Government be open to the charge of discrediting the territory of Alberta, by causing it to be believed that the whole crop was destroyed, and that section of the country almost ruined, while in fact only a relatively small number of settlers suffered from the fires, and there are vast quantities of grain for sale in Alberta, in the very vicinity of the farms affected by the prairie fires ?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I desire to call your attention, Mr. Speaker, for a moment, to this question, which I think hardly falls within the rules. But I may say for the information of the hon. gentleman, that the Government are well informed concerning the condition of the people of the Northwest, to whom this question refers, and also concerning the crops in that region, and that the subject is obtaining the attention of the Government.

PASPEBIAC AND THE HARBOUR OF REFUGE.

Mr. JONCAS moved for :

Copies of all petitions, letters, correspondence or documents of any nature whatsoever, asking the Government to construct wharfs or piers at Paspebiac, in the county of Bonaventure, with a view to making a harbour of refuge at that place.

He said : Before putting this motion into your hands, Mr. Speaker, I desire to draw your attention, the attention of the Government, and the attention of the House to certain facts in relation with it. In answer to a question put by me a few days ago, relative to this subject, the hon. the Minister of Public Works made the following answer :—

Two petitions have been received by the department, one in February, 1882, through Mr. Beauchésne, then member of Parliament, signed by Rev. Cyprien Larrivée, Messrs. Charles Robin & Co., Le Bouthillier Bros., the mayor and councillors of Paspebiac, and 184 others asking for the construction of a public wharf at Paspebiac.

Another petition was transmitted by one Mr. George Romeril, agent for Messrs. Charles Robin & Co., on the 1st of June, 1891, asking that necessary works be constructed at Paspebiac to make it a harbour of refuge. This petition was signed by Messrs. Le Bouthillier Bros., George Romeril, Rev. C. Larrivée and 118 others. Letters were subsequently received to the same effect from Mr. Romeril on the 8th of January, 28th November, and 26th December, 1894, and from Messrs. Robin, Colas & Co. on the 28th March, 1894.

In answer to another question on the same subject, the hon. the Minister of Public Works said :

My department has sent an engineer to Paspebiac, in the county of Bonaventure, with in-

structions to ascertain whether that harbour could or could not be used as a winter port. This engineer was sent at the request of the Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway Company.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am sure there can be no objection from anybody to a public wharf being constructed at Paspébiac, nor to any ameliorations of a local nature being made to this harbour. Commercially speaking, Paspébiac is an important locality. Two of the most important fishing firms of Gaspésie have their main establishments at this place. Every year numerous cargoes are loaded and unloaded there, and Paspébiac certainly deserves that every facility should be given to its trade, and if the inhabitants of the locality had limited their demand to the local improvements they were asking for in the petition of 1882, I would have had nothing to say against it, and besides, I would have been most happy to work hand in hand with them to try and get for them ameliorations to which they are rightly and justly entitled. But, Mr. Speaker, they are to-day asking for what, in my humble opinion, is practically impossible. They are asking the Government of this country to spend unnecessarily a couple of millions of dollars to make at Paspébiac a harbour of refuge and a winter port. And who is particularly insisting on the accomplishment of what I may call this wild cat scheme? The directors of the Baie des Chaleurs Railway, now the Atlantic and Lake Superior, and prominent amongst them Mr. C. N. Armstrong, who is celebrated throughout Canada for his impracticable plans and absurd theories.

In order that the Government may be in a position to deal wisely with the proposal submitted by these gentlemen, I desire to lay before them certain facts which they may not, perhaps, now bear in mind, and to put them on their guard against a project of this kind.

There are in our young country, so many useful improvements to be carried out, improvements which are urgently called for, and necessary, that we should look twice before committing ourselves to enterprises of worse than doubtful utility. Mr. J. W. Rider, the agent of the Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway Company, who has recently visited that part of our province, goes into ecstasies over the scenery of the Baie des Chaleurs and over its climate in summer, and the fertility of the soil. He is quite right so far, and he merely repeats what I have stated publicly myself and written over and over again. But, Mr. Rider was wrong when he stopped short and did not push his inquiry a little further. He would not, perhaps, have so rapidly jumped to the conclusion that Paspébiac can be made a splendid seaport, to which vessels can resort at all seasons of the year. Now, I am prepared to show that he is mistaken and to give reasons why the Government should not undertake to make an artificial

Mr. JONCAS.

harbour at Paspébiac, a harbour involving a useless expenditure of at least two millions of dollars. The reasons are many, but I shall dwell on three leading reasons only:

1st. The uselessness of the expenditure as contemplated with the establishment in the Gulf of St. Lawrence of a port where the rapid transit steamers performing the service between Canada and Europe may touch and land or receive mails and passengers.

2nd. The difficulty, and in fact, practical impossibility of winter navigation in the Gulf of St. Lawrence.

3rd. The flagrant injustice to the county of Gaspé of helping the Baie des Chaleurs Railway Company—now the Atlantic and Lake Superior Company—to make Paspébiac its terminus. First, the uselessness of the expenditure. I am of the opinion of those who maintain that if we ever have between Canada and Europe vessels equal in speed to those now running between New York and Liverpool, they will eventually touch in summer at some port on the Gulf of St. Lawrence, for the convenience of passengers to or from Quebec to Montreal and other great western cities. In these days of progress, a saving of time and distance is a thing of the greatest possible importance. But if that be so, why should these vessels deviate from their route and make a useless run of 120 miles to a port far up the Baie des Chaleurs, when Gaspé Basin, the finest port in the Dominion of Canada lies in their course between the extremity of Anticosti and that of the Gaspé Peninsula? Why, above all, should the Government throw away two or three millions of dollars in order to make of Paspébiac an artificial harbour when Gaspé Basin, which is nearer at hand, affords undeniable and unquestioned natural advantages? I ask any man of sense to say if it would not be vastly better to spend those millions in helping to push on the Baie des Chaleurs Railway to deep water at some point on Gaspé Basin, and thus open up for settlement one of the finest counties in our province and furnish a population of some 30,000 people with easy and rapid means of communication.

Gaspé, as I have said, lies on the very course of the ocean steamers. It is the point from which they are signalled when they enter the St. Lawrence. Lying, as it does, 250 miles lower than Rimouski, this bay is open for navigation in the fall two months at least after the sailing of the last steamer from Montreal and Quebec. It is, moreover, the point in the province of Quebec nearest to Liverpool. This, the following figures will show. I challenge contradiction as to the accuracy of this statement:

	Miles.
Distance from Liverpool to Halifax	2,530
Distance from Liverpool to Quebec via Cape Race	2,850
Distance from Liverpool to Quebec via Gaspé	2,588
Distance from Liverpool to Gaspé.....	2,248

Comments would be useless, and if it is ever considered advisable that the ocean steamers should touch at one of the Gulf ports in our province in order to enable the mails and passengers to reach the west some hours sooner, the choice of Gaspé Basin is the only one open to the Government, in view of the natural advantages it affords. Why then should the Government, in the face of these facts which cannot be denied, and without any sound reason to justify it, waste the public money upon an artificial harbour at Paspébiac?

I have said it would involve an expenditure of two million dollars to make Paspébiac a port where vessels of large tonnage could touch and land their cargoes. I base my assertion on the following reasons:—

Paspébiac is a bay open to winds from the south, the south-west and west; there is nothing but a shoal or point of sand, affording it some slight protection from the east wind.

The steamers which are to do the rapid transit service between Canada and Europe will draw 28 to 30 feet of water. To enable them to land at Paspébiac and to shelter them from the strong winds and the heavy seas resulting therefrom, it will be necessary to construct in a depth of at least 35 feet of water, in the first place, a pier 1,500 to 1,800 feet in length, sufficiently solid to stand the action of the storms and of the ice hurried along, as it sometimes is, by currents of great rapidity.

At the end of the pier aforesaid it will be necessary to construct a shorter pier in the same depth of water, in order to protect the ships against winds from the south-west. Add to this the building of wharfs, required for the needs of traffic, and it will be admitted that I am not far astray when I assert that it will take an outlay of at least two millions of dollars to make Paspébiac what the directors of the railway company require. And this artificial harbour, if the blunder of constructing it was committed, would be most costly to maintain, for the small river which empties in to the bay, brings down a large quantity of sand, which, being arrested by the pier aforesaid, would accumulate within the port and necessitate almost constant dredging.

Is winter navigation in the Gulf of St. Lawrence possible? Suppose it to be, strictly speaking possible, is it practicable, and what benefit should we derive from it? These are two questions of importance which the Dominion Government should consider and solve before granting the request of those who want them to expend at Paspébiac an enormous amount of money for the creation of a port where ocean steamers of large tonnage may find shelter and accommodation at all seasons of the year.

In this age of light, invention and progress, any and everything seems to be possible, provided you only have money—even

to change the course of the St. Lawrence and remove its outlet to New York, as was proposed by an American engineer only a few days ago. With powerful vessels, of special naval design, it is, perhaps, possible that a steamer might, if sufficiently solidly built, occasionally reach Paspébiac in mid-February, by taking plenty of time.

In 1874 a special committee appointed by the legislature of Quebec, and presided over by Mr. Bellingham, examined this question. I have before me the report of that committee, and I find that, while one-half of the witnesses called before it, declared that they considered the navigation of the river and gulf possible in winter, the other half considered that it was impossible. And yet these witnesses had been carefully selected among persons favourable to the scheme. Here is the statement of Mr. F. Gourdeau, then harbour master at Quebec, a man of great experience in the matter, and a man whose competence cannot be questioned:

It would be impossible to have a winter port near Quebec, for the simple reason that the river would be frozen in from the beginning of winter, and it would remain in that state sometimes for the whole winter, rendering an approach impossible for vessels.

2. The vast quantity of ice which covers the river and Gulf of St. Lawrence during the winter is an insurmountable obstacle to navigation, and even though these obstacles were overcome by using powerful steamers with skilled and energetic crew, the trade of the Dominion would not be in any way benefited, owing to the danger, delay and expense attending this navigation.

Moreover, what need is there for expert evidence, when we look at the facts already known. The "Northern Light," built specially by Mr. Sewell, and which was to solve the question of winter rapid and safe navigation in our province, has been an utter failure. She has been unable to perform the services between Prince Edward Island and Cape Breton. The Government have had constructed in Scotland an exceedingly strong steamer, the "Stanley," for the express purpose of transporting, with the utmost possible regularity, mails and passengers between the Island and the mainland. And what is the result? The complaints of the Islanders continue. In fine weather and when the strait is comparatively free of heavy ice, the "Stanley" does wonders, but how often is she compelled to remain for days in the offing and unable to make either coast of the strait? This being so, what can the ordinary steamer be expected to accomplish, when she must traverse immense fields of ice in order to get from the entrance of the gulf to Paspébiac, through the Baie des Chaleurs, which is often completely choked with ice driven in by the east wind and the gulf currents.

But, even though this winter navigation be admitted to be, strictly speaking, possible, I maintain that it is not practicable,

but is simply like many of Mr. C. N. Armstrong's other projects. Utopian, and that the Government should not, when there are so many other important improvements to be carried out, waste the public money on impossible undertakings of the kind. As a matter of fact, the dangers involved in navigating the river and Gulf of St. Lawrence are greater than those presented in winter by the voyage from England to Portland, Halifax, or any other port on the Atlantic. These dangers are caused by the snow storms which prevail nearly unceasingly in those latitudes, the enormous quantity of ice forming there, the absence of buoys, harbours of refuge, and good anchorage grounds for vessels, when they are caught in sudden snow squalls. Steamers intended for this service should be more solidly constructed than for ordinary service, and the cost would thus be increased at least 25 per cent. A crew could not be found without paying double the wages paid on vessels crossing the Atlantic. Moreover, it would be impossible to find a cargo for the vessel, and, as to passengers, no man who was not tired of life would risk a trip on her. The insurance companies would take no risk on vessel or cargo, unless, perhaps, at such ruinous rates as would ruin all parties interested. The foregoing is sufficient to show the utter absurdity of the Armstrong scheme. But there is another reason which should induce the Government to refuse any aid to an enterprise such as this. By helping the Baie des Chaleurs Railway Company to make Paspébiac its terminus the Government would commit an act of manifest injustice towards the county of Gaspé. When the company got its charter from the Quebec legislature in 1872, they bound themselves to build the road from Metapédia to Paspébiac, and reserved to themselves the right to extend it to deep water in Gaspé Basin. From 1872 to 1890, the work of construction went on very slowly; I need not say why. The history of the road is already sufficiently known. The eighty miles now in operation were constructed with the money of the taxpayers of Canada, and if the directors do not soon take steps to carry out the works, it will be the duty of the Government to intervene once more and compel the company to fulfil its obligations. In 1890 the position was such that the legislature threatened to deprive the company of its charter if they did not go on with the work. In 1891 the company appeared at Ottawa asking for a confirmation of the charter which the Quebec legislature was threatening to cancel. They succeeded in their wish, but they are bound to extend the railway to Gaspé. They also undertook to complete it as far as Paspébiac in 1893, and to Gaspé in 1895. In 1894 they changed their name to that of the Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway Company, and by means of a further subterfuge secured

Mr. JONCAS.

a further delay. They are now bound to complete their road to Gaspé in 1897 only. In 1888, through the efforts of the directors, the subsidies granted for the section extending from Paspébiac to Gaspé were allowed to be applied to a section to the west of Paspébiac on the plea that this would enable them to put several miles of their road in operation at once and to place their debentures on the market. To-day the road is built only as far as New Richmond, twenty miles west of Paspébiac. The subsidies are exhausted, the company cannot dispose of its debentures, and they are applying for further favours, which, if granted, would enable them to shirk all their obligations by making Paspébiac their terminus. For years have the sturdy, industrious, energetic people of the county of Gaspé remained at a standstill for want of means of communication which would enable them to find markets in the great centres of the Dominion for the product of their labour; they are deprived of it through the fault of this company, which, having no consideration whatever for the public interest, have looked solely to their own, and have wasted the public moneys in a manner which I will not attempt to qualify. In the face of all this, the company is applying to the Government for fresh favours, and the Dominion authorities are asked to vote millions once more in order to make a winter port at Paspébiac, and to deprive the county of Gaspé of a railway which was promised to it and to which it is entitled. Instead of complying with this request it is rather the duty of the Government to intervene and compel the directors of the company to carry out all their obligations, and if they neglect or refuse to keep promises to which they are lawfully and solemnly pledged, let the authorities apply the law, which is made for great companies quite as much as for any individual member of the community. This scheme of making Paspébiac the terminus is not new. I have fought against it for several years already, and I intend to fight it so long as I am called upon to protect the interests of the county of Gaspé. In advising the Government of the Dominion not to encourage a scheme which would operate a flagrant wrong against the people of the county of Gaspé, I am simply doing my duty. That Paspébiac should be granted any local improvements to which its commercial importance entitles it, is a thing which I should be happy to see, but the rights of the county of Gaspé must not be sacrificed. Furthermore, in the present state of affairs, the Baie des Chaleurs Railway having been put under sequestration by the government of the province of Quebec for non-accomplishment of their obligations, I think the Government at Ottawa would be justified to take the necessary measures to make this road a branch of the Intercolonial. It was at first the intention of the Government to make of the

Baie des Chaleurs Railway a branch of the Intercolonial, as you can see, Mr. Speaker, if you consult the "Hansard" of 1884. In 1884 Sir Charles Tupper, who was then, I think, Minister of Railways, in proposing a vote of \$300,000 to build the first part of this railway from Metapedia eastward to wards Paspebiac, said :

We come to the conclusion that a feeder to the Intercolonial should be there, and we were prepared to ask the House to give an amount for its construction. We had, therefore, decided to build a branch of 20 miles rather than ask for a larger sum.

And in reply to Mr. Blake, he said again :

The hon. gentleman will see that the Intercolonial Railway, by constructing these 20 miles of railway, will be in a very much better position to operate the line than a company could be. Suppose the Government build these 20 miles, much of the expense connected with operating them and the cost of rolling stock would be saved.

And a good feeder of the Intercolonial this road would be. My predecessor in this House, the late Dr. Fortin, speaking on the same subject in 1884, expressed himself as follows :—

I hope it will not be considered out of place for me, if I say a few words in reference to the Baie des Chaleurs Railway. I thoroughly approve of the course the Government has adopted in this respect, as it appears to be the only way this important branch of the Intercolonial could be secured. It will be several years before this work can be brought to completion.

I may say here that if the Government had carried out their first intention, this road would now be built as far as Gaspé Basin. Mr. Fortin continued :

But the population of the two counties, interested in this important branch railway, will now not only live in hope, but will be sure that their aspirations after the long cherished idea of being put in communication by means of a railway with the other parts of Canada, and especially with the markets, will be realized. When this railway will have reached the important port of Gaspé, one of the finest and most secure harbours in the world, it will have traversed the greatest part of the counties of Bonaventure and Gaspé, containing over 5,000,000 (five millions) acres of land, of which a large part is of the best quality, with a population of 40,000 inhabitants—

It is now 50,000.

—which is fast increasing—witness the increase of the population of the county of Gaspé, from 15,557 inhabitants, that it was, in 1871, to 20,685 in 1881. That does not include the population of the Magdalen Islands, which is 4,316 inhabitants. I think it will be interesting to know what are the principal productions of that county in 1881.

Now, I will not read all these figures. Suffice it to say that the county of Gaspé and the county of Bonaventure are two of the finest counties in the province of Quebec. The land is fertile, a large percentage of it

being better, as I have told you in this House, or at least as good, as any in the eastern townships. Now, I would call the attention of the Government and the House to the facts contained in the statement of Mr. McArthur, who was superintendent of the Baie des Chaleurs Railway during the eighteen months that it was in operation. Mr. McArthur has had every opportunity to know the resources of the county of Bonaventure. His statement relates only to that county, but the main features are true also as applied to the county of Gaspé. The following is Mr. McArthur's report :—

Metapedia, Que., 17th Feb., 1896.

L. Z. Joncas, Esq., M.P.,
Ottawa.

Sir,—I have the honour to give you my views as late superintendent of the Baie des Chaleurs Railway, as to why the Government should take over the Baie des Chaleurs Railway and operate it as part of the Intercolonial Railway.

The counties of Bonaventure and Gaspé are, as you are aware, in the absence of railway communication, almost completely isolated from the outside world, for six months in the year, during the close of navigation, consequently there is very little opportunity or facility for doing business.

During the eighteen months the Baie des Chaleurs Railway was in active operation, the business people and public at large found it a great convenience although the line only was in operation to Caplin, some 80 miles, yet unfortunately on account of the line not being extended to Paspebiac it did not pay operating expenses and on account of arrears and other accounts due up to 5th October last, the line was closed to the public and has been closed since.

The company having the road in hand being utterly unable to extend the line to Paspebiac or pay the arrears that have accumulated, if the Government could see their way clear to take control of the railway without delay and extend it to Paspebiac I am satisfied it would not only pay ordinary expenses but would be a source of considerable revenue as well, and I base my opinion on the following grounds :—

The railway runs through a fine agricultural, fishing and lumbering district. At Paspebiac there are two large and old-established fisheries, Charles Robin, Colas & Co., and De Bouthillier Bros. The combined businesses of these firms amounts to over one million dollars per annum, and the amount of freight they pay, the boat running between Dalhousie and Gaspé twice a week, amounts to, I am told, over \$20,000 each season, and they have told me their business would more than double inside of two years had they railway communication the year round, and as seven-eighths of their business is now done by water I am satisfied a large portion of it would be done by rail. There has been, during the last year, no less than six shingle and saw-mills erected along the railway, each of those mills would turn out at least forty carloads per week. There is also a large potato industry carried on between Metapedia and Caplin during the season, and this would extend all the way to Gaspé if they had a conveyance for doing their business.

There were shipped last year from the Baie 150,000 railway ties, which represent about 500 cars, besides over 5,000,000 feet of lumber ; of

course all the lumber and nearly all the ties went by water, whereas if they had railway facilities half of it would go by rail. There is a timber limit on the Bonaventure River of 400 square miles which has never been touched, and, to repeat the words of four American gentlemen, who explored it last spring with the view of investing, is capable of supplying or turning out fifteen carloads of lumber per day for the next fifty years. There are some other very extensive limits along the line which if developed would be a great source of revenue to the railway. Then take from Paspébiac to Gaspé. The fishing and lumber, as well as the agricultural industry, could no doubt be doubled within one year.

The passenger traffic would also be extensive as the Baie des Chaleurs would become a great summer resort on account of its splendid salmon fishing and seaside resort.

There is not a doubt in my mind (and I have interviewed nearly every business man in both counties) but with very reasonable outlay the Baie des Chaleurs Railway would become an immense source of revenue to the Intercolonial, besides putting the people of these two counties on equal footing as regards commercial facilities with the other portions of the Dominion. Yes, these counties have been, in my mind, very much neglected heretofore, and I really think now is an opportune time for the Government to step in and grant them railway communication.

I have the honour to be, dear Sir,

Yours truly,

(Sd.) D. S. McARTHUR,

Supt., B. C. R.

Mr. McArthur has not spoken here of another industry which promises to be successful, if the information I have received is correct. I refer to the coal oil industry. We have operating in the Gaspé Basin a company which has spent there over \$300,000 in sinking wells, and they have good reason to believe that these wells will give a sufficient quantity of oil to insure for them a good business. Now, Mr. Speaker, before ending my remarks, I might bring before the House the petitions which have been sent to the Quebec government and to this Government, giving the history of the Baie des Chaleurs Railway and the history of all the subventions it has received, and giving also the reasons why this Government should take hold of this road and make it a branch of the Intercolonial route, but I think I have given enough reasons without that. It is not at all my intention to blame the Government for the actual state of affairs. The Government is not at all to blame if this railway is now closed, if it is not operated, and if the company is not now in a position to continue the work of construction. On the contrary, the counties of Gaspé and Bonaventure are grateful to the Government for what they have done in helping to build this railway. This Government has granted even more than the ordinary subsidies to this company. But under the circumstances, I think we are justified in asking the Government to go a step further, and to force this company either to fulfil their obligations, or to give up this road, which has been built entirely with the money of the taxpayers of Canada.

Mr. JONCAS.

If there is no law at present empowering the Government to take hold of this road, I humbly submit that such a law should be put upon the statute-books. I hope, Sir, that the Government will take such measures as will enable them to do for the population of the counties of Gaspé and Bonaventure what they have done for the population of other parts of the Dominion.

Mr. McALISTER. I was particularly interested in the remarks made by the hon. member for Gaspé (Mr. Joncas) on the subject of making Paspébiac a winter port, as I have a thorough knowledge of the district, and the difficulties that present themselves in the way of accomplishing this object. I must say that I entirely agree with the objections raised by the hon. member for Gaspé on the ground that the bay, for the greater part of the winter season at least, is filled with ice, and snow storms and high winds prevail in the eastern portion of the bay. I think, perhaps, another difficulty might present itself in the winter season in the way of steamers coming in between the coast of Newfoundland and Cape Breton. I think that bay is always filled with ice in the winter season, and that it would be impossible for steamers to get between those places during at least three or four months in a year. Apart from this objection, it seems to me that the port of Paspébiac is not at all adapted for being made a safe winter port, nor yet for being a very good summer port. So far as safety is concerned, there is not a port along the coast of Quebec, or New Brunswick, or in fact I may say in any part of the continent of America, equal to the port of Dalhousie. While the ice makes there, perhaps, a little earlier in the fall of the year than it does at Paspébiac, and there may be a difference of a week or two in the spring of the year, yet the port of Dalhousie is open to navigation for at least eight months in the year. I have known sailing vessels to go out of that port as late as the first week in January; although that is not the rule, yet such has been the case on several occasions. The port of Dalhousie is protected from wind so that vessels can lie at the wharf in any weather. The wind does not strike any part of the harbour, and vessels cannot only safely enter the harbour under any wind or weather, but can lie there in safety as well. In addition to this, Dalhousie is about 100 miles nearer Liverpool than Rimouski, which in the summer season would make quite a difference in time in transmitting mails and passengers. They can land several hours earlier in Dalhousie than they can at Rimouski, and therefore considerable time would be saved in transmitting mails to Quebec, Montreal and other places west. Dalhousie is, perhaps, little known to hon. gentlemen here, with few exceptions, but those who are acquainted with it, know that my description of it is perfectly correct in every particular. The

bay is free from reefs and shoals, and anything like a fog is never known there. The steamer "Admiral" which plys twice a week between Dalhousie and Gaspé, is seldom prevented from making her regular trips, except, perhaps, once or twice in the fall of the year. If a scheme of this kind should be undertaken by the Government, I think Dalhousie would be the most feasible port, and the best adapted of any place along the coast for becoming a winter port. With regard to the Baie des Chaleurs, I have listened with considerable interest to the statement read by my hon. friend from a report of Mr. McArthy, superintendent of the Baie des Chaleurs Railway. I must say that so far as I know, the statement is correct in every particular. The railway runs through the finest agricultural, lumber and fishing regions, perhaps, in that province. But owing to the fact of the farmers being shut out from access to markets in the winter season, at least, there is very little inducement for them to go extensively into farming. They have to haul their produce by teams in the winter season from 20 to 50 miles to the nearest place where they can reach a railway, or get to a market of any description; therefore there is little inducement for them to go into farming operations very extensively. In the fall of the year when their produce is gathered, the cold sets in, and they have no access by water to Dalhousie, or to Campbellton, or to Bathurst, or to any other market place. Lumbering operations have been carried on considerably along that coast for several years. This road, I may say, skirts an unbroken forest of the best lumber, and in the winter season those who are engaged in cutting shingles, railway sleepers, and telegraph poles, which are the principal articles got out there at the present time, have to keep them on hand until the opening of navigation, and consequently small operators engaged in that business, cannot afford to carry it on profitably. If the Government were to take over this railway, I think it could be made an important feeder to the Intercolonial Railway. It cannot only be made useful to the inhabitants in those sections, but it could be made a paying road. At present I think it only extends down about 80 miles from Metapedia, and along the coast through which it runs it does not touch any port, and is not accessible by water from any direction; whereas if it was extended to Paspébiac, it would be accessible by water, and a great part of the lumber, and the fish now shipped by schooners in other directions, would find its way over that road. I think it would be well for the Government to take this matter into their favourable consideration, and take that road over as a branch of the Intercolonial Railway. I am satisfied it will be found within a very short time to be one of the best paying lines in connection with the Intercolonial Railway.

Motion agreed to.

BUTTER EXPORTS.

Mr. DAVIN. As the tariff has now come down, I will not take up the time of the House with this motion, and so I will drop it:

That the Government should at once take into consideration the propriety of giving a bonus on butter exported to the London markets, as is done by some of the Australian colonies, and also of raising the customs duty from 4 cents per pound to 6 cents, in order to enable the Northwest farmers to compete with the Australian exporters in the British Columbia markets.

Motion dropped.

BREAKWATERS AND PIERS IN PRINCE COUNTY, P.E.I.

Mr. PERRY moved for:

Statement showing the amount expended by the Dominion Government on each of the following breakwaters, piers and wharfs in Prince County, P.E.I., from 1880 up to date:—

1. Malpeque breakwater.
2. Cape Traverse breakwater.
3. McGee's wharf, Egmont Bay.
4. Higgins wharf.
5. Brea breakwater.
6. West Point wharf.
7. Mimiuegash breakwater.
8. Tignish breakwater.

The work let by tender, the amount of each contract, the names of contractors, work done by day's work, names of parties in charge, and name of inspector in each case.

He said: The total amount in the Estimates for this year is \$6,000 for repairs to breakwaters, piers and wharfs in Prince Edward Island, which number thirty altogether. Admitting that one-third of that sum goes to Prince county, it will only amount to about \$2,000 with which to keep the public works in repair. The first public work to which I refer is Malpeque breakwater. I will pass that over, as I see a small sum for its repair in the Estimates as a special grant. Then I come to Cape Traverse breakwater. That cape is a very important point in the province, it being just opposite Cape Tormentine, across the Straits of Northumberland. Cape Tormentine is in New Brunswick, and Cape Traverse in the Island. The Canadian Government has built a very costly pier at Cape Tormentine, which I am able to say, having seen it two or three times, is a very substantial work. But it is only for the accommodation of a private individual in New Brunswick. He is the gentleman who got a special grant from the Dominion Government as a subsidy for a railway to Cape Tormentine; and that hon. gentleman also got a Government grant of about half a million to build a pier at the Cape, but I am sorry to say that this pier is only used by that private individual—I am now alluding to Senator Wood. Senator Wood has built lumber mills along the line of the railway, which is supposed to be his own, although it was subsidized by the Dominion

Government, and he carries lumber to Cape Tormentine in the summer season, from which point vessels take it to distant ports, the pier affording accommodation for loading and unloading. But at the crossing between Capes Tormentine and Traverse, the distance between which is only nine miles, there is no accommodation on the Island side. I crossed there last spring and was detained a couple of hours for the tide, and even when flood tide came there were only three or four feet of water. It is true the Government has spent a few dollars there, but not sufficient to give the accommodation required. When we remember that the winter crossing should be between the two capes, the wonder is that the Government have not thought proper to expend a few thousand dollars there, or even a hundred thousand dollars to provide accommodation on the Island side. Justice is not done to the people of the Island when we remember that the Government has spent \$1,000,000 in New Brunswick, between the subsidy granted to the Wood Railway, as I call it, and the breakwater at Cape Tormentine; and yet on the Island side where there should be direct communication, and the breakwater and every facility for navigation provided, nothing is done. I cannot see for the life of me how the Government can think they are doing what is right. A few years ago the Minister of Public Works told me he had sent an engineer to Cape Traverse, and he showed me a report, but I could not understand it, and I do not think the Minister understood it himself. At all events, the Minister of Public Works never acted on this report, and never gave a dollar for the work. Now, take McGee's wharf, Egmont Bay. I suppose the Government spent \$500 there, although I am not sure that they spent even that much. At Higgins's wharf they spent a very small amount of money also, although the improvement was very much needed. These two wharfs are most important works, and are a great necessity for the people there. But the Government do not seem inclined to do anything for Prince Edward Island. I believe they expended \$500 for the Brea breakwater, to supplement a similar subscription made by the people themselves. But how was that \$500 expended? It was given away to some private individual, likely a friend of the Government, who gets \$2.50 a day for superintendence, and when you come to look at the whole transaction the cost of superintending amounts to nearly as much as the money put into the work. That is not the only place in Prince county where the same mismanagement is allowed to go on. Now, with regard to the West Point wharf. I call it the West Point wharf, but there is no wharf there to-day. Some fifteen or twenty years ago, the provincial government built a wharf there, costing \$6,000 or \$7,000, and when the federal government took over

the public works from the province they paid \$5,000 for it; but since then they have allowed it to go to pieces. There are a few pieces of timber left, and I suppose a few loads of the ballast, but that is all; there is no wharf. Both myself and my hon. colleague (Mr. Yeo) have called the attention of the Minister of Public Works to this, but always without effect. The Government do not understand that the people of West Point are labouring under heavy disadvantages. They do not understand that the people of West Point pay their full share towards the revenue of the country, and that they are entitled to a fair share of the expenditure. The Minister seems to be quite deaf to the reasonable demands of the people of West Point, and he has not spent one dollar there. Now, Sir, it is true that the Government spend a few thousand dollars on the Miminegash breakwater. Miminegash is a harbour of refuge, and three or four thousand dollars more expended on improvements would make it a good and safe harbour. The repairs done by the Government there a year or two ago have effected a great deal of good, and if they could only see their way clear to spend \$3,000 or \$4,000 more, it would complete the work. Now, as regards Tignish breakwater. I have frequently drawn the attention of the Minister of Public Works to that. Some time ago he told the House that he knew the Tignish breakwater was liable to be carried away any day, but, he said, he had no money. Well, Sir, I do not take much stock in that, because I know that the hon. gentleman has plenty of money at his command. If he has no money, how could he advertise the other day for tenders to expend \$37,500 on the Souris breakwater. I have no doubt that work is already going on, and it is quite right and proper that it should be undertaken now, for this is the proper time of the year, when the roads are good for hauling timber, when the people are good for hauling timber, when the people are not busy at other occupations, and when timber can be purchased 50 per cent cheaper than it can in the months of July and August. But why does not the Minister do the same thing for Tignish as he does for Souris? Tignish is in just as bad a condition as the Souris breakwater, but Souris is represented in this House by gentlemen who support the Government, and Tignish is represented here by two gentlemen who cannot see politically in the same light. That is just the difference. If there is \$37,500 at hand to repair the Souris breakwater, I cannot for the life of me see why there is not \$10,000 for the Tignish breakwater. But the reason is as I have stated. The people of Tignish must be punished for not sending members to this House to support the Government. Well, Sir, that is using that portion of the province wrongfully. Why does not the hon. gentleman take a special vote of \$5,000 or \$6,000 to repair the Tignish breakwater? Why does he not

render justice to the people of Tignish, and at once call for tenders and let the contract? The Government are acting not in the interests of the country at large. They are silent when a demand is made on them to do this necessary work. They say: Oh, any usage is good enough for the Tignish people: we will compel them to send a member here to support us. But, Sir, I believe that these gentlemen on the Treasury benches will not be in a way to be supported as a Government in many more months to come. It is unjust and unfair that people who pay their money in taxes for the general welfare of the country should be deprived of the same rights as others, just because they will not send Government supporters of this House. I say, Sir, that if this kind of thing is to be continued, it would be better for Prince Edward Island to go back to where it was previous to 1873, and rely upon its own resources. The people of Prince Edward Island are not indebted to the Government of Canada, for we pay \$200,000 or \$300,000 a year more to the exchequer of Canada than we get from it. It is shameful when you come to think of it. We have been here sometimes as long as seven or eight days without having a mail from Prince Edward Island. In the old days, sixty years ago, we were in no worse a position in that respect than we are now. The Government will not build a tunnel; they will not get a steamer and try the experiment of crossing from Cape Traverse to Cape Tormentine. A few days before an election, the Government may promise to do something, but who is going to believe them? No one will, because they are not true to their promises. It is only an expedient on their part; when the people of Prince Edward Island ask them for bread, the Government offer them a good lump of stone. The Minister of Public Works tells me he has no money at his command. Will he say he has no money at his command for the Souris breakwater? The vote for that is simply in the Estimates. He is not sure yet that those Estimates are going to pass. If he has let a contract for \$27,000, how is he going to pay it if he has no money? If he does not get the vote, what is he going to do? I contend that so far as that is concerned, the Minister of Public Works stands in a very unenviable position. He says he has no money at his command for the Tignish breakwater. Why, Sir, it is wonderful what has become of all the money of Canada. Is it all sunk in the Tay Canal, that Haggart's Ditch? Is it all sunk in the Curran Bridge, or in the harbour works at Quebec, or at Three Rivers, or in the Kaministiquia, or somewhere else? We do not know where it has gone to. I know that \$300,000 or \$400,000 has gone to build a bridge at Fredericton. When the people of Tignish want a vote of \$4,000 or \$5,000 to repair the breakwater there, to give ac-

commodation to the fishermen, there is no money. Those fishermen are a class of people of more benefit to this country than the Cabinet Ministers themselves, because they are a hard-working people. I was looking over the Auditor General's Report the other day, and I could not find where a poor fisherman of Tignish had charged \$300 or \$400 for cab-hire. I could not find where those poor people had an opportunity of making a trip in a special car at the expense of the country. I could not find where they got a twelve or one o'clock lunch at the expense of the public. I could not find where there was \$4,000 or \$5,000 spent by those poor fishermen for newspapers. I could not find any of these things, but the Cabinet Ministers have all these things, although they get a very fine salary of \$7,000 or \$8,000 a year. Will the hon. Minister of Public Works tell me that this is proper treatment as between the Tignish fishermen and the Cabinet Ministers? I am not going to say what I said the other day with respect to the urgent necessity of repairing that breakwater. I have stated it so often that I am getting sick and tired of it. But let not the Minister of Public Works stand up here and give the people the excuse that he has no money at his command to repair that breakwater. If he has no money, what is he there for? He should make room for some one else who will show more of the spirit of justice and fair-play towards the people of Tignish, and who will administer the affairs of this country more satisfactorily to the people than he is doing. If the hon. Minister tells me that he is not going to have anything done to the Tignish breakwater because the people there are not Conservatives, then I will believe him, for he is actually doing that, and I suppose he will take the same position to the very end. But when he tells me that he has no money, that he cannot raise \$4,000 or \$5,000 to repair a work so important as the Tignish breakwater, I do not believe a word of it. It is impossible to reconcile myself to swallowing such a statement. If I were to believe that, how comes it that he can spend \$37,500 on the Souris breakwater? He will, perhaps, tell me that is a work of great importance. I do not doubt it; I know that it is. I have seen the Souris breakwater; I presume my hon. friend never did. I am very glad to find that the people of Souris are going to be dealt with generously and equitably. But, Sir, I ask the same usage for the people of Tignish. I presume the Minister will say to me: You have no right to get it, you do not support the Government, or help them in any way. Well, Sir, I do not help them with a vote, but I watch them very closely, and in doing that I think I am serving the people of this country; but it is hard work. Now, I am not going to tell the Minister of Public Works, who is responsible for the present condition of that breakwater, what he ought to

do. He ought to know himself that he is not doing right by the people of Tignish. He ought to come to his senses and repair that breakwater without delay. He ought to know that more than that should be done for the people of Tignish. A branch railway should be built to that port, which is an important place of shipping. We have six local schooners there carrying on a traffic with Miramichi, Shediac and Charlottetown and other ports. The warfage tolls of Tignish harbour are within a few dollars of being as much as the tolls collected on the Haggart Ditch, where the Government have spent three-quarters of a million dollars. There they had to spend three-quarters of a million dollars, but at Tignish they cannot afford to spend four or five thousand dollars. Why, if they even had used only the money which they have been collecting at that harbour, from year to year, to put in a few planks and save the breakwater and improve it, that would have been so much. But they are so grasping that, once they get hold of a few dollars collected at Tignish breakwater, it is hard for the people to get it back. If the hon. Minister does nothing, and, from present appearances, he is not likely to do anything, the people of Tignish will have to suffer, I suppose, until July next, when these gentlemen will be walked out of their easy chairs to make room for better and abler statesmen.

Mr. YEO. The attention of the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Ouimet) has been brought so often to the wants of public works in Prince county, that I am really surprised he has not given some little attention to our demands. With the exception of two works there, I think, nothing at all has been done. These works were necessary, and the money was properly expended, although, I think, it would have been more satisfactory if, instead of spending the money by day's work, a public contract had been given. However, I am very glad the money was expended and these works attended to, so far as they have been. Every hon. member knows that a very expensive breakwater has been constructed at Cape Tormentine, N.B., and that this breakwater is useless for the want of a similar work on the Prince Edward Island side. There is a pier at Cape Traverse, but it is sanded up, and the hon. Minister has allowed two years to pass without doing anything—without either dredging out and deepening the water at that pier, or taking steps to construct another. The people have petitioned time and again, engineers have been sent down and reports made; but, notwithstanding all this, nothing has been done. During the present winter, if a wharf or pier had been built at Cape Traverse, the winter boat could ply the whole winter between Cape Tormentine, N.B., and Cape Traverse, P.E.I.

Mr. PERRY.

I am surprised the hon. Minister has not given this matter his serious consideration. Not only Prince county, but the whole island, is interested in this work, and it is a shame it has not been attended to. If the pier at Cape Traverse cannot be made available, people are anxious that a pier should be constructed at Carleton Point, some little distance from the terminus of the railway. A petition was sent to the Government, asking that a wharf be constructed at Gordon Point, north of Cape Traverse. And again, at Summerside, one of the most important harbours in the province, petitions have been sent, asking that breakwaters be erected on either side of that harbour, so as to narrow the channel and prevent ice accumulating. The construction of this work would very much help the trade of the Island, by enabling the winter boat to run to the port of Summerside. The lolly forms there in the winter, and it is almost impossible for a steamer to get there, but, if the breakwater were constructed, this difficulty would be done away with. I hope the hon. Minister will bring down an estimate for the building of these works. I might, in addition to the works which have been named by my hon. colleague, mention some others. There is a breakwater petitioned for at Fifteen Point, and another at Cape Egmont, very necessary works. I understand that an engineer has been visiting these places this winter to see whether he could make a favourable report for these breakwaters. I do not know whether this is intended to help along the elections. It is a common occurrence in the Island, to find that just on the eve of the elections, engineers are sent down to lead the people to believe that public works are to be undertaken. I hope this practice will not be resorted to in the coming election. I have, on former occasions, spoken of the necessity for the wharf at Higgins's shore to be dredged. It is useless as it is at present, and a very small amount spent in dredging would make it a very serviceable work. The hon. Minister promised, on other occasions, that he would do something towards constructing a pier at West Point. If I remember rightly, he said he would first complete the work at the Brae and then attend to the one at West Point. But I regret to say, that the Brae has not been completed, and nothing has been done at West Point. I do not know how the Government can justify their conduct in allowing these public works to become deteriorated as they have been. My hon. friend has alluded to Tignish breakwater. This is really an important work, which ought to be attended to without loss of time. It is a harbour in which the whole west end of Prince county is interested. A large business is done here; it is a great resort for boats and schooners; and, if this work be destroyed, a very serious loss will be entailed on the people. The people of Prince county think they are

dealt very hardly with when they see the immense amounts squandered on public works elsewhere, which are of no use, and are told that there is no money to spend on the most important works in their county. I suppose another opportunity will be given for the discussion of these matters. but I hope, in the meantime, the hon. Minister of Public Works will think of his promise and bring down an estimate to go on with some of these public works.

Mr. OUIMET. I was very much gratified to hear the junior member for Prince county (Mr. Yeo) admit that we had done something for his county. The senior member (Mr. Perry) cannot see that we have done anything except for the very corrupt purpose of unduly influencing his electors, and he seems to dread that anything we may do there will have the effect of causing him to be left at home at the next general election. I think he is more in dread of what we are doing than of what we are not, and that the best news he could bring back to his constituency was, that we were squandering money everywhere else, and not spending anything in his county. He would be very sorry if we were to spend any in his county, because it would show the people that, although they are represented by the hon. gentleman, the Government is taking care that they obtain their due share in the expenditure of public money, and that no injustice is done them. I have in my hand a statement, showing that, during the time the hon. gentleman has mentioned, \$64,000 were expended on those different piers mentioned by him in his motion, which after all are works of no general but only of local importance.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Have you at hand a memorandum showing what was expended in Bothwell?

Mr. OUIMET. The people there have such great advantage in being represented by the hon. gentleman that mere material considerations would affect them. I know a great many counties in which no large sums of public money are spent. I would cite my own, for instance.

Mr. LANDERKIN. You have the penitentiary there.

Mr. OUIMET. But that is for the shelter of good people coming from all other parts of the country. If it is a blessing, it is a blessing in disguise. I have been accused even of arranging to have the convicts vote.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Did you get them on the list?

Mr. OUIMET. I am sure the hon. gentleman would be much surprised if they were not. But, seriously, Mr. Speaker, you will understand that we cannot spend the same amount of money upon every public work in the Dominion. And when the hon. gen-

tleman (Mr. Perry) compares Tignish to Souris, he must know very well that he is not stating the case as it should be, as regards the two places. The Souris break-water is the protection for the very important public works that have been built there in order to protect the harbour, which is the most important in the whole of Prince Edward Island. These are very important works, and public money must be expended for their protection. Surely the hon. gentleman will not compare Souris in importance with Higgins's wharf, or Malpeque or Miminegash. I suppose in his own mind these latter places are much more important than Souris, because his friends are living there. But I think he should measure the importance of places in some other way than by what immediately concerns himself. The papers called for will be brought down. The House must have noticed a certain announcement that has been made by the hon. gentleman that perhaps the Department of the Public Work is undertaking work for which we shall not get the supplies this session. This is a very important announcement, and, though coming not from the biggest gun on the other side, I suppose it must be taken as the common report amongst the party of gentleman opposite, and that their plan is to obstruct or to drag the business along so as to prevent the supplies being passed. Well, if hon. gentlemen opposite have decided to prevent the supplies going through, as suggested by the hon. gentleman, the responsibility will rest upon them. At all events the contract has been given for the Souris break-water, and the work shall go on with what money was voted last year.

Mr. PERRY. Only \$10,000 was voted last year.

Mr. OUIMET. I have no hesitation in saying that if I am not Minister of Public Works after next general election, the hon. gentleman will no doubt see that his friends shall meet the obligation which the department has contracted. But perhaps he would not be so fortunate if his friends come into power; for then he would have to keep his long tale of woe to himself, be satisfied with very little, and do what he could to explain to them that the Government he supports has done its best, and hold out hopes for better in the future. It is not fair for hon. members representing the Liberal counties to speak as the hon. gentleman has done, when I can assert positively that his county has been treated most fairly and has had its full share—

Mr. PERRY. No, no.

Mr. OUIMET—and much more than many counties that are much better represented, at least politically speaking from my point of view, than his county is. His tale of woe should end at last, for the people in his district must be very simple-minded if they take any stock in all the

stories that he spends his session in circulating as regards the alleged injustice from which they are suffering.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I do not think the hon. Minister of Public Works has dealt at all fairly with my hon. friend from Prince county (Mr. Perry). It may not be very pleasant for him to hear—

Mr. OUIMET. It was pleasant for a long while, but there should be an end some-time.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It may not be very pleasant for the hon. Minister to hear my hon. friend representing the grievances of a very serious character which have existed for a long time without a remedy. My hon. friend from Prince is simply discharging his duty towards those who sent him here, when he brings before the hon. gentleman publicly session after session the fact that important public works are neglected to an extent which is seriously injurious to the public interest. The works to which the hon. gentleman has called special attention are works not of interprovincial character, it is true, but simply of a local character, still none the less of very great importance. Concerning one or two of them I can speak from personal knowledge. The hon. Minister must know that Tignish breakwater, to which my hon. friend has made special reference, is a very important work and one that to some extent justifies the name of a harbour of refuge. Nobody wishes to say a word against the great importance of the Souris breakwater, which makes a harbour of refuge for the fishing fleet. I do not say a word against the expenditure of money upon that breakwater, nor do I say that what has been spent has been unnecessarily spent. The Government are simply doing their duty in keeping that great public work in proper repair. It is the greatest public work of a marine character in Prince Edward Island. Hon. gentlemen opposite are not responsible for the construction of it. It was built under the direction of the late Hon. Alexander Mackenzie as Minister of Public Works, and it makes the greatest harbour of refuge in the maritime provinces. I myself have seen as many as 80 American and Nova Scotia schooners under the protection of that breakwater during a great storm. Many of those schooners could not have lived but for the protection of that breakwater. Every dollar spent upon that work is well spent. But that is apart from the question here. However necessary it may be to spend money upon Souris, it is also necessary that public works in other parts of the island should receive attention; and I think my hon. friend from Prince is strictly within his right in pressing for attention to these works. Take the case of Miminegash, where some little improvements were made about two years ago. I had the pleasure of visiting that place and spent part of the day upon the pier, and I can

Mr. OUIMET.

bear testimony to the fact that the improvements made have been of very great advantage. But they should be continued, because outside of the harbour there is a ridge of sand forming, and it is necessary to carry the jaws of the harbour a little further out than at present in order to give vessels an opportunity to get in and out. My hon. friend has called special attention to the local character of these works, or the character of these local works; and I want to call attention more especially to the Cape Traverse breakwater, which is a work of an interprovincial character. It is very unfair to speak of so much money having been spent in a county, and to say that the county has got its fair share because it got so much. A county may have works of an interprovincial character, the expenditure for which is not properly chargeable to that county at all. Take this very work, the Cape Traverse breakwater. There you are spending money to build a work not pertaining to the county of Prince alone, but to carry out the terms of union and to give communication between the mainland and Prince Edward Island. That is what the Cape Traverse breakwater was built for, and it was built in such a slipshod way, in such a small way, that it has never fulfilled the purpose it was intended for. It might just as well not have been built at all; it is absolutely no good the way it is now. If a proper breakwater was built, it would involve the expenditure of a large amount of money. This breakwater, as it is now, is of little practical importance, if any; and if the hon. gentleman intends to do that work properly, he has got to bring down a large sum, as he knows, in the Estimates, in order to do it. But I desire on this occasion to call the attention, perhaps not of himself—for it is not properly in his department—but of the gentlemen who sit alongside him, about the importance of that intercommunication, and to the fact that this winter it has been worse than for many winters back. The "Stanley" has been carrying the mails very, very, irregularly. I throw no blame upon the Government, and no blame upon the officers. They could not overcome the physical difficulties which exist on account of ice and the weather. But allowing that everything was done that ought to have been done with respect to the "Stanley," there still remains the alternative route by which in former days we were enabled to have our mails carried very nearly every day. For some inscrutable reason the service has been bungled this year, especially the mail service never was so badly performed as it has been during the past five or six weeks. The mails have been carried only once or twice a week.

Mr. SPEAKER. I would remind the hon. gentleman that he is wandering from the question.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Well, Mr. Speaker, I want to call your attention to the fact that

in the motion reference is made explicitly to the Cape Traverse breakwater; a breakwater built for the sole purpose of enabling this communication to be carried on; and I was going to call the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that if the service is done as badly as it has been, it is in some measure, though not altogether, due to the want of an executive head there. The clashing between the Post Office Department and the Marine Department, and the absence of some responsible head who can direct the mails to be carried over by the Cape route, who can see that the Cape route is always in order to carry it out, is the one main cause of our difficulties down there. I myself had hoped that at this session we would have had an appropriation to test the feasibility of carrying the mails across there in a small but strong steam launch. I have never myself had the data on which to form a proper opinion as to whether the mails can be carried by steamer there in the winter. My impressions have been against it; but I have heard so many practical men say that at least it might be tested, that I have yielded my judgment to theirs unreservedly; and I think it is fair that that route should be tested, not by putting on the "Stanley" there, as some advocate, which I think would be a suicidal and a dangerous policy, but by building a strong and not very expensive steam launch, which could be used to test the question, first of all, whether the ice can be kept open during the winter months. A boat necessary for such a purpose need not be a very expensive one. An extremely strong steam launch would do for the purpose of making the test, and until the test is made, I do not think myself that the Government would be justified in expending an enormous sum of money to build a proper breakwater there. I think that such a launch as I have heard described, could be put there and could test the question, without the necessity of having an actual breakwater built first. I had hoped, therefore, that the Government would not let this season pass without hiring, if they could not purchase, such a boat, and putting her in the hands of an efficient man, a local man, who understands the tides and the currents, and who would take the responsibility of running her there during the winter. It may be necessary that a special launch would have to be built for the purpose, with a screw down very deep—I am not a sufficiently practical man to know that. But I have had it impressed upon me so often by the local men that the scheme of running a boat there in the winter is possible, that I think in justice to them, and in justice to the important public interests which are at stake, the Government should have the test made this winter; and I am the more confirmed in that belief when I see that the existing arrangements do not enable us to have a tolerable mail service in Prince Edward Is-

land at all; and that I think is owing very largely to the cause which I have mentioned.

Motion agreed to.

POST OFFICE AT LINKLETTER ROAD.

Mr. YEO moved for:

Copies of petitions, letters, telegrams and all other correspondence with the Postmaster General or his department respecting the establishment of a post office at Linkletter Road, Prince county, P.E.I.

He said: In making this motion I desire to say a few words to show why I want these papers brought down. During the last session of this House a petition was sent to the Postmaster General's Department asking for the establishment of a post office at Linkletter Road. The petition was sent to the post office inspector of Prince Edward Island for his report, and some time afterwards I met the Postmaster General here, and he told me that the inspector's report had been returned, and that he recommended the establishment of a post office. He said: I have ordered the post office to be established, the only thing that is wanted now to complete it is the name of the postmaster, and I have written to get one named. Of course after this statement of the Postmaster General, I considered that the post office was almost as good as established, having his word that he had arranged the matter. I may say also that the same evening I saw his deputy, and he told me that the Postmaster General had instructed him to open the office as soon as a postmaster was appointed. However, before leaving Ottawa, I thought it well perhaps to remind the Postmaster General of his promise; and I wrote him, and received a reply from him which, with your permission, I will read:

Ottawa, 17th July, 1895.

My dear Mr. Yeo:

I cannot understand how it is you have not yet received my letter. I wrote it the day after I had spoken to you, saying that I had given instructions to establish the post office that you asked for, and I have no doubt you have received it before this.

Yours truly,
ADOLPHE CARON.

Of course, after this I made up my mind that the thing was settled, and I told the people who lived in this locality that the post office had been granted, and would no doubt be established in a very short time. I may say that there can be no question as to the necessity of a post office there. These people have been put to very great inconvenience for a long time, for the want of this office. Well, time passed on. This letter was dated in July. I waited until the end of August, and hearing nothing about the post office, I took the liberty of writing the

Postmaster General on the subject again, and I received a reply from him which I will also read :

Ottawa, 4th September, 1895.

My dear Sir :

With reference to your letter of 31st ultimo on the subject of an application for a new post office at Linkletter Road, township 17, in the county of Prince, I beg to say that I have given the subject of this application my attention, and that should the inquiries which require to be made prove satisfactory, I shall take the necessary steps in the matter.

Yours faithfully,

ADOLPHE CARON.

Of course, I was astonished at receiving this letter, because, as I have said, I thought the matter was settled, and there could be no doubt about the office being established. I had the verbal promise of the Minister, and also the written promise. In matters of very much more importance I would have no hesitation in taking the Minister's word, because we suppose a Minister of the Crown, by virtue of his high position, has every regard for his word, and, of course, I believed his promise in regard to a small matter such as this. I then wrote to the Postmaster General again and quoted to him the substance of the letter which he had written in July, and I received another reply, which I will also read. It is as follows :—

Ottawa, 3rd October, 1895.

My dear Mr. Yeo :

I have your letter of the 28th ult. upon the subject of the establishment of a post office at Linkletter Road, Township 17, county of Prince.

In reply I beg to say that a difficulty has arisen in the matter of the postmastership, which has occasioned some delay.

Yours faithfully,

ADOLPHE CARON.

I did not see that very much difficulty could occur about the appointment of a postmaster. I know that none of the people there are anxious to obtain the appointment, but more than one will take the post office for the convenience of neighbours and himself. From inquiries made, I have not heard of any one having been asked to take the post office. After receiving this letter, and finding delay in the appointment of the postmaster, I came to the conclusion that it involved only a delay until the promise of the Postmaster General would be carried out. Shortly after I came here, I asked a question in regard to this matter, and the reply I got was that, after inquiries made, the Postmaster General had decided that a post office was not needed at that place. I am very anxious to have the papers brought down, because I wish to know to whom the Postmaster General wrote in Prince Edward Island to name a postmaster, and to see whether any reasonable excuse can be given for not opening the post office promised. This is a matter which the House may think is not of very much importance, but it is

Mr. YEO.

of importance to the few people concerned. I have brought the case forward mainly for the purpose of showing it as a sample of how the public departments are conducted in Prince Edward Island. No doubt, it is in accordance with the wishes of some parties that this post office should not be established, although it would not do any injury to any one, and it is a small matter that this action should be taken to gratify a political friend, for that is the only reason I can guess as to why the post office has not been opened. I am very sorry the Postmaster General is not in his place, because, in my opinion, he must have been misinformed in regard to the facts of the case. I cannot for a moment conceive that, after making inquiries through his officers, and having received a favourable report, having, moreover, given his word that the office would be opened, and having written me that it would be opened, and having so instructed his deputy, he would have refused to open the office, except on a misconception of the facts.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I have no objection whatever to the papers being brought down. I am sorry I was not in the House when the hon. gentleman made the remarks which fell from his lips in relation to the promise the hon. gentleman stated I made. I am quite certain of one thing, that whatever promise was made to the hon. gentleman, it was subject to the report of the inspector, for I could not carry out anything without having a report sent to me. However, I will look up the matter and see what the papers in the department indicate, and then I will be glad to bring them down.

Mr. PERRY. I think that is very unsatisfactory. The Postmaster General wrote over his own signature, on 17th July, to my colleague, that he had made all the necessary inquiries, and had ordered the post office to be opened. There is the letter.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Read.

Mr. PERRY. It is as follows :—

Ottawa, 17th, 1895.

My dear Mr. Yeo :

I cannot understand how it is you have not yet received my letter. I wrote to-day after I spoke to you, saying I had given instructions to establish the post office you ask for.

It is signed "Adolphe Caron." Is there any qualification in that; can the Postmaster General wiggle out of it? It is signed in large letters, and I know the signature well. The hon. gentleman also wrote to Mr. Yeo some time in September, or, at all events, last fall, stating that he was making inquiry about the post office. The hon. gentleman does not appear to have had that information when he penned the previous letter. Would the hon. gentleman dare to order a post office to be opened if he did not know it was wanted? This letter flatly contradicts the other one. In

January, he says: "I find now the post office is not wanted." His previous objection was, that he had not got a postmaster. There are no Tories there, otherwise everyone would have wanted the place. But I know the reason which influenced the Postmaster General. There is an individual living in Summerside who has been writing to the hon. gentleman in regard to the matter. He is the future candidate. He, no doubt, advised the Postmaster General to keep back the appointment, as it might be the means of getting him some votes, and at the same time the people would blame my colleague (Mr. Yeo). I stake my reputation, that, when these papers are brought down, if they ever are brought down, and I have my doubts about it, that I will be able to prove that the Postmaster General has been tampered with. He need not tell me that he is not aware that the post office is required. If he is not aware of that fact, he is not competent to hold the position he now occupies. It must be remembered that the hon. gentleman promised verbally and by letter over his own signature, that the post office would be opened. Was not that sufficient to lead us to conclude that his action was taken in good faith, and that the people actually wanted the post office? The hon. gentleman cannot contradict his letters, because we have them. We will find, when the papers are brought down, exactly how the matter stands.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I regret that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Perry) should attribute to me such base motives, as that I should have acted for the purpose of injuring his hon. confrere (Mr. Yeo). Moreover, I am sorry that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Perry) should lead, or try to lead, the House to believe that I have been tampered with, as he called it in a not very parliamentary style. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Perry) has explained better than I could, the whole reason why the post office has not been opened. I was requested by the hon. member to open the post office, and I wrote the letter which has been read to the House. In that letter, I stated that I had given instructions to have the post office opened; that is, as I have already stated, always subject to the report which I receive from the inspector's office. The hon. gentleman states, subsequently, that I was informed that a postmaster could not be found. Well, that would be an excellent reason why the post office should not be opened, as it is not supposed that an office should be opened if there is no postmaster to look after it. The hon. gentleman gives another very good reason; he says that subsequent inquiry has demonstrated that the necessity for the post office did not exist. Consequently, I wrote the letter to the hon. gentleman telling him that I could not open the post office.

Mr. PERRY. Will you open it now?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. No. I am not going to open it now.

Motion agreed to.

RETURNS ORDERED.

Copies of all correspondence, papers and documents relating to the sale or chartering of the steamer "Alert."—(Mr. Langelier.)

Return showing the number of vessels that passed through the Chambly Canal, in each of the years 1892, 1893, 1894 and 1895; the said return to show, separately, the number of vessels loaded with coal and those loaded with wood, as well as those bound upwards and those bound downwards.—(Mr. Langelier.)

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

After Recess.

ONTARIO PEAT, FUEL AND RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. BOYLE moved second reading of Bill (No. 62) to incorporate the Ontario Peat Fuel and Railway Company.

Mr. EDGAR. I would ask the hon. gentleman to give an idea concerning the scope of the Bill, because the name implies a certain amount of novelty.

Mr. BOYLE. I have very little acquaintance with the Bill. The petition was sent to me, and I had not an opportunity of reading the Bill until this afternoon, but I think it is perfectly safe to send it to the committee, where it can be thoroughly discussed.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

TORONTO, HAMILTON AND BUFFALO RAILWAY.

Mr. McKAY moved second reading of Bill (No. 70) respecting the Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Railway Company.

Mr. EDGAR. This company was incorporated only last session. The Bill cannot be for an extension of the time, and it must be for some special object; perhaps the hon. gentleman would tell us.

Mr. McKAY. This Bill is to make the Bill of last year more practicable. There has been found some difficulty in making a settlement with the creditors, and it is necessary that a Bill of this kind should be passed this session to facilitate the settlement, and to make it more expeditious than under the Bill of last year.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 65) to incorporate the Manitoba and Nelson Valley Railway Company.—(Mr. Davis.)

Bill (No. 71) to provide for the amalgamation of the Bay of Quinté Railway and Navigation Company and the Kingston, Napanee and Western Railway Company, under the name of the Bay of Quinté Railway Company.—(Mr. Northrup.)

RAILWAY RETURN FARE TICKETS.

Mr. McLENNAN moved second reading of Bill (No. 6) respecting the sale of railway return fare tickets. He said: It is not necessary for me to say very much about this Bill. It explains itself. Its object is to provide that where there are first-class and second-class tickets sold, the railways shall issue second-class return tickets at the same proportionate reduction at which they issue first-class return tickets. At many stations the railways issue first-class return tickets and refuse to issue second-class return tickets. I claim that this is discriminating against a class of people who perhaps can least afford to pay the high rate. For instance, a man going from Ottawa to Montreal is refused the privilege of a second-class return ticket, and has to pay single fare both going and returning; so that his journey in a second-class car costs him nearly as much as it costs a man to travel on a first-class return ticket in a first-class car. We all know that it is more expensive to construct a first-class car, and it has more comforts and better accommodation than are provided for the poor man in the second-class car. This Bill does not require the railways to furnish second-class return tickets, or even second-class single tickets, where second-class accommodation is not provided already. Some of the railways in the country issue second-class return tickets and some others do not. The Bill does not place any railway company under any extra expense or inconvenience, or ask them to furnish any accommodation which they do not provide at the present time. It only asks them to extend the same justice to the poorer classes which they are extending to the people who can best afford to pay. If their rates are not sufficient now to enable them to do that, let them increase their rates to the more wealthy classes. I think every man in this House will agree with me that this measure will be very satisfactory and in the interests of his constituents. As every member of the House understands the nature and object of the Bill as well as I can explain it, I do not think it is necessary for me to offer any further explanation of it. However, I trust that the hon. members of this House will take this matter into their consideration, and will be willing to deal properly with a class of people who can ill afford to pay a proportionally higher rate for the accommodation they receive in travelling than, in all fairness, should be exacted from them. There was a discussion in this House last year on the question of the granting of passes to members of

Mr. McKAY.

Parliament, and some of the leading members of the House proposed as a remedy that the railway companies should be compelled to give passes to all members of Parliament and Senators. I think the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Ouimet) made the suggestion, and the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), as well as many other members of this House, endorsed it. Well, if those hon. gentlemen believe that it is not interfering with private rights to force the railway companies to give them passes, without charging anything at all for them, it will certainly not be interfering with private rights to extend to the poorer classes of people of this country the justice I propose in this Bill.

Mr. HAGGART. As the Bill proposes to interfere considerably with the railways, I think perhaps it had better be referred to the Railway Committee for their consideration. If a railway company adopt excursion rates, say from Ottawa to Montreal, and sell all excursion tickets as first-class tickets, I do not see any reason why they should be obliged at the same time to furnish second-class tickets and sell them at a correspondingly reduced rate. At present, I think it is an unnecessary obligation to impose upon the railway companies. However, the matter may be fully considered before the Railway Committee; and the different railway companies in the country will have notice of the Bill, and have an opportunity to advance reasons there, if there are any, against the passage of the Bill. I have no objection to the second reading of the Bill, provided it is afterwards referred to the Railway Committee.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). As I understand it, my hon. friend's Bill does not go that far. It only provides that, where the railway company sell first-class tickets and at the same time run a second-class car, they shall be bound to sell second-class tickets at a proportionate rate. I do not understand that they are bound to run a second-class car with first-class excursions or on any other occasion. I understand that it is only when they run second-class cars that they are to be obliged to sell second-class return tickets.

Mr. HAGGART. The Bill applies to excursion rates. The companies often have to have second-class cars attached to excursion trains, and the Bill might cause considerable inconvenience.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, and referred to Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines.

THE INDEPENDENCE OF PARLIAMENT.

Mr. MULOCK moved second reading of Bill (No. 9) further to secure the independence of Parliament. He said: The object of

this Bill, as the title states, is to better secure the independence of Parliament. There has been a constant endeavour in Canada as in other countries where constitutional government is aimed at, to free members of Parliament as much as possible from any influences that might warp their judgment or interfere with them in independently representing public opinion. We are all familiar with the struggles in Canada to perfect our system of representation, so that the will of the people should manifest itself on the floor of Parliament. The theory of our elective system is that certain views range the electorate into certain camps; and the preponderance of those views is supposed to find expression in Parliament as the result of the contests at the polls. If that theory is sound, I am sure that we ought to guard our system of representation in every way, so that the aim in view will not be defeated by anything that may arise after the election takes place. We have adopted from time to time stringent laws to protect the purity of elections. We have enacted that it shall be illegal to buy votes or to influence in any way improperly the minds of electors. We seek at all times to secure the independence of the electors, so that when casting their ballots they may do so uninfluenced except by their political views. We have imposed serious fines and penalties upon any who seek to interfere with the aim of this legislation by resorting to any methods forbidden by the law. If we have been careful and astute to prevent the corruption of individuals, much more should we guard the representation of the ridings after they have given their decision at the polls. It is a painful thing for a member of Parliament to be compelled to admit that the efforts of those who have been framing our laws have been defeated to a very considerable extent. If it is an offence against the spirit of our election laws to corrupt an individual elector, much more is it an offence, I submit, to seek in any way to affect the judgment of a member of the House by holding out to him inducements of personal gain. When a riding sends a man to Parliament, trusting him to represent it according to his best judgment, while he may not know in advance all the questions on which he is expected to express an opinion, and may not have a mandate from the people as to how he shall vote on particular questions, and while to that extent he may be free to exercise his best judgment as questions arise, still there are some questions which were under discussion at the time the election took place, on which each member pledges himself, and on which he is bound to redeem his pledge. But, Sir, whether on the floor of Parliament he violates a pledge by voting against his express promise to the electors, or whether when new issues arise after the election, his judgment is not free, and it becomes the judgment of others, in either case there has been a failure in the system of re-

presentation, because the electors have been compelled to speak by a voice which is not theirs. This is a two-fold wrong: it is not only a disfranchisement of the riding, but it makes the riding speak in a false voice, giving utterances to sentiments which are not the sentiments of the riding. Now, Sir, it is to me a painful thing to have witnessed, ever since I have been a member of Parliament, that which strikes at the very root of our system of representation. I have seen members—I do not know that any of these are at present in the House—but I have seen gentlemen occupying seats in this House, who, everybody knew, had the promises of positions of emolument made to them, who continued to sit long after these promises were made, long after they had ceased to be independent, and who were compelled to vote as mere echoes of the Government, or else forfeit those positions of emolument which they had supposed they had secured. Without naming any of these, I can remind hon. gentlemen of more than one such case in the lifetime of the present Parliament. I think I am within the facts when I say that one of these gentlemen sat at least for three sessions in this Parliament after he had secured the pledge of appointment to an office of emolument under the Crown, which pledge was only recently redeemed, when he vacated his seat and accepted the office. It was notorious that he had the office promised to him, and had therefore ceased to be an independent representative of the constituency which had elected him, and whose views he was bound to represent. But he remained here, hampered as effectually as if he had delivered a proxy of the riding into the hands of the Government, who continued to hold their grip upon the appointment that he was promised. There have been many such instances. I have been told by those who have gone through the records since the election of this Parliament in 1891, that no less than seventeen members elected by the people left their places in this Parliament to enter positions of emolument in the gift of the Crown. Not less than seventeen members chosen by the people were taken from their places in Parliament and put into positions of emolument. In many of these cases these gentlemen continued to sit here, pretending to represent their constituencies, after they had ceased to be free men, after they had ceased to be in the position of discharging their duty to their constituents, and which duty was the paramount obligation imposed upon them. And I am further told—and this is an additional painful statement for me to have to make—that there are, at this moment, sitting in this House, a large number of the supporters of the Administration who have understandings with the Government, who have had promises made to them by the Government, that in the near future they would not be called upon to go back to their constitu-

ents to render an account of their stewardship, but will be placed in situations of emolument in the gift of the Crown. The number in that position, I am told by a gentleman who has made a thorough examination, is not less than twenty-five. You remember, a few weeks ago, Mr. Speaker, that an hon. gentleman was taken directly out of this House and transferred for life to the Senate chamber. You remember the First Minister, a year ago, intimating that all the senatorships which were then vacant—I think eleven in number—had been promised. It is true, he did not say that they had been promised to members of this House, but they had been promised to some members, and some members walked out of this House into the Senate. And the very fact that an office in the Senate can be dangled before members of this House who, perhaps, prefer the secure life appointment in the other chamber to the precarious chances of retaining their hold in this chamber, has a grave influence upon those who would prefer that position. And, Sir, if the Government of the day can dangle public offices before their followers and induce a few, and perhaps an increasing number, to aspire to these positions instead of representing their constituents here, and exercising an unbiassed judgment and a wholesome influence upon the Administration of the day, they become mere parasites upon the Administration, and cease to voice the opinions of their constituents. Not only do they do that, Sir, but, moving about among their colleagues, they become, as it were, corrupting agencies amongst their own ranks. And so a small percentage of persons in that position are likely to impair the independence of the whole body. So it has become now, in my opinion, a crying abuse, and Parliament is cast down from its high position. And not only is the will of the people being interfered with, not only is Parliament being subordinated to the Administration, but there is even a worse evil growing out of this abuse. All through the country the electorate, noticing these things, are coming to the conclusion that the highest aim a man can have in seeking public life is, that he may, through Parliament, find his way into a comfortable position for life. If that becomes the highest aim of those who seek public life, then, public life becomes a means, not of advantage to the public, but of private gain. And thus we shall have coming into public life office-seekers, place-hunters, instead of those ready to make sacrifices for the love of their country, and ready to undertake the labours of public life for the good they can do in the interests of the people. So that, whether we view this evil with regard to its influence on the existing House, or with regard to its demoralizing influence upon public opinion, in either case, I submit, it is of such a pernicious character as

Mr. MULOCK.

to demand the earliest interference on the part of this Parliament. Viewing the situation, as I do, as one of great gravity, and desiring that Parliament should retain the respect of the people and should re-assert itself and become the mouth-piece of the people, the medium through which the will of the people shall find expression upon the statute-book, I feel that I am fully justified in inviting the attention of Parliament to the proposed remedy contained in my Bill. I would deem it an injustice, I admit, if it were made the law, that no member of Parliament, at any period of his life, should be eligible for a Government office, even after he has ceased to be a member. I admit, that men in public life make great sacrifices. And, in that view, one's feelings, to some extent, conflict with one's sense of duty. But, if the system has been so abused as to defeat the ends of those who have sought to establish firmly representative institutions in Canada, I think the duty before us is to terminate the abuse, even though it may involve some slight injustice to members of Parliament themselves. And, in that view, I have suggested in my Bill that no member of Parliament shall be eligible for any office of emolument in the gift of the Crown other than those positions that are made exceptions of under the Revised Statutes, in the Act respecting the independence of Parliament, until a certain period shall elapse, when it cannot be said he has received his appointment as a reward for any betrayal of trust. The House, of course, is aware, that, under the Independence of Parliament Act, members of Parliament may accept certain positions of emolument and still retain their seats, positions as members of the Government, for instance. My Bill, of course, does not interfere with that, but provides that, except in the cases provided in the statute, no member of Parliament shall be eligible for appointment to any position of emolument in the gift of the Crown during the lifetime of the Parliament of which he shall be a member, nor until twelve months after the dissolution of that House. If this rule were adopted, members would be safe-guarded from the influence of the Administration. The Government then could not be absolutely sure of being able to make good their pledges, because they could not redeem them until there had been a dissolution and a general election and a session of the new Parliament sustaining the Government, or, if they were defeated, until the new Government was appointed. Members of Parliament would be, to some extent, deterred from depending upon so uncertain a reward for a betrayal of trust. Now, whether I have made a proper suggestion or not, whether there is a better scheme for remedying this abuse or not, I do not pretend to say. But I do maintain that the present system is open to abuse, and has been flagrantly

abused ; that it can be used, and, I submit, is being used, to defy the will of the people. And, under these circumstances, I submit to the House the Bill which is now before you for the second reading, and I trust that either this or some more effective measure will be adopted to render it impossible for governments to overreach the people and induce members to forget the duties devolving upon them when they accept positions in Parliament.

Mr. DICKEY. I do not at all disagree, Mr. Speaker, with the general line of argument of the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock). I quite agree with him in his statement of possible evils and in his general argument with regard to the independence of Parliament. I cannot, however, follow him in the view he takes of the personnel of this House. It has been my pleasure in the country, wherever I have spoken, and it is my pleasure here, to claim for the House of Commons of Canada, without regard to party, as high a standard of honour and as high a standard of public morality as exists in any similar body in the world, without any exception whatever. Therefore, I part company with the hon. gentleman in his estimate of the House of Commons, as it is constituted. The hon. gentleman entertains certain views with regard to the members who sit on this side of the House. I desire, so far as the members of this House are concerned, if it will have any influence with the hon. gentleman, utterly and absolutely to repudiate the charges which he has made with regard to hon. gentlemen on this side of the House. They are charges made generally, they are charges made so as to affect every hon. gentleman sitting here, without specifying who or what. It seems to me it is most unfortunate that the hon. gentleman should think that his public duty required him to make these charges before the House and before the country. The hon. gentleman says the electors will think that the highest aim of members of Parliament is to get office. I tell the hon. gentleman that I do not believe anything of the kind. I believe the electors of this country have a high opinion of the men who represent them. I believe that the electors of this country are intelligent enough, that they have sufficient sense of public duty to choose with care the men who come here, and that the standard of the men they have chosen is, as I have said, as high as that of any representative assembly in the world. Now, the hon. gentleman was unfortunate in not citing to this House a precedent for the legislation he has introduced. They have representative institutions in the old country, they have them in the United States of America, they have them in the various colonies of Great Britain, and they have them in other countries in the world ; and yet the hon. gentleman

has not cited an instance where it was necessary to place upon members of any representative body the stigma—because it is nothing else—which this Bill would place upon members of this House. It seems to me rather extraordinary that a precedent of that sort should not have occurred, if it was necessary in the working out of parliamentary institutions. Now, Sir, I say frankly that I think it would be most unfair to disqualify members of Parliament from holding public offices, as this Bill proposes to do. It is contrary to the practice in Canada. The hon. gentleman has given us the number—I dare say his figures may be correct—he has said there are seventeen members appointed since the general elections. That may be correct, I have not verified the numbers.

Mr. MULOCK. I did not say I had added them up myself, but that statement has been given to me.

Mr. DICKEY. I say that each of these appointments should be judged upon its own merits, and that simply because a man is a member of Parliament, it should not be said that his appointment to office was a mistake. Take, for instance, the question of judgeships. Is it to be supposed that any hon. gentleman of the legal profession who takes a seat in this House, is at once to be debarred from the opportunity of being appointed to the bench, and not only so, but that the country should be deprived of the benefit of his services upon the bench ? It is, I suppose, almost as important that the bench should be well filled as that the House of Commons should be well filled. And it would be a great mistake to withdraw from the Government the privilege of making selections for public office from the able lawyers whom the people of this country choose, from time to time, to represent them in Parliament. We know that the Hon. Edward Blake sat in this House some years ago. I have understood, I know not whether it is correct, that he was invited to take a seat upon the bench from this House. Now, I think every hon. gentleman will agree with me that a law which would prevent the elevation of a man of his supreme qualifications to the bench would be an injury to the country, and would be a measure which would require very grave reasons to justify it. It is, as I have said, the practice of both parties to appoint men from the House. Now, I do not wish to attack hon. gentlemen opposite upon their record. Hon. gentlemen opposite, when they were in power, some four or five years, appointed, if I am correctly informed, about twenty members of Parliament to positions from the House. Does the hon. gentleman think that the Government led by the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie was lowering the tone of public morality in this country when they appointed these men to office ? I should not say so. Those ap-

pointments were agreed to by men of the highest standard of public morality, such as the Hon. Edward Blake, whom I have mentioned. Those appointments, some of them, were agreed to by the hon. leader of the Opposition, who, I suppose, represents a high tone of morality, and does, it gives me pleasure to admit. Therefore, the hon. gentleman should see that he is asking us to interfere with a practice which has been observed by both sides of politics, and surely he will admit that either side has the best interests of this country at heart. I have here a list of members of Parliament appointed to office by the Mackenzie Government during their regime, and, not counting senators, there are nineteen of them, as I make up the list, some of them very creditable appointments, and some of them serving the country well up to the present day. It is the practice in the various provinces of the Dominion. The hon. gentleman will remember much better than myself the case of the Hon. Mr. Fraser, in the province of Ontario. He was a man who had served his province so well, who had gained the respect of both sides of politics to such an extent, that both sides united in making, I believe, an office for his special benefit, called the Clerk of Forestry, with a salary of \$3,000 or \$3,500 a year. Both sides of politics united in appointing Mr. Fraser to that office as a reward for his public services. Now, does the hon. gentleman think it wise to adopt a measure that would interfere with a practice such as that? The 212 men who sit in this House are among the best men in the country; I say it would be a great mistake to withdraw those 212 men from eligibility to appointments to high offices in this country. There are men who come to this House with special qualifications, legal or otherwise. The Government of the country should have every scope to choose for public offices the very best men they can get, irrespective of the position they may previously have held. Now, Sir, I agree at once that that is a power that might be abused. There is not a power possessed by the Government that is not susceptible of abuse; but because the power is susceptible of abuse, it does not follow that this House should do a still greater wrong to the country, and should put an unmerited insult upon the House. The people must be allowed to pass in the ordinary way in constitutionally-governed countries, upon appointments to office, that is to say, according to the doctrine of responsibility. For these reasons, I do not think the House should adopt this Bill. It is a Bill, as I have said, totally without precedent in any legislative assembly, so far as I know. It is a Bill which I consider withdraws a large number of valuable men from the public service, it is a Bill which is not logical, and it is a Bill that, I think, throws an undeserved aspersion upon this House. If the hon. gentle-

Mr. DICKEY.

man had desired to attain his end, he might have attained it very easily; he might have said that those gentlemen who have a promise of office shall not be eligible to sit in this House.

Mr. MULOCK. How can you do it?

Mr. DICKEY. It is done in the Election Act over and over again, where promises of anything like a gift, are called a matter of bribery. There is no practical difficulty in doing it, if it were necessary to touch the subject at all. The object of the hon. gentleman is one of very doubtful utility, and the method which he has chosen to compass it, is clumsy in its form, and is not such as this House should adopt, even if it adopted the object. For these reasons, I move that this Bill be not now read, but that it be read this day three months.

Mr. MULOCK. The Minister of Justice has not in this case done himself justice. He has stated in justification of the course which I say has been pursued here what occurred during the regime of the late Alexander Mackenzie. I believe that hon. gentlemen opposite strongly condemned that action on the part of Mr. Mackenzie, that they were loud in their denunciations of his having appointed members of Parliament to office, that it was of the high crimes of his Administration. I therefore fail to see how they can reprobate and approbate just as happens to suit their purpose. The hon. gentleman says there is no precedent for discrimination of this kind. I reply by saying that in my judgment there is no precedent for abuses such as have been going on. The hon. gentleman says a simple process would be to remove from this House any hon. gentleman who has the promise of an office. It is impossible to establish the promise of an office—there may be an understanding or a wink, and an understanding between a member of the House and a member of the Government may not become a legal and binding promise, but we know it is a promise that will be made good when the right time comes; and hon. members of the Government will not stand up here and say that there are not members supporting the Administration with whom there are understandings at this moment that they will receive positions of emolument in the near future.

Mr. DICKEY. I have none, I can assure the hon. gentleman.

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. gentleman may not have any in his department. The hon. gentleman, however, knows that before they go out of office they will confer positions of emolument on many members now sitting in this House and supporting the Government. He knows that, and the near future will make good what I am stating to-day, and everybody knows what I am saying is the case. No member of the Government will stand up and pledge his honour that

what I am saying is not correct. The hon. gentleman alluded to the case of Mr. Fraser, a late member of the Ontario government, who was appointed to a government position. If the abuses were few in number and limited to extraordinary cases, such as the one to which he has alluded, no person would raise an exception. Public opinion would not in that case call for remedy. Mr. Fraser's case was a special one. He had been a member of the Ontario legislature for many years, for perhaps fifteen years; he had served the country as a member of the government for several years, and when, owing to ill-health, he broke down, he was placed in the position to which the hon. gentleman alluded. In his particular case I conceive it would have been a personal hardship had there been circumstances to prevent the government taking care of him in his need, and I am sure in such a case Parliament would willingly have made special exception, if necessary, by legislation if he had been prevented from accepting a position by which reasonable provision was made for him. That is wholly different from the Government itself, sitting on the Treasury benches, with all the patronage at their disposal, dangling offices before their followers as inducements for them to be faithful and subservient and not make trouble, and that such would be their reward. That is the state of affairs to-day. Whether the hon. gentleman thinks I am casting a stigma on any members of the House, the future will show whether I am telling the truth. I will guarantee that when this House is dissolved, before this Government goes out of office, as they will in a few months, they will insert in patents conferring appointments to office the names of twenty or thirty of their supporters in this House. It is idle to say to the House and to the country that these appointments will have their origin after the elections; everybody knows, and the people of the country know, that these appointments date from a period anterior to the present moment.

Mr. SPROULE. I have no doubt the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) means well; but if he carried out his boast and intention to the full extent which he appears to indicate in his motion, this law would be very much like the blue laws of Kentucky, more a disgrace than otherwise to the legislature that passed it. The hon. gentleman said he had no precedent for the abuses that were taking place in this House. He must either not be very observant, or read very little, or know very little as to what is going on around him, because if he went to the legislature in Toronto where his own political friends have been in power twenty-three or twenty-four years, he would find any number of precedents. That House, ever since Mr. Mowat took charge, has been conducted on the same principle, and to a much greater extent, as that which has been

followed here. It would be interesting for any one to prepare a list of the members who occupied places in that House at different times during the last twenty years and find where they are to-day and by whom they were placed in their positions. Nearly every member of the legislature who has gone out has stepped into some lucrative employment, either in a government office or commission or some other employment under the government. If the principle is bad, it is bad there as here.

Mr. MULOCK. Certainly it is.

Mr. SPROULE. I never heard the hon. gentleman say a word against it.

Mr. MULOCK. I am not a member of that House.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman has never denied that this has been done.

Mr. MULOCK. I never denied it.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman has taken part in local elections, but he never uttered a word of complaint, although members have been taken out of the legislature during a session; one case occurred no later than between last session and the present one, when a member was taken out of the House and appointed to the position of registrar. One after another has been thus taken out and appointed to lucrative positions, but not one word has been heard against that practice by the hon. gentleman and his friends; but because the hon. gentleman's friends do not happen to be in power here, he is very virtuous and seeks to make the country believe that the majority are doing something that is very wrong. I am surprised at the course pursued by the hon. gentleman, because he is a lawyer. We sometimes say that every lawyer is a candidate for the bench, no matter whether he is a member of Parliament or not. The only reason for his anxiety in the present case is that he never expects his friends to get into power, at least during his lifetime; otherwise he would leave the door opened to secure a comfortable seat when he becomes tired of parliamentary life. The hon. gentleman says the principle is bad, but he thinks that there are exceptions which are justifiable, and he mentions the case of Hon. Mr. Fraser as one of them, he being a man who spent a large portion of his life in the service of his country, and at the end of his parliamentary term found himself without means of support. Is this not the case with many members of Parliament, men who have given the best of their lives to the service of the country, neglected their business and squandered their money, and yet possess accumulated knowledge which would be of great importance and value to the country; but if the hon. gentleman's Bill became law, that knowledge could not be used in the public interest, and the country would be denied the advantage of it. If

the hon. gentleman can find one exception, I think he can find many among members who have served long in Parliament.

Mr. MULOCK. I did not cite the case, the Minister of Justice cited it.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman referred to Mr. Fraser having been a Minister of the Crown for a long time, and he thought in such a case an appointment was justifiable. Where is the difference between a member of the Crown and a member of Parliament, if they both do their duty equally well, give up their time and business in the interest of the country? I do not consider there is any difference in one case as compared with the other. I might mention a number of cases of members of the Ontario legislature being appointed to office. I have already mentioned one case. Then Dr. Widdifield was taken from the legislature, put in a cosy office in North York, which the hon. member (Mr. Mulock) represents. The hon. gentleman no doubt is quite willing to defend that case.

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. gentleman is quite mistaken. He was not taken from the House.

Mr. SPROULE. Was he not a member of the legislature within a few months of the time he was put in office? He was promised that position, and only left Parliament to step into it.

Mr. MULOCK. That is not correct.

Mr. SPROULE. Well, if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock) is in a position to know, absolutely, I will accept his statement, but if he only imagines it to be correct, then, of course, he is in the same position as myself; he believes the rumour he heard.

Mr. MULOCK. That is not correct. I will tell you what did happen. If I remember the facts correctly, he had represented that seat in the House, he resigned that seat, another election took place, and his successor returned, and after some interval, he was appointed to this office.

Mr. SPROULE. He was appointed as sheriff before his successor was elected.

Mr. MULOCK. No, the riding elected his successor.

Mr. SPROULE. Notwithstanding that, Dr. Widdifield was to get the position. It was published in the papers all over this country, and no one pretended to deny it. I do not think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock) can make people believe that now, for it was not denied at the time. However, that is only one of dozens of instances I might cite, if I had time to collect them. There are other instances in the Ontario legislature equally as glaring as this one. It is a notorious fact, that during the last session of the local legislature, instances were cited time after time in that House,

Mr. SPROULE.

and members pointed out as men who had the promise of office as soon as the parliamentary term would expire. And these men did not appear to think it worth while to keep it a secret. Why, they were laughing and talking about it themselves, and expecting the time when they would be shelled into some suitable office. Now, if the principle is good for one parliament, it is good for both. If it is justifiable under Sir Oliver Mowat, it is justifiable here. If it is a stigma upon the integrity and intelligence of the representatives in this House, it must be equally so on the representatives of the local legislature, because the rule, if it applies to one, must apply equally to the other. Now, I say that members of Parliament, from their long experience in this House, frequently make the most suitable men that the country can get for certain offices. They have gained a great deal of knowledge here, which they could not acquire in any other sphere. They have mature judgment and experience, and are better informed upon the details of government, and of the management of public affairs than are men in private life. Therefore, they become the more valuable to the state by virtue of the fact that they have had seats in this House for a length of time before assuming office. Then, again, Sir, if this Bill passed, it would be, as the hon. the Minister of Justice said, an acknowledgment to the world that members of Parliament were so corrupt, that Parliament had to pass a law to keep them out of office for a year or two after they left this House. Sir, that would apply to hon. gentlemen opposite as well as to members on this side of the House. I venture to say that very few hon. members in the party of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock) would endorse the principle which he has laid down in this Bill. I do not think the leader of the Opposition would. I do not think that many of his friends would, and whatever has induced the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock) to bring this Bill before the House, I cannot understand, except it may be for the purpose of trying to convince the world that he is disposed to be extra virtuous. Well, the hon. gentleman can afford to be so, because it is a Bill that is not likely to affect either him or his friends for a long time to come.

Mr. LISTER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) never loses an opportunity, if at all possible, of instancing the Ontario legislature as a justification for something which he wants to support. Sir, the Bill which my hon. friend (Mr. Mulock) introduces, whether it covers or does not cover the evil which is sought to be remedied, is a measure that may fairly be discussed. The evil, as I understand it, is not the appointment of a member of this House to office, because I agree with what has been said by the Minister of Justice, that the mere fact of a man being a member of the

House of Commons should not be a bar to his appointment to some office of emolument. But what I do say is, that to hold an office dangling before a member of Parliament for one, two, or three sessions; to promise to give him, he expecting to receive it; I do say that the effect of that promise is to utterly destroy his independence. Why, Sir, we have a recent case within our own knowledge, in which the Government of this country promised to a member of this House the appointment of collector of customs. One session went past, and he was not appointed; another session passed, and the appointment was still not made, and to such an extent did that hon. member feel the unenviable position he occupied in the House that he resigned his seat, and the result is that my hon. friend from Cardwell (Mr. Stubbs) is sitting here to-day, opposing the Government, as a representative of that constituency. That, Sir, I take it, is an evil that should, if possible, be struck at by legislation. The hon. gentleman from Grey (Mr. Sproule) tells us that the members of this House are giving up their time and destroying their business by coming to Parliament. Mr. Speaker, it is somewhat remarkable the great number of people throughout the country who are willing to give up their time and to destroy their prospects for such a purpose. Why, there is my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) there. I venture to say that a yoke of oxen would not drag him out of Parliament.

Mr. SPROULE. Ditto.

Mr. LISTER. He is willing to destroy his business; he is willing to serve his country, and notwithstanding all these sacrifices, nothing would draw him out of Parliament, except the adverse vote of the electors. I take it that my hon. friend has failed in his argument, because he has not shown that any gentleman appointed by the local government of Ontario had been promised an appointment so as to affect his independence. But here, within the knowledge of almost every member of the House of Commons, we have not only one instance, but dozens of instances, where such a thing has occurred. We have sitting here to-day an hon. gentleman who has been promised a senatorship. They did not act fairly with him, because, when the bolters went out, the men who stayed in appointed somebody else instead of him. We have these facts before us, and that is the evil we complain of. Is there any instance during the time the Mackenzie Government were in power of that Government having held an office before a member as an inducement to get him to support the Government? Can there be cited any instance in which the Mackenzie Government promised a member an office for any considerable time before the appointment was actually made? I submit not, Sir. The evil, as I have said, is not the ap-

pointment of a member of Parliament, but the promise of appointment in order to affect his independence. It is hard to see how you are to get at the evil. My hon. friend who has introduced this Bill thinks that a member of Parliament should not be eligible to office for at least a year after the dissolution of Parliament. That, I agree with the hon. Minister of Justice, is not to be found amongst the legislative enactments of any country that I know of, and the reasons are very powerful why a member of Parliament should not be debarred from taking office. But if the ingenuity of my hon. friend could be exerted in the direction of getting at the case of a man who had been promised an office and had not been appointed, but who hung on to the Government in the expectation that their promise would be carried out, then he would be doing a real benefit to the people of this country. Because, I take it, no more disgraceful condition of affairs could be imagined than to see a man elected by the people of the country to come here as an independent member, and sit session after session voting for the Government after having been given to understand that the reward of his fealty would be his appointment to an office of emolument under the Crown. That is a disgraceful proceeding—one that could not be justified by any process of reasoning. My hon. friend attacks the Administration of Mr. Mackenzie. If the hon. gentleman was in Parliament then he must recall the fact that there was no charge that the appointments he refers to had been held up for the purpose of influencing the members, and no pretense that they had been held over after the promises had been made. The appointments were not carried out for a long time afterwards. The Government of Mr. Mackenzie was assailed violently and virulently day after day by hon. gentlemen opposite who were then sitting on this side of the House, for having made appointments from amongst their followers in the House; yet we find the hon. gentlemen who opposed that so violently then, the moment they get into power, increasing to a great extent the evil of which they then complained. In Opposition they were opposed to what they are doing now. In power, they think it is all right.

Mr. SPROULE. I never attacked Mr. Mackenzie for it, either in this House or out of this House. The hon. gentleman is only setting up that statement to knock it over.

Mr. LISTER. I did not speak of the hon. gentleman attacking; I said hon. gentlemen, not hon. gentleman. Hon. gentlemen opposite, when on this side of the House, attacked the Government of that day for appointing their followers to office. Now that they are in power, what was wrong then is right to-day. The evil aimed at by my hon. friend from York is a decided evil, and if it is

possible to get at it all, this House should cure it.

Amendment (Mr. Dickey) agreed to, and motion, as amended, agreed to.

DETECTIVE CORPORATIONS AND MERCANTILE AGENCIES.

Mr. SPROULE moved second reading of Bill (No. 11) respecting detective corporations and mercantile agencies. He said: In moving that this Bill be read the second time, I would like to give some of the reasons which animate me in endeavouring to bring these associations under the control of the law. There are two classes of agencies in this country which do very extensive work, and which are almost all of them doing a great deal of injury to the people of this country, without the parties injured knowing whence the injury comes, and yet these associations are allowed to continue their work without being under the control of the law, or, comparatively speaking, without the law being able to reach them. These are detective corporations and mercantile agencies. It is a well-known fact that all through this country, in the large cities and towns, there are private detective agencies. Any number of gentlemen can associate themselves together, put an advertisement in the newspapers informing the public that they had constituted themselves private detective agencies, and then carry on a business that may destroy the reputation, either moral or financial, of respectable members of the community, and yet the people thus injured cannot tell who has done the injury. I need only give an instance or two to illustrate what I mean. A year ago last summer, an investigation was had into the municipal affairs of the city of Toronto, and a very respectable gentleman—I think his name was Wallace Nesbitt—was appointed as prosecutor in the case. Well, Sir, while carrying on that inquiry, this gentleman was shadowed everywhere he went by one of the Pinkerton detectives from Chicago. This detective followed him day and night, trying to spy out something which might be made the basis of a charge, and thus break down the credulity of this man who was doing most important and valuable work. This detective continued following Mr. Nesbitt round until, at last, his movements were noticed by some one, who remarked that he was to be found at untimely hours hovering about Mr. Nesbitt's house, and also following Mr. Nesbitt down the streets, into business places and out of them; and, after awhile, some person, who detected him in this work, got the man arrested. What was his reply when he was taken to the police court? He said that he was employed by parties who were trying to destroy the reputation of this public officer.

Mr. LISTER.

He, a foreigner, was brought over here, and employed deliberately to try and worm out some information, or spy out something in Mr. Nesbitt's private life on which he could base a prosecution, or give out to the world that Mr. Nesbitt was unworthy of the office he occupied. The man was stopped in his work; but what right had this man, a foreigner, to come into Canada and do this work without being under the control of the law, without being in any position where the party whom he was tracking almost as a blood hound could put hands on him and make him amenable for his conduct? I say it is a disgrace to the civilization of the nineteenth century that such things should be allowed to go on, and that the parties who do them should not be under the control of the law. Now, the Pinkerton detective agents from Chicago are travelling all over Canada. There is not a month in the year, I might say there is not a week in the year, in which there is not some one of these men travelled through Canada as a spy carrying on this nefarious work, and yet not amenable, comparatively speaking, to the laws of our country, because these people do their work in such a stealthy way that the parties injured do not know by what means they have been attacked. I might mention several instances, but I need only mention one, which I remember hearing of some years ago. A party who had been formerly a citizen of Canada, left his family here and went to the United States, where he accumulated considerable wealth, and where he died. An advertisement was put in some of the papers calling on the heirs of this man to come forward and claim his estate. It was ascertained by the Pinkerton detective agency that the heirs were located here in Canada, and they sent one of their officers over here to purchase the rights which these heirs had in this estate for a few hundred dollars. I believe that by his artful representations, this Pinkerton agent succeeded in purchasing the rights for something like \$400, although the man who had died had left a fortune said to be worth over a half a million dollars. He represented that it was possible they were heirs, but that there was a strong probability they were not, and he got an assignment, perfectly regular, of their and interest in it, and then went across the line to benefit by it. It happened that these parties were brought back, and they were obliged to send men all through the country, to scour the country for the purpose of getting respectable men to bolster up their character, so that they might justify their conduct in a court of law. They succeeded sufficiently to escape the toils of the law; but although they escaped, I am credibly informed that they justly deserved punishment, and had they been compelled to carry on their operations under the control of some such law as I propose, they never could have acted as they did, and

got out of the country scot free. Again, we have respectable associations in Canada that are doing detective work, and who would be well pleased to be under the control of the law. I need only mention one association, which I think most of the members of this House must have heard of. I refer to the firm of Mr. Grose, of Montreal, who has a detective agency there. I had a long conversation with Mr. Grose, and had a letter from him which I find I have forgotten to bring with me, but in this letter he speaks of this abuse to which I have alluded as one of the greatest evils that his firm have to contend with to-day. Parties who are irresponsible, who have no standing in the community, who are, perhaps, without moral character, or any of the obligations of manhood to the people of this country, carry on this work, representing themselves as respectable agencies. They destroy the moral character and reputation of others, they do untold injury, and yet they go unwhipped of justice. This Bill aims at bringing these men under control. In what way? In the first place, they must file a certificate declaring that they intend to become incorporated. They must file this certificate with the Secretary of State. Then they must enter into bonds with justified securities under oath, and then take out letters patent. They must enter into bonds of \$10,000 each, with two good sureties as a guarantee for their conduct, so that there may be something to fall back upon in case they make themselves amenable to the law. There must be a justification of these securities. Power is then given to the association to employ agents to carry on their work, but every man who is employed by the association must carry with him a certificate showing that he belongs to it, and has the right to carry on the work of a private detective. Each employee has a certificate, and then there is a provision made that when any new members are taken into the firm, these members are to deposit each a bond with the Secretary of State, and provide the same sureties as in the first instance. This bond is to be renewed every five years, so that it may be a safe bond. This is required to meet the possibility of the sureties, from time to time, breaking down, and not being worth the amount which they are represented to be worth in the bonds. The duty of the members of the associations and the employees is, then, to discharge their work faithfully. They take oath to do it faithfully, and in this, too, they are under the control of the law. Then these associations, when incorporated, are liable, under the provisions of the Act, and their sureties are liable, on the bonds of the association, for damages to parties injured, where it is shown that the information given is incorrect and that the association has made itself liable to damages. In like manner, the other provisions of the Bill are for the purpose of getting them under the

control of the law. That is with regard to detective corporations.

I now come to the other branch of my Bill, which has for its object, the controlling of mercantile agencies. In endeavouring to obtain a law which will control these mercantile agencies, I can only say that I have received very strong opposition for the purpose of defeating this Bill, from certain quarters; and I believe that if these quarters were as well informed of the object of the Bill and the abuses that take place under this system, as they ought to be, their opposition would not be so strong as it is. There is practically no control over these commercial agencies to-day, just as there is none over detective corporations, except under the common law, which scarcely touches them at all. We know how far the common law or the civil law of Quebec goes when you attempt to punish these individuals. We know that it is almost impossible to obtain a conviction, and, therefore, they may be fairly said not to be under the control of the law at all. If we consider for a moment the untold injury done by these mercantile agencies, we will be surprised that the abuse has been allowed to go on so long without any statute being passed to control them in any way. What is the position of these mercantile agencies? A man comes into the country who is a foreigner. He establishes an agency here. Take either of the agencies you like—the Dun-Wiman or the Bradstreet. They are both foreigners and have their agents in Canada. They appoint an agent in two or three business centres throughout the country. They pay little or no money to these agencies. They put little or no money into the enterprise, but put themselves in such a position that they can practically destroy, not only the moral reputation, but the financial standing of every member of the business community, without the parties injured knowing who it is that has done the injury. In any other line, would this be allowed? A man commences business with a small capital and limited experience, but with the honest intention to develop that business to the best of his ability, according to the needs of the locality. There may be another man in the same line of business who is an agent of one of these associations. These associations take their agents from every quarter. Whoever is willing to do the work for nothing is always acceptable. The one competing with the other, but the one who is an agent can give information to these associations with regard to the financial standing of the other, and ruin his financial standing, even though that information be altogether incorrect, and the one who is ruined does not know who is responsible for the injury. Some people may say that that is an exaggerated statement with regard to the operations of these firms. I say most distinctly, from my own knowl-

edge, that the statement is correct, and I speak from a knowledge of twenty years of one of the agencies, and of half that time of both of them. I have repeatedly invited these agencies to have a permanent respectable agent employed in each town or village, and give him some small consideration, so that he may devote at least a portion of his time for the purpose of making inquiries regarding the financial standing of business men in the community. I have repeatedly asked them to do this, but my request has invariably been refused; and the only expense they incur in carrying on this business, practically speaking, until the last few years, is the expense in postage of sending out their schedules to any one they can get to give a reply. They generally have, if they can get them, two agents in each town or village; but if they cannot get the two, they will do with one, and they pay nothing. The work is done gratuitously, and when men are working for nothing, they are not likely to take the time they should in making inquiries to get correct information and do the work faithfully. Some may say that that is not the way this work is carried on. I think I can give such information as will satisfy them that I am right. I have a letter here from a gentleman who was engaged in this work for a great many years, a gentleman to whom I have reported for years myself, and one who, I believe, endeavoured to do justice to the mercantile community. When I wrote him for information with regard to how this work was carried on, he sent me the following letter:—

Your Bill, so far as it goes certainly is in the right direction, but I feel fully assured that a thorough investigation into the methods of the mercantile agencies would unfold a tale which I think might induce measures more far-reaching. I will state one fact which you can readily perceive is fraught with great injustice to many people doing business in Canada. One agency, at least, of which I was general manager many years, is now directed in almost its minutest details by a man sitting at his desk in New York—not in touch with conditions here, nor in sympathy with a manager or superintendent of any of the offices here, who may make a fair effort to report the circumstances of traders quoted in their books. I speak this from personal knowledge. During my term with them I made them say two hundred and fifty thousand dollars, remitted about two hundred and twelve thousand, the balance left them on their books to collect. This was done without more than a few hundred dollars investment made many years ago not one dollar having been put into the business by them within, say, twenty-five years past. Now I mention this as a prelude to the point I desire to direct your attention to. Every effort of recent years made by me to have a larger portion of the earnings spent in more thoroughly and carefully reporting the country was met by complaints of unnecessary expenses, &c., &c., thus rendering it impossible to give an approach to a report of traders in many parts of the country either safe to the bank or merchant getting the report or fair to party or firm

Mr. SPROULE.

reported upon. Travellers are sent out at long intervals, but chiefly to the larger cities and towns where subscriptions may be secured, beyond this there has not been, by Bradstreet's, one hundred dollars spent annually in Ontario to obtain information from paid correspondents, their chief expenditure being for postage stamps asking indiscriminately for information oftentimes without the least knowledge of the persons from whom they are making inquiry; the reply, however, if one comes, "fills the bill"—the report goes. I need not enlarge as to the frequent result of this. The usefulness of these institutions when properly managed or under proper supervision is not generally questioned, in trade or at least wholesale trade circles, but there is a limit which when reached is dangerous to all classes of trade, and that limit I think is being very closely shaved when they are run solely for the subscriptions that can be collected as small a proportion of the earnings as possible being given up to secure efficiency. There is a class of reports given out by agencies of which I never approved, and more frequently than otherwise while in management I refused to make, these are classed "call reports." The names do not appear in the reference books, but when asked for the reports is whispered into the ear of the subscriber and he only is supposed to learn the degree of wickedness reported. This class of report often extends to the affairs of private parties it will be clear to you that there is room for some restraint being put on this department of their business; these reports are not kept in books but are kept on file. There are numerous details of the workings of these agencies which I think would have a bearing on the minds in the House if understood, but with the limited time I have to get this letter to you by to-morrow, as I understand you wish, I cannot say much more.

Now, this letter is from a gentleman who managed one of these offices, and during the time he held this office he collected and sent to New York \$212,000 in hard cash, although there was never invested in the enterprise here more than \$300 or \$400 at most. And yet the agent in New York, who has only escaped the toils of the law a short time ago, having been tried for alleged forgery, was perfectly satisfied to accept the information he received from irresponsible parties all over the country to whom these letters of inquiry were sent, no other effort to secure correct information being made, and no other expense being incurred than the writing and posting of these letters.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Have you any objection to giving the name?

Mr. SPROULE. None; the writer of this letter is Joseph Priestman.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Of what agency?

Mr. SPROULE. Of the Bradstreet agency. This man speaks from an experience of nearly twenty-five years, and he speaks with an authority that would be impossible except with one who had been engaged in the business. People often wonder that we have such a large number of firms breaking down who are represented by these agencies to be financially sound, and yet

when these firms come to be wound up, we find that they have little or no assets. I have here a sheet showing the firms that have failed. It is headed as follows:—

The following list shows eight months of false ratings by Bradstreet's and Dun, Wiman's mercantile agencies. The ratings for the first four months ending March, 1878, are taken from both Bradstreet's and Dun, Wiman's books. The last four months ending April, 1879, are taken from Dun, Wiman's very latest revised book, dated January, 1879. This list represents 557 insolvents, rated in the aggregate to be worth \$7,248,000 capital, and were kept thus falsely rated up to day of failure. Some of them had their ratings increased only a few weeks before they made an assignment. Instead of above insolvents being worth sufficient to pay their liabilities in full, and have a total capital of \$7,248,000 as the agencies represented them very few of their estates have paid as high a dividend as 50 cents on the dollar, whilst a great many of them have not had sufficient assets to pay more than 5 or 10 cents on the dollar.

I merely mention this to show the unreliability of the information given. And I have given you the reason for its unreliability. The information given, in the nature of things, cannot be reliable, because those who are engaged in this work are doing it for nothing and they are not likely to spend much time in ferreting out the information they ought to have in order to do justice to the parties reported upon and to the mercantile community who depend upon the agency. Let me call attention to a case that came within my own knowledge. A certain gentleman is engaged in business and paying his ordinary accounts to the wholesale men. A friend of his interested in property that is intended to belong to this man's wife, makes an assignment of the property to him, he not paying out anything or investing in the property a single dollar. But it is reported to one of the agencies that this gentleman is engaging in another line of business, and is using his capital to buy property. His creditors come upon him and force him to pay. He is put into court. When he inquires why this is done, seeing that he has been paying his accounts as well as usual and has not heard any complaint, the answer is: You are speculating in property, and we cannot allow you to invest your money in any outside business while you owe money to the wholesale houses. Upon further inquiry, he learns that the information was furnished to the agency by an irresponsible representative who is a rival in business, and did not take the pains to ascertain the facts. The man might have been driven into insolvency as a result of this incorrect information, when, had correct information been given, his credit ought to have been much stronger on account of the property being made over to him. Then take the case of Carsley & Co., which passed through two courts. A gentleman in the city of Toronto, a commercial traveller, stated to one of the agents that the paper of Carsley & Co. had been refused

renewal in the old country. I have here the pamphlet that was issued with regard to this case. It gives the history of this case, which shows the injury that these agencies may inflict upon the community. Here is a statement given by the judge, which I will read:

Now, what are the facts in this case, and will the principles of law and the precedents above cited apply? It appears, by the evidence of Joseph Priestman, manager of the company defendant in Canada residing in Toronto, that he had been informed in the beginning of May that the plaintiffs had asked or had obtained an extension of time. He wrote to the superintendent in Montreal, asking him to advise him of the currency, or whether he had any information to warrant or confirm this rumour, but received no answer. Nothing occurred during a month after, until the 16th June following, when Mr. Priestman communicated with the office in Montreal, informing the superintendent that information had been given by a creditor of Carsley in Toronto that a cable message had been received by an agent of a creditor of Carsley & Co. in London, stating that he had obtained, or asked for, an extension on liabilities of about £60,000 sterling, or \$300,000. This information had been conveyed to Mr. Priestman by a reporter of the office in Toronto named Brown. The reporter Brown has been examined, and here is what he says: "A man by the name of Toshack, manufacturers' agent, representing an English house in Toronto, told him on the morning of 16th June that he had a cable saying that Carsley & Co. were asking for an extension of time on liabilities of £60,000 sterling. Brown immediately went to Priestman to acquaint him with the information, and the latter, on the same day, conveyed it to the office in Montreal, as aforesaid. At that time no information of any kind about the plaintiffs could be found in the office in Toronto. The alleged cable never was seen, either by Brown or Priestman, who had not even the thought, which would have occurred to the mind of any man of common prudence, viz., to call upon Toshack to exhibit his cable; upon the mere information of an outsider of their office, who may have been actuated by malice, for what we know, he transmits the report to the city, where the plaintiffs are keeping their place of business. It must have been hurried by telegraph, as the circular issued by the office in Montreal is of the same date. It has been circulated among 600 persons, many of whom were not subscribers, and the words "Call at Office," was received as a danger signal, says the manager of one of the banks in this city with which the plaintiffs are doing an extensive business. Many of the subscribers called at the office for information and there they were informed by the superintendent that it was stated that plaintiffs had asked for an extension of time in England for liabilities of about \$300,000.

He goes on to give the history of this case further, and he says:

But in this present case there is more; the plaintiffs do not even guarantee the correctness of its information to the subscribers. It is so stated in plain terms in the contract; so that they may be at liberty to circulate any amount of false rumours, and still they would claim that this is a privileged communication. A trader who is not a subscriber, as is the case for the plaintiffs, might have been ruined by such false ru-

mours, and because it would have pleased the subscribers to relieve the company in a private contract of the responsibility of its own acts, we are to be told that this is a privileged communication, and that such trader must submit to a contract to which he has been no party and suffer for it. This is not and never has been the law.

Then the judge goes on to ask, What is meant by calling at the office? He asks a banker with regard to the meaning of these words, who says that he would look upon them as a danger signal, which would be understood to mean something detrimental to the credit of the persons against whose name the words were placed. Now, that only shows the power these agencies have for doing evil, doing it without the knowledge of the party injured. I will read a letter that I have from a commercial traveller of many years' experience in business, and it is a fair sample of a number of letters that I have had upon the same subject:

There are but few who really know what a dangerous and unfair thing it is for a few men under the guise of protecting the wholesale dealers and the banks, for a certain sum per annum, to have both business and private characters of hundreds of thousands completely under their control. I regard it as the most dangerous system ever established in any civilized country. The retail man is completely under their control, and at their mercy. He cannot possibly find out what is said about him, as to either character or business status, consequently if the report about him is either untrue or incorrect he has no redress and simply goes under through misrepresentation.

Seventeen years experience as a commercial traveller has convinced me of the iniquity of these agencies. I know hundreds that have been ruined by them. Who through city and village gossip, &c., of local agents of those concerns completely damned the bright future of many a decent man, we ought to know.

In 1890 a private circular was issued from one of these offices in Victoria, B.C. The board of trade took it up and animadverted on it very strongly, and the result, I believe, was a withdrawal of the report that had been made. But still it is said to have done the commercial community in that province a good deal of harm, and they did not know what was the cause of the damage to some time after. Now, I have here a clipping that I have taken from a paper in reference to Nelson, B.C.:

The mercantile agencies, like Bradstreet's and Dun, Wiman & Co.'s, are useful when they give the correct ratings. We do not know who represents these rival concerns at Nelson, but we do know that the ratings given the business men of Nelson by the Dun, Wiman agency were either made by guess work or by some one who had a personal grudge against several of our leading business men.

I am told that almost every leading business man in that place was rated so low that they were scarcely worthy of credit, notwithstanding the fact that many of the

Mr. SPROULE.

firms were financially sound, and were doing a very good business, and as likely to pay their debts as men owning millions of capital. Then, I take the case of a firm in Montreal, Messrs. H. & N. E. Hamilton, concerning whom I will read an extract from a paper:

Messrs. Henry & N. E. Hamilton, dry goods merchants, Victoria Square, through their solicitors, Geoffrion, Dorion & Allan, have entered an action for \$50,000 damages against the Bradstreet's Mercantile Agency.

It is claimed on behalf of the plaintiffs that they were rated by that agency in March last, as being worth from \$75,000 to \$100,000, their credit also being registered as good, and that at present they are entered in the books of the company as being without capital, and in "D" class, which implies a low credit.

Messrs. Hamilton say no change has taken place in their business in the meantime to justify the change in rating, and that it was due to malice; therefore, damages are claimed.

And they put the damages at \$50,000. Now, it is contended, and I believe from the circumstances that there may be some truth in it, that certain mercantile firms are kept afloat by these agencies long beyond the time they are financially sound because they happen to subscribe to the agency whose books they are taking, and therefore they get a better rating than others who do not take them. It is a fact known to some that immediately after merchants have refused to take their books, their limit of credit goes down, and the next issue of the book or sheet that comes out shows them with a much lower rating than they had during the time they took these agency books. Then, I say it must be assumed that the reason is because they are not subscribers to that mercantile agency, for as soon as the agency ceases to benefit from the firm, they reduce their limit of credit, and thereby destroy their standing in the community. Then, again, I have a letter taken from a paper with reference to commercial men in Vancouver, towards whom the agency was very unfair and unjust. It represented them individually as being worth much less than they were in fact, and as having a standing or credit much lower than they were entitled to from the business they were doing, and from the way they paid their debts. The writer of the letter I refer to is a commercial traveller, and he says:

Sir,—You have kindly permitted the views of one "Commercial Traveller" to appear in your columns, on the subject of Dun, Wiman & Co.'s unjust report of Vancouver's financial position, please grant me the same privilege. What seems to trouble agencies of this description, is publicity, not truthfulness, as they have yet shown no disposition to retract their informants unfair criticism. Why? Suppose the report referred to an individual, instead of a city, and it was in substance as incorrect, regarding his monetary affairs, and secretly furnished to his creditors, or even those he was doing business with; well, what is the result? He has no means of ascer-

taining what is said about him, and consequently is not in a position to refute it. The fact is, all thoroughly posted business men throughout both Canada and the United States are a unit in declaring this system of direct espionage, carried out as it is to-day, an outrage on the mercantile community, and the sooner they are whipped into line the better, how can either a traveller, or even resident representative keep himself so free from the prejudices of local informants and decide truthfully, when refused the information from merchants or others themselves, as it is well known that very many object, and very properly, too, being catechised by some agent with very limited experience of either business men or manners. These agencies have frequently such individuals on their staff, and I affirm, without the slightest fear of contradiction, that the future of many a hard-working, honest tradesman, and merchant, has been blighted and oft-times ruined by the colouring given to his standing and character, from information of doubtful reliability, furnished through these sources. Vancouver city is all right, her merchants have had a slight struggle, just the same as in all newly created places, but they are both holding their own and gaining ground steadily, and the progress and push of the citizens of this terminal city is worthy of imitation anywhere on this civilized globe. Let me close by simply characterising Dun, Wiman & Co.'s confidential circular a species of blackmail, which very fortunately broke out in the right spot, was cured just in time, and will be a warning for the future. Thanking you, I remain, dear sir,

Faithfully yours,

ANOTHER COMMERCIAL TRAVELLER.

Vancouver, 9th June, 1890.

I have read these letters for the purpose of giving information from men of experience, from commercial travellers, and also from the commercial agent who has managed the Dun, Wiman Agency in Toronto for twenty-three or twenty-five years, and who has an intimate knowledge of the operations. I may say that, from time to time, that gentleman has addressed the managers living in New York, to whom he has sent \$212,000 in the course of those years, and asked them to spend a little larger percentage of the earnings for the purpose of obtaining more responsible agents who would take the trouble of verifying, as far as possible, the information selected with respect to the standing of the financial community; but, in every instance, the answer came back, no. Accept the information you get, and this filled the bill whether it was from responsible or irresponsible parties, and no matter how unreliable and inaccurate it may be, and how much it may strike at the credit of any man in the community. What right has any mercantile agency, or any man, to go into any town or village, and of his own motion destroy a man's financial position and his prospects in life? He may be struggling with misfortune, but his chances may be good, and his financial outlook may be all right; but a single inaccurate report damns his future, and he does not know by whom this is done, although it is done by an irresponsible agency in New York, which is not responsible to the people

of this country, whom it has injured. But there is another matter in connection with these agencies which is very objectionable: they claim that all the information they supply is privileged. If the information supplied proves to be inaccurate, they refuse to produce the original report. A great deal of the information is not entered into books, because, in the case of a lawsuit, they are afraid these books might have to be brought into court. But these agencies place a significant mark in their reports—it is a letter. What does it mean? The explanation given is, "Call at the office;" and, when a person calls there, a word is whispered in his ear, which destroys a merchant's chance of doing business with the man who has applied for information. But the report goes beyond that, because the fact that this letter is opposite the man's name is sufficient to destroy his business reputation and financial standing, and he cannot do business until he gets a better rating. Then, these agencies are objectionable for another reason: they are collecting firms. They advertise to collect accounts. When accounts are sent to them to collect, they notify the debtor that they hold an account of which they expect settlement forthwith. If the debtor does not settle, they follow that up by a threat, to the effect that his action must affect his credit in the agency, and he must be badly rated. That is a species of blackmail which forces a man either to go under or endeavour to settle the account. Why should any association be allowed to exercise this tyrannical power over the commercial community? This power extends all over, to merchants, bankers, wholesale dealers, retail dealers, professional men and others. Men are asked by these agencies for information regarding men who are living ten or twenty miles away, and of whom they know nothing. The person from whom the inquiry is made does not look into the matter, because he is not paid for doing so, and, therefore, he replies that he knows nothing of the party except by current rumour, and, perhaps, that is incorrect or deceptive. No one will deny the value of the agencies, that they are useful to the mercantile community and to the banks, and I am very much surprised to find that boards of trade, banking institutions and some of the loan companies object to the passage of this Bill. It does not, however, seek to do away with these agencies, but to place them under proper restraint and legal control, and make them responsible for inaccurate information which damages people financially or otherwise. It compels these agencies to make stronger efforts to secure correct information. One of the clauses of the Bill is in this direction. It provides that a schedule must be sent once a year to every man whose name appears on the agency books, asking him to fill it up and report with respect to his financial standing. It may be, that very many men will refuse to

give this information ; but it does not compel the merchant, or any one else, to give a report. Many a man in business has nothing to hide, because his business is prosperous and his credit good, and he would be willing to give information with respect to his business and his financial standing, and he would much rather do this than have information supplied by some one who knows little about it, and whose information is most likely to be damaging. It may be said that some of these schedules will be incorrectly filled, and that a man is not likely to give a bad colouring to his own financial standing. The agencies, however, are not bound to accept this information as correct ; but, at least, in this way an opportunity is given to the party who is liable to be injured by the agency, to make an explanation of his financial affairs. When he has this opportunity afforded, and refuses to supply information, the agency is justified in obtaining the next best information and basing his rating on that. Then, the Bill seeks to compel these agencies to establish in every important town or village of the country a sub-agent, a man who is under their control, who is responsible for their acts, and who will endeavour to get the information as nearly correct as possible. I was told, in Toronto the other day that the agencies were doing this at the present time, but they never did it until this Bill was first introduced in the House by me a few years ago. When they saw that they were likely to be brought to book by Act of Parliament, then they tried to show that they were endeavouring to get correct information by establishing more agencies. In the large cities and towns throughout the country they have now these sub-agents, but in villages where there are a number of business men they have no agencies at all. They still depend on the old system of securing some one who will make a report for nothing. They get those persons to give them the information upon their own judgment, whether it may be biased by business jealousy or not, or whether it may be correct or not. A man in the same line of business is perhaps asked to report on his fellow-trader. I say that these men ought to be under control. This Bill does not seek to do away with the agencies, but it seeks to make these companies responsible for the operations of the business they carry on in this country. If they are foreigners, they must get a status here by the registration of these bonds, and the sureties upon these bonds are responsible for damages which may be incurred on account of incorrect or careless information given. This, Sir, is the scope of the Bill. It may be that some of its clauses will be held to be objectionable in some respects, but if so, I ask the House, when we go into Committee of the Whole, to assist me in making the measure as perfect as

Mr. SPROULE.

possible. I am not wedded to any single clause in the Bill. My sole and only aim is to bring these people under the control of the law, as I think they ought to be, and to prevent them in the future from carrying on business as carelessly as they have done in the past. If they are making large sums of money, then let them devote some of their profits for the purpose of getting correct information. Let them give the business community an opportunity of explaining their own financial position before they damn them for ever by publishing information furnished by some person who perhaps knows nothing about their business. I move, Mr. Speaker, that this Bill be read the second time.

Mr. LISTER. The Bill before the House is a very lengthy one, covering some eighteen clauses, and as the proposed legislation is of a somewhat novel character, and interesting to a very large section of people, I think it would be dangerous to allow the Bill to go into committee to-night, at all events. If my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) is determined to press the legislation this session, then it would be better to refer it to, say, the Committee on Banking and Commerce.

Mr. SPROULE. I have no objection to that at all.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. My intention was to move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. LISTER. Yes, the debate might be adjourned to-night in order to give hon. members an opportunity of considering the provisions of the Bill. A great deal can be said for and against the proposed legislation. There are no doubt many instances in which grave injustice has been done to business men throughout the country, but whether it would be wise to have the operations of these reporting associations or not, is a wide question about which a great deal could be said. As the Postmaster General states it to be his intention to move the adjournment of the debate, I shall say no more about the Bill to-night.

Mr. MCGILLIVRAY. I rise, Mr. Speaker, to second the motion of my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule). In doing so I can endorse very much of what the hon. gentleman said. The Montreal case, to which he made reference, is a well known case to every man in commercial life and in the legal profession. There was a case similar to it, and prior to it, which did not go so far in the courts as that celebrated case. I refer to the case of Todd vs. Dun, Wiman. I happened to be the solicitor for the plaintiff, and the case was brought down for trial at the Whitby Assizes, and tried before Chief Justice Cameron, who held that the words "inquire at office" were slanderous, and so it went to a jury, and we succeeded in getting a verdict. That was a case of great hardship. Mr. Todd was a mer-

chant in a village in the riding of the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar), and he met with a disaster in having his safe blown up. He had a rival in the grain business in the same village, who happened to be the local agent of one of the reporting agencies. We brought the action against him and Dun Wiman. Unfortunately the action should have been brought against him and Bradstreet, but the agency which first got the report gave the information to the other, and the court held that although Bradstreet was the first offender, yet inasmuch as Dun, Wiman got the information from Bradstreet, and reported it to their subscribers and others, Bradstreet was liable. At all events, that report had the effect of financially ruining Mr. Todd for the time being. A rich corporation such as the defendants was able to appeal against the judgment of the assize court, and the court appealed to, in opposition to the judgment of the learned chief justice, held that the pleadings were not sufficient—although that is a case in which judges disagreed—and it went off on that technicality. We were about to appeal further when we accepted a settlement from the company for a consideration, because we were no longer financially able to pursue it in the courts, we being poor and the company being rich. I do not approve of all the provisions of this Bill, nor do I think any lawyer in the House would approve of them all; but there is very much that is good in the Bill, and I think it should get to the committee stage and be perfected there. Probably the best committee to which to refer the Bill would be the Committee on Banking and Commerce as suggested by the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister), and I understand that the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) is willing the Bill should go there. I really think it is in the interests of the retail merchants and other business men of this country, that some legislation should be adopted to regulate these companies in regard to their business. When they put "inquire at office" or "call at office" opposite the name of a retail trader, they put a danger signal there on account of which no wholesale house would give that man any more credit, until they first made full investigations. In the Todd case. Eby, Blaine & Co., John Macdonald & Co., McMaster & Co., and all the leading wholesale men of Toronto were called to Whitby as witnesses when the case was tried. All held that these words, "inquiry at office," were a danger signal. Some held that they might mean that the man was hopelessly bankrupt, some that he was a bad character, some that he was, perhaps, given to too much sport and neglected his business; but all held that they constituted a danger signal, and would work injury to the man in trade, unless he was a man of considerable means. Without taking up the time of the House. I second the motion

of the hon. member for East Grey, and trust that the Bill will receive the consideration of honourable members in the committee stage.

Mr. CAMPBELL. The Bill now before the House should not, in my opinion, receive the sanction of the House. I do not think the hon. member for East Grey has given any reasons that will hold water why Parliament should pass such a Bill. Even if everything he has said against mercantile agencies were true, the Bill now before us is not worth the paper it is written on. It does not provide any remedy against the abuses which the hon. member claims now exist. But, for my part, I dissent entirely from the statements he has made. I know that in the opinion of every business man in this country, mercantile agencies are indispensable. Owing to our system of giving credit, it is impossible for any business man to get along without such reports as are furnished by Bradstreet's or Dun-Wiman.

Mr. SPROULE. The Bill does not seek to do away with them at all.

Mr. CAMPBELL. The value of these reports depends entirely upon their accuracy, and I contend that the reports of either Dun-Wiman or Bradstreet's are as accurate as it is possible to get them. It is impossible all the time to get perfectly accurate accounts of a man's standing. This Bill provides that the agencies are to send out schedules which every man in business is to fill up, stating what he is worth, and everything else that is required. A great many men will not fill out these schedules at all; but, suppose they do, you know how they will fill them out. Every man naturally wants to make himself out to be as wealthy and trustworthy as possible, and it is only natural that these schedules will be filled out in altogether too glowing colours.

Mr. MCGILLIVRAY. Let the company verify that.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Then you come down to just what the company are doing now. How do they verify the reports now? They consult, not one man only, but the best men in every town and city.

Mr. SPROULE. That is not correct.

Mr. CAMPBELL. They do not confine themselves to one man or to two men, but they consult the bankers, and the men of standing and character, generally, in the community, so that their reports may be corroborated before they are entered on their books. The aim of Bradstreet's or Dun, Wiman is always to report a man a little lower than he really is worth. They want to be on the safe side, so as not to mislead any one.

Mr. SPROULE. In their books a man is often rated a good deal higher than he is worth.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Well, it is impossible to get accurate statement in regard to every man's business. But the whole value of these reports depends on their accuracy. They are not worth anything unless they are as accurate as they can be made, and I believe, on the whole, they are. Look at the enormous work it is to get out these reports. Bradstreet's and Dun, Wiman issue four books every year, and in preparing each book they have to go to every man doing business in this broad Dominion and find out his standing, and verify it every three months.

Mr. SPROULE. No, only once a year.

Mr. CAMPBELL. In addition to that, they send out weekly reports, showing those who have failed, those who have gone out of business, those who have given chattel mortgages, those who have been sued, and against whom judgments have been recorded—valuable information which it is utterly impossible for the business community to get along without. Therefore, I say we should be very careful about hampering or restricting these agencies. I do not believe there is any more important work in the Dominion of Canada to-day, so far as the business community are concerned, than the reports of the mercantile agencies. My hon. friend says that they do not spend a hundred dollars in getting out these reports—that they do not cost them a cent. It does not matter to us whether they get them for nothing or pay a thousand dollars for them. But I can tell my hon. friend that they do not get them for nothing. I believe the rule is to furnish their books to the principal banks, free, in consideration of their getting information from the banks.

Mr. SPROULE. They do not give the books to the banks or to any others unless they pay for them.

Mr. MCGILLIVRAY. I have been their agent for a good many years, and I did not get the books.

Mr. CAMPBELL. You are a lawyer, and I do not suppose they give them to lawyers.

Mr. SPROULE. I am speaking of what I know, when I say they do not give their books for nothing.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I do not suppose they give them to lawyers or to doctors, either. But whether they give them for nothing or not, I know that the information contained in these books is most valuable to the commercial community. When a man starts in business, I want to know his character, and what he is worth. I apply to the mercantile agency for a report as to his

Mr. CAMPBELL.

standing, and if they have not a report, if it is a case of urgency, they wire for the information to their correspondent or responsible adviser in the town where the man does business, and they are thus able to furnish me, in a short time, with the information I desire.

Mr. SPROULE. They can still do that under this Bill.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I know that there is scarcely a city or town in the Dominion which has not representatives of both Bradstreet's and Dun, Wiman residing; and this is absolutely necessary in business, because changes are constantly going on, and business men require to know of them as soon as they are made. With regard to their power to ruin the moral or financial standing of any man, I do not think that enters into the question at all. These agencies are business firms, and their business is to furnish accurate and reliable reports of the standing and moral worth of every business man in the community. That is what we want; that is what we cannot get along without; and the more accurate and reliable they make their reports, the more we want them. For these reasons, I think the Bill proposes to interfere with a matter which we have no business to interfere with. I do not think any case has been made out of a man having been injured. Perhaps, sometimes, a man may be rated too low, but that cannot always be avoided. As to the rule of noting to "inquire at office," in regard to certain persons, I know that if you take up Bradstreet's or Dun, Wiman's book for the Dominion of Canada, you will find that that is done in only a very few instances. Now, there may be certain reasons for that. A man may be speculating on the quiet, he may be engaged in business that would render him unworthy of confidence.

Mr. SPROULE. What about Carsley's case, which I cited? He was good for \$400,000 credit.

Mr. CAMPBELL (Kent). I do not pretend to say that these men never make mistakes, but you must look at the thing as a whole, and I say that, as a whole, you would not find any bankers, merchants or business men asking for a law of this kind. Therefore, I think the Government should consider well before allowing it to become law. If it should become law, and I hope it will not, it should have first most serious and careful consideration. I do not consider that the hon. gentleman's Bill is worth anything at all. These associations send out their schedules, and they are filled out, and all that the hon. gentleman's Bill provides is, that, if any agent makes wilfully a false statement, he shall be subject to a fine. There is not a mercantile agent at all who would make a wilfully false statement, and, therefore, I do not think this Bill would be effective.

Mr. STAIRS. I agree very generally with what has been said by the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister). This is a Bill of a very novel character, and I agree in his suggestion that it should be referred, possibly, to the Committee on Banking and Commerce. I agree very largely, also, in what has been said by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), in support of the Bill, although, singularly enough, I have arrived at a very different conclusion. I only rise for the purpose of suggesting that very great caution should be exercised in dealing with this matter. Though I agree with the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), I think it would be a pity for this House to pass a Bill of this nature; and I think so more because I agree with him than otherwise, for I foresee that it will not have a tendency to cure the evils of which he complains, but rather to intensify them. I may be mistaken, for I have not given very much consideration to the Bill, and, of course, am open to conviction, if the Bill goes to the proper committee; but I think it would be a great mistake for us to embody in an Act of Parliament any legislation that may have a tendency to give character and standing to a class of business of this kind which has many objectionable features, because I am afraid that the effect would be to induce people to place more dependence on these reports. My own idea of matters of this kind is that it is better to let the business men of Canada and these associations fight it out among themselves, and I do not believe it will be very many years before they will settle among themselves what it is best to do. If we should pass this Bill this session, we will be constantly afterwards amending it, so as to make it more reasonable and make the actions of these mercantile agencies less injurious to the business community, and I do not believe that we can by legislation cure the evils of which the hon. gentleman complains. Of course this is a question of opinion, and I am open to conviction; but we should be very careful before we pass any measure of this kind, in seeing that we do not attempt to do anything which we cannot succeed in accomplishing.

Mr. WALLACE. I am sure that the mercantile agencies will be delighted when they read the excellent certificate given them by the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Campbell). According to him, they are the most exemplary class of men in the community. He says that the mercantile agencies are indispensable to the business men of the community. Well, a similar statement was made by the promoter of the Bill. He did not seek to do away with these agencies, but simply to remove the evils which everybody who has examined into the question must admit have grown up under them. The hon. gentleman said that the information they gave was as correct as it was possible for them to give,

and he said this in the face of a statement which he could not contradict, that in the last six or eight months, of 557 failures occurring in Canada, all these men who failed were represented as having combined capital of between seven and eight million dollars. And yet these 557 became bankrupt and paid far less than 50 cents on the dollar. If that be the most correct information possible to give, I for my part must say that greater inaccuracy could not be imagined. The very clause to which the hon. gentleman objects, that of providing security, will, I contend, be one of the best means for ensuring greater accuracy. Under the present system followed by these associations, each man's business record is given by somebody else. Now, who can tell a man's business affairs as well as the man himself, and he is given an opportunity under this Bill to state his own case. These associations are not compelled to accept that statement, but they can verify it or have it contradicted by other evidence; but in justice to the individual, the proposition is one which will commend itself to members of this House, that an opportunity should be given to him to make a statement for himself.

Mr. CAMPBELL (Kent). They do that now.

Mr. WALLACE. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon, they do not. The hon. gentleman made another statement. He said that these agents visit every business man four times a year. They may, in some cases, but not in the town from which I come.

Mr. CAMPBELL (Kent). They prepare four books every year.

Mr. WALLACE. And their books, year after year, are not changed. In the town where I live I guarantee that the four reports do not vary one letter in the line a year. They only go once per annum at the utmost, and sometimes once in two years, but most frequently only once a year. The hon. gentleman says that they visit every man at these particular periods. Nothing of the kind. They go to one man in our town, and he gives information to the best of his ability, and they go to no other. Their agent goes to but one man.

Mr. CAMPBELL (Kent). And you say there are no changes?

Mr. WALLACE. There are changes made once a year, but not four times, as the hon. gentleman stated. Take the reports of that town year after year, and you will find no changes made except once a year, and sometimes perhaps not that even. I say further that every man should get an opportunity of stating his own case at any rate. The bankers give him that opportunity. You go for a line of credit to a bank, and you are asked to make a statement. You write

down your record, your probable worth, the probable extent of your business, your investments of various kinds, and all these things. Who can give that information as well as the man himself? And he has a responsibility attaching to him when he makes that statement, which I consider is, at any rate, a valuable record and one that we should require. The hon. gentleman says that no one is asking for this Bill. How does he know that? We know that there is a good deal of terrorism exercised by these mercantile agencies; that business men who have lines of credit do not wish to jeopardize their positions by coming into open hostility with these concerns, which have the power of ruining them. They have ruined men, and where they cannot ruin they have the power to injure by lowering a man's credit. And so even where not ruinous, it may be undesirable to antagonize these mercantile agencies. It may be for that reason that there are not petitions, that there is not a demand that a Bill of this character should become law. But we know that there is the necessity for restraining these gentlemen; we know that there is a necessity where these institutions exist—and where properly conducted they supply information that is valuable for the business community—that they should have restrictions placed upon them, that they should be made responsible for what they do, and that a certain control of them should be exercised. And that is what is proposed by this Bill. It may be said that the clauses of this Bill are not best calculated to accomplish the end in view. But let the Bill pass its second reading and go before the Committee of Banking and Commerce, which is an experienced committee, where the clauses can be analysed and where a Bill will be produced that will accomplish the result desired in the best way, a Bill that it will be desirable to place on the statute-book of Canada.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The debate which has lasted for some time is a most interesting one and is an evidence of the importance of the legislation which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) has introduced. I venture the opinion that it is a most important Bill that is now before us, and I hold that, even admitting, as I do admit, that there is a great deal of good in the measure as proposed, I am not prepared at the present moment to say that it is in such shape that it deserves to receive the approbation of Parliament. For this reason, and more especially as the Minister of Justice is not present, I would ask that the debate be adjourned. Before the second reading is agreed to and the principles of the Bill thereby affirmed, I think that the measure should be looked into very carefully, and that the opinion of the Minister of Justice should be heard. Under these circumstances I propose the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. WALLACE.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON moved the adjournment of the House.

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 27th February, 1896.

The **SPEAKER** took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

CATHOLIC SCHOOLS IN THE NORTH-WEST.

Mr. GUAY (for Mr. Choquette) asked :

1. Whether the Government are aware that the late Sir John Thompson received the following letter :—

St. Albert, March 5, 1892.

To the Hon. Sir John Thompson,
Minister of Justice.

Hon. and dear Sir,—Has the legislature of the North-west the right to impose on us, in our Catholic schools, Protestant inspectors? You would confer a great favour on us, dear sir, if you would kindly state to us, in confidence, what you think on this subject. The object is to destroy our separate and Catholic schools in the North-west, and finding it impossible to do away with them completely, at present, our legislators, the great majority of whom are Protestants, are determined at any price to prevent them from working. It is with that view that they now want to thrust upon us Protestant inspectors.

Accept, hon. and dear sir, the assurance of our cordial and devoted respect.

(Signed) VITAL, J., O.M.I.

Bp. of St. Albert.

ALBERT PASCAL, O.M.I.,

Vic. Ap. of Saskatchewan.

2. If so, what reply, if any, did the Government make to the said letter; or are the Government aware whether the late Sir John Thompson, then Minister of Justice, replied to the said letter, either in his own name or on behalf of the Government?

Mr. DICKEY. The Government has no knowledge of any such correspondence.

HARBOUR MASTER AT BRIDGE-WATER.

Mr. LANDERKIN (for Mr. Forbes) asked:

Why was Joseph Wyman dismissed from the position of harbour master for the port of Bridgewater? What complaints (if any) were made against his efficiency as harbour master? Who made such complaints?

Mr. COSTIGAN. It was represented to the department by the member for the district that, owing to age and infirmity, Mr. Wy-

man, who did not reside near the place, was unable to perform the duties of harbour master, and Mr. William Oakes was appointed harbour master in his stead by Order in Council of 28th January last. Mr. Wyman is 78 years old.

COMMUNICATION BETWEEN PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND AND MAINLAND.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) asked :

1. On what days has the SS. "Stanley" crossed from Prince Edward Island to the mainland since the 20th day of January last ?

2. How often have the mails been taken across at the Capes route since the 20th day of January ?

Mr. COSTIGAN. 1. January 24 and 29 ; February 3, 5, 10, 12, 15 and 24. 2. January 25, 29, 30 and 31 ; and February 1, 4, 6, 9, 12, 13, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22 and 24. Seventeen times up to 24th February, from Tormentine to Prince Edward Island.

ALLAN McBEATH, APPRAISER.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) asked :

Has Allan McBeath, of St. John, N.B., appraiser, been superannuated ? If so, when, and why, and what allowance does he receive yearly ?

Who has been appointed to fill his late position ? When appointed, and at what salary ? Has a petition been received from a number of St. John merchants asking for Mr. McBeath's reinstatement ?

Mr. WOOD. Allan McBeath, appraiser at St. John, N.B., was superannuated on January 10th, 1896, on account of advanced age, on a retiring allowance of \$528 per annum, to which he is entitled under the Act. He has been recalled, and he is now acting as appraiser. A petition has been received from a number of St. John merchants asking for Mr. McBeath's reinstatement.

JAMES KELLY AND JAMES H. HAMILTON.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) asked :

Has James Kelly, of St. John, N.B., been appointed to any and what position in the Civil Service ? If so, at what salary ? Is he now in the employ of the Government ? If so, in what position and at what salary ?

Is James H. Hamilton, of St. John, in the Government employ ? If so, in what capacity, at what salary, and since when ?

Have either James Kelly or James H. Hamilton passed the Civil Service examination, and if so, when ?

Mr. WOOD. James Kelly has been appointed a preventive officer of customs, at a salary of \$1,000 per annum, and is now in the employ of the Government. Mr. Hamilton is not in the employ of the Government. No examination was necessary in the case of James Kelly.

MAIL CONTRACTS—CHRISTMAS ISLAND, &c.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) asked :

Under what arrangements or contracts are the mails carried between Christmas Island, Cape Breton and East Bay, and between Christmas Island and Grand Narrows ?

When were the contracts entered into, and with whom and what is payable for each service ?

Were tenders called for by public notice before contracts were entered into ? If so, when were the notices published ?

Who is the contractor for each service ? How long is the contract for, and what is paid to him respectively for each contract ?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Carriage between Christmas Island and East Bay is performed under a temporary agreement. Carriage between Christmas Island, Grand Narrows, is performed under a regular contract. The agreement for the Christmas Island and East Bay mail service is dated March 1, 1895. With John McDonald, \$4 per trip. The contract for the Christmas Island and Grand Narrows service is dated October 1, 1892. With James McDougall, \$150 per annum. Tenders were not invited in either case. John McDonald is contractor for the former service, and James McDougall for the latter service. The agreement for the Christmas Island and East Bay mail service is to last during the Postmaster General's pleasure ; the contract for the Christmas Island and Grand Narrows is for four years. \$624 per annum is paid for the former contract, and \$150 per annum for the latter.

HARRIS PROPERTY, ST. JOHN, N.B.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) asked :

What is the total sum to date paid for the purchase of the Harris property for the Intercolonial Railway in St. John, N.B. ? Has any, and what amount has been received from the sale of any buildings, bricks, iron or other moveable property on the land when purchased ? If not sold, what has become of the houses, bricks, iron, &c., on the property when purchased, and if sold, to whom ? What amount has been expended on such property since purchased ? What is the nature of the improvements, and how is the property now used ?

Mr. HAGGART. The total amount paid for the purchase of the Harris property, to date, is \$200,000. The only thing sold off the property were the sashes out of the roof of the shed, as they were not required. They were sold by public auction, and were bought by H. A. Gould, of Sussex, for \$52.28. Three of the houses are occupied as tenements, for which the Government receive rental. Part of the old brick and wooden buildings have been taken down, and the material used in other buildings, or stored away for future use. The expenditure on the property since purchased, is \$3,025.23, and for building the crib-work to make it more convenient for approach to

the property, there was expended \$2,920.07. Three of the large car shops were refitted, and additional railway sidings were laid. These buildings and sidings are used for storing passenger cars, snow-ploughs, and other rolling stock.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. WELDON. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to read a sentence from the daily "Mail-Empire," of Wednesday, 26th inst.:

It has been no secret that owing to a long-standing quarrel, the personal relations of Dr. Weldon and Sir Charles Tupper have, since 1887, been somewhat strained, yet it was never supposed that this would lead him to seek to compass the destruction of a man who has for forty years served this country.

I wish to say, if there is a long-standing personal quarrel, I do not know it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am equally ignorant of it, Mr. Speaker.

SEED-GRAIN STANDARDS.

Mr. DAVIN. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to ask my hon. friend, the Controller of Inland Revenue, whether a petition has come from Portage la Prairie, from the Patrons there, to His Excellency, respecting seed-grain standards, and whether it will be laid on the Table?

Mr. PRIOR. I may say to the hon. gentleman that such a petition has been received.

SUPPLY—THE BUDGET.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Foster:

That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go again into Committee of Supply.

Mr. STAIRS. Before I commence the brief remarks on the Budget which I intend to make this afternoon, I will make one promise, and that is that I will not take up so much of the time of the House as was taken by some hon. gentlemen who preceded me in this debate. I think, if I may say so, that it is very desirable, indeed, that hon. members on both sides should cultivate the practice of making short speeches and not long ones, if they wish their speeches to be attentively listened to in the House, and read with interest outside. Now, I want to say, besides, that I am making these few remarks this afternoon because I believe that hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, in criticising any statement connected with any of the great industries of this country, wish, doubtless, to be accurate, and I feel sure that in cases in which they have been inadvertently inaccurate, they themselves would be the first persons who would desire to be corrected. In my remarks this afternoon, I intend to speak of what I know.

Mr. HAGGART.

and, as in the course of the remarks that were made by the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) and for Addington (Mr. Dawson), they referred to an industry of which I know a good deal about, and made some statements which, I am sorry to say, are not according to the facts, it is but fair to that great industry that the House should be put in possession of the facts. I will take up a remark that was first made respecting the sugar industry in this country, by the hon. member for North Wellington. He introduced his remarks on that subject by some very brief quotations from the Trade and Navigation Returns for the fiscal year 1894-95. He said:

Now, let us take the case of sugar. From the 3rd May, 1895, when the duty upon sugar was increased, to 30th June, 1895, the end of the fiscal year, we imported sugar entered for home consumption—according to the Trade and Navigation Returns, page 221—to the amount of 36,216,286 pounds, the value of which was \$648,610. The duty collected was \$181,081.78, or 28 per cent. According to the Trade and Navigation Returns, page 280, we imported, of free sugar, from 1st July, 1894, to 3rd May, 1895, 309,302,296 pounds, value, \$6,703,359.

And he goes on to make a charge against the refiners of this country that \$1,855,815 in profits was made by the refiners of Canada. In making the statement I do I am speaking of what I know, and I assert most positively that this is not the case. I know it because I happen to be connected with a refinery and I have access to these statements of their business during that period, and also for many years past, and I can assure this House that no such profit was made. If the hon. gentleman's statement was true that that amount of money had been made by the refiners in that period, the company with which I am connected would have received, roughly speaking, about one-third of this sum. The refinery with which I am connected made nothing at all during that particular period, the fiscal year of 1894-95. That I shall show a little later in connection with my reply to something said by the hon. member for Addington (Mr. Dawson).

Mr. WALLACE. For what is the stock of the company selling?

Mr. STAIRS. I will tell the hon. gentleman this, that the company with which I am connected, into which three refineries in the maritime provinces have been united, made a profit in round figures of 6 per cent on the value of the refineries, which every hon. gentleman will admit is not an unreasonable profit. As regards the preferential stock, I do not know exactly what the stock is quoted at. It has been sold as low as 50, and from that to 90, and perhaps on rare occasions at par, for the two different stocks, that is to say, that a man who pays 50 receives one \$100 share of preferential stock and one \$100 share of

common stock, which the hon. gentleman will see is not exceedingly high.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Does the hon. gentleman mean 6 per cent on the actual cost to the existing company?

Mr. STAIRS. To some of the company it is, and to some it is not. What I mean to say is 6 per cent on what the refineries cost in cash when built.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Originally?

Mr. STAIRS. Originally. The hon. gentleman will say that that is not excessive.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I am not saying whether it is excessive or not. I want to get the facts.

Mr. STAIRS. That is 6 per cent on the actual cost. It will be remembered by some hon. gentlemen that one of the refineries had to wind-up and be reorganized, and after its reorganization it was taken over at a lower figure than it cost. I have just been told—and I give this in reply to the question asked by the member for West York (Mr. Wallace) that \$80 had been paid lately for \$100 in preference stock and \$100 in common stock. If hon. gentlemen will look at the prices during the period referred to by the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), they will find that they show conclusively that refined sugar, taking everything into consideration, has been sold as cheaply in Canada as the same qualities have been sold anywhere, either in England or the United States; and if hon. gentlemen will take the difference between the prices of raw sugar and refined sugar in England and the United States, and compare those figures with similar figures in Canada, they will see that they show that the refineries in Canada are not taking any portion of the 64-100 of one cent referred to by the hon. gentleman. Then the hon. gentleman took up another phase of the question.

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. gentleman has challenged the statement made by me with respect to the profits made by the refineries. I would ask him what answer he can give to the statement made by the refineries themselves as set out in the census. He will find at page 323, vol. III., book C, of the census that they admit over their own signatures that they made a profit of 21 per cent.

Mr. STAIRS. If the hon. gentleman will permit me, I will come to that in a few minutes, and when I give my answer he will learn that the refineries did not make any such statement, and so the hon. gentleman's assertion is inaccurate. But I think it better to proceed with my remarks rather than answer the hon. gentleman at the present time. I was going on to say that the hon. gentleman (Mr. McMullen) then took up another phase of the question, and he told the House that the refineries

had, on May 3rd, 150,000,000 pounds of raw sugar on hand. I am sorry to tell the hon. gentleman that such statement is not absolutely correct, the figures are very largely exaggerated. I want to say in this connection that the Government could not have chosen any time for the imposition of a duty on raw sugar without benefit accruing to the refiners and to all holders of sugar in Canada; and I assert most emphatically that for the imposition of a duty on sugar the Government could not, in spite of what has been said by the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), have chosen a better time, even if they had sought the very best time, because at that period the smallest stocks were held. I will give the reason why no better time could have been selected. Just at that time navigation was opening at Montreal. As will easily be understood, Montreal refiners during the winter season import very small quantities of raw sugar, because they have to pay extra railway freight on it. They allow the stocks, before the opening of navigation, to run down to the smallest possible limit they can risk, and the time the duty was imposed the Montreal refiners had small stocks, and had brought in practically no raw sugar at all. It is quite true that the refineries in Halifax had more raw sugar on hand than sometime, but not so much as they might have had, and not so much as they would have had. I am convinced, if I had not been of the opinion that no duty would be imposed, I have no objection to tell the House what took place at that time. In the early part of the winter, naturally enough, the refiners of Halifax thought that if the Government wanted any more revenue, they would take sugar as one of the articles upon which to impose additional taxation. If raw sugar had been very high at that time, it would not have been safe to import very much, but raw sugar just then was very low, and they felt justified in anticipating their wants during the next few months, and they imported a little more than they otherwise would have done. Sugar was low, lower than it ever has been, and if the duty went on it they would receive a certain amount of profit, and if the duty was not imposed, raw sugar was so low that they could not lose anything. I may say to the House that I was not so strongly of the opinion as were some of my co-directors at Halifax that an imposition of duty would take place, and very late in the spring, when it became a question as to whether the duties would be imposed or not, they asked my opinion, and I said I believed that a duty would not be imposed, and we cancelled some very large orders for raw sugar, which, had they been allowed to be executed, would have arrived in Canada before the duty was imposed. There is, therefore, nothing in this transaction which in any way reflects either upon the refineries or upon the Government. I

may say, Mr. Speaker, in addition, that though the refinery at Halifax had a considerable quantity of raw sugar in hand at that time, yet they had not any larger quantity than they have had at some other times, nor larger quantities than they may have had since. There is another thing which has to be taken into consideration in this connection. The refiners did not by any means get the full benefit of the raw sugar which they had in hand when the duty was imposed, because, so doubtful were they as to whether that duty would be imposed or not, that during the few months preceding, all the refineries in Canada had sold very large quantities of refined sugar for delivery at later dates. The benefit accrued, not to the refiners when the duty was imposed, but to the dealers, and in a very considerable degree, to the consumers as well. As a matter of fact, it was not until some time after the duty had been imposed, that refined sugar really advanced in price correspondingly to the advance made necessary by the duty. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I would not be at all surprised if the imposition of that duty upon raw sugar was not a gain; but possibly a loss to some of the refiners. I feel certain that the most liberal calculation that could be made would not show that the refiners benefited to one-fifth of the amount that is claimed by the hon. member (Mr. McMullen) who made this statement. He estimated that the refiners had obtained an advantage of an entire half cent a pound on the 150,000,000 pounds of raw sugar which he said they had in hand at that time. Well, Sir, I do not believe that the refiners had one-fifth of that benefit. Now, then, Mr. Speaker, let us see how the figures really are. The hon. gentleman told us that the refiners made \$1,855,813.77—I notice the hon. gentleman (Mr. McMullen) figured it down to a very fine point in cents; much finer than I could estimate it—and that they also made \$750,000, the advantage which he said accrued on the duty, making \$2,605,813.77. He then adds the duty which was paid upon the sugar which came in between May and the close of the fiscal year, making in all \$2,786,885.55, which he stated the people paid. From what I have said before the House will see that none at all of this was paid by the people, except the duty actually paid to the Government, and that instead of the \$16.40 paid in protection, of which he stated \$1 only went to the Dominion treasury, and \$15.40 into the pockets of the refiners; if he had properly made the calculation he would have had to admit the refiners did not receive the \$1. I would furthermore say, in reply to that hon. gentleman, that the \$750,000 was not imposed as protection, and that the refiners did not get it. Even if they did get it I claim it would be quite legitimate. As an evidence that some at least of the refiners did not expect the change in duty, and that others of them were not very sure about it, I repeat

Mr. STAIRS.

that they sold refined sugar to a large extent before the duty was imposed; for delivery at later dates in the season of 1895. If they had got any part of the \$750,000, it was quite justifiable. It was a class of profit which might be made when increased duties are imposed on any articles, and it would not more than counterbalance the risk that refiners run when duties are reduced. It must be remembered that refiners have to take the risk of duties being reduced as well as of duties being increased, and if they benefit occasionally in one way, they lose very often in the other. As I said before, I doubt if the refiners got a one-fifth part of the \$750,000 mentioned by the hon. gentleman, and they did not get the \$1,855,813.77 or any portion of it. The hon. gentleman did not prove his statement, nor could he prove it. But, I am in a position to make this declaration of my own knowledge. Having had access to the financial statements issued by the refinery, I say here that they did not make anything. I believe, Sir, that taking the question of quality into consideration, the people of Canada during the operation of the National Policy, have had their sugar at as cheap a price as the people of any country in the world. Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman (Mr. McMullen) just asked me to explain about the statement given by the refiners in the census return.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Do I understand the hon. gentleman (Mr. Stairs) to say, that the people of Canada get their sugar as cheaply as any people in the world?

Mr. STAIRS. I believe they do. I would qualify that by saying: taking into consideration the quality of the sugar and the terms and conditions under which it is sold. Now, let us see what the census says. The hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) said: that the Government's own statement (meaning the census returns) corroborated the statement which he had previously made, and to which I have already referred. He told us: the census returns of 1891 would show that there were eight refineries in Canada, that the total capital invested in them and employed in conducting the business was \$5,922,400, and that the wages paid was \$709,811. Now, the hon. member (Mr. McMullen) told us a few minutes ago, that taking the statement of the refiners themselves, they make a large profit. Well, when I go on a little further he will see that the refiners did not state any such thing. The hon. gentleman also said: That the raw material as shown by the census returns cost \$15,023,500, making a total cost including wages of \$15,733,311, and that the output as given by the companies, amounted to \$17,127,100 worth, leaving a net balance of \$1,393,789, or say 22 per cent interest on the investment of \$5,952,400. The hon. gentleman then suggested that we should allow 5 per cent for

wear and tear, which would leave a net profit of 17 per cent. I notice that the hon. gentleman then asked the Minister of Finance to point out where the money comes from.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I cannot help saying here, that the hon. member's figures are correctly quoted from the census, but I would like to ask him how he comes to discuss a question of this kind, which I must say—and I do not say it in any offensive sense at all—he does not know anything about.

Mr. McMULLEN. I took the statement from the census returns and I gave it as the authentic statement of the refiners themselves. The question that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Stairs) wants to answer, is, as to the statement of the refiners, and not my statement.

Mr. STAIRS. I admit that the statement so far as it goes, is true, but the hon. gentleman takes the statement to prove something that it does not pretend to prove. The statement never said, that the cost of refining sugar in Canada was the cost of the wages and the cost of the raw material only.

Mr. McMULLEN. It says so distinctly.

Mr. STAIRS. Does it. If the hon. member (Mr. McMullen) refers to the census returns he will find there certain columns giving the raw material, wages, output, &c. But, does the hon. member mean to say that the cost of making sugar is only the cost of wages, and the raw sugar.

Mr. McMULLEN. Certainly not, but there is 21 per cent interest on the entire investment, including the wages paid to those employed in refining.

Mr. STAIRS. If the hon. member cannot see it, I feel sure that a good many members on the other side will see where he is out before I get through. I do not, in any sense, blame the hon. member for not knowing the facts. It is not to be expected that in a technical matter he will know the facts; but I do think I am justified in saying that when he was not absolutely certain of his facts, he should not have taken them to prove the statements he made, when they did not prove them, and were never intended to prove them. Let me repeat. The hon. member calculates a profit of \$1,393,789, or 22 per cent gross on the fixed capital employed, and he assumes that the only cost of refining sugar is the cost of wages and the cost of the raw sugar. He overlooks altogether the cost of char, of coal, of the barrels, of repairs, of insurance, of sundries, and commercial and selling expenses. Now, let me point out how the calculation should have been made. Excluding the interest on capital, the items which I have just mentioned amount, roughly speaking, to just four times the

cost of the labour. No, I do not mean to say that, but three times the cost of the labour.

Mr. McMULLEN. You might as well say that as say what you are saying.

Mr. STAIRS. Does the hon. gentleman mean to tell the House—he is quite welcome to do it if he likes—that you can refine sugar without char, without coal, without barrels to put it into, without repairs to the machinery, without insuring the refineries, and the stock, without paying brokers' commissions and other selling expenses, and the salaries of clerks and book-keepers? If he means to say that, he is free to do it; but I think most hon. members on his own side would admit that it is a very unreasonable position to take. I say these items amount, roughly speaking, to about three times the cost of the labour. Now, let us see how the calculation stands, and I freely confess that I am not making it mathematically exact, but I am giving a very fair approximation. The wages, as given by the census returns, amount to \$709,711, the items which I have given would amount to three times that much, or \$2,129,134; the cost of the raw material, as given in the census returns, is \$15,023,500, making a total of \$17,862,744, as the approximate cost of making the sugar, instead of \$15,733,311, as given by the hon. gentleman. The output, as given by the census returns, is \$17,127,100, leaving a loss on the year's business of \$735,644, instead of a profit of over \$1,300,000, as claimed by the hon. gentleman, or a loss of about 12½ per cent gross on the capital employed, as given in the census returns, instead of a profit of 22 per cent, as claimed by the hon. gentleman. This is based on the hon. gentleman's own figures, including these unavoidable expenses which I have mentioned, and without which the sugar cannot be refined. If these expenses, besides wages, are incurred in refining sugar, why not include them?

Now, I want briefly to refer to some remarks made on sugar by the hon. member for Addington (Mr. Dawson). Some of his remarks I have already answered, and possibly I may repeat again what I have already stated; but I trust, as I shall not be long, that the House will bear with me for a few minutes. One of the remarks of the hon. member to which I want specially to refer is his charge that there is a monopoly in sugar refining in Canada to-day, and that the refiners of Canada have combined in one undertaking. I desire to deny that most emphatically. There is no monopoly in sugar refining in Canada to-day. The competition between the refineries in Canada to-day is more keen than it ever was before. It is more keen—and I am glad to be able to say it—than it was before the refineries in the maritime provinces were amalgamated into one company. The hon. member asked why we cannot refine sugar

as cheaply in Canada as it is refined elsewhere. I think we can; I feel sure we can, if you make very slight allowances for differences in conditions and differences in products. The products we make in Canada are a little different from those made in England. He tells us that we have a right to add to the price the amount of revenue duty, and that sugar should be sold in Canada at Liverpool prices, with the duty added, and no more. He went very fully into quotations of the prices of granulated sugar in London, and the prices in Montreal, for a considerable period. I am not going to follow him all through those figures, but I am going to point out some circumstances that have to be taken into consideration when you make a comparison of this kind. In comparing sugar made in Canada with sugar made in England, you have to make allowance for the difference in the package. The package used in Canada is much more expensive than the package used in England. Our people, it seems, are very much more particular than people are in England as to the package in which the sugar is delivered. They want every pound of sugar sold in Canada, with very little exception, to be packed in new barrels that have never been used before. In England, they use very largely the old packages in which the raw sugar was received. Our people would not take sugar in those packages at all. Then, there is some difference in the quality of the sugar made. The Canadian granulated, especially, is better than the English granulated. There is also some difference in the terms, and in the cost of freightage. Then, there is another little item—not a very large one, but one that ought to be taken into consideration—that is, the loss in weight in the process of refining, and the corresponding loss of duty. The refiners pay 50 cents on every hundred pounds of sugar they get, no matter what its quality may be—on the low test as well as on the high test. The average test of the sugar imported into Canada is, of course, very far below 100. One hundred is about the test of granulated sugar. It will take a great deal more than 100 pounds of raw sugar of the average test imported into Canada to make 100 pounds of granulated; and some allowance—not very much, but still something—has to be made for that difference. Then, when you take the prices in the newspapers, the Montreal "Gazette," or other papers, I do not believe that you get the very lowest prices at which the articles are selling. Some allowance has to be made for that. To prove that, I may say that the retail price of granulated sugar is very often nearly, if not quite as low, as the prices at which the refiners are selling it. No doubt, the refiners sell sugar a good deal lower sometimes than the prices quoted in the papers. These are some of the things that have to be taken into account when making

Mr. STAIRS.

a comparison of this kind. They show that it is almost impossible, by comparisons of this kind, to prove anything about the profits that any industry is making in Canada.

Then, there is another fact connected with the refining of sugar which has to be taken into consideration, when you make a comparison. The English refiners use beet sugar almost altogether; the Canadian refiners use cane sugar with a very low proportion of beet sugar. You can always refine at a lower cost sugar made out of beet than out of cane, but you cannot get as good results, especially in the making of yellow sugar. You cannot put beet sugar very generally into the making of yellow sugar.

I feel confident that, if the protection on sugar were reduced in Canada, at some periods, not perhaps all periods, the refiners in Canada would not be able to work and would have to close down. The American refiners would, at some periods, take hold of this market, and the German refiners would also perhaps flood it with their very cheap beet sugar, and our refineries would be obliged to close down temporarily, men would be thrown out of work, and a very large amount of wages lost in Canada. The amount of wages given in the census, as paid by the sugar refiners, does not show anything like the real amount paid indirectly, as well as directly, in that industry. There is a very large amount paid for barrels, and a great many incidental expenses, a very large proportion of which is really paid out for labour, and which is not mentioned in the census.

I think I am entitled, when speaking on a question of this kind, to ask the hon. member for Addington (Mr. Dawson), who spoke of monopolies and combines in this industry, what evidence he has to show that there is any monopoly or combine among the refiners of Canada at all? I say, most positively not. I am very much pleased to be able to say that the amalgamation of the refiners in the lower provinces has resulted in a much keener competition. The effect was, as was intended, that, instead of there being three weak refineries, some of which had never been profitable at all and had very slight working capital, and all of which were not in the most efficient state to work, these have been combined in one and strengthened and put in thoroughly good repair, and are in a better position than ever to compete with the larger refiners in Montreal.

It is not amiss, also, to point out, that there is nothing in the story which we have heard from time to time, for many years, that a very large amount of money has been made in sugar refining in the lower provinces.

I feel quite sure that I have said enough to show the members of this House and the people of the country, that the charges made against the sugar refining industry of Canada have no foundation in fact, that this

industry is a benefit to the country, that it employs a large number of men, giving work to the railways and coal-miners and the makers of barrels, and that with these advantages the people are getting to-day a good sugar and, making allowance for the quality, as cheap sugar as any people in the world.

I do not intend to make any more general remarks, with one or two exceptions. When listening to the hon. member for Addington (Mr. Dawson), there were one or two things he said which struck me as needing a little qualification. I was struck with some of the calculations of the average annual trade that he gave, and, as they are used so frequently in this House, on both sides, to prove either the advantages or disadvantages of the National Policy, I think that hon. members on both sides ought to take into consideration, when using these figures, comparing the trade we were doing with England in 1874-75 with the same trade in 1894-95, that they take in these comparisons only the money values and not the quantities. I am certain that the money values in our Trade and Navigation Returns give but a very poor idea of the amount of trade which we may be doing at different times. In the majority of articles, both in imports and exports, the prices are very much lower now than they were twenty years ago, and our imports and exports must have been increased to a much greater extent than the money values would seem to indicate. That is shown by the increased tonnage arriving in Canadian ports now as compared with twenty years ago. I am not going into the question in detail, but simply point this out as worthy of some attention.

I note something that the hon. gentleman said about the effect of reciprocity on the farmers. There seems to be a general opinion among hon. gentlemen opposite, that the farmers of Canada are not interested in the protective tariff and would be largely benefited by reciprocity with the United States. I am not going to lay down any cast-iron rule, either one way or the other, or make any definite statement, but I suggest the farmers of Canada ought to be very cautious indeed before entering into reciprocity with the United States in farm products. I do not say either one way or the other, but I say it is in their interest to consider very carefully indeed before they allow a reciprocity treaty to be negotiated. I believe they are more interested in the maintenance of a protective policy to-day in their products than any other class in Canada. I cannot see how our farmers could successfully conduct their operations, if the duties upon some of their principal products were wiped out with respect to the United States. Take everything connected with meat products. It goes without saying, that, if a majority of farmers in Canada cannot conduct their operations successfully unless they can raise stock; and, if we were to

drop the duty on dressed beef, it is certain that our Canadian manufacturing towns, our large cities and centres, would be supplied very largely with American dressed beef. It was just coming in when the latest increase was made in the duty. I remember, just before that, hearing that Chicago dressed beef was coming into Halifax. That must have reduced the price of ours. After the duty was put on, the import of dressed beef into Halifax ceased.

Now, it is quite certain that unrestricted reciprocity, including the abolition of duties on manufactured goods, as well as those on farm products, would wipe out a very large number of the manufacturing industries of Canada. I was talking, only a few days ago, with a friend who has had a very large experience of manufacturers in the United States, and who in the last year or two has had some experience in Canada; and he gave me, unsolicited, his opinion, that, if we had not the duties to-day, American manufacturers would shut up nearly all the manufactures in Canada. In a late debate I pointed out another result that would follow the abolition of duties on manufactured articles. At that time the duty on agricultural implements was under consideration, and I showed that the result of removing the duties would be that, if our manufacturers did not have to go out of business, the larger and stronger industries would be moved to American centres, where they could manufacture to better advantage for the American market and at no less advantage for the Canadian market. The opinion I then expressed I have had very strongly confirmed since.

Underlying the remarks of hon. members on the other side of the House, there seems to be a belief that any reduction in the duties on manufactured goods coming into Canada would materially benefit the manufacturers of England. I am sure that is a mistaken idea. I feel quite confident that, if we dropped the duty on manufactured articles to-day, the benefit would go, not to the manufacturers of England, but to the manufacturers of the United States, more especially in the case of those articles which Canada is manufacturing generally. Take the staples, such as cotton, sugar, iron, steel and many others. To drop the duties on these articles would injure the Canadian manufacturers and would not benefit those of England. If hon. members will take the trouble to look at the importations, as given in the Trade and Navigation Returns, they will find an illustration of what I say. Take the case of pig iron. Here I may say that, if there is any country in the world that ought to be able to manufacture iron cheaply, it is England, and a few years ago we used to think that, so far as competition in this line is concerned, every other country was out of the running altogether. Take the imports of pig iron, upon which all manufactures of iron are based, and compare the prices of

the iron imported from England and that imported from the United States, and you will find that, in the last year, the pig iron from the United States cost about \$1 per ton less than that from England. Now, does not that show conclusively that, if you drop the duty upon pig iron to-day, the increased imports would be from the United States, and not from England? And I believe the same would apply to a large number of other articles.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The duty does not enable you to keep the American pig iron out. You imported it last year in spite of the duty.

Mr. STAIRS. We have not enough iron furnaces in Canada to supply the demand.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Why, your production diminished 50 per cent last year.

Mr. STAIRS. Oh, no; I think not.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Excuse me, I am confident that it did.

Mr. STAIRS. We need not bandy words about the fact; we can look up the returns. We have more power of production to-day than we had before. I noticed another fact in connection with the Trade and Navigation Returns which shows how impossible it is to institute a comparison between the imports from England and the imports from the United States. The Trade and Navigation Returns show that we imported from England, during the last year, \$123,000 worth of hemp, and from the United States \$497,000 worth. I presume that, in all calculations that have been made, the import of hemp from England was put in as English products and that from the United States as product of the United States. So in this single item England would appear at a disadvantage of very nearly \$370,000, as compared with the United States. As a matter of fact, neither of these imports should be included in a calculation of this kind, because the hemp is not the product of either England or the United States, but comes through these countries in transit. So it is very difficult, indeed, either from the census returns or the Trade and Navigation Returns, to found a reliable argument upon statistics of this kind.

Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to take up the time of the House any longer. A great deal was said by the hon. member for Addington (Mr. Dawson) that might be replied to; but I think the hon. gentleman said very little, even in the long speech that he made, that was new or that has not been already completely answered by hon. members in this House or on the public platform.

Mr. FRASER. The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Stairs) says that the sugar question is a technical question. I believe it is; and I do not pretend to be capable of discussing it. But the hon. member did set up a defence for that particular industry,

Mr. STAIRS.

though I am not able to say whether that defence is complete. But I wish to call the attention of the House to the fact that this is only in keeping with every other industry affected by the tariff. Each industry must set up a defence for the duties that have been adopted for its benefit. So each one is in the same position as a client with his solicitor before this court, each trying to show that the industry he represents is a benefit to the country, and that the tariff, so far as it affects that industry, must be maintained in the interest of the country. That is the real character of the whole system. If we had a sensible system, under which every one had the same rights and there were no special interests protected, there would be no such discussions to show that this or that particular industry was of such value to the country that special privileges must be conferred upon it. This being a technical question, as I have said, I leave the issue between the hon. member for Addington (Mr. Dawson) and the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Stairs) to those who are to follow me, for one must read the statement made by the hon. member for Halifax before he will be able to reply. But the hon. member for Halifax says that the farmers are more interested in the National Policy, and, as I understood him, are more benefited by it than any other class. One or two figures will suffice. The census shows that in Prince Edward Island, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia we had 19,965 fewer farmers in 1891 than we had in 1881. It must be an admirable system in the interest of the farmers that leads to such a result as that. In the whole Dominion of Canada in those ten years, with a fertile country, with only one acre of every hundred of arable land in Canada under cultivation, we actually had 7,000 less farmers in 1891 than we had in 1880. How are you going to prove prosperity? Are you going to prove prosperity by simply making a statement? Are you going to prove prosperity by simply showing that one man in a particular place may have sold an article, at a given time, at a high price? Does that prove prosperity? How are you going to prove that any class in Canada are benefited by a tariff except by showing that all classes in Canada are benefited? But here we have a special class, and the class of all others in Canada most interested—because, being the larger, they are the most interested—and that is the condition of things with reference to it. Now, if the tariff was a good thing for the farmer, we would have more farmers in 1891 than we had ten years previously, would we not? The great boast of the manufacturers is this, that there are more men engaged in manufacturing now than there were formerly, and for that reason they set up the argument that protection must be a good thing. Now, apply that to the farmers who, in Canada, comprise at least 60 per

cent of the whole population, and I have shown you the condition of the farmers. But I will come to that matter a little later. I only refer to it now to show that so far as the provinces by the sea are concerned, from which the hon. member and myself both come, we have, as I said, to speak accurately, 9,965 less farmers than we had ten years ago. A number of things have been said during the debate that I think are worthy of notice. For instance, the hon. member for Kent (Mr. McInerney), who, I am glad to see in his place, lays down the proposition that protection is a good thing in practice. But before a man has made out his case, he must prove that protection is a good thing in principle as well as in practice. I will read his words :

I hold that protection is amply vindicated and justified by results when it brings about three things : first, if it keeps the home market for the industries of the country ; secondly, if it reduces the price of the article, or keeps the price down ; and thirdly, if it enables the manufacturer to go abroad in the open markets of the world, and compete openly there with the manufacturers of other countries.

That is to say, firstly, protection is a good thing if the manufacturers can get the home market ; secondly, if it keeps down the price just as it was, if it makes it lower then it would be better ; and thirdly, if the manufacturers can go abroad. Now, protection, he says, would enable them to keep down the price at the same figure as it was before. But as there are only, at most, about 12 per cent of the population of Canada engaged in manufacturing, what has he to say about the 88 per cent who are not so engaged ? Are they not to be considered at all ? When he says that if the manufacturers of Canada can keep the market at home, can keep the prices as they were, or perhaps lower, and in this way can sell their goods abroad, and compete in the open markets of the world, has he made out a good case for protection ? What of the toiling farmer ? What of the fisherman ? What of the lumberman ? What of the miner ? He does not care for them, if he has only 12 per cent of the population protected, and if, by that protection, they are increasing in wealth. Surely a condition of things would be the best for the country in which the whole 100 per cent were getting the greatest possible advantage in return for their labour. My hon. friend thinks he has made a good point in favour of protection when he shows that 12 per cent of the population can do these things. He must go further. He must show that there is an exclusion of foreign goods, because if an article is as cheap in this country as it was before when it came in under a cheaper rate of duty, then I submit that, so far as that particular article is concerned, there is no need for a duty, or anything else. I notice, for example, that the farmers are now getting a consider-

able amount of attention at the hands of hon. gentlemen opposite. In the previous four or five sessions of this Parliament, I have noticed that the discussion was chiefly directed to the interests of the manufacturer. But things are changed now, and it is attempted to be shown that protection is a good thing because it helps the farmer. For example, the hon. member for Halton says that certain articles were selling at a certain price at a given date, and he thinks he has established his case when he says that the article sells higher on that date in Canada than it does in the United States. His quotations were made for a few days previous to the time he spoke. Now, the hon. member is a very intelligent man, but if he thinks that he has proved his case by showing that on a particular day, at a particular point, an article is higher than it is at some other point on that day, I think he is in error :

In his speech on the Budget, Mr. Henderson, of Halton, begged the farmers to remember the blessings conferred on them by the National Policy tariff on pork. Let me point out that on that very day dressed hogs were selling in Detroit at \$5.25 to \$5.50, and in Chatham at \$4.75 to \$4.90. It continues : "In yesterday's "Empire" live hogs are quoted in Toronto at \$3.75 to \$4 ; in Buffalo, at \$4.45 to \$4.55 ; lambs, \$3.50 to \$4.25 in Toronto ; \$4.45 to \$4.65 in Buffalo. Sheep, \$2.50 to \$2.75 at Toronto ; \$3.25 to \$3.85 at Buffalo. Choice steers, \$3.40 in Toronto ; \$4.25 to \$4.35 at Buffalo. Butchers' cattle, \$2 to \$2.25 in Toronto ; \$3 to \$3.70 in Buffalo. In the face of such figures, which can be found in the "Empire's" market reports almost daily, the Conservative members are paying intelligent farmers a poor compliment in asking them to bless the National Policy."

Does not the hon. gentleman see that the conditions of the trade make the prices, just as the wind changes its course to rush into a vacuum, so does trade ; and according as the reading of the barometer is high or low, so the price varies according to the demand at a particular point. Why, the hon. gentleman arrogates to his policy some of the attributes of Deity, if he thinks it can improve the price in one country only when the demands of our very existence call in various places for a supply that must be provided. I venture to say that there is no day in the year upon which the quotations made by the hon. gentleman could not be shown in a different light at those two points, and from these figures one person could prove that protection is a good thing, and another person could prove that free trade is a good thing. Now, that is not the way to arrive at a principle. If the hon. gentleman's argument is any good at all, he must show clearly that continuously the price in Canada, under the National Policy, has been greater than in the United States. But I will give him a further benefit. What if, during all the years in which protection has been in opera-

tion in Canada, the prevailing prices have altogether been in favour of Canada as against the United States? But, Mr. Speaker, does any man not understand this, that prices, so far as they are affected by the home market, must be fluctuating? There are 60 per cent of the people of Canada engaged in farming, and there are about 12 per cent engaged in manufacturing, and the hon. gentleman thinks that it is a good thing for the 60 per cent to be engaged in providing food for the 12 per cent, and that the 60 per cent have the best market in the world, because they have an opportunity of selling to the 12. Now, can anything be more ridiculous than that? How in the world are the 60 per cent to be made wealthy by selling only to the 12 per cent. That is what I would like to know. The home market is a good market, but you must regulate the home market in order to make protection effective, by finding how many mouths are to be filled, and then raising just the requisite quantity, and dividing it, as is done in some lines of business, among the various farmers, saying to each one: You need to raise so many hogs, and you need to raise so many bullocks, and you need to raise so many bushels of wheat, and you need to raise so many bushels of barley—just the production that is required to feed the 12 per cent; and you dole it out among them, and this makes the country prosperous. It will require more skill and more wisdom than the hon. member for Inverness (Mr. Cameron) is able to bring to bear on this question to make them believe that any policy in the interests of the few is for the benefit of the many. The law of supply and demand does not recognize any such principle. It recognizes this fact, that every man has to labour the best he can, and that it is quite possible for a farmer to get not only the market nearest to him, but markets elsewhere, and then he need not calculate how much he shall raise this year, for it is only a question as to how much he can raise and how cheaply he can raise it, and it is according to the cheapness that he will have an advantage over his neighbour. The whole question is one of industry and skill, and not one as to nice calculation of how much is required, and therefore he will raise that and nothing more. Hon. gentlemen opposite have been talking about farming, and even the hon. member for Kent (Mr. McInerney) devoted some attention to that subject. I wish to place on record the ideas of men who are not politicians, but who formed themselves into a body in order to obtain relief from the effects of the National Policy. Between 300,000 and 400,000 farmers in Canada are combined as Patrons of Industry. I do not think they are all-wise, nor do I think they are lacking in intelligence, but rather that they possess as much intelligence as ordinary men in this country, but the very fact

Mr. FRASER.

that this organization has been called into existence is the best proof that something is wrong in the tariff and the government of the country. I want to put what the Patrons say as against the contention put forward by hon. gentlemen opposite, that the National Policy is in favour of the farmers, and I want the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson), the hon. member for Kent (Mr. McInerney) and the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Stairs), and all other hon. gentlemen who have been telling the farmers that the National Policy has been to their advantage, to settle the question with these men who have combined together for their best interests. I will refer first to what the Patrons say about farmers. They state:

Protectionists maintain to be sure that they benefit the farmer. And we have seen, they are not protecting him against Australian competition, then they coax by steamship bonuses to come here.

I shall never forget the look in the face of an hon. gentleman who sat next to me at a dinner given to the Australian delegates, when one of the speakers, quoting prices, said that he thought \$60 or \$70 could be obtained for a bullock in Canada, and an Australian remarked that such a bullock could be raised for \$12 or \$13, perhaps \$10. The remark of an hon. gentleman whose devotion to the Conservative party is beyond question, was emphatic, it might be described as cursory in the highest sense. The farmers have caught on to the point, and they speak of it in this statement:

At present his only possible competitor in the Canadian market is the American farmer. Canadian protectionists say in effect that, although he has been protected up to the eyes for years, the American farmer does not possess the home market in which he can sell all he raises at remunerative prices, but is obliged to export vast quantities dirt cheap against which it is necessary to protect the Canadian farmer.

Here I may say, the question of exporting "dirt cheap" is a phrase that has no meaning in it, and that is a phrase used by the hon. member for Inverness (Mr. Cameron) about the United States market.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). No, I never said that.

Mr. FRASER. The products of labour are exchanged by men because they want to satisfy their cravings for other things, and naturally these products are not sold dirt cheap; they are simply exchanged in the best markets, and with the most satisfactory results to the individual. They believe that the purchasing power which labour brings them in exchange will give them the greatest benefits with regard to results. Therefore the statement is correct. The Patrons further say:

It is admitted, in short, so far as regards protection to farmers in the United States, it is

a failure. American protectionists, like McKinley, say, in turn, that notwithstanding the National Policy, which was to increase its price and furnish it with a home market, Canadian farm produce is so miserably low that the American farmer must be protected against it, or he will starve.

These are the ideas put forward, and the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) gave a little colour to the idea presented as regards the effect of protection in the United States, by stating that if he lived in the United States he would be a Republican and have supported the McKinley Bill, but as he lived in Canada he could not do so because that measure was a bad thing for this country. That is the idea in the minds of hon. gentlemen opposite—it is one of warfare, it is that if a man can cut and slash his neighbour, it is the better for the individual, and that nations, as individuals, should fly at each other's throats and seek to get the best of them, and that therefore tariff walls are advantageous. The Patrons pronounce protection as a fraud so far as the interests of the Canadian farmers are concerned. They say further :

They pronounce Canadian protection a fraud so far as the interests of the Canadian farmers are concerned. If there were two yellow wagon doctors at a fair vending the same lightening oil, and if each declared it to be a humbug in the hands of the other, we should have little difficulty in coming to the conclusion that both were quacks.

The Americans say : Keep out the low price products of Canada, and Canada says in return : Keep out the trash of the United States. This position must involve humbug, of course, because it cannot be true. Reference has been made to the cheese industry, and I desire to quote what the Patrons, many of whom are engaged in the business, say about it. They say :

The cheese industry has grown rapidly in Canada, and protectionists say gleefully, yes, cheese is protected 3 cents a pound. In the States it is protected 4 cents. Unprotectionists principles it must be dearer there than here, so that our duty is useless. Practical cheese men, like Mr. D. M. Macpherson, Patron M.P.P. for Glengarry, say with truth, that if our duty had never been imposed at all the industry would have thriven with no less vigour.

I admit that Mr. Macpherson, Patron member for Glengarry, may not be correct ; but I presume he has studied the subject, and as he is a practical man, he possesses more knowledge of the industry than professional men in this House. I presume any man who works a farm gets practical experience which is worth all the theories in the world, especially when protection is presented to the people as the best policy for the country. A farmer, for example, is a better authority on farming than is the hon. member for Kent and myself, who are both professional men ; and when these farmers unitedly issue such statements, not for the purpose of securing seats in Parliament and holding

the reins of Government, but because they have studied the question in relation to their own business, surely their opinions are worth more than those held by professional members in this House. These opinions are not the opinions of members connected with the Liberal party, but of men connected with both the Liberal and Conservative parties, who have united against the National Policy for the purpose of securing tariff reform in Canada. I commend to hon. gentlemen opposite who live in farming constituencies what the Patrons say about the effects of the National Policy.

Mr. CAMERON. They are manufacturers.

Mr. FRASER. We have it now—farmers are manufacturers.

Mr. CAMERON. These are manufacturers of cheese.

Mr. FRASER. The hon. gentleman says farmers are manufacturers.

Mr. CAMERON. No. You are speaking of manufacturers.

Mr. FRASER. I am speaking about farmers, and the hon. gentleman has the majority of farmers in his county.

Mr. CAMERON. Cheese-makers are manufacturers.

Mr. FRASER. They depend on wheat, and everything else that they produce.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). I beg to inform my hon. friend that we have cheese manufacturers in Inverness.

Mr. FRASER. I am aware of that, but I am talking about the farmers. The cheese matter is only one matter to which they refer.

Anyway, the protectionist cries, you must admit that the duty of 7½ cents per bushel on corn increases the price of corn. No doubt it does, and more's the pity. The cattle-raising and dairying industries, of so much importance to the country, require cheap feed above everything.

The farmer believes in two things. First, that protection increases the price of the article, and, secondly, being true Canadians, with the pluck of Britons in them, they are not afraid to compete with the United States or anywhere else. That is what they say, and they have arrived at that conclusion for two very good reasons. They know that the small home market never can give them sufficient impetus to go into business, and they feel that as Canada is a better country than the United States, and that as Ontario is much in advance of the states lying immediately south of the line, they are not afraid to meet the people of the United States in open competition. Now, if hon. gentlemen opposite have not already possessed themselves of this "Hand-book Introducing Facts and Figures in Support of the Patron Platform and Principles," if they send me their names I will be very

glad to forward them this book, and to direct their careful attention to it. Although I am not a Patron myself, this book contains so much good political economy, that it will afford much useful and needed information to hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's). Do you endorse it all ?

Mr. FRASER. There is enough that is good in it, to make anything that I am not in accord with perfectly innocuous in the hands of an intelligent man. Now, Sir, coming directly to matters that I think ought to engage our attention in Canada. It is well for us, from time to time, to look at our national book-keeping. I have not compared one year with another, nor have I attempted to show that the country was better or worse off when Mr. Mackenzie was in power. That has been ably done by gentlemen who preceded me on this side of the House. But I shall, Sir, take a calm look at just exactly how we stand as a country during the last twenty-eight years.

Since the year 1868 we find that our imports have exceeded our exports by about \$20,000,000 annually. Now, the very statement of that fact is a complete answer to the National Policy. The National Policy was designed to make our exports greater than our imports, but it has failed in that, and on the average our exports have been \$20,000,000 a year less than our imports. What is the meaning of that ? Why, a child in political economy understands that \$20,000,000 had to go out of Canada to pay some debt of some kind. We did not take it back in bullion, because during the last twenty years the total import of bullion into Canada is only \$9,000,000 more than the export of bullion. Where has that \$20,000,000 annually gone ? If protection is a good thing, it ought to enable us to send more out of the country than we bring in. That was the promise made for the National Policy at the time of its introduction. That promise has failed of its fulfilment, and to that extent the National Policy has failed.

Our gross debt in 1868—and I am merely looking at our books as a careful accountant would, not comparing one year with the other—our gross debt in 1868 was \$96,896,066, and our net debt the same year was \$75,728,641. At that we started on our race as a young nation in 1867. Now, in 1895, our gross debt has reached \$318,480,000, and our net debt has leaped up to \$253,740,000, an increase in our gross debt over 1868 of \$221,583,954, and an increase in our net debt of \$178,011,359. Now, let us take our revenue. In 1868, which is the first year for which figures are obtainable, our revenue was \$13,687,928, and our expenditure was at the modest sum of \$13,486,092. Compare this with our revenue last year. Our revenue last year was only \$33,978,129, and our expenditure was \$38,132,000, which means that the increase in our revenue since confedera-

Mr. FRASER.

tion up to last year was \$20,290,201 each year. We see, therefore, that the increase in our expenditure last year over the first year of confederation was \$24,645,918. Let us take the total trade and see how that stands. The total trade of Canada in 1868 was \$131,027,533, and our total trade last year was \$224,420,488, an increase of \$103,392,952. But let it not be forgotten that since confederation Prince Edward Island, British Columbia, and every acre of land west of Ontario was brought into our Dominion. Therefore, our total trade—notwithstanding all the increase that we made in territory between 1867 and the present time—has only increased \$3,500,000 a year, and when I refer to our total trade I mean of course our exports and imports combined. In 1867, our government cost us \$3.87 per head of the population, but in 1895 our government cost us \$7.87 per capita. Our population in 1871 was 3,485,761. Since that time Prince Edward Island, British Columbia, and all west of the great province of Ontario has been added, but notwithstanding this, at the last census our population was only 4,833,239. Therefore, we increased in population about 67.773 per annum. The increase of our population since confederation has been 39 per cent, but, on the other hand, the increase in our expenditure has been 182 per cent. Now, Sir, I am not going to say that that expenditure was all thrown away by any means, but I will say that if any prudent business man saw that his business had increased only 39 per cent, he would not think he was transacting business on a proper scale if his expenditure increased 182 per cent, while the power of paying the expenditure, namely, population, had only increased 39 per cent. It must never be forgotten, Sir, that a country is like a household. If the wage-earner, the head of the house, has only an increase of 39 per cent in his revenue to meet an increased expenditure of 182 per cent, nothing but bankruptcy stares him in the face. Now, if Canada has only increased 39 per cent in population, let me ask, Are we in a very good position when we have increased our expenditure by 182 per cent. One of two things must be shown. Either that the 39 per cent of the increase in our population are just that much richer than the population in 1867, and that much better able to pay the difference between the 39 per cent, which should be the increase of expenditure in a well-balanced country, and the 182 per cent, which is our real increase. That is not comparing one item with the other. Therefore I want to point out that while our debt per head of population is \$50, in the United States the central, state, county, municipal and school debts all combined amount to \$32 per head. If you add to that \$50 our provincial, county, municipal and school debts, you will see at once the position Canada holds as compared with our neighbours to the south. Then it must not

be forgotten, besides all this, that the very people who above all other pay this debt, the farmers of this country, have been decreasing in number during the last ten years. That is a statement which I submit is worthy of serious consideration by every man in Canada—for this reason. There is no charmed method by which a country can be run different from the way in which every man's business is run. There is no method by which this country can increase and prosper when our debt is increasing in greater ratio than our population. Therefore it is imperative that we should look the present condition of the country squarely in the face, to see whether or not any policy which produces these results is in the best interests of the people of Canada. I am not, Mr. Speaker, going to repeat what has been so admirably done by my predecessors; because I think the process of education has now gone on sufficiently to make our friends on the other side cease their cry that we have no policy. They needed the drastic lesson they have received, because they had been repeating that cry over and over again; and, like many men more honest in their views than they are, they came at last, simply from hearing their own voices so often, to think that there must be some truth in it. Here is a publication called "The People's Almanac" which I understand has been decreed by the Government to be the political bible of the Conservative party, and, from the number of tons of it I see distributed in Canada, I can understand that very well. Now, let us see what this "People's Almanac" has to say about the policy of the Liberal party. In the preface it is stated:

The year 1896 will see a general election to the House of Commons of Canada in which, for the fifth time, the contest will be between the protectionists and free traders.

Not between the protectionists and those who have no policy; not between the protectionists and the annexationists even; but between the protectionists and the free-traders. And when a man sits down to write in cold blood, and to be responsible for what he says, he will tell the truth, whether he wants to or not. That is all the answer I need to make to hon. gentlemen opposite who say that the Liberal party have no policy. This pamphlet tells the truth when it says that this fifth contest is to be exactly on the same lines as all the others—the lines between protection and free trade. What hon. gentlemen opposite mean by free trade I know not, and I care not. I only want to say that the policy of the Liberal party is the same now that it has been in four elections. That policy always has been a policy of taxation for revenue only, looking to the greatest possible amount that can be produced by an even distribution, without respect to classes or persons, and limited to the amount required to meet honest and economical government.

Now, in speaking of the population of Canada, I want to emphasize this—that there is no country in the world that I think equal to Canada in respect of giving the best opportunities to men from all countries to come here and make themselves wealthy and comfortable. I have seen the best of the United States; and while my particular feeling as a child of this soil may, perhaps, lead me to be somewhat emphatic in my statement, I want to say that I believe Canada to be the best country in this world in all that is required to build up a healthy, comfortable and prosperous people. I went to the North-west two years ago. I travelled through Manitoba. Then I went down on my homeward way through Dakota; and as between Manitoba and Dakota, to use an expression sometimes used among Americans, Dakota is not in it. Manitoba is much in advance of Dakota in every respect. But the sad fact which I met with there was that in the last decade the population of Dakota had increased by a greater number of souls than our whole population west of Lake Superior, including Manitoba, the North-west Territories and British Columbia. That is to say, in those ten years the population of Dakota increased more than the combined population of that whole magnificent country. We have been playing for some time with the office of Minister of the Interior. As each man has taken that position, we have heard the exclamation: "This is the man who is going to revolutionize matters in the North-west." I remember particularly, when the present occupant, the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Daly), assumed that office, what a flourish of trumpets there was. "A live man at last." I remember that the daily papers in the interest of the Government announced: "Mr. Daly assumed control of his office this day, and at once inaugurated a new and vigorous policy in regard to the North-west." The hon. member for Western Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) had not much confidence in some of his predecessors, judging from certain statements he made that were neither very elegant nor very flattering. But this man was going to fill the North-west with a population of teeming millions. Well, let us look at the result of the operations of last year. The number of homesteaders who went into the North-west last year was 2,144, or 569 less than the year previous. The immigrants who arrived at Halifax, Quebec and Montreal numbered 22,363, a decrease of 2,290 as compared with the previous year. 17,231 declared their intention of becoming residents, against 18,923 in the year before. The total number who settled in Manitoba, the North-west and British Columbia, were only 4,901, as against 6,650 in 1894, or a decline of 1,749. That is the vigorous policy. That is the policy that was going to people that country—and a better country does not exist in the world. It has everything to commend it to people as a place of settlement; and yet there is a decline each year.

And yet the hon. member for Western Assiniboia, with that devotion that is begotten of the race to which he belongs, still clings to his idols, and calmly awaits further developments. There was a time when in the process of revolution he kicked. Now he is tranquil, and he thinks that the brightest and best place in the world is where a Grit is guillotined. That country can never prosper except by opening the gates and making it worth while for men to go in there from every country under the sun. That great North-west has been peopled so slowly. A number of reasons may be given; but one reason I believe to be the fact that the Government parcelled out among their retainers large tracts of land. Being a sort of radical myself, I want to say here and now that I do not believe any individual or corporation should own a single acre of land except what they are utilizing for legitimate purposes. I believe that the land belongs to the people; and when you make regulations of any kind that enables any man or body of men to hold more than they are prepared to utilize, in order that they may benefit by the rise in value consequent on the labour of others, you are committing a crime of which you will reap the reward some day. A block here and a block there, the Government have given to hungry retainers, who hold these lands and ask more for them than they are really worth. They can go on holding the lands because they got them for a song, and they need not pay interest on the investment because the investment was a mere trifle; and these are the lands that should be open to settlers and cultivated, but which remain instead idle in the hands of speculators. Of course there is plenty of land elsewhere; but any one who goes to that country must see that one of the prime conditions in settling such a country, where in some places there is very little water and where there is very little forest, is that the people must congregate together, so that any artificial lines inclosing large quantities reserved by some parties and preventing the people congregating together, and subjects them, if they try to do so, to being met by the bailiff or some official of some company who stops them from taking up the land which the Creator designed for them and no others. This policy has produced most lamentable results in the North-west. Where are the millions who should have been in that country ere this? Where is that country that was to be the pride not only of its own inhabitants but of all others? To-day I believe there are hundreds in that country, with wealthy soil about them in greater abundance than any place I ever saw, who would leave it to-morrow if they could. I have met such, unfortunately, and I told them: If you leave the country, you will be making the biggest mistake in your life. One of the evil effects of giving large tracts of land to people out there

Mr. FRASER.

was this. It created the idea among the people of Canada that they need only go out there for a few years, take up a large tract of land, and make their fortunes. You can never people a country that way. You can only people it by throwing it open so that a man can obtain just enough land to cultivate, 200 or 300 acres. He will then feel that the country is going to be his home, that there he is going to settle and live and die, and that his first effort must be to raise enough to supply himself and his family, trusting to the years that come for the further increment that is going to increase his wealth. But we have held the country up as a golden Eldorado for speculators. We have inoculated people with the idea that they need only go out there, take up large tracts of land, make immense profits by selling them to others, and then return and become nabobs in their native country where they would enjoy more of the luxuries of life than they could out in the west.

Another factor is the tariff, which puts obstacles in the way of settlers getting the best returns out of what they have to send out of the country and getting in return at the cheapest rates what they require to bring into the country. The Government in place of grappling with the difficulty, through their Minister of Interior (Mr. Daly) as they promised, bring down the pitiable return showing that last year there were 1,794 less people who took up farms than in the previous year. Now, is there anything wrong with the country? I only met one man in the North-west who said there was. He was a minister, and I found that he had bought a tract of land, and when he was not getting any money out of it and nobody was going to hear him, he concluded that the land was bad.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Was he a Minister of the Crown?

Mr. FRASER. No, they have all the advantages without going there at all, and none of the disadvantages.

Mr. FOSTER. To what party did he belong?

Mr. FRASER. He was one of the worst kind of Tories I ever met in the whole North-west. Indeed he wanted to appear on the platform and attempt to answer us, and when we found out that he wanted to run down the country, we had not the time to listen to him. I say that the Government have been very remiss on this question. Though not a native of that country, I speak with some warmth on this question, because I felt the influence that country has on any one who goes there. I feel that if that great country to the west fails, Canada fails. Canada will fail to-day in all that her best admirers hope she may be, if our great west does not succeed. One of the things that struck me in this debate was

the clamour that was made for the National Policy, so far as its effects upon the farmer are concerned. It also struck me that it was a wonderful thing that hon. gentlemen opposite did not think of this panacea for so long a time. Why were the down-trodden farmers permitted for so many years to work under a revenue tariff before this panacea was discovered. Hon. gentlemen opposite had the nation to the south of us as an example. Why did they not relieve the farmers between 1867 and 1874? The poor farmer was allowed to go on in the depths of financial degradation all these years, and there was not a man in the Conservative party whose bosom beat with compassion and who wanted to produce this panacea for all the farmers ill. How is it nobody ever thought of protection between 1867 and 1874? How was it that the fertile brain of my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) was not engaged in solving that problem during all these years? How was it that the scholastic Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster) did not think out this problem and solve it in the best interests of Canada? He seemed to have slept securely all these years without ever thinking of his down-trodden country.

Mr. FOSTER. My heart bled with sympathy.

Mr. FRASER. His heart may have bled as the country is now bleeding, but that bleeding process did not bleed to any practical result. This poor country suffered under a revenue tariff between 1867 and 1874, and there was not a man in the Conservative party to raise his voice in favour of a change to protection. What was the reason? It was because they knew very well that the system then prevailing was the best system for the country. But when adverse fortune struck Canada as it struck many another country, when adverse fortune struck the Conservative party, then they said: Here is a method by which we will overturn our opponents, and we will introduce this panacea for all the ills under which we are now labouring.

Mr. DAVIN. I proposed protection in 1872 to Hon. George Brown.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). You were a Liberal then.

Mr. DAVIN. Not at all.

Mr. FRASER. Why did not the hon. gentleman go to the willing ears of the Conservative party? Because, to hear them talk, you would think they were protectionists all their lives. His party affiliations were not with the Hon. George Brown, and it is a strange thing that he should propose this change to a man who was not in power. It is strange that this panacea was never then thought of. Now, we are passing through exactly a similar condition. Canada to-day is in as bad a position as it was when Mr. Mackenzie was in power. We had a

striking illustration of that to-day, and I could not help looking at the Finance Minister, as his face turned all colours when the best banker in Canada—

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend is out of order in referring to what took place in committee.

Mr. FRASER. Does the hon. gentleman mean to say his silence, and a very suggestive silence, marked by an expression of countenance, is a matter which cannot be referred to because it happened in committee? If so, I withdraw my statement. I thought any changes in the exterior, or changes in the interior indicated by the exterior, were matters we might discuss. If I am out of order, I will withdraw my words. But, I submit, that the reason for all that, whoever said it, was that distinguished men here and elsewhere were hinting that the condition of trade in Canada was not good. And the highest authority in banking had to admit it elsewhere than in this House. I do not intend to berate hon. gentlemen opposite. I am not going to adopt the tactics they adopted against the great and good man who did his best to stem the tide of humbug that was inaugurated by hon. gentlemen opposite. I am not going to hold them altogether responsible for the condition of trade in Canada. I will hold them responsible only so far as their policy has injured the country. But I wish to call their attention to this fact, that during the years I have referred to, the policy they followed was to declare that the Government of the day was responsible, and to promise that, if they were given the reins of power, they would restore to Canada all the benefits that the people wanted. They claimed to have a sort of Prospero's wand by waving which over Canada they could call forth the wealth of soil, and mine, and forest, and sea, and make all Canada prosperous, contented and happy. They promised to bring back those who had left and to keep in Canada all who were here. All I have to say is this, naming no man, that the men who would address a people in their extremity—an extremity brought about by causes beyond the control of the Government—the men who would appeal to the woes of the people, at such a time, were charlatans. The tactics they followed were not the tactics of honourable men. I am not going to take advantage of any difficulty that exists in Canada and seek to convince the people that it is caused by the Government altogether. In large part, they are responsible, but I do not press even that point. All I say to the people of Canada is: Here are the gods you have been worshipping; have they helped you? Dumb idols they are. Break them in pieces and see to it that no such men can ever rule in Canada more. Was it fair, was it generous, was it honest, for these men to use the arguments they did with the people of Canada during these years? I am glad to observe that the medicine is taking effect

upon the mind of the hon. gentleman opposite. I hope that is only the beginning of a state of mind and heart that will make him incapable of leading his party in the wrong direction, as he does now—this I say without wishing him any harm. Periodically, since the adoption of this policy, we have had schemes of different kinds presented to the people of Canada, one thing for one election and another thing for another election. For the last election the cry was reciprocity. This year I see that something entirely new has been brought out. We are now going to strengthen the British Empire by having preferential trade relations with Great Britain. Did the hon. gentleman ever make the calculation what our trade with Great Britain amounted to? The trade with Canada amounts to 3 per cent of the trade of Great Britain. I do not know that it is so much as that; certainly, it is not more. Are hon. gentlemen opposite to induce Great Britain to mould their trade policy with a view to this 3 per cent of their trade? I may be wrong as to the percentage, but I think the figure I have given—3 per cent—is about correct. At any rate, it cannot be very much more. So this is what is proposed—Great Britain is to make her trade relations having in view only 3 per cent of her trade. Great Britain will not do such a thing, and hon. gentlemen opposite know it. But they wish to make it appear that they are the only true friends of British connection, just as in 1891 they sought to make it appear they were the only loyal party in Canada. I am sorry the Secretary of State is not here, because I wish to read two statements made by that hon. gentleman, and to contrast them. The hon. gentleman, when he arrived in New York, was interviewed by the reporter of the New York "Herald." I quote from that interview:

Reporter—"Has the question of adopting protection in trade obtained any foothold in England?"

Sir Charles—"I do not think there is any sentiment there in favour of it. Neither the late Government nor the present, nor any section of the dominant party, would entertain it."

Think of that, and this is the hon. gentleman who is trying to make trade relations with Great Britain by which, for the sake of 3 per cent of her trade, she is going to upset her whole trade arrangements.

Reporter—"How about the Canadian people—are they not inclined toward it?"

Are they? Hear what the Secretary of State says:

Sir Charles—"No, the Canadian people are not in favour of protection."

That appeared in the New York "Herald." If the hon. gentleman says that that is not a correct report of what he said, I will, of course, accept his word. But that appeared in the New York "Herald" immediately after he landed on this side. But I will read

Mr. FRASER.

some further words, in case it may be said that they should, in fairness, be quoted:

They have adopted the policy of incidental protection, the protection of manufactories and industries to which Canada is best adapted. So far as one may judge, the election of 1878 settled it that Canada was in favour of maintaining the present policy.

Yet he says the Canadian people are not in favour of protection. What, then, does he mean? Of course, he means to say that the Canadian people are not in favour of protection as a permanent policy, but that they adopted it for a purpose and for that purpose they maintain it. The New York "Herald" goes to England, and this will show the people of Great Britain what the hon. gentleman wishes them to think. In 1891, we were said to be disloyal. There is a book published in England, called Whitaker's Almanac, in which they give the notable events that occurred day by day. And this is what they say of 18th February, 1891:

Sir Charles Tupper, at Toronto, charged Canadian Liberals with treason, and conspiring to annex Canada to the United States.

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. FRASER. "Hear, hear," says one of the hon. gentlemen opposite. Let me remind him that this very gentleman, the Secretary of State, in Ottawa a few days ago, declared that the whole people of Canada are loyal.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). There has been a considerable change.

Mr. FRASER. It may be that a considerable change has come over the hon. gentleman. No change has come over the people of Canada. They have always been loyal.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. He will settle that when he gets into the Senate.

Mr. FRASER. If he does not settle it before then, judging by recent events, it will remain a long time unsettled. But in this case, as in former cases, the Government are simply humbugging the people, being ready to do anything to distract the attention of the people from the misdeeds of the Administration.

Mr. FOSTER. Appolinaris.

Mr. FRASER. Well, if the hon. Finance Minister will bring the appolinaris, I will be very glad to have it. Now, I was going to say that, so far as this policy is concerned, I believe it will be a failure, not only in England, but here. I believe the country has had enough experience to lead it to appreciate exactly where the party stands, and, as they did not produce this panacea for us previous to 1878, I leave it them, as I said, to settle that question. But I want to know, if protection, as hon. gentlemen opposite say, raises the price of what the farmers have to sell, and cheapens

what they have to buy, how does it come about that the price of the article is increased that is produced in the greatest abundance, and decreased in the article that is produced in the smaller quantity? Now, how can that be? Hon. gentlemen in this House have said that protection increases the price of the article that the farmer has to sell, that is the idea. But, in the same breath, to the farmer they say that protection decreases the price of the article he has to buy; that is to say, that a home market, where 12 people are engaged in manufacturing, decreases the price of the article they produce, and the home market that has the 60 men employed in producing the article, increases the price of the article they produce. Now, every man can see how absurd that statement is. How in the world could it be? Reference was made by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Stairs) to the census, and I want to dwell for a moment on what the census says about protection. I wish to read a statement from Mr. Johnson himself, and it will be remembered that there is not an industry in Canada where one man is doing anything to change one article into another, but what is put down:

The total amount of capital invested in manufacturing industries is \$353,877,000; value of the products is \$475,446,000; cost of raw material is \$255,983,000; the cost of labour is \$98,763,000; and the number of hands employed in all manufactories in Canada is 367,000.

Now, let us analyse that for a moment. Add the cost of the raw material to the cost of labour, and subtract the value of the product, and we find that the manufacturers made a yearly profit of \$119,700,000, or 34.45ths per cent on the capital invested. These are not my figures. This is equal to a profit of \$326 on each hand employed. Now, if you divide the number of hands employed into the wages given, what do we find? They simply give \$277 each; that is to say, the manufacturer made out of each hand employed by him, man, woman and child, \$326, while the wage-earner for his labour only got \$272. Now, I know there must be deductions made from that. There must be deductions for wear and tear, and other things. But that is enough to show high profits, according to the statement made by Mr. Johnson himself. Now, what is the natural increment of wealth? About 3 per cent, that is all. Three per cent is the highest natural increment of all wealth in the world, and here we have over 33 per cent. Those statistics are Mr. Johnson's, and not mine. Now, Mr. Speaker, with the evidence before us of the failure, so far as the filling up of the North-west is concerned, with the evidence before us of the failure so far as every industry natural to Canada is concerned, we find that the natural results have been produced. Why, the very Government themselves are failing. The result of the National Policy on the interests of Canada is shown by the disorgan-

ized state of trade in Canada; and the effect of the National Policy is shown in the disorganized state of the Government of Canada. For the last twelve months we have actually had a resignation a month; in twelve months we have had twelve resignations. What does that indicate? It indicates that the malady of the Government is more chronic than that of trade in Canada, and chronic with a weakness that seems to be very natural to that Government, because these resignations cover quite a space of time. What is the remedy for all that? In the first place, the Government must be changed. I am afraid that repentance will not come to sinners who have erred so exceedingly. In the second place, we must lay our taxation in Canada upon the people of Canada so that each and every one in Canada, without favour to any man, shall pay his just share of the taxation. Of course, some day men will be surprised that we did not go further; men will be surprised that this generation did not break down every customs wall, did not close up every customs-house and let trade move as freely in this country as the wind and the air, and the sunshine. We have not arrived at that point, and I do not expect it just now. It will not arrive for some time, but that that is the right thing to do, I have no doubt in the world. You must levy your taxation so as to strike everybody. What is, after all, the contribution that men give in taxation, except so much given up from their wealth for the purpose of supporting a government? I read, not long ago, how a United States Senator put in very homely phrase the truth I am now stating, that taxation must be levied upon all, and that the revenue must be collected in the interest of the government, from the people, irrespective of any man in the country, and that any incidental protection that may result shall not be because of levying the taxes, but simply because of the fact that any taxation by customs duty must, of necessity, give an incidental protection to the man who is engaged in trade. Senator Vance said:

Protection's battle once begun,
Bequeathed by howling sire to son;
Only can be fought and won
By taxing every son-of-a-gun.

I believe, Sir, that Canada is in that position to-day. We are engaged in the struggle, and that struggle will be carried on until victory is won. However homely those words of Senator Vance may be, they clothe a truth that should guide any party in levying taxes upon the people of Canada. In our legislation we do not sufficiently consider the interest of those who have to toil for a living. I tell you, the Government does not sufficiently recognize the fact that the man who has to work is the sole foundation of all the wealth in Canada. I never pass by the humble shanty of the man who works in the woods, by the humble dwelling

of the man who has to go out on the waves to gather from the ocean the wealth for wife and bairnies, without reflecting on the importance of the role they play in laying the foundations of this country's wealth. Surely, no man can see the fisherman go out upon the ocean without being reminded of these words of Burns :

Wae! may the boatie row
That gives the bairnies bread.

I never see a farmer who has to toil on a piece of land for a living, but I think how sadly we are astray in ignoring these men as the sole foundation of the wealth of Canada, while we are building up monopolies for the men who can look after themselves. Capital does not need Parliament to help it look after itself. Labour does not need it, but labour demands that it shall have the full fruition of its work, that and nothing more ; and that no effort of legislation shall prevent that full fruition. It does not come before us like a pauper to claim protection. All along our lines we have custom-houses, and every man is looked upon as a bad man that brings a dutiable article into Canada. He is treated as a man who is working against the best interests of the country, he is treated as a robber. The things that our farmers want cannot be brought in except by paying tribute. But labour presents itself on the frontier and walks boldly over our border, and no custom-house officer dare take any steps to prevent a busy brain and an active pair of hands from coming here and entering into competition with our own people. Under proper conditions, labour does not demand protection ; all it wants is that there should be a recognition of the great truth that labour, and labour alone, is wealth in this country, as in every other country. We have, therefore, been reversing the order of things all these years. I was struck with a remarkable statement I read a few days ago as indicating after all how little wealth there is in the world. All our legislation is in the direction of the protection of wealth, and, therefore, confirms the remark that we should protect wealth, and it would look after labour. Yes, it has looked after labour. But wealth looks after labour only when it is to its own advantage. Is wealth to be practically the trustee of labour in Canada ? One would suppose, hearing hon. gentlemen opposite speak, that our Government is constituted to act as trustees for the labour of Canada. In making these remarks, I am not saying a word against the great majority of manufacturers who are engaged in lawful occupations, but I am satisfied that the best class of manufacturers are opposed to duties, except in so far as they are necessary to raise the revenue, upon the lines indicated by the Liberal policy, and they want nothing more. Our leading manufacturers to-day are in

Mr. FRASER.

favour of competition. The hon. member for Hants (Mr. Putnam) wags his head ; if he does not hold this belief, he does dishonour to his country. The manufacturers of Canada, like the labourers of this Dominion, are as bright and as intelligent as those in the United States ; they do not need not be pap-fed, and they are not pap-fed to advantage, when they think they should enjoy a market without competition, and thereby without being called upon to use their best skill and ability. I could take hon. gentlemen to towns in Canada where there are manufacturers who have given their whole attention to business, and they advocate a tariff of from 17 to 20 per cent, and are prepared to meet any competition from outside.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). That is pretty good protection.

Mr. FRASER. Seventeen and a half per cent is very good protection, yet with the present tariff averaging 30 per cent, the hon. member for Inverness warned his friends not to take a brick out of the protection structure, and not reduce that tariff below 30 per cent. Perhaps, in view of events, the hon. gentleman may have been wiser than he thought, certainly he was wiser than he thought when he told the people that if the protection structure was interfered with it would fall on them. Thirty per cent protection is too much for any interest in Canada ; 17 per cent is very good, from 17 to 20. I should like to see the tariff less than 17 per cent, I should like to see trade so free that goods and products could be sent from one country to another without duty. For that purpose are our grand harbours, those harbours which indent the lower provinces. Were they simply provided for sightseers ? Did the Creator not design that ships should enter and leave those harbours. Such, no doubt, would be the opinion of the hon. member for Hants, if his party affiliations did not prevent him following the inclinations of his head and heart. What do we want with our ships, except to carry freight between our ports and the rest of the world ? Protection prevents such freedom, and the marvel is that men should still be prepared to stand by it.

Mr. ROOME. Do you favour free trade ?

Mr. FRASER. Personally, I am in favour of absolute free trade—I never go back on my principles—just as I am in favour of a hundred other advances in the future, but I am unable to obtain them at present, and men who, from party exigencies, are never prepared to look into the brighter future will never do very much to elevate Canada. I am in favour of a revenue tariff, because I believe it is the best thing now, because we are not sufficiently educated for free trade, and for a great many other reasons, and I will give the hon. gentleman a

high authority. When the question came up under the new dispensation as to why polygamy was allowed under the old dispensation, why a man was allowed more than one wife, the answer was that this was allowed on account of the hardness of their hearts. The people of Canada are allowed protection on account of the hardness of their hearts, and with this authority I am willing to stand where I do. No country can advance as it should advance when the people are led to believe that greater restriction of trade is in the interest of the country. That is as clear to me as daylight. I believe that in the interests of Canada, a revenue tariff is the best policy. We are told by hon. gentlemen opposite that England is a poor, wretched country; Conservative papers are constantly striving to find out statements regarding failures in England, or poor crops. What have we in this country? In Canada we have the greatest agricultural, mineral and fishing resources in the world. We have every advantage of soil and climate, and yet last year, with all these advantages, we had a deficit of \$4,000,000. How does the position stand in the tight little island, which is said to be going to ruin, that is paying millions a year to keep up an army and navy to force her wares on uncivilized peoples? The Chancellor of the Exchequer is able to announce this year, a surplus of nearly \$30,000,000.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). How is the revenue raised?

Mr. MULOCK. Not by protection.

Mr. FRASER. I refer the hon. gentleman to Whittaker's Almanac, as I am not able to go into details, and, moreover, it would only be teaching one member, as all the rest in the House know the facts. I was going on to say that that country, which is said to be retrograding so rapidly, which is supposed to be going backward, is an example of what free trade can effect. Are we going to emulate them? The example of that country is the only example worth following, that country which has given to the world an object lesson, which takes the raw material of all nations in the world, and manufactures it and sends it back, and makes them pay the duty, plus the price. I suppose the hon. member for West Middlesex (Mr. Roome) would, no doubt, be prepared to shed many tears, but he is a man who would not speak of England's glory.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). You have forgotten the United States.

Mr. FRASER. Now, when they find the facts are against them, it suits them to represent that England under free trade, has declined. They have made an alliance with the miserable protective system in force in the United States, and they can only excuse themselves by saying, that the policy pur-

sued by the people to the south of us must dove-tail into their wretched policy. As has been well said by my respected leader, they adopted the miserable rag of protection from the United States, and they thought they would baptize it by singing "God Save the Queen" over it. The only way in which they can now dove-tail their policy into the policy of the United States, is by trying to show that England which has not adopted this nostrum, must be going to the bad.

Mr. McALISTER. What is the state of the farmer in England?

Mr. FRASER. I cannot bother about answering you as it is nearly six o'clock, and my time is about up. These hon. gentlemen opposite are now forced to proclaim that England must be going back, because if they admit that she is progressing, as undoubtedly England is, then they must admit that protection in Canada should be abolished, and that we should adopt the fiscal policy of the motherland. England is advancing and Canada is declining: therefore England must have a good policy and Canada must have a bad one. We believe, Sir, that that which has made England great can make Canada great. Our country possesses many natural conditions in common with England. Down by the sea where I come from, we are almost identically situated as they are in England. We have not the wealth of their soil, but we have minerals and fisheries, and magnificent harbours for shipping. We have the raw material—

Mr. MULOCK. And the men.

Mr. FRASER. Aye, and the men too, and the women, for we cannot have the men without the women. Sir, this National Policy has not been in the interests of the fishermen of my county nor of any other county in the maritime provinces. The fishermen has to buy everything he needs, but when the sea gives up her wealth to him, the National Policy takes it from him by compelling him to pay higher prices for the necessities of life. Sir, we have had an exhibition in this country, not only of the failure of the National Policy, but also of the failure of the Government. I wonder what are now the heart throbbings of hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches. Sir, a short time ago we had a message from President Cleveland hostile to the motherland, and I charge the responsibility for that message on hon. gentlemen opposite. When President Cleveland read the utterances of the late Minister of Justice (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper), and found that England was spending millions on her army and navy to force her merchandise on uncivilized savages, President Cleveland saw his opportunity. "Now," said he, "is our chance for the English soldiers and sailors are engaged in forcing goods to these savages, and let us take advantage of that." He believed that was the time to strike the blow, for had he not his information on the authority of the

Minister of Justice, an authority which ought to be respectable seeing that the hon. gentleman was a Minister of the Crown. But, Sir, President Cleveland calculated without his host. He woke up one morning to find that this free trade country had surrounded all of the United States with a great cordon of forces. He woke up to find that wherever ships could water and coal, the British ensign flew from their masts. He woke up to find that free trade England had money and men to protect her rights. President Cleveland found that without putting a cent of extra taxation on the people of his country, the English Chancellor of the Exchequer, could simply stop paying £30,000,000 a year to redeem the national debt, could convert that sum into a loan, and have £2,000,000,000 to fight the civilized world. All that was in a free trade country, and yet we are told by Conservative members in this House, and by the Conservative press of the country, that England is going to the bad. Oh, Sir, I wish we had a little of that kind of deterioration here. I wish we had in our exchequer a small portion of the English surplus, and then the Minister of Finance would not have had to meet Parliament so gloomingly as he did. I wish the Minister of Finance had adopted that policy which made England great. But, Sir, up to this time he has failed to do so and he will have no opportunity hereafter. It will be given to others to follow in the footsteps of that mother of nations, that mother of commerce, the only nation that is really worth imitating. It will be given to others in the government of this country, to follow the policy of that great nation whose fleets traverse every sea, and under whose flag commerce is carried from ocean to ocean, and from country to country. That is a good enough country for me. I commend to the study of hon. gentlemen opposite the greatness of Great Britain, ere they permit a member of the Government, or even the most ordinary member of their party, to hold her up for our pity, as a rotten, antiquated, and decaying country. Again, Sir, I say, that Great Britain is the only nation on earth whose example it is worth while for the people of Canada to follow.

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

After Recess.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to take up very much of the time of the House in discussing the questions which have been engaging the attention of this House for some days past. One gentleman remarked, in the course of his address, that this was what might be called a stock-taking time. It seems to me that is a very appropriate term to use, because this is, in my opinion, a time when we ought to look well after the affairs of the country, and see how they have been

Mr. FRASER.

managed. The Government of this country are simply a committee of the House of Commons. They are responsible, first, to the House of Commons, and then to the country. Eighteen years ago, the people of this country dismissed those who were then conducting its affairs, and placed that responsibility upon the gentlemen who now occupy the Treasury benches. We have, therefore, had an experience of eighteen years of their administration, and it is well now to consider how they have managed public affairs during that time. You will remember that His Excellency the Governor General, in opening Parliament, congratulated the country upon the bountiful harvest that Providence had blessed it with during the past year. We all know that it has been a time of peace, that there have been no wars to distract our people; and, under these circumstances, you would naturally expect that the affairs of the country would be managed economically and well, and that, upon the meeting of the House, the Government would be able to show an excellent record for the last twelve months. But I am very sorry to say that the balance sheet they present to us is a very disappointing one; in fact, I think it could not be more so. It is one which every member of this House and every well-wisher of the Dominion of Canada should be almost ashamed of. What does that balance sheet show? It shows, in the first place, that notwithstanding the condition of the country, as I have described it, we have actually increased our indebtedness during the last year by nearly \$8,000,000, so that it now stands at the enormous sum of over \$253,000,000, making a debt charge of over \$50 a head for every man, woman and child in this Dominion. This is a startling fact which ought to command the earnest and careful attention of the people of this country. We are now subject to an interest charge of about a quarter of a million dollars a year more than we had last year, or in any other year. At the same time, the trade of the Dominion has fallen off. In 1895 we exported from the Dominion of Canada, in round numbers, \$113,638,000; the year before that we exported \$117,525,000; so that last year we sold nearly \$4,000,000 less than we did the year before. That makes a rather bad showing, if, as has been frequently asserted, Canada is the most prosperous country in the world, and contains the most contented and happy people to be found anywhere. We have, also, bought less during the past year. Last year our imports for consumption were, in round numbers, \$105,000,000, while the year before they were \$113,000,000, a decrease in our imports for consumption of nearly \$8,000,000 in one year. So that, taking the balance sheet presented to us by the Minister of Finance, we find that our trade had fallen off, both in the exports and the imports, while the charges

against the Dominion have, at the same time, largely increased.

Now, I want, for a moment, to call your attention to what I consider the alarming increase that has taken place in the public debt of this Dominion. We will go back to the time when the Liberal Government took charge of the affairs of this country. In 1873 our debt was, in round numbers, \$99,848,000, and the interest upon that debt was \$5,209,000 a year. After five years of the administration of the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie, who left office in 1878, the debt stood at \$140,000,000, and the interest charge was \$6,797,000 a year. So that, during the five years he was in office, Mr. Mackenzie increased the debt \$40,000,000, and the interest charge by \$1,500,000. Now, this has been made considerable of. Hon. gentlemen have pointed to the fact that the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie increased the debt during his time more largely than it was increased by the gentlemen who now control the affairs of this country. But I want to call your attention to the fact that although the debt increased, he was not responsible for that increase. It was largely due to the fact that his predecessors had left a great many obligations which it was necessary for him to carry out. Sir Leonard Tilley, who was Finance Minister in 1873, in presenting his Budget speech to the House of Commons, stated :

We are further entering upon new and increased engagements, involving very large sums of money. We are entering, or have already entered, upon engagements which will require a large increase in our debt. We have \$30,000,000 for the Canadian Pacific Railway ; we have \$10,000,000 to spend on the Intercolonial Railway, and the canal system that has been accepted by the Government will involve an expenditure of at least \$20,000,000. These are serious matters, inasmuch as they add \$60,000,000 to our existing debt.

Thus you will see, Mr. Speaker, that when the Mackenzie Government came into power these obligations had been created by his predecessors, which he was bound to carry out. And although the then Finance Minister estimated that the carrying out of these obligations would increase the public debt of this country by over \$60,000,000, yet you will see that during the five years of the Mackenzie Administration the debt was only increased by about \$40,000,000, and a large proportion of this work was done. So that while the debt was increased a certain amount during Mr. Mackenzie's time, yet that increase was due largely to these obligations which had been created by his predecessors. Now, on reading the speeches of the Finance Minister from 1873 to 1878, one cannot help but remark the extravagant promises that hon. gentlemen opposite made to the country at that time, and how little they have done towards carrying out those promises. As I have said, the debt is, in my opinion, exceedingly large to-day, and every effort ought to be made to stop

any further piling up of this debt. The Finance Minister, in his Budget speech of March 27th, 1890, only six years ago, used this language :

I stated that last year that looking at the condition of the country and looking at the munificent contributions which had been given by this country for her public works, and at the splendid equipments which Canada had, by means of these contributions, gained for herself, it seems to me that we ought not, after the close of the year 1889, to increase the public debt ; that we ought not to increase the public expenditure for ordinary purposes, and that it was possible, by a prudent course, without stinting the public service in any way to carry on these services in a general way ; to meet the capital obligations which we have already assumed and to go to the year 1892 without adding to our net debt. After that, it seemed to me that we might well take into consideration whether we could not gradually decrease the amount of the debt which we had assumed and placed upon ourselves.

These were very fine words. This was, in my opinion, the course that should have been pursued ; it was a course that commended itself to this side of the House and to the majority of the people ; and we all hoped that the wise policy which the hon. gentleman had outlined in this speech would be followed. But I am sorry to say that these were but idle words, and that no steps were taken to carry out the promises then made, but that, on the contrary, year after year and month after month, the expenditure and the public debt of this country have been growing larger and larger, until now they have become a very heavy burden indeed upon the people. Why, since that language was used in 1890, we have added to the debt of this country over fifteen million dollars, and the interest charge has been increased very largely indeed as well. Now, Sir, one wonders how it is that this expenditure has gone up so high. One wonders where the money has gone. Year after year we are voting a large amount of money to carry on the affairs of this country, and it is astonishing how the expenditure rolls up. I believe that a very large amount is literally wasted. I believe that the expenditure is altogether too large, and before I am through I shall point out some ways in which I think it can be considerably reduced.

Before I leave that point I might call your attention also to the expenditure under two heads. For instance, I find that in 1877-78 the interest on our debt was \$7,048,000 ; in 1894-95 that had grown to \$10,496,000. The administration of justice in 1877-78 was only \$564,000 ; last year it had grown to \$755,000. Now, I ask you if there is any reason for this large increase in the expenditure under the head of administration of justice ? Then we may take civil government. I find that in 1877-78 the expenditure was, in round numbers, \$823,000 ; last year it was \$1,422,000. The fisheries in 1877-78 only cost the country \$93,000 ; last year that had swelled to no less than \$443,000.

Take the care of Indians. Now, we all know that there are not as many Indians in the country now as there were in 1877-78. We also know that there are better means of caring for them. We maintain in the North-west a large force of Mounted Police, very much larger than we did in 1877-78. I find that the care of the Indians in 1877-78 cost only \$421,000; last year it had increased to \$955,000. Or it had more than doubled in that short space of time. Despite the facts that the Indians are gradually decreasing, the expenditure has gone on increasing. Then we find under the head of legislation that in 1877-78 the expenditure was only \$618,000; whereas last year it had grown to \$941,000—a very large increase in that short time. On militia and defence, we find that in 1877-78 the expenditure was \$618,000; last year that had grown to no less than \$1,574,000. Now, Sir, I call your attention to this enormous increase under the head of militia expenditure, and yet the militia all over this Dominion was never in a more inefficient and disorganized condition than it is to-day. The money that has been spent in maintaining that service has been largely squandered and not applied to the purpose for which it was voted by Parliament. Then we take the head of superannuation, another outrageous expenditure, which has grown from \$106,000 in 1877-78 to \$265,000 in 1894-95. Then, the care of Dominion lands has grown from \$87,000 in the former period to no less than \$129,000 last year. Why should this expenditure be increased? Why, we know that we have not got anything like the Dominion lands to care for now that we had in 1877-78. Over 44,000,000 acres has been locked up in the North-west in colonization and railway companies over which we have no control, and a large amount has been sold and given away to settlers, and yet we find that the expenditure has grown from \$87,000 to \$129,000. I might go on and point out other ways in which this expenditure has largely increased, but time will not permit it, and I want just to sum up. The expenditure, which in 1877-78, was in round numbers \$23,500,000, grew last year to over \$38,000,000. The Finance Minister told us, a short time ago, that the public expenditure ought to remain stationary. In 1890 the hon. gentleman thought that the public expenditure would not increase but that thirty-five and a half million dollars would be sufficient for a number of years. You remember, Mr. Speaker, that in 1877 and 1878, the charges were made from every platform throughout the Dominion that the Administration of the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie was a corrupt and extravagant Administration. Sir Leonard Tilley stated, and the present Secretary of State (Sir Charles Tupper) also stated on many platforms, that a Government that could not manage the affairs of this country with an expenditure of twenty-two and a half millions had better give way to others. But no sooner did

Mr. CAMPBELL.

they get into office than the fair promises they had made were forgotten, and year by year since then the expenditure has advanced by leaps and bounds, until last year it exceeded \$38,000,000. And these hon. gentlemen are still going on in their mad career. The hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) in addressing the House a few days ago, told us that \$40,000,000 was little enough with which to manage the affairs of this country. I have no doubt that if he has anything to do with the administration of affairs the expenditure will soon be forty millions, and that it will probably go to forty-five millions before many years are over. But I believe the reign of these gentlemen is drawing to a close and that more economical and business-like men will have charge of the affairs of Canada, and that the Government will be run, as it ought to be, on business principles, as a man would run his own private business. I have no doubt that if you, Mr. Speaker, were to run your extensive business in the way this Government in running the affairs of the country, before three months were over, you would be in the poor-house. And I tell you, Sir, that if the expenditure goes on increasing as it has done, very near the amount mentioned by the hon. member for Pictou, \$40,000,000 will be required next year. And where are we going to stop? These hon. gentlemen seem to think they have nothing to do but spend the money. You would think that they picked the money up in the street or made it. They forget that every single dollar comes out of the pockets of the hard-working people of this country, and that they are only the trustees and are bound to exercise a wise supervision and great care in the expenditure of these revenues. When a business man finds that his expenditure is increasing year by year and that his business is being curtailed, that he is not selling as much as formerly, he at once says to the unworthy stewards who have charge of his affairs that they are not fit for their positions and must give way to better men. That is what the people should do.

Mr. MULOCK. That is what they are going to do.

Mr. CAMPBELL. That is what they are going to do, I believe. Now I wish to call your attention, Mr. Speaker, to another matter, one that was touched upon by my hon. friend from Guysboro' (Mr. Fraser)—the progress of our North-west Territories. The hon. member for Guysboro' deplored the fact that we were not increasing in population as rapidly as we should and that immigration was not going into the North-west as it ought to do. Let me call your attention to a statement submitted to this House by the Secretary of State on 4th May, 1883. He was speaking of the expenditure in connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway. It was stated by the Government that the Canadian Pacific Railway would not cost

the Canadian public one farthing, that every dollar that was spent in constructing that road would be recouped to the people by sales of land in the territory through which it passed. The hon. Secretary of State said :

Why, Sir, the close of the year—

That is the year before—

—after we had repaid them every dollar they were entitled to—

That is the Canadian Pacific Railway Company—

—with all that rapidity of construction, we actually owed \$1,734,129 less than we did at the beginning of the year. The net debt of the Dominion—the net debt on the 30th of June, 1881, at the beginning of the contract, was \$155,395,780.40 ; on the 30th June, 1882, it was \$153,661,650.78, or, as I said before, a decrease of \$1,734,129.62. So much for the ruin that was to overtake this country by the rapid construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Now, Sir, my hon. friend the Minister of Finance has given me this memorandum :

Surplus consolidated revenue, 1879-80.	\$ 4,132,743
Surplus consolidated revenue, 1880-81.	6,316,052
Proceeds of lands, 1880-81	1,744,456
Estimated surplus this year	6,000,000
Proceeds of lands this year	1,750,000
Estimated surplus next year	3,000,000
Estimated proceeds from lands	2,250,000
Estimated saving of interest after January, 1885, 1 per cent on \$30,000,000 \$300,000 per annum or equal to a reduction of debt of.....	7,500,000
If we have a surplus of about \$1,000,000 a year from June, 1884 to 1891, say, seven years	7,000,000
Proceeds of lands, seven years at \$2,000,000 would be	14,000,000

\$53,693,251

That is the estimate of surplus from land sales in the North-west made by the hon. gentleman at that time. Now you will be surprised to know, Mr. Speaker, that our land transactions in the North-west have resulted in this—that we have expended in surveys and in preparing these lands for settlement, \$6,488,904, and that we have only got back into the treasury, \$4,275,526, so that we have a balance on the wrong side of \$2,213,378. So that the rosy pictures the hon. gentleman presented to the House in 1883 of large sums that we were to receive from the North-west offsetting completely the cost to this country of building the Canadian Pacific Railway, faded away and we have to face the fact that we are over \$2,000,000 more out of pocket because of our land transactions. Instead of receiving, as he states here, over two million dollars a year from land sales, and making a total of over fifty-three millions, we have now a deficit of over two million dollars. At that time he fortified himself with a certificate, with a report from a gentleman who ought to have known whereof he spoke, instead of making a mere prophecy. Sir, at that time he produced a letter from Mr. A. M. Burgess, which I will read :

Ottawa, 4th May, 1883.

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

Did you ever hear such a statement as that presented to the House ? This is signed by A. M. Burgess, then and now Deputy Minister of the Interior, and was read by Sir Charles Tupper, and endorsed by him, as a true and fair estimate of what we would receive. He is so particular that he takes in the 1st day of January, and the 31st day of December, both days inclusive. So that all the statements they have made to the House have utterly failed in realization. Now, my hon. friend from Guysboro' (Mr. Fraser) pointed out to-day that the results of last year's operations in the North-west, instead of showing a large increase in the immigration to that section, instead of yielding a large sum of money from the sale of lands and other interests there, show that homestead entries in 1895 were 519 less than they were in 1894. In 1894 there were 2,683 homestead entries, and in 1895 only 2,114, showing a reduction of 519. The number of immigrants landing at Halifax, Quebec and Montreal has also fallen off very materially. In 1894 there were 25,653 and in 1895 only 23,363, showing a falling off of 2,290. Not only so, but the number of immigrants who declared their intention of settling in the country has also fallen off. In 1894 there were 18,923, and in 1895 there were only 17,231, showing a reduction of no less than 1,692 of those who declared their intention to settle in that country. Now, Mr. Speaker, it is fair to inquire what can be the reason that the tide of immigration has not set in towards that country ? I have been exceedingly anxious to find the cause why immigration has not been flowing in that direction, as of yore. Sir, I take up the report of the Minister of the Interior, that is sent broadcast over this vast Dominion as an authoritative document, one that is supposed to tell the truth in matters pertaining to the North-west, and what do I find ? Why, Sir, you cannot imagine what an astonishing reason I find given in the report of the Minister of the Interior. It is almost incredible to find such a reason given by a gentleman whose loyalty is unquestioned, and who is ambitious to appear as an upholder of the great North-west, who delights in praising the climate, the soil, the capabilities and the resources of that country ; and I may say, Sir, that in the pictures he has drawn to the House of the immense resources, the fertility, the boundless extent, and the great mineral wealth of that country, I do not think that he, in any sense, exaggerates ; I believe, and I am proud, as a

humble citizen of this Dominion, to know, that in our great North-west we have boundless prairies which are rich in agricultural resources, and rich in mineral deposits, the rivers of which abound with some of the finest fish in the world, and everything augurs for that country a teeming population at an early day if its affairs are only rightly administered. But what do I find in the report of the Minister of the Interior? Sir, it is almost incredible to find such a statement, such a damning statement, a statement that will check the tide of immigration from every part of the world. Let me read it:

The reduction in the number of homestead entries as compared with the corresponding period last year, although greatly to be regretted, is easily accounted for by reference to the damaging effects upon the crops of 1894 of the excessive drought in the territories, particularly in Eastern Assiniboia.

I ask you, Mr. Speaker, if, of all places in the world you would expect to find such a statement as that in the report of the Minister of the Interior? Instead of ascribing the lack of immigration to the injurious fiscal policy, instead of accounting for it by the enormous charges that are made upon the people of the North-west by refusing them control over the railways, instead of ascribing it to their own maladministration of the affairs of that country, they state here that Providence itself has blighted and blasted the hopes of the people of that country. Sir, that statement ought never to have been found in this report. I do not believe it is true. It may be that in certain sections of that country the crops may have been injured by the drought, which we know has slightly affected some parts; but to publish that fact to the world, and to scatter it broadcast in a public document that will be found in all the libraries of the countries from which we may expect immigration, I say is a mistake that must have deplorable effects. I think that statement cannot receive too strong a condemnation from this House. I think if they had ascribed the lack of immigration to their own negligence, to their own lack of due care in managing the affairs of that country, they would have told the truth. Now, Sir, we have spent a very large amount of money for a good many years in inducing immigrants to go into that country. During the last ten years, we have spent, for that purpose, over three million dollars. We have bonused lines of steamers running to all parts of the world; we have a High Commissioner at a very large expense residing, until recently, in the city of London, England; we have a large staff of immigration agents in that country that are costing us a large amount of money yearly; and yet we find that the results are very meagre, and are yearly growing less. But I find there is some consolation in the report of the High Commissioner. He states:

Mr. CAMPBELL. *

I have only to assure you, in conclusion, that I take the keenest possible interest in promoting immigration to Canada.

How kind and considerate to assure Parliament that he takes the keenest possible interest in this work, for which he receives about \$30,000 a year. The High Commissioner further says:

And I shall continue to do all I can in that direction.

Again, how kind and considerate. The High Commissioner continues:

But I have no hesitation in saying that I regard the filling up of the vacant lands in Manitoba and the North-west, as in other provinces, one of the most important matters, if not the most important, that can engage the attention of the Government of which you are a member. You know we have been handicapped considerably for some time past in consequence of the smallness of the fund available for immigration purposes.

The smallness of the fund, indeed, is the reason given why we have not got more immigrants. Further on, the High Commissioner says:

I do hope the Government will be able to secure a much larger sum for immigration, and that even a larger proportion than usual may be placed at my disposal,—

He wants to handle a little more money.

—for it is this country and on this continent that this expenditure is needed.

I think this country and this Parliament will hesitate for a good while before they place even as much money as they have placed hitherto in the hands of that hon. gentleman. For my part, I believe that every dollar of that expenditure is literally wasted. During the last ten years, over \$3,000,000 have been expended, and what are the results? We were told in 1890 that the Government had brought in 886,000 people, but, when the people were counted by hon. gentlemen opposite, they could find only 500,000, all told. Where did the others go? We did not maintain our natural increase. The money spent on inducing immigration to this country has been placed in the wrong hands, and new men should be placed at the head of affairs, and new measures adopted to induce immigration. The Montreal "Herald" recently contained a statement, that in the city of Quebec over 4,000 people had waited on the Government, asking for bread or work. I venture to say, that in Montreal or Toronto there are thousands of people ready and anxious to work in order to earn a livelihood. A gentleman told me lately, that he had occasion to advertise for a book-keeper at a salary of \$600 a year, and, although the advertisement appeared only in the evening papers of one day, he received 78 applications. Men are seeking work, and they cannot find it. Yet we are spending thousands of dollars yearly to bring other men here to compete with these men in their own market.

I am sorry that, in the financial statement presented to the House, the Finance Minister did not propose any remedy for preventing the increase of the debt which has been going on for the last few years. In 1891, Parliament was dissolved, and an intimation was given to the people that the Government were going to negotiate a reciprocity treaty with the United States. I am free to say this, that I do not think any measures could be placed on the statute-book which would bring such prosperity to the people as would a reciprocity treaty with the United States. In the Senate of the United States, the other day, this subject came before the House Committee, as reported in the following despatch:—

Washington, Feb. 10.—The House Committee on Accounts has decided to recommend the passage of the resolution presented by Mr. Tawney (Rep., Minn.), authorizing the Committee on Ways and Means to investigate the reciprocity question. The inquiry will be conducted by a sub-committee headed by Mr. Tawney, which may employ an expert. The scope of the inquiry is outlined in the resolution, which recites that it is desirable to extend the export of surplus agricultural and manufactured products of the United States to foreign countries, and that in certain countries the importation of these products is restricted by discriminating duties, therefore, the Committee on Ways and Means is directed to report in what countries such restrictions are in force, the causes alleged therefor, their effect upon our foreign commerce as relating to the trade resulting from the commercial agreements with foreign countries entered into after October 30, 1890 (the Blaine reciprocity treaties).

Here is an intimation from the United States that they are, at least, contemplating the subject of reciprocity. I have no doubt that if this Government were anxious to have such a treaty, they could obtain one. What is the position of Canada to-day? It is simply this, that we are a country bordering on the United States for a distance of 3,000 miles. No less than nine states of the American union, with a population of about 27,000,000, adjoin the border line of this Dominion. As was stated by my hon. friend from Huron (Mr. Macdonald) in his admirable speech, if you were to draw a straight line from the northern part of Minnesota to the northern part of Maine, the city of Toronto would lie 300 miles south of that line, and within eighteen hours' journey of that city you would find sixty-eight towns and villages, each one with a population of not less than 10,000. There is a population of 7,000,000 within eighteen hours of the city of Toronto. In my own county of Kent, the city of Chatham would lie 350 miles south of that line, and within eighteen hours' ride of that city there would be a population, in cities and towns alone, of nearly 8,000,000 people. Sir, if we had free commercial intercourse with this great population, you cannot imagine what enormous advantage it would be to Canada. We have had for a number of years a reciprocity treaty with

the United States, and from what happened during that time, we can judge what would happen if that treaty were renewed. It is true that our reciprocity treaty with the States only embraced the natural and raw products of the two countries, for there were no manufactured goods included, but yet we find that the results of that treaty were so satisfactory to the people of Canada that every one deplored when it was abrogated. From 1846 to 1853, the average trade with the United States was \$14,231,000 a year, but in 1855 the reciprocity treaty came into force, and during the eleven years of its existence from 1855 to 1866, the aggregate trade between the two countries rose from \$14,231,000 per year to the enormous sum of \$54,651,000. Here we are at the end of thirty years, after spending millions of dollars in increasing our facilities for trade between the great west and the east, after spending millions of dollars in deepening our canals, building our lines of railway, and constructing enormous bridges across the rivers and tunnels underneath to cheapen the cost of transportation and to facilitate trade and commerce between the two nations; here we are, after these thirty years have passed, after the population of the United States has grown largely, and after the population of Canada has increased to a considerable extent; here we are, I say, after all these years and under all these circumstances, and we find that to-day the trade of Canada with the United States is only \$95,932,000. Sir, if the reciprocity treaty had continued until this date, the trade between Canada and the United States, instead of being \$95,000,000, would have been by this time, I have no doubt, \$150,000,000 or \$200,000,000. What was the feeling of the people of Canada at the time the American Government gave notice of the abrogation of that treaty. Why, Sir, from one end of this Dominion to the other there was scarcely a man who did not regret that course was taken. And so strongly did the Government feel upon the question, that the Macdonald-Dorion Cabinet passed a minute of Council, which was signed by His Excellency the Governor General on the 19th February, 1864, and which reads as follows:—

It would be impossible to express in figures, with any approach to accuracy, the extent of which the facilities of commercial intercourse, created by the reciprocity treaty, have contributed to the wealth and prosperity of this province; and it would be difficult to exaggerate the importance which the people of Canada attach to the continued enjoyment of these facilities.

Nor is the subject entirely devoid of political significance.

Under the beneficent operations of the system of self-government which the latter policy of the mother country has accorded to Canada, in common with other colonies possessing representative institutions, combined with the advantages secured by the reciprocity treaty and of an unrestricted commerce with our nearest neighbours, in the natural productions of the two countries,

all agitation for organic changes has ceased—all dissatisfaction with the existing political relations of the province has absolutely disappeared.

That, Sir, is the minute in Council which was adopted by the Government of the day, and which was endorsed by every well-wisher to Canada. I am sorry to say that this Government is apparently making no effort to bring about the desirable condition of things which would exist under a reciprocity treaty. In this connection, I might state that I have noticed that during the recent election in Cape Breton there was a good deal of discussion as to the course of the Government with respect to reciprocity in coal with the United States. I want to place on record the following letter which was written by the late Right Hon. Sir John Macdonald in reference to that question :

Les Rochers, St. Patrick, Rivière du Loup.

July 30, 1890.

My dear Sir,—In answer to your esteemed note of this day, I desire to say that I am fully assured that the Parliament of Canada will be ready to take off all customs duty on coal, ores and lumber imported from the United States whenever Congress makes those articles free of duty. The Canadian Government has already authorized Sir Julian Pauncefote to state to the American government that they will be prepared to take off the export duty on logs whenever Canadian lumber is admitted into the United States market at a reduced rate of \$1.50 per thousand board measure. You are at liberty to show this to such members of Congress or the government as you please. It should not for obvious reasons be published in the press or quoted in Congress. In the United States Tariff Act provision might be made for making the above-mentioned articles free whenever they are and so soon as they are made free by the Canadian Parliament.

I remain, my dear sir, faithfully yours,

JOHN A. MACDONALD.

This was addressed to an American gentleman whose name is not given here. The House will see that at that time Sir John Macdonald was ready to remove the duty on coal, and he was also ready to remove the export duty on logs whenever the United States Government would reduce their duty to \$1.50 per thousand feet.

Mr. MULLOCK. What is the date of that letter ?

Mr. CAMPBELL. 30th July, 1890. Now, I have stated that in my opinion no legislation we could adopt would be so beneficial to the people of Canada as the opening up of reciprocal trade with the United States. When we look at the trade we do with the different countries in the world, that is quite apparent. It has been stated by hon. gentlemen opposite with a good deal of pride that our trade with Great Britain is increasing. I rejoice to know that that is the case ; but it is quite apparent that our trade with the United States has been increasing in an equal degree. You must bear

Mr. CAMPBELL.

in mind that while everything we send to Great Britain is admitted free, everything we send to the American market has to meet a duty of 30, 40 or 50 per cent before it can get in, and all goods coming to Canada from the United States have also to pay a duty of 30 or 40 per cent. Of the goods we export from the Dominion every year, a large proportion go to the United States market. I may mention a few of the leading articles. For instance, we send to the United States no less than 954,000 tons of coal, while we send to Great Britain only 23,000 tons. Of sheep one year old, we send 105,000 heads to the United States and only 5,336 heads to Great Britain ; and on every one of the former we have to pay a duty of 75 cents, while the latter are admitted free. Of wool we send 5,449,000 pounds to the United States and pay a duty on it of 12 cents a pound, whereas we send only 10,200 pounds to Great Britain. Of barley we send 1,674,000 bushels to the United States, paying a duty of 30 per cent on it, against 30,000 bushels to Great Britain. Of beans we send 347,000 bushels to the United States, paying a duty of 30 per cent upon them, and not a solitary bushel to any other country. Of potatoes we send 773,000 bushels to the United States, and only 628 bushels all told to Great Britain. On all these articles we have to pay a duty to get into the United States market and no duty to get into the British market. We thus find that our natural and best market is across the line in the United States. Our total exports from Ontario are \$30,186,000 worth, of which \$18,000,000 worth went to the United States. Of the products of our mines, fisheries and forests, of our animals, our agricultural products and our manufactures, we send far the greater portion to the United States. The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Stairs) to-day expressed his opinion that if the barriers on trade between Canada and the United States were removed, our manufactures would be simply wiped out, thousands of hands would be thrown out of employment, capital would be lost, and ruin, desolation and distress would prevail throughout the length and breadth of this country. Well, I have a higher opinion of the people of this Dominion. I think our manufacturers and our people generally are able to hold their own with those of any other country in the world. I do not think there is any other country where manufacturing can be done so cheaply and so well as in this Dominion. Our people sometimes forget that when we started housekeeping in 1867, and from that time down to 1874, we had a tariff of only 15 per cent in our favour ; and that from 1874 to 1879 it was only to 17½ per cent ; yet there has been no time in the history of Canada when greater progress has been made in manufacturing in Canada than was made in that time. In 1871, I find we were quite a manufacturing country. In that year we had in-

vested in manufactures \$77,964,000; the hands employed numbered 187,942; the raw material used was valued at \$124,907,000; we paid in wages \$40,852,000; and the value of our product was \$221,617,000. By 1881 we could make a very fair comparison, though during the first half of that period the tariff was only 15 per cent, and during the latter half it was only 17½ per cent. Let us see how our manufacturing establishments increased in that decade. The capital invested had grown to \$165,200,000; the hands employed had increased to 255,000; the raw materials had grown to \$179,918,000; the wages paid had risen to \$59,429,000; and the products of our factories were valued at \$309,171,000. That shows a very healthy progress. During that decade our manufactures were on a sure and solid foundation. I know that in the western part of Ontario every single manufactory we have in existence to-day was started, developed and grew strong during the time we had a very low tariff in force; and our manufacturing establishments have never, I believe, grown as fast as they did during that period. I am a manufacturer myself, and I believe that if we could open up a reciprocity of trade with the United States, the great mass of the manufacturers of this Dominion would be largely benefited and would hold up both hands for it.

I know that, in my own city of Chatham, there is not one manufacturer who would not gladly hold up both hands in favour of a reciprocity treaty with the United States. Why? Because they are handicapped to-day by the taxes on their raw material. They have to pay duty on their coal, lumber, iron and steel, paints, oil and varnish—on all the raw materials that enter into their particular manufactures, the duties are so high that they are not able to compete on an even keel with the manufacturers of the United States, in many instances. This fact was recognized by the Government of this country when, in order to enable our manufacturers to compete in foreign markets, they allowed them a rebate of 99 per cent on the duties charged on American goods. The Government recognized that our manufacturers cannot compete in foreign markets because they are not placed on an even field with their competitors, and very wisely, in my opinion, gave them a drawback of 99 per cent. But it would be better if, instead of taxing them in the first place, they allowed their raw material to come in free.

During the time the National Policy has been in force, the evil results of this policy were shown in the very small increase in our population. From 1871 to 1881 our population increased much faster than it did under the National Policy. The population of Canada increased from 1871 to 1881 at the rate of about 18 per cent, while during the last decade it only increased about 12 per cent, showing that, for some cause or other, the results of our trade policy have not been

beneficial. It is lamentable to think that this vast country of ours has only increased its population 500,000 during the last ten years. That shows clearly that something is wrong.

I do not wish to detain the House for any great length, but I merely want to show that, if we had, in order to get a reciprocity treaty, to embrace, as the Americans propose, a certain list of manufactured articles, as well as natural and raw products, I believe that would be of great benefit to the people of this country. It is well known that a few years ago the Americans were prepared to enter into such a treaty, provided we would consent to have included in it a list of manufactured articles. If we were to do that, our manufacturers would be on a level keel with those of the United States, and I do not believe that we have any reason to fear competition. There is no reason why our manufacturers should not be able to stand competition with those of the United States. Why, we have only one thing to-day in Canada which is enjoying free trade with the United States, and that is our railways. Our railways are the only things that enjoy comparatively free trade with the United States. Our Grand Trunk Railway and Canadian Pacific Railway can load their cars at Chicago and draw them through Canada in bond to Buffalo and New York, without let or hindrance. What are the results? You find that our railways are competing, and competing successfully, with the American roads. They are increasing daily their traffic in every way, although to a certain extent they are handicapped, inasmuch as they have to pay a duty of 60 cents per ton on the coal they consume and duty on the iron and steel that enter into the construction of their rolling stock. Take our vessels. You know that they do not enjoy the same privilege as the railways. A Canadian vessel, for instance, cannot load a cargo at Chicago or Detroit and carry it to Buffalo. It is debarred from that coasting trade. It can carry a cargo from Chicago or Detroit to a Canadian port, and then it must discharge and get a clearance from there to an American port, but it is debarred from carrying from one American port to another. What is the consequence? You find that our Canadian vessels are gradually disappearing on our lakes. There is very little for them to do, and instead of building new vessels, as we did in the days of yore, our ship-yards are now idle and their hands have gone away. But once we have the restrictions on trade removed, if we once open up a reciprocity treaty with the United States, prosperity would bound back to the shores of Canada, and our vessels would be employed in carrying the enormous trade we once handled from the great west to the sea. Why, of the millions of tons of freight that came down the great lakes from the west to the east last year, it is a lamentable fact that only about 5 per cent was carried

in Canadian vessels. But, if the obstructions to trade were removed, our marine men all over the Dominion would benefit, increased trade would flow to Canada, our ship-yards would again be started, and employment be given to thousands who have left our shores to seek their living in a foreign country. Not only that, but, when you look at the enormous trade we do with the United States, it shows clearly that, in spite of all the barriers we place in the way, our trade still seeks a market in the United States in preference to England. I cannot conceive of any measure that would confer anything like the advantages on this country which would flow from the opening up of this trade, and I am glad to know that it is a plank in the Liberal platform, that, as soon as we come into power, which I believe will be shortly, we will enter into negotiations in earnest with the United States. These negotiations will be opened up by men who are anxious to negotiate a treaty, and the result will be, that in a few months after the Liberal party are restored to power, we will have a reciprocity treaty with the United States that will not only embrace natural and raw products, but also a certain list of manufactured goods. Now, it has been said that we could not enter into a reciprocity treaty with the United States without discriminating against Great Britain. Well, in the first place, I think that the members of the Canadian House of Commons have one duty to perform, and one only, and that is to do what is best for our own country. We have to consider what will advance the prosperity of this Dominion, and if we take a wise course in that respect, we shall perform our duty, and we can let other representative bodies look after the interests committed to their care. I know that, so far as England is concerned, she is well able to take care of herself. Her statesmen are the equals of any statesmen in the world, and they are able and willing and anxious to promote the interests of the Empire as a whole. In the second place, even though we negotiate a treaty, before that treaty can become law, it must receive the sanction of the Imperial Government and be signed by Her Gracious Majesty the Queen. That itself, I should think, would be a sufficient guarantee that the interests of the Empire, as a whole, would be sufficiently safe-guarded. The fact that the Government and the Parliament of Great Britain would have to sanction the treaty before it became law, it seems to me, ought to allay any fear that the interests of the Empire would be jeopardized in any way. We find that treaties have been negotiated. Our sister province of Newfoundland, a few years ago, negotiated a treaty with the United States, known as the Blaine-Bond treaty. That treaty would have received the sanction of the Imperial Government, and would have been signed by Her Ma-

Mr. CAMPBELL.

esty but that Canada protested against it, and for that reason it was held over. But the fact that Newfoundland could negotiate a treaty that would be acceptable to the British Government and the British Parliament is sufficient to justify us in believing that if we were in earnest in our efforts to secure such a treaty, an arrangement could be made that would receive the sanction of the Imperial Government. There are a great many lines of goods that we import nearly altogether from the United States. If we entered into a reciprocity treaty that would embrace a certain line of manufactured goods, we could include only such things as we do not import from Great Britain at all. Take, for instance, agricultural implements. We import this class of goods almost wholly from the United States. Of wire nails we imported from the United States last year no less than \$50,000 worth, while we imported from Great Britain only \$1,461 worth. So I might name many articles of which we import almost none from England, while we import them largely from the United States. The list of articles in which reciprocity was agreed upon might be so arranged as not to interfere with our trade with England. I do not think there is any doubt whatever that if the Government were sincere in their efforts, they could obtain a treaty that would be greatly beneficial to the people of this Dominion. We have a great country here, a country with agricultural resources almost unlimited, a country whose progress ought to be very much greater than it is. It is lamentable to think what slow progress we have made in the last few years. In spite of all the efforts that have been made to increase the tide of immigration, we are not increasing the population in anything like the ratio we should. But, I believe a brighter day is coming. I anticipate great things for the future; I see in the near future, this young Canadian giant, conscious of his own strength, moving forward in the path of civilization with irresistible power. And, as he advances, I behold the plains of the North-west, the hills and valleys of the east, and the slopes that stretch to the Pacific, filled with an intelligent, religious, rejoicing people, one in sympathy, one in government, the inheritors and possessors of British institutions, the noblest and freest and brightest development of mankind.

Mr. EDWARDS. Before this debate closes—

Mr. MACLEAN (York). When?

Mr. EDWARDS. I do not know when—I desire to address a few words to the House. In the first place, I wish to refer to a few remarks made by hon. gentlemen on the other side. In the beginning of his speech, the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) said:

I am averse to the principle enunciated last year by the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Edwards), that he was in favour of the total abolition of duties on pork, and on oats and other productions of the field and on other produce which farmers largely produce in which they are greatly interested.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have carefully read my speech delivered to the House last session, and what I shall now read is all that I can find bearing upon that question :

A second statement made by the hon. gentleman who has just spoken, is that our farmers are protected. I deny that proposition most emphatically. They are not protected at all. They may have a small protection or a pretended protection, in the one article of pork, but even the protection on that is more a packer's protection than a farmer's protection.

Further on, I said :

I challenge any hon. gentleman opposite to prove in any degree whatever that the farmers of this country are protected, except possibly to a very small extent, in the article of pork. Who are the producers of the wealth of this country ? They are, above all others, our farmers ! If any class should be protected, it is the farmers and the labourers ; but I defy any hon. gentleman to prove that either of these classes is protected in anything whatever, except as I have said.

Now, so far as the hon. member for East Simcoe is concerned, he did not correctly read my speech. The next question with which he dealt was the construction of the Trent Valley Canal. And he dealt with that canal versus the Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal. So far as the relative merits of these two canals are concerned, I do not think there is any similarity whatever. True, the Trent Valley Canal might be a work of very great importance to Canada, or, at least, to a portion of Canada ; but the construction of the Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal would not only be of paramount importance to the district through which it runs, but it would be of paramount importance to the whole Dominion of Canada. If there is one section of Canada more than another interested in the construction of that canal it is the city of Montreal, and also the city of Quebec. I am not going to dwell at any length on this question, but I will merely say that it is my belief that if that canal had been constructed thirty or forty years ago when it was a live question in this whole district, Canada would be worth many millions more to-day than she is ; and I believe that Montreal would be a much larger shipping port and New York relatively smaller. Sir, I earnestly desire that just as soon as the financial conditions of this country will permit, just as soon as the development of this country will warrant, that great work will be carried out. Great undertakings have been assumed by Canada in the last few years, and it might be premature now to ask, as some are asking, that that canal should be immediately

built ; but just as soon as our condition will permit, I sincerely hope that that great work will be carried out. Now, Sir, in the discussion of this matter, the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) stated as follows :—

The construction of this canal would mean that barges after having delivered their cargoes of grain at Montreal could in turn be laden with Nova Scotia coal and hurried back to these different towns along the line of this canal. Again, in turn these barges passing through to the American side and discharging their cargoes of lumber or their cargoes of grain, could bring back hard coal, and necessarily the result of the double freight would be the lessening of rates each way.

As for that statement, Mr. Speaker, there is no question but that it is correct, and it illustrates what the Liberal party have always contended for, or what the free traders have always contended for, that in order that any country may achieve the best results, it must import as well as export. The hon. gentleman being a protectionist he can only apply this principle to the interior of the country. But I believe that the same principle extended the world over, would be beneficial wherever it was adopted. Now, the hon. gentleman next dealt with the export duty upon saw-logs, and again he made an onslaught on the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). He stated that no member of this House had dared to defend the non-imposition of the export duty upon saw-logs except the hon. member for North Norfolk. Well, Sir, I may say that I and other members of this House have taken exactly the same ground as the hon. member for North Norfolk. The hon. member for Simcoe went on to say :

I ask what does all this mean ? The export from this country every year of 300,000,000 feet of saw-logs means that a large number of mills are working on the other side of the line, the owners of which, if deprived of those Canadian saw-logs, would be compelled to come to Canada and have the lumber manufactured here. I am going to read for the benefit of the House a short extract headed "Bay City," to prove the truth of the statement I made of the quantity of logs exported. This statement is made by Mr. Thos. Pitts, the head of the firm of Pitts & Co., exporters of saw-logs :

Between 260,000,000 and 300,000,000 feet of logs are annually imported from Canada. An export duty would compel us to go to Canada to manufacture our lumber. Along this coast from Saginaw to Cheboygan it would turn 20,000 men out of employment that earn annually in the neighbourhood of \$5,500,000.

That is a startling statement—that the Government of Canada, by their policy of permitting the export of logs from this country, are depriving 20,000 men of employment in Canada. By the National Policy, the Government have imposed high protective duties in order to foster certain industries in this country ; and yet here it is pointed out by an American lumberman that the Government of Canada, by their suicidal policy—because it is a suicidal policy in this respect—are depriving this country of the employment, annually, of 20,000 men.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman not knowing very much about the question himself, read from this American importer; and I think you will agree with me that neither he nor the man from whom he quoted knew anything at all about the subject with which he was dealing. He says that the manufacture of 300,000,000 feet of logs into sawn lumber, would require the labour of 20,000 men, and an annual pay-sheet of \$5,500,000. Mr. Speaker, it would take at the very outside 2,000 men to manufacture 3,000,000 feet of lumber, and the total expenditure for that labour would be \$600,000. Their estimate is just ten times too large. I know, Mr. Speaker, that you will agree with me in making that statement. It simply does away with the contention of the hon. gentleman's whole speech, because it means that he will make any statement at all. Now, a great many not understanding this subject, suppose that the whole production of these logs is lost to Canada; whereas the truth of the matter is the cutting of the logs in the woods and bringing them to the mills, costs about three and one-half times as much as it does to manufacture them into sawn lumber. Furthermore, these logs are rafted in Canada, if they are not sawn in Canada, and that would mean at least 50 cents more per thousand, which would reduce by so much the figures I have already given. But these very saw-logs, after all, are manufactured by Canadians, although manufactured on American territory; and they are manufactured by Canadians driven out of this country by the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite. But under a rational system of government, under the policy that the Liberal party advocates, I believe that these logs would be manufactured in Canada, and manufactured by Canadians who are now working in the United States. The hon. gentleman represents a district of country upon Georgian Bay. He is a protectionist, and he considers the subject as regards the small district in which he lives, and not as regards the interests of the whole of Canada. The imposition of an export duty of \$2 per thousand feet on 300,000,000 feet of lumber would mean to the treasury of Canada, \$600,000 annually. The exportation of lumber to the United States is over 1,000,000,000 feet per annum. In the event of an export duty being placed on such logs, an import duty would be placed on lumber going from Canada to the United States, and this would mean a loss to the Canadian people of \$2,000,000 annually. I never hear, in the course of speeches, delivered by hon. gentlemen opposite, such as the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett), one word as to the preservation of our forests from the ravages of fire. That is a most important question to this House and to each of the provinces. There is another question of great interest, and that is the supply of

Mr. EDWARDS.

timber in the United States and the supply of timber in Canada. There are many business men in this country, and no doubt many members of this House, who believe that the lumber of Canada is an absolute necessity to the United States. It is not the case. In so far as the United States is concerned, in my opinion it will not require one stick of timber from Canada for the next one hundred years.

Mr. SPROULE. American lumbermen do not say so.

Mr. EDWARDS. The supply is very large, indeed. There is the white pine of the north-western states, the yellow pine of the southern states, extending from Washington around the entire Atlantic coast to the mouth of the Mississippi River, and timber of various kinds in Mississippi, Kentucky, and Tennessee, a kind of pine that exists in very large quantities in the south-west, the red wood of California, and the Douglas pine of Washington and Oregon. The quantities are enormous, they are simply beyond calculation. In so far as white pine is concerned, it is quite true that the quantity in that single article is, in the United States, not so large as it is in Canada. What kind of lumber is it we export to the United States? It is our common lumber. The hon. member for South Ontario (Mr. Smith) stated a day or two ago that Great Britain was our best customer even for our lumber. That Great Britain is a very good customer for our pine lumber is quite true, and the best qualities are purchased for that market. But the exports to Great Britain were, in value, \$2,000,000 less than to the United States last year, and the kind of lumber we exported to the United States was that which is the most difficult to sell, namely, our common lumber. If the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite should prevail, the result would be that our common lumber would have to bear an import duty, which it could not in the least degree bear, and this would be a serious detriment to the lumbermen of Canada and to Canada itself, because it is very well known that in so far as our exports are concerned, and also the production of wealth, the lumbermen stands next to the farmer. I have taken down the figures, in so far as exports are concerned for the past two years, and I find in 1894 we exported to England the value of \$11,592,000, while we exported to the United States the value of \$13,338,000. In 1895 we exported the value of \$10,000,000 and \$12,543,000 to the United States. I have already stated that it is of pre-eminent importance to the various provinces of this country that timber of all classes should be preserved against the ravages of fire. If hon. gentlemen speaking on the timber question in this House would devote themselves to the question of its preservation, they would be doing far

more service than by bringing forward the subject of an export duty on logs, or anything of the kind. As regards an export duty on logs, I am opposed to it on principle, as well as opposed to it as a matter of policy. I hold that if gentlemen come here from the United States, or any other part of the world, and attend sales of timber limits in the various provinces, bid for them, purchase limits on certain conditions regulated by the provinces, comply with those regulations, it would be nothing less than theft on the part of the Government to step in and say, gentlemen, before you remove that property from this country, you must pay tribute to us. On principle, it is entirely wrong, and, as I have already explained, it would be a suicidal policy for this country to adopt.

Mr. SPROULE. Does the hon. gentleman not think that the local governments should make regulations to have the timber manufactured in this country?

Mr. EDWARDS. The hon. gentleman asks whether or not I think our provincial governments should make regulations to have the lumber manufactured in this country. So far as that is concerned, there is no Canadian who would be more heartily glad than I would be to see it all manufactured here, but I could not support any such principle. If we sought to carry that principle into effect, we would simply be declaring that the purchasers should not only saw, but should manufacture it into doors and sashes, &c. There is no consistency in such an argument.

Mr. SPROULE. It does not go that far, by any means.

Mr. EDWARDS. There is another question of export duty agitated in this country to which I desire to refer for a short time. I understand a very large deputation of gentlemen who are interested in Canadian pulp mills interviewed the Government, a few days ago, with the object of having an export duty placed upon pulp timber. So far as that is concerned, as a matter of principle and a question of policy, I would be adverse to any such imposition, and I most earnestly hope that the solicitations of the members of that deputation will not be entertained by the Government. What are the conditions of that trade, Sir? The various provinces have restrictions in so far as the cutting of spruce timber is concerned on the limits they own. In the province of Quebec, with which I am most intimate in this respect, spruce timber is not allowed to be cut on government limits of less dimension than eleven inches at the stump. Therefore, any timber cut for pulp wood is not cut upon the limits owned by the Government, but it is cut by the farmers and settlers on their own private lands. These farmers and settlers have never interviewed the Government nor never asked

the Government for an export duty upon pulp wood, and they never will ask for it. And why, Sir? It is because they desire to sell their pulp wood in the free markets of the world for the highest price they can obtain. But the pulp-mill owners, protectionists, of course, would wish to say to the farmers and to the settlers: gentlemen, we will tax you for everything you buy, and for anything you have to sell in so far as we can we will tax you also. That spirit underlies the whole principle of protection. Sir, the interest of the farmers and the interest of the people of Canada is, that they shall have a free market to sell their pulp wood product, as well as all their other products, and a free market to buy in also.

Now, Sir, I shall deal briefly with a much larger hon. gentleman, namely, the Minister of Finance. He told us in his Budget speech that last year the balance of trade was in our favour, and he referred to that fact as "so much to the gain of the general of our business interests." Well, Sir, it is true that last year we did export more than we imported, but what was the reason? It was because the condition of the farmers of Canada to-day is so poor—and I am sorry to say it, but I must say it, because I know it is true—their condition is so bad that they had to sell everything they possibly could sell. And why was it that our imports were not larger? Sir, it was because our people were too poor to buy. The Minister of Finance, like a great many others, probably believes that when we export more than we import we are in a thriving condition. I deny that proposition entirely. I would be glad to see Canada in such a position that she would be able, each year, to buy more than she sells: and if she is making proper development within her own borders, and if the people are prospering as they should prosper, then they will each year be able to buy more than they sell. This balance of trade question is, I admit, a great difficulty to many, although I cannot see how it can be a difficulty to those who have studied the subject at all.

Mr. DICKEY. Hear, hear.

Mr. EDWARDS. My hon. friend (Mr. Dickey) says "hear, hear," and he smiles. I know quite well that he does not think I know what I am talking about, but, Sir, perhaps I do. I contend that in dealing with the balance of trade, you have to consider the whole conditions surrounding a country, and in a new country like Canada—where, if we have not we should have large immigration, affording a greatly increased market for our products—we would be able to buy more than we sell if we were making the very best development. A great many people think that the rule in this respect applied to individuals should apply to nations, and that when a man sells more than he buys, he is in a prosperous condition. I admit that principle so far as individuals

are concerned, but I deny that it applies to countries. For many years the United States had a balance of trade in its favour, but during that whole period the United States was not showing its best development. With a very large influx of population and with the great development that was going on during that time, the United States should have bought each year more than she sold. On the other hand, England for, I think, fifty years, has had each year a very large balance of trade against her; but where is there under the sun a country which is growing so fast in riches as is Great Britain? If the workmen of Canada were simply working for export, and if every hour of labour employed in Canada was devoted to the production of articles for export, then it would be true that we would be retrograding if we did not export more than we imported. But we are making internal development, and it is the application of the labour of the country that produces the riches of the country. I deny the statement that even to-day Canada is not becoming richer. Canada is becoming richer just in proportion as the people of Canada labour. Sir, the statement I make is this: that the labourers of Canada are not receiving a proper proportion of the results of their labour. It is going in a wrong direction, and it is going in a wrong direction because of the system of protection under which we live. Again, Mr. Speaker, the hon. Finance Minister made the statement that we were just now emerging from a period of five years of hard times, of depression. Now, if I recollect aright, the Budget speeches of the hon. gentleman for the past five years, in each of them he described the condition of Canada in glowing terms, and the speeches of the hon. gentlemen behind him were in the same strain. Last year, for the first time, the hon. Finance Minister admitted that there was a little depression in Canada, and he says now that we are just emerging from a five year's period of depression. Well, Mr. Speaker, I am largely engaged in commerce myself. I know something about it, and I regret very much for Canada to have to say, that, in my opinion, we are only fairly well into it—the depression. We have not begun to emerge from the depression at all. I was in business from 1874 to 1878, and I make this statement, that the depression existing in Canada to-day is far greater than the depression that existed from 1874 to 1878. I make this further statement—though I know it will not be accepted by hon. members opposite, and it may not be accepted by a great many of the people of Canada—that in no period for many years did Canada make such great development as she made in the years of 1877 and 1878. A great deal of the prosperity that appeared to exist after 1879 was the result of our large borrowings and our large public expenditures. It was not due to the development of the lands and

Mr. EDWARDS

the other natural resources of Canada at all. Not only was that the case, but the expenditure of the savings that had been made by the people in 1877 and 1878, after that period, made it appear that it was a time of greater prosperity; whereas, I make the statement, and I think I can prove it, that in no period in the history of Canada was such a saving made by the people as was made in those years, I mean in 1877 and 1878. Later on the hon. Finance Minister made this statement:

The returns of the past six months of the current year show an increase of imports to the amount of \$2,500,000 and an increase of exports of \$500,000, making a betterment of trade of \$3,000,000 in the six months.

The increase in imports was five times as great as the increase in exports, and a short time before he had made this statement that that was a bad state of things; yet he calls this a betterment of trade. Now, so far as being a learned professor or reading something on the subject is concerned, the Finance Minister, perhaps, knows, theoretically, something of commerce; but, practically, I am sorry to say, he is a perfect infant on the subject of trade and commerce; he knows nothing at all about it. Later on he expresses a willingness to be judged upon the record of his party for the past seventeen years, but not upon certain periods of that time. Well, Mr. Speaker, I consider the debate which is now closing, the best debate on the Budget that I ever heard in this House. The principles of protection versus those of free trade have been more and better discussed this year than I have ever heard them discussed in this House before. One man may say that he is a protectionist; another may say that he will not go the whole length of free trade, but that he is in favour of a revenue tariff. But there can be no intelligent discussion upon the subject at all unless it is a discussion of the question of protection versus free trade. The application of a revenue tariff is simply the application of the principles of free trade. Mr. Speaker, I have announced it in this House many and many a time, and I am not ashamed to say it here nor in any other place—in fact, I am proud to say it—that I am an out-and-out free trader; but I am willing for the present to accept the policy enunciated by the Liberal party, which is that of a revenue tariff. Now, the hon. Finance Minister said that he was willing to be judged by the whole period of the last seventeen years, but not by any portion of it. Hon. gentlemen opposite, in the discussion of this matter, have given us a very great deal of ancient history. Their minds always revert back to the period from 1874 to 1878, when the Liberal party were in power, and they discuss the conditions, as they consider they then existed, compared with the conditions as they consider they have existed since that time. They are very

fond of ancient history, but they do not go back to the period prior to 1874. From the inception of confederation, up to 1874, Canada lived under a revenue tariff. After that period up to the date of the introduction of the National Policy, we still lived under the same condition, with a simple addition of 2½ per cent to the tariff in the last few years. It is true, for the first few years of that period—I refer to the period when Mr. Mackenzie was in power—a very great depression did exist in this country; but it is also true that at the same time a very great depression existed in the United States and in almost the entire world. Would any rational man expect that a country with a small population such as Canada would not, like all other countries, suffer under such conditions? Not only is that true, but the depression was far greater than it would otherwise have been in the United States and Canada in consequence of the American war. There is this one fact, and it will be so till the end of time: We shall be continually getting out of gear, so far as the proper employment of our people is concerned; and this applies, not only to Canada, but to all other countries in the world. If you could continually keep the number of traders exactly in proportion to the number of producers, no such thing as a depression would ever exist. It is because too many men leave their proper avocations and rush into business, that business is overdone, and labour is, to a great extent, neglected. We have too many traders, and, as a result, business calamities and commercial depression follow. These intervals of depression come about periodically. Now, in so far as the United States are concerned, as a result of the American war and the inflation that occurred after that war was over, the natural period of depression was put a long way further off than it would otherwise naturally have been; but when the depression did come, it was very severe and far reaching in its effects, and it had a very great effect on this country. The Liberal party came into power just after that depression had appeared, for it made its appearance in 1873. It appeared in a very marked manner in the United States in 1873, and it was, I admit, their misfortune to come into power at such a time. Then the improvement began in a very marked manner in the United States in 1878, and the results of that improvement we felt here, and everything that followed was claimed for the National Policy which began its operations in 1879. At that time what were the people of Canada promised? Hon. gentlemen opposite said: Return us to power; let us introduce the National Policy—although they did not know until after they came into power what their National Policy was to be; elect us, and we will bring about such a condition of things that the farmer, the lumberman, the manufacturer and the labourer, every one will be prosperous, and that pros-

perity will continue. Now, hon. gentlemen opposite are willing to be judged by the last period of seventeen years. Well, ask the farmers, ask the people of this country generally what the condition of things is to-day, and they will deny that we have had continuous prosperity since that time. They will deny that for many years past they have enjoyed any degree of prosperity, and they will all admit that to-day we are suffering from the most serious depression that has ever overtaken this country. When hon. gentlemen opposite pretend anything different, they simply insult the intelligence of the farmers of this country, who know very much better, and I am surprised that any farmer in this House will get up and defend the present condition of things and the policy of the present Government. That policy is one which robs the farmers of this country, which robs the producers of all the wealth of this country. It is nothing else but class legislation, and class legislation of a most iniquitous kind. There is one thing in this connection that I will admit. I will admit that after the inception of the so-called National Policy—I call it the irrational policy—there was a movement of population from the small towns to the greater. I admit that the small manufacturing towns grew less and the larger ones grew greater; but I contend that the result to-day is that while the large centres have grown greater, such as the cities of Montreal and Toronto, the whole country has been levelled down in order to build up these places. I hold further that those large cities are suffering more to-day than they have suffered perhaps at any time in their history; and I hold further that these cities cannot make any further great improvement until the country generally again begins to build up. I believe that the business men of Montreal, the manufacturers of Montreal, are beginning to realize this fact. Why, Mr. Speaker, because the policy of this Government is destroying the port of Montreal. The Government speak of their statesmanship in constructing canals. They talk as if they had built them themselves. Not at all, it is the farmers of this country who have built them; and by the Government's policy, the transport trade on these canals is lost to us and diverted to the United States ports. Their policy is destroying, in a commercial, in a manufacturing and in every sense, the great port of the city of Montreal; and until we have a rational policy which will enable the country to grow, which will allow us to import as well as export, the port of Montreal can make no further development. Now, the ex-Minister of Justice (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) took to task the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) because he referred to the geographical and climatic conditions of this country, and the Minister exclaimed that our vigorous climate was very much in our favour, and that we had a country capable of growing good men and so

forth. In so far as that is concerned, I accept his statement, but it was not a reply at all to the contention of my hon. friend from South Oxford. What the hon. member for South Oxford meant was that climatic influences were to some extent against us because of our lack of variety of climate. What he contended, and what any hon. gentleman will contend who gives any study to this question, is that if there is one country under the sun which is less suited for protection than another it is Canada, because of our climate, and because unfortunately of our lack of seaboard, and because of our great breadth and our narrow condition generally. Geographically there can be no doubt that things are to some extent against us. Geographically and climatically, the conditions of the United States are much more favourable than what they are in Canada. The United States have a compact country, a country with great breadth and great length, with seaboard all round it, and with all the climates and all the resources necessary to build up a great country. And of whom are we the competitors? We are the competitors of the people of the United States in the sale of our cattle, grain, butter, cheese and all our other agricultural products. True, the Americans have been living under the same iniquitous system for a number of years; but if there is one country under the sun better calculated to live under that iniquitous system, it is the United States. It is a combination of great countries the east trading with the west and the north with the south. If protection be a good thing for any country, then the people of the United States ought to apply it inside their own territory. They ought to run three or four lines through their own country and have a protective system—the north protected against the south and the east against the west. But the people of that country are bound to throw off that iniquitous system. They are beginning to understand the situation, and they are going to throw it off, and when they do so, England will have the greatest competitor she has ever had or ever will have. Now, what are our conditions? Our conditions are, as have been already described—we border on that great country for about four thousand miles. Is it reasonable, or is it not reasonable to say that it would be greatly in the interests of the people of Canada to be able to trade backwards and forwards across the line, instead of carrying all our products from west to east and from east to west, as we have to do to-day? There can be no kind of doubt that, in this respect, geographical conditions are against us. But, vigorous people that we are, give the producers of this country, the farmers, the lumbermen, the miners and the fishermen, fair-play, and, even with these conditions against us, we are not afraid to meet the people of the United States, or the peo-

Mr. EDWARDS.

ple of any country, in the markets of the world. We, the producers of the natural resources of this country, desire to be able to buy exactly as we sell. Our products are sold in open competition with the products of all the countries of the world. We, the producers of the wealth of this country, desire to buy in the same way. Hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, in discussing this question, compare the farmers of England with the farmers of Canada. Now, Sir, so far as that is concerned, I will admit that agriculture in England is depressed. But I hold that it is only a temporary depression, and that it is only a question of the adjustment of rents. Will any hon. gentleman pretend that the land of Great Britain has lost its value? We compete against the farmers of England, it is true, but in that competition our farmers are handicapped to the extent of the freight to England from the Northwest and other parts of Canada. Is not the land of Great Britain, if it is equal in fertility, worth just as much more than our land, as the cost of transporting our products to their markets? There can be no kind of doubt about that. Talk of England being in a condition of decay. Why, Sir, it is perfect nonsense. We had an exemplification of her great power the other day, when many nations of the world appeared as if they were going to pounce upon old England at the same time. But she was able to stand up and say: You may have the men, but we have the money and the ships, and we are ready for you. There is no decay in England, but the very contrary. England stands higher among the nations of the world to-day than ever before. And is it possible that England can maintain that position with her agriculture going to pieces? Nothing of the kind—it is simply a question of adjustment of rents between landlord and tenant. But it is perfectly true that some of the farmers of England, if not all, are crying out for protection. And it is perfectly natural: the same condition of affairs prevails all over the world. Those who are interested in having protection are the ones who cry out for it. The manufacturers of England are not asking for protection, but the farmers are. In this country, the farmers are not asking for protection, but the manufacturers are. This only proves that it is not a question of principle at all, but a matter of policy for the individual himself. That is what protection amounts to, nothing more and nothing else.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in the discussion of this subject, for a few sessions past, I have contended that the farmer of this country has no protection at all, except, possibly, on the one article of pork. I find that I have been making a mistake. I have looked into the subject, and I find that even in that particular the farmer has no protection. This country exports hog products

far more largely than it imports them. I deny now, and I challenge any man in this House or out of it to show that the farmer of this country is protected in the slightest degree in anything that he produces. I may be told that he is protected in the matter of mess pork. He is not, and I will tell you why. The purchase of the hogs from the farmers of this country is not based upon the question of mess pork, but upon the quantity of hogs actually in the country; and the packer selects from the products what will make mess pork, and the rest he sells for bacon, hams, and so on, and the farmer gets no protection at all.

Mr. STEVENSON. Oh, oh.

Mr. EDWARDS. The hon. member for Peterborough laughs. But I ask him and other protectionists to study this question. Protection is a policy of infants. When I was a lad fourteen years old, I was a protectionist, and for years I would not wear anything that was not grown in Canada, and believed that if every Canadian would be a patriot and use only the products of Canada, and if we should then sell our surplus abroad we would become a very rich people. But before I was twenty years of age, and without ever hearing protection or free trade discussed, without reading one line upon the subject, I became an ultra free trader, and remain a free trader to this day.

Mr. ROOME. Would you be in favour, if your party came into power, of removing the duties upon farm products?

Mr. LISTER. Oh, you are asking that question of everybody. It does neither good nor harm.

Mr. EDWARDS. I have answered that question two or three times already. The hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague) thought he was asking me a very clever question, when, a few years ago he put that query to me. The answer that I then gave is on record, and I ask the hon. member for West Middlesex (Mr. Roome) to read it. I became a free trader by simply applying the principle of protection logically. On the principle of protection, each farmer should be his own shoemaker, his own tinsmith, blacksmith, and carpenter.

An hon. MEMBER. And his own doctor.

Mr. EDWARDS. And his own doctor, I suppose. But when I grew older, I came to the conclusion that it was far better for the farmer to farm and to exchange what he produced for the products of others. And the same is true of countries. If we had, in Canada, all the climates of the world, if we had in Canada all the varied products of the world, we might then put a Chinese wall around our country, allow nobody in and nobody out and trade only among ourselves. But conditions in Canada are the same as in other countries. We

have resources that are natural to the country, and the best interests of the people of Canada lies in applying themselves to producing those articles which are natural to the country and exchanging them for the products for other parts of the world. Any other system is an artificial system, and prejudicial to the producers of the natural resources of the country. Sir, I am no enemy of the manufacturers. I desire that we shall have manufactures in this country, and I deny that under the system we propose to introduce the manufacturing interest will be very much lessened, if lessened at all. I believe that, under the rational system which the Liberal party will introduce, when returned to power, the development of our natural resources will be stimulated, our population will be increased and we shall have more manufacturing, because the manufacturers will have a larger population to manufacture for. Under protection it is quite impossible to sell in the markets of the world, and under the system of our present Government we can manufacture only for ourselves. It is owing to such conditions that we have not increased our population as fast as we should have done. As a result the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway—an enterprise which is national in its character and which has more or less difficulties of existence—an increase of population and general development is of great importance. The greatest question the people of Canada have to consider is, how are we going to fill up our great North-west, because, unless we fill up that country with a population, our progress will be very slow indeed. We have undertaken in the past heavy obligations, which are a charge upon the people of Canada, and, in order to lighten that charge, we must increase our population and develop our country. The great difficulty in the North-west at present is, that we have tried to cover too much country, our population is too sparse. In order to encourage immigration, in order to induce people to come to our shores from foreign countries, we must show them that we have a cheap country to live in, and that those who come here to engage in agriculture, or in the development of our natural resources, shall have fair-play, that they shall not be unjustly taxed, that they shall not be taxed for the advantage of a few manufacturers. Mr. Speaker, as a Canadian, who is proud of Canada, I desire her development, I desire that all impediments to her prosperity and greatness may be removed, and it is my sincere belief that the policy of the Liberal party will remove those impediments, and that our beloved country will attain to that degree of wealth and prosperity which we all hope for her.

Mr. McSHANE. Mr. Speaker, at this late hour of the night, I do not intend to make a long speech; I shall take another oppor-

tunity to say some things which I will not have time to say to-night. But, in the meantime, I desire to draw your attention to some events that occurred in the election that took place recently in the city of Montreal. Sir, although I was told by the Finance Minister that I was a man unworthy to sit in Parliament, yet, with all my unworthiness, the people of Montreal Centre have sent me here, and I desire to give you a little illustration of the tactics that were employed against me when I was a candidate for the high honour of a seat in the House of Commons of Canada. I was opposed by three or four monopolists. One was a very wealthy gentleman, and, although I do not think he was very fond of politics, I believe he was fond of the party in power. This gentleman worked night and day, with his son, and his clerks, and his manager. He told his employees for a month before the election, that, if they dare to vote for James McShane, they would not get any more work. Well, Sir, perhaps it would be just as well for these poor men if they did not get any more work, for, although that gentleman has made millions, he pays his men a miserable \$1 or \$1.10 a day to work in vats, and these poor men, after four or five years, become sick and contract rheumatism. But what does that gentleman care? The day of my election he had guards at his gates, and he told the men before they came out of his factory: "Cry out for Hingston, or you can't get out here." A great many of those men cried out for Hingston, but they voted for James McShane. Now, Sir, I will give you some reasons why one of these monopolists worked so hard against me, and that is because he has got rich by the favour of the present Government, and the poor people of this country have had to pay for it. Now, I want to give you an illustration of the way the tariff policy of this Government works in respect of the article of refined syrup, and I will give you a practical illustration of the protection enjoyed by our sugar refiners. In 1893, the duty on refined syrups was 1½ cents per gallon. This being a reasonable duty, we did considerable business in this article, which we purchased from the refiners in the United States. This, however, did not suit either the Government or the Canadian refiners, and in 1894 the duty was increased to 7 cents per gallon, which was simply an outrage, as the following actual importation by us will prove:—

1894.	
Oct. 18.—500 barrels syrup (costing in New York) 21,221 galls. at 7¼c.....	\$ 1,527 93
Freight to Montreal	\$ 297 00
Wharfage and canal dues ..	10 25
Gauging	15 00
Marine insurance	11 25
Duty, 7 cents per gall., and 20 per cent on pkgs.	1,567 08
	1,900 58
	\$3,428 51

Mr. McSHANE.

Notwithstanding this increased duty, we continued importing syrups, as we understood from our Finance Minister's speech, that he intended to reduce taxation, and we presumed that refined syrups would be one of the articles that would come under the heading of reduced taxation, and we patiently awaited the arrival of the Budget in 1895.

Imagine our dismay, when the Finance Minister brought down his Budget in 1895, and we read that the duty on this particular article had been increased to 10½ cents per gallon. This was the last straw, and we at once retired from the business of importing refined syrups, as we felt it would be quite useless to attempt any further business in an article costing 7¼ cents per gallon, on which we were asked to pay 10½ cents per gallon duty.

Now, there was another gentleman who worked very hard against me, and I will tell you why. This gentleman is a prominent Montreal merchant, and has a large number of steamships trading between Montreal and foreign ports. He has made a small fortune out of this National Policy, but still he is not satisfied. Once he was a strong Reformer, but, when he found out that he could make money out of the present Government, he changed his politics. This gentleman is in the rice business, and I will show how he is protected. The following figures, taken from the Government blue-book for the fiscal year ending 30th June, 1895, are sufficient to prove that the duty on rice is simply outrageous:—

	Value.	Lbs.	Rate of Duty.	Duty Collected
	\$		per lb.	\$ cts.
Cleaned rice.....	98,849	5,876,856	1½ cts.	73,466 31
Rice, uncleaned, unhulled or paddy...	199,620	22,772,306	3-10 "	68,933 41

It will be noticed, from the above, that the Government collected more duty on 5,876,856 pounds of cleaned rice than what they did on 22,772,306 pounds of uncleaned. It will also be seen that the cleaned rice cost originally 1½ cents per pound, and had to pay a duty of 1¼ cents per pound, making the rice cost, duty paid, ¾ cents per pound. The uncleaned rice cost ¾ cents per pound, and the duty was 3-10th cent per pound, or less than ½ cent per pound. This would give a protection of equal to 1 cent per pound, and, on the quantity of uncleaned rice imported, would amount to \$227,723.06. There is only one rice mill in the Dominion, and it is getting 3 cents per pound for rice which cost them as follows:—

First cost	\$0 87½
Duty	0 30
Freight, say	0 25
	1 42

To this must be added the cost of cleaning, and as the same rice can be bought cleaned for $1\frac{1}{2}$ cents per pound, the difference between the latter figure and \$1.42 is to be added to the cost..... 0 30

Actual cost 1 72

The rice-miller here says, however, that it costs more to clean rice here than it does in India or England. We don't believe there is any truth in this, as the cleaning is all done by machinery, and the process of doing so is very simple, and it is very doubtful if the mill employs twenty hands all the year around. But suppose, for the sake of argument, that we admit that the cleaning here does cost more and that we allow $\frac{3}{8}$ cent per pound to cover this extra labour, this would make the cleaned rice cost 2 cents, and still leave the mill a margin of 1 cent per pound, which, on their annual importation, would amount to \$227,723.06. It is no wonder that the gentleman spent money and worked very hard. He told his men that, if James McShane got into power, he could not make any more money out of rice, and that the factory would be destroyed. I have an interest in Montreal and will do something to promote the interest of my native city. No one pretends that rice can be grown in this country. It is an article of food which is consumed by the poorer classes principally, and for the Government to impose a duty of $1\frac{1}{4}$ cents per pound in order that one mill may make \$227,723.06 per annum is simply legalized robbery. Of course, every one in the wholesale grocery trade is aware that the election subscription from this concern must be very large, but, if they subscribe half of the profits, there is still \$100,000 left for the mill. If the Government want revenue, why not impose the same duty on uncleaned as that on cleaned? rice, and they will be \$200,000 richer per annum. If they don't want revenue, make the duty on cleaned rice the same as on uncleaned, and the poor man will get his rice 1 cent per pound cheaper, which would mean a saving of \$200,000 to the consumer; and it would pay both the Government and the consumer if they were to pension off everybody connected with the rice-mill, in order to do away with this iniquity. The rice-mill has had a good time for the last ten years. It is about time that this state of affairs should end, and that the consumer should no longer be called upon to pay $1\frac{1}{4}$ cents on an article of food like rice, which can be bought outside of Canada for $1\frac{1}{2}$ cents per pound. This is protection with a vengeance. I am very sorry the hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. McLennan) is not in the House because I have something to say to him in regard to the references made by him to the cheese trade in Montreal. However, I will be very brief on that point; I would have said more if the hon. gentleman had been in his seat. I desire to read the following letter:—

Butter and Cheese Association of the Montreal Board of Trade.

Office:—10 St. John Street and 39 St. Sacramento Street,

Montreal 24th February, 1896.

Hon. Jas. McShane, M.P.,
House of Commons,
Ottawa.

Dear Sir:

By direction of the executive committee I am to thank you on behalf of the members of this association for your defence of the Montreal cheese trade in Parliament against the slanderous and untruthful statements of Mr. McLennan and others, and I now have pleasure in forwarding you memorandums prepared by prominent members of the trade, which may be of use to you in future discussions of this matter.

I am, dear sir,
Yours truly,

G. A. IRWIN,
Secretary.

Estimated make of cheese in Canada in	
1895, up to 31st of July	1,075,000
Shipped up to 17th August	828,806
Remainder	248,194

There thus could not have been over 250,000 boxes June and July made cheese in all Canada in October, which proves the sheer foolishness of the statement that there were 600,000 boxes held by Montreal speculators alone.

It is well known that almost all, if not quite all, the cheese held in Montreal last fall were held by shippers and merchants regularly and legitimately in the business, proving that the Montreal cheese merchants were justified in assuming that Mr. McLennan had reference to them in stating in Parliament that so many cheese were held by Montreal speculators.

It is also well known that the bulk of the June and July cheese held in Montreal last fall were owned by English houses who bought them as June and July cheese, and had them held here because the facilities for doing so are better than in Great Britain.

Mr. McLennan's charges are not only untruthful, but show a shortsightedness not to be expected in a gentleman of his position, inasmuch that such statements, though false and unwarrantable, are apt to check the confidence and good-feeling that now exist in the trade generally, both in Canada and in Great Britain, to the lasting injury of the dairy trade of Canada. If the honourable gentleman were to set about to damage and injure the dairy interests of this country, no stronger words could do it than those which he uttered on the 20th inst. before this Parliament.

So far from any member of the Montreal butter and cheese trade having ever admitted that June and July cheese were shipped by them as September's, they, as a body, have challenged proof of such actions but no proof has ever been attempted, either in England or this country, showing that those who brought the charges knew they were entirely without foundation.

I am not going to read the letters that have appeared in the newspapers on the subject, because it would occupy too much time. Here is, however, a letter which I received to-day, and I will make it short:

Dear Mr. McShane :

Your letter of the 25th received, and I am indeed glad to hear from you and to know that you are taking such an interest in this matter. Between ourselves, it is doing you a good deal of good, both in a friendly and political way.

You have a very good case, indeed, to make against McLennan ; in the first place, McLennan said that the reason of small prices paid in the spring is largely due to the enormous quantity placed there late in the season. You can answer that the supply and demand always regulate the prices, and that the reason cheese went out low last spring was because there was too much of it and that the merchants suffered the loss in this instance and not the farmers and if it had been placed on the market earlier, the price would have been still lower.

Secondly, that it is a gross untruth and libel upon the trade in Canada that June and July cheese is stored with the view, to use his own words, of placing it on the English market in the fall and representing it as (September make) ; in this connection, he is branding those engaged in selling cheese to England as fraudulent dealers and thus trying to disturb or bring about a loss of that confidence which it has taken years of integrity and honesty to build up.

Mr. Speaker, there is not a man in this House who has paid more money to the farmers of this country than I have. I have bought from them their produce for years and years, and paid them millions of dollars in return, and no man in the city of Montreal knows the farmers better than I do. Hon. gentlemen opposite repeat the old, old story about the hard times in the period between 1874 and 1878. They tell us that Montreal has progressed since then, and they take credit for its progress, but do they expect that Montreal should not have made progress during these eighteen years. I can tell these hon. gentlemen on the other side, that never in the history of that city was it in such a depressed condition as it is to-day. Never was trade so dull, not for years was the shipping less than last year, and seldom have fewer men been employed on the wharfs than during last year and the year before. These gentlemen who support the Government tell us day after day, that the country is prospering, but they are afraid to get out of the positions they hold in order to give the people an opportunity to decide whether their policy has been successful or not. They hold on to the Treasury benches a year beyond their time, but the day of reckoning will come to them, and it is not far distant. Why, Mr. Speaker, the National Policy has been a ruinous policy. For the past six months more bankruptcies have occurred in Montreal than during any similar period for years past. There are more houses to let in the city to-day than ever before. I speak myself as a landlord, and I say that if the people cannot pay their rents it is not their fault, but the fault of the business being so bad. As the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Edwards) has said, the farmer has no protection. I commenced to ship cattle in 1874, and from that year up to 1888, I sent thousands of

Mr. McSHANE.

animals to England, and had fifteen or twenty steamers engaged in the business at the time. The farmer then got 5 or 6 cents a pound for his cattle, but to-day he gets only 3 cents, and sometimes less. In spite of that, we are told that the people of Canada are prosperous. Yes, there are a few blood-suckers and vampires prospering, whose object is to crush the masses of the people, but none others prosper. And the poor workingman is badly treated. I am here to speak for the people of Montreal, and I am here to defend the interests of Montreal, and were it not so late to-night I could give further evidence of the evil effects which the policy of the Government has wrought in that city. I shall again take occasion to speak of customs frauds, and of the manner in which our merchants have been treated for years and years. I have a seat in this House to-night because many honest Conservatives who have hitherto supported the Conservative policy are tired and ashamed of the party they belong to. They have voted for me, and they will vote for me again, because so long as I have the honour of a seat in Parliament, I shall faithfully do my duty. I want no office, and I want no place. I seek none. I shall be true to the interests of my constituents. Were it not that I am suffering from a severe cold, I would give further facts to show to the House how the merchants of Montreal have been treated by this Government for years. Young Mr. Tupper was good enough to refer to me as "Jimmy McShane" in the Windsor Hall in the city of Montreal. Well, he will find that I will protect the interests of the people of that city against any Government that does wrong. I wish to tell young Mr. Tupper that Jimmy McShane never lived on the people of this country and never will. Both he and the Minister of Finance will discover before I leave this Parliament that I am not exactly what they think. Some of the Government newspapers have slandered me ; they endeavoured to crush me, but the people have always supported me, and they know me better than either of these hon. gentlemen. I have some more truthful things to say about the Government, Mr. Speaker, but I will reserve them for another opportunity.

Mr. GRIEVE. Mr. Speaker, after the very able and exhaustive speeches from both sides on the question now before the House, it is not my intention to detain the House with any very lengthened arguments. And, in the remarks I wish to make, I shall confine myself almost exclusively to the question, speaking from a farmers standpoint. I have been astonished that since the commencement of this debate, only one farmer to your right, Sir, has seen fit to address the House with regard to the merits of the National Policy. We have had the question discussed by many leading professional gentlemen who occupy seats on the Government

benches, but only one of the farmers supporting the Government has ventured to speak. It has been contended by hon. gentleman on this side of the House, and I am bound to say it has been contended with a great deal of force, that the existing tariff is a tariff in the interests of the large manufacturers who have formed themselves into rings, who have formed themselves into combinations, who have formed themselves into trusts, &c., with the one great object in view of making themselves rich at the expense of the farmers and the masses of the people of Canada. On the other hand, it is argued by our opponents that the tariff as it is framed at present is decidedly a farmers' tariff. Now, Mr. Speaker, I intend to show that if the tariff was framed with a view to the welfare of the farmers of Canada, it has been a lamentable failure and has fallen very far short of its aim. What has the National Policy done for the farmers of Canada? We know something of the lavish promises made for the National Policy prior to its introduction in 1879. We know that the National Policy, it was promised, would increase the value of farm lands and would increase the value of farm products. We were told that the National Policy was to provide a home market for the farmers. We were told that the National Policy was to keep our young men in our own country, secure for them steady employment, and give them a fair day's wage for a fair day's work. Let me ask, Sir, has a single one of those prophecies been fulfilled? Have farm lands increased in value? I know from my own knowledge that in my section of the country farm lands have largely depreciated in value during the last ten or fifteen years. I am within the judgment of every member of this House when I say that in that period farm property has depreciated at least from 25 to 40 per cent. Sir, I do not intend to confine myself to individual cases that could be shown throughout the different sections of the country, but I will show by figures which have been prepared by the Ontario Government that farm lands generally have very largely depreciated in value. We know, Sir, that in 1878, the Conservative party in Canada and the Conservative press as well, took the ground that the National Policy was to increase the value of farm lands. We know, Sir, that in 1878 not only many of the manufacturers, but many of the labouring men, and many of the farmers of this country, forsook their political allegiance, and their former political friends, and voted for the party that promised to increase the value of farm lands and the value of farm products. Now, Sir, how have these predictions been fulfilled? I take as a basis of calculation the reports of the Ontario Bureau of Industries for 1883 and 1894. These documents are official, being published by the legislature of Ontario. I find from them

that the value of farm lands in the province of Ontario in 1883 was \$655,000,000, and in 1894, \$587,246,000, or a reduction of \$67,754,000. But there are other things that must be considered in making the calculation. Between 1883 and 1894, 1,760,000 acres of land were cleared in Ontario. Hon. gentlemen may say that the value of this land would not add to the depreciation. We know that on an ordinary farm of 100 acres or 200 acres, a piece of bush of 20 or 25 acres does not depreciate the value of the farm, but rather enhances its value. But those 1,760,000 acres of land which were cleared in those ten years were lands in new districts. The ordinary cost of clearing land is \$15 or \$20 an acre. I will put it at the lowest price, \$15, and you have a value of \$29,400,000 that must be added to the amount of depreciation. In 1883 there were in Ontario, 213,000 farmers and in 1894, 243,000, an increase of 30,000. Hon. gentlemen may say that this shows the growing prosperity of the country. But it must not be forgotten that a large number of our farmers were young men who went into the new districts opened up by the provincial government. We know that during the last ten years many townships have been surveyed and opened for settlement in the Rainy River, Port Arthur, Bruce Mines, and other districts. The lands so taken up were formerly in the hands of the Government and assessed as Government lands previous to 1883; but after that time they passed into the hands of farmers and their value has to be added to the value of farm lands in the province in 1894. If we take all these three items together—the ultimate loss, the cleared lands and the value of the farms—we find that \$97,154,000 is the amount of depreciation of farm property in the province of Ontario during those ten years. That is not all. There have been many permanent improvements made in those ten years. Farmers have been putting up buildings such as new houses and new barns, they have been removing stones and stumps, they have been doing much in the way of underdraining, open draining and so forth; and all these must be taken into account in calculating the depreciation in the value of farm lands. I think I am within the mark when I say that the depreciation in the value of farm lands in the province of Ontario in the ten years from 1883 to 1894, amounted to no less than \$140,000,000 or \$150,000,000. Now, Sir, did the Conservative party in 1878 promise that they would increase the value of farm lands? Did they promise that they would raise the prices of farm products? Sir John Macdonald himself, who was the leader of the Conservative party at that time, speaking at a large meeting in the city of Toronto, said:

If you desire this country to prosper; if you desire this country to rise out of the slough of despond in which it has sunk; if you desire to see manufactures rise; if you desire to see lab-

our employed ; if you desire the emigration of our young men stopped ; if you desire to bring back those who have emigrated ; if you desire to see the value of land rise ; if you desire prosperity, you will support the National Policy.

Mr. Speaker, I say that not one of those prophecies have been fulfilled. I do not for a single moment say that this is entirely due to the working of the National Policy ; but I have every reason to believe that it is in a great measure due to the fact that the products of our farms have been shut out to a large degree from our best markets. While it is undoubtedly true that England is the principal, if not the only market for our wheat, cheese, beef, and light horses, and is a strong competitor with the United States for our surplus hay, sheep, hog products, oats, butter, apples, honey, and so forth, yet it is an admitted fact that the country to the south of us is the great market for our barley, lambs, heavy horses, poultry, eggs, pease, beans, potatoes and other roots, and many other products grown by the farmers of Canada. In order to prove that the statements I have just made are substantially correct, I think it only fair to the House that I should give the figures, as gleaned from the statistical Year-book of Canada for 1894. During that year we exported horses to England to the value of \$400,507, and to the United States horses to the value of \$480,525. It should be observed that the class of horses we are exporting to England are well-bred horses sent there for military purposes and for saddle and driving purposes, a class of horses which it is almost impossible for the great mass of the farmers of Canada to raise ; but the class of horses we have been shipping to the United States are heavy draught horses which are used on drays and for heavy working purposes, the class of horses that have been in the past and are at the present time easily raised by every farmer in the country. The values of other articles exported to England and the United States respectively in the same year, 1894, were as follows :—

1894.	England. Value.	U.S. Value.
Horses	\$ 400,507	\$480,525
Horned cattle	6,316,373	9,771
Swine	1,370	5,743
Sheep	163,075	642,231
Poultry	4,534	52,023
Butter	936,422	6,048
Cheese	15,439,198	9,552
Eggs	503,533	199,636
Honey	3,360	567
Wool	624	15,486
Flax	101,126	167,077
Apples, green or ripe.	569,156	221,187
Fruits, all other.....	20,090	136,866
Barley	44,269	216,493
Beans	700	261,662
Oats	642,471	20,817
Peas	1,641,118	329,968
Wheat	6,012,122	76,846
Grain, all other	22,391	141,479
Hay	1,700,409	753,575

Mr. GRIEVE.

1894.	England. Value.	U.S. Value.
Seeds, clover and grass	\$ 662	\$ 29,405
Potatoes	454,181	193,917
Straw	3,145	18,844

Now, Mr. Speaker, I hold that I have clearly demonstrated this fact to the House, that while England undoubtedly stands supreme as the great market for the world's produce, the United States is the principal market for a very large percentage of what is grown upon Canadian soil, and had Canadian shippers equal advantages in placing their products on the American market that they have on the English markets, I do not hesitate to say that our exports to the United States would, in a very few years, increase by 50 or 75 per cent. It is a wonder to me, when we consider the very high tariff existing between the two countries, that we are able to keep up the immense volume of trade that we do between this country and the United States. Will hon. gentlemen opposite pretend, with the facts before them, that there is any chance of our obtaining as good a market outside of Canada in any other country as we can in the United States for many of the articles I have enumerated, and which we have to sell? Are we likely to get as good a market elsewhere for our barley, horses, lambs, small fruits, eggs, poultry, hay, and the many other articles we have to sell, and for which there is, practically, an unlimited demand in the United States? Is it any wonder, Mr. Speaker, that the farmers of Canada, through their different organizations, are crying out for relief? They have a right to get relief, and, Sir, in my opinion, there is only one way by which that relief can be obtained, and that is by a frank and free interchange of the products of the soil between the two countries, or, in other words, the right to sell in the best and most convenient market, and the right to buy in the same.

I must admit that I have been amused at the many speeches delivered on the Budget speech during the few years I have been in Parliament by gentlemen occupying seats to your right, while trying to make the people of this country believe that they were extremely anxious to enter into reciprocal trade relations with our neighbours, and yet have been advancing all sorts of ingenious arguments possible to show that such a treaty would be very bad, indeed, for the farmers of Canada. Have they not tried—and tried with what success, I will leave this House to decide—to prove that the farmers of Canada would be literally swamped by the free admission into our country of American hogs, beef, corn, and many other articles of American produce? In order to show that such statements are entirely erroneous and calculated to mislead the farmers of Canada, I shall take the same articles and

quote from the Trade and Navigation Returns of the fiscal year ending June, 1895, to prove that no such danger may be feared. Produce, the world over, will inevitably find its way to the best market. I have in my hand a table of figures which I had prepared and which I thought I could, as has been done on former occasions by the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) and the Finance Minister, and others, hand in to the "Hansard" reporters without reading; but I understand that, according to what the leader of the House stated the other day, I shall be forced to read these figures from my place in the House. We imported in the year ending 30th June, 1895, as follows:—

	No.	Value.	Duty.
Horned cattle from G. B.	1	\$ 100	\$ 20 00
From U. S.	2,419	35,546	7,109 39

You will see by these figures that we imported quite a large number of cattle from the United States. This would, in a manner, bear out the arguments advanced by some hon. gentlemen opposite that the Americans would swamp our markets if we had a free interchange of agricultural products, but it might be interesting, perhaps, for these gentlemen to know where these animals were shipped to. They were distributed as follows:—

	No.	Value.	Duty.
Ontario	7	\$ 220	\$ 44 00
New Brunswick	32	264	52 80
British Columbia	115	1,825	365 00
North-west Ter.	2,266	33,337	6,667 59
Total	2,420	35,646	7,129 39

You will therefore see that of the 2,420 imported into Canada during that year, no less than 2,266 went into the North-west Territories.

	No.	Value.	Duty.
Horses from G. B.	1	\$ 73	\$ 14 60
St. Pierre	1	10	2 00
U. S.	1,484	46,221	9,244 70

These were imported by the several provinces, as follows:—

	No.	Value.	Duty.
Ontario	240	\$12,208	\$2,441 60
Quebec	82	4,601	800 20
Nova Scotia	20	1,095	219 50
New Brunswick	45	1,858	371 60
Manitoba	193	3,274	654 80
British Columbia	730	20,347	4,069 40
Prince Edward Island	2	95	19 00
North-west Ter.	174	3,426	685 20
Total	1,486	46,304	9,261 30

So that of the 1,486 horses imported into Canada during that year, no less than 730 went into the far distant province of British Columbia. I do not think that the farmers of the older provinces ever expect to work up a trade with the far-off province of British Columbia by shipping stock there. We do not think it possible to send horses and cattle nearly 3,000 miles by rail to that distant province, and if the people of British Columbia can buy their horses and cattle and what beef and flour and grain they require in a more convenient market, I am sure the farmers of the older provinces will not complain. Take the trade in sheep. We imported from the United States, 42,724 sheep, valued at \$59,590, on which a duty was collected of \$11,999. These went into the several provinces as follows:—

	No.	Value.	Duty.
Ontario	100	\$ 213	\$ 42 60
Quebec	2	2	0 40
New Brunswick	995	1,521	305 70
British Columbia	35,881	53,141	10,628 20
North-west Ter.	5,746	5,113	1,022 60
Total	42,724	59,990	11,999 50

There is one peculiar feature about the importation of sheep, and it is this, that the 5,746 sheep which went to the North-west Territories were valued only at \$5,113, or about 85 cents to 90 cents each. I should like to know how that valuation was arrived at. It appears to me that this would be a proper case for the Controller of Customs to inquire into. But let me draw your attention, Mr. Speaker, to this, that of all the sheep imported by Canada during that year, no less than 35,881 went into the distant province of British Columbia.

Take hogs next. Our imports were as follows:—

	Lbs.	\$	\$ cts.
Hogs.....			
Great Britain.....	130	8	1 95
B. W. Indies.....	30	2	0 45
Newfoundland.....	300	15	4 50
United States.....	34,475	1,463	517 28
Total			
Ontario.....	30	4	0 45
Quebec.....	30	8	0 45
Nova Scotia.....	557	32	8 36
New Brunswick.....	130	8	1 95
Manitoba.....	8,150	286	122 25
British Columbia.....	26,038	1,150	390 72
Total	34,935	1,488	524 18

		Lbs.	\$	\$ cts.	
Butter	Great Britain	2,387	477	95 48	
	Australasia	40,291	6,458	1,611 64	
	United States	231,988	37,657	9,279 44	
Total	Ontario	4,388	927	175 52	
	Quebec	4,127	545	165 08	
	Nova Scotia	1,914	326	76 56	
	New Brunswick	771	169	30 84	
	Manitoba	143	23	5 72	
	British Columbia	263,278	42,585	10,531 04	
	North-west Territories	45	17	1 80	
			274,666	44,592	10,986 56
Cheese	Great Britain	19,080	3,633	572 45	
	British West Indies	25	6	0 75	
	France	14,206	2,314	426 18	
	Germany	585	99	17 55	
	Italy	1,649	383	49 47	
	St. Pierre	4	1	0 12	
	Switzerland	4,940	918	148 20	
	United States	106,735	14,829	3,182 11	
	Total	Ontario	25,020	4,647	750 60
		Quebec	53,273	9,445	1,598 19
Nova Scotia		6,465	866	174 01	
New Brunswick		296	59	8 88	
Manitoba		643	142	19 29	
British Columbia		61,496	7,015	1,844 93	
Prince Edward Island		5	1	0 15	
North-west Territories		25	8	0 78	
		147,224	22,183	4,396 83	
Eggs		Doz.			
	Great Britain	3	12	0 15	
	Australasia	24	4	1 20	
	China	12,738	673	636 90	
	Japan	982	147	49 10	
	United States	90,489	13,473	4,524 70	
Total	Ontario	1,210	552	60 52	
	Quebec	112	115	5 60	
	Nova Scotia	50	36	2 70	
	New Brunswick	485	72	24 25	
	British Columbia	102,251	13,502	5,112 58	
	North-west Territories	128	32	6 40	
		104,236	14,309	5,212 05	
Hay	United States—	Tons.			
	Ontario	20	171	40 62	
	Quebec	17	127	34 42	
	New Brunswick	1	11	2 00	
	British Columbia	1,758	12,861	3,517 06	
		1,796	13,170	3,594 10	
Green Apples	Australasia	Brls.	210	84 01	
	United States	17,011	45,277	6,805 66	
Total	Ontario	181	396	72 56	
	Quebec	3,847	5,438	1,538 80	
	Nova Scotia	1,436	3,626	574 95	
	New Brunswick	1,935	4,703	774 08	
	Manitoba	1,179	4,042	471 80	
	British Columbia	7,994	26,361	3,197 81	
	Prince-Edward Island	379	829	151 47	
	North-west Territories	270	1,159	108 20	
		17,221	46,554	6,889 67	

		Bushels.	\$	\$ cts.	
Barley.....	Great Britain.....	449	390	117 00	
	United States.....	10,090	3,085	925 58	
Total.....	Ontario.....	92	78	23 40	
	Quebec.....	220	155	46 50	
	Nova Scotia.....	14	14	4 28	
	New Brunswick.....	165	186	55 80	
	Manitoba.....	20	13	3 90	
	British Columbia.....	10,028	3,029	908 70	
			10,539	3,475	1,042 58
Potatoes.....	British West Indies.....	27	24	4 15	
	China.....	8	4	1 20	
	United States.....	97,234	42,788	14,585 75	
Total.....	Ontario.....	47,553	27,158	7,133 00	
	Quebec.....	1,059	676	158 85	
	Nova Scotia.....	84	92	12 82	
	New Brunswick.....	67	55	10 13	
	Manitoba.....	1,132	828	169 87	
	British Columbia.....	47,300	13,937	7,095 10	
	Prince Edward Island.....	3	2	0 53	
	North-west Territories.....	71	68	10 80	
		97,269	42,816	14,591 10	
Breadstuffs, &c.— Grain and products of— Beans.....	Great Britain.....	135	290	20 25	
	China.....	701	354	105 35	
	France.....	1	5	0 15	
	Germany.....	1	5	0 15	
	Japan.....	4	2	0 60	
	United States.....	6,492	11,809	975 72	
	Total.....	Ontario.....	958	2,536	143 65
		Quebec.....	298	827	44 70
Nova Scotia.....		151	393	24 43	
New Brunswick.....		75	156	11 26	
Manitoba.....		31	89	5 18	
British Columbia.....		5,769	8,344	865 65	
Prince Edward Island.....		49	119	7 35	
		7,334	12,464	1,102 22	
Buckwheat..	United States —				
	Ontario.....	67	40	6 70	
	British Columbia.....	155	105	15 63	
		222	145	22 33	
Oats.....	Great Britain.....	453	354	45 30	
	United States.....	219,606	68,798	21,961 15	
Total.....	Ontario.....	2,557	1,683	256 04	
	Quebec.....	97	55	9 70	
	Nova Scotia.....	45	20	4 55	
	New Brunswick.....	6	3	0 60	
	Manitoba.....	120	39	12 05	
	British Columbia.....	215,243	66,834	21,524 41	
	Prince Edward Island.....	74	45	7 40	
North-west Territories.....	1,917	473	191 70		
		220,059	69,152	22,006 45	

		Bush.	\$	\$ cts.
Grain and other products of-- Pease	Great Britain.....	1,814	2,444	181 40
	China.....	45	19	4 50
	France.....	1	5	0 10
	Germany.....	30	90	3 00
	United States.....	8,657	8,877	866 04
Total.....	Ontario.....	7,657	8,804	765 75
	Quebec.....	31	83	3 10
	Nova Scotia.....	107	427	10 94
	New Brunswick.....	6	7	0 60
	Manitoba.....	110	108	11 00
	British Columbia.....	2,605	1,939	260 55
	Prince Edward Island ..	18	53	1 80
	North-west Territories ..	13	14	1 30
		10,547	11,435	1,055 04
Rye	United States--			
	Ontario.....	6	10	0 60
	Quebec.....	2	2	0 20
	Manitoba.....	556	235	55 60
	British Columbia.....	606	314	60 65
		1,170	561	117 05

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think I have shown by the table of imports I have prepared, that the farmers of the old provinces of Canada have nothing to fear from reciprocity with the United States. But, while the farmers of the United States have imported somewhat largely of farm products into Canada, yet these importations have gone almost entirely, with the single exception of wheat, into the far-away province of British Columbia. I may say again, as I formerly said, that the farmers of the old provinces do not expect, and never expected, to be able to work up a large trade with the people of British Columbia in the way of sending farm produce there. It is nearly 3,000 miles away, the communication being almost entirely by rail, so that the extent to which we would be likely to ship farm products to British Columbia would not materially affect eastern farmers. I grant you, that in one article alone the products of our farms have increased. I refer to the article of cheese. Now, let me refer to some statements made the other day by my hon. friend from Kent, N.B. (Mr. McInerney). I am sorry he is not in his seat, because he was somewhat severe upon my hon. friend from Huron (Mr. McMillan), who tried to show, and I think he did show successfully, that the farmers of the older provinces, at any rate at the present time, were not as prosperous and in as good a condition as they were ten or fifteen years ago. This is what my hon. friend from Kent said, according to the "Hansard," in trying to refute the statement of the hon. member for Huron:

I will endeavour to show that the farmers derive more benefit from the National Policy than any other class of the population of Canada.

Mr. GRIEVE.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. McINERNEY. I have made my statement, and if I fail in demonstrating the proposition laid down, it will be so much better for hon. gentlemen opposite. I state the proposition, and I will at the proper time undertake to prove it.

Now, how does he undertake to prove it? He undertook to prove it by showing what the production of the farmers of Canada was in 1891, compared with the year 1881. He said:

The hon. member for Huron (Mr. McMillan) said there was a falling off in everything produced by the farmers, that land values had decreased, that the products of the farmer had decreased, not only in value, but in volume, that all along the line, so far as the farmer was concerned, the National Policy had been a curse and a blight to him. Now, Sir, let us see how the declaration of the hon. gentleman accords with the figures given by this high and independent authority I now cite.

The authority the hon. member from Kent cited, was some American almanac or another. He goes on to say:

The amount of wheat raised in Canada in 1880 was 32 million bushels; in 1891 it had risen to over 60 million bushels.

Now, Sir, let me give my hon. friend, and let me give the House, the figures as they are gleaned from the census returns of 1891. In 1881 the total production of wheat in Canada was 32,350,269 bushels; he was not far astray there, he was only 350,269 bushels astray. But what say these same census returns which I have received from the Government statistician himself? They were verified on the Agricultural Committee this morning by Professor Saunders of the Experimental Farm, and he gave the total wheat production of Can-

ada for the year 1890 as 42,144,779 bushels, not 60,000,000 bushels as the hon. member for Kent put it. The hon. gentleman was only something like 18 million bushels out in his calculation. But we find that the total wheat production in Canada increased during those ten years, not by 30 million bushels, as the hon. member for Kent tried to make this House believe, but the wheat production increased by 9,794,510 bushels. Sir, what more did the hon. gentleman say? He was interrupted then, as appears from the "Hansard":

Mr. MULOCK. What had the National Policy to do with that?

Mr. McINERNEY. I am not saying the National Policy had anything particularly to do with that, but I am answering the statement of the hon. member for Huron that the value of the products of the farmers of Canada had decreased under the National Policy. These figures show that the wheat product of Canada had increased from 1880 to 1891, had more than doubled in that period. Of barley, we raised 15 million bushels in 1880, and over 21½ million in 1891.

Or an increase, according to his own figures, of 6½ millions during the ten years. Now, let us see again how far the hon. gentleman was astray. In 1881, according to the census returns of Canada, we produced, not 15 million bushels, as the hon. gentleman put it, but we produced 16,844,868 bushels. In 1891, ten years later, we produced, according to the same high authority, 17,148,198 bushels, or, instead of an increase of six millions during the ten years, there was only a beggarly increase of 303,330. Now, let us follow him a little further. He says:

Of oats, we raised 70 million bushels in 1880, and 117,700,000 bushels in 1891. I have here figures, to about the same effect, of different other products grown in Canada, showing that from 1880 to 1891 the products of the farmers of Canada had materially increased. Sir, in face of these facts, I cannot understand how it is possible that a man engaged in agriculture, a man as intelligent as my hon. friend from Huron appears to be, and undoubtedly is, with such figures before him, can stand on a platform, or in an intelligent assembly like this, and make such declarations as he made to us this evening. Now, let us see how far the hon. gentleman was out in his figures with regard to the production of oats.

In 1881 we produced 70,493,131 bushels. The hon. gentleman was only half a million bushels astray in his calculation in regard to the production of 1881. In 1891, instead of 117,700,000 bushels, which the hon. gentleman said we produced, the census returns show that we produced only 82,515,413, or over 35,000,000 bushels short of the hon. gentleman's calculations; our increase during the ten years was 12,022,282. I have had these figures verified by Mr. Johnson, the Government statistician, and I place these before the House and the country to show that the position taken by the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McMillan) was substantially correct, when he made the statement that the farmers of Canada,

in 1891, taking volume of crops, prices of crops, number and value of cattle, value of horses into account, were much poorer than they were in 1881; and if we had the figures up to the present, they would show a much larger decrease in the value of farm products than even in the year 1891. I have another authority I wish to quote to show that the Liberals are not the only people in the country who assume that the position of the farmers is not so good today as it was fifteen years ago. I hold in my hand a book—it is not a Liberal campaign sheet, it is not facts and figures for Liberals, prepared by Liberals; but it is the hand-book of the Patrons of Industry. This hand-book has been referred to this afternoon by the hon. member for Guysborough. It is not the production of Liberals, but of men who formerly belonged both to the Liberal and the Conservative parties, the production of men who found that the farmers were not receiving fair-play at the hands of the Government, men who knew that this was a Government that had done everything in its power to promote the interests of wealthy monopolists and manufacturers, and had done nothing for the farmers. These men organized, and they issued this pamphlet, and I must ask the indulgence of the House while I read a few short quotations from it. Treating of the tariff question, it says:

The farmer is deeply interested in the tariff. He was induced to vote for protection in 1878 by promises which it may be well to examine briefly in the light of ascertained results.

First, it was to augment the selling price of his wares. Mr. Haggart, now Minister of Railways, said in Parliament (Hansard, March 1, 1878):—"What they contended was that by a protective tariff they could so arrange matters that the produce raised by our agriculturists would be greatly increased in value." This was the burden of all the protectionist speeches and of resolutions introduced in the House. Prices were to be increased by keeping out cheap American produce, so Mr. Haggart contended in sunning home market within Canada. Cheap American produce, so Mr. Haggart contended in the same speech, was the basis of Canadian agriculture, and he gave examples which others on the same side multiplied. In saying this the protectionists, as any one can see, were blasting their own argument, for if a long trial of protection in the United States had left the American farmer without an all-consuming home market, so that instead of obtaining high prices at his own door he was obliged to export his oats, pork, wheat and corn for what he could get to revenue tariff countries like Canada, what sense was there in the Canadian farmer trying so worthless a remedy? We all know that the price of farm products has not increased since 1879. Canada, like the United States, is an exporting country, and the price of the staples is determined by the law of supply and demand abroad, which is so much beyond the jurisdiction of protectionist legislators as the phases of the moon.

This is the argument the Liberals have presented ever since the introduction of the National Policy. This was the argument

of the Liberals in 1878, that our markets were regulated by the law of supply and demand. Hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House have always maintained the opposite, but the other afternoon the hon. member for Inverness (Mr. Cameron) enunciated what has formerly always been considered as good sound Liberal doctrine, that the markets of Canada were regulated by the law of supply and demand. Continuing the pamphlet said :

The reports of Mr. Glaffen, statistician of the Government Board of Trade in England, notably that issued in 1888 ("Recent Changes in the Prices of Exports and Imports") are interesting reading in this connection. Going back to the Crimean war, a halcyon period for the Canadian farmer, the average price of the wheat imported into the United Kingdom in 1854 and 1855 was 16½ shillings per 112 pounds of oats, nearly 10 shillings, wheat flour 23 shillings, hams 63 shillings, and so on. The price of wheat and flour has never been so high since. In the three years preceding the adoption of protection in Canada the price of wheat was as follows, per 112 pounds :—

	Shillings.
1876	10·43
1877	12·49
1878	10·99

In 1880 the price rose and Canadian protectionists made themselves believe that it was their work, but in 1882 it fell to 10·67 shillings and has since gone lower. In the calendar year 1894, the declared value of the British imports of wheat (total imports 70,126,232 cwt., value £18,760,505) was under 5·4 shillings per cwt. The all-absorbing home market has also disappointed us. In 1878 we exported \$32,000,000 of animals and farm produce raised within Canada, whereas in 1894 the exports were \$52,000,000. So far from protection creating a secure home market for the farmer he is more dependent than ever upon the foreign market where competition is unrestrained.

It will be remembered that hon. gentlemen opposite in 1878 declared that the farmers of Canada were going to have the home markets for their products built up by the National Policy, hamlets were to grow into villages, villages into towns, towns into cities, and all would be large centres of manufacturing industry, and that the far-

mers would no longer be compelled to send their products abroad to find foreign markets, but they would be sold in this country. But in 1894 we had to export \$20,000,000 worth more of farm products than in 1878, showing that we have not yet the home market that was promised. The pamphlet proceeds :

The answer of protectionists is that if cash prices are lower than they were the cost of factory goods has declined so that the farmer is better or no worse off than before, and they even suggest, some of them, that protection has brought about the decrease in the cost of factory goods. But this is quite another question from that under consideration just now, which is Mr. Haggart's promise that "the produce raised by our agriculturists would be greatly increased in value." The meaning intended to be conveyed by "greatly increased value" was that the cash price would be exalted, as plainly appears from the speeches made in Parliament, and from the famous cry, "I'm for a policy that has raised wheat to \$1.49."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have shown by statistics that the farmers of the older provinces of Canada have nothing to fear in competition with the farmers of the United States. I have shown also that the farm products that are being shipped from the United States into Canada are nearly altogether imported into British Columbia and the North-west Territories. Hon. gentlemen opposite have to admit that the price of farm produce is to-day less than it was in 1878; but they comfort themselves with the idea, that if the price of farm produce is not so great now as it was then yet the volume of farm products that is raised on the farm to-day, is much greater than it was in 1878 or 1880. I have in my hand, Mr. Speaker, a table taken from the census returns, which will show that the products of the older provinces of Canada, are not as great at present as they were fifteen years ago. This table which I have prepared from the census, refers to all the provinces, but as the hour is so late, I will only read the figures which refer to a few of the provinces. First, I will take the province of Prince Edward Island and the following is the result :—

FARM PRODUCTS, PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

	1881.	1891.	Increase.	Decrease.
Wheat area..... acres.	41,942	44,703	2,761	
do spring and fall..... bush.	546,872	596,761	49,889	
Barley..... do	119,368	147,880	28,512	
Oats..... do	3,538,219	2,922,552		615,667
Rye..... do	307	221		86
Pease and beans..... do	3,169	7,180	4,011	
Buckwheat..... do	90,458	84,460		5,998
Corn..... do	2,603	2,651	48	
Potatoes..... do	6,042,191	7,071,308	1,029,117	
Turnips and other roots..... do	1,240,979	2,005,453	764,474	
Hay..... tons.	143,791	132,959		10,832
Grass seed..... bush.	15,247	12,417		2,830

Mr. GRIEVE.

FARM PRODUCTS, PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND—*Con.*

	1881.	1891.	Increase.	Decrease.
Butter..... lbs.	1,688,690	1,969,213	280,523	
Cheese.....	196,273	217,574	21,301	
Flax seed..... bush.	919	746		173
Flax and hemp..... lbs.	25,175	4,367		20,808
Home-made cloth..... yds.	514,682	402,144		112,538
do linen.....	30,008	8,951		21,057
Apples..... bush.	31,501	52,018	20,517	
Grapes..... lbs.	795	4,402	3,607	
Horses.....	25,182	25,674	492	
Working oxen.....	84	116	32	
Milch cows.....	45,895	45,849		46
Other horned cattle.....	44,743	45,730	987	
Sheep.....	166,496	147,372		19,124
Swine.....	40,181	42,629	2,448	
Cattle killed or sold.....	15,200	22,103	6,903	
Sheep do.....	58,872	67,563	8,691	
Swine do.....	26,836	39,304	12,468	
Wool..... lbs.	552,083	528,273		23,810

So, Mr. Speaker, you will see that in the province of Prince Edward Island, while they have increased in some of the products of the farm, they have decreased in others. and the one would almost balance the other. Let me now take the products of the provinces of Ontario and Quebec, and first the province of Ontario:

FARM PRODUCTS—ONTARIO.

	1881.	1891.	Increase.	Decrease.
Wheat area..... acres.	1,930,123	1,430,532		499,591
Wheat, spring..... bush.	7,213,024	6,773,546		439,478
Barley..... do	14,279,841	13,419,354		860,487
Oats..... do	40,209,929	47,160,246	6,950,317	
Rye..... do	1,598,871	1,064,345		534,526
Pease and beans..... do	9,434,872	12,760,331		
Beans in 1891..... do		664,541	3,990,000	
Buckwheat..... do	841,649	1,470,511	628,862	
Corn..... do	8,096,782	9,835,737	1,738,955	
Potatoes..... do	18,994,559	17,635,151		1,359,408
Turnips and other roots..... do	40,335,943	41,200,779	864,836	
Hay..... tons.	2,038,659	3,465,633	1,426,974	
Grass seed..... bush.	173,219	236,819	63,600	
Wheat, fall..... do	20,193,067	14,541,036		5,652,031
Butter..... lbs.	55,924,765	57,065,061	1,140,296	
Cheese.....	53,569,254	81,834,904	28,265,650	
Flax seed..... bush.	38,208	71,339	33,131	
Home-made cloth..... yds.	1,426,558	524,741		901,817
Home-made linen..... do	13,641	5,477		8,164
Apples..... bush.	11,400,517	5,043,612		6,356,905
Grapes..... lbs.	3,697,555	11,725,281	8,027,726	
Horses.....	473,906	551,290	77,384	
Working oxen.....	23,263	12,224		10,839
Milch cows.....	782,243	876,167	93,924	
Other horned cattle.....	896,661	1,052,082	155,421	
Sheep.....	1,359,178	1,021,769		337,409
Swine.....	700,952	1,121,396	420,444	
Cattle, killed or sold.....	363,043	531,404	168,361	
Sheep do.....	748,972	640,431		108,541
Swine do.....	796,548	1,207,631	411,083	
Wool..... lbs.	6,013,216	4,605,053		1,408,163

You will see, Mr. Speaker, that in these products of the farm the only increase worthy of the name is in cheese, which increased in the ten years from 1881 to 1891 by over 28,000,000 pounds. Now, although I have

the tables for the other provinces, I will only give the figures for the province of Quebec, from which you will see that there has been a decrease all along the line:

	1881.	1891.	Increase.	Decrease.
Acres of wheat.....	223,176	191,599		31,577
Wheat, spring..... bush.	1,999,815	1,553,544		446,271
Barley..... do	1,751,539	1,505,600		245,939
Oats..... do	19,990,205	16,905,800		3,084,405
Rye..... do	430,242	213,313		216,929
Pease and beans..... do	4,170,456	1,886,021		2,284,435
Buckwheat..... do	2,041,670	2,009,448		32,222
Corn..... do	888,169	790,685		97,484
Potatoes..... do	14,873,287	15,024,644	151,357	
Turnips and other roots..... do	3,623,380	2,532,853		1,090,527
Hay..... tons.	1,612,104	2,243,435	631,331	
Grass seed..... bush.	119,306	81,548		37,758
Wheat, fall..... do	19,189	14,745		4,444
Butter..... lbs.	31,253,887	32,892,836	1,638,949	
Cheese..... do	8,771,556	30,511,997	21,740,441	
Flax seed..... bush.	65,995	27,647		38,348
Flax and hemp..... lbs.	865,340	575,430		189,910
Home-made cloth..... yds.	2,958,180	2,205,014		735,166
Linen..... do	1,130,301	568,359		561,942
Apples..... bush.	775,557	1,034,039	258,482	
Grapes..... lbs.	158,031	434,361	276,330	
Horses.....	225,006	259,997	34,991	
Working oxen.....	49,237	45,676		3,561
Milch cows.....	490,977	549,544	58,567	
Other horned cattle.....	490,119	374,092		116,027
Sheep.....	889,833	730,286		169,647
Swine.....	329,199	369,608	40,409	
Cattle killed or sold.....	160,207	200,165	39,958	
Sheep do.....	436,336	416,601		19,735
Swine do.....	333,159	341,770	8,611	
Wool..... lbs.	2,730,546	2,547,245		173,301

I will pass over the provinces of New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, British Columbia and the Territories. With the exception of Manitoba and the North-west Territories, the same state of things can be shown—that the products of the farm, instead of increasing very largely in volume, as the hon. member for Kent, N.B. (Mr. McInerney) said the other night, have practically de-

creased in volume. Now, Sir, I have here another short table showing the products of the older provinces—Ontario, Quebec, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island; and I think I shall be able to show that these figures will bear out my contention that while the prices of farm products have very materially gone down, the volume of farm products has also diminished:

Product.	1881.	1891.	Increase.	Decrease.
Wheat area..... acres.	2,277,432	1,698,297		579,135
Wheat, spring and fall..... bush.	31,023,174	23,855,247		7,167,927
Barley..... do	16,463,679	15,401,281		1,062,398
Oats..... do	68,909,000	71,573,769	2,664,769	
Rye..... do	2,095,255	1,307,700		787,555
Pease and beans..... do	13,688,838	14,742,327	1,053,489	
Buckwheat..... do	4,900,718	4,885,368		15,350
Potatoes..... do	54,249,440	49,672,545		4,576,895
Hay..... tons.	4,806,331	6,950,487	2,144,156	
Butter..... lbs.	102,859,803	108,756,546	5,896,743	
Cheese..... do	63,791,671	114,002,632	50,210,961	
Apples..... bush.	13,347,190	7,440,876		5,906,314
Horses.....	814,095	935,296	121,191	
Working oxen.....	114,671	94,550		20,121
Milch cows.....	1,560,719	1,719,893	159,174	
Other horned cattle.....	1,685,995	1,617,101		68,894
Sheep.....	3,014,471	2,413,860		600,611
Swine.....	1,170,675	1,632,626	461,951	
Cattle killed or sold.....	599,311	582,222		17,089
Sheep do.....	1,484,168	1,369,822		114,346
Swine do.....	1,272,706	1,705,715	433,009	
Wool..... lbs.	11,198,816	9,445,703		1,753,113

In the year 1880, two years after the defeat of the Mackenzie Government, before the National Policy could be said to have been fairly begun and before it could affect

very much the prices realized by the farmers, we find that the prices were as follows:—

1880.	January.	February.	March.	April.	May.	June.	July.	August.	September.	October.	November.	December.	Average.
	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.
Wheat..... Bush.	1 28	1 23	1 28	1 26	1 20	1 18	1 05	1 08	1 04	1 00	1 05	1 15	1 15
Oats..... "	0 36	0 38	0 39	0 40	0 41	0 40	0 39	0 35	0 37	0 33	0 34	0 35	0 37 ¹ / ₂
Barley..... "	0 64	0 64	0 64	0 84	0 64	0 64	0 60	0 60	0 62	0 64	0 74	0 90	0 66 ¹ / ₂
Pease..... "	0 70	0 65	0 66	0 69	0 69	0 68	0 68	0 68	0 63	0 64	0 65	0 68	0 67 ¹ / ₂
Rye..... "	0 74	0 76	0 80	0 81	0 81	0 79	0 79	0 59	0 66	0 74	0 89	0 88	0 77 ¹ / ₂
Potatoes... Bag.	0 60	0 60	0 50	0 55	0 65	0 50	0 70	0 65	0 45	0 45	0 46	0 50	0 55
Apples..... Bbl.	2 25	2 40	2 75	2 75	3 25	4 25	3 00	2 00	1 00	1 25	1 25	1 50	2 30
Hogs, dr'sed.....	6 00	6 25	6 25	6 00	7 25	6 25	6 60	6 75	7 00	7 25	6 75	6 25	6 55
Beef..... Cwt.	4 50	4 50	5 00	5 00	5 00	5 00	4 50	4 80	4 50	4 20	4 50	4 50	4 66
Mutton..... "	5 50	7 00	6 25	7 75	9 50	9 50	None	None	None	None	None	None	7 58
Butter..... Lb.	0 20	0 22	0 22	0 23	0 22	0 17	0 15	0 20	0 22	0 22	0 22	0 22	0 20 ¹ / ₂
Eggs..... Doz.	0 20	0 22	0 19	0 17	0 12	0 11	0 14	0 13	0 13	0 19	0 19	0 24	0 17
Hay..... Ton.	8 50	8 00	9 00	9 00	13 00	12 00	9 50	8 50	10 00	10 00	12 00	11 00	10 00
Straw..... "	6 00	5 50	5 25	5 50	6 50	6 50	5 50	6 50	7 50	7 25	9 00	8 00	6 58
Cheese..... Lb.	0 13	0 13	0 14	0 13	0 13	0 11 ¹ / ₂	0 08	0 09	0 12	0 13	0 12	0 12	0 12
Wool..... "	0 31	0 31	0 30	0 32	0 32	0 33	0 28	0 28	0 28	0 27	0 27	0 28	0 29

Now, we will take a period ten years after this, when the National Policy had been in operation twelve years, and when the prosperity which hon. gentlemen opposite

are so fond of speaking of had loaded the farmers with all its benefits. These prices will show how much better their condition was than it had been before:

1890.	January.	February.	March.	April.	May.	June.	July.	August.	September.	October.	November.	December.	Average.
	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.
Wheat..... Bush.	0 85	0 86	0 87	0 88	1 03	1 00	0 96	0 96	0 98	0 95	0 95	0 90	0 93 ¹ / ₂
Barley..... "	0 41	0 43	0 39	0 44	0 50	0 50	0 50	0 50	0 51	0 55	0 51	0 51	0 48
Oats..... "	0 31	0 30	0 31	0 36	0 38	0 45	0 43	0 47	0 43	0 44	0 42	0 45	0 39
Pease..... "	0 55	0 55	0 54	0 53	0 58	0 60	0 62	0 64	0 58	0 62	0 58	0 61	0 58
Rye..... "	0 45	0 45	0 45	0 45	None.	None.	None.	None.	None.	None.	None.	0 50	0 46
Dr'sed hogs. Cwt.	5 60	5 50	5 75	6 00	7 25	6 75	6 25	6 75	6 00	6 25	5 75	5 25	6 08
Cattle..... "	3 50	3 25	3 50	4 00	4 50	4 00	4 25	4 00	4 00	4 00	3 75	3 75	3 87 ¹ / ₂
Sheep..... "	4 50	4 50	6 50	4 50	4 50	5 00	4 50	4 00	4 00	4 00	4 50	4 00	4 54
Potatoes... Bag.	0 64	0 70	0 65	0 63	0 68	0 78	0 85	0 85	0 70	0 68	0 65	0 70	0 71
Apples..... Bbl.	2 10	2 40	2 75	3 25	3 50	3 75	3 00	3 00	2 25	2 00	2 50	2 75	2 77 ¹ / ₂
Butter..... Lb.	0 17	0 21	0 20	0 21	0 20	0 15	0 19	0 18	0 19	0 19	0 23	0 19	0 19 ¹ / ₂
Eggs..... Doz.	0 22	0 20	0 17	0 13	0 11	0 14	0 16	0 17	0 17	0 19	0 24	0 28	0 18
Hay..... Ton.	0 13	0 11	0 12	0 15	0 13	0 13 ¹ / ₂	0 11	0 09	0 9 ¹ / ₂	0 9 ¹ / ₂	0 9 ¹ / ₂	0 8 ¹ / ₂	11 33
Straw..... "	8 50	6 50	6 50	8 00	7 25	7 50	7 00	6 50	9 50	5 75	9 50	7 50	7 50
Cheese..... Lb.	0 09	0 09	0 10 ¹ / ₂	0 10	0 10 ¹ / ₂	0 10	0 09	0 09	0 09	0 09	0 09	0 10	0 09 ¹ / ₂
Wool..... "	0 23	0 23	0 22	0 24	0 24	0 22	0 20	0 21	0 23	0 21	0 21	0 21	0 22

Mr. GRIEVE.

I will now take the year 1895, and show the prices upon which the farmers of the country are growing rich :

1895.	January.	February.	March.	April.	May.	June.	July.	August.	September.	October.	November.	December.	Average for 12 months.
	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.
Wheat bush.	63	63	64	70	84	1 00	83	80	63	65	73	70	73
Oats	34	35	38	41	40	46	41	38	34	29	28	28	36
Pease.....	56	61	66	58	66	65	64	60	56	51	54	54	59
Barley	47	47	48	48	48	50	50	50	41	36	38	38	45
Rye.....	41	42	45	48	57	54	55	50	43	44	45	45	47
Dres'd hogs cwt.	5 25	5 50	5 50	6 15	5 75	5 00	5 50	6 50	6 50	5 50	4 85	4 50	5 54
Cattle.....	3 25	2 75	3 50	4 50	4 50	4 00	4 00	3 75	3 50	3 00	2 75	3 00	3 54
Sheep.....	3 00	3 00	3 75	4 00	4 00	4 25	3 25	3 25	3 25	3 25	3 00	3 00	3 41
Butter lb.	21	19	19	17	16	15	16	1	18	18	20	21	18
Eggs..... doz.	23	24	24	14	10	11	11	11	12	15	18	20	16
Potatoes... bag.	55	55	60	75	75	50	35	40	40	30	25	25	47
Apples.... bbl.	2 15	2 40	2 25	2 25	2 25	2 25	2 25	1 75	1 75	75	1 75	1 75	1 96
Hay	8 50	10 00	12 00	10 50	10 00	10 00	15 00	15 00	17 00	15 50	18 75	17 50	13 30
Straw.....	7 50	7 50	7 50	8 50	7 75	7 25	7 50	9 50	9 50	10 50	12 50	13 25	9 00
Cheese.... lb.	10½	10½	10	9	8½	7½	8	8	7½	7½	9½	9	8½
Wool	19	19	19	21	20	21	21	21	22	22	22	22	20½

You will see that these figures are very much lower than in the years when Mr. Mackenzie was in power. The following are the average prices during Mr. Mackenzie's regime :

	1875.	1878.	Average for two years.
	\$ c.	\$ c.	\$ c.
Wheat..... per bush.	1 03	1 07	1 05
Oats	0 45	0 34	0 40
Barley	0 89	0 64	0 77
Pease	0 78	0 64	0 71
Rye.....	0 68	0 58	0 63
Potatoes... per bag.	1 00	0 72	0 86
Apples	2 30	2 45	2 38
Hogs, dressed... per cwt.	8 26	5 58	6 92
Beef	6 29	4 97	5 63
Mutton.....	8 33	6 75	7 54
Butter..... per lb.	0 23½	0 18½	0 21
Eggs..... per doz.	0 21½	0 16	0 19
Hay	18 50	13 33	15 90
Straw.....	9 58	10 80	10 19
Cheese..... per lb.	0 12½	0 10½	0 11½
Wool	0 33½	0 25½	0 29½

Against these I will give the average for the years 1880, 1890 and 1895, when the Conservative party were in power :

	1880.	1890.	1895.	Average for 3 years.
	\$ c.	\$ c.	\$ c.	\$ c.
Wheat..... per bush.	1 15	0 93	0 73	0 93
Oats.....	0 37	0 39	0 36	0 37
Barley	0 66	0 48	0 45	0 53
Pease	0 67	0 58	0 59	0 61
Rye.....	0 77	0 46	0 47	0 56
Potatoes... per bag.	0 55	0 71	0 47	0 57
Apples.....	2 30	2 77	1 96	2 34
Hogs, dressed... per cwt.	6 55	6 08	5 54	6 05
Cattle.....	3 00	3 87	3 54	3 47
Sheep.....	4 25	4 54	3 41	4 06
Butter..... per lb.	0 20½	0 19½	0 13	0 19½
Eggs..... per doz.	0 17	0 18	0 16	0 17
Hay..... per ton.	10 00	11 33	13 30	11 54
Straw.....	6 58	7 50	9 00	7 69
Cheese..... per lb.	0 12	0 09½	0 08½	0 10
Wool.....	0 29	0 22	0 20½	0 24

You will see that in every product of the farm, there has been a great falling off in

the price as well as, in many cases, a reduction in the quantity produced. Some of the hon. gentlemen who have taken part in this debate, notably my hon. friend from Halton (Mr. Henderson), and my hon. friend from South Ontario (Mr. Smith), stated that the prices of farm products in Canada were very much better than in the United States, and upon that they have based an argument that reciprocity in natural products would not be to the advantage of the farmers in Canada. My hon. friend from South Huron (Mr. McMillan), in the course of his remarks a few nights ago, showed from statistics—statistics that were properly prepared from reliable sources—that the prices of farm products in the United States, taking a period of ten years into consideration, were very much in excess of the prices of similar products in Canada. My hon. friend from Halton and my hon. friend from South Ontario took a certain day's prices. It was easy for them to make out a case in that way. Of course days can be found when the prices of certain products in Canada are higher than in the United States. But let them take a period of years, say from 1882 to 1894, and make the comparison. Some of the hon. gentlemen who have addressed the House upon this question have made comparisons between the prices in the city of Toronto and the average prices throughout the whole United States. That is not a fair comparison. If you are going to take the prices for every part of the United States, why not compare them with the market reports for every point in Canada. Do the hon. gentlemen mean to tell me, Sir, that farmers in the western part of Manitoba or the Northwest Territories receive as much for their products as do the farmers who live within a few miles of the city of Toronto? I think I am within the mark when I say that wheat in Toronto will command, as a rule, 20 cents per bushel more than in Brandon or Portage la Prairie, or even in the city of Winnipeg. And oats are from 15 to 18 cents a bushel higher in Toronto than in any part of the west. Such a comparison as hon. gentlemen have made is calculated to mislead the House and mislead the country. If they wish to compare the prices in Toronto on a fair basis, let them compare them with the prices in Buffalo or New York and we will find no fault. Taking the city of Toronto and the city of New York for 1882, we find the prices were as follows for wheat:—

	Ontario.	U.S.
	Cents.	Cents.
1882	106	118·5
1883	107	112·6
1884	81·4	106·6
1885	80·6	86·2
1886	72·5	87
1887	78	89
1888	99·3	85·3
1889	88·1	89·7

Mr. GRIEVE.

	Ontario.	U.S.
	Cents.	Cents.
1890	91·3	83·2
1891	92·9	93·2
1892	67·8	102·6
1893	59·4	79·8
1894	55·5	67·2

There is what the farmers are protected against. Now, let me take oats for the same period:

	Ontario.	United States.
	Cents.	Cents.
1882	43	47·6
1883	38	50·6
1884	33 ¹ / ₁₀	30·9
1885	31 ⁵ / ₁₀	37·9
1886	32	34·3
1887	34 ⁶ / ₁₀	40·8
1888	40 ⁵ / ₁₀	43·4
1889	30 ¹ / ₁₀	39·3
1890	41 ¹ / ₁₀	32·9
1891	36 ⁵ / ₁₀	42·6
1892	30 ⁵ / ₁₀	40·7
1893	33 ² / ₁₀	39·0
1894	30 ⁵ / ₁₀	35·2

These figures are taken from the Ontario Bureau of Industry, which gives the price for all these years.

Mr. HENDERSON. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to ask him what market he is quoting for wheat in the United States?

Mr. GRIEVE. New York and Buffalo.

Mr. HENDERSON. Now you compare Ontario with New York City, which is very unfair.

Mr. GRIEVE. I compare Toronto with Buffalo and New York.

Mr. HENDERSON. The statistics you are quoting are taken from the Ontario Bureau of Statistics, which states that 49·1 cents is the average price of wheat in the United States in 1894, but you quote 67 cents, which is the New York price. That is unfair, as compared with all the local markets to which farmers deliver in Ontario.

Mr. GRIEVE. I do not think the hon. gentleman can find any fault in comparing Toronto markets with Buffalo.

Mr. HENDERSON. But you are comparing Ontario with New York City.

Mr. GRIEVE. If my hon. friend wants to make a comparison between Ontario and the United States, why not take the Dominion of Canada as a whole as against the United States as a whole? He knows that there is no other part of the province of Ontario to-day where wheat commands as high price as it does in the city of Toronto, and he takes the point in Canada where wheat commands the highest market price, and compares it with the whole of the Unit-

ed States. He knows that even in our own North-west wheat does not command the same price that it does in my hon. friend's own town. Now, I wish to show the position the farmers occupied in Canada in 1881 as compared with 1880. It is all very well

for hon. gentlemen to go on the platform and tell the farmers of this country that they are rich, and are growing richer from year to year, but they cannot deny the statistics I will read them here :

THE PRODUCTS OF FIVE PROVINCES.

Article.	1880.			1890.			1880.	1890.
	Bushels.	Price.	Value.	Bushels.	Price.	Value.	Increase.	Increase.
Wheat.....	31,023,174	\$1 15	\$35,676,650	23,855,247	\$0 93	\$22,175,379	\$13,501,271	
Barley.....	16,463,679	0 66	10,866,028	15,401,281	0 48	7,392,614	3,473,414	
Oats.....	68,909,600	0 37	25,496,330	71,573,769	0 39	27,914,769		\$2,418,437
Rye.....	2,095,255	0 67	1,403,820	1,307,700	0 46	601,542	802,278	
Pease and beans.	13,688,238	0 77	10,549,405	14,742,327	0 58	8,550,549	1,989,856	
Butter, lbs.....	102,859,803	0 20½	21,343,409	108,756,546	0 19½	20,935,635	407,774	
Cheese, lbs.....	63,791,671	0 12	7,654,000	114,002,632	0 9½	10,260,236		2,606,236
Apples.....	13,347,190	0 75	10,010,392	7,449,876	0 90	6,696,788	3,313,604	
Wool, lbs.....	11,198,816	0 29	3,247,656	9,445,703	0 22	2,078,054	1,169,602	
Total value in 9 articles of farm produce			126,238,690			106,605,566	24,657,799	5,024,675
Difference in favour of 1880.....				19,633,124				or nearly 20 per cent.

Now, Sir, we have the total value of the articles I have enumerated here, and these are the principal articles, with the exception of cattle, sheep and hogs, that are produced upon the farm, and it is hard to find statistics in connection with them—in the year 1880, was \$126,238,690, as against a valuation in 1890 of \$106,605,566, or a difference in favour of 1880 of \$19,633,124. That shows the value of the entire grain products of the farm, and others, such as butter, apples, and wool, that were raised during those two years, and it shows a difference of nearly \$20,000,000, or, in other words, there has been a loss of 20 per cent. That, I think, should convince my hon. friends that the farmers of the country in 1890 were not as well off as they were in 1880; and I am satisfied that if we could find the figures of 1895 they would show a still greater reduction in value than do the figures of 1890. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have clearly demonstrated this fact that not only has the price of farm lands decreased in value, not only has the price of farm produce decreased in our market, but the output from some of the older provinces have very materially decreased. How, then, can hon. gentlemen get up and state in this House and to the country that the farmers are in a much better condition than they were in 1878, prior to the introduction of the National Policy? They know well that such is not the case, but they comfort them-

selves with the idea that the farmers are in a much better condition than the farmers of some other countries, and notably of the United States. I have obtained a few statistics from Prof. Robertson which opened my eyes in this respect. I had the idea that with our vast agricultural resources, with the finest agricultural soil, with provinces unequalled by any state in the union, New York, Ohio, or any other, none of which could raise as many bushels to the acre as we can in the province of Ontario. Referring to the census report of 1894, the number of cattle in Canada and the United States were as follows:—

	Cattle.	Sheep.	Swine.
Canada.....	4,060,662	2,513,977	1,702,785
United States.....	52,378,283	42,273,000	46,098,000
	Over 13 times as many as Canada.	Nearly 17 times as many as Canada.	Over 27 times as many as Canada.

What have been the exports of live cattle and other products from Canada to Great Britain? They have been as follows:—

	Cattle.	MEATS.			
		Fresh Beef.	Salted Beef.	Preserved Beef.	Unenumerated.
		No.	cwt.	cwt.	cwt.
Canada.....	82,323		2,729	3,672	671
United States.....	381,932	1,775,538	235,120	205,485	34,315

This shows that the shipments of live cattle and beef to England during the year 1894 was fourteen times as great from the United States as from Canada. Then as to the shipments of live hogs and their products in 1894, the shipments were :

SWINE.

	Pork, Fresh.	Pork, Salted.	Hams and Bacon.
	Cwt.	Cwt.	Cwt.
Canada		7,702	305,019
United States...	4,339	150,186	3,636,473

Or over fifteen times as great as ours in Canada. This shows the falsity of the statements of hon. gentlemen opposite, who have sought to make it appear that the farmers of the United States were not in as prosperous a condition as the farmers of Canada ; if we take the trade returns of the two countries and make a comparison it appears that the United States have more cattle horses, sheep and swine, and that their exports to Great Britain are very much in excess of those of Canada.

Let me ask, how are we to improve the condition of the farmers? My answer is that the only way you can improve the condition of the farmers of Canada is to give them better markets and better prices will follow, and if you cannot do that, give them the privilege of buying in the best market possible. We have lying along the side to the south a large and wealthy country, containing many populous cities. Would it not be advantageous to the Canadian farmers to be able to send their beef, eggs, barley, lambs, horses and a thousand and one other articles of farm produce into those large and wealthy cities. According to the census returns, we have within a short distance of the border line New York, with a population, in 1890, of nearly 2,000,000, Chicago with 1,250,000, Brooklyn, nearly 1,000,000, Boston, 500,000, Buffalo, 255,000, Detroit, 250,000, or seven cities with a population of over 5,000,000. Would it not be an advantage to Canadian farmers to be able to send their product to those cities with a united population greater than that

Mr. GRIEVE.

of Canada? Reciprocity would be the very best thing the farmers could get. There is not a leading man in Canada who has not at some time advocated a reciprocity treaty with the United States. I might quote from speeches delivered by the present Secretary of State, the late Sir John Macdonald, Sir Leonard Tilley, and many others to show that they were willing and anxious to enter into a reciprocity treaty with that country, but I will not quote them as the hour is late. Hon. gentlemen opposite say that the farmers do not pay increased prices for what they buy. Let me show whether the farmers do not pay taxes or not. The following articles are taxed in this way:—Wall paper, ungrounded, not including borders, 35 per cent ; all other papers hangings and borders, per roll of 8 yards and under and proportionately for greater lengths, 1½ cent per roll, and 25 per cent. Then there is the duty on coal oil of about 6 cents per gallon. No doubt some hon. members imagine that the farmer is still using tallow candles. Then there is the duty on Paris green, for the farmer is even taxed on the material with which to kill the potato bugs.

Coal, bituminous, 60 cents per ton of 2,000 pounds ; brick for building and paving brick, 20 per cent ad valorem ; drain tiles, not glazed, 20 per cent ad valorem ; cement, including Portland or Roman and hydraulic or water-lime, 40 cents per barrel ; including the duty on the barrel ; grindstones, not mounted and not less than 12 inches in diameter, \$1.75 ad valorem ; slate pencils, 25 per cent ad valorem ; slates, slate mantels and other manufactures of slate, school writing slates, and roofing slates, 30 per cent ad valorem ; manufacture of leather and rubber, caps, hats and muffs, &c., 25 per cent ; upper leather, &c., 17½ per cent ; sole leather, tanned, but undressed, 10 per cent ; all manufactures of leather, 25 per cent ; belting of leather, &c., 20 per cent ; harness and saddlery, 30 per cent ; whips of all kinds, 35 per cent ; boots and shoes, 25 per cent ; Indian rubber boots and shoes, 30 per cent ; Indian rubber clothing, &c., 35 per cent ; nails and spikes, horse-shoe nails, &c., 30 per cent ; composition nails, 15 per cent ; wire nails, 1 cent per pound ; cut nails and spikes of iron or steel, ¾ cent per pound ; shoe tacks, 1 cent per thousand ; cut tacks, a half cent per thousand, and 1½ cents per pound ; screws, commonly called "wood screws," 8 cents per pound ; screws of iron, steel or brass, 30 per cent ; clothes wringers, 25 cents each and 20 per cent ; cutlery, 25 per cent ; picks, mattocks and grub hoes, axes and hatchets, 35 per cent ; axes of all kinds, scythes, hay knives, prong forks, rakes, hoes and other agricultural tools or implements, 35

per cent ; shovels and spades, 50 cents per dozen ; files and rasps, 35 per cent ; builder's hardware, cabinetmaker's, harnessmaker's and saddler's hardware, including curry combs, carriage hardware and saws of all kinds, 32½ per cent ; cuffs of cotton, linen, xylonite, xyolite, or celluloid, 4 cents per pair and 25 per cent ad valorem ; shirts, costing more than \$3 per dozen, 25 per cent ad valorem, and a specific duty of \$1 per dozen ; corsets, linen, silk and cotton clothing and other articles made from cotton fabrics, 32½ per cent ad valorem ; gloves and mitts of all kinds, 35 per cent ad valorem ; clothing, ready-made and wearing apparel of every description composed wholly or in part of wool, worsted, the hair of the alpaca, goat or other like animal, 5 cents per pound and 30 per cent ad valorem ; hats, caps and bonnets, 30 per cent ad valorem ; umbrellas, parasols and sunshades of all kinds and materials, 35 per cent ad valorem ; braces or suspenders and parts thereof, 35 per cent ad valorem ; bells of all descriptions, except for churches, 25 per cent ; clocks, 25 per cent ; watches, 25 per cent ; salt, 7½ cents per 100 pounds ; shingles, 20 per cent ; pails, tubs, churns, brooms, washboards, &c., 20 per cent ; mowing machines, self-binding harvesters, harvesters without binders, binding attachments, reapers, sulky and walking ploughs, harrows, cultivators, seed drills and horse rakes, 20 per cent ad valorem ; portable machines, portable steam engines, threshers and separators, horse-powers, portable saw-mills and planing mills, and parts thereof in any stage of manufacture, 30 per cent ad valorem ; sewing machines, or parts thereof, 30 per cent ad valorem ; pumps of all kinds and wind-mills, 30 per cent ad valorem ; bird cages, 35 per cent ad valorem ; barbed wire fencing of iron or steel, ¾ of 1 cent per pound ; buckthorn and strip fencing of iron or steel, ½ of 1 cent per pound ; machine card clothing, 25 per cent ad valorem ; pins, manufactured from wire of any metal, 30 per cent ad valorem ; organs, cabinet, 30 per cent, organs, pipe, 25 per cent ; all sugar above 16 Dutch standard in colour, and all sugars of whatever kinds, grades or standards, 64-100ths of a cent per pound ; syrups and molasses, 5-10ths of a cent per pound ; towels of every description, 25 per cent ; bags or sacks of hemp, linen or jute, 20 per cent ; yarns, woollen or worsted, 30 per cent ; knitted goods of every description, 35 per cent ; fertilizers, compounded or manufactured, 10 per cent ; fishing rods, 30 per cent ad valorem ; furniture of wood, iron or any other material, house, cabinet or office, finished or in parts, including hair and spring and other mattresses, bolsters and pillows, 30 per cent ad valorem ; coffins and caskets, 25 per cent ad valorem ; billiard tables, with or without pockets, and bagatelle tables or boards, cues, balls and cue racks, 35 per cent ad valorem ; farm and freight wagons, carts, drays and similar vehicles, 25 per cent ad valorem ; cotton batts, batting and sheet wadding, dyed or not, 22½ per cent ad valorem ; cotton warps and cotton yarns, dyed or undyed, n.e.s., 25 per cent ad valorem ; gray, unbleached cotton fabrics, 22½ per cent ad valorem ; white or bleached cotton fabrics, n.e.s., 25 per cent ad valorem ; cotton fabrics, printed, dyed or coloured, 30 per cent ad valorem ; collars of cotton, linen, xylonite, xyolite or celluloid, 24 cents per dozen and 25 per cent ad valorem.

Sir, I might go through the whole list and mention very many other articles. It is no wonder the farmers of this country are

complaining bitterly of the high taxation that is imposed on them by the present Government. I remember reading a few years ago a piece of poetry that was composed by an old farmer in the western part of the province of Ontario. He had been attending many political meetings, and he had heard the party on the one side talking of the high taxation that existed, and he had heard the other party saying that the farmers and labouring men of the country did not have to pay any taxes. He went and got for himself a copy of the Canadian Customs Tariff, and after looking over it he composed the following :—

I was once a well-off farmer, now I'm worried and in debt ;

I've got poor a-payin' taxes, but I have to pay 'em yet ;

There's a tax on food and clothing, poor and scanty though they be,

But Sir Mackenzie Bowell says : ' Be thankful for ther' ain't no tax on tea ! '

There's a mortgage on the homestead, and the interest ain't all paid,

I've worked hard from early morning till the evening's dewy shade ;

Wife and me don't follow fashions an' I don't get on a spree,

Yet, I'm poor although they tell me that ther' ain't no tax on tea.

In my house there's no pianner, no rich carpets on the floor,

An' the tariff would'nt let me put a door-bell on the door,

An' my wife can't get a bonnet, that would be a luxuree.

But she says " we must be thankful for there ain't no tax on tea ;

I can't buy a bit o' cotton, but I have to pay a tax,

An' they levy on my wood-pile by a dooty on the axe,

An' the salt that's in my porridge is'nt now admitted free,

But the Lord be thankful for one thing that ther' ain't no tax on tea.

Once I tried to buy a picture, it was " lithographed," they said ;

Thirty-odd per cent o' dooty knocked that bargain in the head,

Had it been a great oil paintin,' worth ten thousand, then you see

'Twould been " a work of art," they said, and been admitted free.

When I'm working on the back lot, I would often like to know

Just how long 'twill be till sunset, or till dinner-horn will blow ;

So I thought a watch I'd purchase, but the man spoke up, says he,

Dooty's thirty-five on watches, but we get in diamonds free.

One and one-sevenths of a cent on sugar ; thirty-five per cent on boots

Does'nt help my wheat or barley, or increase the price o' roots ;

Diamonds will not cut my medder, though they may be nice to see,

An' my only crumbs o' comfort is ther' ain't no tax on tea.

Everything a farmer uses ; everything a farmer wears ;
 Hand-rake, cradle, scythe or pitchfork—each its load of dooty bears ;
 This is called "the poor man's tariff," for it keeps him poor, you see
 An' they tell him to be thankful that ther' ain't no tax on tea.

Once they told us that consumers didn't have the tax to pay ;
 That it made the things all cheaper, that it worked the other way ;
 An' I've thought the thing all over, an' I'm blessed if I can see
 If that's so, then, what's the reason that ther' ain't no tax on tea.

Wife and I are getting feeble, soon we'll both be goin' where
 Taxes do not worrit people ; tariffs do not enter there,
 But they'll foller our poor spirits right into eternitee
 By a tax on shrouds an' coffins to get even for the tea.

Well, Sir, if that old farmer had to compose that poetry now, he would have to make a considerable change in it, because I understand that there is now a tax on tea, and the treasury last year was enriched by over \$10,000 from this tax on tea. Now, Sir, hon. gentlemen on the opposite side of the House who have taken part in this Budget debate, have been telling us about all that this Government have been doing for the farmers. They tell us that they have established, not only a central experimental farm near Ottawa, but some four or five other branches of experimental farms, and they are continually telling the people that this has been done because they are anxious to improve the condition of the farmers. Sir, it is true that they have established experimental farms ; it is true that they have spent up to the present time nearly \$400,000 of the people's money in establishing these farms. But let me ask you, Sir, what benefit do those farms confer on the great mass of the farmers of Canada to-day ? While experiments are being conducted there, are they such as are beneficial to the farmers of the country ? I have no fault to find with the gentlemen employed there. I believe the conductor of the experimental farm, Professor Saunders, is a first-class man for his position. I have no fault to find with him or with any of those associated with him. But I do find fault with the Government because, after having established these experimental farms at great cost to the people of Canada, they refuse to give the information gleaned there to the farmers of the country. I would like to ask the Minister of Finance, if he were in his place, if he could tell me how many of those farm reports were circulated among the farmers of Canada during the last two years. Last year I brought this matter before the House, and I showed that not one report had been sent by the members of

Mr. GRIEVE.

this House to their constituents. I showed that while the report on dairying was circulated to the farmers of the country in the spring of 1895, the information contained in that report had been gathered as far back as 1892. If that is the way the Government intend to conduct these experimental farms, if they intend to withhold the information that should be given to the people of this country, then I think they had better stop prating about the great benefit these experimental farms are to the farmers of the country, or else abolish them entirely. The chairman of the Agriculture Committee told us the other day that he could not get passed in the House the resolution which was passed in the committee a year ago to have a large number of those reports printed and circulated among the farmers of the country. He said the Minister of Finance had refused to pass that resolution unless the number were cut down very materially, and the chairman of the committee had to cut it down. What is the Agricultural Committee for but to look after the interests of the farmers. And when that committee makes the request, I say it is the duty of this House to see that these farm reports are printed in large numbers and circulated among the farmers.

Mr. Speaker, I will now refer for a few moments to some of the speeches that have been made in this debate. I am sorry that my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) is not in his seat. That hon. gentleman, in the course of his speech on the Budget this session, comforted himself with this assurance. After depicting the prosperous condition of the farmers, he said there were some signs of the depression lifting. Sir, this is an old story with my hon. friend from East Grey. When I came into this House in 1891, I heard that hon. gentleman speak on the Budget. After criticising the position taken by the members of the Opposition, he admitted, then, that there was a certain amount of depression in Canada, though it was not nearly so great as the depression that existed in the United States ; but he comforted himself with the idea that there were some signs of the depression lifting. In 1892 he again spoke, and he again saw some signs of the depression lifting. Again, in 1893, he saw some signs of the depression lifting ; in 1894, and again in 1895, he saw the same signs of the depression lifting ; and, Sir, in the year of grace 1896, he again sees signs of the depression lifting. The hon. gentleman has, perhaps, a short memory. He claimed the other afternoon that the farmers of the country were in a fairly prosperous condition ; but, referring more particularly to the farmers of his own section of the country, he said : I know the farmers of my section of the country are not as prosperous as some others, because in the year before last, they

had barely half a crop, and last year barely a third of a crop, and, in some cases, not a fourth of a crop. Well, I would like to ask that hon. gentleman what is the condition of the farmers of the good old county of Grey at the present moment. I have here the report from "Hansard" of a speech delivered by the hon. gentleman in this House in 1893, page 446. Speaking on a resolution of the member for Compton, in favour of free corn, the hon. gentleman pictured the condition of the farmers in the following language :—

But it is unfortunate that a very small percentage of our farmers are cattle feeders to-day. In the first place a large percentage of them have not the money to build suitable barns and stables in which to keep their cattle during the winter and feed them so to make them prime beef. In the second place they cannot afford to be out of their money the length of time involved if they raise cattle, not only through the summer would they have to wait, but through the fall and winter, some six months, and in the meantime feed their cattle a very large amount of what means money before they could get a return. I believe that every eighteen out of twenty farmers to-day are obliged to depend upon the sale of their coarse grains, and anything coming into competition with these coarse grains in our markets must be detrimental to the Canadian farmer.

If that was the condition of the farmers of Canada in 1893, if it was true that a large majority of them were unable to put up proper buildings and shelter to feed and take care of their stock; if it was true that a great majority of them had to depend on the sale of their coarse grains in order to keep their engagements at the end of the year; if it was true that they were not able to feed their cattle for the British market or the local market, because they could not afford to lie out of their money, what must be the condition of the farmers in the hon. gentleman's part of the country to-day, after two years' crops that have been almost entire failures? Sir, I leave him and the farmers in his part of the country to work out that question among themselves. But not only did the hon. gentleman say that the farmers were fairly prosperous, but he said that the workingmen were prosperous. He said the working people have lots of employment in the large cities and towns. The hon. gentleman thinks that because they are kept from actual want, they are happy; he thinks because they are able to get three meals a day, and be fairly well clothed, that they have no right to complain. I want to tell the hon. gentleman, if he does not know it, that the condition of the working classes in the country is worse to-day than it has ever been before in the history of Canada.

Mr. FAIRBAIRN. No soup kitchens.

Mr. GRIEVE. Let him go to the city hall in the city of Ottawa on a morning after a

snow storm, and he will see there hundreds of men looking for the work of cleaning it off the streets. Let him go to the offices of the Electric Railway Company, and he will see the same state of things there. Let him look at the men on the streets shovelling the snow, with one eye on their work and the other on the clouds, looking and praying for another snow storm in order that they may earn a dollar to procure for themselves and their families something to eat. And the worst of the condition of these men is that on every 30 cents or dollar that they earn they have to pay 25 or 30 cents in taxes. That is the state of things, not only in Ottawa, but in Montreal and Toronto, and in every other city in this Dominion. My hon. friend says there are no soup kitchens. I can tell him that if the Liberal party were in power to-day and such a state of things existed, you would see an agitation for soup kitchens raised by hon. gentlemen opposite in every town and city in order to make political capital, just as they did in 1878. There is more need of soup kitchens in Canada to-day than there ever has been before in the history of the country.

The hon. member for East Grey also made reference to our public debt. He says the people of Canada do not need to feel alarmed at our having a large public debt, because neither the people of this generation nor the people of the next generation either will have to pay it. That surely is a glorious doctrine to preach. What is the object of every man's labour, what are we struggling and striving for from morning to night? Is it not to try and save up something for those who are coming behind us? Let my hon. friend go back into his own part of the country and tell an audience of farmers there not to mind struggling to pay off the mortgages on their farms, that they need not be alarmed about that, that as long as they pay the interest, that is all they need care about. Why, he would be hissed from the platform. Does he not know that one great object of every farmer is to try and clear off the mortgage on his farm. Who wants to leave as a legacy to his family a farm with a heavy mortgage on it? That is what all the people are working and struggling for—to try and pay off their indebtedness, whether that indebtedness be in the shape of a mortgage or any other shape. And if it be true that the people of this country are trying to clear off their indebtedness, why should not the Government do the same? Let us look for a moment to what the English Government have been doing. During the past fifty or sixty years, they have reduced the public debt of England by over \$900,000,000. Let us take a leaf out of the book of the people to the south of us and see what they have been doing in reducing their public debt. I have the figures

here, but they have been given so often that I shall not trouble the House with them again.

But the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) says: Do not bother your head about our public debt; all you have to pay is the interest. Well, what does the interest on our national debt amount to? \$10,466,204 per year. That has to be paid, he says. Well, if you go into the country before a farming audience and talk to them of millions of dollars, they do not understand you, but put it in thousands or better still in hundreds, and then they will begin to understand you. Why, this interest of ten and a half millions of dollars, which we have to pay yearly, means that every day we have to pay nearly \$30,000. It means that every hour of the day we are called upon to pay over \$1,200. Let me express this interest which we have to pay on our national debt in cattle. It would take 418,652 cows at \$25 per head to pay one year's interest on our national debt. If a farmer undertook to tie those cows in his stables, and started on the 1st day of January, tying in two cows every minute, 120 every hour, or 1,200 every day of ten hours, it would take him nearly twelve months before the last poor animal got in out of the cold. He would have to work every hour of the day and every day of the week from Monday morning to Saturday night, and still have some cows left to tie up. He could not go to church on Sunday; but he would have to keep tying them up day in and day out, and it would take him twelve months before he got through. Put it in wheat at 60 cents a bushel and it would take 17½ millions bushels of wheat, or nearly the entire product of Ontario for one year, to pay one year's interest on our national debt. It would take Prince Edward Island just thirty years to produce sufficient wheat to pay the interest on that debt for one year. It would take the province of Quebec over eleven years to do the same thing. It would take New Brunswick, according to the census of 1891, nearly ninety years to pay one year's interest on our national debt. It would take Nova Scotia, according to the census returns over one hundred years to pay only one year's interest. Take the county of which I have the honour of being one of the representatives in this House. It is not one of the largest nor is it one of the smallest counties in the province, but it is one of the best grain growing counties we have in Ontario. Well, it would take the entire wheat product of that county at current prices for twenty-one years to pay one year's interest on our national debt. It would take all the wheat, and barley, oats, rye, beans, pease, potatoes, all the hay, all the wool and the butter and also the cheese that is produced in the county of Perth in three years, at present prices, to pay one year's interest on our

Mr. GRIEVE.

national debt. Load that wheat in cars, put 500 bushels in each car, and it would take 35,000 cars to carry it at one time, or one continuous string reaching almost from the city of Stratford to the city of Ottawa to pay one year's interest on our national debt. Now, I think that I have shown that while the interest on our national debt is, in the eyes of the hon. member for East Grey, only a very small matter, yet it is not such a small matter after all.

I wish to pay my respects for a moment to my hon. friend from Inverness (Mr. Cameron) the practical farmer from Inverness. He spoke the other night of his practical experience as a farmer, but he gave me the idea that of being that kind of an agriculturist who farms the farmer. He argued that the reduction of duties would not reduce the price of the articles to the consumer. Well, Mr. Speaker, this is the old protectionist argument. In 1878 and 1879, when these high duties were imposed, we were told that they were not going to raise the prices to the Canadian consumer. Hon. gentlemen opposite would not admit that for a moment. They were going to make the coal and steel and iron producers of Pennsylvania pay their share of the taxes of Canada. They were going to make the manufacturers of cutlery in Sheffield and Birmingham pay their share of the taxes of Canada. They were going to make the sugar producers of the West Indies, the manufacturers of glass in Belgium, the cotton producers of the Southern States, the tin manufacturers of Germany, pay their share of our taxes. But after seventeen years' experience, the Minister of Finance himself has come before this House and said that the people of Canada actually pay this taxation themselves. I would simply quote his own words, and I wish his statement to be placed side by side with that of the hon. member for Inverness, who said that when the duty was reduced upon coal and other articles, it made no difference to the taxpayers of Canada, but simply meant so much additional profit to the dealers. The hon. Finance Minister said in his speech, page 1035:

In 1882 the Liberal-Conservative Government struck off entirely the duties upon tea, coffee and tin; and from that period until the present time there has thus been saved to the people on these articles alone the following amounts:—

On tea	\$13,454,857
On coffee	677,231
On tin	1,486,347

Total \$15,618,435

Every dollar of this amount has gone directly into the pockets of the great mass of the consumers in this country.

Further on he said:

In 1887 an agitation was raised, which became successful, for taking the duty off anthracite

coal, which was supposed, and which did lie heavily upon the western provinces. The duty of 50 cents per ton was taken off, and from that time up to 1895, inclusive, the amount of \$6,044,355 was remitted to the consumers of anthracite coal. In 1890, besides other reductions in the tariff, there was a reduction of 10 per cent on common window glass, and 15 per cent on molasses, and on these two articles alone, articles of common consumption, there has been saved \$521,755 to the people of this country.

I commend the statement made by the Minister of Finance to my hon. friend from Inverness (Mr. Cameron). After giving a list of articles on which reductions had been made the hon. Finance Minister goes on to say :

This list does not include all the articles on which reductions have been made, but it covers a large proportion of the more important articles and shows that there was an important and significant reduction. And hon. gentlemen must take into account this fact—that this reduction in tariff was made at a time when reduction of the tariff was accompanied with the greatest difficulties. It was made at a time when prices were lowering in the United States, in Belgium, and in every manufacturing country; not only when prices were lowering as quoted in the regular markets, but when hard times had made it necessary for manufacturers to sell, if they could get cash, even if they had to sell at cost, or less than cost. Many and many a case occurred in which manufactured goods were held as collateral by the banks, and the manufacturers were unable to meet their obligations, the banks sold the collateral security for whatever they could get, in order to turn it into cash. It was in this period of depression, this period of strong competition, this period of slaughter prices, that we undertook the revision of the tariff. Taking all these things into consideration, the remarkable cut that was made in the tariff on these articles, going to the very verge of the extreme, shows that a great advantage was afforded to consumers in the remission of taxation and the consequent cheapening.

This is exactly the argument the Liberal party have been using all these years. They have been saying that wherever a reduction of duty has been made it has been of benefit to the public. I think the statement of the Minister of Finance will bear out their position and convince the people that when the tariff was raised from 17½ per cent to 35 per cent, it meant that increased burdens of taxation were laid upon the people. Now, let me say one word more in conclusion—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear. Oh, oh.

Mr. GRIEVE. I hope the hon. gentlemen will allow me to proceed. I have two hours' figures here that I can give them if they wish. I think that after the speech made by the Minister of Finance it is not necessary to try to convince the people of this country that the vast mass of consumers bear the burden of taxation. Had the hon. Minister made that speech ten years ago, I believe the people, would ere this, have risen in their might and driven from power

the party that has created such heavy burdens of taxation. There is only one question further that I wish to refer to in connection with the hon. Finance Minister's speech. This is what he says :

I read an article but a little time ago in the "Nineteenth Century Review," in which the general question which is agitating many thoughtful minds at the present day was raised and discussed, as to whether the Empire would be able to feed itself in the event of a war by Great Britain which would cut off its supplies from hostile nations. Feed itself! Why, Sir, if statesmanship is not able, practically to solve that question, statesmanship must find it impossible to solve any of the great questions which, from time to time, present themselves for solution. The Empire able to feed itself! Yes. That article said 100,000,000 bushels of wheat were necessary to England, other than what the colonies afforded her at the present time, in order to feed the people of the Empire there. One hundred millions bushels of wheat! Why, fifty thousand Canadian farmers, with 100 acres each, in wheat, and raising thirty bushels to the acre, would produce 150,000,000 of bushels of wheat for export to Great Britain. And, what is fifty thousand farmers cultivating five millions of acres, compared to the numbers of millions of acres of good wheat in Manitoba and the North-west Territories, which has not yet been scratched by the plough. Meats to the amount of one hundred and forty millions of pounds would have to be supplied by the colonies to make up for Great Britain's deficiency, supplied now from foreign countries. Why, cattle and horses, and pigs in illimitable quantity could be raised in this country. And as to butter and cheese, fifty thousand farmers owning fifty cows amounting to 2,500,000 cows, would supply butter and cheese enough to meet the demands of Great Britain for such supplies. And, with the vast lands of the North-west, that is not an estimate which cannot be reached, if means were taken by which it could be reached.

This is one of the brightest pictures I have ever known to be drawn in this House. It is worthy of a great artist. It should be framed and hung in the national art gallery. And there is another picture something of the same kind that should hang side by side with it. The older members of this House will remember the beautiful picture that was drawn some years ago by another great artist in this House when he told us that in 1891 the great provinces in the west would be raising 640 million bushels of wheat and that the sales of land would reduce the national debt by more than the amount of public expenditure upon the Canadian Pacific Railway. If these two pictures were hung in the national art gallery, they would show future generations of what stretches of imagination Ministers were capable of in the nineteenth century. How long does the hon. gentleman suppose it will take to fill up that country with these 50,000 farmers producing 150,000,000 bushels of wheat. I have in my possession a letter from a friend. It is dated from the capital city of the North-west. I may say, Sir, that this letter is not written by any disgruntled Grit or office seeker, but by a gentlemen

who went to the North-west some years ago from the province of Ontario; a man who was the backbone of the Conservative party in his own township, who for many years represented his township in the county council and was spoken of time and again as the Conservative candidate in the riding for the local legislature:

Regina, February, 1896.

Mr. James Grieve, M.P.,

Dear Sir,—Permit me to thank you for blue-books sent last session. They have been of great importance in disseminating knowledge among the people. I would be so pleased if you could send me the "Hansard," it would be of great service in confounding the Davinites. You are aware that a Redistribution Bill is to be brought up to give the Territories another representative. I hope it won't pass, as we have enough of such men as are now members of Parliament in the west. I hope they will forever bid adieu to Parliament, as they are of no service to this part of Canada. I don't think the Territories will send a Conservative back the next time. I trust some change for the better will be made in the Government, and that soon. If not, the whole Territories will be abandoned, as no farmer can live here, freight rates are so high, machinery, the same monopolies in every branch of trade. Since I came here four years ago, six families have left for every one that came, and there are now more farms abandoned than occupied. Coal oil is 45 cents per gallon; wheat, 35 cents; oats, 12 cents; barley, the same, and so on. If there cannot be a reduction of duties that will break up the combines, I am certain this part cannot be settled with all its fertility. There don't seem to be any one to represent the settlers. They are dumped off here to shift for themselves. The only care the Government has is to look after their officials, of which there is a great abundance here, nearly every second man you meet is an official of some sort, or wearing the Queen's livery, while more than one-half the rigs you meet are filled with government gentry and their servants at the Government House. There is no person to occupy it half the time; its inmates are either to the Rockies or seeking pleasure at some other point. The Governor is not popular here. He had full control of the Territorial Fair; he would not allow any other body to have a say in the matter. It is claimed that the prize money is not yet paid, and a lot of other expenses the same. It is said that \$600 of the money went for liquor and such like. He should be recalled at once, as he don't seem to meet the requirements of the people. The Minister of Interior is just as unpopular; he never does the country any good when he comes, either as a statesman, morally or socially; he only comes out here for a holiday and for a good time (he never comes but there is a frost in the country at the same time). It is reported on what I would call good authority that when he came here two years ago or over that he got into a heavenly or happy state of mind and danced with joy while under the influences of the Ambrosial cup of the gods. It was told of him that one Pocklington had a choice piece of music that nobody has ever heard. It wasn't a hymn or psalm either. It was said Pocklington declined to sing it, and thereupon the minister offered to raise Hayter Reed's salary two hundred dollars if he would cause Pocklington to sing. This was the time Vankoughnet's doom

Mr. GRIEVE.

was sealed, so you see what sort of men we have to look after our interests. I have noticed that \$150,000 is placed in the Estimates for immigration purposes. This is utter waste—better spend the amount in the North-west in making roads and finding employment for those that are here. Make the people contented and then every one will become an immigration agent. Let the Government do something to keep the people here. As it now is there is not one settler to every six sections, and that in a radius of twenty miles around the capital. And other ways you might go a hundred miles and not find a settler. I see we are to have dairying instructors sent out here. This would be the country for horses, sheep, cattle and dairying, if there were settlers; but they should come in summer, when people could go and hear them, and not now, just at the approach of an election. There is no use of them coming here to instruct the people to make butter and cheese for the C.P.R. That day is gone, as the freights would take it all. Last summer butter could not be sold at Regina at any price for at least two months. If the country could be settled, and butter and cheese factories established, unlimited amounts could be made, for our natural grasses here are equal to Ontario clover fields. But there is no use of talking unless the duties are taken off machinery, coal oil and what constitutes a man's living, and combines destroyed. In ten years there won't be a farmer here—all will have gone. Around Balgonie, twenty-five miles east of Regina, thirty-two families are leaving this spring for Kansas, and a number have already gone. In Township 20, Range 19 west of 2nd Meridian, north of Regina twenty miles, more than one hundred people have left. Several families of McFaydens, Campbells, McKaskells, Camerons, McLeods, McLeans, Moores—all have left, and not a solitary one in their place. The school-house is untenanted by a single child, and only two or three other homesteaders in the township. The same can be said of the whole country in a lesser degree. Those people were what is known as Crofters, brought out here at a great outlay to the country. Around Balgonie they were Germans, and industrious, but they could not stand high duties and monopolists. This is a lamentable state of affairs, as this is a fertile part of Canada and no barren waste. Horses, cattle, sheep, wheat, and dairy products could be raised here under what is possible circumstances. What we want is reasonable transportation rates, access to American markets, tariff for tariff purposes only. Don't force us to give a bonus on every manufactured article and get nothing in return only to pay enhanced prices for machinery.

Now, I commend that letter to the Minister of Finance. That, perhaps, will give him some idea of the difficulty of realizing his prediction about the thousands of farmers in that country raising 150 million bushels of wheat, and having other thousands of farmers raising all the butter and cheese that the people of England require. As I have said, that letter is written by a good old Conservative friend of mine. Now, Mr. Speaker, before closing, there is one other matter that I wish at this moment to refer to. It appears to me that it is very much to be regretted that the great Conservative party in Canada, or, perhaps, I might be more justified in saying a very small percentage of the great Conservative party in

Canada, have seen fit to bring back into political life one whose whole political career has been anything but creditable to himself or to the party with whom he has been for the past forty years associated. The people of Canada will not soon forget the most violent attack he made only a few short years ago upon his political opponents when he did his utmost to brand the great Liberal party in Canada as being disloyal to the mother country, and as being most anxious to join our political fortunes with the great republic to the south of us. No baser calumny was ever uttered by any person claiming to be a Canadian statesman. Such a statement, Mr. Speaker, was in direct violation of every principle of truth and righteousness. Not only did he wilfully malign the Liberal party in Canada, but he made a most discreditable attack upon the management of one of the greatest corporations we have at the present time, or ever had, in Canada. I refer to his attack upon the Grand Trunk Railway, closely following the general election of 1891. Even before he left the shores of his native provinces, and immediately after landing upon English soil, he launched forth in one tirade of abuse against all and sundry connected with that great enterprise. And, Sir, if he failed in discrediting that great business enterprise before the English shareholders, it was certainly no fault of his. I think I am justified in saying that no other corporation, or I might go further in saying that the Grand Trunk Railway of Canada has done more to populate, to build up, and to enrich this country than all other corporations combined. Did he stop for one moment to think what effect his attack might have had upon the 20,000 workmen who are employed on that road? Did he think for a moment of the thousands of families whose bread and butter depended upon the financial success of that great enterprise? Does he not know that the Grand Trunk Railway pays out annually nearly \$12,000,000 to its employees? No, Sir, Sir Charles Tupper, the High Commissioner at the Court of St. James, thought of nothing else but his own selfish wishes and ideas. Why did he make such an attack upon the Grand Trunk Railway? It will be remembered that, shortly before the general elections in 1891, Sir Charles Tupper tried not only to get the Canadian Pacific Railway to help the Conservative party in those elections, but he attempted to enlist the support of the Grand Trunk Railway, as well. Mr. Seargeant stated on oath, when he was in the witness-box, being examined in connection with an election trial:

Sir Charles Tupper called upon me and I think that is generally pretty well known. That is public property, not all that passed, but only the reference to certain questions of coal duties, and so on. The Grand Trunk Railway company pays an enormous sum, close upon \$1,000,000 per year in taxation on duties and they employ some 1,500 or 2,000 men. They have, therefore, a

great interest in this prosperity of the Dominion, and an equal interest in the prosperity of our own shareholders. There is intervening between the shareholders and their dividend the heavy taxation and a protective policy. The abolition of the latter would give the shareholders a dividend that at present goes out of the country and some \$700 per year would probably go into the pockets of the shareholders instead of being applied by the Conservative party, as it has been applied towards the construction, partly of lines competing with the Grand Trunk Railway Company. When I came into office on the first day of January, I had occasion to review the whole situation. I had been in Canada seventeen years. I came over from England in 1874, but I had never had anything to do whatever with questions of politics or voted in my life, certainly not in Canada. I had taken no interest whatever in the political situation, but when I came to assume the office of General Manager of the Grand Trunk Railway I found that it was necessary for me to consider the political situation, that is the opinions of the Conservative and Liberal party and to see how these opinions would react on the prosperity of the shareholders of the Grand Trunk Railway. I came to the conclusion that the general policy which was advocated by the Reform party, that is the policy of doing away with as much taxation as possible and relieving the industries of the country from as much impost as it was practicable to do having regard to the fiscal requirements of the country was more in accord with my views, that it was more what the Grand Trunk Railway required than the policy of protection which was being pursued by the other side, and I, therefore, lent my sympathies, I say frankly, to the general policy which has been announced by the Reform party.

Now, Sir, because the Grand Trunk Railway took that stand in 1891 and refused to join with the great Conservative party, Sir Charles Tupper, both before he left Canada and after he went to England, made a most violent attack upon that great corporation. So violent was the language that he used, and so violent was the attack he made on the Grand Trunk Railway, that even some Conservative papers in Canada at that time took the High Commissioner to task. I will read from the Toronto "Mail" of 9th June, 1891:

His attack on the Grand Trunk Railway was as gratuitous an act of folly as ever insolence drunk with success committed. It was doubly insensate since he must have known that the Grand Trunk had the means of exposing his attempt to bribe its management. His subsequent performances, oratorical and literary—are on a piece with his attack upon the Grand Trunk. After ostentatiously assuming the character of an impartial representative of this whole Canadian people and their common ambassador to Washington, he proceeds to show his impartiality by the most violent and slanderous attacks on the party in Canada opposed to him, first, in an American, then in an English magazine. His article in the "Contemporary" impudently accusing Canadian Liberals to the British public of conspiracy to subvert British institutions and annex Canada to the United States, considering his position and the nature of his duties may safely be said to be unique in the history of the public service. The appointment of such a man as the

head of the state would be not merely the inauguration of violence and corruption unredeemed by any true wisdom or statesmanship, it would be the signal for a disruption of the community and for a moral civil war.

That is not the language of a Liberal paper, but of a Conservative paper. I have another quotation I desire to read, from a paper supporting the platform of the Patrons of Industry, a newspaper that has given an undivided support both in federal and local politics to that organization. The Mitchell "Recorder," of January 10th, 1896, speaking of the elevation of Sir Charles Tupper, sen., to the Premiership, said :

It might save the Conservative party, but it would be calamitous to the country. Of all things on earth this country don't want a Tupper at the head of it. In profligate expenditure, in useless pomp and swagger, in exaggerated, rash, and reckless statement, and in self-appropriation and maintenance, there is not a family since the days of the old Family Compact that has cost Canada as much as the Tupper family. The record of Tupper has been one continuous record of arrogant pretension and profligate extravagance. He has lived in bumptious and lordly fashion in London on the substance of Canada as if he possessed it by right of inheritance. Last year he cost this country over \$28,000. This country has seen and known enough of Tupper and all his connections. From the Tupper regime give us a rest.

I do not think it is necessary to add anything to these remarks by the Conservative and Patron press, for these organs speak louder than I could possibly do. Mr. Speaker, as the hour is growing so late, I will close by referring to some remarks made by the hon. member for Inverness (Mr. Cameron). He speaks of the Liberal party being weighed in the balance and found wanting. He talks of the handwriting on the wall. Does he not know that the handwriting was seen on the wall a few months ago down in Antigonish? Does he not know that the same handwriting appeared a short time after in Verchères? Does he not know that it again appeared only a good deal plainer in Montreal Centre and in Jacques Cartier? Then it again appeared up in North Ontario where a majority of the votes cast was against the restrictive and coercive policy of the Government. Again in Cardwell it was very distinctly seen. Then in West Huron and Charlevoix; and last but not least when the Secretary of State went down with all the prestige of a coming Premier and only escaped defeat by means not creditable to himself or the party with whom he is associated. The Liberals do not fear the general elections. Let them come on within a few months or six months hence, they are prepared, they are anxiously waiting until the dissolution of the House shall take place; they are prepared to go before the country. The handwriting will again appear on the wall, and the writing will announce that the great Conservative party, which has controlled the destinies of

Mr. GRIEVE.

this country for the last sixteen years, has been weighed in the balance and found wanting.

Mr. CASEY moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

Mr. COSTIGAN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 2.10 a.m. (Friday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 28th February, 1896.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

THE CANADIAN JOCKEY CLUB.

Mr. HAZEN moved :

That the select standing committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills have leave to sit this day during the time the House is in session.

He said: I may say in support of that motion that there is a Bill before the committee dealing with the Canadian Jockey Club, in the interest of which a large number of gentlemen are here from different parts of Canada, who are anxious to get away to-night, and the committee have unanimously recommended that motion.

Motion agreed to.

THE CHICAGO EXHIBITION.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I wish to say in reply to a question of the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin) with reference to the expenses incurred at the Chicago Exposition, that it is not proposed to bring down a return, as I find that it is all contained in the Auditor General's Report, as follows:—

1891-92....Page B-172.....	\$ 5,009 14
1892-93....Pages B-125 to B-134	120,409 94
1893-94....Pages A-19 to A-22.	113,937 86
1894-95....Page B-6	1,913 63

\$241,270 57

This includes more than the orders require, and contains the full and detailed expenses up to 30th June, 1895; and the House will at once see, I think, that it would be very undesirable to spend considerable time in preparing these returns which could not be obtained in as full and exact a manner as they are contained here. I will send this to the hon. member for Winnipeg as an answer to his question.

SUPPLY—THE BUDGET.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Foster :

That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go again into Committee of Supply.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, it is a matter of considerable difficulty to attempt to address this House on the question of the Budget after so much has been said about it, and well said, by hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House ; still I think it is my duty to emphasize a few points, and perhaps to review in a more or less cursory manner the arguments which have already been laid before us.

The great question that we have to consider when we are asked to grant Supply, is, whether the Government of the day has a right to be entrusted with any Supply by this House. That depends entirely on whether they have the confidence of the House and the confidence of the country. It will be the object of my speech to show, first, that they do not deserve the confidence of the country ; second, that they have not got the confidence of the country ; and, third, that it is very doubtful whether they have got the confidence of this House, and for all these reasons we would not be justified in giving them Supply.

There is, Sir, another reason why we should not on this particular occasion grant supplies to the Government, even had they the confidence of those who now sit in the House. We must not forget that this is a moribund Parliament in the strictest sense of the word. It is usual to speak of a House in its fifth session as being a moribund Parliament, and it has occurred only once in the history of confederation that the House has reached its fifth session, until the present Parliament. But if the House in its fifth session is ordinarily and usually considered to be moribund, how much more is this House to be characterized by this name, when it is sitting beyond the allotted days of Parliament, beyond the three score years and ten when its life should become a burden to it ?

This sixth session is an excrescence on the constitution, and it was never contemplated, when confederation was formed, that this House should sit more than five times in the five years, for which the members thereof were elected, but it was left open to have a sixth session in case of an emergency, and the present session has been called for the purpose of meeting a special emergency. That emergency is due entirely to the policy of the hon. gentlemen opposite, or rather I should say to their lack of definite policy, on the great question we have to settle before we leave Ottawa on this occasion. Before the last session of the House, action was taken by the Government in regard to the Manitoba school question, which would naturally

involve legislation in the session of 1895. When that occasion came on, and the Government consulted their colleagues on the benches behind them, they found it was impossible to carry that legislation then, and by a special stretch of the constitution, only justified by a great emergency, they decided to call an extra session at a time when the first session of a newly elected Parliament should have been sitting.

Under these circumstances, I say that we are not only a moribund Parliament, but we are sitting here in a session called for one special purpose, and that one special purpose alone we should discharge, and go immediately to the country, that the Government may receive the verdict of the electors upon what they have done, and that the country may elect new members instead of ourselves to form a policy for the years next ensuing. It is possible within our constitutional power this year to vote Supply for the year beginning 1st July next. It is contrary, however, to all precedents that we should do so—contrary to English precedents and contrary to Canadian precedents—for not a single instance can be shown in England or here, when a dying House has, in an extra session, presumed to vote Supply, to lay the foundations of new policies in respect of public works, militia matters, and the like, in the dying moments of the House, when it should be quietly composing itself to meet the stern judge before whom it must come when dissolution arrives.

For all these reasons, I say that this session of Parliament, no matter how fully the Government possessed the support and confidence of their supporters in this House, even if it were open to us to believe that they possessed the confidence of the electors—we should not vote them any more Supply than is sufficient to carry on the business of the country until new elections have been held, and new members sit in our places, and a set of Estimates is presented to them by a Government fresh from the people.

Coming to another of the reasons why I think we should not grant Supply to this Government, it is that they do not possess the confidence of the country, even though they may have the confidence of the majority of the members. They have not got that confidence in respect of their policy, whether their financial policy, their school policy, their administrative policy, or as regards the minor duties of the Government. They have not the confidence of the people in regard to their personnel. The individuals composing this Government have not got the respect of the people, nor the respect of their own party throughout the country, nor the respect of all their followers in this House. I will speak of that later and more fully.

Another reason why the people have not confidence in this Government is their lack of capacity as legislators and administrators. The Government have not their confidence

either, in respect of that particular quality which, above all others, should characterize men who presume to guard the destinies of this country—purity of administration.

Now, let me go over these points a little more fully in this order. As regards the financial policy, I say they are not supported by the people, and I claim, and the claim is so evidently supported by fact that it can hardly be disputed by anybody, that the National Policy as a means of securing popular support in Canada is played out.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CASEY. I hear on the other side a sarcastic cheer or two from hon. gentlemen who evidently think the National Policy is not played out. Whether this comes from hon. gentlemen who derive some benefit from the National Policy themselves, or from hon. gentlemen who do not know the feelings of the people, I am not aware; but it must come from either one of these two classes, because it is an undoubted fact that the name has ceased to charm, from one end of Canada to the other.

The Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster), the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Montague) and all the lesser lights who buzz around them on the platform, have been telling the farmer, for a year back or more, that he is prosperous, happy and contented. Sir, they may tell that to the Marines, but there is no use telling it to the farmers? If anybody knows what the farmer's position is, the farmer himself ought to know it, and, if you go from one end of this country to the other, and ask the farmers, whether the National Policy has made them rich, you will receive the answer in such a strong negative that I should hardly be considered in order, if I repeated it on the floor of this House. So, Sir, with the farmers, the National Policy has ceased to charm.

The Minister of Finance, a year ago, tried to make us believe—and I think he repeated his argument in the Budget speech this year, although I cannot remember everything he said in that valuable effort—he tried to make us believe that the increase of population between 1881 and 1891 showed a great increase in the farmer's home market. He told us there had been an increase of half a million souls in that time, a mighty small increase, but still an increase; and he claimed that this half million of people were an addition to the farmer's home market, and why did he claim it? He said: "Do you not see, Mr. Farmer, these 500,000 people are not your rivals, because the census shows that all the increase that has taken place in the population of Canada, in these ten years, is in the population of cities and towns? There are no more farmers than there were ten years ago; there are, rather, fewer farmers, and, therefore, you have fewer rivals to compete with, and you have 500,000 more mouths—as he called them—

Mr. CASEY.

in the cities and towns to buy your produce and to pay for it."

Strangely enough, that argument did not seem to satisfy the farmers. When they realized the fact, vouched for by the Finance Minister, that the farming population of the country was decreasing, while the population of the cities and towns was increasing, they rather leaned to the belief that the policy of the Government was a policy unfriendly to the farmers. They said, that a policy which depleted the farms to fill the towns and cities with men who were not always earning a living, was not a policy good for the farming community. I believe they were right, Mr. Speaker, and I believe that that one argument of the Minister of Finance did more to show the farmers of Canada how utterly ignorant that hon. gentleman was of their interests, and how utterly unfit he was to frame a fiscal policy for this country, than anything that has ever been said from this side of the House.

Then, Sir, if the National Policy has not made the farmer rich, has it made anybody else rich? I doubt it. It has failed to start the new industries in the cities and towns that we were told it would start. It has led to a certain growth of industries already existing, where those industries were of such a nature that they could combine to take advantage of the high taxation. It has enabled the big fish in certain lines of manufacture—such as the Masseys among agricultural implement makers—to swallow the little fish, to create a monopoly within a monopoly, and to keep up prices by such means. But the National Policy has not visibly increased the total amount of production. It has not made the tall chimneys rise, nor has it caused the busy hum of industry to sound throughout Canada, as was promised it would do.

Now, in proof of these statements, I wish to refer to a few elections that have lately taken place. If the National Policy was popular with the farmers, the Government should have carried all the by-elections that have taken place within the last few months. Let Verchères answer, let Charlevoix answer, let Antigonish answer, let Cardwell answer; I say, let even North Ontario answer, whether the Government policy has swept the by-elections, where the farmers predominated? It is clear that in all those counties I have mentioned, except North Ontario, that policy has been repudiated, because open opponents of the Government have been actually returned in them; and, as regards North Ontario, the hon. gentleman (Mr. McGillivray) who represents that seat in the House, represents a minority of several hundreds of the people of that riding. He was opposed by a Liberal candidate, and by a Patron of Industry.

Mr. MCGILLIVRAY. A Conservative Patron.

Mr. CASEY. A Conservative Patron, says my hon. friend. I have always understood that, when a man became a Patron, he shed the old garment, and come out in a bright and shining new coat—I will not say of many colours.

Mr. MCGILLIVRAY. He took six hundred Conservative votes.

Mr. CASEY. My hon. friend says he took some Liberal votes?

Mr. MCGILLIVRAY. I said Conservative votes.

Mr. CASEY. It is quite true, he did that. And why did he take five or six hundred Conservative votes, and why did he take a certain number of Liberal votes? It is because he was directly opposed to the Government and their fiscal policy; it is because that Patron was running on the same policy as that of the Liberal party, the policy of a revenue tariff, as opposed to protection. For that reason he took Conservative votes, and for that reason he took some Liberal votes also, and for that reason the member for North Ontario (Mr. McGillivray) represents only a pretty small minority of the people of the riding for which he sits. The six hundred Conservatives, who, he says, voted for the Patron candidate, in doing so voted diametrically against the Conservative Government, and against the gentleman who now holds the seat. I have, therefore, a right to count the Patron Conservative voters and the Liberal voters as opponents of the Government, and opponents of it because of its fiscal policy. I conclude that, if the Patron candidate had not been in the field, these gentlemen would have voted for the other candidate who represented their views on the financial question, and my hon. friend from North Ontario (Mr. McGillivray) would have been at home, attending to other matters to-day.

I quote all of the counties I have named as proofs that the Government has lost the confidence of the farmers. But what about manufacturing constituencies? Well, Sir, is there a greater headquarters of the National Policy, and of manufacturing industries in Canada, than the city of Montreal? Is there a suburban district more directly interested in manufacturing than the district of Jacques Cartier? And what was the verdict of Montreal Centre, and what was the verdict of Jacques Cartier? It was against the Government and against it by overwhelming majorities. Not only that, but it was against the Government at a time when the Government's policy on the school question would naturally have commended itself to the majority of the electors in those districts, on the ground of their religious associations. When the Government had been making the strongest bid they possibly could for the support of the Catholic Church and Catholic electors, just at that crisis, the manufacturing centre of

Montreal and the adjacent suburban county of Jacques Cartier returned opponents of the Government by immense majorities. What could have caused that result, but a revulsion against the fiscal policy of the Government?

It is clear, then, that the agricultural and the city constituencies, as far as heard from, have repudiated the National Policy, as it is called. Sir, I will ask another question. Why is it that the Government are afraid to have other elections for vacancies now existing in the House? Soulanges is vacant; Missisquoi is vacant; Pontiac is vacant. Two of these constituencies, Soulanges and Missisquoi, were vacated at exactly the same time as Northumberland, in which we have had an election, and at about the same time as Cape Breton, in which we have had an election. Why have the Government not ventured to face the electors in those constituencies? Because they dare not. Because they know that even with the assistance of their remedial policy in those Quebec counties, they have not the slightest chance of securing a supporter in either. The Government have shown by their action in postponing the elections in those counties, that they have not confidence in their own policy, that they have not confidence in the electors, that they have no confidence whatever in their prospects of success.

Now, in regard to the policy which we speak of as the National Policy, it is not, in the strict sense, what my friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) is fond of speaking of as scientific protection. It is not a policy of carefully-contrived protection. I am not going to argue the question of protection just now. I am taking for granted, as most people in the country do, that protection is a bad thing. But even so, the National Policy is not a carefully-contrived system of protection. It is a system of jobbery; it is not protection. It is a system by which the combines who are going to make money by the imposition of certain taxes, dictate to the Minister of Finance what taxes are to be imposed. That was proven to the House last session by statements of the Manufacturers' Association, read by myself and by a number of others on the floor of this House. It was proven that the Association had given the Finance Minister a brief, a letter of instructions, and he acknowledged that it was a most valuable brief for him in the revision of the tariff in 1894, and that he had followed the instructions given to him in that brief, as a faithful attorney. He had done what his masters told him; and had not followed his own judgment.

I said then, and I say now, that the relation between the combines and the Government is the same relation that existed of old in the Roman Empire between the publicans and the central

government. The publican or tax-collector paid a certain sum, annually, into the treasury for the right of taxing the people of distant provinces as much as he wished. He paid a certain sum to the treasury, and put the balance of the taxes into his pocket. That is just what the Canadian combines are doing to-day. They contribute to the election funds, and the Government, in return, do for them what they please with the tariff; and that tariff, instead of producing a revenue for the treasury, produces a revenue for the combines. I say the combines; I do not use the word manufacturers, because the scandal I refer to does not affect all the manufacturers of this country; it only affects, I believe, a very small proportion of them. To use a term that has become almost classical by repetition, the boodle that is in the National Policy is only for those industries which are able to combine to keep up prices. Other manufacturers do not make money by it. They are taxed by it, like the rest of the community. It is only the fortunate few combinesters, some of whom have seats in this House, Mr. Speaker, who are able to profit directly by this system of taxation. There are gentlemen sitting in this House who are concerned in the combines, who are prominent members of them. I would ask the member for Halifax if they have not confessed themselves to be members of these combines? The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Stairs), who spoke yesterday on the sugar question, has shown himself to be connected with the sugar combine. It would take too long to give a list of the members of this House who are connected with combines, but there are men in this House who have a pecuniary interest in voting taxes to be imposed, not for the benefit of the community—

Mr. SPEAKER. Order. The hon. member must not accuse members of this House of having a direct pecuniary interest in voting for particular measures.

Mr. CASEY. Well, Mr. Speaker, we will have to express the matter in a more parliamentary fashion. I say that there are gentlemen in this House interested in various combines, that these combines do derive the benefit of taxation imposed on the people, and that those taxes do not go into the treasury, but into the pockets of those combines, and, therefore, into the pockets of men who sit in this House.

Mr. DAVIN. I rise to order. Is that parliamentary, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member is entirely out of order.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order; withdraw.

Mr. CASEY. What I say—I am not insinuating—

Mr. CASEY.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member has made a direct charge that members of this House are voting money into their own pockets.

Mr. CASEY. I have not said that these members are influenced in their votes by the well-known fact of their connection with these combines.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order. The hon. member must withdraw the statement he made in reference to members of this House—that they were voting money into their own pockets. Surely that is out of order.

Mr. CASEY. Well, Mr. Speaker, I will withdraw it in the parliamentary sense.

Mr. DAVIN. I rise to order. The hon. member must absolutely withdraw it.

Mr. CASEY. Speaking to the point of order, the precedent has been established, and established by the late Sir John A. Macdonald—

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member cannot speak to the point of order after the Speaker has ruled. I have ruled that the hon. member must withdraw that expression.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Chair. Withdraw.

Mr. CASEY. I ask you, Sir, with regard to the parliamentary rule—

Mr. SPEAKER. Order. The hon. member must withdraw the statement that hon. members of this House have voted money into their own pockets.

Mr. CASEY. I am not aware that I put it in that language.

Mr. SPEAKER. That is the way I understood the hon. member.

Mr. CASEY. If it be unparliamentary to make the statement in the words I used, and if they conveyed that impression to you, Mr. Speaker, then I will have to withdraw the statement, of course. But in regard to the last phrase I used, as to which I wish to speak to the point of order, I say that it was established by Sir John A. Macdonald himself, on a ruling in a question just like this, that the expression, "I withdraw the phrase in a parliamentary sense," is quite sufficient to cover the ground. When a member of this House has stated what he knows to be a fact, he is allowed to withdraw it in a parliamentary sense, without committing himself to a lie, by saying that the thing is not true. In that sense, I withdraw the statement.

Having referred to their financial policy, I wish to say something of the personnel of the Government. I have said that we have no confidence in the personnel of the Government, and that the country has no confidence in it. And I have the very best authority for stating

that we should not have any confidence in the personnel of this Government, because one-half of the Government have said that they have no confidence in the other half, and the other half have returned the compliment. There are two halves of the Government, each of which has told the other that it has no confidence in them, and believes them to be unfit to sit in the Council Chamber. Therefore, they cannot grumble if the people of the country take them at their own valuation, and believe that what each side says of the other is true, and that both halves of the Government are entirely unworthy of our confidence, either as individuals or as politicians.

Now, I wish to quote briefly from the official explanation made in this House in the early part of the session, to prove that the two halves of this Government have no confidence in each other. I quote the statement made on behalf of the Ministers who bolted about the time this House met, on January 2nd. The hon. Minister of Finance, who was then not a Minister at all, said that he had a duty to perform before the House adjourned, and he conceived it should be performed at once, and he proceeded to say that he did not propose to enter into any discussion of the subject, but was going to make merely an official statement as to why he and his colleagues, who were acting with him, had left the Government. He went on to say that there had been no disagreement between the bolters and the Premier on any constitutional point, that their reasons for difference were purely personal, that they had not lost confidence in the policy of the party, and then he used these words :

Mr. DAVIN. Is not the hon. gentleman referring to a past debate ?

Mr. SPEAKER. I would point out to hon. members that in the discussion of the Budget, considerably greater license is given than upon ordinary occasions ; and this being an official statement made by a member of the Government, I would hardly like to rule that a reference to it is out of order.

Mr. CASEY. I yield to your ruling with greater pleasure still, this time, Mr. Speaker. This statement, I may say, is a pretty fair ground for alleging want of confidence in the Government, and it has been quoted again and again in the House in various other debates. Well, the hon. Finance Minister (Mr. Foster) then said :

Though with many misgivings, we agreed to enter the Government under Mr. Bowell in succession to Sir John Thompson, we have nevertheless unitedly and loyally striven to the best of our ability to make it strong and efficient, and it has been with growing regret that we have seen our efforts result in a measure of success less than that for which we had hoped and striven.

The hon. gentleman confessed that the Government had been a failure. He confessed that he had never believed in the First Minister under whom he took office, that his misgivings had been justified, and that for those reasons, purely personal, he withdrew. He then went on to say :

We are of the opinion that the Liberal-Conservative party ought to be represented by the strongest Government possible to be secured from its ranks, that the necessity therefor was never greater than under existing circumstances, and we believe that such a Government can be formed without delay. This we have repeatedly urged upon the Premier, with the result that we found ourselves face to face with Parliament, having a Government with its numbers incomplete and with no assurance that the present Premier could satisfactorily complete it. Under these circumstances, we thought it our duty to retire, and in this way to pave the way, if possible, for the formation of a Government whose Premier could command the confidence of all his colleagues, could satisfy the Liberal-Conservative party that its strongest elements were at its head, and impress the country that it had a Government which was united and had power to govern.

Those were the reasons which induced the Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster) to withdraw from the Government early in January. And now what do we find ? We find the Finance Minister back again, and he has brought his tail behind him. Like the sheep that belonged to little Bo Peep, he has come back and carried his tail behind him, for all his colleagues returned with him, except the one who made way for his father (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper). We find him back again, faithful, above all things, to the salary of his office and the position which he desires to retain in this House. But how much better is he off with regard to the Government than he was before ? He hoped that the result of his withdrawal would be that they would have a Premier who could command the confidence of his colleagues and satisfy the Liberal-Conservative party that they had a strong Government ; but it is just the same Premier he has now that he had before ? We do not suppose that the Minister of Finance is so changeable in his views as to have a different opinion of the Premier now from what he held in January last. And we must take his own words that the Finance Minister knows he is now sitting as a member of a Government whose Premier cannot command the confidence of his colleagues, who cannot satisfy the Liberal-Conservative party that its strongest elements are at its head, and impress the country with the fact that the Government is united and has power to govern.

There is a denunciation of the Government by the second man in it, because the Minister of Finance is second only to the Premier. There is the statement that that Government has not the confidence of the country, and still more that it does not deserve the

confidence of the country so long as Sir Mackenzie Bowell is at its head. That is a statement which the Minister of Finance has never withdrawn. What can the country think of a Government whose second in command speaks in this way of his leader and the colleagues who remained faithful to his leader ?

On the other hand, Sir Mackenzie Bowell had something to say for himself. He pointed out in another place, that the reasons given by the Minister of Finance for withdrawing were not reasons which could justify the members of the Government in retiring from the Cabinet, unless there was something in the character or reputation of its head which warranted their leaving, and refusing, in the future, to associate with him. He appealed to the country against the necessary inference from that, and he pointed out that he did not seek the position he holds, but far from that, and he pointed out that he did not seek them, but they sought him. He says if the Government failed to be a success, it was on account of the failure of his colleagues, and not from any lack of competency on his party. He said :

Had not jealousy and a determination to destroy the usefulness of the head of the Government been firmly rooted in the breasts of those with whom I was associated, I flatter myself that we should have been successful in carrying on the affairs of this country.

That is the Premier's opinion of his colleagues in reply to their opinion of him.

I was inclined at first to think that the Premier was altogether right in this matter, and his colleagues altogether wrong. I am inclined still to believe in the Premier to this extent, that he acted in an honourable and upright manner, and to the best of his lights, up to the time of that split in the Cabinet. But when he condescended to receive back these men who had betrayed him, who had watched for the exact moment when they could strike him down with the most fatal effect, in order to destroy him as leader of the party in the Government, I began to feel that there was some force in their statement, and that he was not quite so big a man as is required for the place. I am inclined to think he was not sufficiently strong in his determination to do what he thought was right, or he would never have sat again at the Council table with these men. Sir, I might enlarge upon that, but it has been quoted frequently before, and I only give enough of it to establish my point.

But it is not only that these hon. gentlemen accuse each other of incompetence, of treason to a chief, and political misdeeds of that kind. They have gone further. Men who sit at that Council board have accused each other on the floor of this House of conduct that would prevent them from being accepted anywhere in decent society. We have heard the Minister of Agriculture ac-

Mr. CASEY.

cuse the hon. gentleman who was lately Controller of Customs, the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace), and we have heard the member for West York accuse the hon. Minister of Agriculture, of writing anonymous and slanderous letters about another colleague in the Government.

Mr. WALLACE. No one made a statement accusing me of writing those letters.

Mr. CASEY. I heard the Minister of Agriculture use words in this House which could have no other meaning than that he believed that the member for West York had got these letters up himself, and then tried to throw the blame upon him.

Mr. WALLACE. He would not dare to say that.

Mr. CASEY. He said he wished to God that the member for West York would be able to clear himself of that accusation. I heard him say also that he was going to institute criminal proceedings against the member for West York.

Mr. WALLACE. He did not say that.

Mr. CASEY. Well, proceeding—then : and that he had gone to consult the best criminal lawyer in Ontario on the subject, and had found him already engaged by my hon. friend from West York for his defence.

Now, Sir, unfortunately for the interest of truth in this matter the condition of the health of the hon. Minister of Agriculture has compelled him to leave the country for a time—I am afraid, at least for the rest of this session. And so we shall not have the opportunity we should have had of having this matter cleared up ; and we are left in grave doubt as to whether the Minister of Agriculture is right in thinking that the hon. member for West York was at the bottom of a conspiracy about these letters, or whether the member for West York is right in thinking the same of the Minister of Agriculture—and also what the Postmaster General must think of one or both of these hon. gentlemen. But the fact remains that these gentlemen have accused each other on the floor of the House of conduct that would rule them out of decent society, and that the matter has not been cleared up and does not now seem to be in process of being cleared up. Those accused would consult their own interest by taking the quickest means of bringing to light the truth about this matter.

Meantime, while such accusations are bandied about, what are we to think of the men who can talk thus about each other ? These accusations are not made by their opponents, but they are made by these gentlemen against each other. They cannot expect that the country will have any confidence in them as individuals, while such charges remain unanswered and not cleared up.

I have dealt with the fiscal policy of the Government and with its personnel. There are smaller instances of their ad-

ministrative and other policies which I must refer to in order to show their incapacity for public office in a general way, to show that they have not acted as men of ordinary political sense would have acted in their positions. Take the case of the Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway Company. Last year the Minister of Finance confessed that they had undertaken to guarantee the interest on bonds of this wildcat scheme to a very large amount. I would not trouble you with figures, even if I remembered them. But when the matter was called attention to in the House, they had to admit that it was wrong and to withdraw the promise of a guarantee that had been given. That was the act of an incapable government.

Then we had the Hudson Bay scheme. I am not going to discuss the merits of that road as a colonization road or as an outlet for Manitoba grain. But I wish to point out that this Government passed an Order in Council, involving a matter of \$2,500,000, in favour of that road, and when the subject was ventilated on the floor of the House, they did not dare to carry out the terms they had made with the directors of the road. Either they knew that they were doing something wrong, something corrupt, when they passed the Order in Council, in which case they must be condemned for seeking to create a boodle fund, desisting only because they were afraid it would be found out. Or else the Order in Council was passed in good faith for the purpose of opening up the North-west and affording facilities for shipment, in which case they did what was wrong and cowardly in withdrawing from their position.

Then, to come down to the affairs of this session, we have the Order in Council which was passed recently to allow United States cattle to be exported from St. John, N.B. In the first place I do not see any justification for the issuing of this order. It is a confession, a confession which was also made openly across the floor of the House, that they had no hope of having the scheduling of our cattle by Great Britain withdrawn. It was a confession of the utter failure of the High Commissioner, who has now a seat in this House, to secure a removal of that discrimination against our cattle: a confession that all the time and words and money he had expended in that matter had resulted in nothing, and had been perfectly valueless to the people of this country. As to the confession of failure I quite agree with the Government. There was a failure. The High Commissioner had shown himself to be a perfect failure in connection with the matter. It was about time to recognize the fact, but not time to recognize it, I think, by making regulations for the exportation through Canada of United States cattle. The true way to recognize it was to dismiss the High Commissioner and send in his stead a man who had some weight and influence with the home government. But the Gov-

ernment chose this other way of doing it. They passed an Order in Council allowing the Canadian Pacific Railway to bring American cattle to St. John, N.B., to be exported by Canadian steamship lines. And here is the greatest proof they have shown yet of their sympathy with the Canadian farmer. First they subsidized a railway through American territory to reach St. John—I mean the Canadian Pacific Railway—then they subsidized Canadian lines of steamers to cross the Atlantic, and then they allow this railway and these steamers to carry United States cattle in competition with those exported by the Canadian farmer. I have no doubt they will go to the Canadian farmer and tell him that this is a convincing proof of their love for him.

Another subsidiary feature of their policy—part of the fiscal policy really—is the export bonus scheme. We have that in two shapes. We give a bonus to Canadian manufacturers who export certain lines of goods, farming implements especially, to other countries. We repay them when they export the goods, all the duties paid upon the raw material in the goods exported. We also give a bonus, or offer a bonus, for the manufacture of beet-root sugar. Now, Sir, what do both these schemes mean? They mean that the people of this country are taxed to supply cheap goods to the people of other countries. Taking the Masseys as the type of implement makers, we see that when they sell implements in Canada, they charge the full profit to the farmer on the goods, including the materials and the duties on these materials. But, when the Masseys send their goods to Australia, or to England, or anywhere else, they can sell them cheaper by the amount of the duty of the raw material. That is to say, the farmers of Canada not only have to pay a high price for the goods produced by the Masseys, but they have to pay the Masseys a bonus to enable them to sell cheap goods to the people of foreign countries. That is one of the smaller items of policy which have lost this Government the confidence of the people of Canada. All their fancy fads for farmers proceed on the same basis. Their butter-shop plan, their dead-meat-export plan—all these things are based on the idea that it pays to tax the people of this country for the purpose of selling things cheaply abroad.

Now, I must refer, naturally very briefly in this connection, to another line of policy which has lost them the confidence of the people. I refer to their method of handling the Manitoba school question. I do not intend to discuss the Bill before the House, of course; I have no right to do so; but I wish to refer to the way they have handled this question since it first came up. In the first instance, their conduct was marked by sluggishness and dilatoriness; in the second, by rash haste and inconsiderate action. When

the Privy Council of England decided that it was the duty of the Canadian Cabinet to hear the appeal of the Manitoba minority in this matter, the first duty of that Cabinet should have been to hear the appeal. They should have inquired into the alleged grievance, they should have consulted with the Government of Manitoba, and amongst themselves, as to what were the least modifications in the existing law that would be required to remove that grievance. They should have gone into the whole matter carefully, with all obtainable evidence at their command. They should then have matured, after a due lapse of time, and after careful inquiry, a proposition which would have appeared, at least on the face of it, to offer a solution of the difficulty, and to remove the grievance of the minority, without overriding and destroying the legislation of the province. Had they done so, I am sure we should not have been sitting here to-day in special session to consider a Remedial Bill for Manitoba.

What did they do instead? They heard a lawyer on each side of the case, they took no evidence whatever as to the conditions of the old separate schools in Manitoba, as to the condition of the new public schools in Manitoba, and as to what might be necessary to produce a workable compromise between the two. After hearing arguments on each side, they adopted the whole plan of the plaintiff in the case, gave judgment in his favour, and passed an Order in Council directing Manitoba, in effect, to restore separate schools as they had been before 1890. They did not do this with their eyes shut. They had plenty of advice from the leader on this side of the House before that time, that their proper method to proceed was to inquire first and decide afterwards. He had recommended a commission of inquiry a long time before that, but, instead of listening to that advice, they rushed on, perhaps on the advice of the late Minister of Justice, on the advice, perhaps, of the Premier—I do not know on whose advice they rushed on to give judgment without any inquiry.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I ask you, and I ask the House, if they are not very sorry they did not adopt the advice from this side? If they had adopted a commission of inquiry last year, had gone to the country and had the elections, pending a report of that commission, with a promise to see fair-play in the matter after the elections, the elections would have now been over, a new House would have been sitting here, duly qualified to pass Estimates and do all other business. I do not know whether the Government would have been in power or not, but they would have had a vastly better chance of being in power, if they had held the elections last spring, than they are going to have after the elections that are coming on. But, having passed

Mr. CASEY.

that Order in Council, they decided to hold a session. There, too, they showed a mistaken policy, they showed their incapacity for political management by going on with the session instead of having an election. Having held the session, they showed their incapacity, their absolute want of judgment, in not pressing the remedial legislation to an issue during that session. It would have met with far less opposition last spring and last summer than it is meeting with now.

Then, Sir, between last session and the opening of this one, they had plenty of time to negotiate and to inquire; they could have appointed a commission of inquiry, and then had full information on the subject to lay before the House, when we met to consider this Bill. But they had not sense enough to do that, Mr. Speaker, and when the House met, so far from having their legislation ready to present to us, and get it over, they were forced to adjourn for two weeks by an eruption amongst themselves; and, when they did get together again, they did not appear to be any more ready with a Remedial Bill than they had been six months before. Now, only on the 4th March, are we going to have the first consideration of the Bill which they have proposed; a Bill which, if they had kept their promises, they should have had ready for presentation at the opening of the session; which they should have presented at the opening of the session; which they should have had discussed to a finish, which they should have taken the sense of the House upon, before they dared to ask us to vote a single cent of Supply.

I say, Sir, that, until they have done that, until the principle of the Bill, at least, is debated in the House on the second reading, they have no right to ask us to believe that they have the confidence even of their own supporters. We know that they have not the confidence of a lot of them, for they have said so in the House, and we do not know how many more, who have said nothing, are thinking a great deal about it. Now, those are some of the reasons why I think we should not give this Government any money just now, why we should not have sufficient confidence in them to entrust them with it. But we are told that one great change has occurred in the Government since it was last reorganized, which of itself should restore the confidence of the people of the country. It has gained one great acquisition, the High Commissioner has taken his seat as a Minister of the Crown, retaining his High Commissionership, and retaining the old personality he had when he was in this House before, to a considerable extent—to what extent, I wish to point out at some length.

We are told that the return of this great man would restore the confidence of the people in the Government. We were told that it would do so, but, Mr. Speaker, I do

not see that that result has materialized. Now, there is a generation of electors throughout the country, a generation of members in this House, who only know the High Commissioner by reputation. They know that he was a great man at one time. They know that he wielded great influence in Nova Scotia and in this House. They took it for granted that if they could only get him back all would be well. What has been the result?

He came out here at his own suggestion, he succeeded in worming himself into the Government of which he had been a servant, on the strength of his promise that he would do great things for them. He succeeded in getting elected in a Nova Scotia constituency by a majority about equal to the ordinary party majority in that county, and he came here as a member of the House. During the two weeks or so that have elapsed since he took his seat he has made two appearances before the House, other than merely to answer questions. The first was within ten minutes after his admission into the chamber, when he had to rise and try to defend himself. I think ineffectually, from the charge of slandering his opponents in the campaign. The other time was when he had to rise and deny the charge of having stolen \$40,000 of public money. I do not think the Secretary of State and High Commissioner is to be congratulated upon the nature of his two appearances before the House and the effect they will have upon the people of the country.

He has retained, I say, a great deal of his old personality. He has always been, he is and always will be, the great I, the great capital I, the Ego, the essence of all the Egos. He has never ceased to blow his own trumpet since the time when his action in 1867, in dragging his province into confederation against her will, nearly succeeded in setting that province in a state of rebellion—from that time till now he has never ceased to sound his own trumpet, and force upon us the belief that there was one person at all events who had confidence in him. His return on this occasion was hailed as the return of a Master Mind. It was thought he would bring good luck to the Government, as he had done before; that he was a sort of Mascot, a lucky individual to have about, with whom in the ranks they could not fail. I am afraid hon. gentlemen opposite are beginning to find out that this hon. gentleman instead of being a Mascot is going to prove the Hoodoo of their party. They will find that instead of ringing the death knell of Liberalism, he has come out to hold funeral services over, and to pay last respects to the memory of a Conservative Government in Canada. They will find that this man who must be first or nowhere, who must bully his province into confederation, who must bully the Premier under whom he served as

a member of the Civil Service to give him a seat in the Cabinet, who will bully his colleagues before long, if he has not done it already, will succeed in tolling the bell over them instead of over us on this side of the House.

The Minister of Finance and his colleagues objected to Sir Mackenzie Bowell as being old and feeble and played out. Well, Sir, I leave it to you and to the House if the saviour of the party who is sitting for the time being in the third place in the Cabinet, with the intention of taking the first place and the name of Premier as soon as the session is over—if the Secretary of State is not a much more played out man than the Premier under whom he temporarily serves—older in years, older in experience, no doubt, but I think more used up by his experience of politics than the comparatively young man for his years who is now Premier of the party.

I said a few minutes ago that the new generation thought the Secretary of State is something great because they did not know him, but they now find out that the man of whom they heard so much, when paraded before their eyes, is what is commonly called a back number, that the great I, the great Ego, instead of being the over-ruling providence of the party at the present time, has become the great "I was." The Secretary of State is the great "I was" of the Conservative party. What he was we need hardly discuss; what he is now, you can see for yourselves, and I do not think the sight will tend greatly to strengthen the Government in this House or in the country. Why, if he is not a man of the past, if he is not an out-of-date politician, has he not contributed something to the debate on this occasion?

He was Finance Minister, and the ruler of various other men who were Finance Ministers, at other times; he professed to have laid the basis of the wonderful progress in our iron manufactures, which perhaps hon. gentlemen opposite have not noticed, but which he told us would take place within the few past years. Why has he not contributed to the Budget debate? Why has he not told us how the great schemes of 1887 have succeeded? Why has he not told us why all the promises have not been fulfilled? It is because he was ashamed, in the face of those promises, to stand up before the House and confess to the failure which everybody has found out has attended those schemes, and the lack of fulfilment which everybody knows to have occurred. What is the use of a master-mind, a capital I, if he cannot get up and take part in a debate such as this? We are in the last day of this discussion. He told us in Nova Scotia that no man had a right to be considered a leader, or had a right to be in public life, who was not ready to discuss any public question at any moment beneath the

glare of the electric light. The light is lit ; it will burn here I do not know to what hour to-morrow morning. I do not intend to occupy the floor all the rest of the afternoon and evening, and there will be an opportunity for the Master Mind to discuss the great issues of the day beneath the glare of the electric light. Let him rise and make his glaring statements, beneath this glare and we will see what a glaring failure he will make of it. I say so because we have here his promises when he was Minister of Finance in 1887, the proof of the failure of which is within everybody's knowledge.

I have made a few extracts from that speech, some in regard to the financial policy, and others in regard to different subjects, but I do not wish to frighten the House by the bulk of the papers I now hold in my hand, because I am not going to read them all. In 1887, Sir Charles Tupper made a statement at the beginning of his Budget speech which shows how history repeats itself. Hon. members will all remember that he came out to Canada just after the writs had been issued for the general elections in that year : that he stayed and took command of the forces, and went back to the old country after spending one session as Finance Minister. This is what he said about coming out to this country, and what followed : —

I was in communication, as I shall point out in a later period, with the Government in regard to a proposed treaty with Spain ; and having received a letter from the Finance Minister on that subject, as well as a communication from my right hon. friend who leads the Government (Sir John A. Macdonald) in regard to the proposed Imperial and Colonial Institute, I felt that it was desirable that we should have personal communication on both of these questions. Under those circumstances I cabled to my right hon. friend to say, that if he approved of it, I would take a run out to Canada so as to have an opportunity of discussing these two questions fully with him and his colleagues before proceeding any further. I received promptly his approval of my visiting Canada ; and when I landed in New York I learned for the first time that a general election was to take place in this country. I not only learned it for the first time, but I will say with all frankness to the House that I was surprised at that information. I had previously learned the result of the elections that had just been held in the province of Ontario ; and while down to that period I thought it not unlikely that there might be an appeal to the people this season, after those elections I felt it unlikely that any appeal would be made until after this session of Parliament. I mention that in order to show that this important question was receiving my attention. Well, unhappily for myself, I may say, I visited this country ; and after I arrived here my right hon. friend laid an embargo upon me, and I was obliged to leave all those enjoyments and pleasures which have been so much descanted upon in this House and elsewhere ; I was obliged to leave my comfortable residence in London and go into the campaign without that health or strength that I required for such a service.

Mr. CASEY.

There is a good deal of "I" about that too, Mr. Speaker, but the drift of it is that he had come out to consult the Government about another matter, and he "got cotched on the jury and could not get off," as the old darkie was when he went into town. I have said that history repeats itself. I shall read to the House now a telegram from Sir Charles Tupper to Sir Mackenzie Bowell, dated London, 14th November, 1895 :

Long interview Colonial Minister last night. Imperial Government will support fast Atlantic service, extent £75,000, vessels similar "Teutonic," but will require Canadian Government to invite new tenders. Agents General and self meet Colonial Minister Tuesday re cable. Have no doubt Government will support proposal and appoint commission at once to arrange details pending declaration policy Imperial Government. Will advise you result of meeting.

You notice, Mr. Speaker, the repetition of history. Sir Charles Tupper always had two matters to come out to consult the Government about. It was Spain and the Colonial Institute in 1887, and it was the fast line and the cable question in 1895. His telegram continues :

Shall I come out consult you about these two matters ? Think could render you material assistance. Do not make contents this message public until further advised.

He says "he thought he could render Sir Mackenzie Bowell material assistance." He came out here, and he rendered him material assistance ; very material assistance indeed, towards the end of Sir Mackenzie's political career ? In reply to that message, Sir Charles Tupper received, as on the former occasion, the approval of his chief, and the following telegram was sent to him, dated Ottawa, 2nd December, 1895 :

Re fast line, Come out to consult, get all information possible.

BOWELL.

And so faithful was the hon. Premier to the reputation of his High Commissioner, that when he was asked why Sir Charles Tupper had come out here, he said : "I telegraphed him to come out." But here is the proof that the suggestion to come out did not come from Sir Mackenzie Bowell, but from the High Commissioner himself, as was the case on a former occasion. We all know perfectly well, now, what Sir Charles Tupper had in view when he came to Canada, and we know in what way he was going to render that "material assistance" to his beloved chief.

Then, Sir, at the close of the extract which I have read from the speech of 1887, the present Secretary of State was very pathetic in pointing out that he had to resign his comforts in London in order to come out here. I want you to observe, Sir, that in 1887, immediately the election was over, immediately the session was over, immediately he got his iron and coal tariff fixed, and immediately he got his Canadian

Pacific Railway arrangement through. Sir Charles Tupper was back to the old country to enjoy that comfortable residence in London, "and the enjoyments and pleasures which have been so often discarded on in this House." That is what he is after this time, too, Mr. Speaker. He is out here just for the occasion, to lend his powerful hand, as he believes he can do again, in refitting this broken-down and utterly discredited Government, as we infer it must be from the manner in which he talks about it. But he wants to get back soon to his comforts and pleasures in Queen Victoria Street, London. It remains to be seen whether that beautiful programme will be carried out.

History repeats itself again, Sir. Sir Charles Tupper, in that Budget speech, speaking on the expenditure of \$10,000,000 for the purchase of lands from the Canadian Pacific Railway at \$1.50 an acre, said :

I am glad to find that the statement meets with the approval of hon. gentlemen opposite, and I knew it would meet with their approval, because, when I am able to congratulate myself and the Government and the country on the fact that we have been enabled to make an investment of \$10,000,000 in the purchase of lands at \$1.50 an acre, which these gentlemen estimated a few years ago at \$3, \$4 and \$5 an acre, the House will see that I am not only justified in striking off \$10,000,000 from our debt, but also in congratulating the country on making a very excellent bargain.

Now, Sir, this is another case of history repeating itself. This is another thing that the High Commissioner has come out to do this time. He has come out to fix up another arrangement with the Canadian Pacific Railway, and to buy back from them for hard cash the remaining lands which we gave them as part payment for the construction of the railway. This is the common talk of the country, and it is substantiated on good authority. I believe it will turn out to be one of the chief reasons for the present visit of Sir Charles Tupper. He made a great point in 1887 about reducing the debt by ten millions of dollars, because after giving that \$10,000,000 in cash to the Canadian Pacific Railway, and increasing the debt by that much in order to do so, we received back in payment lands which we had presented to the company a few years before, and Sir Charles Tupper thinks that by that stroke of the pen \$10,000,000 was actually wiped off our debt? Well, that is about the style of the High Commissioner's financing generally. He will no doubt try to help his friends of the Canadian Pacific Railway by a similar deal before he returns to the comforts, &c., of his London house.

Well, Sir, I wish to call attention to the fact that Sir Charles Tupper played the same old tune at that time, which has been played ever since, in regard to the depressed condition of trade in this country. It seems to be always the case that we are just recovering from a period of depression, which the glorious policy of the Gov-

ernment had enabled us to get through without feeling it much, for here is a statement made by Sir Charles Tupper nine years ago :

Then, Sir, I will refer for a single moment to another evidence which will probably be regarded by the House as more conclusive than all of those to which I have alluded—of the fact that we have passed the period of serious depression which Canada has suffered in recent years, and that the outlook for the future is all that we can possibly desire.

My hon. friend (Mr. Davies) looks up to me in a startled manner. I assure him that was a speech made nine years ago by Sir Charles Tupper, and that it is not culled from the Budget speech of this year. Nine years ago, also, we had finally passed from a period of depression, which the National Policy had prevented us from feeling, and then the outlook for the future was all that we could possibly desire !

I speak of it as a serious depression, and I notice that some hon. gentlemen opposite look almost incredulous, and why? Not because the same depressing causes and influences have not been in operation in Canada that have been in England, the United States and all other countries, but because here depression has been almost unfelt. Instead of suffering as the country suffered during the previous period of depression which has visited Canada, we have passed through a period of almost equal depression almost without knowing it, and why? Because, Sir, the changed policy of the country, the activity of our industries, the employment given to our own people, the keeping of the money in the country and distributing and expending it among our people, and the great expenditure in connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway have enabled Canada to pass through what would probably have been as serious a depression as existed before, without scarcely knowing that such a thing as depression existed.

In that last paragraph, Sir, he has hit the nail on the head. The way in which we got through that period of depression without appearing to feel it as much as we otherwise would, was by borrowing money and expending it recklessly on the Canadian Pacific Railway, without regard to any prospect of profit from the expenditure, but merely for the purpose of putting money in circulation and keeping up the boom which was attributed to the National Policy.

Then, after some preliminaries, he began to refer to the iron trade. Amongst those preliminaries, were these :

I referred to the efforts we were making in connection with lines of steam communication, but I omitted on that occasion to refer to the fact that the sanction which was obtained from this House to establish a line of steam communication with France has, as you know, Sir, not been successful up to the present moment.

This is not this year's speech, Mr. Speaker, this is a speech of nine years ago. Nine years ago, the present Secretary of State felt it necessary to apologize that up to that moment steam communication with France

had not been established. I think if you inquire of Echo, whether steam communication with France has been established yet, nine years later, Echo will give you a very peculiar reply. He goes on :

But I am glad to be able to say that the appropriation placed by Parliament at the service of the Government for that purpose is about to be utilized—

It was about to be utilized nine years ago. It has not been utilized yet.

—and that a strong French company are preparing to put on a line of steamers between France and Canada that I have no doubt will render that effort on our part as successful as the others.

Which others ?

There we have a sample of the hon. gentleman's predictions of nine years ago. We were to have steam communication with France, to be supplemented, subsequently, by a treaty of commerce with France. Well, we have the treaty with France, but we have not the steam communication, which is the only thing that will make that treaty of any use. The hon. gentleman's predictions in that regard are proven to be as fallacious as possible.

Referring to the iron question, he pointed out in general terms the importance of the iron industry to any country, and went on :

Now, Sir, if there is a country in the world to which the iron industry is important, it is Canada, and why ? Because we possess the coal and we possess the iron ore and we possess the fluxes ; and, therefore, it is necessary to develop the great iron industry within our borders, and yet down to the present moment we have left almost untouched, this enormous, this almost illimitable field for the extension of our National Policy.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, and down to the present moment this field is still almost untouched. After all that this gentleman proposed to do in his Budget speech of 1887, the iron industry of Canada is not any more developed to-day than it was nine years ago.

He goes on to speak in general terms of the national importance of that industry. He says :

The means of developing the iron industry of a country depend, first, upon the possession of the ore ; second, upon the possession of the coal or other fuel that is required to utilize it ; third, upon the possession of the fluxes, and fourth, upon the proximity of these articles to each other, and of the facilities for transporting the product from the points where it is manufactured to the great centres of the country, where it is to be used as an article of commerce. Now, Sir, Canada occupies in this regard a vantage ground over almost every country in the world.

I believe that is quite true so far ; but from that the hon. gentleman drew the peculiar deduction that because we had special advantages for manufacturing iron, therefore, we needed to use artificial means to develop the iron industry. Why, Sir, if any other country in the world had the facilities for

manufacturing iron that we have in Canada—if they existed in free-trade England or in any other country where capital could be cheaply and effectively used—those resources would have been developed long ago. But in Canada, under the upas tree of the National Policy, progress has not been made. I continue the quotation :

England possesses coal and iron ore to an almost illimitable extent ; but the House will, perhaps, be surprised to learn that even England, with all its ore and all its coal, imports from Spain, a thousand miles away, more ore than is required to manufacture the entire production of steel in England.

He goes on to speak of the advantages possessed by the United States, and he claims that Canada's advantages are far greater. From all of which, I should certainly draw the conclusion, that the iron trade of Canada needed less meddling or coddling than that of any of these other countries.

I wish to quote one or two specific prophecies in regard to Canada, and then I will close this branch of the subject :

The time is not long since, when charcoal iron was one of the most important industries in Ontario and Quebec.

He confessed that the time was past when the manufacture of charcoal iron was an important industry in Canada :

I have no hesitation in saying that if the protection we have given to cotton and woollen and all other industries of Canada be applied to iron to-morrow, it will show what the past history of Canada has shown, that these charcoal iron industries will again be in full blast, and that in Ontario and Quebec they will become most essential and important industries to-morrow as they were in days gone by.

The fact being, Mr. Speaker, that in the days when the charcoal iron industry was important in Canada, we had not a protective tariff : and since the protective tariff came into force, this industry has died out.

Every person knows that charcoal iron is the most valuable product of iron ; every person knows the increase of value of charcoal iron ; every person knows that the great difficulty is the cost of producing it, but there is no country in the world that has such a field for the production of charcoal iron as the provinces of Quebec and Ontario. What have you, Sir, in these provinces ? You have the ore in illimitable quantity, you have a boundless field for the production of the ore, and you have, running along through the same tract of country, magnificent forests adapted to furnishing the charcoal. At present what are the people obliged to do ? Those who go into the wilderness to make a farm have to spend their valuable labour in cutting down this timber, and consuming it on the ground without receiving anything from it. Vivify, give protection to the iron industry, as you have given it to cotton, woollen, and everything else, and what will be the result ? It will be, that when a man goes into the forest to make a farm in Ontario or Quebec, the most valuable product

under his hand will be that which he has to spend all his labour and capital now in wasting. You will have colonization extended in Ontario and Quebec as nothing else could extend it. The experiments recently made by some of the great lines of railway in the United States have shown, as the result of scientific analysis, that the mode of making the life of a rail infinitely greater than it is, is to have incorporated in the rail a large portion of charcoal iron, and under this recent discovery, there is a field for the development of charcoal iron, that will go far to make it one of the leading industries of Canada.

It is almost trifling with the House to ask if any of these promises have been redeemed. Are we making charcoal iron in central Ontario where the iron and wood are contiguous? Has that become an important industry in Quebec or elsewhere? We all know it has not. We all know he was trifling with us when predicting that which he knew would not occur. He went on to say :

There is at present, as you know, in Ontario, running through a large number of counties and townships, a most valuable deposit of iron ore. A railway has been built to central Ontario, over 100 miles long, to carry this ore to Weller's Bay, to be shipped across the lake to Charlotte, Oswego, and other points on the American side. Well, from Oswego, and Charlotte on the American side to the anthracite coal field, is only 150 miles, and I say that, under a policy which will give iron the protection we give to everything else in Canada, under the National Policy, you will have the ships that convey the ore to Oswego or to Charlotte, or to any of those places from Kingston, Cobourg and Weller's Bay, bringing back the anthracite coal, and you will have the establishment of blast furnaces at Cobourg, Kingston and Weller's Bay that will give the iron industry of Ontario the same position it occupied years ago.

Well, that ore is just as good as it used to be ; the anthracite coal is just as near as it used to be ; the lake is still open during the proper seasons of the year—and yet we do not see the smelting furnaces at Kingston, at Cobourg, at Weller's Bay, although nine years have elapsed since the great prophet, the great "I was," the great Master Mind, promised, as a dead certainty, that his higher tariff would procure the establishment of such industries. This is how his promises in the past have turned out, and we may judge from them what will be the future results of any promises he may make now.

He went on then to deal with the particular aspects of the iron trade, which he said, would be vivified and made to flourish like a green bay tree by his tariff. So far, however, it has not vivified to any extent. Then he said, going back to his dear Nova Scotia :

In the county of Pictou, iron, coal and limestone are found in the closest proximity ; within a radius of ten miles there is everything necessary to build up a great and successful industry ; and this mineral wealth is found on the seaboard so that the products of the industry can be cheaply transported by water to the head of Lake Superior if required. All descriptions of

iron ore are found in this country, so that when we are told by persons engaged in the iron-founding industries that they require to import Scotch pig iron, the answer is that we possess within our own borders every variety of iron ore, so that any mixture desired can be made.

It seems he thought we had every variety of pig at home, that we had specular iron ore, and so on, giving technical descriptions.

What he said was true about the great advantage of Pictou county ; and if that county had not been cursed by the Tupperizing influence of the hon. gentleman, and the Fostering care of the Minister of Finance, it would now be a flourishing seat of the iron industry. The iron ships built in Nova Scotia would have taken the first place among the shipping of the world, which the Nova Scotian wooden ships used to take, were it not for the suicidal policy of this Government. Coming nearer home, the hon. gentleman then referred to the immediate neighbourhood of this city :

Magnetic iron ores are found more or less throughout the Laurentian range of mountains along the Ottawa River. At the Hull or Baldwin mines, west of the Gatineau River, the ore analyses 67 per cent. The quantity is estimated at 100,000,000 tons. The Haycock mine ore ranges from 64 to 68 per cent metal, Bristol mine 58 per cent iron, and so on.

Now, as a matter of fact, under the Mackenzie regime, the regime of a revenue tariff, these Gatineau iron ores were being worked. They were making Bessemer steel there, and they had a contract to supply car wheels to a company as far away as India. What are they doing now? What has become of the Haycock mine? The National Policy has Tupperized and Fostered it out of existence. I give you only these instances of the utterances of the false prophet in days gone by, and no doubt we shall hear more of the same kind from him, now that he has returned, and we shall know what to expect.

I want to call attention for a few moments to some of the hon. gentleman's utterances since his return to this mundane sphere from the "glaring electric light" of London. At North Sydney, Cape Breton, on 29th January, he made a speech in which he referred, among other things, to the Washington treaty, and he took a great deal of credit to himself for that treaty. He forgot to tell his hearers how anxious he was to get coal put on the free list in that treaty, as between the United States and Canada ; but he told them he was the only one to be thanked for the \$5,500,000 award obtained with regard to our fisheries as a consequence of that treaty. He said :

Well, what happened? The arbitration was held in Halifax. The United States sent their ablest men as arbitrators. The witnesses were produced and the result was that this impartial and independent tribunal gave an award \$5,500,000 as the cash value of the free use of the Canadian inshore fisheries over and above the value of those of the United States, \$4,500,000 of

which went to Canada and \$1,000,000 to Newfoundland

To whom was it due that we obtained that grand result from the Halifax arbitration? Who was in power when that arbitration was conducted? Who prepared the case and presented it to the arbitrators? Whom have we really to thank for that first and only instance, in which Britain or Canada has triumphed over the United States before a court of arbitrators? We have to thank, in the first place, the Mackenzie Government, and its Minister of Marine for the time being, and then my hon. friend from Queen's, P.E.I., (Mr. Davies) who, with some assistance, got up our case for the Halifax arbitration and secured that magnificent award. I am willing to give the hon. Secretary of State (Sir Charles Tupper) his share of the credit for the treaty if he will give our friends credit for the management of the case before the arbitration.

Then this retiring gentleman began to boast of how he was followed around by reporters from place to place in Cape Breton, as if he were a lump of sugar in fly time. He said:

The Opposition candidate and his speakers were not followed by a staff of able reporters, representing papers on both sides, as he was. Perhaps this was due to the modesty of these gentlemen.

However modest the Opposition speakers may have been, I am sure it was not the High Commissioner's modesty that attracted the reporters to him? At any rate, he said their speeches were not being put on record and handed down to posterity as his were. Well, Sir, I am helping a little to hand down his speech to posterity by putting part of it on the pages of "Hansard," but for which, I am afraid, posterity would not see much of it, notwithstanding that it has been published in a Conservative Halifax organ:

He had not invited these reporters, but they were following him everywhere and he was very glad to have them. The public men who would say one thing at one place and another thing at another, who had one story to suit one community and another story to tickle the ears of another section was unworthy the name of a public man.

Well, the hon. gentleman in that campaign stated that Mr. David McKeen had no promise of anything, that no promise of reward had been given him for making way for the High Commissioner in Cape Breton—not a word said about putting him in the Senate. But now, immediately the election is over, Mr. David McKeen is put in the Senate. Will the hon. Secretary of State or, if he cannot, will the High Commissioner explain the consistency of these two statements? Or, if he cannot explain, will he admit that he is unworthy the name of a public man?

He was glad to have every word he uttered taken down by these reporters and sent off—not

Mr. CASEY.

on the wings of the wind, but by a much faster means—electricity—

Perhaps he will not be so glad, before he gets through hearing them quoted against him.

—and published all over the country so that the next morning the people of the entire country could know what he had said.

Then comes the passage about the electric light, which I have already read.

Now he told us still further:

Well, in 1878 he came down to Cape Breton, outlined the National Policy and told the people that the first plank in his platform was protection to coal. He was proud to stand face to face with the people to-day and ask them if he had not kept his word. If every promise he had made them and every hope he held out to them had not been fulfilled. The public man who holds out false hopes and displays false lights is unworthy of the confidence of the people and ought to be driven out of public life.

I wish I could conclude my remarks with that sentence, for I think it is, perhaps, the most emphatic condemnation of this Government that has ever been uttered. I will read it again, so as to fix it still more deeply upon your mind, Mr. Speaker, and the minds of hon. members:

The public man who holds out false hopes and displays false lights is unworthy of the confidence of the people and ought to be driven from public life.

Who has been more frequently convicted of showing false lights, of holding out false hopes before the people, than the hon. gentleman who made this speech, and who was brought here to take such a very high place in this House?

He tells us that he does not mind these accusations of unfulfilled promises; he does not mind accusations of corruption and political untruthfulness, and things of that kind. He says he has always been used to them, that the Grits are always saying such things about him. That statement reminds me of what was said by his distinguished colleague, the Minister of Railways, when accused of other matters in this House, who said that he did not pay the slightest attention to accusations of that kind—and they were accusations of a very personal nature, indeed—that he had been accustomed to them from his childhood upwards? That is the line of defence these hon. gentlemen take. They say that because they have always been accused of being dishonest, because they have always been accused of this or that personal wrong-doing, because they have always been accused of making false promises, no attention is to be paid to the accusation? But we cannot but be reminded of the old and true proverb that where there is a great deal of smoke there must be a little fire. That is all that I think it is necessary to quote from the Port Morien speech.

After the election in which he was so very moderately successful, they gave the hon. gentleman a banquet at Halifax. But before I come to that I must remind the House of one point in regard to one of the reasons of his success in Cape Breton that has been lost sight of. There was a grave scandal in that an employee of this Government, a man engaged for a special purpose, to do a certain work, put in a large part of his time canvassing for the High Commissioner in Cape Breton. I refer to Mr. A. W. Wright, who was appointed as a commissioner to inquire into the sweating alleged to be practised in certain cities of the Dominion. He was given ninety days to complete his investigation. That term was up on the 29th of January; but for ten days or more before the time his engagement was up, he was one of the most prominent speakers for the Secretary of State during the campaign in Cape Breton. While he was in receipt of public pay, he was taken away from the duty he was set to perform, and was sent down at public expense to canvass for a member of the Government in Cape Breton. Organizations of working men, trades and labour councils in different places, have called attention to this fact. And I have obtained the information by question across the floor of the House that up to the 29th of January, he was in the employ of this Government, and that during that time he was canvassing in Cape Breton. And, as a matter of fact, the job he was appointed to do is not done yet, for he has never made a report.

After the election was over, a banquet was tendered to the High Commissioner in Halifax, at which he delivered himself of certain "unwritten chapters of political history." He told us for how long, and how sadly, he had feared that he would be called upon to save the Conservative party, and leave the delights of residence among the aristocracy of London. And, referring to the election of 1891, he said :

I went there to aid my revered friend Sir John Macdonald to the utmost of my power, but I found that the struggle and the momentous issues that were at stake were wearing upon him and striking him down to an extent that I witnessed with the utmost dismay. After the election I went back to London and was sent by the Government of Canada to represent it at the great postal conference in Vienna. I am again in a position to give you evidence that the position of Prime Minister of Canada was not the object of my ambition. I hold in my hand a copy of a letter which I addressed to my son on the occasion of the death of Sir John A. Macdonald. It is in the hand of Mr. Just, a gentleman in my department, who was acting as my secretary in Vienna. I will hand it to Mr. Stairs to read it to you and then you can judge whether I was anxious to be Prime Minister of Canada.

The letter is dated, Vienna, 4th June, 1891. It begins :

My dear son,—I, as you know, have always felt the deepest personal attachment for our

great leader, Sir John A. Macdonald, but I myself did not know how much I loved him until on my arrival here last Saturday, I learned that he was struck down by illness. The news was then reassuring, and I attended the dinner at the Hofburg Palace, with the Emperor and a King, at four o'clock,—

Ah, Sir, he was, undoubtedly, in great society, dining with emperors and kings ?

—but refused the invitation of the Minister for the theatre that evening, and all invitations since.

It appears he drew the line at the theatre. He did not mind going to a plain, every-day dinner with an emperor and a king or two, but he drew the line at the theatre, while his leader was lying sick ?

It now seems that there is no hope; how mysterious are the ways of Providence.

Very mysterious, indeed.

Never, in his long and useful life have his invaluable services been so important to Canada and to the Empire, and God alone knows what the consequences to both may be.

But the good Sir John A. Macdonald is dead, and Canada and the Empire still stands.

I received your telegram saying that there was a disposition in certain quarters that Sir John Thompson should succeed him, with great satisfaction, and a strong sense of personal relief. You know I told you long ago, and repeated to you when last in Ottawa, that nothing could induce me to accept the position in case the Premiership became vacant.

I am glad to put the hon. High Commissioner on record as stating that nothing can, under any circumstances, induce him to accept the Premiership, should it become vacant. I hope his colleagues and his party will bear that in mind, and that, after this session is over, and when we are preparing to face the electors, they will not try to tempt this man, of high principles, this man of high associations, who dines familiarly with kings and emperors—that they will not try again to tempt him in vain to accept the Premiership of this country ?

I told you that Sir John looked up wearily from his papers and said to me : "I wish to God you were in my place;" and that I answered : "Thank God I am not."

He had better take care, Mr. Speaker, he is getting awfully near it now ?

He afterwards, well knowing my determination, said he thought Thompson, as matters now stood, was the only available man. Of course he had in view the charges that were made against Langevin, and still pending. Had it been otherwise, and I had been in Parliament, I would have given him my support, as you will know.

That is very nice reading for the hon. member spoken of.

When this terrible blow came, I naturally dreaded that my old colleagues, and the party for whom I had done so much, might unite in

asking me to take the leadership, and I felt that in that case a serious responsibility would rest upon me.

A serious responsibility would rest upon him, knowing, of course, that he was the only man who could save the party, the Master Mind, and so on. He was quite correct in feeling that it would be a serious responsibility to accept.

Believing, as I do, that compliance would have involved a material shortening of the few years at the most remaining to me, you can imagine, my dear son, the relief with which I learned that I was absolved from any such responsibility, and able to assure your dear mother that all danger was past.

She must be very anxious now, Mr. Speaker?

Your course, my dear son, is to think only of your duty to Canada, and that is to give your hearty support to whatever can combine the members of the party in the greatest degree.

He seems to have been afraid that the "dear son" might not support a Cabinet which did not contain his "dear father."

I need not tell you how glad I will be if our mutual friend Thompson should be the man. His great ability, high legal attainments, forensic powers, and above all, his personal character, all render his choice one of which our party and country should be proud.

I believe every member of the House will agree with the High Commissioner in thinking that all these reasons did justify the choice of Sir John Thompson rather than the writer of this letter himself.

It was a strange coincidence that about one o'clock on Wednesday night, the 27th ult., I concluded my speech in response to a toast at a banquet given to myself by a large number of peers and members of the House of Commons, of both parties, by an eulogium upon Sir John A. Macdonald, when, by a slip of the tongue, I used the words "and now, at the close of his long and useful life," when I immediately corrected myself by expressing the hope that he would be spared many years to serve his country as he had done in the past.

It is to be sincerely hoped, Mr. Speaker, that the Secretary of State and High Commissioner, or either of them, will make no such slips of the tongue in regard to the present Premier of the country. It seems to have a very fatal effect on Premiers.

While this prayer, for such it was, was enthusiastically cheered by the Lord Mayor, three ex-Secretaries of State for the Colonies, of both parties, and many members of the House of Commons, both Liberal and Conservatives, my dear friend appears to have been struck by the fatal shaft, and our prayer denied.

It was very sad, indeed, that even three ex-Secretaries of State for the Colonies, a number of peers and members of the House of Commons, and a High Commissioner, could not have averted the fatal effects of this first slip of the tongue. He should be very careful how he lets his tongue slip in the future. A friend of mine beside me

Mr. CASEY.

suggests that the powers above are too well acquainted with him.

We can only bow with submission, knowing that the blow came from the One who doeth all things well. Let us all endeavour to work as untiringly and as unselfishly for the progress and prosperity of our country as Sir John has done, and so, come what may, we will be consoled as he has been, by the conviction that we have done our duty.

Really, Mr. Speaker, the tone of this letter is as surprising as it is touching!

It is a source of great satisfaction to me in this sad hour to feel that through good and evil report, I have stood at his side, and in sunshine and in storm have done all in my power to sustain and aid him in the great work to which he has, since first we met, devoted successfully all his great powers. He has left a bright example for us to follow, let us endeavour to imitate him as far as we can, and we will deserve well of our country.

Your loving father,

CHARLES TUPPER.

Sir, I did not know all that was in that letter, when I began to read it. There are some things in it that are touching, or that were meant to be touching, but I cannot refrain from seriously asking the House and the country, if that letter does not show signs of a peculiar—I would not say disease—but a peculiar eccentricity of mind? The man who wrote that letter was intensely fond of having it known that he had been dining with very distinguished people. He descends even so far as to ordinary members of the House of Commons in England, but he ascends to emperors and kings!

I ask if it is not a sign of that Megalomania which has become of late years a disease recognized by the medical profession. Megalomania has a short English name, it is called Big Head. It is described by the doctors as a sort of frenzied self-conceit. It is the same disease which was attributed by several distinguished physicians to the late lamented Louis Riel, and said by them to be the cause of his very eccentric conduct in the North-west. I leave it to hon. members to consider, whether a man so affected should be deprived of the last few years of his life, to which he so touchingly referred in the letter I have read, in which to rest in the bosom of his beloved family, and console himself for his toils in the past?

The war-horse has had his day. He has taken his share in the battle, and now if he does, in the words of Job, "paw in the valley and rejoice in his strength," he at least does not do it in public, for we do not see him pawing and rejoicing on the floor of this House. If he "sniffeth the battle from afar," he does it so very far away that we do not perceive he is taking any interest in it! I think he has earned the immortality sought after by Hindoo Buddhists, that state of Nirvana or quiet beatific contemplation in which Buddha himself ever sits, with immovable face, except when he

yawns in disgust at the foolishness of those who bend in adoration before him. I think the job of Buddha would just suit the High Commissioner and Secretary of State. I fear his usefulness for other purposes in political life in Canada is gone.

There was another banquet in Halifax subsequent to the one to which I referred, at which Mr. Murray, the defeated candidate, made some criticisms on the conduct of the campaign. He answered Sir Charles Tupper's allegation that it was because of the latter's explanation of his policy that he had been elected for that county. He said :

Sir Charles Tupper had stated since his return that his election in Cape Breton was due to the fact that he "propounded a policy that the people could understand." The election returns in the districts where he propounded his policy in person should be evidence of its acceptance to the people. He spoke in Sydney, where he had an energetic organization. Sydney is the capital of the county, and he succeeded so well in having the electorate understand his policy that the Liberal majority was increased fifty votes. He spoke to a great gathering of workmen at Glace Bay under exceptional advantages ; the result was a strong Liberal gain among the class of voters whom he declared were especially indebted to him. He next spoke at Port Morien, a district which afforded the Tory party strong hopes of great gains, and the result was the Tory majority of 123 at the last election was reduced to 40. At a meeting at Port Morien Sir Charles Tupper evidently reached the conclusion that the "policy which the people could understand" required a little propping, and he induced the manager of the Dominion Coal Company to strengthen it by promising that a branch railway would be constructed into that village.

And so on. I merely quote these words to show that wherever the policy of the present Secretary of State was laid before the people, it seems to have been to the advantage of our people.

I am sure that will be the case throughout the country. I am satisfied to abide by the results when the people have the policy of the Government and the policy of the Liberal party laid before them. It is we and not they who have a definite policy, on all the subjects now before the people. It is we who have a definite policy in fiscal matters, the policy of a revenue tariff as opposed to the present policy of protection conducted on jobbing principles. In all other matters our policy is pretty well known to the House and the country by the presentation it has received in different speeches this session. I will read the headings of the different resolutions embodying that policy, which was confirmed at a convention of the Liberals here in 1893. The first plank is free trade and reduced taxation ; the second plank is enlarged markets and reciprocity ; the third plank in purity of administration ; the fourth plank is a demand for strictest economy and decreased expenditure.

On this point I want to call attention to one ominous feature which I have noticed in the speeches of hon. gentlemen opposite. Hon. gentlemen opposite have been complaining, the hon. member for Inverness (Mr. Cameron) among others, that the Estimates before the House are not large enough, that \$38,000,000 is not enough to spend. They appear to be leading up to a proposal to expend a great deal more money than that already proposed. We hear very vague estimates in regard to military matters, public works and railway subsidies. We do not know where the Supplementary Estimates and the resolutions will land us, if this Government seeks to bring them to completion. I protest against this, and I call attention to it as a very serious feature of this debate.

The fifth plank pleads for responsible government and the independence of Parliament ; the sixth, for land for the settler, not for the speculator ; the seventh opposes the Dominion Franchise Act ; the eighth attacks the gerrymander ; the ninth pronounces the Senate to be defective ; and the tenth, in regard to the question of prohibition, declares its decision should be left to the voice of the people themselves. When this definite policy, compared with the patchwork policy of the Government, comes before the people, I have not the slightest doubt of the result ; and, in common with others, I am anxious that we should get through the business we have come here to do, and pronounce on the one question that is properly before us, and go as soon as possible before our judges, the people.

Every sign on the Government benches seems to indicate hon. gentlemen opposite are afraid of that event ; every sign among us goes to show that we are anxious for it, and will be grateful when it comes. I hope the discussion which will commence on Tuesday of next week will be the last discussion we shall have to undertake during this session ; that immediately that question is disposed of one way or the other, we shall have the House dissolved and final judgment passed upon the Government, whom I have denounced, and I think properly denounced, as incapable, from their policy, their personnel, their mental capacity and administrative acts, to rule this country any longer.

Mr. MCGILLIVRAY. Mr. Speaker, it was not my purpose to take up any of the time of the House upon this subject, and were it not for the references of the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Casey) to the result of the late election in North Ontario and the issues then defined and then pronounced upon, I would not have troubled the House at all. If the hon. gentleman knows as little about the other matters of which he has spoken during the last two hours as he appears to know as to what the issues in North Ontario were, and what

issues were decided, then he knows very little indeed. The election in North Ontario, he said, resulted unfavourably to the Government on the question of the National Policy and the fiscal policy of the Government. Why, Sir, he appears not to know that the greatest issues in that contest were the fiscal policy and the National Policy.

Mr. CASEY. That is just what I said.

Mr. MCGILLIVRAY. The hon. gentleman said that North Ontario did not pronounce in favour of the fiscal policy of the Government. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Casey) said: Let North Ontario answer. Well, Sir, North Ontario did answer. That hon. gentleman told the House that I represented only a miserable minority of my constituency.

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. MCGILLIVRAY. And that seems to find echo in the voice of one of his friends on the other side of the House. Now, it was a three-cornered fight in North Ontario, and the candidates seeking the suffrages of the people were, a representative of the Patrons, myself, a strong supporter of the Government.

Mr. MARTIN. On the National Policy.

Mr. MCGILLIVRAY. On the National Policy and all their policy, save in one particular, and that is not pronounced upon yet by me. There was also as candidate a representative of the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. MARTIN. Did I understand the hon. gentleman (Mr. McGillivray) to say that the Patron candidate was a very strong supporter of the National Policy?

Mr. MCGILLIVRAY. No, I said I was.

Mr. CASEY. We all knew that.

Mr. MCGILLIVRAY. You did not seem to know, judging from the way you spoke. The Liberal in that contest hardly saved his deposit; merely saved it. Then, what are hon. gentlemen opposite talking about? Did their policy commend itself to the people of North Ontario? One of the best known Liberals in the county, who had just got out of the warden's chair, who had just received the almost unanimous support of the county council, was the Liberal candidate, but he merely saved his deposit. By the way, before I go further, let me say that the Liberal candidate was also an office-holder under the Ontario government. The hon. member (Mr. Casey) complained that Mr. Wright was down in Cape Breton assisting the Secretary of State (Sir Charles Tupper) in his election. Sir, does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Casey) not know that one of the leading officials of the Ontario government went from county to county in the late by-elections? I refer to Mr. Peter Ryan, of Toronto, than whom no more eloquent man is to be found in the whole ranks of the Liberal party. Although Mr. Ryan holds one of the best

Mr. MCGILLIVRAY.

offices in the city of Toronto, and is paid equally by Liberals and Conservatives, yet he thought it no impropriety to go up into Cardwell, and speak to his co-religionists there, in the interests of the candidate of hon. gentlemen opposite. I might quote, Sir, many prominent instances such as that. It was just as reprehensible for one of the friends of the Liberal party, holding office, and paid by the people of this country, to take part in the elections as it was reprehensible for Mr. Wright to take part, if either is reprehensible. Mr. Gillespie, the Liberal candidate in North Ontario was Division Court Clerk in one of the most important townships of North Ontario. He had everything in his favour, except his religion, and that seems to have told against him. It seems to have told against him, Sir, not in my favour, but in the favour of the Patron candidate. I did not poll the Liberal votes that went from Mr. Gillespie because he thought to worship as he pleased. I did not poll the Liberal votes of the townships of Brock, or Thorah, or Mara. They went to the Patron. Now, Sir, who was the Patron candidate? He was a Conservative. There were two Conservatives in that fight, two men who before had always been fighting together, two men who had met time and again at the Liberal-Conservative convention of the county. He was chosen as the standard bearer of the Patrons, and, therefore, the contest was unequal, so far as the Conservative candidate was concerned. Now, I gave my hon. friend (Mr. Casey) the information while he was speaking, that 600 Conservative votes went from me and went to the Patron candidate. Where were these 600 Conservative votes to be found? We have a riding almost 200 miles in length, and where were these votes to be found? Why, they were where the Patron candidate lived. There was nothing more natural than that. The candidate of the Government was not even a resident of the riding, but Mr. Brandon was not only a resident of the riding, but was a resident of the most pronounced Conservative township in the whole constituency. Mr. Brandon refused to say that he would vote want of confidence in the Government. He had been challenged, time and again, upon every platform to say whether he would vote confidence or non-confidence in the Government, but he kept silent. Consequently, a large Conservative vote of the district in which he lived, went for the Patron candidate. That vote going to him, can in no sense be considered as meaning want of confidence in the Government, because I am informed that even after his nomination he assured Conservatives that he was as good a Conservative as he had ever been, and when challenged by Conservatives supporting the Government, he refused to say that he would vote against the Government. When the hon. gentleman

(Mr. Casey) tells me that I represent a minority instead of a majority of my county I tell him that he is quite mistaken. I believe that I fell between 200 and 300 below getting half of the whole vote of that county. But many hon. gentlemen have sat on the opposite side of the House as the result of a three-cornered fight—I do not know how many of them at present, but in the past there have been a good many. Where there are three distinct parties, as there now appear to be, surely, Mr. Speaker, a majority of 780 over my nearest opponent is large enough in all conscience, not to say anything of a majority of more than 1,000 over the Liberal candidate. Now, Mr. Speaker, what were the issues of the contest in North Ontario, and what were the issues in the Cardwell election? The language the hon. gentleman (Mr. Casey) made reference to in regard to Cardwell was also misleading. First, with regard to Cardwell. I am one who believes that Cardwell would have been carried by the present representative of that riding, whether he ran as a Conservative candidate or as an independent candidate. I believe he is in this House quite independent of the support he got from the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). It is said that the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. Stubbs) belongs to the third party. The hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). I believe, speaks of him as a follower, but wherein and how? The hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) is an opponent of the Government upon the trade policy, but throughout that contest—and I was in it—the supporters of Mr. Stubbs were equally supporters of the National Policy, as the supporters of Mr. Willoughby were. The dividing line there was remedial legislation, and in that three-cornered fight, the independent candidate succeeded. But now as to North Ontario. I was able to show the people of that county that the National Policy was in the interests of the farmers of Canada. I was able to show them that \$1 would, at the present day, buy more of the goods required by the farmers than at any time in the history of this country. I was able to show them that everything used upon the farm, and required to be purchased by the farmer, was purchased for less money, by far, than when hon. gentlemen opposite were in power. Mr. Speaker, I was able to point them to the United States, where they could buy horses in the state of Idaho at \$2.50 a head, and then I was able to show that in the little township of Scugog, a sale had only just at that time taken place of eighteen horses, where the horses actually averaged \$43 a head, old and young. I was able to point out to them, that the Liberal party, when in power, did not take taxes off anything, but put the taxes higher than they were before. I was able to show

them that they had a free breakfast-table—that their tea was no longer subject to duty, and that whatever loss in the revenue of the country was occasioned thereby, was made up by judicious taxation of the luxuries used by the rich.

But it is not my purpose to talk to the House at length simply upon the issues in North Ontario. I wish to point out to the hon. gentleman—for he does not appear to know—that since this Parliament was elected there have been upwards of sixty by-elections; and what is the record of those elections? So far as I have been able to make it out hurriedly this afternoon, of those 60 odd by-elections the Liberal party have only succeeded in thirteen. Instead of citing Montreal Centre, Jacques Cartier and the other counties he named, why did not the hon. gentleman come down to a later date and speak of Northumberland, N.B., which has given this House the latest addition to its membership? Why did he not dwell upon the result in Cape Breton? Why did he not refer to the fact that the mover of the Address in this House this session, the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Powell), had been sent here as the result of one of the recent by-elections? And so he might have gone on and told us of a number of other elections which have resulted favourable to the Government. But he refers to Montreal Centre, where local issues and local jealousies determined the result; and I might say the same of Jacques Cartier.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member says that the Government now in power is a Government socially, personally and mentally unfit to govern. I listened, as a new member, with some surprise to an old member like the hon. gentleman speaking of the hon. Secretary of State (Sir Charles Tupper) as one having a big head. That may be parliamentary language, Mr. Speaker. I know not; but I do know that, if the hon. knight has not taken up much of the time of this House in talking upon the different subjects brought before it, that cannot be said of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Casey) who has just taken his seat. He is troubled with big something else: he is a big talker. I do not think, Sir, that it is becoming in a member of this House to speak of the representative of this great country of ours in the capital of the Empire as the hon. gentleman spoke of the hon. baronet this afternoon. Is it a crime, Sir, in our representative to dine with emperors and kings? I should have thought the hon. gentleman would rather take pride in the fact that the representative of Canada in London was considered worthy to be invited to dine with kings and emperors. Then, the hon. gentleman says that, while the Secretary of State was willing to dine with the king, he refused to go to a theatre because of his feelings towards his leader. Well, there is all the difference in the world between the two.

It might have been because of his representative character, as representing the Canadian people in the great metropolis of the world, that he dined with the king, whereas going to a theatre would be simply for the satisfaction of personal enjoyment.

The hon. gentleman says that the Liberal party have a well-defined policy. Well, Mr. Speaker, it is so well defined that he took very good care not to tell us what it was. I challenge the hon. gentleman, I challenge his leader, I challenge every lieutenant his leader has, to tell us what their policy is. They have not told us in this debate yet, and now we are nearing the end of it.

Now, I wish to say that we, on this side of the House, do not speak of the leader of hon. gentlemen opposite as they speak of ours. Let them go into any county in the province of Ontario, and they will hear the name of the Liberal leader spoken of in kindness by Liberal-Conservatives and Liberals alike. We do not wish to treat him as hon. gentlemen opposite treat our leader.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Which is the leader?

Mr. MCGILLIVRAY. The hon. gentleman asks me, which is the leader. We have a Premier, who is our leader; but we have also the Secretary of State, who is our leader in this House. Now I hope the hon. gentleman understands.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Under which king do you serve?

Mr. MCGILLIVRAY. I am glad to know, Mr. Speaker, that I serve under both. But I was going to say, when I was interrupted, that Conservatives are pleased to join with Liberals in speaking well of the Liberal leader. I think, Sir, that it would be a pitiable thing if the politics of this country should ever descend so low that political opponents could not speak of men as they find them. We might say things of their leader, if we would; but, inasmuch as those things have been denied by him, we do not repeat them. Even when they are pronounced to be true by Liberal organs in the province of Quebec, we do not repeat them: we take his word that he did not speak of Orangemen as they say he did. We take his word, and let his papers eat the leek. And even though we think he made a mistake on one occasion in connection with the last Riel Rebellion in the North-west, we have forgiven him for that, too. We think it was only a mistake. We believe that, after all, he is a Canadian of whom we can be proud, and so we speak of him.

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

After Recess.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 38) respecting the Montreal and Ottawa Railway Company.—(Mr. Bergeron.)

Mr. MCGILLIVRAY.

Bill (No. 43) to incorporate the Queenston Heights Bridge Company.—(Mr. Coatsworth.)

Bill (No. 44) relating to the Board of Trade of the city of Toronto.—(Mr. Coatsworth.)

Bill (No. 49) respecting the Huron and Erie Loan and Savings Company.—(Sir John Carling.)

THE CHIGNECTO MARINE TRANSPORT RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. POWELL moved that the order for second reading of Bill (No. 59) respecting the Chignecto Marine Transport Railway Company (Limited) be discharged and the Bill withdrawn.

Motion agreed to, order discharged, and Bill withdrawn.

Mr. POWELL moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 75) respecting the Chignecto Marine Transport Railway Company (Limited).

Mr. EDGAR. The hon. gentleman, when introducing a Bill in this way, should at least explain the provisions of the Bill and the changes he proposes as compared with the one he has withdrawn.

Mr. POWELL. I thought the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) was in his place when the matter was discussed the other day. The Bill, as introduced, had some provisions that I certainly would not undertake to bring before the House, implying the continuation of the subsidy. The Bill in that form, to be introduced should have the assent of the Governor in Council. I undertook to have it amended in committee, but it was thought that this was the proper course; and I see that it is in accordance with precedent, as shown by a case which came before the House in 1885, and which is reported on page 428 of "Hansard" of that year. That Bill was withdrawn and a new one with the objectionable feature expunged, was introduced. The Bill I now introduce simply contemplates the extension of the time within which the company may construct the work, and does not imply the renewal of the subsidy.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 72) respecting the Montreal Park and Island Railway Company.—(Mr. Lachapelle.)

REPORT.

Report of the Department of Marine and Fisheries for 1895 (Fisheries Branch).—(Mr. Costigan.)

SUPPLY—THE BUDGET.

Mr. MCGILLIVRAY. As you were leaving the Chair at recess, Mr. Speaker, I was giving the leader of Her Majesty's Loyal Op-

position a certificate of character, or rather I was certifying to what that character was in the minds of the party of which I am a humble member in the province of Ontario. Let me just add that we like the hon. member because he looks so much like a former leader of ours. We loved Sir John Macdonald and we love the hon. gentleman. We love him so well that we shall use voice and vote to keep him where he is for a very long time to come—on your left rather than on your right.

But all this was merely by way of preface to my remarks when I came to speak on the address of the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) at greater length. The hon. gentleman said that the policy of the Liberal party was well defined. But he did not venture to define that policy, nor, as I said before, has a single member of the Opposition, so far as I have heard them, defined what their policy is or stated upon what they were going to the country. Within the last few years they have spoken successively of commercial union, tariff reform, unrestricted reciprocity and free trade as they have it in England. So far as we have been able to learn what their policy is, it seems to be free trade as they have it in England. I need not take up the time of the House in dealing with that, because free trade as they have it in England is now being repudiated by the farming community of that country in large numbers. The hon. member for West Elgin said the National Policy was against the interests of the farmers of this country. But he was not able to say wherein or how. As I had occasion to say during the campaign, I say now, the farmers of England and Scotland are asking for exactly what the farmers of Canada have to-day. My recollection is that the leader of the Opposition, in reply to that statement, to that statement of mine on a previous occasion, said that if that were to come about it would be disastrous for the farmers of Canada. But that does not alter the fact, Mr. Speaker, that the farmers there who were content with the free trade policy eighteen years ago are to-day asking for protection on their wheat, on their cattle and on their horses as we have it here to-day.

It is said that the National Policy puts us in antagonism to the people of the United States. Sir, no policy of the Canadian Government has ever had even the appearance of antagonism to the American people. We are not responsible for the tariff as it exists to-day, except that it was inaugurated for the purpose of protecting ourselves against the effects of the tariff they imposed, and only so far as was required for the purpose of protection. I believe that it is the wish of every Conservative in Canada to have the closest relationship possible with the people of the United States. We have done nothing, we have said nothing, to antagonize them in any sense. We look

upon them almost as if they were our own people. We have a common language, a common destiny, and we have common traditions, and come of common stock. Yes, Mr. Speaker, and we have a common flag. When we cross over to that country it never occurs to my mind where the dividing line is. And if there is one thing our American neighbours are to be congratulated upon it is that when they separated from us a hundred years ago they kept the old flag. They added some stars and stripes thereto, it is true, but it is the old red, white and blue still; and by no act of any Canadian will the relations between these two peoples be disturbed.

It is also said that we are fostering combines by this trade policy of ours. I will not dwell upon that at length, but I would like to ask the hon. gentlemen where are the combines that are of such a disturbing character. Are we not getting everything to-day cheaper than we ever got it before? Talk about combines. Let them go to the other side of the line where everything is under a combine, sugar, whisky and oil and what not.

Now, taking up the question of the National Policy in general terms, rather than in a specific way, the hon. member for Guysboro' (Mr. Fraser), said the other night that it was a miserable thing made up of patches, a thing that no one could understand and no one support with any degree of consistency. Now, let us look at what the members of the Opposition have said and done in these respects. The hon. leader of the Opposition has not always thought as he does to-day. There was a time when he was as strong a protectionist as there is in this House. Then he was younger. He had just received the first inspiration of politics at that time. He was commencing to make his mark in another legislature than this, and he spoke out in no uncertain way as to what was the proper policy for the French Canadian people. I believe he is correctly reported in the "Canadian Manufacturer" of 1894, and here is what that paper says of the early views of the leader of the Opposition upon the fiscal policy:

It is not, perhaps, so well known that the very first speech Mr. Laurier made in a legislative body contained a strong plea for protection. The speech is to be found in the English edition of "Wilfred Laurier on the Platform," published a few years ago. The Quebec legislature where he delivered it had nothing to do with such matters, but that did not prevent him from declaring that it was the duty of the French-Canadians to create national industries as a means of checking the exodus of population, and removing other ills. He wanted to see the abundant raw material which the province possesses, transmitted into factory goods by Quebec labour, and went so far as to endorse Papineau's advice that French-Canadians should buy nothing from Great Britain. Sir, is the gentleman who leads the Liberal party to-day, the same Wilfred Laurier mentioned here? He who cries out piteously

in plaintive language against the enormity of Canadians putting a tax upon British goods? At that day he thought nothing should be purchased from Great Britain, but to-day he wants the barriers to be thrown down, and everything bought from Great Britain that we do not produce ourselves. We find that at that day his protection was of a contracted character, because he was then speaking for only French Canadians for his ideas so expressed only applied to French Canadians. But the National Policy which we advocate to-day is a wider and a larger policy than that, it is a policy for Canadians, irrespective of the province in which they dwell. Sir, these are the views the hon. gentleman formerly held, and I trust that there is no doubt but what his conversion has been honest and sincere. Now, what about other leaders of the Opposition? What of the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson). If I recollect aright, in the olden days he was just as strong a protectionist as I am myself. But he has forgotten the visions of that time, he has forgotten the spirit of his dreams in large measure, and yet he is to-day supporting the National Policy, in part. He is one of those, I am told, who would not have the tariff disturbed in so far as canned goods are concerned. Well, they talk about the National Policy not being such a thing as we can all support. I would ask our friends opposite to point to a single hon. gentleman on this side of the House who does not accept the whole policy, and support it as a whole. But are hon. gentlemen opposite all agreed in opposition to this policy of ours? Surely not. What does the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister) think of it? What is his opinion as to the duty on coal oil? Should it be removed? The hon. gentleman is silent, and he may well be, because he knows that his tenure of a seat in Parliament would not be worth a day's purchase if he went back home and advocated that the duty on coal oil should be taken off.

Mr. LISTER. The hon. gentleman does not know what he is talking about.

Mr. MCGILLIVRAY. Mr. Speaker, would it not be more to the point if he would answer my question by addressing himself to you, and tell us whether he has advocated that that duty should be taken off altogether. I know what I am talking about; and some other hon. gentlemen opposite will hear from me later on.

Mr. LISTER. You are not in a Foresters' lodge just now.

Mr. MCGILLIVRAY. Let me tell the hon. gentleman that he does not know what he is talking about when he talks about a Foresters' lodge, for there is no such thing in existence.

Mr. LISTER. I do not want to know, when they pay \$6,000 a year to you.

Mr. MCGILLIVRAY.

Mr. MCGILLIVRAY. Well, the hon. gentleman is getting personal; what I am saying must hurt him. But I am simply challenging him as a public man, and not going into his private affairs. It is none of his business where my salary comes from. Now, as far as that hon. gentleman is concerned, I will leave him alone.

Mr. LISTER. I think you had better.

Mr. MCGILLIVRAY. Well, I don't think he has hurt me very much yet, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. MCGILLIVRAY. Now, let us come to the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Campbell), whom I see in his seat. What does he think of having free corn, and free flour? How would that suit him? He will not tell me that I do not know what I am talking about. Then what of the hon. member for North Essex (Mr. McGregor)? If he is not in his seat, he ought to be. I have the record of a resolution once proposed in this House, reading to this effect: "That it is expedient to place corn on the free list." The hon. member for North Essex was found with the wicked Tories voting "nay" on that motion; and so was the hon. member for Carleton, N.B. (Mr. Colter).

Mr. GRIEVE. Who placed that resolution upon the Order paper?

Mr. MCGILLIVRAY. I do not know the hon. member who is interrupting me. I have not been long enough in the House, nor do not know who put that resolution on the Order paper. All I know is how hon. members voted upon it. Now, during my late contest the hon. member for East Huron (Mr. Macdonald) visited North Ontario in the interest of the Liberal party. He came up there to talk against the National Policy. I met him on a certain platform one night, and asked him there and then, would he be in favour of the removal of the duty upon salt? and he was as dumb as an oyster, Mr. Speaker. Then what of the genial and popular member for Lincoln (Mr. Gibson)? What does he think about the duties upon small fruits? What is the opinion of the hon. member for Wexford (Mr. Lowell) upon the same subject? Would they take the duty off small fruits? If those hon. gentlemen were obliged to give their opinions, they would say: No. Now, I come down to the address delivered the other evening by the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Edwards). The hon. member for Russell is in harmony, in a large measure, with the policy of the Government, as would appear from what he said the other night. He does not want the Government policy as to logs and lumber disturbed; nor, as I understand, does the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), who supports the policy of the Government on that question. Mr. Speaker, there are some fourteen or fifteen members of the Opposition supporting one or other of the branches

of this great national trade policy. How can they be agreed upon a policy when we see one after another of them rising in their seats and talking in favour of some one or other of the features of the policy of this Government? They can never hope to agree on a policy if they act when they come into power, if they ever do, as they have been acting in Opposition. The hon. member for Russell (Mr. Edwards), of whom I would not say an unkind word, nor would any one who knows him, for to know him is to respect him. I find, according to "Hansard" of 1894, referred to this subject. The hon. gentleman was challenged by Hon. Mr. Montague in these words:

I ask the hon. gentlemen opposite whether they are prepared to cut off agricultural protection which the farmers enjoy at the present time.

Hon. gentlemen opposite were silent for the most part, but the hon. member for Russell sprang up and said:

I will answer for myself. I am prepared to vote for the removal of the deceit, snare and pretense that is offered to the farmers of this country.

Further down, the hon. gentleman is reported to have said:

I have never believed, nor do I believe now that it is a protection to the farmers.

Now, I do not wish to impute improper motives: but we can hardly expect men engaged in the business, followed by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) and the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Edwards) to be very much in love with a policy that keeps out American oats, corn and pork. These men, until the National Policy came into force, could buy oats on the Chicago market at 12 cents per bushel and bring them into this country and feed them in our northern bush lands to the exclusion of the oats of the Canadian farmer. So it was with regard to American pork purchased in the Chicago market and used in the Canadian woods. No wonder those hon. gentlemen are opponents of the National Policy in some measure and to that extent. The hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) spoke to-day as if the Patron party were supporters and in sympathy with the Liberal party. If hon. gentlemen will read the columns of the "Globe," for the last three months, they will see how far they are supporters of that party. If I recollect rightly, the "Farmers' Sun" opposed the return of the hon. member for South Huron just as strongly as it opposed the candidature of Mr. Gillespie in North Ontario. I am not here to say one unkind word of the Patron party, I am not here to impute their motives. I know this, that they are as much supporters of the Government as they are of the Opposition, in so far as numbers are concerned, at least, in the counties in the midst of which I live. Another charge made repeatedly in

this debate is, that the Conservative party is a corrupt party.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear!

Mr. MCGILLIVRAY. Some very genial members of the Opposition say, "Hear, hear" to that sentiment, my confrère from one of the Ontarios being of the number. During the late contest in North Ontario, I had a number of those gentlemen in my riding, including the hon. member for Ad-dington (Mr. Dawson), but he did not give five-hour speeches there, he did not read his speeches there, but he spoke right out from his mouth without the use of manuscript what he thought: and there was also the hon. member for South Huron, and we were to have had the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), but some accident happened to him, and he could not get there, and another gentleman was sent in his place, and the hon. gentleman for West Ontario was also there. Inasmuch as I am one of his constituents, I do not like to speak too harshly of him.

Mr. EDGAR. Go ahead.

Mr. MCGILLIVRAY. From the beginning to the end of the contest, that hon. gentleman howled upon the corruption and against the corruption, so-called, of the Liberal-Conservative party, forgetful and unmindful of the history of his own party in the past. If there has been corruption in the Conservative party, in so far as I can remember, during the last quarter of a century, the punishment has been meted out to the party by a Liberal-Conservative Government. I need not go into names. Mr. Speaker, you and the members of Parliament here assembled have yourselves seen what has been done in this Parliament by a Conservative Government to erring Conservative members. But what did the Liberal party do? Have they been as careful, have they been guarding in an equal degree public interests? I need hardly remind the House of what they are doing in my own province. A few years ago the hon. member for Lincoln in the local House was unseated for corrupt practices, and, in the twinkling of an eye, the local legislature passed a whitewashing Act, which admitted of that gentleman coming right back into the legislature. The same thing was done in regard to Dr. Dowling, representing South Renfrew. Look at what was done in one of the Algoma elections. There was a returning officer so corrupt that he refused to accept the votes of honest electors by the score, and in that way the party succeeded in bringing about the return of the Liberal candidate, and, when these parties, thus deprived of their franchise, appealed to the courts, by bringing suit, then the Ontario Government came down with a measure that put an end to the suits, and they in consequence could not be proceeded with. These acts, I submit, are wrong in the ex-

treme, yet we never hear any hon. gentleman opposite declaim against them. I need not take up the time of the House by referring to similar acts in the Quebec legislature, although I could do so.

Mr. LISTER. What about Muskoka and the frozen-whisky brigade? You might give us that.

Mr. MCGILLIVRAY. The frozen whisky only did harm to those who used it, but Apjohn did a wrong to innocent men who had a right to the franchise. That is the difference between the two. Hon. gentlemen opposite have been a whole month abusing the Conservative leaders in this House and in the other branch of the legislature. A while ago, they were manifesting sympathy towards the leader of the Government; to-day, they are acting in a manner deprecatory of his conduct. They say that prominent Liberal-Conservatives deserted the leader of the party, heartlessly and corruptly. They forget again the history of their party. They have only to go back a few years in order to see the Liberal party of this country drive from their ranks the Hon. Robert Baldwin by running a horse-jockey against him. The same party which to-day is declaring that the Conservatives are abusing their leader, deposed Alexander Mackenzie from their leadership in a most improper manner. And this very same party, by reason of the policy that they announced—perhaps they did it in all honesty, and in all parity of purpose—but which policy would have a most detrimental effect upon this country; they actually drove the Hon. Edward Blake out of Canada altogether, after they had practically if not actually deposed him from the leadership. It does not lie in the mouths of these men to say that Liberal-Conservatives are not true to their leadership. Sir, they have been true in the past, and they are true to-day—a little family quarrel is nothing at all. Let me draw your attention, Sir, to the fact that in the past the Liberal party have been a sectional party. Their policy in one province has been opposed to their policy in another province. For instance, it is not so long ago since Mr. Blake, then one of the leaders of the Liberal party, said: Let British Columbia go. That same party advocated a policy in the province of Ontario that would result, if carried out to perfection, in the annexation of this country to the United States. At the same time, the leaders of that party down by the sea advocated secession, and in the province of Quebec the religious and race cry was invoked. The difference between the Liberals and Conservatives is that we have always had a policy for the whole country, and the Liberals never had such a policy. In pursuance of our policy, the Canadian Pacific Railway was built, although the leader of the Liberal party, Hon.

Mr. MCGILLIVRAY.

Alexander Mackenzie, said that all the resources of the British Empire could not build that road in ten years, yet this young country of ours built it in a little over half that time. In the same way, the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Edwards) declaimed in this House against the Trent Valley Canal and in strong terms he pronounced it to be a waste of public money. Sir, I am not in love with the Trent Valley Canal, simply because it runs through my constituency, but, let that canal be constructed, as it is now the purpose to construct it, let it unite the waters of the great lakes with the mighty St. Lawrence, and then what will the farmers of this country have? They will have their wheat transported from Port Arthur to Quebec for less money than it costs now to carry it by rail from Toronto to Montreal. That surely would be a boon to the farmers of this country. To use the language of the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) the other night, I believe that the Trent Valley Canal is one of the greatest public works that Canada has ever undertaken. But, it is all in line with the policy of the Conservative party. It is for the purpose of bringing the farmers of the North-west into sympathy with the farmers of Quebec and Ontario, and with the farmers of the maritime provinces. The same policy that enlarged our canals and built the Canadian Pacific Railway, is now advocating the building of the Trent Valley Canal. I sincerely trust, Sir, that whether the Liberals or the Conservatives be in power after the next general elections, that part of the Government policy at least will be carried to completion, as it is now proposed to carry it.

This afternoon, it was stated that the Conservatives were not a united party, and all through this debate the same thing has been asserted, time and again. Sir, we are a united party on the fiscal policy of the country. The Liberals are disunited altogether upon that. Then, Sir, take other matters of policy, whether it be the school question, remedial legislation, or any other policy, the Liberal party are hopelessly divided. These gentlemen opposite tell us that we from the province of Ontario cannot give an unbiased vote upon that question. Mr. Speaker, until I came to this national assembly, I never heard before in my life that the people of Ontario are not as liberal, in thought and in action as are the people of other provinces. Nowhere in the great province of Ontario can a word be heard to-day against a man being a leader in politics because of his religion. Sir, when, after Sir John Abbott's death, the Liberal-Conservative party were called upon to elect another leader, they with unbroken voice from the province of Ontario pointed with one acclaim and one accord to a man who differed from the great majority in religion; and so to-day you can go where you will throughout Ontario—and I believe

I represent in this House one of the most ultra-Protestant constituencies in that province—go where you will throughout the province of Ontario, and you hear no unkind word spoken of the hon. the leader of the Opposition because of his religion. I take this opportunity, here and now, to hurl back the statements of hon. gentlemen opposite, that the Conservative party are divided. Is remedial legislation distasteful to some? Why, we know it is to these hon. gentlemen on Opposition benches. How in the world can it be hoped that the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin), and the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte), who is now joined with Major Mulvey—how is it to be hoped that they can agree upon a policy? Sir, we have Major Mulvey in the Manitoba legislature, saying that he would take up arms in order to prevent the policy of the Government of Canada going into force in his own province. Sir, if that party opposite contains the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin), the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte), and Major Mulvey, how much more than that let me ask can any party be divided? I would advise hon. gentlemen opposite to look after their own household, and let ours alone on that point.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). You are adopting the rule: don't trouble us before our time.

Mr. MCGILLIVRAY. I hardly grasp the force of that remark. Mr. Speaker, what I wish to draw the attention of hon. gentlemen to is this fact, that whatever difference there may be on this side of the House, if there be any, that is a question of conscience. I say that upon the general policy of the Government we are all united over here. Hon. gentlemen opposite are disunited. On that particular incident of government which brings about the question of remedial legislation, there may be differences of opinion here, as there certainly are over there. I wish, Sir, to repel the insinuation that there is any ultra-Protestant feeling in Ontario, that would not meet in fair argument, and by fair conduct, opponents of a religious school of thought different from ours. We do not want our French-Canadian fellow members of this House, whom we love and respect as much as we would if they came from Ontario—we do not want them to think there is any act of ours inspired by hatred to their religion or to the religion of any body of people.

I would not have spoken to-night but for the remarks of the hon. member for West Elgin. You see my remarks are disconnected, because I did not intend to speak. The hon. member for West Elgin said—and that is what prompted me to speak at all—that I represent a minority. That is what hurt my feelings. I do, however, in one sense represent a minority, Mr. Speaker, I believe it to be the duty of every man, once he is the choice

of the people, to represent the majority and minority alike; and, in that sense, I do represent, I hope, in some small measure, at least, even the minority of my constituency.

One word more, Mr. Speaker, and I have done. I have taken exception to the language used by the hon. member for West Elgin, in speaking of one whom we young Conservatives have learned to respect and revere these forty years. I should have thought that the hon. member, and, indeed, every hon. member of the Opposition, would have gladly welcomed to this House once again the hon. baronet who represents Cape Breton. I cannot see why they should turn their batteries upon him, unless it be that they think he is going to work injury to them. I should have thought that a man who had been honoured by his Queen as that hon. gentleman has been honoured, a man who has been honoured by the people of his own province as he has been honoured for forty years, ought to be a man who would give character even to the House of Commons of Canada. We dislike very much to hear the language hurled across the floor of this House that was to-day hurled against that hon. gentleman, although he was not in his seat at the time. I hope that, whatever our differences may be, we can afford to speak of one another in kindly language, as we learn to know one another better; and let me assure you, Mr. Speaker, that we Conservatives, at least, whatever treatment may be meted out to us in that respect, will speak of the hon. leader of the Opposition and his lieutenants with the respect they deserve—because they in some considerable measure do deserve the respect of the people. I would be sorry indeed to think that the men of character were only to be found in the Liberal-Conservative party. I would be sorry to think that the men coming to this national assembly from away down by the sea, from Quebec and the maritime provinces, were not worthy of respect, alike with us from Ontario. I think it ought to be our pride to know that it is only men of character who get here at all, whether they come as Liberals, as Conservatives, or as Patrons. Now, Mr. Speaker, let me assure the hon. member for West Elgin, and others who asked me the question this afternoon, that we on this side of the House are quite contented with our leaders. We know that we have been led ably in the past. We know that for a quarter of a century old Sir John Macdonald safely piloted the ship of state through many a tempestuous political sea. We know that he did his work well. When he passed away, he was followed successively by two great men, who led the Conservative party in the same able manner. Both of these are now dead; and to-day we have at the head of the Government of this country a man whose political life is pure, and who has ably administered one of the greatest departments of Government. That

hon. gentleman has to-day the affection and support of the whole Liberal-Conservative party of this country; and, Sir, whether his leadership be long or short, we know not, but this we do know, that, if the time should come for him to step down and out of that place, we have one to succeed him, to whom we, as Liberal-Conservatives, can, in a political sense, all bend the knee and loyally support.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I think I may fairly congratulate the hon. gentleman (Mr. McGillivray) upon one thing, at least—that, under circumstances somewhat depressing, with almost empty benches and no very enthusiastic audience, he has managed to bring to the discussion of this question a very considerable amount of energy and apparent enthusiasm. Perhaps, his disconnected remarks, as he terms them, might be pardoned, from the fact that the discussion upon this Budget has been somewhat exhaustive during the past four or five weeks; and, if the hon. gentleman has not said anything new, it may be that there was not very much new to be said. But, if he said nothing new, he has certainly delivered himself of one or two startling statements, to which, I think, I ought to call his attention. The hon. gentleman says that he was elected in North Ontario because he was able to tell the sturdy farmers of that constituency, that the Conservative Government had, in the first place, given them a free breakfast table. This catch phrase is sometimes used to trap the unwary; and, when I heard the hon. gentleman make the statement to-night, I wondered if he had paused for a moment to think what he was saying. A free breakfast table! If the hon. gentleman had taken up the tariff which was under his hand, he would have seen that, far from it making the breakfast table of the poor man free, from the time he sits down till he rises there is not a single article, with the exception of tea and coffee, that he can call free at all. While the hon. gentleman was speaking, I amused myself by running over a few of these articles.

An hon. MEMBER. The table-cloth.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) You can take anything you like. Baking powder is taxed; rice is taxed about 74 per cent.

Mr. HAZEN. Not at breakfast.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman finds that very amusing; but I can show him plenty of families who use rice at breakfast. Oatmeal, flour, cornmeal, cocoa, earthenware and china of all kinds, table-cloths, napkins, table cutlery, of all kinds, fruits of all kinds, the different kinds of meat and fish—everything that is used on the table is taxed from 20 per cent up to 74 per cent.

An hon. MEMBER. Sugar.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Yes, sugar also. I need not go through all the items. Now, will

Mr. MCGILLIVRAY.

the hon. gentleman tell me what single article there is on the breakfast table, outside of tea and coffee—and these only when they come from the country of production—that is free?

Mr. MCGILLIVRAY. I used the term in general.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman used the term in general, when, as a matter of fact, there is not a single thing on the table that is not taxed up to the hilt.

An hon. MEMBER. Cold water.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) My hon. friend behind me calls my attention to the fact, that one of nature's bounties has so far escaped taxation—that is, water, whether boiled or cold. How long it may remain so, I do not know. But I ask the hon. gentleman, who obtained his seat in this House on false pretenses of that kind, for goodness' sake, to go back to his constituents and hand it back to them. Then the hon. gentleman, in drawing a very impassioned picture of the unity that exists between Canadians and Americans, said that they had everything in common. Why, he says that their flag is one in common with ours. True, he says, they have added a few stars and stripes to it, but that does not prevent the two being in common. Well, Mr. Speaker, I never knew there was anything in common between the two flags, except that both countries tax the cotton used in each pretty severely. Apart from common taxation, I do not see anything in common between the two flags. Then the hon. gentleman asked, in triumphant tones, where is the hon. gentleman who can point out a combine which has existed in Canada under the National Policy? Did the hon. gentleman ever hear of the nail combine? of the cordage combine? of the sugar combine?

Mr. MCGILLIVRAY. The hon. gentleman misunderstood what I said. I said a combine that bore hardly upon the people.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I am quite willing to accept that. I am going over the combines, and before I resume my seat, if the hon. gentleman will favour me with his attention, I will convince him that these combines bear most heavily upon what is called the common people, and it is because they bear upon the people, and not upon the classes, that they are permitted to exist. If they bore hardly upon the classes and not the masses, the classes would remove them out of the way in a very short time.

Then the hon. gentleman capped the climax by telling us, in the sixth week of the debate, that he has not yet been able to discover any platform which the Liberal party has at all, except it may be free trade as they have it in England. I ask him, as a young member of the House whether he would not do better for himself and his constituency if he would be a little

more guarded and prudent in his statements, because every one knows that the statement he has made is silly. Why, the Liberal party met in convention only three years ago, and laid down a policy consisting of some nine or ten planks, to which they agreed unanimously. That has since been published all through the country, and because some silly utterances were delivered here, before the hon. gentleman spoke, of a similar character as those to which I am now calling attention, some of my hon. friends behind me took the precaution of reading that platform from beginning to end, plank after plank.

Mr. MCGILLIVRAY. They have changed it since.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) That platform has never been changed. There does not exist a power in this country that can change it, except the power that made it. The Liberal party, in convention assembled, determined upon that platform; and neither the leader of the party, whom we respect, nor any leading man in the party, has power to change or alter that platform one iota, except with the consent of those who made it. And I ask the hon. gentleman is it fair, is it just, that at a time when the Budget debate is in progress, and when we are trying, upon each side of the House, to find out what are the distinctive issues which divide the parties, so that we may discuss those distinctive issues, I ask is it fair to try and cloud the argument by telling the country that there are no issues at all. Now, I am not going to shirk the fact that the Liberal-Conservative party have a distinct, clear, and definite policy. I do not want to put up a man of straw and knock it down, but I am going to challenge the policy of that party, as its leaders have enunciated it, and the party have accepted it. I ask you to do us the same measure of justice. Our policy has been formulated in language so clear and distinct that it cannot be misinterpreted. That policy has never been altered. I ask you, if you differ from it, to point out in what respect it is wrong, but do not set up a policy to which the Liberal party never agreed, and, having successfully knocked that down, call upon your neighbours to admire you as an exceedingly clever fellow.

The hon. gentleman took some time in treating us to a lecture on the comparative unity which prevails in the Conservative party. In the light of recent events, I think we might have been spared that, but if it does him and those around him any good, we will let him enlarge upon that point with all the unction which the hon. gentleman possess, and will not notice it at all.

Let me draw attention, for a moment, to the policy of the two parties. The hon. gentleman followed a plan which has been adopted by older and more experienced politicians than he, of reading, from time to

time, detached statements made by members of the Liberal party, five, ten, fifteen, and some twenty years ago. I do not know what he wanted to prove except that these men were not thoroughly consistent, throughout all these years, in the political policy they advocated. Well, I would not give very much for a man who, for twenty long years, amidst all the changing scenes of political life in Canada, was able to say, I have never wavered from the policy which I laid down when a boy. Wise men frequently change their opinions; it is a common saying that fools rarely do. If a man becomes convinced, after reaching years of maturity, that the opinions he held in his callow youth were not just and right, I would not give much for him if he had not the moral courage to announce his change of heart. Now, what is the Liberal policy? Summed up in a few words, it is to reduce the expenditure of the country to the lowest possible point consistent with an efficient service. You tell us that that cannot be done. Well, we have spent hour after hour on this side going into details and showing how it can be done. In reply to challenges which came from the other side, gentlemen on this side undertook the labour of pointing out the particular departments of the service in which money can be saved, and those are all upon record. We are ready to go to the country with that statement, on which we pledge ourselves, that very large and important reductions can be made in the expenditure of the country, without impairing the efficient administration of its affairs. But we say our policy, further, is to raise by customs taxes and excise duty all the money required to carry on governmental affairs, and we say that not a dollar of taxation shall be raised by the country directly, nor permitted to be raised indirectly, except it is for the Government's service. I can use the very words of our platform, namely, that the customs tariff of the Dominion should be based, not as it is now, upon the protective principle, but upon the requirements of the public service, as summing up what I have endeavoured to lay down the last moment or two. That is the Liberal policy. It provides for customs and excise duties sufficient to carry on the affairs of the country. It provides that all taxes collected shall go into the treasury, and it provides for a reduced expenditure by the Government.

What is the policy of the Government? If we can get down to a distinct issue between the two parties, we will have something tangible to present to the people and argue upon. I have such an abiding faith in the absolute justice of the policy of the Liberal party that I do not want to twist or turn it, or twist or turn the policy of my opponents. I am ready to discuss the two policies side by side in and out of this House. What is the policy of the Conservative party? It is to raise, in the first

place, by customs and excise duties, as much money as is required to carry on the service of the country. But, over and beyond that and largely more important than that, to permit taxation to be levied by private persons for what they call the purposes of protection. Now, Sir, I am not going to ask my hon. friends' opposite to accept my statement for that. The policy of the Conservative party was formulated by the Finance Minister two or three years ago in carefully prepared language, language that could not be misunderstood. It has been re-affirmed from time to time, and it has never been challenged by any leading member of the Conservative party. It is embodied in the tariff which was then framed and which is to-day in existence, to the practical workings of which I shall call attention before I sit down, and that policy reads as follows. I am now quoting from the Finance Minister Budget speech of 1894 :

The arrangement of a tariff and the principle which is to be adopted has two aspects—it looks to the revenue which is required in a country, and it looks as well to the general trade and development of a country. I wish, at this early stage of my remarks upon this subject, to say that, so far as the revenue aspect is concerned, it is of infinitely less importance than the effect of the principle and the details of the tariff upon the trade and development of a country.

Now, Mr. Speaker, hon. gentlemen will see that the hon. Minister was not levying a tariff for the purpose of collecting taxes to carry on the affairs of the country—that, he says, is of infinitely less importance than the main object which he has in view. What is the main object which he has in view? The development of the trade of the country. How is he going to develop the trade of the country? By protecting it against inroads from outside. How is he going to protect it against inroads from outside? By taxing the foreign commodities and keeping them out. And so the primary object he has in view is the taxation of those commodities which the people require and the keeping of them out of the country. As a secondary and subsidiary object he proposes to raise money for the purpose of carrying on the Government of the country. Now the crucial point of difference, between the policy laid down by the Conservative party and the policy of the Liberals, is that the Liberals do not propose either to levy or to authorize other people to levy a single dollar of taxation for the purpose alone of developing any particular industry. They eliminate that principle entirely from their policy. They say: You are justified in levying taxation only for the purpose of raising sufficient revenue to carry on public affairs, and every dollar you levy or authorize to be levied beyond what is required to carry on the affairs of the country, is taken improperly and wrongfully from the pockets of the people. Now, I submit that that is,

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

in a nutshell the difference between the two parties.

The Conservative policy has been in force sixteen or seventeen years. How has it worked out? Sir, I am not going to trouble this House with a vast mass of figures showing how the public debt has increased from 1878 until to-day. Everybody knows how our debt now stands—somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$253,000,000. Hon. gentlemen will remember that, five or six years ago, a very distinguished and important member of the House called the serious attention of the House to the extraordinary and abnormal increase of our public debt, to the danger which threatened us if that debt continued to increase, and warned this House and this country against the danger that would follow if the process of increasing the public debt continued. I will venture to call your attention to a word or two that the Finance Minister said in his Budget speech in 1889. After telling us the liabilities that we had incurred and were then incurring, and showing what the debt of the country was, he went on :

So that, putting these two facts and these two sets of items together, my own opinion as a member of the Government; and it is an opinion in which I know I shall have all reasonable support from my colleagues in the Government in retaining and maintaining, is that, taking for granted that the condition of the country during the three years to come shall be equally prosperous with its condition to-day, should no extraordinary events arise to cause extraordinary expenses for the three years ending on the 30th June, 1892, we ought to meet our capital engagements, pay what we have to pay in the running expenses of the country, and add not one dollar to the net debt of the country. What I mean is this, if I have not made myself clear, that counting in the sinking fund investment, which is laid up as against gross debt, we ought in the next three years to meet all our capital engagements to the amount I have mentioned, and at the end of that time have no greater net debt than we shall have on the 1st July, 1889; and this is estimated on the basis of the tariff which we have to-day, without contemplating any increase in the tax rate. After 1892, with equal prosperity, with an increased population, and with consequently increased consumption and increased contributions to the revenue, on the same rate of tariff, I believe that, unless extraordinary events occur which call for extraordinary expenditure, this country ought to go on for a series of years without any increase of debt at all, providing for necessary capital expenditure and the services of the country out of the revenues which come in to make up the consolidated revenue of the country. That is my forecast, and one which I believe, if nothing intervenes of an unexpected character, will be fully carried out by the march of events.

And the next year he took occasion to recapitulate that statement in a few words. In the course of his Budget speech of 1890, he said :

I stated that last year that looking at the condition of the country, and looking at the munificent contributions which had been given by this country for her public works, and at the

splendid equipment which Canada had by means of these contributions gained for herself, it seemed to me that we ought not, after the close of the year 1889, to increase the public debt, that we ought not to increase the public expenditure for ordinary purposes, and, that it was possible by a prudent course, without stinting the public service in any way, to carry on this service in a generous manner, to meet the capital obligations which we had already assumed, and to go to the year 1892 without adding to our net debt. After that it seemed to me that we might well take into consideration whether or not we could not gradually decrease the amount of the debt which we had assumed and placed upon ourselves.

So, the hon. gentleman, making provision for all the public works then in contemplation, calculated that for the next six or seven years not a dollar should be added to the public debt, and that after six or seven years we should begin to cut that debt down. Now, I wish to call the attention of the hon. Finance Minister to the facts as compared with his prediction and see where we stand. In the year 1889 the public debt was a little over \$237,500,000. There was to be no increase but rather a reduction up to this year, according to the hon. gentleman's statement reaffirmed over and over again. As a matter of fact he has increased the public debt since then by nearly \$16,000,000. This is in addition to enormous sums which he has taken from the public by increased taxation. This latter statement, of course, he will deny. But the main statement as to the increase of the debt is not denied and cannot be denied, for it is shown by the public accounts themselves.

And, instead of the expenditure during that time being reduced as the hon. gentleman promised, we find that since 1889 it has increased by several millions of dollars. So that while the expenditure was under 37 millions in that year, it was over 38 millions the last year.

Now, at this very time we have the ex-Minister of Justice, with these facts staring him in the face, standing up and declaring that he for one is not disposed to limit the debt where it stands to-day. He is ready to plunge Canada into large expenditures, and he thinks the time has come when the expenditure of this country, instead of being 36 or 37 or 38 millions, should go up and become 40 millions. The hon. gentleman is not in his place to-night, but I would like to ask him what portion of this community does he propose to wring the extra two and a half millions out of. I do not know how it may be elsewhere, but last night we heard the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Edwards) declare that never, in his long and varied commercial experience, had the times been as hard, or the depression as great, and the people as poor, as they are to-day in this part of the world. I think I can say without hesitation that that state of facts exists, and has existed, for several years in the maritime provinces; and I am told by those who come from the metropolitan cities of

Toronto and Montreal that not for a decade have times been anything like as bad or as dark as they are to-day. But still, Sir, we find leading men in the Conservative party, who have violated their promises and their pledges to the people with regard to the public debt, who have increased it nearly 16 millions during the last seven or eight years, standing up here and declaring, and that on the eve of an election, that they propose to plunge this country into debt still further, and largely to increase the public expenditure besides.

Well, Sir, I was reading in the London "Times" the other day a little warning upon this matter of expenditure, which I will ask the House to allow me to read because it is very apropos, and shows when you once have run the expenditure up, the difficulty of getting it down. The financial critic in the "Times," of January 20th of this year, I think it is, writes:

Increase of expenditure is nearly always permanent with nations as with individuals. New indulgences speedily come to be regarded as necessities, and each instantly creates a little army of interested partisans ready to fight for it to the death. Every claim upon the exchequer successfully established in a year of plenty, practically has to be met in a year of impoverishment. The daughter of the horseleech is not so insatiable as local interests or industries that have once learned to look to the state to atone for lack of enterprise, initiative and adaptation to changing circumstances.

These are wise words, and I wish they could have some weight with hon. gentlemen who to-day propose largely to increase the expenditure of the country. Now, I think a mistake is made very frequently in attributing to the policy which prevails in any one country the trade depression or the good times which may from time to time exist. The policy does not necessarily make the good times, and does not necessarily cause depression, though it may accentuate and aggravate both. But a most singular ignorance appears to exist in this House, or is assumed at any rate, as to the existence of good or bad times in the mother country or in Canada.

We hear hon. gentlemen talk about the condition of affairs in England, and talk about the effects of the free trade policy there, and talk about the desire of the Liberal party to revert to that trade policy as their policy, and talk as if England to-day was on the downward grade, and as if depression marked every branch of her industries. Why, Mr. Speaker, I never knew more deplorable ignorance about anything than exists, or is expressed at least, in this House with regard to the effects of the trade system which England adopted many years ago. Hon. gentlemen state from time to time that England never dared to adopt free trade until she had built up her manufactures by a system of protection, and after she had built them up and made them strong, then, and

not till then, did she introduce the principle of free trade. That talk is all nonsense. England had no such thing as manufactures, such as we now understand by that term, when she had her protective system. England had no such thing as a foreign trade, such as we understand it now, when she had the system of protection. There was nothing but stagnation in those days; and when people talk about protection and free trade, they must remember that free trade was not introduced in England in the year 1846, but was begun to be introduced as early as 1822. Now, let me read a statement to you from a valuable book which I hold in my hand as to the condition of matters in England some years ago, at the period to which I am referring. Mr. Bowley, who published a book called "England's Foreign Trade in the 19th Century," a book from which I had the honour to quote last year, and a book which took the prize at the Cambridge University among a large number of essays written on the same subject, says, on page 46:

It was not the theory of free trade, but the practical need that impelled the London and Edinburgh merchants to petition, in 1820, against every restrictive regulation of trade not essential to the revenue. A commission was appointed in response to these petitions, and they found that as regards revenue there were an infinite number of petty duties serving no purpose but to hinder trade, and laid down the fundamental principle that: "Commerce must be a source of reciprocal amity between nations, and an interchange of productions to promote the industry, the wealth and happiness of mankind," and, "if we should be compelled to continue any of the present restrictions.....it will be understood.....that it is a matter not of option, but of necessity, and not caused by any ideas on our part of promoting our own commercial interests by it."

This commission was appointed in 1820. The Corn Laws were not repealed till 1846; for though the case had been thus clearly stated, and the opinion of experts given, the confusion of the country after the war and the one-sided views that distress generates clouded the issue; different claims were raised by classes with conflicting interests, and amid the uproar the old-established monopolies only yielded their ground step by step.

Newmarch's description of our fiscal system in 1820 is as follows:—"At that time the system of prohibition, protection and fiscal confusion was at its height. It was said by competent authorities that the number of Acts of Parliament relating to the entry, export and custody of goods as matters of custom-house supervision, was not less than 1,500. All the special interests were in full possession of the vested rights to which they laid claim. There was the Corn Law of 1815; there were the differential duties in favour of the West India proprietors; the monopoly of the East India Company; the rigorous application of the navigation laws against competition on freights. There were heavy duties on raw materials of industry, and prohibitive or extravagant duties on foreign manufactures.

Mr. Speaker, that was the condition of matters as pictured by this writer and by Newmarch in 1820. Now, I will read one more

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

paragraph, with your permission, as to the condition of matters at that time in Great Britain:

Let us now glance at the state of England at the end of the 18th century, bearing in mind that the changes from that to her present condition would have been impossible without foreign trade. There were practically no manufactures, in our present sense of the word, no ships to carry great increments of goods, no foreign demand for them, no admission to other countries; the products of machinery were known by our ancestors of three generations ago as little as to savage races now.

Now, I commend these statements of one of the best writers in Great Britain of the present day, to those gentlemen who assumed that before England adopted the principle of free trade she had thoroughly built up and established her manufactures. He goes on to say:

The population of Great Britain and Ireland was 16 millions in 1801; in 1892, it was 38 millions. Total imports and exports were 37 million pounds in 1791; in 1891, there were 744 million pounds. At the same time the average income per head has increased greatly. In fact, in the 18th century foreign trade was of so little importance to the majority of the inhabitants of England, that with one important exception the whole of it might have been destroyed without making any appreciable change in the habits or wealth of the people; the rich would have been deprived of some luxuries, the poor of very few, a small class of traders would have been affected, and an unimportant branch of revenue destroyed, but no other result would have followed.

So you will see that the introduction of machinery into Great Britain was co-incident with the introduction of free trade, and the combination of the new inventions and the machinery which was introduced, and the free trade which was also introduced and gave free play to the working of the system, enabled the trade of Great Britain to increase from 37 million pounds in the beginning of the century until it was, in 1891, 744 million pounds.

I may remark at the same time that a curious and very valuable diagram attached to this book by the learned writer shows that while this extraordinary increase has taken place in the total volume of the commerce and trade of that country, during the whole time from the beginning of the century till 1845, when free trade was fully established, the per capita increase was almost nil, and that it was only from 1845, when free trade in its entirety came in, the per capita trade of the country rose from about five or six pounds per head until in 1890 it exceeded 20 pounds per head of the population. I do not want to weary the House with any further extracts on these points, but I thought I might give them in justice to the argument which I advanced, and because they exhibit the precise facts which are at variance with what hon. gentlemen assume from time to time to be true.

How do we stand to-day, comparing Canada with England? While we have deficits, they are embarrassed with surpluses, and I believe the Chancellor of the Exchequer to-day has upon his hands as the result of last year's operations a surplus of \$30,000,000, or £6,000,000 sterling. While we have depression, they are enjoying an expansion of trade and a return to the good old times. I took the "Times" newspaper the other day, which reviewed the trade of the previous year, 1895, and I found in giving a summary of trade the newspaper said:

If the agricultural depression were removed there would be an all-round prosperity, but the home harvest having proved disastrous, and prices being generally complained of, centres depending upon agricultural support have not had the benefit others have already experienced. With encouraging railway and board of trade returns, together with the improved conditions shown by the absence of failures of any serious importance, and evidence of more careful trading, if the present political disturbances are removed a fair development of the revived prosperity already established is probable, as prices of all commodities are still at a low or reasonable prices, food products are cheap, and no fears are now entertained of any immediate fiscal changes in America or the East which will disturb the basis traders are now operating on.

In the same article it says:

A year ago the feeling was distinctly evident that the cycle of adverse years had given place to a more prosperous era, and the experience of 1895 has fully justified this, as in many trades the improvement then being felt has become more marked, and in some a return to the activity of the "good old times" has been recorded. The previous depression continued to some extent early in the year, but before midsummer this had given place to a marked revival in the leading industries, the metal, woollen, and cotton markets showing more rapid development than traders have of late been accustomed to.

While we have in that condition of matters a return to the good old times in Great Britain in all trades, mentioned one after the other, how is it in Canada? Well, Sir, I am not going to repeat what I have said before. We have heard the evidence of leading merchants and statements made by other parties in Canada, but one and all unite in this fact, that never before in the history of Canada was the outlook poorer or times harder than they are to-day.

The Minister of Finance tries to minimize the damaging evidence of the facts of increased debt and taxation which I have cited by quoting the average rate of customs duties and taxes for the five years when the Mackenzie Government was in power, and comparing them with the rate of taxation during the past year. That is a very favourite method adopted by the hon. gentleman. He takes a single year which suits his purpose, or a cycle of years. He has in this instance taken the lowest year for fifteen years, when there was a deficit of \$4,000,000, and compared that with five years of the Mackenzie regime, and he

declared that the rate of customs taxation is very little more than it was then. I submit that is a most unfair and unjust way to make a comparison. If the hon. gentleman wants to make a comparison, let him take ten years or the average of the past ten years, and ascertain what the average per capita of customs taxation has been in Canada, and he will find that instead of \$3.42, it is \$4.45, or \$1 increase per capita customs taxation over that prevailing under Mr. Mackenzie's rule, and that on 5,000,000 of population means \$5,000,000 a year, which tallies with the actual result. In 1895 we raised by customs taxation \$17,800,000, but only \$12,700,000 in 1878, which shows an increase during that period of about \$5,000,000. That is a fact which I verify and prove by taking the average per capita for the past ten years, and the result shows that taxation for customs amounts to \$4.45 per head. But I am not going to dwell on these figures.

The hon. gentleman referred to the shipping interest, and he drew a conclusion to this effect, that the amount of tonnage calling at our ports in Canada for the past years has gone on increasing from year to year. I thought if there was a branch of industry to which the hon. gentleman ought not to have called attention it was the ship-building and ship-owning industry. As a matter of fact, ship-building, which, years ago, was a most valuable industry, has to-day become practically extinct. I do not charge that the National Policy has been directly and solely responsible for this. There were other causes in operation which went to reduce and destroy the ship-building industry, but as a matter of fact, I say that the National Policy was a factor in the destruction of the industry, and an important factor, too. As a matter of fact, what do the figures show? In 1864 we built \$6,000,000 worth of tonnage; in 1894 only \$750,000. Between 1873 and 1878, our registered tonnage in the maritime provinces alone increased \$5,000,000 in value. Between 1878 and 1894 the value decreased by \$11,000,000. During the past twelve years, since 1884, the total tonnage of the maritime provinces has decreased nearly one-half, or, to speak accurately, by 400,000 tons. But, said Mr. Foster,—I am quoting his words:

We have come through the period of 1890-95 with increased shipping returns. The tonnage of vessels coming in and out of our ports, not including coasting vessels, has increased in that period by 640,000 tons.

The fact is true. The hon. gentleman has stated the fact correctly, but I should like to ask if that is a matter of unmixed congratulation on the part of Canada. It is not so when the facts come to be analyzed. The sea-going vessels, inward and outward, in 1878 showed 6,684,384 tons. In 1895 the tonnage was 10,976,829, but of this only 2,000,000 tons were Canadian; and of the

3,600,000 tons of freight Canadian bottoms carried a good deal less than one-fifth; accurately speaking, they carried 18 $\frac{2}{3}$ per cent of the sea-borne freight and employed 112,000 men out of 430,000. So it comes down to this, that 80 per cent of the sea-borne Canadian freight is carried by foreigners and 20 per cent is carried by Canadian bottoms. In 1878 we carried 30 per cent, and that proportion is being reduced nearly every year. The total tonnage coming in and going out of our ports increased from 6,500,000 tons in 1878 to 11,000,000 in 1895, or an increase of over 4,000,000 tons, whilst our Canadian tonnage remained stationary, the increase being all in the foreign ships. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is not a matter upon which we can congratulate ourselves, but it is rather the reverse. The increased tonnage came to our ports and carried away increased quantities of freight, but all the profits have gone to foreign ships, and not to Canadian ships.

Sir, we object to the policy of the Government, which I have outlined, because, while it increases the taxes enormously, we say, that those taxes paid into the treasury bear but a small proportion to the taxes actually paid by the people. I made a careful estimate last year—and I verified it again this year—on the basis of population, of the actual taxes collected each year since 1878, and I say that the figures show that over \$100,000,000 more have been collected under the present National Policy system than would have been collected if Mr. Mackenzie's 17 $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent tariff had been continued. My hon. friend from Brant (Mr. Paterson) made an estimate, in which he made allowances for this, and allowances for that, and he said he estimated it under the mark, so as to leave no room for controversy at all, and I think he brought it down somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$75,000,000. I believe, Sir, he made allowances which it was unjust to make, and it is no use making unjust allowances, because you can be as unfair one way as the other. I say, taking it carefully and accurately, and just charging the actual taxation over and above what Mackenzie's tax would have yielded, and making allowances for the increase of population, this tariff of the present Government has taken \$100,000,000 more out of the people of this country than Mr. Mackenzie's tariff would have taken if it had continued in force. That is the amount which goes into the treasury alone. Now, Mr. Foster says that the collection of this tax for the treasury is, under the National Policy, of infinitely less importance than the question of developing the industries of the country. That means that the main object of the National Policy is so to arrange it that people are compelled to buy home-made goods and that the taxes paid into the treasury shall be a small proportion only of the taxes exacted from the people. Last year, I undertook to prove

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

that statement by going into details, and showing the proportions of taxation that were collected for the treasury, on cottons, sugar, rice, iron, and a number of other articles. I do not propose to weary the House with similar calculations, but I will call attention to one fact, in order to emphasize my argument.

In 1895 we imported, in round figures, \$4,200,000 worth of cotton, and, with a duty of 28 per cent, we paid upon that, \$1,200,000. But, if we can accept the statements made by the cotton manufacturers and embodied in our census returns, about \$13,000,000 worth of cotton was manufactured in Canada, and, at the same rate of taxation, there was paid upon the cotton manufactured in this country, \$3,600,000. That is about the proportion which the National Policy exacts from the people, and relegates to the treasury and to the pockets of the favoured few; \$1,200,000 goes to the treasury, and \$3,600,000 is paid by the people, which never reaches the treasury at all, but goes into the pockets of the Canadian manufacturers. And just the same argument applies to sugar. I wish to call attention to a statement made in this House last night by a gentleman who is supposed to be an expert in this matter. The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Stairs), who is largely interested, as he told us, in the sugar refineries of the maritime provinces, said (and I took his words down carefully) that he ventured to say that the Canadian people got their sugar as cheaply as any people in the world. That was a most extraordinary statement, coming from the hon. gentleman. I deny it. I say it is not correct. I myself this morning got some of the prices current of sugar in Liverpool, England, on February 7th last, only a few weeks ago. I find by these prices, that good yellow sugar—better sugar than what they call good yellow in Canada—cost 13s. 9d., less 2 $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent, which means \$2.91 per 100 pounds.

Mr. HAZEN. Is that what we call brown sugar in this country?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) No; fair yellow sugar; a good yellow sugar.

Mr. HAZEN. That is not as high a grade as white sugar.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Not being an expert, and for fear I should make a mistake, I applied to one of the largest grocers in Canada on this point, and he said that the sugar which I am now quoting the price of is a better sugar than the sugar which is called good yellow, and sold here. Now, what did the same kind of sugar sell for in Canada on the same day, namely, the 7th of this month? The same sugar which cost \$2.91 per 100 pounds in England, cost \$3.75 in Canada, a difference of 84 cents per 100 pounds; and yet the hon. gentleman (Mr. Stairs) tells me that the Canadian people get their sugar as cheaply as do the people

of any other country in the world. If the fact was as the member for Halifax stated, there would be no need for a tariff to keep out the foreign sugar. If you can refine sugar and sell it as cheaply as they do in England, why do you keep a tariff on it of about two-thirds of a cent per pound? Although a smaller duty is put on raw sugar now, yet the duty on refined sugar has been raised, so as to leave the rate of protection just as it was before. You have $\frac{2}{3}$ of a cent per pound protection on sugar now, and almost up to that point do the sugar refiners of Canada charge the people extra for their sugar.

Mr. HAZEN. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to ask him a question? Is he making any allowance for the cost of bringing that sugar here from Great Britain, and is he making any allowance for the fact that the white granulated sugar here is put up in new packages which are more expensive than the packages in which yellow and brown sugar are put up?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman does not understand my argument. I do not make any allowance for the cost of bringing the sugar here. That is not necessary for the statement I am rebutting. The statement I wish to rebut is the statement made by my hon. friend for Halifax (Mr. Stairs) that the Canadian people get their sugar as cheaply as do the people in any country in the world. I say it is not true. I say that the English people get their sugar nearly a cent a pound cheaper than our people do.

Mr. HAZEN. The hon. gentleman's (Mr. Davies) statement would be more satisfactory if he would make a comparison between white sugars, and not between white sugar on the one hand, and yellow sugar on the other.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I quoted the prices of what I am told by my hon. friend from Brant (Mr. Paterson) is refined yellow. The quotations I read were given me from the Montreal house this morning. I knew the hon. gentleman (Mr. Stairs) was wrong, because I had made inquiries last year, but I wanted to be fortified with the quotations of the current market prices within the last fortnight, and I gave the hon. gentleman (Mr. Stairs) the quotations of Gillespie & Co., of Liverpool, for February 7th, and the quotations of the Montreal market for the same day.

Mr. HAZEN. Has the hon. gentleman got there, the price of granulated sugar in Great Britain?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I do not see that any sugar is sold in England under the name of granulated.

Mr. HAZEN. The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Stairs) tells me that there are tons and tons of it sold there as granulated sugar.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I am dealing with the current prices given by Gillespie & Co., of Liverpool, and not with what the hon. gentleman from Halifax (Mr. Stairs) tells the hon. member (Mr. Hazen). This reads:

Brown or low grades, f.o.b., less $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent per cwt., 11s. to 12s. Fair to good yellow, f.o.b., less $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent per cwt., 12s. 3d. to 13s. 9d. Fine yellow to white, f.o.b., less $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent per cwt., 14s. 6d. to 16s.

These embrace all the sugars which I am told the English people use. As I say, Mr. Speaker, we are charged $\frac{1}{2}$ a cent a pound on raw sugar and 14-100 cent per pound on refined sugar, under the revised tariff, so that we still retain the 64-100 of a cent per pound of protection to the refiner; that is nearly $\frac{2}{3}$ of a cent per pound. Now calculate what that comes to on the quantity consumed in Canada, namely, about 250,000,000 pounds a year, and you will see it means \$1,500,000 which the people of this country pay in taxes to the sugar refiners. If we were allowed to import the English sugar to-day free of duty, the consumers of sugar in this country would save about \$1,500,000 a year, which is the amount that is improperly transferred to the pockets of the sugar refiners.

Then, the hon. gentleman went on to say, in reply to a statement made by the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) as to the profits which it appeared on the face of the returns the sugar refiners made, that the hon. member for North Wellington was mistaken. "Why," said the hon. gentleman, "I tell the House that the refiners only pay 6 per cent upon the original investment." What has the original investment got to do with it? The people who own the refineries now did not make the original investment. The original investment has been lost; and the complaint we make against this National Policy is that the original investments, not only in sugar, but in cotton and other favoured industries, have been sunk, lost and destroyed. Sir, the question is not what they are paying on the original investment, but whether the hon. member for North Wellington was right when he said that they are paying 22 odd per cent upon their own investments. The hon. member for Halifax undertook to show that my hon. friend from North Wellington had omitted certain things from his estimate, such as charcoal, barrels, and so on. Well, Sir, I do not think he is right, though I am not going to discuss a technical point of that kind with him—because I think that if he examines the statement made by the hon. member for North Wellington he will find that these articles are all included in the raw materials.

Mr. STAIRS. They are not.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Charcoal is as much a raw material as sugar, and so is the barrel. Now, I will show the hon. gentleman how he proved too much. He said: "Those

articles were not taken into consideration by the member for Wellington, and if you take them into consideration, you will find that the refiners, instead of making 22 per cent, have lost 12 per cent." Is that true? Will the hon. gentleman venture to say that they have lost 12 per cent? Why, Sir, the thing is childish and ridiculous.

Mr. STAIRS. I quite admit that it is not correct. I say that by those census returns you cannot prove anything.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Perhaps the hon. gentleman is right, that you cannot prove anything from the census returns. But he undertook to show that my hon. friend from Wellington was wrong because he had omitted charcoal and barrels from the calculation, and he says: "If you include charcoal and barrels, I will prove that the refiners lost 12 per cent." The fact that they did not lose 12 per cent shows that the deduction should not have been made.

Mr. STAIRS. I did not say that at all. I said that the basis taken by the hon. member for Wellington would prove that the refiners had lost 12 per cent; but I did not say that they had lost 12 per cent.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) No, the hon. gentleman did not say they had. What he said was that if those items were deducted from the statement of the hon. member for Wellington, as they ought to be, the result would be a loss of 12 per cent instead of a gain of 22 per cent, which, I say, proves that the hon. gentleman is wrong in his assumption.

Mr. STAIRS. No, it does not prove any such thing.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The result shows that they would lose 12 per cent if the deduction were made; but the fact is that they did not lose 12 per cent, and therefore the deduction should not have been made.

Now, let me say something in regard to another article akin to sugar, to show the gross and grievous injustice this tariff works. Take the article of rice. When the Finance Minister reformed his tariff a couple of years ago, he referred specially to rice. It had been pointed out time and again with what grievous injustice that tax bore upon people who used rice, and the Finance Minister said that on cleaned rice the rate would not exceed 30 per cent; and the House was induced to agree to the tariff he then proposed, upon that statement made by him. But what is the fact? I take up the Trade and Navigation Returns, and I find that in 1895 we entered for home consumption of cleaned rice 5,876,856 pounds, valued at \$98,849, on which we paid a duty of $1\frac{1}{4}$ cents a pound, amounting to \$73,466. Now, what rate of duty does this show that we paid on cleaned rice? Was it 30 per cent, as the hon. gentleman said it would be? No, Sir, but $74\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. But, Sir, why are we asked to pay that exorbitant rate of

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

duty? If you turn to the next entry you will see why. There was imported of uncleaned rice, or paddy, 22,772,306 pounds, valued at \$199,620, on which we paid duty at the rate of 3-10ths cents a pound, or \$68,933. On that uncleaned rice the protected millers were enabled to tax the people of Canada about \$270,000. That is, to exact that much from the consumers to whom they sold by virtue of the tariff of $1\frac{1}{4}$ cents a pound, which kept out foreign cleaned rice, they made the people buy the rice they cleaned, and upon that they were enabled to charge them $1\frac{1}{4}$ cents a pound, less the 3-10ths cent a pound duty they paid themselves. They took from the people the \$270,000, less the \$68,000 which they paid on the uncleaned rice, leaving \$200,000 which the people of this country paid in tribute to the rice hullers. That may be a small matter, but it is one of the most iniquitous features of a very iniquitous tariff. It is based on the principle so often stated by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), that for one dollar you pay into the treasury, you pay two dollars or more into the pockets of the protected manufacturers. What gentleman will pretend to defend that exaction, that iniquity?

Then, take the article which the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Stairs) is more particularly interested in. Take cordage, on which there is a customs tax of $1\frac{1}{2}$ cents a pound and 10 per cent, which is equal to $2\frac{1}{2}$ cents a pound on rope. What is the effect of that? The effect is practically to exclude all foreign cordage from this country, and to enable cordage manufacturers to form a combine. The effect was to enable that combine to go and buy up the small factories in St. John and Quebec. They did buy them up for the purpose suppressing all home competition as far as they could, and after they had bought them up, they maintained their monopoly of the market, so that to-day there is not a man in Canada who dares to sell a pound of cordage except by the will and the permission of the hon. gentleman opposite, the president of the Consumers' Cordage Combine. I make the statement deliberately; there is no wholesale buyer who can purchase a pound of cordage except by the hon. gentleman's will or who can sell it except at prices which the hon. gentleman dictates. The tariff which the Finance Minister has framed effectually precludes any competition from abroad; and the hon. gentleman, acting in a combine with the Kingston Cordage Company, Alexander Main & Co., of Hamilton, and the Continental Twine Company of Toronto and Brantford, takes precious good care that not a man in Canada can buy a pound of cordage from them unless he signs a written agreement that he will only sell that cordage to the public at the price fixed in the list they give him.

Mr. HAZEN. What has become of the Patrons' Factory at Brantford?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I do not think it makes rope at all.

Mr. HAZEN. I thought you spoke of twine.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I spoke of rope. Now, Mr. Speaker, as the fact was challenged by the hon. gentleman who preceded me that there are no combines in this country at all in consequence of the National Policy tariff, let me call his attention to this most iniquitous combine. Let me call his attention to this most iniquitous combine. I hold the documents in my hand here, headed Montreal, Kingston, Hamilton, Toronto and Brantford, and dated 1st January, 1896. They are marked "confidential." Here is the agreement :

COMBINE AGREEMENT.

Montreal, Kingston, Hamilton, Toronto
and Brantford, Jan. 1st, 1896.
(Confidential.)

Dear Sirs,—We send you the following agreement (two copies) which we will thank you to sign, retaining one copy yourselves and mailing the other to Messrs. R. & T. Jenkins, 15 Toronto Street, Toronto.

Agreement—Provided you shall have complied with the following conditions, viz. :—

1. That you shall not have bought or received any cordage made by any manufacturers other than ourselves, during either of the periods of six months commencing severally 1st January, 1896, and 1st July, 1896.

2. That you shall have duly settled for all your purchases of cordage from us, in conformity with our established prices and terms.

3. That you shall not have, during either of said above named six months' periods, sold any cordage, either directly or indirectly, at less than said established prices and terms (19 cents a pound).

4. That you shall have immediately upon receipt hereof, signed one copy of this document and returned same to Messrs. R. & T. Jenkins, above named, receipt and acknowledgment of same by them being an essential condition of this agreement.

Premium.—If all the above conditions are complied with, and if you have during the period between 1st January, 1896, and 30th June, 1896, inclusive, bought and taken delivery from us of not less than 4,000 pounds of cordage, we will, on July 31st, 1896, and on the last day of each calendar month to December, 1896, inclusive, each severally on your respective purchases from us, pay you through the said Messrs. R. & T. Jenkins, a premium as follows :—Three per cent on the net amount of the invoices of such cordage bought by and delivered to you, or on your account, from us, during the sixth preceding calendar month respectively.

Also if all the above conditions are complied with, and if you have during the period between 1st July, 1896, and 31st December, 1896, inclusive, bought and taken delivery from us of not less than 4,000 lbs of cordage, we will, on 31st January, 1897, and on the last day of each calendar month to 30th June, 1897, inclusive, each severally on your respective purchases from us pay you through the said Messrs. R. & T. Jenkins, a premium as follows,—Three per cent on the net amount of the invoices of such cordage bought by and delivered to you on your account, from us,

during the sixth preceding calendar month respectively.

If any of the associates of this Agreement make complaint that you have violated its provisions, you will be notified, and should you fail to furnish evidence to the contrary, which shall be satisfactory to Messrs. R. & T. Jenkins, you agree to waive any and all claim to the premium.

We reserve the right to revoke and cancel all or any part of this proposition at any time upon notice to you by registered letter of our desire and intention to do so, but not thereby to relieve ourselves from any obligations which may have accrued hereunder, on your above described purchase of cordage up to the date of the said revocation.

Yours truly,

Consumers' Cordage Co., Ltd., Montreal,
Kingston Cordage Co., Kingston.
Alex. Main & Co., Hamilton.
Continental Twine & C. Co., Toronto &
Brantford.

We hereby agree to sustain the above and adhere to all the conditions therein named, waiving any and all right to premium in case of violation.

Premium on January purchases, payable on 31st July, etc., etc., etc.

Along with that there is the list of prices ; and for the ordinary commercial cordage that is used everywhere from our fishermen down to the woman who hangs up her clothes line, 9 cents per pound is the established price ; and all the man gets who sells it is his 3 per cent, and he dare not buy a pound outside of Canada or a pound inside of Canada except from this combine. This is a most iniquitous slavery to which they have reduced the people of Canada. By what means ? Simply because the Finance Minister has, by his policy, played into their hands, and enabled these combines to rob the people in this way. Why, when I tell you that these very gentlemen go down to Newfoundland and the Island of St. Pierre and sell to the fishermen there, under the noses of our fishermen, for 1½ and 1¾ cents a pound less than our fishermen can buy at, then I have shown you that the cup of their iniquity is full. Yet still we find men in this Parliament who have the courage to stand up in the face of damning pieces of evidences such as I have read, and shout for the party and support the National Policy. Have I proved to the hon. member for North Ontario (Mr. McGillivray) the existence of combines in their most iniquitous forms ?

Mr. MCGILLIVRAY. The hon. gentleman has not proved what I asked. I asked where were the combines that bore hardly upon the people as the result of the National Policy ? Now, I would ask the hon. gentleman whether there is not a coal combine, although coal comes into this country free ? He cannot prove that the coal combine is the result of the National Policy ?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Have I not shown the hon. gentleman that the National Policy, by means of this tax on foreign

cordage, excludes foreign competition? Have I not show him that these cordage companies bought up the small factories, that they have thus become the only cordage companies in Canada, and that they have entered into an agreement by which you cannot buy a pound of rope except from them and at their prices. Does the hon. gentleman want more? Why there never was a case so proved up to hilt?

Mr. HAZEN. Are there not combines in free trade England?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) If there are, they must exist under conditions which render them the least profitable. Free trade minimizes the possibility of a combine being successful. The very thing which justifies or causes the existence of a combine is the exclusion of foreign competition.

Mr. MCGILLIVRAY. What about coal? That is free, and look at the combine we have in coal.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I do not quite understand the hon. gentleman?

Mr. MCGILLIVRAY. I think that the most iniquitous combine we have in the coal combine. It keeps the price of coal up, and coal comes into the country free.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I was not aware there was a combine of coal in Canada.

Mr. MCGILLIVRAY. Yes, there is; it is a well known fact that in Ontario there is a coal combine, and that you can buy from nobody but it.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) That is merely a combine among the local dealers.

Mr. MCGILLIVRAY. It is exactly the same thing, the coal men have a combine.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) If the hon. gentleman proves to me that there are half a dozen combines like the one I mentioned, he only strengthens my argument. I live near a coal country where coal is mined, where within a hundred miles of me there are half a dozen companies mining coal, and I know no combine among them; but if there were such a combine, I suppose foreign coal would be brought in and destroy it.

Mr. MCGILLIVRAY. You could not buy any in Ontario except from the combines, and there is a grocers combine too.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I shall leave that for a moment, and call the attention of hon. gentlemen to another feature of the National Policy, which seems to me to deserve equal condemnation, and that is the kerosene oil duty. We on this side inveighed against that two years ago as being most iniquitous and unjust, and asked that the duty should be cut down. What did the Government do? They cut down the duty a cent and a sixth per gallon, or some tupenny ha'penny cutting like that, and what is the fact to-day? Last

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

year we imported 6,454,666 gallons, valued at \$414,427 on which we paid a duty of \$387,279.80, or a little less than 100 per cent. But in the maritime provinces, I find that while Prince Edward Island paid 105 per cent,—Nova Scotia paid 115, and New Brunswick 125 per cent on the coal oil that they consumed. Can that be defended on any ground? The rich people in the cities use the electric light and gas, but the poor man has to use coal oil; and before he gets it, you levy a duty of from 100 to 125 per cent on it; and then you stand up here like little men and vote for its continuance every year. I say it is disgraceful. I shall not weary the House by going over any more items.

I have shown a feature of the National Policy that I very strongly object to, perhaps more than any other. That is the feature which enables favoured industries to tax, by virtue of the tariff, the people of this country and put the taxes into their own pockets. It enables them to levy two or three times as much taxes as are levied directly and go into the treasury for the purpose of the Government.

Then I complain that the National Policy is a disloyal policy, because it discriminates most strongly against Great Britain.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman says "hear, hear," whether by way of derision or approval I do not understand, but I will give him very shortly the figures, and he will tell me whether what I say is true or not. You, it is true do not single out any specific article and charge it greater duty from Great Britain than from the States, but you look at the whole field of your imports, take the classes of goods which mainly come from Great Britain, which have come and will come for many years from Great Britain, and you levy upon that class of goods a higher rate of taxation than upon other goods which come from the United States. You are not sinning through ignorance; you are sinning wilfully. Last year we imported from Great Britain about \$31,000,000 worth of goods dutiable and free on which we paid \$7,000,000 of duty, or about 22½ per cent. In the same time we imported from the United States about \$54,500,000 worth of goods, dutiable and free, upon which we paid only \$6,800,000 in duty, or about 12½ per cent, a discrimination against Great Britain of almost 10 per cent. Of course, it will be said, that a large portion of raw material comes from the United States duty free, and that this should be taken into account. The argument is good. But, eliminate the free goods altogether, and bring it down to a question of dutiable goods. We imported from England, of dutiable goods, about \$23,300,000, upon which we paid about \$7,000,000 duties, or 30 per cent; from the United States we imported

\$25,795,000 worth of goods, on which we paid in duties \$6,897,000, or 26½ per cent. So that you discriminate directly against the classes of dutiable goods that are brought from Great Britain by 3½ per cent, quite enough to turn the trade away from one country to the other. And the figures show that this is largely what you have been doing. When my hon. friend from South Brant (Mr. Paterson) was making his argument, the other evening, the Finance Minister inquired, if the same discrepancy did not exist in 1878. He did not say it did, but he put it interrogatively. He wanted to insinuate that the same discrimination existed under the Mackenzie revenue tariff, and, therefore, he was not to blame for introducing this discrimination. I looked up that point, and I find that there is not a word of truth in the suggestion made by the hon. gentleman's question. I find that in 1878 we imported from Great Britain, in dutiable and free goods, \$37,431,000, on which we paid in duty \$6,445,000, or 17 per cent. From the United States we imported \$48,628,000, on which we paid duties of \$4,790,000, or 10 per cent. So that the discrimination upon the total imports, dutiable and free, existed in 1878, as it does to-day. But, when you eliminate the free goods—and I think hon. gentlemen opposite were right in contending that they should be eliminated—we find that the figures are as follows:—Of dutiable goods, we imported in 1878 from Great Britain \$32,000,000 worth, on which we paid \$6,400,000 of duty, or 20 per cent; from the United States we imported \$23,400,000 worth on which we paid in duties \$4,790,000, or 20 per cent. So that the same rate was levied upon dutiable goods from Great Britain as from the United States in 1878. But since that time you have deliberately, with your eyes open, knowing well the classes of goods we import from Great Britain, raised the rates against British goods, so that they are 3½ per cent on the whole higher than the rates on goods from the United States, enough to turn the current of trade from one to the other. And when the Liberal party openly invited your attention to this great discrimination, to this great wrong you were doing the motherland, and by a carefully framed resolution you asked to reduce the duties upon the classes of goods mainly imported from Great Britain, you gave a unanimous vote in the negative. But, notwithstanding that you refused to remove this discrimination, hon. gentlemen go out through the country and upon public platforms everywhere, and prate about their loyalty to the mother country and their desire to increase the trade between that country and Canada.

I have already said that the figures proved that the results which I said were sure to flow from such discrimination, have shown themselves. Take the last three years of the trade with Great Britain and compare them with the three years between 1873 and

1875, under a revenue tariff, and you will find these interesting results: In the period from 1873 to 1875, three years the duties on goods imported from Great Britain amounted to \$24,147,000, being an average of 12½ per cent. On goods from the United States, consisting largely of corn, bread stuffs, coal and other articles on the free list we paid duties of \$10,520,000, an average of 7 per cent. On goods from other countries the duties paid amounted to \$7,130,000, or 24 per cent. But in the last period of three years, from 1893 to 1895, the duties on goods from Great Britain amounted to \$24,751,000, an average rate of 22 per cent; on goods from the United States, \$21,384,000, or 13 per cent, and on goods from other countries, \$12,293,000, or 20 per cent. So that, whether you judge by the imports of a single year or by terms of years, it is proven conclusively, that your policy is a policy of gross cruelty and unjust discrimination against the motherland.

Now, Mr. Speaker, before I sit down, I wish to call attention to some remarks which were made in this debate by the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper), with regard to the iron trade of this country. The hon. gentleman spoke in laudatory terms of the effect of the National Policy in developing the iron trade, and he tried to make this House believe that the free trade policy which was being carried out by Great Britain, was having the result of destroying the iron trade there, whereas the protective policy that we have adopted, was developing the Canadian iron trade. In order to prove this the hon. gentleman quoted at great length from the report made by the delegates from the masters and men of the British iron trade who were sent to the continent of Europe to examine into the condition of the iron trade there and to find out how it was that the continental iron trade was able successfully to compete with the British. After having given a number of quotations to show that the fact was, that the continental iron trade was competing successfully with the British, the hon. member for Pictou added to the quotation the following remarks of his own:—

That is a most extraordinary revolution in the iron and steel trade of Germany under a protective system, and it is under this policy of Germany that England is having so difficult a road to travel, and such a difficult experience. It is in connection with this that the price has dropped and dropped to such a figure that one reference in the "Times" goes to show that industries were running in England and selling their goods below cost.

Now, the conclusion which the hon. gentleman drew, and which he asked the House and all those who read his remarks to draw, is, that the delegates of the iron trade who visited the continental works, had reported that the reason why the continental works were able to compete

successfully with the British works was, that the former were living under a system of protection. He said so in so many words, and I charge against that hon. gentleman, who I am sorry is not here to-night, because I have been waiting for this opportunity of speaking to him, that under his very hand, and in the very article from which he quoted, was conclusive and irrefutable evidence that the statement he made was not true. Sir, those delegates, after stating the fact that the continental iron works were enabled successfully to compete to-day with the English manufacturers, went on to point out the reason why this was so, and in commenting upon that report the "Times" says:

The point upon which the delegation appears to lay the greatest stress is the higher range of transportation charges in this country. This is described as "undoubtedly the greatest factor in favour of the foreign producer." Figures are given to prove that "Continental rates are generally at least one-half the rates charged for long distance traffic in this country." It is stated that the Belgians can send their iron 100 miles to Antwerp by rail and thence by sea to London for considerably less than is charged by rail from Staffordshire to London. British manufacturers also suffer from higher shipping freights. Not only have continental manufacturers cheaper transport from works to ports by railway, but they also have cheaper freights by steamer from the ports of Antwerp and Hamburg to outside markets; and even to our own colonies and India.

This article in the "Times," winds up as follows:—

While the report clearly shows that English manufacturers stand at a disadvantage in respect of railway and shipping charges, royalty rents, the payment of higher rates of wages, and less settled labour, it also appears to point to more enterprise and business tact on the part of continental industries. In Germany, for example, great care is taken to give the rank and file of the men a sound technical education, and young men of special promise are even sent to technical colleges for a two years' course of study, at the expense of their employers, so that the German manufacturers have the great advantage of employing a body of men who thoroughly understand the technique of their business. The delegation also suggests that there appears to be greater enterprise on the part of continental firms in organizing syndicates for the purpose of extending foreign business; and the syndicates established to regulate prices and production, are also believed to be helpful to continental manufacturers as against our own. Nevertheless, the report concludes that "if English manufacturers enjoyed the same railway rates and royalties as those paid on the continent, foreign competition could be defied in neutral markets." This final conclusion is in a sense encouraging, but it will not prevent Belgian and German firms from occupying British and colonial markets unless and until the railway companies and the steamship companies assist the British manufacturer to remove the obstacles that now hinder him from being on a level with his competitors of which at present there is no sign.

So you see, Mr. Speaker, the main reason to which these delegates attributed the

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

ability of the continental works to compete with the English manufacturers, was that transportation charges on the continent were so much lower than the transportation charges in England. The other point to which they call attention is a point to which, apart from all party politics, I desire to call attention here, and that is the very great attention which is being paid on the continent of Europe to the technical education for men who are working in the iron trades. The same remark applies to other trades as well as the iron trade. It is said that England's monopoly of the principal markets of the world, is passing away. That may be, and I agree that the monopoly has ceased, but there is this to be said, that if her monopoly has passed away, she has at least a very proud and a very satisfactory pre-eminence to-day. I find that of the world's iron and steel supply, while she supplied 50 per cent fifty years ago, to-day she still supplies 45 per cent, and if she has not a monopoly she has, as I say, a very proud and satisfactory pre-eminence. The reason of it is not far to seek, and the reason is not discreditable to her, although it may be creditable to her rivals. The fact of the matter is that the Germans, the Belgians, and the other nations on the continent, have come to England and have studied British methods, and have graduated in British schools, and, as a consequence, they have acquired commercial aptitudes in all respects equal if not superior to those of their masters; and, having applied themselves to the study of the technique, as it were, of their trades, having given to their employees a better technical education than has been given in England during some years past, they have overtaken their English competitors. Sir, I would like that our Canadian manufacturers, instead of relying solely upon the increase of duties to enable them to compete with foreign manufacturers, take a leaf out of the book of their continental neighbours, and give to their employees and to the young men growing up in their establishment, a better technical education than they have heretofore. Let them learn to rely on their own pluck, and their own energy, and less upon governmental interference and governmental pap. Sir, upon this point I would like to repeat certain words which were used lately by Sir Henry Fowler, in a speech which he delivered at Wolverhampton:

In this respect (technical education) foreigners were ahead of England, and attached more importance to it. In foreign countries they made greater sacrifices for it, and did not grumble at the expense. In this country we want it very much on the lines of technical instruction for foremen and better class artisans. In a competition between two manufacturing countries, the country where the manufacturing population has the better technical education, was more favourably equipped and had a distinct advantage in the markets of the world.

Now, Sir, as we are situated, here we are

a manufacturing country, in fierce competition with our neighbours to the south. If we want to succeed and beat them, we must also adopt a line of better technical education for our foremen, and better class artisans; and if we look to our own enterprise and our own energy, we will be much more likely to succeed than if we rely altogether upon government support and government patronage. Now, before I sit down, I want to call attention to the industry which the hon. gentleman from Pictou said had been so marvellously developed under the National Policy, that is the iron industry. From 1867 to 1879, that is a period of twelve years, pig iron was free in this country. There was a duty of 5 cents on bar and wrought iron, and coal was free. That was under the Mackenzie revenue tariff, to which we desire to return. What was the result of that? All kinds of manufactures into which iron entered, were encouraged, especially the manufacture of agricultural implements. I need not speak of that, because it has been done already by those better acquainted with the details than I am. But in 1879 we had the introduction of the thin end of the wedge of protection, so far as iron is concerned, with \$2 on pig iron, 17½ per cent on bar iron, and so on in proportion. But in 1883 we, for the first time, gave a bounty of \$1.50 on pig iron; and then, in 1887, came the drastic measure proposed by the present Secretary of State, when the pig iron duties were raised to \$4 or \$4.50 for the long ton, puddled bars, \$9, bar and plate and hoop iron, \$13, and so on in proportion. Now, the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Casey) gave, this afternoon, what I intended to give if he had not done so, the promise made by Sir Charles Tupper at that time to induce Parliament to levy this heavy exaction upon the Canadian people. He promised that 20,000 men would be brought into the country, adding 100,000 to our population; and there was no reason, he said, why we should not steadily progress to the point of manufacturing all the iron we used, and this increase of 100,000 would be trebled and become 300,000. We would have furnaces in Carleton County, N.B., and all the way out to the Rocky Mountains and British Columbia. Iron was to be made in the country, and our manufacturers were to use our iron, and the development was to take place all along the line. What was the result of these additional duties? I say the result was, summarizing it, to double the price of nearly every piece of hardware, from a tenpenny nail up, and I have made close and accurate inquiries on this subject. Further, it almost wiped out the hardware importing business of the country. This was a very important trade before, and it received a shock from which it has not recovered to this day, by the imposition of the iron duties of that time. It also materially and prejudicially

affected the shipping of the country. It increased to Canadian producers the prices of every article into the manufacture of which iron enters, to the extent of from 50 to 100 per cent, thus adding \$3,000,000 or \$4,000,000 to the taxation. Take up the Trade and Navigation Returns to-day, and hon. members will see that the amount of duty paid on iron and steel manufactures has varied from \$2,000,000 to \$3,000,000 per year, while the duties levied on the people altogether, directly and indirectly, come to \$3,000,000 or \$4,000,000, at the very least. It has not produced, I need scarcely say, either blast furnaces or an increased population. What was the result? The rolling mill men, constantly on the watch, as such men always are on the watch, to make what they can out of these wretched tariff exactions, got a clause put in the tariff allowing scrap iron to be imported at two dollars a ton. The result was, that they raked heaven and earth to buy scrap iron, and scrap iron was imported here from every part of the world, and we have the authority of the Finance Minister for the statement that the dealers were enabled to import it so cheaply that there was not a pound of Canadian pig iron manufactured into bar iron, but that it was all made up of scrap iron imported from abroad. In order to make assurances doubly sure, those men formed themselves into wire nail combines, tack combines, bar-iron combines, nail combines and other combines in every branch of the iron and steel trade. I acknowledge that these duties have by the tariff of 1894 been changed, and are now more equalized. What is the result? American iron has become so cheap that, even with comparatively lower duties, we cannot compete. In Montreal, Scotch iron is largely used, while American iron is coming in. In Toronto, American iron is almost exclusively used. The member from Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) quoted from letters from Massey, Harris & Co., stating that they used some Canadian iron, but the quantity, I am assured, is very small. As a matter of fact, by far the largest proportion of iron used is iron manufactured in the United States, and Ontario manufacturers under this policy are handicapped to the tune of \$5 on every long ton of iron they use, besides 60 cents per ton on every ton of coal. While this is going on and we are taking duties from the people amounting to from \$2,000,000 to \$2,500,000 on iron and steel, and bringing these iniquitous combines into existence to fleece the people and compel our people to go and buy iron abroad, what is the effect on the production of pig iron in this country? As a matter of fact, we produced very little more pig iron last year than fifteen years ago. I find, speaking in round numbers, that the whole quantity manufactured in Canada for the year 1884 was 28,000 tons; for 1885,

25,000 tons ; 1886, 27,000 tons ; 1887, 39,000 tons ; 1888, 22,000 tons ; 1889, 25,000 tons ; 1890, 26,000 tons ; 1891, 20,000 tons ; 1892, 30,000 ; 1893, 47,000 tons ; 1894, 62,500 tons, and last year, 1895, it dropped to 36,000 tons. Why did it drop ? It dropped because iron became so cheap in the United States, that notwithstanding the enormous protection given to it in Canada of a duty of \$4 per ton, on pig iron, and the bounty of \$2 per ton, aggregating a protection of \$6 per ton, Ontario manufacturers are forced to go and buy iron in the United States, because they can buy it cheaper there. We imported last year 34,000 tons of pig iron from abroad, about the same quantity we manufactured in the country on an expenditure of \$72,000 in the shape of bounties.

I will close my remarks by summing up shortly why I, for one, oppose this National Policy. I submit that protection has blighted our trade and commerce ; it has produced stagnation and commercial atrophy in the maritime provinces, at least ; it has caused an alarming exodus of our population ; it has helped to destroy our shipping interests ; it has depreciated our farming lands ; it has caused an unfair distribution of wealth ; it has encouraged extravagant expenditure, with all its attending evils ; it has prevented us enjoying the cheap goods of the world, while we have had to sell our surplus products in the cheap markets ; it unjustly levied unnecessary taxation for the development of special industries, without compensating the people taxed ; and it has discriminated against British trade.

Mr. MCGILLIVRAY. Where has it depreciated land values ?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It has depreciated land values in this very simple way, by driving people out of the country, and, as population decreases, the price of land invariably falls. It is a rule as certain as the rising of the sun.

Mr. MCGILLIVRAY. Have our lands depreciated in proportion to the depreciation to the south of us ?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) That has nothing to do with it. The same system is in force there, and the same system has had the same results.

Mr. MACDONALD (P.E.I.) How is it in England ?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I will tell the hon. gentleman in a few minutes. The hon. gentleman imagines that in England farming interests are depressed. That is the one industry in England that has not increased. Does the hon. gentleman know why ? Farming in England is in a depressed condition because of the heavy rents which farmers have to pay.

Mr. MCGILLIVRAY. They do not have to pay the rents they were obliged to pay fifteen years ago.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman is mistaken. The hon. member for King's (Mr. Macdonald) laughs. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman has made himself acquainted with this branch of the subject, but I wish him to understand that within the last week I have made a rather extended study of this branch of this subject, and I have gone to Mulhall and examined the statistics, and I find that the rents to-day are larger than they were fifteen years ago. In England the amount paid for rent is as large as that paid for labour. There was a report brought down to the British Parliament only a few years ago, prepared by a commission, at the head of which was no less a personage than the Duke of Devonshire, and it shows the value of the produce, the cost of labour and the total expenditure. As regards twelve farms the rent is given relatively to the cost of labour, and I will ask the hon. gentleman's close attention to these figures : Farm No. 1 : cost of labour, £177 ; rent paid, £200. Farm No. 2 : cost of labour, £1,000 ; rent, rates and taxes, £1,098. No. 3 farm, cost of labour, £458, while the rent was £505. No. 4 farm, cost of labour, £243, while the rent was £475. No. 5 farm, cost of labour, £576, while the rent and the tithes together were £1,085. No. 6 farm, cost of labour, £480, and the rent, £555. No. 7 farm, cost of labour, £822, and the rent, rates and taxes, £942. No. 8 farm, cost of labour, £80, and the rent and tithes, £136. No. 9 farm, cost of labour, £20, and rent and taxes, £197. No. 10 farm, cost of labour, £718, and the rent and taxes, £880. No. 11 farm, cost of labour, £348, and the rent, £443. No. 12 farm, cost of labour, £360, and the rent and tithes, £1,203.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). Is not the tax included in that rent ?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) In some of them the taxes are included, but I want to show the hon. gentleman that, from the evidence taken before that Devonshire commission on the twelve farms that were given, the rent and taxes exceeded largely, in many cases, and in all cases equalled the cost of the labour on the farm. The hon. gentleman (Mr. McGillivray) will see the impossibility of making farming pay, when I tell him that the rents—although they are not paid at the same rate to-day as they were fifteen years ago—are kept up at the same rate. They cannot get the same money paid in, but they never yet reduced the rents. The rents in England were fixed shortly after the wonderful increase in values, and the good times of 1870, and ever since, the struggle has been on the part of those who were interested in the land in England, to keep the rents up. It would not be human nature if they did not try to keep the rents up, and, in that respect, they are not more selfish than any other class of the community. They want to get the rents if they can ; but the people are unable to pay these rents, and why ?

It is because of the markets of the world which have been thrown open, and the competition which the English agriculturist has to meet, in the wheat from Argentine, and from India, and from Russia, and from the United States, and from Canada. And, hampered as he is with the enormous rent and taxes he has to pay, the farmer in England, of course, feels himself handicapped, and the agricultural industry is depressed for that reason.

But, does the hon. gentleman (Mr. McGillivray) imagine that the panacea which is offered in this House, from time to time, for the ills of the English agriculturist would do him any good? What good would it do the English farmer to tax foreign corn and let Canadian corn in free? If you tax Canadian corn, or all corn that comes to the country, what would be the effect? Why, the effect would be to enable the landlords to get the rents which to-day they cannot get. If the hon. gentleman doubts my word, I will give him the words of a man whom hon. gentlemen opposite are very fond of citing of late years:

"One effect of such duties," says the Right Hon. Henry Chaplin, "was undoubtedly to very materially enhance the price of the produce of the land, and thus to increase its value."

Its value being the rent the landlords get for it.

But a much more important man than Mr. Chaplin, says: The owners of property, those who are interested in the existing state of things, the men who have privileges to maintain, would be glad to entrap you from the right path, by raising the cry of fair trade under which they cover their demand: protected industry; and in connection with which they would tax the food of the people, in order to raise the rent of the landlord.

That was said by the Right Hon. Joseph Chamberlain, the present Colonial Secretary. The hon. gentleman (Mr. McGillivray) therefore will see that if agriculture is depressed in Great Britain, it is neither coincident with, nor in consequence of free trade prevailing in that country; but it is coincident with, and in consequence of, the extraordinary area of the world's surface which has been opened up to the production of cheap cereals, and to the fact that they are brought into England in competition with the English farmers' products, the English farmer being hampered at the same time with a rental far in excess of the entire value of much of the land in Canada.

Mr. MCGILLIVRAY. Not as large as it was fifteen years ago.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I may tell the hon. gentleman that although the landlord is not able to collect as much rent as he did fifteen years ago, yet he retains the same rent roll.

Mr. MCGILLIVRAY. They practically remit a portion of the rent.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) They practically remit from year to year.

Mr. MCGILLIVRAY. And the lands have gone down in value there greater than here.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Lands have gone down in value, but not so much as the hon. gentleman imagines.

Mr. POWELL. Would the hon. gentleman allow me to ask him one question? Does not the report of that commission, of which the Duke of Devonshire was chairman, state that there has been a practical reduction of rents in England, ranging all the way from 15 to 50 per cent?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I do not mean to say that I have read the report with such accuracy as to enable me to deny what the hon. gentleman says. But I will give him Mulhall's Dictionary of Statistics, where the rental of Great Britain is given for 1893 as compared with 1873.

Mr. MCGILLIVRAY. The real rental or the nominal rental?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Mulhall does not use the word "nominal." He gives it as "rental," and I have a right to assume he means the real rental. He shows that the rental is a little larger now than it was twenty years ago. I frankly admit from my own personal knowledge and reading, that many of the landlords have not been able to collect from the tenants the rents they charge. What then? Will taxing the food of the people enable them to do it? Probably it will. It will give a higher price for all the corn which the people of England have to consume. It will give the farmers there higher prices. It will enable the farmers to pay the rent, but it will not put a dollar into the farmers' pockets. It will increase the landlord's rent and that is about all it will do. Any man who studies the question, Mr. Speaker, will see that the enormous rentals which are exacted from the English tenants is one cause of the extraordinary depression which has existed in the agricultural industry in England, and now, Sir, I will close my remarks by thanking the gentlemen for their attention, and by repeating the words which the Right Hon. Joseph Chamberlain only a few days ago addressed to some colonial gentlemen who waited upon him. Speaking with reference to the colonies, he said:

Develop your resources, encourage your native industries. Trade will diversify as population increases. Rely on yourselves, and not on duties, and you may become then a great nation.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). I did not intend to make any remarks on this Budget debate, but after listening to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davies) this afternoon, I thought I would be hardly doing my duty to myself, or to the county which I have the honour to represent, if I allowed this debate to pass without having something to say.

I do not believe in talking much; I do not believe in talking unless you have an object in doing so. I have an object in talking to-night, which is by no means to bore the House; but I would ask the indulgence of the House for a few moments. When I took my seat this evening, I was surprised to hear the hon. member who has just taken his seat (Mr. Davies, P.E.I.) make the remarks he did in reference to the free breakfast table. If there is anything Canada is proud of to-day it is her breakfast table, which is free to all intents and purposes, notwithstanding what the hon. gentleman has said. What do we find upon that breakfast table? In the first place, we find flour. Flour is taxed, to be sure; but does not Canada make its own flour? I am from the maritime provinces, and I have had the temerity, not only in 1887, but in 1891, to stand upon the hustings and say: "Gentlemen, return me to Parliament, and I shall be willing to advocate a duty of \$2.50 a barrel on flour, and still it will not increase the price of flour in Canada one jot or tittle." And what I said in Annapolis I say here. Talk to the people of Canada to-day about the price of flour. Why, when a barrel of flour gets below the price of \$5, it is not worth talking about; it is hardly worth eating. Then, we have bacon and pork on the breakfast table. Will the hon. gentleman from Prince Edward Island stand up in this House and say that he will advocate a reduction of the duty on pork? Hon. gentlemen opposite say that tariff reduction was enunciated by the Liberals in convention in 1893, but they do not specify one single article on which they will reduce the duty. If the hon. member for Queen's will stand up in his place to-day and say that when the Liberals come into power he will advocate a reduction of the duty on pork, I will pause and allow him to say it.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I have no hesitation in telling the hon. gentleman that pork will have to be treated just the same as any other article in the general reduction of duties. I presume that a reduction will be made on that as on everything else.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). "I presume." The hon. gentleman will not say so. He gets on his feet to reply to me, and he says nothing when he does reply. What else have we on the breakfast table? We have tea. The National Policy has taken the duties off tea. It has also reduced the duties on sugar, and made it so free that the poorest people can now have sugar, whereas previously they had to be satisfied with Black Jack molasses. Then look at the other articles we have on the breakfast table. Take knives and forks. We produce our own iron, we have our own coal, we have the labour, and we have the money in Canada to produce them. Are these articles not essentially free? Take the table itself. We have the woods in the forests of Canada,

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis).

and we have the men and the money to produce it. We do not have to go abroad to buy any of these things.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Will the hon. gentleman answer me a question? Do the duties laid on flour and pork and the other articles used at the breakfast table enhance the prices of those articles?

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). They preserve the market for these articles in Canada. You can to-day buy a barrel of flour in Canada at retail cheaper than you can in the city of Boston; I know that of my own certain knowledge. The same is true of sugar. The hon. gentleman has compared the price of sugar in Canada with the price of sugar in Great Britain. His comparison is not fair, because he does not compare the same grades of sugar at all.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I did take the same grades.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). There is one grade of sugar in Great Britain and another grade in Canada; but if you take the same grade in both countries, I say that sugar is manufactured and sold as cheap in Canada as it is in England or any other country in the world. Sugar is a very sorry article for hon. gentlemen to select to prove their contention; because we can recollect that not many years ago it was a common thing for people to get only ten pounds of sugar for a dollar, whereas now in a country store you can buy as many as twenty-six pounds of sugar for a dollar. I am astonished at the hon. gentleman mentioning sugar as a ground for attacking the National Policy. If there is one thing I congratulate the Opposition on, it is this: that by means of the National Policy the Liberal Conservatives of Canada have made them good and loyal British subjects. Why, we do not hear any talk now of going to Washington for the sign by which to conquer. We do not have any excursions down to Boston to the boot and shoe trades union. We do not have any speeches made in New York. We do not have any people going in private cars down to Kentucky following Wiman, for the sign by which to conquer. No, the Opposition are looking to England now, and who has taught them to look to England? It has been the Liberal-Conservatives of Canada and the National Policy. The hon. leader of the Opposition smiles. He has talked a great deal in the United States and in Canada about sentiment. Perhaps he forgets some of the things he has said in regard to that. In 1888, on the 13th day of August, the hon. leader of the Opposition made a speech at Oakville, Ont., in which he said:

I read the prints of Ontario and I know that every day these people weep tears because they feel that if unrestricted reciprocity is adopted it must lead us into annexation. Well, I have only this to say. It is a great argument in

favour of unrestricted reciprocity, because if it means anything at all it means that the change will be so advantageous to the people that they will want to go into the still closer union with the United States. Sir, it is very well to be sentimental but after all sentiment is not business.

That is what he said in Canada when talking to a Canadian audience; but when he is in Boston, talking in the Vendome Hotel, what does he say with reference to sentiment? This is an extract from his speech there in 1891, as reported in the "Globe," of November 27th, 1891, and surely he will not dispute that:

Mr. Blaine said referring to the reciprocity treaty of 1854: "He was free to admit that that treaty was not abrogated on commercial grounds, but in consequence of the feeling that had grown up that Canada had sympathized with the Southern States in their conflict." With this statement I, as a Canadian, can find no fault. The American people had then too just a cause to be incensed against Canada. I would not at this board accuse my own country, much as I could in anything believe it in the wrong, but I am relieved from any anxiety in that respect because what I say here I have again and again stated in my own country. I am a Liberal of Liberals. I was at that time too young to speak but old enough to feel, and since I came to man's estate, time and again on the floor of Parliament, on public platforms, I have declared that in my opinion the conduct of England, of Canada, towards the United States during the war was a disgrace to the civilization of England, of Canada. The American people could fight their own battles, they required no help, but when they were engaged in a supreme struggle for the life or death of this great nation, when they were fighting for a cause as great, as holy as ever engaged the devotion of men, when they had reason to expect the outspoken sympathy of those nearest to them, it was galling that southern privateers could be built, manned and equipped in England with the passive connivance of the British Government to destroy American commerce on the high sea. It was galling that rebel refugees could find shelter in Canada, and then with impunity and without provoking condemnation plot abominable crimes to help secession.

That was the hon. gentleman's idea with reference to sentiment when he was in the United States. Sentiment there counted for something. He praised the people of the United States; he commended them because they did not look to business but allowed their sentiment to abrogate the treaty which they had at that time with Canada. But in Canada, sentiment counts for nothing. Sentiment here is very good, but give him business first. He said:

And then with impunity and without provoking condemnation, plot abominable crimes to help secession.

Yes, the hon. gentleman is very fierce in condemning secession in the United States; but when he comes to Canada he is nothing loath to send for a man to assist him in forming a Government, who has been in the very hot bed of secession. When this

late crisis which we have heard so much about took place, what did rumour say with reference to the hon. gentleman? Rumour said that he had telegraphed from Montreal to the Hon. Mr. Fielding to come and assist him in forming a Government. Well, the Hon. Mr. Fielding was steeped in secession in 1886. He plotted a most damnable crime of manhood and was assisted by his colleagues of that time, the Hon. Attorney General of Nova Scotia being one. They were steeped in secession and annexation.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I call the hon. gentleman to order. He has no right to make the charge that Mr. Fielding was steeped in annexation. It is a foul slander.

Mr. SPEAKER. I am unable to rule that the hon. member for Annapolis is out of order in making reference to any person outside of Parliament.

Mr. HAZEN. I rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman referred to my hon. friend from Annapolis as being guilty of a foul slander. He ought to withdraw that expression.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think that the hon. gentleman should withdraw that.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Certainly if you say so, I withdraw it in the parliamentary sense. I await to see whether the hon. member for Annapolis has the manliness to withdraw the statement he made charging Mr. Fielding with being an annexationist.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). If I said that Mr. Fielding was an annexationist I withdraw it, because I did not mean to say that; but I will not withdraw my statement that the Attorney General of Nova Scotia is an annexationist, because I can prove it by his own words. When the hon. leader of the Opposition was in the United States he was horrified at people plotting the abominable crime of secession; but when he is in Canada and wants to form a government, he does not hesitate to send for these people who, in 1886 and 1887, upon every stump in Nova Scotia, talked secession and talked of breaking up the union. That was the issue, and nothing else was the issue in the province of Nova Scotia. I have plenty of extracts to prove this, and I have no need to say it to the people there, because they understand it perfectly well. They know perfectly well that in 1886 that was the real issue—the breaking up of this union.

Mr. BOWERS. What of it?

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). What of it? You, a Canadian, you say what of it—I am astonished that there should be a representative in this House to-day who would say "what of it?" when we talk of breaking up the union.

Mr. BOWERS. Cannot a Nova Scotian be as loyal as a Canadian?

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). To be sure, we have hundreds of thousands of good loyal British subjects. The young men of Nova Scotia are rising in their might and putting their iron heel upon the reptile secession and the reptile annexation. If there is anything I have talked against since I came into politics, it has been this most abominable crime of secession. Look in the "Parliamentary Companion," and in 1887, I there told the people that I held the matter of annexation in supreme contempt, and I did. And even my friends in 1887 asked me not to go too far in that, as I might lose a few votes, because I held the annexation sentiment and the secession sentiment in contempt as reptile sentiments. I say that one of the most deplorable crimes ever perpetrated on the country was committed by these Liberals in Nova Scotia when, for the purpose of gaining a victory, they brought forward that question of repeal. But the leader of the Opposition has brought this secession right down to date, because if rumour be true—and if he rises in his seat and says it is not true, of course. I will accept his denial, as everybody will—but if rumour is true Mr. Fielding was telegraphed for to come into the Government which was to be formed by the hon. leader of the Opposition. And not only was it true that he was to come to that government, but he was to run for office in the county of Annapolis. I have it on good authority that the leader of the Opposition telegraphed to Mr. Fielding, and Mr. Fielding telegraphed to the clerk of the municipality of the county of Annapolis to the effect that he would accept the nomination in Annapolis county. I say that if there is one thing upon which I congratulate the Opposition, it is upon the fact that we are making them loyal British subjects. We hear nothing now talked about the United States.

Mr. BERGERON. What about Dominion day?

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). I was going to refer to that. This matter has been brought down not only by the hon. leader of the Opposition but also by the Nova Scotia government itself. The other day there was a motion brought up in the local house, lately prorogued in Nova Scotia,—and it was brought up of course by a Liberal-Conservative—that Dominion Day be given as a school holiday throughout Nova Scotia, and that motion was voted down. It was voted down in this provincial legislature led by the Hon. Mr. Fielding, who was to be the would-be colleague in the would-be government of the hon. leader of the Opposition.

We have heard a great deal of talk about the Liberal policy. We have heard it read by different hon. gentlemen in the Opposition—the policy that was launched upon this country in 1893 by the 2,000 delegates who had assembled here in Ottawa. Well, they have changed their policy a good deal since.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis).

The hon. member who preceded me (Mr. Davies) said that that is the policy of the Liberal party and that no power, not even the leader of the Opposition himself, can change it. His words were:

And there is no power under heaven to change it—not even the leader of the Opposition himself—to change that policy.

But the leader of the Opposition has evidently done his best to change that policy, for what has he been saying, not later than 1895? When you place his utterances of 1895 alongside his utterances of 1889, the contrast is extremely funny. In 1889, that is, before the Grit convention of 1893, Mr. Laurier, speaking in Toronto, on 30th September, said:

I have read history in this way that every reform has cost to the Reformers years of labour, and these years of labour I, for one,—

A great big "I."

—am prepared to give; and though the Democrats may be defeated in the States and though Canadians may grow faint-hearted in Canada, the Liberal party, so long as I have anything to do with it, will remain true to the cause of unrestricted reciprocity until that cause is successful. I will not expect to win in a day—

I do not think he will be disappointed there.

—but I am prepared to remain in the cool shades of opposition until the cause has triumphed.

That was his position in 1889. Well, they had this Grit convention in 1893, and, being bolstered up by patriotic gentlemen like Sir Oliver Mowat, and others, they have, to a considerable extent, changed their platform and they have made it extremely extensive and extremely general. But, notwithstanding that extremely extensive and extremely general platform, Mr. Laurier, in Montreal, on the 22nd January, 1895, said:

The Liberal party believe in free trade on broad lines, such as exist in Great Britain—

Nothing about the United States of America here.

—and their immediate object is a revenue tariff.

It is the revenue they are after.

A tariff to be derived from customs, but which will levy no duties except for the purposes of revenue. For means of government, for all economic principle, I go to the land of sound government and sound common sense—old England.

There is no talking of a trip in private cars to Kentucky, or Florida, or New York, or Boston. The National Policy and the Liberal-Conservatives have taught them better manners and better sense.

It is from that land that I take my theories, and upon that platform, exemplified as I have told you, the Liberal party of Canada will fight the next battle.

But everything is general: there is nothing specific with reference to it. The only time

he ever approached anything like a specific statement was at Winnipeg, in 1894 :

When the Liberal party comes into power we shall examine very closely as to which is the best way to raise the amount necessary for carrying on the affairs of government.

They thoroughly understood, as every one of common sense must understand, that we must have money to carry on the Government. You cannot carry on any government without money, and that money must come from the people. The politician who teaches any doctrine different from that, is either a knave or a fool.

We shall, I say, examine the proper objects upon which to levy taxation. We shall make it as easy as possible upon things which are necessary, and, indeed, are the necessities of life for the people. We will also make taxation as light as possible upon all things which have to be used by the common people.

He takes good care not to go into details and tell the people what they are.

To get the money which will be lost if we take off some of the present taxation, and to make up the deficit which will arise, it will be necessary to get an addition from some other sources. This will be attempted to be done in this manner : In the first place there will be a difference made in the present tax imposed upon raw materials to be used for manufactured articles.

Then there is a great big full stop, and nothing more is said with reference to that. There is nothing specific, nothing by which the people can judge what their policy is, or whether the duties they will impose are likely to be less burdensome than those now in existence. There is nothing but a large platform of generalities.

Now, as I said, if there is one thing I congratulate the Opposition upon, it is their loyalty to England. We had some fine speeches when the resolution of my hon. friend from North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) was before the House. Why, I cheered the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), and so did other members on this side. It really did one's heart good to hear the expressions of loyalty at that time. But there has been a great change, and it would not be any wonder to me if Canada should say, in the words of Shakespeare—and I quote it with all deference to the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), who seems to have a copyright on Shakespeare, so far as this House is concerned :

Why should I think you can be mine and true,
Though you in swearing shake the throned Gods,
Who have been false to Fulvia.

They have been false to Fulvia. Not the Liberal party, not by any means the Liberal party, but many of the leaders of that party have been entirely false to Fulvia. They have been preaching annexation—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). A good many of them have. Their papers have been preaching annexation.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). I say, yes, and I will prove it in a moment. Their papers have been preaching annexation and have been saying that there is a large annexation sentiment in Canada. Take the papers of the United States from 1886 up to date, and I have gone to the trouble of getting extracts from a number of them, which I have here. They teem with assertions that there is a great annexation sentiment in Canada. They quote the speeches of public men, they read between the lines of speeches of public men of the Liberal party in Canada and assert distinctly and emphatically that there cannot but be a large and growing annexation sentiment in Canada. If there was ever a foul slander, this is one. I say, there is not a growing annexation or secession sentiment in Nova Scotia notwithstanding what the hon. member for Digby (Mr. Bowers) says. He may preach annexation ; he may preach secession.

Mr. BOWERS. I rise to point of order—

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). I have never seen the reptile there.

Mr. BOWERS. I did not say there was a growing sentiment of annexation or secession in Nova Scotia.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). An incident took place in Nova Scotia, and I doubt very much that it has ever been heard of in this House. On 21st June, 1887,—that was during my first Parliament here—the Queen's jubilee was celebrated. It was a time when all loyal Canadians and all loyal British subjects did do their utmost to do honour to the glorious old woman—and I say that with the utmost respect—who rules over the destinies of this Empire. The government of Nova Scotia—at that time led by the Hon. Mr. Fielding, gave orders that no British flag should be hoisted on the provincial parliament buildings. That is the very same gentleman that the leader of the Opposition called upon to assist in forming his Government, when he thought His Excellency was going to call upon him to form a Government. It placed on its flag-staff on the Provincial Buildings in Halifax the colours of a defunct trading company.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). What is the hon. gentleman reading from ?

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). I am asserting what I know to be a fact, and I know that there are gentlemen in this House to-night who will corroborate what I say. While on the same day the Halifax "Chronicle" ran up the Stars and Stripes—

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). Is that a Tory paper ?

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). We all know what the Halifax "Chronicle" is, it is the organ of the local government in Nova Scotia, and it ran up the Stars and Stripes upon the Queen's jubilee in 1887. Did you ever suppose that a Conservative paper would run up the Stars and Stripes? At the same time, a member of the "Chronicle" staff was a reporter for a leading Boston paper, and in his report to this Boston paper of the celebration of the Queen's jubilee, he explained this Halifax "Chronicle" incident as follows:—

The "Chronicle" has never advocated annexation, but it has very warmly espoused the cause of commercial union with the United States. This may be all that it intended to support, but the popular interpretation is that it intends to come out squarely for annexation.

And of the action of the local government, he says:

This was done by order of the local government, and is taken as an indication that the policy of the Government is Nova Scotia first, and that it will not be influenced by the sentiment of loyalty to the British Throne in shaping the future destiny of the province. There is no doubt that in this they give voice to the most enlightened sentiment of the people here.

Is that not precisely on the same lines as the speech of the hon. member for South Oxford at Oakville, made just about the same time? All he cares about is business. It is business first, sentiment afterwards. It was business first and sentiment afterwards with the "Chronicle," and the "Chronicle" ran up the Stars and Stripes. This was never denied. The paper has never denied this report. They all saw it, the "Chronicle" saw it. But, in addition, the "Chronicle" told its readers:

There is nothing dishonourable attaching to the charge that certain gentlemen are annexationists.

There is nothing dishonourable, says the "Chronicle." They can be annexationists, and still be honourable men. They can be traitors, and still be honourable men. And on the following day it merely postponed the use of:

Annexation as a remedy now when no constituency, or no considerable number of constituencies, could be got to support it.

It recognized the fact that there was a true and loyal sentiment in Nova Scotia, and in the rest of Canada. It recognized the fact that there was no constituency or no number of constituencies that could be got to support it, but at the same time the "Chronicle" declared:

Nobody can predict when a crisis in our history may create an enormous and irresistible sentiment in favour of seeking political union with the United States.

They were coquetting with the United States then. They were going down to Boston. The leader of the Opposition was

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis).

going there, the member for South Oxford was going there, the Attorney General of Nova Scotia was there, and he made a howling speech in New York, which he never delivered. That seems very funny, but it is true. It is no use in going into that now, but I will reserve it for a future occasion. Now, the Halifax "Chronicle" of August 20th, 1888, referring to the Oakville speech of the hon. member for South Oxford, said:

These clear and sensible words are in striking contrast to the toadying utterances which meet one on all sides. They are honest, manly and healthy.

You see, Mr. Speaker, that sentiment was going all along the line. You see it originated at Oakville, you see it coming from the hon. leader of the Opposition, you see it coming from the hon. member for South Oxford. The Halifax "Chronicle" goes on to say:

They bid Canadians look those most important pending questions straight in the face. These matters are worthy of frank and full discussion. There is no need of beating about the bush. Our present political relations cannot always exist.

Just exactly what the hon. member for South Oxford said in his Oakville speech, and also said in his Boston speech. He said upon the floor of this House that he was prepared to stand by his Boston speech, and thus brought it down to date. The "Chronicle" goes on to say:

Why should our public men, whose business it is to grapple with all the vital questions, speak of them with bated breath? Are we such a cowardly lot of people that we do not want to know the truth and act accordingly? Besides, an attempt has been made in the Tory press—

Good for the Tory press, I say. They could not pay a better compliment to the Tory press than by saying that of them—

—to resist all who venture to express a candid opinion on these topics. The hour for open and fearless discussion has arrived, and Sir Richard has gallantly led the way.

The leader of the Opposition was at Oakville along with the hon. member for South Oxford, and the "Chronicle" and all the Liberals along the line got the cue, and pointed out the speech to their friends as leading directly to annexation. The Halifax "Chronicle" says so. I do not say so, because if I did, I would be only a Tory and be biassed. But those are the words of the Halifax "Chronicle," and are its interpretation of this Oakville speech by the hon. member for South Oxford, who was accompanied by the leader of the Opposition. Now, let us take the Acadian "Recorder," which is generally called the two-cent Annanias of Halifax. In commenting on the member for South Oxford's speech, it saw the "Chronicle," and went one better, for it deliberately told the public and the Yankees that retaliation would force Can-

ada into annexation. No one need ask me whether it was a Liberal paper or not. This is what it says :

We are not so thin-skinned as to fear to express a candid view on the matter. We are told by the Tory press that the Americans will straightway hasten to apply the terrors of non-intercourse, should Canadians agree that retaliation would lead to annexation. But whether or no, the truth must be spoken, and we are of opinion that no surer method could be found to force Canada into the union than by putting on retaliation breaks. As things now stand, there is widespread dissatisfaction in this country, and many there are who would gladly vote for annexation.

A most foul slander, I repeat, a most foul slander, not only upon the province of Nova Scotia, but upon the whole Dominion of Canada. And still these Grit papers herald out these things to the United States, they are copied by the United States papers, and scattered over that country. Not only do we find them in the United States papers, but also in speeches of United States senators and public men, who are fairly bubbling over with the idea that Canada is anxious to come into the union. Then the "Recorder" goes on to say :

Should the retaliation millstone be tied about our necks in the meantime, the weight would soon carry us down into the currents of annexation.

Now, Sir, I think I have told you what I said I would. I told you I would read extracts to prove from the mouths of the Liberals themselves that they were in favour of annexation. I see by a paper this moment placed in my hands that this same Attorney General has been nominated in Annapolis county to oppose me at the next elections, the same gentleman who was in the Government that ordered the flag to be pulled down from a public building, and whose organ is the "Morning Chronicle," which paper ran up the Stars and Stripes in Nova Scotia.

Mr. FLINT. I rise to a point of order. The government of Nova Scotia never ordered the British flag to be run down from a public building. I deny it in toto, and I challenge the hon. gentleman to give the authority for his statement. He has no authority of any consequence whatever.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). I have read my authority.

Mr. FLINT. The hon. gentleman never gave the authority.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). It was so reported by the reporter of the Halifax morning "Chronicle," it was sent to the Boston "Herald" and copied into different papers in Nova Scotia; it was never denied, but it was referred to by the morning "Chronicle," which added to it. I defy any hon. gentleman to controvert that statement. I will give the hon. gentleman the papers

where he can ferret it out for himself. The hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint) knows perfectly well that it is true, and that they gained a victory in 1886 upon one of the most despicable cries ever raised in any province.

Mr. FLINT. As regards the alleged order, I deny it in toto. It was denied in toto at the time, and the correspondent of the paper who wrote to Boston was a Conservative, and wrote for the Halifax "Herald."

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. That is not a point of order.

Mr. FLINT. It is a denial, and I give it here.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The hon. gentleman may not have adduced evidence sufficient to satisfy the hon. gentleman. But as I understood it, the point of order was, that the hon. gentleman did not give the authority on which he founded his statement, nor state where he had found it. The hon. member for Annapolis has twice repeated his statement and given the evidence on which he founded it. No point of order has been established by the hon. gentleman opposite.

Mr. FLINT. The point of order was that the hon. gentleman had twice made a statement and said it was not denied. I denied it, and I stated so, and I deny it now from my place here.

Mr. SPEAKER. As to the point of order in regard to the expression made use of by the hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Mills), I question very much as to whether the hon. member for Yarmouth was not out of order in making his statement.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman twice stated that the hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint) could not deny it, and this was said in the hearing of everybody here.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The hon. gentleman gave his evidence.

Mr. FLINT. He gave no authority.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). I gave the authority. I state again that it is a matter of common repute. The hon. gentleman may rise to his feet and give it a bald denial, but I reassert it, and I am in as good a position to know what goes on in Nova Scotia as is the hon. gentleman. I have read extracts from the report which was actually made by the Halifax "Chronicle" reporter, sent to the Boston "Herald," copied in different papers throughout Canada, copied in papers in Nova Scotia, in the morning "Herald," and referred to in the "Chronicle" in the extracts I have read from that paper. The hon. gentleman although not having looked into these matters has yet taken on himself to contradict me, and to say this is not true. It is a matter of common repute in Nova Scotia; it is known there. I have

spoken in tones of great indignation on the stump in Annapolis with respect to this abominable secession Nova Scotia government carrying out such transactions. Is it not this and the refusal of a Dominion holiday to the school children, on a par? Will the hon. gentleman deny it?

Mr. FLINT. Yes, I will deny it. The hon. gentleman has said that the legislature of Nova Scotia would not allow the school children a public holiday on Dominion Day. I deny it in toto; there is not a shadow of foundation for the statement.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). The hon. gentleman is quibbling, if that is a parliamentary term.

Mr. SPEAKER. No.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). I take it back, because I thought myself it was going a little too far. The hon. gentleman is doing the same as I would do if I were to quibble.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). It is a sort of suppression of the truth—it is a suppression of the truth.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order. It is not quite parliamentary to make use of an expression of that kind.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). I will take it back at once because I desire to be parliamentary, but when I get talking on these matters as to loyalty and the way we have been used in Nova Scotia, I am very apt to drift into unparliamentary language. The hon. gentleman is not correct exactly. There was a motion made, I think by the hon. member for Pictou, in the local legislature to establish 1st of July as a Dominion holiday in Nova Scotia and establish it in the public schools. Is not that correct? That motion was voted down by every Liberal in the Nova Scotia legislature, and every Liberal-Conservative voted in favour of it.

An hon. MEMBER. Is that correct?

Mr. FLINT. If the hon. gentleman will permit me—

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). I will give the explanation—I do not want the hon. gentleman to make my speech. I ask if this statement is not correct, for I know it is. The Liberals get out of it by saying that nothing can prevent the trustees from allowing the holiday. But if so, the teachers will have to make it up or lose their pay. That is the only way the Liberals can get out of it, but there is no doubt of the fact that they voted down the motion to observe Dominion Day in Nova Scotia. This is the very same Attorney General, the agent of the Queen, who is supposed to be one of the most loyal British subjects, who is supposed to put his iron heel down on the reptile of annexation and secession or anything having treason and secession in it. He was one of the first

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis).

to vote for this motion, and he was one of the first to have a part in issuing this order that the flag be not raised on the provincial building in Halifax, but an old flag of some defunct company should be placed on the public building instead of our own British flag. This gentleman, according to the paper handed to me just now, has been nominated by the Liberals to oppose me, and when he comes here, and when they form that grand government they are going to form after the general elections, he will be asked to come into the fold in the same way as Mr. Snyder was.

Mr. BERGERON. If elected?

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). I think I will have something to say in regards to that. If he is elected, he will come here because he considers that all the rest of the Liberal members from Nova Scotia are political impossibilities. He has said so in regard to the hon. member for Guysboro' (Mr. Fraser), the hon. member for Yarmouth, and the hon. member for King's, and he thinks the hon. member for Queen's is nowhere. He is in fact one of the greatest of the political impossibilities in the eyes of this Attorney General. If he comes here there is no doubt that the leader of the Opposition will welcome this secessionist and annexationist, and this Attorney General may perhaps be Minister of Justice.

Mr. LAURIER. Why not? Did not Sir John Abbott sign the annexation manifesto in 1849?

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). If Sir John Abbott committed robbery why should you? This tu quoque argument is very good, but it will not answer principles. I am not here, however, to speak for Sir John Abbott. "Let the dead bury their dead; let us act in the living present." Hon. gentlemen opposite think that they may come to the Treasury benches, and I ask the leader of the Opposition if he is going to take such people into his Cabinet. If he is, the people of Canada want to understand it.

Mr. LAURIER. If I followed the Tory precedent I would.

Mr. MILL (Annapolis). Mr. Speaker, I shall say nothing more about those matters, nor do I intend to say very much further with reference to our policy. I was returned here in 1887 upon the National Policy. I fought the "Secesh" cry, I fought the repeal cry, I fought the annexation cry, and I was returned to Parliament upon the National Policy pure and simple, from a constituency in Nova Scotia that had direct dealings with the United States of America. The people of Annapolis, Nova Scotia, are not the blue ruin, down-trodden people that the Liberals think. The hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) went into the county of Annapolis, and endeavoured to make the people believe that they were going to ruin, and that their farms were depreciating in

value. But, Sir, he did not know the people to whom he was talking. Go to the county of Annapolis, go through the province of Nova Scotia from one end of it to the other, and although you will not find very rich men, you will find men who are comfortable. You will find farmers there who are laying by from \$200 to \$2,000 a year off their farms. You will find some, of course, who are going behindhand. Will you not find such people in every department of life? You will find lawyers who are going behind hand simply because they have not the brains to go ahead. I say, Sir, that the average farmer in the county of Annapolis is one of the best provided men on the face of the globe. So are the farmers throughout the province of Nova Scotia, and so they are all through Canada. It is a libel upon Canada for hon. gentlemen opposite to speak of great poverty in Canada, and to speak of the poor people we have in Ottawa. The citizens of Ottawa do not know what poor people are. Go to the slums of English cities, and there you will see poverty in all its squalid degradation. I have been through the city of Ottawa from one end to the other, and I have failed to see soup kitchens or any crowds of men seeking labour. If the honest man wants to earn an honest dollar he can earn it any day in the week. He can earn it in Nova Scotia, he can earn it anywhere in Canada. It is a libel upon Canada to say that this country is going to ruin by reason of the National Policy. The late lamented Sir John Thompson was a man whom I loved beyond all other men, a man that I had the highest regard for. I was with him frequently practising at the bar; I was under him when he was on the bench. I was proud to be his colleague in this House, and a nobler man I never had the pleasure of knowing. Death has done a great deal against the Liberal-Conservative party. Death has taken away two great leaders. I revered Sir John Macdonald, but I did not know him so well as I knew Sir John Thompson. Death also removed Sir John Abbott, but death did not make the changes in the Liberal leadership. Did death make a change in the leadership of the party when Mr. Mackenzie, that respected old gentleman, was thrown overboard? He entered this House without knowing he was pitched overboard by his party until he saw his seat occupied by the man who succeeded him. It just occurs to me now, Sir, that when I first came here in 1887, for two or three years, the leadership of the Liberal party was in commission. We had a leader from the maritime provinces, we had a leader from Ontario, we had a leader from Quebec, and a leader from somewhere else. There was no head to the party whatever; it was all in commission. Then we had the Hon. Edward Blake. Death did not remove the Hon. Edward Blake. He was an able man—there is no doubt about that in the

world—and the present leader of the Opposition (Mr. Laurier) is an able man. I am proud to hear, Sir, the general expressions of respect that those who know personally that hon. gentleman (Mr. Laurier) entertain for him. But he is wrong with reference to his policy. He is wrong with reference to his associates, and he is all wrong with reference to what he has done in his political life. There is not the slightest doubt about that, and the people of Canada will tell him so soon. They have told him so before, and they will tell him so again. Let me quote to the House the words of the late Sir John Thompson, who, announcing his policy in Pictou, N.S., after becoming the leader of the Conservative party, used the following words:—

We propose a tariff reform that will reduce the tariff as low as possible compatible with producing the revenue absolutely necessary to carry on the public services of the country and which will give the preference to Canadian workmen over foreigners, whether mechanics and manufacturers or farmers.

Where duties are levied we will levy them on articles that can and ought to be produced in Canada, and we will lighten the duties on articles that we cannot manufacture or produce and are obliged to import.

The Government is pledged to raise only the revenue the country actually needs, and to raise it by those methods that will be least felt by the great consuming masses. That pledge has been carried out by the abolition of the duties on tea, coffee, sugar, &c. If the Cartwright tariff for these articles were still in force, the people of Canada would be paying between \$8,000,000 and \$10,000,000 a year more customs taxes than they are now paying under the National Policy. We have shown our sincerity by abolishing the taxes on many of the necessaries of life and we propose to continue to reduce the duties as we are able.

Step by step as the United States makes a reduction of duties on articles of Canadian produce, the Canadian Government will take a corresponding step in lowering the duty on American products—and this has been Canada's statutory offer for years. Consistent with the necessities of the revenue the Canadian Government will do everything in its power to make trade freer between the two countries, without sacrificing our commercial independence, the control of our own tariff, or the bonds of our attachment to the mother country.

It is our aim and determination to build up Canadian industries from the Atlantic to the Pacific, in preference to aiding in developing the interests of foreign countries; and to do our part in developing and consolidating the glorious Empire to which we belong.

That, Sir, is the true Canadian policy. There is no doubt that if Sir John Thompson were alive to-day he would still go further with his policy and advocate the fast line of steamers that this Government intends to establish between Canada and Great Britain, encouraged as they are by the liberality of the Conservative Government of Great Britain. It is to this policy, Sir, that I pin my faith. It is on the National Policy that I will appeal to my constituents, and I have no doubt at all that if I live I will be the

candidate in Annapolis, N.S. What has this policy done for Canada? It is acknowledged by every one that Canada has progressed and prospered. I, in common with other of the young men of Canada, have faith in my country. Our young men who are springing up in Nova Scotia intend to blot out those old anti-confederation ideas that have been handed down from their forefathers. Our young men of Nova Scotia are coming out strong for Canada and strong for the Empire. This National Policy makes the interest of Canadians paramount to the interests of foreigners. As I have read from the words of our late lamented leader, it prevents Canada from being made a slaughter market for the surplus products of any other nation. It fully protects Canadian enterprise and industry, and it loyally refuses to consent to trade arrangements with foreign countries which in any way discriminate against Great Britain. It has been thrown in our teeth by the hon. member who last spoke, that this Government has a tariff against Great Britain, and is disloyal by reason of that tariff. I do not consider that we are disloyal for that reason. It would be extremely awkward, under existing circumstances, to make an exception of the articles that are produced in England. I think the mother country can get along very well if we do tax goods that come from there. She is not complaining of that.

It is a policy which gives confidence and stability to capital, ensures prosperity to our manufacturing industries, and enables our artisans to maintain a scale of wages far in excess of those which obtain in European countries. It retains our skilled artisans at home on wages that will enable them to live in comfort, and it has provided our farming population with a home market for many lines of agricultural products that cannot be exported. Our home market in Nova Scotia is a market which the farmers of that province know how to value. I do not wish it to be understood that, because I speak of Nova Scotia, I am by any means a provincialist. I am a little better acquainted with the province of Nova Scotia than with the province of Ontario; but I know perfectly well, that what obtains in the province of Nova Scotia, obtains to a larger extent in the province of Ontario and in the great North-west. This National Policy and the progressiveness of the Liberal-Conservative Government have kept Canada on the highway of national prosperity, while almost every other country has been suffering from severe commercial depressions. What has been the case in the United States. I have only to refer to the fact, which is within the knowledge of every gentleman within my hearing, that in that great country, with its 60,000,000 of population, they had a turn in their tariff not very long ago, and what was the result? Crash after crash went manufacturing throughout the country;

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis).

crash after crash went the banks. Where only one bank failed in a population of 5,500,000 in Canada, one bank failed in every 250,000 people in the United States. And why was that? It was because of the instability that resulted from the changes in the tariff.

This National Policy has enhanced our credit, and that is one of the great arguments in its favour. For there is no market so susceptible as the money market. It will vary at the slightest indication of prosperity or retrogression in any country, and there has been no retrogression, so far as Canada is concerned, in the money markets of the world. It has been all progression, and Canada stands to-day in the money markets of the world higher than she has ever done before. That is an incontrovertible argument in favour of the great progress Canada has made, and in favour of the stability of the National Policy. This policy has encouraged and developed inter-provincial trade, and welded together this vast Dominion into a homogeneous whole. And just here it is recalled to my mind, that the hon. Attorney General of Nova Scotia has frequently said in the province of Nova Scotia, more particularly in the county of Annapolis, that there has been no inter-provincial trade between Nova Scotia and the upper provinces. He has gone to the people of Granville Ferry, many of whom were made wealthy by their ship-building industry, and he has said to them time and again: "Where has a prow of your vessels ever been pointed to Ontario or Quebec? We have no interprovincial trade." He has even gone so far as to say: "Bring an Ontario man down, and exhibit him at 10 cents a head and a fortune would be made, for people will rush to see him as a curiosity." But the Attorney General has changed his mind as to interprovincial trade. What has changed it? The same thing that has changed hon. gentlemen opposite from looking to the United States to find a sign with which to conquer, into loyal citizens who now look to good old England. The same thing has caused the Attorney General of Nova Scotia to see that we have built up a vast interprovincial trade throughout the whole Dominion of Canada, from one ocean to the other. This policy has already produced among Canadians a feeling of security, of national pride, of commercial and industrial independence, without which no people can ever attain to the acme of national prosperity. This policy has been sustained by the votes of three general elections; and by the votes of another general election the very same old policy will be again sustained. And, in response to these popular verdicts, what has been the result accruing from the National Policy? No less a sum than \$200,000,000 has been invested in manufacturing industries in this country since the inauguration of the policy in 1879. Hon. gentlemen on the other side

of the House, time and again, during this session, as well as in previous sessions, have stood up in this House and have ridiculed the census returns by taking note of the little manufactories scattered throughout the towns and villages of our country. I tell you, Mr. Speaker, it is the little manufactories that I am proud of. It is the little manufactories that show the strength of the country. Their existence proves that capital and labour have been disseminated and scattered throughout the country, and not clustered or congested. Nothing imperils the security of capital or paralyzes industrial enterprise more surely or quickly than uncertainty as to the fiscal policy of the country. This has been exemplified in the United States. We do not want it exemplified here, and the people of Canada do not want it exemplified here, and they will speak in no uncertain tones at the coming election. Now, I will not trouble the House any longer. I do not speak very often in Parliament, and I do not propose to. I have no great desire to speak from here to the county of Annapolis. When I go back to the county of Annapolis, I can do my talking then.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It is not my intention, Sir, to detain the House more than a very few minutes in addressing myself to some of the observations that have been made by the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Mills, Annapolis). I do not think the hon. gentleman need have made any apology by saying that he does not often address the House. That is perfectly true, and I think he has a very good excuse on the present occasion, because it is perfectly obvious that if Mr. Longley had not been nominated for the county of Annapolis, the hon. gentleman would not have troubled us this evening. I could not help contrasting the speech made by the hon. member for North Ontario (Mr. McGillivray), in the earlier part of the day, with that made by the hon. gentleman just now. The two speeches remind me very much of the two brothers who travelled for the purpose of promoting the principles of temperance. The one was a total abstainer, and the other was an habitual drunkard. The total abstainer devoted himself to lecturing, and he apologized for his brother by saying that they taught the public by precept and by example. He undertook to tell them what the advantages of temperance were, and his brother was a good illustration of what were the evils. The hon. member for North Ontario (Mr. McGillivray) to-day told us what excellent things hon. gentlemen on that side always said of the leader on this side (Mr. Laurier), and that on this side we, or some of us, at all events, had been saying unhandsome things of the leaders of the hon. gentlemen opposite. I may say, in answer to the hon. member for North Ontario that I would refer him to the speech just now delivered by

the hon. member for Annapolis. The hon. gentleman devoted himself to charges of sedition, secession, corruption and all other imaginary forms of wickedness that could be attributed to Mr. Fielding.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). I did not touch upon corruption; but if I had, I could have shown how the hon. leader of the Opposition offered to buy a province.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman has got through his speech except the addendum which he has just now added. Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman said

Mr. MCGILLIVRAY. I was speaking of the leaders in the House.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman from Annapolis also spoke of the leaders in the House. He charged my hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), he charged my hon. friend here (Mr. Laurier) with giving the cue to the annexationists and secessionists of the country, and the agitation went on all along the line, to use his expression, which he repeated over and over again. The hon. gentleman has not explained to us one fact in his speech of an hour and twenty minutes, and that is how it was that the people of Nova Scotia themselves, this loyal people, this devoted people to the cause of British connection, came to return Mr. Fielding and Mr. Longley and other gentlemen, with a majority to support them, to the legislature of Nova Scotia.

Mr. POWELL. And added a million dollars to the debt.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Will the hon. gentleman say when that was added? The hon. gentleman gives a fact—if it be a fact—that transpired after they came into possession of the Government, as a reason why they came into possession. He says that the course taken after the people of Nova Scotia had made them members of the Administration was the reason why the people of Nova Scotia elected them as such.

Mr. POWELL. I understood the hon. gentleman to say the last election.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I am pointing out the fact that these gentlemen were in power before the last election, and they carried the election. The good old county of Annapolis, the good loyal county, that county which is eminently loyal, which returns the hon. gentleman who made this violent and most vociferous loyalist speech this evening, is represented in the local legislature by Mr. Longley, a gentleman returned to that legislature by a larger majority than ever returned the hon. gentleman to this House. How does the hon. gentleman account for that fact?

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). It is the franchise. They disfranchised the Dominion

officials down there, and that is why they gained the election.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman has explained to us how he became a member of this House. He is sent here by the officials of the Dominion, and if it were not for the officials of the Dominion, he would not be here at all.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). Indirectly, that is true.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I must say that the hon. gentleman has not given us a very high opinion of the people of Nova Scotia by the speech which he has made here this evening. And I would be rather inclined to form my impression of those people from their having returned Mr. Fielding, Mr. Longley, and others, with a majority to support them, to the legislature at Halifax than from the observations which the hon. gentleman has addressed to the House this evening. I look rather to the example of the people of Nova Scotia in supporting that administration than to the precepts which the hon. gentleman has claimed here this evening with regard to these people. Otherwise, I would suppose that they were of rather suspicious character.

Now, the hon. gentleman has told us a good deal about the disloyalty of these people. He has told us that they pulled down the British flag, that they erected the Stars and Stripes, that they did a number of other heinous things which are certainly very wicked, and I would be willing to agree with the hon. gentleman if he had not drawn upon his imagination for his facts, that these were very serious offences on the part of the Government, yet the people of Nova Scotia has again and again entrusted the government of that country to these people, and placed in them the most implicit confidence.

Then the hon. gentleman told us about a terrible offence which the government of Nova Scotia has committed with regard to the schools there. Why, they ought to have made Dominion Day a holiday, and have given to the children the opportunity of shouting as loud as they please, of running as fast as they please, on that day, all over the country, but the Government of Nova Scotia, just out of perversity of disposition in consequence of the original sin that rests upon it, refused to make Dominion Day a holiday. Well, I know that there are a great many people in Ireland who do not march and sing and rejoice over the story of the battle of the Boyne. They have historical reasons for the course which they take. These reasons may be right or they may be wrong, but nevertheless, they are easily accounted for. Now, it does so happen that the people of Nova Scotia were brought into this Dominion against their will. They think that the course taken towards them was a very improper and a very unconstitutional one, and they are not

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).

going very readily to rejoice over what they look upon as their humiliation. A few years ago there were men in this country advocating the National Policy, and they were told that that National Policy would weaken British connection, and they were friends of the hon. gentleman from Annapolis. They were, like him, devoted to the National Policy, and what was their answer when that statement was made? They said it was so much the worse for British connection. Now, let us suppose for a moment that the people of the United Kingdom took it into their heads that they would be better rid of Canada. Let us suppose that they undertook to make a bargain with the United States to hand Canada over and annex it to that country, and that they would not be particular about consulting us. If they did they might consult a moribund Parliament, and I do not know that they would ever have a better opportunity than the present, for if there ever was a moribund Parliament anywhere, that Parliament exists here now. Let us suppose that the British Government and Parliament undertook to deal with us and decide our destiny without consulting us at all. What would be the feeling of this country with regard to the transaction—whether it would be a transaction in their interests or not? Would they not feel humiliated? Would they not think they should have had a voice in deciding what their fate would be? And the people of Nova Scotia said we elected a legislature under the constitution we had, but we did not elect a Parliament to transfer us to another body without our consent. That was the position of Nova Scotia, and if all the hon. gentleman said about that holiday were true, would it be an extraordinary thing under the circumstances?

Then the hon. gentleman became very violent with regard to the visit of my hon. friend (Mr. Laurier) to Boston. It was almost enough to make one hope that the hon. gentleman would not go to Boston again. It seems to have inoculated hon. gentlemen opposite with a sort of poison, and the disease it gives must be contagious. It broke out in the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny) early in the session and the hon. member for Annapolis has been at fever heat with it. Is it very extraordinary that the leader of the Opposition should go to Boston? The increasing anger of hon. gentlemen about this incident reminds one of the story of the old lady who, reading the account in the book of Genesis of Joseph being sold into Egypt was much distressed. But when she read it a second time she said: I had a good deal of sympathy with him at first, but here he is sold into Egypt again, and he is a fool for putting himself in the power of his brothers a second time. Hon. gentlemen opposite grew warm on this subject last year but this year they virtually say to the leader of the Opposition: You have been guilty of an abominable

crime, of a treasonable offence in going to Boston and speaking there, and you ought not to be tolerated as the leader of a party in this House. But later on the hon. member for Annapolis virtually said: You are a decent fellow yourself, but you are surrounded by a very bad lot. So the hon. gentleman has blown in all directions upon my hon. friend here to-night. Sir, Lord Elgin was in Boston and made a speech there. Sir John Young some years later, made a speech at, I think Augusta, in the state of Maine, and discussed the relation between England and the United States, and discussed the political destiny of Canada. I did not altogether like that speech, but if the hon. gentleman will turn to that speech he will see that this gentleman who was not a leader of one side or the other but the Governor General said things very objectionable from his super-loyal standpoint. The hon. gentleman said he was delighted to find that hon. gentlemen on this side were so loyal, and somehow he seemed to get it into his head that he had something to do with that loyalty. The hon. gentleman is labouring under a delusion. Mr. Canning speaks of a man who, hearing a noise in a theatre said: That is my thunder and my hail. So the hon. gentleman says that gentlemen on this side are loyal and that he is to be congratulated upon having made them so. Hon. gentlemen on this side have no need to go to a reformatory to be made loyal, they have always been loyal. If the hon. gentleman were on this side and had the experience of being in opposition, instead of being invigorated by the cool and bracing airs that blow in these shades he would be one of the most discontented men; he would be crying out blue ruin and wanting to establish soup kitchens. We know what these hon. gentlemen did when they had the opportunity before. The hon. gentleman said he was delighted to find we were loyal, but he took an extraordinary way of showing his pleasure. I think I have never heard him in a more irritable mood and violent mood; I have never known him to evince a stronger disposition to fight everybody. I could not tell what was the matter with the hon. member for Annapolis to rouse his indignation and provoke his intense excitement, until at last he announced that the Hon. Mr. Longley had been nominated as the Liberal candidate in Annapolis.

The hon. gentleman made a few remarks with regard to flour and pork. I shall not follow him in that discussion, because I do not know exactly where he was. He argued that the duty upon flour did not increase the price, and did not impose any additional burden upon the consumer. But, when he came to pork, he hesitated. He did not seem to be able to get over pork. He did not tell us whether the duty on pork increased the price to the consumer or not. But I wish to say a word or two with regard to some features of the tariff, and I shall occupy only a few minutes. Hon. gentlemen on the other side

of the House who have spoken on this subject have overlooked some patent facts. From 1860, when the high tariff was introduced in the United States—or rather counting from 1865, because one could hardly judge of prices before that time in consequence of the fluctuating value of the money that was in circulation—to 1878, there was a gradual fall in the price of lands in the United States. And on the Canadian side during the same time there was a gradual increase in the price of lands. I would like hon. gentlemen to bear that fact in mind, and it is a fact. In 1878 you changed the tariff in Canada, and immediately what was happening on the American side began to be manifest on this side. From that hour there has been a gradual diminution in the value of farm lands. To what is that attributable? Mainly to the National Policy. Now, the hon. gentleman refers to lands in England. Why, Sir, lands in England are in a different position. Agricultural lands in England, so far as they have diminished in value, have diminished because of the lowering of the prices of transporting the product of the lands of America, and India and Russia. Now, that is not our position. The diminution here has been in consequence of rendering the land less profitable by the cost of everything that the farmer consumes.

Mr. MCGILLIVRAY. By opening up the North-west Territories.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). In part by the construction of more railways than are required, but largely for the reasons I have stated.

Mr. SMITH (Ontario). No.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Yes, I could easily show that, but I do not wish to trespass upon the time of the House. I take one instance; I take a township containing 53,760 acres. That township had 300 inhabitants less in 1891 than it had in 1881. That township has diminished on the average by three per cent a year for the last twelve years, and for the ten years preceding, the land increased at least 3 per cent a year. Now, what does that mean? It means that lands being valued at \$40 an acre, and I am taking the assessed value, there was a loss of \$64,512 every year to the holders of those lands. Then I take again the 300 labourers. They represent labour worth \$60,000 a year, which has been withdrawn from the cultivation of those lands. That represents to the little village in the township the loss of a market of \$15,000 a year in clothing, \$3,000 in boots and shoes, \$7,000 in groceries. So you see there is over \$144,000 loss in the township every year during the last ten years.

Mr. MCGILLIVRAY. Has the hon. gentleman based his theory upon the idea that these 300 had left the country altogether; and if not, should not the country still be

credited with those who have gone to the North-west and elsewhere?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman asks me a question. I can tell him that three-fourths of these men are in Michigan. Then there is more. Look at the losses. The village sustained a loss of \$20,000 a year on the sale of products to those persons who have gone away. Take an ordinary township, and what is the result? You have a large number of carpenters, of painters and of other mechanics, who formerly were employed by farmers in making fences, in erecting buildings, in repairing buildings, and in doing work of that sort. You have the sale of the nails, and the lumber, and the paint, and what is required for those repairs, that has, in a great measure, ceased. You have nothing like the improvements going on, you have nothing like the amount of capital expended in repairs that you had fifteen years ago.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds and Grenville). What does Mr. Blue say about the increase in farm buildings?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No matter what Mr. Blue says. I am speaking of what has come under my personal observation, and I take a single instance in which I have made personal inquiries. Why, Sir, if I were to take the whole county, I would say that a county of 60,000 people sustains an additional tax of \$180,000 a year compared with 1878; I would say that that \$180,000 would be infinitely better employed by the persons who produced it, who earned it, if they were allowed to retain it in the production of wealth, than it can be in the hands of any administration. I am not going further to trespass upon the indulgence of the House. I take a single point, and bring it under your attention, and I ask every candid man on that side of the House whether the agricultural population are not sustaining serious damage in consequence of the policy that has been adopted.

Motion agreed to, and House again resolved itself into committee of Supply.

(In the Committee).

Office of the Queen's Privy Council
for Canada \$33,885

Resolution reported.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON moved the adjournment of the House.

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

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 2nd March, 1896.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 76) to incorporate the British American Coal and Transportation Company.—(Mr. Hazen.)

THE CANADIAN JOCKEY CLUB.

House resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 48) respecting the Canadian Jockey Club.—(Mr. Tisdale.)

(In the Committee.)

Mr. LISTER. This Bill has not been reprinted.

Mr. TISDALE. All the amendments are in it.

Mr. LISTER. The amendments proposed in committee are quite extensive, and, in my judgment, before the Bill is considered by the committee the Bill should be reprinted, so that all members may have an opportunity to consider well its provisions. What is proposed by the promoters of this measure is to incorporate a joint stock company, to be called the Canadian Jockey Club, and there is to be issued by that company stock to the amount mentioned by the Bill, and I understand that the large majority of that stock will be held by the gentlemen who are promoting this measure, but who are not acting in accord with the horse-breeders throughout the country. The effect of the Bill, if passed as it is now, will be to give to the stock the voting power, instead of to representatives of the clubs, while, if, perforce, it provide for taking in and affiliating clubs throughout the country, there is no provision that will prevent stockholders from having entire control of the management of the company. If it is in the interest of stock-breeding, then, all the clubs throughout the country should have a right to affiliate, and the gentlemen who promote the measure should have no more power on the board than every other club, which it is contended should have one representative each, no matter how much stock is held by the promoters, that the stock should not have the right to vote, but that every club should have one vote. In that way representation from all the clubs would be obtained, but in this way the joint stock company would obtain entire control of the club. It is true, the clubs would have representation on the board, but, so far as the Bill itself is concerned, would have no

voice in the management of the central club. I say, therefore, that the principle of the Bill is wrong. It should not get its power as a joint stock company; its power should be that of a club, the object being to interest breeders in improving the breeding of horses, and every club should have a vote, regardless altogether of the question of stock, stock, in fact, being thrown on one side entirely. But, under this Bill, the stock is to govern, and the powers placed in the hands of the stockholders is simply enormous, not so great, to be sure, as they were under the Bill as originally presented, but still they are simply enormous. It will be within the power of this joint stock company to say that any horse that is found upon a non-affiliated track shall be debarred, and that it shall not have the right to run upon any affiliated track. The intention is that the rules of this jockey club shall be the same as those of New York and other states, and the result of the Bill will be that any horse declared ineligible by this company will be ineligible in New York state or in any of the other states acting with the company which it is now proposed to incorporate here. Regardless altogether as to whether the horse is properly debarred or not, regardless altogether whether the owner has done anything which ought to debar the horse, the mere fact of the horse having gone upon an unaffiliated track will be sufficient, if this company thinks proper to make that a rule, to debar that horse, and to prevent him going upon any track in Canada or the United States not affiliated with this jockey club. The result of that will be that this joint stock company can compel every track in Canada to affiliate with this track, and thus bring every track in Canada under the control of this company. That, Sir, I submit, is not good legislation. It is simply unprecedented. I do not believe that you can find any such legislation as is proposed here in any state or in any province of this Dominion. For the benefit of the committee I will take the liberty of reading a letter which I have received from a gentleman who is well qualified to express an opinion upon this question. He writes:

I have been following with much interest the various phases the Canadian Jockey Club Bill has taken, and I see with some alarm that it passed the Private Bills Committee yesterday; true, in somewhat a modified form, but still in such shape as to be a menace to horsemen generally; but more particularly to race-track owners the country over.

I have noticed in the papers, you are taking an interest in this very uncalled for piece of legislation, and that you appreciate clearly what a tremendous power is being given to the individuals who are asking for it; and consequently, I am calling your attention to a few points which strike me as vital, even though the Bill be passed in its modified form—if such its present shape can be termed.

The great cry of those at its back is, "in the interest of racing these sixty days' meetings

must be put a stop to." I think I almost quote William Hendrie's words before the committee. With these ideas I am entirely in sympathy. Now, this I understand is to be done by an insertion of certain words in the Criminal Code of 1892, so that plank is pulled from the platform. But still they do not seem satisfied, and consequently it must be that more is desired. Now, to my mind, it is very wrong that any body of men, especially the governors of race tracks,—unless elected by the horsemen of the Dominion,—should control racing; and the clause in the Bill regarding affiliation is the one to which I wish particularly to call your attention, for as the section now reads, they have power to refuse a license to any track, whether it obey their mandates or not. This is distinctly wrong, since if they act in unison with the American Jockey Club, all horses racing on such a track would be disqualified everywhere. I think it should be framed in such a way, that any race track should have the privilege of coming into the association, and if they obey the rules, should remain members in good standing, and should have a representative on the board who would have a voice in all that was done; each member of the board to have one vote and not have it regulated by the amount of stock held. We do not live in an age when any close corporation,—however high may be the standing of each individual member,—may be trusted with such gigantic power as that demanded by these people.

I would like to call your attention to one point, but with apologies as it is an amendment suggested by yourself. I refer to the question of outlawing all horses on tracks not in affiliation with the Canadian Jockey Club. If an amendment in accordance with my suggestion could be inserted, there would be no necessity for this clause, for each track would be given its election of coming in or remaining out, and if they did not accept what must necessarily be reasonable rules, then in the interest of racing generally, they should be made to pay the penalty of outlawing.

I hope I do not trespass too much on your time and patience, but I take such a deep interest in this matter that I should like to let you know my ideas. If you think this letter might be used to any advantage you may use it as you think fit. These are my sentiments regarding what is for the best interests of the turf, and the breeding of thoroughbred horses in Canada.

This is from a gentleman who takes an interest in this matter, and one of the leading turf-men in the country who has seen this letter, has endorsed it as follows:—

I have read this letter and it embodies my ideas concerning the Bill exactly.

Mr. SPROULE. Name.

Mr. LISTER. It is of no consequence, I suppose.

Mr. SPROULE. You have read the letter, and you had better give the name.

Mr. LISTER. The letter was written by Mr. R. R. Pringle and the endorsement was by Mr. Joseph E. Seagram.

Mr. SPROULE. They are very good men, too.

Mr. LISTER. These are the men. I beg to move, Mr. Chairman:

That the committee rise and that the Bill be referred back to the Private Bills Committee for further consideration.

Mr. TISDALE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Lister) is like the gentleman who wrote that letter. Both of them must have misunderstood this Bill. Mr. Seagram sent a long circular, and a very able one, I think, to every member of this House.

Mr. LISTER. I did not get it.

Mr. TISDALE. Well, he sent a circular to a great many members before this Bill came up. On account of that circular and for other reasons the Bill as first introduced was reprinted before it was submitted to the committee at all. Then, when it came before the committee, the Bill was changed and that is the reason why I mentioned that the amendments were so simple that it was not necessary, in my opinion, to have them reprinted. The principal change was this, and it was a very important one: As the Bill was introduced and taken before the committee, it enabled the Canadian Jockey Club to control all the clubs in the country whether they affiliated with it or not. It also asked for the prohibition of race meetings lasting more than a certain number of days. Now, the prohibition of race meetings was struck out at the suggestion of the Minister of Justice, who thought that if any such thing was to be dealt with it should be dealt with in the Criminal Code. The striking out of that clause was the first important change made in the Bill. The other changes were to strictly limit the Bill to these clubs who saw fit to affiliate, so as to make it entirely voluntary; and in regard to the important question that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lister) mentioned I will read the clause, showing that it does give representation to every club that affiliates. Subsection 2 of clause 4 says:

2. The club committee shall consist of twelve members of the club, and each duly incorporated racing or hunt club in Canada, being the owner or lessee of a race track affiliated with the club, shall be entitled to have at least one member on the club committee; and if it is necessary, owing to the increase or decrease of such clubs, to increase or reduce the number of the committee, such increase or decrease, as the case may be, may from time to time be effected by by-law of the club committee.

Mr. LISTER. It gives representation, but no vote.

Mr. TISDALE. Yes, it gives a vote.

Mr. LISTER. Who is to elect a member on the club committee?

Mr. TISDALE. His own club. Now, that provides distinctly that every club that affiliates shall have one member on the committee, and if the twelve gentlemen whose names are mentioned as the provisional club committee are not sufficient, then every club—and from remarks of gentlemen before the

Mr. LISTER.

committee, I would be within the mark in saying there are at least one hundred of them in the Dominion—every club that joins shall have a member on the club committee. If there are fifty clubs affiliated, the club committee would have to be composed of fifty members. Let me say, that so far as Mr. Seagram is concerned, when I received the circular some ten days before the meeting of the committee, I asked him by all means to be present, because I agree with everything the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lister) has said in regard to Mr. Seagram's connection with racing. I agree with everything the hon. gentleman has said regarding Mr. Seagram. He wrote to me saying that it would not be possible for him to come here, but he hoped the Bill would be modified so as to meet his views. He took strong ground, and I think proper ground, against the compulsory clauses of the Bill providing that this Canadian Jockey Club should have control over any clubs that did not see fit to affiliate with it. I wrote to him this morning, informing him that his views had been sustained by the Private Bills Committee, and that the horsemen who were present, including the secretary of the association, at once conceded to the limitation clauses of the Bill to which he objected; and I explained, on their behalf, that the clauses regarding compulsory powers had been originally put into the Bill in order to elicit discussion from horsemen throughout the country. I have more regard for the views of the Horse Breeding Association than I have for those of the racing men, and they assented to this portion of the Bill in every particular. I do not know whether the other gentleman is an owner and breeder of horses or not, though I know him to be a high authority on racing matters. At any rate, ample notice of the Bill was given to everybody interested, not only by circular letter, but by publication for several days in the newspapers, as to when the Bill would come before the committee; and there was a very full representation, not only of the gentlemen whose names are here, but of the Horse Breeders' Association, which is a more extensive and important body than the Racing Association. Now, why should we have any delay? The very points made in that letter have been met in the Bill. There is a clause providing that every association that joins the club shall have a member on the board of directors. The whole scheme would be inoperative and of no benefit to the different racing associations if the Bill did not contain this provision. That is the very principle of the Bill. But it is limited, and I think properly limited, in its effect to those who see fit to join. Those who remain outside of the club are free. Therefore, I cannot see that any case has been made out for delay. What could be fairer? How could you form an association that would be workable otherwise than in the way proposed? First, the Bill

compels nobody to join. In the next place, if any club does join, there is no danger of its being swamped. The stock of the club is only \$10,000 in shares of \$250 each, with a few hundred dollars paid in to comply with the law. The club was incorporated first by letters patent under the general Act. The gentlemen who compose it are representative men in Ontario and Quebec. The provisional directors are: William Hendrie, contractor, and James M. Lottridge, brewer, both of the city of Hamilton, in the province of Ontario; John Davis, customs official, and George M. Hendrie, contractor, both of the city of Windsor, in the said province; Andrew Smith, veterinary surgeon, Robert Davies, brewer, and George W. Beardmore, merchant, all of the city of Toronto, in said province of Ontario; Adam Beck, of the city of London in said province, merchant, and James P. Dawes, brewer, and James H. Wardlow, merchant, both of the city of Montreal, in the province of Quebec. These are all representative men and men of high character, who have a great many thousand pounds invested in the breeding of the best class of horses. Not only do they assent to the Bill, and not only did Mr. Beck and Mr. Sinclair, the secretary of the Horse Breeders' Association, who came here to represent them, agree to the Bill, and through them the people who have hundreds of thousands of dollars invested in the breeding of horses. I am satisfied that all the objections raised by the two gentlemen mentioned have been met. The reports that went out through the papers were that the compulsory clauses were eliminated; but the details were not noticed by the reporters, especially the important detail I mention, giving each club a representative on the board of directors or the club committee. If only a few clubs join, this will not amount to much, but if many join, it will be very important to them. I think, therefore, no case has been made out for delaying this Bill. There was a full representation before the committee; all questions were asked there and answered by gentlemen who understood the matter; there was a full attendance of the Private Bills Committee; and the provisions of the Bill as it was adopted were agreeable all around.

Mr. EDGAR. As one of the members of the House who have not the advantage of belonging to the Private Bills Committee, it strikes me that the point which we are most interested in having explained is whether or not this association is a voluntary one—whether or not other racing associations are entirely free to join or affiliate with it. That occurs to me to be the point we want to understand. If they are entirely free to join or not to join, and there is nothing against public interest in the Bill, it becomes largely a domestic matter, and I do not see why we should interfere with it. But the hon. gentleman who has charge of the Bill has not explained to us exactly the clauses

of the Bill which show that this is a voluntary association.

Mr. SPROULE. It seems to me that there is a good deal of force in the objection raised by the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister). If it is true that no association can join this incorporated club unless the latter is disposed to admit it, that would be a very serious objection. As there are a number of important amendments in the Bill, I think it ought to be reprinted before the House is asked to pass it. There are a great many members who are not on the Private Bills Committee and who know a very little about the nature of the Bill. The names of the two gentlemen who wrote that letter ought to be a sufficient guarantee, because they are thorough sportsmen who have owned some of the best horses in Canada, and are men of authority in sporting circles; so that when they take objection to the Bill, it seems to me that is sufficient ground for our considering it fairly before we allow the Bill to pass. I do not think that any harm will be done if the Bill is allowed to stand until it can be reprinted and every member will have an opportunity of going over it and seeing for himself whether it is on the proper lines or not.

Mr. TISDALE. If any one wishes to have the Bill reprinted, I will not resist that suggestion.

Mr. MARTIN. I would like to ask not only that the Bill be reprinted, but that a reasonable delay be given, so that I, for instance, may communicate with the Racing Association in Winnipeg in regard to it. I understand, from what has fallen from previous speakers, that this Bill practically affects every race track in Canada, by means of the power this club are going to get with regard to ruling horses off the track, and so forth. I believe that associations of this kind should not run on the principle of joint stock companies. Surely it ought to be representative wholly. We ought not to incorporate private persons coming here and asking for privileges of this kind. Such privileges should only be given to a body made up entirely of representatives from the different racing tracks, and having no stock at all, because stock is not a thing that is necessary in a body of this kind. It is not a question of a man having a thousand or two thousand dollars invested in a jockey club, which ought to give him a say in its management; but it is a question of the representation of the different racing tracks, and I am entirely without any advice from the Racing Association of Winnipeg, which is an important body. I should like to have time to send them a copy of this Bill, when reprinted, and get their advice as to whether I should oppose or support it.

Mr. HAZEN. With regard to what has been said by the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Edgar) and the hon. member for Win-

nipeg (Mr. Martin), I would like to say, having been present, as chairman, at the meeting of the Private Bills Committee which considered this measure, that the whole object and intention of the Bill is that its rules should only be binding on such clubs as voluntarily come in and affiliate with this club, and that in no sense is it binding upon any club or racing association that does not affiliate with it. The whole object which the gentlemen who came before the committee had in view, and I think a very commendable object, was this: They were gentlemen who had invested large sums in improving the breed of horses in this country, and in keeping up a high standard for the race courses of this country. It seems that about a year ago, a number of people came over from the southern states to Windsor, and there conducted a series of races during fifty or sixty days, which resulted in a great amount of gambling and evil. What the promoters of this Bill desire is to make horse-racing in Canada as respectable as it possibly can be made. As the Bill was first presented, it provided that the central association should be able to make rules that would control racing upon all tracks in Canada, whether they were tracks or associations affiliated with the club or not. That feature was eliminated in the Bill before the committee, and as it stands to-day, the association is a purely voluntary one. It is perfectly voluntary for any racing association to come in and affiliate with this club or not.

Mr. MARTIN. While apparently voluntary in name, this association, by the powers given it, is able indirectly to make its rules practically compulsory on all courses.

Mr. HAZEN. I do not think so. No power is given this club in this measure that is not now already possessed by any association in Canada. That is the way the committee were impressed with the matter, and, after full discussion, they determined not to adopt the amendment which had been moved. However, since this Bill has been before the Committee of the Whole to-day, it is clear to me that a little amendment has to be made in subsection G, section 5, in order to make that perfectly clear. However, as the mover of the Bill has consented that it should be reprinted, it is a waste of time to discuss the matter now.

Mr. CASEY. I quite agree in the suggestion that the Bill should be reprinted before we finally discuss it, but there are one or two points that might well be raised now so that the whole House may think of them before we come to a final discussion. In the first place, I have very grave doubts that we have any right to charter an association for the purpose of carrying on racing, or to give to any such body authority to make rules which shall govern racing throughout Canada, or on any particular tracks in Canada. It seems to me that the question of racing

Mr. HAZEN.

does not come within the list of subjects given to this Parliament by the British North America Act. It does not come under the head of trade and commerce, and it might more properly be classed under the head of civil rights or police regulation, which belong to the provinces. That would be a question for the Minister of Justice to consider very thoroughly before this Bill is again submitted to this House. But if we have the right to make any law on the subject, I am sure that our powers should not be exercised further than to charter certain persons as the Jockey Club of Canada, providing for the admission to the club of representatives of all racing associations duly organized and recognized in any part of Canada, and give the club power to make rules regarding such tracks alone as are affiliated with it.

I think that is as far as we ought to go. I do not believe that we should give them any power to keep a stud book for all Canadian-bred horses, as this Bill appears to do. There are other much more important associations than the Jockey Club, which are concerned in the breeding of horses, and to them, or a board selected from all of them, should be entrusted that work. The Jockey Club should not be authorized to disqualify horses which are run on other tracks than those controlled by the club. I need not go into the details of my objections to the Bill, since I object, in the first place, to the jurisdiction of the House in connection with it. I hope the Minister of Justice will study up the matter, and give us his matured opinion when we are next asked to pass the Bill. I think the Bill should be referred back to the Private Bills Committee before it comes up again in Committee of the Whole. The meeting of that committee was held on Friday last at an hour which prevented a great number of members attending.

Mr. EDGAR. There is one feature of this short discussion that, I think, will be very satisfactory and reassuring to the country, because it is perfectly clear there is a large number of gentlemen, on both sides, determined to oppose the passing of a coercion Bill on its second reading.

Mr. DICKEY. I promise the committee that I will look very carefully into the Bill before it comes up again. I do not think much of the question as to jurisdiction, because this Bill belongs to the whole of Canada, and I do not think any other legislature could possibly pass it. However, that is a matter for consideration. I think a good deal of consideration could profitably be given to the provisions of section 4. It seems to me that the mode in which affiliation is to take place is very indefinite, and the status of the affiliated clubs is also not very definite. I think the promoter of the Bill would do well to consider that, so that he would be prepared with some amendment when it comes before the committee again.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. Minister says that this Bill must be within our power because it applies to the whole of Canada, and no other legislature can pass an Act which does so. That point seems to me very ill taken. There are certain classes of subjects in regard to which this House is not allowed to legislate at all, and upon which only the local legislatures can pass Acts. On such subjects, no local legislature could pass an Act affecting the whole of Canada, but neither could this House. I believe, as at present advised, subject to a much more matured opinion of the Minister of Justice than he seems to have now, that this House has not the right to legislate on this subject at all for the whole or any part of Canada. I may say that I am not at all opposed to the objects of the Bill, as I understood them originally from the promoters. I find that the principal point in the Bill in regard to which I spoke with Mr. Hendrie and other promoters, is not in the Bill as now before us. That was the prohibition of long-term racing at certain points. I believe such racing is not sport; it does not promote morality or anything else that is good, and I would be strongly opposed to it. I see that this provision is eliminated, and I believe it is proposed to reach that object by an amendment to the criminal law, in regard to which the Minister of Justice has no doubt been consulted. I do not know in what other way it could be got at by this Parliament. I believe that the whole subject of the regulation of racing, except so far as amendments to the criminal law are concerned, belongs to the legislatures of the different provinces; and I hope the Minister of Justice will look at it more critically than he evidently has done, before he gives another opinion on that point.

Mr. MCGREGOR. We have not had time to hear from those to whom we sent the amended Bill. Before the Bill is referred back—

Mr. TISDALE. It is not proposed to refer it back. The committee simply rises and reports progress, for the purpose of reprinting the Bill.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Another point to which I wish to call attention is, that this, being a close corporation, as it were, can decide exactly what tracks shall affiliate with it. There are a number of tracks in Canada upon which large amounts of money have been expended, and this association may decide not to allow any of these tracks to affiliate, except those acceptable to themselves. This may involve hardship and great loss to certain people. What we say is, that, where a track has been properly conducted, where the owner of the horse is an honest man, and the horse has no bar against him, the track should have the right to affiliate and the owner should have the right to run his horse on the affiliated track.

Otherwise, this association may exclude a track from affiliation, and, if a man runs his horse on that track, it will be barred from appearing on any track in affiliation with the association. I hope time will be given to send out the Bill to the different parties who are interested.

Committee rose and reported progress.

CHIGNECTO MARINE TRANSPORT RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. POWELL moved second reading of Bill (No. 75) respecting the Chignecto Marine Transport Railway Company (Limited). He said: I would ask that the Bill be allowed to stand.

Mr. SPEAKER. The motion having been put, it would be better to move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. HAZEN moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

ORDERS IN COUNCIL.

Mr. INNES (for Mr. McMullen) asked:

1. How many Orders in Council were passed between the 4th and 17th January, 1896?
2. How many of the same involved increases of salaries or allowances?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The number of Orders in Council passed within the time stated was 235, of which 28 involved increases of salaries or allowances.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE—PAYMENT OF DEPARTMENTAL EMPLOYEES.

Mr. EDGAR asked:

Was the opinion of the Department of Justice taken before the passage of the Order in Council of 1st February, 1896, respecting the payment of departmental employees, an extract from which appears in the Auditor General's Report, page Q 217?

Mr. FOSTER. It does not appear that it was.

SOURIS BREAKWATER.

Mr. PERRY asked:

Is the contract for Souris Breakwater, Prince Edward Island, let? If so, who is the contractor? Was the lowest tender accepted? What is the amount of contract? Is the work commenced? When is it to be completed?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. In the absence of the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Oimet), I beg to reply: The contract for the Souris Breakwater, P.E.I., is let, the contractors being Messrs. Heney & Smith, of Ottawa. The lowest regular tender was accepted. The amount of the contract is \$27,950. Material has been purchased, and, after the opening of navigation, the work

will be commenced and pushed forward vigorously. The work is to be completed by the 17th of February, 1897.

FEES AND COSTS, DISTRICTS OF MONTREAL AND QUEBEC.

Mr. MONET (for Mr. McShane) asked :

Statement of fees and costs paid during 1895 to law firms or individual lawyers by the Dominion Government in the districts of Montreal and Quebec, and all costs? What is the amount paid O'Connor & Hogg in 1895 for services rendered in the districts of Montreal and Quebec, or on any cases arising therefrom?

Mr. DICKEY. In answer to the last part of the question, I would say that the amount of the fees, costs and disbursements paid O'Connor & Hogg in 1895 for services rendered in the districts of Montreal and Quebec, or any cases arising therefrom, was \$4,495.15. For a reply to the first part of the question, I beg to refer the hon. gentleman to the Auditor General's Report.

IMPORTS OF FLOUR AND WHEAT.

Mr. CAMPBELL asked :

1. How many barrels of flour have been imported into Canada for consumption since the 1st day of July, 1895, up to and including the 31st day of January, 1896?

2. Amount of duty paid on the same?

3. Quantity of wheat imported for consumption in Canada during the same period?

Mr. IVES. In the absence of the Controller of Customs (Mr. Wood), I beg to state that: 1st. The total number of barrels of flour imported into Canada for consumption between the 1st day of July, 1895, and the 31st December, 1895, was 26,913, upon which duty was paid to the amount of \$20,185.01. 2nd. The total quantity of wheat imported into Canada for consumption during the same period was 76,647 bushels, upon which duty was paid to the amount of \$11,947.06.

CENTRAL EXPERIMENTAL FARM—SALES OF HAY.

Mr. McMILLAN asked :

Was any hay sold from the Central Experimental Farm at Ottawa within the last twelve months? If so, how much? Was it advertised and offers received before being sold? Was it the cut of 1894 or 1895? Who was the purchaser or purchasers? What was the price per ton and did the price paid include delivery at the station, or was delivery extra? To what address and railway station was it shipped?

Mr. FOSTER. Some hay was sold from the Central Experimental Farm at Ottawa within the last twelve months, the quantity being 69 tons 1,600 pounds. It was not advertised, but inquiries were made by the farm foreman of the Central Farm to ascertain its value, before any prices were fixed on it, and it was offered at the prices estimated by him as its full value at the time.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON.

Of the total, 61 tons 54 pounds were the cut of 1895, and 8 tons 1,546 pounds the cut of 1894. There was sold on the 31st October, 1895, to John Moss, 2¾ tons at \$6 per ton, crop of 1895, not delivered; to James Hellem, 2 tons on the same date, at \$6, not delivered; to C. Bailey, 1 and 1-10th tons on the same date, at \$6, not delivered; to D. Porter, of Wiaraton, Ont., in December, 55 tons 450 pounds of hay of 1895, pressed and delivered to car on siding near farm, at \$10 per ton; to the same purchaser, and on the same date, 8 tons 1,546 pounds of hay of the growth of 1894, at \$8 per ton, also pressed and delivered to car on siding near farm. These latter quantities were forwarded to the address of D. Porter, Wiaraton.

POST OFFICE, VICTORIA, B.C.

Mr. EDGAR asked :

1. To whom and when was the contract first let for the construction of the post office at Victoria, B.C.? What was the amount of the contract price? Who were the contractor's sureties? To what value (if any) was work done by the first contractor?

2. Was the contract given to the present contractors, Messrs. Elford & Smith, after public competition by tender or otherwise, and was their tender the lowest? What was the amount of their contract? What are the names of all persons who are or have been sureties for Messrs. Elford & Smith on this work? How much has been paid to the said contractors? Have they made claim for any further sum? When should the building be completed, according to terms of contract? Has the building been completed according to contract?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. 1. To Mr. Fred. Toms, of Ottawa, on 21st November, 1894, for \$195,765. The security given was an accepted cheque for \$10,000 drawn on the Merchants' Bank, of Ottawa. No work was done by Mr. Toms. He died at Victoria before the work could be commenced. 2. Messrs. Elford & Smith were the next lowest tenderers after Mr. Toms, and they accepted to do the work at the price of the tender of Mr. Toms, whose tender was the lowest received after public advertisements. It was similar to that of Mr. Toms, namely, \$195,765. The security given by Messrs. Elford & Smith for the fulfilment of their contract is a deposit receipt for \$10,000 from the Bank of British Columbia, payable to the order of the hon. the Minister of Public Works. No personal securities were given. \$48,530 has been paid to the said contractors. They have made no claim for any further sum. The building should be completed 1st May, 1897; the date has not yet come for completion.

DOMINION REFORMATORY.

Mr. CHARLTON (for Mr. Mulock) asked :

1. The Minister of Public Works having, on the 24th of February, 1896, stated that the Government had disbursed certain moneys, amounting

in all to \$6,211.92, on account of the Dominion Reformatory, what are the names of the persons to whom such moneys have been paid ?

2. What are the respective amounts paid such persons ?

3. On what accounts were such payments respectively made ?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON :

Site purchase—Jas. McPhee and E. H. Tiffany, agent M. J.	\$5,000 00	
Site purchase—legal services: E. H. Tiffany	\$73 55	
Travelling expenses—		
James Adams.....	\$44 68	
James Devlin	40 30	
Douglas Stewart.....	10 75	
	95 73	
Surveying—M. J. McLennan.....	292 50	391 78
Opening quarries—pay list:		
Wm. Beatty.....	33 00	
Findlay McPherson.....	19 00	
Laughlin P. McDonald.....	18 00	
Gagnon Debrett.....	9 00	
Laughlin Dewar.....	0 50	
Jacques Sabourin.....	0 50	
Clerk of Works, James Adams....	125 00	205 00
Travelling expenses—		
W. R. Billings.....	27 66	
James Adams.....	200 00	
Douglas Stewart.....	20 25	
Jas. Shearer.....	38 00	
Wm. Beatty.....	3 10	
J. W. H. Watts.....	10 10	
	299 11	504 11
Miscellaneous—		
Advertising, Alexandria "Glen-garran".....	3 50	
Negatives, blue prints, &c., D. A. McLaughlin	312 10	
Govt. Printing Office (printing).....	0 43	316 03
		\$6,211 92

VISIT OF SIR DONALD SMITH TO WINNIPEG.

Mr. McCARTHY asked :

1. Was Sir Donald Smith authorized on behalf of the Government to negotiate with the Premier or administration of the province of Manitoba with reference to or on the subject of the school law of that province ?

2. If yea, has Sir Donald Smith made any report with respect to such negotiation ?

3. Or did Sir Donald Smith voluntarily or otherwise undertake to act as mediator between the Government of Canada and the Government of Manitoba, or to negotiate with the said last mentioned government on the subject referred to in the first preceding question ?

4. If yea, has Sir Donald Smith made any report in respect of such mediation or negotiation ?

5. And what, in either of the supposed cases, was the substance of Sir Donald Smith's report ?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I beg to say, in reply to the hon. member, that the answer to the first portion of the question is, No. In response to the remainder of the question, I have to say, that the only communication that has taken place between Sir Mackenzie Bowell and Sir Donald Smith, was of a purely personal character, no report having been made.

FISHING LICENSES.

Mr. CHARLTON asked :

1. The number of fishing licenses granted by the Government within the district of which David Sharp, of Port Dover, Ont., is fishery overseer, for the years 1894 and 1895, stating the number for each year ?

2. The name of each licensee, the territory covered by each license and the amount received for each license in each of the years 1894 and 1895 ?

Mr. COSTIGAN. If the hon. member will be satisfied with an answer to the first part of the question, I will reply ; but, as the answer to the second part of the question will require a large amount of clerical work, I will ask him to put a notice on the paper.

Mr. CHARLTON. I will be satisfied with an answer to the first part of the question, and will put a notice on the paper for the balance of the information, if it can be obtained.

Mr. COSTIGAN. In 1894, there were 56 licenses granted for that district, and in 1895, 88.

CREAMERIES IN NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES.

Mr. DAVIN moved :

That, in the opinion of this House, it would be expedient to apply \$20,000 to aid in establishing creameries and cheese factories in the North-west Territories, and that this sum should be considered as an addition to the immigration grant.

He said : Last year, I moved a motion of which the present motion formed a part, but I have divided the motion this year, because I found that there are persons who were in favour of giving \$20,000 to creameries in the North-west Territories, but opposed to a bonus on butter. The motion as to the bonus on butter I dropped, because it did not come up until after the tariff was brought down. But I find, from a discussion which took place here last year, and from the division which took place, that there seemed to be a strong feeling in favour of the motion that I had placed upon the paper. The Minister of Agriculture, in speaking to it, held out the hope, as I thought, that, when the finances of the country looked better, my proposition would be accepted by the Government. Those who opposed it, showed a complete misconception as to the position of the Territories and as to the claims that were made by these Territories, and as to what the Territories are entitled to. I could wish very much to be able to interest both sides of the House in this matter, and I am persuaded, that, if I could only get the leading men on both sides of the House to consider this proposition, they will agree with me. But, unfortunately, it is exceedingly difficult to get the House to pay attention to any question

that is not strongly related to party battles, and, Mr. Speaker, I could wish that we made this chamber more a council for the advancement of the country, rather than a great party cockpit.

Mr. EDWARDS. You do your share.

Mr. DAVIN. Well, I hope I do not contribute much to the cockpit character to the House, because that is a feature of this House that I should certainly like to see entirely abandoned. Now, the Minister of Agriculture said, last year, as a reason why the Government could not accept my motion:

Although the Government cannot pledge themselves at this time, with the finances as they are, to expend any such large sum as my hon. friend asks for, I have the authority of the Government to say to him that we are most sympathetic with regard to that industry in the Territories.

And the hon. member for York, I do not know whether he was supporting me or combatting the motion, but he seemed to be sympathetic, upbraided the Minister of Agriculture for not being ready to give me more than sympathy. Although I am glad to get that I could wish for something more satisfying. The member for Lotbinière (Mr. Rinfret) moved an amendment and spoke on it, and showed a complete misunderstanding of the claims of the Territories. When I ask here to-day for \$20,000. I do not ask it as a favour from Parliament or as a grant, but 'ex debito justitia' it is a claim made by a province or any claim behind the subsidy that a province gets. And, Sir, the time will not be ill taken up, even supposing I do not get all I ask, if I can only get hon. members of this House to look at the exact position we occupy in the North-west as regards things that should be done there, because I say here, without fear of contradiction from either side of the House, that we are in the position to-day of being owed by the federal treasury over \$1,200,000, and if the House will bear with me, I will show how that is. I found last year no objection from principle to my proposal set forward either by the Finance Minister or by the Minister of Agriculture. The hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte), in opposing my motion, said:

I am not satisfied that the appropriation of \$20,000 for which we are called upon to vote would receive proper application, so as to promote the best interests of the farming community. At all events, there is one sure thing, it is that we have already done a great deal in favour of the North-west.

The view that we have already in this Parliament done a great deal in favour of the North-west, is the view that I challenge right straight. I join issue with that position; I say it is untenable if it means this, that you have done more than you were entitled to do. I grant that the Government have done a great deal more than many hon. members would wish them to do, that the

Mr. DAVIN.

present Government have done far more for the North-west than many of their critics.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That is a cockpit observation.

Mr. DAVIN. The spurs, I was going to say, of the hon. rooster for Bothwell, but I say the hon. member for Bothwell, on that occasion, were blunted. I am here to-day advocating a proposition that is of a protective character. I think we are making considerable progress in protection. I have been reading the Queen's speech in the Imperial Parliament, and I find Her Majesty has had a speech prepared for her by Lord Salisbury and by the man who used to be called the Apostle Paul of radicalism in England, Mr. Chamberlain, in which there is a strong protective measure adumbrated.

Mr. CASEY. He is not an apostle, but an apostate.

Mr. DAVIN. I said he was the Apostle Paul of radicalism, and if he has ceased to be a Radical, you may say he is an apostate to Radicalism, but probably the best way to consider him is that he was the Saul of Radicalism, and is now the Apostle Paul of Conservatism. There is a measure announced to check the importation of destitute aliens. That is going a long way from the position taken by Bright and Cobden, and is a thoroughly protective measure. Another measure indicated is for the betterment of agriculture in Ireland. This proposal of mine is a measure for the betterment of agriculture in the North-west Territories. I take it then, Mr. Speaker, that the only objection to my proposal is the money I ask, and in proceeding to remove that objection, I lay this down, that we owe the Territories at least, as I have said, \$1,200,000. We kept from them last year \$100,000, and we are determined to keep from them \$100,000 in the forthcoming year. Until certain proposals lately made respecting irrigation are adopted, we cannot in any part of the North-west be sure of a grain crop every year. They are not sure of a crop in any country in the world, but by a wise adoption of the principles of irrigation that have proved successful in India, you may be sure of obtaining a crop every year in the North-west Territories. Besides, with the competition of the Argentine Republic and elsewhere, we cannot encourage the people anywhere to go into wheat raising exclusively. I think that we in this Parliament should be ready to do as much for the Territories as Russia has done for its provinces and it will interest my hon. friends of the Opposition if I add we ought to do as much or a little more than that apostle of free trade, the present Premier of Nova Scotia has done, and the Act which he passed in 1894 may show a reason why certain members on the Opposition side of the House may, when we come to vote, give me their votes on this matter. In 1894,

what did the Minister of Agriculture in Russia, in despotic obscurantist Russia do? Wheat and all grains were very low, and he wisely determined to stimulate the different branches of agriculture, among them dairying, so as to convert the grain into more remunerative products. Dairy experts were employed from abroad from Denmark, from Germany, from Switzerland. Information on the dairy processes was published in the Russian language, and loans were raised to establish cheese and butter factories. Improvements were introduced respecting the carriage of dairy products by rail; in other words, they had in 1894 introduced the cold storage system that we have introduced, and what was of great importance, and I only wish we could do the same thing here, railway rates were reduced. Depots were established for the storage of butter and cheese, and a great impetus was given to the dairying industry. We are only following in the wake of European nations in what we have done, and we have not gone as far as Russia. Hon. gentlemen must bear in mind that in the North-west we have no provincial grant. A certain amount is given us every year, but we have no regular provincial subsidy. Our government, as I explained here on a previous occasion, is a kind of makeshift government, and so far as its resources go, it is, in my opinion, half-starved as to the money which it should have for doing the work of managing those Territories. But, Sir, not merely has Russia moved in this matter. Nova Scotia, whose Premier, Mr. W. S. Fielding, was one of the chairmen at the great Liberal convention of 1893, who was one of those who reported the tariff resolution, which has, you know, denounced protection; Mr. Fielding's government had an Act passed in 1894, in which there is the following clause:—

Any person, firm, or association, establishing and maintaining a creamery and cheese factory in Nova Scotia, shall be entitled to receive from the treasury, the following sums:—Two hundred dollars in the first year in which such creamery and cheese factory shall be in operation; one hundred dollars in the second year, and one hundred dollars in the third year.

This would amount to \$400. The Act provides that these grants shall not be paid to any more than three factories in a county. There are seventeen counties in Nova Scotia, and, multiplying these by 400, you get \$6,800, which this free trade Liberal Premier is ready to give for the carrying on of creameries, which, also, have the benefit of the lectures and the help which are given by the Dominion Government as well. There are thirty-eight members in the legislative assembly of Nova Scotia, and there are twenty-nine members in the legislative assembly of the North-west Territories. So, if we take that relation—although that is unfair to the North-west Territories—that would give you thirteen counties in the

North-west Territories, to be multiplied by 400, which would amount to \$5,200. If Mr. Fielding had the management of our affairs that is the sum he would give to the creameries in the North-west Territories. Well, Sir, that would be something. If we had, for instance, three creameries in Western Assiniboia, and three or four in Eastern Assiniboia, and three or four in Saskatchewan, and four, or five, or six in Alberta, getting this \$400 each as help, which Mr. Fielding is ready to give to the creameries of Nova Scotia, it would be a great assistance to the creamery industry with us.

Mr. BORDEN. Mr. Fielding is giving it.

Mr. DAVIN. My hon. friend, the member for King's (Mr. Borden) tells me that I am quite right in my inference, which I have taken from the Act, that Mr. Fielding is giving that sum of money. The hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Forbes) in discussing Mr. Fielding's action with me, said, But why should we take money from the federal treasury to give it to the North-west Territories? Now, Sir, that is the unfortunate position the people of the North-west are in, when we come to discuss their affairs in this House. Some hon. gentlemen cannot get it out of their heads that the North-west Territories are in the position of a province and have a subsidy; whereas we in this Parliament are governing the North-west Territories, and all that we have done is to give them a little assembly with twenty-nine members, having certain powers, and not full provincial powers. They have a little government up there that is simply a financial committee, without the power of making departments, and without the power of that responsible system, which is the British system, and which is the only possible way that representative government can be carried on successfully, economically, and properly. Our assembly in the North-west Territories is not in a position to do what the Nova Scotia Assembly can do. Sir, we have in the North-west Territories as intelligent a body of farmers as in any province in the Dominion of Canada. We have an assembly that, in my opinion, will compare in ability with any assembly of any province in the Dominion, and our little local government, or financial committee, whatever you like to call it, I venture to say, that taking its four members, they will compare well with any four men in any Ministry in any of the provinces. Why, then, treat us in the position of pupilage, as we are treated. Now, our people have established dairy associations for some years past, and they held a meeting on Tuesday, January 28th last, at Regina; and they appointed days for conventions, to which, I hope, the Acting Minister of Agriculture will be able to send either Professor Robertson, or some of his colleagues, to lecture to them. The leading paper of the Territories, the "Leader," commenting on that meeting, says:

It would have done Professor Robertson's heart good to have seen the earnestness which characterized the proceedings, and to have heard the practical expressions of those representative farmers who assembled in Regina on Tuesday, to take measures to propagate information regarding the industry about which the Professor is so eminent an authority.

The president, Mr. Hopkins, who is well known to me as a leading farmer and a leading dairyman, inculcated this sound doctrine in his speech :

Make a standard article of first quality, and it can create and maintain for itself a market.

And then the editor of the "Leader," commenting on all this, says :

It will pay the people to forward in every available way the dairy interests, and in no way can the Dominion Government at the present time spend money in the North-west, more judiciously, or to greater advantage than by assisting to develop that industry.

This is the way he concludes the article :

We would urge on the North-west representatives in Parliament, to strongly press the motion which Mr. Davin has now before the House in respect to that matter.

Now, Sir, I come to the question of money, which my hon. friend from Brant (Mr. Paterson) asked me about. We ask \$20,000. That could be given to the local assembly to spend for this purpose, or, if it was thought too large, a smaller sum might be given, say the amount that Mr. Fielding gives in Nova Scotia. At the present time, we vote the sums, practically, specifically, for the North-west Territories. That is to say, although we vote a lump sum, we still indicate what this money is for, and although not bound, mechanically, the assembly and the executive are bound in honour, and they are bound morally, to spend the money for the purposes for which it is voted, and if they did not, this Government could pull them up sharp by an Order in Council. The proposition that I lay down is this—and I call the attention, not only of the Minister of Finance, but of the Acting Minister of Agriculture to it, and I call the attention of my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) to it, because he is the member on the Opposition side of the House who watches, so to speak, North-west matters, and he is an ex-Minister of the Interior. I lay this proposition down : That the North-west Territories are entitled to be at least treated on the same financial footing as was Manitoba in 1870, when it had a population of only 17,000. I don't think that you can get over that proposition, and if you cannot get over that proposition, then you cannot get over the corollary proposition which I draw from it. If you upset that proposition I grant you that I am entirely upset ; but if you admit it, you are bound to do what I ask, and more than I ask to-day. Now, according to

Mr. DAVIN.

the census of the North-west Territories, as laid on the Table by the present Secretary of State, it will be seen that we have 91,000 people there—that in the four divisions of Eastern Assiniboia, Western Assiniboia, Saskatchewan and Alberta we have 73,506, and in the other parts of the Territories the balance. And surely these 91,000 people are entitled to all the rights and privileges which were granted to the 17,000 people in Manitoba in 1870. Now, that money was not given to Manitoba out of favour, or as a gratuity or a charity, but as a matter of right ; and if we are placed in the position the people of Manitoba were placed in at that time, what should we get ? The first item they got was \$50,000 for government and legislature. Then they got 80 cents per head of their population, which on our population of 91,000 amounts to \$72,800. Then they got 5 per cent on so many hundred thousand dollars, because they had no debt, which would amount to about \$27.77 per head, which, as we have no debt, would give us \$126,353. Then, inasmuch as Manitoba had not lands, but all their lands were in possession of the Dominion Government, they got, I think, \$100,000 on that account ; we would be entitled to about \$125,000. That probably is far too little ; but suppose you put it at that. These items would give us \$349,000. Now, what amount is in the Estimates this year for the North-west ? On page 60 you will find that it is \$242,000. Mind, these sums were given to Manitoba independently of the cost of Government House, of paying for a governor and paying the judges. Take \$242,879 from \$349,150, and you have \$106,271. There is, therefore, that much less in the Estimates this year than we ought to have ; and if you go back, you will find that, according to the population we had, in 1883, in 1884, in 1885, in 1886, in 1887, in 1888, in 1889, in 1890, in 1891 and right on to the present, and putting us on the same basis as you put Manitoba in 1870, we have been entitled right along year after year to about \$100,000 a year more than we have got. If I am establishing a just proposition there, is it not a fact that the milk that should have been given to these young territories has been, so to speak, skimmed—that they have been deprived year after year of the amount of money to which they have been entitled, and therefore deprived of the instrument of development which they would otherwise have had ? Yet they are told that we cannot pay so large a sum as \$20,000 for dairies. Now, Sir, we are very imitative in Canada, whatever the reason is ; there is not a great deal of originality amongst us. Although I am not an unqualified admirer of what takes place in the United States ; yet they are a very progressive people, and if they do well and make successful experiments, I would just as lief take a leaf out of their book in such a case as anywhere else. In my childhood I was taught :

Seek for the truth where'er 'tis found,
 Amongst your friends, amongst your foes,
 On Christian or on heathen ground,—
 The plant's divine where'er it grows.

And I suppose it is as true of political as of dogmatic truth. What was done in the United States with regard to Dakota, Minnesota, Montana and Wyoming? They were organized into territories respectively in 1849, in 1861, in 1864 and in 1868. The area of Minnesota was 83,000 square miles, of Dakota, 149,000, of Montana, 146,000, and of Wyoming, 97,000; making an aggregate of 476,455 square miles. Their populations at the time of their organization into territories were: Minnesota, 6,000; Dakota, 4,837; Montana, 10,666; and Wyoming, 9,000; or an aggregate population of 30,032. The Canadian districts have areas as follows:—Assiniboia, 95,000 square miles; Alberta, 100,000; Saskatchewan, 114,000; and Arthabasca, which is not yet organized, 122,000 square miles. Now, take their populations separately. The population of Eastern Assiniboia is 23,317 white, and 379 half-breed. That is more than was the population of either Minnesota or Dakota, of Montana or Wyoming, when organized into a territory; it is twice the population of the most populous of them, Montana, which had only 10,000; and it is more than the combined populations of the three others—Minnesota, Dakota and Wyoming—when they were organized into territories. Western Assiniboia has a population of 10,608 white and 488 half-breed, making a total of over 11,000, which is more than the population of Montana when it was organized into a territory, and as much as the combined populations of Minnesota and Dakota when they were organized into territories. The population of Saskatchewan is 5,763 white and 4,168 half-breed, or a total of 9,931, which is nearly equal to the population of Montana when it was organized into a territory, and nearly equal to the combined populations of Minnesota and Dakota when they were organized into territories. Then take Alberta with a population of 26,115 whites and 2,578 half-breeds, or more than the population of Minnesota, Dakota, Montana and Wyoming, when they were at their several periods organized into territories. Now, I want to point out the way these territories were treated by the federal government at Washington when organized into territories. Take, first, Minnesota. It got a governor, judges, and executive officers who were appointed and whose salaries were paid by the federal government in Washington. Now, what we do for territories with millions of square miles of area and a population fully three times that of the four territories to which I have referred in the United States, when they were organized,—we do for that vast region what was done for each one of the four territories I have referred to when their populations respectively were only 6,000, 4,000, 10,000 and 9,000. With a population of only 6,000 Minne-

sota got a governor, chosen by the territory, judges, and executive officers, whose salaries were paid by the federal government. Then it got a legislature chosen by the people, federal appropriations for legislative expenses, public buildings, militia, or territorial troops, besides lands for schools and universities. We have got lands for schools, but none for universities; and in addition to the amount therefore I put in, when calculating a short time ago as to what should be given us, I should put down 150,000 acres of land, that being the amount which, I think, was given Manitoba.

Mr. MARTIN. It was never given but promised.

Mr. DAVIN. I presume that the promise of a high-minded Government is as good as given.

Mr. MARTIN. I would not give a cent for it.

Mr. DAVIN. But you belong to the spirit that denies. The United States territories got lands for schools and universities. How much? One-eighteenth of the area of the territory. Now, suppose we got one-eighteenth of the vast area of the North-west, or suppose each of the territories got one-eighteenth to deal with themselves; that would set them up, it would put them in a position to help to start housekeeping.

The American territories got land grants for each territory and future state for 1,800 miles of railway—we have got nothing of that sort. We cannot build a railway 50 feet long and give any land to bouns the project. Look at what the result has been to one state alone. Take Minnesota, she got lands for 1,800 miles of railways, and these railways were organized and controlled by the legislature—that is a very important thing. The fares are controlled, the running is controlled, and what is the result? Three per cent of the gross earnings go to the Minnesota treasury, and that amounted, ten years ago, to \$600,000 per annum. In one thing we did better for the North-west Territories, but it was only obtained after a great deal of agitation on the part of some of us. I came down in 1884, as a delegate, and pressed that on Sir John Macdonald, who was then First Minister and Minister of the Interior. I pressed at the time two or three other things, and they were put into the Act, but at that time he did not give us representation. I remember him looking at me in the press gallery, and lifting up three fingers to show that he had given three of the things asked, when the Bill was brought down, but not tht fourth. The fourth we got in 1886.

Minnesota further got subsequent land appropriations, as they got in Manitoba,—swamp lands—for agricultural and internal improvements, amounting to one-third, including school and railway grants, of the area of Minnesota.

Now, we know what progress these territories made as such, and what progress they have made as states, and we know that our North-west Territories have many things in common with those states. And my reasoning is this, that if we had had the same means, if we had had the instruments of production and progress more largely in our own hands, we should have made more progress than we have up to this time. But the fact is that we have owing to causes into which it is not necessary to enter,—owing to harsh and narrow criticisms, want of faith, want of imagination as much as anything else.—we have only just got as much as would enable us to go on, and the means for progress and expansion have not been at our command. Now, I have been blamed because I condemned the North-west people lately in this House for not having gone more fully into hog raising. Well, I believe in the hog on the farm; I believe in poultry and sheep and cows; I believe that one of the great advantages of dairying is this, that by means of skimmed milk and buttermilk, you are enabled to fatten a large number of hogs. Not only that, but you are enabled to have better cattle and cattle in greater numbers if you carry on dairying to the extent I would wish to see it carried on. It is the opinion of men who are more skilled than I in these matters, it is the opinion of experts, and it is my own opinion from observation—for, after all, a man cannot have been brought in contact from fourteen to fifteen years with farmers, interested in all their affairs as I have been, without being able to give an opinion of some value—and my opinion as well as that of experts is that we might acquire a superior and a permanent reputation in the North-west as producers of butter. Let me give you one striking fact. The butter produced in the dairy at Moose Jaw, which is in the centre of my constituency, has a more solid body than any butter produced in any other part of the Dominion. Although we have dairies in every part of Canada, from Halifax to Esquimalt, yet Prof. Robertson tells us that the Moose Jaw dairy butter has the greatest body of any produced in the Dominion. The quality of butter is determined by two things. First, by the cow, for some cows will produce milk that is better for butter-making than others, and other cows will produce milk that is better for cheese-making. The grasses in some parts of the country are better for butter producing, while the grasses in other parts are better for cheese producing. There cannot be the least doubt, for instance, that Ontario stands pre-eminent, while Quebec stands high—let us say that Ontario and Quebec stand pre-eminent—as cheese-making countries. Why, we are the largest suppliers of cheese to the English market to-day. I do not see why the low position that Canada holds as an exporter to England of butter should not be improv-

Mr. DAVIN.

ed by the North-west Territories, if proper and statesman-like action is taken. There is no reason why we should not take the same position in the export of butter that we take now in the export of cheese. The cold-storage policy that my hon. friends the Finance Minister and the Minister of the Interior spoke of last year is a good policy. The advantage of it for our people in the North-west would be great. At present, without cold storage, in Balgonie, and other places where there are not creameries, they must sell their butter for 10 cents a pound, which does not give the farmer a fair return for his investment. What I propose is that in places where they cannot afford to establish creameries, you should do for them what the free trader, Fielding, has done in Nova Scotia—you should say to them: If you establish creameries, we will give you so much money, say \$200, if you like, or make it more if you like. But do something to help the people there, as Mr. Fielding has done in Nova Scotia. They need the help, of course: I should not be here asking for it if they did not need it. What is sometimes not understood is that in a new country, no matter how fertile, no matter of how great expanse, you will have a large immigration, that, in the early days, will require your fostering care. The Russians find it in their country, and Fielding has found it in Nova Scotia. I am perfectly confident that if we accede to the proposition that I have laid down here to-day, the results to the North-west will be of the greatest possible advantage.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I suppose my hon. friend scarcely expects to press this motion to a conclusion to-day.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Surely he is not going to back down on this. It is the only thing left him.

Mr. FOSTER. Order. The latter part of the hon. gentleman's motion has reference to a department that is not to-day here represented. I am quite sure that the hon. Minister of the Interior, who has charge of immigration, would be glad to be present before the matter was disposed of. So far as the application of the resolution is concerned, it affects, to a certain extent, a kind of work that has been carried on by the Department of Agriculture. It attempts to make a specific appropriation for a particular branch of work which comes directly under that department. While I quite agree with my hon. friend in the general proposition that the Government of the Dominion should treat the North-west Territories, not as a province, but a part of the country directly under its own administration, so to speak, and, therefore, liberally, so far as the finances will allow, it is a little difficult, I think, in pursuing these general lines of administration, to make exceptions in the votes as to the different sections of the country where the money shall

be expended. You take, for instance, this same vote for the establishment of creameries and the encouragement of making butter and cheese of a high and uniform grade. The vote has always been, and I suppose will remain, a general vote at the disposition of the department, and the department, from year to year, considers in what parts of the country there is the greatest need for the encouragement of these branches of work. It is not, and never has been the policy of the department to continue the work of encouraging the cheese and butter industries by these special means consecutively year after year. The object of this vote, and it has been used for that purpose, is to take a certain section of the country, and, by the application of the methods of the department, to give an impetus and an encouragement: to take, as it were, the initial step in a uniform and intelligent manner. It is expected that the farmers of one district, having learned and profited by the work of the department during a year or two, when it especially has these matters in charge, shall then go on with the added experience and with the encouragement already given and prosecute the industry themselves, quite independently of the Government. That has been done, and sections of the country, notably Prince Edward Island, show the excellent effects which that policy has produced. The expenditure out of this vote, in its initial years, was largely in the province of Prince Edward Island, and some other portions of the maritime provinces. That work has had its effect. The output of the cheese and by butter factories has been very largely increased, and the area over which these have worked has been continually extended. But better than that has been the demonstration that has been given of the fact that the making of butter and cheese on an improved basis, having quality and uniformity chiefly in sight, is a thing which pays the farmers themselves, that it is feasible, that it actually produces profit, that it opens to them avenues of work apart from other and congested lines, and promises steady remuneration. Once this is accomplished, the work of the department is done, and the department then moves its machinery, and gives similar encouragement for a year or two to some other section of the country, repeating there what has been done in the sections of the country already attacked, so to speak. I am led to believe, by the officers of the Agriculture Department, that during this year a large part of their endeavours will be directed towards the North-west Territories, with a view to the encouragement of the establishment of creameries, and also to making a uniform and high-class quality of butter and cheese in that part of the country. That is, so far as I am informed, the object of the Department of Agriculture, and its efforts will be particularly directed towards the North-west during the present

season. I thought it proper just to make these remarks, and show my hon. friend that with the vote we have at present asked from Parliament it is the intention of the department not to neglect that large garden of Canada to which he has so ably directed the attention of the House this afternoon. Further than that, I do not feel prepared to speak at the present time. I would suggest, if the hon. gentleman would like to have the opinion of the Minister of the Interior, towards whose administration his resolution looks as affecting that branch of the Government, that might be well to adjourn the debate and take it up at a future time. However, I do not see how it is possible for my hon. friend to do other than that which he has so ably done this afternoon, that is, to direct the attention of the House and of the Government to the necessity which exists for the fullest possible recognition of the resources and capabilities of the great territories of the North-west, which mean so much to our Dominion, and from which I am sure such a large part of its prosperity is to be derived.

Mr. SPROULE. The work which the Dairy Commissioner has carried on for some time in Prince Edward Island, no doubt with a great deal of success, has reached that stage, we are told, when it can be practically abandoned for the future: and the general vote of \$20,000 which was set apart for that purpose, will now be available, doubtless, for carrying on the same work in some other part of the country. Therefore, it seems to me that the Government could well afford to direct their attention towards the development of the butter trade in the North-west Territories, as it is the most helpless part of Canada in that line. Commencing, as they do, with a very scattered population, not strong in wealth nor in numbers, it is much more difficult, when expense is considered, to commence operations there than it is in a more thickly-settled part of Canada. Now, we have used that vote for developing dairy operations in Ontario: two or three factories have been put in operation, and part of the expense of beginning operations has been borne by the Government. After assistance has been given for a time, and where the population was so thick as it is in the older settled provinces, it is not difficult to carry on operations by the people after the Government had stopped work. We are told by the Dairy Commissioner that he is not likely to be needed in the future in Prince Edward Island, and the pronounced success which has attended his efforts there ought to be a strong inducement to commence similar operations in other parts of the country. As no part of the country can be more deserving of assistance than the North-west Territories, I think that the Dairy Commissioner might very well direct his efforts during the coming season to that part of the

country. The Canadian Pacific Railway last year showed a commendable spirit, and proved that they were anxious to assist the enterprise as much as possible by offering to give assistance, in what direction I don't now exactly remember, but I think it was in the direction of assisting to provide cold storage, and, if necessary, refrigerator cars. There is no doubt that if the Government were to join with them in providing cold storage and refrigerator cars, then giving assistance to start butter factories, the trade could be carried on, and carried on very successfully, even with the assistance of the small sum that is at their disposal out of this \$20,000. Then, as the hon. gentleman only asks for \$20,000, it seems to me this vote is quite as available for this purpose as if there was a separate vote given for that special purpose. Now, what is the difficulty of starting these creameries? First, it is a scarcity of settlers; in the second place, it is the expense of starting. A few years ago, I believe, we proposed a scheme which was never carried out, that is, to assist in converting cheese factories into butter factories, provided they would continue their operations in the winter the same as in the summer. In other words, it was suggested to aid these associations wherever they proposed to convert a cheese factory into a butter factory, by giving them at least \$300 to pay part of the expense of putting in creameries. Now, if that was done in the North-west Territories, no doubt in many localities they would take advantage of it. And in addition to the \$300, the assistance given by the Canadian Pacific Railway would help them still further in establishing creameries, and I think it could be used just as well for the purpose the hon. gentleman indicates by his motion. I am quite sure that the people in the North-west would appreciate such assistance. I am quite sure also that the success which has attended the efforts of the Dairy Commissioner in Prince Edward Island warrants him carrying on the operations in the North-west Territories upon the same line; and if he did so, I have no doubt that the people out there would appreciate it very much, and the result would be as successful as it has been in the other portions of the country where he commenced to carry on operations by the small aid that was given him through this \$20,000.

Mr. McMILLAN. While listening to this discussion, the idea has struck me that this Government has been spending a large sum of money every year under the impression that they were benefiting the farmers. They took up a scheme last year of purchasing butter and sending it to the old country, and I think instead of benefiting the farmers it has injured them. Last fall I visited a little creamery in Renfrew, a creamery that has been got up by a joint stock company, and I ascertained how much the plant of that creamery cost. I found that they

Mr. SPROULE.

could not obtain in Canada the most improved machinery, and they had to go to the other side to get it; and I ascertained that the plant of that creamery cost \$6,000; but the duty was \$1,200. Now, if the Government are so very anxious to favour the creamery business and the dairy business, why do they not give a rebate of duty upon the plant that is put into a creamery for a cheese factory, and also a rebate of duty upon the raw material that is used for the same purpose. I hold that if they want to confer a real benefit upon the farmers, they can do it in this way. This would be no fictitious benefit, and if they are really desirous of benefiting the farmer, I hold that one of the first steps to take is to give a rebate of duty, the same as they have done upon the raw material used by the manufacturers of agricultural implements and others, when the article manufactured is to be exported. Why should they not grant similar aid to this most important industry? We know at the present time that farming in Canada is very much depressed, and this would be a real benefit to every factory, not only to those to be established, but to those already in operation. I hope that the Government will take this into their serious consideration before spring opens up, and before they begin to establish factories in the North-west. My hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) spoke of a grant of \$300. If they have to bring plant from the other side when they want to change a cheese factory into a creamery, this grant of \$300 will be saved to each creamery or each cheese factory that is put into operation all over the country. Our separators are brought principally from the other side: they are not made on this side, and a great deal of the raw material that is used also comes from the other side; therefore, I think the Government could confer a real benefit upon the dairy industry by granting this rebate of duties.

Mr. SPROULE. Separators are being manufactured in Canada now.

Mr. DAVIN. Before the vote is taken, I wish to say, in reply to my hon. friend, that the last part of the question about immigration, to which the Minister of Finance has referred, could be dropped. That might be supposed, from a rhetorical point of view, to weaken my position, at least it so struck some hon. members, I meant it as an 'a fortiori' proposition. I meant it in this way: I say, that this, as an immigration vote, would be justifiable, and it would leave us still entitled to \$100,000 extra, as a grant to the North-west Territories. But it could be dropped; I do not labour on that point, because the Minister of the Interior was not in his seat. I would be willing, and I have the authority of my seconder, to drop it from the motion. The Finance Minister, leading the House, did not grapple with my argument. My argument is this,

that we are entitled to be treated on the same basis as Manitoba was treated in 1870. That is a proposition which should be dealt with—we are entitled to be treated in the same way as Manitoba was treated in 1870, with a population of 17,000. The fact is, we are not treated in that way. We were entitled to be treated in that way twelve or thirteen years ago; but, as a fact, I repeat, we have not been treated in that way. We were entitled to be treated, year after year, on the same basis as Manitoba was treated in 1870, and for that reason we are due \$1,200,000. That is my proposition. Either that proposition is incapable of being blown to the winds as ludicrous and absurd, or it has to remain there, and, remaining there, then a paltry sum, such as \$20,000, is not a sum to be treated as so much that might or might not be given us. If it is thought that persons on the spot would be able to deal better with the \$20,000 than the central Government, then, give it to Mr. Haultain and Mr. Ross, or, rather, to the assembly as constituted now, but let it be indicated that this matter will be dealt with, and, if not, a grant of as much as Mr. Fielding gives to each creamery, \$400, would be a material help. The farmers in Nova Scotia cannot require as much aid as farmers who come in as pioneers in certain parts of the Territories. Take the country around Balgonie; take the Germans who have come in there, who make the very best settlers, and who are founding a great population in that part of the Territory, these men need help much more, in my opinion, than any of the inhabitants of Nova Scotia. If we are entitled to \$100,000 more than we receive, and I hope that amount will be put in the Supplementary Estimates, either this amount of \$20,000 can be given out of that or supplementary to it, because, if you make the people contented and satisfied in the North-west, they will write letters home to their friends in Germany and elsewhere; and the result will be a great aid to immigration. The result will be that we will have greatly aided immigration. The hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule) referred to a matter which all these propositions touch, and that is our sparse population. All these propositions of mine touch that point. We have about sixteen sections in each township to do the work of thirty-six. Half the townships are given away and cannot be settled on, and there are two sections of Hudson Bay and two sections of school lands, and so there are sixteen sections in every township to do the work of schools and what not for thirty-six. And here is a very important feature in that regard: One of the great enemies of the North-west Territories is the gopher. One of the greatest difficulties experienced in getting rid of the gopher is this, that there you have an odd section between every even-numbered section, a whole square mile given up, so to speak, to the free roaming of gophers. If a man kills or poisons them on his own land,

there is this section uninhabited which is a big breeding ground for them. So we have a sparse settlement, and we need help. We do not scruple to say that we need help far more than the people in other parts of the Dominion, and we are entitled to more money, and, being entitled to more money and needing more help, the House should grant us the \$20,000. I had expected on this motion much more support in debate than I have received.

Mr. MCGILLIVRAY. In view of the statement of the Minister, that the Minister of the Interior is absent, I move the adjournment of the debate.

House divided :

YEAS :

Messieurs

Allan,	Leclair,
Amyot,	Livingston,
Baird,	Macdonald (King's),
Bennett,	Macdowall,
Bergeron,	McDougald (Pictou),
Boston,	McGillivray,
Cameron (Inverness),	McGregor,
Cargill,	McInerney,
Carpenter,	McIsaac,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	McLean (King's),
Carroll,	McLennan,
Chesley,	McNeill,
Dupont,	Mara,
Earle,	Marshall,
Fairbairn,	Martin,
Ferguson (Renfrew),	Masson,
Foster,	Mills (Annapolis),
Fréchette,	Moncrieff,
Grandbois,	Monet,
Grieve,	Patterson (Colchester),
Guillet,	Powell,
Haggart,	Putnam,
Haslam,	Robinson,
Hazen,	Somerville,
Henderson,	Sproule,
Hodgins,	Stairs,
Hughes,	Temple,
Hutchins,	Tisdale,
Innes,	Turcotte,
Ives,	Tyrwhitt,
Kaulbach,	Wallace, and
Langevin (Sir Hector),	Weldon.—64.

NAYS :

Messieurs

Borden,	Fauvel,
Bowers,	Flint,
Brown,	Forbes,
Campbell,	Laurier,
Casey,	Lister,
Christie,	McMillan,
Colter,	Mills (Bothwell),
Davies (P.E.I.),	Paterson (Brant),
Davin,	Perry,
Dawson,	Rider,
Devlin,	Tarte, and
Edgar,	Yeo.—25.
Edwards,	

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

ST. JOHN, N.B., AS A WINTER PORT.

Mr. HAZEN moved for :

Copy of the contract entered into between the Minister of Trade and Commerce on behalf of Her Majesty and the trustees for the bondholders of the Canada Shipping Company, for

a steamship service between St. John, New Brunswick, and Liverpool, Great Britain.

He said: Mr. Speaker, in rising to make the motion which, for several weeks, has been standing in my name upon the Order paper, I would ask that I might be granted the indulgence of the House while I bring to its attention a matter which is of very great national importance to the people of this country. For many years past, it is well known, that the question of the imports and exports of this country, during the winter season, through our own Canadian ports, has attracted the attention of our public men, irrespective of party, and irrespective of the part of the Dominion from which they may come. More especially, Sir,—though I do not wish to press this question from a sectional standpoint—more especially has the subject been one of serious consideration in the lower provinces, and particularly in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia. As far back as the days of the confederation agitation, and the confederation elections in our province, it was a burning question. And, at the time of confederation, one of the arguments that was held out by the advocates of confederation, to enlist the sympathy of the people of the lower provinces in favour of that scheme was: that with confederation accomplished, and with shorter railway communication to the western provinces than existed at that time; then, an intercolonial railway was one of the terms of the union, all the freight going from and coming to Canada would flow out from, and into, the ports of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, instead of going to the ports of Boston and of Portland, Maine. Well, Mr. Speaker, confederation was accomplished, and the Intercolonial Railway was built. It is too late now, at this stage of our history, to discuss the reasons which led to the Intercolonial Railway being built along the north shores of the province of New Brunswick, and up the St. Lawrence, instead of taking the shorter route. The reasons were sufficient for the statesmen of that day. The idea of a military route had, no doubt, great weight at that time, and the long route of the Intercolonial Railway between the ports of the lower provinces and the western portions of this country was found to be such a disadvantage that it was impossible by means of that road, to divert to the lower province ports the Canadian trade that was going to the United States ports. Some years after the completion of the Intercolonial Railway, the Canadian Pacific Railway was constructed, and after the main line was built, this Parliament voted a large subsidy for the construction of another branch of the Canadian Pacific Railway, from the south shore of the St. Lawrence, opposite the city of Montreal, across the state of Maine, down to the province of New Brunswick, terminating at the port of St. John. This route lessened the distance between Montreal and the port of St. John by about

Mr. HAZEN.

300 miles. The people living in the constituency which I have the honour of representing in this House, then naturally expected that the trade of the west would flow into their port, and into other ports in the lower provinces. This trade, however, did not follow immediately upon the completion of that short line, and when the people of my constituency spoke to the officials of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and to members of the Government about the matter, they were told that their first duty would be to put their port in order, so that they would have proper facilities for handling that trade when it came to them. The citizens of St. John acted upon this advice, and they set to work to put their port in a position to accommodate the trade sought for. In the first place, they gave, as a free gift to the Canadian Pacific Railway, a branch line running for three or four miles from the Canadian Pacific Railway at Fairville to the deep water terminus at Carleton, on the western side of the harbour. They gave them this completed road, and they also gave the Canadian Pacific Railway valuable property in connection with the terminus in the city of St. John. Therefore, the Canadian Pacific Railway received, at that time, from the city of St. John, a right of way, a constructed railway, and also the grounds necessary for a deep-water terminus, which, in nearly every other city in this country has cost the company hundreds of thousands of dollars to obtain. All these were given to the Canadian Pacific Railway by the city of St. John, as absolutely free gifts.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) On the Carleton side.

Mr. HAZEN. On the west side where the Canadian Pacific Railway ends, because it terminates on the west side of the city of St. John, at Fairville, and this branch line runs from Fairville, for three miles, around Carleton, and down to the deep-water terminus at Sand Point. The citizens of St. John also gave to the Canadian Pacific Railway a gift, or a bonus, of \$40,000 for the construction of a grain elevator at their terminus, and they gave this without conditions of any sort, except, of course, that the elevator had to be built. In addition to that, Mr. Speaker, the people of St. John built deep-water wharfs at the Canadian Pacific Railway terminus, where the elevator is. These wharfs were dredged at the face and sides to a depth of twenty-seven feet, so that at the lowest spring tides, any vessel drawing twenty-seven feet of water can lie there with perfect safety. The citizens of St. John built this at their own expense, and from first to last that city, in order to provide these terminal facilities has expended \$300,000, without receiving one cent of assistance from the federal Government. That, Sir, is creditable to the enterprise and the energy of the people of my constituency, and I feel proud of

the fact that I represent a city which has shown so much business energy in that respect. Well, these facilities were provided; our city had put its port in order, as advised to do by the railway authorities, and others, and still, for a year a more, no western trade came to our port. There were some reasons for that, Mr. Speaker. It is well known by everybody that if trade gets into certain channels, it is a difficult matter to divert its course. The trade of the Canadian west, unfortunately, was accustomed to seek an outlet in Boston and Portland, and it was impossible, in a day, or a year, to divert that trade to St. John, or to any port in the lower provinces. But, in this case, there were special reasons which made it all the more difficult. In the first place, I am sorry to say, there was a section of our own newspaper press, and of our own people, who did not hesitate, for years, to say that the idea of getting western business through a lower province port was a mere dream, that our city could never become—as the advocates of confederation claimed—the Liverpool of America, because they said that nature and geography were against us, and that the only natural winter ports of the Dominion were those of the United States. In the second place, there was another very powerful influence operating against us, and that was the influence of the Allan Line, and of the Dominion Line of steamers, the two greatest of the ocean carrying corporations connected with the Dominion of Canada. The Allan Line was interested in Portland. For years before confederation, the Allan Line steamers had received an enormous subsidy from the Parliament of Old Canada, a subsidy which at one time, I believe, amounted to fully half a million dollars annually. At that time, before railway communication existed between the western parts of Canada and the lower provinces, the terminus of the Allan Line was of necessity in Portland. It had built up interests there. It had capital invested at that point, and in season and out of season, the Allan Line Company and Dominion Line Company did not hesitate to say that the ports of the lower provinces were unfit for doing the winter business of Canada, and that it was absolutely necessary for them to send their steamers to Portland. However, Mr. Speaker, during last winter our opportunity came, and in the month of November last, gentlemen representing the Beaver Line of steamships—a line of steamers owned and controlled by Canadians, having agencies in every part of this country, and in every part of Europe as well—came down to the city of St. John and said that if they could get the sympathy and support of that city, and if the people and their representatives would support their claim for a fair and moderate subsidy, and make every effort to get it from the Dominion Government, then they would take their steamers which had been running in the winter to the port of Boston,

and bring them to the port of St. John. They also guaranteed to use every possible effort to divert to the port of St. John the business which had been going to Boston and Portland. That proposition naturally commended itself to the citizens of St. John, and the result was that a delegation came from that city to Ottawa. My hon. colleague, who sits beside me (Mr. Chesley), the mayor of the city of St. John, myself, and other gentlemen who take an interest in public matters, were members of that deputation. We came to Ottawa and urged upon the Government the propriety of granting a subsidy of \$25,000 to the Beaver Line, as an experimental service for this present winter. Hardly had we got to Ottawa, before we were met with the bitter opposition of the representatives of the Allan Line of steamers, and the representatives of the Dominion Line of steamers, and the representatives of the Grand Trunk Railway who also came here. But so strong a case were we able to make out, so well able were we to convince the Government that our city had gone to such great expense, that it was only right and fair that the Government should, in a moderate way, assist this enterprise, that, on the 20th November last, a contract was signed with the company controlling the Beaver Line of steamers. From that contract, which I now hold in my hand, I will read a few paragraphs to show the nature of the contract. The first paragraph provides :

The contractors owning and controlling in their capacity aforesaid the four steamships "Lake Superior," of the tonnage of 2,880 tons net, "Lake Winnipeg," of the tonnage of 2,106 tons net, "Lake Huron," of the tonnage of 2,576 tons net, and "Lake Ontario," of the tonnage of 2,741 tons net, the "Lake Superior," "Lake Winnipeg" and "Lake Ontario" being each guaranteed by the contractors capable of a speed of thirteen knots per hour, and the "Lake Huron" of twelve knots per hour, will place said steamships on a route between the port of Liverpool in Great Britain, and St. John in the province of New Brunswick, the first named, the "Lake Superior," to sail from Liverpool for St. John on the 23rd day of the present month of November, 1895, and on the return voyage to sail from St. John for Liverpool on the 11th day of December, 1895, regular sailings by one or other of the steamships named to follow from Liverpool and St. John fortnightly after the said 23rd day of November, and 11th day of December respectively, until ten complete round trips have been run from Liverpool to St. John and return, the last sailing from St. John to complete the said ten trips to be made on the 18th day of April, 1896.

It will be seen by hon. gentlemen, that the contract is for ten sailings, for which the subsidy was \$25,000, or \$2,500 for each round trip. The paragraph goes on :

Each of the said steamers while employed as aforesaid shall be run at an average speed of not less than eleven knots per hour, and the length of the voyage between the said ports shall not exceed nine days, extraordinary con-

ditions of the weather excepted. It is understood and agreed that no calls are to be made by the said steamers at any intermediate or other port either on the westward or eastward voyages while employed under the terms and during the continuance of this contract.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Does the contract exclude them from having a terminus in the United States?

Mr. HAZEN. Yes, the words are explicit. There are only two ports mentioned—Liverpool in Great Britain and St. John in New Brunswick.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I did not gather, from what the hon. gentleman read, that they were excluded from going to a terminus in the United States after leaving St. John.

Mr. HAZEN. The language is plain and clear. It says, from the port of Liverpool to the port of St. John, and "no calls are to be made by the said steamers at any intermediate or other port, either on the westward or eastward voyages, while employed under the terms, or during the continuance of this contract." Then, there are the usual provisions that these steamers shall have the necessary accommodation to carry the mails, when required to do so. I do not think it necessary to read any of the other clauses until we come to the seventh, which is a very important clause.

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

After Recess.

Mr. HAZEN. When you left the Chair at Six o'clock, Mr. Speaker, I was referring to the contract that had been entered into on the 20th of November last between the Minister of Trade and Commerce, on behalf of the Queen, and the representatives of the Beaver Line; and I had read the first paragraph of that contract, which showed that the contract was for a service of ten trips between Liverpool, in Great Britain, and St. John, N.B. The seventh clause in the contract provides:

The Governor in Council may, if deemed expedient, fix from time to time the maximum rate for passengers or freight or any class or classes thereof, and in any such event the contractors shall carry on each steamer running under their contract, according to its capacity, both on outward and homeward voyages, all or any freight which may be offered at a rate not exceeding said maximum rate or rates. The freight rates on east-bound trips sailing from St. John, as hereinbefore provided, on through bills of lading to Liverpool from any place in the provinces of Ontario and Quebec, and Canadian points farther west, shall in no case be greater than from the same place to Liverpool via any United States route or port, and on west bound trips the rates from Liverpool to any place in Ontario, Quebec and Canadian points farther west, shall be as favourable as via any United States route or port to the same place.

Mr. HAZEN.

This provides that the charges by this line on freight from Liverpool to western ports, via St. John, shall be as low as they are by Portland or Boston, and that the same rates shall prevail on outward freight; that is, this line has to meet competition both ways. The clause goes on:

The contractors will carry on said steamships on each and every voyage from St. John, aforesaid, at least 400 cattle and horses or other live stock occupying a similar space upon the vessel, or at least 4,000 head of cattle or horses or their equivalent in other live stock, in the course of the time covered by the contract, provided that no prohibitive restrictions are during the continuance of this contract placed upon the importation into Great Britain of live Canadian cattle, and the balance of the full cargo shall in the case of each vessel consist of grain, cheese or other products, preference in all cases being given to the products of western Canada.

This clause was inserted because of the criticism, that, if this line were subsidized by the Government, it would be merely a competitor with the tramp vessels that come to St. John for the deal trade of the province of New Brunswick. So the provision was inserted, making it imperative on the company to carry 4,000 head of cattle or other live stock, and providing that the balance of the cargo should be made up of grain, cheese, or other products, preference being given to the products of western Canada, and that the cost of carrying these products from western Canada, via St. John, to Liverpool should be as low as the cost of carrying them to Liverpool via Portland or Boston. It is unnecessary to refer to the other sections, until we come to the eleventh section, which provides that the Government shall pay to the trustees of the company the sum of \$25,000, or \$2,500 a trip, to be paid, provided the contract is carried out in accordance with the provisions which I have read. That was the contract entered into on the 20th of November last. Every precaution was taken in that contract to secure the rights of the western shipper and the western producer, because it was felt, that, in order to justify the granting of that sum of money, it would be necessary to show Parliament that it was granted, not merely in the interest of the local port of St. John, but in the interest of the western shipper and farmer as well: and, by the figures which I shall give to the House in a few moments, I shall be able to show that that can be amply and fully justified. In pursuance of that contract, on the 13th day of December last, the steamer "Lake Superior," of the Beaver Line, sailed from the port of St. John with a full cargo of western products, and, I believe, was the pioneer ship in the inauguration of a new era in the trade of the Dominion of Canada, and, I trust, in the prosperity of the ports of the lower provinces, as well. Scarcely, however, had this contract been entered into, before the representatives of the Allan Line

and the Dominion Line, to whom I referred this afternoon, began to decry the enterprise, and rushed into the public press to show that the subsidy was one absolutely unjustifiable, and that the Government of this country had no business whatever to grant such a subsidy. Not only did those representatives take that course, but some of the newspaper press, not understanding the question, also put forward the idea that the subsidy was not justified in the general interests of the country, but was simply a political deal, having in view the near approach of a general election. Going back to criticisms of the representatives of the Allan and Dominion Lines, I find in the Montreal "Witness" of Saturday 23rd November last, interviews with these gentlemen. The first one is with Mr. D. A. P. Watt, the representative of the Allan Line in that city. Mr. Watt said:

There is no trade requirement for a fortnightly line of steamers between Liverpool and St. John in winter any more than between Liverpool and Halifax, or between Liverpool and Louisbourg. The winter mail steamers are made to call at Halifax to land and receive the mails, but they bring to and take from Halifax very little cargo, and during the many years they have been running to that port they have failed to develop any local trade.

But Mr. Watt failed to tell the representative of the paper that one of the chief reasons why his company had failed to develop any local trade was because their interests were centred at Portland, and it was their desire to develop the local trade there rather than at the port at Halifax, where they simply touched for the purpose of landing or taking passengers or of landing and taking mails. Referring to the establishment of the line, he said:

Its establishment is unlikely to benefit anybody in the Dominion outside that city (St. John), where a certain amount of money will necessarily be spent for disbursements, and some wood merchants will get a low rate of freight for their export of deals.

In conclusion, he said:

Altogether it is manifest that this new service is a political rather than a commercial steamship line, and that the approaching elections has more to do with it than any trade requirement.

Mr. Torrance, of the Dominion Steamship Company, said to the reporter:

I think the subsidy to the Beaver Line is most unjust to the other lines as it is actually more than is paid to the Allan and Dominion mail steamers, which have so long and so well served the public interests.

How he can establish that proposition it is entirely impossible for me to tell:

These steamers have never been able to bring to or take from the lower provinces a tithe of their capacity, although the Government has taken care in the contract to provide that the lower province ports shall be served at very reasonable rates—and I think that the money

which has been voted must largely go to the Canadian Pacific Railway which must charge for their longer haul considerably more than is charged either to New York, Boston or Portland. It looks to me as if it were largely political in view of the approaching elections.

This whole matter was well threshed out some few years ago at a conference in the residence of Sir John Abbott, when Mr. Seargeant, Sir William Van Horne, representatives from St. John and Halifax, and the managers of the Allan and Dominion Lines met to discuss the possibility of a service to a lower province port. After a full discussion it was agreed that it was impracticable owing to the longer railway haul and the consequent diminished earning of the steamers. The same conditions exist to-day. I can quite understand it would be very attractive to the country to have its own winter port for imports and exports, but I greatly fear as a steamship man that this is impracticable.

With regard to this latter part of Mr. Torrence's interview, I desire to say that I was present at that conference, to which he refers, at the residence of Sir John Abbott in Montreal. Sir John Thompson was there, my then colleague from the constituency. Mr. Skinner was present, and also the junior member for Halifax, besides Sir Wm. Van Horne and representatives of the Allan and other carrying companies of that city, and I say there was no such agreement reached or arrived at as that to which Mr. Torrence refers. The matter was there discussed in a general way, and no agreement was reached. But the representatives of the lower provinces who were there insisted that their ports were perfectly fit to do this business: they urged that it could be done in those ports if a reasonable subsidy was granted in order to get the enterprise initiated.

I have quoted these statements to show how entirely these gentlemen were misled. If they were looking at the question not from the point of view of their own particular interest but from the general standpoint of the country's interest, how entirely mistaken they were in the view they took, they must now recognize after the convincing proofs since shown that the business of the country can be done as well by the lower province ports as from Portland or Boston. During the last month I see by the papers, that a representative of the Allan Line has been in the city of St. John, inspecting the harbour there, and making soundings at the wharfs. If it is the intention of the Allan Line to bring their steamers to that port, despite what their representatives may have said of the port in the past, they will receive a hearty welcome, and we will do all we can to make their business there as easy and profitable as possible. To show what has been the result of giving that subsidy, I want to lay before the House some figures of the first five trips—the only ones concerning which I am able to get the figures now—of the boats of the Beaver Line showing the total amount of freight they have brought into Canada, the total amount they took out, and the time taken on each voyage.

Particulars of cargoes carried by the first five steamers of the Beaver Line, from Liverpool to the Port of St. John, N. B., winter season, 1895-96.

	Date of Sailing.	CARGO IN TONS.					
		Local.		Through.		Total.	
		Weight.	Meas't.	Weight.	Meas't.	Weight.	Meas't.
Lake Superior.....	Nov. 23.....	610	32	42	220	652	252
Lake Ontario.....	Dec. 9.....	290	110	180	430	470	540
Lake Winnipeg.....	do 22.....	37	25	350	510	387	535
Lake Superior.....	Jan. 4.....	260	160	240	550	500	550
Lake Ontario.....	do 18.....	54	120	510	380	564	500
Total.....		1,251	447	1,322	2,090	2,573	2,377
					1,322		2,573
					3,412		4,950

These inward cargoes are not so large as I would like to see them. The vessels had capacities for considerably more freight than they brought inwards to the western points; but it must be remembered that it was late in the season when the project was started, and the Montreal and Toronto merchants and the merchants of other cities had made their contracts for the winter. But I am assured by the agent that if the steamers come to St. John's next winter, they will be able to fill up almost every vessel with inward cargo. In addition to

that, I would like to state here that the last of these vessels which arrived at St. John brought a very much larger inward cargo than any of the previous vessels, and is now discharging her cargo in that port.

Now, with regard to the outward cargoes, I may say that every one of these vessels has had a full cargo during the present winter, and more freight is offered almost than the company can take care of. The following statement shows the business done:—

Class of Export.	"SS. Lake Superior," 1st from St. John, Dec. 13.	SS. "Lake Ontario," 1st from St. John, Dec. 28.	SS. "Lake Winnipeg," 1st from St. John, Jan. 10.	SS. "Lake Superior," 2nd from St. John, Jan. 23.	SS. "Lake Ontario," 2nd from St. John, Feb. 5.	Grand Totals.
Cattle.....		75 head.	126 head.	164 head.	123 head.	488 cattle.
Sheep.....	1,843 head.	542 do	40 do		930 do	3,355 sheep.
Horses.....	75 do	66 do		20 do	172	333 horses.
Grain—Wheat.....		17,013 bush.	9,860 bush.	15,723 bush.	16,000 bush.	58,596 bush. wheat.
do Pease.....	6,211 bush.	1,642 do	120 bags (split).	160 bags (split).		7,853 bush. pease & 280 bags (split).
do Beans.....		172 bags.				172 bags beans.
Hay.....	2,737 bales.	1,095 bales.	2,510 bales.	3,455 bales.		9,707 bales hay.
Apples.....	1,135 bbls.	176 bbls.	60 bbls.	1,513 bbls.	1,200 bbls.	4,084 bbls. apples.
Fish.....	677 cases.		79 cases.	76 cases.		832 cases fish.
Cheese.....	4,289 boxes.	2,243 boxes.	493 boxes	9,069 boxes.	3,000 boxes.	19,094 boxes cheese.
Provisions.....	915 pkgs.	436 pkgs.	229 pkgs.	547 pkgs.	1,400 pkgs.	3,527 pkgs. prov's ns
Sundries.....	280 do	72 do	584 do	941 do	200 do	2,077 pkgs. sundries
Butter.....	925 tubs.	433 tubs.		77 tubs.	300 tubs.	1,725 tubs butter.
Maple blocks.....	12,655		3,664	756	1,000	18,075 maple blocks.
Spruce deals.....	210 stds.	202 stds.	308 stds.	290 stds.	200 stds.	1,210 std. sp. deals.
Ottawa pine.....	90 do	120 do	60 do	18 do	50 do	338 std. Ott. pine.
Timber.....	292 pieces.				182 pieces.	474 pieces timber.
Eggs.....	2,017 cases.				300 cases.	2,317 cases eggs.
Leather.....		217 bales.		71 bales.	250 bales.	438 bales leather.
Asbestos.....		1,650 pkgs.				1,650 pkgs. asbestos
Flour.....		3,000 sacks.	3,500 sacks.	4,500 sacks.	500 sacks.	11,500 sacks flour.
Oatmeal.....		1,960 do	1,360 do	698 do	1,150 do	5,168 do oatmeal.
Staves or heading.....		2,310 bbls.	3,189 bbls.	1,000 bbls.	400 bbls.	6,899 bbls. staves.
Potatoes.....					200 bbls.	200 bbls. potatoes.
Plaster.....					100 do	100 do plaster.

That, Mr. Speaker, is the record of the first five trips of the Beaver Line. But while the Beaver Line contract only calls for ten trips during the season, through their agencies in the west and through the co-operation of the Canadian Pacific Railway—which for its dealings with the Beaver Line deserves all possible praise, having met their wishes in every possible way—they have succeeded so well in securing business that they are not contented with keeping to the letter of their contract, but, I believe, have provided four extra sailings. So that there will be fourteen sailings of the Beaver Line during the season instead of ten. I understand that the two or three sailings since those the figures for which I have given, have been with full western cargo, including not only goods from the western ports of Canada, but also goods from Minneapolis,

Chicago and other points in the United States. But, to my mind, the most gratifying part of the Beaver Line service lies in the admirable manner in which they have handled the freight entrusted to them to carry from Great Britain to Montreal and other western points. I have here the figures, and I desire to give the House a comparison showing the time occupied in the delivery of cargo at Montreal by the Beaver Line via St. John, N.B., with the delivery by Allan and Dominion Lines via Portland, Maine. I am able to show that cargo for western points—taking Montreal as a centre—by the Beaver Line on the first five trips that have been made, was landed in Montreal in quicker time than freight leaving Liverpool for Montreal by the Allan and Dominion Lines by way of Portland, Maine:

TIME OCCUPIED IN THE DELIVERY OF CARGO AT MONTREAL, VIA THE BEAVER LINE, AND ST. JOHN, N. B.

Steamer.	Sailed from Liverpool.	Arrived at St. John.	Arrived at Montreal.	Time in Transit.
SS. "Lake Superior"	Nov. 23.	Dec. 2.	Dec. 6.	13 days.
SS. "Lake Ontario"	Dec. 9.	do 20.	do 22.	13 do
SS. "Lake Winnipeg"	do 22.	Jan. 2.	Jan. 4.	13 do
SS. "Lake Superior"	Jan. 4.	do 15.	do 17.	13 do
SS. "Lake Ontario"	do 18.	do 28.	do 30.	12 do

Toronto goods were also delivered in 13 days on two occasions.

TIME OCCUPIED IN THE DELIVERY OF CARGO AT MONTREAL, VIA THE ALLAN AND DOMINION LINES, AND PORTLAND, ME.

Steamer.	Sailed from Liverpool.	Arrived at Portland.	Arrived at Montreal.	Time in Transit.
SS. "Vancouver"	Dec. 12.	Dec. 23.	Dec. 26.	14 days.
SS. "Numidian"	do 19.	do 30.	Jan. 1.	13 do
SS. "Labrador"	do 26.	Jan. 5.	do 7.	12 do
SS. "Laurentian"	Jan. 2.	do 12.	do 15.	13 do
SS. "Scotsman"	do 9.	do 21.	do 23.	14 do
SS. "Mongolian"	do 16.	do 28.	do 30.	14 do

So that freight from Liverpool via St. John to Montreal in these five sailings was never more than thirteen days, while freight from Liverpool via Portland to Montreal was, on three occasions out of six, fourteen days in transit; on two, thirteen days, and one, twelve days. And I think that if any fact was wanted to disprove the statement that our geographical position is such that we cannot do the winter port business for the Dominion, it is supplied by these figures,

showing that with steamers certainly not superior, and sometimes not so good, the run from Liverpool to Montreal via St. John has been more quickly made than from Liverpool to Montreal via Portland.

Now, that is not all that I wish to bring to the attention of the House, nor is it all that this subsidy has accomplished. Having a regular series of sailings provided for, the Grand Trunk Railway warmly co-operated with the Beaver Line people, and the result was that other lines also sought St.

John for the purpose of carrying freight coming from the west to the old country.

For a number of years past there has been a line of steamers, the Furness Line, running from London to Halifax, and then to St. John, and on its outward voyage from St. John to Halifax, and then to London. That line of steamers, until the present winter, scarcely did any western business whatever, but, during the present winter, owing to the development of the western trade over the Canadian Pacific Railway, brought about by the activity of the agents of the Beaver Line in the west, diverting to St. John the trade which they had formerly taken to Boston, so much freight was brought over that line that the Furness Line people began to reap the benefit of it also. I have here a statement, showing the shipments of western goods from St. John to London by the Furness Line, during the winter season of 1895-96 :

FURNESS LINE.

Shipments of Western Goods from St. John, N.B., to London during Winter Season 1895-96.

Nov. 13.—Per SS. "Damara," 1,145 tons—
Elora, Ont., 900 sacks oatmeal.

Nov. 29.—Per SS. "St. John City," 1,378 tons—
Minneapolis, U.S., 125 sacks flour.
Astoria, Oregon, 1,000 cases canned salmon.

Victoria, B.C., 10 casks seal skins.
Toronto, Ont., 485 sacks flaxseed.
Toronto, Ont., 40 cases furniture.
Toronto, Ont., 102 cases catsup.
Fergus, Ont., 600 sacks oatmeal.
Montreal, Que., 1,031 boxes cheese.
Montreal, Que., 19 rolls leather.
Montreal, Que., 16 pckgs. sundries.
Deptford Mines, Que., 3,000 bags asbestos.

Dec. 13.—Per SS. "Halifax City," 1,377 tons—
New Westminster, B.C., 118 bales hops.
Fergus, Ont., 900 bags oatmeal.
Ridgetown Ont., 134 sacks beans.
Toronto, Ont., 337 sacks flaxseed.
Toronto, Ont., 60 tierces liver.
Woodstock, Ont., 200 sacks split peas.
Chatham, Ont., 155 pckgs. windmills.
Montreal, Que., 238 cases soup, &c.
Deptford Mines, Que., 500 bags asbestos.

Toronto, Ont., 8 pckgs. sundries.
Dec. 18.—Per SS. "Damara," 1,145 tons—
Myrtle, Man., 140 sacks split peas.
Toronto, Ont., 161 cases bacon.
Keewatin, Ont., 2,500 sacks flour.
Claremont, Ont., 176 bags clover seed.
Montreal, Que., 50 bags clover seed.
Montreal Que., 1,652 boxes cheese.

Jan. 6.—Per SS. "St. John City," 1,378 tons—
Vancouver, B.C., 48 bales hops.
Seattle, B.C., 16 pckgs. furs.
Winnipeg, Man., 1 case deer head.
Keewatin, Ont., 500 sacks flour.
Fergus, Ont., 300 sacks oatmeal.
Ridgetown, Ont., 375 bags beans.
Toronto, Ont., 16 pckgs. sundries.
Montreal, Que., 276 boxes cheese.
Quebec, Que., 29 cases leather.
Altercliffe, Que., 626 boxes cheese.

Jan. 19.—Per SS. "Baltimore City," 1,534 tons—
Minneapolis, U.S., 15,959 sacks flour.

Mr. HAZEN.

Victoria, B.C., 2 bales furs.
Keewatin, Ont., 2,250 sacks flour.
Mount Forest, Ont., 500 sacks oatmeal.
Toronto, Ont., 160 sacks clover seed.
Toronto, Ont., 125 sacks flax seed.
Toronto, Ont., 364 pckgs. implements.
Toronto, Ont., 223 pieces radiators.
Toronto, Ont., 7 pckgs. sundries.
London, Ont., 500 sacks split peas.
Woodstock, Ont., 400 sacks split peas.
Ingersoll, Ont., 300 sacks split peas.
Montreal, Que., 805 cases canned meat.

Jan. 24.—Per SS. "Halifax City," 1,377 tons—
Minneapolis, U.S., 4,441 sacks flour.
Ontario, 7,898 bush. peas.
Ingersoll, Ont., 713 boxes cheese.
Walkerville, Ont., 500 cases whisky.
Toronto, Ont., 13 pckgs. effects.

This is the first time that a line of steamers has carried this large amount of products from western Canada, and, to some extent, from the Western States. I am in receipt of a letter from the agent of the Furness Line, a portion of which, I think, it might not do any harm to read to the House. It is written by Mr. Schofield, agent of the Furness Line at St. John :

We send herewith statements of the western shipments by the Furness Line hence to London, and the Donaldson Line hence to Glasgow during the present winter season. In addition to these shipments we have now on hand here about two hundred carloads of similar freight, which will be loaded by steamers of the two lines during this present week. Further engagements of cargo have also been made in the west for succeeding steamers, and the business will be continued steadily by both lines during the entire remainder of the season.

Further on in the letter, he says :

We are happy to be able to say that so far the steamers have all arrived here safely, and in good time, and the captains report no difficulty whatever in navigating the Bay of Fundy, notwithstanding the fact that several of them never visited this port before coming here this winter. The Canadian Pacific Railway also deserves credit for the expeditious manner in which they have handled the business, which, however, has already assumed proportions entirely beyond their present accommodations and facilities here, which clearly must be increased during the coming summer season. * * * * *

The small quantities of Canadian cattle obtainable for export has also been a disadvantage, which it is now expected, however, will be overcome by the proposed change in the Canadian regulations whereby United States cattle may be shipped from Canadian ports.

But, as a result of this development of the western business, another line of steamers came forward, as well, the Donaldson Line, which runs from Montreal to Glasgow in the summer, and hitherto in winter has been running from Baltimore to Glasgow. This line transferred their services from Baltimore to St. John, and, during the present year, has been running from St. John to Glasgow. I have here manifests showing the amount of western produce carried by that line during two trips—I have not got the others, I regret to say :

DONALDSON LINE.

Shipments of Western Goods from St. John, N.B., to Glasgow during Winter Season 1895-96.

Dec. 30.—Per SS. "Concordia," 1,617 tons—
Minneapolis, U.S., 2,345 sacks flour.
Indian Head, N.W.T., 4,804 bushels barley.

Ontario, 8,400 bush. peas.
Ottawa, Ont., 59 boxes cheese.
Toronto, Ont., 46 pckgs. meats.
Toronto, Ont., 58 pckgs. meats.
Ingersoll, Ont., 2 cultivators.
Fergus, Ont., 1,500 bags oatmeal.
North Glencoe, Ont., 525 bags flour.
Ontario, 428 sacks peas.
Montreal, Que., 442 boxes cheese.
Montreal, Que., 36 bales cotton.

Jan. 21.—Per SS. "Warwick," 1,640 tons—
Minneapolis, U.S., 1,341 bags flour.
St. Paul, U.S., 59,894 bush. oats.
Manitoba, 15,996 bush. wheat.
Fergus, Ont., 550 bags oatmeal.
Wellington, Ont., 124 bush. peas.
Myrtle, Ont., 277 bush. peas.
St. Mary's, Ont., 401 cases eggs.
Toronto, Ont., 30 boxes bacon.
Toronto, Ont., 3 radiators.
Toronto, Ont., 118 boxes eggs and meats.
Montreal, Que., 222 tubs butter.
Montreal, Que., 5 bales cotton.
Montreal, Que., 6 pckgs. effects.

I know it must be uninteresting for the House to hear me read these lists of figures, but, at the same time, I think it most desirable that a statement of this business should be laid before Parliament, and that the attention of the country should be directed to the fact, that this business is now being done through our own ports that was formerly done from Boston and Portland. This business has already attracted a great deal of attention throughout Canada, and from the "Cattle Exporters' and Butchers' Advocate," published in the city of Montreal, I think, I find, in the issue of 26th January last, the following:—

OUR CANADIAN WINTER PORT.

The port of St. John, N.B., is rapidly coming to the front as a desirable and advantageous freight and passenger route. That the port is not behind its rivals on the other side of the line is evidenced by the following:—

"The 'Lake Ontario,' of the Beaver Line, left Liverpool on Saturday, January 18, at 4 p.m., arriving at St. John, Tuesday the 28th inst., at 6 a.m., the passengers left on the afternoon train reaching Montreal Wednesday morning. Twenty cars of freight were despatched the same evening and were delivered in Montreal Thursday at noon, thus goods were shipped from Liverpool via this route, and delivered at Montreal in the incredible short time of 12 days. The Beaver Line state they are confident that with more perfect arrangements, they can further reduce this record."

In the Montreal "Gazette" of 28th January, I find this paragraph:

The Beaver Liner "Lake Ontario," which left Liverpool at 4 p.m., January 18th, arrived here at 4 o'clock, this morning. Twenty carloads of freight were despatched to Montreal, this afternoon. The "Mongolian," of the Allan Line—

I ask the attention of the House to this:

—which left Liverpool two days ahead of the "Ontario," only reached Halifax yesterday, and will not get into Portland, Maine, till to-night, so that the "Ontario's" bulky freight for Upper Canadian cities will reach its destination in, at least, forty-eight hours quicker time than the "Mongolian's." This is one advantage that accrues to Canadian merchants and shippers who patronize St. John in preference to American ports.

Just think, Mr. Speaker, freight going by the Beaver Line to St. John, beating the freight carried by the heavily-subsidized mail steamers of the Allan Line fully forty-eight hours, and yet the Allan Line representative, Mr. Watt, objects to a subsidy to the Beaver Line as unjustifiable, claiming that no business could be built up by that line from maritime province ports.

I think that the figures I have read must have demonstrated to the House, as I think they will demonstrate also to this country, when the people are put in possession of the facts, that a most gratifying commencement has been made in the way of doing the business of Canada in the winter season through the ports of Canada itself. These statements show most clearly, and this winter's operations show most clearly how entirely misleading were the statements made that geography was against the lower province ports, and that the natural winter ports of Canada were in the United States. Portland and Boston, for this winter not only have there been shipped the products of Canada from the port of St. John, but also cattle, flour, and other products of the United States. The results of this winter's operations have set at rest the unfounded belief that the port of St. John is an unsafe port owing to the dangers consequent on navigating the Bay of Fundy, for vessels this winter have entered our port without a single casualty. There is a well-equipped and efficient corps of pilots, the dangerous points are well protected by fog-whistles and lights and the testimony of the captains of the Beaver Line is that in winter the port of St. John is an easier and safer port to make than is Portland, Maine. No record, as I once before pointed out to this House, can be found of a casualty occurring to a steamer sailing direct from Liverpool to St. John, or from St. John to Liverpool, and the wrecks which have given an evil reputation to the Bay of Fundy have occurred largely on the southern coast of Nova Scotia to ships coming from Halifax which, instead of standing well off to sea, hugged the shore of that province too closely, being anxious to make a quick run to St. John. This winter's operations have also shown that the bugbear of fog has nothing in it to cause alarm during the winter season, because these steamers have not been delayed one moment in coming in and going out of the harbour; and these operations have further shown that the great rise and

fall of the tide is not an obstacle in loading vessels which cannot be overcome, and that for some classes of freight it is really an advantage rather than obstacle.

But, Mr. Speaker, there is another aspect of this case which I wish to bring before the House on this occasion. It is a well-known fact that for a great many years past, a subsidy of \$126,000 a year has been paid by this country to the Allan Line of steamers, part of it going through private arrangements to some boats of the Dominion Line, for carrying the mails via the St. Lawrence in summer, and Portland, Maine, in winter. I think this country has been obtaining very little value for that subsidy, for although we are paying that sum for the carriage of our mails, the Allan service has not been up to the times, the boats have not been able to compete with the fast boats sailing from New York, and fully two-thirds, I am within the mark, of the Canadian mails during the winter and summer both, have been carried, not by the boats subsidized for the purpose of carrying the mails, but carried by steamers sailing from the port of New York; and this winter's operations have shown that the Beaver Line steamers, which have carried some mails, have been able to carry the mails as satisfactorily and as quickly as have the Allan boats which have received the large subsidy of \$126,000. The granting of that subsidy, to my mind, is not fair to the people of the country. I believe it has hurt the country more than a little, for the popular idea has prevailed abroad that this country during more than six months of the year is ice-bound, and the only way of getting out is through foreign ports, that our mails have to be carried through foreign ports, and that when we subsidize a line of steamers to carry our mails it is with Portland as the terminal point. I do not think it is fair to the people of the maritime provinces, to the labourers and others who benefit by having vessels come there, that a subsidy should be given to a line of steamers whose whole interest is to build up a foreign city and community. Early in the present session, I asked the following question:—

Is it the intention of the Government to discontinue the granting of subsidies to lines of steamers between Canada and Great Britain, touching or terminating at ports in foreign countries?

To that question, I received the following reply from the Minister of Trade and Commerce:—

There has been no change since the policy of the Government was disclosed in the debate which took place when the Fast Line Subsidy Act was before the House.

In order to find out what the reply really meant, I had to look up the "Hansard," and see what that declaration of policy was, and in the speech of the Finance Minister, which I find reported in "Hansard," 1889, page 1370, this was the declaration of policy:

Mr. HAZEN.

Another thing that has been determined by the Government is that this new steamship service shall be distinctly a Canadian service. Therefore we have granted subsidies to the Allan Line, and we are now paying a yearly subsidy of \$126,000 to that line, their vessels having the privilege of going to an American port. This may have been necessary in the past; no doubt at first it was necessary. But I think it will strike the minds of hon. gentlemen that the time has come when, if we pay Canadian money to establish a route of this kind, the whole advantage of that route should come to Canadian ports and to our own country, and so the Government have laid it down as a policy that whatever line be established it should have the characteristic and shall be a completely Canadian line in that respect.

That was the policy of the Government of this country, a policy which would be universally approved by every one in this Dominion, as well as in this House, in 1889. But from that year down to the present winter, the old state of affairs has continued, a subsidy of \$126,000 a year being paid to the Allan Line, which makes its winter terminus in Portland, Maine. There is no excuse for the continuation of that service now. As the matter stands, it has been demonstrated beyond a shadow of doubt that a lower province port is quite as capable of doing this business as is Portland, and I am pleased to have seen it stated in the press recently that the Government have determined that in the future they will not pay one dollar to a steamship company making its terminus at the port of a foreign country. If the subsidy of \$25,000 given to the Beaver Line has done nothing else, it has accomplished a great deal in that it has made clear that our eastern ports are capable of doing our business, and demonstrating that there is no necessity of giving a subsidy for any further time to vessels that have their termini at foreign ports.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to approach this question from a sectional or from a local standpoint. While I cannot, as the representative of my constituency, shut my eyes to the fact that very great benefit has inured, not only to my constituents, but I believe to all classes in the province, as well, by the establishment of this line from our port, because it is to the advantage of our fishermen, our farmers, our miners, and all other classes that if their products are to be sent to the English market they should have the opportunity of sending them by a regular line, running from a port near at hand, yet I do not wish to view the question from a local standpoint, but rather from a Canadian, from a national standpoint, from the standpoints of a united Canada and of Canada for the Canadians. I think every part of Canada, every man who is a Canadian, and who believes in this Canadian Dominion, who desires to see it grow and flourish, must be glad that the time has come when it has been demonstrated that the business of Canada in winter does not end at Montreal, but that for the future

it can be done from ports of the lower provinces. There are very great possibilities for this business. I have looked into the Trade and Navigation Returns to endeavour to ascertain the volume of Canadian business which goes in the winter season to ports of the United States. Owing to the fact that these returns are not as full and as complete as they should be, I have been unable to obtain full information, but such information as I have I will give to the House.

Our Trade and Navigation Returns, page 545, show that foreign goods passing in bond through the United States for Canadian importers, in the provinces of Ontario and Quebec only—there are no returns for the other provinces—amounted to \$14,829,581 worth in 1895, and in the year 1894 (page 543, Trade and Navigation Returns), these imports for Ontario and Quebec alone passing through United States ports in bond amounted to \$14,753,686. From the United States returns, which seem to be more complete, at page LXXIII, I find that in the year 1894, there was transhipped to Canada imports to the amount of \$20,175,576. Going back again to our own Trade and Navigation Returns, we find that the value of goods exported via Ontario, Quebec and Manitoba, in bond through the United States during the year 1895, amounted to : domestic, \$11,271,002 ; foreign, \$224,484, or a total of \$11,493,486. In 1894, these exports of ours passing through the United States in bond amounted to : domestic, \$11,485,357 ; foreign, \$989,407, or a total of \$12,474,764. The United States report, at the page I mentioned above, says that there were received in the United States, for transshipment from Canada, exports to the value of \$17,068,629. According to the United States returns, which are clearly incomplete, the Canadian business done through the ports of the United States in 1894, amounted in round numbers to forty million dollars' worth. I believe, taking one year with another, and considering the length of time the St. Lawrence is closed to navigation, that at least sixty or seventy million dollars' worth of Canadian business has passed through United States ports each year, and which business properly and naturally belongs to the ports of the lower provinces. Even supposing that only fifty millions dollars' worth of Canadian business was done through the United States—and I believe this figure to be far below the correct estimate—and supposing that even half of that can be diverted to St. John and Halifax, and other ports of the lower provinces, there would be ample business to keep us busy in the winter, not only at these ports, but at other ports as well. Sir, it is the duty of every patriotic Canadian to encourage by every means in his power the transaction of all business possible in Canada, and it is his duty to try and divert that trade from the avenues in which it has been running in the United States. The figures which I have given above only relate to our

trade at the present time, but there is reason to believe that the trade between Canada and Great Britain will grow immeasurably greater in the future. As was pointed out by the Minister of Finance in his Budget speech, recent events have attracted the attention of the British people to Canada as it has never been attracted before. Great Britain now largely depends for her food supplies on Russia and the United States from the latter of which countries she each year imports \$400,000,000 worth of food products. Recent events have shown that it is possible at any time that England may become embroiled with Russia or the United States, when, of course, her food supplies from these countries would be cut off. Public attention in England has been directed to the Dominion of Canada and the other colonies as a source of supply, and British statesmen feel that the mother country must look to friendly nations for assistance in this respect. We may fairly expect that with that sentiment prevailing in England, her trade with Canada will rapidly develop in the future. The bounteous harvest which we had in the Northwest last year, must naturally attract attention to that country, and tend year by year to increase its population, and as a consequence increase the volume of its products. That being the case, we have not only to consider our present trade, but the possibilities of our future trade as well, and in consequence of the great step forward made this winter in diverting that trade to the lower ports, we have every reason to hope that it will continue to grow. I appeal to the hon. members of this House, and to members of the Government, that every encouragement should be given to the development of Canadian trade through Canadian ports. Irrespective of politics and from a national standpoint, it is a question which commends itself to every one of us. I do not appeal to any sectional prejudices, but I appeal to all the people of this great country. I appeal to the cattle-producers of Ontario and the wheat-growers and wheat-dealers in the west, to consider the advantages which our maritime ports offer, and to endeavour to send their freight in our direction. I would also ask the merchants in Montreal and Toronto, the great importers of this country, patriotic Canadians as they are, to assist us in building up the lower provinces, and by so doing to help us in making Canada greater and richer. A large amount of merchandise which these gentlemen import is sold to the people of the lower provinces. They have their agents there every day going from hamlet to hamlet and from store to store, selling their goods to our people from samples. I appeal to them, not only from patriotic motives, but from the standpoint of their own self-interest, to encourage the growth of the maritime provinces. If the rate of freight is equal, as I have shown it to be, and if the facilities for handling their goods be as

good in the lower province ports, as I believe they are, then I appeal to these merchants to give instructions that their goods imported from England shall in future be carried to the lower provinces, and not to ports in the United States. If they do this, it will give an enormous stimulus to Canadian trade. Speaking about the development of our trade with England, I wish to give two illustrations to the House. It is unnecessary for me to give hon. gentlemen the figures as to the immense increase in our cheese exports during the last few years. Taking the export of bacon from Canada to Great Britain, I find that in the year 1891 we exported 7,150,075 pounds, valued at \$590,852, and in 1895 we exported to Great Britain Canadian bacon to the amount of 37,526,058 pounds, valued at \$3,546,107. From the year 1891 to the year 1895, a period of four years, we increased six times the value of our exports in this one item alone. Still, Mr. Speaker, we only provide 8 per cent of the bacon that is used in the British market, and in this particular trade it will be seen that there is a splendid chance for extension and development. Sir, I must ask the pardon of the House for having trespassed so long upon its time. This, however, is a matter of national importance, and not merely a local question, and that being so, I thought it right to bring the question as strongly as I could before the House and the country. I sincerely hope that the energetic and active press of this country, irrespective of party politics, will do their very utmost, as they have been doing to a considerable extent this winter, to call the attention of the consumers, of the merchants and of the people of Canada generally, to the facilities which the lower province ports offer for transacting the business of this country, and to the importance of maintaining those ports. It is, I believe, the duty of the Government—no matter what Government be in power—to do what it can to turn trade in the direction of our own ports, and especially is it incumbent upon them to do so when they have before them the example of what the city of St. John has done by its enterprise. I sincerely trust, no matter what the fortune of war may be in the coming election, no matter what party may be in power, that it will be the pleasure of that party for some years yet to provide sufficient subsidies to insure the regular running of steamers from that port, and to do what they can liberally and ungrudgingly to assist that port, and by so doing to assist the general interests of the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. CHESLEY. Mr. Speaker my colleague, the hon. member who has just taken his seat, at the beginning of his address, called us back to the days of the confederation of these provinces. He mentioned the fact that the construction of the Intercolonial Railway was a part of that compact, and referred to the great expectations enter-

Mr. HAZEN.

tained by some of the public men of that day as to the results of confederation and the building of that railway for the purpose of uniting old Canada with the maritime provinces. That, Mr. Speaker, is somewhat ancient history, and I am not going to travel over the same ground this evening. But I wish to call the attention of the House to the fact that for many years past the people of the city which I have the honour to represent in this House have looked forward to the time when, as the result of the confederation of these provinces and the building of the railways uniting them, the products of western Canada would pass through the port of St. John to the markets of Great Britain. When what is now known as the short line railway, from Montreal to St. John, was completed, our people felt that with an open harbour easy of access at all seasons of the year, there was no sufficient reason why St. John should not be the winter port of Canada. Holding this view very strongly, they at once determined, so far as it was within their power, to provide such accommodation for ocean going steamers and such facilities for handling the trade, as would be required. I remember very well that at that time public meetings were held in the city of St. John at which this whole question was discussed very fully. The board of trade, the press, and the common council of the city of St. John took up the matter also and discussed it very thoroughly. I also remember very well some of the adverse criticisms made by a portion of the press of the city at that time. That portion of the press held that it was unnatural for the port of St. John, owing to its geographical position, ever to expect to command the exports of Canadian goods and the imports of British goods to western Canada. However, a very large and intelligent number of the people of St. John held different views. They felt that upon the completion of the railway I have named, which had reduced the distance between Montreal, the commercial metropolis of Canada, and the city of St. John, to 480 miles, and with that port open at all seasons of the year, there was no reason that they could see why it should not be utilized for the shipment of the exports of Canada and the imports brought into the country by the merchants of the west. Having been myself a member of the city council of St. John for several years, I know how thoroughly and carefully the whole question was discussed and investigated by that body. They finally determined that whatever facilities were necessary for the accommodation of ocean-going steamers and for the handling of the export trade of Canada, they were prepared to provide. I remember the adverse criticism that was directed against the city council at that time for the expenditures they were making in order to carry out that determination. At the same time, we were strongly backed up by a portion of the press; and on the strength of the public opinion in

our favour, we determined that suitable facilities should be provided. We found on investigation that although the Canadian Pacific Railway had connection with the city of St. John, it had no connection with the harbour, and we concluded that it was necessary that that railway should be extended to the deep-water terminus. With that object in view the city council purchased from the Government of Canada the Carlton Branch Railway, paying for it \$40,000; and that piece of railway was handed over to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for a long term of years at a nominal rent. This gave the Atlantic division of that railway connection with deep water at the harbour of St. John. At that terminus the Canadian Pacific Railway Company made certain improvements, among others building a wharf and erecting a warehouse. But the city council felt that the accommodation which the railway company provided was entirely inadequate to the trade which we expected to do through the port of St. John, and the council at once had plans and specifications made for the purpose of making the deep-water terminus suitable for these ocean-going vessels, and providing all the facilities that would be necessary for handling the expected trade. Very large and commodious wharfs having a depth of 27 feet of water at low tide were built at great expense, a large area of ground was set apart; on this an elevator with a capacity of 350,000 bushels, and with machinery enough to operate one of double that capacity was erected. All that would be required in the future would be additional buildings. The Canadian Pacific Railway tracks were laid upon these wharfs, warehouses were built, and a complete deep-water terminus made equal to anything of the same extent that we have at any sea port on the Atlantic coast. I think the whole cost, in round numbers, about \$300,000. I make this statement to show the strong view of the situation held by our people, and their strong faith that the time would eventually come, which was predicted by our public men at the time of confederation, when the exports and imports of the country would, in the winter season at least, pass through our port. Our people had strong faith in the statements made by the public men of that day, but, Sir, for one or two years this trade did not come. We were told by the vested interests in other directions, that the Bay of Fundy was almost impossible of navigation, that trade would not offer at the port of St. John sufficient to warrant a steamship company attempting a service to that port. But, during last autumn, the manager of the Beaver Line came to the city of St. John himself to examine the conditions existing there for ocean-going vessels, and the facilities for handling inward and outward cargoes. He brought with him the oldest and most experienced men in their employ; and, after examining the whole

situation and taking all matters into consideration, he concluded that we were fairly well equipped for the winter business. As a result of that examination, an offer was made by that company to give us a fortnightly service between St. John and Liverpool, if a subsidy of \$25,000 could be obtained from the Government. I can only say that this proposition was placed before the Government by a delegation from that city, including the representatives of the city of St. John, and we pressed the matter upon the attention of the Government as strongly as we could. We made every effort, we used every argument possible to induce the Government to enter into a contract with this company upon the basis and terms I have named. I am glad to know that the Government did enter into a contract with the Beaver Line Steamship Company to give us a fast service of ten trips after the close of navigation of the St. Lawrence for the sum of \$25,000. The first steamer reached the port of St. John early in December, and, although a very short time had elapsed between the signing of the contract and the arrival of the first vessel and there was some doubt as to whether the manager would be able to secure a full cargo, the first vessel left the port, on the 12th or 13th of December, with a full cargo from western Canada, consisting of cattle, horses, sheep, cheese and other agricultural products. As an evidence of the success which has attended this enterprise, I may be permitted to read an extract from the press of the city of St. John, which appeared in the St. John "Sun" in the month of January, about the time the second or third boat left the port:

Winter port matters are booming. American cattle are coming here for export, and it is not unlikely that the Beaver Line will make extra trips. The Allan Line seems to have an eye on St. John, as there is in the city at the present time a gentleman connected with that concern.

A "Sun" reporter met a large number of gentlemen at the Royal Hotel last night, who are helping to make this the Canadian winter route. From them he obtained the following information:—

Joseph Lunness of the firm of Rogers, Halligan & Lunness, of Toronto, who rank among the largest exporters of live stock in America, is here. He will ship 390 sheep by "Lake Ontario." They will be here by noon to-day. This will be the first shipment this firm have made by way of St. John. Mr. Lunness says he came down for the purpose of ascertaining what sort of a place St. John is for shipment of cattle. They handle large numbers of American cattle from Chicago, along with Canadian cattle. They have been shipping by way of Portland, Me., all along, but if they can do as well by using St. John they will give us a part of their trade. Mr. Lunness says his firm shipped 25,000 sheep and 3,000 cattle from Montreal last summer. The new regulation providing for the export of American cattle from St. John, he says, give this port a great advantage. This is the only Canadian port through which American cattle can be exported. Rogers, Halligan & Lunness are feeding 2,800 head of cattle at Walkerville, and 500 at Toronto.

Mr. Lunness will remain here until to-morrow afternoon.

W. H. Reid of Kingston, Ont., will send 36 head of cattle over in the "Lake Ontario." W. G. Elliott, of Montreal, will give her 50 cattle, 200 sheep and 60 horses.

Other live stock is on the way here for the "Ontario." Yesterday's accident will delay them somewhat, but they are all expected by noon to-day.

The "Ontario" is sure of a full cargo. In addition to the goods already mentioned as taken in by her she has received 20 carloads of provisions, 10 carloads of cheese and 10 carloads of apples.

Mr. Ludington, the live stock agent of the Allan Line, is at the Royal. Mr. Ludington is inspector and valuator for the insurance on all cattle shipped by their steamers. He says he had a few days to spare and came down here to see what the chances are for shipping cattle from this port. He wants to know what it costs to load a ship here. There has been some talk of Allan Line steamers coming here, but Mr. Ludington declined to tell the "Sun" man whether there was any truth in these stories or not. Mr. Ludington says he is going over to Sand Point to look at the facilities for handling cattle and general cargo.

Hatheway, the big Boston cattle man, will ship 240 head of American cattle to Glasgow by the "Concordia." This will be the first lot of American cattle sent from a Canadian port for years.

All the gentlemen above mentioned say St. John has scored a great point by securing the right to export American cattle.

Another paper gives this account :

The quantities of western goods arriving at Sand Point for shipment across the Atlantic are very large. There is said to be no less than 36,000 sacks of American flour here and on the way.

The "Lake Ontario" will sail for Liverpool this afternoon, having been detained as a result of an accident on the Canadian Pacific Railway. Her cargo is made up of 200 standards of deals, 16,000 bushels of grain, 700 or 800 boxes of meats, between 4,000 and 5,000 boxes of cheese, a lot of catmeal, canned goods, butter and apples. It amounts in all to about 3,000 tons. The live stock arrived yesterday afternoon and was all on board at midnight. There are in all 188 horses, 107 head of cattle and 900 sheep. To-day some more apples and a quantity of feed will be taken on board.

The western cattle men are satisfied with the way the live stock was handled at Carleton yesterday, and the Beaver Line people have no word of complaint to make as to yesterday's work.

I read these to show, that quite early in the history of the enterprise, it was already meeting with great success, as regards the quantities of goods being shipped. The results have been highly satisfactory, I think, to all concerned. I believe that the steamship people are thoroughly well satisfied with the work so far, and I know that our own people in the city of St. John are more than pleased. I believe that the people of the country at large will be glad to know that we have in Canada winter as well as summer ports, that we have in our country ports through which all our exports and imports can be shipped and received at all

Mr. CHESLEY.

seasons of the year. I not only feel that our people are satisfied in that respect, but they ought to be further satisfied when they know that business can be done as cheaply and as expeditiously from Canadian ports as it can be done from ports in the United States. We must remember that a very short time ago, about the end of last January, an Order in Council was passed by the Government allowing American cattle to be shipped from the port of St. John. Some criticism was aroused at the time by the granting of that order. I hold that Order in Council in my hand, and I will read it to the House. For my part, I cannot understand why there should be any objection, or why it should be adversely criticised. It simply enables Canadian railways and Canadian steamship companies to handle a larger amount of freight than they could otherwise do. These cattle will be shipped in any case, and shipping them from St. John is an advantage to that port. This is the Order in Council I refer to :

At the Government House at Ottawa, Friday, the 24th day of January, 1896. Present: His Excellency the Governor General in Council. His Excellency, by and with the advice of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada, is pleased to order that the regulations relating to quarantine and transit of United States cattle through Canada, shall be and the same are hereby amended in such way as to allow shipment of United States cattle from the port of St. John, New Brunswick, subject to the following conditions:—

1. That the regulations relating to the inspection and isolation of United States cattle passing through Canada in transit, from one United States port to another, be made applicable to cattle shipped from the port of St. John.

2. That such cattle not having pratique in Canada, but simply passing through in bond, be shipped as United States and not Canadian cattle.

JOHN J. MCGEE,

Clerk of the Privy Council.

The first shipment of these cattle, numbering, I think, some 240 head were shipped by the Dominion Line steamer "Concordia" to Glasgow. But that is not all, Mr. Speaker. The fact of that Order in Council being passed has increased the traffic on the western railways to the port of St. John, and I have every reason to believe that it has not only brought cattle to our ports for shipment, but also that large quantities of grain and flour have also found their way to the port of St. John, owing to the lowering of rates in consequence of the large quantities of goods being moved by the railways from the west to the seaboard. In addition to all this, we have the Furness line of steamers running from St. John and Halifax to London. These steamers have been running for some two or three years, if I recollect aright, but I think that up to this winter they had developed very little western trade. I believe that in consequence of subsidizing of the Beaver Line, and the bringing of western goods to the port of St. John, it has so increased the traffic, it has

so advertised the facilities of the port of St. John for handling goods, that people who knew but little of the advantages we possessed have had their attention attracted to us, and large quantities of grain, flour, cheese, and other commodities, from the western states have also come through for shipment by these vessels, via the port of St. John. So large have been the quantities of goods coming to the port that the management of the Furness Line, which is the same as the Donaldson, gave us two or three, if not four additional boats to Glasgow, which boats also have been fully loaded with goods from the west. All this is an advantage to the farmer, to the shipper, and to the manufacturer. Having three lines of steamers, one running direct to Liverpool, one to London, and one to Glasgow, the western man is given the advantage of these three great markets. I might here say, Mr. Speaker, that the Canadian Pacific Railway, over which nearly all these goods have passed during the past three months, has thrown into this business the energy that is characteristic of its management and has contributed in no small degree to the success of the whole enterprise. As an evidence of this, I will read a statement which appeared in the *Montreal "Gazette"* of February 4th last :

The Port of St. John, N.B., is rapidly coming to the front as a desirable and advantageous freight and passenger route. That the port is not behind its rivals on the other side of the line, is evidenced by the fact, that the "Lake Ontario," of the Beaver Line, left Liverpool on Saturday, January the 18th, at 4 p.m., arriving at St. John Tuesday, the 28th inst., at 6 a.m.; the passengers left on the afternoon train, reaching Montreal on Wednesday morning. Twenty cars of freight were despatched the same evening, and delivered in Montreal Thursday at noon; thus, goods shipped from Liverpool via this route were delivered in Montreal in the short time of twelve days.

I think that is a complete answer to the argument against the port that perhaps business would not be as expeditiously done as it might be from Portland or Boston. As a further evidence that the more freight you have to carry the cheaper it can be moved, and as a further evidence that the Canadian Pacific Railway are alive to the value of this trade and the interests of this country, I wish to read one or two despatches wired from the great centres of trade with reference to the rates of freight:

New York, February 5.—Commissioner George B. Blanchard, of the Joint Stock Traffic Association, said, to-day, of a report from Chicago, that western packers and forwarders had adopted a plan to break up the association by shipping over the Canadian Pacific Railway, and connecting lines, to St. John, N.B., where the consignments were taken on board steamers for European ports. I have no knowledge of the matter. If the information is correct, it means that shippers do not want to pay regular rates, and, therefore, ship by a line that will cut rates. The joint traffic lines will keep up rates, and depend on their facilities to obtain business.

On the same day there was wired from Chicago to the same paper the following :—

Chicago, February 5.—The Michigan Central sent a telegram to-day to Commissioner Blanchard, of the Joint Traffic Association, urging that all the western lines should be allowed to make a cut rate of 25 cents a hundred pounds on coarse grain to the seaboard, from St. Paul, which the Grand Trunk, in contraction with the Chicago-St. Paul lines, has been authorized to make since February 1st, to meet the Canadian Pacific's manipulation of rates, by which it is diverting great quantities of all grain, except wheat, from the North-west to Canadian ports for export to England. Within the last ten days it has carried over 1,000,000 bushels to St. John, which would otherwise have gone to New York. The agreement of that Joint Traffic Association allows the Grand Trunk Railway to fight its battles against the Canadian road in this manner, by making cut rates to Boston, but the American trunk lines to the seaboard are showing their dissatisfaction at not getting their share of the grain shipments.

The inference from all that is, that the effect of these large volumes of trade being offered over these roads, and almost all these shipments being made from the port of St. John, has enabled the railway and steamship companies to make a rate of freight which has attracted freights from western points to St. John. It not only proves that we can do the business there successfully, but it proves beyond doubt, that the larger the volume of trade which is handled by a railway, the cheaper it can be done; and that, while the Canadian Pacific Railway, by the Soo line, has a short route to the sea-board, it is very evident, from the despatches I have read, that they are taking advantage of that, and making a rate lower than that made by the Joint Traffic Association in Chicago for controlling of this western business. The result of the whole thing is, that the farmers of Canada get a cheap rate to the markets of the world for their produce, by sending it over the line of railway named and these lines of steamers from the port of St. John to Great Britain. As further evidence, let me read an extract that appeared in one of the St. John papers about that same date, with reference to this same matter :

Reference was made in this column yesterday to the large amount of American goods coming here for export. Inquiry reveals the fact that about 400 carloads have come here since December 19, or about 66 cars per week. These include 361 cars of flour, 20 of cheese, 5 of canned beef, 5 of grease and one or two others. The flour came from Minneapolis, the beef and grease from Chicago. While this is a great thing for St. John, it is not, as pointed out yesterday, so great a thing for the steamship companies. The farther west they go, the larger proportion must go to the railways and the keener the competition of ports like Baltimore. The nearer to the port of shipment the steamers can get their cargo, the better of course for them, and hence the importance to them, and likewise to this port, of securing more lower province and Quebec and Ontario goods. When the upper province goods that have come forward are added to the

amount of United States products, the total shows a great volume of business.

I may say that, so large has this volume of business become, that the Beaver Line Steamship Company, that were to give us ten trips during the winter season, have already been obliged, in order to handle the large amount of goods they were able to secure going out, to put on two extra boats and make four additional trips to clean up the business before the opening of navigation through the St. Lawrence. So you see, Mr. Speaker, that, when trade gets running in a certain groove, and when great volumes of it are being moved along certain lines, the cheaper it can be handled and the greater it will grow. I think this fact must be entirely gratifying to all concerned. I further think that the success of this winter business in St. John, which was started to some extent as an experiment, perhaps, is a full and complete justification for the Government entering into a contract with this line of steamers; it is, furthermore, a full and complete evidence that the business can be done at St. John, that the business can be done through the port of St. John as well, as cheaply and as expeditiously, as it can through American ports. I think it further demonstrates the fact, that, as to speed, and as to time, which is a factor in handling these goods, is shown to be in our favour. Sir, I have another little article here from a newspaper on that point that I wish to read to the House:

The Beaver Line steamship "Lake Ontario" arrived at Patridge Island early yesterday morning and was docked about 9 o'clock. The steamer sailed from Liverpool at 1 o'clock on Saturday, 18th inst., and had moderate weather until Saturday last, when a heavy north-east gale sprung up which caused a heavy sea. Captain Campbell states that the wind blew a hurricane and was the worst he had experienced for years.

The "Ontario" brought out 107 passengers and 1,300 tons of general cargo. The steamer not only made a profitable trip, but quite a victorious one, as the passengers for the west embarked yesterday afternoon on the same train that carried those who arrived on the SS. "Mongolian" at Halifax on Monday. The latter steamer sailed from Liverpool two days ahead of the "Ontario," and her passengers for the west will not reach Montreal any quicker than those who sailed from Liverpool for this city. The "Ontario's" western freight is being rapidly shipped by the Canadian Pacific Railway and will arrive in Montreal before the "Mongolian" can reach Portland, Me., from which port the latter steamer will ship her freight for western ports.

The above clearly points out that the port of St. John is the winter port of Canada.

Then, Sir, there has been more or less comment in the press, made, I think, chiefly by parties having vested rights in other ports, to the damage of the port of St. John; I allude to misrepresentations and to statements that have been circulated through the press from time to time, concerning the navigation of the Bay of Fundy. We have been told, over and over again, that the Bay of

Fundy was dangerous to navigators, that it was almost impossible for vessels of the class required for this ocean service, to be navigated with any degree of safety in the Bay of Fundy. That statement has been industriously circulated for years, circulated, I have no hesitation in saying, by parties who have vested interests and vested rights at other ports, and whose sole aim and object was simply so to misrepresent the Bay of Fundy and the harbour of St. John, and all in connection with it, that their own vested rights in other ports might be preserved, or not materially interfered with. But, Sir, this winter's operations have proved beyond a doubt that all these statements are unfounded. You have heard the statement made by my colleague who has just taken his seat, with reference to an interview with the managers of the Allan steamers, and the managers of the Dominion steamers, as reported in the Montreal "Witness." I think, Sir, these statements come with a very bad grace from a steamship company or companies that have for many years received large subsidies from the Government of this country for bringing the mails to the city of Halifax, throwing them on the wharf, taking the mail-bag off the wharf, going to a United States port, making an arrangement with the Grand Trunk Railway to carry from that port all the western freight of Canada, and being paid with Canadian money for doing it, thus building up a United States port, a port in a country not friendly to us, a port in a country that won't trade with us, a port in a country that shows no disposition to trade with us. And yet, Sir, these vessels have been subsidized heavily, not by \$25,000, but by \$125,000 a year, and all we, as Canadians, have received from that large expenditure of money is simply found in the fact, that these vessels run to the city of Halifax in the winter season, throw the mail-bags on the wharf, and take up others, and away they go to Portland. All our Canadian goods have been shipped in the past over the Grand Trunk Railway to Portland, and you see the whole business of Portland in the winter season is simply dependent on this line of steamers, and on the business done over the Grand Trunk Railway. I say, it comes with bad grace from steamship companies that have been enjoying large subsidies of the public money of Canada, to stand up and tell us that no business is developing there, that no business would ever develop; that, when these boats had been running there, little or no trade could be had; that little or no trade developed, and that it was the fault of the merchants, who had never taken hold of this matter. They also point us to the city of Quebec, and tell us that Quebec has lost all its trade because the merchants did not take hold with energy. I believe firmly what the management of the Beaver Line stated to us at the outset. They said: We have

our agents throughout the west and in Great Britain, and if we can get this subsidy, we can bring western business to your port: all we have to do is to be in a position to offer as low freight rates as any other route. They have kept their word, and have succeeded in carrying out what they promised, and, in fact, the volume of trade and the success of the whole enterprise have exceeded the expectations of its most sanguine friends. I hope we have heard the last of Canadian subsidies being paid to steamship lines having their termini at foreign ports, the result of which is to build up the trade of those ports. I hope further, that we will no longer be told by steamship companies that it is all the fault of the people of St. John that they have made no effort to develop trade, and that when the steamship companies have had connections made for a long time with Great Britain, they must keep up those connections and continue to carry their business to a foreign port. We are told, further, not perhaps directly, but indirectly, through the press, and through interviews with some steamship people, that on every occasion the Bay of Fundy has been held up to steamship owners and to the Government of this country as a great bugbear which stood in the way of successfully doing trade through the port of St. John, the result of this winter's business has thoroughly disabused the minds of the people of the maritime provinces at all events of that idea, and so great has been the success of this enterprise that I believe, and I know that it will be continued, that the farmers, the shippers, and people who have goods to sell in the markets of Great Britain realize that this venture during the past three months has proved that goods can be laid down in Great Britain just as cheaply through the ports of the maritime provinces by our steamship lines as through ports of the United States. Here is an extract from a letter written by the manager of one of the lines of steamships as regards the navigation of the Bay of Fundy. I know this gentleman very well, and he is a man who would not make a statement if he did not believe it to be entirely true, but would rather give the statement the benefit of any doubt that might exist—I allude to Mr. Schofield, manager of the Furness Line and Donaldson Line of steamers from St. John. He says that this is what his captains state in regard to the navigation of the Bay of Fundy:

All the vessels have arrived safely and in good time, and the captains report no difficulty whatever in navigating the Bay of Fundy, notwithstanding the fact that several had not visited this port before coming here this winter.

I think that statement, coming from the source it does, is an entire and complete answer to the assertion we have heard made so frequently through the press, and in in-

terviews by parties interested in other directions, parties who were interested in remaining in the position they were, and who were not willing to consider any change that might be offered in regard to adopting the lower province ports with a view to trade being done through them. To-day I have information to show that there is no diminution, notwithstanding the fact that three months of the winter have passed, in the volume of goods shipped from the port, but rather an increase, and I will read statements appearing in one or two of our newspapers, as late as 25th February, to give the House an idea of the great quantity of goods still coming to our port for shipment:

The Beaver Line steamer "Lake Ontario," will take the largest shipment of live stock yet made from this city. Her cargo will consist of 107 head of cattle, 188 horses and 883 sheep. She will also take about 200 standards of deals, 15,000 bushels of grain, about 5,000 boxes of cheese, about 800 boxes of meat, besides a lot of general cargo. The steamer will sail for Liverpool this afternoon.

The Beaver Line boat "Lake Winnipeg," will sail for Liverpool about 1 p.m. to-day. Her cargo will be made up, among other things, of: 16,000 bushels of wheat, 10,000 maple blocks, 2,500 boxes of cheese, 500 packages butter, 75 cases pain killer, 5,000 sacks flour, 300 standards of deals, 385 head of cattle, 72 horses and 13 sheep. Of the 385 head of cattle, 317 are American, and a fine lot they are said to be. The lot furnished by one man averaged 1,500 each. The pain killer mentioned above is shipped by Davies & Laurence, of Montreal, and goes to Bombay.

The Canadian Pacific Railway advertise in the English papers a "personally conducted" excursion from Great Britain to Winnipeg by the Beaver Line "Lake Superior," leaving Liverpool on April 4th for this port. The party, which will likely number several hundred, will be in charge of J. J. Haslett, the Canadian Pacific Railway immigration agent.

This is true. Notwithstanding the large volume of business done this winter, large quantities of goods not only Canadian but also American, continue to arrive. When the arrangement is made for the coming winter, the service will be made weekly instead of fortnightly as at present. There is no reason in the world why one of these vessels cannot leave the port every week with just as full a cargo as she has once in two weeks. I believe that as a result of this winter's operations, we have demonstrated beyond a doubt, that the Canadian business can be done through the port of St. John in winter, as well as it can be done through United States ports. I believe that we shall require to pay subsidies to steamers coming to the port of St. John to carry away our exports or to bring in the freight which our merchants may import. The following table will show the details of the cargoes inward and outward carried by the Beaver Steamship Line, from December 4, 1895, to February 19, 1896:

SUMMARY STATEMENT of Cargoes carried by the "Beaver Steamship Line"—Ports of call, St. John, N.B., Canada, and Liverpool, England, from December 4, 1895, to February 19, 1896.

Mr. CHESLEY.

INWARD.

Date into St. John.	Steamer.	Iron and Steel, bbls.	Telegraph Wire, cks.	Galvanized Iron, cases.	Machinery, cases.	Tin Plates, cases.	Tin Ingots.	Hardware, cases.	Oranges, cases.	Lemons, cases.	Grapes, brls.	Salt, sacks.	Merchandise, cases.	Glass, boxes.	Drugs, cases.	D. Goods, cases.	Karthenware, crates.	Wool, bundles.	Liquor, cases.	Hemp, bales.	Carpets, bundles.	Hats, cases.	Oil, brls.	Passengers.	
Dec. 4	L.S.*	191	2	11	2	340	12	1	242	10	15	7253	698	1	9	16	60	73	64	250	15
do 21	L.O.*	740	1	488	3293	1404	187	46	61	402	52	
Jan. 2	L.W.*	90	6	1451	36	72	280	2100	1098	569	1	65	35	402	6	4	53	
do 15	L.S.*	517	21	350	200	795	3042	1028	25	90	51	525	10	23	
do 28	L.O.*	7512	2064	6	154	4900	844	2	226	57	42	4	122	80	114	
Feb. 14	L.W.*	389	6	453	1960	939	571	55	68	3	10	20	

OUTWARD.

Date ex St. John.	Steamer.	Apples, brls.	Flour, brls.	Cheese, boxes.	Timber, pieces.	Deals, pieces.	Vegetables, brls.	Hay, bales.	Sheep, No.	Horses, No.	Cattle, No.	Wheat, bush.	Asbestos, bap.	Staves, bbls.	Feed, bags.	Skins, bbls.	Eggs, boxes.	Plaster, brls.	Liquor, cases.	Seed, cases.	Lard, tierces.	Fish, boxes.	Drugs, cases.	Chairs, bbls.	Organs, No.	Meats, cases.	Poultry, cases.	Merchandise, cases.	Hardware, cases.	Butter, tubs.	Sundries.	Passengers.	Value.		
Dec. 12	L.S.*	1200	23705	2215	20325	611	2737	1843	75	75	75	17012	1200	2310	1960	1	1408	121	38	349	9	61	107	925	1	148	126,212	66
do 27	L.O.*	176	1500	2443	39892	1714	1005	542	66	66	9-60	2850	1360	23	361	75	18	433	29	45	100,231	90	
Jan. 11	L.W.*	60	1750	493	3698	30369	120	2510	40	20	125	146	15752	698	16	208	338	201	16	80	925	00	
do 26	L.S.*	1483	2250	8289	756	21798	160	2958	20	20	107	15995	1470	547	86	39	57	1651	17	128,499	69		
Feb. 6	L.O.*	2052	2717	9314	15283	200	107	883	188	188	107	15995	1470	55	585	122	17	751	26	36	97,630	37	
do 19	L.W.*	570	1500	1628	3360	5235	431	18	72	384	17690	250	270	56	411	200	37	19	70,233	24		

* "L.S.", "Lake Superior"; "L.O.", "Lake Ontario"; "L.W.", "Lake Winnipeg."

The House is now in possession of all the information we have in connection with the matter. I am glad to know the experiment has been a complete success, and that while there might have been misgivings at the outset, the people of St. John and everybody concerned, are now more than gratified at the result of the enterprise.

Mr. IVES. When the deputation from St. John waited upon the Government last fall, with the proposition that an experiment should be made of shipping Canadian products from the port of St. John, there were several matters which the Government had to consider, with a view of determining whether they could reasonably hope the project would be successful. To my mind, it seemed to be requisite that there should be a railway company disposed to favour the route via St. John, and disposed to take hold of the matter in earnest, so as to supply that port with the necessary freight to give these ships full cargoes. It also seemed to me to be necessary, that a transportation company, having fairly good ships, reasonably economic freight carriers, should be ready to go into the enterprise. In the next place, in order to make the experiment of any value at all as showing whether it might be continued successfully, it was necessary to fix as a condition, that the rate should be as low for both east bound and west bound freight, as that quoted from any American port. It was at once recognized by the Government, and by the gentlemen who waited upon the Government, that the experiment would be of no possible utility, except upon the condition that the freight rates should be as low as by any other possible route. We had also to provide, of course, in order to safeguard the public exchequer, that in case the experiment did not succeed, and full cargoes were not obtained, that the power should be retained by the Minister of Trade and Commerce to cancel the contract at any time during its course. It was also thought necessary, in order that the experiment should be of any advantage, to stipulate that the freight which these ships carried should be largely freight from Ontario, Quebec, and western points. It would be of no particular advantage to demonstrate, that a subsidized line of freight steamers could get loads of deals from New Brunswick, or cargoes of freight from any of the maritime provinces. That, of course, would not serve any interest of the Dominion at large. It was therefore stipulated that these vessels should be loaded with at least four-fifths of their cargo from western points, and we took power to cancel the contract if that, as well as the other conditions, were not complied with. To my mind, it seemed that if we made an experiment of this kind and it succeeded, it would demonstrate that St. John could be utilized as a winter port of the Dominion, under ordinary favourable circumstances. Well, Sir, we made that contract, because

for the first time a steamship company and a railway company seemed prepared to take hold of the project, with a view of making it a success. I am sure it is gratifying to the members representing the city of St. John, and to the people of that city, as I know it is gratifying to the Government and gratifying I believe to the people of Canada at large; to find, that the experiment has proved so successful. It has been a pronounced success, and I have no reason to doubt from what I have heard, that the other leading Canadian lines of transportation will fall in with the policy of the present Government, and will in future seek their cargoes at maritime province ports. In answer to a petition from the Maritime Board of Trade of the maritime provinces, the Government have just laid down as its policy, that after the termination of existing contracts, no subsidy will be given to any line of steamers that touches at any other than a Canadian port on this side of the ocean. That is the settled policy of the Government, and we trust that that declared policy, coupled with the proof of what has been done by the city of St. John, will lead to, practically, a very large increase of business from Canadian ports during the winter season. There was only one thing that my friend (Mr. Hazen) the mover of this resolution said, with which I am disposed to quarrel. He seemed to express some lack of confidence as to which political party will have the granting of the subsidy next fall. I beg his pardon if I did not understand him, but it seems to me, that the patriotic course of the present Government in this matter, as well as in a thousand other matters, is likely to commend itself to the approval of the people of this country. We have no objection to bring down the contract and the other papers, and they will be laid on the Table at the earliest opportunity.

Mr. BORDEN. My hon. friend (Mr. Ives) the Minister, could not take his seat without reminding the people of Canada, that they owe this Government a special debt on account of the subsidy which has been recently granted; intending thereby, I suppose, to make the subsidy do good service at the approaching elections. The Government can hardly take very much credit for this subsidy, in view of the fact that it took so long a time to persuade them, that such a subsidy would be of any use. It was only at the last moment, and on the very eve of a general election—as is now clear from the statement made by the Minister of Trade and Commerce—that the Government was induced to give this subsidy. Mr. Speaker, I have been very much interested in the discussion that has taken place, and I must say that I think the hon. gentlemen who represent the city of St. John have a right to congratulate themselves, and to congratulate the city which they

represent, upon the results which have followed the granting of this subsidy. But while these exercises, which have partaken more or less of a sort of jubilation, have been very interesting, I would have been more pleased had the hon. members who represent the city of Halifax been here to join in the programme. I noticed that my hon. friend the senior member for St. John (Mr. Hazen), with a fine irony and with great regard, perhaps, for the feelings of the hon. gentlemen who represent the city of Halifax, always referred to the shipments from St. John by this line as utilizing the ports of the maritime provinces; but I failed to gather from my hon. friend's speech or from the speech of the hon. junior member for St. John (Mr. Chesley), where the port of Halifax came in, or what port they meant to indicate other than the port of St. John. It occurred to me, Mr. Speaker, that the port of Halifax was not "in it." Now, as has been said by the two first speakers, we have had many promises, made both before and since confederation, as to what would happen as the result of the confederation of the old provinces. I remember very well when quite a young man hearing the speeches of the hon. gentleman who now leads this House, describing what Halifax would be in the near future, immediately after confederation—that it would be the Liverpool of Canada, the great entrepot of this Dominion. And still, nearly thirty years afterwards, it comes down to this, that Halifax is not "in it," but the business is being done by the sister city of St. John. Now, Sir, as a member coming from the province of Nova Scotia, I may say at once that I rejoice in the success which has attended this effort to build up the port of St. John, so far as it is a success. I am bound to say, however, that I was somewhat disappointed in the figures given by my hon. friend the senior member for St. John as to the number of tons of freight which these steamships brought from Liverpool in the first three trips out of the ten. If I remember rightly, I think the number of tons averaged something like 1,000, although each of the steamers has a capacity of four or five times that amount. It did seem to me that that was not as desirable a showing as we should expect. But my hon. friend the junior member has given us further light upon the subject. Before he got through he had proved almost too much, because he told us that during the concluding portion of the time for which these boats had been subsidized two or three additional steamers were found to be necessary to carry the large amount of freight which was offering; that one or two other lines of steamers were bidding for it, and that when the arrangements should be made for the coming season he had no doubt that a very much larger quantity of freight would be registered. Now, it seems to me that my hon. friend has thus proved

Mr. BORDEN.

conclusively to the House that no further subsidy will be needed. But, to refer again to the city of Halifax, the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce told us when the Government were approached by the delegation from St. John, three or four things were necessary in order to carry out this scheme. First, he said it was necessary to have the co-operation of some great line of railway. That, it seems, was found in the Canadian Pacific Railway. Next, it was necessary to have the co-operation of the shippers who were willing to send their produce across or bring their goods from Great Britain. In the third place, it was necessary to have a provision in the contract by which the freight rate to be charged would be as low as the rate to and from any port in the United States. Well, Sir, it occurs to me that these provisions might be found with reference to the city of Halifax as well as with reference to the city of St. John. We have the railway, and the Government owns the railway that runs from Halifax. Consequently, if the Government were desirous of doing justice to the city of Halifax, there would be no difficulty in making arrangements with the railway that should co-operate in the project. And there is no difficulty in finding shippers who will ship their goods from this country, and if you subsidize a line of steamers and arrange with a line of railway to carry them, provided the rates of freight over those lines will be as low as the rates over other lines. Therefore, if the Government and the members who represent the city of Halifax were as zealous as the gentlemen who represent the city of St. John in looking after the interests of their own city, a similar arrangement might be made with Halifax to that which has been made with St. John. I think, Mr. Speaker, there is at present a freight line of steamers subsidized to run to the city of Halifax, known as the Furness Line. But I think the subsidy received by that line is only \$25,000, and that for a whole year—not simply for ten trips throughout the year—and the condition is imposed on it to call not only at Halifax, but also at St. John; while in the arrangement made with the Beaver Line, I observe that the city of St. John is the only point at which these steamers are to touch. Now, both hon. gentlemen have referred to the Allan Line, and have called attention to the fact that the Allans received a very large subsidy while they do the principal part of their business through the ports of the United States. My hon. friends were perhaps not in politics at the time, and they do not remember the chapter in Canadian history when the Allans made some large subscriptions towards a certain fund in the interests of the party to which these hon. gentlemen belong; and we all remember, from the evidence that came out in the investigation shortly after the election of 1872, that Sir Hugh

Allan had a distinct promise from the Premier of this country that he would be recouped for the money he had advanced. My hon. friend must not be annoyed at the Allans or at the Government, because the arrangement which was made so long ago as 1872 is being carried out, and until the Allans are recouped, my hon. friend need not hope to have the arrangements which is now being carried out, and which, I agree with them, is altogether wrong, changed. The hon. gentlemen have demonstrated, beyond question, that when any subsidy is given to any line of steamers to carry the mails from Canada to Europe, it ought to be a condition that those steamers should not touch at any other ports than the ports of Canada on this side. And I was glad to hear the statement of the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce that when the next contract is made for the carrying of mails from this country to England, the line of steamers contracted with shall not touch at any other than Canadian ports on this side. I do not intend to continue the discussion. I rose chiefly to call attention to the absence of the gentlemen who represent the interests of Halifax, and I note that it is not from ignorance of this subject coming up that they are absent, because I saw the junior member for Halifax (Mr. Stairs) in the House when my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Hazen) rose to make his motion this afternoon.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman seems to be quite true to his natural political instincts when he attempts to create rivalry and dissatisfaction between Halifax and St. John. That is the whole gist of the argument, if there be any argument. In what he has said. Instead of feeling pleased that a trade, started as an enterprise in St. John, had developed beyond the most sanguine expectations of its promoters, he rather blames the Government because the enterprise has been successful. I do not think the country will endorse his sentiments, or be inclined to attach as much importance, as he does to the support which is given to a steamship line. It is gratifying to know that, with the small subsidy given, we have secured a Canadian winter port through which we can satisfactorily ship the produce of Canada.

Mr. FORBES. That port has been there for a long number of years.

Mr. SPROULE. And it would be there for a much longer number of years before the hon. gentleman or his friends would have developed it if they followed their present policy. It ought to be a great pleasure to Canadians to know that we are not confined to Halifax as a winter port. We have, by the enterprise of the hon. gentleman who for the time being represents that section of the country, assisted by the Government, who are always ready to develop every enterprise that can be developed in the coun-

try, a winter port at St. John which meets all our requirements. We have been, hitherto, generally obliged to use Portland in the winter for the purpose of shipping our stock. But now we can ship from St. John. But the freight men of Ontario are not altogether satisfied, for this reason, that all the space, they claim, is taken up by Americans. The supply of American cattle is so great that the Americans have taken up the space to the disadvantage of the shippers from Ontario, who are practically shut out at present. But that can only go on for a limited period, because, according as more freight is offered and the demand for more steamers increases, of course there will be a greater number of steamers to do the trade. This winter the Ontario cattle men have been unable to take advantage of this port, and although the returns of freight given by the hon. gentleman from that district shows that a very large trade is being done from Ontario in different lines, it is only a question of time when a much larger trade will be done. The hon. member for St. John (Mr. Hazen) spoke of the shipment of maple blocks by this line. I think those were nearly all produced in my part of the country. Why, we have immense quantities of valuable timber used for that purpose, and during the last eight or ten years, dozens of mills in my part of the country are getting these maple blocks and shipping them to England. They have heretofore carried on the trade in summer, because it is not advantageous to ship in the winter, but when they learn that they can ship as profitably in the winter as in the summer, no doubt that business will be materially developed and become very valuable. I am quite sure it will be a pleasure to all Canada to know that this port is turning out so satisfactory, that the trade offering is an encouragement to continue in the future, and also to know that no subsidy will be required to induce steamers to go to that port in the future. It is regrettable that the return cargoes are not as large as they might be, but still if the return cargo be sufficiently large to make the trade a paying one, no doubt the steamers will continue the business. If they can get full supply one way, and a partial cargo the other, that will be sufficient to enable them to go on doing business at this port.

Mr. FORBES. I had not intended to take any part in the discussion, but the remarks of the last speaker seemed to indicate that he is not correctly informed as to the facts relating to the Atlantic service, and I rise to put him right. I am surprised that the Government cannot announce its policy whereby it intends to satisfy the city of Halifax for being deprived of its pledged rights. From confederation down to today, at every general election held in that city, the people have been told by Cabinet Ministers and Conservative candidates that Halifax was to be the great winter port of

Canada. Now, speaking for myself, I have no objection to St. John getting all it can of the foreign or provincial trade. I have no objection to this or any other Government developing the trade of that port, but when we are told that a steamboat line is subsidized very heavily by this Government to carry freight from western Canada to the old country from the port of St. John—subsidized at the rate of \$25,000 a year, or \$2,500 per trip—and that these steamers are almost exclusively utilized by American exporters, as stated by the hon. gentleman who has just sat down, who declared that the space was taken up by American exporters to the exclusion of western Canadian exporters, and who complained of the contract this Government had made.

Mr. SPROULE. I did not complain of the nature of the contract, but that the Americans had taken advantage before the Canadian exporters, and had secured this space in advance. The Government had nothing to do with it.

Mr. FORBES. My hon. friend distinctly said that this line of steamers was under contract with the Government to carry passengers and cargo from the port of St. John, and he then, as representative of western exporters, said that the steamers did not give the Ontario exporters a chance because they had given exclusive rights to the American exporters.

Whether they can do that by virtue of the powers they have under the contract made with the Government, or whether they can do it because the American exporter gives a larger rate of freight, I do not know, and I do not care. All I know is, that Canadian citizens are paying large prices to enable these shipments to be carried through this port. Here we have to-night a declaration from a Conservative member of Parliament, that the steamboat lines are boycotting the Canadian exporters and refusing them privileges in the carrying of freight, while they grant those privileges to the American exporters. One cannot but come to the conclusion, that the Canadian people are paying to assist in carrying on the American export trade to the exclusion and injury of the Canadian exporter. Now, if, after three or four months of experiment of shipping from St. John, vast quantities of goods are lying in the warehouses, or in the stations, along the line, waiting for export because the steamers cannot carry them as fast as they are offered, surely that is conclusive evidence, either that the subsidy is too large, or unnecessary, the cargoes being sufficient to pay freight without a subsidy, or, on the other hand, that the Government contract is not sufficient for the requirements of the country, and that, instead of having a contract for ten trips, we should have twenty or, perhaps, forty trips a year. I hope that the export trade from that port, or any other, will continue to grow quite as rapidly

Mr. FORBES.

as this trade has grown in the last four months, and that steamers will see that it is to their advantage to come to these ports to carry away western freight.

One thing more I would like to refer to. It has been said by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), that the Liberal party would never have done anything to develop the trade of St. John or any other maritime province port. My hon. friend is wrong there, quite wrong. If he will go over the history of the years when the Liberal party were in power, he will find that they took the only step that has ever been taken to make a maritime province port the winter port for Canada. During the regime of the Liberal party, they made the Allan Line come to Halifax and discharge their cargoes there. They did it to the great injury of the ports of Portland and Boston, those ports which the hon. gentleman and his friends have supported so long here, and which could have no better representatives here than the hon. members for Halifax, who, though sitting in this Parliament for so many years, have done nothing to benefit any maritime province port, while they have done all they could to assist the ports of Boston and Portland, having behind them the influence of the Canadian Pacific Railway. The hon. members for Halifax have never put themselves on record in this House, or done anything else in Parliament to benefit any maritime province port. A few years ago, just previous to the by-elections in 1892, a mass meeting was called in Halifax to protest against the renewal of the Allan Line contract. I was present at that meeting, and remember it well. The hon. members for Halifax, the same gentlemen who now represent that city, had been unseated for corrupt practices, and were seeking re-election, and by the way, Mr. Speaker, I am surprised that neither one of these gentlemen are in their seats to-day, although both are in Ottawa, and the junior was in the House when this debate began. At this great meeting, held in the Academy of Music, the hon. members were looked to for special speeches, and were expected to make wonderful statements as to the renewal of the Allan contract. The meeting was addressed by the hon. senior member at that time (Mr. Kenny). He moved a resolution, and spoke in most glowing terms of the great advantage to the western Canadian exporters of the port of Halifax and the great advantage to Nova Scotia of having these ante-confederation promises fulfilled, promises which had been made in 1867, repeated in 1871, in 1873, in 1878, in 1882, in 1887, and still again in 1892. He had great pleasure in informing the people of Halifax that at last they were to control the winter port of Canada. The resolution he moved approved the policy of the Government and denounced the efforts of the Allan Line to have their subsidy increased. He spoke in

glowing terms of the establishment by the Government of the fast line, with a 22-knot service, and spoke of the great advantages that would accrue to the Dominion. The whole American continent was to receive its mails through Halifax by fast train connections with Montreal, Chicago and New York. No sooner had he resumed his seat, than the hon. junior member (Mr. Stairs) rose to move his resolution. He came to the most gratifying part of his remarks, when he presented a telegram from the Premier of the Dominion, to the effect that he was pleased to say the Government had refused to yield to the bluff of the Allan Line but had a contract for the mail service at the old rates, and he was proud to say, that, through the influence of himself and others, the old 13-knot Allan boats would land at the dock at Halifax. That, we thought, was the crowning speech of the evening, until it turned out to be a hoax. That bubble was pricked before the evening was over. It was shown that he was not speaking with authority, and that has been proven to be the fact. The contract was renewed, and the boats went to Portland, as before, and the same money was paid, \$125,000 a year. That meeting in Halifax was got up for the purpose of deceiving the electors of the province of Nova Scotia. I have no hesitation in saying that the Government had never any intention of making Halifax a winter port, nor did they have any intention of making St. John the winter port of Canada until they were brought to do it by the force of commercial argument, by the fact that steamboat lines were uniting with commercial men in the maritime provinces to prove to the Government that freight could be sent through to these ports just as advantageously as through Portland or Boston. What I want to ask the Government is this: Where is the city of Halifax to get its 'quid pro quo'? Where is it to get its satisfaction for relinquishing its rights to the fulfilment of the promises made to it? It is whispered to me here, that Halifax is to get the fast Atlantic line, while St. John is to have the freight line. It may be, that the Government will be able to consummate that scheme, but I doubt it very much indeed. The hope will be held out to us, at any rate. What advantage is it going to be to us in Nova Scotia? I have the right to advocate one port, not as against another, but to claim that the promises made by the Government and their representatives, shall be fulfilled. I want to know, where does the advantage come in to the port of Halifax, as the hon. member for St. John said, to have these mails dumped on the dock, while the passengers are carried elsewhere? You cannot pass a law to compel the passengers to land at Halifax. You may pay \$750,000 for getting these mails thrown upon the wharf at Halifax. Is that going to deceive the people, that justice is being done to that port?

Is that going to compensate those people for the loss of the freight which should be handled by the citizens of that port? Is that going to compensate them for the loss of the passenger traffic which the Government cannot control under the present conditions of the railways in the province? Sir, until the Government awakes to the fact that they cannot divide these subsidies among the several maritime ports of the Dominion for the purpose of making votes, for the purpose of gaining political influence, I say as soon as they arrive at the conclusion, then we will have this thing settled upon a commercial basis, free from politics. But if they are going to divide it up in this way, and parcel it out among several ports for the sole purpose of making political capital, I say that the principle on which they are working is one which deserves condemnation. Unless you are prepared to give railway facilities to the port of Halifax, similar to those which the port of St. John commands—and I am proud to say it does command—then the dropping of the fast Atlantic mails and passengers at the port at Halifax will be a mere farce; they will not stop there. It has been said in the press, and talked of by merchants and others, that the Government intend to sell out the Intercolonial Railway from Halifax to St. John, and to give it as a part of a bonus to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company if they will accept the contract for the fast Atlantic service. This may do very well, and it undoubtedly will prevent any western bound freight from being shipped from the port of Halifax. When this Government refused to extend the railway called Temiscouata branch into the city of Halifax, then they took away all chances, commercially, from the city of Halifax of ever being a winter port for that trade; there is no doubt about that. St. John as a Canadian port has secured a winter service, but I want to know whether it is going to please the members from Halifax to accept a fast Atlantic service under the terms and conditions indicated by the junior member from St. John. If we are to have this line from St. John made a success, it must be carried out upon a commercial basis; and I trust, Mr. Speaker, that the time is not far distant when exporters will see it to their advantage to ship from the port of St. John without the aid or assistance of a Dominion subsidy. To-day we have three lines of steamers sailing from the port of Halifax. They afford a great convenience to the small exporting towns of the province of Nova Scotia. It has been demonstrated it is to the interest of our exporters of fish and of farm produce in that province to ship them by rail or by schooners to the central port of Halifax, and thence by steamers to the great consuming ports of the world, either in Great Britain, the United States or the West Indies. This is a trade which will grow; it will grow to a much greater extent, and much more satis-

factorily, under a changed tariff or fiscal condition in this country. I have great hopes that under a condition of change of affairs which will shortly come about, the return cargoes for these steamers will tend to lessen the freight of the outward cargo, and thus encourage export, so that it will be far greater than it is to-day. Until the Government look at this thing from a practical standpoint, until they look at it from any other point of view than that taken by the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule), I do not think they can make it a financial success, for the exporters of this country. I only hope that the trade of St. John will grow and prosper. Very little thanks I believe are due to the Government for what has been done. For many long years the port of St. John has been in the same or in a better condition than it is to-day. For many long years the port of Halifax has been in the same condition it is to-day; yet it has never occurred to those hon. gentlemen opposite and to such violent supporters as the hon. member for East Grey, that this thing might have been done before, that possibly a subsidy might have been tried before, and that if the trade of the port of St. John had increased in the proportion that hon. gentlemen say it has within the last three months, it would to-day have been one of the greatest exporting ports of the Dominion, or indeed of the western continent. I say, therefore, that very little thanks are due to the Government, very little thanks possibly are due to the members for St. John for foreseeing this thing at this late hour in their political life. True, they have been able, on the eve of an election, to bring such force to bear on the Government as to cause the Government to yield, and I heartily approve of their wisdom in taking the Government at the eleventh hour, and putting the nippers upon their throat. It is better late than never to do a good thing. But I do not think much credit is owing to the Government for deserting the maritime provinces in the way they have done since confederation. I think the people of the maritime provinces will look upon the matter in the same light; and I am glad to know that the matter has been discussed in Parliament and that the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Hazen) has made the motion that is now before us.

Mr. BAIRD. It would appear, if the statements of the hon. member for Queen's, N.S. (Mr. Forbes) are correct, that if the Government entered upon this scheme with a view of playing an election card on the eve of a general election, they must give the Government credit for having exercised almost unerring sagacity in playing a winning card. The thing apparently is about to succeed, and if the Government have a number of cards like this up their sleeve, the general elections will be about secure. Both the hon. gentlemen who have spoken of the port of Halifax, say the port of Halifax is not in it. They go on to recite that for

Mr. FORBES.

years and years they were taunted with the prediction that Halifax was to become the Liverpool of America. Well, I think I can offer them a few words of consolation on that subject. For years and years the Conservatives of the province of New Brunswick were taunted with the same argument, that St. John was to become the Liverpool of America, and no greater joke could be played for the past ten or fifteen years than to repeat in an election campaign that it was predicted that St. John was to become the Liverpool of America. But the Liberal statesmen and the Liberal editors who dealt so freely with this subject in the past, are very silent at the present time. It would appear that St. John is about to become the Liverpool, or one of the Liverpools, of America, and these gentlemen now are forced to join in and to give their praise to the scheme that has been carried forward by the Government of the day. They certainly have taken hold of it with a strong hand, and have tried to turn the tide of traffic towards Canadian ports. To those gentlemen I would say, for fear that they might be laughed at, do not make fun of the prediction for Halifax may yet become the Liverpool of America. You must bear in mind that at the present time there are but few millions of bushels of grain raised in Canada for foreign export, but the time must soon come when hundreds of millions of bushels of grain must find their outlet somewhere on the Atlantic seaboard to foreign countries. It would appear that the wheat fields of the United States are being rapidly depleted. The hon. gentleman takes issue with that statement, but I think that those who have made a careful study of the question, say that the exports from the United States must gradually decrease until they completely dry up, while those of Canada are just beginning to expand. In a few years, if this tide of traffic is turned and kept turned towards Canadian ports, I think that St. John will have more than she will want to do, and Halifax will have more than she will want to do, as winter ports. I will give the port of St. John a second place to no other. I come from the province of New Brunswick, and it is natural that I should feel strongly in her favour. Her location is a wonderful one, furthest inland of all the Canadian ports that are open to the sea all the year round, she has a commanding position for that trade. All it required was to turn the tide of this traffic and it has quickly secured the prize, as has been demonstrated so clearly by the hon. gentlemen who have spoken from the city of St. John, and the result of that experiment needs no comment from me. I think I am right in saying that these hon. gentlemen have made out a clear case for the port of St. John: they have made out a clear justification for the Government of Canada in taking the step they have in

granting this subsidy to encourage this trade, and a clearer justification for doing what should always be done, that is, withdrawing any subsidy to a line of steamers that goes to ports of the United States. This is all I wish to say on the subject, and we may be fully assured that the outlet for this traffic from Canada is going to be from Canadian ports and that St. John and her sister ports will be called the Liverpools of Canada.

Mr. FEATHERSTON. I am satisfied that the subsidy of \$25,000 per year to the Beaver Line has created quite a "boom" not only in St. John, but throughout the maritime provinces, as all the hon. members seem to be interested in the question notwithstanding the jealousies of different sections. I desire to draw the attention of the House to some of the workings of this line from an Ontario standpoint. We in Ontario have shipped a large quantity of our produce by way of St. John. I know the Beaver Line, and I have shipped a great many thousands of cattle by that line, which I consider to be one of the best and safest carrying lines in the trade. But we all would like to have the advantage of those boats for the cattle trade; but now we are not in a position to get the benefit of them. The reason is that an Order in Council has been passed permitting American cattle to be shipped over this route and by this line. I know well many of the gentlemen to whom reference has been made. Recently I asked one of them how he liked shipping from St. John, and he replied, very well, but we are very much handicapped by the Americans. To illustrate, he said, I will show what freight I have to pay from Galt to St. John. I have to pay \$82 per car for my cattle, whereas they have a special rate, run on express time, from Chicago to Montreal in 48 hours and have only to pay \$54 per car, or \$2 per head on an average car load in favour of American cattle being sent to that port as compared with Canadian cattle. The junior member for St. John (Mr. Hazen) alluded to British connection and the greater safety resulting from shipment by Canadian ports. We have been threatened with war with the United States. No doubt it would be safer in time of war to make shipments to the mother country by a Canadian route, but I do not see how we are going to get around the Yankees when the freight is carried through the State of Maine.

Mr. HAZEN. There are two routes through Canadian territories, one by the Intercolonial Railway and the other by Rivière du Loup.

Mr. FEATHERSTON. I am dealing with the route at present under discussion. This line goes through the State of Maine, and no doubt Canadian freight would be stopped in case of war. I think the subsidy of \$25,000 is given not only for the benefit of the people of Ontario, but for the benefit of

the maritime provinces and St. John City, but the greatest benefit as regards the cattle trade is derived by cattle shippers from Chicago to St. John. Canadian shippers were almost entirely shut out of the last vessel. The senior member for St. John (Mr. Chesley) stated that 317 American cattle were shipped on the "Lake Winnipeg," which sailed on the 27th February last, and that the vessel carried only a few other cattle. No doubt this is on account of the advantage possessed by shippers from Chicago to St. John, and those shippers are going to close St. John as a shipping port for Canadian cattle, and American cattle shippers will control it. What I would advise shippers to do is to go to Chicago and ship American cattle from there by way of St. John. The difference between shipping from Chicago to St. John and from Galt or London to St. John, is a saving of \$2 per head in favour of the former route, which in itself would be a good profit. Any one who has been in the cattle business during the last few years and can secure a profit of \$2 per head in this way will be willing to remain in the business the whole year round.

Mr. CHESLEY. No doubt 300 odd went by "Lake Winnipeg." I may say, however, for the information of the House that that was the sixth steamer of the subsidized line, and the other shipments had gone by vessels not subsidized.

Motion agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. FOSTER moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. EDGAR. In the absence of the leader of the Opposition, who spoke to me about the matter, I desire to ask whether under the special order for the next few days' questions can be asked, which is the usual practice. I believe that it was understood by the House that this should be the order of business; Thursday's order of business as arranged is that the Government business should come next after questions put by members.

Mr. FOSTER. The arrangement made is very clearly seen in the resolution passed, and it was that this should be the order of the day, with the exception of Monday. On Monday the old order of the day remains and questions can be crowded in.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But always when a concession has been made there has never been any reluctance shown to answer questions.

Mr. FOSTER. And there will not be.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I recommend that the modification suggested be made. The Supplementary Estimates were promised me.

Mr. FOSTER. They are coming.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. When?

Mr. FOSTER. As soon as we can get them ready.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 10.55 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 3rd March, 1896.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

THE REMEDIAL ACT (MANITOBA).

Sir CHARLES TUPPER moved second reading of Bill (No. 58) The Remedial Act (Manitoba). He said: Mr. Speaker, in times past I have had occasion to propose to this House the consideration of measures of very great importance, but I confess that I have never risen to propose the second reading of a Bill under the same deep sense of responsibility that I feel on the present occasion. The question that is now submitted for the consideration of this House is one which, in my judgment, transcends in importance any measure that has ever been submitted to this House during its existence. I cannot do better than to draw the attention of the House, briefly, in the outset, to what has been accomplished by the great measure of confederation which to-day brings us face to face with the question under consideration.

In 1864 a measure was concerted between the governments of New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island, and Nova Scotia for the legislative union of these maritime provinces. The Hon. Sir Leonard Tilley was at that time the Prime Minister of New Brunswick, the late Col. Grey was Premier of Prince Edward Island, and I had the honour to hold a similar position in regard to the province of Nova Scotia. I need not say to the members of this House, who all know, either personally or by long repute, Sir Leonard Tilley, that he was one of the fathers of confederation, and one of the public men who throughout his long career in Canada has been known and respected for his very high attainments and great patriotism. When we met as arranged, to hold a conference at Charlottetown for the purpose of taking up that question, a deputation came down from the province of Canada—then United Canada—and asked that they should be heard in reference to the still larger and wider project, of providing for the confederation of all the British North American colonies. I need hardly say that all gentlemen present in this House who have given attention to the history of Canada in those days, are well aware that

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

the position of Canada was then anything but a happy one. All who have given attention to this subject know that questions of race and religion had formed prominent subjects of consideration between the great political parties, the Conservative and Liberal parties, of this country, and that during that period, so great had the conflict become, so closely balanced were the parties representing, as it were, Upper and Lower Canada, which, to a certain extent, were divided into hostile camps, that good government had become impossible. The commerce of the country was in a deplorable condition; the financial condition of Canada was anything but such as would afford gratification or satisfaction to any person interested in the welfare of the country; and the credit had sunk so low, that 6 per cent debentures were only saleable at a ruinous discount. Under this condition of things, a decision was arrived at between the leaders of the great parties of which Canada was then composed—the Liberal and Conservative parties—to unite in an effort to change the constitution of Canada, either by arranging a federal union of Upper and Lower Canada, or a confederation of all the provinces. That question was submitted to our consideration at Charlottetown. The additional fact presented itself, that as Canada stood, for six months in the year it was shut out from any communication to the ocean, except through a foreign country, while in the maritime provinces our trade naturally was forced into United States channels, because we had no means by rail of intercommunication, or of carrying on trade with the old province of Canada. We listened to the statements made by the late lamented Right Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald, and by the late lamented Hon. George Brown, who were the leaders of the delegation that came to us on that occasion. And when they presented to us the position in which Canada stood, and when we considered the whole question, we felt that it was incumbent upon us to make an effort to see if the political position of all British North America might not be ameliorated and greatly enhanced by the adoption of the policy of union. Now, I do not intend to take more of your time than is necessary in reference to that matter, further than to say that, having arrived at that conclusion, we adjourned the question of a legislative union of the maritime provinces, and took up the wider and larger question of the confederation of British North America.

The result is known to all the members of this House. In October, 1864, a conference was called under the shadow of the Crown and with the hearty concurrence and approval of the Imperial authorities, and was held at the city of Quebec; and, after considerable discussion, in which several of the provinces were represented, the general principles of the union were arrived at. I am sorry to say that of those fathers of

confederation, the only one that I see in this House, besides myself, is my old colleague and friend, Sir Hector Langevin; and he will bear me out in the statement that there was no feature of that conference which impressed itself more deeply upon those who wished to see the British North American provinces placed in an improved position—in a position that would guarantee their being able to hand down to their children and their children's children the British institutions they enjoyed;—there was no consideration that had greater significance or greater importance in the minds of all the delegates present on that occasion than that this measure afforded the means of removing that antagonism of race and religion which had been found to act so fatally in reference to the interests of Canada. I need not remind you that subsequently, at the Westminster Palace Hotel in London, in the year 1866, the governments of Canada, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick found themselves in a position to act under the parliamentary authority they had received, and that measures were there accomplished which enabled an Act to be passed through the Imperial Parliament changing the constitution of British North America, and uniting under one government the provinces of Canada, which were then separated and known as Upper and Lower Canada, and the provinces of Nova Scotia, and New Brunswick, with powers under which not only the great territory of the North-west and the distant province of British Columbia, but also the Islands of Prince Edward and Newfoundland, might be brought into one confederation; so that there should be a consolidated government for the whole of British North America. That object was steadily pursued, and that object has been attained, except as regards the Island of Newfoundland, which, I still venture to hope, may at no distant day round off this confederation by becoming a part of the great whole of British North America. I need not detain the House to detail the wonderful change that ensued in every part of Canada. I need not detain the House while I point out that Canada rose rapidly to a status that had never before been occupied by any British colony or any outside portion of the British Empire. I need not remind you that, so far as government is concerned, Canada is practically independent. I need not remind you that, so far as measures relating to the internal life of Canada are concerned, we have practically the uncontrolled administration of our own affairs. I need not remind you that the status which Canada has attained has enabled her to be admitted as an integral portion of the great international conventions that are held throughout Europe—that at the international conference held in Paris in 1883 for the protection of submarine cables, Canada was as fully represented, and occupied a position in every respect equal to that of Belgium or Germany or any of the other

great powers represented there. I need not remind the House that under this improved status, foreign affairs touching Canada are to a large extent placed under our own control—that arrangements have been made, with the hearty approval and assent of Her Majesty's Government, by which Canada practically negotiates her own treaties, with the advice and assistance and support of the great Empire of which we form a part. I need not remind the House of the wonderful material advancement and progress which Canada has made. I need not call attention to the fact that whereas, when this question of confederation was taken up, there was no railway connection even between Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, to-day, from the eastern shores of Cape Breton on the Gulf of St. Lawrence away across to the Pacific Ocean, you may pass without leaving the car in which you have taken your passage. The development, the progress, the prosperity of this country has transcended anything that the most sanguine gentleman entertained in reference to what this great confederation would accomplish. The illimitable wilderness of the great North-west has been opened up by our transcontinental line of railway; and to-day, although some of our more sanguine expectations have not been realized, we are in a position to show that in this desert of yesterday more wheat was grown during the past year than in the whole of the United Kingdom. I give that as an evidence and indication of the position we have attained. Not only is that the case, but it was only a short time ago that the city of Ottawa witnessed one of the most striking events that has ever taken place in the history of any British colony, or in the history of any colony of any kind in the world. It was only the other day, as it were, that the wonderful scene was presented of the great colonies of Australia, New Zealand, South Africa and Canada being united in a conference and conclave here. Not only so, but that conference was attended by a distinguished representative of the Imperial Government, who took part in it, and who recognized it as one of the most important and transcendent events that had ever occurred in any part of the British Empire. I need not draw your attention to the fact that on that occasion you had the Imperial Government recognizing that Canada was a great highway—that under the wonderful progress and development she had made, she had become a great highway of intercommunication between England and the colonies of the Empire on the east and those on the west—between Hong Kong and Australia. In connection with those proceedings, we have had the gratification to find that the Imperial Government is at last thoroughly enlisted and pledged to the support of the means by which the intercommunication between the United Kingdom and those colonies shall be effected, in connection with the fast Atlantic service and

the cable communication to be established via Canada with Australia. In fact, we are in a position to obtain at the hands of the Imperial Government substantial aid and assistance and co-operation in taking advantage of the great position we now occupy.

I spoke a few moments ago of the deplorable condition of the credit of Canada at the time this confederation was undertaken and accomplished. Instead of the 6 per cent bonds of Canada being away down, and sold at a ruinous discount, we have had the pleasure of finding, after all these great improvements, many of them of a very costly character, the credit of Canada so enhanced that our 3 per cent, when I left England, were standing at a premium of about 3 per cent. I give that as additional evidence. As I have referred to the distinguished nobleman who represented the Imperial Government at the Colonial Conference at Ottawa, I may be permitted to read a single sentence that fell from Lord Jersey on that occasion. He said :

It is with wonder that I think of what Canada has done to bring the northern and southern parts of this Empire together. She has linked the two great oceans, after an exhibition of courage, statesmanship and skill, which has never been surpassed in the history of the world.

And when I was sent to communicate with the government of the great republic to the south of us at Washington, Mr. Bayard, the eminent statesman who now represents the United States of America at the court of St. James, said to me : The confederation of Canada, and the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway have brought us face to face with a nation, and we may as well regard the question from that point of view. Instead of being isolated, separated, weak, even antagonistic provinces, they recognize the fact that we have become united, under one Government, in one great whole, and that we possess, in the northern portion of this continent of North America, a boundless field for advancement and progress ; and many of the most eminent statesmen of the United States have again and again drawn attention to the wonderful progress, wonderful development, and wonderful position which Canada has attained. I draw attention to that for the purpose of coming more particularly to the point now under consideration.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. And hon. gentlemen will see in a moment, if they will indulge me with the opportunity, the point to which I wish to call their attention. There would have been no confederation—I say it in the presence of my colleague who was at the Westminster Palace Hotel. I say it within the knowledge of Sir Leonard Tilley, who was one of the fathers of confederation, of the Hon. Peter Mitchell, who was at that conference, of the Hon.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

Wm. Macdougall, and the Hon. Sir Wm. Howland ; I say it within the knowledge of all these gentlemen, for six of us still, I am glad to know, remain—that but for the consent to the proposal of the Hon. Sir Alexander Galt, who represented especially the Protestants of the great province of Quebec on that occasion, but for the assent of that conference to the proposal of Sir Alexander Galt, that in the Confederation Act should be embodied a clause which would protect the rights of minorities, whether Catholic or Protestant, in this country, there would have been no confederation. And I draw attention to the fact that when you contrast our present position with that which Canada occupied on the occasion when Mr. Geo. Brown and Sir John A. Macdonald felt impelled, by the necessities of the case, by the condition of their country, to seek some change in its constitution which would relieve it from the terrible consequences of that war of religion and races that had been maintained in old Canada down to that time, it is significant that but for this clause protecting minorities, this measure of confederation would not have been accomplished, and no man could say how humiliating might not have been the position, either of Canada or any of the smaller provinces if that great work had not been accomplished. In the very valuable, although fragmentary, work of Mr. Pope, which I have in my hand—the history, so far as he could glean it from the documents left by the late Sir John A. Macdonald, of the establishment of confederation, I find the proposition made by Sir Alexander Galt on that occasion, made in the interests, not of Roman Catholics, but of the Protestants of Quebec, demanding that there should be embodied, as a 'sine qui non' to his agreeing, or to the Protestants of the province of Quebec agreeing to any confederation being accomplished—I find there the fact simile of the resolution which Sir Alexander Galt drafted with his own hand, and which was embodied in the Confederation Act. I say, therefore, it is important, it is significant that without this clause, without this guarantee for the rights of minorities being embodied in the new constitution, we should have been unable to obtain any confederation whatever. That is my reason for drawing attention to it at present. Now, I propose to read the terms of that provision whereby the protection of minorities, whether Catholic or Protestant, in any province of the Dominion, should be maintained. The third subsection of the 93rd section of the British North America Act of 1867 says :

Where in any province a system of separate or dissentient schools exists by law at the union or is there after established by the legislature of the province, an appeal shall lie to the Governor General in Council from any act or decision of any provincial authority affecting any right or privilege of the Protestant or Roman

Catholic minority of the Queen's subjects in relation to education.

Whether that applies to, or how far that bears upon the question under consideration in regard to Manitoba, it is not essential for me to inquire, because, in the Manitoba Act, which forms the law under which that province came into confederation, it was provided by the 22nd section :

In and for the province of Manitoba the said legislature—that is the provincial legislature—may exclusively make laws in relation to education, subject and according to the following provisions.

I draw special attention to this, because it touches the fatal objection, as I understand it, that is entertained by many persons who have not had the opportunity, or who have not availed themselves of the opportunity, of ascertaining precisely the position in which this question stands, that if the Government of the Dominion, under any circumstances, interferes in the question of education with regard to the province of Manitoba it is coercing the province of Manitoba, and interfering with the autonomy of that province. It is the very reverse. As the Act itself provides, the Manitoba legislature may exclusively make laws in relation to education, subject and according to the following provisions :—

Nothing in such law shall prejudicially affect any right or privilege with respect to denominational schools, which any class of persons have by law or practice in the province at the union.

An appeal shall lie to the Governor General in Council from any act or decision of the legislature of the province, or of any provincial authority, affecting any right or privilege of the Protestant or Roman Catholic minority of the Queen's subjects in relation to education.

In case any such provincial law, as from time to time seems to the Governor General requisite for the due execution of the provisions of this section, is not made, or in case any decision of the Governor General in Council, on any appeal under this section, is not duly executed by the proper provincial authority in that behalf, then and in every such case, and as far only as the circumstances of each case require, the Parliament of Canada may make remedial laws for the due execution of the provisions of this section, and of any decision of the Governor General in Council under this section.

I think it would be impossible to find any terms in the English language that would more thoroughly establish the position that the exclusive right of the province of Quebec, or the province of Ontario, or the province of Manitoba to legislate in reference to education is confined to the case in which they have not taken away any of the rights enjoyed by any one of these provinces at the time they entered confederation ; that is to say, that if it can be shown that any right enjoyed by any province at the time it entered confederation has been infringed upon, if it be shown that the privileges that were enjoyed under that right, whe-

ther by Roman Catholics or Protestants, have been interfered with and removed, the moment that took place, under the Imperial Act of Confederation, under the law as it stands upon the statute-book, the right is transferred 'ipso facto' from the local legislature, because the local legislature hold that exclusive right, subject to the fact that they shall not invade the privileges of the minority, to the Parliament of the Dominion. And holding that under these circumstances, the moment it can be shown that the provincial legislature have invaded that right and have used the power entrusted to them contrary to the spirit of the Act of union, the Imperial Act of 1867, and to the law under which Manitoba came into the confederation—the moment it can be shown that the rights and privileges enjoyed have been infringed, that moment their power to legislate exclusively in regard to the question ceases and is transferred ipso facto to the Parliament of the Dominion of Canada. I would not say that I would hold that to be an incontrovertible position if I were not fortified in it by the highest authority in the British Empire, the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. The Dominion of Canada in its federal constitution has a great advantage in two respects over the federal constitution of the great republic to the south of us. There, as you know, the central power was built up by the sovereign states each consenting to give a part of the power it enjoyed, retaining for itself everything that was not specifically yielded. When we met in Quebec to frame a constitution for the Dominion of Canada, we had the advantage of many years of experience in the actual working of the constitution of the United States, and availing ourselves of that experience, we reversed their method and provided that the local legislatures of all the provinces should be restricted to the exercise of such powers as were specifically defined by the law as appertaining to them and that everything else should belong to the federal authority. Had that been the constitution of the United States of America that people would have been spared the sacrifice of a million lives and untold treasure in maintaining their union against the results of that defect in their constitution.

But there is another respect in which we have an advantage, and I hold that it is a very great and very significant advantage—and that is that while the United States have a supreme court by which questions of controversy in regard to the rights of the state governments and federal governments are to be settled, that court does not hold the position and does not offer the advantages of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in relation to Canada. That court is composed of men who are placed in their judicial position by the governments of the day, so that in that court you may have a great preponderance of gentlemen

who have held prominent and important political positions in the country just previous to their going upon the bench. I have no hesitation in saying that I believe that the supreme court of the United States enjoys the confidence not only of the United States, but of the world to a very large extent, that it is regarded as a tribunal of the very highest, most important and most impartial character and that its judicial decisions have very great weight. But it cannot be forgotten that those who take part in controversies between the United States and any of the states of the union, those who have cases adjudicated upon involving questions of state against federal rights will too often be apt to believe that the strong party proclivities of the judges have something to do with the decision. Happily for us, that is not our position. Our ultimate court of appeal is a tribunal which is not only regarded throughout the civilized world as one of the most independent, most able and most impartial tribunals it is possible to find in any country in the world, but that it is a tribunal which stands apart from and beyond and above anything that touches political questions or considerations in Canada, and that therefore you can look to that tribunal with unqualified confidence that it will give a decision upon which any person and every person may rely.

Now, Sir, I will draw attention to some statements made by this august tribunal, the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council upon the question before us. And I will only read a few brief extracts in regard to it, because I know that the whole judgment is before hon. members on both sides of the House :

(4). Does subsection 3 of section 93 of the British North America Act, 1867, apply to Manitoba ?

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

There was the pith of the whole thing. As the constitution provides that it is only in cases where the rights enjoyed upon entering the union are infringed upon and interfered with that the duty is thrown upon the Dominion Government and the Dominion Parliament to take steps to protect these rights and restore these privileges, the whole issue turns upon the question just there asked. They say further :

The 3rd subsection of section 22 of the Manitoba Act is identical with the 4th subsection of section 93 of the British North America Act.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

The 2nd and 3rd subsections respectively are the same, except that in the 2nd subsection of the Manitoba Act the words "of the legislature of the province or" are inserted before the words "any provincial authority," and that the 3rd subsection of the British North America Act commences with the words : "Where in any province a system of separate or dissentient schools exist by law at the union or is thereafter established by the legislature of the province."

Their lordships say, as delivered by the Lord Chancellor :

In view of this comparison, it appears to their lordships impossible to come to any other conclusion than that the 22nd section of the Manitoba Act was intended to be a substitute for the 93rd section of the British North America Act. Obviously all that was intended to be identical has been repeated, and in so far as the provisions of the Manitoba Act differ from those of the earlier statute, they must be regarded as indicating the variations from those provisions intended to be introduced in the province of Manitoba.

They then come to the gist of the question :

In Upper Canada, a general system of undenominational education had been established, but with provision for separate schools to supply the wants of the Catholic inhabitants of that province. The 2nd subsection of section 93 of the British North America Act extended all the powers, privileges and duties which were then by law conferred and imposed in Upper Canada on the separate schools and school trustees of the Roman Catholic inhabitants of that province to the dissentient schools of the Protestant and Roman Catholic inhabitants of Quebec. There can be no doubt that the views of the Roman Catholic inhabitants of Quebec and Ontario, with regard to education, were shared by the members of the same communion in the territory which afterwards became the province of Manitoba. They regarded it as essential that the education of their children should be in accordance with the teachings of their church, and consider that such an education could not be obtained in public schools designed for all the members of the community alike, whatever their creed, but could only be secured in schools conducted under the influence and guidance of the authorities of their church.

Then they continue :

Their lordships being of opinion that the enactment which governs the present case is the 22nd section of the Manitoba Act, it is unnecessary to refer at any length to the arguments derived from the provisions of section 93 of the British North America Act. But in so far as they throw light on the matter, they do not in their lordships' opinion weaken, but rather strengthen the views derived from the study of the later enactment.

It is admitted that the 3rd and 4th subsections of section 93 (the latter of which is, as has been observed, identical with subsection 3 of section 22 of the Manitoba Act) were not intended to have effect merely when a provincial legislature had exceeded the limit imposed on its powers by subsection 1, for subsection 3 gives an appeal to the Governor General, not only where a system of separate or dissentient schools existed in a province at the time of the union, but also where in any province such a system was there-

after established by the legislature of the province.

I think it will be impossible to find language clearer, or more unmistakable, to establish the position that their lordships have taken that the rights and privileges of the Roman Catholic minority in the province of Manitoba have been invaded by the legislation of that province; and as I have said before, the moment that conclusion is arrived at, the power given them under the Education Act exclusively to legislate on the subject of education, is removed, and is transferred to the power of the Dominion Parliament:

Their lordships are unable to concur in the view that there is any presumption which ought to influence the mind one way or the other. It must be remembered that the provincial legislature is not in all respect supreme within the province. Its legislative power is strictly limited. It can deal only with matters declared to be within its cognizance by the British North America Act, as varied by the Manitoba Act. In all other cases, legislative authority rests with the Dominion Parliament. In relation to the subjects specified in section 92 of the British North America Act, and not falling within those set forth in section 91, the exclusive power of the provincial legislature may be said to be absolute. But this is not so as regards education, which is separately dealt with, and has its own code, both in the British North America Act and in the Manitoba Act. * * * Acts amend-

ing the educational law in some respects were passed in subsequent years, but it is not necessary to refer to them, as in 1881 the Act of 1871 and these amending Acts were repealed. The Manitoba School Act, 1881, followed the same general lines as that of 1871. The number of the board of education was fixed at not more than 21, of whom 12 were to be Protestants and 9 Catholics. If a less number were appointed the same relative proportion was to be observed. The board, as before, was to resolve itself into two sections, Protestant and Catholic, each of which was to have the control of the schools of its section, and all the books to be used in the schools under its control were now to be selected by each section. There were to be, as before, a Protestant and a Catholic superintendent. It was provided that the establishment of a school district of one denomination should not prevent the establishment of a school district of the other denomination in the same place, and that a Protestant and Catholic district might include the same territory in whole or in part. The sum appropriated by the legislature for common school purposes was to be divided between the Protestant and Roman Catholic sections of the board in proportion to the number of children between the ages of 5 and 15 residing in the various Protestant and Roman Catholic school districts in the province where schools were in operation. With regard to local assessments for school purposes it was provided that the ratepayers of a school district should pay their respective assessments to the schools of their respective denominations, and in no case was a Protestant ratepayer to be obliged to pay for a Catholic school, or a Catholic ratepayer for a Protestant school. * * * What is the position of the Roman Catholic minority under the Act of 1890? Schools of their own denomination, conducted according to their views,

will receive no aid from the state. They must depend entirely for their support upon the contributions of the Roman Catholic community, while the taxes out of which state aid is granted to the schools provided for by the statute fall alike on Catholics and Protestants. Moreover, while the Catholic inhabitants remain liable to local assessment for school purposes, the proceeds of that assessment are no longer destined to any extent for the support of Catholic schools, but afford the means of maintaining schools which they regard as no more suitable for the education of Catholic children than if they were distinctively Protestant in their character.

In view of this comparison, it does not seem possible to say that the rights and privileges of the Roman Catholic minority in relation to education, which existed prior to 1890, have not been affected. * * *

As a matter of fact, the objection of the Roman Catholics to such as alone receive state aid under the Act of 1890, is conscientious and deeply rooted. If this had not been so, if there had been a system of public education acceptable to Catholics and Protestants alike, the elaborate enactments which have been the subject of so much controversy and consideration would have been unnecessary. It is notorious that there were acute differences of opinion between Catholics and Protestants on the educational question prior to 1870. * * *

For the reasons which have been given, their lordships are of the opinion that the 2nd subsection of section 22 of the Manitoba Act is the governing enactment, and that the appeal to the Governor General in Council was admissible by virtue of that enactment, on the grounds set forth in the memorials and petitions, inasmuch as the Acts of 1890 affected rights or privileges of the Roman Catholic minority in relation to education within the meaning of that subsection. The further question is submitted whether the Governor General in Council has power to make the declarations or remedial orders asked for in the memorials or petition, or has any other jurisdiction in the premises. Their lordships have decided that the Governor General in Council have jurisdiction, and that the appeal is well-founded, but the particular course to be pursued must be determined by the authorities by whom it has been committed by the statute. It is not for this tribunal to intimate the precise steps to be taken. Their general character is sufficiently defined by the 3rd subsection of section 22 of the Manitoba Act. * * *

All legitimate grounds of complaint would be removed if that system were supplemented by provisions which would remove the grievance upon which the appeal is founded, and were modified so far as might be necessary to give effect to these provisions. Their lordships will humbly advise Her Majesty that the questions submitted should be answered in the manner indicated by the views which they have expressed.

Then the Queen's Order in Council follows, and I will read a clause of that:

The Lords of the Committee in obedience to Your Majesty's said general order of reference, have taken the said humble petition and appeal into consideration, and having heard counsel for the parties on both sides, their lordships do this day agree humbly to report to Your Majesty as their opinion that the said questions hereinbefore set forth ought to be answered as follows:—

(1). In answer to the first question:—That the appeal referred to in the said memorials and

petitions, and asserted thereby, is such an appeal as is admissible under subsection 2 of section 22 of the Manitoba Act, 33 Vict. (1870) c. 3, Canada.

(2). In answer to the second question :—That grounds are set forth in these petitions and memorials, such as may be the subject of appeal under the authority of the subsection of the Manitoba Act, immediately above referred to.

(5). In answer to the fifth question :—That the Governor General in Council has jurisdiction and the appeal is well founded, but that the particular course to be pursued must be determined by the authorities to whom it has been committed by the statute ; that the general character of the steps to be taken is sufficiently defined by subsection 3 of section 22 of the Manitoba Act, 1870.

(6). In answer to the sixth question :—That the Acts of Manitoba relating to education passed prior to the session of 1890, did confer on the minority a right or privilege in relation to education within the meaning of subsection 2 of section 22 of the Manitoba Act, which alone applies that the two Acts of 1890 complained of did affect a right or privilege of the minority in such a manner that an appeal will lie thereunder to the Governor General in Council. * * *

Her Majesty having taken the said report into consideration, was pleased, by and with the advice of Her Privy Council, to approve thereof, and to order as it is hereby ordered, that the recommendations and directions therein contained be punctually observed, obeyed and carried into effect in each and every particular. Whereof the Governor General of the Dominion of Canada for the time being, and all other persons to whom it may concern, are to take notice and govern themselves accordingly.

I think no argument is called for in the face of this emphatic judgment of the Privy Council, the highest tribunal in the great Empire to which we have the honour to belong, in order to show, if the claim on the part of the government of Manitoba to exclusively legislate on the question of legislation is raised, that, under the decision of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, by the legislation passed by the province of Manitoba, they deliberately denuded themselves of the right to exercise exclusive jurisdiction on the question of education ; and no man, I hold, whether legal or layman, can read therein the emphatic statements made by the Lords of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council without arriving at the conclusion that the responsibility and the duty were transferred from the legislature and government of Manitoba and imposed on the central Government of the Dominion and on the Parliament of the Dominion to legislate in respect to this case.

But, Sir, it may be said, and I am rather surprised to hear a statement of that kind made : But the law says "may," it does not say "shall." Is there any hon. member within the sound of my voice who will say that, on a ground of that kind, you will turn your back on a helpless minority who are struggling for their privileges, of which they have been deprived by the local government, and will say : Yes, it is quite true that the

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

lords of the Judicial Committee said we may do it, but they did not say we shall do it ; and we intend to leave you to suffer in the face of the decision of the highest judicial authority that can be given in the Empire ? A position of that kind would be unworthy of the government of any civilized country. I hope no body of gentlemen who are entrusted with the high position of administering the Government of Canada, will ever shelter themselves behind a subterfuge so plain and transparent as that, and avoid that duty and that responsibility which have been thrown upon them in regard to one of the most vital, one of the most important questions that can ever be presented.

Sir, I have already told you that this clause was insisted upon in the interest, not of Roman Catholics, but of Protestants. I have told you we would have had no confederation, the whole matter would have ended in hopeless failure, if we had refused to embody this protection for the Protestant minority in Quebec, as represented by Sir Alexander Galt. My colleagues who were there on that occasion, will bear me out in the statement, that so emphatic was Sir Alexander Galt on that question, that, until the conference would agree to adopt that policy, he was not prepared to take any hand or part, or assist in any way whatever in accomplishing confederation.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Hear, hear.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I say, moreover, that, not only was this done in the interest of Protestants, but the valuable, though brief, compendium of the circumstances connected with confederation which Mr. Pope has recently published, shows that it was carried unanimously, that the provinces of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia and the province of Canada all voted yes in favour of this provision, which was for all time to come to protect the rights of the minority, whether Catholic or Protestant.

But I say that, independent of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council altogether, there is a higher law, and that is the great law, that you should do unto others as you wish them to do unto you. I believe that public sentiment of this country, when fully advised of the true position of this question, when considered in the light of history, in the light of evidence, that the overwhelming judgment of all classes and all creeds will be, that the Government of Canada would be unworthy of the position it occupies, that the Parliament of this Dominion would be unworthy of the position it occupies, if it turned deaf ears in a case made clear and established and declared in terms so unmistakable by the highest judicial tribunal in this Empire.

Mr. Speaker, one of the highest and most distinguished educationists in the Dominion

of Canada, who himself is a Protestant and a Presbyterian, has given a clear and emphatic enunciation of his views on this question—I refer to Sir William Dawson. Sir William was many years a superintendent of education in the province of Nova Scotia, and from that post he has risen, step by step, and point by point, until he has attained one of the most exalted and respected positions among educationists throughout the world. The British Association did him the honour, did itself the honour, to elect him as its president, in consequence of his great educational attainments. I need not tell any one who knows anything of Sir William Dawson, that he is a man who is not only a Protestant, but a Presbyterian of the sternest sect, and yet Sir William has declared, unwilling as these men usually are to take part in a discussion of this kind, and has published, over his own signature, the most clear and emphatic declaration it is possible for a man to publish, as to the absolute necessity, in the interest of good government, and in the interest of justice and fair-play towards different religions and races, that, in taking the steps which the Dominion Government have most reluctantly taken, and have been impelled to take only by a sense of the duty that devolves upon them, they have the warm, the emphatic, approval of one of the most distinguished Protestant educationists to be found in the whole Dominion of Canada.

I may say here, that I have detained the House for some little time in regard to what has been accomplished by confederation. I have felt warranted in doing it because I was in a position to show that this confederation would not have been an established fact without embodying in the law that protection of the rights of the minority, both Catholic and Protestant, which it does embody, and, therefore, it was worth the expenditure of some little time of the House, in order that the attention of hon. members—especially as many of those taking part in those negotiations are not now remaining—should be drawn to this very important point.

In speaking of Sir William Dawson, I named him as a very eminent educationist, but I do not mean to say that our position rests only upon this high authority. I have had the satisfaction of meeting with and receiving communications from a large number of eminent divines, in the Church of England, in the Presbyterian Church, in the Wesleyan Methodist and Baptist churches, and I have been gratified to find, that those gentlemen, with scarcely an exception, were ready to endorse the action of the Government of Canada, to sustain the action of the Parliament of Canada, in giving redress to any minority, whether Catholic or Protestant, whose clear, unqualified and established rights had been infringed by the local government of any province.

But I say, Sir, apart from that altogether, apart from the responsibility that is imposed by the law—for I hold that the responsibility is imposed by the law in the clearest and most emphatic terms—apart from that altogether, I put the issue to the people of this wide Dominion. I ask them to look at what has been accomplished since the Act of Confederation was passed in 1867. We have been a happy family, Sir. I refer not to one political party nor to the other political party, but I do say: the people of this wide Dominion, whether Catholic or Protestant, whether French or English or Irish, whatever their race, whatever their religion; I say that the people of this wide Dominion have been a united, a happy and a prosperous people. By united action our people have raised Canada to a position of which every Canadian may be justly proud. If there be any man to be found in Canada who from any narrow, any selfish, any exclusive, any bigoted, or any fanatical sentiment would yield for a single moment to a disposition to advance his own race, religion or sect at the sacrifice of the interest and the conscience of others: if there be any such man, I ask him to look back at the deplorable condition into which Canada had sunk when she yielded to that sentiment, and when we had in this country a great party fomenting a war of races and a war of creeds. I ask such a one to look back upon Canada at that unhappy period, and I ask him to raise his eyes to the present proud position that our country occupies. I ask him to inquire from himself as to the reason for all this progress, all this prosperity, all this high position that we have obtained throughout the civilized world—for it is not extravagant to use that term in regard to Canada. I ask such an one if he is prepared to re-open a war of races, and a war of creeds, because he wishes to deny to a small and helpless Roman Catholic minority in the province of Manitoba the rights which the Imperial statute and the law under which Manitoba came into the union have guaranteed to them should be preserved. I care not who the man is: I care not which side of the House he sits on. I say that the Canadian who, with the history of the past to guide him, and with the history of the present before him, can for any such purpose be willing to lend his hand to promote and countenance in any way or shape a war of races and a war of religions, and a war of creeds, is an enemy of Canada. He may be acting from the highest and most conscientious principles. He may regard, as many do regard, that this is a question of separate schools, and that he is opposed to separate schools, and consequently he may wish to defeat this measure that is now proposed to the Parliament of Canada. But, Sir, no man who takes the trouble to examine this question can for a single moment consider that the question of separate schools is at

issue at all. It is not a question of separate schools, it is a question of the constitution of the country. The progress and the prosperity and the future development of Canada depends upon that constitution being sacredly maintained, and that all the rights that are guaranteed under it, whether to the central or the provincial governments, shall be sacredly guarded. I do not intend to detain the House by discussing this self-evident point at any great length, but I put it to any intelligent man who recognizes the fact that within this wide Dominion you have got over 41 per cent of the population Roman Catholics; I put it to gentlemen who may hold—and I think some have without due consideration held—rather narrow views on the subject; I put it to them: whether for any object that was not of the most transcendent importance it would be right for this Government to refuse, or right for this Parliament to refuse, to grant redress in a case such as is presented on the present occasion, and to leave rankling in the minds of over 41 per cent of the entire population of the Dominion of Canada the sentiment that a Roman Catholic cannot, in the Parliament of this country, obtain the same just consideration that he would obtain if he were a Protestant. I thank you very much for the kind attention you have given to these very imperfect remarks. I may say that in forming this Bill the Government, while doing substantial justice to the rights of the minority, have been careful to encroach as little as possible upon the local government. No person can read this Bill without seeing on the very face of it that it is not proposed that the Government of Canada should take action under even this Bill, by the appointment of a board, the appointment of the superintendents, the guarantee that the schools shall be of the same high character as that of the other schools in Manitoba, for, before all that is done, this Bill provides, first, to invite the government of the province of Manitoba to take action; and it is only when they refuse, and when the unpleasant and disagreeable duty is forced by the Act of the Imperial Parliament upon the Dominion of Canada, that this Government proposes, in the least degree, to interfere with this matter. And, as I say, the coercion comes not from the Dominion Government. There is no coercion so far as the Dominion Government is concerned. There is not a line of coercion to be found in the Bill from beginning to end. There is a simple, a most easy and natural provision, to meet the interests of these people whose consciences deprive them from the opportunity of making use of such schools in Manitoba as they are now taxed to sustain. Under these circumstances, the Government have been compelled to adopt the policy which they have adopted. I need not say that they have adopted this policy in the face of great difficulty, because it is always an extremely unpleasant thing for any government to find

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

itself in a position in which there is even a single member of their party that does not see eye to eye with them. In the face of even this difficulty, the Government have felt compelled, in justice to their own position, and in regard to their duty to the country as imposed by the Imperial Act, the Government have felt obliged to take the step they have taken. They have taken that step in the most moderate and temperate manner that was possible to be devised, and even down to the present hour they have been open to any suggestion by which the responsibility which is imposed upon them under the circumstances could be removed. They are still open to any suggestion, from any quarter, of any means which will remove the necessity of their being compelled to take action of this kind, and having done that, Mr. Speaker, I have no hesitation in saying to you: that the Government would feel that it was unworthy the position it occupies; that the Government would feel that it did not deserve the confidence of that great Liberal-Conservative party who have enabled it to accomplish so much for Canada; that the Government would feel that it was unworthy the confidence of gentlemen on either side of this House if, on a question so momentous, so important, and so vital to the good government, progress and prosperity of Canada, they were not prepared to lay down office if necessary, or to refer to the great intelligent electorate of this country for a decision as to whether they had discharged their duty or not.

Mr. LAURIER. Mr. Speaker, if, in a debate of such moment, it were not out of place for me to make a personal reference to myself—a reference which, however, may perhaps be justified, not so much on account of the feelings which may not unnaturally be attributed to me, being of the race and of the creed of which I am, but still more in consideration of the great responsibility which has been placed on my shoulders by the too kind regard of the friends by whom I am surrounded here—I would say, that, in the course of my parliamentary career, during which it has been my duty on more than one occasion to take part in the discussion of those dangerous questions which too often have come before the Parliament of Canada, never did I rise, Sir, with a greater sense of security; never did I feel so strong in the consciousness of right, as I do now, at this anxious moment, when, in the name of the constitution, so outrageously misinterpreted by the Government, in the name of peace and harmony in this land, when, in the name of the minority which this Bill seeks or pretends to help, in the name of this young nation on which so many hopes are centred, I rise to ask this Parliament not to proceed any further with this Bill.

Sir, the position which I have taken from the first on this question, and which I have maintained all along up to this moment, and on which I more than ever firmly rely, is of such strength that it largely takes away the pain which no man of sensitiveness can well avoid when, impelled by a paramount sense of public duty, he has to take a course which he knows may not be fully shared in and believed in by all his friends. But, Sir, the argument seems to be overwhelming, that, if this Bill were to become law, while it would afford no protection whatever to the suffering minority in Manitoba, it would be a most violent wrench of the principles upon which our constitution is based. Sir, the hon. gentleman who has just moved the second reading of this Bill, who comes back to this House again, after an interval of several years, to take his place at the head of his party, and who, we are told, is to force this Bill on his unwilling party, has taken some credit to himself and to the Government of which he is a member, as being the champions of the minority. In so far as this contention is concerned, I have not the slightest desire to take one single particle from the encomiums to which the Government may be entitled; but the hon. gentleman has largely taken away from the praise which we would gladly have given to the Government, by the statement which he has made over and over again in his speech—reiterated, not once only, but, perhaps, ten times—which was, in fact, the burden of his whole speech, that the Government, in this instance, are not free agents, but are simply the creatures of necessity—the tools, the instruments, of the constitution, which, in this matter, leaves them no option, but compels them to bring forward the measure which they have now brought to the attention of the House. I do not intend at this moment to controvert that claim in any way, though I shall address myself to it further on. But I give every allowance to the claim of the hon. gentleman, that, in bringing forward this Bill, he is impelled by the desire of doing justice to the minority. Well, Sir, if such were the intention and the motive of the Government, I commend their intention, I commend their motive—would to heaven I could likewise commend their sound judgment and good sense! Sir, to do justice, and, of all things, to do justice to a minority, is always a great and noble thing; it is one of the noblest attributes of human nature. But, Sir, the hon. gentleman who has spoken for the Government knows, from his long parliamentary experience, that amongst men the standard of justice is not uniform, but is largely affected by differences of religion, differences of education, and a multitude of other circumstances. The hon. gentleman is aware—more than anybody else, perhaps, he ought to be aware—that, in a community with a free government, in a free country like this, upon any

question involving different conceptions of what is right or wrong, different standards of what is just or unjust, it is the part of statesmanship not to force the views of any section, but to endeavour to bring them all to a uniform standard and a uniform conception of what is right.

The hon. gentleman has referred at length—and I do not blame him for that—to the history of this confederation. In that I followed him closely. There is a page of that history, however, of which he might have spoken, but of which he has not said a single word. He might have referred to the page of the history of confederation which tells us of the manner in which his native province of Nova Scotia was brought into the union. The hon. gentleman has not forgotten, surely—or, if he has, he is the only man in this country who has—that, when the idea of confederation—a great, a good, a noble idea—was brought to the attention of the people of Nova Scotia, it did not meet with ready acceptance; and for obvious, very obvious reasons. Sir, I am within the mark when I say, that, since the days of Athens of old, there never was, perhaps, a corner of the earth with so few acres and so few people, which in a given time produced such a galaxy of men of the very first class as the small province of Nova Scotia. The names in which she prides, Huntington, Uniacke, Johnson, Young, Howe—above all, Howe—are the names of men who were the peers of the most famous men of their generation—the names of men who, if they had moved and acted on a wider and better-known theatre, would to-day live, not only in the hearts of their own countrymen, as they now and will for ever live, but would also be household names throughout the civilized world. Sir, that is not all. In its isolation, its semi-independence, the province of Nova Scotia had attained to a remarkable degree of prosperity. Its merchants like the merchants of Venice, were princes. It is not to be wondered at, therefore, that, when asked to join confederation, the people of Nova Scotia had some misgivings as to their course. What would have been the part of statesmanship upon that occasion? The part of statesmanship would have been to try and persuade them of the grandeur of the idea of a Canadian confederation—because they were a people eminently fitted to see the grandeur of such an idea. But, Sir, such was not the course taken. There was at the head of the government of Nova Scotia at that time a gentleman who to-day has been brought back from England to force this measure upon the people of Canada. Instead of applying himself to persuading his own fellow-countrymen of the grandeur of this Act of Confederation, he forced the project down the throats of the people of Nova Scotia by the brute force of a mechanical majority in a moribund Parliament. And Sir, the hon. gentleman must to-day bear

the responsibility and the stigma that, for a whole generation, the great idea of confederation was to the people of Nova Scotia synonymous with oppression and coercion; but I am glad to say that to-day the people of Nova Scotia, especially the young generation, have become reconciled to the idea of confederation. The hon. gentleman, however, knows that the bitterness of the initial coercion has never been removed, and never will entirely disappear until it is buried in the grave of the last man of that generation, whose manhood was outraged by the arbitrary proceeding which trampled under foot the dignity and self-respect of a proud people. Sir, if the hon. gentleman, while he was tracing the history of confederation, had recalled that page, it might, perhaps, have struck him and those around him that coercive methods never yet led any people to good and wise action. But I would recall the history to the hon. gentleman, not only of his own province, but of the Dominion of Canada at large.

The hon. gentleman has told us that ever since confederation we have been a happy people. Well, if this were not so important a debate, I would say that if the people have been happy, the Cabinet Ministers, unfortunately, have not always been happy. But the subject is too important for pleasantries. I take issue with the hon. gentleman when he says that the people have always been happy. Is that the way the hon. gentleman has read the history of Canada since confederation? The people of Canada have been happy. Why, what has been the course of events ever since we have had confederation? Is it not a fact that, almost from the first moment of its existence until now, confederation has been torn, not once, not twice, but repeatedly, by agitations which more than once have shaken it to the very roots, and threatened its very existence? Why, the ink was scarcely dry upon the document which established confederation when the New Brunswick school question arose. From New Brunswick it spread to Quebec, and thence into Ontario, and for years, as every one knows, it embittered and impassioned public opinion of the Dominion to the exclusion almost of every other topic. Then, immediately after that, the attempt by this Government, of which the hon. gentleman was a member, to take away from the statute-book of Ontario the Act known as the Streams Bill, aroused the people of Ontario to a determination to maintain their legislative independence at all hazards. Then, a few years after, the repeated disallowance by the Government, of which the hon. gentleman was a member, of the railway legislation of Manitoba—that legislation by which Manitoba sought to get rid of the incubus of the monopoly in transportation which had been given the Canadian Pacific Railway—brought Manitoba to

Mr. LAURIER.

the very verge of rebellion. The day came when bloodshed was within measureable distance; and it was only when the Government decided to come down and yield, that strife was averted. Then arose the agitation consequent on the demand for the disallowance of the Jesuits' Estates law, which rekindled the religious passions and prejudices of former years, and excited them to a very dangerous pitch. Now, again, I am sorry to say, we can hear the roar coming upon us of another wave of agitation and civil commotion in this country. The demon of discord is in the land, blowing the wind of strife over all and in all directions, awakening slumbering passions, arousing old prejudices. You can follow the trace of its passage in our cities, towns and country villages, nay, in the backwoods settlements where the rude toil and the anxious days of the pioneer do not save him from its evil suggestions. Still the hon. gentleman seems to think lightly of this. He thought it would be misery if we had a civil and religious war. It would be misery, most certainly. But if religious war is to be brought in this country, by whose action will it be brought but by the action of this Government, which, although it had the methods of persuasion in its hands, has chosen to take the methods of coercion in order to redress a wrong.

Sir, there is one thing that is certain at this moment. The attention of the people from all parts of the country is upon this chamber, and whatever may be our opinion upon this question, whatever views we may hold as to the policy of the Government, there is one thing which cannot be denied. These frequent recurrences of agitations and commotion are a severe strain, and a very severe strain upon the tie which binds these provinces together; and the danger is all the more to be apprehended, if, searching further on for the causes which have brought about this commotion, you find that on every occasion there was only one cause, always the same, and that was the feature of our constitution which abridges the independence, the sovereignty of the provincial legislatures. In one form or the other, such was the cause of these agitations. In view of these salient facts, it may not be out of place at present to look further into the history of our own country; and by the dangers through which we have passed, learn, if possible, to avoid the danger with which we are threatened. I call attention to this fact, that when the idea of a union of our provinces was first mooted, the question was debated whether the bond of union should be legislative or federative. The very force of events made this a federative union. The fact that the provinces are scattered and divided by long distances, and by divisions of creed and race, made it imperative that there should be a division of legislative powers, a central legislature to be invested with

that class of subjects which affects all the provinces, and local legislatures to be invested with those subjects which alone affect the different communities. This division of legislative powers is absolutely essential to the federal form of government. It seems also essential that all the legislatures should be absolutely free of each other, and free from supervision. The hon. gentleman has alluded to the differences which exist between our constitution, in this respect, and the American constitution. Sir, though I am prepared to say that, in many respects, the Canadian constitution is far superior to the American, it may be that in this respect it is not on a par with the American. Under the American system, all legislatures, whether the central legislature or the state legislatures, are free from the control of each other. There is, in a sense, the control of the Supreme Court, but this control is simply judicial. It is not allowed to review the discretion which is vested in any legislature. The only control it has is to keep within bounds the different legislatures, and prevent the encroachment of their respective powers. The weak point in the American constitution is just what has been stated by the hon. gentleman. The reserved powers are in the states, while with us the reserve powers are in this Parliament. But our constitution goes much further. It gives to the Dominion Government the control of and supervision over provincial legislatures. The hon. gentleman said this was a boon. I say, perhaps it was a very great mistake. Under our constitution, the Dominion Government has in its power to disallow, within a certain period, all Acts passed by the local legislatures. In matters of education the Government has still more extensive powers, because Parliament here can interfere and substitute laws for those of the provincial legislature in regard to education.

Now, Sir, before I go any further, it may not be out of place to ask what was the reason for these extraordinary powers being imported into our constitution. In so far as the power of disallowance is concerned, this can be traced very clearly to the power of disallowance which is possessed by the Imperial authorities over colonial legislatures. The Imperial Parliament has the power of disallowance, of supervision over the Acts of these colonial legislative bodies. This may be easily understood because colonies are dependencies. But the relations between the Dominion and the provinces are not the same. Between these there is no superiority and no inferiority; all are equal, with this exception that the Dominion Parliament is invested with larger powers, that is, powers of a more extended and more important character than the local legislature. Indeed, it must be accepted, and accepted as a truism, that under popular government the majority must rule. I do not mean to say, Sir, that the majority will always be right. No, Sir,

the majority may err, the majority may prevaricate. But I am not prepared to say that the majority will always do wrong, will always prevaricate and will always wantonly and wickedly do injustice to the minority. It may be that the majority will prevaricate, it may be that the majority will do wrong to the minority. What is the remedy of the minority under these circumstances? The remedy of the minority under a free government is to agitate and endeavour to bring over the majority to their way of thinking. This is the rule under free government. But under our constitution the minority has also another power. It may not only agitate within the sphere of the province to convince the majority, but it may appeal to the executive of Canada, to the Parliament of Canada, to the people of Canada, and thus force the issue which was confined to their own province into the federal arena. Now, if in any province there is a contest of such bitterness that the minority will not rest satisfied with the arbitrament of the majority, that fact alone proves that the question at issue is one which deeply, very deeply, affects the people in that province. It is therefore manifest, it is obvious, that if, under these circumstances, the minority take an appeal to the executive of Canada, to the Parliament of Canada, the bitterness of the strife will be imported into the Dominion at large, and there rage not only with equal violence, but, perhaps, with increased fury. That, Sir, has been our experience within the last twenty-five, yes, almost thirty years. Recall the fierceness of the agitation over the New Brunswick school Act; think of the feeling aroused by the Jesuit estates question. In these cases the whole country was convulsed. In one, disallowance was demanded in the name of Roman Catholicism, while in the other disallowance was demanded in the name of Protestantism, and the old feuds which divided our ancestors threatened to invade our country, and here work the mischief which they had worked in other lands.

In view of these facts, what is the lesson to be deduced from this teaching of our history? The lesson we should deduce is that if it was a wise provision to establish this power in the constitution for the supervision of the local legislatures, perhaps it was not dictated by unmixed wisdom. For, Sir, experience has taught us that this remedy of interference with local legislation has never been applied and probably never can be applied without friction, disturbance and discontent; that you cannot apply that remedy without causing as much dissatisfaction as satisfaction. It must be evident that while you redress the grievance of the minority by such act of interference, you run grave risk of creating a grievance on the part of the majority. But the remedy of interference is found in the constitution; and, being there, it must be applied. But it must be applied in such a way as not to provoke irritation; it must be applied in

such a way that even those who suffer by it shall continue to love the constitution, shall be ready to live for, and, if necessary, to die for it. Sir, the power is there, and, being there, the aid of the Dominion Government will be sought by the minority. What is the rule that ought to be followed? I shall be told by the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper), in fact, he has already told us, that the rule works mechanically, and that no judgment is to be exercised by this Parliament in such matters. Sir, that cannot be the rule. It cannot be that this remedy is to apply mechanically. This remedy must be granted or denied according as the circumstances of each case require. And that, Sir, is the very language of the statute that the hon. gentleman cited a few moments ago. The remedy is to be sought and applied as the circumstances of the case require. And it can be intelligently applied only after full and ample inquiry into the facts of the case, after all means of conciliation have been exhausted, and only as a last resort. These, in my judgment, are the principles which ought to guide us in this matter. And, assuming these principles to be true, I may now apply myself to a history of this case.

The hon. gentleman did not say much, in fact, did not say anything at all with regard to the history of this case or the circumstances which bring it before this Parliament for discussion on this occasion. Those circumstances are so well known, however, that I do not wholly blame him for not having referred to them. But there are some salient facts which it is well to bring again before the attention of the House. In 1870, the provincial legislature, shortly after the province of Manitoba was brought into the union, in the full exercise of the powers which had been conferred upon it by this Parliament, confirmed by the Imperial Parliament, established a system of separate schools. In 1890, the legislature, again in the full exercise of its powers, abolished those schools. Now, Sir, the minority, under such circumstances, could certainly not rest quiet, having a remedy against the legislation that has been passed. They came before this Government, they came before this Parliament, with petitions asking for redress of their grievance. The hon. gentleman has taken credit to himself for the fact that the Government acted in no other spirit than that of fairness and justice to the minority. Sir, if this Government had given the minority the same measure of justice it has given to other parties, the minority would have had redress of their grievance long ago.

An hon. MEMBER. How?

Mr. LAURIER. I will tell the hon. gentleman how. The hon. gentleman, perhaps, has not forgotten that, in 1890, the legislature of Manitoba passed four Acts which

Mr. LAURIER.

came up for review by the Minister of Justice and the Government of Canada the following year. One of these Acts was an Act abolishing the French language as an official language; one was an Act abolishing separate schools; one was an Act establishing a cattle quarantine, and the last was an Act dealing with public companies. Two of these Acts were disallowed, and two were allowed to go into operation. Which were the Acts which were disallowed? Were they the Acts abolishing the French language and separate schools? No; these were allowed to go into operation, and the Acts disallowed were the Acts to establish the cattle quarantine in Manitoba and to make certain provisions with regard to public companies in that province. The Cattle Quarantine Act was of such great consequence to the Government of Canada that they had to disallow it, and they disallowed it because they said there was another Act passed by this Parliament which we now know was never applied, this latter part being the cause of the scheduling of our cattle in England. The other Act was with regard to public companies, one of the provisions of which enacted that if any public lands came within the possession of public companies and rested there for ten years, at the end of ten years they should revert to the Crown. The Act was disallowed for this reason among others:

The provisions that land held by any company for a longer period than ten years from the date when such lands were acquired, shall be forfeited to and become vested in the Crown for the use of the province of Manitoba, except that any company now holding lands may hold them for five years from the date of the passing of that Act, would have the effect of confiscation in respect to all companies which, before the passing of the Act, acquired lands in Manitoba under competent legislation and by Dominion Land Patents, involves a breach of faith by causing a detrimental change in the terms on which the contracts with those companies were made.

Sir, it was confiscation. If I remember right, and I do remember right, one of the complaints of the minority in all their petitions was that they were subjected to confiscation by the Act of 1890. Sir, the power of disallowance has always been held by the Government opposite to be essential to the administration of this confederation. If they ever had a fair chance of putting into operation the doctrine which they have always preached, they had it, not when they disallowed the Cattle Quarantine Act, but when they did not disallow the Manitoba Schools Act.

Mr. MONCRIEFF. Would the hon. gentleman allow me to ask him a question? Does he think that the Government should have disallowed that Manitoba Schools Act?

Mr. LAURIER. The answer to that question is very plain. The hon. gentleman asks me what was my view. Did the hon. gentleman, or anybody else on that side, ever take the view of the Liberal party on the question of disallowance? I am judging those hon. gentlemen out of their own mouths, and by their own doctrine; and I say to the hon. gentleman who has put me the question: If he thinks it was right and proper to disallow the Cattle Quarantine Act, would it not have been ten times better and more advantageous to the country to disallow this Manitoba Schools Act? But, Sir, in this matter the hon. gentlemen, as usual, apply their doctrine just as it suits them; when they think it is convenient to apply the doctrine, they do so; but when they find it is inconvenient, they do not apply it. Now, I refer to this case simply as an answer to the claim which was made a moment ago by the hon. gentleman that the Government in this matter acted simply as the friends of the minority. Then they referred the minority to the courts; they told the minority: Go to the courts and test the validity of the Act. And you remember the terms of the Order in Council. They stated specifically that if the courts confirmed the validity of the Act, then they might come before the Dominion Government, and the Dominion Government would take up their claim. Well, they went before the courts, and they were not successful. The court decided that the Act was valid, and within the power and purview of the Manitoba legislature. Then they came again with petitions, and what were those petitions? Those petitions affirmed three grievances in substance; first, they said that the Act of 1890 was an outrage upon their conscience in establishing a system of common schools; nay, more, that though it was nominally a system of common schools, yet in reality they were establishing Protestant schools. Then they alleged as another grievance that the Act was a violation of the compact which had been entered into by the population of the North-west Territories and the Government of Canada, which compact had been repeated several times afterwards by the legislature of Manitoba itself. Now, Sir, the Government, in my estimation, should have done just one thing above all others: when they received these petitions they should have investigated them, they should have ascertained the facts which were alleged by the minority of Manitoba in order to apply such remedy as the facts warranted. This was the first thing they should have done, but they did not do it. What did they do? They went again before the courts, and this time to ascertain whether they had power under the constitution to pass the remedial order which they were asked to pass in favour of the minority. The judgment of the court of last resort, the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, was that the Government had the power to interfere, to pass the remedial

order which was asked for, and that Parliament had the power to enforce it by legislation. Sir, what was then the duty of the Government? Again I say, it was their duty to investigate the complaints of the minority. But they failed to do that; they passed a drastic Order in Council which they sent to Manitoba, and now they ask us in the name of the minority to pass this Bill, though no investigation has ever taken place. They say in the name of the minority they are bound to pass it. Sir, I take issue with them, and in the name of the minority of Manitoba I say that their course to-day is unconstitutional, is weak, and dangerous. The hon. gentleman told us a moment ago that the Government is bound to act mechanically in this matter. Now, I ask Parliament this question: Are we, upon the complaint of the minority, unsupported by evidence, without having made any investigation—are we to be told that the laws of the majority are to be set aside? Sir, if you tell me this, then I say it was a mere mockery to give to the province of Manitoba the right to legislate upon this question. It is true, hon. gentlemen say that they stand upon the constitution. I take issue with them. I stand also upon the constitution, and I rest the case on the judgment of every Canadian, of all men who believe that above the constitution, nay, not above the constitution, but in it, incorporated in every word and syllable of it, there are to be found those laws of eternal truth and justice on which alone nations can be founded. Sir, we are told that the legislature of Manitoba has the right to legislate in matters of education. Is that denied? No, that is not denied. The legislature of Manitoba has the right to establish separate schools; this is not denied. The legislature of Manitoba has the right to abolish separate schools; this is not denied. Somebody says, No. The Judicial Committee of the Privy Council says, Yes. The Judicial Committee has decided that the legislature had a right to pass that legislation; but the constitution also says that although the Manitoba legislature had the right to pass that Act, the minority has an appeal to this Government and to this Parliament. But if you tell me that this appeal is to be granted as a matter of course, without an inquiry, without any investigation whatever, I repeat what I said a moment ago, that this power of legislation on education was a most fatal gift to place in the hands of the province. It was not only a fatal gift, but it was a delusive right. It was a snare to entrap the legislature into humiliation, because, if they had not the right to pass legislation, if it was far beyond the power of the province, then the provincial government were entrapped into the belief that they possessed that power. But I say more: though the legislature of Manitoba had the right to pass that legislation, yet the minority of Manitoba has the right to come to

this Parliament to ask redress for this grievance. That redress must be based on one condition—that the minority of Manitoba alleges and proves a wrong such as the hon. gentleman has described, a wrong which appeals to the heart and mind of every man, which is a violation of those sacred rights which God has implanted in the breast of every man, and which the Greek poet has called—

Heaven's law, unwritten and unchangeable.

I understand the position of the minority in the province of Manitoba, in their petitions, to be, that they have such a grievance to offer to the people of Canada. They say in their petitions, that their consciences are outraged, and, if their consciences are outraged and violated, it seems to me that this, in the opinion of every man, would be held to be one of those violations of

Heaven's law, unwritten and unchangeable.

They say more. They say that they made a compact between themselves and the Government of Canada, that a compact was made between the Crown of England and themselves, and that this has been violated; and, if a compact to which the Crown was a party was violated, I hold, at all events for my part, that this ought to be held to be one of the violations of

Heaven's law, unwritten and unchangeable.

These are the grievances which the minority of Manitoba have to urge upon this Parliament. How are we to know what the facts are, how to deal with them, except by investigation and by inquiry? Sir, we say this is the position that ought to be taken by everybody. This is the position I have taken myself. I know there are some hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House who controvert it, and I will deal with them immediately. I know what is their ground for saying there is no necessity for inquiry. Their ground is, that the case has been settled by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, and the decree leaves them no option to do anything but one thing, what they are doing to-day—direct interference. Such is their conclusion. If so, let us inquire into it for a moment. They tell us the facts have been settled by the decree of the Privy Council, and there cannot be any question now for the Government to investigate and determine. Are the facts better known to-day than they were four years ago, when the reference was made to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council? Have we more knowledge to-day?

An hon. MEMBER. We do not require it.

Mr. LAURIER. I will come to that by and by. Are the facts, I ask, better known to-day than they were four years ago? Have we any more knowledge to-day? The knowledge we have to-day is the knowledge we had four years ago, and no more. Let

Mr. LAURIER.

me recall the attention of the House once more to the reference which was made to the courts, first, to the Supreme Court, and then to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. The hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper), a few moments ago, read some of the questions. There were six, but some of them may be dismissed. The first question was this:

1. Is the appeal referred to in the said memorials and petitions, and asserted thereby, such an appeal as is admissible by subsection 3 of section 93 of the British North America Act, 1867, or by subsection 2 of section 22 of the Manitoba Act, 33 Vic. (1870, chap. 3, Canada.)

To this question the answer was, yes, that the appeal referred to in the said memorials and petitions is such an appeal as is admissible. The second question was as follows:

Are the grounds set forth in the petitions and memorials such as may be the subject of appeal under the authority of the subsections above referred to or either of them?

To this also the answer was in the affirmative. I pass questions 3 and 4, because they are not material, and I come to question 5, to which I ask the close attention of the House. It is as follows:—

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

Assuming the material facts to be as stated therein! Assuming the facts to be as stated therein! What was the answer to this question? The answer was in the affirmative, of course; that, assuming the material facts to be as stated in the petition, then this Government has the right to pass the remedial orders which are asked of them. I ask, were the Government, when they drafted this reference to the courts, of the same opinion as they are at the present time? Were they of the opinion, that the facts were well known and required no investigation? If they were of that opinion, why did they not say so in the reference sent to the courts? If they were of that opinion, that the facts required no investigation, then, I want to know why did they ask arbitrament on a false statement of facts, why were they thus guilty of deceit? If they were not of the same opinion, and could not state that the facts were well known, then, I ask, why do they tell us to-day that no investigation is required? A judgment has been rendered on a certain statement which, assumed the facts to be true, and an answer given in the affirmative. These hon. gentlemen tell us to-day, that the facts are well known and require no investigation; still, when they went before the courts which had to decide the question, they did not hold that position, but they held that the facts

were very doubtful. I charge them with deceit on the one occasion or on the other occasion. I charge them with deceit, either four years ago or to-day ; they can choose between the option ; but there is deceit in some way, there has been deceit all along, and, because there has been subserviency to expediency all along, the question is as difficult of solution as it is at the present time.

But, even under the terms of the decree rendered by the judgment of the Privy Council, there was not that importance given to it which appears to attach to it to-day. It may seem invidious in a man of my creed and race that I should assail the basis of this Bill. I do so because I am of the creed and race of the minority. I do so because I believe that the minority have a strong case to present to the people of Canada, whenever they have a chance to do so, and I do not want their case to rest on falsehoods of any kind. Let the truth be presented, and I believe it will appeal to the heart and conscience of all men, no matter his creed and race, but I do not want the case to go on false facts presented by hon. gentlemen opposite. I spoke a moment ago in regard to the reference to the Privy Council and the question whether the Government had the right to pass these remedial orders. Shall we be told, that the Government here will place on the answer to this question a greater weight than was placed on it by the minority themselves ? Let me refer, Sir, to the argument of Mr. Ewart, the counsel of the minority before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. Here it is :

Before closing I should like to say a word or two as to what we are seeking. As has already been remarked, we are not asking for any declaration as to the extent of the relief to be given by the Governor General. We merely ask that it should be held that he has jurisdiction to hear our prayer, and to grant us some relief if he thinks proper to do so.

If he thinks proper to do so ! The decision was that the Governor in Council had jurisdiction to make the remedial orders if he thought proper. But how was he to come to a conclusion, except by investigation of the facts ? And what was the construction put upon the judgment by the minority themselves when they came before the Privy Council of Canada ? Did Mr. Ewart, the counsel for the minority, say that the Government were bound to act immediately, without any more inquiry into the facts ? Why, Sir, the very first thing that Mr. Ewart proceeded to do was to put before the Privy Council of Canada, many facts which, in his opinion, should induce the Government of Canada, and the Parliament of Canada, to grant to the minority that relief which he was asking for. Mr. Ewart commenced by stating this, that he rested his case upon four or five facts, which, being proved, should be sufficient, in his judgment, to entitle the minority to

the relief which they were seeking. The first is to be found at page 22 of the book. Mr. Ewart says :

My first argument is this : The people of Canada made a solemn agreement that in Manitoba the schools should be separate. There was a solemn agreement made between the Government of Canada and the people of Manitoba, and he asked that if that agreement had been made, and if it were proved to have been made, then it should bind the people of Canada in honour to maintain it against the people of Manitoba.

Mr. Ewart's second argument was a consequence of the first. He said :

The legislature of Manitoba was composed at the outset of a popular branch, and of a Senate, and a few years afterwards the Senate was abolished.

Well, Sir, second chambers, legislative councils, are not very popular nowadays, but if they have a value, and they should have that value ; it is that they ought to be a protection for minorities. The Roman Catholic minority in Manitoba, Mr. Ewart said, did not view in a favourable light the abolition of their Senate, but they were made to agree to it upon the representations made to them that their schools and their institutions should never be tampered with by the legislature of Manitoba. And, Sir, it seems to me that this is a strong and powerful argument in favour of the minority. If they could show that they were induced to make away with one of the bulwarks which was a protection to their rights, their liberties, and privileges, it seems to me it is a strong case, which should go in their favour in the judgment of all Canadians who love their country. Then, Mr. Ewart's third argument was : That the Liberal party in Manitoba, when coming into power in 1887, had made a compact with the minority that their schools would not be interfered with. The fourth argument was allied to the third argument, and was, that subsequently a similar agreement had also been made, and Mr. Ewart proceeded to say—and I call your attention, Mr. Speaker, and the attention of the House, to the language used by Mr. Ewart :

My first four arguments, then, are founded upon agreements and promises :—First, the compact made by the Dominion of Canada ; second, the promises made by the Protestants of Manitoba ; third, the promises made by the Liberal party in Manitoba ; and fourth, the promises made by the Greenway government. All these agreements and promises have been violated—those of the Greenway government ; those of the branch of the Liberal party in Manitoba (and I say it with a bowed head, for to that party I once belonged) ; those of the Protestants of Manitoba (and I feel the shame of it, for in that faith was I born and nurtured) ; and those, too, of the people of Canada. For this violation, however, the Liberal party of Canada, the Protestants of Canada, and the people of Canada have not yet made themselves responsible ; and to them I lift my eyes with confidence, that when the facts are known, then that which has been done will

by them be repudiated, and all injustices remedied. With a full sense of my responsibility for the statement, I add that in my humble judgment Canada would not be a fit place for an honest man to live in, were its inhabitants to remain unaroused to indignant action by the relation of such shamefully perfidious action.

Sir, there was an appeal made here to the Liberals of Canada, to the Protestants of Canada, and to the people of Canada, and Mr. Ewart ventured the opinion, that as soon as these facts would be known, this injustice would be remedied. But, Sir, I am sorry to say, for the minority of Manitoba, that Mr. Ewart, having supported all these contentions with proof and affidavit, the hon. gentleman who represented the Manitoba government on that occasion, Mr. McCarthy, the member for Simcoe, having stated that he wanted to controvert that evidence, and wished some time to do it, Mr. Ewart, in my estimation, very imprudently, rather than undergo the delay—because he wanted that Remedial Bill last session—withdrew all his affidavits and his evidence. When Sir Mackenzie Bowell stated that they would allow Mr. McCarthy to produce affidavits in reply to those produced by Mr. Ewart, Mr. Ewart then said :

Allow me to say that that would throw the matter over so late that it would be impossible that anything could be done this year ; and rather than that should happen, I would withdraw the affidavits and rest the case upon the other material.

Well, Sir, the Liberals of Canada, the Protestants of Canada, the people of Canada, upon whom Mr. Ewart relied to come to the rescue of the minority upon these facts being known, were deprived of the very evidence upon which he rested his case for a favourable consideration of the claims of the minority of Manitoba.

Mr. DALY. These affidavits are all printed.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman says they are all printed.

Mr. DALY. Certainly.

Mr. LAURIER. Sir, this is the kind of law we have from this Government !

Mr. DALY. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to call his attention to the fact that all these affidavits are printed. I make this statement in reply to his that the people are deprived of the knowledge of what these affidavits contain.

Mr. LAURIER. Sir, I reaffirm what I said a moment ago. That is the kind of law which is administered by one of the judges who pretended to adjudicate upon this case ! Here are affidavits which were brought in support of the contention of the minority, and when the hon. gentleman (Mr. McCarthy) who represented the majority of the people of Manitoba, stated that if these affidavits were to go in, according to all the

Mr. LAURIER.

rules of evidence, he should have an opportunity of contradicting them, then, rather than that he should have this opportunity of contradicting them, they were withdrawn, and though they were withdrawn, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Daly) says that they are printed, and that they are in the hands of the public ! Sir, it is that evidence that has been withdrawn, it is that evidence which the other side never had the opportunity of contradicting, which we are now told is to go before the people of Canada, in order to secure redress for the minority ! This is why this question is so difficult of settlement. It is that we are going to pass a law to-day forcing a system of schools upon the majority of the people of Manitoba, upon facts which the people of Manitoba never had an opportunity of contradicting. That evidence may be true. For my part, I will be disposed to believe it, but I am not disposed to attach any importance to it unless the government of Manitoba have an opportunity of contradicting it. If they had an opportunity of contradicting that evidence, then, Sir, it would go for what it is worth, but if they have had no opportunity of contradicting it, then it is the most baseless of all claims to make in favour of the minority in Manitoba ; and for my part, speaking in the name of the race and the religion of the minority of Manitoba, I will not rest their claim upon such evidence as that. Then Mr. Ewart proceeded to argue the claim of his clients upon the merits of separate schools and public schools. Well, Sir, the moment he came to that he invited all the old controversies which have been raging in this country for twenty years, aye, for forty years and over. The minority have a right to present the strongest case they can make to have their own schools, that I admit. The minority have views which are not shared in by the majority. There has been a struggle of old upon that, and although the argument of Mr. Ewart is very strong upon that point, it could have been made much stronger if supported by evidence. If we had a committee of inquiry, then one of the minority could have come before it, and laid down the doctrine in which the Catholic people are instructed, and that would have been a great and a sound argument to have offered to the majority. Sir, there is precedent for that. In the motherland, at the time of the agitation for the restoration to the Roman Catholics of their civil rights, a committee of the House of Lords sat to investigate what the Roman Catholic doctrine was upon certain points. An eminent bishop of the Roman Catholic church, Bishop Doyle, was heard amongst others before that committee ; and it is a matter of history that the evidence of Bishop Doyle did more to remove the prejudices which existed at that time in England against the Roman Catholics than anything else. I am sorry that that wise

precedent was not followed by the Government of Canada. I am sorry to say that they did not have any inquiry, where both parties—both the government of Manitoba and the Roman Catholics of Manitoba—might have been heard and where all parties would have had an opportunity of presenting their views. If that had been done, it is probable that the question would have reached nearer to a settlement than it has reached to-day, even when the Bill to restore the rights of the minority is before us.

Mr. FOSTER. Will my hon. friend allow me one question, for the sake of clearness. According to his argument now, what he would investigate is not the allegation of a grievance as stated by the minority asking for the appeal, but the arguments advanced by a counsel as to why the Government should act.

Mr. LAURIER. I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, that I have not had the power of making myself understood by the hon. gentleman. What I would investigate is precisely what is alleged in the petition of the Roman Catholic minority. Among the things that are alleged in this petition are these: first, that there was a compact made between the Roman Catholics of Manitoba and the Crown of England, as represented by the Government of Canada, whereby their schools were guaranteed to them; second, that the system of common schools is repugnant to their consciences; third, that the schools established in Manitoba, though nominally public schools, are in reality Protestant schools. These are the things to be investigated; these are the things on which the Roman Catholic minority have all along been resting their claim. What are we to conclude from all this? We are to conclude that the Roman Catholic minority of Manitoba have a grievance and have a right of appeal to this Government. It is undoubted that the minority have a grievance, it is undoubted that they have the right of appeal, that this Government has jurisdiction to hear the appeal, and to pass remedial orders, and that this Parliament has the right to pass remedial legislation. But what I contend is that, before these remedial orders and this legislation can be passed, all the facts connected with the claims of the minority should be investigated, so as to give the Government and Parliament of Canada something to act upon. Until this is done, I say the Government cannot act in this matter without putting themselves in a false position. Sir, I know that this view which I take has been disputed in a good many quarters. For instance, a few days ago a report of a theological consultation was published in one of the ministerial organs in Quebec, the effect of which was that no Roman Catholic could vote in favour of an investigation into this matter. One of the

reasons given for this was that an investigation would lead to nothing, because those who were in favour of it and who promoted it were not believers in it. Well, Sir, I happen to know to some extent the reverend gentleman who gave that consultation. He is a most eminent divine, and a young man, yet with great talents and a great future before him. But I am bound to say that when he gave that consultation, the reverend gentleman had not read the answer of the government of Manitoba to the Order in Council of this Government. Let me quote the language of this reverend gentleman. Referring to the bishops, he says:

They are of opinion, and quite properly, that it would be inconsiderate in so grave a matter to trust their hopes in a projected inquiry, which would unavoidably bring in new delays, and which, setting aside federal interference, to which its promoters are opposed, would fling back Catholics to the mercy of their persecutors.

I say that the reverend gentleman who gave that consultation evidently had not read the answer of the government of Manitoba, in which they positively admit the power of interference by this Government. Here is the answer given by the government of Manitoba to the amended Order in Council:

The remedy sought to be applied is fraught with great danger to the principle of provincial autonomy. An independent consideration of the subject, as well as the recognized constitutional practice in analogous cases, clearly indicates that it should only be made use of as a last resort and after the clearest possible case has been made out, it is obvious that so drastic proceeding as the coercion of a province in order to impose upon it a policy repugnant to the declared wishes of its people can only be justified by clear and unmistakable proof of flagrant wrong-doing on the part of the provincial authority.

Sir, here is a clear admission—as clear as language can make it—on the part of the government of Manitoba themselves that this Government has the power to interfere, and that this Parliament has the right to interfere by legislation; but, as they very properly say, this is a power which should be exercised only very sparingly and in cases of flagrant wrong-doing. But, Sir, this admission by the government of Manitoba is followed by an offer to remedy the grievances complained of. What is the inference to be drawn from that? The inference that there is an implied engagement on the part of the government of Manitoba that as soon as the grievances have been investigated, they are prepared themselves to give the minority the measure of relief to which they are entitled, the moment those wrongs to which I have alluded have been proved to their satisfaction. Now, Sir, I pass from this consideration, which is the main argument I have to advance, to another consideration. I know that there are eminent authorities who assert that the right of the minority rests on the sole fact that separate

schools were abolished. Separate schools were established in 1870, and they were abolished in 1890. There are eminent authorities who hold that the moment these facts, which are notorious, are taken into consideration, the minority have the right to a restoration of their schools.

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. LAURIER. I will not dispute that. I hear some one say "hear, hear." I am quite willing at this moment to take that view of the case. Let us suppose that the right of the minority rests alone on the fact that the separate schools which were granted them have been abolished. Sir, I want to know from those who pretend to be the friends of the minority—who pretend that we have power to discard everything else and stick close to that fact—why did not the minority in their petition press their case upon that fact alone? Why did they not say to the Government of Canada: We have nothing to allege but the simple fact that these schools have been abolished, and we claim that they have to be restored. But they did not rest their case there; they took the ground I have stated. They said: The people of Canada should restore our schools, because the schools now established are an outrage on our consciences; and we claim that the people of Canada should give us back our schools, because when we entered into confederation there was a compact with us, made by the Crown of England that we should have our schools forever. If the minority in Manitoba had rested their case on this simple fact, would it have been as strong a case, as it could be made by the allegation of those other facts? My hon. friend who interrupted me a moment ago knows that the case of the minority is not so popular that they could afford to neglect any argument or fact by which they could strengthen it. There are men in the party of hon. gentlemen opposite who are prepared to vote against the Government on this occasion, because they do not believe in separate schools. But they are British men, and have British blood in their veins; and I imagine that even those who do not believe in separate schools, if it were shown to them that a compact made with the Crown and by the Crown had been violated, would be prepared to review their judgment, and on this ground alone give the minority the satisfaction they are seeking. And therefore this is the reason why I say that, even as a matter of prudence, even if the rights existed otherwise, it would have been wise and statesmanlike to have this investigation into all the facts which are alleged in the petitions. There are men in this House who pretend to be friends of the minority, and who think they are going to carry out this question to a conclusion by high-handed proceedings. Sir, they are not the friends, but the worst

Mr. LAURIER.

enemies of the minority, if they think they can carry this question by any other method than the method of persuasion. But there is more than that. Even if we have the right to legislate at this moment, even if we have the fact that a wrong is established, have we the evidence before us that would warrant us in passing this legislation, and in formulating a remedy? The wrong exists, very true, but how is the remedy to be established? Here is a Bill passed in darkness, passed in ignorance. What evidence have we to-day here of the condition of things in Manitoba? What evidence have we of the different things we should know in order to legislate intelligently upon such a subject? What is before the House? A half-hearted and faint measure—a measure of compromise, and nothing else. This measure cannot be satisfactory to those who pretend so clamorously here that they are the friends of the minority. It is a measure of compromise to be administered by whom? Is it a measure of compromise which this Government itself can administer? No, it is a compromise which is to be administered by a hostile government. What benefit, do you think, will accrue to the minority on this question from this legislation?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. LAURIER. Yes, since this half-hearted measure has to be administered by a hostile government, would it not have been far more wise to have had a commission appointed? The government of Manitoba might have been represented on that commission, and there would have been the chance, then, that if a measure of compromise were agreed on, and there was nothing else to expect, at all events it would be administered by a friendly and not a hostile government. But there is more than that. The Government say to-day that they are bound to bring in this measure, because the Manitoba government have refused to come to any terms. I take complete issue with the Government on this point. The government of Manitoba never was approached in a proper spirit upon the point. It was approached with threatening hands. It was threatened with the strong arm of this Government unless it would do what it was ordered to do. But even after this outrageous proceeding, the Manitoba government made this reply, to which I call the attention of friends and foes—no, I shall not say foes, because I do not believe the minority have foes in this chamber—but I call attention to this reply:

It is a matter of regret that the invitation extended by the legislative assembly to make a proper inquiry into the facts of the case has not been accepted, but that, as above stated, the advisers of His Excellency have declared their policy without investigation. It is equally a matter of regret that Parliament is apparently

about to be asked to legislate without investigation. It is with all deference submitted that such a course seems to be quite incapable of reasonable justification and must create the conviction that the educational interests of the people of the province of Manitoba are being dealt with in a hostile and peremptory way by a tribunal whose members have not approached the subject in a judicial spirit or taken the proceedings necessary to enable them to form a proper opinion upon the merits of the question.

The inquiry asked for by the reply of the legislature to the remedial order, should, in the opinion of the undersigned, be again earnestly invited, and in the event of the invitation being accepted, the scope of the inquiry should be sufficiently wide to embrace all available facts relating to the past or present school system.

This is the answer, and are we to be told that, in the face of this offer, we are to pass it by, to ignore it, to trample it under foot? Sir, I claim that, in the face of such an offer, the Parliament of Canada should not proceed any further. We would confer no benefit upon the minority by so doing, and would incur a great danger for the future of this confederation.

I arraign the policy of the Government upon every step they have taken in this question. They have been wrong from first to last. Why did they not approach the government of Manitoba in a friendly, instead of the hostile, spirit in which they approached it? When the last judgment was rendered by the Privy Council, why did this Government not go themselves to the people of Manitoba and say to them: Here is the decree of the sovereign tribunal of this land, here is the judgment which says that the Government of Canada, and the Parliament of Canada have a right to interfere in this matter. Do not compel us to take this extreme measure, but remedy this grievance yourselves. Had the Government done this, it is possible, nay, it is very probable, that the government of Manitoba, in the face of that decision of the Privy Council, would have accepted this friendly suggestion. Why did not this Government send an ambassador to Manitoba? Why did they not do at first what they did at the last hour? Why did they not do twelve months ago, what they did last week, when they sent my hon. friend from Montreal West (Sir Donald Smith) to Winnipeg as an ambassador, and no better person could have been chosen. Nay, I was wrong? I forgot for the moment that we had yesterday a statement from the hon. gentleman who leads the House (Sir Charles Tupper) that the hon. member for Montreal West (Sir Donald Smith) had not been sent as an ambassador by the Government here. They are not even entitled to that faint measure of praise which I was prepared to give them. They are not worthy of it, for we must accept the statement of the right hon. gentleman that my hon. friend from Montreal West simply went on his own accord. Finding that the Government were not prepared to do their duty, he went him-

self, as a messenger of peace, in order to restore the harmony and peace which was threatened by the action of the Government.

I admit that this is a most crucial question, but it is all the more crucial that it has been bungled from first to last by the Government. There are men in this House, who are against separate schools, but who would have no objection to the re-establishment of separate schools in Manitoba, provided they were re-established by the province of Manitoba itself. There are men in this House who are in favour of separate schools, but who think very strongly that it would not be advisable to interfere with the legislation of Manitoba at all until all means of conciliation had been exhausted. Sir, in face of this perilous position, I maintain to-day, and I submit it to the consideration of gentlemen on both sides, that the policy of the Opposition, affirmed since many years, reiterated upon more than one occasion, is the only policy which can satisfactorily deal with this question—the only policy which can remedy the grievance of the minority, while, at the same time, not violently assaulting the right of the majority and thereby, perhaps, creating a greater wrong. This was the policy, which, for my part, I adopted and developed the very first time the question came before this House, and upon this policy to-day I stand once more. Sir, I cannot forget at this moment that the policy which I have advocated and maintained all along has not been favourably received in all quarters. Not many weeks ago I was told from high quarters in the church to which I belong that unless I supported the school Bill, which was then being prepared by the Government, and which we have now before us, I would incur the hostility of a great and powerful body. Sir, this is too grave a phase of this question for me to pass it by in silence. I have only this to say: Even though I have threats held over me coming, as I am told, from high dignitaries in the church to which I belong, no word of bitterness shall ever pass my lips as against that church. I respect it and I love it. Sir, I am not of that school, which has been long dominant in France and other countries of continental Europe, which refuses ecclesiastics the right of a voice in public affairs? No; I am a Liberal of the English school. I believe in that school, which has all along claimed that it is the privilege of all subjects, whether high or low, whether rich or poor, whether ecclesiastics or laymen, to participate in the administration of public affairs, to discuss, to influence, to persuade, to convince,—but which has always denied even to the highest the right to dictate even to the lowest. I am here representing not Roman Catholics alone but Protestants as well, and I must give an account of my stewardship to all classes. Here am I.

a Roman Catholic of French extraction entrusted by the confidence of the men who sit around me with great and important duties under our constitutional system of government. I am here the acknowledged leader of a great party composed of Roman Catholics and Protestants as well, in which Protestants are in the majority, as Protestants must be in the majority in every part in Canada. Am I to be told, I, occupying such a position, that I am to be dictated the course I am to take in this House, by reasons that can appeal to the consciences of my fellow Catholic members, but which do not appeal as well to the consciences of my Protestant colleagues? No. So long as I have a seat in this House, so long as I occupy the position I do now, whenever it shall become my duty to take a stand upon any question whatever, that stand I will take not upon grounds of Roman Catholicism, not upon grounds of Protestantism, but upon grounds which can appeal to the consciences of all men, irrespective of their particular faith, upon grounds which can be occupied by all men who love justice, freedom and toleration.

So far as this Bill is concerned I have given you my views. I know, I acknowledge, that there is in this Government the power to interfere, there is in the Parliament the power to interfere; but that power should not be exercised until all the facts bearing upon the case have been investigated and all means of conciliation exhausted. Holding these opinions I move that the Bill be not now read the second time, but that it be read the second time this day six months.

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

After Recess.

Mr. WALLACE. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that members of this House will set aside party feeling for the time to rejoice that we have the pleasure of having again with us the present leader of the House, the hon. Secretary of State (Sir Charles Tupper). Though political lines divide us, we all recognize, I hope—at any rate the Conservative party in this House and throughout the Dominion recognize—the splendid services rendered to Canada prior to confederation and since then, by that hon. gentleman, and recalled to our minds so vividly this afternoon. For my part, I have always admired his splendid courage, which has brought the Conservative party and the country as well through many difficult crises. I recall one particularly, that during the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and I remember with pride and pleasure the indomitable courage exhibited by the hon. Secretary of State during that trying period. He, like our other great leader, Sir John Macdonald, always had faith in our country and its possibilities.

Mr. LAURIER.

But, while I say that and while I have followed the hon. gentleman during many years in this House with very great pleasure, and though to-day I closely adhere to the doctrines of the Conservative party as I understand them—to the principle of protection and those other and large principles leading to the confederation of the Empire and closer connection with the motherland—I regret that on the question he has brought before the House to-day I am unable to follow him. The hon. gentleman called to mind the fact that Canada before confederation was divided on racial and religious lines and that at confederation those lines disappeared and the questions which had seriously divided the old provinces were left to be settled by the various provinces, and, as he very aptly said, we have been a happy family ever since. I regret that, by this Bill, which, I presume, was left to him as a legacy, a pledge to bring which before the House was made before he became a member of the House and a member of the Government, he should take such action as must divide the country on racial and religious lines. I believe that while these questions were kept in the domain to which they properly belong, that of the provinces, the provinces have always settled them fairly and satisfactorily, and each province has been satisfied and has done its part to upbuild the Dominion. That being so, I all the more regret that a Bill should be brought forward which will revive these racial and religious questions in the House of Commons and in the Dominion and plunge us again into those very difficulties which confederation was intended to overcome. Now, Sir, with reference to another matter alluded to by the hon. leader of the House, I have a few words to say. He referred to the people of bigoted and fanatical impulses, and he said the man who promoted a war of races or creeds, is an enemy to Canada. I quite coincide with that statement; I believe that those who promote these difficulties are enemies to Canada. But, while that is my belief, I repudiate the implication that those who are opposing this Bill, are open to be characterized by any such words. It is not upon us who may think proper to oppose this Bill that the charge can be thrown that we have done anything to promote racial or religious strife. If we oppose this Bill, as I shall oppose it at every stage, at the same time I repudiate the implication that I am responsible for bringing this question before the Parliament of Canada. Sir, this is a very serious matter. The leader of the Government has told us, this afternoon, that this is the most important question that has come up since confederation. I agree with him in that view, and I go this far in saying that before that question was ever brought up to be fought over in the Parliament of Canada, and to create disturbance of a kind which we all must deprecate and deplore, I say, that every

effort should have been made to prevent it. This is a new form of legislation, it is something unknown heretofore. It is true, there is a provision for it on the statute-book, there is a reserved power; and the highest courts have declared that we have the power to enact some sort of legislation to remedy grievances, if grievances exist. But I say, that before we undertook to legislate in this way, every resort should have been exhausted, every effort should have been made, to avoid it. I cannot agree with the statement that every effort has been made to have the province of Manitoba settle this question themselves. I am fortified in that opinion by the documents that have been presented to the House, by the drastic order that was made last March, asking the province of Manitoba practically to re-enact a system of separate schools which previously existed, and which were found to be wholly unsuitable to the circumstances and conditions of the country, which were found to give a very inadequate education to the children, and which was productive of very poor results in every direction. So I say that, for my part, though I shall oppose this Bill, I shall not quietly rest under the implication, that, by opposing it, I am promoting racial or religious disturbance in the country. On the contrary, I say that the full responsibility of so doing will rest upon the Government who have proposed this legislation, who have thrust it upon the Conservative party; because the Conservative party, as I know it in the province of Ontario, have not been, at any time in my recollection, at any rate, in accord with the principles of this Bill. Now, what are the facts of the case? We have been told to-day that there is a legal obligation, that there is a constitutional order, as it were, and we were told by the hon. leader of the Government, that it is not a question of separate schools, but of the constitution. Well, Sir, when that matter was first brought before the House of Commons, by way of resolution declaring in favour of the creation of a court to investigate these matters, a resolution moved by the Hon. Mr. Blake and seconded, I think, by the present leader of the Opposition, there was no legal obligation contemplated then, nor is there to-day, for enforcing any legislation that may be enacted. Sir John A. Macdonald, who was then the leader of the Government, asked Mr. Blake about this point, when the latter brought in the resolution:

Of course my hon. friend in his resolution—
The resolution upon which the Act of Parliament was founded.

—has guarded against the suspicion that such a decision is binding upon the executive.

The reply was:

Such a decision is only for the information of the Government, the executive is not relieved from its responsibility. The answer of the tribunal will be simply for the information of the

Government. The Government may dissent from that position.

And that is the position of affairs in this case. An opinion has been given by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, but that opinion is not a decision binding upon us. In that decision the Privy Council declared the constitutional powers of the Government, but did not declare a policy at all. But, Mr. Speaker, because we have the power to legislate, does that imply that we are under an obligation to legislate? It then becomes, Sir, a political question. We have power to-day to legislate upon insolvency, but we are not doing so. We have power to-day to pass a prohibitory liquor law, but that does not make it compulsory on this Parliament to enact a prohibitory liquor law. And so, in this case, it is clear we have the power to enact some sort of legislation, though it is questionable whether we have the power to go as far as this Bill goes, and such was the indication of the Privy Council, not in the line of the Bill we have before us to-day, but some sort of legislation. But, for my part, I am not disposed to split hairs on that matter, because I am opposed to the principle of separate schools altogether. I do not believe they are good for any country, and experience has proved that. The province of Manitoba, in their wisdom, abolished the separate school system after nineteen years' experience, and, after five or six years' experience, have twice, I believe, reaffirmed their adherence to that system, and on the last occasion by a majority almost unanimous, because both political parties in the province are committed to the maintenance of the public school system. Therefore, I say, that the people of Manitoba, who have the greatest interest in this matter, whose whole legislation would be affected by this Bill, if passed, have, by an almost unanimous vote, decided that they are in favour of a public as against a separate school system. But we are told that the rights that were granted previous to the union have been infringed upon by provincial legislation. But, Mr. Speaker, the Privy Council, in the case of Barrett against the city of Winnipeg, decided that there was no infringement of rights previous to the union; that there were no rights existing, either by law or practice, that had been interfered with. They further declared, that the legislation of 1890 establishing a public school system was quite within the powers of the local legislature. They have reaffirmed that in their later decision, so that the fact stands to-day, that the local legislature of Manitoba, who, in their wisdom, have enacted a public school system, and abolished the separate school system, were acting quite within the powers which the Manitoba Act gave them. But we are told, that rights and privileges were affected, and that there was a grievance. But, Mr. Speaker, while there may have been a grievance, it does not follow that

either a moral or a political wrong has been done. The legal grievance referred to in the Bill, consists in the abolition of a privilege heretofore granted, irrespective of whether that privilege was founded on justice or reason; and the privilege has been withdrawn. But a privilege was also given to the Protestants of Manitoba that they should have Protestant schools, because it said Protestant and Roman Catholics. That privilege has been withdrawn from the Protestants, so they have exactly, as I understand it, the same grounds for grievance as the Roman Catholics. But is it a grievance? Is it a grievance that the children of the Roman Catholic population have supplied to them now efficient schools in place of inefficient schools? Is it a grievance that there is a better system of education in the province of Manitoba for all the children of the province, both Protestant and Catholic, than there was before? Because where two schools were established before, and where the population was not sufficient to properly maintain those two schools, there is one efficient public school to-day. But we are told: But these are Protestant schools, and therefore you are doing an injustice to the Roman Catholics by compelling them to send their children there. To that I have to reply that we have the opinion of the Privy Council exactly to the contrary. The Privy Council, in their first judgment of *Barrett vs. City of Winnipeg*, said as follows:—

They cannot consent to the view which seems to be indicated by one of the members of the Supreme Court, that the public schools under the Act of 1890 are in reality Protestant schools. The legislature has declared in so many words: that the schools shall be entirely unsectarian, and that principle is carried out throughout the Act.

There is the evidence of the Privy Council after examination as to what the law was, that the schools are entirely unsectarian, and therefore there is no such thing as compelling the children of Roman Catholics to attend Protestant schools. In their late decision the Privy Council reaffirmed, in almost similar phraseology, their decision. They said:

It is true that religious exercises prescribed for the public schools are to be not distinctly Protestant, for they are to be non-sectarian, and a parent may withdraw his child from them.

So the schools now established, according to the statement of the Privy Council which examined into the question, are strictly non-sectarian.

Who are asking for the repeal of this Act? They are not, as I have shown, the people of Manitoba, because they are almost a unit in favour of its maintenance, and we have the best evidence to show not only that the Protestant population, but a large section of the Roman Catholic population are in favour of the public school system, because they know, as we know here that where a public school system is only in

Mr. WALLACE.

vogue there are more efficient schools and better progress is made by the pupils, a result which every parent desires. Who, then, are they who are asking for the repeal of the Public Schools Act of Manitoba? They are not, I affirm, the people of the province of Ontario. They are not the people of the great province and of the Territories to the west of Manitoba. I do not believe there is any province that would willingly desire to interfere in the affairs of Manitoba, because we had evidence in the province of Quebec during the last by-elections, when the strongest efforts were made to secure the support of the electorate on the plea that separate schools were to be re-established in Manitoba, that the Government failed to receive support on that ground, though, as I say, strong appeals were made to the people. So we may safely conclude that the people of the province of Quebec are not interested, as they should not be interested, in forcing separate schools on the province of Manitoba. Then, who are they who are forcing these schools on the province? We have evidence here, I am sorry to say, that the hierarchy are interested in doing so, and have interested themselves very much. I will refer to that matter more particularly later on. But, Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to this fact, that if they succeed in forcing a separate school system on the province of Manitoba against the wishes of the people of that province, they are not going to stop there. They will immediately demand that the same system be applied to the Territories as they are formed into provinces, and they will even make their demand without waiting for the formation of the Territories into provinces; and we have evidence before us to-day that the legislature of the North-west Territories, or rather the North-west Council, passed a school Act during the last session of the council, but through some means which we do not quite understand, although we know the fact, the signature of the Lieutenant-Governor was not given to the Act, and, therefore, it did not become law. I have not heard of any proper reason given why the Governor did not affix his signature to the document, which it was quite within the power of the North-west Council to enact, and therefore I say there has been a miscarriage of law in some respects, and we are told, and it has not been contradicted, that this course was taken because of the strong opposition of Archbishop Langevin to the measure, and in consequence of his protest. We do know that the same course was attempted with respect to legislation passed by the North-west Council some years ago. I have here a copy of the protest of Archbishop Langevin's predecessor, Archbishop Taché, sent to the Government against that law, and calling on the Government to disallow it; but Sir John Thompson, who was then Minister of Justice, refused to disallow it because the Council of the Territories, he

said, had not exceeded the powers conferred on them by the Canadian Government, and as, therefore, the law was 'intra vires,' he had not the right to interfere. A strong feeling was aroused against him by Archbishop Taché, because he refused to disallow the Act. The same state of things prevails to-day, and this explains the fact that the Act passed by the North-west Council is not a law on the statute-books to-day. Not only will the hierarchy go to the North-west Territories, if this Bill is carried in this House, and have the same law to establish separate schools enacted there, but they will get power to go back to the legislatures which have declared that they do not want separate schools. They will go to British Columbia. Why not? If this law is right for Manitoba it must be right for British Columbia?

An hon. MEMBER. No.

Mr. WALLACE. An hon. member says "no." I presume he thinks they would not want a separate school system there.

Mr. AMYOT. It is not in the constitution.

Mr. WALLACE. They will go and ask to have the constitution altered.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. WALLACE. Why not? If they have the right to force this school system on Manitoba, they will claim the right to force it on British Columbia, and on Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island. We will then find ourselves in this position, that every year there will be interference with the educational legislation of the various provinces. I hold that we should approach this subject with the greatest care—or rather we should not approach it at all—because there will be difficulties, and no man can see where the difficulties will end. Hon. gentlemen say that the passage of this Act now will settle the question. The very Act of itself is evidence to the contrary. What does the last clause say? It reserves to the Dominion Government further power, and the power may be given as soon as it is shown that the powers conferred by this Bill are inadequate to the proper carrying out of the terms of the Act. We were told that the separate schools were granted to the province of Manitoba. First, because there was a treaty and by that treaty they were entitled to separate schools. Mr. Speaker, there was no treaty that gave them that right. There were four treaties, so-called, or bills of rights, made up there. Two of these were by a convention or a mass meeting of the people; there was one, at any rate, made by the provisional government of Louis Riel, and the fourth was said to be made, but I think the evidence is conclusive that the fourth, so-called treaty, or bill of rights, was a forgery. But, even if it were not a forgery, and even if these third and fourth treaties were in existence, the then Governor General of Canada, Sir John Young, refused to

treat upon the basis of these, because they were the product of a rebellious government. He consented to treat upon the basis of the first and second, which were from a convention of citizens assembled in Winnipeg, and this convention sent these Bills of Rights down here, and had them brought before the people, and it was the second of these which was the basis upon which the Manitoba Act was founded. Therefore there is no treaty. In the second Bill of Rights, and in the first, and third, there is no mention of separate schools of any form. In the fourth one, this bogus one, which we claim, and which the evidence amply proves was a bogus one, there is mention of separate schools; but that was never considered by Sir John Young or by the Government of that time. Now, we are told, Mr. Speaker, that by the law they should have separate schools. But, Sir, the decision of the Privy Council, to which I have already alluded, does not bear out that proposition. The decision of the Privy Council does not make it compulsory in any way that there should be a separate school Act. Indeed, I should say the Privy Council does not give a decision at all, but simply expresses an opinion to the effect that: if the Parliament of Canada choose to enact such legislation within certain restricted limits, it has power to do so. I claim that this Parliament of Canada is as free as air to-day, not to enact a single line of legislation upon this matter. It becomes a political question, and for the future prosperity of this Dominion, for the future quietness of this Dominion, and its peace, I think that the Government should stay their hand even now, and decide to withdraw this Bill. I say that, because the Bill will provoke disaster, it will provoke quarrels, it will set province against province, and race against race, and religion against religion, and it will be of no benefit whatever to those whom it is intended or designed to serve. I say, Sir, that the Government in this matter have made a great mistake, and that it is not too late yet for them to retrace their steps. Mr. Speaker, there is not a line in the Public Schools Act of Manitoba that interferes with the liberty of either the parent or the child. It does not interfere in any way with the liberty of the people to educate their children in religious subjects as they may please. It does not interfere in any way with any of the privileges that it is proper they should enjoy. Therefore the conscientious convictions of Roman Catholics amount to this. They say: we want our children educated in the dogmas of our church in the public schools. But, Sir, I say, that we have no right to teach the dogmas of any church in the public schools of the country. If we acknowledge that right we must concede it to every religious denomination. We must give the same right to the Presbyterians, to the Methodists, to the Baptists, to the Mennonites, and to all the religious denominations in that country. Then we would find

ourselves in this position. One school teaches what another school denies, in one school the dogmas of one church are taught, and in another school the dogmas of another church directly in opposition to it are taught. Sir, I say that they have no right to do that at the expense of the state. Each church should do that at its own expense. I say it is not the duty of the state to engage in such work, and I say that the state which undertakes to do it, is making a great mistake. Moreover, Mr. Speaker, what is the experience of all countries in this respect. We know that in almost every country where they have tried it, they are endeavouring to abolish, or have abolished it to-day. The separate school system—the ecclesiastical system it may perhaps be more properly called—has always been a failure in educating the people. It is not the object of these ecclesiastical schools to educate the people in the ordinary branches of education, but the object is, to inculcate the dogmas of their church; and the history of all countries proves, that they have always failed when they have undertaken to teach, not only the dogmas of their church but to give a general education. Why, Sir, look at our own country. We go to foreign countries, and we see the failure of such education there, but come down to our own country, and what do we find? I have here a copy of the Montreal "Gazette" having information bearing on the question, but before I refer to that, I will speak of the failure of such an educational system in other countries. They have tried the education of the people by the church in all countries, and it is not confined to the Roman Catholics, because the Church of England, and the Methodists, have all had more or less of the idea in their minds, that their school should be a church school. I repeat that it has been a failure, wherever that has been tried. In Belgium, which is almost exclusively a Roman Catholic country, they have made the schools non-sectarian. They have taken away the sectarian schools and established non-sectarian schools in their place. In Italy they have done the same thing, and they had great need for it, and I am told they find the most satisfactory results from the change, because Italy, which was the cradle of the arts, had degenerated until almost half of the people were illiterate. Now Italy has adopted the system of non-sectarian schools and the people are getting a good education. In Ireland the same result has been found. They have established a system of national schools there. In every province of Australia, the non-sectarian system of schools has been established. Then again, in the United States, our nearest neighbour, we know that the greatest efforts have been made by the archbishops, and bishops, and priests, and all the dignitaries of the church, to attempt to fasten upon the states of the union a sectarian system of education. But, I believe

Mr. WALLACE.

that in every state of the American union to-day, the non-sectarian is the system of schools established by law. Here in Canada, in the province of Nova Scotia, in New Brunswick, in Prince Edward Island, and in British Columbia, we have non-sectarian schools and the people get along without separate schools. In the province of Ontario we have sectarian schools, but the fact is, that two-thirds of the Roman Catholic population are to-day being educated in the public schools. My hon. friend beside me says "No." Well, I make the statement, and I make it on good evidence, and I would ask that hon. gentleman to produce proof to the contrary. In the province of Ontario two-thirds of the Roman Catholic pupils are educated in the public schools, and there is no interference with their religious convictions there. They get the same fair-play as the Protestant pupils. I have the evidence of Roman Catholic people in the locality where I live that they are the strongest advocates of the public school system under which they were educated themselves, and they are good members of their church, too. In the province of Quebec we have a system of separate schools, or rather of religious schools, and I will read an extract from the report of the Superintendent of Education for that province, as published in the Montreal "Gazette." In his report for 1895, Mr. Boucher de la Bruère says:

The country schools are not as good as they might be. The children leave them without having received a sufficiently lasting impression to make them wish to increase their knowledge.

* * * To quote from one inspector's report, the slow increase in efficiency is due to the apathy of most of the members of the school board—too many of whom are unable to read—to the indifference of parents to the miserable salaries paid to teachers, which makes it difficult to obtain competent ones.....In one district, another inspector declares, where 166 schools were in operation, 38 teachers were without certificates, and 66 the year before.....Most of the teachers are entirely ignorant of the first principles of pedagogics, have no system in their work, and content themselves by making their pupils learn their books by rote.....The pupils recite their lessons fairly well, but without understanding their meaning.....As it is declared that the average salary to teachers is, in some districts, \$108 for 10 months work, and as some must get considerably less than this, and as these small wages are not always promptly paid, it is not difficult to understand what is behind the teachers' indifference.....To put it briefly, the people, in too many cases, do not appreciate their duty to their children in the way of education. They are content to fit them to be hewers of wood and drawers of water for their more fortunate or better educated fellow-citizens.

In the face of that, I think it is not unfair to ask those priests who have interested themselves so much in the educational affairs of the province of Manitoba to pay a little attention to the educational affairs of the province of Quebec, where it is so badly needed. I have also a report in my hand

upon the operation of the separate school system in this city of Ottawa. In response to a complaint which was made, the Hon. Geo. W. Ross, Minister of Education for the province of Ontario appointed three commissioners to visit the separate schools in this city, and gave them full powers to investigate and report. In that report, the first thing that attracts my attention is that the teachers, whose duty it is to teach loyalty to the children under their care, were themselves disloyal, disobeying the instructions of the Minister of Education, who had ample power conferred upon him, and who delegated ample power to these commissioners to make the inquiry they did. Here is a portion of their report :

On arriving at this school the next morning, Brother Director Mark informed them that "his higher superiors had given instructions that he was not to allow the commissioners to examine the classes." They next visited La Salle school. Here they were received by Brother Director Philadelphus, who said "he had orders not to allow the inquiry in this school."

The commissioners retired, and having doubts as to the extent of the resistance to be offered, they returned to La Salle school, and were informed by Brother Philadelphus, that "As soon as the commissioners entered a room, a brother in charge would leave his class. The pupils would be allowed to remain, and be at the disposal of the commissioners. Nothing would be said to them (pupils), to set them against the commissioners, the teacher would not answer any questions the commissioners might ask him. He (teacher) would give them no information regarding his class. In fact, the resistance to the inquiry meant everything short of using force." This view of the official instructions to the Brothers, was confirmed by Brother Director Mark, on whom your commissioners called a second time, and both gentlemen assured the commissioners that the same order had been issued to all the Brothers in the city.

These gentlemen found that they could not resist the commissioners, but would have to submit. Then the commissioners proceeded to examine the classes, and they say:

Thus, in a class of 51 boys of an average age of over 10 years, working in multiplication with a multiplier of three figures, not one had the correct answer to $7 \times 8 \times 2 - 3 \times 7 - 7$, written on the blackboard in this form. In a class of 31 boys, of an average age of 11, none had the right answer to $7 \times 8 \times 4 - 6 - 2 \times 9$. In the other classes only a few pupils got the correct result.

I might go on all through this book and show, perhaps not as bad a state of things as this, because it could not be worse, but a general want of progress in these schools.

For instance, in a class of fifteen pupils, seven failed to give a single correct answer; in a class of thirty-nine pupils, ten failed to give a single correct answer; in a class of twenty-four pupils, eleven failed to give a single correct answer; and so on. But I will not take up the time of the House in detailing these facts. I will simply say that all through this book is to be found evidence of the utter failure of the separate

school system in the city of Ottawa. If that be the history of these schools here, we do not need to go to the province of Manitoba for evidence of the inefficiency of the separate schools there. We have the evidence furnished by the Manitoba government, by the inspectors there, by all those in authority, that the whole system of separate school education in Manitoba was utterly inefficient—that the pupils did not get that education which they might properly be expected to get, and therefore the system was changed and the separate schools were abolished.

Now, I said a moment ago that I thought those gentlemen, the members of the hierarchy in the province of Quebec and in other provinces who were interesting themselves so much, might well devote their energies to improving their own schools, instead of attempting to force upon Manitoba a system of separate schools, which is not wanted by the people of that province. The utterances of these gentlemen are, in my opinion, utterly uncalled for, and are subversive of the freedom of the people of Canada; and, if they are not so already, such utterances should be made contrary to the law. In every election that takes place an attempt is made by these gentlemen to interfere and force their views, illegally, as I contend, on the people of the country. I will just read to you a small portion of a letter written by Bishop Cameron, of Antigonish, during the recent election contest in the county of Cape Breton. In this letter he says :

And yet we meet the appalling spectacle of a multitude of men who are loud in their prayers of liberty and justice and religion arrayed against remedial legislation, the only available means under the constitution of redressing that wrong, and then doing all they can to perpetuate the monster evil, subversive of religion, justice and liberty, in order to attain their own selfish ends. In defiance of God, and to our shame among those hell-inspired hypocrites, Catholics are to be found.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I object personally to be put in that class even in such good company.

Mr. FOSTER. Your objections may not hold.

Mr. WALLACE. I think they will hold with the people of Canada. Now, we have another gentleman, Archbishop Langevin, who makes a statement as to the duty of Catholics, with which I have not so much to do, except to say that no archbishop has the right, under the laws of this country, to interfere with the free exercise of men's voting power. He has the right to exercise his franchise without interference from anybody, but the laws of this country prevent an employer from intimidating an employee and prevent one man interfering with another. And they apply exactly to this case. Archbishop Langevin says as follows :—

It has been said, falsely, that the Catholic hierarchy in this Dominion of ours, is to settle the school question. No, the Catholic hierarchy—you know it, and I can say it plainly—the Catholic hierarchy leave the Catholics in their religious convictions, and all those who do not follow the hierarchy are not Catholics. When the hierarchy has spoken there is no use for any Catholic to say the contrary, for if he does he is not longer a Catholic; such a man may carry the title, but I declare this as a bishop: I say to-night, and I say it with plain authority, a Catholic who does not follow the hierarchy on the school question is not more a Catholic, and who will be the one to entitle such a one to the name of Catholic?

Now, I contend that that is an intolerable species of intimidation. The Roman Catholic bishops have no right to intimidate any voter by any such penalties. We know that the members of the Roman Catholic church, like the members of every other church, desire to be in good standing with their church; and therefore when they are read out of that body, when they are deprived of those advantages which the church says it confers on members in good standing, because they do not choose to follow the dictates of that church upon any question, that is an intolerable interference with the liberty of the subject.

But we have still further an ultimatum from the Rev. M. M. Paquet, from Laval University, who writes to the press as follows:—

Rev. L. A. Paquet, of Laval University, in conformity to the desire of the episcopal authority of his diocese, Archbishop Bégin, and with his express approval wrote to "L'Événement" a two-column letter on February 18th, from which the following is taken:—

Is it not infinitely better, therefore, that, having the right and the occasion, the central power should raise up a rampart of religious justice and protection, that will resist all winds and all tempest? I may add that, given a party spirit which so profoundly divide our public men, it is not from a particular political group that we can look for the force of union necessary to rely under the same banner all Catholics. The hierarchy alone can hope to produce this union by calling upon our legislators, and especially upon those whose conscience it controls, to rise for a moment above the temporal interest which animate them to forget their political divisions and, taking the judgment of the Privy Council of England as their starting point to make it a solid basis of a truly remedial law. To the ecclesiastical power, then, belong the right to judge whether the interference should take place in the form of command or of counsel.

It evidently has taken the form of command in some cases:

And when the interference takes an imperative form, as in the case of the Manitoba schools, only one thing remains to be done by the faithful, and that is to obey.

An hon. MEMBER. That strikes you.

Mr. WALLACE. No, but I am afraid it does strike some in this House, because I remember hearing that the hon. member for

Mr. WALLACE.

Ottawa County (Mr. Devlin) who went down to Cape Breton, was one of the loudest there in his desire to resent any attempt to interference.

Mr. DEVLIN. Were you there?

Mr. WALLACE. I was not, but I was told it by a member of Parliament who was there; and we are now told by the public press that the hon. gentleman is now in the position of Davy Crockett's coon who exclaimed:—"Don't shoot, Colonel, I will come down." And the hon. gentleman has come down. Mr. Paquet went on to say:

And when that interference takes the imperative form, as in the case of the Manitoba schools, only one thing remains to be done by the faithful, and that is to obey.

Now, I see that the functionaries of the Roman Catholic Church claim that it is the duty, not only of the electors but of members of Parliament, to obey them, and that is another interference or attempted interference with the rights and freedom of the Canadian people, which should not be tolerated, and will not be tolerated either.

Now, a good deal has been said about a commission to investigate this matter; and I think the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin) was loudest in his demand for a commission. Why, what does he want a commission for? Is it to get at the facts? I am told he is the author of this Act of 1890, which we are called on to abolish, and surely he made a full investigation before framing that Act. If he did not, he should have, before he undertook to pass that law. We heard that he made an investigation and that he found the separate schools were very defective—not only defective but utterly useless—and should be abolished, and they were abolished accordingly; and I cannot see exactly why he should demand a commission or what good a commission could do him. I suppose his intention is to enlighten his fellow-members on this subject. But there is another way of proceeding. While I think a commission is utterly unnecessary, I believe that a convention or a meeting of the two governments, or of representatives of these two governments, would have smoothed away many of the difficulties which are now presented to us. But some say: But you are opposed to separate schools altogether. So I am. I do not think this Bill should have been brought into the House of Commons at all. I do not think that a separate school Bill should be passed anywhere. But, if the province of Manitoba, after passing a separate school Bill, choose to reverse their decision, that is a thing with which the other provinces have no right to interfere. The Confederation Act gives the various provinces power to establish separate schools if they so desire, and I presume it is not the business of any other province to interfere

with them if they embody that desire in the shape of a statute. So that, if there are any grievances of any kind—which I cannot see, for my part—the people of the province of Manitoba are the people to remedy those grievances. But they have stated that they will not establish a system of separate schools in the country, because they have had experience of separate schools, and they have had an experience of a public school system, and they prefer the latter to the former.

I am sorry that the question has been brought before the House of Commons, and that it has become a bone of contention in every province of the Dominion. For this agitation is not confined to the province of Manitoba, but is going on in every province. At a time when the people of Canada should be, if possible, more united than ever; at a time when the old land is menaced and threatened by enemies who are jealous of her greatness, her power, and her pre-eminence among the nations, instead of bringing in here a proposal that must divide the people of Canada, we should carefully avoid all such questions and should join together, as we did in the resolutions passed the other day, and, presenting a united front, should be ready to assure the people of Great Britain, that we have sunk our minor differences, and are determined to do our duty as a portion of the great Empire in maintaining its supremacy both on sea and on land. In this view, it is all the more unfortunate that we have this Bill and this contentious subject thrust upon the people. I hope the Bill will not become law, for, if it does, it will only mark the commencement of litigation and serious disturbance throughout the Dominion. The matter does not end with the passage of this Bill, for the Bill itself provides for further legislation. And we know that the people of Manitoba will resist as strongly as they can, legally and constitutionally, the attempt to force upon them a system of education obnoxious to them. They will bring the Bill before the courts, testing its constitutionality and in every other constitutional way they will resist it. I shall, therefore, have pleasure in recording my vote against the Bill and in favour of the six months' hoist, as moved by the hon. leader of the Opposition.

Mr. DICKEY. Mr. Speaker, I feel a good deal embarrassed in rising to discuss a question of such magnitude as this, particularly in view of the fact that I have not had very much experience in this House, or out of it, in dealing with questions so large, and because of the fact that there seem to be two lines of opposition by which the Government's position is opposed. I think it would be better, if I were to discuss this question from a point of view from which, I think, it has not yet received sufficient attention in this debate, and that is the drier, the merely legal aspect, of the question at issue. I may say, Sir, at the outset, that, in order

to understand the Confederation Act and the Manitoba Act, on the subject of education, it is necessary to look at the circumstances under which those Acts were passed. Those circumstances have been brought vividly to the attention of the House this afternoon by the Secretary of State (Sir Charles Tupper), who himself took a large part in framing that constitution. But I do not think it can be too often said, I do not think the people of this country can have it too strongly or too frequently impressed upon them, that these educational sections of the British North America Act are Protestant in their origin and were designed to protect Protestants' rights, and that they were essential to the formation of the confederation, of which we are all so proud. It is almost useless for me to labour that point in this House; but, in order that there may be no mistake, I desire to refer to three of those persons who must know more than others of the beginning of our constitution. I refer, first, to Sir Alexander Galt, who said in 1864:

Now this applied to Lower Canada—
Speaking of the educational clauses.

—but it also applied and with equal force to Upper Canada and the other provinces; for in Lower Canada there was a Protestant minority, and in the other provinces a Catholic minority. The same privileges belong of right here,—

Speaking in Quebec.

—as belonged to the other of right elsewhere. There could be no greater injustice to a population than to compel them to have their children educated in a manner contrary to their own religious belief.

That is the opinion of a Protestant. I now call to testify the late Hon. George Brown, who certainly was no friend of separate schools. In the course of the confederation debates, Mr. Brown, speaking of these educational clauses, said:

I admit that from my point of view that is a blot on the scheme before the House. This is confessedly one of the concessions from our side that have to be made to secure this great measure of reform. But surely, I for one, have not the slightest hesitation of accepting it as a necessary condition of the scheme of union.

Then, Sir, we find the Hon. Sir Oliver Mowat, in a speech delivered in the House of Assembly in Toronto in 1890, said—and, Sir, I think it is well that we who live now under the pressure of strong feeling outside, should hark back a little and see how the men who made this constitution viewed these provinces, and what our duties should be in the light which their opinions will throw upon it—

In what spirit was the new constitution framed? It was a compromise all round, and an essential part of that compromise—so essential that without it confederation could not have taken place—was the provision by which the separate schools of Ontario, and the Protestant dissentient schools of Quebec, were guaranteed by the Imperial en-

actment. But for these being guaranteed, we should have no Dominion Parliament with its present limited powers, we should have no provincial legislatures with their powers.

I think, Sir, that it is useful for us, no matter what view hon. gentlemen may take of this subject, it is useful in allaying prejudices, that the attention of the country should be directed to the historical origin of these troublesome provisions in the British North America Act. There is one point, however, I think nobody will dispute from a constitutional point of view, and that is, that the British North America Act and the Manitoba Act recognized the rights of a minority, as such. And I would respectfully say, that it seems to me that a great deal of the argument of the hon. gentleman who immediately preceded me, and a great deal of the argument of the hon. leader of the Opposition missed its point, from the fact that both these hon. gentlemen dealt with the ordinary case of a minority asserting its rights, and not with the case of a minority which was granted special privileges by the constitution under which we are working. Sir, we hear a great deal in the country and elsewhere about equal rights. So far as I am concerned, I will yield to no one in my insistence upon equal rights all round in this country, without respect to creed or class. There is no privilege granted to anybody in the British North America Act because of his religion. But, Sir, when you speak of the phrase "equal rights," as applied to minorities, you can only use it fairly in this sense, that a Protestant minority should have equal rights with a Catholic minority, and that Catholic minorities should have equal rights with Protestant minorities. You cannot use "equal rights" in the sense that a minority shall have equal rights with a majority, because the very charter to which you are appealing tells us that the minority 'per se' has certain specific rights, and in apportioning them out all you can say is that no creed is favoured, no minority holding any particular creed is favoured as against a minority holding a different creed. Now, Sir, there has been a good deal of controversy as to whether there was a bargain made when the province of Manitoba came into the union. I have heard a good deal about bills of rights, and as in the case of the last speaker, I have heard charges of forgery bandied with regard to bills of rights. I may say that I do not regard the question of bills of rights as of any prime importance. I concede that if every member of the Government which then existed in Canada had promised everybody in the province of Manitoba, personally, that a certain thing would be done by the Dominion Parliament, and that afterwards the Dominion Parliament had not fulfilled that promise, we cannot here to-day recognize those promises. The question for us is, what did the Parliament of Canada do when Manitoba came into the union?

Mr. DICKEY.

Now, as to whether there was a bargain made or not, all we can do is to look at the question from a common-sense standpoint, look at it from the standpoint of ordinary historical training. What do we find? We find that there was a special Act passed for Manitoba, providing for certain particular matters as to which Manitoba required special treatment, and one of those matters was the subject of education. Now, I ask any hon. gentleman why was Manitoba not left under the general clause with regard to education in the British North America Act, unless it was thought that there was some particular reason, arising from negotiations or otherwise, which led Parliament to deal specifically with that? I offer that suggestion for what it is worth. But, as a matter of fact, we find that the province of Manitoba took this constitution as it was offered to them by the Federal Parliament. It took it loyally, it passed an Educational Act, to bring those provisions into effect, and it lived under that Act for twenty years. Therefore, it seems to me that we can very well presume that there was some sort of an arrangement made at that time, although that may not be necessary for the contention. There is one more point to which I wish to direct attention. In the Manitoba Act an admitted difference between the Manitoba Act and the British North America Act is to be found, and that is that the future legislature of Manitoba is prevented from making laws "prejudicially affecting any right with respect to denominational schools which any class of persons have by law or practice before the union. These words "or practice" are new. Now, I need not go over the history of the construction of these words. We know that the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in the Barrett case, held in effect that those words "or practice" meant absolutely nothing; that whatever may have been the intention of Parliament in putting in those words, they were absolutely futile. There is no gentleman in this House, or out of it, there is no man who studies that question from a constitutional standpoint, but will be bound to admit that Parliament, when it put in those words "or practice," intended to preserve to the minority of that day all the rights that they were then possessed of with regard to schools. Sir, if the Parliament of Canada had properly expressed its meaning then, we would to-day have no Manitoba school question on our hands; because the Act of 1890 would have been ultra vires of the legislature, being in contravention of this first section. So, I say that I do not think this House can approach this question without feeling that it was owing to a mistake of this House itself that this question ever came here at all. That is of no constitutional weight, I admit; it may, perhaps, strike some minds as of no force whatever; but it certainly is, to my mind, an element in this case that at the very

threshold we find these men have their rights taken from them because we failed to safeguard them as we intended, and as we thought, and as they thought, we did at that time. It seems to me that is a matter of some moment. Now, Sir, the hon. leader of the Opposition said something with regard to the alleged view of this Government that this section was a mechanical section: that we said: Prove a wrong, and immediately the section will act. Well, that hon. gentleman speaks of further investigation. I ask him, if a substantial wrong, such as he has spoken of with regard to Protestant schools is fairly proved, should there be any hesitation, then, in Parliament acting? Should not the operation of Parliament be mechanical with reference to the question of redressing a wrong? I think it should; and the real question at issue between the hon. gentleman and myself is not the mechanical action of this section, but the time when it shall act. Now, there has been a good deal said with reference to the obligation of Parliament to deal with this question now. I frankly admit that it is a very difficult subject to deal with off-hand; it is a very difficult subject particularly for an unpracticed speaker to make himself clear upon. But I desire to point out my view of the obligation of Parliament in this regard; and for a moment I wish to direct the attention of the House to the Manitoba Act, under which these proceedings are taken. It says an appeal shall lie to the Governor General in Council. Now, I suppose that no hon. gentleman will dispute that it is imperative on the Governor General in Council to hear that appeal. The hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) when arguing the case before the committee of the Privy Council, did dispute that; but I think, on reflection, that he will withdraw from that position. I think we must admit that it is imperative to hear the appeal. Then a decision is made, and then comes the question whether this House should act. Now, I have no doubt at all, as a lawyer, that this House has ample discretion to act or not to act. I have not the slightest doubt that this House is perfectly competent to reject this Bill, and to refuse absolutely to interfere at all in the affairs of Manitoba. I will go further than that, and I will say that there is no obligation whatever for this House to do anything at any time; that you could not by any conceivable means bind this House, or bind any future Parliament. Take, for instance, the question of the payment of our debt. There is no power in the world except war, and even that would not accomplish it, to oblige this Dominion to redeem one of its bonds. If this Parliament were so craven and dishonest as to repudiate its bonds, there is no power in the world to oblige the payment of those bonds; and yet will any hon. gentleman say that this Government is not bound to redeem its bonds? There is

no power to oblige the country to keep its treaties except the arbitrament of war. We know the history of the United States, and its Indian treaties. We know that the United States for generations acted upon the principle that it was strong and the Indian population was weak, and there was nothing to oblige them to fulfil its treaty obligations to the Indians, and we know that the history of the United States as regards the treatment of the Indians has been a century of dishonour. We know moreover that the history of that question has proved that no country can violate its obligations with impunity, because every dollar the United States made by its Indian policy has been paid for in blood over and over again by some of its best citizens. The British Parliament itself is omnipotent. It is said it can do everything except make a man a woman; and yet where is there anybody in whose honour you can trust so absolutely as in that of the British Parliament? There is nobody to which you can look with more confidence to carry out its obligations, independent altogether of law, because there is no law binding the British Parliament itself. If this Parliament can pay its debts on bonds, shall it not equally pay its debts of honour, if this turns out to be a debt of honour? The British Parliament deals with many subject populations, and in all its dealings has always shown one tendency. However, I shall not follow that line further, although I had intended to do so.

The hon. gentleman who spoke last (Mr. Wallace) made what I think was a capital mistake in dealing with this question in that he said we had power to pass a prohibitory law, and need not do so, that we had power to pass an insolvency law, and need not do so. That is perfectly true. But the cases are not in the slightest degree parallel. No lawyer in this House will contend for one moment that the cases are in the slightest degree parallel. We have here the case of parties who claim to be aggrieved, who claim to suffer a wrong and come to us for justice. And are we to refuse justice because we do not exercise all the powers, every power this Parliament possesses? The cases are as I have said, not in the slightest degree parallel. The hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) argued before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council that this Parliament in dealing with this legislation was exercising a power ad hoc, simply for this purpose. There is no doubt about this, that if this Parliament were exercising a power ad hoc, it would be obliged to exercise that power under the wording of the statutes. Nothing can be clearer than this, that if this legislation dealt with magistrates, courts of law, or any public functionary whatever subject to law that word "may" in section 3 would mean "shall," and we would be obliged to so interpret it. But I do not rest on so narrow a view as that.

We are asked now to refuse to exercise this legislation because we do not believe in separate schools. The hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) argued at great length against separate schools. So far as I am concerned his arguments are quite useless. I may say I was born, at all events I was educated and brought up and trained to believe that separate schools were not good for the country, and I still hold that opinion. I am dealing, however, with this question, not with respect to my opinion of such schools, but in reference to my sense of obligation under the constitution. What would be thought of a court that was given jurisdiction, for instance in divorce, if when a case came before the judge he should say: my religious convictions are against divorce, so I refuse altogether to hear your case. That is a parallel case, and you feel at once that that would be a refusal on the part of a public functionary to discharge a public duty.

I come now to the Manitoba Acts of 1871 and 1881, under which separate schools were established for all classes in the province of Manitoba. In 1890, as the House is very well aware, these rights and privileges were taken away by the Manitoba statute. I hold that this House has already taken a position upon this question. I hold that this House has already indicated the line of policy that should have been pursued with respect to this question. In 1890, Mr. Blake introduced his familiar resolution on this subject, in these words:

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

That resolution was introduced by Mr. Blake with particular reference to this Manitoba school question, which was then looming on the horizon. He said:

Again, when you act on the appellate educational clause, as, for example, in the case of Manitoba, the very case which is now in a sense pending, as to whether recent legislation be within the limits of the rights of the provincial legislature, and whether any relief is due under the appellate clause to those who claim it, you have a legal question, or rather, in this case, a mixed question of law and of fact; which circumstance it was that induced me to insert the word "fact" in my motion, conscious as I was that it was only on the rarest occasions that any reference of that description would be necessary. Yet it seemed to me that, in this particular instance I was constrained to provide for an emergency which may arise.

There you have Mr. Blake introducing this resolution for the very purpose of dealing with this question through the instrumentality of the courts of law, and you have

Mr. DICKEY.

this House unanimously adopting this very resolution for the purpose of dealing with this Manitoba school question. In 1891, a Bill was introduced by the then Attorney General, the late Sir John Thompson, for this very purpose of carrying out the policy which emanated from the then leader of the Opposition—I am not sure whether Mr. Blake was leader at the time, but he occupied a very high position in the party—and referring this matter to the courts. That Bill passed this House with the unanimous consent of every hon. member. I therefore say that so far as this House could adopt a policy which would bind itself in the future, it did so by adopting that resolution and Bill without any division or without any criticisms but in every sense unambiguously empowering the Government of the day to use the power put in their hands by that Bill for the purpose of settling this very troublesome question. The Government of the day acted upon that suggestion. It has been said, and the leader of the Opposition touched it to-day very gingerly, and I do not think he came very well out of his reply to interruption from this side of the House, that this Government should have vetoed the Act of 1890. The hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte) has been most persistent in asserting that the Government was derelict in its duty in not vetoing the Act of 1890.

I have observed, Sir, in some quarters, a tendency to represent that this Government is dealing with this Manitoba school question in a different way from that in which Sir John Macdonald dealt with the New Brunswick school law, and I have observed a tendency to draw a comparison between Sir John Macdonald's action of that day and the action of the present Government—a comparison not to the credit of the present Government. Well, Sir, if this Government had acted upon the suggestion of the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte), faintly and feebly supported by the hon. the leader of the Opposition, and vetoed this Bill, it would have then been running counter to the action of Sir John Macdonald with regard to the New Brunswick school law. The New Brunswick school law came before this House, and the present Minister of Marine (Mr. Costigan) pressed very strongly for some relief with regard to that Act, and he endeavoured to get it vetoed. There was actually a vote of this House, ordering the Government to veto that Act, but Sir John Macdonald refused to veto it for the very wise reason, that the educational sections of the British North America Act form a code by themselves, and that everything connected with education should be dealt with under that code in the 93rd section.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman is mistaken, in saying there was any resolution of this House to carry the veto in the case of the New Brunswick School Act.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The hon. Minister (Mr. Dickey) refers to the amendments, which were to the same effect.

Mr. DICKEY. I may be wrong, technically, but I think the hon. gentleman will agree with me, that Sir John Macdonald did not carry out the wish of the House of Commons in regard to that Bill.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The resolution carried was the resolution of Mr. Colby, and in that resolution this House recommended the local legislature to so amend the law as to make it satisfactory to the people of the province.

Mr. DICKEY. Not at all. The resolution in favour of the veto, which I refer to, was with regard to a subsequent Act, in 1873.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Yes.

Mr. DICKEY. Well, Sir, this Government has pursued exactly the same course with regard to this Manitoba Act. It refused to veto this Act. Now, in the New Brunswick school case, there was no appeal to this Parliament, or to this Government, for the very obvious reason that the circumstances that would give an appeal did not exist in the province of New Brunswick. There were no rights acquired after the union, as to which any appeal could be made. They were in the same position in New Brunswick as if this Manitoba school law of 1890 had been passed in the year 1870, and they had no rights acquired after the union upon which to base an appeal. Therefore, the course of the Government with regard to this Manitoba Act has been exactly parallel to the course of Sir John Macdonald's Government with regard to the New Brunswick Act, and, I may say, also parallel to the course of the Government of Hon. Alexander Mackenzie with regard to the same New Brunswick school law.

Now, Sir, as I said, the Government referred this question to the courts for a decision. The Hon. Edward Blake enforced upon this House, with his magnificent diction, and wide wealth of illustration and knowledge, the propriety of withdrawing questions of this sort from political strife, and referring them to the courts. I know, so far as I am concerned myself, I have no hesitation in saying, that the opinion of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council upon this question is of infinite value to me in dealing with it. I know perfectly well, that I have prejudices. I know perfectly well, that on questions of this kind, where prejudices are strong and deeply-seated upon both sides of the question, that nothing could have a better effect, nothing could have a more reassuring effect, and in no way can a man go safer than in taking the opinion of a body that is above prejudices, and above influences, and which decides the question according to the actual rights of the matter. And so, with regard to the Privy Council. When I hear hon.

gentlemen taking strong ground against the position of the Government, I feel that in that judgment of the Privy Council, whether it is binding or not, you have the greatest possible moral safeguard and moral support, in dealing with this vexed question. Sir, it is said, that that judgment is not binding upon us. It is certainly not binding upon us. Legally, we are not bound to accept the opinion of the Privy Council of England. There is no doubt about that at all. But, Sir, I ask, what has this solemn Assembly been doing during these years? What did this House mean by solemnly taking this question up, and placing it in the hands of the court, and saying to the court: Decide this according to the rights and justice of the case? Was it a solemn mockery? Did we intend, after all, to do what we liked? I put this case to hon. gentlemen. Suppose the Privy Council decided, that we had no jurisdiction to interfere, and suppose the Government had undertaken to interfere, in face of the judgment of the Privy Council, what then would be the opinion of this House? What is the difference, either the one way or the other? The Privy Council has given its judgment upon the question, and, while we may not be technically bound, and while we undoubtedly are not technically bound, I say, that this House would be stultifying itself, this House would be—I cannot find words strong enough to express the idea I have—but this House would be entirely stultifying itself, by taking any steps which would involve the assertion that the judgment of the Privy Council was not right. What is that judgment? I refer, Sir, to the two last sections. I candidly appeal to any hon. gentleman who wants to solve this question upon legal right and upon constitutional practice, irrespective of prejudices; I commend him to the careful reading of the last sections of that judgment, which say:

Their lordships have decided that the Governor General in Council has jurisdiction, and that the appeal is well founded, but the particular course to be pursued must be determined by the authorities to whom it has been committed by the statute. It is not for this tribunal to intimate the precise steps to be taken. Their general character is sufficiently defined by the 3rd subsection of section 22 of the Manitoba Act.

It is certainly not essential that the statutes repealed by the Act of 1890 should be re-enacted, or that the precise provisions of these statutes should again be made law. The system of education embodied in the Acts of 1890 no doubt commends itself to, and adequately supplies the wants of the great majority of the inhabitants of the province. All legitimate grounds of complaint would be removed if that system were supplemented by provisions which would remove the grievance upon which the appeal is founded, and were modified so far as might be necessary to give effect to these provisions.

I defy any candid man to read that, without arriving at the conclusion, that the Privy Council, while not dictating what course was to be pursued, unmistakably indicated

that they thought it necessary to redress this grievance in some way or other. Everyone must come to the conclusion, in reading this, that in their view—whether it is binding or not is another question—in their view, this grievance should be remedied in such a method as would commend itself to this House. It is extremely to be deplored, that an hon. member of this House feels himself unable to follow the judgment of the Privy Council. This is not the last case of this kind that will arise.

There are other cognate questions that may arise. A written constitution has many disadvantages; but one of its advantages is that under it you are enabled to refer all disputes in regard to the powers of legislation to the courts, and obtain their decision upon them. The hon. leader of the Opposition has referred to several cases in which he thought this Parliament tried to trench upon the right of provincial parliaments. He only showed how dangerous it would be if this Parliament were left to judge of its own rights, and the local parliaments were left to judge of their rights. He only showed how necessary it is that we should look to the arbitrament of the courts in order to settle our powers. Now, I say that this House will take a most serious step—a far-reaching and dangerous step, in my judgment—if, after obtaining the judgment of the courts indicating clearly the course that should be followed, it deliberately rejects that judgment, and, in all future cases of this kind, renders an appeal to the courts absolutely impossible. If this House were to say to-night that, notwithstanding the judgment, we propose to act as we like, and throw aside all that has been there decided, what would be the result? The result would be that the next case of this kind that came up could never be referred to the courts, nor submitted to judicial decision; but it would simply have to come here to be fought out from first to last, as a mere political scramble, as to how it would affect votes one way or the other. That would be a condition of things very much to be deplored.

The hon. leader of the Opposition said that the Government had bungled this question from start to finish. Well, Sir, I have shown that the Government of the day had the unanimous authority of this House originally for referring this matter to the courts. Sir John Thompson, not once or twice, but a dozen times, in the Protestant province of Ontario, declared in the most unmistakable terms years ago that he proposed to settle this question according to the constitution and the decision of the courts. There never was any doubt whatever as to his position. There never has been, from the beginning of this matter to the present time, any hesitation whatever with regard to the position of the Government. It has been a policy of allowing the courts to settle these vexed questions, and carrying out such policy

Mr. DICKEY.

as the courts declare is required under the constitution. The hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), with his acute legal mind, long ago saw that. He pointed out to the House in 1893 that to accept a reference to the courts meant that we would be bound, finally, to accept whatever decision the court made. Now, Sir, there is one point upon which a good deal has been said, that is, that the remedial order should not have been made at the time it was made.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Hear, hear.

Mr. DICKEY. That is a question of very considerable importance, and I see the hon. member for Bothwell refers to it. In order to properly judge that point, it is necessary that we should look back and see how matters stood when that remedial order was made. In 1893, I think it was, the argument on the appeal was begun before the Canadian Privy Council, and it was interrupted to enable the opinion of the courts to be taken as to the power of the Government to deal with the question. When the question came back in February, 1895, the Government were in this position: The argument was uncompleted. Mr. Ewart, who was arguing the case on behalf of the Manitoba minority had been cut off in the middle of his argument; and certainly it would have been an extraordinary proceeding if, after having adjourned the court in order to find out whether we had jurisdiction in the matter or not, we should not again meet after the question of jurisdiction was settled, and hear the argument of counsel. In July, 1894, this Government had approached the Manitoba government in regard to this matter; and I will read the last section of the Order in Council then adopted:

The committee beg to observe to Your Excellency that the statements which are contained in this memorial are matter of deep concern and solicitude in the interests of the Dominion at large, and that it is a matter of the utmost importance to the people of Canada that the laws which prevail in any portion of the Dominion should not be such as to occasion complaint of oppression or injustice to any class or portion of the people, but should be recognized as establishing perfect freedom and equality, especially in all matters relating to religion and religious belief and practice; and the committee, therefore, humbly advise that Your Excellency may join with them in expressing the most earnest hopes that the legislatures of Manitoba and the North-west Territories respectively, may take into consideration at the earliest possible moment the complaints which are set forth in this petition, and which are said to create dissatisfaction among Roman Catholics, not only in Manitoba and the North-west Territories, but likewise throughout Canada, and may take speedy measures to give redress in all the matters in relation to which any well-founded complaint or grievance be ascertained to exist.

To that the Manitoba government made a reply, categorically refusing to recognize any grievance at all. In their reply, made in October, 1894, they say:

The questions which are raised by the report now under consideration have been the subject of most voluminous discussion in the legislature of Manitoba during the past four years. All of the statements made in the memorial addressed to His Excellency the Governor General, and many others, have been repeatedly made to and considered by the legislature. That body has advisedly enacted educational legislation which gives to every citizen equal rights and equal privileges, and makes no distinction respecting nationality and religion. After a harassing legal contest, the highest court in the British dominions has decided that the legislature, in enacting the law of 1890, was within its constitutional powers, and that the subject of education is one committed to the charge of the provincial legislature. Under these circumstances, the executive of the province see no reason for recommending the legislature to alter the principles of the legislation complained of. It has been made clear that there is no grievance, except it be a grievance that the legislature refuses to subsidize particular creeds out of the public funds, and the legislature can hardly be held to be responsible for the fact that their refusal to violate what seems to be a sound and just principle of government creates, in the words of the report, dissatisfaction amongst Roman Catholics, not only in Manitoba and the North-west Territories, but likewise throughout Canada.

So that this Government had approached the Manitoba government in a memorial which I think every hon. member must admit was most conciliatory in its terms; and that memorial had been met with this statement: We know all about this subject; it is an old story; it has been discussed over and over again; there is no grievance; and we will make no remedy. These facts, of course, were before the Government when this reference went on. Then the Government refused—

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would like to ask a question of the hon. gentleman. He spoke about Mr. Ewart being incomplete in his argument. I would like to ask whether he maintains that the proceedings before the Privy Council ought to be judicial proceedings in form rather than a diplomatic?

Mr. DICKEY. Judicial, I should say.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That is the appeal?

Mr. DICKEY. Yes.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It must be judicial in its form.

Mr. DICKEY. Oh, yes. Then, Sir, the Manitoba government refused to appear before the Privy Council to argue this case at all, which course certainly did not look at all towards conciliation. The Manitoba legislature met, after the judgment of the Privy Council was delivered in February. There was a speech delivered from the Throne, on which I cannot lay my hands just now, but every hon. gentleman knows that it referred to the judgment of the Privy Council, and reiterated the determination of

the Manitoba legislature not to recede at all from the position it had taken. Then, Sir, the hon. gentleman who represents Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) also spoke on this subject, and he emphatically repudiated the slightest chance of our obtaining any accommodation from the Manitoba legislature with regard to this question. The Manitoba legislature was then sitting. There was a chance of getting that question dealt with by that legislature then, and thus saving the loss of a whole year in getting it out of the way. It had been hanging before this House for three or four years; we had been taunted by the other side with keeping it here; we had been taunted with delay in dealing with it; motions had been made to censure the Government for the time they had shown in reaching a conclusion. Was it, therefore, unreasonable that the Privy Council of Canada should go on to hear the incomplete argument of Mr. Ewart and the argument of the Manitoba government, so as to enable the matter to be dealt with, if there was any disposition to deal with it amicably by the Manitoba legislature, which was then sitting. It seems to me that the action of the Privy Council at that moment, though it may seem to hon. gentlemen opposite now, under different motives, open to censure, was such as was reasonable and proper under the circumstances; and it seems to me that the course of events in Manitoba ever since has amply justified that action. The Manitoba legislature has shown no disposition whatever, so far as I am aware, to meet this subject in any other way than by standing upon what they considered their provincial rights. Last July, the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), speaking in this House, said:

For my part, I have no hope, not the slightest expectation of any arrangement being made with the province of Manitoba. I do not think, if we read the answer to the remedial order made by that legislature, not in haste, not in anger, but after due deliberation, that any sane man should hope that the same Government which brought down the answer to the remedial order, or the same legislature which, by a very large majority adopted it, will, in the next six months—and that is the limit given them to change their course—make any alteration in the conclusion at which they have arrived.

And he went on to repeat this in different passages throughout his speech. Now, the hon. leader of the Opposition referred to the terms of that order, and he spoke of it as a drastic order. It seems to me that that is a very strong expression. The hon. gentleman himself did not always hold that view. In the year 1895, he spoke rather slightly of the remedial order. He did not then seem to think it was drastic enough; he did not seem to think it was directory enough, and he said:

The Order in Council is termed a decision. I do not understand that term exactly. As I read it, and I have read it pretty carefully, it

can hardly be called a decision. It is simply an invitation to the government of Manitoba to deal with the question and to leave them to apply a remedy to the evil which has been created by their own legislation.

So that it seems to me that I can appeal from Philip drunk to Philip sober, and ask the hon. gentleman if he was not right in 1895.

Mr. EDGAR. What was the date the hon. gentleman was drunk.

Mr. DICKEY. Page 34 of the "Hansard."

Mr. LAURIER. The last one is the drunk-en one, the first one was sober.

Mr. DICKEY. I thoroughly agree with the hon. gentleman. Now, Sir, a good deal has been said with reference to the drastic nature of the remedial order, and I think that it is a matter of very considerable importance. I dispute entirely the proposition that there is anything whatever drastic about the remedial order except what is drastic in the judgment of every court. It is true it is clear; it is true it is definite; it is true it is decided; but that it is drastic, or offensive in any sense, I most certainly dispute. There is one thing overlooked with regard to the remedial order, and that is this, that while attention has been drawn to the three sections in which the rights are adjudged, which certainly are clear and definite, it is not always pointed out that there is recited in that order a part of the judgment of the Privy Council of England, which I have just read, declaring that it is not necessary at all to re-enact the Act or do anything more than modify it just sufficiently to practically replace the rights, and their finding, which is in that remedial order is clearly limited by the statement in the order that all they want is practically to redress their grievances, not necessarily repealing the law and not necessarily re-enacting the old law. So that it seems to me that the Manitoba government entirely misread the order which was sent to them, when they insisted that it meant re-enacting the old law or re-establishing the old system in toto. It is perfectly true that to take the A, B, C paragraphs, adjudicating the rights, there is some foundation for that contention; but that was qualified by what went before, which showed that all that was contemplated by this remedial order was a substantial righting of the grievances of the minority there, as adjudicated by the Privy Council of England. I wish also to draw attention to the last section of that order, which is as follows:—

The committee, without necessarily adopting this view.

That is the view that the legislation by this Parliament would be irrevocable:

Observe that section 22 of the Manitoba Act may admit of that construction.

Mr. DICKEY.

The committee, therefore, recommend that the provincial legislature be requested to consider whether its action upon the decision of Your Excellency in Council should be permitted to be such as, while refusing to redress a grievance which the highest court in the Empire has declared to exist, may compel Parliament to give the relief of which under the constitution the provincial legislature is the proper and primary source, thereby according to this view, permanently divesting itself in a very large measure of its authority and so establishing in the province an educational system, which no matter what changes may take place in the circumstances of the country or the views of the people, cannot be altered or repealed by any legislative body in Canada.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Does the hon. gentleman contend for that view?

Mr. DICKEY. No; distinctly, no. I point this out to show that this remedial order, this very much abused remedial order, is nothing more than a definite statement of the rights of the minority as the Privy Council of Canada saw them—

An hon. MEMBER. Privy Council of England.

Mr. DICKEY. And the Privy Council of England as well—and I will challenge any hon. gentleman, I do not care what is his legal ability or standing, to take the report of the proceedings before the Privy Council of Canada and draw any order definitely fixing these rights and giving Parliament jurisdiction to deal with this question that is one single word less drastic than the Order in Council we passed. There is absolutely nothing in that order except what is absolutely necessary to vest this Parliament with jurisdiction to deal with the question. So that I think that the criticism of that much abused order is entirely due to confining that criticism to two or three paragraphs in which the rights are defined.

Well, Sir, this Government is now inviting the House to read the Bill the second time. One would think to hear the speech of the leader of the Opposition that this Government was enamoured of this Bill. One would think that to hear the hon. gentleman that if there was one thing this Government loved it was to pass remedial Bills, Bills for the province of Manitoba. I can assure the hon. gentleman that it is for no love of the question that the Government is dealing with it. Every hon. member must know how invidious and difficult a question this is, and how absolutely absurd it is to suppose that the Government is grasping at jurisdiction in this matter. Nothing could be clearer to any man of common sense, to every citizen of the country, than that, whatever love we have of political power, the last thing that that sentiment would cause us to do would be to go outside and grasp at jurisdiction which, as the hon. gentleman has said involves the loss of the support in this House of a number of our strong friends. Cer-

tainly there can be no foundation for anything of that sort. Every hon. gentleman must feel that whether the Government is or is not mistaken as to the position, it is firmly convinced that public duty obliges it to submit this question to the House. There cannot possibly or conceivably be any political capital to be made out of questions so troublesome as this.

The hon. member from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) asked me if I thought this legislation would be irrevocable. I would not refer to that but for the fact that so high an authority as the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) expressed positively to the Privy Council of Canada the opinion that this legislation of this House would be irrevocable. So far as I am concerned, I can find no foundation whatever for that doctrine. The statute says :

As far only as the circumstances of each case require, the Parliament of Canada may make remedial laws for the due execution of the provisions of this section.

It is contended that because we may make laws therefore we can not repeal them. If so, then the local legislature cannot repeal its laws, for section 22 says that in and for the province of Manitoba, the provincial legislature may exclusively make laws in relation to education. Therefore, if the phrase "make laws" does not give the power to repeal those laws, we have no power here to repeal them. But I have no sympathy with this view at all. This legislature can deal with no question ad hoc, this legislature can deal with no question except with the plenary powers of a body holding its high position. In this respect its powers are circumscribed as to the extent they are in any other case. But that there is anything to take away our implied sovereign right of repealing our own legislation I do not admit.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Does the hon. gentleman deny that the local legislature has jurisdiction over this subject and over this Bill if it becomes law ?

Mr. DICKEY. I do not think the local legislature can amend or repeal the Act that we pass.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Why not ?

Mr. DICKEY. I do not think the constitution would allow them to—if the hon. gentleman will excuse me for answering so shortly.

There is another point to which I wish to draw the attention of the House and it is this :—We have the statement of the Secretary of State to-day showing so admirably the very serious consequences which lie behind this question. What I wish to press upon the House is that if they refuse to interfere in this case, we practically wipe out this section from the statute-book. What are the facts here ? The hon. leader of the Opposition says that we should have a com-

mission to investigate. To investigate what ? He has given us the question which he thinks should be investigated. The first was whether there was a compact, the second, whether the public schools are repugnant to Catholics and the third whether they are really Protestant schools. Let any hon. gentleman look this question fairly in the fact. What is the wrong done ? The wrong done is the repeal of certain legislative rights. These legislative rights inhere in the Act which was repealed. No practice can extend them, no indulgence in practice can mitigate them ; they are included in the Act which is repealed and you have to look to that Act and to that Act alone to find what those rights were. They are taken away by the Act of 1890. The hon. gentleman says that we must hold a commission to inquire whether the schools under the Act of 1890 are Protestant schools or not. I dissent entirely from that view. The question we have to look at is this :—Is the Act of 1890 on its face—not in its administration, which may be one thing to-day and another thing to-morrow, but on its face and in the powers it confers and in the rights it takes away—an infringement upon the rights of the minority under section 22 of the Manitoba Act ? There is nothing to investigate. The hon. member for Simcoe, when he argued the question before the Privy Council of Canada, said that he came there to discuss questions of law and history, but not to discuss questions of fact. I think he was perfectly right. The hon. gentleman also wishes us to investigate the question of whether public schools are repugnant to Catholics. Now, Sir, as I have already said, separate schools are not agreeable to me, but the question of whether public schools are repugnant to Catholics or not, is a question settled by the charter under which we live ; it is a question settled by the British North America Act for all time, as long as that Act shall last. We are not to inquire what were the motives that induced the Canadian Parliament of that day to ask the British Parliament to pass that Act. They have recognized as legal the rights of minorities with respect to schools. Suppose we inquire into the question whether those schools were repugnant to Catholics ; and suppose we had one set of Catholics coming and saying they had no objections to public schools ; and another set coming, as they certainly would, as every hon. gentleman in this House knows, and saying that public schools were repugnant to them ; what would be the position in this matter ? The position would be that we would have to give effect to that law, and that our investigation, or inquiry, would be simply a farce, gone through, possibly, for the sake of delaying this question a little longer, but to no practical end whatever. Therefore, I cannot see what there is to be gained by an investigation. Now, Sir, as I said before, if this power is ever

to be exercised, it must be exercised now. It is not a question of inquiring whether you will interfere or not in this case. If some right of the Manitoba minority were taken away relating to administration, or to some detail of their law, then it would be a fair case for inquiry. But this House cannot shirk the question, there is no hon. gentleman in this House who can shirk the question. The question is now on a matter of principle as to whether you are ever to put this Act in force or not. You have a case where there is no dispute that every right has been swept away. Now, Sir, I wish to direct attention for a moment to the situation in the province of Quebec. In a country like this where we have mixed populations differently distributed in the various provinces, questions of this sort have to be dealt with in a very broad spirit. I say here that the Protestants of the province of Quebec are depending to-day, so far as the legal support of their schools is concerned, upon the very same power that the Catholics of Manitoba are now invoking to save their schools; and if we were to refuse to interfere with the province of Manitoba, we would certainly shut ourselves out for ever from interfering in the province of Quebec. Suppose the Catholics of the province of Quebec were to legislate on similar lines with reference to Protestant schools there, what would be the result?

Mr. MARTIN. Would not an Act of that kind be ultra vires?

Mr. DICKEY. I am coming to that, if the hon. gentleman will allow me. I am glad the hon. gentleman sees the force of the point I make. Suppose the Catholics were to legislate on similar lines, what would be the result? I have no doubt that the hon. member from Winnipeg (Mr. Martin) would feel at once that a gross injustice had been done, and I would feel the same. But he and I must remember that religious convictions are things that we must take as we find them, and that we cannot improve them by legislation. If the Protestants of Quebec would consider it a gross injustice to be forced to contribute to Catholic schools, so the Catholics of Manitoba have a perfect right to express their disgust at a proposition that they shall contribute to schools that are against their conscience. That is not a personal question for us to settle; the question we have to consider is whether the conscientious repugnance to these schools is bona fide expressed or not. Now, in the province of Quebec, as I may explain to the hon. gentleman, all that is guaranteed by the British North America Act, subsection 3, to the Protestants, are the rights that were enjoyed by the Catholics in Ontario prior to the union. Now, those rights in Ontario prior to the union, and which are guaranteed absolutely to the province of Quebec,

Mr. DICKEY.

are a mere nothing. What are they? Merely a right for any five persons to form a school section, and when they do form a school section, they are exempt from general school taxation, and they get their share of the legislative grants.

Mr. EDGAR. Is the hon. gentleman speaking of Ontario or Quebec?

Mr. DICKEY. I am speaking of Ontario before the union, as showing the limit of the legal rights of the Protestants in Quebec that cannot be taken away from them.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman speaks about Ontario standing in a different position from Quebec. That depends wholly upon whether that first subsection is applicable; but if you confine it to denominational schools, then they stand upon exactly the same footing.

Mr. DICKEY. Well, I cannot go into a definition of denominational schools with my hon. friend to-night; we may have a discussion of that some other time. But what I am now pointing out is that the rights ensured to the Protestants of Quebec under the British North America Act by the doctrine of ultra vires, are only those rights which existed in Ontario at the union. I think there is no dispute about that. Well, now, those rights were simply to form a school section, and to tax themselves, getting a share of the legislative grant, and being exempt from taxation for the schools of the majority.

Mr. MARTIN. Is that the full limit of separate schools?

Mr. DICKEY. They have no right to deal with school books. The Protestant schools of Quebec to-day could be forced by legislation to take any school books that the Catholic commissioners of Quebec chose to assign to them. The Catholic commissioners of the province of Quebec, if the legislature should so declare, could force upon Protestants, books that were most offensive to them, and could say that they should not enjoy school grants unless they used those books.

Mr. LANGELIER. That is an entire mistake.

Mr. DICKEY. Well, the hon. gentleman may show that it is a mistake. More than that, the Protestants of the province of Quebec have no right by law, or no right secured by the doctrine of ultra vires, to form a school board or to form any system of general organization for their schools. Article 1894, of the Quebec Code of 1883, gives the Council of Public Instruction certain powers. That council is divided into two bodies, one Roman Catholic and the other Protestant. Each section has power to fix the time of meeting, to make regulations respecting normal schools, regulations for organization, government and discipline of public

schools, for the classification of schools and teachers, to select text books, etc., except in the case of books relating to religion or morals, which are otherwise selected; to make regulations for the boards of examiners, the cancellation of teachers' certificates, and the appointment of a central board of examiners. Now, Sir, all these ample powers, which are necessary in order to run an efficient school system, could to-morrow be swept away by the legislature of Quebec, and the only remedy that the Protestants of Quebec would have would be to come here by an appeal asking this House to interfere. So that we are to-day not deciding the question of the Catholic minority of the province of Manitoba, we are deciding the question of all minorities in the Dominion of Canada, Protestant as well as Catholic. The hon. member for North Simcoe has often referred to the smallness of the minority in Manitoba. It seems to me that if there could be one additional claim on the consideration of the House, it would be the fact that the Catholic minority in Manitoba is small and helpless. I think, Sir, hon. gentlemen would be very sorry if any doctrine were started, that, because the Protestants in the province of Quebec amounted to only one-seventh of the population, therefore, their rights may be disregarded. It will not do to figure upon questions of right or wrong according to majorities. The rights that are secured to the minority in Manitoba should be upheld, so far as the law confers them. The hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) is perfectly consistent, he is perfectly logical, as one would expect to find a gentleman of his legal training. The hon. gentleman says: You should never use this power with respect to appeals under the educational section of the statutes. So that, of course, he is perfectly consistent. But I ask hon. gentlemen in this House who may some day come here appealing on behalf of a minority of another class, to consider that they are to-day assisting in laying down the principle that will guide this House for all time to come, in dealing with questions under the educational clauses either of the Manitoba or the British North America Act.

There is one argument which is used with a good deal of force, and that is the argument, that this is the coercion of Manitoba and infringement of provincial rights. Well, Sir, I have a great deal of sympathy with an argument of that kind. I believe that, if that position could be made good, this House would stay its hands at once, that, if we were infringing on any power of the local legislature, we should say, "hands off." But there can be no shadow of doubt about the legal position on this point—it is too absolutely clear to admit of argument. I do not know how it is represented in some parts of the country, but there cannot be the slightest doubt, from a legal standpoint, that, if we pass this Bill, assuming it to be

within the limits of our jurisdiction, we have the absolute right to do so; what I mean is, that there is not a shadow of doubt of our right to replace all the rights the Roman Catholics had formerly. In case there should be any doubt, I will read the observations obiter of Lord Watson and Lord Macnaghten during the argument in the Manitoba school case before the Judicial Committee. Lord Watson said:

You start this part of your argument by saying that the legislature of Manitoba is to have exclusive legislative powers in the matter. But that is not in the Act. They are to have exclusive power except in so far as it is qualified by the provisions of the Act, and that leaves it open. We cannot assume that the legislature meant to give them the entire exclusive power, without the qualification of these provisions, and the only question really is to what extent is their exclusive right qualified, by the provisions of the section. You cannot take any benefit from the assumption that the legislature did give or meant to give them the whole power. They did not mean to give them the exclusive power.

Lord Macnaghten said:

They had the exclusive power till they overstepped the limits of the section. When they did that I do not see any limit to the remedy which the Dominion Parliament might apply, except the mischief which had to be remedied.

Then, reinforcing these dicta, is the solemn judgment of the court given on this point, where the Lord Chancellor says:

Before leaving this part of the case it may be well to notice the argument urged by the respondent that the construction which their lordships have put upon the 2nd and 3rd subsections of section 22 of the Manitoba Act is inconsistent with the power conferred upon the legislature of the province to "exclusively make laws in relation to education." The argument is fallacious. The power conferred is not absolute but limited. It is exercisable only subject and according to the following provisions. The subsections which follow, therefore, whatever be their true construction, define the conditions under which alone the provincial legislature may legislate in relation to education, and indicate the limitation imposed on, and the exceptions from, their power of exclusive legislation. Their right to legislate is not indeed, properly speaking, exclusive, for in the case specified in subsection 3 of the Parliament of Canada is authorized to legislate on the same subject. There is, therefore, no such inconsistency as was suggested.

So there is no doubt whatever that this is strictly within the limits of the powers of this Parliament. Sir, there are many cases in which this Parliament's legislation conflicts with the local legislatures. Take the question of insolvency. When we legislate on the question of insolvency, we can change the whole relation of debtor and creditor in the provinces; we can change the Registry Acts of the provinces and affect the register as regards priority of securities; we can change the whole operation of civil rights, so far as relates to debtor and creditor. Yet no one would say the Bill

would be an infringement on the powers of the local legislatures. Take, for instance, a question on which it is often urged this Parliament has not properly exercised the right it possesses, that of declaring a work to be for the general advantage of Canada. The moment we do that, we withdraw that work from the jurisdiction of the local legislatures. And yet nobody would say there is an infringement of the local powers, because we simply go back to our charter, which has given us that power, and, therefore, there cannot be any infringement of the local powers. The fact of the matter is, that no argument of that kind can be based except on this assumption, that the British North America Act in this respect was a mistake, and that these sections about education should never have been passed, and that they should be repealed. It is too late now to argue questions of that kind. We are here to decide this question according to the law, as it now stands, and I am dealing with this simply on that assumption.

I may say, for myself, that I represent a county which is almost wholly Protestant, which is very strongly Protestant. It has been said, that we should go to the country and get a mandate from the people on this question. I do not at all agree with that theory. This question was started in the Parliament before this, in 1890. That Parliament took a stand with respect to this question, by passing Mr. Blake's resolution, authorizing a reference of this question to the courts. The very first session of this Parliament dealt with that question, by passing the Act of 1891, which was in the same direction. It is a question with which this Parliament has been familiar in every aspect. It has been brought up now by the decision of the Privy Council for judgment, and, in my opinion, this Parliament is right to at once deal with it and to take the responsibility of dealing with it. Surely, it will be very much to be regretted, if any constitutional doctrine should be found which would oblige this Parliament to throw that bone of contention amongst the constituencies of the Dominion. We all know it is difficult enough to discuss these questions here quietly and without raising any religious feeling, but, I think, no lover of his country, in this House or out of it, could view with anything except great alarm and regret, the possibility of running elections in which the chief issue would be one of Protestant against Catholic; and, really, this would be the case, if this question were before the people. I, for one, would do everything in my power to avoid coming to the conclusion, that any constitutional doctrine would take me so far as that. I recognize that, though a member for Cumberland and representing the Protestants there, I at the same time, recognize that I am a member for the whole Dominion, and I must discharge my obligations to the whole Do-

Mr. DICKEY.

minion, as I see them; and I am here to say this, that, if the people of Cumberland gave me any mandate on a question like this, one which was contrary to my convictions, I would not obey that mandate, but I would act according to the best of my convictions, and allow them afterwards to pass judgment upon my action. That is the position I take now. I believe that when the people of this country as a whole understand this question thoroughly, and having had time to think over this matter quietly, and not in the heat of an election contest, I believe that there will not be nearly as much difficulty in settling it as has been the opinion in some quarters. I believe it is really a vote of want of confidence in the people of Canada to suppose that after having had time to calmly consider the question, they will not judge rightly—assuming the side for which I am arguing to be right, as I think I have to some extent made clear.

Now, Sir, in conclusion, I desire to say, that so far as I know, the Government, and certainly I myself, make no claim whatever to Catholic votes on account of our action in this matter. We claim the support of those Catholics who believe that our course is in accordance with the constitution and for the best interests of the country, and, Sir, we claim also, and with equal confidence, the votes and support of intelligent Protestants who think that our course is in the best interests of the country, and is the course that is demanded by the constitution. It would be a great misfortune that there should be any appeal whatever to Roman Catholic votes, or to Protestant votes as such, and so far as I am concerned, I entirely disclaim anything of that kind. I think that the people of this Dominion stand somewhat towards the minority in Manitoba as the Catholic majority in Quebec stand towards the Protestant minority in that province. The Protestants of this country have had in the province of Quebec a great object lesson of generous, frank and fair treatment towards the minority of their faith by the Catholic majority in Quebec. And, Sir, I do not think that the Protestants of this Dominion should be behindhand in a generous treatment of their fellow-countrymen, and I believe, Sir, that this Bill should be adopted. The details of the Bill are a matter of controversy. It was a Bill which was very difficult to draw, and a Bill as to which the Government will be glad to receive suggestions, if it goes into Committee of the Whole House. But, Sir, the question at this present moment is not a question of detail. The question now is a question of principle. The question now before the House is whether the educational sections of the Confederation Act are ever to be carried out, and upon that question I do sincerely hope that this House will speak in a way that will prevent such a controversy from being raised again.

Mr. EDGAR moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 10.50 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 4th March, 1896.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

THE REMEDIAL ACT (MANITOBA).

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Sir Charles Tupper for second reading of Bill (No. 58) the Remedial Act (Manitoba) and the proposed motion (six months' hoist) of Mr. Laurier in amendment thereto.

Mr. EDGAR. Mr. Speaker, I agree entirely with what was said yesterday by the leader of the House when, in moving the second reading of this Bill, he announced that he was introducing into this House a most momentous question. I believe, Sir, that this question is pregnant with results that may work for the weal or the woe of Canada; and I fear that it may perhaps endanger confederation itself, unless it is dealt with and discussed by this Parliament in a spirit of broad statesmanship and patriotic moderation. The leader of the House yesterday, in his speech, dealt very largely with historical questions; and, no doubt they were ably dealt with and were very interesting, only there was that one glaring omission from the history he gave of confederation, which was referred to by my leader. The leader of the House entirely forgot to tell us about his connection with the coercion of the province of Nova Scotia, which was a most important event in the history of confederation. I believe that as long as the hon. gentleman's name is remembered in connection with confederation, it will be remembered in connection with that incident. The hon. gentleman, too, when he began to touch the question of the Remedial Bill, told us a good many things which may have been entirely new to him, but which were not entirely new to most of the members of this House. I suppose that the absence of the hon. gentleman from the country, and his busy occupation with other important duties, prevented him from taking the same interest in that question, or at least, learning as much about the law re-

lating to it as the members of this Parliament on both sides, as a rule, know. Therefore, I dare say, that a good deal of what he told us had more interest and more information for people who did not understand the question than for the members of this House. I have also the same complaint to make of the speech of the leader of the House that I have to make of the speech of the Minister of Justice, delivered later in the day. They both elaborately confuted many positions which we, on this side, have never held. I do not think it was very profitable. At any rate, after the speech of the leader of the Opposition, the Minister of Justice should not have assumed that it was necessary to argue a number of positions which were frankly admitted by the leader of the Opposition as being beyond dispute. Now, Sir, I would like, before making the few remarks I have to make on this question, to clear away a few matters which are not in dispute between the other side of the House and this side of the House, at any rate.

In the first place, the question of the federal jurisdiction of this Parliament to legislate upon the subject of education in Manitoba is not denied. Nobody ventures, I think, to deny that; and yet a great deal of the argument of the hon. gentlemen was directed against this man of straw, which they set up and valiantly knocked down.

Why, in the argument before the Canadian Privy Council, prior to the issuing of the remedial order in March last, the province of Manitoba, through its counsel, the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), expressly admitted the jurisdiction of this Parliament. The argument of the hon. member for Simcoe (see page 67, of the argument in the blue-book), puts that beyond question. Well, if the province of Manitoba admit it, if the council of Manitoba admit it, no one in this House or country would venture for a moment to deny it. It was only last week that the legislature of Manitoba, according to the reports in the newspapers, passed a memorial in which they most emphatically admit the jurisdiction of this Parliament to deal with the subject. That memorial says that "while the constitutional right of the Dominion Parliament to deal with the question is not denied"—and so on.

Then there is another matter, proof of which was elaborately made by both the Ministers of the Crown who spoke yesterday. They undertook to show the House that the Catholic minority of Manitoba had a grievance. Well, that is not disputed nor can it be disputed successfully, because the judgment of the Privy Council itself says that there is a grievance, and the counsel for the Manitoba government, in his argument before the Privy Council, made the distinct admission that there is a grievance. His words are very few, and I may as well read them to the House:

Hon. Mr. Curran—It may be necessary to hear why justice should not be done. But there is a grievance.

Mr. McCarthy—I am not going to say that there is not a grievance ; I am precluded from that by the judgment.

Now, that is a question which it was unnecessary to occupy the time of the House in proving. It is not the existence of the grievance we dispute, but the extent of the grievance which ought to be inquired into.

A great deal has been said by the Ministers to prove that the principle of provincial rights had nothing to do with this question. Well, we know perfectly well that this question of education does not stand on the same footing as the other questions with reference to which the provinces have exclusive right to legislate, and in connection with which what is called the question of provincial rights has been raised, from time to time, since confederation. But I say this : the question of provincial rights does arise in this way. It does not arise by denying the jurisdiction ; but a respect for provincial rights in general should teach us how to interpret and how to endeavour to exercise those powers which we undoubtedly have. In that sense alone, the question of provincial rights arises in this case, and that is a most important sense which should have very great influence upon this House. Now, this Government at least cannot dispute, it does not lie in the mouth of this Government to dispute, the fact that the question of education should be left to the provinces except as a last resort, because the present Government, or at least the Government of Sir Mackenzie Bowell, on the 27th of July last, passed an Order in Council, which was sent up to Manitoba, in which they used these words :

In the interests of all concerned, it will not be disputed that, if possible, the subject of education should be exclusively dealt with by the local legislature. Upon every ground, in the opinion of the sub-committee, this course is to be preferred.

So to that extent provincial rights are to be considered. The Government have agreed with us, but why they are not doing it is another question. The position in which this Parliament finds itself to-day is this. We are in search of a remedy for that grievance of the minority. What is the best way to apply the remedy ? Why, it is through the province, as the Government themselves admit, in that passage I have just read from their Order in Council of the 27th of July, and also as they admit in this very Bill we are considering now. They admit by their Bill that the province of Manitoba is the proper machine for carrying out, not only the executive, but the legislative functions connected with the separate schools and religious education in that province. Section 1 of the Bill refers it to the Government to appoint a board of education in the first instance. Another section,

Mr. EDGAR.

section 7, I think, empowers the local government to appoint a superintendent. So much for the executive functions which they think properly should belong to the province. Then take section 74, the great section on which the whole machinery of this Bill depends, the section which provides money for the establishment of schools under this Bill. Why, that is frankly left to the legislative powers of the province of Manitoba. So I say that by their admissions under the Order in Council, and by the way they have drafted this Bill, the Government is estopped from denying our contention that the provincial legislature of Manitoba is the place of all others to deal with this question of education. Then, Sir, we must consider in connection with this subject, what is the best time to apply this remedy. Surely the people of this country, as a whole, when they see the unfortunate agitation and the bitterness that is being raised from one end of this country to the other, will say that this remedy is only to be applied as a last resort. The Manitoba legislature have frankly admitted that the jurisdiction is here, but they say and they contend that the power resting with us should only be exercised as a last resort and after the clearest possible case has been made of flagrant wrong-doing on the part of the provincial authorities.

Then, Mr. Speaker, we must consider what the details and particulars of that remedy shall be. The Government have admitted by this Bill and by their Order in Council of 27th July, 1895, that the remedy need not be the same as that prescribed by the remedial order of March last. They have let that slide, so to speak ; they only undertake to come under one corner of it. Therefore, apparently, according to their judgment, it is unnecessary for us to legislate according to the terms of the first remedial order. Well, then, what guide have we ? Have we the infallible wisdom of the Treasury benches alone ? Do the Ministers by intuition and instinct know exactly what this legislation should be ? They had one idea in March, 1895, when they passed the remedial order ; they have evidently another idea to-day when they bring forward this Bill. Which is right ? What has caused them to change their opinions ? Where has the new light come from ? They made no inquiry ; they refused to make any inquiry. Therefore, I contend, the House is absolutely at liberty, following the example of the Government, to exercise their own judgment as to the best form which that remedy should assume. But how can members of this House say what form the remedy should take without inquiry, without further information ? A few blue-books are brought down to us. But do they give us information ? Why, Mr. Speaker, the Government had all this information on the 21st March, 1895. They took one view of the position then ; but they take another

to-day. So that, either they must have decided in the first place without exact information, or, they have acquired that information and have not communicated it to the House, which we cannot assume, as it would be most irregular and improper. We are driven to conclude that they have not got exact information, and, without it they are changing their minds from time to time, from day to day, from month to month. I know that some contend that the duty is thrown upon us as a Parliament to act. I am not going to discuss how far there is a binding, cast-iron obligation resting upon this Parliament. That there is a bounden and imperative duty before us is contended by some. But is there anything to show when we are to act; is there anything to show how we are to act? The law which prescribes the duty provides that these matters are left for us to settle. Therefore, I say, whether the duty is absolutely binding upon us or not, it is equally our duty to consider how we are to act and when we are to act. Do we know so much about this question of the Manitoba schools, do all of us know so much about the question that we have nothing further to learn about it? There may be a few members from Manitoba and the North-west, and a very few others, who have had any means of ascertaining the condition and position of the Manitoba schools. We have a good deal to do in this Parliament in attending to our own affairs, and never till this moment have we been called upon to legislate upon these questions; and naturally we are not informed regarding them. That is not discreditable to us. We cannot legislate intelligently upon that question without knowing much more than we do. You might as well ask a county council in Ontario to legislate about the lobster fisheries in Nova Scotia. I have no doubt that if the duty was cast upon them, and if they took proper measures to inquire into the case, and had all the facts concerning the lobster fisheries laid before them, they could and would legislate intelligently upon the subject. But I say that we are just as much at sea—or as far from the sea—as an Ontario county council would be in a case like that. Is this not an important enough question to be inquired into? Why, Sir, the Government, some years ago, thought it worth while to appoint a Royal Commission to investigate the question of Chinese cheap labour. Is that so important a question that before legislating upon it, or declining to legislate upon it, the Government had to send a special Royal Commission to the Pacific coast—of which commission the distinguished member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), I think, was the secretary—and, in comparison, is not the question now before us sufficiently important to be inquired into before we are asked to legislate? Then there is a question which, I think, we happen to know something about, most of us

a great deal more than we do about the Manitoba schools. We all know more or less about the evils of intemperance. And yet it was considered necessary to appoint a large commission and spend tens of thousands of dollars upon the investigation of that question for the information of Parliament. And this question that we know nothing about is not worth while to investigate, it appears. Now, Sir, I would not suggest an inquiry in order to shirk any parliamentary responsibility that is thrown upon us to deal with this question. It is not for the purpose of shirking responsibility that we suggest it, but it is for the purpose of being able to do our duty, to assume our responsibility in the proper way, that we ask for further inquiry. Now, the Minister of Justice suggested that there were no facts in dispute, there was really nothing in dispute in this matter, that it was all a question of interpretation of two statutes. There was the original school law, and there was the repeal of that, and by looking at those statutes, he said, anybody could tell what the grievance was, how much it was, and all about it. Well, now I venture absolutely and entirely to differ from the Minister of Justice. For instance, can he find out between the four corners of those two Acts, to his own satisfaction, whether those schools up there now are Protestant schools or not? Can he find out to his own satisfaction whether the schools that were not separate schools before 1890 were Protestant schools or not? Well, if the Minister of Justice is able to satisfy himself on those points, there are some people who know a great deal more about that question than either he or I do, or than any member of this House can possibly know, who do not agree with him. Let me give you an example. A memorial in 1892, signed by nearly all, or perhaps all, the Roman Catholic bishops and archbishops of Canada, contained this allegation:

Since the establishment of the province of Manitoba until 1890, the public schools of the province, as established by law, were either Protestant or Catholic schools.

Then they say:

Practically, and in spite of all assertions to the contrary, the result of the new system is purely and simply the legal suppression of all Catholic schools, and the maintenance of all Protestant schools, with all the rights and privileges they enjoyed previous to the school law of 1890.

This document is signed by all the Canadian bishops in 1892, and I quote from page 336 of the blue-book. Now, that may be very simple and clear until we hear the other side. The Minister of Justice, perhaps, knows better than the Bishop of Rupert's Land whether we could properly call these Protestant schools. But in 1895, the Bishop of Rupert's Land, in a letter published in this blue-book, dated at Winni-

peg, refers in this way to these very schools which the Roman Catholic archbishops have been characterizing as Protestant schools :

The religious services are in no true sense Protestant. There never was in the Protestant schools under the old system, any instruction properly to be called Protestant. There was immeasurably less religious instruction than in the board schools of London, yet Cardinal Vaughan and the most of the Roman Catholic clergy supported the candidates favourable to such teaching in preference to those advocating the secularizing of these schools.

I quote this language from the Anglican Bishop of Rupert's Land, who lives in Winnipeg. Now, Sir, will the Minister of Justice tell me where he can find a judgment settling that disputed point, that direct contradiction between men of the highest possible standing, and with the best possible means of knowledge—will he tell me where he can find such a judgment in the four corners of either of these statutes? Can anybody doubt the absolute good faith of the gentlemen who make these two absolutely contradictory and vital statements, vital to the decision of this question by this House? Nobody can dispute their good faith. One or the other is mistaken, both cannot be right; therefore, this House ought to know which is right, before it is called upon to pass this legislation. Now, there is another very important question indeed at issue, to which I would like to draw the attention again of the Minister of Justice, and to ask him if he can show me a settlement of this point within these two Acts of Parliament. There is an executive report, from which the hon. gentleman quoted last night, signed by Thomas Greenway, and dated 20th October, 1894; it quotes the substance of a despatch that was sent up from this Government for the consideration of the Greenway government, and it says :

It is also stated that the Act of 1894 decrees the confiscation of all school property in all the districts which do not submit their schools to the new law, even although the school property may have been acquired by Catholics with their own money.

That is an official statement on behalf of the minority sent in to this Government and forwarded to the Manitoba government. What does Mr. Greenway say about that? Does he admit that to be the case? He does not. Here is his language :

In so far as the Act of 1894 is concerned, there is no ground for the statement attributed to the memorial, but it decrees the confiscation of school property in the districts which had not submitted their schools to the new law.

Now, Sir, there again is an absolute and positive contradiction in terms about a most essential and material element in the settlement of this school question. What does the Minister of Justice say about it?

Mr. EDGAR.

Which is right or which is wrong? He should have told the House. There is nothing in these Acts to which he refers us, that will give a decision of this question. Here again parties are making conflicting statements too important to be ignored. There are the memorialists on behalf of the Roman Catholic minority, on the one hand, who no doubt believe they are right and think that they have accurate information; but there is an absolute and positive contradiction by the Premier of Manitoba, on the other hand, who believes he is right, and has means of information. How are we unfortunate people down here to decide, without something more definite than a reference to a couple of Acts of Parliament, which is right and which is wrong? But we must know that, before we can conscientiously vote for the passage of this or any other Bill. Then, Sir, it will be remembered that in the argument before the Canadian Privy Council, previous to the issuing of the order of 21st March, 1894, the committee called before them a gentleman who made a statement before that committee. I think it was a sworn statement; at any rate it was accepted by the committee, and so far as I can make out, it was not withdrawn, or asked to be withdrawn. That was the statement of Mr. O'Donohue at Winnipeg. What does he say? He made some statements which are of vast importance, if true, and if not true they should be contradicted authoritatively and proved to be untrue. What does he say? He takes two points which are most material to the consideration of this question. He says, in the first place, at page 34 of the blue-book :

I am more convinced than ever (speaking of the Act of 1890, the repealing Act) that it is the best for the country and the Roman Catholics in particular, that they would be the greatest gainers, and would accept the School Act if the French clergy would allow them to do so.

Is not that a statement of vast importance, if true? Why should it not have been disproved if not true? I do not say it is true. Mr. O'Donohue goes on to say :

Another grievance many Catholics complain of is that our school property, instead of being held by the Catholic trustees, for the people, is held in fee simple by the Superintendent General, or head of the Oblat Fathers in France.

Is this not a statement that cannot be ignored? The members of the Privy Council, the Postmaster General, the ex-Minister of Justice and the Finance Minister were there, and I think the Finance Minister was there too, all listening to that statement. If they had a formal contradiction of it, why has it not been laid before Parliament, so that we may know as much as they do?

Then there are most extraordinary contradictions in connection with a very important matter indeed concerning these schools. The Minister of Justice touched

very lightly last evening upon the question of contract between Canada and the Territory of Rupert's Land, that came in as Manitoba. The hon. gentleman said we might imply, we might presume, there was an understanding with them, because they lived for twenty years under the provisions of this statute of 1872. Well, Sir, that is a very poor thing to go on to show a contract and treaty between Canada and the district that came in under the Act of 1872 as a province. We are entitled to something more than that. Is that all the information there is to be had about this matter? Perhaps the Minister of Justice was wise in touching on it so gingerly, because he and this House know how contradictory the statements are on that point. The House will remember there were a great many bills of rights upon which on one or all of them it is said the legislation and treaty was based between Manitoba and Canada. There was one bill of rights called bill No. 4, and I should like the Minister of Justice to tell the House what he thinks of it. Has he evidence that it should have full weight or not? At all events, we know perfectly well that there is great dispute as to whether it was applicable at all to this question; and that is a very material point we should know about. In the argument, at page 48 of the blue-book, Mr. McCarthy, in reply, said:

Dealing with it in that way the question of fact must arise as to whether bill of rights No. 4 was ever brought here or not, and there being no trial of that question of fact, you will plainly see how difficult it would be to come to a conclusion with regard to it either one way or another. On that question all the official papers seem to be one way and the statement of the Rev. Father Ritchot in the other direction.

Well, Mr. McCarthy may be right or wrong. That is the statement made by him before the Ministers, and I believe that undoubtedly a state of confusion exists on that very important question. The parties are not dead. The hon. member for Montreal West (Sir Donald Smith) was himself an active party during the negotiations for the creation of the province of Manitoba. Father Ritchot is alive. He could be examined; Sir Donald Smith could be examined, and a dozen more witnesses could be examined, and documents could be examined, and then we would not be presuming something in regard to an Act of Parliament, but there would be actual evidence as to how much weight should be attached to the conditions respecting separate schools, and regarding bill of rights No. 4. None of the members of this House at the present time possess this knowledge, and yet we are asked to vote for the second and third reading of the Bill.

Another question of dispute on a very material point I may refer to: it is this. In his argument before the Privy Council, at page 23, Mr. Ewart introduced a very important statement of fact. He said:

My fourth argument is nearly allied to the third. It is based upon promises made by the Greenway government (after its accession to office) to His Grace the Archbishop of St. Boniface, and to various other persons, in order to enable him to obtain for his Cabinet a representative of the Roman Catholics and to carry the general elections of 1888. In support of this I read the affidavits of the Rev. Vicar-General Allard and Mr. W. F. Alloway.

These affidavits were all afterwards withdrawn by Mr. Ewart. However, that is the state of affairs. We find at page 62, Mr. McCarthy said, when speaking in reply:

I am instructed to-day by the Attorney General, and that is all I propose to say about it,—that the alleged agreement between Mr. Greenway and the archbishop has been repeatedly denied. I am not denying it now, but it has been repeatedly denied, and I gather from the statement read yesterday that it had been denied.

Can anything be more solemn and important than the promise made by the then and present Prime Minister of Manitoba to the late Archbishop of St. Boniface, in the capacity of representative of the minority; and yet that fact is absolutely in dispute, and we are offered no evidence about it. Sir, if I had time I could find many other most important facts which are essentially necessary to inform this House before we are called upon to take this responsible action; facts which are absolutely in dispute, which are not admitted, and in relation to which no inquiry has been made. Still, Sir, in the absence of such information, we are asked to go on with the second reading of this Bill.

Now, I think I can show that some members of this Administration have had it in their mind that an inquiry was necessary. I do not see the Minister of Railways in his seat, but his colleagues who were there will probably remember this circumstance which occurred in the argument before them, prior to the remedial order. Mr. Ewart was about to conclude his argument when this conversation occurred:

Hon. Mr. Haggart—I suppose you intend to produce evidence to show how the Acts of 1890 interfered with the rights and privileges you had acquired?

This was addressed by one of the court, as those gentlemen of the Canadian Privy Council called themselves, when they were hearing the representative of the province of Manitoba, and the representative of the minority. This question was addressed by the Minister of Railways to the counsel representing the minority. What was Mr. Ewart's answer to that? How did Mr. Ewart get out of it? He simply said this:

That is established sufficiently by the judgment. That must be taken as conclusive upon that point. And the matter went no further. But, if we turn to the judgment, we find how easily Mr. Ewart was let off. Because these facts were not proved before the

judgment was given; they were not stated in the case submitted for the judgment of the Privy Council, as facts at all. The material point on which this decision turned, assumed these to be true for the sake of the judgment; assumed them to be true for the sake of argument, assumed them to be true for the sake of the decision; and yet Mr. Ewart said: They are sufficiently established by the judgment. Now, Sir, the judgment was based upon this submission:

No. 5.—Has His Excellency the Governor General in Council power to make the declarations or remedial orders, which are asked for in the said memorials and petitions, assuming the material facts to be as stated therein.

If the Minister of Railways were in the House now, when this is pointed out to him, I am sure he would at once fall back upon the ground he very properly held there, namely, that evidence should be produced to show how the Acts of 1890 interfered with the rights and privileges acquired. The hon. gentleman is not in the House, but, perhaps, he may have changed his mind. At any rate, that was the view of the Minister of Railways at that time, as to the necessity of proving something even before the remedial order. There was another Minister then, who is not a Minister now, and I am glad to see him in his place. He seemed to have had the same notion in his mind then, whether he may have changed it since or not. He seemed to have the idea running through his mind, that they had to decide on the merits of this question, not on a formal matter, but on its merits. We find that, when Mr. McCarthy was making his argument, Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper said this:

The question that occurs to me, right or wrong, is this: That granting all you say as to our political responsibility, and as to our power to do one thing or another, does not the Act in its nature contemplate that we shall approach the question, not as a political or party body; not that we shall merely go through a form of inquiry on the appeal made to us, but that we shall, to the best of our ability, deal with the merits of the case, being responsible, to Parliament nevertheless, for our action on the merits.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is the merits of this case which we want to be able to deal with, as the Minister of Justice (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) seemed to think then. He says they should not go through the form of an inquiry, but get at the merits. Well, we do not want to go through any form of inquiry, or to let any one else do it for us, unless it is for the purpose of submitting it in full to Parliament. Therefore, at that time, it is quite clear that the Minister of Railways and the then Minister of Justice (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) had it distinctly in their minds that they were not to act on this solemn occasion without full inquiry into the merits of this case.

Mr. EDGAR.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. You will admit, I suppose, that I did not get a very definite answer to that question.

Mr. EDGAR. I do not know. It was not the answer I looked at. I looked at what my hon. friend (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) said, and the frame of mind he was in when he stated that. I have not read the answer yet; but the answer of counsel in arguing a point is not always taken as evidence in a court of justice. It appears, also, that not very long ago it occurred to somebody—goodness knows who it was, for we cannot find out—that a little further inquiry into this matter would be desirable in the public interest. I suppose; and we have the hon. member for West Montreal (Sir Donald A. Smith) sent up by somebody on behalf of this Government, to make some inquiries—not for the benefit of the House, nor for the information of this House—but, I suppose, for the information of the Government. I complain about that a little. I think they should have taken us into their confidence, and that the very valuable inquiries which could be made, and, no doubt, were made by the member for West Montreal, should have been laid before the House, when we are called upon to pass this legislation. Was it voluntary, or was it requested, that the hon. member for Montreal (Sir Donald Smith) should go up there? Of course, we know he takes a profound interest in the present combination that sits upon the Treasury benches. We know that he is a sort of—if I might say it without offence—a sort of dry-nurse to that combination. He was there when they came into existence a few weeks ago—when the readjustment took place; and he is said to have been watching over them ever since, as carefully as if they were infant industries. When one of them squealed in the nursery, he would come up to Ottawa from Montreal; whenever he heard that one had called another a naughty name in the nursery, he would come down from Winnipeg to set matters right. It was generally understood on this side that he had a deputy or assistant dry-nurse for the Ministry in the hon. member for Compton (Mr. Pope), who also fusses around on the outside circle with a great interest in the whole combination. I was inquiring of a medical man what the particular duties of an assistant nurse in a case of that kind were, and I was told that his particular duties were to look after the pap bottle and see that it was properly administered.

Now, Sir, there is another party to this case: there is the province of Manitoba, which we cannot ignore. The Government are not ignoring it in their legislation. Now, what has the province of Manitoba said on the subject of the inquiry that we suggest should take place? Why, Sir, as long ago as the 19th of June, 1895, in reply to the

communication that was sent to them forwarding the remedial order, the government of that province said in a very respectful way to this Government :

We believe that when the remedial order was made, there was not available then to Your Excellency in Council full and accurate information as to the workings of our former system of schools.

We also believe that there was lacking the means of forming a correct judgment as to the effect upon the province of changes in the direction indicated in the order.

Being impressed with this view, we respectfully submit that it is not yet too late to make a full and deliberate investigation of the whole subject. Should such a course be adopted, we shall cheerfully assist in affording the most complete information available. An investigation of such a kind would furnish a substantial basis of fact upon which conclusions could be formed with a reasonable degree of certainty.

That was in June last. There is now, it appears, great urgency about this legislation. If the Government were impressed with its urgency when they passed the Order in Council in March, and if they are impressed with its urgency now, they must have felt its urgency last June; and did they do anything to meet this reasonable suggestion of the other high contracting party, the government of Manitoba? No, Sir; they absolutely ignored it. They have never proposed investigation. They did later on ask the government of Manitoba what they would suggest about legislation; but the demand made by the government of Manitoba for an investigation was never replied to. The Order in Council which was passed by this Government in reply to that of the Manitoba government, and which was sent to Manitoba shortly after the prorogation of last session of this Parliament, ignored the offer of an investigation altogether—discourteously ignored it, I think. However, did the government of Manitoba abandon that idea? No, Sir; they did not. On the 20th of December, 1895, they again addressed a respectful memorial to the Dominion Government, in which they said :

It is a matter of regret that the invitation extended by the legislative assembly to make a proper inquiry into the facts of the case has not been accepted, but that, as above stated, the advisers of His Excellency have declared their policy without investigation. It is equally a matter of regret that Parliament is apparently about to be asked to legislate without investigation. It is with all deference submitted that such a course seems to be quite incapable of reasonable justification, and must create the conviction that the educational interests of the people of the province of Manitoba are being dealt with in a hostile and peremptory way by a tribunal whose members have not approached the subject in a judicial spirit, or taken the proceedings necessary to enable them to form a proper opinion upon the merits of the question.

No wonder it strikes the government of Manitoba in that way. The first of these requests for investigation which I have read

was from the legislature of Manitoba. The next, that of December last, was from the government of Manitoba. An election has been held since. A new legislature of Manitoba has assembled, and has again dealt with the question; and what did they say last week? They said:

Be it resolved,

That this House notes with cordial approval that the advisers of his Honour the Lieutenant-Governor did earnestly repeat to the advisers of His Excellency the invitation extended by this House to them to make full inquiry before asking Parliament to legislate and did also suggest that the scope of the inquiry should be sufficiently wide to embrace all available facts relating to the past or present school systems.

That it is sincerely regretted that these repeated and earnest invitations for an inquiry have been absolutely ignored by the advisers of His Excellency, who propose, without complete information, themselves to ask coercive legislation from Parliament, the great majority of whose members are necessarily without a full knowledge of the facts relative to the past and present school systems of Manitoba.

Sir, if ever there was a voice of a people, that is the voice of the people of Manitoba—a parliament elected since we have been sitting here, carrying that resolution by a vote of 31 to 7. And still the Government here will ignore that united voice of a great province. I think Parliament, at any rate, should not ignore it. Thank goodness, on this question we are not tied down to the views of the Government. This free Parliament of Canada can think for itself; and in the face of that request from an important, a rich and a growing province to this legislature, it would be worse than discourtesy—it would be criminal—for this Parliament to ignore it.

I say that alone is ample reason for our refusing to give this Bill a second reading just now. Then, what can the public think of the position the Government are putting that minority in—be the cause of that minority never so good—when they refuse an open and free inquiry into the grievance. What cause that deserves sympathy or assistance is afraid of any inquiry? Yet that is the position into which this Government is putting that unfortunate minority in the North-west. I say they do not deserve to be put in such a false position, and Parliament should not be a party to putting them in that false position before the eyes of the country, and of the world.

I believe I can show the House another very strong reason why the greatest caution and deliberation should be exercised in passing this law, and I think I will have the benefit of the assistance of the late Minister of Justice (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) too in this argument, because I am going to quote from what he said himself, in his famous report on which the remedial order was based. The argument had been advanced before the Privy Council that it would be impossible, once re-

medial legislation was enacted here in pursuance of the remedial order, to change or revoke that legislation. It was argued that such legislation would then become irrevocable and unchangeable by any Parliament on this side of the Atlantic. What does the late Minister of Justice say about that in his report to the Council? He refers to it in order to let Mr. Greenway's government know that they had better look out, that they had better be pretty quick and pass legislation such as the remedial order required, or this Parliament would do it, and then it never could be changed, no matter how the circumstances of the country might change. This is what the hon. gentleman said:

In this connection it was urged by counsel on behalf of the province, that should Parliament legislate under these circumstances, its enactment would be absolute and irrevocable, so far as both Parliament and the provincial legislature are concerned. The committee, without necessarily adopting this view, observe that section 22 of the Manitoba Act may admit of that construction. The committee, therefore, recommend that the provincial legislature be requested to consider whether its action upon the decision of Your Excellency in Council should be permitted to be such as, while refusing to redress the grievance which the highest court of the Empire has declared to exist, may compel Parliament to give the relief of which, under the constitution, the provincial legislature is the proper and primary source, thereby, according to this view, permanently divesting itself in a very large measure of its authority, and so establishing in the province an educational system which, no matter what changes may take place in the circumstances of the country or the views of people, cannot be altered or repealed by any legislative body in Canada.

Now, the ex-Minister of Justice, while not necessarily adopting this view, says it is worthy of consideration, and submits it with the stamp, the quasi stamp at least, of his formal approval, to the legislature of Manitoba in order to force their legislation on. Why, unless the hon. Minister has utterly changed his mind, what is the position this question will be in if his law be right? If it be true that by the passing of this legislation we will absolutely and irrevocably fix a yoke upon the neck of the people of that province which no power, by any legislative authority in Canada, can remove, what sort of position will we place them in? Should not that reason alone—for the doubt, at any rate, has been created as to whether that is not the law by the ex-Minister of Justice himself—give us pause before we pass that absolute and irrevocable legislation. The hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Dickey), last evening, was frank enough to admit what we probably all knew before, that we had discretionary legislative powers in this House upon this question; and he argued that while that was the case—and the leader of the House had argued earlier in the day to the same effect—still, we were bound in honour to pay what we

Mr. EDGAR.

owe to the minority. Well, I will go so far as to agree with the Minister of Justice that we are bound in honour to do justice to the minority, and nobody, I hope, intends otherwise in this House; and I am sure that nobody in this House, if he did intend to do otherwise, would dare to say so. He would be ashamed to say so. Therefore, I too, say, we are bound, in honour, at least, to pay that debt due to the minority. And I say we, the Liberal party, are prepared to pay that debt in gold—not in hollow promises and not in worthless paper like this Bill. The hon. gentleman seemed to admit that, on the face of it, the remedial order of March last did look pretty drastic and somewhat offensive, but how did he get over that? He got over it in this ingenious way—by saying that although the operative part of the remedial order might seem to be drastic and offensive, still there was a recital in that order of the judgment of the Privy Council which would show that it was not so drastic as it seemed to be. So that we have an admission from the Government at last, that the operative part of the Order in Council has gone a good deal further than the judgment of the English Privy Council. The hon. gentleman must have meant that, if he meant anything. He said that in order to mitigate the harshness and offensiveness and drastic nature of the operative terms of the remedial order, we must read into it, and read with it the judgment of the Privy Council, which was so much more mild that it would dilute and weaken and soften, and possibly render palatable the otherwise disagreeable remedial order. Well, Sir, that is something to know. It is something to have that admission from the hon. Minister. But I am sorry to say that when he made that admission he did it without making a very good argument, because, on looking at the remedial order, I find that there is no recital in it at all. The recital is in the Minute of Council, in the sub-committee's report made by the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper).

Mr. DICKEY. That is quite correct. It was a slip. I meant to say that the recital was in the Minutes of Council.

Mr. EDGAR. Then there is no force in the argument. The hon. gentleman made the admission that—

Mr. DICKEY. They both went together, the Minute and the Order.

Mr. EDGAR. But one is a report, and the other is the solemn act of His Excellency in Council. Why, they are of different dates.

Mr. DICKEY. If the hon. gentleman will excuse me, they bear the same relation to each other that the reasoned judgment of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Coun-

cil does to the formal order of that committee.

Mr. EDGAR. They may bear some theoretical relation, but I do not think you can read into the formal order of a court what a judge on the bench may have said. The record signed by the court, officially, is what the court means to say, and no recital or statement in any other judgment will vary the force of that decree. I place myself firmly and with confidence upon that legal position. But, after all, the important fact is that the Minister of Justice admitted that the remedial order is so much more rigorous in its terms than the judgment of the Privy Council that the latter was used to mitigate the former.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Justice last night appealed to us with a good deal of feeling not to make this question an issue at the general elections by refusing to pass this Bill. I would like to know who is pressing it forward, who is forcing this legislation on the country a few weeks before a general election, but the Ministers themselves? They are forcing this law upon an unwilling province, and one more unwilling and more determined than ever not to take the law as it is leaving the Ministers' hands to-day, after insult has been added to insult, by refusing so often the reasonable request of the province for an inquiry. In spite of all that has been done to induce them to refrain, the Ministers are forcing this upon the province and upon the people of Canada who do not want it. The hon. gentlemen upon the Treasury benches know a good deal better than I do, probably, the rebellion among the people of this country who have hitherto been supporters of this Government. And still they are forcing it upon the country on the eve of a general election. That is a policy of dictation and coercion, and policies of dictation and coercion have often produced in other countries, and in this country, too, in days gone by, rebellions and uprisings of the people, and bloodshed; it was never a policy of inquiry and conciliation and fair-play and equal justice to all that produced those results. Why cannot the Government yield, even at this late hour, and withdraw this issue from the general elections? I am sure that the whole House will assent at once if they will offer to put it off and make a full inquiry so that the matter may be removed from the political arena, as it ought to be.

I know, Mr. Speaker, that I have no right whatever to speak on behalf of the Roman Catholic minority of Manitoba. But I remember very well that in my own province not so very long ago, when the liberties and the rights of the Roman Catholic minority there were threatened. I as a Protestant citizen did speak out on their behalf. And I think I can fairly claim to know a little of the opinions and feelings upon most questions of the Irish Roman

Catholic minority in my own province of Ontario. I think I know enough of them, at least, to venture to say that their fathers have suffered a great deal too much coercion in Ireland for them to desire to coerce Manitoba, or any other province in Canada. I believe that they are too much attached to the principle of home rule to unite with any party in this country to crush out the home rule aspirations of a province in Canada, as they would, by passing this Bill. I believe they are altogether too intelligent a people not to trust that justice will be better and more speedily and more surely and permanently secured by a full and frank investigation of the grievances of their co-religionists in Manitoba than by this proposed method of action. And I know this, also, that they are too intelligent to allow a hollow cry—which we know is going to be raised in this election—of “the church in danger,” to distract their attention from the main issue, and cause any Liberal among them to support this incapable and discredited Government.

This Bill I believe to be a hollow compromise; I believe it is only a miserable makeshift that pleases neither party to the question. Hon. gentlemen on the other side know full well that it is not satisfactory to a large class of their followers. They think they will, perhaps, please another section of the Cabinet, or of their followers, but I think they will be mistaken, because I see on the Notice paper of this House a large number of amendments in the other direction, by the hon. member for Bagot (Mr. Dupont), who is intelligent enough to see that this Bill as it stands does not give efficient relief to the Roman Catholic minority of Manitoba, and does not meet the principles that he for one has been contending for. So I think the Ministers will see that it is an unacceptable and a mistaken compromise; and I sincerely hope before the vote is taken on the second reading, that the Ministers will make up their minds to withdraw that legislation from this House.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Mr. Speaker, I was somewhat unfortunate last night, after the leader of the Opposition took his seat, in not catching your eye. The hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) rose in my stead, and spoke in my stead; but, Sir, I can say that that hon. gentleman did not make the speech which I wished to make yesterday, and which I shall try to make to-day. Since I have been in public life I have endeavoured to consider all questions such as the present one, independent of any consideration of race, of any consideration of nationality, of any consideration of province. I must say at the outset that I deplore that a question such as this should have come before the Parliament of Canada. I deplore it because, among some of the people of our country, it has created division and it has

created irritation, which are never favourable to the political health of any country. But, Sir, I believe that at all hazards the constitution must be maintained, and it is from that point of view that I desire to consider this question. In my own native province, upon questions like the present one, and occasions now historic, I have had to face fierce fights, but there again, without considering whether these questions affected me prejudicially as a public man, not considering whether the sentiments of my people were enlisted in defence of the view which I had taken, I treated those questions as matters affecting not one nationality, not one province, but I considered them from the broad standpoint of the general interests of the Dominion. Now, Mr. Speaker, I look upon this question as a purely constitutional one. Although I know that religious views and ideas are involved in it more or less, I want to consider it in this Parliament, the national assembly of the Dominion, peopled by the representatives of so many different races—I say that on the floor of this Parliament, this question should be viewed from the constitutional standpoint, and in the light of the general interests of all our people. In the interest of the country, in the interest of the party which is concerned, it is better that it should be tried as a constitutional question, separated as much as possible from the irritating elements which unfortunately accompany it. Sir, as I view the question, it resolves itself into this: The highest tribunal in the Empire has declared that rights have been taken away from a minority; and that minority, under the laws which govern this country, the constitution under which this country began its career has appealed to the highest tribunal in the British Empire; and that tribunal, outside our strife, ignoring all questions of nationality or of province, viewing it as that tribunal does all great questions coming from every portion of the vast Empire to be submitted to its impartial judgment the judges of that high tribunal, the last tribunal to which a British subject can appeal, declared that rights had been taken away from the minority of Manitoba. Sir, I shall have occasion to refer later to the circumstances under which a clause for the protection of minorities, happens to be in the British North America Act; and under that clause I say it became the imperative duty of the Government, under the judgment rendered by the Privy Council, to hear the appeal of that minority, coming before them for redress. Now, this appeal having been heard, the Government of Canada proceeded to apply the remedy which the constitution afforded to the minority. Sir, hon. gentlemen on the other side have spoken of drastic measures being taken by this Government in relation to this matter; but I hope to be able to show before I resume my seat, that every thing that could be done by this Government to induce the Manitoba legislature

Sir ADOLPHE CARON.

to take into its own hands the application of that remedy, was done by this Government. I hope also before I resume my seat to be able to show by an analysis of the Orders in Council which were passed, that if to-day we have before this Parliament a debate the most important and the most momentous which has ever been heard within the walls of this House since confederation, it is because the legislature of Manitoba would not harken to the voice of those of her citizens, within her jurisdiction, who were asking her to remedy the evils from which they were suffering, and to restore to them the rights which the Privy Council of England had declared should not have been taken away from them. Sir, we proceeded so far that hon. gentlemen opposite and an important portion of the people of Canada reproached the Government for not using its power to settle before this day the Manitoba question, which, as I have already stated, was creating so much irritation, and is creating so much irritation at the present time. We were accused of delaying the solution of that question. We avoided everything that could interfere with the autonomy of the province, because I believe that the man who would knowingly touch the autonomy of any of the great provinces composing this confederation, would not feel a patriotic heart within his breast; and I would be the last to do so, and I would fight for delay, and would put up with any measure of tardiness, so as to be able to avoid the exercise of a jurisdiction which is given, under the British North America Act, to the Federal Government, but which is to be exercised only when every other means have failed. And I say that, if to-day that power is not exercised, it is because, after trying every means and attempting a solution by every possible method, we found it impossible to induce the province of Manitoba to accede to what I consider and what I believe can be easily established, is the right of the minority. But, Sir, we are told by the press in some instances, and by hon. gentlemen opposite on some occasions, that we should not disturb the peace and harmony of that province for the sake of a very small minority, a minority much smaller, of course, to-day than it was when the province became a part and parcel of confederation, small because other elements have been introduced into that province, and the majority disturbed. Instead of there being a French majority, as was the case at that period, other elements having been brought in subsequent to the first settlers, we find to-day the argument used, that it is a very small minority in that country for which to bring about the disturbance and trouble prevailing at the present moment. But I hold, that the smaller the minority, the greater is the duty of this Parliament, the natural protector of minorities, the power that stands independent

between every province and every element composing the province, to stand forward and protect the minority.

Mr. Speaker, I venture to express the opinion, that, unless minorities can be convinced that the constitution which prevails in Canada will be applied fairly, and will protect them in their rights, confederation does not meet the necessities which it was intended to supply. I venture the opinion, that it is incomplete, and that it may wreck the institutions under which we live. Sir, speaking, as I do, as a French-Canadian, proud of my origin and proud of my native province, I say I would stand up in the old province of Quebec and fight, if any attempt were made to interfere with the rights of the Protestant minority of that province. I would do so, because with me it is not a question of what religion the minority belongs to, but it is with me a constitutional duty that we owe to those minorities, which, when they surrendered at confederation their own autonomy to form part of a larger union, relied on the good faith of that British North America Act, which was expounded to us so eloquently yesterday by one of the fathers of confederation, the Secretary of State, the leader of the Government in this House. If the minority in Quebec were interfered with, I would stand up with the same energy for the defence of their rights as I stand up to-day to protect the minority in the province of Manitoba.

Viewing this question upon its merits, I desire to express the opinion, that I agree altogether with the majority of the province of Quebec, who think we cannot make too many concessions to our friends who are a minority there, not speaking the language we speak, not going to the same church as we attend; but I consider that in the province of Quebec the different sections of the people are willing, in fact, it has been a rule which obtained long before the law included it in the Confederation Act, that we should concede to the minority the rights we enjoy ourselves. We have done it; and what is the result? The result is, that, to-day, this question which might, and does in other sections of the country, divide men belonging to different nationalities and churches, the Protestants and Catholics of Quebec view in the same light, and have come to the same conclusion upon it, that protection for the minority in Manitoba is a right which interests the Protestant minority of Quebec to the same extent as it interests the minority in the province of Manitoba.

Sir, when confederation was carried out, when the Protestants of the province of Quebec stated what they wanted in that old province, a certain number of counties to be set aside to be represented by the minority, what was the answer of the majority? The majority never discussed for one moment whether it was asking too

much on the part of the Protestants to make that demand, but the only question discussed by those who took part in the framing of that important measure, was this: We do not wish to refuse anything to the Protestant minority, but we should like them to represent those constituencies without our appearing to be forced to make the concession by law; their rights will be respected, they are perfectly safe in our hands, but our only objection is, that it may appear we made this concession by the compulsion of law, instead of doing it willingly, as we are prepared to do. But, Sir, it was not only in relation to these constituencies that this concession was made. Long previous to confederation, the Protestant minority in Quebec, in so far as education is concerned, enjoyed all the rights and privileges which the Catholic minority, by law, enjoyed in the province of Ontario. Not only that, but outside of any constitutional enactment, and outside of any legislative act, when the Protestant minority came to us, and stated that they were desirous that there should be set aside in the common jails of the country special apartments for the women belonging to their own religion, the concession was granted without a moment's hesitation. So it was with the asylums, and so it was with many other privileges given the Protestant minority, which we were not by any means bound to grant by legislative enactment, but which we were prepared to give of our own volition, so as to obtain that priceless boon which we enjoy in the province of Quebec, namely, peace, harmony, and good-will among all the people. I have already stated, Sir, that long before the constitution decreed that the Protestant minority of Quebec should have their own schools and enjoy the same privileges that had been conferred by law on the Catholic minority of Ontario, our fellow-Protestant fellow-subjects in Quebec never had for a moment to dread the least intervention on the part of the Catholics. And, Sir, I am glad to say that not only in the province of Quebec, but in other provinces, there are men belonging to the Protestant Church who view the matter from the same standpoint as we do. I believe that liberal and generous expressions of opinion cannot be too widely circulated when they come from men known to belong to a different church from the one for which they speak, and I shall therefore read to the House a letter addressed by Mr. Carnegie, an ex-M.P.P. of Ontario, to Sir Mackenzie Bowell. Mr. Carnegie says:

Dear Sir Mackenzie Bowell:

While, as I fancy you are aware, I entertain very strong views in opposition to separate schools, disapproved and still disapprove of the then Government's failure to disallow the Jesuit Bill, joined heartily in the equal rights movement, until it was virtually strangled by its leader, and still approve of the principles which it was formed to maintain, and above all, en-

dorse with all my heart, Meredith's position on the school question ; yet, after reading the report leading up to, and the order just passed by the Governor General in Council with reference to the Manitoba school question, I think you will be glad to learn that I heartily approve of your course in this matter. Indeed, I do not see how you or your colleagues could have done otherwise. To my mind, it is not so far as you are concerned, a question of separate schools or no separate schools, but one of obedience or non-obedience to the Confederation Act. If we do not like its terms and conditions, as I do not in this respect, let us appeal to the enactors of it for the amendment we desire ; but do not let us override and defy its provisions. Wishing you a long lease of life, &c.

Your old and sincere friend,
(Sd.) JOHN CARNEGIE.

There is another letter, Mr. Speaker, addressed to Sir Donald A. Smith by the Rev. Mr. Campbell, of Montreal, which I shall take the liberty of reading to the House :

General Assembly, Presbyterian Church in
Canada.

Dear Sir Donald A. Smith :

Will you allow me as a citizen to thank you for the very interesting and important historical statement which you gave to the public last week, in response to the requisition presented to you. What you divulge as to the negotiations with the people of the Red River settlement, prior to their acceptance of the terms accompanying their entrance into confederation, to my mind, ought to have much weight in contributing to a solution of the present vexed problem affecting Manitoba. I hope that due regard will be had to the noble sentiment of the 15th Psalm, as to changing not though one sweareth to his own hurt. The good faith of our Sovereign, and of the sovereignty of the people of Canada, whom you represented in the transaction, must be respected even though it entails inconvenient consequences to do so. What you suggest, even as to the limitations of the pledges given, may help to an equitable settlement of the present difficulty. At all events, in view of your statement in this connection, I hope our Protestant friends throughout the Dominion will try and view the matter calmly and consider how it would affect them, had the destinies of a new province been different from what they have proved to be and been in the hands of a large Roman Catholic majority which proceeded to alter the status accorded to the Protestants equally with the Catholics in your negotiations in 1870. As a citizen of this province, I feel that we of the minority are handsomely treated in educational matters by the majority, and I could wish that my co-religionists in the provinces in which they predominate should not be outdone in generosity by their French-Canadian fellow-citizens.

Ever yours faithfully,

(Sd.) ROBERT CAMPBELL.

To the Hon. Sir Donald A. Smith, K.C.M.G., M.P.

Sir DONALD A. SMITH. That letter was written to me last year.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. That letter, Mr. Speaker, was written just a year ago, as Sir Donald Smith informs me. Now, Sir, these are considerations which I venture to say should have the greatest possible weight with a Parliament such as ours. This coun-

Sir ADOLPHE CARON.

try is divided into two parties, and will be, and I for one believe that the form of government which we have here is the best possible one. But, let us not forget that if, for the sake of party advantage, any political party should divide the people by any question which can be avoided, the result would be detrimental in the extreme to the future, to the greatness, and to the development of Canada. Sir, the idea which permeated the whole of the Confederation Act, as I understand it, was protection to the minority, and the intention of the statesmen who took part in the building of that legislative monument was to give to every class of the population the fullest possible enjoyment of religious liberty.

At confederation that was evidently what was intended to be done in Manitoba, as we may see by the words of the late lamented great leader of the Conservative party, Sir John A. Macdonald. When applied to by a member of the legislative assembly of that province to express his opinion as to the laws relating to education in 1889, when the new education law abolishing separate schools was before the legislative assembly, Sir John Macdonald wrote the following letter, which explains itself :

You ask me for advice as to the course you should take upon the vexed question of separate schools in your province. There is, it seems to me, but one course open to you. By the Manitoba Act, the provisions of the British North America Act, section 93, respecting laws passed for the protection of minorities in educational matters, are made applicable to Manitoba, and cannot be changed, whereby the Imperial Act confirming the establishment of the new provinces, 34 and 35 Victoria, chapter 8, section 6, it is provided that it shall not be competent for the Parliament of Canada to alter the provisions of the Manitoba Act in so far as it relates to the province of Manitoba. Obviously, therefore, the separate school system in Manitoba is beyond the reach of the legislature or of the Dominion Parliament.

Although I fear to take up too much of the time of the House, still, I think it is important, in the discussion of a question like the present, to place before Parliament and before the country the views entertained by the leading public men of Canada. Those who remember or who have read in the political history of this country of the troublesome times which existed in Canada previous to confederation, know that the people of the provinces were divided on religious questions ; and it seems to me that we should by every possible means avoid going back to the same questions, and possibly causing a return of those old troubles which we thought had disappeared. Among some of the most distinguished statesmen and political leaders in this country, who afterwards educated public opinion upon these questions, Sir Oliver Mowat and the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie fought fiercely against separate schools for a time ; but after the fight had been fought, and the

benefits of the new system had been realized by experience, those men were the last who would advocate going back to the system which obtained previous to confederation. It is right, I think, to recall to the memory of hon. gentlemen what took place in the legislature of Quebec before the union. The Protestants of Lower Canada had by practice, although not by law, the full control of their schools, and of every question affecting the education of their children in that province; and, although, as history proves, they never had to complain of the manner in which they were treated by the Catholics, yet, when confederation was carried, and when it became necessary to prepare the Confederation Act, the Protestants insisted upon their rights and privileges being protected by a clause in the Confederation Act. At that time it seemed useless to insert such a clause, because they had always enjoyed, undisturbed, the same rights as the Catholic minority enjoyed in the province of Ontario. Still, they insisted on a clause being inserted, and it was in London that Sir Alexander Galt had inserted in the Confederation Act the very clause which to-day gives the minority in the province of Quebec the right of appeal to the Privy Council. I have heard it questioned during this debate whether the rights of the minority in the province of Quebec could be interfered with as the rights of the minority in the province of Manitoba are interfered with at present, or whether it was not ultra vires of the legislature of Quebec to pass a law that would change the status now enjoyed by the Protestant minority in that province. I cannot see that there can be a doubt on that point. I cannot see that there can be a doubt that to-morrow the legislature of Quebec could pass a law appointing Catholic inspectors, for instance, or imposing on the minority a selection of school books which they might not find acceptable. I am supposing a case; but I am quite sure that it is a case that can never happen in the province of Quebec. But what would be the remedy of the minority? Their remedy would be, under that clause of the Confederation Act, to come to the Governor in Council and ask the Governor in Council to hear their appeal; and it would be for the Governor in Council, after hearing that appeal, to pass whatever remedial order the Governor in Council should deem necessary. Now, Sir, however old the history may be, it is of advantage to turn back its pages and see how far they may throw light upon questions of this kind. Some hundred years ago, when the Quebec Act was under discussion in the British Parliament, there were then in that old British Parliament, from which we draw our parliamentary precedents, men whose descendants still live in Canada, who wished to crush the new subjects of His Majesty the

King. But there were other men who, casting a prophetic eye upon the future of the British Empire, considering the question, not from the standpoint of might, but from the standpoint of right, replied to those who were trying to crush the new subjects of His Majesty: We may have the might, but we have not got the right; and the Quebec Act was passed. It was passed just a year before the war of 1812, and I do not think it can be denied by anybody that if it had not been for the loyalty of the French Canadians of that period, the Crown of England would not be able to boast to-day of having the Dominion of Canada as a portion of its great Empire. It was through the loyalty of the French people—those people who have shown their loyalty on every occasion—that Canada was preserved to the Crown of England. And, Sir, it seems to me that when, at this moment, men whose work I approve of and admire, are banded together to strengthen the union and tighten the bonds which connect the different component parts of the British Empire, those men who take an interest in Imperial federation, might, I think, look back to that period of history which I have cited and reason, as did the men of that day: if we have the might, we have not the right, and shall therefore make the concessions to which the minority are entitled. You have the power, but you have not the right, and that is a point which I consider should not be forgotten when we are discussing this matter.

Coming to another branch of the subject, I want to show how the school question stands, and I must here apologize to the House for having to read a document which is rather long, and which I was at considerable labour to compile, in order to make my review of the question as concise as possible, for I wish it to go in "Hansard." In discussing this question I desire to put concisely and clearly before the House the reasons why I believe the Government is right in the course which it has followed. I start, first, with the motion moved by Mr. Blake, and seconded by the hon. leader of the Opposition. At that period, in 1890, Mr. Blake, one of the most eminent men who has ever occupied a seat in Parliament, seeing the school question loom in the distance and believing, as a true patriot, that it should be removed from the political arena moved the motion to which I have referred. He felt that this question would create trouble, and prevent the country from developing peaceably and quietly as it should, and he wanted to remove it from the political arena and leave it to the impartial decision of the tribunal of justice. Sir, by that motion, he proposed to refer to the high tribunals important questions of law or fact in matters of education, in order to ascertain whether the power of disallowance could be exercised by the executive. And, as this House knows, his proposal was carried unanimously. Now, as I view it, the

policy of the Government with regard to the Manitoba school question, has been directly in accord with the ideas which led to the unanimous acceptance of Mr. Blake's motion by the House of Commons. We have taken the matter from court to court, we have desired by all possible means to avoid its coming before Parliament; and in the last resort we had the decision of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. And it was only after we obtained that decision that we acted, as I intend to show by the record which I propose to submit to the House:

Manitoba was created a province by the Act of Canada, commonly known as the "Manitoba Act, 1870," (33 Vic. ch. 3). This Act was confirmed by a statute of the United Kingdom (34 Vic., chap. 28). The Manitoba Act provided that after a date named the provisions of the British North America Act, 1867, shall, except those parts thereof which are in terms made or by reasonable intendment, may be held to be specially applicable to, or only to affect one or more, but not the whole of the provinces now composing the Dominion, and except so far as the same may be varied by this Act, to be applicable to the province of Manitoba, in the same way and to the like extent as they apply to the several provinces of Canada, and as if the province of Manitoba had been one of the provinces originally united by this Act.

Provisions are made by the 93rd section of the British North America Act, 1867, and the 22nd section of the Manitoba Act, 1870, for an appeal to the Governor General in Council from Acts of the legislative assembly affecting the rights and privileges aforesaid.

Section 93 of the British North America Act, 1867, provides that "in and for each province the legislature may exclusively make laws in relation to education, subject in accordance to the following provisions:—

1. That they shall not affect any rights or privileges with respect to denominational schools.

2. The privileges and rights granted Catholics in Upper Canada are granted to Protestants in Lower Canada.

3. An appeal shall lie to the Governor General in Council from any Act or decision of any provincial authority affecting the rights of any Protestant or Catholic minority in any province, where a system of separate schools exists at the union, or is thereafter established.

4. The Parliament of Canada may make remedial laws where the provincial authorities fail to do so.

In 1871 the Manitoba legislature, at its first session, passed "An Act to establish a system of education in this province."

By this Act, a board of education was formed, composed of one-half Catholics and one-half Protestants; also one superintendent of Protestant schools and one of Catholic schools, who were joint secretaries of the board. The duties of this board were:—1. To make regulations for the general organization of common schools. 2. To select books to be used in the schools. 3. With sanction of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council to alter and sub-divide any school district established by Act. The general board is divided into two sections, and among the duties of each section are the following:—Control and management of discipline in school. To make rules for examination, grading and licensing of teachers and for withdrawal of licenses on suffi-

cient cause. It shall prescribe books as have reference to religion and morals. Section 13 of the Act divides money appropriated by legislature between Catholics and Protestants. The said statute is amended from time to time, but the system prevailed until 1890. The only substantial amendment was in 1875, when the board was increased to 21, 12 Protestants and 9 Catholics, and the moneys voted were to be divided in proportion to the number of children of school age in the respective Protestant and Catholic districts. The denominational distinction between the Catholics and Protestants, and the independent working of the two sections became more and more pronounced under the different statutes afterwards passed. Section 27 of the Act of 1875, c. 27, allows the establishment of schools of one denomination in the school districts of another denomination. The same principle is carried out and somewhat extended by sections 39, 40 and 41 of the Act of 1876, c. 1. In 1877, by c. 12, s. 10, it was enacted that in "no case a Protestant ratepayer shall be obliged to pay for the Catholic school, and a Catholic taxpayer for the Protestant school. It is manifest from all this that until the Act of 1890, the school system created by the legislature of Manitoba under the provisions of the constitutional Act, was entirely based and carried on on denominational principles as divided between Protestant and Catholic schools. In 1890 Manitoba passed certain Acts, viz.:— chapters 37 and 38 of 53 Vic., entitled respectively "An Act respecting the Department of Education," and "An Act respecting Public Schools," which affected very injuriously certain rights and privileges of the Roman Catholic minority in that province in relation to education acquired by them under various prior statutes of Manitoba, as well as rights and privileges possessed by them before the creation of Manitoba as one of the provinces of Canada. The first of these Acts, c. 37, abolished the Board of Education and the office of Superintendent of Education and creates a Department of Education, which is to consist of the executive council or a committee thereof, and also an advisory board composed of seven members, four appointed by Department of Education, two by teachers of province, and one by the university council.

Among the duties of advisory board is power to examine and authorize text books, &c., to determine qualifications of teachers, to appoint examiners, to prescribe the form of religious exercises to be used in schools.

The Public Schools Act, c. 38, repeals all former statutes relating to education. It also enacts as follows:—

By sections 3 all matters concerning school district appointments, agreements, contracts, assessments and rate bills are made subject to provisions of this Act.

Section 4 continues in office school trustees holding office when Act comes in force.

By section 5 all public schools are free, and in rural municipalities children between the ages of 5 and 16, and in cities, towns and villages between the ages of 6 and 16 shall have right to attend school.

By section 6 it is enacted that religious exercises shall be conducted according to regulations of advisory board, religious exercises just before closing hour. Children may be exempted from attending such exercises.

Section 7, religious exercises in public schools are entirely at the option of the school trustees for the different districts.

Section 8, the public schools shall be entirely non-sectarian, and no religious exercises shall be allowed therein, except as above provided.

This Act provides for the formation, alteration and union in rural and urban municipalities, election of school trustees, and for levying a rate on taxable property for school purposes.

Subsection 3 of section 108 is as follows:—

Any school not conducted according to all the provisions of this or any other Act in force for the time being, all the regulations of the Department of Education, or the advisory board, shall not be deemed a public school within the meaning of the law, and shall not participate in the legislative grant.

By section 143 teachers are prohibited from using unauthorized text books.

By section 179, in cases where before the coming into force of this Act, Catholic school districts have been established as in the next preceding section mentioned (that is, covering the same territory as any Protestant district), such Catholic school district shall, upon the coming into force of this Act, cease to exist and all the assets of such Catholic school districts shall belong to, and all the liability be paid by the public school district.

Under the provision of the British North America Act and the Manitoba Act, the Roman Catholic minority of Manitoba appealed to the Governor General in Council. In November, 1890, proceedings were taken to test the validity of the provincial statutes.

The form which the proceedings assumed was an application by Dr. Barrett (a Catholic ratepayer) to quash a by-law of the city of Winnipeg passed under the authority of the statutes. This application was on the 24th of November, 1890, dismissed by Mr. Justice Killam. An appeal was taken to the full court, and on the 2nd February, 1891, was dismissed, the Chief Justice and Mr. Justice Bain holding that the legislation was valid. Judge Dubuc, however, dissented.

A further appeal was taken to the Supreme Court of Canada, and on October 28th, 1891, the court (comprising five judges) unanimously held the Acts to be ultra vires.

A further appeal was taken to the Privy Council on 30th July, 1892, and judgment was given, reversing the decision of the Supreme Court and holding that the legislation was valid. A petition from the members of the Roman Catholic Church in Manitoba, dated in August, 1890, was presented to the Dominion Government, asking:

That it may be declared that such provincial law does prejudicially affect the rights and privileges with regard to denominational schools which Roman Catholics had by law or practice in the province at the time of the union.

This petition, as is well known, was dealt with by the Order in Council of 4th April, 1891, which stated that:

An appeal had been asserted, and the case is now before the Supreme Court of Canada, where it will in all probability be heard in the course of next month. If the appeal should be successful, these Acts will be annulled by judicial decision, and the Roman Catholic minority of Manitoba will receive protection and redress.

That is in the terms of the Order in Council itself. Again, there was a petition from the Roman Catholic Church in Manitoba, dated 27th September, 1892, received by the Government, also asking redress. That petition

was signed by the Archbishop, of the Roman Catholic Church of Manitoba, which stated:

Your petitioner believes that the time has now come for Your Excellency to consider the petitions which have been presented by and on behalf of the Roman Catholics of Manitoba for redress, under subsections 2 and 3 of section 22 of the Manitoba Act, as it has become necessary that the federal power should be resorted to for the protection of the Roman Catholic minority.

The petition of 1892 asked:

That it may be declared that to Your Excellency the Governor General in Council, it seems requisite that the provisions of the statutes in force in the province of Manitoba prior to the passage of the said Acts, should be re-enacted in so far, at least, as may be necessary to secure to the Roman Catholics in the said province the right to build, maintain, equip, manage, conduct and support these schools in the manner provided for by the said statutes.

The petition was referred by Council to a sub-committee, which sat on the 26th November, 1892. The report of the sub-committee was submitted to Council, and incorporated in an Order in Council of 29th December, 1892, which fixed the 21st January, 1893, as the date for hearing the appeal. Of course, the history of that appeal is well known. Argument upon this appeal was heard on the 21st January, 1893. Manitoba refused to be represented at this argument, and, by Order in Council of 23rd February, 1893, the preparation of a case was advised. By Order in Council of 22nd February, 1893, it was advised that copies of a draft case be transmitted to Manitoba. By Order in Council of 8th July, 1893, it is ordered that the amended copy of the case be submitted to Manitoba. By Order in Council, 31st July, 1893, the case was referred to the Supreme Court of Canada. I would like to draw the attention of the House to this, as I consider, important feature, namely, that all these Orders in Council and proceedings that were being taken by the Federal Government, step by step, and stage by stage, were communicated, in every instance, to the Manitoba government. By Order in Council, 15th August, 1893, it is decided to notify the Attorney General and Mr. Ewart, that the case will be submitted on 3rd October next. There is no drastic character in these proceedings. Whatever information the Federal Government possessed, it considered itself bound to communicate to the provincial government of Manitoba. The Supreme Court of Canada, by a majority of members, decided against the claims of the petitioners. The Catholic bishops and archbishops of Canada sent in a joint petition in May, 1894, asking that the Act of Manitoba, 57, chap. 2, be disallowed. That is the last petition that came before us. This is a very important Order in Council to which I wish again to draw the attention of the House. By Order in Council, 26th July, 1894, the

said petition was referred to the Lieutenant-Governor of Manitoba. It seems to me that the friendly intention, at least, of the Federal Government is shown by the fact, that the Order in Council and the petition itself of the bishops and archbishops and Catholics of the province of Quebec were referred to the Lieutenant-Governor of Manitoba, with the request that he lay the same before his advisers and legislators. A further petition, signed by the Catholics throughout the province of Quebec, was presented late in 1894, asking for the interference of the Federal Government. An appeal was taken to the Privy Council in England, under the title of Gerald Brophy et al., appellants, and the Attorney General of Manitoba, asking if the appeal of the Roman Catholic minority is such an appeal as is admissible by subsection 3 of section 93 of the British North America Act of 1867, or by subsection 2 of section 22 of the Manitoba Act of 1870. Are the grounds set forth in the petitions and memorials such as may be the subject of appeal under the authority of the subsections above referred to, or either of them? Does the decision of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, in the cases of Barrett vs. the City of Winnipeg, and Logan vs. the City of Winnipeg, disposed of or concluded, the application for redress based on the contention that the rights of the Roman Catholic majority which accrued to them after the union, under the statutes of the province, have been interfered with by the statutes of 1890 complained of in the said petitions and memorials? Does subsection 3 of section 93 of the British North America Act of 1867 apply to Manitoba? Has His Excellency the Governor General in Council power to make the declarations or remedial orders which are asked for in the said memorials and petitions, assuming the material facts to be as stated therein, or has His Excellency the Governor General in Council any other jurisdiction in the premises? In this case the judgment delivered on 29th January, 1895, was favourable to the minority. On the 4th, 5th and 6th of March, the appeal of the minority was argued before the Privy Council of Canada. On the 29th March, 1895, a remedial order was passed by His Excellency the Governor General in Council, and transmitted to Manitoba. On the 19th June, 1895, the Manitoba legislature refused to give effect to the remedial order, suggesting that a commission be named to inquire into the subject. On the 8th July, 1895, the leader of the House laid down the policy of the Government as being that of waiting until the month of January next to pass remedial legislation. This policy was adopted by the House on 11th July, 1895, by a vote of 82 to 116; and, as is well known, this session of Parliament was called for the purpose of considering remedial legislation. Now, Sir, if I have inflicted the reading of

Sir ADOLPHE CARON.

this long document upon the House, for which I apologize again, I have done so because I felt it was right to lay before the House and the country an exact statement of the statutes regulating this question, together with the different Orders in Council and a history of the proceedings adopted by the Federal Government in their negotiations with the government of Manitoba. I have done this in order to dispel any impression that might still exist, in the minds of hon. gentlemen, that the Government of Canada meant to adopt drastic measures, which, in their nature, could have produced, on the part of the government of Manitoba a feeling of dissatisfaction, or that it meant to injure in any way the feelings of the majority of that province. That would have been a fatal mistake, Mr. Speaker, and I think the record will show, when it is examined, that the proceedings adopted by the Federal Government were such that any such impression, if it exists, must be dispelled. This question has been before the country for a very long time. It is impossible, in the face of the facts, to state that the Government of Canada have been hasty in the measures which they have adopted in relation to this very important question. It has been before the people of Canada one way or the other since 1890. I was under the impression that it was but fair that everything should be attempted to prevent the autonomy of the province of Manitoba being interfered with by the exercise of the federal authority of a jurisdiction which is undoubtedly committed to it by the British North America Act. My statement, I can guarantee, is absolutely correct, it having been taken from official records which have been consulted and copied in very many instances, as can easily be seen by the document itself, and which have enabled me to submit what I consider to be an absolutely reliable historical account of the legislation upon this question, and also the measures adopted by the Federal Government to deal with it in relation to the government of Manitoba. I will now take up another branch of the subject.

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

After Recess.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Mr. Speaker, before recess I stated that I desired to address myself to another branch of the subject. I wish to put upon record the utterances of some of those who took the most prominent part in building up this confederation, and my object in doing so is to show that at that period of the history of the country those men were striving to build up from provinces, separated from each other as they were, which constituted this northern half of the American continent, a confederation,

vast in its extent, whose aspirations would be greater than could be the aspirations of the various colonies belonging to England, and enjoying absolute separate government I wish to put upon record the utterances of men whose names have remained in the history of Canada a legacy to those who have followed them, and whose example I hope will be followed by those who now strive, as they strove, to increase the prosperity and power of Canada. One name, and the first on the list, is that of Hon. Mr. Holton. Although a very much younger man than Mr. Holton, I had the honour and privilege of counting him among my friends, and although we sat on different sides of the House, I have on more than one occasion, as a young man entering Parliament, enjoyed the advantage of his advice, and I say among those who helped to build up confederation no name is worthier of being remembered than that of Hon. Mr. Holton. Mr. Holton, as will be found in the debates of confederation, said at that time :

My object in doing that was to show what were the opinions of these men as to the rights of minorities, and also upon the educational question which at that period, as we know, was a most disturbing element.

Mr. Holton said :

It may not be appropriate by the House generally, especially by the members from Upper Canada, but the hon. gentleman (Mr. Galt) knows well the importance of it.

Speaking on the question of education, he said :

And that the English Protestants of Lower Canada desire to know what is to be done in this matter of education before the final voice of the people of this country is pronounced upon the question of confederations.

Hon. John S. Macdonald said :

I want to know what they are going to do for the Catholic minority of Upper Canada.

Sir George Cartier, then Mr. Cartier, said :

A measure which would have for its effect to give strong central, or local government, which would at once secure and guard the person, the property, and the civil and religious rights, belonging to the population of each section.

Mr. Haultain, one of the strongest champions of the Protestant views of the period, said :

I heard decided objections to this scheme from certain sections of the Protestant minority of Lower Canada. They say it will place them at the mercy of the French-Canadians. I am compelled to say that there is no part of the scheme that I feel more doubt about than the effect it will have upon the educational and political interests of the Protestants of Lower Canada. I heard it said that it would affect in a fair and just manner the educational interests of the Protestant minority, but on the other hand I have heard gentlemen qualified say, although there has not been open hostility to the educational interests there has been a certain amount of obstruction.

Mr. George E. Cartier, replying to Mr. Webb (of Richmond and Wolfe), said :

As a Catholic and as a member of the Canadian Government, I now reiterate that when the measure for the settlement of the local government comes before the House for discussion, it will be such as to satisfy the Protestant minority of Lower Canada.

Hon. Mr. Belleau said :

The hon. member for Wellington (Hon. Mr. Sanborn) laid great stress on the danger which might be incurred by the Protestant minority in the local legislature of Lower Canada. He fears that they may not be sufficiently protected by the Catholic majority in respect of their religion, their schools and possibly their property. I heard that remark with pain ; but I can tell him, the Protestant minority of Lower Canada have nothing to fear from the Catholic majority of that province ; their religion is guaranteed by treaty, and their schools and their rights which may be connected with them, are to be settled by legislation to take place hereafter, and when that legislation is laid before the House, those members who so greatly tremble now for the rights of the Protestant minority, will have an opportunity of protecting that minority, they may then urge their reasons and insist that the Protestant shall not be placed in a position of the slightest danger.

Then, at that period of time, those who foresaw that there might be a possibility of disturbance or trouble in the local legislatures, pointed out the remedy which has been adopted by the present Government, as being the remedy that would apply for the protection of the minority :

But even granting that the Protestants were wronged by the local legislature of Lower Canada, could they not avail themselves of the protection of the federal legislature. And would not the Federal Government exercise strict surveillance over the action of the local legislatures in these matters. This would be protected by the vigilance of the Federal Government, which will never permit the minority of our portion of the confederation to be oppressed by the majority.

Now, Sir, these quotations which I have made show that the idea which permeated the minds of the men who banded together for the purpose of building up confederation, was that the minorities must be protected in so far as their religious interests were concerned, and that, if these interests were not sufficiently protected by the local legislatures, then their remedy would be to appeal before the Federal Parliament. I take great pleasure in quoting from the speech of Sir Richard Cartwright upon confederation. Of course, I need not say that this speech is remarkable for its elegance of diction, and for the views set forth.

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I say so, and I think when I have read it, the hon. gentleman will agree with me.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. We agree with you now.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Sir Richard Cartwright made the following reference to the protection of minorities :—

All I hope is that in adjusting our new constitution, local and general, we shall not allow our minds to be warped by antiquated notions of the dangers which threaten liberty. * * * While it is true, that here as elsewhere, there are always dangers enough to retard our progress, I think that every true reformer, every real friend of liberty will agree with me in saying, that if we must erect safeguards they should be rather for the security of the individual than of the mass, and that our chiefest care must be to train the majority to respect the rights of the minority, to prevent the claims of the few from being trampled under foot by the caprice or passion of the many.

I think that the hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) at that period in his useful career, was absolutely correct, and I take pleasure in quoting the views he expressed then, as a strong indication that the views entertained by those who believe that minorities must be protected at all hazards, are the proper views to be entertained. I quote now from the Hon. George Brown, the leader of the Reform party, who, in 1865 described the situation as it was then. I quote from the confederation debates, page 85 :

WHY UNION TOOK PLACE.

Here is a people composed of two distinct races, speaking different languages, with religious and social and municipal and educational institutions totally different. With sectional hostilities of such a character as to render government for many years well nigh impossible, and yet, Sir, here we sit patiently and temperately discussing how these great evils and hostilities can be justly and amicably swept away for ever. We are endeavouring to adjust harmoniously greater difficulties than have plunged other countries into all the horrors of civil war.

Hon. George Brown goes on to express his views as to the rights of minorities protected in perpetuity. After quoting the proposal concerning the rights and privileges which the Protestant or Catholic minority in both Canadas possessed as to their denominational schools at the time when the union would go into operation, Mr. Brown said :

I admit that from my point of view this is a blot upon the scheme before the House. It is confessedly one of concessions from our side that have to be made, to secure this great measure of reform.

But it is urged that though this arrangement might perhaps be vain as regards Upper Canada, it is not so as regards Lower Canada, for there were matters of which the British population have long complained, and some amendments to the existing School Act were required to secure them equal justice. Well, when this point was raised, gentlemen of all parties in Lower Canada at once expressed themselves prepared to treat it in a frank and conciliatory manner with a view to removing any injustice that might be shown to exist.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON.

Mr. T. C. Wallbridge—That destroys the power of the local legislatures to legislate upon the subject.

Hon. Mr. Brown—I would like to know how much power the hon. gentleman has now to legislate upon it? Let him introduce a Bill to-day to annul the compact of 1863 and repeal all the sectarian school Acts of Upper Canada, and how many votes would he get for it?.....What has rendered prominent public men in one section utterly unpopular in the other in past years? Has it not been our views on trade and commerce? No, Sir; it was our views as to the applying of public money to local purposes—the chartering of ecclesiastical institutions, the granting of money for sectarian purposes, the interference with our school system, &c. A most happy day will it be for Canada when this Bill goes into effect and all these subjects of discord are swept from the discussion of our legislature. But, Mr. Speaker, I am further in favour of this scheme as a remedial measure, because it brings to an end the doubt that has so long hung over our position, and gives a stability to our future, in the eyes of the world, that could not otherwise have been attained.

There is a great deal in what the Hon. Mr. Brown said at that time which might be applied to the situation to-day. He admitted that the local legislatures could not annul the privilege. Mr. Brown and the assembly thus declared that a concession was made and a great principle established—that the rights of the minorities could not be interfered with by the local legislatures. In fact, a national guarantee was given. Now, Sir, I have quoted enough to show the nature of the compact—how it was approached and how it was understood and explained by those who were the fathers of confederation. What has been the position since 1867? Harmony, peace and concord. Shall we reopen an old sore? Shall we go back to chronic discord and religious strife? What I have quoted, I think, indicates that, after the troublesome times of religious strife, which had nearly ruined the prospects of Canada, a spirit of toleration and conciliation spread over Canada, and over those who had at heart the interests of the country, and they were ready to sink their differences and unite together to guarantee to the minority the rights they possessed, and they have enjoyed those rights ever since. To-day we ask that the same rights shall be granted to the minority in the province of Manitoba. Recently, in looking over some old books, it was a curious coincidence at this particular moment, that I opened an old book called a "Digest of the Synod Minutes of the Presbyterian Church of Canada," prepared by the Rev. Mr. Kemp, of the Free Church, of Montreal, in which I read the following passage, which appears in the introduction, and which I quote to show how remarkably well the Catholics and Protestants got on together in the province of Quebec in almost every period of its history :—

About the year 1790, the Presbyterians of Montreal of all denominations, both British and

American, organized themselves into a church, and in the following years secured the services of the Rev. John Young. At this time they met in the Recollet Roman Catholic Church, but in the year following they erected the edifice which is now known as St. Gabriel Street Church, the oldest Protestant Church in the province. In their early minutes we find them, in acknowledgment of the kindness of the Recollet Fathers, presenting them with one box of candles and one hog-head of Spanish wine.

That indicates the state of feeling that existed in 1790, and I hope that we shall not go back on our history and show less toleration to-day.

Now, Sir, I would like to pass to another branch of the question, that is, the respective attitudes of the two great parties towards this question. When the late-lamented Sir John Thompson was leading the Government, and when he had the conduct of this vexed question, he announced in Ontario, in Quebec, in the House, and wherever he had occasion to speak, that the policy of the Government was to stand by the decision of the tribunals; and, Sir, that is the policy which has been faithfully adhered to by the present Government and by the party supporting that Government. It will be within the recollection of every hon. member, that, when the Barrett case was decided against the minority, the minority submitted, because they knew that the policy of the Government was not to import this question into the political arena, but to keep it out of that arena, and to have it decided by the tribunals, where, it was considered, all such matters should be discussed and determined.

Now, Sir, as I wish to avoid wearying the House by reading the declarations of Ministers on this subject, made in Parliament, I ask permission to put in these declarations, which are all taken from the official records. If that is permissible, it will save a great deal of the time of the House.

Mr. LAURIER. Follow the rule.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Then I shall read the declaration of the hon. First Minister (Sir Mackenzie Bowell) to the Senate. He said:

In reply to the hon. leader of the Opposition I am prepared to state the decision at which the Government has arrived on the Manitoba school question. I desire to state that the Government has had under consideration the reply of the Manitoba legislature to the remedial order of the 21st March, 1895, and after careful deliberation has arrived at the following conclusion:—

Though there may be a difference of opinion as to the exact meaning of the reply in question, the Government believes that it may be interpreted as holding out some hope of an amicable settlement of the Manitoba school question on the basis of possible action by the Manitoba government and legislature, and the Dominion Government is most unwilling to take any action which can be interpreted as forestalling or precluding such a desirable consummation.

The Government has also considered the difficulties to be met with in preparing and perfecting

legislation on so important and intricate a question during the last hours of the session.

The Government has, therefore, decided not to ask Parliament to deal with remedial legislation during the present session. A communication will be sent immediately to the Manitoba government on the subject with a view to ascertaining whether that government is disposed to make a settlement of the question which will be reasonably satisfactory to the minority of that province, without making it necessary to call into requisition the powers of the Dominion Parliament.

A session of the present Parliament will be called together to meet not later than the first Thursday of January next. If at that time the Manitoba government fails to make a satisfactory arrangement to remedy the grievance of the minority, the Dominion Government will be prepared, at the next session of Parliament, to be called as above stated, to introduce and press to a conclusion such legislation as will afford an adequate measure of relief to the said minority based upon the lines of the judgment of the Privy Council and the remedial order of the 21st of March, 1895.

This is clear and sufficiently distinct, indicating the policy of the Government upon this very important and intricate question. It must be for Parliament and people of the Dominion to say whether they approve of this policy or not.

The declaration of Mr. Foster is identical in language and is to be found in the "Hansard" of 8th July, 1895.

Now, on the 11th July, 1895, the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster) spoke as follows regarding the resignation of the Ministry:—

I am glad that my hon. friend shows such skill in reading political weather predictions, if I may so denominate them. I have but very few remarks to make in reply to the question which has been put by my hon. friend on previous occasions, and repeated to-day. Some differences arose between members of the Cabinet with reference to the question of remedial legislation. The statement which I made the other day to the House gave the position of the Government on that matter. The differences in the Cabinet arose chiefly on two lines. Some of our colleagues were of the opinion that it was useless, and consequently unnecessary, to prolong negotiation or to enter into further negotiations with the Manitoba government with a view to the settlement by that government of the question—by that government themselves with the powers that they have. The other question of difference arose consequentially from that. They believed that remedial legislation should be introduced at once, starting from the premise that there was nothing to be hoped for from the action of the Manitoba government and legislature itself. I need not reiterate the position of the Government. That was shown in the statement I made the other day in this House. Both these positions were taken in that statement. The one that we would yet grant to Manitoba a certain amount of time, in the hope that negotiations would be entered into and an amicable settlement of this question arrived at. The other was, that in so intricate and important a question, the greatest deliberation was necessary in the perfecting of legislation in the matter, and that no remedial legislation should be introduced this session. These differences of opinion were canvassed by the different members of the Govern-

ment. I regret to say that one of our colleagues, who has not a seat in this House, finds it impossible to accede to the view of the majority of the Government. He still holds very firmly and strongly to his view that remedial legislation should be undertaken and pressed to a conclusion at once; and as he finds it impossible to accede to the view of the majority in that respect, his resignation has not only been sent in but accepted, and he is now no longer a member of this Government, I regret to say. With reference to our two colleagues from the province of Quebec, who have seats in this House, I must say that they showed a disposition to canvass and discuss and look thoroughly into the grounds of difference between their own views and the views of the majority of their colleagues, as expressed in the statement I made the other day to this House, and in the end these differences proved to be rather a misunderstanding as to details than a real divergence of opinion as regards the principles that were involved. At the most it was simply a question of disagreement as to detail. As to the question of principle that remedial legislation was necessary and that it would be introduced by this Government at the next session of Parliament, to be called before the 3rd of January, in the event of the province of Manitoba not making a reasonable and satisfactory settlement of the question—with reference to that matter, I say it was a matter of divergence upon details and not upon principles. On the principle all were agreed, all members of the Cabinet stood side by side with my two hon. friends upon my left, and my hon. friends have been enabled—and wisely and patriotically, I believe, acted in that line—to see that it was a misunderstanding or a disagreement simply upon details, and they have been able to come to the conclusion that in the statement which was made on Monday last by me, the remedial legislation was actually and positively promised, and that there is no intention at all of going one single jot outside that statement, and that our intention is to carry out in perfect good faith the statement of the Government on Monday last. Having come to that conclusion, my two hon. friends, the Postmaster General and the Minister of Public Works, have believed it to be their duty which they owe to their party, to their country, and to the cause which they themselves have deeply at heart, to work in harmony with their former and present colleagues, and that we should stand together and carry out the policy of the Government in this way.

I wish to refer to the declarations made by other members of the Government, when addressing public meetings in the various parts of Canada. Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper said at Sydney:

I am a Protestant and firmly cling to my faith, but I desire justice, fair play, and constitutional treatment for all. We must abide by our parliamentary compact, and I am ready to sacrifice my political career, if that be the price for doing that justice to the Catholic minority which I would fight to obtain for the Protestant minority under similar circumstances.

Mr. Haggart, at Smith's Falls, stated also:

The question may be settled, as I think it will be, by the people of Manitoba, but the possibilities are that it may have to be settled by the Dominion Government. We will settle it, as the hon. Finance Minister said it is our duty to do, and as the law and constitution require us to do.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON.

Our policy with regard to the question has been fairly and squarely stated by the Finance Minister. The policy of the Government as to that has been stated by him in the House of Commons, and on this question there has been no discussion in the Cabinet.

And Mr. Foster, at Smith's Falls, said:

I tell you plainly that on the broad principle of it, I am in favour of public schools. I am not in favour so much of separate schools, but I stand here, not as a private citizen, but as a member of this Government and as a public man, not free to carry my personal likes or dislikes into the settlement of a question which is lodged in the very kernel of the constitution which I am sworn to settle according to my belief as to how the constitution meant it. That is my position; look at it fairly and squarely.

I am sorry, from the fact that the rules of the House require it, that I have had to read in extenso, these declarations, as I wish them to appear in "Hansard." This is the position of the Conservative party; this is the position which has been taken and consistently followed by the Government and which has resulted in the present session being called for the purpose of carrying out the promise made that this question should be settled. But I wish to ask hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House, and I wish to ask the people of the country, whether the attitude of hon. gentlemen sitting to your left, Mr. Speaker, has been equally consistent and whether it has not at different periods and in different places varied very considerably. I quote now from "Hansard" of 1893, page 1882, where Mr. Laurier is reported as follows:—

The question after all is a simple one. In 1890 the legislature of Manitoba passed a law which the Roman Catholic minority deemed oppressive; that minority appealed to the Government against that law; this prayer has to be denied or has to be granted; this is the simple issue.

At page 1982 of the "Hansard" of 1893, Mr. Laurier says:

The question is a difficult one—I admit that it is surrounded with difficulties—because it is surrounded with passions, passions religious and national.

And again at page 2004 of the "Hansard" of 1893:

I blame the Government even now for not having done sooner—

Just fancy, Mr. Speaker, in 1893, the hon. gentleman found that we were not moving fast enough, and to-day he is proposing that we should put off for six months longer the settlement of this vexed and irritating question:

—I blame them for those long delays * * * after procrastination, after long delays, shifting of expedients, subterfuge, at last the Government will have to pronounce a decision.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I like to hear my hon. friend from L'Islet (Mr. Tarte) applaud—

ing "subterfuges" and "procrastinations." He also has changed his ground upon this question upon more than one occasion. Again Mr. Laurier is reported as having said, in 1894 :

The longer this question is kept before the public the worse it is for the good of Canada.

But now it is to be kept for six months more before the public "for the good of Canada."

It is a question to which there should be an immediate and speedy answer.

I am quoting the words of the hon. leader of the Opposition, although from the speech you heard from him a few days ago you would not imagine the same gentleman was speaking, seeing that he expresses such different views in such an absolutely positive manner as he did yesterday. Again I quote from Mr. Laurier's speech in the House of Commons, as given in the "Hansard" of 1895, page 4502 :

Something must be done and done at once—
Done at once, you will observe, Mr. Speaker.

—because this policy of delay, this policy of vacillation is not only paralyzing, but it is fast disintegrating national life ; I say because it is arraying creed against creed, race against race, something must be done and done at once.

Well, if in 1895 it was arraying creed against creed and race against race, is it wise to continue such a state of affairs ? The proposition of the Government is to adopt a measure which, according to my judgment is a fair measure and one that is acceptable to the minority.

An hon. MEMBER. Not at all.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I do not presume that my statement settles the question between us, but I venture the statement that this Bill is satisfactory to the minority. In Toronto, on 5th February, 1895, Mr. Laurier said, as reported by the "Globe :

The question is a legal one that is before the Government to answer to-day.

In those times it was always "to-day" with the hon. gentleman ; to-morrow would be too late. In 1895 the question had to be settled immediately, as it was arraying race against race and creed against creed. But now the hon. gentleman thinks that this arraying of race against race and creed against creed should continue for six months longer :

I do not desire at the present time to say anything to make their position more difficult than it is. It is a difficult question.

The hon. gentleman always displays a great deal of kindness when he finds the Government in a difficulty :

For my part, I must tell you frankly that I see in the question but a question of fact. I never saw any question of law or interpretation of the constitution. I think it was a question of fact and nothing else.

Again :

This is not a political question at the present time * * * To-day it is purely a judicial question.

Well, we took that view of the matter, that it is a purely judicial question, and for that reason we followed the course that was pointed out to us by the Hon. Edward Blake and the leader of the Opposition in transferring the question to the tribunals which should decide it. Mr. Laurier, speaking at Morrisburg, 8th October, 1895, the "Globe" report again—it will be seen that there is a great change in the hon. gentleman's views—said :

The first thing they must do is to investigate this question. Let the Government do this and appoint a commission and I will support them.

What has become of the commission ? It is no longer spoken of. The policy of the leader of the Opposition to-day is simply to turn the Bill out of the House—no investigation, nothing but simply give the Bill the six months' hoist. Mr. Laurier at Prescott, 9th October, 1895, "Globe" report, said :

He asked his fellow-countrymen to divest themselves for the moment of party and religious differences, and appealed to them if they did not think that the better way of dealing with this question was by such an investigation upon the result of which the Government could act.

Here again we see the change that has taken place. Then there was a possibility of a commission ; to-day there is no possibility of anything at all. The hon. gentleman will not even admit the principle of the Bill, but as the leader of the Opposition, moves the six months' hoist. Mr. Laurier in the House of Commons on the 19th of April, 1895, said, as reported in "Hansard," page 38 :

The Order in Council is termed a decision. I do not understand that term exactly. As I read it, and I read it pretty carefully, it cannot be called a decision, it is simply an invitation—

That is not very drastic—simply an invitation.

—to the government of Manitoba to deal with that question, and to leave them to apply the remedy to the evil which had been created by their own legislation—an invitation, I say, though I am sorry to say, couched in most unfortunate language.

Mr. Laurier in the House of Commons on 15th July, 1895, said :

We had an order passed by the Government commanding the province of Manitoba to restore the schools of the minority, commanding it to do so under the threat that if it failed to obey this Parliament would force schools upon them.

I do not see, Mr. Speaker, how the remedial order can be looked upon in the light of a threat. The remedial order is based, upon the judgment of the Privy Council, and the phraseology used in that order is the phrase-

ology which is proper for an Order in Council based upon a judgment.

The course taken by the Government was to prepare a drastic Order in Council calling upon the Manitoba government to restore the separate schools, or failing it, they would do it by the supreme authority of Parliament. Could a more imprudent course ever be taken?

Now, again, on page 38 of the "Hansard," the hon. leader of the Opposition says:

If there is such an outrageous state of things prevailing in Manitoba, not a moment is to be lost in coming to the rescue of the oppressed minority.

That was in 1893. The hon. gentleman said then there was not a moment to be lost in coming to the rescue of the oppressed in Manitoba, if they were placed in such a position as that. But since then he has changed his views completely, as I have shown by these quotations. At Morrisburg again the hon. gentleman says, quoting from the "Globe" report:

Those facts are clear to you, and to all who believe in a system of separate schools.

Again, in the same place:

The question cannot be settled until there has been such an investigation. * * * *
If I were in power, and if I had the responsibility, I would try the sunny way, I would approach this man Greenway with the sunny way of patriotism.

These are very charming expressions, but I am afraid that when the hon. gentleman came to put the sunny way into practice he would find that it would not go very far. I think it would be necessary to use other means, although the one suggested by the leader of the Opposition may be much more agreeable. Now, Sir, I quote the "Cultivateur," a paper published by the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte).

An hon. MEMBER. A fine paper, too.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I know the proprietor is a very fine writer. I will read some quotations from that paper giving the writer's views of the hon. gentleman's speech at Chicoutimi:

Mr. Laurier reiterated amidst indescribable enthusiasm his solemn engagement to re-establish the Catholic schools on his arrival in power.

That will take more than six months, to which date he wishes to hoist this Bill. If the hon. gentleman is going to keep the minority waiting for ever, I am sure he is not treating that minority as I think they are entitled to be treated. Now, here is what the hon. gentleman said at Sorel, in August, 1895, according to the "Globe" report:

He knew those Conservative papers well. They would be delighted, it would seem, if he said a word about separate schools.

From that quotation it would appear that the hon. gentleman never uttered a word

Sir ADOLPHE CARON.

at all about the school question. Still, I have been quoting extensively the different views which he expressed at various times and at various places:

In Quebec those pious Conservative newspapers were Catholics; in Ontario they were Protestants. In Quebec the saintly "Minerve," Sir Adolphe Caron, Mr. Ouimet and the Ultramontanes, were listening to him with clubs in their hands, ready to down him if he said a single word about the school question, and in Ontario, Mr. Clarke Wallace, Sir Mackenzie Bowell and the Tory and Orange papers, were watching him with another club ready to strike him if he dared to say a word on the same question.

Well, between those two clubs the hon. gentleman has been obliged, evidently, to make many different statements upon this question which is now before Parliament. In August, 1895, the hon. gentleman said at Sorel, according to the "Globe" report:

Now, he had expressed his views on the school question on many occasions and in many parts of the Dominion. He had said over and over again, that it was a question of fact, and that the Federal Government had a right to interfere, but it had never yet interfered. It had shuffled---

You can see, Mr. Speaker, when he was speaking in Sorel, where he was not threatened by the club of Clarke Wallace, he again complains of delay. He says:

It had shuffled and dallied with the question all along.

Then Mr. Paraud's paper, the "L'Electeur," interprets Mr. Laurier's speech made in the House of Commons in April, 1895, as follows:--

Mr. Laurier has pronounced himself boldly for the re-establishment of separate schools in Manitoba.

"Boldly," the word is very appropriate, considering the motion that has been presented to the House. There is a great deal of boldness in kicking out a Bill which is intended to settle the separate school question. But at Sorel, the hon. leader of the Opposition pronounced himself boldly for the re-establishment of separate schools in Manitoba, and vigorously reproached the Government for not having interfered more promptly. But how can he, at Sorel, attack the Government for not interfering more promptly, when he wants now to prevent the Government from interfering for six months longer? I do not see how the hon. gentleman can reconcile these contradictory statements. The Winnipeg "Tribune" interpreted the speech of the leader of the Opposition made in the House of Commons on April 19, 1895, as follows:--

Mr. Laurier's declaration in Parliament on Monday is that if called upon to deal with the vexed question, he will stand upon the broad principle of provincial rights---

Another new idea.

—and decline to interfere with the province, beyond making a request for the fairest treatment

of the minority under the circumstances. We are sure Mr. Laurier does not believe in separate schools.

I am beginning to believe it myself, Mr. Speaker, from the conduct the hon. gentleman has followed in relation to this question.

He is too advanced and liberal a thinker to endorse them.

So that from his liberality, and his being a great thinker, the minority would never have a chance of seeing this vexed question settled by my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition. Now, Sir, I have heard it stated as an excuse why separate schools in Manitoba were objected to by some people, and even by some hon. gentlemen in this House, that education in the province of Quebec is not equal to education in other portions of the Dominion. Well, Sir, I think I can speak upon that question, coming from the province of Quebec. I think it is possible to show beyond a doubt from the history of that province that the system of education which has turned out some of the most eminent men in church and state, must be equal to the education which is to be found in other portions of the Dominion. But I will take, on this point, a witness that cannot be questioned, I will take the evidence of the daily "Sun," of St. John, N.B., whose editor visited the Columbian Exposition held in Chicago. The gentleman who wrote that article, I have been able to ascertain, is a man well versed in educational matters, and well able to judge whereof he speaks. He quotes page 33 of the report of the provincial secretary on the Columbian Exhibition, and this is what he says :

In drawing, writing, models for teaching the blind, education of deaf mutes, and in fact generally all that tends to the advancement of a country and a people in an educational point of view, Quebec schools are in the front rank.

I am satisfied with that evidence, given by one who is foreign to our province, and I place it against the statements made by hon. gentlemen belonging to that province who attack the educational institutions which we possess there.

I have one more branch of the subject to treat, and I will treat it briefly.

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I can sympathize with the hon. gentleman ; I am quite certain I have been too long already, but I promise not to do it again. The leader of the Opposition the other day in one of his most eloquent and brilliant strains, made a speech which was certainly very interesting, interesting from the fact that it treated of various questions, and spoke a little of the school question. But I want in the most friendly way to criticise some of the remarks made by the hon. gentleman on that occasion. The hon. gentleman commenced his speech by appealing to Canadians in the

name of the constitution and of the minority, not to go beyond this with the Bill before the House. The constitution and the interests of the minority constitute the very reasons which have impelled the Government to bring down this legislation. So upon that ground it is quite impossible for us to agree. But the hon. gentleman said we were compelled to bring down the measure. The Secretary of State, he said, "was brought back to Canada to force the Bill down the throats of Canadians." Well, Sir, the hon. gentleman is so anxious to have a hit at the Secretary of State that he and his friends hit wildly in place and out of place. The leader of the Opposition knows well that long before the Secretary of State came from England the policy of the Government on the school question had been definitely settled ; and it was because the hon. gentleman viewed that question in accordance with the settled policy, as enunciated by the leader of the Government and by the then leader of this House, that he accepted a seat in the Government whose fixed policy was to bring remedial legislation before Parliament and to stake its existence as a government on the settlement of that question.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Hear, hear.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The hon. gentleman, as he and hon. gentlemen opposite have acted in all debates in which they have taken part, gave a painful description, which no doubt will be circulated abroad, of the strife, trouble and dissension which exist in Canada. I am not aware of all this strife, trouble and dissension. The little trouble which exists at the present moment in Manitoba is exactly what we are trying to settle and remove from the national life of Canada, and we wish to remove it from the national life of Canada because we desire to bring out to our vast prairies and to the great province of British Columbia the surplus population of the old country. By what means can you induce the surplus population to come and settle in a country when it is divided by religious and sectional strife and dissension ? Let me say to the hon. gentleman that as a Canadian I feel that to call special attention to trouble, dissension and strife as existing, is hurtful to the interests of this Dominion, and I deeply regret it. But if it does exist, it may be due to the fact that the hon. gentleman and his friends have been preaching it so long that outside people have begun to believe it exists in Canada.

"In 1870, by the power vested in it," the hon. gentleman (Mr. Laurier) said, "the Manitoba legislature abolished separate schools." As I understand the Barrett case, and I speak after having studied it, and I believe I understand it, it was decided by the court that the legislature of Manitoba had the right to pass a law changing their system of schools. In the Brophy case it

was decided by the Privy Council that rights had been taken away from the minority, and that this minority had the right under the constitution to call upon the Federal Government to restore those rights, to appeal to the Governor General in Council to apply a remedy as regards the removal of those rights. The hon. gentleman said "in 1890,"—and he made quite a point of these words, and hon. gentlemen opposite evidently thought that it was a strong point, for they applauded very much—"four Acts came before the Government; one, to abolish the French language; two, respecting the quarantine of cattle; three, with respect to joint stock companies; four, the School Act." and, he continued, "of all those Bills the only one that was not vetoed by the Government was the School Act."

Mr. LANGELIER. There were two.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Yes, there were two, the other being that to abolish the French language. Does the hon. gentleman not see any distinction between a cattle quarantine Bill and a Bill affecting the rights of the minority of Manitoba? Mr. Blake framed a resolution for the purpose of removing from the political arena a question that he supposed and we supposed was going to prove an irritating one to the people of Canada, and this resolution was unanimously adopted by this House. Does not the hon. leader of the Opposition see a difference between that resolution and a cattle quarantine Bill? The reason why the School Bill was not vetoed was because, acting upon the resolution proposed by Mr. Blake and adopted by this House unanimously as regards this question, we appealed to the legal tribunals instead of vetoing the Bill, and I think we were right in doing so. The hon. gentleman made another point about evidence not having been submitted, and he referred to affidavits which were published in the blue-books, and which were withdrawn when the argument was made before the Privy Council. Well, Sir, Mr. Ewart did not rest his case upon these affidavits. He rested his case upon the facts, as explained in the petitions of the minority. He rested his case upon the judgment of the Privy Council, and the reason why these affidavits were put in the blue-book after being withdrawn is simply because we thought the record would not be complete without them. We thought it was due to Parliament that we should show Parliament all the proceedings which had taken place before the committee of the Canadian Privy Council, sitting as a judicial tribunal, and these affidavits were published so as to make the record absolutely complete. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Laurier) wishes to investigate, first, if schools had been promised the Catholic minority; second, if the existing schools are against the conscience of the minority, and, third, if they are Protestant schools. Well, Sir, as to separat

Sir ADOLPHE CARON.

schools being promised, he has the statements of Mgr. Taché and of Sir Donald Smith upon that point. As to the existing schools being against the conscience of the people, it seems to me that the investigation would not need to be very long. What stronger evidence can there be that the present Manitoba schools are Protestant than is to be found in the fact that when it was proposed to secularize these schools, every clergyman belonging to the Protestant Church protested against religious teaching being abandoned in them. Now, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Laurier) also made the statement that Sir Donald Smith had been sent to Manitoba by this Government. Sir, I wish to meet that statement simply by denial. Sir Donald Smith himself has already denied it. As a member of the Government, I can say, as far as my own personal knowledge goes, and as well as the knowledge I have been able to get from my colleagues, none of us knew he was going on any particular mission to Manitoba. I do not even know now that he was on such a mission, although, from his close connection with Manitoba and the North-west, it would not be surprising to me if the hon. gentleman (Sir Donald Smith) had frequent interviews with Mr. Greenway and others up there. I can understand, Sir, the proposal for a commission to investigate made by the leader of the Opposition some time ago, I could understand the proposition from the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte) to have a committee of the House to investigate, because those two propositions admit the principle of the Bill; but when a gentleman of the vast parliamentary experience of the leader of the Opposition moves the six months' hoist, he cannot deny that it is the strongest possible negative that could be given to any measure. I wish to say one word, Mr. Speaker, about what, according to my view, was a painful reference made by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Laurier) to what he called a threat of the church, or of a member of the church. Sir, if the threat was not more definite than the explanation of it given by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Laurier), I am sure it was not a very serious threat. But, Sir, it is not usual for members of the Catholic clergy to threaten anybody. The hon. gentleman himself admits that clergymen, as citizens, have a right to hold the strongest possible views on political and public matters. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Laurier) admits that members of the clergy can carry out these views to the extent of voting for or against principles which are contrary to theirs. Well, if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Laurier) goes that far, he must agree that members of the clergy have a right to tell a person or a party: If you entertain such views, I cannot endorse them, and I am prepared to vote against them. That is the right of the clergy, and, Mr. Speaker, why should it not be? Are not the clergy of Canada a na-

tional clergy? Are not the clergy of Canada composed of the sons of the men and women of Canada? Have not our clergy the same training as those who have not adopted as perfect a life as they have chosen to select? And, Sir, under their monastic gowns, do not their hearts beat as warmly for Canada as do the hearts of the laymen? May I be permitted, Sir, to mention an instance? My only brother, a Redemptorist, is labouring in St. Thomas, West India Islands, among the blacks, and in July last I received a letter from him, in which he told me that he had just completed a new home for his co-workers in that island, and he wrote to me: If it is not too much trouble or too much expense, would you send out to me a Canadian flag, because on our holidays and on the days when we rejoice, I should like to see the flag of Canada floating above the home of the Redemptorist Fathers here. And, Sir, I have a sister who is a nun in Durban, Natal, and when she writes home she is as anxious to know about how Canada is getting on as she is anxious to know about the interests of her own family. Of such are the clergy of Canada and the religious orders of Canada, composed. Sir, we are proud of our clergy. We are proud to follow them. Read the history of Canada from beginning to end. Point out to me a critical period in the history of our country during which the clergymen of Canada did not lead the people, loyal always because they were led by the clergy, loyal to the country and loyal to the Crown. In 1812, when our people were under the sorest temptation to give up their allegiance to England, because of the promises held out by the Americans, what course did the clergy of Canada take? Even in that period of 1837, when the sentiments of the French race were more moved than at any other period, when some of our own people were fighting for constitutional rights, but ignored the constitutional way in which those rights should have been vindicated, what course did the clergy of Canada take? Did not we then see the archbishops and the bishops publishing mandaments all through the country telling the people that their duty was to remain true to the Crown, and to respect the constituted authority. Why should we not follow such a lead? Sir, I do not wish to be misunderstood, and I am not insinuating that the hon. gentleman, the leader of the Opposition, attacked the clergy; but carried away in the discussion, the hon. the leader of the Opposition said that he had been attacked by the clergy. My contention, Sir, is that it is not the habit of our clergy to threaten. I know not what the threat to which the hon. gentleman refers was? If he referred to the letters which have been published in the newspapers, I do not see how that could be construed into a threat. I speak here in the presence of men from the province of Ontario, whom I have known when I was

engaged in campaigns under the leadership of the great old leader of the Conservative party, Sir John A. Macdonald, and under the leadership of that other great man whose loss we deplore, Sir John Thompson. I know that my fellow-countrymen from Ontario are fair-minded men, and I have always been treated by them as a brother and a friend. I know that these gentlemen cannot be led to believe that the French-Canadian Catholics or the French-Canadian clergy are not true and loyal to the Crown of England and to the flag of Canada. I can speak for them, because I have had every possible opportunity of studying their past history and the history of their present movements, and I am unable to find an instance in which it can be stated that the clergy of Canada have been disloyal. I ask again, where did the threat come from? It was painful to me to hear the hon. gentleman make the remark he did.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me apologize for having kept the House so long. But before I sit down, I must mention a piece of badinage which was communicated to me to-day. It was said that the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) was complaining sadly of the hon. leader of the Opposition. In sadness and grief, he said: The leader of the Opposition has taken everything away from me; he has taken my motion away, and now he is taking from me my position as the leader of the strong Protestant element of Ontario.

Mr. GEOFFRION. Mr. Speaker, after the conclusion of the speech of the hon. member (Sir Adolphe Caron) who has just preceded me, I will endeavour to be cool, because I realize the importance of the question now before the House, and I do not want to stir the passions of anybody. I will try to reason with hon. members on this question. I have been listening to strong arguments from the opposite side in favour of equal justice to minorities. Appeals have been made to the constitution in support of those arguments. I am just as anxious as hon. gentlemen opposite are that justice should be rendered and that our constitution should be respected. But I most emphatically say that this Bill, which I have now before me, does not render justice, and I am most decidedly in favour of voting the six months' hoist, because the acceptance of such a Bill would be a delusion and a denial of justice. It has the label of a Remedial Act, but I do not see the remedy. If there were not so many weak points in the Bill, if it were possible to amend it, I would hesitate to pronounce at once against it, and to vote against it, in toto. But it cannot be amended. I do not know who is the father of the Bill. I do not know whether it has several fathers, or only one. I do not know whether they have so framed the Bill on purpose or by accident, but they could not have made it worse. It is evidently not by ac-

cident, but intentionally, framed so that it may be no remedy. It is of no use to repeat that at last justice shall be rendered to the minority of Manitoba. As this Bill, if passed, will, in my opinion, exhaust the remedial legislation which is to be introduced pursuant to the order adopted by the Government, it will leave the Catholics of Manitoba in a worse position than they would occupy if this Bill did not pass.

Mr. McALISTER. May I ask the hon. gentleman if he objects to the principle of the Bill?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. LISTER. There is no principle about it.

Mr. GEOFFRION. Mr. Speaker, you cannot have schools without money, you cannot have teachers without money; and not only does this Bill, in clause 74, deny a part of the grant to the separate schools which might be established under it, but under the whole organization of the Bill, it is almost impossible even to levy on the ratepayers the money necessary to support the Catholic schools. The clause authorizing any Catholic to exercise his option in favour of public schools is most dangerous. At first sight, it appears to be fair; but if you establish separate schools, there is no coercion in obliging Catholics to support the schools of their own creed. To allow some Catholics the privilege of not joining the separate schools is to remove from the minds of the Catholics the possibility of supporting them. Mr. Speaker, I will give an instance to show how the support of these schools is taken away by the Bill itself. I have to go into these details, because, as I say, I believe the Bill is no Remedial Act at all. A Catholic may declare that he intends to join the public school. It is clear that parties contributing to the public schools will be taxed a smaller amount than those who are not assisted by any public grant, and who, being a minority, have to support their separate schools. A Catholic will have the option of declaring that he intends to contribute towards the public schools, and, at the same time, he is entitled to send his children to the Catholic schools at the rate of 50 cents a month. We also find in the law that loans may be made and debentures issued, to build schools; and it is not even provided in the Bill that when a debt has been incurred for that purpose, the Catholic who shall exercise his option to join the public school shall be bound to contribute to the debt. Therefore, as soon as a thousand dollars have been spent to build a school, if any number of Catholic ratepayers—who might sometimes be the majority—should wish to avoid contributing to that debt in a certain district, they would exercise their option of giving notice that they wish to join the public school. In such a case, where will be the ratepayers to pay the

Mr. GEOFFRION.

debentures for building the Catholic school, or to support it? And after all that is done, a Catholic ratepayer may still exercise his option of sending his children to the Catholic school by paying 50 cents a month. Therefore, if the separate schools are deprived of public grants and of the support of the ratepayers, how could they possibly exist or be established in the province of Manitoba? And if that be so, you will admit the principle, that separate schools ought to be established, and deny to a certain extent their existence. Not quite a year ago, I was called upon, in another place than here, to express my opinion upon remedial legislation in Manitoba. I was then a candidate in the county of Verchères, and the remedial order had been passed about a month before that. In fact, I believe the election was intentionally postponed on account of the remedial order, so as to make it a test in Verchères. My late lamented brother had died in July previous, and it was only in the following April that the Government found it necessary to replace him, and, by a peculiar coincidence, the remedial order had been passed about a month previous. I stated at Verchères before the electors, as I state here, that my feelings are in favour of remedial legislation. Both as regards creed and race, my sympathies are with the minority of Manitoba; and I stated at Verchères, as I do here, that I am ever ready to support or contribute in the best way I can to the passing of any legislation that will remedy the grievances of the minority in Manitoba. The hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Ouimet) was present at the time. I stated, in his presence, that I had no confidence in the present Government, and that I could not believe in the famous remedial order, then shown to me. I told the hon. Minister that, if he were ready to show me a law, if he could show me a measure drafted which would do justice to the province of Manitoba, I would at once declare—not that I would support the Government, because that I never will—but that I would support the measure. Then the hon. Minister held up the remedial order, and said: This is the law. It is not yet enacted, he said, but the Government is pledged, the honour of the Crown is pledged, and whatever law is to be passed will be according to that remedial order.

Mr. OUIMET. Mr. McCarthy will show that to-morrow.

Mr. GEOFFRION. Well, you showed the remedial order, and the people did not believe you, but they believed me. They voted for the man who promised that he would be in favour of remedial legislation, and I am still in favour of it; but, when I examine this Bill and seek in it the provisions of the remedial order, I find that the most important part of the remedial

order is omitted. I find that the right to a proportion of the grant to the public schools is removed from this measure, although that right is one of the privileges recognized by the Privy Council, and is one of the privileges which was embraced in the remedial order. Now, this promise was made and was not kept, and I am here to vote against a Bill which is not carrying out the promise made on both sides in that county. I do not care to take up too much of the time of the House upon the details of the Bill, but I will at once say that this Bill is framed in such a way that, in the hands of an unwilling government, or an unwilling party charged to apply that law, it will be of no avail. The presumption, of course, is, that a government which passes its own laws will execute such laws fairly; but, when the laws are by way of a judgment, when the law is a condemnation of the parties by a court of higher jurisdiction, to do the thing which they are averse to doing, the adverse presumption is, that, instead of executing the law in good faith, they will only do what they are bound to do, and nothing else. And that is where lies the danger of a Remedial Act of this nature. I have heard the term "drastic measure" used. I am not in favour of a drastic measure; but, if this Parliament is to pass a remedial law, let it be stringent, let it be positive—do not leave any door open by which the party charged with its execution may evade the law. There is, I know, danger in such legislation. I know how bitter the feelings in Manitoba would be, if a law such as I understand ought to be passed, were to be enacted by this Parliament; and that is why I would be in favour of negotiations, that is why I think that negotiations, conciliation, if possible, ought to be first tried.

I have heard it stated somewhere, that a distinguished member of the opposite party has expressed his regret that more attempts were not made to have this law repealed or modified by the legislature of Manitoba itself. The first clause at once leaves to the Lieutenant Governor in Council of Manitoba the right to constitute the Board of Education. I need not say that, as this is a kind of order, a kind of judgment, which has to be passed against the province of Manitoba, the Manitoba government may at once entrust the execution and administration of this law to parties so unwilling and hostile that actually nothing will be done. The powers of that Board of Education are considerable. They are to select the books, organize school districts, make by-laws for the administration of the funds from whatever source the money may come, and you see at once that an unwilling board may actually make a dead letter of this law. They select the books, but even in that respect this law is, on its face, an insult to the very Board of Education which is to be entrusted with its administration.

That board is not considered qualified to make the selection of its own books. It is ordered by this law to use either the public school books of Manitoba or the books of the Ontario separate schools. Why this distinction? Why not leave to the Board of Education of Manitoba the same discretion which is left to the Board of Education of Ontario, or to the Board of Education that deals with our separate schools in Quebec, or to Boards of Education generally, in the selection of their own books?

It is something unbearable for a province to say: You shall copy another province; you shall go for your law, you shall go for your books to another province. We are told that a Board of Education created under such circumstances will act with the intention of carrying out the law. Mr. Speaker, I am sure it is impossible to expect the same. I have mentioned clause 74; I need not go over that any more; it is so clear that this ought to be altogether replaced and the old draft of the law, as I understand it to be, reinstated. Now, the Catholic minority of Manitoba is entitled to separate schools—I may call them also public schools, for they are public schools for the purposes of that population—but why deprive them of the right of their proportion of the public funds? Why not support them, if it is not the intention once again to let them fall to the ground so that in a few years there will be separate schools. Because, under these provisions, the public schools will ultimately become so much superior to the separate schools that all, or at least a great majority of the people will use their option in favour of the public schools and the separate schools will be empty. Also, we see how expensive these separate schools may be. By section 23 we find that five heads of families can obtain the establishment of a separate school. They will have to tax themselves at least \$20 a month, and they will be subject to another tax of 25 per cent more, or \$5 a month more. Then, under section 24, a supplementary levy may be made, so that five people having children may find themselves obliged to pay \$30 or \$40 a month to support their schools. And this while the Protestants in the neighbourhood, who do not have a separate school will pay only 50 cents a month.

Mr. OUIMET. While the hon. gentleman is looking over his notes, I would like to ask, with reference to these so-called inferior schools, if he has read Mr. Ewart's letter that during last winter there were forty-four Protestant children attending these "inferior" schools, though they are kept by people who pay their taxes to the public schools and then out of their private funds support schools of such a superior character that Protestant parents send their children to them?

Mr. GEOFFRION. The hon. gentleman may rest assured that I did not claim that

the schools now existing in Manitoba were inferior, especially those to which reference is made by Mr. Ewart. What I claim is that the schools that will have to be maintained under this Act will necessarily become inferior. But while I say that, I do not wish to be understood as saying that Catholic schools are inferior to Protestant schools. Far from it. It was from the other side of the House that I heard an hon. gentleman yesterday making unfavourable comparison of the separate schools with the public schools. All I can say is that if you judge of the tree by its fruit, it must not be forgotten that the leader of the Opposition was educated in a Catholic school, and the hon. member who attacked these schools was educated. I suppose, in Protestant schools. An answer may be made to the objection that the Catholic schools will be deserted by reason of the right of option which is given to Catholics to join the public school. It may be said that the hierarchy will prohibit Catholics from joining public schools and will thus force them to join separate schools. Well, why not make it the law? Why be obliged to look to another power to force them to send their children to the separate schools? There is another point. A large amount of property in Manitoba, as in other provinces—but probably more in Manitoba than elsewhere in the Dominion—is held by non-residents. And do you believe that non-residents not sending their children to school there, will not at once make their option in favour of the public school so that they may be taxed less? Do you not believe that Catholics, after all, are like other people, and like to keep their money? Where a man has to make his option, having in view the fact that his children must attend the school he supports, he may have conscientious scruples; but there will be no conscientious scruples where they have no children to send to the schools. Whence will come the support of the schools so far as the non-resident landowners are concerned, if you give them the opportunity of exemption from the support of the separate schools? Again, as I have already stated, the power is given to the school commissioners or school trustees to borrow money. Now, if you read the separate school law of Ontario or Quebec you will find that when a party makes his option and supports the separate schools, his land shall remain liable for payment of the debt contracted. That is to say, if the school section issues debentures, payable in twenty years, and a landowner who was a supporter of the separate schools when the debentures were issued, decides to abandon the separate schools and to support the other, his property, nevertheless, remains charged with the debentures. I have read this Bill with much care, and I find that all the parties who make option and join the separate schools are liable only for the assessment for the current year. So that if in a district having twenty sep-

Mr. GEOFFRION.

arate school supporters, debentures are issued and a school built, ten or fifteen of the people may afterwards become supporters of the public schools and leave the debentures to be paid by the ten or five who remain. Still further, here are schools that are not subsidized and probably will not be subsidized by the government. By virtue of what right, then, do you oblige these schools to receive outsiders at a rate less than the supporters of these schools have to pay?

Section 112 is rather a strange provision, also. I may be wrong, but I am satisfied that such an appeal is exhausted and rendered impossible by the law we are asked to pass to-day. I contend that by legislating now in connection with the schools of Manitoba, we remove for ever the right to legislate hereafter for those schools. I claim that this appeal can exist only when there is a grievance, and when a new appeal is taken a grievance may be found to exist. But how can we find a grievance if this imperfect law is strictly applied and executed? There will be no grievance if there is no violation of the law; and consequently, if the government of Manitoba refused to make any grants of public money to these separate schools, or if they appointed a Board of Education which would make by-laws or regulations under which these schools would be hardly available, it would not be any grievance; it would not be a grievance as long as they executed the law; and therefore this saving clause, according to my view, is calculated rather to deceive than to protect anybody's rights. Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to deal at any greater length with the details of the Bill. I am satisfied that we are not in a position to legislate at present in this direction. It has been said, and I find it everywhere repeated, that such legislation as is here proposed should be based on facts. We have to investigate the facts; and as I said, it may be imprudent on my part, but I cannot blame those who desire to investigate before passing this legislation. As far as I am concerned, I would be ready to vote for a remedial law, but perhaps in doing so I would be yielding to my prejudices. Mr. Speaker, we have heard much about a strife of creeds and races. I am opposed to anything that will stir up such a strife; but you cannot abolish the bonds of creed and race; I say more, it is not desirable that those bonds should be abolished. I claim that you can build up a strong nation with different races. What is Great Britain after all but a combination of various races? Can you suppress the Scotchman? You may call him an Englishman as much as you like, but he will always call himself a Scotchman. And so with the Irishman.

An hon. MEMBER. And the Frenchman.

Mr. GEOFFRION. You cannot suppress a Frenchman, either. As I say, it is well that these bonds should exist. You can no more

suppress the bonds of race than you can suppress the bonds of family. And when I now claim justice for the Catholics of Manitoba, I say I may perhaps be yielding to a prejudice, but I cannot blame those who desire to investigate further before passing this legislation. Now, a good deal was said by the hon. Postmaster General about the six months' hoist. Sir, I think that is the only thing you can do with this Bill. As I said before, it cannot be amended; in order to amend it you will have to make a new Bill; and considering that this Parliament can last but a few weeks longer, the best thing we can do with the Bill is to give it the six months' hoist. Sir, having decided to vote against this Bill, I repeat that I shall do so, not because I am opposed to remedial legislation. On the contrary, I stated last year, that I had no confidence in the promises that were made on behalf of the Government by one of the Ministers; but I have a strong faith that our leader will be able to succeed where the Government are sure to fail. I have full confidence in my party, and not only in the leader of my party, but in his lieutenants. I am a full private in my party. Unfortunately, I am not a young member, but I am a new member. For the statements I now make I desire to be held alone responsible, speaking only for myself. I am stating my own personal views. It may be, as I have seen it stated in the "Mail and Empire," that we do not come to the same conclusion by the same route. Sir, I have no reproach to make to those who are opposed to this Remedial Bill, or opposed to any of its features. I am willing to believe that they are acting in good faith. I respect their opinion, and I claim for myself the same respect in opposing this Bill. I do so because I conscientiously believe that it is legislation that ought not to be adopted by this House. I believe it would be a source of injustice, and it would remove for ever from this Parliament the power of coming to the help of the people of my creed and race in Manitoba. I oppose this Bill precisely because I feel that if we were to pass it to-day, it would put an end to all possible chance of re-establishing separate schools in Manitoba. I am satisfied, moreover, that this Bill will create animosity, and will stir up ill-feeling among the people of Manitoba. I oppose it because I see that it is likely to do more harm than good. Though it may be accepted by interested parties, and though some of the people of Manitoba may accept it, although we have no proof of that, nevertheless I must vote according to my own opinion; and if some people in Manitoba are willing to accept it, for my own part, I am willing to accept it. Mr. Speaker, this discussion has already been too long, but I did not wish to give my vote upon such a question without explaining why I am in favour of the motion for the six months' hoist.

Mr. AMYOT. Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Verchères (Mr. Geoffrion) concluded his speech by saying that his leader would be able to succeed better than hon. gentlemen opposite. I should like to know why. I should like to know how. Is there any connection between the leader of the hon. member and the leader of the Manitoba government? Is the Greenway government led by the leader of the Opposition here, or is it vice versa? Are we to hold responsible for the acts of Mr. Greenway the leader of the Opposition in the Dominion? I should like to know if the leader of the Opposition has got a strong hold on Mr. Greenway, and if he does not use it so as to put an immediate stop to that infernal conduct where property and consciences are stolen. I denounce him to the whole of the confederation.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. AMYOT. Hon. members may laugh. They will have to laugh a little more later on, but they will also have to feel ashamed for Mr. Greenway's party, which they think they could lead if they were in power. The hon. member for Verchères has said that we can be a strong nation with diverse races. That is true, and that is the desire of this Government. I say that in order that there may be a strong nation with diverse races sacrifices have to be made of sentiments, and those who make them are the Protestants who are at the head of the Government, supported by their friends, and those who feel they cannot sacrifice their sentiments even to render the strictest justice are led by one who, we would think, should understand better a cause of justice. It will be the pride of the Conservative party, under these circumstances, as it has been so often in the past, to know that those who are above prejudice, above passion, above the animosities of race and creed, are within the ranks of the Conservative party and are to-day bringing all the strength of their party to render justice to a minority. Yes, we are able to form a strong nation with diverse races. That is true. That is the way England does with her colonies all over the world. She gives most ample liberty to the new peoples enrolled under her flag. You may study the history of England, that great colonizing power, and you will find that it is not by tyranny, it is not by imposing false and bad laws, that she progresses. No. She tells the people of all her new colonies, as if they were speaking to allies: Keep your laws, your language, your customs, and be a happy people; work out your destiny with England for the honour of humanity and for the glory of the British flag. I hope those great loyalists, who are proud as we are to-day of the British flag and the institutions of Britain will be with us in recognizing that it is not by tyranny that she

creates and gives happiness to a nation; but that these loyalists will grant justice to a minority. It is very easy to utter loyal sentiments for the British flag; but do not forget that Her Majesty the Queen has signed that law which has promised liberty and justice to the minority of Manitoba. If hon. gentlemen have any respect for that Crown and for the Queen, and feel that great loyalty of which they speak, they will join with us in doing justice to the minority. The hon. member for Verchères says: I am in favour of the constitution, and I am in favour of a remedial law; but in spite of the constitution, I will vote against the remedial law. Why? We have heard some members say the Bill is bad because it is too stringent, too exacting, it takes Manitoba by the throat and forces the law upon that province. The hon. gentleman has said that he promised his electors to vote for a remedial law, but the law is not satisfactory. I believe he has had experience enough in parliamentary usage and practice to know that when we are in favour of the principle of a Bill we vote for the second reading, and we introduce amendments in committee to remove any faults we may find in the Bill. That is the sound constitutional position which he should have taken, and his reasoning that he will vote against the Bill because it is incomplete is equivalent to saying to a man: You are very hungry, here is a meal for you; but as it will not be sufficient, you shall have nothing at all. I will not follow the hon. gentleman in all the details he has given as to the law, because the time has not arrived for the discussion of those points.

What is the object and purpose of the Bill? There were three things in the remedial order. First, "the right to build, maintain, equip, manage, conduct and support Roman Catholic schools in the manner provided for by the said statutes, which were repealed by the two Acts of 1890 aforesaid." Does not the Bill contain all that? Does it not contain provisions for the appointment of officers, for a Board of Education with all the powers necessary to build, maintain and equip the schools of the Roman Catholic minority. The second is the right "to share proportionately in any grant of public funds for the purposes of education." The hon. gentleman says you should impose on Manitoba the obligation of paying the amount necessary. Suppose we put in the law this clause: It shall be the duty of the government of Manitoba to grant a proportionate amount to Catholic schools; and if Manitoba, led by the friend of the leader of the Opposition, said no, what power would we have? Can we pass legislation to force Mr. Greenway or the Manitoba government? Can we legislate in their stead? What power have we? The only thing we can do is to pass a declaratory law, and the Bill contains that declaration. It says that it is decided that such is the

Mr. AMYOT.

right of the minority. Mr. Speaker, when the government of Manitoba will be led by men who are friends of the minorities as well as of the majorities; when the government of Manitoba will be led by friends of justice; then the Manitoba government will find in the law such declaration, and will give justice to the minority. But, Sir, so long as the Manitoba government will be led by friends of the Liberal party in this House, unless we go there with an army, unless we go there with force, unless we go there as a nation equipped for war in order to obtain that justice, which the constitution says is due, I do not see any human way of forcing Manitoba to give us justice. We might, perhaps, say in this Bill that a certain amount, yearly, should be given to the separate schools out of the lands which the Federal Government own in that province. Well, Sir, it will be easy to pass such a law later on. It might be, perhaps, possible to insert such a clause even in this Bill, but that I do not discuss now. But, Sir, is that a reason to oppose the Bill? It might be a reason to propose an amendment, but it is no reason to oppose this measure. Then, the third part of the remedial order says:

The right of exception of such Roman Catholics as contribute to Roman Catholic schools from all payment or contribution to the support of any other schools.

In that connection, Sir, the Bill before the House is complete. What will be the position when this remedial law is passed? If Mr. Greenway or his officers seek to take school taxes from the Catholic minority, then this law will be enforced. The minority will say: We will not pay, then there will be an execution, and the courts will decide. And, Sir, where is the court in the British Empire which will decide that this remedial law is not based upon the constitution, and binding upon all British subjects. I say, Sir, that this Bill gives all that it is possible to give, based upon that remedial order, and the remedial order is based upon the judgment of the Privy Council. In fact this law is based upon the one prepared by Mr. Ewart, who represents, legally, the minority in Manitoba. He, himself, had prepared his project mainly upon the laws abolished by the statute of 1890. And now, Mr. Speaker, we hear these gentlemen of the Opposition saying that they are not satisfied with this Bill because it is not complete. Let us see, Sir, what the interested parties, those of the minority who are living in Winnipeg say with regard to this Bill. I will not take the words of a Conservative, because they would not be convincing to my hon. friends of the Opposition. I will take the words of the most prominent French-Canadian Liberal member of the Manitoba legislature. I will take the words of a man whom none of these gentlemen of the Opposition would dare accuse of being led by false motives. I will

take the words of a man whom they are bound to respect, one who has held their flag high in the Dominion, and more especially in the province of Manitoba since he has been residing in that province. We will see what that gentleman says of the present Bill. I take the Manitoba morning "Free Press." of February 27 of this year, and I find in it the resume of the speech made in the legislature by Mr. Prendergast. This is what he says :

Mr. Prendergast viewed with regret the curtailment of the powers of this House by the Remedial Bill. He had taken it for granted for years that this Government would never do anything to relieve the minority; he also took it for granted that the Remedial Bill would be carried. The law, the constitutional law, must be complied with, as expounded by the highest courts in the realm. He reviewed the steps which had led up to the remedial order. The Blake resolution had been passed mainly to afford an easy solution of the educational question. He cited the opinion of Sir John Thompson that the decision of the Privy Council should be followed by action. Mr. Laurier also held that whenever the constitutionality of an Act was proposed to the court for its decision, that decision should be binding and final. Mr. Prendergast denied that the remedial order was in any sense a mandate or a command; it was simply a notice given by Order in Council. He, for one, would not be in favour of returning to the Act which existed before 1890. The responsibility for the remedial order rested with the honourable gentlemen opposite; the proceedings at Ottawa had not been high-handed. He said this as a Reformer, a follower of Mr. Wilfred Laurier; he was not a follower of Sir Mackenzie Bowell. The remedial order called for the supplementing of the Act of 1890 by a provincial Act which would remove the grievances of the minority. Speaking of the relations of Catholics to the hierarchy, he said they were at least as free as the supporters of the Government were in relation to the Government. Under the circumstances, he considered the Remedial Bill, though clumsy in some respects, to be satisfactory; and if he were a member of the House of Commons he would support it. He thought that the Catholic schools might get along if necessary, without the Government grant; if they were given by remedial legislation the right to tax themselves, and relieved from the incubus of taxation for other schools.

Sir, the two powers which Mr. Prendergast asks for are given by the Bill. First, there is the power for the minority to tax themselves, and second there is the exemption of the minority from paying taxation for these schools which their conscience prevents them sending their children to. The Bill gives all that, and Mr. Prendergast, speaking in the name of the minority of Manitoba, he a Liberal, led in federal politics by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Laurier), says that when these two powers are given by the Federal Government, the Catholics in Manitoba may be able to maintain their schools. It is under such circumstances that the hon. member for Verchères (Mr. Geoffrion) and his friends say to the minority in Manitoba: We will refuse you a law

that gives you power to tax yourselves, and that exempts you from paying taxes for the support of schools which your conscience does not allow you to use. That is the position taken by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Geoffrion), who has been elected to this House to support remedial legislation. Mr. Prendergast continues to say:

If he were in the Commons, he would insist upon the Catholic schools receiving a share of the money to the credit of the land grant. He believed that four years hence it would be seen that separate schools still existed, but under worse circumstances than before. He agreed with the amendment that it was the duty of this legislature to remedy the grievances; he regretted the necessity for the Federal Government to pass remedial legislation; but it was an act of justice, a duty thrown upon their shoulders.

These, Sir, are the words of Mr. Prendergast. But I hear some gentlemen say: Oh, they are such a small minority in Manitoba. Mr. Speaker, it is true that the Catholics are a small minority in Manitoba. But, Sir, the Conservative party of Manitoba, which, in Manitoba, as everywhere else, is the upholder of liberty, is not in a very small minority in that province. If you take the returns of the last election for the Manitoba legislature, you find that out of a total of 25,507 votes, giving thirty-two government supporters, the government supporters have received 11,178 votes, whereas the Conservative candidates received 10,719 votes, the Patrons 2,680 votes, and the Independents received 930 votes. But add to that, Mr. Speaker, the zig-zags of the map of the Manitoba constituencies as gerrymandered by Mr. Greenway; add to that the manipulation of the voters' lists; add to that the fact that some polls were placed at a distance of 100 miles from the homes of the voters, and you will see, Sir, that the Conservative party is not in a very small minority in the province of Manitoba. You will see, also, Sir, when party passion is over, when the present Bill will be the law of the land, when it will be understood and interpreted, when the sentiment of justice which exists in the heart of every Canadian is awakened, you will see then, Sir, that the Conservative party will be in power in Manitoba. Then the Conservative party will get back the majority in Manitoba, and you will have a friendly administration at the head of affairs there. Then this law will be the safety of the minority, will bring back peace to the Dominion, and will allow us to work harmoniously together for the development and the welfare of the country. That is what this law is likely to do; and when I hear a man of the intelligence and experience of the hon. member for Verchères (Mr. Geoffrion), who was elected specially to support this law, saying that he refuses it because it is incomplete, I say, you refuse the only law, perhaps, that will ever be presented in favour of the minority; you want us to lose the

only chance that will ever be given to the minority to obtain justice; and you shut the door upon the future peace, harmony and happiness of this country. That is what you do by refusing to accept this law. Mr. Speaker, it is rather extraordinary to see the diversity of opinion amongst those who are opposed to this measure. There is one reason why we should accept it as soon as possible, it is this: The minority have been suffering for five years, and they cannot go on much longer as they are now, having to sustain their schools for the education of their children besides paying for the common schools. I hold in my hand a printed circular signed by D. Guillet, O.M.I., parish priest of St. Mary's church, Winnipeg, appealing to the whole Dominion for assistance for private schools. I will not take up the time of the House by reading it; but I say that, as a matter of justice, we cannot delay any longer. We should immediately render that justice that has been asked so strenuously during the last five years. I will not follow the hon. member for Verchères in the discussion of the details of the Bill; it would be wasting my time, and the time of the House, to do so. But there is a point which I think it is important to elucidate. We have been told repeatedly on the hustings, in the press, and in this House, that we should have an inquiry. I ask myself, why have an inquiry? For which part of the law do we want an inquiry? I would like some of the hon. gentlemen of the left to tell us. Do we want an inquiry to know that a board of education is necessary, or that it has been abolished by the law of 1890? Do we want an inquiry to know that superintendents are necessary, that it is necessary to form school districts, to have trustees, school assessments, and so on? Which part of the law requires an inquiry? Do we not know that in 1871 a law was passed organizing separate schools? Do we not know that it was amended? Do we not know that it was codified in 1881? Do we not know that in 1890 it was abolished, and that we have to re-enact those provisions of the law permitting separate schools? We want an inquiry, says the leader of the Opposition, but we have had inquiries already; we have had law-suits in which all the parties were represented. The facts have been admitted. If you take the proceedings before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, which are before this House, you will find that Lord Macnaghten, at page six, gives a résumé of the facts. He says:

It is agreed that there was no law or regulation or ordinance with respect to education in force at the time.

Further on, he says:

The practice which prevailed in Manitoba before the union is also a matter on which all parties are agreed.

Mr. AMYOT.

And he quotes the statements of Archbishop Taché, which he says have been accepted as accurate and complete. During the argument by the lawyers, we find, at page 14, that Sir Horace Davey, speaking for the city of Winnipeg, says:

The different churches and denominations, the Roman Catholic Church and the Episcopal Church of England and the Presbyterian Church, maintained their own schools where they had sufficient congregations for the purpose.

At page 22, Sir Horace Davey again says:

Then, my lords, it is said that the public schools are in competition with the denominational schools. Of course they are and intended to be.

At page 51 he again says:

Happily there is no dispute as to the facts, as to the state of affairs with reference to education, existing at the time of the union, and upon which the claim to possess certain rights and privileges is based.

Then, we have the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), who was arguing before that tribunal; and I find this, at page 79:

Lord Watson—Was the school of 1891 in any sense a denominational school also?

Mr. McCarthy—It was a separate school—not only denominational but separate.

Lord Morris—That is a fortiori.

Mr. McCarthy—Yes, I say so.

Lord Morris—It was controlled by a Roman Catholic body, and the atmosphere and surroundings of the education were Roman Catholic.

Mr. McCarthy—Yes, it was a Roman Catholic separate school.

Lord Morris—You could not make it stronger than that.

Mr. McCarthy—No.

Again, I find at page 87:

Lord Watson—I think that you may assume, as I think all the judges below have assumed, that prior to 1870 it was the inseparable and universal practice in the district which is now called Manitoba, that each denomination provided and supported its own schools without any obligation to contribute anything towards the support of any other denominational schools.

Lord Shand—And not only is that so in the judges' opinions, but I think it is universally accepted. Both parties are now agreed about it, as I understand. I do not think there is any difference about it.

You see, Mr. Speaker, there was no difference between the parties before the courts as to the facts; they all agreed. They accepted the statements of Monseigneur Taché and of the different parties before the courts as being the truth. All the matters of fact have been admitted repeatedly before the courts, in both Canada and England. It was merely a question of law and jurisdiction, and when all the facts have been admitted, when they have all been stated in the newspapers, when they have been before the public for five years, we are told: Let us investigate. But did Manitoba in 1890, or 1891, or 1892, or 1893, or 1894, even

think of asking an inquiry? Why should we have an inquiry? Is it to ascertain the circumstances under which the law was passed? We do not want any inquiry to learn that, because it is all a matter of history. We have only to look at the public documents, and we find all the circumstances related in them. I have no objection to substantiate what I say by a few quotations. I need not refer to the conditions of the entry of Manitoba into confederation, because that has been stated over and over again, but I shall refer to the words spoken by Mr. Davies, the Premier of Manitoba in 1876, when the consent of the Roman Catholic minority in Manitoba was sought for in order to abolish the legislative council. Mr. Davies then said:

It may be said that the council is a safeguard to the minority. He assured the minority that their rights would never be trampled upon in this province. There would always be sufficient English-speaking members in the House who would insist on giving their French fellow-subjects their rights, to protect them.

Now, I would ask any man of honour, be he ultra loyal to the British flag or not, whether those words spoken by an Englishman were only meant to betray, to deceive and to despoil. I shall quote the words of Mr. Luxton:

There were some questions of sentiment which lay close to the hearts of the French people, and he could assure them that the English-speaking members would not ruthlessly deal with these, if the French representatives were sufficiently patriotic to support the measure before the House. They would recognize their generosity and not forget it.

Mr. McKay said:

He was very much pleased to hear the generous and just remarks of the hon. Premier, the hon. Secretary, and also of the hon. member for Rockwood, who gave the minority in the House that confidence which the members of this House, and by their votes on this Bill would express, the security they felt in the hands of that majority.

These are the circumstances under which the Catholic minority of Manitoba gave up that safe-guard, the legislative council. Were these promises intended to deceive? I am sure that nobody would dare to make that accusation against the hon. gentlemen I have just quoted. Yet in 1888, what do we find? I shall leave a prominent member of the Liberal party at that time to state what occurred. In a speech delivered by Mr. Jas. Fisher, M.P.P., in the Manitoba legislature, may be found the following:—

I make the grave charge, that this school legislation was put upon the statute-book of this province in defiance of the most solemn pledges of the Liberal party.

And how is that substantiated? By the affidavits of parties who swore that the Hon. Mr. Greenway obtained power in Manitoba on promising to the minority the main-

ance of their privileges. Mr. Greenway stated that he had talked the matter over with his friends and that he was quite willing to guarantee, under his government, the maintenance of the then existing condition of matters with regard first to separate Catholic schools; second, to the official use of the French language; and third, to the French electoral division. And the next day the same language was repeated elsewhere by Mr. Norquay. But what do we find? A few months afterwards, when the Catholics had given up their safe-guard, when they had elected a Liberal member, when they had given a majority to Mr. Greenway, we find that, in spite of the promise made by the Queen, by the British Government and by the Federal Government, in spite of the promises made by the Manitoba House of Assembly, in spite of the promises made by the Liberal members in the parish of St. François Xavier—in spite of the most solemn promises, we find them passing that law of 1890, which was then interpreted by a man called Joseph Martin, who, I think, is one of our colleagues in this House, in the following letter, addressed to Mr. C. J. Brown:—

Protestant Schools, Manitoba,
Superintendent's Office,
Winnipeg, 10th April, 1890.

C. J. Brown, Esq., City Clerk,
Winnipeg.

Sir,—As there has been some discussion as to the relations between the school boards at present existing in the city of Winnipeg and the city council, and the effect of the change to be made in the law on the 1st of May in these relations, I beg to advise you as follows:—The two boards should make estimates and forward them to the council in the ordinary manner. They should each go on in their ordinary way until the 1st of May, on the 1st of May the Catholic School Board will cease to exist and, the Protestant School Board will become the Public School Board of the city. The members of the present Protestant School Board will continue in office as Public School Trustees for the remainder of their respective terms. After the 1st of May all moneys due to the Catholic School Board on the levy of 1890 will belong and be payable to the Public School Board.

The Act is being printed as rapidly as possible, and will shortly be distributed.

I have the honour to be, sir,
Your obedient servant,
(Sd.) JOSEPH MARTIN,
Supt. of Education, per E.A.B.

Certified true copy,
C. J. BROWN,
City Clerk.

City Clerk's Office,
Winnipeg, January 20, 1896.

So that after power had been obtained through these promises, after the candidate in St. François Xavier had given his word, and after Mr. Greenway had given his word that the separate schools would not be disturbed, that the French language would be maintained, the first thing Mr. Greenway

did was to take away the schools, and say to the Catholics: Now we will impose upon you schools directed by a Protestant school board, and you will have to pay for them, and you will receive no grant for your own schools. This is the greatest act of betrayal and deceit that was ever perpetrated to the dishonour of a nation; and I pity the party which says: If our chief were there, he would have influence enough over Mr. Greenway to obtain a better settlement. It is just as if some one were to say to you: Do not go into that forest with such a leader, because it is full of brigands who are his enemies; but if you will follow my leader, he is a friend of those bandits, and will protect you.

Those reasons I have given are supplementary reasons why the Act which we propose should receive the sanction of this House. I do not give them as the most important reasons. The real, the essential reason why we should pass this Bill is this: We are bound to pass it by the constitution. We are bound to comply with the decision of the highest tribunal of the Empire; and we must pass this Bill besides so as to restore peace and harmony. How does the hon. member for North York (Mr. McLean), who is a loyalist, hope that in case of difficulty with some other country, we, the forty-one hundredth of the population, would willingly fight alongside of him, if all the time he had been taking us by the throat and preventing us from educating our children as we please, depriving us of liberty of conscience and preventing the exercise of our free will in this country? How does he hope to form a strong confederation, if he goes on that way? I address him, because he is at the head of a newspaper. That newspaper has not the excuse of being an opponent of the Government. That newspaper pretends to be a friend of the Government and to be Conservative. And yet, when he sees his party trying to do justice, trying to restore harmony, he does his best, through his journal, to create public opinion against this act of justice, and then he turns to us and says: Well, you see, public opinion is against you. But he is a man of honour, of heart, of sound disposition of mind, and I hope that he will soon understand that he cannot go on long that way. We, of the province of Quebec, have been faithful to the party for over thirty years. Why? Because Sir John Macdonald and the great chiefs of the party have been faithful to us. Political sympathy must be mutual. If this involves a sacrifice of sentiment for the hon. gentleman, he must not ask us, for the sake of that sentiment, to sacrifice our conscience. For us this is not a sentiment; it is above that. For us this is a matter of conscience, which must come before party politics, before party interest, before everything; for God and conscience are inseparably related. Let him respect our conscience, and it will be easier to work poli-

Mr. AMYOT.

tically with him, and he will continue to have good allies in the province of Quebec. As to the "Globe"—well, we know what party passion is, and we never expected anything good from that quarter.

It has been said that this Bill involves coercion. I do not know of any statute that does not involve coercion of some kind. You pass a law to say that, if a debtor does not pay you, you may seize his property: that is coercion. You pass a law to force your neighbour to build a fence between his property and yours: that is coercion. The municipal law is coercion from beginning to end. I defy any man to quote me a public statute that does not involve coercion. The laws of God are coercive and the laws of man are coercive also. But what is the coercion in this case? The constitution says that the minority shall have the right to separate schools. But the government of Manitoba refuses to recognize those rights and deprives the people of these separate schools. The constitution directs us to give them back. Well, we will give back the schools. There is no coercion in that. It is illegally coercive in the minority of Manitoba to force the people to send their children to schools which they cannot allow their children to attend, in accord with their consciences. That is the real coercion. We do not force Protestants to send their children to the schools, but we give to the Catholics the opportunity of having schools of their own in which to educate their children according to their own religion and their own conscience. There is no coercion in that. We say there is no coercion against the government of Manitoba. Why, what kind of men must they be? How must we approach these magnates who have in their control the goods and the consciences of the Catholics? Must we approach them kneeling, as petitioners approach the Grand Turk? Must we approach them with kid gloves? I suppose they are not wild beasts, that we must approach them with a gun. We have sent them repeated Orders in Council, among them that of the 26th July, 1894, the best diplomatic document that ever was penned. We have sent them prayer after prayer. But in vain. It is not because we do not approach them with white gloves, that they refuse: it is because they are determined not to grant what we ask. It is because they pretend that they have the right to deprive the Catholic minority of their schools. Mr. Speaker, I will not take more of your time, but I conclude by saying this: It will be a matter of never-failing pride for the Government, that, in spite of so many difficulties, they have taken the case of the minority in hand, and I hope that all lovers of their country, all lovers of fair-play will join in this measure of justice to the minority of Manitoba. And I hope that, when this discussion is over and the Bill is passed, it will be easy for us to

go on working in harmony for the prosperity and development of our country.

Mr. LAVERGNE. Mr. Speaker, before giving my own views of this question, I wish to answer some of the remarks made by my hon. friend from Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot). The hon. gentleman has posed as a great defender of an oppressed minority. He said he was very much surprised to see men of the same religion and the same race as the minority rising in this House to oppose remedial legislation. I might say that I take somewhat the same view as to coercing a small and new province and removing from that province the right of making its own laws, especially laws which are within its power. I come here as a defender of the Manitoba minority, and I would be ready to accept a larger task—I would be ready to defend any minority, whether Roman Catholic or Protestant. My hon. friend, in support of his argument, has quoted the utterances of a member of the Manitoba legislature, and has said that we ought to be satisfied with this law, when a man like Mr. Prendergast, an eminent Liberal, has stated that he is satisfied with it. I believe that I can establish conclusively, that we are not very far from Mr. Prendergast's position. If my hon. friend has read the motion which was made in the legislature of Manitoba in amendment to the motion proposed by Mr. Sifton, he will see that what Mr. Prendergast wants is conciliation, and an amicable settlement, such as we desire ourselves. For the information of my hon. friend, I will read the motion made by Mr. Fisher, a Liberal, which was supported by Mr. Prendergast, and of which the last two clauses were as follows :

And, whereas, it would be in the highest degree unfortunate if, by means of the Parliament of Canada assuming to exercise its undoubted power in the premises, this province should lose, possibly for all time, its exclusive control over the educational legislation of the province, and there is now most imminent danger of this happening.

Therefore, this House is of the opinion that the present situation calls for prudent and conciliatory action in the hope that such result may, by wise counsels, be avoided, and to this end that the time is opportune for a calm and dispassionate review by the legislature of the matters at issue between the majority and minority, with a view to considering whether a reasonable settlement of the question may not be found which will avoid all excuse for federal interference.

Sir, that is exactly our policy. We want to arrive at an amicable settlement ; to use Mr. Fisher's words, we want a reasonable settlement of this question, and I believe that Mr. Prendergast is entirely in sympathy with us. Now, my hon. friend, in criticising the views expressed by my hon. friend from Verchères (Mr. Geoffrion) in opposition to clause 74 of this Bill, admitted that probably the Manitoba minority would not be allowed to share in the grants of public money voted

for education. But, said he, we cannot do any better, we would have to go there with an army in order to enforce our views. Then soon afterwards the hon. gentleman speaking of the gerrymander, and giving the figures of the majority of the Liberal party in Manitoba, said that in a few years the Conservatives will be in power there, and they will fix up this matter. Well, my hon. friend has forgotten one thing. Let me tell him for his information that the Conservatives of Manitoba are opposed to remedial legislation quite as strongly as the Liberals. They even say that they wish to go one better, and they stated on the public platform that they were afraid that Greenway would compromise the matter with the leader of the Opposition in the House of Commons. I think my hon. friend should not venture to make such statements until he knows all the facts. The hon. gentleman says he does not like the gerrymander. He says that Mr. Greenway would have no majority at all in the provincial legislature were it not for a gerrymander in that province. I am surprised at the hon. gentleman changing his views. If there has been a gerrymander there—a statement which I think requires investigation like many others—I would say that, unfortunately, they had followed the bad example given in this Parliament by the Conservative friends of the hon. member. Now, hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House who have taken part in this debate, have told us that this is a very serious matter to deal with. I must say that I entirely agree with them. It is probably the most solemn occasion and the most important question that this House has ever confronted. I fully appreciate the responsibility which rests upon us at this time. Now, Sir, in order to put my views before you, it may be necessary to repeat some things which have been already said, and said, perhaps, better than I can say them. However, to lay the foundation of an argument which I intend to make, I must present a very brief review of the judicial history of this case. Before the admission into the union of the Territories which now form the province of Manitoba, there was no system of schools in those territories recognized by law. There was a system of voluntary schools, the Roman Catholic schools being supported by grants made by that church, and by the parents of the children attending these schools ; and the schools of other denominations being supported in the same way. In 1870 the province of Manitoba was admitted into confederation, and an Act was passed that same year by the Federal Parliament which received the sanction of the Imperial Parliament, which Act contained certain provisions in relation to schools. The compact which was made between the other provinces at the time of confederation, was, I believe, accepted by the province of Manitoba, and it was expected that this compact would cover a solemn engagement on the part of

the majority of admitting and keeping separate schools without their supporters being obliged later on to pay for the support of other schools. This compact was embodied in one of the sections of the Manitoba Act, section 22, and subsection thereof. I may say at once that that clause seems to have been wiped out by the decision of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. I believe it was the intention of the parties to this compact that by this clause Roman Catholics would be entitled to their own schools without being obliged to support the schools of any other denomination. The legislation concerning education in the rest of the Dominion, was also embodied in the Manitoba Act. Section 2 of the Act reads as follows :—

On, from and after the said day on which the order of the Queen in Council shall take effect, as aforesaid, the provisions of the British North America Act, 1867, shall, except those parts thereof which are in terms made, or by reasonable intendment, may be held to be specially applicable to, or only to affect one or more, but not the whole of the provinces now composing the Dominion, and except so far as the same may be varied by this Act, be applicable to the province of Manitoba, in the same way, and to the like extent as they apply to the several provinces of Canada, and as if the province of Manitoba had been one of the provinces originally united by the said Act.

By virtue of this clause, it was considered that the same disposition which existed in the province of Quebec and the province of Ontario would have existed, also, in the province of Manitoba. Other dispositions, which I will not read now, but to which I may have occasion to refer later on, were made to complete the system. This system worked satisfactorily for all the people until 1890. The population was very materially altered as to origin, creed and race, in that year. No doubt, at the time of the union of the province with the Dominion, it was considered that the French population would at least maintain its relative proportion. Later on, in 1890, they have become almost a small minority. These two Acts, which it is proposed to remedy, were passed, namely, an Act to establish a Department of Education and an Act called the Public School Act. This public school Act, no doubt, repealed the separate school system which had existed in the province. I wish to say that the tests which have been made since 1890 as regards the validity of this Act were of a very satisfactory nature to the province of Manitoba during five years. The first test was by means of a writ to quash the by-law making certain assessments and levying rates for the support of public schools. A Roman Catholic, Mr. Barrett, caused this writ to be issued. A few weeks afterwards it was decided by one of the judges of the province that the assessment was legal. It had been attacked under section 22, the first subsection of which reads :

Mr. LAVERGNE.

Nothing in any such law shall prejudicially affect any right or privilege with respect to denominational schools which any class of persons have, by law or practice, in the province at the union.

It had been contended by Mr. Barrett that the law was not constitutional, that it was not within the power of the province of Manitoba. The first victory was for the province. An appeal was taken to the Court of Queen's Bench of Manitoba. Judgment was rendered there in February, 1891. Until then, the Federal Government, which it is now admitted has a right to interfere on certain occasions, had not done anything. The Manitoba people, evidently, were quite satisfied that they would carry the day. However, an appeal was taken to the Supreme Court. There the province was defeated. It was declared that the law was ultra vires of the powers of the legislature. The subject came next before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, the highest tribunal in the Empire. There the judgment of the Supreme Court was reversed, giving a victory to the government of Manitoba. That judgment was rendered in July, 1892. At that time, nothing had been done by this Government in the way of interference. I may say, however, that more than a year before an appeal had been taken under the "Manitoba Act," section 22, subsection 2, and the provisions of the British North America Act were also invoked in that appeal. Before the decision of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council was given, the Privy Council of Canada decided to leave the matter in abeyance. It was considered that if the law were declared to be ultra vires, it would be the end of the matter. After the judgment of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council was given, the appeal taken by the Roman Catholic minority, represented by the ecclesiastical authorities and leading citizens, was pressed and a decision was asked from the Government. Then it was decided to take other means of settling the question. It was resolved to take advantage of a certain statute allowing such questions to be referred to the Supreme Court, and a certain number of questions were referred for the opinion of that tribunal. On February 20th, 1894, the Supreme Court rendered a judgment. The Supreme Court declared that there was no appeal, and that Parliament had no right to interfere with that legislation of the province of Manitoba. Therefore, for four years, from the month of May, 1890, up to the month of February, 1894, the claims of the province of Manitoba had been supported by all the courts of the land. It had been maintained that they had the right to pass these laws, and that the Government or the Parliament of Canada had no right to interfere in any way whatever. The consequence of this was, that during these four years the system of public schools was very

solidly established in that province. The consequence was that the people were very well satisfied with the system. The consequence was that the action of the legislature of Manitoba in 1890 was supported at the general elections of 1891. The consequence was, again, that that system of public schools having worked to the satisfaction of the great majority of the people of that province, in the year 1895 new general elections were held, and Mr. Greenway, who fought the battle mainly on that ground, was endorsed by the people, and came back to office with a larger majority than before. Now, Sir, I have said that the judgment of the Supreme Court was given on the 20th February, 1894. An appeal was taken from that judgment, and the case was argued before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, and a judgment was rendered on the 29th January, 1895, which, I think, was sanctioned by Her Majesty about the 22nd of February. Then, Sir, until the 22nd of February, 1895, the law which had been in force in Manitoba, was the law approved by the tribunals of the province of Manitoba, was the law approved by the Supreme Court of Canada, was the law approved by the majority of the people, and, until that last judgment, it was the law which had been so far approved by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, which had refused to interfere in the first case. It is no wonder that we find some resistance. It is no wonder that, after such encouragement by the tribunals and by the opinion of the people, which endorsed that policy of the government in two general elections—it is no wonder, I say, that the province of Manitoba hesitates to part with that legislation. Let me ask, Sir: How long after the decision of the Privy Council did the Government of Canada interfere? It was just one month after. And what means of conciliation were tried? What was done with the object of obtaining a settlement of that question, in order to preserve peace and harmony between the people who form this confederation, and who are of different religions, of different creeds, and of different races? I say, Sir, that the means taken by this Government to obtain a settlement was not only a drastic piece of legislation, but it has been almost an outrageous one. Have this Government ever shown that they were willing to interfere? I say not. What they have always shown was that they wished to have nothing to do with the matter, and that they wanted to wash their hands of it. I say that this Government have encouraged resistance on the part of Manitoba, and have encouraged the people of Manitoba in trying to keep that legislation. That school law has taken deep roots in Manitoba, and it has been appreciated by the majority of the people. It is considered as a very great injustice on the minority, and it is considered that it has been enacted in a spirit of dom-

ination and a spirit of selfishness. I say, Sir, that the circumstances which have followed this legislation, have justified, so far, the people of Manitoba in trying to maintain it. As to every detail of that Manitoba school law and as to its justice, I say that this Federal Government never had any policy. This Government never would express any opinion on it. Every time an appeal came before the Privy Council of Canada, they tried to put it off, or they left it in abeyance to have a decision in one case or another case, and they referred it from one court to another. They admit to-day, that they are very sorry that they have to deal with that law. Sir, I believe that there never was a desire on the part of the Government, that there should be a settlement of this question. I believe that the majority of the Cabinet were opposed to interference. We know what quarrelling there was amongst them, and we know what difficulty there was about their keeping their promise. We are sneered at in some quarters, when we speak of an investigation. Well, Sir, I believe that an investigation is the only mode of settling that question. There is no agreement as to the facts of the case. We have before us the words of the bishops, we have the words before us of eminent ecclesiastical authorities; we have before us the words of the lords of the Privy Council, but they do not agree upon the facts. I will point out one of these facts—I do not claim that it is very material for the issue that is before the House—in order to show how desirable investigation is, to arrive at a settlement, not by force, but by conviction. I for one am quite ready to take the word of his Grace Mgr. Taché when he says that the public schools established in 1890 are Protestant schools. However, Sir, that statement, I may say, at once, is not admitted by the lords of the Privy Council. I suppose the hon. members of this House have some respect for the opinions of those gentlemen, and I believe it is my duty to read what they state on that point. This is what their lordships have said:

They cannot assent to the view which seems to be indicated by one of the members of the Supreme Court, that public schools under the Act of 1890 are in reality Protestant schools. The legislature has declared in so many words that public schools shall be entirely unsectarian, and that principle is carried out throughout the Act.

Now, Sir, this is a fact of some importance. His Grace Mgr. Taché says that these schools are Protestant schools. The lords of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council say that they cannot agree to that. It is no wonder that we do not all agree as to the facts. I say I am quite ready to take the word of Mgr. Taché; but when it is contradicted by a Protestant bishop and by other Protestant ecclesiastical authorities, can I ask my Protestant friends to reject

the opinion of their own clergymen, and say to them: "The one man you have to listen to and believe is not your own bishop or your own ecclesiastical authority, not the lords of the Privy Council, but Mgr. Taché." Sir, I believe this shows that we do not agree as to the facts, and that an investigation would go a great length to persuade and convince the people of what should be done—to convince them, I sincerely hope, that there are grievances to be remedied.

Now, Sir, as I stated some time ago, the first subsection of section 22 of the Manitoba Act has been almost wiped out by the first judgment of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. But I believe their lordships said that they did not know the circumstances of that case. They were not bound to know them, and they could only give to the words of the subsection their ordinary meaning. They could not extend their meaning to include the possible intention of the contracting parties, or of the legislators, and those words did not mean anything else than that the minority might be bound to support public schools, that did not prevent them having their own private schools. This is a point which I believe would be of great importance to inquire about, and would help in showing the justice of the claims of the minority.

Now, Sir, to what extent are we going to go to provide a remedy? What legislation are we asked to pass, and on what ground? It has been a fine question whether we should consider this matter from a judicial or a political point of view. It seems to be admitted, and I have no doubt that it is the right view, that this is for Parliament simply a political question—that we are not bound to interfere unless we find that it is just to do so; that we should not sit as a tribunal, because this is a political question. But I can go further. Whether it is a political or a judicial question, suppose we sit as judges, do we not require to be informed as to the facts? Even if we were judges, all the more should we require to be acquainted with all the facts.

Now, Sir, I would like to know what are the material differences in the working of the existing schools and the working of the schools which existed before the legislation of 1890. From the information which I can gather from documents, which I believe have come from a proper source, I find that this objectionable law has been accepted in thirty-seven Catholic school districts. I do not know what proportion that is of the whole. I do not claim this to be an argument against a remedial law, but I claim that it is an argument in favour of investigating this matter. How does that system work? If those schools are Protestant schools, if they are an outrage being imposed on the Catholic people, how is it that thirty-seven Catholic school districts have accepted them? My hon. friend from Bellechasse (Mr. Am-

Mr. LAVERGNE.

ytot) has gone pretty far in his denunciations of Mr. Greenway. In fact, he has compared him to a bandit, and he has said that we are associating with bandits. He did not pay much of a compliment to his Conservative friends who are associating with us in Manitoba and in the other provinces. What information have we concerning the working of these schools? Officious people, good people, have distributed some pamphlets from which we gather some information, but we have information from some other sources also. It has been said that Mr. Greenway is very tyrannical to Roman Catholics. But what do I hear? I hear that in most of those districts where the public school system is in existence, the Roman Catholic religion is taught, the catechism is taught, and prayers are said after school hours. What more do I hear? An inspector of those schools went privately to one of the Ministers and told him: Why they are teaching the Roman Catholic religion in the schools. What was the answer of the Attorney General, who is the Minister of Education in the province of Manitoba? He asked this inspector whether that took place after the ordinary hours of the school, and the inspector replied that it did. Well, then, said the Minister, it is none of your business; we are not going to interfere; we are in favour of public schools, but we do not object to Catholic parents having their children instructed in the Catholic religion so long as that instruction does not interfere with our school system. I cite that as an example of tolerance, and I say that we should hesitate before removing from the legislature of Manitoba a power which has been declared *intra vires* of that province. I should dread the consequences. I should be afraid, that if we did not use all possible means of conciliation, retaliation might be used against the French Canadians who are in the minority. I am certainly in favour of remedial legislation; but where I differ is with regard to the methods to be adopted and the procedure to be adopted. I desire the removal of these grievances, but I desire also a proper investigation into the facts before we act. We have the admission of the Canadian Cabinet that these facts were not proved. They admit this in their reference to the Supreme Court. In the fifth question of that reference, they say:

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

"Assuming the material facts to be as stated therein." Who drafted that question? Was it not the Cabinet of Canada? Then what new evidence has since been brought in? None whatever. What do we know? What have we got to remedy? We know that one statute has been repealed and an-

other passed, and that is about all we know. All the facts we can get do show that the system of public schools has been carried on in a spirit of conciliation and tolerance. Was any hope of conciliation held out by Manitoba? Why, three months after that remedial order was passed in March last, the Manitoba legislature was sitting, and what did they offer? I quote from the resolutions which were moved in the legislature of Manitoba by Mr. Sifton. I cannot lay my hands just now on the first statement in those resolutions, but it was in the exact terms of the one which was repeated a few days ago. I will simply read a very short extract from those resolutions:

We believe that when the remedial order was made, there was not then available to Your Excellency in Council full and accurate information as to the working of our separate schools. We also believe there was lacking the means of forming a correct judgment as to the effect upon the province of the changes in that order. Being impressed with this view, we respectfully submit that it is not yet too late to make a full and complete investigation of the whole subject. Should such a course be adopted, we shall cheerfully assist in offering more complete information available. An investigation of such a kind would offer a substantial basis of facts upon which conclusions could be formed with a reasonable degree of certainty.

Now, on the hustings, and in the previous session, some offers were made, better offers were made perhaps. It was offered to supplement the law, it was offered to make such legislation as would cause these grievances to disappear. I shall not delay the House by looking for these quotations, but nobody will deny that it was distinctly offered to give a remedy. It was asked to show what was wanting, and they declared that they were ready for it. Now, is only the legislature of Manitoba ready for conciliation? What does His Grace Mgr. Langevin say? He is reported to have said, and the report has not been contradicted:

If I were to go into details, I would be misunderstood, but this I will say that once the people see what we really want, they will really be surprised to see how reasonable we are and will be amazed to see how reasonably and harmoniously the system will work, and will ask themselves why was this not got before? We never asked for the old law, and we have no intention of interfering with the present school system.

Taking these words contained in the resolutions presented by Mr. Sifton to the legislature of Manitoba, which were carried by a large majority, and taking the words of Mgr. Langevin, I say this is the proper time for conciliation and investigation. What was the plain duty of the Government after the judgment rendered by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council? Or, take it a little later on, after the first session of the legislature of Manitoba, in June, when they suggested that an investigation should be made, what was the duty

of the Government? Their duty was to accept this as the olive branch held out to them, and to come to a settlement after an investigation. Why, Sir, we know what human nature is. Had there been no other reason than self-pride, was it to be expected that Mr. Greenway, having the system of schools well settled in the province, being encouraged by the way the Federal Government dealt with the system, and the system having struck deep roots in the social life of the province, was it to be expected, I say, that he would get down on his knees immediately? And how long was he given after the judgment of the Privy Council had been sanctioned by Her Majesty? I believe it was less than one month. I believe that the judgment was sanctioned by Her Majesty on the 22nd February, and on the 21st March that remedial order was issued.

Now, Sir, I wish to say one word as to the finality of the law. It has been said, and I myself would say, is it not a very dangerous matter, in view of this question of finality to saddle that province, to saddle that minority with a law which will be ineffective? What opinions have we upon that question? We have the opinion of the very gentlemen who form the Government of the day. I quote from the remedial order:

The committee, without necessarily adopting this view, observe that section 22 of the Manitoba Act may admit of that construction. The committee, therefore, recommend that the provincial legislature be requested to consider whether its action upon the decision of Your Excellency in Council should be permitted to be such as, while refusing to redress a grievance which the highest court in the Empire has declared to exist, may compel Parliament to give the relief of which under the constitution the provincial legislature is the proper and primary source, thereby according to this view, permanently divesting itself in a very large measure of its authority and so establishing in the province an educational system, which no matter what changes may take place in the circumstances of the county or the views of the people, cannot be altered or repealed by any legislative body in Canada.

We may say that it is at least open to question. We have had here to-night the opinion of one of our own colleagues, which, I may fairly say, is a high legal opinion, the opinion of a recognized authority in law, and a man of great experience. Although not on the same side of the House as the gentlemen who expressed this opinion in the report of the Privy Council, he concurs in that opinion, and declares that the law will be final.

Now, it is said that we wish to delay the question. I join issue on that point. The question has been delayed by the Government for five years. And now, when we are coming to the end of a Parliament, and nearing the close of the last session of that Parliament, at a time when we have hardly sufficient time to examine that Bill properly

it is proposed to saddle it upon the province with all its defects, with the result, according to high authorities on both sides of the House that it cannot be altered in future. Sir, I believe that if this Bill passes it will not be a settlement of the question, but only the beginning of the quarrel. It is a common saying among lawyers that a poor arrangement is better than a good law-suit. We believe that with the methods we on this side propose to employ, we shall reach, not a poor arrangement, but a good arrangement, and that we shall not avoid a good law-suit, but a bad law-suit.

Now, Sir, I say it would have been better to have disallowed that law. It was within the power of the Government to do so, and it would have been according to the methods and usages of the party then and now governing the country. I admit that, in principle, we on this side do not favour their views with regard to disallowing the Acts of provincial legislatures. But I say that rather than impose this legislation upon the province, it would have been better to disallow the provincial law. If this Bill can be made efficient, it will simply have the effect of re-enacting the old provincial law. If I am right in that contention, would it not have been far better simply to have disallowed the statute of 1890, and thus have given full force to the laws which existed before it was passed. We are going to do what is, in effect, the same thing—for if this proposed law can be made operative it will be about the same thing. Is this the remedial order? Is this the judgment of the Privy Council? I say, no. The judgment of the Privy Council did not go so far; even the remedial order did not go so far. The law, if it can be perfected, will go that far, if so, then why not have disallowed the school law in the first place, and thus have settled the question?

Now, Sir, we have heard many high-sounding phrases about loyalty and respect for our institutions, and so on. I do not think that the appeals made by my hon. friend from Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) will convert his friends from East York (Mr. Maclean), and North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). Now, the hon. Postmaster General has told us that we should not speak with disrespect of the system of education in the province of Quebec, and I admit that. But there is one point to which I wish to call the attention of the House, and this is another reason for investigation. Was there any justification for Mr. Greenway and the legislature of Manitoba, in interfering with the system of education which existed in that province prior to 1890? Now, we must remember that the people who migrated from the province of Quebec to settle in Manitoba and the North-west Territories, were accompanied by some of their ecclesiastics, and they must have carried their traditions and their usages into that coun-

Mr. LAVERGNE.

try. Now, Sir, I am not afraid to say, and I think I shall be borne out in my statement by the public records, that, so far as our elementary schools are concerned in the province of Quebec, I believe they are defective, and we must remember that it was this system of elementary schools which the French-Canadians took with them into Manitoba. We must not be blind to the facts concerning some portions of our educational system in Quebec. I claim, with the Postmaster General, that, as far as concerns our classical colleges, our academies, our convents, our model schools, and I will even go so far as to say, the elementary schools in our villages, they are fairly satisfactory; but I must say that our elementary schools in the back concessions are nothing at all; they are nil. Now, if these schools have been carried into the province of Manitoba by the French-Canadians who went there, it is no wonder they have been found deficient, and it is no wonder that an attempt has been made to improve them. You may call it selfishness, you may call it a spirit of domination—and I am ready to admit that the legislature has created a grievance—but I do not impute such bad motives to the legislature. I see some patriotism in it. I believe that people must be educated, and that people who desire to prosper must be educated. I say that I am ready to believe, and do honestly believe, that, if these schools have been modeled after ours in the back concessions of the province of Quebec, they must have been pretty bad. Now, Sir, that is my first ground, I am opposed to this legislation now, because we want first to have an investigation into the facts. We want evidence to be put in by the majority, as well as by the minority. We want to deal fairly with the majority, as well as with the minority; we want to give equal justice. We want to be informed about all these matters, and then we will know the exact measure of justice which is required, then we will know the exact remedy which is necessary. More than that, Mr. Speaker, I say that, when we take from a provincial legislature powers which have been declared constitutional, we ought to be very sure of our ground, and, before removing those powers from the legislature, we ought to try and convince all parties concerned. We have, perhaps, convinced the Roman Catholics, we may be convinced ourselves, but we want to convince the Protestants, as well. We must remember that the Roman Catholics are in a minority in this country, and we are a still greater minority in the House of Commons. According to the last census, we form about 40 per cent of the population, but in this House the Roman Catholics form only about one-fourth of the deputation. Therefore, I say, that we are bound to convince the Protestant majority that the rights of the Roman Catholics have been invaded in Manitoba, and, when they

are so convinced, when public opinion is convinced that there is a grievance to be removed, then it will be easy work, then the legislature of Manitoba will yield to our wishes. But, if they should not grant a remedy, if we were backed by public opinion, if we were backed by a great majority of the Protestants, we would have no difficulty in setting the wrong right. I take it for granted, that the Protestant majority are ready to give justice, I take it for granted that they are animated by a spirit of British fair-play, which nobody will deny; and I am convinced that, when it is proved to them that an injustice has been committed, they will at once be ready to remedy such injustice. Now, as I said a little while ago, why should Protestants take our word? We must remember that the Protestants, who hold very different views from our own, deny the facts which have been alleged by the Roman Catholic minority; the Manitoba legislature also denies these facts. Why should they take our word, unsupported by evidence? They have as much confidence in themselves as we have in ourselves. Then, I say that the only way to reach an amicable settlement, the only way to convince the whole people that something must be done, is to investigate the matter. When could that have been done? It could have been done since last June, after the suggestion was made by the Manitoba legislature. If an investigation had been entered upon then, it would now be closed. Sir, I ask myself sometimes, in reading this Bill, if it has not been devised simply with the object of getting rid of this whole matter. I cannot believe that hon. gentlemen opposite could be animated by any such motives; still I have heard it said by enemies of the Bill, but, at the same time, the friends of the Conservative Government: Give them the Act; it won't do them any good; the law is useless, and we can well support the government. Sir, I hope such motives will not weigh with an hon. gentleman, because it would be an infamy to saddle upon these people such a law simply because it will not do them any good. Now, I will pass to another point. Will it help the Catholic minority in Manitoba? I do not intend to deal with all clauses of the Bill. The hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) said that when the Bill was in committee was the proper time to make amendments to it. The Bill has been distributed, it had its first reading before we had seen it, but we have seen it since, and we have a right to question its efficiency, to examine its general lines and to show that the measure is not one that is acceptable. It is admitted that owing to the way the Bill is drafted, section 74 deprives the minority of its share in the educational grant. That grant, I observe from the last sessional papers of the province of Manitoba amounts to \$130 for every school. In our province that would pay for two elementary schools.

That grant is a very serious matter. It is admitted by the wording of the Bill that we cannot force the legislature to grant a share of the money for the support of the schools. I will read the clause to which I refer:

4. The right to share proportionately, in any grant made out of public funds for the purposes of education having been decided to be and being now one of the rights and privileges of the said Roman Catholic minority of Her Majesty's subjects in the province of Manitoba, any sum granted by the legislature of Manitoba and appropriated for the separate schools shall be placed to the credit of the Board of Education in accounts to be opened in the books of the Treasury Department and in the Audit Office.

It has been asserted that they have a right to it. But this right cannot be enforced. This is simply a trap to catch Roman Catholic support and Roman Catholic votes, to deceive simple people. This right should not be asserted if Parliament does not feel it can enforce it. The fact of it is that it is adding insult to injury. These words are there to deceive, and that is what they amount to. This is one of my greatest objections to the Bill, and is one of the most serious and urgent reasons for opposing it and for contending that this matter should be settled by means of conciliation. I believe we cannot force the legislature of Manitoba to vote this appropriation and to make this grant? Are we going to be satisfied with a bald statement of this kind without a law to enforce it? Not only as a French Canadian, not only as a Roman Catholic, but on broader grounds, as a Canadian, I shall always refuse to pass legislation which places not a Roman Catholic minority, not a French minority, but any minority whatever in an inferior position than that occupied by others, which places a minority, a class of people or a certain religious denomination in an unfair situation as compared with the balance of the population. It is humiliating, it is outrageous, I will never assent to that, and rather than do so I would be disposed to refuse any remedial legislation.

Another point is this, is the Bill efficient? I will not read it; I believe the hon. member for Verchères (Mr. Geoffrion) has shown a great many deficiencies in it. Can it prove effectual, can it be operated? Take the clause cited by the hon. member for Verchères. He showed that the power rested in the hands of the local legislature, in the hands of the Manitoba government. What do they say? They protest against this measure. They may submit to the technical part of it, but without their good-will we cannot do anything whatever with the Act, if passed. I will not say much on this point, because it has been well dealt with by the hon. member for Verchères. I have many other reasons for objecting to this Bill, but at this late hour I do not wish to prolong the debate. Another reason is this: I distrust the hon. gentlemen who have charge

of the measure and who are seeking to pass it through Parliament. They will tell us that perhaps we may improve the Bill in Committee. I feel convinced that hon. gentlemen opposite will not be here to execute it as a law. I fear that after hon. gentlemen opposite have gone before the people they will not be sent back to execute this law, and we are afraid to receive such a legacy and would sooner renounce any estate such as this. The first clause gives power to the local government of Manitoba to name the members of the council of public instruction. As the hon. member for Verchères has pointed out, they might make the law inefficient by appointing men who would not be willing to make use of it. There is a delay allowed of three months after the coming into force of the Act within which to make appointments to the board. This means that after this session is over there will be forty days to enforce the law. Three months afterwards a report will be made or the fact established in a regular way that the local government have not acted; then this Government will be entitled to appoint the members of the board. In six months from the present time we will probably have given an account of our good or bad deeds to the people to whom we have to account for our actions in Parliament. I affirm that the law can be set aside by the hon. gentlemen themselves. This Bill in fact is to bridge them over the elections,—it is a six months' hoist so far as the elections are concerned. Now, Sir, I distrust such a policy. I say that we have enough to satisfy us, that this law will never be enforced by these gentlemen, and will never be enforced by the legislature of Manitoba. A remedy like that we do not want. Sir, I will not detain the House any longer. I have stated my reasons, and I am not afraid in this matter to take this ground. I shall give my vote according to the dictates of my conscience, and I state my views before this House without any fear.

Mr. MASSON. Mr. Speaker, at this late hour of the night, I must apologize for wishing to take part in this debate, the importance of which is my only excuse. We have been told that we are now face to face with one of the greatest questions that the Parliament of Canada has ever had to deal with. And, considering the far-reaching effect, not only for the present, but for the future of Canada, that this enactment now before the House may have, I certainly agree with that statement. But, Sir, while agreeing with the statement that the question is momentous, and that it is fraught with serious consequences, it does not, in the least degree, lessen the duty of each member of this House to do the very best in his power to carry it out in the spirit and to the letter of the constitution. It is not a question to be treated as a party question. It is not an ordinary political question, as we have in times past look-

Mr. LAVERGNE.

ed upon the majority of questions that have come before the House, but it is purely and simply a constitutional question. It is as such that it comes as a legacy to the present Government. It does not come to them by any action of theirs, nor at their seeking, nor because it was any part of their policy, but, being an outgrowth of circumstances, it has come in a constitutional way to rest upon the shoulders of the present Government. It is, therefore, necessary, in debating this question, in order to base any argument upon the constitution, to trace, briefly, as I will endeavour to do, the history of the clause in the constitution under which we are now called upon to act. That matter has been gone over in a more able manner than it is possible for me to do, but still, I may be pardoned for attempting to rehearse some of the statements already made, in the hope of referring to some that I consider of importance, and which have not hitherto been dealt with. We have already been told that but for the recognition of separate schools as part of the constitution of Canada, there would have been no confederation. There is still another element to the back of that, and to see exactly why it depends on that question, we have to recall the very first steps taken towards confederation. At the two meetings of the fathers of confederation, in 1864, in the first preliminary statement made as to what should be, in the opinion of these gentlemen, left absolutely to the control of the provinces, one of the first subjects mentioned, and which these gentlemen agreed upon, was that of education. Now, it is to that early statement that I wish, for a moment, to call the attention of the House. The statement that the control of education should be left to the jurisdiction and management of the several provinces, was met with great feelings of distrust, not only in the province of Quebec, but in the province of Ontario. And, Sir, the distrust was not expressed by the minority in the province of Ontario, for the minority in that province then had much the same system of separate schools that they have to-day: the alteration made from that day to this being very slight, indeed. The feelings of distrust were evinced by the Protestants of Ontario, or of Upper Canada, then called, on behalf of their brethren in the province of Quebec, where they knew their brethren were weak. There was not a Protestant church in the province of Ontario that did not take that question up, and they brought what pressure and power they could to bear upon those in authority. Resolutions were passed, and conveyed to the leaders of the people of that day, and there was not a church paper published in the province of Ontario, either of the Presbyterian, the Methodist, or the English Church, but rung the changes upon the great danger in which the minority of Quebec would be, if the power of entirely controlling education

was passed over to the great Catholic majority of Lower Canada. The agitation created by the Protestant churches of Ontario was taken up by the Protestants of Quebec, and petitions after petitions were circulated, and in due course, in the year 1865, they were presented to the Parliament of Upper and Lower Canada, at its very first session after these resolutions had been drafted. Now, what was the result of that agitation in the way of bringing forth petitions? Since the question was mentioned in the House yesterday, I have hurriedly looked over the records of the Parliament of 1865, and I find that between the date of the 6th of February and the 17th March, in that year, forty-nine petitions were presented to Parliament, praying for redress in that matter, and that the Protestant schools of Quebec should be made permanent, and at least equal to the separate schools of Upper Canada. The effect of this agitation and of these petitions may be pointed out. In the very commencement it was laid down that the provinces should have entire control of the education, but it was made clear that the existing laws as regards separate schools for the minority, should remain permanent.

That was agreed to in 1864, and following that, petitions came in asking that the separate schools of Lower Canada should be so improved as to be at least equal to those of Upper Canada. Those petitions resulted in the introduction into the Parliament of Canada of a Bill to change the Educational Act as regarded Lower Canada. That Bill failed to pass, receiving the six months' hoist, which is moved for the Bill before the House to-day. But it brought from the Hon. George E. Cartier a promise that such an amendment should be made to the school laws of Lower Canada as soon as the province had power to do it. So ended the efforts in 1865. That and that only was the result of the agitation at that time. But another Parliament is about to assemble. Again the church papers take the matter up. On a former occasion I referred to a number of passages from those papers. I will now only refer to a brief extract from one. In the "Presbyterian" we find these words:

Parliament will soon meet again to discuss the question of confederation. What has been done since last session was called? Has there been placed before the public the true aspect of our laws on common school education?

This paper, although largely subscribed for in the province of Upper Canada, was printed in the city of Montreal, and this expression refers undoubtedly to the schools of Lower Canada. The article goes on:

Two or three meetings, a number of circulars, a number of petitions, an application to Parliament, and then a total cessation of everything like effort.

This article urged further action, and further action was taken. In 1866 the Parliament met, and we have again a flood of petitions, resulting in the promise of Sir George E. Cartier being introduced into the resolutions and being placed, by way of proviso, in the Draft Act, providing that after the union the Protestant schools of Lower Canada should be made equal to the Roman Catholic schools of Upper Canada. But that promise, made by a member of the House whom we all respected, and so firmly engrafted into the resolutions, was not satisfactory to those who were still urging for something further in the way of protection of the rights of the minority in that province. It was said, and wisely said, that while they could trust the present representatives, the time would come when they would be no more, and other rulers might arise who knew nothing of the past struggles, and might act far differently. The result of pressure on those lines was the introduction of the subsection which is now the cause of all our trouble—the subsection providing that in case of provincial legislation prejudicially affecting the rights of a minority, which they either had at the time of the union or received afterwards by provincial legislation, it should be subject to appeal to the Federal Parliament. That was the result of two years of struggle upon that question; and I wish particularly to draw attention to the fact that that struggle was mainly, if not entirely, on behalf of the Protestant minority of Quebec. It is true that some petitions were presented to Parliament during those same years asking for an improvement in the Separate School Act of Upper Canada; but as that Act was at that time almost equal to what it is to-day, there was not very much effort made beyond presenting petitions. Now, I wish to call the attention of the House to the source from which the opposition to that subsection came. It was opposed by John Sandfield Macdonald, himself a Catholic representing an Upper Canada constituency; but he opposed it, not on any sectarian ground, but on the ground that such a provision would be an interference with the rights of the majority—taking the broad liberal ground that the majority should rule and the minority should submit. I mention this to show that the very questions raised to-day about the respective rights of the majority and minority were then discussed by the late John Sandfield Macdonald. The subsection was also opposed by Christopher Dunkin in a very able speech, in which, in prophetic language, he described exactly the scene we have witnessed during the last two years—that an application for the enforcement of the right of appeal would cause just such trouble as we are having here to-day. On these two grounds, and these two grounds only, was the subsection opposed. It was, therefore, thoroughly discussed on that line at that time. It was passed, however, and

became part of the British North America Act. The same provision became, for the same reasons, part of the Manitoba Act. Let me mention also that, so far as I can find the only two or three little references made to that clause were made by Protestant members, and were in favour of it. We therefore have in our constitution, as stated by the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) a different question from the ordinary question of provincial rights. It was not a question whether or not the province had the right; but it was a technical question under the constitution whether the province, having a right to do certain things, was still limited in that right, and whether, if the province passed that limit, it was subject to appeal. I am glad the hon. gentleman made that statement so emphatically as he did, because it is sufficient answer to the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace), who yesterday expatiated very loudly on the question of provincial rights, ignoring altogether the question arising under this subsection, ignoring this subsection to such an extent that he referred to the decision of the Privy Council in the Barrett case as declaring unmistakably that the province had complete jurisdiction.

Now, the Government are charged with having dealt weakly, imprudently and unsatisfactorily with this matter, if they did not do absolute wrong. With the exception perhaps of the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) no one, in this debate, has charged the Government with direct wrong. I think the hon. leader of the Opposition came very close to it on several occasions, but, in that peculiar style of his, he could come close up to the line without touching it, and then withdraw from it. We are told that the Government have not dealt fairly with the minority. We are told by the leader of the Opposition that, if they had dealt as fairly with the minority in Manitoba as they have with other questions, the minority would have had their rights long ago. But in what step they did take they were wrong or dilatory, the leader of the Opposition failed to point out. The fact is, that no sooner was that Act passed than an application to veto it was presented. The Government did not veto it. Does the leader of the Opposition blame the Government? Does the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) blame the Government? Does the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), who, perhaps, was the originator of nearly all this trouble, blame the Government? No, on the floor of this House, last session, he said the Government were right in not vetoing the Act. Why, then, should we be called on now to argue that the Government were right or wrong in that question? I think it is admitted by the House and country that the Government were right in not vetoing that Act. Why should they have to veto

Mr. MASSON.

it? Almost immediately after it passed, those interested brought it before the courts. They claimed it was ultra vires; and in such cases the court was the proper tribunal to settle the question. The Barrett case passed through various stages until the judgment of the Privy Council declared that the Manitoba government had acted within its jurisdiction, and that consequently the Act was not a proper subject for veto. More especially was it not a proper case for veto, when the British North America Act and the Manitoba Act, in matters of education, are a code in themselves. The British North America Act provides a remedy for all grievances. Therefore, the proper course was, not to veto the Act, but to apply the remedy that the Act itself provided, and those interested immediately took steps to have an appeal. Now, how has the Government acted in each stage of this matter? The parties were granted an appeal, and the appeal was brought on. The province of Manitoba was notified of the appeal, but refused to attend. The argument began, and then certain legal questions being raised, the Government did what was right and proper, and what no gentleman on the other side can say was improper, because only two sessions before their leader, by a resolution known as the Blake Resolution, had provided for the reference of all such questions to the courts. These questions were propounded; and, in pursuance of the Act based on that Blake Resolution, they were referred to the courts, and in due process of time we had a decision. We have a decision that no hon. gentleman on the floor of this House or in the country would dare to take exception to. That decision declares that the right to appeal existed under the Manitoba Act, that the appeal was well founded, that the Manitoba minority has a grievance, and that it rests with this Government and with this House to remedy that grievance.

Now, we are told that the subsequent proceedings have not been taken in the proper spirit. I suppose it makes a good deal of difference whose ox is gored in this as well as in other cases. It makes a good deal of difference from what standpoint you look at it; but, trying to look at it in an unprejudiced light, I fail to see anything left undone which should have been done by the Government in the way of approaching Manitoba in a kindly spirit. From my standpoint, I think it did not rest with this Government to approach Manitoba at all. Manitoba was one of the parties interested, nay, the party mostly interested, and it was the duty of the government of Manitoba, when that judgment was pronounced declaring that there was a grievance, and pointing out the line upon which a remedy might be applied, to at once apply the remedy. They did not need to hesitate or wait for any request or interference from the federal authority. It was their duty to

administer the law according to the constitution. And, having been told, if they did not know it before, what that constitution required, it was their duty to at once apply the remedy. But they did nothing. On the contrary, they declared, in spite of the Privy Council's decision, that they would stand by their Public School Act and would grant no remedy. Notice was then given for a continuation of the argument, and they did, on this occasion, attend. Now, certain delays were asked for, and we are told that the matter was hurried on, that the delays granted were insufficient. But it was not to inquire into matters of fact or into matters of conscience, or into matters of past compacts, or of subsequent bad faith that delay was required. It was to have time to prepare an argument, and that time was granted, and the argument was proceeded with and completed. We are told still, that there must be some inquiry, that there were some questions raised in that argument about matters of fact, that affidavits were produced, and that they were withdrawn.

If I were to take the words of the hon. leader of the Opposition as he gave them and put the ordinary interpretation upon them, I would understand him as representing that the counsel for the minority based his whole case upon these affidavits, and that when he withdrew these affidavits he withdrew his whole case. But can the hon. gentleman present such an argument in view of the whole case? The affidavits referred to matters entirely beyond those referred to in the judgment of the Privy Council and the remedial order. It was quite within the scope of the counsel's duty to urge independently of what appears upon the face of the Act that there was a breach of the contract. It was quite in the line of his duty to argue that and to produce evidence if he desired to establish it. But he had sufficient case upon the Act itself and what was admitted at that argument to argue for and obtain the relief that the remedial order granted. You will note, Sir, that the judgment of the Privy Council and the remedial order go no further than the interpretation of the rights under that subsection. To establish a compact would be to establish that the other subsection referring to the rights that could not be taken away that it would be ultra vires to interfere with, was defective, and as the Minister of Justice stated, there is a clause in that Manitoba statute in which the language differs from the corresponding clause in the British North America Act, and that the introduction of the word "practice" shows that it was the intention to preserve that practice. And that intention to preserve the practice was admitted on the floor of this House last session by a speaker who takes strong grounds against the Bill. The hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) stated on 17th July last that to make it quite clear that the minority should be pro-

tected in all the rights they had enjoyed in reference to denominational schools the word "practice" was put in as well as the word "law." The argument of the Minister of Justice was not as has been stated based upon a new interpretation of the word "practice." It was admitted last session by the opponents of this legislation that the word was introduced for the purpose stated by the hon. Minister. It is evident that there was a compact of some kind and that the intention of Parliament was to carry that compact out. But we have the interpretation of the other subsection in the Barrett case, and by that this Government has chosen to be bound. They have not attempted to go back of that or to base any of their remedy upon what was outside of that interpretation. Nothing whatever has been done that could for a moment be construed into carrying it beyond that interpretation. Therefore it is unnecessary, in discussing the Bill before the House, to say whether there was a compact beyond that or not. We are quite within the mark when we say that the remedies applied by this Act are such as are provided in the subsection under discussion and that it is not necessary to go beyond it.

But, the order being made, we are told that it was too drastic, that it asked for too much, that, in fact, it asked for the re-establishment of inefficient schools. That being called to the attention of the Government, time was given. I do not wish to take up the time of the House in going over what has been gone over several times within the last few days; but to follow up the history, the order of July was then sent to Manitoba, to which order there could be no exception taken on the ground of it asking too much. That order gave them the option of applying the remedy or of suggesting the remedy and, as they have the power, of applying it. But still nothing was done. The pledge of the Government had to be kept, that pledge being that this Parliament should be called together and this Bill introduced and pressed to a conclusion. But we are told that this Parliament is in its dying days and the people have not been consulted, and have not been told what was going to be done, and therefore it would be hasty legislation to pass this Bill now. There are many ways in which the opinions of the people are made known to their representatives. We cannot refer everything to a plebiscite, for if so we would kill all party government. But we know that when questions arise members of the Government go through the country stating their views upon them and gathering the feeling of the people who attend and hear their addresses. I recollect in an early stage of this question, at a large meeting held in the city of Toronto, hearing the late leader of the Government and of this House, Sir John Thompson, state that every step he took in the matter he would take after having had the opinion

of the highest legal tribunal, and that, having obtained that opinion, he would follow it to the letter. And that statement was received by that great meeting with cheers, and none cheered louder than the hon. gentleman who, on the floor of this House—blamed the Government for following the Decision of the highest tribunal in the Empire, the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace). I heard the hon. gentleman, the late leader of the Government on several other occasions in my own town and in other places in Ontario, make the statement, and never once did I hear that statement made by him or by any one else representing the Government which he then led, but it was received with approval by the men who are now trying to blame the Government for having followed that course. That was the solution proposed—that the difficulty should be constitutionally solved and it only remains for this Parliament constitutionally to enforce it.

As has been remarked, the Government are attacked on two different lines. We have the leader of the Opposition leading one line, or perhaps, I might say many lines. For while the hon. gentleman has a very fine record for talking on both sides of the question and all round the question and never saying anything emphatic on either side, I think he excelled himself in that respect yesterday. First, he was very much opposed to coercion. He read us a very eloquent lecture upon the evils of coercion and how very wrong it would be to practise it. Then almost in the next sentence he proceeded to say that veto was the remedy. The hon. gentleman did not say that the Act should have been vetoed, but if the question had not been asked him, which showed that he was really dodging the question, no person who heard him would have thought, no reporter in the gallery would have reported otherwise than that the hon. gentleman had recommended the veto.

How close did he go to it? He tells us that the minority asked for it, and if justice had been given to them, as it had been in other cases, they would have had their grievance redressed long ago. He then goes on to say that four Acts were passed that session, that two were vetoed, and two were not. This Act was not vetoed, and one referring to the French language was not vetoed. The minority's rights were not protected by the veto, either as regards the French language or as regards their schools; but in other matters, the veto was brought into play. And so he argues until he leaves the question, thoroughly impressing every one who heard him that he thought that was the remedy that should have been applied. But, unfortunately, a member from this side of the House put to him the question whether he thought the Government should have disallowed the Manitoba School Act, and then he answers neither yes or no, but avoids the question.

Mr. MASSON.

Well, having lectured against the evils of coercion, he then tells us that an inquiry should be made as to whether there was a grievance, and almost immediately afterwards tells us that there was a grievance, a grievance against heaven's laws, the unwritten and the unchangeable. Then, having told us that there was a grievance, he virtually tells us that it was impossible to remedy it, that this Parliament could not give a remedy. Then he says that the constitution gave the remedy, and that that remedy should be applied. What does the hon. gentleman's argument amount to from all these various statements? Whether the Government vetoes or does not veto, whether they coerce or do not coerce, whether they consider there is a grievance or no grievance, whether there is a remedy, or no remedy, whether they apply it or leave it alone, in any case and in every case, they must be wrong. I think that is really the substance of the hon. gentleman's argument. To follow his argument further than that would only be a waste of time at present. Almost at the close of his speech, he wants a reference, and he wants many things inquired into. One thing he wanted inquired into was whether this matter of education was a matter of conscience with the Roman Catholics. Well, as a Protestant, I never doubted it. As a Presbyterian, it is a matter of conscience with me, and I thought that the Catholics went further than any Protestant church in the matter of conscientiously looking after the education of the youth. But the hon. gentleman wants an inquiry to satisfy somebody, surely not himself. I can assure him there is no person on this side of the House who wants any inquiry on that question. We all grant that the matter of education is a question of conscience with the Roman Catholics. He wants an inquiry as to compacts, and what compact was broken. That might be a very important question for inquiry, but quite outside, as I have already said, the question we are dealing with. Are the schools Protestant? Does the hon. gentleman want to inquire into that? He has had an ample opportunity to do so. Surely he has found out by this time whether they are or not. If we take the Catholic view of it, they are Protestant; we have the Protestant view of it that they are Protestant; but if they are not, will that satisfy the conscience of the hon. gentleman? Will it satisfy the conscience of the hon. gentleman to have the Catholics deprived of their rights to have schools of their own, to teach their own schools, and to have their own religious instructions given in those schools? Is that not inflicting a twinge upon the conscience of the hon. gentleman? Does he not think it would be an outrage on the conscience of the minority of Manitoba to have that right taken away, whether the schools are Protestant or not? I can understand men who

have no deep religious feelings of their own, who care not for religious matters, who would like to see the country brought up to infidelity or to materialism, and religion swept out of the back door—I can understand men of that class being satisfied with schools having no religious instruction in them, or with passing the schools over entirely to secularism; but I cannot understand a member of any Christian church, who thoroughly believes in the religion he professes, deeming it a matter of small importance whether religion is driven from our schools or not, or whether the right to teach the religion of the parent to the child, is a matter of no practical importance. I know that many Protestants think they have other means of teaching religion, and it was stated by the Minister of Justice, as his private opinion, they had better do away with separate schools altogether. The only alternative is to do away with religious instruction in schools. That is the only alternative that has ever worked with any satisfaction. We have the statements of the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) that the secular schools had been a success in some countries. But it is a matter of opinion as to what success is. If obtaining classical lore or secular education is all that is required in our schools, why, then, we may look at the secular schools of some countries as being a success. But to look at it from a religious standpoint, can we say that any of them have proved a great success? The hon. gentleman referred to several countries. Why did he omit Germany, where they were first introduced in Europe, a country whose circumstances are so parallel with our own, with its Protestant states and its Catholic states? About eighty years ago it introduced secular schools, and has had, therefore, several generations of experience. Why did he omit it? Was it because he knew, from a Christian standpoint, it would not only be a failure but a great disaster? Germany was then as Canada is to-day, thank God, a religious country, very religious it might be called. How is it to-day? Largely gone over to infidelity. Why did he not refer to France, the next in importance, and where a still closer parallel can be drawn; where, on the expulsion of the Jesuits, the state had to take charge of the male education, and did it with secular schools? How is France to-day in this regard? Is the religious element of France improved by the change or otherwise? I do not think there are two opinions on that point. The hon. gentleman did refer to Italy. What about Italy? He said it was a great success there. He must have been reading of the first few years' experience in Italy. Introduced in 1848, for the first 12 years the reports, the best I have discovered furnished by the British and Foreign Bible Society, are loud in their praises of the secular

schools. The priests and clergy had been driven out; these men had a better chance to do the work they were after, and they were loud in their praises. They stopped praising, and it is interesting to note the change in their tone. But without seeking to go over the matter in detail I would refer to one of the authorities, which states that Italy is now under thralldom worse than that of Rome. I wonder if it is possible for the member for West York (Mr. Wallace) to know of any thralldom worse than that of Rome? Yet such was the language of that report, and also that the national schools were the hot-bed of infidelity. Does the hon. member for West York claim that is a success and one that is desired for Canada? If so, I commend his opinion on that point to the hon. gentlemen he pretends to lead. But the hon. gentleman also referred to the United States. Does he find it such a glaring success in that respect there? They have only been started fifty years; commencing in New York, they spread west and south; and how about the infidelity that has followed? How about Sabbath observance in that country, where there is no Bible or religious instruction in the schools? You can trace it from state to state; the crop has always been an outcropping of infidelity. If that is a success desired to be attained by the introduction of secular schools, by schools that are not Protestant, that are not Catholic, where no religion is taught that would hurt anybody or do any good. If that is the result, does the leader of the Opposition wish to say that the minority in Manitoba would have no grievance if such a condition prevailed there? For my part I am inclined to respect their consciences so far as to say that not only would I give them schools of which they would not complain as being Protestant, but I would give them schools in which they were entitled to teach the religion of their fathers. That is what our various Protestant churches have fought for, what the Huguenots fought for, what the Orangemen fought for, what the Calvinists of Scotland fought for, the rights of civil and religious liberty, including the education of their child as they liked, none daring to make them afraid.

On that point we hear a great deal said about the rights of the State and the rights of the Church, as if these two statements comprised all the rights that could possibly exist. We know that on questions of civil and religious liberty the fight was often between the State and the Church. But that does not embrace all the rights, and to my mind on the question of education; neither the State nor the Church has the about the rights of the State and the rights to educate and to direct the course of the education. It is the duty of the State and the duty of the Church to assist in that education, but not to control it, and I think we often mistake the position both

of State and Church when we give to either one or the other the full power. It is their duty and privilege to assist, but in my humble opinion it is the right of the parent first to educate. I will not detain the House much longer on this question, important though it is. I have traced briefly the history of the legislation that brought this question about, the manner in which it has come before the House; and it now only remains for me to say in regard to the Act itself, the details of which I trust we will soon be able to discuss clause by clause, when perhaps I may consider it my duty to take some exception or ask for some amendments with respect to the details, but speaking of the Act as a whole, I consider it to be strictly within the lines of the judgment of the Privy Council, strictly within the lines of the remedial order, going as far as is absolutely necessary in remedying the grievance which is complained of, and going no further. I think the Bill shows proof of great care on the part of the Government in the endeavour on their part to go just as far as the judgment of the Privy Council pointed out it was their duty to go, just as far as it was absolutely necessary to redress the grievance and to apply the remedy, and yet not to interfere with the public schools of Manitoba. And while we hear from the other side of the House, from the hon. gentlemen who have just spoken on the subject and who have declared that the Bill is incomplete, the leader of the Opposition also stating that it granted no relief to the suffering minority and that it would be of no real value to them—a statement also made by two of his followers—we are still bound to say that it does remove the conscientious grievances that were imposed upon them, that it does relieve their consciences from the temptation of which we have heard complaints made and places them on a fair footing, giving them a clear right to educate their own children in their own way and to support their own schools and carry these matters out while at the same time not interfering in the least degree with the regular working of the public schools. These are the two objects which have been kept prominently before this House in the various debates which have taken place here. I think the Government deserve credit for the manner in which they have carried out this policy. We were told by the last speaker (Mr. Lavergne), that the Manitoba government were promising redress, and that in the last general elections the leader of the Liberals there had been charged by the other side with a desire to coquette with the question, and had been charged that if he were returned to power we would grant a remedy. I do not think it is necessary, Sir, to look to an opponent for an explanation of one's intentions. The Liberals in Manitoba gave their own statement, and that statement was emphatic enough. They stated that

Mr. MASSON.

they would stand by the Act of 1890, and that that was the issue. I will not trouble the House with reading the statements of the Liberal leaders in Manitoba, for they have already been quoted on more than one occasion. The statements were very emphatic, not only those made by Mr. Greenway himself, but those made by Mr. Sifton, in Mr. Greenway's presence. They stated that they would not back down from the School Act which they had passed, that they would not interfere with their public schools, and that they would not re-establish separate schools. It is, therefore, quite unnecessary to quote from the words of the opponent of a political leader, to find out what that political leader means, when he himself makes an unqualified statement of his meaning. We have been told, over and over again, by gentlemen opposite, that every sunny means of conciliation has not been adopted in regard to the government of Manitoba. Well, it is easy to say that "everything" has not been adopted, because it is a very wide expression, and it might include some very fine details that have not been attended to. But have hon. gentlemen opposite who have made these charges, ever pointed out one thing which has been left undone, or one effort that has not been made, which would lead to any different result? It is a well-known thing in practice, in the profession to which I belong, that when a flat refusal is given, there is no necessity of tenders; there is no necessity of begging, and praying, and pressing for a thing to be done if there is once a positive refusal. Now, Sir, on three occasions at least, has the olive branch been held out to the government of Manitoba. Three attempts have been made to get Manitoba to do something, and on each and every occasion the answer has been an unqualified refusal. That being the case, Mr. Speaker, I think it is idle for hon. gentlemen opposite to talk about something possible being done yet. Sir, it is for this House to respect itself. The Remedial Bill is now before it, and if it is the desire of this Parliament to stand by the constitution—and I trust that it is the desire of every member of this House to carry out the constitution to the letter and in the spirit—it is their duty to support this Act. If, in the meantime, before this Act receives a final assent, Manitoba will, as she properly should do, by a statute of her own, grant a remedy and keep the control of education in her own hands, then, Sir, I am sure there is not a member in this House who would not be glad that this Act would become unnecessary and need be pressed no further.

Mr. IVES moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

Mr. FOSTER moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 1.30 a.m. (Thursday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 5th March, 1896.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 79) to incorporate the National Sanitarium Association.—(Mr. Roome.)

THE REMEDIAL ACT (MANITOBA).

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Sir Charles Tupper for second reading of Bill (No. 58) the Remedial Act (Manitoba), and the proposed motion (six months' hoist) of Mr. Laurier in amendment thereto.

Mr. IVES. As a representative of the Protestant minority of the province of Quebec, I have naturally given a great deal of study to the question as to how the interests of that minority are affected by the question now under discussion. I propose, with the permission of the House, to devote the chief part of the few moments that I intend to speak, to the consideration of that branch of the question more especially. The House is aware that at the time the Quebec conference met to consider whether or not the provinces would agree upon a scheme of confederation, a very serious objection was raised by my distinguished predecessor, Sir Alexander Galt, on behalf of the Quebec minority, more particularly on account of the position in which the minority was likely to be placed in educational matters. The provinces all agreed in demanding that to them should be given the subject of education; and while that seemed to be a necessity, then the position of the minority in the province of Quebec was brought to the attention of the Quebec conference very forcibly by Sir Alexander Galt. The first answer that was made to Sir Alexander Galt's objection was that the Confederation Act, which would necessarily be an Imperial Act, should be made to guarantee, beyond the power of repeal by the Quebec legislature, the 'status quo' in school matters and school laws, as it existed at the time of confederation. That view Sir Alexander Galt protested would not protect the minority, because, under the school law, as it existed at the time of confederation, the governing body was a board known as the Council of Public Instruction; and although it had been before confederation appointed by the Governor in Council of United Canada, it would after confederation be appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council of the province of Quebec; and inasmuch as the sole management, regulation and control of the dissentient

schools would rest with that body, and inasmuch as that body might be all Roman Catholics, so far as anything that the minority could do would avail to prevent this, it was felt and represented by Sir Alexander Galt that the 'status quo' in school matters existing at confederation was entirely insecure and unsafe for the Protestant minority. It was then promised to Sir Alex. Galt that in the session which the Parliament of United Canada was to hold before confederation came into force, the law would be amended and changed in such a way as to meet the objection of the Protestant minority of Quebec. In that last session, a serious effort was made by the Government and the Parliament of United Canada to pass a new and more satisfactory educational measure. But that effort did not succeed, and, at the time of the London conference, it seemed to be necessary that some other measure should be taken to protect them, otherwise it was impossible that the Protestants of Quebec could agree to the scheme of confederation. It was then proposed by Sir George Cartier, and our present colleague, Sir Hector Langevin, that they would remain in the legislature of Quebec long enough to have passed by that legislature amendments to the school law which should make safe, secure and satisfactory the position of the Protestant minority of Quebec, and to protect these amendments from subsequent repeal. To make the position of the Protestant minority secure, Sir Alexander Galt, at the London conference, proposed to his colleagues an amendment, which you will find in Mr. Pope's confederation papers, a facsimile of the handwriting of Sir Alexander Galt himself, and that amendment is substantially the provision under which the minority of Manitoba are to-day appealing to the Government and Parliament of Canada. That amendment was inserted, not for Manitoba, not for Roman Catholics even. It was suggested by a Protestant of the Protestants, a representative of the Protestant minority in the province of Quebec, and it was designed for the protection of that minority after confederation. That amendment was adopted by the London conference. You will find it in all the drafts which are given in Mr. Pope's book, from the rough draft to the fifth and final one; and you will find it in the British North America Act itself. Sir, this provision was inserted to protect legislation which had not then been passed; it was inserted to protect legislation which Sir George Etienne Cartier and Sir Hector Langevin promised they would see passed and adopted by the legislature in the province of Quebec, in the first or second session after confederation. Such was the good faith between public men of that day, such was the confidence that the Protestants reposed in the two distinguished French-Canadians whose names I have mentioned, that they were willing to trust to these men for the introduction and adoption of the neces-

sary legislation, and all that they asked was, that the Imperial Parliament should provide a clause which would protect the legislation after it was passed. Now, another provision was adopted, not at the London conference, but subsequent to that conference, which appears for the first time in the Imperial Act itself. That provision is a clause which secures to the Protestants the same provisions of law as had been given to the Roman Catholic population of Upper Canada. The way in which I account for the words "shall be, and the same are hereby extended," in the clause to which I am referring, is, that a petition was forwarded to Her Majesty in person at the time the Bill was before the Imperial Parliament, from the Protestant school teachers of Lower Canada. You will find that petition in Mr. Pope's papers. The conclusion of it is as follows:—

Wherefore, your memorialists humbly pray your most gracious Majesty to take their case as above stated into your favourable consideration, with a view to the introduction of proper and just safeguards into the Imperial Act of confederation, should such Act be passed.

They state :

That while your petitioners would prefer a general and non-denominational system of education, they believe that so long as the present system of separate schools shall continue in Lower Canada, they may justly claim the following privileges as constitutional rights, which should in no way depend on the vote of the local legislature:

1. That all direct taxes for the support of schools, paid by Protestants, unless otherwise designated by themselves, should be applied to Protestant or non-denominational education ; and that all public money given for the same purpose should be divided between Protestants and Roman Catholics in proportion to population.

2. That suitable and adequate provision should be made for the protection of the educational interests of Protestants in the management of educational funds, the establishment and proper classification of schools and institutions of superior education, and generally in the administration of educational affairs.

That petition, received by Her Majesty and referred to the Imperial Government, while this Bill was before the Imperial Parliament, unquestionably led to the insertion in the British North America Act of the provisions of that subsection, where it says :

All the powers, privileges and duties at the union by law conferred and imposed in Upper Canada on separate schools and school trustees of the Queen's Roman Catholic subjects, shall be, and the same are hereby extended—

These are the words—"are hereby extended."

—to the Queen's Protestant and Roman Catholic subjects in Quebec.

So that the Protestants, at the time of the confederation, by provisions of the 1st subsection of section 93, are constitutionally protected in the possession of the law as it

Mr. IVES.

stood at confederation, which practically gave them the right to establish dissentient schools. It gave them the benefit of the law of Ontario, as applied to the separate schools in Ontario. And they had also the promise of the distinguished French-Canadian statesmen, whose names I have mentioned, of amendments by the Quebec legislature, and it gave a constitutional provision protecting this legislation against subsequent repeal.

Now, it would be interesting here to refer for a moment to an article contributed to a volume known as "Canadian Pamphlets," in which Sir Alexander Galt gives his opinion of the position of the Protestants at this time. He says :

The only status, therefore, which we are guaranteed under the Imperial Act of confederation is that existing at its passage. Now, it is well known that this was wholly unsatisfactory to the Protestants, especially in Montreal and Quebec, and an endeavour to pass the requisite amendments made in the last session of the Canadian Parliament was defeated. So important did I regard this defeat, that I resigned my seat in the Government, and declined any greater share of responsibility than was accepted by other Protestant representatives.

However, as it threatened to interpose most serious obstacles to the acceptance of confederation, it was finally agreed, to be satisfied with the assurances of Sir George Cartier and the French-Canadian Roman Catholics following him ; that, at the first session of the local legislature of Quebec, the required legislation should be obtained, and that the local government should be so organized as to ensure this result. Though not a member of the Government, I formed one of the delegation to London, and assisted in the compilation of the Act of confederation ; and on the 1st of February, 1867, when confederation took place, I re-entered the Ministry, and, with the assistance of Sir George Cartier and the Hon. Mr. Langevin, the school Bill, as it now stands, was passed ; but even then it was not attained without great difficulty, as can be testified by all who were acting with me in Quebec at the time.

* * * * * The educational rights of Protestants as respects much of the principle and mode of taxation, separate management and other important points are therefore not secured by the Act of Confederation, but rest upon a provincial statute of Quebec that is subject to repeal.

Now, before referring to the Act passed by Sir George Cartier and his supporters in the province of Quebec, I think it is proper to give you an idea of the law of Quebec and Ontario, respectively, as it stood at the time of confederation, inasmuch as the body of that law is all that is secured to us by article 1 of the constitution. The law of Quebec at the time of confederation, in a few words, was this : The Governor in Council appointed the Council of Public Instruction which consisted of not more than fifteen, and not less than eleven persons, and the Superintendent of Education made one of their number. This council had power to make, from time to time, with the approval of the Governor in Council, such regulations as they deemed expedient for

the organization, government and discipline of the schools, and the classification of schools and teachers. They had also power to select, with the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, such books, maps, and globes as could be used in the schools, and to exclude all others. They had power also to make rules and regulations for the guidance of the Board of Examiners of teachers; also power to revoke teachers' certificates. There were provisions for the establishment of dissentient schools by meetings of Protestant heads of families, similar to those which applied to separate schools in Ontario, and they had a right to share in the legislative grants. These, in the main, were the leading features of the Lower Canada law, a board appointed after confederation by a Catholic Governor and a Catholic Council, and which might be, were bitter feelings to arise, entirely composed of Catholics. This board had the power of controlling the organization, management and maintenance of all Protestant schools; had the power to impose any sort of text books they saw fit upon those schools; had power in Quebec of making those schools inoperative and so distasteful that they would not be used. Under that law, the Protestants of Quebec could be very easily placed in the same position in which a man would be who was living in a comfortable house with his family, but in a house where another man owns the doors, and windows, and the staircases. They could be very easily placed by the Catholic majority of Quebec in just as uncomfortable a position as this man would be in if the owner came and took out the doors, and windows, and staircases. The house would be left; so the dissentient schools would be left, but the machinery by which those schools would be worked could be made absolutely inoperative. Now, if you go to the school law of Ontario, or Upper Canada, as it existed at the time of confederation, you find there also that any number of persons, not less than five, being heads of families, freeholders, or householders, residing within any school section, or any township, incorporated village, or town, or within any ward of any city or town, and being Roman Catholics, could convene a public meeting of persons desiring separate schools for Roman Catholics, for the election of trustees for the management of the same. This meeting could elect three persons to act as trustees, and one of these could give notice to the reeve, or head of the municipality, or chairman of the board of common schools, of the election of such trustees. Thereupon, the trustees became a body corporate. They had power to impose, levy, and collect rates or subscriptions from persons sending children to the separate schools; and they were empowered to perform the same duties with regard to separate schools as the trustees of common schools. Separate school teachers were made subject to the same examina-

tions, and received their certificates of qualification in the same manner as the common school teachers did. Supporters of separate schools were exempted from the payment of common school rates, upon giving notice, and any Roman Catholic who desired, might withdraw his support from the separate schools by giving the notice prescribed by law. Every separate school was entitled to share in the funds annually granted by the legislature for the support of common schools, according to the average number of pupils attending such schools during the twelve next preceding months; but the separate schools were not entitled to any portion of common school moneys, and were free from local assessments for common school purposes. The trustees were required to send to the Chief Superintendent of Education a correct return of the number of children attending each school, with the average attendance during the next preceding six months, and upon this return, the Chief Superintendent determined the proportion which the trustees of each separate school were entitled to receive out of the legislative grant, and the grant was payable monthly to the trustees of each school for that school. The Roman Catholic separate schools were subject to inspection, as provided from time to time by the Chief Superintendent of Education, and were subject, also, to such regulations as were imposed, from time to time, by the Council of Public Instruction. In the event of disagreement between trustees of separate schools and the local superintendent of common schools, or other municipal authority, the case in dispute was referred to the arbitration of the Superintendent of Education. The Council of Public Instruction, to whose regulations the separate schools were subject, was appointed by the Governor in Council, and held office during pleasure. It consisted of not more than nine persons, who, in the exercise of their duties, were subject to the lawful orders and regulations of the Governor in Council, and they had power to make such regulations as they deemed expedient for the organization, government and discipline of the schools, and for the classification of the teachers; and they had power also to recommend or disapprove of text books to be used in these schools. Now, under this Ontario system, the same fatal defect, if you apply its provisions to Quebec, existed, as exists in the case of the Quebec law itself, there was no provision for a Catholic board or a Catholic committee; there was no provision for any special Catholic management of those Catholic schools. The public schools of Ontario, as they existed at confederation, were governed by a board which might all be Protestants, which probably were nearly all Protestants, and by a Protestant Superintendent of Education. When you come to apply those principles to the province of Quebec, you are in precisely the same situation that you are in if you are

using the Catholic machinery of Lower Canada. You have the board appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, and that board entirely controls the schools, and that board may be entirely a Catholic board. Now, what was gained by inserting the words in the second subsection of section 93 of the British North America Act, which brought the Ontario law into effect, and applied it to the Protestants of the province of Quebec, I have so far failed to see. The machinery, perhaps, was a little more perfect for taxation and assessment; in the case of the examination of certificates of teachers, it was a little better; but otherwise, in its main features, it was practically one and the same thing if applied to the Protestants of Quebec.

I go on to note the legislation which was passed in 1869 by the legislature of the province of Quebec, before Sir George Cartier and Sir Alexander Galt and Sir Hector Langevin left that legislature. The legislature of that province made these important amendments. They provided for a large board to compose the Council of Public Instruction. They provided that a certain number on that board should be Protestants, and they provided that the entire control and management of Protestant schools should be given to and exercised by the Protestant members of the Committee of Public Instruction for the province of Quebec. Here you have the turning point, the vital point in the whole system. The school books, the rate of taxation, the methods of conducting the schools, the grading of the schools, everything connected with the schools was placed in the hands of Protestants themselves, and have remained there ever since. Not only was that overwhelmingly important change made, but we were given great advantages in other directions. For example, the superior education fund was divided in a manner much more beneficial and satisfactory to Protestants. Prior to the passing of this law, our colleges and higher schools had to apply to the Superintendent of Education for the necessary funds. He gave them whatever he thought they should have, subject to the approval of the board. There was no settled basis on which we shared in the fund for superior education, there was no fixed rule by which our colleges and higher institutions received aid. This Act cured that defect, and it gave us such a proportion of the total funds as our population bore to the total population of the province of Quebec, an equitable and easily understood basis of division. In the cities of Montreal and Quebec, prior to the statute of 1869, the Protestant schools only received, in Montreal one-fourth of what Protestants contributed in the way of school taxes, and in Quebec only two-thirds of what Protestants contributed. That was an actual provision of the old law; hon. members will find it in

the Consolidated Statutes of Lower Canada, chapter 15. Why it was so fixed, I do not know; but the result of the statute of 1869 was to give the Protestants of Montreal, not one-fourth, but the proportion to which the population of the city entitled them, and the proportion allowed to Quebec was not two-thirds, but that proportion to which their population entitled them. There were other matters of minor importance dealt with, but with which I would hardly be justified in taking up the time of the House. I have already shown that the Act of 1869 is valuable as regards the interests of the Protestants of Quebec. Some amendments to the Act have been made since. One was made in 1888, giving the school teachers of the province of Quebec the right to elect one of the members of the Council of Public Instruction, a most valuable provision to the educationists of the province; and all these provisions hang upon a clause, almost similar, word for word and letter for letter, with the clause in the Manitoba Bill we are now discussing.

Do you wonder, then, Mr. Speaker, that as representing the Protestant minority in the province of Quebec, I take a great interest in this question, and that I would protest against any action of this Parliament which would be in the direction of holding this clause as inoperative, and one that cannot be used because it would be coercion of the province and an interference with the autonomy of the province. Will you tell me of any case where this clause ever would be required, if the local government, seeing what it had done and the injustice committed, was ready to rectify a wrong? This was put into the constitution to meet such a case as this, and will it be said that, when the majority refuses to give way, and refuses to restore rights, when it refuses to do justice for five years consecutively, and the minority appeals to us, as they have a right to do under the constitution, we are to shut the door in their faces, because, forsooth, it is interfering with the autonomy of the province to act upon the plain provisions of the law in the protection of minorities? It seems to me the greatest possible absurdity to say that it is coercion for this Parliament to exercise the powers specially conferred upon it by the constitution itself. Anyway, whatever you do, do not fail to know this, that, if you refuse to call into exercise the power you unquestionably possess in the case of Manitoba, you may have before many years go by to hear an appeal from the Protestants of the province of Quebec. What would be more natural than for that province to say: If we cannot make you listen in one way, we will try and make you listen in another; if you cannot, without this step being taken by us, listen to justice, then we propose to repeal the legislation passed on the subject of education in the province of Quebec. Then

we come here, a minority as numerous as the majority of Manitoba is, a minority owning a very large proportion of the property in the province of Quebec, a minority to which belong some of the most distinguished of the citizens of the province, with an appeal to have our rights restored to us. What are you going to do? How are you going to constitutionally act on our petition and give us a restitution of our rights, if you have refused to hear the prayer of the minority in the province of Manitoba? You cannot blow hot and cold. You cannot act so inconsistently as that. If you hold to-day, that hands must be kept off Manitoba, that you must not interfere with Manitoba, if you hold it to be coercion to exercise this power in the case of Manitoba, then, what can you say, you Protestants, you Orangemen, who are always so much to be relied upon to protect the rights of Protestants, not only here, but in Ireland, and everywhere—how are you going to protect us? I asked the question of one of the most distinguished members in this House prominent in the Orange body: "What are you going to do, when we come here with an appeal?" "Oh," he said, "we will take care of that." "But," I said, "I cannot rely upon that; I cannot rely upon your simple statement that you will take care of us. How are you going to take care of us? Are you coming down with force to restore us our rights, are you going to take care of us by armed means, or how?" Well, Sir, I got no satisfactory answer from the hon. gentleman, and I said to him: I cannot go back to the Protestants of the province of Quebec and say to them: We did not grant the petition of the minority in Manitoba, but I have got the assurance of the hon. gentleman from York (Mr. Wallace), that he and the members of the Orange body will take care of us, when the trouble comes.

Sir, there is only one way in which the Parliament of Canada can take care of the Protestant minority in the province of Quebec, and that is, to enforce the constitutional provisions inserted in the constitution to protect the minorities all over this Dominion. The Manitoba minority, if I understand it, ask for nothing but their rights, and I hope that the minority of the province of Quebec will never ask for anything more than their rights. I believe that if justice is done in this case, we shall never hear any appeal from the minority of Quebec, nor any reason for an appeal.

I was exceedingly pleased this morning when I took up the "Citizen" to observe that Sir Oliver Mowat has given to the country his views upon this important subject, in a resolution in the Ontario legislature. If you will study the resolution, you will find that Sir Oliver admits that it is established by the judgment of the Privy Council that the Manitoba School Act of 1890 deprives the Roman Ca-

tholics of rights and privileges in relation to education. You will find, also, that he admits that the Manitoba legislature should remove the grievance by supplementary legislation. You will find, also, that he says that Ontario, though opposed to separate schools by a large majority, always recognizes its constitutional duty to give effect, by provincial legislation and otherwise, to the provisions of the constitution on the subject. Sir Oliver Mowat says it is much preferable that Manitoba should deal with the subject. He says that remedial legislation by the Dominion should be the last resort. He deprecates hasty action by the Dominion, and he thinks there should first be a thorough investigation of the facts by the Dominion. Now, Sir, with all these statements of Sir Oliver Mowat, excepting the last one, I heartily concur, and I commend them to the careful reading and the close study of hon. gentlemen opposite. I do not find that Sir Oliver Mowat has anything to say about drastic remedial orders. I do not find that he has anything to say about the inadequacy of the present Remedial Bill. I do not hear him say that it is a proper thing to reject this measure on the second reading, because, forsooth, it is not strong enough, as the hon. member for Verchères (Mr. Geoffrion) said last night. Sir, Oliver Mowat simply says—and that is the only point of difference between him and this Government—that the question is: whether now, or a little later, for remedial legislation. Now, this resolution of Sir Oliver's makes it very plain who is guiding the destinies of the Liberal party all over this broad Dominion at the present moment. We find that a resolution was introduced in the Manitoba legislature a few days ago, to which Sir Oliver refers in his resolution. We found, a few weeks ago, that there was a sudden change of base by the leader of the Opposition, when he announced this policy of a commission of investigation. I am happy to know, Sir, that so good a man, and so loyal a man, and so safe a man, as Sir Oliver Mowat is steering the Liberal ship at this time. It is surprising, how near the two parties are together at the present moment, upon this question. Sir Oliver says that a grievance exists which ought to be remedied by the province of Manitoba. This Government says so too. Sir Oliver says that the Dominion should only interfere as the last resort. We say so too. He says that he wants to have further investigation, but we say that five years is sufficient to ask the Manitoba minority to wait for a remedy for their grievances. Now, you will find, if you study carefully this resolution, that Sir Oliver wants to investigate what, and the hon. leader of the Opposition wants to investigate what? The leader of the Opposition wanted to investigate whether there was a compact when Manitoba came into the confederation that she should have separate schools. He wanted to investigate

whether the minority in Manitoba really in their conscience did not like these schools that Mr. Greenway had established ; and he wanted to investigate as a third point whether these schools were Protestant schools or Catholic schools. That is the whole trouble that has for many years afflicted the leader of the Opposition. Now, if you will look at the clause in question of the British North America Act, you will find there what it is that gives rise to this appeal, and if you examine what it is that gives rise to this appeal, you will find exactly what there is to investigate. What is it which gives rise to this appeal ? The British North America Act says :

Where in any province, a system of separate or dissentient schools exist by law at the union, or is thereafter established by the legislature of the province, an appeal shall lie to the Governor General in Council from any Act or decision of any provincial authority affecting any right or privilege of the Protestant or Roman Catholic minority of the Queen's subjects in relation to education.

That is what the right of appeal is based on. If you look at the Manitoba Act you will find it is more brief :

An appeal shall lie to the Governor General in Council, from any Act or decision of the legislature of the province, or of any provincial authority affecting any right or privilege of the Protestant or Roman Catholic minority of the Queen's subjects in relation to education.

Now, what have you to investigate. You have simply to investigate whether the legislature of the province of Manitoba have passed any Act which affects any right or privilege of the Roman Catholic minority of Manitoba in relation to education. That is all you have to investigate. Whether these schools are Protestant schools, or whether they are Catholic schools, has nothing to do with it. The only question to be investigated is the one simple question : whether the Act of 1890 affected any right or privilege of the Catholic minority of Manitoba in relation to education. That is the only question, and the lords of the Privy Council have settled that question. And when it comes to the subject of the investigation, who wants this further information ? Surely Mr. Greenway does not want any further information. He lives on the spot ; he passed the Act. He surely was familiar with the Norquay system of education adopted in the statutes of 1871 or 1872. Mr. Greenway knows what Acts were repealed ; he knows what Act he passed to repeal those Acts ; he knows whether or not that Act affected the rights of the minority of Manitoba in relation to education. What does he want an investigation for ? The French Liberals do not want any investigation, because they have already made up their minds that the present Bill is not strong enough. The Government do not require

Mr. IVES.

any investigation ; they are satisfied ; they have rendered their judgment, and that judgment is in accordance with the judgment of the Privy Council. The irreconcilables in this House do not want any information, because if you were to pump information into them for a hundred years, they would still be opposed to separate schools, and would not want anything done. Then, who wants further information ? For what reason should further information be obtained ? We know, on the other hand, that if this question is not settled in this House at this session, it becomes a question in the next general election ; and if so, does not that increased a hundredfold the danger to the fabric of confederation which the hon. leader of the Opposition referred to in his speech ? Does the hon. gentleman for any political purpose, want to keep this sore open, this question unsettled ? Is he gaining by it ? Does he find his present position happy, when he has actually to dragoon some of his followers into supporting him ? Does he want to go to the country with this question unsettled ?

Mr. LAURIER. No.

Mr. IVES. I do not think he does. I do not think he is wise if he wants this question kept open. Surely Mr. Greenway can afford a remedy. Mr. Greenway's legislature is now convened ; Mr. Greenway is there ; Mr. Greenway can adopt any remedy he thinks right and proper, and can pass it long before we get out of committee on this Bill. The Government of this country are not anxious to interfere with this question. I admit with Sir Oliver Mowat that our interference should be the last resort ; but we do not think, from anything we have seen, that either Mr. Greenway or Mr. Laurier or the Liberal party, who have been making a football of this question for the last five years, are anxious to have it settled. We think the responsibility rests upon us to do justice to the minority of Manitoba, who have waited five years for justice. We do not propose to make those people a football of the politicians for another year or two years ; and if the hon. gentleman's policy is further investigation, why did he move the six months' hoist, during which there can be no investigation ? Why did he not propose his own motion, based on the opinion of Sir Oliver Mowat, for a commission ? Why, indeed ? Because his irreconcilable supporters in this House would not vote for it. I say, Mr. Speaker, that when the two great parties in this House are so nearly agreed upon this matter as to make it merely a question of when—whether now or a few weeks or a few months from now—we should settle this question. It is the duty of all parties to join together and agree upon a settlement of the question. The hon. leader of the Opposition the other day referred to questions that have divided us in the past. He referred to perhaps the most diffi-

cult and exciting of all questions we have ever had in this House—the question of the Jesuits Estates Act. What was the result on that question? The combination of the wise men on both sides of this House resulted in limiting the number of those who united against that Bill to thirteen; and when it was found that the two parties united to do the proper thing in regard to that question, there was no excitement in the country; the whole matter was settled. And if the hon. leader of the Opposition and his followers would do as they want to do, as their consciences tell them they ought to do, as many of them are begging permission to do—join us in the settlement of this question—they would find themselves a great deal more comfortable when they go home at Easter, and we should have this vexed question removed from the sphere of current politics.

Mr. McNEILL. As one of those irreconcilables who want more information, may I ask my hon. friend a question? Was there something in the nature of a compact between the province of Quebec and the province of Ontario with regard to separate schools? Was it understood that if separate schools were granted to the minority in Ontario, separate schools would be granted to the minority in Quebec?

Mr. IVES. I am not aware that there was ever any compact. They were granted long before confederation.

Mr. McNEILL. Was it not one of the understandings?

Mr. IVES. It may have been, but I am not aware of it.

Mr. McNEILL. Is it not notorious that when Sir Alexander Galt proposed separate schools for the minority of Quebec, the reply was that if the minority of Ontario received separate schools, separate schools would be granted to the minority of Quebec?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. No, it is not.

Mr. McNEILL. I have always understood that there was something in the nature of a compact of that kind. I have heard it stated in this House, and it has never been contradicted before.

Mr. LAURIER. No investigation is wanted. They are ready to proceed. You are too inquisitive altogether.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. Speaker, in rising to discuss this question, I wish to say that the views I hold in regard to it are not dictated by the least feeling of hostility to my Catholic fellow-subjects or my French fellow-subjects in this country. I am glad to say that on this question I have no religious bigotry and no race feeling at all. We all admit that this question is one of the utmost importance, and that it is exciting great interest all over this Dominion. We know that there are great differences of opinion

on this question. I admit frankly that there are sincere differences of opinion. I do not claim any more sincerity for myself in holding the opinion I do on the question than I allow to those who differ from me. I believe that the members of this House who differ from me on this question are just as sincere in holding their views as I am in holding mine. I have no fault to find with them. My object in rising is to state my own position and to give my reasons for the views I hold and for the vote I intend to give. I admit frankly that this question is a most difficult question for any Government to deal with, I care not what Government is in power. It happens at the present time that the government in power is the Liberal-Conservative Government. They have to deal with this question, and they find it a difficult question to deal with. But, Sir, it would be just as difficult a question for the Liberal party to deal with if they were in power. They would find themselves confronted with the same difficulties that the present government are confronted with. Because this is one of those questions on which there always have been and always will be differences of opinion—differences which in a country like ours it seems impossible to reconcile. We have a most difficult country for any government to govern on questions of this kind. We have the province of Ontario, which is strongly Protestant; we have the province of Quebec, which is strongly Catholic; and when questions such as this arise, it is inevitable that there should be differences of opinion, and very strong differences of opinion. It is a little unfortunate too that some questions, in recent years, have stirred up these feelings perhaps more than they should be stirred up. I say that this is a most difficult question for the Government to deal with, and they have my sympathy in dealing with it. I am very much pleased at the manner in which it has been discussed in this House. No one can find fault with that, and I shall endeavour to discuss it equally in a manner at which no one can cavil. Before entering on my subject I wish to say a word or two about the speech of the hon. leader of the Opposition. We all admit that he made an eloquent and brilliant speech; but it seemed to me that while speaking, he felt most keenly the difficult position he occupies in trying to please the two opposing camps in his own party. He seemed to feel that he was treading between pitfalls, into any one of which he ran the risk of dropping at any moment, and it was amusing to watch the agility with which he steered clear of these pitfalls. I found the leader of the Opposition making a strong plea for further delay on this question, but I found him at the same time strongly condemning the Government for not having acted in this matter more promptly. I cannot reconcile these contradictory propositions; I leave that task to the hon. gentleman and his followers.

I suppose that I am one of the irreconcilables alluded to by the hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Ives), and I must admit that I want no further investigation or information. This question has been before this House, in one way or another, for five years; and I think most of us are pretty well informed on it. We know enough, at any rate, to give an independent vote and make up our minds as to how we are going to vote, and I want no further delay, no investigation, no commission, which would result in putting off the settlement of this matter and keeping it before the country perhaps a few years longer. I want it settled now without any further delay. The hon. leader of the Opposition spoke a good deal about the policy of conciliation. He blamed the Government for not having endeavoured to deal more gently with the government of Manitoba. In fact it seems to me as if those who advocate so strongly this policy of conciliation look upon the Manitoba government as a lot of children who must be coaxed into doing something, but must not be told plainly the facts of the case, who must be approached very gently and humbly and coaxed into something they think they ought not to do. I take no stock in this policy of conciliation, but at the same time I must say that those who advocate it have no reason to find fault with the Government. It is said that the Order in Council issued at first was harsh in its tone. It is said, on the contrary, and I have no doubt it is so, that it was issued in accordance with the judgment of the Privy Council. But subsequent to the issuing of the Order in Council, there had been milder messages sent by this Government to the Manitoba government, and I am free to say that if conciliation on the part of this Government could have accomplished anything, the whole question would have been settled and not have come before this House at all.

As I said when I rose, I wish to state my position frankly on the question. It is no new one in this House. When Sir John Thompson became Premier, I wrote him a letter in which I assured him of my support in carrying out the main policy of the Conservative party, but, at the same time, I told him plainly that in case remedial legislation was introduced, I would be compelled to vote against it. In speaking on the amendment introduced into this House by the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte) in 1893, condemning the Government for their policy on this question, I supported the Government, and I stated then plainly that if a Bill of this kind were introduced I would vote against it. Last year I stated my position on the question, so that it is no surprise to the Government and my constituents, and therefore I have no hesitation in saying that my position to-day is what it was then, and that I am constrained to vote against this Bill.

It is contended that Parliament is not legally bound but is morally bound and

Mr. CRAIG.

bound in honour to pass this legislation; and that is the question to which I propose to devote the most of my remarks. Are we in honour bound to pass this remedial legislation? I do not want to weary the House going over the facts; but as I wish to make my speech as connected as possible I will just recite again the facts which have been recited over and over again in this House. I shall recite them most briefly, and in everything I shall say endeavour to confine myself most strictly to the subject and make my remarks as brief as possible. Look at the case once more. Manitoba had no school system by law before the union. After the union, the system of separate schools was established and separate schools granted the minority in that province. We find that these separate schools were abolished in 1890, by the same power that established them, and a system of public schools was then established. The minority asked to have this Act disallowed. The Dominion Government refused to disallow it. And here I say that for this I give the Dominion Government great credit. No doubt, great pressure was brought at that time to bear on the Government to disallow the Manitoba Act of 1890, but the Government took the ground that they would not disallow it, and I was very much pleased to hear Sir John Thompson declare that not only did the Government not disallow the Act but never had the slightest intention of disallowing it. In that I supported him most cordially. But what is the position of some hon. members opposite?

Mr. McMILLAN. Speak for yourself.

Mr. CRAIG. What position did the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte) take? He took the ground that the Government should have disallowed the Act. Well, I approved of the Government in not disallowing it. That is the reason for his condemnation. In the speech he made in 1893, when moving his amendment condemning the Government, the whole point of his speech was this, that the Government had not disallowed the Act of 1890. Whether his friends agree with him, he knows better than I; but in a speech delivered the other day by the leader of the Opposition, we find him touching on this question of disallowance, and while he did not say—because, I suppose, he thought it was not good policy at this time—that the Government should have disallowed the Act, yet he almost said so, and hinted strongly in that direction. He said there were two other Acts disallowed at the time, which did not conflict so much with the Dominion Parliament, and which were not Acts that should have been disallowed any more than this school Act. I do not know what his own secret opinion is, but he gave me the impression that he wished to leave on the mind of his Quebec supporters the idea that he would have been in favour of disallowing the Act. This Act was not disallowed and

was then carried to the courts. The Privy Council's decision, as we all know, was that the Act of the Government was *intra vires*, that in passing the Act of 1890, the Manitoba legislature had kept entirely within its own power. The next step in the proceedings was this: Under a section of the Manitoba Act, the minority appealed to the Dominion Government for relief. They said they had a grievance, and they asked the Dominion Government to listen to their appeal. The Dominion Government were not quite sure that this was a case which came under this section of the Act, that it was a case which came within their right to hear the appeal, and referred the point to the Supreme Court. The Supreme Court decided that this was not a case which came under this section of the Act providing for an appeal. The matter was carried to the Privy Council, and they decided that this Government could hear the appeal. I am not a lawyer and am not talking as a lawyer, but judging by what I have heard from gentlemen of the legal profession, who have studied the question, I hold that this judgment of the Privy Council saying that they had this right was not properly a judgment, but merely an opinion upon this section of the Act. They said that this was a case in which the Government had the right to hear the appeal. Well, Sir, the Government did hear the appeal, and passed the remedial order.

Now, I come to the point which I wish more especially to discuss. It was held, and it is held that the Government were bound to pass this remedial order. I do not agree with that opinion. I hold that the Government had to hear this appeal, but they were not bound, either morally or legally, to make any remedial order; in other words, while they were bound to hear the appeal, they were not bound to grant what was asked for. It is asked: What, then, is the good of the right of appeal to the minority? It was this good, that it gave them the right to bring their case before the Government, to state the facts, and to argue the case and show reasons why, in their opinion, relief should be given. But did it follow as a matter of course that they had a right to have their appeal granted? This I hold to be one of the crucial points in the argument of those who favour remedial legislation. They hold that it followed, as a matter of course, that the minority had a right to have their appeal granted. That I cannot admit. I admit that the Government had the power to advise Parliament to apply a remedy if they thought the circumstances of the case warranted it, but only on that condition. The Government must consider, and Parliament must consider the whole circumstances of the case, and if they decided that a remedy should be granted, they were perfectly right to grant it. Now, I wish to say further, and, to my mind, it is an argument that cannot be refuted: By the constitution, separate schools established before the union could not be

taken away; I think we all admit that. But if separate schools established after the union by any provincial legislature could not be taken away, then I say that should have been distinctly stated in the Act. If it was the intention of the Manitoba Act that separate schools established by the legislature after the union could not be taken away, that should have been stated. But I do not find it stated at all. I find it stated that if these separate schools are taken away, the minority have the right to bring their case before the Government and Parliament, and ask for a remedy. The argument is that, while the Manitoba legislature had the right to abolish these schools, this Parliament is morally bound to restore them. If that is so, the argument ceases. If we have no right to look at the question in a political light, which I hold is the proper light in which to regard a question like this affecting the interest, not of Manitoba alone, but of the whole Dominion, there is no use of argument. I should judge, from his speech, that the leader of the Opposition thinks that Manitoba is morally bound to restore separate schools. I do not agree with that position; I do not think that separate schools should be established at all. The hon. gentleman did not state this opinion distinctly, but from the tenor of his speech, I gather that he holds that opinion. The argument of those who favour this Bill is that a province in which separate schools were established before the union cannot get rid of those schools—and that, I think, we all admit—and that a province in which they are established after confederation cannot get rid of them either. No matter what change takes place, no matter how small the minority in the province may become, separate schools cannot be got rid of, because this Parliament is morally bound to restore them. Putting the case in that way destroys the whole force of the argument, to my mind.

The Government did make a remedial order, and Manitoba refused to obey it. The Government, last session, did not press remedial legislation upon this House, but made a pledge that it would be brought down and pressed this session, and to-day we have a Bill before the House. I have no intention of discussing the details of the Bill at the present time. It is said to be a mild Bill. It is said to be so mild that it will not give any relief to the minority. I was amused and a little surprised at the speech of the hon. member for Verchères (Mr. Geoffrion), and at his criticism of the Bill. He did not hesitate to tell us that the reason he was going to vote for the six months' hoist was that he considered the Bill not strong enough, and that, even if passed, it would be of no use. He says: I promised that I would vote for remedial legislation, but I am not going to vote for a Remedial Bill that does not give a remedy, therefore, I am going to vote to throw the Bill out. And he went further. He

said that he preferred to wait and get a better Bill from his own leader. When the hon. gentleman said that, I saw the hon. leader of the Opposition change countenance. I saw that he felt that while he himself had very cleverly dodged all these troublesome issues, yet his own follower, in his first speech in this House had clearly spoken his views, and had announced that he was going to vote against this Bill because it was not a Remedial Bill at all, and gave no relief to his suffering compatriots in Manitoba.

Mr. FOSTER. But suppose that you help to get his leader in ?

Mr. CRAIG. Well, I may say frankly that I shall be very sorry to get his leader in. And I say further, that while I esteem his leader very highly, I should be still sorrier to get that hon. gentleman in if he were going to carry out the promise or the implied promise of the hon. member for Verchères. But, however mild this Bill may be—and I am prepared to say that it is a very mild Bill, I think it is about as mild a Bill as it could be to be a Bill at all—the reason I object to it and the reason I vote against it, is that however mild it is, it restores the system of separate schools in Manitoba, and that is a principle I cannot support. Now, if it were true that Parliament was morally bound, bound in honour, to pass this Bill and grant this relief, that would be a very strong plea. It is not argued that Parliament is legally bound, but if it is morally bound, that is a stronger plea even than to say that it is legally bound. Now, are we so bound? What are the reasons given? Well, I have not heard many reasons given, because I think it is pretty hard to find any very strong reasons. But I have noted down one or two reasons, and one is that the Manitoba Act was the result of a bargain, that it was understood that separate schools were to be guaranteed to the minority. Well, Sir, I have not been able yet to come across any proof that there was any such bargain. But I will say, that, if we could find such a bargain, if we knew that there was such a bargain, then my mouth would be closed. But there is no proof of this fact, and, therefore, I cannot accept any such statement. But, Sir, another argument is, that this clause in the British North America Act giving an appeal, was put in for the protection of the Protestants of Quebec, and that confederation could not have been accomplished without it. Well, that may be the case; but, at the same time, I do not suppose that the fathers of confederation could look forward and see all the circumstances that would arise; and as I said before, if it was contemplated by them that separate schools, as they were established before the union, or after the union, could never be taken away, then they failed to express their opinion on that point. Now, I want to refer for a moment

Mr. CRAIG.

to a matter that has been often spoken about in reference to this Bill. It is said, that, if we refuse to pass this Bill, then the legislature of Quebec could take away some of the privileges of the Protestants, and, if they were to come here and ask for relief, we would have to refuse to grant it, because we had refused in this case. Now, Sir, that may appear to be a good argument, but I hold it is no argument, on the ground I take, because I hold that every case must be considered on its own merits. But I go further than that, and I say, that the cases are not parallel in any sense of the word. And why? For this reason, that there is no similarity at all between the public schools of Quebec and the public schools of Ontario, which, I suppose, are similar to the public schools of Manitoba. Why, Sir, what do we find all over the province of Ontario? We find Catholics going to the public schools; we find no objection on their part. We do not find that their consciences receive any wrench at all. I know that in my own town, where we never distinguish between Catholics and Protestants, they go to the same school together; they study together; they grow up together; there is no difficulty at all. But, when we go to the province of Quebec, what do we find? We find that the public schools there are really religious schools, and are schools to which a Protestant could not send his children, because a great part of the time, or, at least, a good deal of the time, is taken up with religious instruction and religious instruction in the tenets of the Catholic Church. Now, Sir, I say it would be an outrage to suppose that Protestants should send their children to schools like that, and I do not suppose that Catholics would want them to do it, either. Well, a great deal has been said about the generosity of the Catholics of the province of Quebec; and, while I rejoice that this is the case, at the same time I hold, that those who base an argument on that, altogether lose sight of the fact that I have just alluded to, namely, that the schools are entirely different in character to the public schools of Ontario. The public schools of Manitoba, as I understand, are religious schools in no sense of the word. There may be some very slight religious exercises at the beginning of the school, but you cannot call them religious schools. But the public schools of Quebec are religious schools in every sense of the word, and they are Catholic schools in every sense of the word, as well; and, while I make no objection to that, I say it would be absurd to compare the two classes of schools and to suppose that there would be the same objection to Catholic children going to the schools of Ontario or Manitoba, as there would be to Protestant children going to the schools of the majority in the province of Quebec. Now, Sir, this question, after all, is too serious a matter to be decided by suppositions or imaginary bargains,

or any conjectures at all. I hold, that on this question we must be guided by the facts, we must examine all the circumstances of the case. Now, the first decision of the Privy Council declared that no rights enjoyed by the minority at the time of the union were taken away. Now, that is a point on which I lay a great emphasis. I think, from my point of view, that is a most important declaration, that the Privy Council, after hearing argument with reference to the School Act of 1890, declared that no rights the minority had at the time of union were taken away. Well, then, the second decision said that the minority had a grievance. Now, a great deal of stress is laid on this word "grievance." As I said, I am not a lawyer, but I have been given to understand by lawyers, and men who are skilled in their interpretation, and men who have studied the facts, that this word "grievance" does not really mean that a great wrong is done to these people, but it means this, that something had been done to them which gave them a right of appeal, and I understand that is as far as it goes. I do not pronounce on that, because I am not in a position to do so. But I hold, that that word "grievance" means here that something had been taken away from them which gave them a right of appeal to the Governor General in Council. Now, Sir, I ask, is this grievance such a one as warrants us in imposing on Manitoba remedial legislation? That is the question that comes to my mind. I know there are many members of this House who say it is; but, to my mind, the answer is, no. I am not able to answer this question in the affirmative; if I was, I would vote in support of the Bill. I was rather amused, last night, in listening to the speech of the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot), in referring to the position taken by the hon. member for Verchères (Mr. Geoffrion). The member for Verchères objected to this Bill because it does not give enough; and the member for Bellechasse said that reminded him of a man who should come to you hungry, and you should say to him: Well, my friend, I would like to give you a meal. I have got a loaf here, but it is not quite enough for a meal, and, therefore, I will not give you anything. He said the Government were offering remedial legislation, and the member for Verchères says: Well, this Bill may give some remedial legislation, but it does not give enough, so I will vote against it. Now, I ask: Is this grievance such a one as warrants us in imposing remedial legislation on Manitoba? To my mind, it is not. While there may be a grievance, I hold that it is not such as would warrant us in imposing remedial legislation on Manitoba. Now, are we in honour bound to redress this grievance? We have the power; does our honour require us to use this power? Let us see what the minority lose. Did they lose the right to educate their children as they

saw fit? Some say they did; they say they lost the right to educate their children as they saw fit; that they wished to teach them religion, and they were deprived of that right. But what they did lose was the right to have the state aid in teaching religion. No one wishes to deprive them of the right to teach religion to their children; all the Act of 1890 says is, that, if they wish to teach religion to their children, they must pay for it themselves, and by that Act they have lost the aid of the state in educating their children in their own way. They lost the right to control any state-aided schools. Now, there is no doubt that what the minority want is control of their schools. I find no fault with them for that, I find no fault with them for asking that certain things be given them; that is their own business. All I am concerned with is the question, whether this is a case in which I should vote to interfere with Manitoba, and to pass a law overriding that which they have passed. Did the minority suffer by the change? Are the public schools less efficient? Do their children receive an inferior education? Sir, I answer all these questions in the negative. I hold that the minority did not suffer at all by the provincial legislation. It is said that they suffer in their conscience. Well, I do not know whether they do or not. I have no evidence on that point. It has been said they do, but I am not at all clear, because, judging from what I see of the Catholics in my own province, I hardly think this would be the case. Are the public schools Protestant? Now, this is a great point. I think it was referred to by the leader of the Opposition as one of the points that ought to be investigated. But I remember, two or three years ago, when he made a speech on this question, and his whole speech was based on the supposition that these schools were Protestant. He said, that, if these schools were Protestant, then there ought to be redress. Well, Sir, I agree with that. But from what I have learned, these schools are not Protestant in the true sense of the word. The schools are public schools, and the Privy Council expressly declared that they were not Protestant and not sectarian in any sense of the word, that while there are certain religious exercises given there, they cannot be called Protestant schools? What, then is the grievance? As I have said, the minority seek the control of their schools and to teach religion in them to their children. They say they have lost this right. So they have. They ask to have it restored, to be able to control their schools and to teach religion in them to their children. In reply I say this: I respect every man's religion and I have no desire to interfere with the way in which any man worships God—that is his own business, it is not my business. I am glad I live in a country where there is freedom of conscience. I do not know any country where more than in Canada there is re-

religious freedom ; I have no sympathy with religious bigotry and intolerance, and I have no fault to find with any man on account of his religion. But the state is not called upon to teach religion. It is outside of its business entirely. Why, if the state is called upon to teach religion, and you carry that argument to its logical conclusion, where do you land ? The state will have to tell us what church we must attend before long ? If religion must be taught, then a religious test for teachers must be employed. But that test is never imposed in the public schools of Ontario and in the public schools in Manitoba. So I lay down in answer to that idea, this, that if teaching religion in the schools is to be carried on they must teach it in their own schools, and pay for it themselves, but I am entirely opposed to the state teaching religion at all. But, Sir, are we bound in honour to say to Manitoba : You have passed a law abolishing separate schools ; you know best what your country requires, nearly all your people endorse your action, but we are bound in honour to restore the separate school system in Manitoba ? Shall we say that ? Are we bound in honour to override the legislation of the province ? It is said we are not overriding it, but I hold that this Bill does override it, in this way, that the separate schools have been abolished, and it is claimed that we are in honour bound to restore them. Shall we say to Manitoba : We are bound in honour to believe the majority of your people desire to oppress the minority ; we are bound in honour to override the expressed wish of the great majority of your people. It is said that this is one way to promote peace and harmony. Sir, I hold the very opposite. It is said by some : Only pass this Bill and then the whole question will be settled. I hold that if this Bill is passed by this House and becomes the law of the country, instead of peace and harmony we will find strife and faction. We will find in Manitoba resistance to the enforcement of this Act, and I believe we will find, and I shall be sorry to find it, in Ontario that instead of the question being settled, it will assume still greater prominence, and I believe the people of the province, so far as I know them, will be indignant at a law having been passed overriding the law of Manitoba and restoring separate schools in that province. It is said that patriotism requires us to pass this Bill. I think patriotism requires us to leave the question to the people of Manitoba ; and I say here and I believe this, and I believe it sincerely, that if the minority had trusted the people of Manitoba more, if they had waited for them to give relief, if they had not appealed to the Governor in Council, if they had not pressed their claim on this Parliament in appeal, this question would have been settled before now and settled peaceably and amicably. Sir, how will this Bill be enforced ? Will it help the minority ? Will it help the minority to place

Mr. CRAIG.

them in direct conflict with the majority ? Will it help them to have this Bill passed for the purpose of giving them certain rights and leave them in a great measure dependent on the majority for the carrying out of the provisions of the Bill ? After all the Bill will be no relief at all. On that question there can be very little difference of opinion. The Bill will give very little relief. While it establishes the principle of separate schools, it does not go far enough to give the minority the relief they have a right to expect. My conclusion is this, that we are not bound in honour to pass this Bill.

I will vote against this Bill, first, because I am opposed to separate schools. I am opposed to separate schools because I think they are not in the best interests of this country. I have never advocated, and I do not advocate any agitation in Ontario to endeavour to abolish separate schools. I accept the situation there. But I am glad to know that in a great many sections of Ontario the Catholics do not ask for separate schools, but are quite satisfied with the public schools, which are as a whole well administered. I hope to see the day, not only in Ontario, but in Quebec and the whole Dominion, when no separate schools will exist, when children will go to the same schools, not to be taught religion, which I hold should not be taught, and which in the public schools in Ontario is not taught in any sense of the word, but where the pupils will study science, the arts, reading, writing, arithmetic, spelling, and learn to become good citizens of this Dominion, which is going to be a great country in the future. I have not lost hope that that time will come ; I believe there are signs that the day is approaching. There are signs of greater liberality in religious matters, and it requires no great strength of imagination to look forward to the time when separate schools will be a thing of the past, and the agitation about separate schools will be one of the events to which we shall look back with horror and disgust.

I shall vote against this Bill because I think the grievance is not one that calls for any interference. In saying that I admit, while I am opposed to interference generally, that there might be a case which would call for interference. I do not take the ground that no such case could arise. I believe a case might arise in which Parliament would be called upon to interfere, but I hold this is not such a case.

I object to this Bill because of the difficulty of enforcing it, and because no real injustice has been done to the minority. I have dealt with those questions already, and I am now only summing up my reasons for opposing the Bill.

I oppose the Bill because no real benefit will accrue to the minority by passing it. I hold rather that the minority will find itself in a more difficult position because of the hostility of the majority, which would be

exercised against them by this Bill being forced on the majority. I will vote against this Bill because I hold that its passage would be a greater grievance to the majority in Manitoba than that from which the minority at present suffer.

I oppose this Bill, finally, because I am a Conservative. I am proud to belong to the Conservative party. Whatever opinions I hold on this question, and if I may seem to be a follower of the leader of the Opposition on this question at this moment, I am not his follower on questions of public policy and questions of trade and finance. I am a firm believer in the policy of protection; I am a firm believer in what is called the National Policy. I believe that policy has helped to build up this country, along with the energy, intelligence, industry, and economy of the people. I believe that policy is going to accomplish still greater results for this country, and I am proud, as I have said, to be a Conservative. But I shall vote against this Bill because I am a Conservative, and because I do not want the Conservative party to have to bear the odium which will be attached to it, of forcing separate schools on Manitoba. I shall regret exceedingly, and I say this deliberately, if this Bill shall pass its second reading. That may involve consequences which we do not like to contemplate, but I am prepared for those consequences. I have thought this matter over carefully, and I believe even those consequences would be preferable to the fact of having a party which has done so much for this country compelled to bear the odium which will attach to it for all time, of having forced separate schools on Manitoba.

Now, Sir, I wish to say a word with reference to the member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), and I am sorry he is not now in his seat. At a meeting lately held, I spoke somewhat in this strain, and the member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) criticised my attitude, and said: Oh, it is very easy for the member for East Durham (Mr. Craig) to talk about opposing this particular Bill, but what he should do is to oppose the Government on everything.

Mr. McNEILL. Whether right or wrong.

Mr. CRAIG. And the member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) said: Because the member for East Durham is sincere on this question, he opposes this Bill; therefore, he should be insincere on every other question, and therefore he should be a hypocrite on every other question. Sir, I have no sympathy with remarks of that kind. I regret that I am compelled to separate myself from my fellow-members who differ from me on this question. I have no doubt at all as to the sincerity of the Government in carrying forward this measure. I have no doubt, Sir, that they think they are doing what they ought to do, in the interests of the country. I have no doubt that they

think they are carrying out the principles of the constitution, and whatever my own opinion may be, I cannot help admiring them for pressing forward, when they think they are right, even though defeat may stare them in the face.

I thank the House for its attention, Mr. Speaker. I have not said anything new, nor had I any idea of doing so. I have simply stated my views, and before I sit down I repeat: I take the position I am taking with great regret, because it is a pain to me on any occasion to vote against the Government, and to sever myself from many of my fellow-members, whom I esteem so highly.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I regret to hear from the hon. gentleman (Mr. Craig) that he is to vote against this measure, because he is a Conservative. He places himself in such a position that the Conservative party, which I have no doubt, as a whole, is to vote for this measure, cannot agree with him; and if he regrets separating himself from us, for the moment—I hope it is only for this one occasion—he may be sure that we regret as much as he does the position which he has taken. Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to go over all this question again. During the last three days and three nights, it has been treated of by a number of hon. gentlemen, and, for my part, I may leave the matter rest there. The question has been well treated by members of the Government side, from their way of thinking, and also by members of the Opposition, from their point of view. Sir, the hon. the leader of the House (Sir Charles Tupper), when he spoke on Tuesday, was kind enough to mention my name, and to appeal to me as likely to support what he said with reference to the basis of our confederation. I took down his words then. He was speaking of the decision that had been reached between the leaders of the two great parties before confederation, Sir John Macdonald and the Hon. George Brown, and he said:

The result is known to you all. When in October, 1864, a conference was called under the shadow of the Crown, by the concurrence of the provincial and Imperial authorities, at Quebec, after considerable discussion the basis of union was arrived at. I am sorry to say that only one of my colleagues is here to-day (and he mentioned my name). He will bear me out in the statement: that no feature impressed itself more deeply upon all the delegates present than that this measure of confederation afforded a means to remove that antagonism of race and religion, which had been found so vital with reference to the interests of Canada.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I agree entirely with what the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) states there. During the conferences which we had with regard to confederation, we always had in view the settlement of the difficulties which previously existed between the two great political parties, and between the two great provinces of Upper

and Lower Canada. The question of representation, based upon population, was a great difficulty in our way. We saw that if we conceded that principle, Upper Canada would have a much larger representation than Lower Canada, and that, therefore, we of the province of Quebec, could not carry any measure unless Ontario was disposed to grant it. We thought that we should not be put in that position. Before confederation, the struggle went on for years and years, until at last we found ourselves in the position that the Governments were defeated by a majority of one or two votes, and that new Ministries were required to be formed. We could not proceed with the work of the country, and the country was suffering. The question then was, not only a question of race, or a question of religion, but it was a question of our very existence. And, it was so much felt in that direction, that the Hon. George Brown, when he again saw the defeat of the Government by a majority of two, approached, through a common friend of himself and the Government, the leader of the Government, and led him to understand that he was ready to have a conference on the subject, to see if a different state of affairs could not be arrived at. The leader of the Opposition and the leader of the then Government met, and the result was that they came to an understanding that we should have confederation. That question was submitted to Parliament, and a new Government was formed, having Mr. Brown, amongst others, in the Ministry. Mr. Brown would have wished not to enter the Government at that time, at all events, but he was told that in order that his party should agree to this measure, they should have at least one, if not two representatives in the Government. The Hon. George Brown finally agreed to enter the Government, and the result was the different conferences upon confederation; first, the conference at Charlottetown, P.E.I., and later on the conference at Quebec, at which conference the true basis of the Confederation Act was discussed and settled.

We had taken in view the settlement of our difficulties, not only with regard to carrying on the Government, but with regard to the future of the two great provinces, on the questions of race, religion and representation. As the leader of the House stated on Tuesday, when we went to England and settled there finally the basis of confederation, we considered not only those difficulties which we had before, but another question, which was agitating some portions of the provinces, and which we thought should be settled at the same time. That was the question of divorce. Previous to confederation divorces were granted by one province or the other as the case might be. We thought it might be better that that question should be left entirely to the Federal Parliament—for different reasons,

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN.

among them that by putting this question there the difficulties would be greater in the way of divorces and avoid mere mockeries, such as we find often in the United States. Another reason was that if we left that question to be settled by each of the provinces—for example, in the province of Quebec, where to the Roman Catholics, who are in a very large majority, divorces are not palatable and are against their creed—Protestants who required divorces, and who had a right to them according to the rules existing in the other provinces, might go to the central Parliament and not to the legislature of Quebec; so that the province of Quebec would not be placed in the position of being told by the Protestants: "You are opposed to us; we cannot get justice from you." If justice was in that direction, we thought it should be left to the Parliament of Canada, and there it is. As has been stated by the leader of the House and by the Minister of Trade and Commerce, previous to the adoption of confederation the question arose, in the Parliament of the two provinces, whether we should not have new legislation in reference to education for Ontario and Quebec; and if my hon. friend the leader of the House remembers that circumstance, he will recollect that two Bills were introduced at that time, one for Ontario and one for Quebec. We saw the difficulties that were in the way, and the two Bills were withdrawn, though the Hon. Mr. Galt was very much annoyed at their withdrawal, and insisted on having passed, at all events, the Bill for the province of Lower Canada. Well, after discussing the matter, we saw that it was impossible to pass a Bill for that province alone. Under those circumstances, it was suggested by Sir Alexander Galt that the matter, so far as the province of Quebec was concerned, should be left to be dealt with by the legislature of that province, so soon as it was established and met after confederation. As was stated by the Minister of Trade and Commerce to-day, this matter was left by Sir Alexander Galt to Sir George Cartier and myself to have the Bill passed in the legislature of Quebec, of which we were to be members as well as members of this Parliament. It is a recollection that I am proud of—that the representative of the Protestants of the province of Quebec in Parliament would say to two French-Canadians and Catholics: "We all trust you, and we rely upon you both carrying this measure through the legislature of Quebec, and putting the Protestants of that province on a proper footing, so far as their educational matters are concerned." When afterwards the clauses of the Confederation Act were passed, we put in that clause guaranteeing that, in all provinces where separate schools were established previous to confederation, those schools and the legislation for them should not be changed after confederation. When the legislature of Quebec met, and we

moved the measures which we had promised, it is true they met with opposition on the part of one member especially, who was perhaps a leading member; but he had no success. We were bound to fulfil our promise, as our word had been given; the members of the House stood by us, and the Bill was passed. I do not intend to read the Act, but it is as well that I should indicate some of its provisions. There was another Act in 1868 on the subject of education; but this special Act was to provide more efficiently for the support of schools in certain cases, and other objects. That Act was passed on the 24th of February, 1868; it is the law of the land; and it cannot be changed, so far as those schools are concerned, without the consent of the Protestant population of the province of Quebec. Then, in 1869, the main Act, which consists of 39 clauses, was passed. The hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Ives) said, that in that Act the great concessions, the prescriptions in favour of separate schools were adopted. In the first clause, we find it provided that four months after the passage of the law, the Lieutenant-Governor in Council shall appoint twenty-one persons, fourteen of whom will be Roman Catholics, and seven Protestants, to form the Council of Public Instruction for the province of Quebec, with the Minister of Public Instruction or Superintendent of Education for the time being, and until then, the members of the present council will remain in force. After the four months had expired, the Council so reorganized was to be divided into two committees, one composed of Roman Catholics and the other of Protestants. That is the basis of the present system, and all that relates to the separate schools is dealt with by these Councils separately. For the Catholics there is the Committee of Roman Catholics, and for the Protestants the Committee of Protestants, and each is invested with the same powers as regards their schools. The Protestant Board looks after the Protestant schools, and the Roman Catholic Board looks after the Roman Catholic schools; and the money is divided between them, according to population—that is, the money granted by the government. These committees distribute that money, according to their views, among their schools, so that the Catholics do not interfere with the Protestants, nor the Protestants with the Catholics. The two sections are perfectly distinct, there can be no trouble between them, and the majority will never interfere with the minority. It has been said that, if justice be not done to the minority in the province of Manitoba by this Bill, there might be a change in the province of Quebec—there might be an attempt on the part of the very large majority of Roman Catholics in Quebec against the separate schools of the Protestants. Nobody need fear that, we will never do any-

thing of the kind, and I make that statement on behalf of the province of Quebec. We have bound ourselves by law, the constitution requires it, and we do not want to excite new difficulties in our province by acting unjustly towards our friends, the Protestants of that province. If we cannot obtain justice for our co-religionists of the province of Manitoba, that is no reason why we should commit an injustice towards the Protestants of Quebec.

There is another branch of the subject of which I wish to speak now. I was asked, whether there had been some pledges, or arrangements, or contract made between the Dominion Government and Manitoba before Manitoba entered confederation. Well, I shall not enter into the details of the first rising of the half-breeds under Riel, because they are a matter of history, but I may say this, that, when the first rising took place, the Dominion Government found itself in this position. It had to decide, whether it would put the rising down by force of arms, or succeed in inducing the rebels to listen to reason and submit themselves to the laws of Canada. Well, at that period the Archbishop of St. Boniface was absent from his diocese. He was in Rome, attending the Council of the Vatican. The question then was, what could be done to obtain the exercise of his influence over these people, and I was entrusted by my colleagues to cable him and ask him to come back and help the Government to restore peace in that country. I did so, and the archbishop replied at once, that, though it was very inconvenient for him to leave his work, nevertheless, he would come. And he came, loyal, as he had always been, and as he continued to be until his death. He had interviews with the Ministers, and he claimed, on behalf of his people, that they should be treated with all possible leniency. He asked that an amnesty should be granted, and that afterwards proper treatment should be given them, because at that time there was no other power there than a power which could hardly be said to be capable of being exercised at that moment by Canada. The archbishop went, and the result was that, in a very short time, the half-breeds ceased their opposition, and we began to have peace again in that portion of the Dominion. Well, delegates were sent down from these people, and the archbishop, of course, was communicating with those who could help that country and obtain for the people a proper administration of their affairs. These delegates came down. I remember the names of two of them, Father Ritchot, and Mr. Black, and I think there was another. They came down empowered to negotiate with the Government. Sir John Macdonald and Sir George Cartier were entrusted with the task of negotiating with these delegates and endeavouring to prepare a measure to give a government to that country. The delegates were together a long time.

Unfortunately, Sir John Macdonald was laid up for, I think, three weeks, and Sir George Cartier had to continue the negotiations. Parliament was sitting, and we did not want to have Parliament rise before the matter was settled. It was understood that these people were to have schools of their own, not schools where they would be taught another religion than their own, but schools that they could control in this and other respects. That is the reason why the clause was put in the Act. The words may not be exactly the same as those referring to the separate schools in the province of Quebec, but it was understood that they would have their schools, and Parliament so understood when the Act was passed. It was so understood in Manitoba afterwards, because, for twenty years those schools were maintained unchallenged, until Mr. Greenway's government changed the law and did away with the separate schools. That is the reason why the appeal is made here by the minority. They believe, and I believe with them, that they should have their schools in which to educate their children as they please and that they should not be bound to send their children to schools where the religious doctrines taught are not their own. I do not see why they should not have their schools just as the Protestants have in the province of Quebec. My hon. friend from Durham (Mr. Craig) says he does not want separate schools and he will not interfere to restore them, and therefore, will vote against this measure. If to-morrow the same thing should occur with regard to the separate schools in Quebec, I wonder how he would vote. I think he would find good reason why he should interfere and give back to the minority the rights and privileges that they have to-day. And he would be perfectly right. But he will never be called upon to take such a course; because the Protestants will never have cause to complain of the Roman Catholics of the province of Quebec.

Mr. Speaker, the law that was passed to give the minority their schools in 1870 was the result of an arrangement between the Government and Parliament and themselves. It was a compact, and they should be maintained in the enjoyment of their rights and privileges. We have in the Confederation Act a compact, and it was so considered when the Bill was before Parliament in England. They regarded it as a treaty between us, the different provinces, and that such a treaty was to be accepted by Parliament as it stood and passed. If the Parliament of England thus respected our position as provinces, why should we here refuse to that minority, that small minority in Manitoba, the maintenance of the compact that was made with them? Why should we refuse to them what has been granted to the Protestants of the province of Quebec? And I am glad to know that it was granted cheerfully.

Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to go into a discussion of the nature of the Bill. That

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN.

has been done already. The only thing I have to say is that I believe it is a most acceptable measure and that it will give to the minority in Manitoba the relief for which they are asking, that it will restore to them the rights and privileges which they had under the old Act, which were recognized by every government and every legislature during twenty years and which should never have been taken away from them. It was promised at the time to the Archbishop of St. Boniface who was acting for his people, that this should not be disturbed but should be maintained. Well, unfortunately, the archbishop was deceived, and the schools have been done away with, and the Parliament of Canada is appealed to, to try to remedy the evil. The province of Manitoba have had plenty of time to give justice to these people. They have been asked to do so. And I have no doubt that if they were ready to-day to do substantial justice to these people we should have no more trouble, but could proceed with the work of the country in other departments. But the answer has been: No, and No, and No. We are bound by the constitution to give relief to these people, and for my part I should feel that I was committing an injustice, that I was not acting fairly towards these people and towards the country if I did not vote for this measure. Therefore, I will support it as it is. If it passes exactly as it is I shall be satisfied. I understand that the people there are satisfied with it—I mean the Roman Catholics for whose benefit it is intended.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. They are not.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman is not from Manitoba, and therefore the Bill is not for him. But the people there are satisfied.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to read him a letter which has been received from there.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I believe that the people are satisfied with the Bill. The archbishop who speaks for them, and who knows quite as much about it as the hon. gentleman, is satisfied with the Bill and has accepted it as it is. Therefore I say, if they are satisfied, why should not we be? Some say the Bill does not go far enough. But the people themselves say it is sufficient. When it is passed I hope that peace and harmony will be restored.

Mr. SPROULE. In rising to continue this debate I must first express the regret which I experience in being obliged to differ with political friends with whom I have been associated for a long time and with whose lines of policy I have usually worked in hearty accord. It is a matter for regret amongst politicians on either side of the House when they find themselves out of accord with the political party with which they have worked many years, and you readily understand, Mr. Speaker, as

I have no doubt the House does, that it is a very strong provocation which will induce any member of Parliament to go against his own political party. It is only the conscientious convictions which I hold on this question, and the interpretation which I put upon the constitution that we have heard so much about of late, and the understanding I have with regard to the rights of the majorities and minorities, that induce me to take the stand which I take to-night. But we owe a duty to our country as well as to our party, and there will sometimes come in most men's lives a time when they are obliged to leave party, and to stand for what they regard as the best interest of the country. As representatives of the people we are sent here, as far as possible to reflect the views, and the sentiments and the wishes of our constituents in whatever part of the country they live. In endeavouring to do that to-night, I am about to speak on the line which I have mapped out. We are asked in connection with this debate, what duty we owe to our constituents? The hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Masson) my colleague, who spoke on this question last night, said that it is not usual for the Government to submit a question to the people by way of a plebiscite; but they go up and down the country and hold meetings; they watch the press of the country, and by that means endeavour to ascertain the sentiments of the people, and then to keep themselves in accord with those sentiments in discharging their duties as legislators or as a Government. Now, if that be the case, and I presume it is a fair exposition of the case, I wonder how hon. gentlemen supporting the Government of the day, and composing the Government of the day, can justify their position upon this question, or pretend to say that they are in accord with the sentiment of the country. At the outset, I may say that I regret to find that the Government are, in my judgment, so much out of accord with the sentiment of the country. Why do I say so? How do I estimate or gauge public sentiment on this matter? I take the press of the country, from one end of it to the other, especially that press which represents the political party to which I belong, and which endeavours to give voice to their sentiments, to defend their policy, to support their conduct; and I say that the Government must regret to-day to find that there is scarcely an important Conservative paper which is defending them and their policy in endeavouring to pass the Bill that is before the House. If you go from Prince Edward Island in the east to Victoria in the west, and look over the Conservative papers in this country, I think you might count on the five fingers of your hand all those that come out and give a straightforward support of this measure, and of the policy of the Government in attempting to pass it. Then I take the independent press of the country. I might

mention a few of them, but they are so well known to this House and to the people that it is scarcely necessary for me to do so. But it would not be out of place to ask, in reference to those papers that have supported the Government so strongly in the past, where are they to-day? The only one that is giving even a half-hearted support to their policy is the "Mail and Empire," of Toronto; and yet it has never, so far as my judgment enables me to understand it, adduced any respectable argument either to defend or justify their course to-day. If we leave out of account the "Mail and Empire," where do we find the rest of the papers? Where do we find the "World," the next greatest exponent of the principles of the Conservative party? We find that it is arrayed against the Government's course on this question. Where do we find the Toronto "News"? Where do we find the Toronto "Telegram"? Where do we find the Toronto "Star"? Where do we find the Hamilton "Spectator"? I might go over the whole list, and I find in almost every instance that those papers are arrayed against the party, and they believe that they are voicing public sentiment. Then, if they are voicing public sentiment, how can the Government to-day be in accord with that public sentiment? If it be the duty of the Government to reflect public sentiment in their legislation, then I ask, how can they square this legislation with the sentiment of the country, as expressed by these papers? Now, we are told by the hon. member for North Grey that in order to ascertain what public sentiment is, the Government go out into the country and hold political meetings. Well, if I take the expression of the public meetings that have been held in this country, do I find any stronger evidence of public sentiment being with them than it is as expressed through the press? I can assure you that the verdict of the people is to the contrary, as expressed in public meetings that have been held for the last two or three years in every part of the country. Why, they have scarcely gone upon a single platform and dared to say that in the end they were bound to pass remedial legislation, and asked the electorate of this country to endorse it, and where the electorate have endorsed it. When they went into North Ontario and put up their candidate, what were they obliged to do? They were obliged to have their candidate keep from the knowledge of the electorate his intention regarding remedial legislation, as they knew, otherwise, that he could not receive the support of the people. I ask the hon. gentleman from North Ontario (Mr. McGillivray), what course did he take in trying to induce the electorate to support him? He said: I am not going to be pledged in this matter; but I point you to my record in the past as to what you may expect from me in the future. Have I not gone through two or three political fights in the province of Ontario?

Mr. MCGILLIVRAY. The hon. gentleman is mistaking my position in North Ontario.

Mr. SPROULE. In what respect, I would like to know, am I misstating the hon. gentleman's position? I was going on to say that according to what I read in the papers which reported him pretty extensively, his language was to this effect: The electorate of this county know my record, because I have fought two political fights in provincial campaigns on this question. They know the stand I have taken on the question of separate schools; they know what I have said. Now, then, I tell you that I am standing to-day upon the same ground that I have always stood. Now, Mr. Speaker, what was that ground? Was it in support of a remedial law which would force separate schools on Manitoba, or was it against it? Why, if I understand the ground the hon. gentleman has taken in the past, it was that when Ontario and Quebec entered into a compact at the time of confederation, they accepted these separate schools as an arrangement between the two provinces. They are here to stay, and we cannot help it. But I shall never support their extension into any other province or any other part of the country. That was the record upon which that hon. gentleman sought election, and it was upon that record that the people accepted him. But had that hon. gentleman come out plainly and told the electorate of North Ontario: I am going down to vote for remedial legislation, I am assured by men who ought to know the situation, that he would have been buried under a majority of nearly a thousand votes in his own riding. Is that an evidence that the Government are fairly entitled to accept as voicing public sentiment in favour of this legislation? No; I say it is not. Then if I go to Cardwell, what does public sentiment tell me there? It tells me that the Government candidate who had apparently, at least, come out and admitted that he was prepared to support the policy laid down by the Government upon this question of remedial legislation, was buried under a hopeless mass of votes; he was buried so far as his political life is concerned, never to rise again, at least in that constituency. But the hon. gentleman who frankly opposed the policy of remedial legislation, was accorded the support of the majority of the voters of Cardwell, and public sentiment declared against interference with Manitoba. Then the Government went down to Montreal Centre and tested public sentiment there. But did public sentiment endorse the legislation they propose to-day? No, Sir, but the candidate who was put up to oppose them now sits in this House in opposition to the Government. Then they tested public sentiment in Jacques Cartier, and met with the same response. Look also at the result of their efforts in Verchères. In fact, in almost every

Mr. SPROULE.

constituency where they have tested public sentiment, up to the present time, they have been defeated. They went down to Cape Breton to elect the hon. Secretary of State, and by a herculean effort, by dint of exercising all the power they could bring to bear, they did manufacture sufficient public sentiment to endorse their present course. But I say there are many men of intelligence to-day who, as I read in the public press, are observing the signs of the times as indicated in the way we judge public sentiment, and who have come to the conclusion that the voice of the country is against the Government in this attempt to interfere with the rights of Manitoba. There is no mistaking it, and if hon. gentlemen constituting the Government do not believe it to-day, a time will come when they will recognize it, when at the elections the people will speak with a voice so strong that they cannot misunderstand it, and many members who now fail to recognize that voice, as indicated by public sentiment, will be left in the minority after the votes have been counted, and they will then recognize that they misunderstood public sentiment and acted contrary to it.

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

After Recess.

Mr. SPROULE. Mr. Speaker, in continuing the debate on this most important subject, I may refer for a few seconds to the portion of it under consideration when you left the Chair at six o'clock. I was endeavouring to give then what, according to my judgment, was public opinion and public sentiment on this measure, and how far they were in accord with the action of the Government in dealing with this most important measure. There is no doubt that no question which has engaged the attention of Parliament for a great many years in this country is regarded as of as much importance as the one before the House to-day. On this question above all others, you might naturally look to the press of the country for an exposition of public sentiment, and also as manifested by public gatherings, through church assemblies and similar channels. I was endeavouring to show that if we examine the press of the country there can be no mistake as to what public sentiment is, because while the press supporting the Government in their policy, their National Policy, their measures relating to the fast steamship line and the development of trade, and on almost every other line of policy which has been under consideration during the last fifteen or sixteen years, those journals have been notably silent as regards saying anything endorsing the measure now under the consideration of the House. On the contrary, there is scarcely a Conservative paper in the country but has given out

some discordant sound, some note of warning, some suggestion which might induce the Government to abandon what very many regard as an insane course they are following at the present time and desist from seeking to force on an unwilling province a Bill that will take away rights that every province has heretofore enjoyed, which the province of Manitoba has heretofore enjoyed, and which in the opinion of the large majority of the people it should enjoy in the future. So far as my judgment goes, there can be no mistake as to what public opinion is. Then if the Government are running counter to public opinion and thereby lose the support of their own friends, they should not blame their friends, but rather blame their own blindness that leads them in a channel which compels their friends to desert them.

Why do I oppose this Bill at the present time? I oppose it because it is making a serious inroad on principles which have been heretofore regarded as sound. What are those principles? This Bill is interfering in the first place, with the rights of the province. There is no one who is acquainted with the history of Canada and has watched closely affairs during the last twelve or fifteen years who failed to regard with a good deal of suspicion anything that raises the question of provincial rights or causes antagonism between any province and the Federal Government, because we have had several fights in this country on that line, and the lesson taught is to avoid in future as much as possible any interference with the rights of the provinces. Only a few years ago we had a very great struggle on provincial rights, it occurring on the Streams Bill. Two or three enactments were passed by the provincial legislature. They were disallowed by the Dominion Government on the question as to the right of a province to control streams within its own territories. What was the result? When the question was taken to the courts the highest court of the Empire decided against the Dominion. In the meantime a very strong feeling had been aroused. The agitation that had been carried on against the Dominion Government for interfering with what a great many regarded as the rights of the province had created a feeling of antagonism against the Dominion Government, which threatened to be very serious. But for the fact that the highest court of the Empire decided against the Dominion Government and in favour of the provincial government controlling those rights, we do not know how the agitation would have ended, or what disastrous results would have flowed from it. Then we had a struggle as regards the claims of a province to own minerals and timber. This again involved the question of provincial rights, and ended in a decision against the Dominion, and the province was secured in the rights which it enjoys to-day, and which the people

thought they were entitled to enjoy at that time. That contention also raised a great deal of agitation. This agitation which went on, intensified and accentuated the feeling that the provinces should know what rights belonged to them, and be accorded those rights without any interference. Then we had a question of provincial rights somewhat similar to the very important question which is now under discussion. Hon. gentlemen will remember that we passed the Canadian Pacific Railway Act, and by that Act we practically took away the right of the province to charter local railways, a right which all the provinces had enjoyed up to that time; or, in other words, we put a monopoly clause in the charter of the company, which prevented the Manitoba government from exercising what was the undoubted right of every province, to grant charters for railways within its own territory. What was the result? A very serious fight took place, a very strong agitation was carried on. It was considered a grievance which at the time was difficult to remove. And what was the result of that agitation, and what was the result of that strife? We were obliged to buy back that monopoly from the Canadian Pacific Railway at a very great cost, for the purpose of appeasing the feeling and the anxiety of Manitoba, and we were obliged to give them back the power which they thought, under the constitution, they should enjoy, and which they complained was unfairly taken from them. Until that was done we had nothing like a settlement of that question. All these things have tended to create a feeling of antagonism between the government of Manitoba and the Dominion Parliament. Then, after that, we had what was known as the Jesuits' Estates Act. That was a question dealt with in this House and discussed at very great length. Upon what ground did we, who voted with the Government upon that occasion, justify the vote which we gave. It was solely upon the ground—I speak at least for myself—that we were upholding the rights of the province of Quebec. We got our information upon that question from a source which would be regarded as sufficient authority to satisfy most members of the House. We got our advice from the late Right Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald. We were told, that at confederation, the rights of the provinces were laid down, and amongst these undoubted rights were: first, the control of the land within their bounds, to sell that land, to give it away, or to use it as they saw fit. We were told, that the right of the control of educational affairs rested with the provinces. We were told, that it did not matter whether it accorded with the views of the majority of the Dominion Parliament or not, the right of the province was to control its educational affairs. We were told, that, so long as the province raised

money according to the ways laid down in the British North America Act, it did not matter how they spent it. It was said to us, that the provinces might grant licenses to raise money, or they might sell their lands to raise money; but, so long as they raised it according to the constitution, they could use it for any purpose they desired, no matter whether it was agreeable to outsiders or not. I remember distinctly putting a question to the Right Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald about that. I said: Suppose that a province should pass a law to use money for a purpose which, in the judgment of the Dominion Parliament, and in the judgment and the wisdom of the people of Canada, would be detrimental to the interests of the Dominion, or to the interests of the other provinces, or even to the interests of the province itself, would the Dominion Parliament be justified in vetoing that law. And Sir John Macdonald's answer was: So long as they raised that money in the manner laid down under the constitution, it is a matter of unconcern to us, and it is none of our business, if they pitched that money into the St. Lawrence or into the fire. And he further said: They have sold a portion of what was their own land, and they have raised money; they are now using this money on educational lines, and they are entitled to do so, and, whether it is agreeable or disagreeable to us, it is the right of the province, and we must be satisfied with it. Upon that understanding, and believing the right hon. gentleman to be a greater authority than I on provincial rights, although it was against my judgment, and although it was against the judgment of my constituents, I supported the Government on that occasion. And, Sir, I remember that the Right Hon. Sir John Macdonald said, in answer to the same question: It may come back to you in the province of Ontario to-morrow, and how could you be so inconsistent as to oppose the right of the province of Quebec to deal with her own land, her own money, and her own education, if, on a similar question arising in the province of Ontario, you were obliged to vote the other way? Those were the arguments then used by Sir John Macdonald, in the case of the Jesuits' Estates Act.

Now, Sir, I regard this present question as being on the same lines. Manitoba has seen fit to deal with education. It is the right of that province to deal with that matter. It is true, it is said, that Manitoba can deal with it only within certain limits. I admit, there is a proviso in that, but it has been the generally-accepted principle heretofore, that every province had the uncontrolled right to deal with education, and every province had used that right according to its will, and there has been no interference with it up to the present time. This is the first time in Canadian history that we have been asked to interfere with that right of a province. We are asked now to endorse a

Mr. SPROULE.

principle, the very opposite of the principle we stood by, when the province of Quebec was making a fight for her rights. We stood by the province of Quebec then on a question which was very unpopular with us, which, in the judgment of many, was wrong; but we stood by the principle, believing that we stood up for the rights of a province. If that rule is applied to the province of Quebec, then, why should it not be applied to the province of Manitoba to-day? The same that applies to one should apply to the other; the same rights the one province has, the other province ought to enjoy. Sir, I oppose this Bill because it prevents the will of the majority from being carried out. The invariable principle is, that majorities must rule. Some say, that majorities should not always rule, but they do rule in every walk of life. If you go into a business corporation, the majority rules; if you go to a church meeting, the majority rules; if you go to a township council, the majority rules.

Mr. DEVLIN. If you go to Turkey, the majority rules, too.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). And the majority in heathen countries rules.

Mr. SPROULE. I am talking about civilized life, as we understand it in the British Empire. I say that in every part of the British Empire it is regarded as the correct principle that the majority shall rule, and whatever decision the majority comes to, it is generally recognized to be right. Now, it does not matter whether you apply the principle to a township council, or to a municipal corporation, the principle that the majority rules is the principle that holds good. Why should a rule the reverse of this be applied to the province of Manitoba? In the provincial legislature there, the majority rules. In this very House the majority rules by their voice. Whether the minority acquiesces in the principles promulgated or not, it does not matter; the majority rules. The province of Manitoba has rights, or she thinks she has rights, which she was entitled to enjoy, and, according to her understanding of her rights, she is dealing with a question in which she is vitally interested. A large majority of her people have come to the solemn conclusion, that it is in their interests and the interests of their province, that they shall in future have a different system of education from what they had had up to the year 1890. And yet to-day we are trying to prevent that majority from ruling in the province of Manitoba. We are told, that this is something embodied in the constitution, and that, therefore, it should be held sacred, and we should not disturb it. There is no doubt there is some show of argument for those who hold that view, and I will deal with it later on. I have here the debates which took place in 1865 and 1866, when they were trying to bring about

confederation, and I have looked at the discussions which took place upon the resolutions on which the British North America Act was founded. I see here one of the eminent men of that day, forecasting what might be the dangerous result, if you insist on taking away the rights from majorities. And to-day, in the light of experience, it seems to me to be verified to the letter. John Sandfield Macdonald, who was a Roman Catholic, was speaking against that provision of this resolution, which was intended to place upon provinces rights for minorities which never could be changed, no matter what the changed condition of the country or the character of the people. He moved a resolution in opposition to that, and, in supporting his resolution, he said :

I rise, Sir, to propose another amendment. I can assure the House that I never knew a measure of anything like this importance go through with so few attempts to amend it. Nor do I rise for the mere purpose of putting my amendment on record, for I do feel that the views I am about to express, and which I have ever held since I have been a member of this House may not commend themselves to any considerable number of the members. I have no desire that the rights of the Roman Catholic minority of Upper Canada should be abridged.

He had no desire that they should be abridged, but he refused to endorse the principle that the resolution granting them should be perpetual.

I have no desire that the rights and privileges of any other denomination shall be interfered with in any respect ; but I wish hon. members to bear in mind that the experience we have had in this country, not to allude to that of the neighbouring state, proves that a denial of the right of the majority to legislate on any given matter has always led to grave consequences. I need only mention the Clergy Reserve question. This, it must be recollected, was forbidden to be legislated upon by the Union Act ; yet it was the cause of fierce strife and legislation for many years. The original constitution of the United States prohibited the question of slavery from being interfered with by Congress ; yet an agitation for its suppression was early commenced, and has at last terminated in civil war. The agitation of the Clergy Reserve question produced a rebellion in Upper Canada. I say, Sir, that by making a constitutional restriction in respect to the schools of the minority, we are sowing the seeds from which will in the end arise a serious conflict, unless the constitution be amended. The minority will be quite safe on a question relating to their faith and their education in a colony under the sway of the British Crown ; but if you expressly withdraw that question from the control of the majority, the rights of the minority will not be safe in either section of the province, if you distrust the action of the majority. It is our duty, Sir, to see that a question which affects us so dearly as the education of our children—a question which has before now created no little excitement in Upper Canada—shall not be withdrawn from the management of the local legislature. We ought not to deprive them of a power which they will want to exercise, just because they are deprived of it, and provoke a desire on their part to alter the

system. You may rely upon it other religious bodies will be sure to protest against any particular creed having special rights, or an exclusive monopoly of certain privileges, whatever they may be. I should be astonished if any one in this House would say, either to the Protestant minority in Lower Canada or to the Roman Catholic minority in Upper Canada : " You are not to trust to the justice of the majority." Have they ever known a country where the majority did not control affairs and where the minority had not to submit ?

And yet we are asked to-day to prevent the majority in Manitoba controlling the affairs of that province, although we have never known a civilized country where it was not the case that the majority controlled and the minority submitted. He goes on :

Does not the majority rule and the minority submit in England and in France ? I have never heard of any case where this was not the case. The minority is safe against undue encroachment on its rights, and I am willing to trust to the sense of justice of the majority in Upper Canada to preserve the religious and educational liberties of the Roman Catholics of Upper Canada. I am now getting some what advanced in years, and I am the more anxious to put my opinions on record, because before long I shall have the satisfaction of saying, though perhaps not on the floor of this House, that I protested against resolutions intended to prevent the free expression of opinion by the majority of the people of Upper Canada, and the exercise of a power which ought to be entrusted to them.

We can see to-day, in the light of experience, the foresight and intelligence of the late John Sandfield Macdonald in the forecasting what might be the result if the rights of the majority in a province were taken away, and they were not allowed to exercise the rights that belong to every civilized country. He went on to move a resolution as follows :—

That the following words be added to the original motion :—

" And that it be an instruction to the said committee to consider whether any constitutional restriction which shall exclude from the local legislature of Upper Canada the entire control and direction of education, subject only to the approval or disapproval of the general Parliament, is not calculated to create widespread dissatisfaction, and tend to foster and create jealousy and strife between the various religious bodies in that section of the province."

He goes on to say :

If hon. gentlemen think they are going to silence the bitter feelings which have been engendered in Upper Canada in consequence of the attempt to make permanent a certain system of education, they are much mistaken ; and I desire to have the expression of the opinion of the members of this House on the subject, whether they think that the restriction in the proposed constitution I have mentioned is calculated to bring about harmony, and whether it is not better to let the Catholics of Upper Canada and the Protestants of Lower Canada protect themselves, or rather trust for protection to the sense of justice of their fellow-subjects.

An hon. gentleman who opposed that motion said :

Though I am against the separate school system, I am willing to accept this confederation, even though it perpetuates a small number of separate schools. Under the present legislative union we are powerless in any movement for the abrogation of the separate system ; it is even very doubtful if we could resist the demands for its extension. We will not be in any worse position under the new system, and in one respect we will have a decided advantage, in that no further change can be made by the separate school advocates. We will thus substitute certainty for uncertainty. I deeply regret that the hon. member should have thought it necessary for any purpose to move this resolution.

He did not contemplate any further changes, but he was willing to accept what was then in existence in Upper and Lower Canada.

Mr. DEVLIN. Who held that language ?

Mr. SPROULE. It was Mr. A. Mackenzie.

Mr. DEVLIN. The late Hon. Alexander Mackenzie ?

Mr. SPROULE. Yes, I think so. Now, I think I have made clear two things. The first is that it was never contemplated at confederation to compel every province that came into the union to accept separate schools, but only to accept the solemn compact made between Upper and Lower Canada, and to act on the understanding that that compact should be carried out. Acting on that understanding, in two or three local elections in the province of Ontario in which the school question engaged a great deal of attention, I steadily refused to say one word against separate schools in Upper or Lower Canada, because I considered that under the solemn compact made at confederation, the rights enjoyed by the minorities in the two provinces should be maintained. But I held that it was never contemplated, when confederation was brought about, that similar rights should be extended to every province that came into the union, and I am justified in that belief by the resolutions that were moved at that time. Some say that we are bound not only to give separate schools to every province that comes into the union, but after it comes in, and it engrafts on its statutes some privilege in regard to schools that may or not be justifiable, that privilege must remain there for ever. I say there is nothing in the resolutions to warrant that contention. In reading the resolutions assigning to the legislatures of the provinces the subjects which they could control, I find this laid down :

The local legislature shall have power to make laws respecting the following subjects :—

Among these is :

Education, saving the rights and privileges which the Protestant or Catholic minority in both Canadas may possess as to their denominational schools at the time when the union goes into operation.

Mr. SPROULE.

But it says nothing about the same right being extended to any other province that may come in. That was the solemn understanding come to when these resolutions went to the Home Government as a basis for legislation. But we are told to-day : "Oh, but the British North America Act says so-and-so." In the legislature one hon. gentleman got up and contended that the Bill that passed the Imperial Parliament should not become law until it was submitted to the Parliament of Canada, and the Parliament of Canada had an opportunity of expressing its opinion upon it, and either assenting to or dissenting from it ; and also until there was an appeal to the people upon it. One reason he gave for that view was : We know by experience, he said, that it sometimes happens that we make laws on certain lines ; but if, after these laws have been made and become constitutional laws, certain provisions are found in them that were never contemplated, we ought to have some opportunity of examining them before we are asked to assent to them. In opposition to that, the Attorney General, who was afterwards Sir George Cartier, spoke as follows :

In reply to what the hon. member for Hochelaga has just said, I shall merely tell the hon. members of this House that they need not take any alarm at the apprehensions and the predictions that the hon. gentleman has made.

That was the danger of something creeping into the law which it was never contemplated should be embodied in it.

I have already declared, in my own name and on behalf of the Government, that the delegates who go to England and will accept from the Imperial Government no Act but one based on the resolutions voted by this House, and they will not break faith in order to bring back any other. (Hear, hear). I will pledge my honour and that of the Government to that effect, and I trust my word of honour will, at least, have as much weight with the House and the country as that of the hon. member for Hochelaga. (Cheers).

And it was accepted on that ground, but there was the resolution, there was what the provincial legislature was to have, the right to control education, save only as regards the compact entered into between the two Canadas. But afterwards, in clause 93 of the British North America Act, an improvement was introduced that goes even further than that. It says :

All the powers, privileges and duties at the union by law conferred and imposed in Upper Canada on the separate schools and school trustees of the Queen's Roman Catholic subjects, shall be, and the same are hereby extended to the dissentient schools of the Queen's Protestant and Roman Catholics in Quebec.

Where in any province a system of separate or dissentient schools exists by law at the union,—

That only applied to the two Canadas, Upper and Lower Canada, and it did not contemplate any other province. It did not contemplate that the resolution I have read

should extend to any other province. It did not contemplate that it was to extend to provinces coming afterwards into the union. It says :

Where in any province a system of separate or dissentient schools exists by law at the union, or is thereafter established by the legislature of the province, an appeal shall lie to the Governor General in Council.

That does not give the right to establish them and then say that, once established, they are never to be disturbed afterwards. Now, the delegates who were acting on behalf of Manitoba were not satisfied with what had taken place in New Brunswick about education, and they wanted to pass a law which would go further than the British North America Act went, and secure for themselves greater powers and improve their position. They passed what is known as the Manitoba Act. Here is the clause of that Act applying to the subject :

In and for the province of Manitoba the said legislature may exclusively make laws in relation to education, subject and according to the following provisions :—

Nothing in any such law shall prejudicially affect any right or privilege with respect to denominational schools which any class of persons have by law or practice in the province at the union.

They went further than the British North America Act, because that Act only provided that they shall enjoy what they have at the time of the union. But it was changed because of the New Brunswick case. The minority had not the right to have separate schools in law, and, therefore, that right could not be given back to them. The minority should enjoy the right which they had on going into the union. Is any right taken away from them which they enjoyed when they came into the union? Did the Privy Council say so? The Privy Council did not say anything of the kind. The Roman Catholic minority in Manitoba had not that right in practice, because there were no separate schools there in practice; they had what is known as parochial schools, which they might establish to-day upon the same basis. And, therefore, we are not going beyond the bound of reason, when we say that they have not the right, under the Act providing for the incorporation of Manitoba into confederation, to appeal against the Manitoba statute which did away with separate schools, because they did not enjoy the right to separate schools when they came into the union. That right was given them after they came into the union. The union was consummated in 1870, and separate schools were given in 1871, and the Roman Catholic minority are enjoying to-day all the rights they enjoyed on coming into the union, and no right which they enjoyed then is taken from them to-day. Therefore, they cannot complain fairly on that line.

We are told that the constitution shows that they shall enjoy certain rights. Now,

I would like to ask this House, what are constitutions? They are only compacts between governments and individuals, made to suit the necessities of the time and circumstances, and, as time goes on and conditions change, as people die and pass off the stage of action and others take their places, as the necessities of the time and changing circumstances and conditions may require, those constitutions may be changed. Constitutions are not immutable. At one time one of the provisions of the British constitution was, that there should be church and state. Where is church and state to-day? Where would it be to-day, if that constitution never changed? The old system of church and state has been done away with by the very descendants of the men who were the strong advocates of it years ago, and who regarded it then as one of the safeguards of the British constitution. But, as time, as conditions, as the circumstances changed, it was a wise act to do away with it. There was a time when a Roman Catholic could not hold any office. But is there any one to-day who, in his wisdom, will say they have no right to hold office, as well as any Protestant? Things have changed, and they hold office to-day by virtue of the will and consent of the majority.

Mr. DEVLIN. Has the Manitoba government the right to change the constitution granted to it?

Mr. SPROULE. Yes, so the British North America Act says. It has the right to change its own constitution in certain lines. I shall not specify all the lines, but it has that right. But I say that constitutions are only compacts, which only last so long as those compacts suit the situation, the circumstances, the conditions and the age in which they are applied; and, when they are not in harmony with the age, they must be changed.

Mr. AMYOT. Would the province of Quebec have the right to change the constitution, so far as separate schools are concerned?

Mr. SPROULE. I have shown the hon. gentleman that, under the solemn compact they have entered into, they are pledged to Ontario to retain those schools, and I do not look at it as standing in the same relation at all. I have given the reasons. It is because that compact was entered into before confederation, under which that province must have separate schools, but, as regards Manitoba, the compact was only that they should enjoy what they had on going into the union; and on going into the union, Manitoba had not separate schools.

The seigniorial tenure was, at one time, a very burning question in the province of Quebec. It was at one time suitable to the wants of the people, but, as time and conditions changed, it was abolished by law. We

had a clergy reserve fund that gave a certain portion of land for the benefit of the clergy, and that was embodied in the compact between Upper and Lower Canada and formed part of our constitution. Is it standing to-day? No, long since the clergy reserve lands were taken away from the clergy and used for the purposes of the country, because the changed conditions of the day rendered the change necessary. The constitution of the United States provided that Congress should not interfere with slavery. Enlightened public opinion in that great republic, however, demanded that slavery should be done away with, because it was inhuman and not in consonance with the advanced state of civilization, and not in harmony with human feeling and sympathy; and, although the American constitution provided that it should not be changed, what did the people do? They first made a compromise, what is known as the Missouri compromise, and declared that slavery should not go beyond certain bounds. But that was not sufficient; public opinion was too strong to stand slavery to any extent, however limited, and they abolished slavery, though they were obliged to do it by changing the constitution, though, in order to effect that change, they had to resort to arms and cause the loss of tens of thousands of valuable lives and millions of money, and though they had to accomplish that change by one of the greatest civil wars the world has ever seen. The constitution, however, had to be changed, because the requirements of the time demanded it. What are constitutions, if they are not made to suit the requirements of the times and of the age in which we live? If the constitution of Manitoba became entirely unsuited for the requirements of Manitoba, would it be wise to insist that Manitoba should abide by it, and not effect a change? I say it would be most unwise. Because she saw fit to think otherwise, because she seeks to make this change, are we going to abuse her? No. I would like to ask hon. gentlemen: Suppose that through some inadvertence or malicious design, or from any other cause, you had engrafted upon the constitution of that country a separate school system that was entirely unsuited to the civilization of the age, entirely unsuited to the requirements of the rising generation, who ought to be given a fair education. It is said that this separate school system is a good one; but suppose that the separate school system had been the worst. Merely because that system had been engrafted upon the constitution, must it remain there for ever? Would that be common sense or common wisdom? Would it justify any class of men in abiding by it? Would not these men rather be justified in so amending the constitution as to bring themselves into harmony with their environments and with the requirements of the country in which they find themselves? Why is this Bill objectionable? It is ob-

jectionable mainly because it establishes two systems of educational law, and two systems of education in a country where they can hardly afford to support one system. We hear it often said: Suppose the people of Quebec were to do with their separate schools there what the people of Manitoba have done with the separate schools there. But the cases are not at all the same, and the comparison is not a reasonable one. You can only compare things that are, to some extent, alike. I go to the province of Quebec, and I find the people settled on narrow lots that extend a mile and a quarter in length, but are only, if I remember well, forty rods in width. A family lives on the front of each lot, and the front of the lots is like a continuous village. The people are congregated in large numbers in a small space. If the people want two schools they may be quite able to support them, for they are numerous enough and wealthy enough to do so. But compare that with the conditions in Manitoba. Half of the land is kept as a reserve, and not settled at all in some places; the people can get 160 acres each, instead of 80 acres each, and there are only four families in a mile, instead of from eight to sixteen. Is it to be supposed that the same rules are applicable to the people of Quebec that are applied to the people of Manitoba? Not at all. The provincial government, in their wisdom, decide that the conditions were such that it is impossible to impose two school systems upon the people, that the people are too weak and cannot maintain them in efficiency. That is the reason why they did not wish to perpetuate the two systems there. I have here a pamphlet that deals with the subject, and it shows that the population there is sparse and scattered. Reading this pamphlet, one gets an idea of what it means for such a population to attempt to maintain two school systems. This pamphlet takes 198 school sections and shows that in 1894 the average attendance in no single one of them reached ten. Some of them are as low as five, and the line of figures runs nine, five, eight, seven, six, seven, nine, and so on. Every one of them is below ten. What would be the condition in that country if you were to insist upon the establishment of another school system amongst these people who are struggling to maintain one system of schools? Would such a thing be wise? A few years ago we had an appeal from Quebec. I remember that a number of Protestants from one part of that province came here and asked this House to provide means to transport them to the neighbourhood of Calgary so that they might settle together where they could keep up their schools and churches. As an evidence of the difficulty of maintaining these institutions where populations were sparse, they showed us a map of that country where the Protestants, one by one, had been bought out by the Roman

Catholics until they had become distributed in very small numbers, yet in much larger numbers than can be found in the settled country districts in Manitoba. And they said: We are unable to keep up our societies, we are unable to maintain our churches, we are unable to support our schools, because we are so few in number. When they were asked: Why do you not attend the schools of the majority, as the Roman Catholics of Ontario attend the public schools there? the answer was: If the schools in Quebec were of the same nature as the public schools in Ontario where the object is to give a secular education and not teach the religion of any particular church first, we would send our children to them. But in those schools they teach principles that are regarded as inimical to the belief of a Protestant denomination. Therefore, we cannot send our children to their schools, and we are too weak to keep up our own schools. Is not that the condition in Manitoba? And if the Government came to the conclusion that this condition of things overburdened the people, and decided that it would be better to give them one system of national schools where religion was not taught, where the tenets of no particular church were taught, have they not strong reason for doing so? For, whatever may have been said, I have never seen it proven that any religious creed or the tenets of any particular church were taught in these schools. They go through the form of reading the Lord's prayer, and they occasionally read a passage of scripture; but they have never introduced any catechism or the teaching of the dogmas of any church. They have made a system of national schools in which the chief desire is to give the rising generation that secular education which is necessary to fit them for becoming good citizens. We are asked to compel the people of Manitoba to go back to the dual system, and to carry on that dual system under two sets of laws, one set of schools under the control of their own laws, and one under laws passed by this Parliament. What must be the result? It must engender a feeling of strife and resentment in the minds of the majority which, if aroused now, may not die out within the lifetime of the youngest member of this House. We are told that we should pass this Bill and settle the question finally. If I could hope that this would be a final settlement of this question, I confess that I should be inclined to do a great deal that I would not otherwise do. But I regard it as only the commencement of this fight, if this is forced upon the people contrary to the will of the majority there.

Now, I object to separate schools on principle. But while saying that, I have no feeling against those who regard separate schools as the right schools. The principle which I regard as right in this country is to bring the children up together in one

school, where they will learn, through the associations of youth to love and respect each other, where they will play together, where they will learn to tolerate each other's eccentricities, and learn that human nature is human nature in one, the same as the other; where they will grow up together, having inculcated in their minds the same principles of education, science and knowledge that must be useful to them throughout life. I regard it as a correct principle in the interests of the state that in school the children shall see nothing of the diversity of religion, though that may remain, and the church has the right to teach it, but that it shall not keep the children apart in two hostile camps as is now being done. This is essentially why I oppose this Bill. I do not care whether it is a weak Bill or a strong Bill. The Bill has in it the principle of forcing upon an unwilling province separate schools which were done away with because the people regarded them as unsuitable to the requirements of the situation or the condition of things in their country. Then again I oppose it because I think the state ought to control education. I believe the trend of the age is towards the state controlling education. Those of us who remember our schoolboy days will no doubt recollect when we went to what were called pay schools, and we paid so much a month for the support of the teacher. There was not much difference in the amount of religion taught in those schools and that taught today; but they were pay schools kept up by voluntary subscriptions, and kept up by those who wished to educate their children. The state in its wisdom afterwards thought it necessary to take over the control of education because there was a large number of poor children in the country whose parents were unable or too careless to give them an education, and this made it possible for a very large percentage of them to grow up in ignorance. Believing that education ought to be the birthright of every citizen of the British Empire, and that intelligence is the best guarantee for good citizenship, the state thought it right to give them an education, and therefore it took the schools of the country under its control. Instead of having pay schools, instead of having parochial schools, instead of having church schools, we have what is known as free schools controlled by the state. As soon as the free school system was introduced in Upper Canada it was regarded as the best system yet devised for the people, and it has been controlled by the state from that time to the present. Now, then, I said that the trend of the age is towards the state taking control of education. Why do I say so? Because the day of private schools and parochial schools has passed away. I am strengthened in that opinion by the history of other countries as well as our own. I need not cite the case of Upper Canada, because no

one would pretend to stand up to-day and say that we should revert to the old system of allowing churches to keep up their schools and private individuals to keep up their schools, instead of the state doing it. But we have gone further than that by taxing ourselves for the education of children whose parents are not able to pay for it, by giving money out of the public treasury to support poor schools where the people are not able to tax themselves for it. In the province of Ontario the development of our educational system has been along that line for the last thirty or forty years, until it is a recognized fact to-day that no one would pretend to deny. I say again that the trend of the age is towards free schools, as shown by what has taken place in other countries. I take a work that I hold in my hand, and in it I find facts drawn from the history of other countries which strengthen my conviction in that regard. According to the "Encyclopedia Britannica," Vol. 8, page 712, I find that all over Europe education is passing from the control of the clergy into the hands of the state. Europe is older than our country; it has learned, as every country learns, by the experience of the past, and their experience has taught them the wisdom of taking the control of education from under the hands of the clergy, from under the hands of the church, and transferring it to the control of the state. The same is said to be true even in Mexico, and Central America, and in South America. Then when I come to look at some other countries I find that in Ireland, that benighted country, where it is sometimes said the people are steeped in ignorance, they have a system of national schools. Under the national school system of Ireland, Roman Catholics and Protestants are educated together. They have learned by experience the folly of keeping children apart when they are educated, because separate education, instead of harmonizing opposing sentiments and feelings, tends to accentuate them, tends to make them worse. Therefore, the wisdom of the administration of Ireland has led them to devise what might be regarded as a national school system. Australia has also come to the same conclusion, because the common school system of Australia is based on the principles of perfect religious freedom, and the non-establishment of any particular form of religious belief. I need not give the history of the United States in regard to this question, as it is doubtless well known to members of this House. Although attempt after attempt has been made by the Roman Catholics, and in all honesty, in all sincerity, to bring the educational affairs of that country under the control of their church, as they have no doubt a perfect right to attempt to do, I say that great country, which is regarded as in the forefront of advancement and civilization to-day, has never accepted the principle of separate schools, and has

Mr. SPROULE.

never allowed education to pass from under her control. To-day her schools are free to every child of the state, and the children must be educated together in all state-supported schools. Denominational religion is not taught in her schools, but the principles of religion that are common to all, are inculcated in many of them. I know something about the schools in the United States, because I passed some time in her educational institutions; and although the state teaches some of the doctrines of religion that are common to all creeds, the same as are taught in many parts of this country. I heard no objection from any Roman Catholic. And although, as I say, application has been made from time to time for separate schools, the state has never abandoned her control of education. No doubt some honorable gentlemen will remember that two or three years ago the question was asked of one of the high dignitaries of the Roman Catholic Church of the United States, Mons. Satolli, Would the church in the United States allow the children of Roman Catholics to be educated in what were commonly called godless schools, and the answer was that under the circumstances, they could do so; under the circumstances they were at liberty to send their children to the public schools. The Roman Catholics do not enjoy the privilege of separate schools there, as they do here. Now, then, in Mexico also, free public schools have been established, and whoever sends a child to a parochial school is fined. Experience has proven the wisdom of preventing parochial schools from controlling the education of the country, and the state has made it a punishable offence for any one to send a child to a parochial school. On this question I find some facts quoted by Dr. Sidney. In the Republic of Central America children between the ages of eight and fourteen years are required to attend public schools. Education is free, compulsory, and under state control. Then I come to South America, to the republics of that continent with their 50,000,000 of population, and what system do we find there? Until twenty years ago the education of the children was carried on in parochial schools and under the control of the clergy, but experience has shown the unwisdom of that system of education, and they have changed it. Their schools now are public, under state control, and compulsory. The education of that great country is to-day closely modelled after the system prevailing in the state of Michigan. In that great country of fifty millions of people, whoever sends a child to a parochial school is fined, and the parochial schools have been closed. Free schools have been established in Uruguay, and Venezuela, under a system much the same as that prevailing in other republics I have mentioned. Then we come to New Brunswick, and we find that they have practically state schools. They have state schools in the province of Nova Scotia, they have state schools in

Prince Edward Island. Then, I say, I am justified in the conclusion that the trend of the age is towards the state controlling the education of the country. Why, I ask, should Manitoba be compelled to go back to what is really an obsolete, an unsatisfactory, and an unsuitable condition of things for the needs of that province? For that reason again, I am opposed to this Bill. Now, Sir, we are told that we have a right to legislate because there is a grievance. What law has ever been passed restricting a man's rights, that does not leave a grievance behind it? Is there any law that restricts us in any walk of life that does not give rise to some grievance, if we are to consult our own feelings when rights have been taken away from us? But if, in the interest of the state, in the interest of humanity, it is necessary even to create a grievance by taking away certain rights, the state is justified in taking away those rights in the interest of the whole. And though there may be a grievance behind it, it is no justification for going back to the old condition of things simply because it is a grievance. Was there not a grievance in New Brunswick when the provincial government took control of the schools and changed the system? The Minister of Marine and Fisheries fought that question eloquently in this House, declaring there was a grievance and a very serious grievance. But when Sir John Macdonald was appealed to, he refused to give back what they regarded as their rights, because, he said, it was the right of a province to control that matter, and he informed them that it was their duty to go to the highest tribunal, the people, and fight out the question there. He told them to go first to the provincial legislature, and then to go to the people, because the people had the power to change the representation in the legislature. He told the representatives of the minority to go before the people and convince them that their demand was a right and just one, and, he said, there was sufficient justice in humanity to grant what is right.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will permit me an explanation, as he referred to me by name. He has stated that the late Sir John Macdonald, when appealed to by the minority of New Brunswick, told them that he could give them no relief, but to go to the legislature. I think the hon. gentleman will find that there they were sent, not to the legislature, but to the courts, and the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council.

Mr. SPROULE. I read the discussion a few days ago. The contention is that the courts of justice offer no redress and, therefore, the people have to come here for redress, and that the British North America Act contemplated that we should come here for redress. But the understanding, as expressed by Sir John Macdonald, was that you must go back to your own legislature,

and if you do not obtain relief there, then appeal to the electors, because they can put out the members of the legislature; but, in Sir John Macdonald's opinion, we had no right to interfere. I read the debate in this way, and I am in the judgment of those who have read it as well as myself.

Will Manitoba settle this question if left alone? I believe, if Manitoba were left alone she would ultimately settle it: perhaps the minority would not get all they expect or claim, but the province would settle it as satisfactorily as it was settled in New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, and the other provinces. I have sufficient respect for the judgment and fairness of the people of that great country, many of whom went there from Ontario and Quebec, to believe that they do not want to act unfairly to any of the people there, and if left alone they would settle the question in a way that would be satisfactory to the minority after a time. The minority are taking advantage of the law which exists there to-day, and I find they are bringing the schools under the control of the law in increasing numbers every year. I have, therefore, the right to assume that not very great dissatisfaction exists there.

Who are clamouring for this law? Are the people of Manitoba clamouring for it? It is true that a largely signed petition has been sent here asking for the change, and I cannot shut my eyes to that fact; but it was got up, I am credibly informed, by the hierarchy, and was signed by people who were asked to sign it, and they sent down the petition. This was all right. But the greater clamour comes from the province of Quebec, many of whose people know little of the situation, whether separate schools joined with national schools can be worked or not. They are forcing the issue, and they are the party who are forcing the fight on the situation to-day. I do not believe, if they knew the situation as well as the people there do, if they knew the difficulties that Manitoba has to contend with, they would fight strongly and insist so vigorously in forcing on an unwilling people a measure that is not desired there, and compel them to restore the school system which was abolished because it did not suit them.

There are some features of this contest that attract my attention at the present time, and which must attract public attention. One is the voice of the bishops and clergy on the question. We all understand that it is a serious offence to interfere with the rights of a member of Parliament in the discharge of his legislative duties or to intimidate him. Those of us who know anything about the Roman Catholic religion, are aware that it is a very serious thing to take away from any member of that church the rights of the church, to tell a man who believes that through that church alone he can find salvation, that the ecclesiastical

authorities will take away from him the rights of the church. I believe it to be a very serious threat when you tell any man discharging his duties as a member of Parliament, or is about to go back to the electors for endorsement or otherwise, that if you do so and so the church will declare you to be no longer a Roman Catholic. I have here a statement which was put out a few days ago, and it seems to me a very serious matter with respect to Roman Catholics in this House. I am sorry to mention it, and I do not do it for the purpose of creating any feeling, because I know it may make some hon. members who are Roman Catholics feel that I am doing what I should not, as a Protestant do, in speaking of it. But I only speak of it because of the sentiments enunciated by the leader of the Opposition the other night. That hon. gentleman said: While I love my church and revere my church, and respect my church, yet in the discharge of my duty as a Liberal in this House, following the principles of Liberalism as enunciated, known and carried out by the great Reformers of the British Empire, I refuse to be controlled in the discharge of my duty even by my church, because I regard it as the first duty of a member of Parliament to do his duty to the state, and while I am unwilling to come into conflict with my church, I believe I know the situation better than they do; I do not regard it as offensive because they imagine they are right in doing so; and I think they are rather objects for sympathy than otherwise. Father Lacombe, a very respectable missionary—I do not blame him for his utterance, because he thought he was doing right, and doing what he conceived to be his duty—declared that no man who opposed this Remedial Bill would be regarded as a Catholic. He said:

If, which may God not grant, you do not believe it to be your duty to accede to our just demands, and that the Government, which is anxious to give us the promised law, be beaten and overthrown while keeping firm to the end of the struggle, I inform you, with regret, that the Episcopacy, like one man, united to the clergy, will rise to support those who may have fallen to defend us.

Archbishop Langevin of St. Boniface has stated his views in these words:

It has been said, falsely, that the Catholic hierarchy in this Dominion of ours is to settle the school question. No, the Catholic hierarchy—you know it, and I can say it plainly—the Catholic hierarchy leads the Catholics in their religious conviction, and all those who do not follow the hierarchy are not Catholics.

And he has instructed them that this was clearly their duty, because the church instructed them in their line of conscience, by telling them that it was their duty to support the Bill which gives back these rights to the church.

When the hierarchy has spoken there is no use for any Catholic to say to the contrary, for
Mr. SPROULE.

if he does he is no longer a Catholic. Such a man may carry the title, but I declare this as a bishop: I say to-night, and I say it with plain authority, a Catholic who does not follow the hierarchy on the school question is no more a Catholic, and who will be the one to entitle such a one to the name of Catholic? Where is the society or government who will give him the right to call himself a Catholic when I in my authority as a Catholic bishop, declare that such a man has no right to the name.

Then, I say, the bishop is putting them outside the pale of the church, and that is a very serious matter for Catholics. Sir, I regard that as a most unfortunate thing, because it is interfering with what most people in this country look upon as the right of every member of Parliament to do, namely, to follow the dictates of his own judgment in matters where the state must control, and where the state must be above the church and above religion, and where members believe that they know the condition of things better than the men who are attempting to give advice. I do not blame the clergy of the Roman Catholic Church for doing so. I do not blame them for bringing every influence they can to bear upon the church to do so, but I think it is unfortunate that that influence should be brought to bear. A man who has the courage of his convictions, and who has the manhood and the integrity to say: In the face of all that, I regard my duty to the state as so and so, and I shall carry it out, notwithstanding the fact that I may be buried under the anathema of the church, and notwithstanding that the whole church shall be arrayed against me, and support the party opposed to me; I say that the man who has the moral courage to say that will be endorsed by the people of this country. They will regard him with respect and honour, and they will look upon him as a greater statesman than they did before. This is one of the features of this contest which makes me to-day go very strongly against this Bill. We are told that if we do not legislate in this case, Quebec may take away the rights from the Protestants of that province. I was glad to hear the hon. member for Three Rivers (Sir Hector Langevin) speak in the generous and manly tone he did this afternoon, when he said that whether the minority in Manitoba got their rights or not, Quebec would never descend to any principle so low. I always had a high opinion of the French-Canadian people, I always regarded them as chivalrous, as honourable, and as disposed to do right to the minority down there. But above and beyond all that, I say that whether we legislate or do not legislate, the rights of the minority are not in danger in that province. There was a solemn compact entered into with the province of Quebec in this matter, and I believe that no person would dare to break up the original contract which was entered into between the two Canadas before confederation, and embodied in the

Confederation Act of 1867. And should the people down in that country wish to legislate upon that question, and if they felt as strongly on it as do the people of Manitoba, would the people of Manitoba be disposed to interfere with their rights? I think they would not. And if the people of Quebec came to this House would they be inclined to regard with quietness and courtesy any effort that was made to interfere with their rights. I think they would not. They would be the very strongest to create an agitation that would be large in its proportions, and dangerous in its results, if they were not allowed to control their rights, as they were allowed in the Jesuits' Estates case. They would tell us that any legislation against them was an interference with the rights belonging to their province, and they would not brook any interference. Now what should the Government do with this question at the present time? I say they should leave it to the people of the province of Manitoba to deal with as in their judgment they think best. That was what they should have done in the first place. While the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council said to the minority: You have the right to appeal, what did that mean? Some say that the Government are now only carrying out the judgment of the Privy Council. I do not so understand it. Although that was very fiercely contended a few months ago, no member of the Cabinet to-day will say that the Government is obliged to take this course because of the judgment of the Privy Council. That judgment of the Privy Council was an opinion in the nature of advice to the Governor in Council here. It told them that the minority had the right to appeal to them for a hearing of their case. That was all. They heard that case, and according to their judgment and wisdom they could say either "yes," or "no," you have a grievance and we will change that law, or we will not change it. It was equally their right to say: we will not interfere with Manitoba, or we will interfere. It was the right of this Government to say: if the circumstances are such that we ought to interfere, then we can interfere with it; or, if the condition of things are such in Manitoba that they cannot successfully carry on two educational systems, we shall not interfere with it. But, Sir, this Government were equally at liberty to say either one or the other. There is no judgment of the Privy Council telling this Government to interfere or not to interfere.

Now, we are told that if this Bill is passed the fight will be over. Well, Sir, if I believed that, I would be inclined to go a long way. I would be disposed to do many things I would not otherwise wish to do, if I thought that the passing of this Bill would be a finality in this matter. But, Sir, can I shut my eyes to the agitation going on in the country to-day? Can I shut my eyes to the unanimity of sentiment in Mani-

toba, where three elections have been run on that question, and where there has been a majority in favour of the rights of the province every time. Can I shut my eyes to the fact, as we are told, that at least 85 per cent of the people of Manitoba are in favour of allowing that province to work out her own destinies according to the law she has placed upon the statute-book? Can I shut my eyes to the fact that all over the country there is no defence of the action of the Government by the press of the country who gauge and educate public sentiment? Can I shut my eyes to the fact that there has been scarcely a gathering all over this Dominion, which says to this Government: Go on and do what you are doing to-day. No, Sir, it is the very reverse. I therefore say that I have no right to assume that the passage of this Bill would be the end of this contest. I do not believe that the heartburnings and the strife that is raised to-day, would all die out in a few months if we force Manitoba to do as she is not inclined to do. I believe that the sentiment of the country does not justify any interference with the province of Manitoba in this matter. I believe that public sentiment of the country is, that there shall be no interference.

Now then, what will be the result to the present Government if they persist in pressing this Bill. It must in my judgment inevitably result either in their defeat in this House, or in their defeat in the country. It may be said that the country has not spoken. We have often asked them of late to appeal to the country, and we have said, that although we believe public sentiment is against you, yet if you appeal to the country, and if the voice of the country says, pass that law, you will be justified in doing it. But they have not appealed to the country, nor given the electorate an opportunity to speak. If they are defeated in this House they must appeal to the country, and if then the judgment of the electorate is that the Government shall go on with the measure, then they will be justified. The Government will be fortified with public opinion behind them, and they will be fortified with the support of many friends in this House who are opposing them to-day. Sir, if I know anything about the public sentiment of the country, I say it is all adverse to the policy of the Government in this matter. Mr. Speaker, I can only express regret, as I did at the beginning of this debate, that I am obliged to place myself in opposition to the Government of the day. However, I do not believe that I am in opposition to the sentiment of the Conservative party of this country when I oppose the Government. I believe that the Government is against public opinion, and that I am with public opinion in doing as I am doing now. I believe I am in harmony with the sentiments of the people of Ontario to-day, when I am standing as I am against

the Government on this question. I believe that I am also in harmony with the sentiments of the people of Manitoba when I stand up here to oppose the Government on this occasion. I believe, too, that I am in harmony with the people of the North-west Territories, because the same difficulty is looming up there, and that is another reason which leads me to think that this fight will not be ended soon. If we are successful in forcing Manitoba to-day, the next thing will be to force us to repeal the law which gave national schools to the North-west Territories. The Catholics regard themselves as having a grievance there the same as in Manitoba. Archbishop Langevin said so at Edmonton, I believe. He said: We are not reconciled to the laws which have been put on the statute-book of the North-west Territories; the national schools there do not satisfy us any more than the national schools in Manitoba. Therefore, I say that if the parties who are forcing on this remedial legislation succeed in getting it, the fight will commence in the North-west Territories as soon as the Bill is passed. The school Bill passed in the North-west Assembly has been held in abeyance, and has not yet received the assent of the Lieutenant-Governor. Why is it held in abeyance? Because the clergy do not approve of it. Now, I would venture to ask this Government, as the authority either to veto that law or to allow it to go into operation, what they intend to do with it? Do they intend to give the people of the North-west Territories the right to control education, or do they intend to veto that law? And if they veto it, will they start the fight there which they started on behalf of the minority in Manitoba? Will they continue that fight also for five years, until they secure in the North-west Territories what they wish to secure in Manitoba to-day. I say that this justifies us in believing that the fight will not be ended by this Bill; but that the passage of this Bill would be only the commencement of the fight. The fight must go on, though this Parliament must go to the country, and though dozens of members who support the Bill to-day may be left at home by an exasperated electorate. As John Sandfield Macdonald said at the time of the birth of confederation, if you take from the majority the right to control education, you do not settle the question for ever. It will loom up again. Like Banquo's ghost, it will not down; it will come to the front, and the fight will continue. Therefore, in the interest of humanity, in the interest of the people of Manitoba, who think they ought to enjoy freedom, as every westerner thinks they ought, I ask you, not to exasperate them too far. If you do, the consequences may be something that we do not wish to contemplate to-day. We all hope that the consequences may not be serious; but we all know what the feeling of the people of Manitoba was when we were obliged to

Mr. SPROULE.

hark back and repeal the monopoly clause in the Canadian Pacific Railway Act; and if we force this measure upon them, the results may be serious, not only to that country, but to confederation, because it tends to destroy provincial autonomy. Then I say, in the interests of all the provinces of this great Dominion, in the interests of the people of that country, who live under a condition of things entirely different from the condition of things here or in the province of Quebec, let them enjoy the rights they are entitled to; let them adopt laws suited to their conditions an environment, and carry out those laws according to their will, so long as they are doing no substantial injustice to any portion of the people. For these reasons I am about to vote against this Bill. I am sometimes told, that, in voting against the Government on this Bill, I am voting for the Opposition. Well, it is fortunate that we can sometimes meet, even if we do not always meet. If I think the Opposition are right, I am generous enough and glad enough to record my vote with theirs. I want to see the Bill killed; the Opposition are moving with the same end in view, therefore, we vote together. I do not regard it as an unmixed evil that I am voting with them. I do not regard it as an unmixed evil that I am voting against the Government, which I have loyally supported these seventeen years, because I think they are wrong on this question, and it is my duty to vote as I think right. Feeling, as I do, that the best thing we can do in the interest of the country is to kill this Bill, I intend to vote for the motion made by the leader of the Opposition; and I was glad that he made that motion, because it gives us an opportunity to vote straight against this Bill, and to kill it, if possible. On other lines I am with the Government. They may see fit to read me out of the party for taking the independent stand I do. If they do so, that is their right, and they can act according to their own sweet will. But, so long as I occupy a seat in this House, I shall regard it as my right to vote according to the dictates of my conscience, and with such understanding as I have, on every measure that comes before this House. Therefore, regarding this Bill as a most obnoxious one, not only as doing away with a system of education that is the very best for the rising generation, but as taking away from the province of Manitoba the right of control in educational matters, which it ought to enjoy, I shall have much pleasure in voting for the six months' hoist.

Mr. BEAUSOLEIL. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, in rising to discuss the motions which have been placed in your hands, I wish, at the outset, to state that, in my opinion, the question of denominational schools ought not to be approached as a purely political question, still less in a party spirit. The question at issue, in my humble opinion, is one that towers far above purely

political or party issues, as it concerns the creed and the conscience of a large number of citizens in this country. I consider further that it would be a death-blow dealt at confederation, if those weighty interests which are dearer to us than life itself were used as a political foot-ball by politicians and were solved from the standpoint of the more or less ephemeral interests of the party in power, instead of being determined from the standpoint of right and justice. In support of this position, let me appeal to the statement made by the hon. leader of the Opposition on the 5th February, 1895, before 6,000 people in the city of Toronto :

I have been asked to state what position I occupy upon that question (the Manitoba School question). Let me tell you, then, at once, I do not wish her or anywhere else, to make any political capital out of that. Even if I had it in my power to be borne into office over that question I would not do it.

This solemn statement, the hon. leader of the Opposition reiterated at the monster meeting of Sohmer Park in Montreal and elsewhere. Never, so far as I know, did he take any other position on that question. As a matter of fact, you may read all his speeches and you will find that he has been dealing all along with this question in an incidental manner, placing all the time in the fore-ground the economical issues of the day, which are the ground-work of the platform of the Liberal party. That the school question is not a party question, is further evinced by the fact that it was not embodied in the platform formulated by the great convention held in this city in 1893. Still at the time, it was as much a burning question as it is to-day. The session had scarcely been brought to a close, and the Government policy had been arraigned by the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte) in a motion of want of confidence, which I had the honour to second. Now, you may read all the resolutions which were adopted and you will not find a single sentence, a single word, a single syllable in connection with the Manitoba school question. And why so? The reason is that, as every body was satisfied that it was impossible to be of one mind on the question, it was better to leave every one free to act as he pleased. Mr. Speaker, I have endorsed the programme drawn up by the Liberal convention in 1893, and I still adhere to it in its integrity. I voted confidence in the hon. leader of the Opposition, and in every circumstance I have expressed the respect and the deep admiration I entertain for him. I have nothing to take back. It is a matter of genuine and deep regret to me to be under the necessity of separating from my leader and registering my vote against the resolution which he has moved in amendment to the second reading of the Remedial Bill, and here are the grounds which warrant my taking that course.

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. BEAUSOLEIL. (Translation.) I am one of those who conscientiously believe in denominational schools for Catholics and for Protestants as well, for Manitoba Catholics as well as for Quebec Protestants. I believe in the inalienable right of the head of a family to decide in which school his children are to be educated, in which religion they will be brought up, and I look upon as an intolerable usurpation any attempt at infringing that right.

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. BEAUSOLEIL. (Translation.) In looking over the educational legislation of the province of Manitoba, I find that in 1870 a complete system of separate schools was set up in favour of Protestants, then in a minority, and in favour of Catholics, who were then in a majority. A council of public instruction was established, comprising a Catholic section, having under its control the Catholic schools, and a Protestant section, having under its control the Protestant schools. The public grants were distributed according to population, and the school taxes were appropriated to the maintenance of Catholic or Protestant schools according to the religious tenets of the rate-payers. That state of things continued for twenty years. In 1890, two Acts were passed, altogether doing away with that state of things, substituting to the separate schools a so-called system of public schools; but in reality Protestant, which despoiled the Catholics of all the rights they had hitherto enjoyed. It was, in my humble opinion, an iniquity, an act of intolerable tyranny which it was impossible to tamely acquiesce in. The Catholics vigorously protested, but it was of no avail. Vainly did they petition for the exercise of the federal power of disallowance. This action, had it been adopted, would perhaps have resulted in a momentary commotion, but never would it have led to an agitation fraught with such danger as the one which we now witness with so much sorrow. After having twice run the gauntlet of the judicial tribunals, the Catholics now come before this House, with a judgment of the Privy Council to the effect that their most sacred rights have been infringed upon. They come before this House, asking that their schools be restored to them, that the imprescriptible rights of their conscience be respected, and that a stop be put to tyranny, under the unbearable weight of which they have too long suffered. Are we to turn a deaf ear to their prayer? Shall we tell them in so many words by our vote that might is right, and that there are no longer any rights which the majority are bound to respect? Are we then to shrink from the most important, the most imperative, the most honourable duty which is incumbent upon this Parliament, that of extending our protection

to the minority in the enjoyment of their rights? As for me, Sir, I say I cannot do so. Therefore, I will vote for the second reading of the Bill, on this ground, first, that it lays down as a principle the restoration of separate schools in favour of the Manitoba minority.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BEAUSOLEIL. (Translation.) In the second place, I vote for this Bill, on the further ground that it practically sanctions the principal of federal interference, with a view to the protection of the constitutional rights of minorities. It is high time, Sir, that we should loudly proclaim that principle, because we do not know when other minorities will come before this House and claim the redress of grievances similar to those of the Manitoba minority. For fifteen years, the Conservative party in Ontario has adopted as the first plank of its political platform the abolition of the separate school system in that province. Have the hon. gentlemen forgotten the electoral contests of 1882, 1886, 1890 and 1894, and the savage onslaught directed by Mr. Meredith and his friends against everything that bore the Catholic name? Can any hon. gentleman in this House give us the assurance that, were the exercise of the principle of federal interference withheld in the case of Manitoba, the province of Ontario, which is by far more powerful, would not altogether do away with the separate schools, without troubling itself about the constitution or the judicial tribunals? And I put the question to the hon. gentlemen: what is there that could deter the Catholic majority in Quebec from dealing in the same way with the Protestant minority in that province? It is really too bad, from the standpoint of the principle of federal interference, that the aggression did not originate in Quebec? Those very men who cry out against federal interference would be the first, the most eager to resort to the best and most efficacious remedies, such as disallowance or the passage of a Remedial Bill, to the effect of bringing the Protestant minority under the aegis of Parliament. Can any man, in his sober senses, either in this House or out of it, have any doubt but that a decisive intervention would have been quickly and effectually secured? Does any hon. gentleman believe for one moment that the Protestant minority would have been kept waiting five years, forced to run the gauntlet of the judicial tribunals, and to crawl on its knees before a hesitating, if not a refractory House? Why, then, have two weights and two measures? Are the eternal principles of right and justice not the same everywhere and for everybody? I just said, Sir, that, from the very fact that other minorities were threatened with the same fate, intervention was expedient. Allow me, Sir, to bring back to the remembrance of the House two threats uttered by the hon. mem-

Mr. BEAUSOLEIL.

ber for Simcoe North (Mr. McCarthy) during a memorable debate which took place in this House in February, 1890, as recorded in "Hansard." He said:

I do not say, Sir, that the time may not come when it will be proper to move—though in that I do not find much sympathy in this House—to do away with the dual language in this Chamber.

And further on:

And I do hope that before very long the delegation from the province of Ontario will call on this House for its aid to blot out the separate school clause from the British North America Act, which limits and fetters the people of that province. That clause was carried by a majority of French-Canadians and was imposed upon the people of Ontario against their will.

Such would infallibly be, in my opinion, the conclusions reached, should we vote down the Bill on its second reading, thereby defeating the principle of federal interference. I now come to the third ground which prompts me to support this measure, that is the unconquerable hostility of the Manitoba government to the principle of separate schools. The Greenway government, we are told, are ready to make concessions, provided that the remedial order and Bill be withdrawn. They are ready to give the minority their share of the public grants, and to allow religious teaching to be given in their schools at certain stated hours. I am willing to grant that the Greenway government are disposed to promise a great deal and to do something in that direction. But will any one in cold blood pretend to say that our Manitoba co-religionists would be justified to exchange the protection afforded by the constitution and the law for a mere system of toleration which could be taken away from them at any moment? They have struggled for six years past and they have not yet succeeded in having their grievances set right. And it is at the very moment when they are about to gain the battle, that you want them to lay down their arms and to surrender at discretion? Such a proposition cannot be seriously entertained. Now, invert the terms of the proposition and substitute to the Manitoba legislature that of Quebec, and to the Catholic minority substitute the Protestant minority and tell me how the latter would welcome the proposition to waive their claims and the pledges given by the constitution, and what for? To surrender without any stipulation of conditions, to the persecuting power! The Greenway government do not want to accept and will never agree to accept the separate school principle, that of state-aided schools, receiving aid and protection from the provincial government. They have worked up to such a pitch provincial fanaticism that it would probably not be safe for them to recede from their position. And far from making any concessions, they have reiterated their firm determination to fight to the bitter end. The local legislature is now in session, and what do we see? From

the very first day, the government submitted to the legislature a series of resolutions protesting not only against federal interference, but against the re-establishment of separate schools. One of the resolutions reads as follows:—

Therefore, be it resolved: That this House notes with cordial approval that the advisers of His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor in the Order in Council of the 21st December, 1895, did decline to recommend the re-establishment of state-aided separate schools.

And in order that there might be no doubt as to the meaning of the resolution, Mr. Sifton explained it as follows:—

For himself he could see no other meaning, and certainly there was no intention of any other meaning than reiterating the position, the positive, definite conclusion that the government would in no way, shape or form be a party to the re-establishment of state-aided separate schools.

As the government had gone to the country on a statement of their position on this question, it was now only right that the members elected should have an opportunity of placing themselves on record.

And that policy so clearly enunciated was endorsed by a vote of 31 against 7. Mr. Fisher, who was anxious to check that torrent of hostility, appealed to the good sense and moderation of the legislature. He moved a resolution, the conclusion of which I will read to the House:

Therefore, this House is of opinion that the present situation calls for prudent and conciliatory action in the hope that such a result may, by wise counsels, be avoided, and to this end that the time is opportune for a calm and dispassionate review by the legislature of the matters at issue between the majority and minority with a view to consider whether a reasonable settlement of the question may not be found which will avoid all excuse for federal interference.

That motion was defeated by a vote of 30 against 7. To my mind, it is beyond a doubt that, whatever favours or concessions the Manitoba government may be disposed to grant to the Catholics in the administration of public schools, they will never agree to the restoration of denominational schools. In consequence, I have reached the irrefragable conclusion that the only remedy calculated to restore to our compatriots their schools, is a federal statute. Now, Sir, having laid down the principles and reached the conclusion I have just mentioned, I come to consider the Bill, as it stands. I for one do not look upon the Bill as an ideal one. The principles upon which it is founded are, no doubt, excellent, but they have forgotten to draw from them all the conclusions. Thus I look upon as a very unfortunate idea that of allowing the provincial government three months either to accept or ignore the Bill, to appoint the members of the School Board of Education or in default of the provincial government, to empower the Federal Government to make the appointments. Were any doubts left as to the ten-

dencies of the local government, were not their hostility so open and so emphatic, there would perhaps be some excuse for that alternative. But under the circumstances it is, to say the least, an act of weakness. The Bill recognizes to Catholics the right to share proportionately in any grant made out of public funds for educational purposes; but it fails to oblige the province to make such grants in proportion to those which may be granted to public schools. To my mind, that clause is entirely illusory. Another defective provision is that which invests the provincial government with the exclusive power of appointing inspectors to whom is committed the duty of ascertaining the efficiency of the separate schools. It is quite clear that with such provisions as these, the separate schools will lack efficient visitation and will not be subsidized by the provincial authorities. Evidently, the Bill is based upon the false assumption that it will be accepted and fairly put in operation by the local government. How such an idea came to spring up in the minds of our Ministers is more than I can understand. It seems to me that the Bill ought rather to proceed from the principle that the provincial government having shown openly and reiterated their hostility to separate schools under any shape, the federal law should provide for their creation and their maintenance under the exclusive control and protection of the Dominion Government. In short, the separate schools should have been made a purely federal institution until, at least, the local legislature had passed a new statute restoring to the minority the full enjoyment of all their rights. Through their having adopted a different principle, the Dominion Government run the risk of securing from their legislation but partial and unsatisfactory results for the minority. Neither do I mean to take back or to mitigate any of the charges which I have made in regard to the unsettled and wavering government policy which has only resulted in complicating the position, in fostering an agitation fraught with danger and in making more difficult the adjustment of the matter. Far from taking back any of those charges, I make bold to arraign the Government on a further ground still more serious; it is that of having endangered the passage of the measure in not having brought it down at the very outset of the session, in losing valuable time in intestine squabbles and by throwing for a whole month as a bone of contention to the disputation of parties a budget which they had no intention to have voted by the House. If, owing to the threatened obstruction which the Government measure might be offered in the Committee of the Whole, both by their friends and by my own friends who oppose the Bill, it could not be pressed through this House and made law before this Parliament has reached the natural term of its life, that is to say before the 25th of April, the

Government will be held responsible and will warrant the belief of those who challenge the sincerity of the Ministers.

Mr. RINFRET. (Translation.) I think the hon. member would find it difficult to substantiate his statement, as to some of his friends intending to make obstruction. As to me, I must say that it is the first intimation I have of it, and I do not think our friends on this side of the House are harbouring any such thought. Whether the followers of the Government intend to pursue such a course is more than I can say.

Mr. BEAUSOLEIL. (Translation.) Well, then let us say that the obstructionists are among the followers of the Government. Notwithstanding the shortcomings of the Bill, which may be corrected in the Committee of the Whole, through the amendments of which the hon. member for Bagot (Mr. Dupont) has given notice, I shall vote against the six months' hoist and in favour of the second reading of the Bill. I, taking that position, I have the support of the Catholic minority in Manitoba; I have the support of the most distinguished representative of the Catholics of that province, a Liberal like myself, the member for Provencher, a thoroughly French and Catholic constituency, the Hon. Mr. Prendergast, who, during the debate on the Sifton resolution, at the sitting of the 27th February last, from his seat in the legislative assembly, thus delivered himself:

Under these circumstances, I consider that the Bill, although defective in some respects, is satisfactory, and if I had the honour to sit in the Dominion Parliament I would vote for it. I believe that even without the aid of the government, the separate schools would get on, provided that the remedial law gave the Catholics the right of collecting their taxes and relieved them of the burden of being taxed for the support of other schools.

To sum up, Mr. Speaker, this is how I size up the position: 1. The Bill which is before us recognizes the right of the Manitoba Catholics to their own schools; 2. It provides for the establishment of a system which will enable them to establish, control and maintain their schools; 3. It dispenses them with contributing towards the support of public schools; 4. It allows them to tax themselves for the support of separate schools. As the men best authorized to speak in behalf of the Manitoba minority accept this state of things as satisfactory and declare that, strictly speaking, they can get on without the legislative grants; and further, that if they were members of this House, they would vote for the Bill; and as I do not wish to be more Catholic than the Pope is, nor more loyal than the Queen is, I shall vote for the Bill. But there is uppermost in my mind another consideration which prompts me to take this course. It is the deeply seated connection that it is in the public interest that this question

Mr. BEAUSOLEIL.

should be settled before the general elections, in order to remove this bone of contention from the field of party politics. I deprecate the perpetuation of this quarrel, because I do not want the discussion of trade to be completely lost sight of and hindered by the thrusting of this sectarian contention into the arena. It is obvious that if the law did not pass, the next elections would be exclusively fought out on this question of federal interference, and the voters would not be able to express their opinion on the evils under the weight of which we are being crushed. The Liberals believe in their policy, in their chief, in their programme. The Conservatives mean to invoke with pride their eighteen years of power and protection. What interest have both parties to perpetuate a situation and a crisis which have continued already too long? I appeal to all those who desire to see peace, harmony, prosperity prevail in this country, to put an end to this agitation, in awarding justice and right to whom justice and right are due, and in restoring political order in the country. Before resuming my seat, Mr. Speaker, I desire to settle a question which is of a somewhat personal interest to me. Some public sheets have stated that in supporting the Remedial Bill, I was deserting my leader, and the attitude I had taken in the past in order to assume a new role. That is a gratuitous assumption. Sir, and to disapprove it, I need but refer to the well defined attitude which I took on the question at issue, from the very first day when the question was brought before this House. On the 7th March, 1893, three years ago, I solemnly pledged myself, as follows:—

Should the hon. the Minister of Justice pledge himself to adopt such remedial legislation as might be calculated to redress the grievances complained of, in accordance with his report of the 21st March, 1891, I am ready, with a large number of my friends, on this side of the House, to lend him a loyal support, thus making up the loss of a few votes among his own friends.

In the month of July, 1895, I reiterated that statement in identical words before this House. I have never flinched from my determination to support a Remedial Bill, and I will stick to the end, regardless of consequences, to the course I have so far pursued, and which has never been censured neither by my chief nor by any Liberal newspaper.

Mr. LANGELIER. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, since this debate was opened, I have heard several members give utterance on the floor of this House to their regret that such protracted and acrimonious discussions should have been raised in connection with the school question. What occurs here should not be wondered at, as the very same spectacle has been witnessed in all the countries where religious opinion is divided. What happens here occurred also

in Germany, in France and in England, where numerous and hot disputes have arisen in connection with the education of youth and childhood. As far as France is concerned, the hon. members of this House are quite aware of the fact that for eighteen years, during the whole reign of Louis Philippe, the Catholics, although an overwhelming majority of the French people belong to that religious persuasion, were not allowed to have schools conducted according to their own religious tenets. Not only they did not receive any grant from the state, but the state put under the ban those schools which were wholly supported by private citizens. The hon. members remember, no doubt, that remarkable incident in the life of the great French orators, de Montalembert and Lacordaire, who, having one day attempted to open free schools in Paris for the education of youth; were arrested by the police. I am happy to state that they did not go that far in England. Still, a few years ago, the Gladstone government was defeated on that very same question of public instruction, owing to the fact that they could not come to an agreement as to how public instruction should be organized in Ireland. I heard, a little while ago, the hon. member for Durham East (Mr. Craig) give expression to a desire, which, I do hope, will never be realized. He said the day was fast approaching when, in his opinion, religious teaching would be banished from the schools. I am sorry I cannot concur with the hon. member in his opinion, and that not only from a Catholic standpoint, but from a Protestant standpoint as well, and I may say I guard myself on high Protestant authority. I remember in that connection, reading last year a pamphlet containing a report of a meeting held in England. The meeting was held in connection with religious teaching in the schools, and the Bishop of Manchester made an address, in which he recorded deplorable facts showing what had resulted from purely secular schools, known also as godless schools. He recorded his own experience in Australia in that respect. It would appear that in Australia, for over twenty years, religious teaching has been altogether eliminated from the schools, and the Bishop of Manchester quoted many statistics to show the deplorable results of that system on the morality of the people and especially of the youth in that country. The same experiment was repeated in France. In that country the liberty of instruction, it is true, is recognized; but what does that freedom amount to? It consists in this, that Catholics, Protestants and Jews have the right of opening schools and teaching therein whatever they like, but at their own expense. In the state-aided schools, no religious teaching is given. It is distressing to find that religious principles are disappearing in France, and with them public and private morality. Frightful scandals have

quite recently come to light in France. Those scandals, I venture to say, are not the outcome of the government policy, but rather that of the educational system in vogue in that country. The school troubles in Canada may be traced back to a pretty remote period. They originated with the Ontario Catholic schools, and were finally settled by the educational statute passed in 1863. When confederation was established, all those who took part in its formation, were anxious to ward off the difficulties which had been encountered under the old regime, and which had given rise to discussions much to be regretted. In order to accomplish this object, it was decided that power should be given to the local legislatures to make laws with regard to education, but no plenary power was accorded, and there was introduced a limitation, to the effect that the legislature should have no power prejudicially to affect the rights of the minorities, existing at the time of the union, in educational matters. There was also another provision to the effect that, whenever a local legislature should pass a law prejudicially affecting a privilege of the minority in educational matters, that minority should have the right of appealing to the Governor General in Council and to seek for relief and the redress of their grievances. Such was the enactment passed at the time of confederation.

Now, what happened, after the entrance of the province of Manitoba into the confederation? The province of Manitoba was annexed to the confederation in 1870. It is beyond controversy that when that province was annexed to the Dominion of Canada, and when it came to providing for the drafting of the terms of union, the object which the framers of the Act had in view, when drafting the Bill, was to obviate the school troubles which had been met with in New Brunswick, where the minority later on, appealed to the Federal Parliament. Parliament debated at great length this New Brunswick school question during the sessions of 1872 and 1873. The question at issue with reference to the New Brunswick school question was this: A law had been passed in 1871 by the local legislature doing away with the schools of the Catholic minority of that province. The minority petitioned the Federal Government, praying for the disallowance of the obnoxious law; the contention was that it was unconstitutional. The Federal Government deemed it expedient to obtain the opinion of the law officers of the Crown in England, and they applied for the opinion of the law officers, because at the time they could neither refer the question to the Supreme Court which had not yet been constituted nor to the Privy Council of England. Therefore they thought that the opinion of the law officers should be obtained as to the legality of the statute. The answer was that the law was not unconstitutional, and the ground on which they

vested their opinion was that the denominational schools in question were not in existence under the law, prior to confederation, and existed only by practice. Now, the experience acquired in connection with the New Brunswick school troubles was turned to account, and at the time of the drafting of the charter of the future province of Manitoba, provision was made or thought to have been made to prevent the recurrence of such difficulties. Such was, beyond any doubt, the intention of the framers of the Manitoba Act. Clause 93 of the British North America Act contains an enactment conferring power on the provincial legislatures, exclusively, to make laws in relation to education. It is also enacted that nothing in any law they may pass should interfere with or prejudicially affect the rights acquired by any religious minority under laws passed prior to confederation. In the Manitoba Act, undoubtedly, the words "by practice" were added, with a view to obviating the difficulties which have occurred in New Brunswick. Such is the way in which they dealt with that question in framing the Manitoba Act. Unfortunately, from the Privy Council judgment in the case of *Barrett vs. the City of Winnipeg*, it appears that the Manitoba Act did not contain the guarantees of protection which its authors had in view, and that, in consequence, the Catholic minority in Manitoba did not secure the protection which it was evidently the intent of the law to give them. In 1871, the Manitoba legislature passed a statute establishing a separate school system for that province. Later on, that law was consolidated and amended in 1881, but I will pass over the amendments which have been made, and deal exclusively with the law of 1871, under which had been set up the separate school system. It is not on record that the law in question did give rise to any important debates at the time it was enacted. At that time Protestants and Roman Catholics were then in about equal numbers. Neither is it recorded that the law in question did meet with any serious opposition in the Manitoba legislature. What was then the educational system created by the law of 1871? Before going any further, Sir, let me point out that there exists an important difference between the system of dissentient schools, such as it obtains in the province of Quebec, and the separate school system, as it exists in the province of Ontario. Many people in the province of Quebec are under the impression that the law concerning the separate schools of the province of Ontario is similar to that existing in the province of Quebec; and I must say that such persons labour under a very serious misapprehension. There are notable differences between the two systems, and it will suffice, in order to prove my point, to mention the main provisions of the Quebec law compared with the Ontario educational law. In the province of Ontario,

Mr. LANGELIER.

the religious minority, which, as the hon. members are aware, is Catholic, is entitled to separate schools; but, Sir, those schools remain under the direct control of the Government, under the control of the Minister of Education. They are under the immediate supervision of inspectors appointed by the government, and the religious minority has no direct control over the appointment of the inspectors. I do not say, Sir, that the religious minority cannot exercise an indirect influence over the appointment of those inspectors, but, even if it does, it is only indirectly, because the latter are selected by the government of the day. That influence, of course, may be brought into play through the ordinary channels, but not otherwise. Such is the system prevailing in the province of Ontario. The separate schools in that province are under the immediate control of the Department of Education, under the control of the head of that department. Such is, in short, the Ontario system.

But, Sir, such is not the system of separate schools that obtains in the province of Quebec, and about that system I may speak with a thorough knowledge of the matter, as, for about nine years past, I have had the honour to be one of the members of the Council of Public Instruction for the province. The Quebec system differs materially from the Ontario system, in this respect, that, with us, in Quebec, the schools are under the control of the Council of Public Instruction, but that council is subdivided into two sections, the Catholic committee, and the Protestant committee. Each of these religious denominations enjoy a complete and distinct organization in educational matters, practically speaking. One might say, judging from the standpoint of the Protestant schools or of their organization, that the province of Quebec is exclusively Protestant. If, on the other hand, you were to judge from the Catholic standpoint, you might be tempted to say that you are in an exclusively Catholic province, and therefore, that the schools are exclusively Catholic. The organization which is styled the Council of Public Instruction of the province is composed of Catholic and Protestant members. That council consists of a certain number of members who control all matters educational. The Catholic bishops of the province, the apostolic missionaries are ex-officio members of the Catholic committee. To these ex-officio members are added an equal number of Catholic laymen as members, and an equal number of Protestant members is added to that of Catholic laymen. Such is, Sir, the composition of the Council of Public Instruction in the province of Quebec. As I said, this council is divided into two sections, the Protestant committee and the Catholic committee. The Protestant committee of the council has exclusively under its control all the schools of the Protestant minority in the province. I may here, say, to the credit of my pro-

vince, that the Quebec legislature has been so liberal, so generous towards the minority as to go to the length of introducing the following enactment in its educational law. The superintendent of Public Instruction is ex-officio member of each committee, and the legislature, through respect for the minority, has introduced into its educational statute an enactment to the effect that the superintendent, notwithstanding that he is ex-officio member of each committee, has the right of voting only in the committee on which devolves the consideration of matters pertaining to his own faith. Therefore, Sir, if the superintendent happens to be a Catholic, he has no right to vote as member of the Protestant committee of Public Instruction. He is free to join in the debate, to take part in the proceedings, to give expression to his views, but he has no right to try to have those views carried by the committee, although he be a member of that committee. Likewise, if the superintendent happens to be a Protestant, he may, as member of the Catholic committee, take part in the debates, and in the proceedings with the other members of that committee, but he has no right to vote. Practically, those two committees really constitute two different bodies; and it is equivalent to having two councils of Public Instruction, a Catholic council and a Protestant council. A striking proof that the council of Public Instruction as a body exercises no control over the schools of either religious creeds, is found in the fact that, since I am a member of the council, there was held only one meeting, and that several years ago. That council, which is composed of a Catholic committee and a Protestant committee has had but one meeting these nine years past, and that meeting was called merely to adopt certain amendments to the law, interesting both Protestants and Catholics. They have come to the conclusion that it was perfectly useless to call together the Council of Public Instruction, and that it was preferable to hold separate meetings of either the Catholic or the Protestant committee, according to the requirements of the case. It was but last week that a sub-committee met to discuss the consolidation of the educational laws, as the matter proves to be of common interest to Protestants and Catholics alike. We, on our side, appointed a Catholic sub-committee, and the members of the Protestant committee appointed one on their side, and both sub-committees will take into consideration the scheme laid before them. Therefore, as I said, the Quebec Protestants have complete control over their schools in the province. The same applies to Catholics. So far, I have dealt with the general management of the schools. I come now to another point: what machinery does the law provide for the establishment of separate schools in the province of Quebec? Nothing is less complicated than the machinery. If a sufficient number of rate-

payers professing a religious faith different from that of the majority declare that they want to withdraw from the school corporation under the control of the majority and signify such dissent in writing, to the chairman of the commissioners from that very moment they cease to be liable for any taxes or school rates imposed for the common schools. It is highly important to know how the school rates are distributed. In the first place, the taxes imposed upon the Catholic inhabitants go to the Catholic schools, and the taxes upon Protestants go to Protestant schools. There was never any trouble on that point. But at the outset, there arose a difficulty which was settled through an amendment to the educational law, passed in 1869. That amendment goes to prove the great liberality displayed in educational matters by the legislature of the province of Quebec, the overwhelming majority of which is Catholic. The question was as to how should be distributed the taxes levied upon neutral corporations, such as the railway companies, and the banks, which are quite numerous. This difficulty was solved by the legislature of the province of Quebec, and I have no hesitation in saying that it was solved there in a much fairer and more liberal way than it was by the Ontario legislature. In Ontario, it is the directors of those corporations who decide to which school corporation their taxes will be paid. So then, even if one half of the shareholders of a bank were Catholics, the directors could not allot the tax to the public school fund. In the province of Quebec, the taxes are divided between the Catholics and the Protestants, in proportion to the population. That amendment to the educational law, passed in 1869, may be invoked as an argument in favour of the position which we, on this side, now take, while the confederation scheme was being debated, they tried to impose upon the Quebec legislature the very same enactments which were, subsequently to confederation, passed into law in 1869. The Quebec representatives objected to that enactment, and would not bow down before the threats. The hon. Mr. Cauchon, a well-known statesman, wrote many editorials in the "Journal de Quebec," in opposition to the pretensions of Sir A. T. Galt, and against the very same enactments which were, later on, embodied in the Act of 1869. He said: The guarantees which you ask for now, will be granted to you later on; it would be a gratuitous insult and perfectly useless on your part to seek to impose them upon us. Had they tried, in 1869, to coerce the Quebec legislature, as they are now trying to do with the Manitoba legislature, that law would not have passed. The Quebec Protestants have now more than they asked for at that time, because, the generosity, the spirit of fair play of the Quebec legislature were appealed to. Now, let me offer another remark, in answer to what was said

here this afternoon by the hon. member for Durham East. I do not call in question the good faith of the hon. gentleman, but I say he has made an egregious mistake in what he stated about the Quebec schools. The hon. gentleman said: The Catholic schools of that province are purely Catholic schools. Well, I appeal to the hon. gentlemen in this House who have attended those schools. I did also attend them, and I may say that religious teaching takes up but a small portion of the school hours. Through all the provinces the schools open at nine o'clock and continue till twelve; they open again at one o'clock to close it at four. That amounts in all to six hours a day. Well, out of those six hours, religious teaching, strictly speaking, hardly takes up half an hour, which is devoted to the teaching of catechism, and that only during that portion of the year when young children are being prepared for their first communion. During all the remaining hours of the day, there is no purely doctrinal religious teaching given, but children are taught writing, reading, geography, history and mathematics, and sometimes, in the more advanced classes, chemistry and geometry; in short, all the matters taught in the schools of the other provinces. I am not here to vindicate all that occurs in educational matters, in the province of Quebec; but I think it my duty to point out certain conclusions drawn by some newspapers from statistics which have been lately published. I do not know from what source they come, but I presume they have been drawn from the census bulletins. Well, I may say that very little credit ought to be given the census, for in many instances its glaring inaccuracies have made it the laughing-stock of the public. There is nothing less safe than statistics; and although in certain cases, they may be useful, it is on condition that no abuse is made of them. For instance, when I had the honour to be mayor of the city of Quebec, I used to receive from the department of Agriculture the vital statistics. There was a table showing the rate of mortality in the principal cities of the Dominion, Montreal, Quebec, Toronto, &c. To my great surprise, I found out that the city where public health was presumed to be in the worst state was, first, Three Rivers, and in the second place, Quebec. As far as Three Rivers was concerned, I was not prepared to pronounce myself, but I could speak with a thorough knowledge of Quebec, and all those who have visited that city know that if there is a city where prevails good sanitary conditions, it is Quebec. The number of deaths in Quebec was nearly double that of Toronto. In scrutinizing more closely the matter, I found out that an important fact had been overlooked: it was that in the cities of Quebec and Montreal, there are certain institutions where are received foundlings from the different parts of the province of Quebec, and even from Ontario,

Mr. LANGELIER.

and from the other provinces of the Dominion. It is a well-known fact that the rate of mortality among those children is excessive; yet, all those deaths were credited to the city of Quebec. Well, the same remark holds good in educational matters. I find that the educational statistics would be simply alarming, were they exact. For instance, from those statistics, the number of people who cannot read is 7 per cent for the province of Ontario, and 29 per cent for the province of Quebec. I freely admit that the number of illiterate persons is more considerable in the province of Quebec than in the province of Ontario. It is not within my province to explain the causes of that difference; still, I may say that the statistics are not correct, and in this connection I appeal to the experience of professional men in this House, and I am sure none of them will gainsay my statement. When I tell them that they must often have found from their own experience that at least one-half of our Quebec farmers, when asked to sign their names, declare themselves unable to write. A false shame, Sir, the fear of the ridicule they would incur in writing not as fine a hand as they would like to, prompts them to say that they do not know how to sign their names. Those farmers will tell you: Please, sir, do sign my name for me. I write such a poor hand. Those people have attended school and could have signed their own names had they not been prevented from so doing by a false shame, by the fear to incur ridicule in writing an imperfect hand. If the census officers contented themselves simply with asking the farmers whether they knew how to write and read, I do not wonder that the latter told them that they did not know how to write, for fear less they should be asked to show what they could do. I merely say this, Mr. Speaker, to show that one must not place too much reliance on statistics. Besides, our school statistics, as applied in Quebec, are far from doing justice to the province. We have a law concerning statistics as to educational matters. The members of the Council of Public Instruction have bestowed particular attention to that law, and at our meeting of last week, it was one of the questions that came under our consideration. The report of the Department of Education mentions only the institutions under the control of the government, that is, state-aided institutions. All independent institutions remain beyond the reach of the statistics published by the department of Public Instruction in the province. In order to show the importance of that omission, I may call the attention of the House to the fact that the Quebec Seminary, an excellent institution, which imparts a classical education of a very high order, is not included in those statistics. If you refer to the report of the department, you will find that this institution, which has a scholar population of 500 pupils, is not mentioned there. The same remark applies

to the Sulpician College of Montreal, called the "little seminary," which is also omitted from this report, because those two institutions receive no legislative grant. So likewise with a number of private schools. I freely confess, Sir, that I am in terrible dread of statistics, because, although they be useful, they may be made to say many things which are not always true. We have had, in the province of Quebec, for a long time, splendid private schools, which imparted tuition to a large number of pupils, without receiving any aid from the state. I may mention here, Sir, a school conducted by Miss Machin, a person of great abilities, who trained up the best pupils who came from all parts of the country. That school did not appear in the report of the department of education, although it counted 50 pupils. Let me mention another private school, probably the best commercial school we ever had in Quebec, conducted by the late Mr. Thom, a man who exercised a very beneficial influence, and who trained in his school several of our leading business men, and taught pupils from all the cities of Canada and from several parts of the United States; still the name of that school does not appear in the report of the educational department, because it was not a state-aided school. My object in calling attention to those facts is to caution those who might be tempted to place too much reliance on statistics. As I just remarked, Sir, I am prepared to say that probably we are behind the province of Ontario in educational matters, but not to the extent stated. Mr. Speaker, I have read of late in certain public sheets that the separate school system which obtained in Manitoba, was similar to the system established in the province of Quebec. Such an assertion, Sir, is not grounded on facts. In the province of Manitoba they had no council of public instruction, composed of Catholics and Protestants, and organized on the plan of that existing in the province of Quebec. There were two boards, a Protestant and a Catholic board, whilst in the province of Quebec, there is but one council, and that council is composed of a Catholic committee and a Protestant committee, having each their own jurisdiction. Such was the state of things which prevailed in the province of Manitoba under the law of 1871, and which continued until 1890, when they passed the new law, from which originated all the subsequent troubles. Sir, it has been stated here that the ground on which the new law had been enacted was the inefficiency of the Catholic schools. Sir, I do not think it is any justification for what has been done, saying that the schools established by the Catholic minority were not in a proper state of efficiency. If they really were inefficient, as stated, that was a good reason for insisting that they should be conducted on a better plan, but it did not warrant the government in taking away from

Catholics their right to separate schools. There is the right of using and abusing, and it was the duty of the Manitoba government to tell the Catholic minority: if you do not make a better use of the legislative grant, you shall no longer have your share of it. Such is the course pursued in the province of Quebec, and that practice prevails also in Ontario. If the Manitoba schools were in a state of inefficiency, the government might have stopped the legislative grant. Now, Sir, whatever may be the value of the reason alleged for sweeping away the Catholic schools, it is beyond doubt that from the law of 1890 originated all the troubles which have cropped up both in the province of Manitoba and throughout the Dominion of Canada; that law of 1890 has been the main spring of all the disputes which have since arisen. The first action of the Catholics was to petition for the disallowance of the law. Through their petition to the Dominion Government the Catholics practically asked for the law being disallowed; for, Sir, it is no use quibbling here. The Catholics were asking, by their petitions, the Dominion Government to remedy the state of things brought about by the legislation of 1890. Now, the only efficacious remedy the Government could resort to was the exercise of the power of disallowance.

What is the law of the land with reference to the power of disallowance? Had the Dominion Government the right to veto the Manitoba legislation? The Government had the incontrovertible right to disallow that law. If you read the constitution, and refer to clauses 56 and 90 of the British North America Act, you will see that the Government have the right to disallow any legislation passed by a local legislature within one year after receipt of the authentic copy of the Acts passed by such legislature. Such is the enactment of the Act of 1867 with regard to the power of disallowance. The minority, grounding itself on the constitution, prayed for the disallowance of the law passed in 1890. Now, Sir, the Dominion Government had, beyond the shadow of a doubt, the right to disallow that law. If I may judge from the reports of the newspapers and from the words fallen from the hon. Postmaster General yesterday, they are under the impression in the province of Quebec, that the Dominion Government could only disallow the law on the ground of its being unconstitutional. Such a statement is altogether erroneous, as shown from the very text of the constitution. The British North America Act makes no such distinction. The Government may disallow any law passed by a provincial legislature. The Dominion Government had, therefore, the power of disallowing the law in question. Were they bound to do so? I give here expression to my own individual opinion, and I may say that, to my mind, it is chiefly when a law is perfectly constitutional that it must be dis-

allowed. Then it is that the power of disallowance must be exercised, because, in the case of an unconstitutional law, it is perfectly useless to veto it. No judicial tribunal has the power to apply an unconstitutional law, so that from the very fact that a law is invalid, it is set aside by the courts and it would serve no purpose, if the Government were to disallow it. In that case, I hold that government interference is unnecessary, and even fraught with danger, for the subject of disallowance could be a law, the invalidity of which would be open to doubt and then the Government would arrogate to themselves the right to determine a question still pending between them and the provincial authorities. That is what occurred in the case of the province of Quebec. The Dominion Government disallowed a law passed by the provincial government, establishing a court of district magistrates. The law officers of the crown at Quebec were of opinion that the law was perfectly constitutional. Still, the Minister of Justice disallowed it. Hence it will be seen how the exercise of the power of disallowance upon the grounds of invalidity is fraught with danger. What is on that point the practice of the Imperial Government? That Government has the right to disallow within two years any law passed by the Dominion Government. Now, I am aware but of a single case where the Imperial Government disallowed such a law upon the ground that it was 'ultra vires.' It was in the case of the famous Bill passed in 1873, to provide for the examination of witnesses on oath by committees of the Senate and House of Commons. The object of the Bill is well known. A special committee had been appointed to inquire into the charges brought by the Hon. Mr. Huntingdon, with reference to what is known as the "Pacific Scandal." The House had not been prorogued, but simply adjourned, in order to allow the committee to sit. Well, in the meantime, to the utter surprise of every body, the Bill was disallowed upon the ground that it was 'ultra vires.' I think there can be no possible doubt about the propriety of having disallowed this Bill upon the ground that it was 'ultra vires,' but it is the only case of that kind I know of. The practice of the Imperial Government is to disallow none but the laws which they consider contrary to the general interests of the Empire, and I think it is the right practice. That is my individual view of the matter. I know that it is not looked upon in the same light by everybody, but I say that if we wish to conform to the English practice, and disallow none but the laws affecting the interests of the whole Dominion, the question arises: Should the Dominion Government have disallowed the Manitoba Acts of 1890? As to those who pretend that further investigation into the matter is requisite, I quite understand that they should have paused before urging the disallowance of the Act; but

Mr. LANGELIER.

as to the Government, who hold that the minority has a well-established grievance, how could they hesitate to disallow it? I quite understand that the hon. leader of the Opposition might hesitate, being of opinion that a proper investigation into the facts of the case ought to be made; but, if those grievances are as well established as the Government say they are, their duty was to disallow the law of 1890. Did not the Government in 1891 possess all the information which they have to-day? Certainly, yes. Have they obtained any further information since 1891? Absolutely none. Now, had the Government been honest and consistent with themselves in the course they have followed, they should at the time have said, as they do say now: The rights of the minority have been interfered with, and that interference with their rights affects the interests of the whole Dominion, therefore, this Bill ought to be disallowed. It is of no avail saying that the Government acted in that way through scruples, for they were not over-scrupulous under other circumstances. I have just mentioned the English practice, but I am going to show what is the practice of the present administration, which is, with the exception of a few changes, but the continuation of the Government I am about to speak of, and as my hon. friend from L'Islet (Mr. Tarte) suggests, this Government is but a revised edition, considerably enlarged but not improved, of the Government of 1878. They did not scruple, as I said, to disallow a law of the Manitoba legislature, a policy which brought us on the very brink of civil war. They did twice disallow the Act to provide for the building of the Red River Valley Railway. The Manitoba people had grievances against the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and in order to escape from their monopoly, they wished to communicate with the Northern Pacific Railway. They then decided upon the construction of the Red River Valley Railway. That law was not disallowed, on the ground that it was "ultra vires," but the reason alleged was that it interfered with the interests of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, with which the Government had passed a contract, extending over a certain number of years. And as the hon. leader of the Opposition remarked but the other day, a law was passed in the same year, doing away with the use of the French language; another law was enacted establishing quarantine regulations for animals, and another, concerning public companies. The Government disallowed two out of those four laws, that concerning the quarantine regulations and that concerning public companies. The law concerning quarantine regulations was disallowed because the government held that there was a danger of contamination for the Canadian cattle, and the law, therefore, affected the general interests of the

Dominion, thus endangering the exportation of Canadian cattle. What was the reason alleged for disallowing the law concerning the public companies, passed at the same session? Here again the general interest of the whole Dominion has been alleged, and it was held that the law embodied a clause enacting the confiscation of the property of those companies. Such was the reason alleged in both cases. Now, was the health of cattle, in the opinion of the hon. Ministers, who are at the head of affairs, a more weighty question than the interests of the Catholic minority in Manitoba? Could the hon. Postmaster General tell me whether the Government were of opinion that it was more important to protect the live cattle than the Catholic minority in Manitoba? The course followed by the Government seems to show that they are of opinion that the laws interfering with the French language and doing away with the separate schools of the Manitoba minority have less importance than the Act concerning the protection of live cattle. Why did they not disallow those laws? For a very well known reason, Sir. We were on the eve of the elections of 1891, and the Government did not want to go to the country with the responsibility of a disallowance exercised in favour of the Catholic minority. The Government thought it safer to disallow the Bill concerning live cattle rather than that concerning separate schools. But, after they had declined disallowing the act in question, the elections being over, the Government immediately passed an Order in Council, dated March, 1891. In that Order in Council, it was stated that these questions required the decision of the judicial tribunals, and it was further declared that—and I call particularly the attention of the hon. members to this point—if the legal controversy should result in the law being declared "ultra vires" by the judicial tribunals, there would still be left a door open to the minority, and that was the appeal to the Governor General in Council. Was that door really open to the minority? There did not seem to be the least doubt about that, at the time, but it will be seen that two years later, the Government began to entertain certain doubts about the matter. Then, Sir, began a series of trials which were brought to a close only last year. Proceedings were taken in 1890 to test the validity of the Educational Acts by means of an application from Mr. Barrett, a Roman Catholic ratepayer, and Mr. Logan, an Anglican ratepayer, to quash a by-law of the city of Winnipeg, on the ground that the law was ultra vires. Judge Killam, of the Manitoba Court of Queen's Bench upheld the validity of the law. An appeal was taken to the Manitoba Court of Queen's Bench, and the court affirmed the decision of Judge Killam, Judge Dubuc dissenting. The case next went to the Supreme Court of Canada, which unanimously reversed the

decision of the Court of Queen's Bench, holding the Manitoba Educational Act of 1890 to be ultra vires, on the ground that it prejudicially affected the rights and privileges of the Catholic minority acquired by practice prior to the union. Appeal was then taken to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council of England, and their Lordships to the surprise of every body and even of the appellants, reversed the decision of the Supreme Court of Canada. The appellants did not expect at all to win their cause before the Privy Council, but the case of the minority was so badly argued before the tribunal that they reversed the decision of the Supreme Court of Canada and declared the Acts of 1890 ultra vires. Their Lordships, in rendering their decision said that the Manitoba legislature had no right to enact statutes prejudicially affecting the rights and privileges guaranteed to the Catholic minority of the province by practice, but further said that the Catholic minority had the same rights as they had prior to the union, that is to say, that they had a right to their separate schools within the ordinary meaning of that word, but not within the meaning accepted here. Lord Herschell, in delivering the last judgment of the Privy Council, has again referred to that point, and disposing of the comments made about the decision rendered by this tribunal in the case of Barrett vs. the city of Winnipeg, and of Logan vs. the same municipal corporation, stated that the duty of the tribunal was to interpret the constitution, and to determine the true construction of the words used. The question was not what may be supposed to have been intended, but what has been said. They had merely to determine what was the true construction of the language used by the framers of the constitution to give effect to the intent of the legislature. Now, his Lordship says that the expression "separate schools," is not a technical expression, but is a term used in common parlance, without any special meaning. Within the ordinary meaning of that expression, the Catholics continue to enjoy the same rights as they had enjoyed previously and still enjoy, and they are free to establish, if they like, separate schools. I need hardly tell you, Sir, that the expression "separate schools" carries with us a technical and special meaning. Had the matter been rightly explained to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, they would have rendered quite a different decision, and the law would have been declared invalid. It is perfectly well understood from the history of the question that those words carry with us a well determined and defined technical meaning. Had this definition been well explained to Lord Herschell and to the other members of the Privy Council, the decision rendered would have been quite different, because they gave that expression of "separate schools" the ordinary meaning and not the

technical meaning in vogue here. Nobody was more surprised at the decision of the Privy Council than Sir John Thompson himself was, for he did not entertain the least doubt that the judgment of the Supreme Court would be confirmed by the Privy Council. The Government, however, had to face the music, to cope with the difficulty. They again evaded the difficulty, as they had done when up came the question as to whether they should entertain the petition for disallowance which had been transmitted to them in 1891. In 1891, it appears from the Order in Council that neither Sir John Thompson nor any of the Ministers did entertain any doubt about their right of interference; not the least doubt apparently existed in their minds about it, for they told the Catholics in so many words: Should the legal controversy result in an unfavourable decision being rendered against you, you will always have the right of appealing for redress to the Dominion Government. But those very men who in 1891 were so positive, in 1893 no longer enjoyed the same freedom from doubt. Then, what did the Government do? They declared that it was their duty to submit the case for reference to the judicial tribunals, to determine the question as to whether they had the right of intervening after the judgment of the Privy Council had been rendered, although that judgment was quite foreign to the question at issue. And the minority was again sent back before the tribunals; after having run the gauntlet of the courts, from Winnipeg to London. In connection with the case submitted for reference to the Supreme Court, I think it but fair to point out an error which has gone around the Conservative press of the province of Quebec, and which I have heard repeated here. They would mislead people into believing that if the Government did not undertake to disallow in 1891 the educational acts, and to entertain the appeal in 1893, it was because the hon. Mr. Blake had caused a resolution to be adopted which precluded them from interfering. Well, Sir, I have in my hands Mr. Blake's resolution, and there is not a single word in it in that direction. It was further stated that the hon. leader of the Opposition had seconded Mr. Blake's motion. And all this with a view to lead people into believing that the Government had been constrained to take the position they did take, by the action of Mr. Blake and of the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Laurier). That is, at least, what I inferred from the words fallen from the Postmaster General (Sir Adolphe Caron).

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. (Translation.) The hon. member is quite mistaken. What I said was that the course pursued by the Government was on the lines of the resolution presented by the Hon. Mr. Blake, seconded by the hon. leader of the Opposition, and carried without a single dissentient

Mr. LANGELIER.

voice in the House. But I never meant to say that it was under the Blake resolution that the Government were constrained to take the course the hon. gentleman insinuates they have pursued.

Mr. LANGELIER. (Translation.) I am very glad to hear that, for it is the first time I hear it from a Ministerial source. It has been the contention all the time that the Government could not take any other course.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. (Translation.) We have never made any such statement.

Mr. LANGELIER. (Translation.) Not only the political sheets, but even "La Semaine Religieuse," a small religious weekly stated that if the law had not been disallowed at the outset, and if the appeal had not been entertained without delay in 1893, Mr. Blake and the leader of the Opposition were to blame. I have no French copy of the Blake resolution; but it is so miserably translated that it makes Mr. Blake utter an absurdity; that is the reason why I prefer to use the English version. I may say incidentally that I do not know by whom Archbishop Taché has been imposed upon.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. (Translation.) Hear, hear.

Mr. LANGELIER. (Translation.) In a pamphlet which he has published on the Manitoba school question, the Archbishop falls into the same error as the Government press did. He quotes a so-called Blake resolution, which is not at all conformable to the original. I do not wish to call in question his good faith, but evidently he has been imposed upon. The resolution reads as follows:—

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

So, then, the point upon which Mr. Blake obtained a decision of the House was that it was expedient to provide means whereby the Dominion Government "might" and not "should" refer to the judicial tribunal questions of law or fact, mentioned there, when they thought proper to do so. But it never occurred to him to propose a resolution to provide means whereby the course to be pursued by the Government upon a political issue should be prescribed. If the resolution was not so explicit in its terms, it could be made still clearer, by referring to the debate which then took place. Sir John Macdonald said that when he first read the resolution hastily, he saw an objection to it, because he was under the im-

pression that it was meant to obtain from the judicial tribunals legal decisions which would be binding on the Executive, but on scanning the resolution, he added, his first impression was dissipated and he saw that such a decision was only for the information of the Government, that might either agree to or dissent from such a decision. Now, Sir, such an enactment is not unknown to our law. That right of reference to the Supreme Court has not the merit of novelty; it may be found at chapter 135 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, as follows:—

The Governor General in Council may refer to the Supreme Court for hearing or consideration any matter which he thinks fit to refer; and the court shall thereupon, hear or consider the same and certify their opinion thereon to the Governor in Council: Provided that any judge or judges of the court who differ from the opinion of the majority, may, in like manner, certify his or their opinion or opinions to the Governor in Council.

As seen from the above enactment, even prior to the Blake resolution, the Government had the perfect right to refer questions to the Supreme Court. The only difference which exists between these two modes of reference to the Supreme Court, is that under the law prior to the Blake resolution, the cause was referred to the Supreme Court 'ex parte,' and without being argued. Further, the judges of the Supreme Court were not obliged to give the reason for their opinion. Finally, there was no appeal from the Supreme Court to the Privy Council. The Blake resolution aimed primarily at adopting a mode by which lawyers could argue before the tribunal: in the second place, to obtain a reasoned judgment of the tribunal, and finally to provide for an appeal to the Privy Council. It is a most fortunate circumstance for the Manitoba minority that this appeal should have been provided for, because otherwise they would have found themselves without a remedy. Three members of the court decided, that an appeal did not lie, while two members held that an appeal would lie. And the two judges whose opinion was favourable to the Catholic minority were, prior to their ascending the bench, Liberals, while the three others were Conservatives. I do not, Sir, mean to lead the House to believe that the minds of the judges were in the least biased in rendering that decision, but I simply wish to state that Justice Fournier, that man who had, for years and years, been denounced by the Conservative press, as an enemy of religion and a foe of the clergy, and those so-called enemies of the clergy know how to stand by their co-religionists. I do not mean to say that he rendered that decision, because he was a Catholic; no, but because he was of opinion that it was the law. However, that also evinces the fact that he was not such a bad Catholic after all, nor such an enemy of the clergy as stated by the Conservative papers which have so often held these men up to

public animadversion. Such, Sir, are the circumstances under which Mr. Blake's resolution was presented to the House during the session of 1890. I am not aware, Sir, of the reason why they waited till the next session of 1891 to turn that resolution into law and place it upon the statute-book; for, the Blake resolution was adopted in 1890. Under that law, reference was made to the Supreme Court, and that high tribunal gave a decision, as I have just said. The Privy Council of England reversed that decision of the Supreme Court. Here again, Sir, there prevails in the minds of a class of people in the province of Quebec a very erroneous opinion, and that erroneous opinion is being daily disseminated and scattered broadcast by the French Conservative press throughout the province and the other provinces. The opinion I allude to is this: that once the Privy Council had rendered their decision, the Dominion Government had only to act mechanically that they were merely a machine entrusted with the execution of the Privy Council judgment. Such is not the case. A client who consults his lawyers is not bound to follow the latter's advice. Such is the exact position of the Dominion Government. All they did was to consult the Supreme Court and the Privy Council as to whether it was within their jurisdiction to entertain the appeal of the Manitoba Catholic minority. The Supreme Court held that the Government had no jurisdiction to hear the appeal in question, but the Privy Council decided that the Governor in Council had jurisdiction. As those who are conversant with the legal profession are aware, Sir, there is a material difference between a law giving jurisdiction and a law making it binding upon a tribunal to decide in favour of the appellants. Every day cases are taken to the Supreme Court, which first decides the question of jurisdiction. It often occurs that after having decided in favour of the appellants in so far as its jurisdiction is concerned, the Supreme Court decides against them on the merit of the cause. The tribunal which decided that it has jurisdiction does not thereby decide that the appellants are going to gain their case, that is elementary. Subsequently to that decision, it only remains for the tribunal to hear the cause and to render their decision. Such is the position in which the Government find themselves placed, under the judgment of the Privy Council, and no lawyer could hold the contrary opinion. The Government has jurisdiction, that is what the tribunals have decided. The Privy Council therefore held that the Government could take cognizance of the complaints of the minority. What is taking cognizance in such a case? It is to inquire about the facts upon which they have to pronounce. When the Government found that they had jurisdiction, they had to hear the Catholic minority who wanted to lay before them certain

grievances, and the government of Manitoba who denied the same. The Privy Council never pronounced as to the existence of the grievances of the Catholic minority. It simply declared that if they had any grievances, they had a right to appeal to the Dominion Government in order to urge them. It is a well known matter of procedure that before obtaining that a court should deal with a case, the existence of a grievance warranting the appeal must be proved. If no good reasons had been given to warrant it, that appeal for a federal interference should have been dismissed. According to the rule followed by the courts, it is not enough to state a grievance, it must be proved. It is quite true, Mr. Speaker, that for my part, I would have been willing to take the word of one of the petitioners, Archbishop Taché; but if I am to believe the hon. member for Three Rivers (Sir Hector Langevin), I should not take the word of Archbishop Taché, for the hon. member for Three Rivers contradicted him under oath. We all remember that at the time of the inquiry held, in 1874, with respect to the North-west rebellion and the amnesty question, Archbishop Taché stated under oath that an amnesty had been promised him by Sir George Cartier, Sir John Macdonald, and Sir Adam Archibald. The hon. member for Three Rivers, heard as a witness, disproved that statement of Archbishop Taché. But, notwithstanding that, I would have been willing personally to accept the evidence of that bishop. I have well known Archbishop Taché; I was even one of his relatives. He was among my personal and close acquaintances, and I would have been willing to take his word as regards the grievances of the Catholics. But if Archbishop Taché's statements are denied by the local government, which of the statements of the representatives of the Catholic minority, or of the statements of the representatives of the Protestant majority are you going to accept? What have the Government done? Have they inquired about the facts? And facts have a great importance here. The Protestant people are greatly mistaken with respect to education. Thus a great many among them are unable to see why the Catholic minority should object to the school system established in Manitoba. It is said that the Act passed in 1890 established schools having no connection whatever with any creed. That is what is said by the framers of that Act, and they claim that the schools existing under that legislation are strictly conducted as prescribed by law, that is to say, they are neither Protestant nor Catholic. It is rather difficult to have it understood by the Protestants that the Catholics may have serious objections to such schools. It is known that the teaching of the Catholic Church, at least its discipline, if not its doctrine, makes it imperative that religion shall be taught in every Catholic school. Teachers sharing the religious faith of the

Mr. LANGELIER.

child are required, because it is feared that the religious convictions of the teacher might make themselves felt, even without his knowing it in his teaching. Thus, I will not refer to moral philosophy, but let us take history. Is it possible for a Protestant teacher to teach Catholic children certain parts of the history of the Reformation, for instance? Catholics and Protestants do not appreciate from the same standpoint that moving page of modern history. I stated a moment ago that there lay a right of appeal to the Privy Council here. The hon. gentlemen opposite have taken much trouble to try and show that there was a right of appeal. I never entertained the least doubt about it, and it was placed beyond any discussion by the judgment of the Privy Council. But it is plain that it does not mean that the appeal should be sustained in any case. The Privy Council declared that the British North America Act is not applicable in this case; that it is only section 22 of the Manitoba Act that applies here. It is stated in this latter Act that whenever the local legislature shall pass a law affecting in any way the rights and privileges of the minority, whether Catholic or Protestant, an appeal shall lie. Let us suppose that the Manitoba legislature, instead of passing the Act of 1890, which, in my opinion, is so prejudicial to the Catholics, had merely provided that the Lord's prayer should be said at the opening of every class. The province of Manitoba would have made a law giving rise to an appeal, under the judgment of the Privy Council, because it would have affected the rights of the Catholic minority. But will it be said that, for such a matter, all this complicated machinery should have been set in motion? No man of sober judgment would pretend that. Let us give another instance: The same right of appeal lies with reference to the Acts of the Quebec legislature. Should it pass an Act providing that in the future, the taxes of dissentient corporations should be distributed otherwise than they are now, there is no doubt that such a law would interfere with a right of the Protestant minority in the province of Quebec. Should we for all that set in motion all this ponderous machinery? Surely not. It is plain that the intention of the fathers of confederation, as well as of the framers of the Manitoba Act, was that educational legislation should be within the exclusive jurisdiction of the legislature, and that the right of appeal should only be exercised in the most serious circumstances, and when no other means are available to remedy the situation. It is the point that should have been established in this case. Was it established? I say, no. The hon. member for Berthier (Mr. Beausoleil) stated a moment ago that it was useless to inquire into the grievances of the Catholic minority, inasmuch as the Manitoba government had declared that they would do nothing to remedy the existing state of affairs. Well, Archbishop Langevin has him-

self repeatedly stated that he would accept no compromise, that he wanted all his rights, that he wanted the separate schools to be restored as they existed prior to 1890. I have his words here. Here is what he said in the month of April last, in Notre-Dame Church in Montreal. It will be observed that he wants nothing less than what the Protestant minority enjoys in the province of Quebec :—

English-speaking as well as French-speaking Catholics are a unit on this question. They want no compromise. After having called upon all the Catholics of the Dominion to sign a petition claiming the full liberty of our schools, it would be strange, indeed, if one should accept a semi-liberty. Once more I say : No compromise ; our rights, such as are guaranteed by the constitution. We decline to accept a position inferior to that of the Protestant minority in the province of Quebec. I repeat that the Catholics have only one mind and one conviction, and that is that we must claim our rights to their utmost extent.

Later on, he stated in St. Hyacinthe cathedral, on May 26th, 1895 :

I insist upon stating that in educational matters the Manitoba Catholics will never accept the crumbs falling from the table while the Quebec Protestants are seated at the festive board. No, never.

We are neither slaves nor sons of slaves, and as long as the Quebec Protestant minority will enjoy their full rights, we, Canadians from the west, will never consent to half measures.

Then, a few days later :

Some say : " He is speaking too much." Others find that he does not speak enough.

My brethren, I wear on my head a sacerdotal crown, but, thank God, my neck is not peeled off. It knows, and has never known any yoke but that of the Lord.

And lastly, a month ago, at Edmonton, in the North-west Territories :

We will have all our rights, even though we should have to die to obtain them.

Such were the statements made by Archbishop Langevin. We will see in a few moments whether the Bill now before the House grants a fair remedy to this down-trodden minority, whether they are granted the fulness of their rights and whether they are put on the same footing as the Protestant minority in the province of Quebec. This is a material point, for not only have they required the federal interference, but they have also asked for the restoration of all the rights of the Catholic minority without any exception, all the rights enjoyed by the Quebec Protestant minority. Yet, now, they seem willing to accept much less, by accepting what is given in the Bill. The Greenway government never declined to grant what is proposed by this Bill. Never was a compromise proposed as that which it is intended to make by this Bill. Had the Federal Government, instead of sending threats to the local government, said to them : Be reasonable, you violate rights

that are sacred to the minority, do justice to them—had, then, the Manitoba government declined to act, they would have incurred a universal reputation. If the Dominion Government should act too hostile in their intended purpose to restore the minority their rights, they will have against them the reasonable people of the whole Dominion. These reasonable people would be in favour of the minority, were they convinced that they are oppressed. The Catholics are not the only people who wish that justice should be done to the Catholic minority in Manitoba. I think, Sir, the great majority of the people of this country would not forgive the Manitoba government for holding to the whole law of 1890, were they shown that this law deals unjustly with the Catholic minority in that province. Were they to maintain such an attitude, they would set all the people against them, and were then the Federal Government to interfere, they would have the whole people of Canada to support them in any measure calculated to do justice to the Catholic minority. There is a most important point, in my judgment, and it is why I cannot agree with my hon. friend, the member for Berthier (Mr. Beausoliel). I consider as disastrous to the interests of the Catholic minority the interference now proposed by the Government. They want to allure that minority by the last section of the Bill. By that famous section, they want to allure the Catholic people and induce them to accept this Bill. They say to the minority : It is quite true that this Bill will give you nothing, but the principle will have been accepted and, later on, we will pass a good Bill giving you all what you claim. The Ministers would not dare to state that in this House, but it is what is being done. Is the hon. Postmaster General willing to state that this is only the beginning and that the Bill will be completed later on ? If he is willing to make such a statement, I am willing for my part to vote for the Bill. Is the hon. Postmaster General (Sir Adolphe Caron) willing to state that that which is now before the House is only the beginning and that this Bill will be completed at another session ? Let him answer forthwith. He keeps silent and he will not speak. The reason why he will not speak is well known. The hon. Postmaster General does not answer, and they will go on trying to deceive the representatives of the minority in having them believe that this is only the beginning of the measures of justice which the Government intend granting to them. They say that this Bill sanctions the principles of interference, and that the law will be completed later on. I hope the minority are not simple-minded enough to be enticed by such an allurement. This Bill will not give separate schools to the Manitoba Catholics, because it does not provide the means for the working of such schools, and the local government will not give the money

required, although it is stated in section 74 that the separate schools shall have their share of the public grants appropriated for separate schools. This section simply adds insult to the injury already done to the Catholics. It is making a mockery of the Manitoba minority to have such a clause in this Bill. Section 74 states that the minority will be entitled to their proportionate share in the public grants for separate schools; now, it is well known, Sir, that the Privy Council never affirmed, as contended in this clause, that the minority had a right to this proportionate share in the public grants. The Privy Council simply declared that there was a difference between the law of 1890 and that of 1871, a difference which warranted the appeal of the minority and gave jurisdiction to the Federal Government. But it is not stated that the Catholic minority are entitled to the grants appropriated by the legislature. The Privy Council held the contrary in the case of Barrett. Sir, it is chiefly through the last section they want to allure the Catholic people. This section reads as follows:—

Power is hereby reserved to the Parliament of Canada to make such further and other remedial laws as the provisions of the said section twenty-two, of chapter three of the statutes of 1870, and of the decision of the Governor General in Council thereunder may require.

With that they say to the Catholic minority: Accept this Bill, it is only a first instalment, and full justice will be done to you later on, at the next session and at the following session. It is a first instalment, but the debtor will never pay. He is insolvent. What I regret in this Bill, Sir, is that it will sanction for ever the principles that the Catholic can expect nothing over what is given to them by this Bill. The Manitoba legislature will henceforth be deprived of the right to legislate in relation to that question. It is the opinion of the best jurists that the moment the Federal Parliament interferes, it takes away from the Manitoba legislature the right to legislate upon that point.

Mr. TURCOTTE. (Translation.) It has had time to legislate.

Mr. LANGELIER. (Translation.) The hon. member for Montmorency has perhaps a deeper knowledge of the law than I have, but I am not giving him my own opinion only, but that of prominent jurists. The Manitoba legislature will be powerless to do anything, and the Federal Parliament will itself be unable to interfere. The hon. Postmaster General does not dare to state that the Government will do anything further later on, because they are determined to do nothing. Now, the Catholics will be compelled to be satisfied with what is given them by the Bill. Well, it is making a mockery of them. They have objected to the plan proposed by the hon. leader of the Opposition, saying: The inquiry you propose would delay the establishment of

Mr. LANGELIER.

separate schools. Do you imagine that you are going soon to have separate schools under this Bill? Let us simply consider the whole fabric of the Bill. The establishment of these schools requires the appointment of a Board of Education which will be appointed by the Manitoba government, who are declared to be the desperate enemies of separate schools. Presuming that as expected by the Federal Government, the Manitoba government will be willing to take advantage of this provision, do you imagine that they will appoint very zealous men? They are simply bound to appoint Roman Catholics. There are some who are very zealous for separate schools, but there are also others who do not want them. Suppose that Roman Catholics should be appointed to that board, such as Mr. Donoghue, who appeared before the Privy Council of Canada when the appeal was heard and stated that he did not complain of the public schools. The Manitoba government, by appointing to the Board of Education such men as this one, would play a trick to the Catholics. But it is to be presumed that the Manitoba government will not take advantage of the power given them by this Bill. They will, on the contrary, utterly ignore it. Then you will have to wait three months before the Federal Government can do anything, from the date of the putting in force of the statute. Besides, certain it is that the Dominion Government would not make such appointments from one day to another. But should the members of the Board accept their appointments, it will take them more than one day to get organized; they will have to appoint a chairman and a secretary; four or five months will elapse before such an organization is completed. The law can now be carried out. What will happen? The Catholics, willing to have separate schools, will have to apply to the municipal council to be granted that permission, and to cause school districts to be established. That municipal council, like that of Winnipeg, for instance, which is opposed to the thing, will do nothing; they will have to give it such time as is required. It will not decline to do it, but say that it has other business to do, and allow one, two or three months to elapse before it deals with it. Here we are again with a delay of three or four months before a school district can be formed. But should the municipal council decline to establish these school districts, then the law suits would begin anew, followed by appeals, to say nothing of all the proceedings that can take place in the meantime.

So much for the delay. I could point out many others, but taking the Bill itself, it is plain that you cannot have separate schools before seven, eight or ten months. But there is more than that. This Bill does not give a cent for these schools. True, it refers to the establishment of a Board of Education, but, as stated the other day by Principal Grant, of Kingston, in a Toronto news-

paper, when will that board meet? No accommodation is even provided for them. Will they meet in the streets, in a store? And if they meet somewhere, something must be paid for the premises. They have to appoint a chairman, a secretary. There must be a superintendent; if he is qualified, he will have to be paid a good salary. All these people will have to be paid, and this Bill does not provide a single dollar. I forgot to mention that the superintendent will be appointed by the Manitoba government. They also put in this Bill that the Manitoba government may make regulations concerning the schools. Well, to charge a hostile government to make the regulations is in itself, it appears to me, making a mockery of the people. I will ask all fair people: how will they cause this organization of separate schools to work, if they have not the funds required to meet the expenditure? The Manitoba Catholics are not richer than those of the province of Quebec. Now, suppose that in our province the Government should not grant a cent to the Council of Public Instruction, would we have a superintendent and two secretaries? These officers cost thousands of dollars to the government. The province is compelled to make a large annual expenditure to keep the machinery in motion, for, if it give nothing, the very Council of Public Instruction would not work six months, it would not meet if the public did not pay the travelling expenses of its members. There are, for instance, in the province of Quebec bishops who have no revenue at all. I may mention a bishop, Mgr. Lorraine, Apostolic Vicar for Pontiac, one of the most distinguished members of the Council of Public Instruction, who has no resources whatever, who cannot procure the strictest necessities of life owing to a poor population. He would be unable to pay his own travelling expenses if the government did not pay them. In another clause of this Bill, they pretend to make provision for the raising of the funds required. They compel the municipal councils to levy upon the dissident Catholic ratepayers a sufficient amount to pay twenty dollars per school per month. If the schools are opened during eleven months, as is the case in the province of Quebec, it would make \$220 per school per year. The municipal council is authorized to collect 25 per cent besides this amount. If it warrants the impossibility of doing it, then there will be no separate school. If, upon the spur of zeal at first, a certain number of separate schools are established,—and it is likely to happen— they will not be kept standing very long, and gradually, when the Catholics will find that they are overburdened by the expenditure caused by such a system, when they will have to pay for a superintendent of education, for a secretary of the board, in short to bear all the educational expenditure, including the school-houses, they will with-

draw—and they will have a right to do it—from the separate schools organization and the efficiency of these schools will cease in proportion as the number of their supporters will decrease. But we must bear in mind that it is provided by this Bill that separate schools will have to be kept upon an equal footing, as to efficiency, with the public schools, otherwise they could not continue to exist. There is another remark, as to which I would like to say a few words. The hon. member for Berthier (Mr. Beausoliel) stated that this Bill sanctioned the very important principle of the right of a father to have his children educated as he intends them to be. The hon. gentleman did not notice that the Bill compels the parents to send their children to public or separate schools, they are not free to send them to a private school chosen by themselves. The father must send his children to a school kept in conformity with the law. Is that sanctioning the liberty of the father of a family? It is the very reverse that is sanctioned by this Bill. Now, does this Bill respect the rights of the minority in another most important respect? The hon. member for Berthier (Mr. Beausoliel) stated that this Bill sanctions the principles that the Catholics have the right to control the schools. Is the selection of the books to be used left quite unrestrained, or to whom is that selection reserved? In the province of Quebec, this is considered as a very important matter. The selection of the books belongs to the Catholic committee as regards the Catholics, and to the Protestant committee as regards the Protestant schools. No other authority, not even the government, has any right to deal with it. The selection of books relating to religion and morals is left to the care of the ministers of religion who have under their jurisdiction the various schools. Now, what do we find in the Bill now before the House? Is the selection of books unrestrained under this Bill? No, for under its provisions, they must be either books approved of by the Protestant board of schools, or books in use in the Ontario separate schools. They go insulting the future board of education by refusing to trust to their judgment. They are not left the liberty to select the school books; the right is taken away from them who will be entrusted with the management of the new educational system, to select at their will among the methods of teaching, a privilege which belonged to the Catholic minority prior to the law of 1890, and which was taken away from them by that law. I regret, Mr. Speaker, having taken so much of the time of this House. This Bill is simply a mockery. By the last section, the minority are made to believe that this is only the beginning of the measures of justice and that, later on, this shapeless Bill, this abortion of legislation will be completed. This is only an allureurement of which we must beware. By adopting this Bill, we would

make worse the position of the Catholic minority in Manitoba in favour of whom we may now make an appeal to all reasonable men among the Protestants of the whole Dominion. By adopting this Bill, we would cause the characters to be changed, and to the mind of a great many people in this country, the minority who are down-trodden would give way to the Protestant majority in Manitoba who, in their turn, would profess to be treated with hardship by the majority, and who would have the sympathies now going to our co-religionists. I think there could be nothing more to be regretted for the Catholic minority or more contrary to the restoration of their rights. On these grounds, Mr. Speaker, I shall vote for the motion of the hon. leader of the Opposition.

Mr. MONCRIEFF moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

Mr. FOSTER moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 12.10 a.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 6th March, 1896.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 77) to amend the Railway Act (from the Senate).—(Mr. Boyle.)

RETURN ASKED FOR.

Mr. CASEY. Before the Orders of the Day are called, Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind the leader of the House that I have his promise to bring down very shortly the correspondence ordered by the House some weeks ago between the Government and the High Commissioner with regard to the nature of his duties and so on.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I made inquiries on that point and I was told that that order had been complied with and the papers brought down.

Mr. CASEY. I think a mistake was made. There was one order for correspondence about the reasons for the High Commissioner's return to Canada, and that correspondence was brought down. But there was also a general order for correspondence regarding the High Commissioner's duties

Mr. LANGELIER.

since the last return was made upon that subject in 1884.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I daresay I have been misinformed, and I will give immediate attention to the matter.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would like to ask the Minister of Finance, who promised that we should have Supplementary Estimates, when he proposes to introduce them?

Mr. FOSTER. The Supplementary Estimates are in course of preparation. I may say that I have not hurried them very much, because I did not see any immediate prospect of having them acted upon by the House. I will have them for the hon. gentleman in time.

REMEDIAL BILL (MANITOBA).

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Sir Charles Tupper for second reading of Bill (No. 58) the Remedial Act (Manitoba), and the proposed motion (six months' hoist) of Mr. Laurier in amendment thereto.

Mr. MONCRIEFF. Mr. Speaker, the question now before the House is one of peculiar interest, one that has interested the country for many years past, and one, Sir, that I hope is very nearly at an end so far as its political significance in this country is concerned. The hon. gentleman from Quebec Centre (Mr. Langelier) who preceded me last night, spoke in the French language. I never before realized so fully the necessity, either that the dual language should be abolished, or that I should understand the French language itself; I think, however, the latter alternative would be much more preferable than that the beautiful French language should pass into oblivion. Sir, I hope that in any remarks I may make to-day, I shall not give the slightest offence to any of my Protestant friends with whom I disagree on this very serious question; and at the same time I hope that any remarks I may make will not be considered in the slightest degree offensive by any of my French fellow-members of the House, with whom I am proud to say I have been on the most friendly social relations since I have had the pleasure and the honour of a seat in this House. Sir, the question before the House is one, as I have said, of peculiar interest, and largely so on account of a seeming religious aspect that pervades it. As for myself, I may say I do not think that its religious aspect is the most important. The hon. gentleman who preceded me had a few objections to make to this Bill; and I gathered enough from his remarks, which I understand were very eloquent indeed, to ascertain what were some of his objections to the Bill. The first objection the hon. gentleman had

was that the Bill was no good. Sir, I do not think it comes properly from him to say whether the Bill is good or not; that is a judgment which should come from the members of Manitoba itself. There are three Roman Catholic members to-day in the legislature of Manitoba; one of them, I believe, is a Liberal, and the other two are Conservatives; and all three have agreed that the Bill meets the requirements of the minority in Manitoba. There are no objections whatever to this Bill, with the exception of those which have been conjectured by the followers of the hon. leader of the Opposition. The next objection made by the hon. member for Quebec Centre was that the Government did not disallow the Manitoba Bill of 1890, five years ago. That is a pretty argument to come from a follower of the leader of the Opposition—that this Government ought to have disallowed that Bill. Why, the leader of the Opposition claimed credit the other day for the Reform party for the position it had taken in that it had always opposed disallowance. Sir, if the Government had disallowed this Bill, what would have been the result? Why, the whole Reform party, including the hon. gentleman himself, would have condemned this Government for so doing. Another thing that the hon. gentleman said—if I am wrong, of course, he can correct me—was that all that the judgment of the Privy Council had decided was that jurisdiction was given to this Government to make a remedial order. Sir, he is entirely mistaken. That is only one of six propositions on which the Privy Council gave their opinion. He is correct in what he says, but that is only one of six propositions, and he omitted the other five. The most important of them is probably the sixth, and last, which I shall refer to in its proper order. But allow me to say this: If the hon. gentleman believes that that is all the Privy Council decided—and he nodded assent to me when I made the remark that that was his statement—then we can well understand why so many people throughout this country, of less intelligence than that hon. gentleman, should misunderstand what the decision of the Privy Council was in this matter. Sir, I suppose it is well known in this House that I am a Protestant. I was brought up as a Protestant; but, at the same time, I should be ashamed of myself, I should feel unworthy to be called a Protestant, if I held in less esteem any one of my fellow-countrymen because his religious convictions were not the same as my own. Now, Sir, religious convictions are acquired. I may say, in childhood. It is the whispering of a mother in the ear of her child that initiates and confirms his religious conviction; and a man feels when he buries his religious convictions for one moment, that he buries the respect and the love he has for the mother who gave them to him. Is it, then, to be wondered at, Mr. Speaker, that on an occasion of this kind, when there is

a possibility of religious feeling arising that the discussion should be of an extremely interesting character. The hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), who spoke last night, said quite enough indeed, in the tongue of the other half of the dual language. Now, Sir, what are his objections to the Bill? If I understand him correctly, that hon. gentleman said that he was opposed to separate schools, and that is one of the reasons he opposes this Bill. Well, that reason simply belittles his intelligence, because that, in my opinion, is no reason at all. I am just as much opposed to separate schools as he is. I do not think that his mind has thoroughly grasped the position. He also said that he saw no legal or moral obligation on the part of this Parliament to enact remedial legislation. I must direct my reasoning powers as against those of the hon. gentleman. I think when an hon. member says there is neither legal nor moral obligation to support this Bill, either he has not studied the question, or else he must be so prejudiced against separate schools that he drowns, so to speak, the salient points of the argument in favour of giving redress to the minority in Manitoba. He also interpreted the law according to the declaration made by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). That hon. gentleman—I am sorry is not in his place—

An hon. MEMBER. He never is.

Mr. MONCRIEFF. The hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) has adopted the interpretation of the judgment of the Privy Council as given by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), instead of taking the plain English of the judgment. If the hon. member for North Simcoe were in his seat, I would hope, before I conclude my remarks, to convince him that there were two sides to this question. The hon. member for North Simcoe has spoken in that strain before, and any hon. member who follows him to-day is going to be led astray. The hon. gentleman also bases his reasons for voting against this Bill on the ground that a certain number of people in the country have become a little excited, as they naturally would on an occasion of this kind, and pastoral letters have been written by bishops to their followers. What have we to do with what the hierarchy or the clergy of the country have written? No. If every Catholic priest in Ontario were to write a letter, it would not have the slightest effect on me when I am judging a constitutional case. Why was the statement of the hon. gentleman made? Why should he refer to letters of priests or bishops? Was it not done for the purpose of engendering religious dissensions among ourselves, or at all events through the country? It could be done for no other reason, and it could not possibly affect the constitutional question before the House.

I come now to a branch of the case nearer the point at issue. There has been within the last two or three years a great deal of agitation in this country over this question. How has it arisen? I am giving the House the view of the matter as it strikes me, whatever I say is only my own opinion, and I hope the House will believe me when I say that it embodies my conscientious convictions. How has this agitation come about? If there is any man responsible for this agitation more than another, it is the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). He held the brief for the government of the province of Manitoba in the Barrett case, and he did not cease when he had completed his duties in behalf of the Manitoba government, to hold that brief, which in fact he has held ever since. I have no quarrel with the hon. gentleman as regards his conscientious convictions, but I say that the fact that the hon. gentleman held that brief and pocketed thousands of dollars for appearing before the Privy Council has not tended in any way to change his judgment. The hon. gentleman has done more than any one else to agitate this question throughout the country. The hon. gentleman has to-day practically the support of the Toronto "World," which presents the hon. gentleman's views to the public. That hon. gentleman did not always have the support of that paper. Only a few months ago that journal called him the leader of the strife party. I have here some extracts from the "World," which will be interesting to the House. Here is an article headed "The Strife Makers en Tour." I will read a few extracts:

The first thing we learn about the new party at this stage in its history is the fact that the head office is not attracting new and able men. Whatever may be the change of complexion in the rank and file in the country the leaders of the party to-day are the same as they were when the party sprang into existence at Ottawa.

Further on the article says:

The head office walked the platform at Georgetown and at Stratford, but no district agents appeared on the scene to report progress of third party local affairs. The three representatives of the third party, in fact, attracted just about as much attention as any three Toronto drummers would command on their way to work a western town. The chief of the party was easily distinguishable from the right and left wings by his get-up, the most pronounced feature of which was a new style English tile hat (Piccadilly).

Mr. SOMERVILLE. What is the date of these extracts?

Mr. MONCRIEFF. October 13th, 1893.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. There has been a change since then.

Mr. MONCRIEFF. Those gentlemen afterwards took a trip to Listowel, and I have here a report of the remarks of the hon. member for Simcoe, at a meeting held at that place. He said:

Mr. MONCRIEFF.

It might be asked, why am I here to-day after fighting for so many years in the ranks of the old party? For one thing I am here because I decline to allow the Jesuits' Estates Bill to pass unchallenged in the Parliament of my country.

Further on he said:

In regard to the Manitoba school question, my position is this: Under no circumstances, no matter what the pleadings before the court may be, I am not prepared to support any interference with the Manitoba school law.

Sir, he occupies that position to-day, and for some years past, and his record in this House on every occasion has established that that is the position he has taken.

Therefore, Sir, we have as leader of the third party—and I trust every hon. gentleman in the House will follow my remarks—we have an hon. gentleman as leader of the third party, who says, that under no circumstances, no matter what the argument may be, no odds to him what the pleadings may be before the courts; he will oppose any interference with the Manitoba government on this question. Well, Sir, when I meet with a man of that kind, a man who takes such a position as does the leader of the third party, it could hardly be expected that anything I may say would influence him. At the same time, Sir, I have a right to know that the hon. gentleman (Mr. McCarthy) is not amenable to reason, and having concluded from his own statements that he is not amenable to reason, I then have the right to say, that I trust, that in this Parliament and in this country, there are few men like him.

Now, Sir, I come to another branch of the question. It surely must have struck this House as very strange and very peculiar, that the leader of the Opposition should have moved the "six months' hoist" in amendment to the second reading of this Bill. Why, Mr. Speaker, that is the motion in amendment, that the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), had already prepared to move himself. Why, that is the resolution of the member for North Simcoe. The leader of the Opposition, made a speech in which he did not oppose relief to the Manitoba minority, but he thought it was necessary for an inquiry to be held. Then, why did you not move for an inquiry, and if you do not tell me why, I will tell this House why you did not.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Address the Chair.

Mr. ACTING SPEAKER (Mr. Mara). The hon. gentleman should address the Chair.

Mr. MONCRIEFF. I hope I am not deaf, but I did not hear what Mr. Speaker said. I take it for granted that you rose, Sir, because I was out of order, and if I am out of order I will, of course, withdraw.

An hon. MEMBER. They object to you addressing the leader of the Opposition in a direct manner.

Mr. MONCRIEFF. Oh, I find that I should have addressed the Chair. Well, Mr. Speaker, I can assure you that I did not intend any disrespect to the Chair. It was a slip of the tongue. Now, Sir, I will come back again to what I was saying. I said, that the hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Laurier) had stolen the amendment of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). The leader of the Opposition made a speech of an hour or two's duration, but in the course of that speech, he never for one moment said that the Manitoba minority were not entitled to some redress. However, he did say, and I suppose he was sincere when he said it, that he was not quite sufficiently possessed of the facts to vote upon this question, and consequently he believed it was necessary to have an inquiry, and that when the inquiry was made he was prepared to deal with the matter. Now, Sir, I shall deal with that position of the hon. gentleman at a later stage of my remarks; but in the meantime, I do not think I am very far astray in telling the House this. I will take the House into my confidence this much at any rate, and say: That the hon. leader of the Opposition does not, I think, mean one word of what his amendment says. He is not sincere in that. But, Sir, I think that he means that he may be able to secure a larger vote in the House by his "six months' hoist" amendment, than he would secure if he moved a motion based on his own speech.

An hon. MEMBER. Order.

Mr. MONCRIEFF. Surely that is not unparliamentary. The hon. the leader of the Opposition has never once declared in this House, that he was opposed to the minority in Manitoba receiving the restitution of their rights. Sir, at the present moment there is a Bill before this House by which the rights of the Manitoba minority are to be restored to them, and the leader of the Opposition knows just as well as I do, that the Bill is satisfactory to the Manitoba minority.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. No.

Mr. MONCRIEFF. Yes, satisfactory to the Manitoba minority, satisfactory to the clergymen in Manitoba, if the hon. gentleman likes to know, and satisfactory to the members of Parliament who represent Manitoba who are of the Catholic religion. But still, the hon. the leader of the Opposition says: I want to defeat this Bill. Well, Sir, the hon. member for Verchères (Mr. Geoffrion) rather let the cat out of the bag. He said: "I am going to oppose this Bill, because it does not give as much to the minority in Manitoba as I think they ought to have, and I know that my leader will give a better Bill when he gets into power." Sir, under such circumstances does it not seem rather ridiculous that the leader of the Opposition should move to defeat this Bill altogether. The Bill is on the Table of the

House, and if there is any particular clause that he does not approve of, cannot he move an amendment to it, and I can assure the hon. gentleman this much—although I do not speak for the Government—I know that this Government is prepared to do what is right, and if he has a suggestion that will improve the position of the Manitoba minority, this Government will be pleased no doubt to consider it. Now, what can I conclude from all this? The hon. gentleman (Mr. Laurier) went through the province of Ontario last summer, and at each and every meeting he addressed, he told the people that under no circumstances would he consent to ride into power on a question such as the one before the House. Then, in moving this "six months' hoist" is he conscientiously and honestly following out the promise that he has given the country and the statement he has made time and again in this House of Commons. He told us that he would not wish to ride into power over a religious question. I have a right to ask the hon. gentleman, why therefore, did he not propose a motion in harmony with his speech. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman (Mr. Laurier) and the leader of the third party (Mr. McCarthy) had been consulting together before this motion was introduced. I might imagine that these two hon. gentlemen had a little consultation together, and that the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) said to the hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Laurier): My friend, I think if you move this motion it will have more effect than if I moved it. I think I can hear the hon. gentleman (Mr. McCarthy) say: You know, Mr. Laurier, if I move this motion, I don't stand well at any rate with your French supporters; you know that I cannot draw a French vote; you know that I cannot draw the vote of a Government supporter in the House, but if you will make this as a party motion on your side of the House, it will have some effect, and I and my lieutenants behind me will support you in that and so we may defeat the Government. Has not the hon. gentleman (Mr. Laurier), I submit, tried to ride into power on religious prejudices? What else can it be? The motion is not an honest motion—so far, I mean, as following the argument the hon. gentleman addressed to this House. Then, it must have been for some other purpose. Was it for the benefit of Manitoba? No; it is prolonging the discussion. For whose benefit was it? It was moved in the hope of being for the benefit of the Reform party in the country.

Sir, I have spoken too long on the initiatory parts of this address. I now come to review the legal aspect of the question. The position of Quebec, Ontario and the other provinces at the time of confederation was most satisfactorily explained by the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Ives) yesterday, and by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Dickey) on the previous day. But it is necessary for the continuity of my remarks,

that I should, even at the expense of keeping the House for a while, repeat much of what has already been said. It is often said that we cannot have too much of a good thing, and I hope the House will forgive me.

Now, in the provinces of Quebec and Ontario, there were, prior to confederation, respective minorities. In Quebec there was a Protestant minority, in Ontario there was a Catholic minority; and, when the subject of confederation was under discussion, the rights of those respective minorities were well guarded. In the province of Quebec, at that time, there was practically no law that gave the Protestants the rights they required. We know that the Protestants in the province of Quebec, though not numerically strong, formed a most important body; and, whether they did or did not, they were entitled, and they felt that they were entitled to protection under the Confederation Act. Knowing the position they occupied at that time, knowing that they were not secure in the absolute control of their separate schools, they insisted, while the agreement was being formed, that a better law should be enacted in the province of Quebec than then existed, for the protection of their interests. An understanding was come to between those who framed the Confederation Act, that after confederation took place, an Act should be passed by the legislature of Quebec, securing to the Protestants of that province certain further provisions and better control over the Protestant schools. Was there anything at all unreasonable in that? Is not that what we might expect would be done? Among those who were then gathered together, were Sir George Cartier and Sir Hector Langevin, who now sits in this House—and, Sir, I regard with respect the men who framed the constitution, and I regret that there are not more of them living to-day. Those two gentlemen promised that, after confederation, Quebec province would pass a law for the protection of the rights of the Protestant minority in Quebec. That was no part of the Confederation Act; but it was suggested that the Confederation Act itself should also, as far as possible, assist in making permanent the provisions of such provincial law so to be passed. It was urged, that a law of the province would be liable to be repealed at any time the province might think fit, and, therefore, that a provision should be inserted in the constitution by which any interference with any rights or privileges acquired by the Protestant minority of Quebec passed after the proposed union, should be subject to an appeal to this House. That was considered protection enough, and the provincial Act was passed in the first or second year after confederation. Under that Act the Protestants, as Protestants, had a representation on the Board of Education for the province of Quebec. Before that time they never had any such representation

Mr. MONCRIEFF.

and their school books could be prescribed by the bishops who might compose the Board of Education of the province. Under the new law, a board was formed, having two divisions, the one being Protestant and the other Catholic. The Protestant Board had charge of everything relating to Protestant schools. They prescribed their own school books, and regulated the working of their own schools. These rights they never had before, and these rights are certainly very sacred and very dear to the Protestants of the province of Quebec. Now, the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin) asked: Would it not be ultra vires of this Parliament to interfere in any way with the rights of the Protestants of Quebec? I tell him that it would not in respect of any post-union legislation of the province. The same, the Confederation Act, provided that whatever rights and privileges the Catholic minority in Ontario had at the time of confederation, should be transplanted, so to speak, in the province of Quebec, for the benefit of the Protestant minority in that province.

Now, what rights and privileges did the Catholics of Ontario, at that time, enjoy, which were granted by the Confederation Act to the Protestant minority in Quebec? Why, they were very slight, indeed. The Roman Catholics in Ontario, as such, had no representation on the school board there. The two systems of schools were under the control of the one board, on which the Roman Catholic minority, as such, had no representation. And, therefore, when the Confederation Act provided that the Protestant minority of Quebec should enjoy all the benefits which the Catholic minority had in Ontario at that time, it did not certainly give the Protestant minority of Quebec all that they desired, and all that they now enjoy. The privileges which the Roman Catholic minority enjoyed in Ontario were not considered sufficient in the interests of the Protestant minority of Quebec. It was for this reason that the clause was put in the Confederation Act, providing that, in respect of any post-union legislation, there should be a right of appeal to this House. Now, in answer to the question of the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin), I may say that any legislation of the province which would interfere with the rights of the Protestants in Quebec, which they had at the time of the union, and which were given them by the Confederation Act, in order that they might have the same rights and privileges as the Catholics in Ontario possessed in respect to schools would be ultra vires. But any legislation not affecting such rights would not be ultra vires. Therefore, the very Act which was passed by the province of Quebec, after the union, giving additional rights and privileges to the Protestant minority of that province, not given them by the Confederation Act, could be constitutionally repealed by the Quebec legislature. No one can gainsay that.

An hon. MEMBER. Yes.

Mr. MONCRIEFF. No; the hon. gentleman might say that in that case there would be the right of appeal to this Parliament, and in that respect I agree with him. If the legislature of Quebec should to-day pass an Act taking away from the Protestant minority the right of representation upon the Educational Board—which is a right granted to them since the union, and was a right not enjoyed by the Roman Catholic minority in Ontario at the time of the union, and which is a right certainly sacred to the Protestants of Quebec—such legislation would be *intra vires* of the legislature of that province, but the question then would come up of the right of the Protestant minority there to appeal to this Government for a redress of their grievance.

Mr. MARTIN. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to put him a question? When was it that the Protestants in Quebec got their representation on the Council of Public Instruction?

Mr. MONCRIEFF. It was in 1869, two years after confederation. By the Act of that year there was established a Board of Public Instruction, consisting of twenty-one members, fourteen of whom were Catholics, and seven Protestants; and I may say that there previously never was a board in that province on which Protestants, as such, were entitled to a seat. Is not that a right and privilege dear to the Protestants of Quebec?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Where did you get the idea that legislation since the union stands upon a different footing from the legislation before the union? The words of the section are: "In any province where a system of separate schools exists by law at the union, or is thereafter established."

Mr. MONCRIEFF. I understand the hon. gentleman to ask where I get the law for saying that the rights and privileges which the Protestant minority in the province of Quebec had before the union were to continue? Perhaps I had better read the subsection of the British North America Act:

Nothing in any such law shall prejudicially affect any right or privilege with respect to denominational schools, which any class of persons have by law in the province at the union.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That refers to denominational schools, which any class of persons, either of the majority or the minority might have had; whereas, in the other case, they are persons who belong wholly to the minority, and are protected in a different way.

Mr. MONCRIEFF. Then, take section 2:

All the powers, privileges and duties at the union by law conferred and imposed in Upper Canada on the separate schools and school trustees of the Queen's Roman Catholic subjects, shall be, and the same are hereby extended to the dissentient schools of the Queen's Protestant and

Roman Catholic subjects in the province of Quebec.

So that whatever privileges the Catholic minority in Ontario had, as such, at the time of confederation, were granted by the Act of Confederation to the Protestant minority in the province of Quebec, and nothing more. The hon. gentleman shakes his head; it is the first time I have ever remarked any expression of dissent on this point. For the purpose of making it clear, let me read the first part of section 93, which, really, I should have read preceding what I did quote:

In and for each province the legislature may exclusively make laws in relation to education, subject and according to the following provisions:—

Those provisions are the subsections I have just read. Allow me to read subsection 3, which will complete my quotations from the Act:

Where in any province a system of separate or dissentient schools exists by law at the union or is thereafter established by the legislature of the province, an appeal shall lie to the Governor General in Council from any act or decision of any provincial authority affecting any right or privilege of the Protestant or Roman Catholic minority of the Queen's subjects in relation to education.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). You see both stand on the same footing.

Mr. MONCRIEFF. Now, Sir, I simply say this to make it clear that there has been given by the Confederation Act, by the compact that was then made, a right of appeal on the part of the Protestant minority of Quebec, and the Catholic minority of Ontario, against what? Not against any law that existed prior to confederation, but against any interference with any privilege that has been given to the minorities of these provinces by provincial legislatures passed since the union. I do not believe that there is any gentleman, lawyer or not, in this House, who would dispute that all the provinces at that time were put on an equal footing in that respect.

Now we come to the question of the manner in which Manitoba has been dealt with; and here I must ask your consideration for a little while. At the time the negotiations were taking place for an Act suitable to the circumstances of the province of Manitoba, is it to be wondered at for a moment that the question of separate schools should be considered in the interests of both parties? At that time the population was about equally divided, half being Catholics and half Protestants. Is it to be for one moment supposed that both parties were not looking after their own interests? It is to the Act under which Manitoba became part of the union, we must now look to see what the privileges of the minority were to be. There was no telling, at that time, which were to be the minority, whether the minority were to

be Protestants or Catholics. But the Bill was drawn so, that, whichever became the minority in future years, should be protected. Let me read here the sections of the Manitoba Act which particularly apply :

In and for the province, the said legislature may exclusively make laws in relation to education, subject and according to the following provision :—

1. Nothing in any such law shall prejudicially affect any right or privilege with respect to denominational schools which any class of persons have by law or practice in the province at the union.

2. An appeal shall lie to the Governor General in Council from any act or decision of the legislature of the province, or of any provincial authority affecting any right or privilege of the Protestant or Roman Catholic minority of the Queen's subjects in relation to education.

Now, what followed immediately after the union? The Protestants being half, the legislature in the year 1871 passed an Act creating a Board of Education for the province of Manitoba. That board consisted, I think of an equal number of Protestants and Roman Catholics, and each branch of the board had control of its own schools. Now, it may be well to look at the judgment of the Privy Council referring to the position of affairs in Manitoba at the time of the union. At that time there had been no separate schools established by law. And, when the Act of Union was formed, there was inserted the words "or practice" after the words "by law," which I have no doubt was intended by the negotiators to protect the minority, whichever it turned out to be. Now let me here quote from the judgment of the Privy Council on the Manitoba case :

Those who were stipulating for the provisions of section 22 as a condition of the union, and those who gave their legislative assent to the Act by which it was brought about, had in view the perils then apprehended. The immediate adoption by the legislature of an educational system obnoxious either to Catholics or Protestants would not be contemplated as possible. As has been already stated, the Roman Catholics and Protestants in the province were about equal in number. It was impossible at that time for either party to obtain legislative sanction to a scheme of education obnoxious to the other. The establishment of a system of public education in which both parties would concur was probably then in immediate prospect. The legislature of Manitoba first met on the 15th March, 1871. On the 3rd May following, the Education Act of 1871 received the Royal Assent.

I also wish to say here, Mr. Speaker, that, immediately after the union was accomplished, the Manitoba legislature, representing Catholics and Protestants together, created a school system that was satisfactory to the province. The Lords, in their judgment, speaking of the position of affairs up to 1890 and the result of the legislation of 1890, made the following remarks :—

Contrast the position of the Roman Catholics prior and subsequent to the Acts from which

Mr. MONCRIEFF.

they appeal. Before these passed into law there existed denominational schools of which the control and management were in the hands of Roman Catholics, who could select the books to be used and determine the character of the religious teaching. These schools received their proportionate share of the money contributed for school purposes out of the general taxation of the province, and the money raised for these purposes by local assessment was, so far as it fell upon Catholics, applied only toward the support of the Catholic schools. What is the position of the Roman Catholic minority under the Acts of 1890? Schools of their own denomination, conducted according to their views, will receive no aid from the state. They must depend entirely for their support upon the contributions of the Roman Catholic community, while the taxes out of which state aid is granted to the schools provided for by the statute fall alike on Catholics and Protestants.

Moreover, while the Catholic inhabitants remain liable to local assessment for school purposes, the proceeds of that assessment are no longer destined to any extent for the support of Catholic schools, but afford the means of maintaining schools which they regard as no more suitable for the education of Catholic children than if they were distinctly Protestant in their character.

Sir, after the legislation was passed in 1890, what followed? Petitions after petitions were sent into this Parliament by the minority in Manitoba, some of which alleged that the Act was ultra vires. Well, it was decided in the Barrett case that the Act was not ultra vires, that before the union there had been, neither by law nor practice, any separate schools in the province. But the law lords themselves, in considering the question, show by their expressions, that they felt that the words "or practice" were put into that statute for the purpose of covering what "by law" did not cover. I will read now what they said in that respect, which I find on page 273 of the Manitoba case :

It may be that those who were acting on behalf of the Roman Catholic community in Manitoba, and those who either framed or assented to the wording of that enactment, were under the impression that its scope was wider, and that it afforded protection greater than their lordships held to be the case. But such considerations cannot properly influence the judgment of those who have judicially to interpret a statute. The question is, not what may be supposed to have been intended, but what has been said.

Now, can any hon. member of this House come to any other conclusion than that when this Manitoba Act was framed, the words "or practice" were added for some particular purpose? Then, Sir, an appeal followed to the Supreme Court of this country to find out whether there was any right under that Act for the minority to appeal to the Government of this country for the redress of their grievances. A good deal has been said against this Government for having asked the opinion of the Supreme Court; but I think if anything was justifiable on the part of this Government it was their action in ap-

pealing to the Supreme Court before they asked this House to legislate on the question. Why, if we had not the judgment of the Privy Council to establish that we have authority to deal with this matter, the result would have been that after we had passed this legislation the Protestant majority of Manitoba would have taken it to the Supreme Court, and would have taken it home to the Privy Council to have it there decided whether our legislation was constitutional. Now, we have the fact established in advance that the law we are about to enact, is constitutional. It would not have shortened the proceedings one day; the Protestant majority of Manitoba, if we had disposed of this matter before the judgment of the Privy Council, would unquestionably have carried it to the Privy Council in the end. Now, there were several questions submitted to the Privy Council for decision. Hon. members have risen in this House and have confined the issue before the Privy Council to the simple question of jurisdiction. Now, at the expense of wearying the House, I propose to put on record once more what questions were submitted to the Privy Council. The questions were six in number and were as follows:—

1. Is the appeal referred to in the said memorials and petitions, and asserted thereby, such an appeal as is admissible by subsection 3 of section 93 of the British North America Act, 1867, or by subsection 2 of section 22 of the Manitoba Act, 33 Vic. (1870), Chap. 3, Canada?

That, Sir, is the first question. Then in sequence let me give the answer:

1. That the appeal referred in the said memorials and petitions, and asserted thereby, is such an appeal as is admissible under section 2 of section 22 of the Manitoba Act, 33 Vic. (1870), Chap. 3, Canada.

Question 2. Are the grounds set forth in the petitions and memorials such as may be the subject of appeal under the authority of the subsections above referred to, or either of them?

Answer to question 2. That grounds are set forth in the petitions and memorials such as may be the subject of appeal under the authority of the subsection of the Manitoba Act immediately above referred to.

Question 3. Does the decision of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in the case of Barrett vs. The City of Winnipeg, and Logan vs. The City of Winnipeg, dispose of or conclude the application for redress based on the contention that the rights of the Roman Catholic minority, which accrued to them after the union under these statutes of the province, have been interfered with by the two statutes of 1890, complained of in the said petitions and memorials?

Answer to question 3. That the decision of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in the cases of Barrett vs. The City of Winnipeg, and Logan vs. The City of Winnipeg, does not dispose of, or conclude, the application for redress based on the contention that the rights of the Roman Catholic minority which accrued to them after the union, under the statutes of the province, have been interfered with by the two statutes of 1890 complained of in the said petitions and memorials.

Question 4. Does subsection 3 of section 93 of the British North America Act, 1867, apply to Manitoba?

Answer to question 4. That subsection 3 of section 93 of the British North America Act, 1867, does not apply to Manitoba.

Question 5. Has His Excellency the Governor General in Council power to make the declarations or remedial orders which are asked for in the said memorials and petitions, assuming the material facts to be as stated therein, or has His Excellency the Governor General in Council any other jurisdiction in the premises?

Answer to question 5. That the Governor General in Council has jurisdiction, and the appeal is well founded, but that the particular course to be pursued must be determined by the authorities to whom it has been committed by the statute; that the general character of the steps to be taken is sufficiently defined by subsection 3 of section 22 of the Manitoba Act, 1870.

There, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentlemen who have preceded me in this debate, opposed to the Bill, have stopped, and, I think, they have led this House to understand that no other question of any practical value was submitted to the Privy Council for their consideration.

Question 6, which I am about to read, is the question which is important above all others, and it is the one above all others which materially deals with this subject. The question is:

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

The answer to that question is as follows:—

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

Then allow me to add the final words of the judgment of the highest court in England:

Her Majesty having taken the said report into consideration, was pleased by and with the advice of Her Privy Council to approve thereof and to order, as it is hereby ordered, that the recommendations and directions therein contained be punctually observed, obeyed and carried into effect in each and every particular. Whereof the Governor General of the Dominion of Canada for the time being, and all other persons whom it may concern are to take notice and govern themselves accordingly.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. MONCRIEFF. Hon. gentlemen opposite may say "hear, hear." If they would support legislation following that judgment, I would respect more their cries of "hear, hear." Sir, after having heard the answers given by the Privy Council—the Privy Council being, as we all know, the highest court in the realm—are we not obligated to follow the decision given? If there be any just reason for a grievance on the part of the minority of the province of Manitoba, and the Privy Council has decided that we have not any justification for refusing to remedy it, are we not bound by law and by honour to deal with the minority in a fair and honourable way? The hon. member for North Bruce, speaking in this House, I think, last year, said as follows:—

That a grievance exists, I admit. No one can gainsay the fact, the patent fact, that certain rights and privileges were conferred upon the Catholic minority in Manitoba, and that those rights and privileges, after they had been enjoyed for nineteen or twenty years, were taken away suddenly, and, as I have already said, I believe harshly, in certain respects.

With the judgment of the Privy Council staring us in the face, irrespective altogether of the remarks made by the hon. member for North Bruce, can there be any question whatever but that we should deal with this question fairly and honourably as between the province and the Dominion?

Under such circumstances, what are we to do? We have it admitted before this House that a grievance exists. We have it admitted that certain privileges were given to the Catholic minority in the province of Manitoba by the Act of 1870. We have it admitted beyond question that the Act of 1890 deprived the minority in the province of Manitoba of all those privileges. We have the judgment of the Privy Council of England that those privileges were granted, and that they were taken away by the Act of 1890, and the fact of taking them away was such a grievance as regards the minority in the province that under subsection 2 they had a right to appeal to the Dominion Parliament for redress. Are we to give them no redress whatever? Are we to disregard the whole facts of the case; are we to disregard the judgment of the Privy Council? If we are to do so simply because we are opposed to separate schools. Let us say so at once and be done with it. The question of whether we favour or are opposed to separate schools has nothing whatever to do with it. We are face to face with the difficulty—what are we to do? Are we to follow the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), who said that under no circumstances whatever, no matter what the pleadings might be before the courts, he would oppose any interference with the legislature of Manitoba. If we intend to take that

Mr. MONCRIEFF.

position, then we will wind up the matter at once. But I say that the Dominion of Canada is bound in good faith to keep inviolate the contracts made with any province when it came into this union. If we should now, when an occasion presents itself fail to carry out the constitution to the letter with a province of the Dominion, no matter how small, and affirm that it was not a question of the constitution, but one of force, and a majority should control it, nothing now could happen to assist in the disintegration of the Dominion more than to decide that the minority in Manitoba should not have relief on the case presented to this Parliament. We are bound to keep good faith with the provinces. By the Act of 1870, which established the province of Manitoba, we are bound to hear an appeal, and to deal honourably and fairly with the minority, whatever it may be, in that province, when any question arises which deprives them of any right they had acquired in regard to education. That question has arisen; the occasion is now. Is this House to tell the minority in Manitoba that no matter what we agreed to at the time of the admission of the province, we are opposed to separate schools, and will support the government of Manitoba. It would be a very sorry day for the Dominion when we made such an assertion.

Now, Sir, let us take, for a moment, this point. All legislation affecting legislation enacted after the union, is on the same footing, as is this question now before the House. I ask if any hon. gentleman in this House will dispute what I say. I say again, that all legislation passed by the provincial legislatures since confederation, is on the same footing as is this question. And, Sir, if we say that we shall not treat fairly the minority in Manitoba, we shall have, if the occasion ever presents itself, to say to the minority of the province of Quebec: We refuse to assist you; you must be governed by the majority in your own province. Of my Protestant friends in the province of Ontario, I ask this question. I ask the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule): If the minority in the province of Manitoba happened to be Protestants, what course would he take on a question like this? I want the hon. gentleman to think about that. If the minority in the province of Manitoba happened to be Protestant, would that hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule), and others who feel like himself, object to grant them relief under the constitution?

Mr. SPROULE. As it is, yes.

Mr. MONCRIEFF. No, Sir, you would not.

Mr. SPROULE. I say, yes.

Mr. MONCRIEFF. I beg you a thousand pardons. If it were a question of Protestantism, I am sure you would say: I shall support the Protestant minority in the pro-

vince of Manitoba, the constitution says so, and, under the constitution, you, the Protestant minority, are entitled to be relieved.

Mr. SPROULE. I wish distinctly to say to the hon. gentleman—and he has no right to do other than accept my word—I say emphatically, I would not.

Mr. MONCRIEFF. Well, I shall accept the hon. gentleman's word. I cannot do less. I accept his words to mean this: That if the Protestants of the province of Quebec were deprived of the rights they received under post-union legislation, he would not hear their appeal.

Mr. SPROULE. It is not the same at all.

Mr. MONCRIEFF. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) says that he will not grant relief to the Catholic minority in Manitoba. Now, if the minority in Manitoba, as was at one time expected, happened to be a Protestant minority, the hon. gentleman says that he would not hear their appeal. Well, he must follow up that position, constitutionally, and he must also say: If it happened that the appeal came from the Protestant minority of Quebec; if it happened that Quebec deprived the Protestants of their Protestant Board of Education, the hon. gentleman could not take any other course but to refuse to the Protestants of the province of Quebec any relief whatever. That is his position. Sir, I know that every Roman Catholic member in this House is willing to give the Protestants of Quebec their rights. I know that every Roman Catholic will maintain, inviolate, every single privilege given to the Protestants, under any Act of the legislature, passed since confederation.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to ask him one question? Does he say that there is any sort of analogy whatever, in law or anything else, between the position of the Protestants of Quebec and the position of the Roman Catholics in Manitoba?

Mr. MONCRIEFF. A man must be blind who does not see that the position in regard to post union legislation is exactly the same. The Protestants of Quebec have acquired the rights I speak of since the union, and every Act of Parliament passed by any province of the Dominion since confederation is *intra vires* of the legislature to repeal it.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Will the hon. gentleman tell me, what rights the Protestant minority in Quebec have?

Mr. MONCRIEFF. Does not the hon. gentleman know?

Mr. O'BRIEN. Will the hon. gentleman define what the rights are, that the Pro-

Mr. MONCRIEFF. Why, everybody knows that.

Mr. O'BRIEN. A great many people do not know.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman himself does not know.

Mr. MONCRIEFF. I would not be standing on the floor of this House to-day if I did not know the rights of the Protestant minority of Quebec. Does not the hon. gentleman know that there is a Protestant Board of Education in Quebec?

Mr. O'BRIEN. That is no answer.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). Certainly it is. That is one of the privileges of the Protestants in that province.

Mr. MONCRIEFF. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) asked me, what is the similarity between the position of the Protestant minority in Quebec and the position of the Catholic minority in Manitoba? I do not know whether it is my obtuse way of putting things to the House, or whether it is the obtuse character of the hon. gentleman, but I thought I had made that plain. I tell the hon. gentleman that all the privileges, and rights, sacred to our Protestant friends in the province of Quebec, and which are as sacred as the educational privileges are to the Catholics of Manitoba; all these rights which are of any practical value, have been acquired since confederation. It is *intra vires* of the legislatures to repeal every one of those Acts passed since the union, and, Sir, if the province of Quebec chose to act—shall I say, so ugly—they could take away the Protestant Educational Committee that is now existing in the province of Quebec.

Mr. O'BRIEN. What then becomes of the Roman Catholic minority in Ontario?

Mr. MONCRIEFF. I am just as well able to answer that question as the other. What I want to give to the religious minority of one province, I want to give to the religious minority of another. Every Act that has been passed in the province of Ontario since confederation, is under the control of the legislature of Ontario, and is subject to the same right of appeal as an Act passed by the legislature of Quebec. I ask any member of this House, especially any lawyer, to dispute what I say. That is, I think, a fair answer to the hon. gentleman.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the question has arisen, whether or not this Bill is coercion. I say it is not coercion. I say, that, if we pass this Act, we are not coercing Manitoba, but we are following the lines of the constitution: we are giving the minority the right which they had under the constitution, and nothing more. To say, that giving a man a right which he has under the constitution is coercion, is something which I never heard

Now, Sir, let us look for a moment at the result of the legislation of 1890. What does the hon. member for Winnipeg, for whom I have the greatest respect—who, I believe, knows more about matters in Manitoba than perhaps any other hon. member of this House—what does he say about the legislation of 1890? In a letter to the "Globe," of the 25th September, 1895, he says:

As a matter of fact, Manitoba made no difference in the religious exercises of the old Protestant schools. In other words, the religious exercises that had been adopted by the old Protestant board have been applied to the new national schools. I believe myself that it is wrong; I have never hesitated to say so; and I would have been glad if the legislature of 1890 had adopted a thoroughly national system of schools, excluding therefrom religious exercises of every kind.

Such, Sir, is the view of the hon. member for Winnipeg. Now, the "Globe," not for the purpose of quieting religious dissensions, but, I believe, for the purpose of assisting the Reform party of the country to defeat the Conservatives, sent a certain gentleman of high education to the province of Manitoba to investigate the school matter. I believe his name is Dr. Grant—a thoroughly educated man, I admit; but he went up there at the instigation of the "Globe," and made a report, which, I may say, is, on the whole, rather against the Bill now before the House. The hon. member for Winnipeg, who, I agree, is fully conversant with the affairs of Manitoba, has addressed a letter to the "Globe," in reference to the report made by Dr. Grant, and what does he say? He says:

I cannot, however, congratulate it on the success of its experiment in sending Principal Grant here with that view. It seems to me that he has succeeded in nothing, except in making the most egregious blunders with regard to the facts of the case, and that his own opinions which he puts forward as exemplifying the highest wisdom as applied to the case in question, instead of being wise, are most absurd and ridiculous. In fact, the three letters on the question force me irresistibly to the conclusion that Dr. Grant, instead of being the exceedingly wise man he sets himself up for, is in fact a conceited humbug.

Whatever we see in Reform newspapers respecting Dr. Grant, we have, at any rate, the opinion of the hon. member for Winnipeg, that he is a conceited humbug, and is not possessed of the facts, as they are in Manitoba.

Now, Sir, let us consider for a few minutes the position of the leader of the Opposition. That hon. gentleman knows all about separate schools; and he has stated on several occasions in this House, that the Roman Catholics are unanimously in favour of separate schools, and that, if the Manitoba schools are not Protestant, they are still offensive to the Catholics. I think he speaks truly for his co-religionists. Now, the Protestant schools of Manitoba are either one thing or the other. If they are Protest-

ant, it is certain that they are objectionable to the Catholics; and the hon. leader of the Opposition says, that, if they are not Protestant, they are equally offensive to them. Now, seriously speaking—for this is a matter of conscience—if they are objectionable, are we going to impose them upon the Roman Catholics, when they have a right, under the constitution, to be protected from having them forced upon them? The hon. leader of the Opposition also says, that Protestants, as a rule, are in favour of the system of common schools, while Catholics are unanimously in favour of separate schools. "If," says the hon. gentleman, "the schools are Protestant, every Protestant will say that the Government should interfere by all means and stop the outrage." "If the schools are not Protestant," he says, "they are still offensive to the Catholics." Is this the time for the hon. gentleman to talk of postponing this question? I say, no. The question is put in a nutshell by his own statements. Am I to say, that, when the hon. gentleman spoke these words, he was saying what he did not believe? Am I to assume, for one moment, that he was saying what was untrue? I accept his words, and this House has the right to accept the words of a gentleman in his position. Does he need any commission of inquiry? What is a commission required for? It makes little difference—if the schools are Protestant they are offensive; if they are not Protestant, they are equally offensive.

Again, the hon. gentleman says, referring to his Catholic friends:

If their conscientious conviction is that their children should be taught religious principles, which they deem essential and necessary, who can object seriously?

The hon. gentleman, surely, if not by direct language—and I will show direct language shortly—by indirect language, expressed himself in favour of separate schools for Manitoba. He is in favour, under that statement, of restoring any rights to the Roman Catholic minority in Manitoba of which they may have been deprived. Let me say here that I am not in favour of separate schools. I wish that we could all see alike, I wish that there was no necessity for separate schools in the country. I wish my children to go to school along with the children of my Catholic friends, and I do not see why my Catholic friends' children should not go to the same school with mine. I am willing that my wife should educate her children in her faith, and I am willing that the wife of every Catholic should do likewise. But that does not satisfy the conscientious conviction of Roman Catholics. Roman Catholics believe that religion should be taught in the schools, and I do not want, for a moment, to interfere with their conscientious convictions. There I draw the line, and I shall not, for one moment, attempt to cross that line with

my opinions or prejudices, if I choose to call them so. Sir, I believe in the old golden rule of doing to others as you would like to be done by, and the whole question now before this House resolves itself down to this golden rule. Do we want to do by the Roman Catholic minority of Manitoba as we would wish the Protestant minority of Quebec to be done by. Let us do to the one as we would do to the other. The hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) has, time and again, in this House, stated that the minority in Manitoba have a grievance, but he does not think it proper, in the interests of the Dominion, to grant the relief they ask. He also contended that the right of appeal given did not mean anything. I am sorry the hon. gentleman is not here, but I must say that I have never read a statute giving a right of appeal, in which the higher court was dictated to as to what it should do. When an appeal is given, the unwritten law is that the court of appeal shall act as it thinks right. To say that we have the power to hear an appeal, and are not bound to legislate one way or another after having heard it, is absurd. What is the use of an appeal unless it means something? The appeal comes before us, and it is admitted that the minority have a grievance. It is declared by the highest court in the realm that the grievance is within our competence to remedy, and that the minority in Manitoba have had taken away from them, rights they acquired since the union. And is it possible that the Parliament of Canada will say: We will not give to it any consideration. Why, Sir, that surely is going too far.

Another point is this: It has been contended that provincial rights should prevail, and that the province of Manitoba had the right to pass this law. True, it had, but allow me to tell every hon. member of this House that the province of Manitoba has no exclusive jurisdiction in school matters. For evidently good reasons the framers of the Manitoba Act did not give Manitoba exclusive jurisdiction in school matters. What that reason may be, it is easy to conjecture. It was in case the tide of population might change one way or another, the minority might feel safe and rely on the Dominion Parliament for protection. The judgment of the Privy Council itself makes that view clear. What does it say:

Bearing in mind the circumstances which existed in 1870, it does not appear to their lordships an extravagant opinion that in creating a legislature with limited powers, it should have been thought expedient, in case either the Protestants or Roman Catholics became dominant, and rights that came into existence, under certain circumstances, were interfered with, to give Parliament the right to legislate in matters of education, so far as necessary to protect the Protestant or Roman Catholic minorities.

The minority in Manitoba might as well have turned out to be Protestant as Catho-

lic. The appeal which has been made, it has been decided we have the right to hear. In answer to the sixth question, the law lords decided that the minority in Manitoba had acquired rights under the Act of 1870, and that those rights have been taken away from the minority by the Act of 1890. Now, we are face to face with what we have to do. Are we to refuse any legislation? Are we to disregard the judgment of the Privy Council of England, and ruthlessly throw out any appeal from the minority in Manitoba simply because they are a minority? If we desire to do that, we might as well throw to the winds the whole constitution. I was very much pleased, Mr. Speaker, in reading the report of the meeting of the Grand Orange Lodge of Ontario West at London, the other day, to note what was said by Mr. Hughes, the Grand Master of that lodge. Mr. Hughes is a man who, today, has under his control the education of twenty-five thousand children. He has occupied his present position for a quarter of a century. He is one of the best-educated men in the province, and he understands education, probably, better than any man on the floor of this House. That is the gentleman who spoke as grand master of the Orange Lodge, an institution for whose members I have the greatest respect, an institution which, if I understand its constitution aright, is bound to give equal rights to all, whether Catholics or Protestants. It is no part of the programme of the Orange institution of this country, if I understand it aright, to maintain any special privileges in this country. The grand master, in his remarks to the lodge, at its meeting at London, spoke as follows:—

Whether the Manitoba minority had a grievance was not the question to be dealt with here. The highest authority in the land says the minority had a grievance. Whether that minority was Catholic or Protestant made no difference. Every man and woman in this house would say it was an outrage if the minority was Protestant. Then in all justice, truth and righteousness, how can it be called wrong to right that grievance?

Sir, the remarks made by that gentleman are worthy of commendation. Whether he is a Catholic or a Protestant, there is no man who can gainsay what Mr. Hughes said. And I believe that, notwithstanding the fact that Mr. Hughes's remarks, made to that great convention in London, were not approved of by the committee who took them into consideration, what Mr. Hughes said will, I believe, outlive the comments of that committee. I believe, that, when the members of the Orange body, for whom I have the greatest respect, are fully conversant with the circumstances of this case, those who in that meeting favoured a course which would perpetuate strife between the religious sections of this country, will eventually be in the minority, and that the broad and

liberal opinion stated by the grand master on that occasion will prevail in this Dominion.

Now, let me turn to the remarks that have been made on this subject heretofore by the hon. leader of the Opposition. That hon. gentleman has, over and over again, declared, that he would be the last man to desire that the party to which he belonged should walk into power through the door of religious strife. I am willing to accept what he says, but I fail to see that his actions carry it out, and I shall prove to this House, or, if I do not prove it, I shall be wonderfully disappointed, that the statement I have quoted is not carried out by the hon. gentleman's actions. The hon. gentleman made a speech in which he asked for an inquiry. Is he sincere in asking for that inquiry? That is a question that every hon. member on each side of the House should think over. What does he want to inquire about? He has already stated on the floor of this House, that, if the schools are Protestant, they are offensive, and, if they are not Protestant, they were equally offensive. Now, he did not want an inquiry to find out whether the schools were offensive. What, then, does he want an inquiry for? Let me give his own words:

I agree that there was no cause for a reference of this question to the Supreme Court.

This was said at the time when we were discussing the propriety of having this question submitted to the Supreme Court. Said the hon. leader of the Opposition:

This is a mere question of fact on which each one can pass his judgment when the papers have been placed before us.

This was said on the motion of the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte), that the papers in the Manitoba matter should be laid on the Table, and the hon. leader of the Opposition then said, that each member of this House would be quite able to pass his judgment on the facts, as soon as the papers were laid on the Table. Now let us consider his sincerity again. Says the hon. gentleman:

I have only this remark to make to the hon. gentleman, that the longer this question is kept before the public the worse it is for the good of Canada. It is a question on which there should be an immediate and speedy answer.

Is that not worth while considering? What is he doing now? Moving the six months' hoist of this Bill to keep the question a year longer before the people of Canada, and to keep up the agitation among the different religious sections of the country. He then says, that it is a matter upon which an immediate and speedy answer should be given. Some time ago, the hon. gentleman did not urge a reference, as we all know very well. He pressed for an immediate answer from the Government on this Manitoba school ques-

tion. Now, however, he moves the six months' hoist. Is he sincere in that? Are those his honest convictions, or does he do it for the purpose of defeating this Government? If those are his sincere convictions, then he has blown both ways, and I do not know in which course he really believes. Not long since, the leader of the Opposition made these remarks:

I say that the reference to the Supreme Court under such circumstances is most dangerous.

He was then speaking on a motion opposing the Government for having referred this question to the Supreme Court. He goes on:

Because if the Supreme Court should decide that the Government have the power to interfere with the legislature of Manitoba, and the Government should not obey the mandate which they themselves had sought, there would be a powerful and righteous agitation in some parts of the country against them.

Does this House take into consideration the meaning of these words? The hon. gentleman opposed a reference to the Supreme Court; he said it would put the Government of Canada in a dangerous position, because, if the judgment of the Supreme Court was against them, they were bound to carry out the mandate. Sir, the Government submitted the matter to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, judgment has been given, and this Government is prepared to carry out the mandate. The hon. gentleman did not expect when he made these remarks that this Government was prepared to carry out that particular mandate; he thought the Government would shirk it; and so he said the Government were putting themselves in a dangerous position, because, if the judgment of the high court was against them they would be bound to carry out the mandate. Sir, let me take him at his own words. He says they would be bound to carry out the mandate; why should he then oppose them to-day? Is he opposing them to-day because he honestly believes that they ought to be opposed? Or is he opposing them to-day, as I rather suspect, for political purposes? An hon. member opposite shakes his head. Probably he was in the little room with the leader of the Opposition and the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), and they decided that this would be the way to catch the most Protestant votes from Ontario. If he was in that little room, and heard them decide that the leader of the Opposition should submit this resolution, and not the hon. member for North Simcoe, because it would catch more Protestant votes, let the responsibility be with him. It is not a pretty thing for a party who do not want to ride into power upon any religious questions, to submit a resolution to this House that draws the religious lines. Sir, hon. gentlemen opposite ought to be ashamed to support such a resolution. The Reform party do not believe in such a resolution. Hon.

gentlemen opposite do not believe in supporting the hon. member for North Simcoe any more than I do, but they submit this resolution because they think they can catch more votes. I think I have proved to every fair-minded member that this is not a question of separate schools. A man may be as much opposed to separate schools as I am, and still vote against the resolution of the leader of the Opposition. I ask this House to remember, besides, and in this I speak feelingly, that what is the case of the Catholic minority in Manitoba to-day, may be the case of the Protestant minority in Quebec to-morrow. I challenge any man in the House to say that I am wrong in making that statement. There is no doubt whatever that I am right in what I have said. If to-morrow legislation took place in the province of Quebec by which the Protestants were deprived of representation on the Educational Board, the hon. member for North Simcoe, I think, would be found rising in his place and insisting upon Protestant rights in the province of Quebec. I ask him, and I ask this House, to apply the same doctrine to the province of Manitoba that it is conceded in this House would be applied to the province of Quebec if any interference were made with the rights of the Protestants of that province. Sir, I also ask this House to remember that if there is one thing more than another that tends towards solidifying confederation, it is to give the provinces of this great confederation to understand that when the occasion presents itself to the Dominion Parliament, the rights of minorities will be respected, that the terms of the treaty under which they entered the union will be kept inviolate by the Parliament of Canada. If you want to disintegrate this great Dominion, then I say let the provinces know that you keep no faith with them. Mr. Speaker, I intend to vote, as surely my remarks have shown, against the amendment of the leader of the Opposition and in favour of the motion of the Secretary of State. I may err in voting that way, but, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that if I err in voting that way, I shall certainly err in favour of the constitution. If, Mr. Speaker, I err in voting so, I shall at least err in favour of the Protestant minority in Quebec as well as the Catholic minority in Manitoba; if I err in voting so, I shall at least err on the side of peace, and harmony, on the side of adjusting these religious questions; if I err in voting in the way I have indicated, I shall err on the side of that line of action which will bind together more firmly the several great provinces of this great British colony.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Moncrieff) has spoken in a spirit of reasonableness as regards his attitude towards the Roman Catholics, and I was very pleased to hear his remarks in that direction. But I

have been informed that the hon. gentleman in a recent contest which took place in Ontario expressed views which scarcely coincide with those he has enunciated with so much vigour and eloquence to-day. I am informed that the hon. gentleman was a very active and strong supporter of Mr. Gurd, the P.P.A. candidate for the provincial assembly. I understand that among the planks of the P.P.A. organization is one that no Catholics shall be dealt with, that no Catholics shall be employed by a member of the association. I find it difficult indeed to reconcile the attitude which the hon. gentleman takes here to-day as a member of this House with his attitude in an election for the Ontario legislature and the candidature of the member of the order to which I have referred. I am told that the hon. gentleman was so anxious and desirous that the support given by him to Mr. Gurd should be known that he went to the ballot box and ostentatiously dropped his ballot marked for that candidate. We know that the local legislature contest in the county of Lambton from the P.P.A. standpoint was very bitter indeed, that all means possible were taken to incense the people against the Roman Catholics; that the supporters of Mr. Gurd, chief among whom was the hon. gentleman who has just spoken, brought into that country a woman named Margaret Sheppard, who maligned the Roman Catholic people and the Roman Catholic clergy, and who introduced into the contest there elements very widely different from the sentiments which the hon. gentleman has addressed to the House to-day. The remarks I am now making with respect to the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Moncrieff), I am sorry to say, apply to a number of other hon. members from the province of Ontario. When it was a question of opposition to Sir Oliver Mowat their attitude towards Roman Catholics was very different. Those very same men who find in every piece of legislation carried through the Ontario legislature by Sir Oliver Mowat some proposal to hand over the affairs of the province to the Pope, are to-day filled with pleasure and delight at the action of this Government in connection with the Remedial Bill. I think it is very evident and clear how that change of opinion has come about. In the one case the effect of the attacks was against Sir Oliver Mowat, the Liberal Premier of Ontario; in this case arguments of that kind are calculated to tell against the Government which hon. gentlemen support here. I am very sorry to notice this change of view as regards the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Moncrieff), and I think it takes away very largely from the effect of the very fine sentiments he enunciated to-day. The hon. gentleman spent considerable time in dealing with the matter which was first brought into this debate by the Minister of Justice, and one as to which I crave the indulgence of the House while I offer a few

remarks. The hon. gentleman elaborated time and again the position of the province of Quebec. It is urged that the change by which Protestants obtained representation in the Council of Public Instruction took place subsequent to 1867, that the only remedy the Protestants could have in case the provincial legislature of Quebec should repeal that law and refuse to Protestants representation on the Council of Public Instruction, would be an appeal under the appeal clauses which we are dealing with in considering this Bill now under discussion. I do not think it would be a matter of very great importance to the Protestants in Quebec if they were denied representation on the Council of Public Instruction. It is very proper they should have such representation, and it is very creditable to the Roman Catholic majority that they should freely have accorded this representation to Protestants, and allowed, freely and without compulsion, the Protestant board to decide all questions affecting Protestant or dissentient schools in that province. But for many years prior to 1869, the Protestants had no such right or privilege in that province, and yet they did not appear to suffer very largely on that account. The Minister of Justice attempted to convey the idea that the Council of Public Instruction in the province of Quebec had control over the text books, and if the Protestants were eliminated from the board the council might impose such text books on the dissentient schools as would be disagreeable to Protestants. I admit at once that if that were the fact it would be a matter of very considerable importance, but it is not the fact. The law with respect to the selection of school books is the same as it was prior to 1867. The law is exactly what it was in 1861, under which the Council of Public Instruction have no power to select text books which refer to questions of morals and religion. So far as other text books are concerned it is a matter of no importance. Protestants can learn arithmetic from the same book as Catholics, or vice versa; it is not as regards text books or arithmetic, geography, or grammar that any difficulty would arise. It could only be upon questions of morals or religion, and as to that, the provisions of the Quebec law are the same as they were in 1861. They provide that these text books are not selected by the Council of Public Instruction; nor are they selected by the school trustees of the districts. Section 65 of the Common Schools Act of the statutes of 1861, gives the duties of school commissioners, and as to the course of study, &c., subject to this proviso:

But the curé, priest, or officiating minister, shall have the exclusive right of selecting the books having reference to the religion or morals, for the use of the schools for children of his own religious tenets.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that applies just as well to Protestants as to Catholics, and, therefore we see, what this idea introduced

Mr. MARTIN.

by the Minister of Justice amounts to. It has been suggested to me by an hon. member, that this idea was repeated by the Minister of Trade and Commerce, who represents particularly in the House and in the Government—rather in the Government than in the House—the Protestants of Quebec. It was stated as an argument of great strength by him. But there is nothing whatever in it, because, as I say, while the Protestants perhaps would regret and feel injured, if their representatives on the Board of Education were done away with, yet, it would not be considered as an attack upon their religion, or as an attack upon them in any respect at all. If it were true, as suggested by the Minister of Justice, that by a change in the law of Quebec the text books affecting morals and religion for dissentient schools were to be selected by a Council of Public Instruction exclusively Catholic, then there would be an opportunity for great wrong, and a proper reason for protest.

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

After Recess.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 69) to incorporate the Hamilton Blast Furnace Company (Limited).—(Mr. McKay.)

SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 76) to incorporate the British American Coal and Transportation Company.—(Mr. Hazen.)

THE REMEDIAL ACT (MANITOBA).

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, at six o'clock I was alluding to the point raised by the hon. Minister of Justice, and repeated with considerable emphasis by the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce, who is the Protestant representative of Quebec in the Government. The point they made was: that there have been changes in the law of the province of Quebec since confederation, which, if repealed by the legislature, would place the Protestants there in an anomalous position, and one which they could only obtain a remedy for under the clause which we are discussing in connection with this Bill. I was able to show that the law in the province of Quebec—which was important to the Protestants with regard to the choosing of text-books and with regard to morals and religion—was the same prior to confederation as it has been since. That being so, under the British North America Act, any attempt to change that law would be ultra vires of the legislature of Quebec, and would have no effect at all; because the Protestant minority of the province of

Quebec are entitled under the British North America Act not only to all the rights and privileges enjoyed by the Catholic minority in the province of Ontario, but also to all the rights and privileges the Protestant minority in the province of Quebec enjoyed at the time of the union. So, any point that is attempted to be made for the Government based on this aspect of the affair falls to the ground; and we come to find that the only change of importance to Protestants in Quebec that was made since confederation, was a change by which, under the law, they are entitled to a certain number of members on the Board of Public Instruction. As I said before, a repeal of that law would not be pleasant or palatable to the Protestants there; but still it would not be such an infringement of their rights as to create any trouble or difficulty; and therefore it is a matter of very little moment, so far as this Bill is concerned.

One other matter with regard to the remarks of the hon. member for East Lambton. He made use of an argument which I have heard used upon the stump, in connection with this question, but which I have not heard in the House, and had not expected to hear in the House from any lawyer of standing. It was not put forward by the hon. Minister of Justice on behalf of the Government, and it requires only a moment's consideration to show its absurdity. The hon. gentleman read from the formal part of the Order in Council adopted by the Imperial Privy Council on the report of the Judicial Committee. It is as follows:—

Her Majesty having taken the said report into consideration, was pleased, by and with the advice of Her Privy Council, to approve thereof and to order, as it is hereby ordered, that the recommendations and directions therein contained be punctually observed, obeyed and carried into effect in each and every particular. Whereof the Governor General of the Dominion of Canada for the time being, and all other persons whom it may concern are to take notice and to govern themselves according.

The hon. member for East Lambton interpreted that to mean that we were bound to do what the Government proposed to do by means of this Bill. In the speeches on the stump to which I referred, gentlemen representing the Government, reading these words, have alleged that it would be high treason to Her Majesty on the part of the Government here to refuse remedial legislation to Manitoba in pursuance of these words. Now, Sir, every lawyer knows that these words are contained in every Order in Council that is passed on the recommendation of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council—that they are purely formal, and have no reference particularly to this question. And if it were necessary to allude further to an argument of that kind, it merely drives us back to the question what the Privy Council decided in their judgment contained in the Order in Council; and, so

far as these words are concerned, they throw no light upon the question one way or the other. Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. Secretary of State, in moving the second reading of this Bill, dwelt at considerable length upon the negotiations which finally resulted in the confederation of the first four provinces of Canada. As I understood him, he urged as an argument why this Bill should be passed, that difficulties and troubles existed at the time of the union and long prior thereto with regard to the question of separate schools in the province of Ontario, and the question of dissentient schools in the province of Quebec. As the founders of confederation were able to adopt certain provisions contained in section 93 of the British North America Act for the purpose of finally settling those disputes, he held that to be a reason why this coercion Bill should be passed. Now, in the first place it is evident that the negotiations and the legislation resulting therefrom had no reference whatever to any other province than the four provinces in question. The constitution of Manitoba was established long after that time, and the section as to education in pursuance of any provisions of the British North America Act. If it were intended, at the time that settlement took place, that in the new provinces of Canada as well as in the old provinces, this agreement as to separate schools for Catholic minorities, and as to dissentient schools for Protestant minorities, should apply, we would have found a provision in the British North America Act that in establishing a constitution for a newly-created province thereafter, the same provisions should be inserted. But nothing of that kind was found in the Act, and the provisions made with regard to the provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick are quite different from the provisions made with regard to the provinces of Ontario and Quebec. Although the words are the same in the first subsection of the clause giving to any class of persons the rights and privileges they enjoyed at the time of the union, it is well known that Nova Scotia and New Brunswick enjoyed by law no rights and no privileges, and therefore those two provinces are confined to that section providing that if, after confederation, any rights and privileges should be conferred by legislation, there should be an appeal to the Government here. So each province was dealt with according to its own circumstances, and nothing whatever was said with regard to new provinces that might afterwards be brought into the union, as Prince Edward Island, British Columbia and Manitoba have been. Therefore, I fail to see what possible reason can be derived from the negotiations which then took place, or from the parliamentary settlement that was made in pursuance of those negotiations with regard to the provinces of Ontario and Quebec, why this particular Bill should be passed.

The hon. Secretary of State (Sir Charles Tupper), all through his speech, seemed to put the question upon the basis, that there had been in Manitoba an enjoyment, prior to the union, of a right or privilege by the Roman Catholic minority which the legislature of Manitoba afterwards interfered with. He repeated that statement, time and again, in that speech. It is scarcely necessary, it seems to me to point out to this House, every member of which has very fully, for the past five or six years, studied and discussed this question, that in no way is that the question involved, because it has been determined by the Privy Council, in the case of *Barrett vs. Winnipeg*, that the statute of 1890 in no way affects injuriously any right or privilege which the Roman Catholics enjoyed at the time of the union, and the right which the Privy Council, in its second judgment, has determined to belong to the minority in Manitoba, is a right claimed to have arisen owing to the passage of the School Act of 1871. That is the question we have to deal with. And the question, it seems to me, which should divide those who are for and those who are against remedial legislation, is: Had the statute of 1871 the effect of giving to the Roman Catholics in Manitoba the right never to have that statute changed? And does the fact, that the statute of 1890 repeals the statute of 1871, and thus takes away the privileges conferred upon the Roman Catholic minority by that statute, demand, in itself, from the Government, in the first place, by its remedial Order in Council, and from Parliament, in the second place, by its Remedial Bill, ipso facto, without anything further, the interference of the Government and the House? It is contended, on the part of the Government, that the mere fact, that this statute of 1871 gives separate schools to Manitoba, and that the statute of 1890 takes away those separate schools, compels the House of Commons, no matter what the views of its members may be, to pass a Remedial Bill, restoring those separate schools. Now, I take issue with that. The opponents of remedial legislation contend, that that is not a constitutional interpretation of our fundamental law there; they contend, that that is not the decision of the Privy Council in the second case, but that, on the contrary, what the Privy Council decided was, that the statute of 1890 having taken away from the minority certain rights and privileges conferred upon them by the statute of 1871, a case arises under the 3rd subsection of section 22 of the Manitoba Act, which gives jurisdiction to the Governor General in Council to hear and determine the appeal of the Roman Catholic minority, but, just as the Privy Council in its judgment expresses it, it is for the authorities—that is, the Governor General in Council here—to determine what relief shall be given, and the nature of the relief. It must be either one way or the other. Either we are bound, without

Mr. MARTIN.

any option, without any opportunity of discussion, as a mere machine, to restore everything that was taken away, or there is the right of inquiry, and there is the responsibility of the Government, in the first place, and Parliament afterwards, of determining just how far it is fair and right to the majority and the minority in Manitoba to interfere with local legislation, which does take away any of these rights and privileges thus conferred. And it is our contention, that the very first thing necessary, under the circumstances, is for the Governor General in Council here to thoroughly understand all the circumstances, to take up the law as it was in 1871, and as it was amended from time to time up to 1890, to consider the rights and privileges conferred upon the minority by those laws, to learn on what pretext the legislature of Manitoba in 1890 took away some of those rights and privileges, and whether the taking away of those rights and privileges was an unfair oppression of the minority, or a legitimate exercise of the provincial jurisdiction in the matter of education. That is our contention, and that is a very different matter, indeed, from the suggestion put forward by the Secretary of State, that, in doing this, the Government was merely carrying out the constitution. I contend, that they are not carrying out the constitution. I contend, that they are attempting to place an interpretation upon the Manitoba Act, and that they are seeking to evade their responsibility in the premises. They certainly have never heard the case of Manitoba. They have only heard the case of the minority. Upon the strength of that case, they have, by a remedial order, conceded to the minority the whole of their claim. They have passed a remedial order, the effect of which, if it had been carried out by the legislature of Manitoba, would have been to restore exactly the state of things that existed in 1890, prior to the passing of the School Act of that year. That is the only way in which the legislature of Manitoba could have obeyed the remedial order. Then, up to that point the Government acted in accordance with their own theory. They passed the remedial order, which correctly carries out that interpretation of the constitution; but they stopped short when they came into this House, and presented a Bill, not in the terms of the remedial order, but another kind of a Bill. It has been said, on their part, by speakers outside of this House, and probably inside this House, that the Government would never restore to Manitoba the inefficient schools which were proved to have been in existence there under the legislation prior to 1890. On what principle do they refuse to restore these inefficient schools? According to their own argument, they must do it. According to their interpretation of the constitution, we have no discretion, we have no right to inquire whether it is well for the minority that these schools

should be restored, or not, any more than we are entitled to inquire whether it is fair that the majority should have done as they have done. If the mechanical theory is the correct one, then it is useless for them to say that by their remedial legislation they will make the schools efficient, for that is not the complaint here. The complaint is that the statute of 1871, having conferred a right or privilege—no matter how extreme, no matter if it had gone ten times as far as it actually did go—it is binding for all time, and that if the local legislature of Manitoba repeals that Act, or interferes with it, we are bound, under the interpretation put forward by the Government, to give back to them what was taken away, whether we think it is right or not, whether we think it is fair or not. But, Mr. Speaker, that contention they have entirely failed to carry out. And why? Why has the Bill, as presented here, failed to follow the terms of the remedial order? Because, in spite of the Government's decision to close their ears, in spite of their decision to act without any investigation into the conditions in Manitoba, facts have come to their knowledge since the passing of the remedial order which have shown them that these schools were inefficient, that there were many reasons why the legislature of Manitoba were quite justified in dealing with the state of things as it existed in Manitoba prior to 1890. And they admit that by saying that they will not, in their Bill, give to the minority the relief that the remedial order gives, but they will temper that by making, of their own accord, provisions which did not exist in the old law, and which they propose to put in now, for the purpose of making these schools efficient. Surely they must be wrong, either in one instance or in the other. If we are a mere machine in this matter, if we have no discretion, then the only thing that we can do is to pass the Remedial Bill in the terms of the remedial order, giving back to the minority in Manitoba whatever they had before, without any attempt to inquire whether what they had before was right or wrong, fair or unfair. If, on the other hand, we have the right to do as the Government have done in presenting their Bill, if we have the right to take into consideration the circumstances, to look at the law that was passed, and make up our minds upon our responsibility as legislators, how far we will restore these schools, how far we will impose conditions upon the restored schools, with the view of making them more effective in the interest of the minority, for whose benefit they were established, if that is our duty in making a Remedial Bill, surely it follows that that was the course that the Government should have taken in connection with the remedial order. And I say, Mr. Speaker, that there is where the whole difficulty in this question has arisen, as I shall show when I come to deal with the suggestions which

have been made, and are being made, day after day, pointing to a compromise or settlement of this question through the Manitoba government.

Now, the Minister of Justice recognized the fact that there had been throughout Canada a great deal of very unfavourable, very hostile criticism of the remedial order; and he endeavoured to show that on the 21st March, 1895, when it was passed there was really no course open to the Government but to pass the remedial order in the terms in which it is couched. Let me examine for a few moments the reasons given by the hon. Minister in support of this contention. In the first place, he said, it was well known that Manitoba intended to do nothing in the premises, and, as a proof of that very broad and, I must say, very untrue statement, he instances the fact that in 1894 a communication was sent from the Government here calling the attention of Manitoba, and also of the North-west Territories to the unfair position of their school legislation, as affecting Roman Catholics, and that, in answer, the government of Manitoba sent a communication stating that they were satisfied with their school legislation, and did not intend to depart from it. Surely, Mr. Speaker, it cannot be argued that that was any indication of the position that Manitoba would take in view of the present position of the question. For that correspondence took place before the decision of the Privy Council was known, and the decision of the Privy Council entirely altered the position of Manitoba. The government of Manitoba have never said that they intended to defy the constitution; they have always admitted that they were bound by the constitution. But in 1894 there was no decision which made it clear to them. Therefore, anything they may have said or done prior to that decision is no indication what their position would be after they had the decision of the highest tribunal in the land pointing out to them the position in which the province was placed, and showing them that in case they refused to redress these grievances the Government here and this Parliament had the power to take the subject of education out of their hands, and legislate for them. The next thing that the hon. Minister of Justice cites as an indication of the position of Manitoba is the speech from the Throne, in 1895, and this, I may say, is the only indication whatever that Manitoba had given, up to the time of the passing of the remedial order, of what their position would be. I will read it, and I ask the House to consider whether what is said in the Speech from the Throne in Manitoba, in 1895, is couched in such language as to induce the Government here to believe that there was no use in attempting to negotiate with Manitoba upon this question. These are the words:

It is not the intention of my Government in any way to recede from its determination to up-

hold the present public school system which, if left to its own operation, would in all probability soon become universal throughout the province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me, that is a very moderate assertion of the right, of the intention, of the province to stand by its legislation. There is no suggestion there that they do not propose to be bound by the constitution; there is no suggestion there that they are not prepared to receive communications, to enter into negotiations with this Government with regard to that matter. Yet that is really the only evidence that is put forward by the Government as to any indication of its attitude given by the legislature of Manitoba prior to the 21st March, 1895, when they, without any inquiry, on the shortest possible notice to Manitoba, without any endeavour to investigate the facts, passed the remedial order, which, Mr. Speaker, I say is an order calling upon Manitoba to restore the old law just as it was, with inefficient schools and everything else, no matter what might be contained in those statutes that were in force prior to 1890—all had to be restored. Now, let me read the material part of the remedial order in proof of what I have to say. After reciting all the facts, the remedial order, the kernel of it, is this :

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

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

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

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

Those were the three things which the Roman Catholic minority were deprived of by these Acts, and the remedial order goes on to say :

And His Excellency the Governor General in Council was further pleased to declare and decide, and it is hereby declared that it seems requisite that the system of education embodied in the two Acts of 1890 aforesaid, shall be supplemented by a provincial Act or Acts which will restore to the Roman Catholic minority the said rights and privileges of which such minority has been so deprived as aforesaid.

Not any modification, not any change, but restore those rights and privileges of which such minority has been so deprived as aforesaid.

And which will modify the said Acts of 1890, so far and so far only as may be necessary to give effect to the provisions restoring the rights

Mr. MARTIN.

and privileges in paragraphs (a), (b), (c), hereinbefore mentioned.

Now, Mr. Speaker, could words be clearer? Is it possible to state in more definite language, that what they are called upon to do is to restore those statutes in so far as they affected the Roman Catholic minority, exactly as they were, without any regard to whether there was anything in them providing for efficiency, without any regard to any matters of detail, without any other consideration at all, except the one fact, that they should have those schools as they were before, that they could not be taken away from them, and, if they were taken away from them, or if there was an attempt to take them away, by the local legislature, then this Government and this Parliament intervened to restore them, not because they were right, not because they were fair, but because the constitution compelled us to give them back those schools exactly as they were. Now, the Minister of Justice said that the remedial order did not say that. He said it pointed out, by recital, the judgment of the Privy Council. I would like to ask the Minister of Justice: If you are reading a document, or a deed, do you look for the recitals for what the deed is to pass? Do you look at the recitals, or do you look at the operative part? I say, that you have got to look at what they are ordered to do. The remedial order orders them to do something. It recites the facts and the circumstances which have led up to the passing of the order. The Minister of Justice says it recited the judgment of the Privy Council, and the remarks of these judges that it would not be necessary to repeal the Acts of 1890. Well, I suppose, no one has contended that: it has never been contended by any one, that it would be necessary absolutely to repeal the Acts of 1890, because it is admitted, on all hands, that it had the right to change, as we did change, the constitution of the Protestant board. But what the remedial order does, is to say, that you must change the Act of 1890 so as to give these three things to the Roman Catholics; there is no qualification, there is no suggestion whatever in the remedial order itself, that anything less than a complete compliance with it would be an answer to it, and it was so interpreted by the people of Manitoba. When it was laid before the legislature, the legislature took the ground that they could not obey it, and they refused to do so. I shall allude later on to suggestions made by the legislature in making that refusal. But what I am trying to emphasize now is, that the Government had precluded themselves and had precluded the government of Manitoba, from entering into any negotiations, from proposing or suggesting any compromise, from doing anything at all, except what they did, that is, in a dignified manner to refuse to obey the remedial order. I say, that, so far as that aspect of the case is concerned, the whole difficulty in which the

Government finds itself to-day, and in which this Parliament finds itself to-day, has arisen from the fact, that the Government have passed this exceedingly drastic, this exceedingly far-reaching Order in Council, without, as I say, attempting to exercise any discretion in the matter, pretending that they were a mere machine; and now, when they find that they are not able to propose to this House a Bill in the terms of the remedial order, they begin to think of negotiations. They began to think of compromise. The time for negotiation, the time for compromise, the time for consideration, the time for inquiry and for investigation, was before judgment, and not after judgment. These hon. gentlemen, acting in a judicial capacity, have given judgment. They are about to proceed with execution, and they hesitate in executing their own judgment, and send Sir Donald Smith to Winnipeg to see if there is not some possibility of the government of Manitoba doing something, anything to get them out of this hole, even if it was only to throw out a suggestion. I believe at the present moment they are on their knees to Mr. Greenway, imploring him to come to Ottawa in order that they may say that he is coming here for the purpose of settling the difficulty. Settling what difficulty? Getting the Government out of the trouble in which they have placed themselves by passing this most unfortunate remedial order. It may be that Mr. Greenway will come here. I can scarcely see how he can avoid it, on the principle he has laid down, because he has said, time and again: We admit the constitution, we do not dispute the decision of the Privy Council; we desire to control our educational affairs; we admit you have jurisdiction to take them out of our hands; we are prepared to do justice in the premises, to give every facility for investigation, and if, after investigation, a case is made against us, we are prepared to make matters right ourselves. We do not desire coercion; we do not desire to be interfered with. But I can say this, that if Mr. Greenway does come here, that will be no sign and no indication that there is any hope whatever that the government of Manitoba will do anything in the premises. They cannot do it. The Government here have rendered it impossible for them to do it. Every attempt has been made. His Excellency sent for Mr. Greenway and Mr. Sifton. They came here. They met His Excellency, and they discussed the question with him. Nothing came of it. Sir Donald Smith went to Winnipeg. He met Mr. Greenway and Mr. Sifton. They discussed the question together, and nothing came of it. Nothing will come of any negotiations or any attempt at compromise or settlement of this question, unless one thing is done, and the Government were early in the day informed of that. If they are prepared to retrace the false step, if they are prepared to re-

peal the remedial order, and place the matter back where it was when they made that fatal blunder, the door of negotiation, the door of compromise will be opened, and they may have some chance of obtaining what all hon. members in this House, on both sides, would deem to be the most fortunate result that could occur under the circumstances, a settlement of this case by Manitoba herself, and one satisfactory to the minority. The Minister of Justice, it is true, in referring to the communications which passed in 1894, and the Speech from the Throne in 1895, threw out the suggestion that something had happened since the passing of the remedial order as a justification of his position. He stated that the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) had stated, in July last, in this House that Manitoba could not recede from her position. Surely nothing that occurred after the passing of the remedial order could be any justification for the passing of that order; and I can say this, that what the hon. member for North Simcoe meant by saying that Manitoba could not recede from its position was, as I have been endeavouring to explain, that the people of Manitoba considered the remedial order a most harsh judgment given against them in their absence, without any opportunity, on their part, to meet the case made against them, and they believed they were justified in the interest of the province in answering that remedial order by a dignified refusal to obey it. The legislature of Manitoba had, I believe, the approval of nineteen-twentieths of the people of that province in their answer to that order, and surely, under those circumstances, hon. members could not expect the government to recede from their position; they could not do it if they desired, for they would lose the public confidence which they now enjoy to so large an extent if they receded one iota from the position they took in June in answer to that order. But that is all they have done. They have never said they would refuse to do justice in the premises. They have only said they would not obey the remedial order. I therefore say that until and unless the remedial order is rescinded, and the question put back where it was on 21st March, there can be no hope of any settlement or any compromise.

There is an incidental feature of this case to which, at this stage, I may refer, and that is the appearance in the printed documents that have been laid before this House of a number of affidavits which were presented to the Governor General in Council by Mr. Ewart on behalf of the minority, but which were withdrawn. The hon. member for Pictou, the ex-Minister of Justice, boldly justified the course of the Government in printing those affidavits. But I wish to draw the attention of the House to the fact that in 1895 the Government were challenged with the impropriety of printing affidavits which were withdrawn or not al-

lowed to be entered, affidavits on which the remedial order was not based, because the remedial order could not be based on material which was not before the courts, and which was put on one side. What would hon. members think if the Court of Queen's Bench in Manitoba heard a case, and during the case certain affidavit evidence was presented by the plaintiff, and for one reason or another, was withdrawn, and not entered, and not considered by the court in its judgment, yet, on certifying a case, as the court is bound to do, for appeal to the Supreme Court of Canada, the court should include in that case for appeal the affidavits that had been withdrawn. Why, it would be considered an outrage in that case, and it is all the more an outrage on the part of the Government, because if a court is bound to be fair, how much more is the Governor General in Council, the representative of the Queen, bound to be fair in a matter of this kind. And so the present Minister of Justice (Mr. Dickey) considered it at that time. Last session the matter came up on the motion of the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), and Mr. Dickey with regard to that matter spoke as follows:—

Mr. DICKEY. I desire to make a personal explanation, not to offer any remarks on the subject before the House. The hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) referred to the publishing of some affidavits which were put in evidence at the hearing before the Privy Council of Canada, and subsequently withdrawn as the case proceeded. The hon. gentleman seemed to feel that that was a great injustice, not only to himself but to others, and the present Government as an organization has quite enough faults to answer for without answering for my personal faults, and I therefore desire to take the personal responsibility of publishing those affidavits. They were put in and read, and subsequently, as the proceedings show, were withdrawn. Mr. Ewart claimed they should be printed, and there was no contest over it, in fact, the question was never raised. I was then Secretary of State, and the Printing Bureau sent and asked me whether they were to be printed, the message being received by me just as I was going into the room on the second or third morning, and without consulting my colleagues and without giving the matter serious attention, I said, "Certainly, they are part of the proceedings, print them, and print that they were withdrawn." I may have been entirely wrong, perhaps I was; I must say, on considering the matter when the printed book was placed in my hands, I thought I had made a mistake. What I want to say is that any observation founded on want of good faith or on the idea that there was any intention on the part of the Government in so acting is entirely mistaken. We are still subject, and I personally and particularly am subject to any remarks as to any practical injustice that has been done, but I do not want the House to suppose that there was any intention in placing the affidavits there, of taking any unfair advantage, and that there was anything more than a mistake made. The mistake occurred inadvertently, and the hon. members may refer to it as they think proper, but they should consider it not an intentional and wrong act.

Mr. MARTIN.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it occurs to me that is a most manly, honourable, and straightforward explanation, and it was so accepted by the House. But what do we find this session? We find the hon. the ex-Minister of Justice coming forward boldly, and claiming it was right, claiming there was nothing wrong about it, that it was done deliberately and intentionally, and that it was justifiable. I say, Mr. Speaker, that it is an outrage. I say that no greater wrong could be done than to publish evidence withdrawn by the plaintiff, and never allowed to be answered. It is sometimes suggested; but why do you not answer these affidavits now. Why, that is worse than what I was talking about; it is settling the case after judgment. They want us to give our evidence after judgment has been rendered against us. What is the object of that? I suppose if we answered these affidavits now, there would be counter affidavits in reply, and the matter might go on for some time. But I say this, Mr. Speaker: There is an answer to these affidavits. I can say further, that these affidavits are not true so far as they refer to actions of mine. I do not propose to discuss them here, or to consider them at all in connection with this case. They were not made a part of the case. I never knew of them until after judgment was given. It is so manifestly unfair, and against the ideas of justice, that these affidavits should be published, that one would have thought that no government would do it, no matter how depraved, no matter how lost to all idea of fair-play and decency, as this Government in many cases has shown itself to be. Surely one would think they would have enough manliness, and enough decency, and enough fairness, not to attempt to prejudice the people of Canada, by sending broadcast, with the official stamp, documents that are no documents at all, affidavits that are not affidavits in this case, and which were withdrawn and never considered. Yet, with a view of attempting to influence the people of Canada, this Government have descended to this petty means. What do you think of a government capable of that? Were it not that this is in entire accordance with their conduct in many instances, my surprise would be greater than it really is.

Mr. AMYOT. Are you talking about St. François Xavier now?

Mr. MARTIN. Yes, with regard to St. François Xavier. What does the hon. member (Mr. Amyot) think with regard to that?

Mr. AMYOT. If the hon. gentleman will allow me to tell him, I will tell him.

Mr. MARTIN. Yes.

Mr. AMYOT. I think it was a most extraordinary way of imposing upon the people by false promises. False promises were made, while it seems it was the intention of the

candidate, and of the Government at the time to deceive the people.

Mr. MARTIN. Now, Mr. Speaker, there we have an example of what we are complaining of. Even a member of this House has allowed his judgment to be influenced by these affidavits. Even a lawyer, and a Queen's Counsel I am told—

Mr. AMYOT. Yes, and able to read.

Mr. MARTIN. I do not think that the title of Q.C. adds any very great lustre to the hon. gentleman's position.

Mr. AMYOT. I do not agree with the opinion of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. DALY. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Martin) is not one.

Mr. MARTIN. I do not think that title adds any very great lustre to the hon. gentleman's position, considering that every fifth-class lawyer in the country is a Queen's Counsel.

Mr. DALY. Except yourself.

Mr. MARTIN. If he is a Tory.

Mr. DALY. I suppose you include the Attorney General of Manitoba.

Mr. MARTIN. But, he is not a Tory. A distinguished Queen's Counsel said to me the other day in Winnipeg, that he wished he could get rid of his right to be a Queen's Counsel, because, he said, nowadays it is a greater distinction not to be a Queen's Counsel than to be one. Why, my opponent in the city of Winnipeg, a very respectable lawyer but a gentleman who hardly ever appears in court, when he was defeated, he was made a Queen's Counsel.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. He was not paid any money.

Mr. MARTIN. No. Here we have the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot), a lawyer, a Queen's Counsel, and a member of this House, actually telling me what he thinks of what occurred in Manitoba, based on statements contained in these affidavits. If the hon. gentleman were a judge would he express the slightest opinion upon a case, either of the defendant or the plaintiff, based upon affidavits which the other side had not had an opportunity of answering?

Mr. AMYOT. I do not speak of these affidavits. I speak of the facts of the case as they appeared at St. François Xavier. It was promised there, that if the Greenway candidate was elected, and if the government of Mr. Greenway succeeded, that never would the Catholic schools be touched, that never would the French language be interfered with, and that the territorial divisions would not be changed. But immediately after, when on account of these solemn promises the Greenway candidate was elected; the first opportunity was taken by that government, to deprive the French

of their schools, of their language, and of their territorial divisions. The hon. member (Mr. Martin) has had eight years to contradict that, and he never could contradict it, and he never will be able to contradict it.

Mr. MARTIN. These are the very affidavits I have referred to. The hon. gentleman will find them on page 129 of the papers in reference to the Manitoba school case, presented to Parliament during the session of 1895. The first one he will find is an affidavit of James Fisher, of the city of Winnipeg, barrister-at-law—a long affidavit, referring to these very suggestions which the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) has taken as true.

Mr. AMYOT. It is not from that book I take them at all.

Mr. MARTIN. Where did you get them?

Mr. AMYOT. We got them from Manitoba years and years ago. They were given to the public, and they are well known, and the hon. gentleman is not able to deny their truthfulness.

Mr. MARTIN. I say, I am able to deny the truthfulness of the statements made in those affidavits; but I never had an opportunity of doing so, because they were withdrawn. The gentleman who presented them, Mr. Ewart, dared not allow an answer to them; and, rather than submit them to be answered by those affected, he preferred to withdraw them, and did withdraw them. But, in spite of that, we have them printed at length in this official book, bearing the Government stamp, and sent broadcast throughout the land to influence the electors on this question; and, if they have influenced, as they appear to have done, the learned Queen's Counsel, the hon. member for Bellechasse, who knows something about the circumstances, and must have known that they were withdrawn, how much greater must be their influence, and how much more unfair their operation, upon the great body of the electors, who cannot be supposed to know all these circumstances to which I have alluded.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I wish to say a few words with regard to my own connection with the legislation which is before us for consideration. As there has been an endeavour throughout Canada, by the use of certain statements made by me, to discredit through me the 1890 Act of Manitoba, I desire to explain just what I did. I have nothing to withdraw. I stand by every word that I have said on this question. But I protest against the unfair manner in which advocates of the Government have misrepresented my attitude with regard to this question. Last year, on the 25th June, while the House was in session, having observed in one of the papers here, that the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Ouimet) had stated in an interview, that, if the Roman

Catholics were allowed to have religious exercises in their schools in Manitoba, they would be perfectly prepared to accept the 1890 Act as it was. I wrote the following letter to the "Citizen" newspaper of this city:—

Editor Citizen,—I notice in your issue of today's an interview with the Hon. Mr. Ouimet, from which the following is an extract:—

However, it would be idle to discuss that now as no legislation has been asked by the Catholics of Manitoba giving them the right to share in the funds provided for education by the Government or by the local authorities if their schools are not up in secular teaching, to the public schools of the province. All that they ask is to be at liberty to add to the secular education required in the public schools such religious teaching as will meet their religious views. I may say that if that had been provided for in the legislation of 1890, we would never have heard of the Manitoba schools question.

There has been all along a very serious misunderstanding between the Roman Catholic church and the people of Manitoba, if the above is an accurate statement of the position of the church. I suppose, however, that we must take for granted that Col. Ouimet is in a position to formulate the wishes of the Roman Catholics in connection with this question. If so, then I may say at once that there is no need of any remedial legislation in order to bring about such a state of affairs. I believe the people of Manitoba would be willing to give the Roman Catholics all that is asked for.

Everybody wishes that a solution of the question may be found without any coercion on the part of the Dominion Parliament, and if the demands of the minority are correctly expressed by the Minister, I am very much at sea in my acquaintance with the views of the Manitoba people, if they will not bring about of their own accord all that is asked.

When I introduced the School Bill of 1890, I pointed out that in so far as it provided for religious exercises in the schools, it was in my opinion defective. I am one of those who deny the right of the state to interfere in any way with matters of religion. I said then, and I still think that the clause of the 1890 Act, which provides for certain religious exercises, is most unjust to Roman Catholics. If the state is to recognize religion in its school legislation, such a recognition as is acceptable to Protestants only, and in fact only to a majority, of Protestants, is, to my mind, rank tyranny. The desire of those with whom I think in this matter is to eliminate every question of a religious nature from the school laws and to make the school laws purely secular. This has not been done in Manitoba, and that course is apparently not supported by a majority of the people there. That being so, surely it will be admitted that the nature of the religious exercises or religious teaching (I am unable to make any clear distinction between the two) should be such as is agreeable to the consciences of those whose money is taken to support the schools. I have sufficient faith in the liberality of the Manitoba people to declare on their behalf that if a final settlement of this question can be reached upon the lines suggested by Col. Ouimet, they will do their part. What Manitoba has insisted upon is that the Roman Catholics shall not have a system of separate schools such as existed prior to 1890, which were exempt from the general laws as to efficiency. If the Roman Catholics are willing to accept the

Mr. MARTIN.

schools as they exist at present and as they may from time to time be modified with the addition of such religious teaching as they may desire, then there should be and I am sure would be no difficulty in reaching a settlement of the whole question without any legislation on the part of the Dominion Parliament.

Yours truly,

JOSEPH MARTIN.

Ottawa, June 25th, 1895.

Now, Sir, I still adhere to every word in that letter; and I again make the statement, that, if this is the only objection that the Roman Catholics have to our legislation in Manitoba—that there are religious exercises there which are not acceptable to them, though acceptable to Protestants—the people of Manitoba, in order to settle this question, would be willing to remove from their schools all religious exercises. If that were not done and it were insisted upon by Protestants that the religious exercises which are acceptable to them should remain there, the people of Manitoba would be prepared to give those schools in Catholic districts the same right to have religious exercises suitable to them. I have no doubt of that. And if it were not so, if the people of Manitoba were prepared to consider the conscience of Protestants and not the conscience of Catholics, they would be guilty of the rankest tyranny; and knowing the people of Manitoba as I know them, I am satisfied that they would not rest under any such imputation. I am opposed myself to any religious exercises in the schools, simply for the reason that I consider that we have no right to deal with the question of religion in the legislature. I believe it is one of the subjects that, under the British North America Act, belongs neither to the Dominion Parliament nor the local legislatures—the determining of what religion a citizen of Canada shall profess or be taught. That, it seems to me, is something, under our constitution, over which none of our legislatures have control or should have control, and I say that any attempt to deal with the question of religion in a community who are not all of the same religion, is wrong. I say further, in support of the stand I take, that the schools should be secular, and that, so far as the religious exercises provided for by law in Manitoba are concerned, they are of no importance whatever. They are merely formal, and I may say that one of the leading divines of the Presbyterian Church in Manitoba, when I put the question to him: Do you consider that the reading of those passages of Scripture and the prayers provided have any effect at all upon the religious education of the children in the schools, he admitted to me that they had not, that the matter was one purely of sentiment, and that the reason he desired those religious exercises was in order that the people might not be able to say that we had godless schools. Now, surely there is nothing in that. If religious

exercises are of such purely formal character as to have no effect upon the character or the religious education of the children, then surely we can well afford, rather than have any citizen of that country feel that he is imposed upon in his conscientious belief, to do away with that small modicum of religious exercises. That is the stand I take; and I must say this, that the wrong is about as small as can be under the circumstances, because, in the first place, the question of having religious exercises is entirely within the control of the trustees in each district. If the trustees are, as they may be under the Act, all Catholics, or a majority Catholic, they can refuse to have these religious exercises. If they are Protestants who think like me, who are opposed to religious exercises on the ground that I take, they can refuse to have them; and I must say that I believe in the majority of school districts in Manitoba they do not have them. I believe, in actual practice, most of the schools in Manitoba are godless schools in the sense in which I refer to them. Therefore, I say it was a great mistake that when we were making this Act of 1890, we did not eliminate from it all suggestions of any attempt to influence the children one way or the other, in a religious sense. Because the moment you go beyond the purely formal exercises in the schools, you get at once into trouble. The moment you attempt to inculcate religious dogma in a mixed community, the question is, what dogma? Even amongst Protestants, supposing there are no Catholics, the question would be whether you would inculcate Christianity, as understood by the Presbyterians or by the Episcopalians. If you are going to have religion as one of the subjects to be taught in the schools, it follows that the teacher must be competent to give religious instruction. Therefore, he must be examined upon religion. What is to be the test? Is he to answer questions according to the Episcopalian, the Baptist, the Methodist or the Presbyterian view?

Mr. DAVIN. I want just for my own information and the information of the House, to ask my hon. friend, who was Minister in Manitoba at the time, I believe, whether one set of districts and one set of inspectors and one set of trustees were all abolished, and one set retained—whether the Protestant set was retained and the Roman Catholic abolished?

Mr. MARTIN. The hon. gentleman's question has no bearing on the point I am now treating. I have no objection to refer to that when I come to it, and I will give the hon. gentleman full explanation of what was done in that matter; but surely the very question that is put by the hon. member, representing a constituency contiguous to Manitoba, shows that before dealing with this subject, the Government ought to have inquired as to these very matters concern-

ing which the hon. gentleman is seeking information. What better evidence can we have that they do not know anything about that, that they do not know what was done, that they do not know how the Act of 1890 was an interference, or how the Acts prior to 1890 were interferences, and what was the effect of them—whether the schools were good schools or bad schools? All these questions all this desire which this House has shown from the very commencement of this debate, a most laudable desire, to learn something about it, is the strongest kind of argument against the autocratic action of the Government in deciding the whole question in the entire absence of any knowledge whatever on the subject. The hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) refers to a matter which is being put forward as an objection to the 1890 Act. It may be that it is an objection, it may be that perhaps there might have been some unfairness in that respect, but I do not think so. The 1890 Act abolished all the old laws and started out with a new system entirely. It interfered as fully and as completely with the Protestant schools as it did with the Roman Catholic schools. There were two Boards of Education. One was composed exclusively of Catholics and had entire control of matters in Catholic schools, and the other was composed entirely of Protestants and had entire control in Protestant schools. The government, of which I was a member, being a Liberal government, being imbued with the idea that the government should bear full responsibility for the expenditure of all money entrusted to them for the carrying out of the laws, in 1890, came to the conclusion that that system was not right, regarding it from that standpoint. They held that the government had no right to hand over to a board of Catholics or a board of Protestants a large amount of government money, and allow that board to spend the money and regulate these schools, and thus relieve themselves from all responsibility as to the manner in which those schools were carried on. They believed that it was the duty of the government to see to the execution of the school laws. For that reason they abolished both boards. The point that the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) more particularly alluded to, as I understand it, was with regard to school trustees. Now, there was, in most cases, no difficulty. In most cases throughout the province the Catholic school districts were quite separate and apart from the Protestant districts, and the law was the same in both cases. The old district was declared to be a new district under the new law, and the old trustees—in the case of a Catholic district, the Catholic trustees, and in the case of a Protestant district, the Protestant trustees—were continued in office until the next election. When the next election came round, every person who owned land in the school district, whether he

was a Protestant or a Roman Catholic, was a ratepayer under the law, and was entitled to vote in the election for trustees. There were, however, one or two cases in the province where the school districts were co-terminus, the Protestant and Catholic districts covering the same territory. Some special provision had to be made for these cases. I do not think that this occurred in any other place than the city of Winnipeg. The statute provided that in such cases the Protestant board should be the school board under the statute until the next election. Now, it may be that there was some slight unfairness in that. But, in discussing that provision, I stated to the House that if the Roman Catholic members of the House thought that it was not fair, the government were prepared to change it in any direction they suggested. It was a matter of very small importance. This was in the month of May, and in December the annual school trustee elections came on, and it was a mere question whether we should order a special election in Winnipeg in May to choose trustees for the unexpired portion of the year, or continue the Catholic or the Protestant board in control of school matters until the regular time for the election. Strictly speaking, it was not exactly fair to continue the Protestant board in operation even for that short time. But, as I have stated, I offered to make any change that the Roman Catholic members of the legislature might suggest. They declined to make any suggestions, taking the ground, which, I think, was not unfair, from their standpoint, that they thought the law unconstitutional, and would not be responsible for any part of it. They were wrong, as it turned out. This has been put forward as a strong argument as against our course, but I think that if there was a wrong, it was a trifling one, and I am sure that if they had made any suggestions, their views would have been met.

Now, I desire to say a few words with regard to the effect of the Manitoba Act upon this question in supplement to what I have already said with regard to the remedial order. I take this stand, Mr. Speaker—I believe that the Remedial Bill which is now before us for consideration is wholly unconstitutional and ultra vires, and I shall endeavour to satisfy the House of the correctness of that position from a constitutional standpoint. How do we get jurisdiction in this matter? How does it come that this Parliament is entitled to deal with education in Manitoba, it having been provided in the Manitoba Act that the province shall have exclusive jurisdiction in educational matters. Our jurisdiction arises from the fact that the Privy Council in England have interpreted the subsections of section 22, which conferred the jurisdiction as to education upon Manitoba to mean this: That if Manitoba, at any time, passes a statute which gives rights or privileges to the minority, and afterwards re-

Mr. MARTIN.

peals that statute, there shall be a right of appeal to the Governor General in Council, and to Parliament. Subsection 3 provides as follows:—

In case any such provincial law, as from time to time seems to the Governor General in Council requisite for the due execution of the provisions of this section is not made, or in case any decision of the Governor General in Council on any appeal under this section is not duly executed by the proper provincial authority in that behalf, then, and in every such case, and as far only as the circumstances of each case require, the Parliament of Canada may make remedial law for the due execution of the provisions of this section, and of any decision of the Governor General in Council under this section.

When are they to make it? In case such provincial laws are not made. Now, Mr. Speaker, has the legislature of Manitoba ever had the opportunity of passing, as a provincial law, the Remedial Bill which is proposed for our consideration? Never. They have never been asked to pass it. And I say that is the source of the jurisdiction of this House—that there should have been a first refusal of the legislature of Manitoba to enact such provincial law as “seems to the Governor General in Council requisite for the due execution of the provisions of this section.” That is one reason. Another reason is that the Governor in Council has never determined that this Remedial Bill which we are asked to pass is requisite for the due execution of the provisions of section 22. I say that this Parliament has no jurisdiction to pass an Act upon the subject of education in Manitoba until the Governor General in Council, as provided in section 22, has passed an order providing for that Act. And another circumstance must intervene, and that is that the order must be transmitted to the legislature of Manitoba and they must refuse to pass the Act. Now, neither of these things has been done—there has been no Order in Council by the Governor General providing that this provincial law shall be enacted by Manitoba; there has been no refusal of the legislature of Manitoba to enact this provincial law. We propose to coerce Manitoba by this Bill. We propose to usurp the jurisdiction of Manitoba, which I grant, under certain circumstances, we have the right to do, and we are bound to do. But I say those circumstances must arise. It is suggested that the remedial order goes further than this, and will include any Bill not exceeding the remedial order. I say no; I say that you are just as far wrong when you fall short of the remedial order as when you exceed it. Because the whole thing comes down to this. Has Manitoba ever refused to pass this law? It is suggested by some that it cannot make any difference; that Manitoba has been asked to restore the schools as they were. In answer to that request of the Government upon them they might have passed this Act; therefore they have had an oppor-

tunity to pass it, and it was no injustice to them for this House to do so. I think that is an absurd argument. We do not get this jurisdiction as a matter of justice or injustice to Manitoba; we do not get this jurisdiction as a matter of fair-play to Manitoba; we only get it under certain circumstances, and those circumstances must arise before we have the jurisdiction. It makes no difference whether Manitoba has had a chance to do it or not. You might as well say that you need never send a remedial order to Manitoba. An argument of that kind proves altogether too much, because, if the transmission of a broad remedial order which covered everything, which restored the schools just as they were, gave Manitoba an opportunity of legislating thus far, then there was really no necessity of sending it to them at all. You might say we have got jurisdiction here, because they should never have gone wrong. It is clear that if they have gone wrong, they should not have gone wrong; therefore there is no injustice in putting them right. But our jurisdiction does not arise from any such considerations as that; our jurisdiction is to come within the express words of section 22, and unless we come within section 22, we have not got any jurisdiction. I would like to know how the legislature of Manitoba could ever have foreseen the Remedial Bill proposed now by the Government, from reading the remedial order. Do you think it would have been possible by any guess of the legislature to have arrived at the abortion of an Act which is put forward on behalf of the Roman Catholic minority in Manitoba? Could they ever have supposed, after what has been said by His Grace the Archbishop of St. Boniface, by the clergy of Quebec, by the advocates of remedial legislation—could the legislature of Manitoba ever have supposed for a moment that an Act like this would have met the difficulty? Why, when we come to go into suggestions of that kind, where do we land? We cannot depart from the letter of the law. There is a clear system laid down, and it is very simple, first, that the Governor General in Council must decide the kind of law, and he must embody that in an Order in Council. That must be transmitted to the legislature of Manitoba. If they accept it and act upon it, that ends the whole difficulty. On the other hand, if they refuse to carry it out, this Parliament has jurisdiction, not to deal with the question of education in Manitoba, not to exercise their discretion as to what kind of a law is proper to be enacted for Manitoba, but to put into the statute-book the law which the Governor General in Council has deemed requisite for the due execution of the provisions of this section. That is what we can do, and that is the only thing we can do. We have no discretion. I do not say for a moment, Mr. Speaker, that the Remedial Bill must be simply a copy of the remedial order. We have the right, once vested with jurisdiction, to devise any expedient that we may

think fit to give effect to our jurisdiction. We have a right to provide every kind of detail in order that our jurisdiction may be effectually executed. But we have no right to depart from the provisions of the constitution. Our Act must carry out the remedial order in every particular; every one will admit that it cannot exceed it. I humbly submit that the considerations which I offer for your approval show conclusively that we can no more fall short of it than we can exceed it. If that be so, Mr. Speaker, it is to my mind a further argument emphasizing the great crime that the Government committed in attempting to decide the nature of this legislation, of this interference, with Manitoba, in the absence of all knowledge of the circumstances under which a statute was passed, the circumstances of the people to whom the statute applies, the probable effect upon the majority and upon the minority of the proposed legislative interference of this House. The hon. the Secretary of State, in his remarks upon this Bill, contended that there was no coercion. Well, I do not know what coercion means, Mr. Speaker, if it is not the exercise of the jurisdiction given us here.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Was the Bill of 1890, coercion?

Mr. MARTIN. Well, I am not prepared to say whether it was or was not. It is not material to this question, and the Privy Council of England has decided that it was quite constitutional, quite fair, and quite just.

Mr. COSTIGAN. They decided it took away rights, and forced the minority to support schools they did not believe in.

Mr. MARTIN. In the Barrett case they decided everything in our favour; on the other hand, in the second case they decided that the taking away of those rights from the minority, gave a right of appeal here; and as I say, the moment that the Privy Council gave that second decision, the people of Manitoba were placed in a very different position from what they were before. Sir, I have no hesitation in saying that in no part of Canada is there a people more law-abiding, with greater respect for constituted authority and for the constitution, than the people who reside in the province of Manitoba. I venture to say that in no part of Canada is there less crime in proportion to population than there is in that province. They are law-abiding, they recognize the constitution, the Government in their answers have said so each time, and they admit that this Parliament, after the matter has been investigated and an Order in Council has been properly passed, has jurisdiction to interfere. But it must be by coercion, or else there is no use for it, as the hon. gentleman has said. What does it imply? It implies that a wrong has been done to the minority of that province, and that the Governor Gen-

eral in Council has called upon the legislature to right that wrong, and the legislature has refused. Therefore, under the provision of this constitutional Act, the Parliament of Canada forces the legislature of Manitoba to do justice in the premises. That is what coercion is; any interference by this Parliament, under circumstances of that kind, would be coercion.

We, in Manitoba, do not contend, that this Parliament has no right to coerce us, but we do contend, that, where the constitution has seen fit to give a responsibility of that kind to the Parliament of Canada, this Parliament is not doing justice to itself, nor to Manitoba, if it proceeds to the extremity of coercing that province until every other expedient has been tried. We say the Government have proceeded to coercion without trying every other expedient, without making the slightest attempt to see whether the people of Manitoba were prepared, in view of the decision of the Privy Council, and in view of the position in which they were placed constitutionally, to deal with the question themselves. From what has already fallen from me, it must be clear to the House, that I am in favour of a full investigation of this matter. I favour an investigation and inquiry into the circumstances that existed there, not because it is the policy enunciated by the leader of the Opposition, because I should like to say in this House, as I have said out of it, that this question is with me one that transcends party, and, if the policy of the leader of the Opposition did not meet with my approval, I would feel bound to oppose it in every way until justice was done in this respect to my province. I say, therefore, that I do not adopt the policy of investigation because it is what has been asked by the province which I stand here to represent. When the remedial order was sent to the legislature of Manitoba, after refusing most positively and most definitely to obey the remedial order, this is what the province said:

We believe that when the remedial order was made there was not available then to Your Excellency in Council full and accurate information as to the working of our former system of schools. We also believe there was lacking means of forming a correct judgment as to the effect on the province of the changes indicated in the order. Being impressed with this view, we respectfully submit that it is not yet too late to make full and complete investigation of the whole subject. Should such a course be adopted, we will cheerfully assist in affording the most complete information available. An investigation of such a kind would furnish a substantial basis of fact upon which conclusions could be framed with a reasonable degree of certainty. It is urged most strongly that upon such an important a matter, involving as it does, the religious feelings and convictions of different classes of the people of Canada, and the educational interests of their province, which is expected to become one of the most important in the Dominion, no hasty action should be taken; but that

Mr. MARTIN.

on the contrary, the greatest care and deliberation should be exercised, and a full and thorough investigation made.

That was the first answer. When this Government, which was bound to pass their remedial order at once—it could not afford time for Manitoba to prepare its case; time was the essence of the contract, and it had to be done at once—ascertained the trend of public opinion, they found time to adjourn the passing of the Remedial Bill from July, 1895, to January, 1896, in order that a second attempt might be made upon the province to see if the provincial government would recede from their position. Again the province of Manitoba made it most clear and distinct, that they were prepared to assist in every way in an investigation. I know the Minister of Marine and Fisheries does not desire that the province of Manitoba should settle this matter. He is, probably, the only man in this House who does not wish it.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The hon. gentleman does not know anything of the kind, and he has no right to say so.

Mr. MARTIN. The hon. gentleman's own utterances show it. The hon. gentleman said, in this House, that he would be very sorry to have a settlement made by the province of Manitoba; that they did not want a settlement.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Never.

Mr. MARTIN. That they wanted to pass remedial legislation.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I rise to a point of order. I hope the hon. gentleman does not feel bound to give such an interpretation of what I stated on that occasion. I have explained before, that the dropping of one word in the unrevised "Hansard" might have exposed me to that misinterpretation of what I said. I have already explained the matter. I have stated repeatedly, and the country knows it, and no man has said more plainly than I have, that the question should be settled by the legislature, instead of being brought here. I have always said that.

Mr. MARTIN. The hon. gentleman has been very unfortunate, I must admit.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Not so unfortunate as the hon. gentleman thinks.

Mr. MARTIN. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Costigan) did make an explanation, and he said that the word "not" ought to be put in, but the difficulty is, if you put the word "not" in, you have all the other parts of the speech to explain. You have the part of it to explain where he said: That even if we had Mr. Greenway's promise it would not be any good to us, and where he said: We want the Remedial Bill and we want to coerce Manitoba.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Martin) is wrong. The hon. gentleman has

no right to state what he may believe to be true, but which I know is wrong. I never said I wanted coercion.

Mr. SPEAKER. When the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Costigan) says that he did not use the word, of course the hon. gentleman (Mr. Martin) must accept that statement.

Mr. MARTIN. I certainly do, but I say I have got my impression of what the hon. gentleman meant from what he was reported to have said in the "Hansard." Of course the "Hansard" may be wrong. I know it is a very inconvenient thing to have.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Is that the corrected "Hansard" you are about to read from?

Mr. MARTIN. I am not disputing what the hon. gentleman says. I accept his statement now, of what he desired to say, but I suppose it is not out of order to read what got into the "Hansard" in some way or other. I suppose the reported must have been listening to some other gentleman, and thought it was the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. That hon. gentleman said:

I hope I will not be offensive to any hon. gentleman, but I will as a matter of duty state clearly that my convictions are, not from a desire to attack any hon. gentleman, but to state the matter as I understand it, and my observations are of course subject to correction. At that time, to speak of a commission was to throw the question overboard so far as the minority was concerned, it was to rely upon the legislature of Manitoba to redress the grievance and to do justice to the minority. If the leader of the Opposition had a guarantee in his pocket and could produce it before this House, from the government of Manitoba, stating that in 24 hours from this time they would amend their law and re-establish separate schools, acquiescing in the remedial order, I say that would be no remedy, that it would be no settlement of the case, that they could kick it aside three months afterwards, if they thought it had not worked well.

Mr. SPEAKER. I would point out to the hon. member (Mr. Martin) two breaches of the rules, which he is committing. In the first place, he is reading from the report of a past debate, and again, even supposing that the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Costigan) was reported exactly as the hon. member from Winnipeg (Mr. Martin) states he was in the "Hansard"; if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Costigan) denies he made this statement, his denial must be accepted.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Permit me to point out, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member (Mr. Costigan) did not deny that he is correctly reported; but simply, that one word is omitted which he declared altered the construction of the whole sentence. It is easy for the hon. gentleman (Mr. Martin) to put in the word "not," and then we have the exact fact.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the hon. member (Sir Richard Cartwright) cannot very well get over the objection; that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Martin) is reading from a past debate.

Mr. MARTIN. There is no question, that is the binding rule of this House. It is a little inconvenient sometimes, but I will have to submit to it. Well, Mr. Speaker, I was going on to say, that while they were in such a violent hurry to pass such a remedial order, that time could not be allowed for anything, yet these gentlemen allowed considerable time to elapse between the receipt here of the answer to the remedial order, and their announcement of what they intended to do. And for what purpose did they delay? Why, we are told, it was for the purpose of seeing if they could not get some settlement out of Manitoba. It was for the purpose of trying again to get Manitoba to submit to the remedial order. And Mr. Speaker, the legislature of Manitoba lays down in the clearest language, that they are prepared to deal with this question fairly and reasonably. They say as follows:—

It is a matter of regret that the invitation extended by the legislative assembly to make a proper inquiry into the facts of the case has not been accepted, but that, as above stated, the advisers of His Excellency have declared their policy without investigation. It is equally a matter of regret that Parliament is apparently about to be asked to legislate without investigation. It is with all deference submitted that such a course seems to be quite incapable of reasonable justification and must create the conviction that the educational interests of the people of the province of Manitoba are being dealt with in a hostile and peremptory way by a tribunal whose members have not approached the subject in a judicial spirit or taken the proceedings necessary to enable them to form a proper opinion upon the merits of the question.

The inquiry asked for by the reply of the legislature to the remedial order should, in the opinion of the undersigned, be again earnestly invited, and in the event of the invitation being accepted the scope of the inquiry should be sufficiently wide to embrace all available facts relating to the past or present school systems.

The desire of the legislature and government of the province throughout the whole course of the proceedings, beginning with the enactment of the statutes of 1890, has been to provide the best possible means of education for the children of our citizens. To that end every possible effort has been put forth and every possible pecuniary sacrifice made in order that there might be established a school system based upon sound principles and equipped and administered in accordance with approved modern educational methods. Though very much remains to be accomplished it may be fairly asserted that a reasonable measure of success has attended the efforts which have thus been put forth.

In amending the law from time to time and in administering the system it is the earnest desire to remedy every well-founded grievance and to remove every appearance of inequality or injustice that may be brought to notice.

With a view to so doing, the government and the legislature will always be ready to consider

any complaint that may be made in a spirit of fairness and conciliation.

It seems, therefore, most reasonable to conclude that by leaving the question to be so dealt with, the truest interests of the minority will be better served than by an attempt to establish a system of separate schools by coercive legislation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have endeavoured to point out, that the remedial order has absolutely prevented the Government of Manitoba from entertaining any of the numerous suggestions that have been made to them, by and on behalf of the Dominion Government, with a view of their entering into negotiations with this matter. If that be so, if that fatal error of the Government has had that effect, how much more will the passing of a coercive measure in this Parliament tend in the same direction. I think it will be admitted by every one who favours remedial legislation, by the advocates of the rights and wrongs of the minority in Manitoba, that the most effectual way in which to remedy those wrongs, is to have them remedied by the legislature of Manitoba. I might go further. I might say that in my opinion no coercive Bill passed by this Parliament could ever be effectually carried out in Manitoba so as to be of real advantage to the minority in that province. As long as the people there believe that they have been unfairly treated, as long as they feel that the coercive power of this Parliament has been employed unduly and hastily, without giving them an opportunity to show the facts, and without proving a case against them, they will feel inclined to throw every obstacle in the way of the carrying out of a measure passed by this Parliament. The Government themselves, by the provisions which they have inserted in this Bill, have acknowledged that, in order effectually to carry out the remedy for the minority which they offer, they must have the concurrence of the government of Manitoba: because they provide that the government of Manitoba are to appoint a Roman Catholic board, and are to pay over the proper share of the government grant to the Roman Catholic board brought into existence by this Act. By these provisions they admit that the law can be properly put into execution only with the approval and concurrence of the local authorities. I say, therefore, that the Government, having made one fatal mistake in passing the remedial order in the terms in which it is couched, and under the circumstances under which they did pass it, will intensify the difficulty very much, indeed, if they press to a conclusion the coercive Bill now before the House. I believe that if that Bill be withdrawn, and the remedial order of the 21st of March be rescinded, the people of Manitoba, being law-abiding, and understanding the position in which they have been placed by the second decision of the Privy Council, will be prepared to do justice in the premises. I am not bound to rely upon my own knowledge of the people of

Mr. MARTIN.

Manitoba in making that statement, because we have it from the government and the legislature of Manitoba, that they recognize their position, that they do not propose to fight the constitution, that their objection to the remedial order and to the Remedial Bill is not that this Government and this Parliament have no jurisdiction in the premises, but that the jurisdiction conferred upon the Governor General in Council, and upon this Parliament, has not been exercised in a manner calculated to bring about a settlement of this question—in a manner calculated to really aid the minority, on whose behalf it is suggested we should pass this law. We all desire to remove this question from the arena of Dominion politics. I believe every word the hon. Minister of Justice gave utterance to as to the intense desire of the Government that they should not be called upon to exercise this jurisdiction. That desire is reciprocated on this side of the House. We also would be glad if there were no Manitoba school question in this House. That there is a Manitoba school question in this House, that we are here taken away from the subjects we should properly be considering, to deal with a matter of interest only to a small community, and delegated to the constitution to the legislature of the province to which that community belongs, is, I say, the fault of the Government who have control for the time being of the destinies of Canada. It is their fault. They thought they could gain great political capital by the step they took. They had decided to appeal at once to the country. They were under the impression that this hasty action would bring to their side the votes of a large percentage of the electorate of Canada. They have found that instead of it bringing them political strength, it has brought them political disunion. They have found that in every constituency that has been opened since they passed that unfortunate remedial order, they have been weakened instead of strengthened. And they find now, when they propose to follow their remedial order with a coercive Bill, that they have arrayed against them a large section of the members of this House, who were elected to support them, and who agree with them in other matters of policy. I say, Mr. Speaker, that they have brought all this upon themselves by their own action. The policy of the hon. leader of the Opposition is exactly the opposite of the policy of the Government. I am very glad, indeed, from the stand that has been taken by the legislature of the province from which I come, that I am able to support the policy of the hon. leader of the Opposition upon this question. As I said before, if that policy were not a fair one to Manitoba, if it were not in the interests of Manitoba, I should feel bound to register my vote against the leader of the Opposition, and, if necessary, in favour of the Government. I am not placed in that position. I am here prepar-

ed, heartily prepared, to vote for the six months' hoist of this Bill. By that vote, I do not intend to express the idea that this Parliament should not interfere in the Manitoba school question; but I intend to express the idea that the action of the Government in this matter has been wrong, from beginning to end, that they have not been actuated by proper motives, that they have taken hold of the question in the wrong way; I believe that there is no man in Canada better fitted to bring about a solution of this troublesome and burning question than the hon. gentleman whom the Liberals have the great good fortune to have at their head. That gentleman has the confidence, I believe, of a large portion of his native province. He also has the confidence of a large portion of the people of Manitoba, the province particularly affected by this question. He has announced his policy as being opposed to any attempt at coercing that province unless and until it is shown clearly and distinctly, that the province of Manitoba is not prepared to submit to the constitution and is not prepared to redress wrongs when these wrongs have been pointed out to it. If that gentleman comes to power, we believe that there will never be any necessity for his proposing in this House a coercive law for Manitoba. I am satisfied that he will be able to settle this question, not, as I understand the cheers of hon. gentlemen opposite to mean, because the government of Manitoba happens to be Liberal and he is the Liberal leader; not at all for that reason, but because he has taken a statesman-like view of this question. It is not the Liberals of Manitoba who have taken their stand upon this question; it is the people of Manitoba. Conservatives in that province are just as strong upon the school question as the Liberals. The government there which would attempt to use that question as the football of party, would soon lose the support of the people of that province. Therefore, I say, it is not because the leader of the Opposition in this House is the leader of the party to which the government of that province belongs, that I look to an amicable settlement, under his auspices, of this question, but because he, from the first, has taken a high exalted position upon it—a position which is calculated to inspire confidence in him by the people of Canada from British Columbia to Nova Scotia, including the province of Manitoba. I look for a settlement in that way, but I have no hesitation in saying, that the people of Manitoba have not put themselves in the wrong upon this question, no one will refuse to accord this to the legislature of Manitoba, that, upon each occasion when they have been called upon to express themselves upon this question, they have done so in a dignified, statesmanlike way. They have touched the question fairly, and, if they are fairly approached, as I know they will be, by the

hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier), when that gentleman becomes, as he soon will become, the Premier of Canada, we will have heard the last of the Manitoba school question, and this Parliament will proceed to do the proper business of the Dominion of Canada, which requires so much, and has so little, of its real consideration for the past seventeen years.

Mr. DALY moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER moved the adjournment of the House.

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 9th March, 1896.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

REPORT.

Report of the Department of Printing and Stationery, for the year ending 30th June, 1895.—(Sir Charles Tupper.)

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 80) further to amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Béchard.)

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. WELDON. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to call the attention of the House to a paragraph which appeared in the Toronto "News" of Saturday, 7th instant, reading as follows:—

Dr. Weldon was willing to go into the Bowell Administration a few weeks ago and accept the remedial policy and office together.

I sent a copy of this extract to the Prime Minister, requesting from him an answer which I might communicate to the House, and to-day, I have that answer, as follows:—

Dear Dr. Weldon,—

I have to acknowledge your note of 7th instant, calling my attention to a paragraph which appeared in the Toronto "News" of the same date, to the following effect:—

Then he gives the quotation:

This statement is entirely without foundation.

Yours sincerely,

MACKENZIE BOWELL.

I wish to say, Mr. Speaker, that it may be a question of practical politics within our party as to whether, at an early date, the "Toronto Mail" and the "Toronto News" should not be read out of the Liberal-Conservative party.

INQUIRIES FOR RETURNS.

Mr. CASEY. I wish to call the attention of the leader of the House to a matter in regard to which we had some conversation on Friday last. I supposed then that a return to an Order of the House which I moved some time ago had been brought down, and I find it in the index under a different heading. The return has come down, but there is in it an omission to which I wish to call attention. The order of the House was for—

Copies of all Orders in Council, instructions from the Government or any department, and other documents relating to the appointment of a High Commissioner in London, or the nature of his duties, or discharge of those duties, which have not already been laid before the House.

Now, the only documents contained in this return are a report of a committee of the Privy Council, dated 11th May, 1880, in regard to the appointment of Sir A. T. Galt as High Commissioner, with a copy of his commission; also copy of a report to the Privy Council, dated 24th May, 1880, in regard to his appointment, to which is attached a memorandum of instructions given to Sir A. T. Galt. These are of date 20th May, 1880. Now, the last return which was moved for was by Mr. Blake, in 1884, under circumstances which the Secretary of State will remember, for he was in the House at the time. I do not remember exactly what was brought down then, but I wish to obtain by my order documents of the same sort which have come into existence since that time. The hon. Secretary of State, in his dual capacity, will have special knowledge as to what documents of this nature exist, and I have no doubt now that I have called his attention to what is lacking in this return, he will take every means to get them down at the earliest possible date. I suppose he understands the scope of the motion, although I believe he was not present when it was moved. It is merely to get down such documents as will define the nature of the duties of the High Commissioner, and his relations to the Government and the different departments thereof.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I had not seen the return, but I will take immediate steps that the motion made by the hon. gentleman may be fully complied with as early as possible.

Mr. McMULLEN. I desire to inquire with respect to returns moved for on 17th January: 1. Showing the number of employees, employed temporarily or otherwise, who have not contributed to the Superannuation Fund. 2. The number of employees on the

Mr. WELDON.

Intercolonial Railway. Neither of these returns has as yet been brought down. Is there any hope of getting them shortly?

Mr. HAGGART. The order was given to Mr. Pottinger, manager of the Intercolonial Railway, to send up the information as soon as possible. It has not yet arrived.

Mr. McMULLEN. There was an order of the House passed on 17th February for a copy of tenders received during the year for the conveyance of mails between certain points in British Columbia. That would be a short document to prepare, and yet a month has elapsed, and it has not been brought down. When may I expect to get it?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I gave instructions, when the motion was passed, to have the document prepared, and I was under the impression that it had been brought down. But I will look into the matter, and have the return expedited as rapidly as possible.

Mr. McMULLEN. I was in the return office just before the opening of the House, and it has not been received.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. No doubt the hon. gentleman is right.

Mr. MULLOCK. I wish to call the attention of the Government to what I am told is an omission in regard to certain papers laid on the Table of the House two weeks ago. I am informed that the papers laid on the Table with respect to the report of the Board of Visitors to the Royal Military College at Kingston do not contain the full findings of the board, and there are other findings of an important character which have not yet been laid before the House. I am requested to ask if such is the case, and if those findings can be laid on the Table at an early date.

Mr. DICKEY. I laid on the Table the papers exactly as they were handed to me by the Deputy Minister. I understand there was a defect in the papers, and I will inquire immediately and correct the defect.

THE CANADIAN JOCKEY CLUB.

House again resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 48) respecting the Canadian Jockey Club.—(Mr. Tisdale.)

(In the Committee.)

Mr. MARTIN. When this Bill was before the House on a previous occasion, I asked that it might stand in order that I might have the opportunity of hearing from the racing association of Winnipeg. I have not had time to hear from that association, and I should like the Bill to stand for a further period, as I expect to hear in a day or two. I understand that amendments are to be proposed which will meet many of the

objections that were urged against the Bill by certain gentlemen in Ontario who are interested in it; but one of the strong objections to the Bill still remains, and that is that a committee of twelve is appointed by the shareholders of the club, and these shareholders are those who own the stock in this like any other incorporated joint stock company. If this body is to control racing in Canada, there should be provision made whereby the shares should be taken up by the different racing associations which are to be affiliated to this company, otherwise representation on the board will not amount to much: twelve original shareholders would control the organization, and the affiliated associations would have very little representation in the club. While it is true that the rights of the club to make regulations is confined to these clubs which are affiliated with it, still I believe the intention is that this club shall control racing in Canada, and this organization will be able to make such arrangements with the racing associations in the United States as to practically have a monopoly of racing in this country. I do not see any objection to that, provided each association is entitled to fair representation upon the board; but it highly undesirable to give to any small body of men having \$5,500 in stock subscribed, and \$550 paid up, practically the control of all these matters. It is objectionable that there should be any stock whatever. The proper system for an organization of this kind is to make it entirely representative of the different affiliated clubs, and there is very serious objection to racing associations, such as that in the city of Winnipeg, being controlled by an organization of this character. However, I speak without any great knowledge on the question, because I have had no time to communicate with the racing people of Winnipeg, and I should like very much if the promoter would allow the Bill to stand until Friday, by which time I am satisfied I shall have received an answer.

Mr. TISDALE. Would not Wednesday suit?

Mr. MARTIN. Yes. It takes a little over a week to get an answer from Winnipeg.

Mr. EDGAR. Before the committee rises I would draw the attention of the promoter of the Bill to one or two points which he might consider in the meantime. He was good enough to place in my hands a few moments ago some of the suggested amendments which have been assented to by the parties who desire the provisions of the Bill to be extended. It appears to me, however, that perhaps a little more is necessary to carry out what is intended. I would suggest that in section 4 it should be made quite clear when the next club committee shall be elected, because that does not appear on the face of the Bill. If that is left to be regulated by the Companies' Act, that leaves it to the company. By clause 5 it is

also left to the company to say when the meeting shall be held. Probably some provision could be placed in the Bill to prevent the first club committee lasting for years if it so chose. In the next place the amendment to section 4 does not, so far as I can see, provide how the representatives of the affiliated clubs are to be elected members of the committee. It says that each affiliated club shall be entitled to have one member on the committee; but it does not say in what way or how often the affiliated club shall elect its representative. I think the provision is inoperative unless it does that. Again, in section 5 enormous and unusual powers, though perhaps necessary powers, are given to the club committee in regard to the making of by-laws. For instance, it can make by-laws to disqualify jockeys and trainers, and to place all tracks under the control of the committee. That is a very strong power. The club committee makes these by-laws first; but they are of no good whatever until they are approved of, not by the affiliated clubs at all, but by the shareholders of this company, who have paid up \$2,000 of stock. In that way, I think the ultimate control of these by-laws and all the regulations covered by them would be left in the hands of the present company. I throw out these suggestions to the promoter of the Bill.

Mr. TISDALE. I am much obliged to my hon. friend for calling attention to these matters; but it seems to me that the Companies' Act, which is made applicable to this Act, will determine the time of the annual meeting. However, I will consider the matter with the promoters of the Bill; and, if there is any doubt, it will be removed.

Mr. EDGAR. It says according to the express provisions of the by-laws of the company.

Mr. TISDALE. I may say, for the information of the House, that since the last time the Bill was before us, there has been a meeting of the representatives of those who objected to the Bill, and the amendment which I am instructed to ask the House to introduce, covers all the points in dispute. However, it may be, as the hon. gentleman has suggested, that in considering these amendments, they have overlooked some of the technical provisions to which he has called attention, and I will have them considered. In the meantime, I have given notice of these amendments, so that they will be printed in the Orders, and hon. members of the House will be able to see what they are. I have no objection whatever to allowing the Bill to stand.

Committee rose and reported progress.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 64) to incorporate the Imperial Life Assurance Company of Canada.—(Mr. Coatsworth.)

CHIGNECTO MARINE TRANSPORT RAILWAY COMPANY.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Powell for second reading of Bill (No. 75) respecting the Chignecto Marine Transport Railway Company (Limited).

Mr. POWELL. In moving the second reading of this Bill, I may say that this matter has been before the House frequently, and I presume that all the members are fairly well acquainted with the objects of the Bill. As introduced originally, the Bill had some defects; and, at the instance of some hon. members, it was re-drafted and re-introduced as amended, and it now comes before the House for its second reading. The work of the company was begun some years ago. Its object was to connect the Bays Verte and Fundy by a railroad that would have the capability of transferring ships from one bay to the other. Upon that work the company have already expended some \$3,500,000. Their time for the completion of the work has expired, and the bondholders, who are now promoting the work, are desirous that the time be extended. The provisions of the Bill are, first, a mere reviving of the company; second, the renewal of the powers of two amending Acts as to preferential bonds and stock. I need not say anything further on the Bill, as hon. members are already acquainted with the work.

Mr. WELSH. Mr. Speaker, I do not like the look of this Bill. I have been keeping a sharp lookout after it, ever since it has been on the Order paper, and I do not like it. In the year 1882, I find that a Bill respecting this railway was introduced into this House by Mr. Cameron, of Victoria, and the matter was discussed very fully. The Secretary of State (Sir Charles Tupper) spoke very favourably of the Bill, and referred to the Chignecto Railway in glowing terms, and on May 8th, 1882. Sir Charles Tupper brought in a resolution to the effect that the House should go into Committee of the Whole to grant a subsidy to this company. It was a new question before the House at that time, and the matter was very fully discussed. The Hon. Mr. Mackenzie on that occasion said, that the matter was brought before them without giving the House time to consider it, and on May 11th, the Hon. Secretary of State spoke again on this matter, and said:

The whole question is thoroughly familiar to members of the House, and is so fully set forth in the papers which have been distributed, and the subject in one form or another has so long engaged the attention of Parliament, that I do not think it will be necessary to detain the House very long in explaining the proposal of the resolution.

The hon. gentleman then goes on to explain matters connected with the railway, and in

Mr. TISDALE.

speaking of the navigation of the Bay of Fundy, he remarks:

I regard the tide in the Bay of Fundy of the greatest possible advantage because it does not leave a vessel dependent upon the wind to the same extent as elsewhere. The vessels go up with one tide and down with another.

Well, I had not the honour of a seat in this House at that time, but there was a gentleman here, Mr. Killam, representing Yarmouth, who was intimately connected with shipping, and he opposed the scheme, in the following language:—

As to the commercial merits of the scheme I claim, speaking with all modesty, to be as fair a judge as any hon. gentleman on either side of the House. I leave all the statements of the Minister of Railways as to the number of fishing vessels which may use this railroad, the tonnage of the vessels entering the Bay of Fundy, and likely to use this railway, with his conjectures, as to whether a vessel could be carried up by the tide, to the public who are better qualified to judge than the hon. gentleman. But I do not believe his statement to-night that the railway has the commercial value he attaches to it. I believe any sort of transmission would have a certain amount of local commercial value, but not that general commercial value which he believes. I do not believe it would have that general commercial value which he believes. It might be possible to have some mode of crossing the Isthmus, which could save time and thus induce owners of vessels to pay some toll for crossing it. The commercial value of the work must be estimated by what those vessels would be willing to pay. Not one of the 600 fishing vessels spoken of bound for the United States ports could be expected to pass through the canal and be transported over the ship railway. With a fair wind they would square away to get out of the Gut of Canso, preferring to take their chances upon the open sea outside the Bay of Fundy, than to go into the Bay of Fundy where fogs and difficult navigation render the course more dangerous and necessitate their paying a higher rate of insurance. Nothing has been done since I have had the honour of representing a constituency in this House to show any serious intention of going on with the Baie Verte Canal. This canal will not be of very general commercial—but may be of considerable local—value. This proposal to vote \$150,000 a year for twenty years may be regarded as simply a means of attracting offers from capitalists, in order to get their idea as to what might be done. I do not see why, if the Government have deliberately adopted the intention of substituting the scheme of a ship railway, they should not have informed the House that they resume the responsibility, because the distinguished engineer who had this subject under consideration will be in a difficult position when he attempts to borrow money to proceed with its construction. It may be said to him, that the Canadian Government do not in any way endorse the scheme, that they did not think it was of sufficient commercial value to make it worth while to construct it, but are willing to say: If you will take the whole risk, you may do so, and if you succeed we will give you the annual subsidy. This indicates that the Hon. Minister of Railways has abandoned the scheme which for years he pretended to regard with so much favour. He gives it up, and says that if Mr. Ketchum, or somebody else will find

the money to build it, and make it a complete success, the Government will then pay the money. I look therefore, upon this as an abandonment of the project which the hon. Minister pretended he had at heart.

We therefore see, Mr. Speaker, that the only hon. gentleman who at that time was connected with shipping in the House, gave his opinion that this railway would be of no value to the country. Then, Mr. Speaker, we find again, when the House went into committee on that Bill, Sir Charles Tupper said :

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is proposed to make a contract on the terms of the proposal, taking every guarantee that the work shall be done in a proper manner and binding the Government, should the work be done to their entire satisfaction and the work satisfactorily performed, to pay the subsidy and to continue paying so long as the service is efficiently performed.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the leader of the Opposition in the House at that time, Mr. Blake, commented on this statement of Sir Charles Tupper, and made the following remarks which show how far-seeing that hon. gentleman was :—

Mr. BLAKE. I suppose the contract will enable the company to raise capital more easily. But the terms of the agreement may be such as may entangle us, inasmuch as capital is to be raised on the strength of them. Hence may arise some such kind of obligation, as is sometimes recognized by governments to pay the subsidy, inasmuch as capital was raised on it, although the conditions might not have been fulfilled.

That is fourteen years ago, Sir, and here we are to-day, with the obligation resting upon us that Mr. Blake foresaw. This matter has been before the House several times since 1882. In 1888 there was a long discussion on the question, and I believe nearly every member from New Brunswick spoke against this Bill. They all said the scheme was going to be a failure. I had the honour of a seat in the House at the time, and I took part in the discussion. On April 19th, 1888, the present Secretary of State (Sir Charles Tupper) moved the second reading of Bill (No. 101) to make further provision respecting the granting of a subsidy to the Chignecto Marine Transport Railway Company (Limited). Mr. Jones, then member for Halifax, opposed the Bill very strongly, and I took a hand in the discussion and spoke as follows :—

I quite agree with the words that have fallen from the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones). I think it is a work that is unnecessary, and that is my private opinion. I know the place well. I know Baie Verte and I know there is a shoal strand where you have to go for five miles from shore before you get twenty feet of water. I would like to know how you will build this railway. If you build it on the principle of a marine slip you will find great difficulty. Any person in this House conversant with the shipping interests knows that there are very few marine slips so perfect that they can take a ship out of

water and take her on the rocks on to the slip without doing her an injury. I say that in taking a ship out of water, say a ship 1,000 tons, loaded or unloaded, and conveying her overland, the chances are that the ship will be badly injured. If this Bill passes I hope there will be a clause inserted that the company will be liable for any damage or injury done to a ship during transport. I notice that this company applied for a charter seven years ago and that they got what they asked for. I find that a few years after they applied for an amendment to that Act. They obtained the amendment seven years after the passing of that Act granting them all they asked for, and without their putting a spade in the ground or having a shilling paid out they asked this House for further amendments. I think that is pressing the matter rather close. The hon. the Minister of Finance stated the other evening that everything comes to those who wait, and I think those gentlemen who applied for an amendment to the charter are acting upon that principle. I think it is a bad principle, where a company after seven years comes a third time applying to this House for further concessions or for further grants in some way or other, that we should grant it until they do something. In looking over the list of promoters of this scheme I do not find many shipowners among them. Every hon. gentleman in this House knows that some ten or twelve or thirteen years ago there was an agitation for a Baie Verte Canal, and this was agitated for a number of years. Finally the Government of the country appointed a commission to take evidence as to the feasibility and chance of success for that canal. I think that the result of that commission was that the canal was not warranted, that it was not feasible and that it would be of no service. I myself remember being in court when the evidence was taken.

Then I go on to repeat some evidence given by an old shipmaster in opposition to the scheme. The hon. member for St. John, N.B., (Mr. Ellis and Mr. Weldon) spoke very strongly against this scheme, although, if it was going to benefit any part of the Dominion, it would certainly benefit New Brunswick. The hon. Secretary of State (Sir Charles Tupper) then replied as follows :—

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I can hardly allow the measure to be carried, after what has been said, without making a statement to the House. I would remind the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) and the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Welsh) that they are six years too late in the speeches they have addressed to the House to-night. This Parliament deliberately, six years ago, adopted the policy of giving a certain amount of aid for securing the construction of this work, after the matter was put fairly and distinctly before the House ; and from that hour down to the present, although certain modifications and extensions of time have been asked, not one dollar additional has been asked by the promoters of this enterprise over and above what Parliament deliberately sanctioned six years ago. So much for that part of the question. Now, Sir, why did the House sanction this work ? I can understand the position of the hon. member for Halifax perfectly well.

I hope the hon. members for Halifax, who are present, will pay particular attention to this :

The hon. gentleman wants to prevent the construction of this work in the interests of his own constituents. He wants every vessel sailing from the Gulf of St. Lawrence to be compelled to pass by the port of Halifax, to make a friendly call at that port, and leave a little money there on its way to New York, Boston, or Portland. But I consider it the height of ingratitude on the part of the hon. member for Queen's to stand up here and oppose a measure which, if it is going to benefit one part of this Dominion more than another, will benefit the island on which he lives. Why, Sir, it will give to the great article of export of that island, potatoes, a value almost equal to the amount of the duty that now meets them in the United States. It will enable the large fleets with which Captain Welsh is identified—if he will allow me to use his name—to make two or three voyages between Charlottetown and Boston and New York, for every one that it can make as matters stand today.

Mr. WELSH. No.

I again reply, no, with equal force now. The hon. Secretary of State (Sir Charles Tupper) then went on to say :

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Why, Sir, I am not attempting to offer to the House, on a question of this kind, my opinion in opposition to that of a gentleman who is perfectly familiar with navigation on the water ; but that hon. gentleman has had no experience in navigating his ship on land.

Mr. WELSH. No, and I do not want to.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. He is no authority on the question of taking his ship over land for twenty miles.

Then again the matter was brought up, and, after a long argument, the company got their charter and \$150,000 per year for twenty-five years. Then we go on to 1891, when we find another extension called for. This company would require a parliament for itself, it comes before us so often. The matter was brought forward again on May 29, 1891, when the hon. Minister of Finance moved, that the House resolve itself into committee on the following resolution :—

That it is expedient to provide that the time for the completion of the works of the Chignecto Marine Transport Railway Company, Limited, shall, as respects their title to receive the subsidy heretofore authorized, be the 1st day of July, 1893, instead of the 1st July, 1890 ; also that all penalties, forfeitures and deductions incurred by the company under section 2 of chapter 4 of the Acts passed in 51st Victoria be remitted, and that said section 2 be repealed.

Several gentlemen took a hand in the debate on that resolution, and the Secretary of State gave a long account of what had been done by the company, from their point of view, towards carrying on this work. He stated, on behalf of the company, the difficulties they had met, owing to financial troubles in London money market and several other matters. Then I got up and replied to the hon. gentleman. I said :

I would not have said anything in regard to this matter except that Prince Edward Island

Mr. WELSH.

has been brought into the discussion. The Minister of Marine has given the House to understand that the Island will be benefited by this scheme. I have denounced it every time it has been brought before this House, and I denounce it now—

That was in 1891, and now, in 1896, I denounce it just as forcibly.

—and I say that when this company has had eight or nine years to carry out this work and has only made use of three years of that time, and now asks for an extension of time and to be relieved from the penalties involved from non-fulfilment of contract, the boot is on the other leg. If they had a claim against the Government which had been put aside, they would have claimed damages to the extent of millions. I have read the article quoted by the Minister of Marine ; and as regards the engineers, I would not give two-pence for their opinions. They are full of theories ; the engineering difficulties no doubt can be conquered and the railway completed, and Canada will have to pay \$2,000,000.

I said two million dollars ; but, if we carry out this Bill, and renew the charter of that company, that railway is going to cost this country five million dollars.

Mr. POWELL. How do you make that out ?

Mr. WELSH. In this way. If you want to buy an annuity of \$170,000, you might get that for something between two million and three million dollars payment, cash down. Now, Canada has no money to spare and she cannot afford to pay three million dollars in cash for an annuity. But the contract says we have to pay \$170,000 for twenty years. At the expiration of that time, that will amount to five million dollars at 4 per cent interest. Is there a man who dares to deny it ? I would like to see him on his legs.

Mr. POWELL. I deny it.

Mr. WELSH. I have got it computed. I have got in my hand the calculation made out by the manager of the most important bank in Ottawa.

Mr. FOSTER. Extend it to one hundred years, and it would be much more.

Mr. IVES. Why does he stop the interest at the end of twenty years ?

Mr. WELSH. Because the contract says, that, when they build this road, the Government will pay them a subsidy of \$170,000 a year for twenty years. That is why I stop there.

Mr. IVES. Why not go on for ever reckoning the interest ?

Mr. WELSH. Go on as much as you like, you will only make the interest all the greater. For once in my life, I have to compliment the hon. Minister of Finance. It seems that in November, about eighteen months ago, he was in London, and a deputation of this company waited on him. I

quote from a pamphlet issued by the Chignecto Marine Transport Railway Company :

Hon. Mr. Foster, when in London last October, received a deputation of the share and debenture holders at the office of the High Commissioner, and in reply to their request that the question of the railway company's concession should be considered by the Government as early as possible, he said :—" Conditions always accompany the grant of a subsidy, and if the conditions are not fulfilled, the Government is not equally responsible at all for the payment of the money. The Government, however, in this matter is bound to take in other considerations than those of strict and absolute legality, and I can assure you—and this is as far as I can go in an assurance as a responsible member of the Government—that the Government will take this matter up, as was promised Mr. Provand, and we will give it our best consideration on the ground of what might be called moral obligations. (Of how it may affect credit, and also, as we are primarily bound to do, in respect of the best interests of our own people, for whom we are trustees and for whom we are bound to act with great care and prudence. I think you are perfectly right in asking that you should have a decision upon this question as soon as possible. It has been impossible, and I may say that it is impossible to have a question of this gravity—

That is well put, "of this gravity."

—considered without what we may call a full meeting of Council, and circumstances during the holidays have rendered it impossible for the Government to be assembled in force."

I went on, then :

Canada will have to pay \$2,000,000 for a railway that will not be worth one cent when completed. Talk about granting \$125,000 a year as a subsidy. I say this is boodleism carried out to a great extent. Talk about wild-cat schemes, this is one of the most wild-cat schemes that ever entered into the imagination of any one.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, I did not believe there was a man outside of a lunatic asylum that would approve of the measure.

As I was afraid the Minister of Marine might subsequently say that this resolution passed the House without opposition, I protest against it. I should like to give it the six months' hoist. How many men in Canada have a dollar or a cent invested in this scheme? The money is that of English capitalists, and the credit of Canada will be injured when this scheme is exposed and the railway proves to be a failure. I told the late House that if the Government brought a shipowner or a man engaged in the shipping business who had invested a dollar in the scheme I would hold my tongue, but I never heard such was the case. If there were any honourable way of getting out of the scheme I should like to see it adopted, because it is only going to be a swindle.

In 1893 the matter again came before the House, being brought up by myself on a question of privilege :

Mr. WELSH. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I want to call the attention of the House to an article in the "Free Press" of the 4th February inst., and to put myself in order, I move the adjournment of the House.

Then I will go on to quote the paragraph, as follows :—

Some months ago the Dominion Government passed an Order in Council agreeing to extend the time for the completion of the Chignecto Ship Railway, without forfeiture of the subsidy voted by Parliament in aid of the scheme, provided work on the railway is actually in progress on the 1st day of July next, 1893, and the company establishes to the satisfaction of the Governor General in Council that it has secured all the capital necessary fully to finish and equip the railway, docks and other works of the company in all respects according to the requirements of the contract. The company must therefore raise the necessary funds to complete the project before the 1st July next, when the extension granted some years ago will expire. The directors have issued preference bonds upon the railway to the amount of \$350,000,—

I suppose they mean pounds sterling.

—and hope to obtain the needed money by the sale of such bonds. They expect that the capitalists who have already invested money in the project will take up the new issue of bonds rather than see the work abandoned.

I then went on to say :

Well, if this is true, Mr. Speaker, I do not like it. Every extension of time, and every charter that has been granted to this railway, has been done with the sanction of Parliament; and on every occasion that this matter has been brought up, there has always been, from this side of the House at all events, and I think in the minds of a great many gentlemen on the other side of the House, an expression of dissatisfaction, seeing that this scheme had been approved and supported by Parliament. This matter was brought up in 1888, when the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the following resolution :—

And they passed the resolution, extending the time to 1889 and providing :

Also that the company may be conferred a further delay of twenty-four months for such completion, on the condition of the payment of a monthly penalty of \$5,000 for each month during which the works remain uncompleted after the above-mentioned date, and also that the amount of capital mentioned in section 2 of the Act 49, Victoria, chapter 18, as that on which the payment of the subsidies limited so as to make up the net earnings to 7 per cent per annum, shall be \$5,500,000 instead of \$5,000,000.

I said further :

There was considerable debate on that motion, and it was opposed by my hon. colleague and by many others, including Mr. Mitchell, the late Minister of Marine. I will not take up the time of the House by quoting the whole of the debate, but I will read an extract from the remarks of Sir Charles Tupper which, at this time, read like a theatrical performance. Among other things, he said :

"But I consider it the height of ingratitude on the part of the hon. member for Queen's to stand up here and oppose a measure which, if it is going to benefit one part of this Dominion more than another, will benefit the island on which he lives. Why, Sir, it will give to the great article of export of that island, potatoes, an increased value."

Then the hon. gentleman went on and made a long speech. I continued :

When I read those speeches and the remarks that were made to sanction this wild-cat scheme, it reminds me of one of Baron Munchausen's yarns. I see some very strong opinions were expressed by the Hon. Mr. Mitchell and others. This has been going for eight or nine years. If the time is extended much longer there will be no ships left to pass over the railway, even assuming that it will be possible to carry them over. I have opposed this scheme ever since it was introduced into this House, with all my power. If the Government have extended the company's time by Order in Council, their action is not fair and honest to foreign capitalists. This scheme has always been ventilated on the floor of Parliament, and hon. members have had an opportunity of expressing an opinion on it, and it is well that this has been the case, because it has tended to inform foreign investors of the position in which the company stands before Parliament. I am within bounds in stating that the last discussion in this House was the means of saving foreign capitalists very large sums of money. I have denounced, and I denounce now, this scheme and all such wild-cat schemes, such as the dead-meat scheme, and the Chignecto Railway, as being the means of doing great injury to this Dominion, for if foreign capitalists find such schemes have received the sanction of Parliament, and have been subsequently granted extensions of time and other privileges whereby to assist the companies in carrying on their schemes, the credit of Canada must severely suffer. I oppose this scheme now in order that my action throughout may be consistent. I repeat that I have always opposed it, that I oppose it still, and that this Parliament would do well to express its opinion on the matter, because if it does so, no doubt private foreign capital will save money as well as the taxpayers of the country, if the work should be completed, to the extent of \$3,000,000.

I say that now.

When this subject was brought before the House last year, with a view to grant the company an extension of time, the Minister of Finance delivered a long speech, in which he embodied many statistics connected with the railway, including the quantity of mud and rock removed and grading done, statistics handed him, no doubt, by the engineer of the road. I have little faith in the engineer's reports.

Then I go on to give an illustration respecting engineers. They are always sworn never to say anything that will prevent giving employment to an engineer. Then the Minister of Justice (Mr. Dickey) comes in. He was at that time simply the member for Cumberland, and I really believe that he was the acting solicitor of the company.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. WELSH. Yes, I make that statement. There was another hon. gentleman in this House, then, as member for Westmoreland. He is now a senator. This railroad runs across between Cumberland and Westmoreland. The hon. Minister of Justice took a hand in this debate at that time:

Mr. DICKEY. Mr. Speaker, I do not think that either of the hon. members for Queen's, P.E.I.,

Mr. WELSH.

have added anything to what they have already said in this House with reference to the Chignecto Ship Railway. But I think they would have done themselves more credit, if I may use the expression, if they had not taken this particular time to say what they have said.

If he had applied that advice to himself he would have done well. It would have been much better for himself and would have saved his own constituency. I have great regard for the hon. member, and I think this was one of the most inconsistent actions of his life. Then he goes on to say :

I understood the hon. member to express great fears that our endorsement of this work would result in a loss of credit, and would, therefore, render it difficult for us to raise capital again when we needed it.

Well, Sir, if any thing could render it impossible for Canadians to get money on the English markets, it would be that the great Dominion of Canada should undertake to plead the statute of limitations. The Dominion of Canada has made a grant in aid of this work; the time within which the work was to be completed was limited to a certain period; men go on and subscribe capital, and put three millions of dollars and a third in hard cash into the work.

He goes on with a lot more. Then the hon. gentleman, I think, imputes some sinister motives to my action in the matter. He says again :

I cannot understand what the other hon. member's (Mr. Welsh's) objection to this railway is, whether that it will not carry ships or that it will not pay. I think an old sailor is something like an old lawyer—

God forbid, I say now.

—very conservative, and finds it difficult to get out of the old ruts. The hon. gentleman has been sailing wooden vessels all over the world, and he has come to the conclusion that a steamer cannot do useful work over this railway.

Sir, I owned steamers before that hon. gentleman was born, and I own steamers now, and I am more interested in steamers than I am in anything else afloat. So the hon. gentleman made a blunder there.

The hon. gentleman has been so long away from the practical work on the sea that I am afraid I must take the judgment of others in this matter. The people who put their money into the work were not as visionary or as foolish as the hon. member imagines.

I guess they will find that out.

He will excuse me saying that I think his judgment in this matter is biased by his political feeling.

Mr. WELSH. No.

Mr. DICKEY. The people who invested their money in this work did so on the advice of thoroughly competent men—

I say that I have never seen them yet, not one of them.

—who investigated the scheme and satisfied themselves as to its feasibility; and if the hon. member for Queen's sets up his judgment against the

engineers who pronounced this scheme to be feasible, I think the House must come to the conclusion that he is biased by political feeling or by something else.

Mr. WELSH. I do not doubt the feasibility of building this railroad, and I did not object to the statement of any of the engineers.

Then the present Minister of Justice goes on and gives us a long speech of about two pages; I will not weary the House by taking it up. I asked the hon. gentleman, at that time, when he imputed sinister motives to my action:

Is the hon. gentleman speaking as a member of Parliament, or as solicitor for the Chignecto Railway Company?

And the hon. gentleman never answered that question, he never told us whether he was speaking as member for Cumberland, or as solicitor for this Chignecto Railway Company. I hope he has thrown it off his back by this time. Now, Mr. Speaker, I take up the words of the Finance Minister, eighteen months ago. When replying to a deputation from this company, he said this matter would be taken up and carefully considered by Parliament, that they were the trustees of the people's money. Now, there is not an hon. gentleman in this House but will acknowledge that we are legally clear of all claims. They failed in every contract they entered into with the Government. The company, time and again, were before this Parliament for extension of time, we have given them all they asked for. On the last occasion we gave them two years' extension of time, they paying \$5,000 a month for every month they were short in completing the work, and the Government even forgave them that penalty. Now, fourteen years after the charter was given they come before Parliament and ask us to pass a Bill which I believe is the thin edge of the wedge to get hold of the \$170,000 a year for twenty years. I think we have no right to pass this Bill, or to consider it, until we know what action the Government is going to take in this matter, whether the Government propose to regrant them all the privileges and subsidies that we gave them fourteen years ago. I say that even if this railway was completed to-morrow it would stand a monument of parliamentary folly as long as there is a rail on the road, and as a monument of the folly of those who advocated it. Now, as to any moral obligation. Mr. Provand, the chairman of this company, had several interviews with me. I said there might have been some moral obligation, and I said: "Do you tell me you have got a million and a half of money ready to complete this work?" "Yes," he says, "we have." "Well," I said, "I would advise you to keep that million and a half pretty sure, because as sure as you put that in, you will have to get another million and a half, and then you will lose it all." Then I advised

him to apply to the Government on the ground of moral obligation. I tell every hon. gentleman in this House that it behooves him to look out, for if this matter is carried through, as I have no doubt it is the intention of the company, it will cost this country five millions of money. And for what purpose? Suppose it had been built fourteen years ago. There was then, I suppose, five wooden ships to one now sailing in the gulf. I have never yet heard a ship-owner acknowledge that if this railway was built to-morrow, and he had a hundred ships, he would never allow one of them to go on it. I know that I have had ships in England, Scotland, and in almost every port of Great Britain, and it was an anxious time with me when I wanted to get a ship taken out of the water, even on a slip of 150 feet. In nine cases out of ten where a ship is taken out of the water and put on the docks, she is strained and injured. The Secretary of State, in his speech, gave a vivid description of the great works on the London docks, where they have hydraulic locks and lifts and other apparatus for lifting a ship up and down. But the hon. gentleman forgets that lifting a ship up and down is not carrying it over the land; and the hon. gentleman also forgets that the navigation of that time on the Bay of Fundy is out of date now. But the most difficult navigation on the coast is at the head of the Bay of Fundy. The tide, in some parts of the Bay of Fundy rises over 50 feet. There is only one place in the world where there is a greater variation of tide, and that is at Chepstowe, on the Bristol Channel, near Gloucester, the rise and fall of the tide being over 70 feet.

Mr. DICKEY. The hon. gentleman speaks of the rise and fall in the Bay of Fundy. At what point does he speak of?

Mr. WELSH. Sixty feet in the Basin of Minas? Am I correct?

Mr. DICKEY. Not so far as Chignecto.

Mr. WELSH. No, I said in the Basin of Minas. This House has now before it a serious matter, for this work, if carried out, will cost the taxpayers of the Dominion \$5,000,000. If any one will challenge this statement, I will prove in black and white; and, if there is any moral obligation resting on the Government, they had better buy out that moral obligation, and not permit an everlasting exhibition of our folly to be seen in this ship railway. I hope hon. members will seriously consider this subject. I have no political feeling whatever in regard to it, my whole desire being to further the interests of the taxpayers. We are not so flush of money that we can afford to see public funds spent, except on projects for the benefit of the people of this Dominion.

Mr. POWELL. Is it not a fact, that insurance rates are less in the Bay of Fundy than in the Gulf of St. Lawrence?

Mr. WELSH. That has been gone over by the hon. gentleman's predecessor, Mr. Wood, now Senator Wood.

Mr. POWELL. I was not aware of it.

Mr. WELSH. But I will reply, in the words of the Minister of Justice: What part of the Bay of Fundy does he refer to? I have paid insurance rates for vessels laying at the point where the Chignecto Railway is supposed to start, at Tignish—I have had hundreds of vessels insured there at 12s. 6d. per cent, and in some parts of the Bay of Fundy I could get the same rate. But you cannot get insurance done as low in the Bay of Fundy in the summer time as in the St. Lawrence.

Mr. POWELL. Did you ever see a policy—

Mr. SPEAKER. Order. We are not in Committee of the whole House, and there cannot be a series of questions exchanged between hon. members.

Mr. WELSH. If the hon. gentleman wants any information about insurance rates, I can give him satisfaction on that point. I have done some business in the Bay of Fundy, not much, but I have done a large business in the gulf, and for sixty years I have been in active shipping life in this Dominion. I take great interest in the shipping business. I desire to read an extract from a speech delivered by an ex-Minister of Marine (Mr. Mitchell), who possessed a great knowledge of shipping. In 1888 he spoke as follows:—

Well, six years ago, and seven years ago application was made, if I recollect aright. He states that a young gentleman who has devoted six years of his life to the prosecution of this enterprise, invested a large amount of money in it. Now, Sir, that gentleman to whom he refers may have invested a great deal of money in it, but so far as I can learn there is no work done. Where the money has been invested I do not know. That is the second proposition the hon. gentleman has made. The third proposition is the great advantage it would be to the trade and commerce of Montreal and Quebec and the gulf ports, connected with the trade of St. John. Now, Sir, I ask: What would be the trade suppose you had a canal built to-morrow over that route—much less a ship canal? Does my hon. friend pretend to tell me that he has submitted to this House any statistics upon which he could base the continuation of the insane act? because I say it is nothing more than a piece of folly, first, to have subsidized such a thing as that Chignecto Ship Railway, and next to continue it from year to year upon the statute-book, encouraging the belief—not that such a thing is not possible, because it is possible—but that such a railway, if built, would inure to the benefit of the country, or in any way benefit the trade and navigation of Canada. Sir, my hon. friend speaks of the shortening of the distance of 600 miles between Montreal and the port of St. John. What trade is there between the two? By the railway which we have subsidized from Montreal down to the harbour of St. John, you can carry, in less than twenty hours, freight and passengers. Does any man believe that in face of the low railway carriage at this day, people will ship goods down the

Mr. WELSH.

St. Lawrence, ship them an eight or ten days' voyage down to the point where a vessel will take them on, and then take them over a railway down into the waters of the Bay of Fundy, and thence down the St. Lawrence? Why, Sir, there is no business between the two ports to start with, and my hon. friend has not submitted any statistics to show that there is any business to warrant such an expenditure as this. In the next place it is apparent to every one conversant with the current of trade in this country, that railways are taking away trade from the ships, that shipments by railway are taking the place of shipments by water in large quantities by vessels. My hon. friend speaks of 600 vessels visiting the Gulf of the St. Lawrence. Whose were they? Were they vessels of Canada? No, Sir. If 600 vessels last year, or the year before, visited the Gulf of St. Lawrence, they were the vessels of the United States, they were the fishing vessels for which we have sacrificed so much by the Bill we have already passed in this House, they were the vessels of a foreign nation from whom we are seeking justice, but have not got it as yet, they are the vessels of a country from which we are excluded from reciprocity in the natural productions of Canada. Are we going to expend \$170,000 a year for that purpose? And if we did so, would any of these 600 vessels go over that railway? Why, Sir, there is not a particle of evidence submitted by the hon. gentleman to show that if the railway were built to-morrow, these fishing vessels—and they are the only ones that go there, comparatively speaking—there is not a tittle of evidence to show that they would go over that railway, even if it were built. I have been engaged in the trade of that country in shipping, and in business, for many years, and my hon. friend has not; and I may tell him now that if that railway were built to-morrow, it would not pay the grease to oil the wheels that run over it, and it is an expenditure of public money which this country is not warranted in making. Sir, my hon. friend has brought forward another argument to induce this House to adopt this scheme, he says it is to be built with British money. Is it possible that my hon. friend, occupying the prominent position he does as the representative of this country in England, speaking with the authority which that gives him, is going to give currency to an idea that if English money is going to be invested in this enterprise it can be invested profitably and with satisfaction to the men who furnish the money? Sir, does my hon. friend himself believe that this railway will ever pay a dollar? He has not told this House that he does. I tell this House that I would regret to see any investments secured under false pretenses, brought into Canada to discredit Canada by putting them into a scheme which must be an utter failure, and an utter ruin to the men who furnish the money. The hon. gentleman says this country was pledged to this scheme six years ago. What are the facts? Seven years ago a scheme was propounded for building a canal. Subsequently this scheme comes up for building a ship canal, and a charter is granted. He says the House is pledged to it. Who pledged the House to it? The influence of my hon. friend pledged the House to that scheme.

This is a quotation from a speech delivered by the Hon. Mr. Mitchell, formerly Minister of Marine and Fisheries. I think, Sir, I have wearied the House long enough for the present, and I will leave the matter in the hands of hon. gentlemen.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I agree with one remark that has fallen from the hon. member (Mr. Welsh), and that remark was that this was a very important question. I do not intend to weary the House with this oft-told tale further than is necessary, but as briefly as possible, to place the position of this question, as I understand it, before the House. In 1870, the Government of Canada appointed a royal commission to travel through the country, to take sworn testimony, and to form the best and most intelligent judgment that they could as to the canal expenditure that the Government ought to undertake. That commission was composed of the most eminent men that the country could produce. Sir Hugh Allan, a gentleman of great enterprise and of very high standing in connection with everything regarding navigation and the commerce of the country, was the president. Other gentlemen occupying very high positions in the commercial world, and eminent engineers, were appointed on that commission. They travelled through the country where canal expenditure was the subject of important consideration. They took the sworn testimony of the highest and best authorities, commercial men, sea captains, persons connected with navigation, and persons connected with trade, and they made their report. They divided their recommendations in that report into two classes. First, they put in No. 1 class the works that in their judgment the interests of Canada required should be undertaken so soon as the means could be provided to accomplish them, and in that category they placed a canal to connect the waters of the Gulf of St. Lawrence with the waters of the Bay of Fundy. The Government adopted that report, Parliament adopted that report, and after surveys and examinations and estimates had been made, we had before us the opinions of eminent engineers that the construction of such a canal as was recommended would cost something over \$5,000,000. Parliament adopted that report, and it voted \$1,000,000 towards the commencement of the work, after giving the subject careful consideration. This scheme then had the imprimatur of Parliament. The Government went out of office shortly afterwards, in 1873—as I dare say some hon. gentlemen in this House may remember—and the duty of taking up this question devolved upon their successors in office. The Government of the Hon. Mr. Mackenzie took this matter up, and they put a large sum of money in the Estimates for the purpose of promptly proceeding with the construction of this canal, at a time when it was estimated to cost something over \$5,000,000. Further examination and investigation in connection with the work led the Government of Mr. Mackenzie to doubt the accuracy of the estimated cost of that canal. The subject was referred to Mr. Page, a very eminent engineer, and the result of his investigation was that, in his

judgment, the amount required for the construction of that canal would be nearer \$9,000,000 than \$5,000,000. Under those circumstances, that Administration submitted to Parliament the question: as to whether although an expenditure of over \$5,000,000 would be justified, the work was one that ought to be proceeded with when there was reason to believe that the cost would be nearer \$9,000,000 or \$10,000,000 than \$5,000,000. Under these circumstances, there was, I believe, no person in the House who pressed the Government at that time to proceed with the work at so great a cost as was estimated by Mr. Page.

Now, a gentleman who is well known as an engineer of very considerable ability, took this subject up, and he came to the Government with the proposal to substitute the somewhat novel undertaking of a ship railway instead of the canal. The increased cost connected with the canal arose from its having been discovered that there was a much larger amount of rock to be encountered than was originally supposed. Mr. Ketchum, the engineer who brought this subject under the consideration of the Government, submitted a proposal to construct a ship railway instead of a canal. If the ship railway were practicable, he showed that it would be of more value than a canal, because it would open earlier in the spring, and close later in the autumn than a canal would, and that therefore the commercial objects to be attained would be attained to a greater extent by a ship railway than by a canal. The Government of that day met the proposal of Mr. Ketchum with the statement that although it was known that ships could be raised by hydraulic power, and although it was known that they could be carried on a railway for a certain distance; yet there was no place in the world where ships were carried for so great a distance as that proposed, between the waters of the Gulf of St. Lawrence and the Bay of Fundy. And we said: that under these circumstances, the Government would not embark any capital, and they would not be responsible for the payment of any public money whatever for this work; unless upon the proposal that the capitalists undertaking it should be obliged to demonstrate the absolute success of the scheme before they should be in a position to claim any money. The contract, therefore, in this instance, differs from almost all other contracts of a public character in this respect, that not a dollar was to be taken from the public treasury of Canada until the parties engaged in this enterprise found all the capital that was necessary to construct and complete the works, and put them in successful operation. And more, the contract provided that if at any time they failed to operate the ship railway successfully, these subsidies should cease. The House will at once see that it would be an extremely difficult matter to

raise capital under these circumstances, because so many considerations were involved which might prevent the realization of capitalists, that they would be extremely careful in entering upon such a work. When this matter was submitted to the House by myself, on that occasion—and the matter was fully, and fairly, and clearly stated to the House—hon. gentlemen on both sides arrived at the conclusion that, if for a subsidy of \$150,000 for twenty-five years (or as it was subsequently changed by an Act of this Parliament, to \$170,000 for twenty years); if for that sum of money a work of equal value could be had to that which had been adopted by both parties in the House without any division whatever; then we would be warranted in undertaking it. \$170,000 a year for twenty years would involve an expenditure, if capitalized at 4 per cent, of about \$2,343,000. That is to say, Canada was to obtain a work of equal value to the canal which had received the approval of Parliament and of both governments, for less than one-half of the money which Parliament had originally agreed, in view of all the facts, to expend upon it. Now, Sir, I do not intend for a single moment to enter into a discussion, at this hour of the day, as to whether the Royal Commission, in the first instance, had gathered the correct trend of public sentiment on the subject, or as to whether they were right in the conclusion at which they arrived, that the Government of Canada would be warranted in an expenditure of \$5,000,000 for the accomplishment of this work; because that is all beside the question. After this House had on several occasions, without division, adopted the policy of making this expenditure, and a solemn binding contract had been made with British capitalists for the accomplishment of the work, all that discussion ceased to be relevant. Although, in the light of all the information and experience I have been able to obtain in connection with this work, I believe as confidently to-day as I did at the time the measure was first submitted to Parliament, that the expenditure of \$5,000,000, which was originally proposed for the canal, and much more the lesser expenditure of one-half that amount for accomplishing the work, was a wise and judicious expenditure, yet, assuming that I am altogether wrong in that, I say that in my judgment it does not touch the question. This work, having been thus commended to British capitalists, not by myself, but by the authority of a Royal Commission who had investigated it, and on sworn testimony the most full and able and complete that they could command, and British capitalists having been found to undertake the work, I say that if they have carried on their operations in good faith, they are entitled to all the support that is required from hon. gentlemen on both sides of this House to implement that contract, thus fairly and honestly made. Now, Sir, I would just draw the attention of the House for a single

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

moment to the fact that after this contract was made, the responsibility for that work not having been in operation long ago rests upon this House, and not upon these contractors. When they were in a position to put their bonds on the money market for the purpose of obtaining capital, they found—and I invite the attention of every hon. gentleman to this as a most important point—that by an amendment to the general Railway Act, passed by this House after the contract had been made with them, and before they were able to put their scheme on the money market in London, they were prevented from obtaining the capital. That was a provision passed in 1888, which had not been noticed as having any bearing on this project, but which prevented the bonds for a public work being put on the market until a certain amount of expenditure had been made. But for that all the money they required for the completion of this work would have been promptly obtained in London, and the work would have been completed long ago. I say that is a circumstance which I am sure every hon. gentleman in this House, looking at this contract between capitalists and the Government of Canada, will regard as having great weight.

Mr. EDGAR. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to ask him a question? Did not the company in a few months obtain the requisite portion of capital, and then issue their bonds?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, the fact is as I have stated. When they were in a position to put their bonds on the market, they put a portion of their bonds on the market above par; and when they would have obtained the whole of the money, they were precluded from doing so by this unfortunate amendment of the law. I call the attention of hon. gentlemen further to the fact that the House came to the conclusion that was an unwise amendment of the law, and it has since been repealed. But, in the meantime, before the debentures of the work could be placed upon the market, a financial collapse occurred, which I have no hesitation in saying was unprecedented in the history of the world. In my judgment there never was a house that occupied the position of the Barings in London; and, as hon. gentlemen know, that house unfortunately in the meantime came to grief, which caused a disturbance to the money market that has lasted to a greater or less extent down to the present hour. I do not myself believe that there will ever be a financial house in London occupying the same position that was occupied by Baring Bros. at that time. The consequences of that failure were of the most disastrous and widespread character. They were of such a character as to bring down the contractor who had contracted with the company for the construction of this work—a man of great wealth, but one whose means were largely invested in the Argentine Re-

public, which was especially affected by the failure of Baring Bros. Under these circumstances, what has happened? These gentlemen have expended in good faith—and I am quite certain that there is no member of this House who will not regard that as establishing a strong moral claim, irrespective of the merits of this case—some £700,000 sterling, equal to some \$3,500,000, in the prosecution of this work; and about \$1,500,000 more is required in order to complete it. Now, not to weary the House, but to put this matter in a nutshell, where every hon. member of this House will at once see, I think, that we have a clear and obvious duty before us, these gentlemen came to the Government for an extension of time. In the first instance, an extension of time was granted; but they were still unable, owing to the great disturbance in the financial market in London, to obtain the money; and in 1892 they came before the Government of Canada and pressed for a further extension of time, in order to enable them to obtain the means to complete this work and get some return for the vast amount of capital they had expended. The Government, very properly in my judgment, said to them: "You are not in a position to ask for an extension of time, because you are not able to show the Government that if you got that extension of time, you could obtain the means to complete this work; and therefore application for these indefinite extensions of time, without a guarantee that they will result in the accomplishment of the work, cannot be entertained." But the Government pledged itself, as hon. gentlemen will see, that when they were able to obtain the capital required to complete this work, it would ask Parliament to extend the time in order to enable them to do it. That is the position to-day. Mr. Provand, to whom the hon. member has referred, and who had visited this country, for the purpose of pressing the Government on this subject, returned to London, and the result was, that the parties who had furnished this £700,000 sterling, were so deeply committed, that the company were enabled to induce them to take up the project and to furnish the necessary amount of capital. I saw some of the most eminent bankers in London, and they told me that they had a large amount of these bonds, upon which loans had been made, and on which they stood to lose the money unless the work was completed; and one eminent banking house said: We are prepared, under these circumstances, to subscribe £50,000 more for the purpose of completing this undertaking. Now, this £700,000 sterling is represented by securities in the vaults of large banking houses in the city of London, who are deeply interested in the completion of this work. I do not mention it as an additional inducement, but every member of this House, I am sure, will see, that, when the Minister of Finance goes to London to raise a loan, these are the parties to whom those

interested in the matter go for the purpose of furnishing money for the Government of Canada; and I need not say to the House the disaster it would be to the Dominion, if it was felt that parties acting in good faith, supplying their capital, as this capital has been supplied, in good faith, and expending such a large amount of money in order to carry out a public contract with the Government of Canada, were not in a position to obtain from the Government and Parliament of this country every fair, honourable and just consideration. I believe there is not a member of this House who will not say that a more fatal blow could not be struck at—I do not say the Government of Canada, because its credit, its standing, is so extremely high that it would be very difficult to interfere with the floating of a loan—but at any commercial enterprise, however sound, however valuable in the best interests of the country, than to create the impression, that an enterprise in which British capital has been furnished to carry out a contract in good faith, and meeting the difficulties that this enterprise has met with, difficulties of an altogether unprecedented character, as is entirely within my own knowledge—cannot come back to the Government and the Parliament of this country with perfect confidence that they will be met in a fair, straightforward, honourable and business manner. Under these circumstances, I am sure I need not detain the House more than to say, that I do trust there will be no difference of opinion in this House on a question of this kind, and that, what I regard as the good faith and credit of the Government and Parliament of Canada will be maintained. If this extension of time be granted by the House, I have every reason to know that the capital has not been only provided, but that the Messrs. Pearson & Sons, the most eminent, or as eminent contractors as are to be found in the United Kingdom, have made a contract to complete, for the amount of money now obtained, these works and put them in thorough operation as promptly as possible. I do trust, that, under these circumstances, there will be no division of opinion in this House, and that on a question, to the principle of which both sides have been committed, in the first instance, by approving the construction of a canal which was to cost double the amount that this is to cost—that on a question of that kind and one which this Parliament has again and again unanimously endorsed, and an enterprise with regard to which a charter has been granted unanimously by this House, we should all be united. There has been a good deal of misconception with regard to this matter, and I trust that that misconception will be entirely removed by what I have submitted to this House. I will not detain the House further than to say, that I regard this as a very serious and important question in the best interests of Canada, and

I trust there will be no substantial division of opinion here upon the fact, that, whatever may be thought for or against the commercial value of this project, the position in which it stands is one that ought to, and, I trust, will, receive the approval of hon. gentlemen on both sides.

Mr. EDGAR. There is a point about this resolution I would like to have explained. After the speech of the hon. Secretary of State, I certainly admit that I do not understand the position of this legislation. We are now discussing a motion to read a second time a Bill introduced by a private member of this House, asking for the ordinary extension of time for the completion of a private enterprise. On this occasion the hon. Secretary of State said—

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Will the hon. gentleman allow me just one moment. My hon. friend, I am quite sure, will admit, that I did not introduce the discussion of this question. The discussion arose on a motion by a private member to extend the time allowed this company for the completion of its contract, and the hon. gentleman undertook to challenge, as in opposition to what was asked with regard to this Bill, the wisdom of giving any further assistance by legislation or otherwise. This discussion was not invited by me, but I thought it was better at the outset, as the hon. gentleman had brought up the subject and treated it at length from that standpoint, that I should briefly state to the House the position in which I regard the question.

Mr. EDGAR. Another Bill was introduced by the same hon. member who has moved the second reading of this Bill to-day, respecting the Chignecto Marine Transport Railway Company, Limited; and in that first Bill the single clause was certainly very much more comprehensive than the language of the single clause in this measure. That first Bill, which was withdrawn, practically gave an extension of all the powers, franchises, rights and privileges conferred upon that company. It struck me at the time, that, if that Bill had passed, we would have committed Parliament—

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Hear, hear; the first Bill was an entire misapprehension.

Mr. EDGAR. The House would have been committed, by the passage of that first Bill, to the granting of this money.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Quite so.

Mr. EDGAR. I understand that it is absolutely clear, that the money has been forfeited by the lapse of time, under the terms of the contract.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Legally.

Mr. EDGAR. Of course. Not illegally, I suppose. It is forfeited, and I understand, that, in order to incur that responsibility again on behalf of Canada, Parliament will

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

require to revoke that subsidy to those concerned, in some shape or other.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Quite so.

Mr. EDGAR. Very well; I certainly supposed that the only thing we were asked to do by this Bill was to give an extension of time for the completion of a public work by a private company in which they had already expended a considerable sum of money.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Hear, hear.

Mr. EDGAR. And Parliament has never, so far as I know, refused to do that.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Hear, hear.

Mr. EDGAR. Therefore, I was surprised when the Secretary of State took this occasion to go on into the merits of the case, as he did. It seemed to me that after his speech, if we passed the second reading of this Bill, we would practically, unless we protested against it, be bound to make that grant. We have not discussed that question; it is not before us except in this indirect way, and I do not propose to discuss the merits of it at all on this motion, if it is distinctly and clearly understood by this House that this is only the extension of the right of that railway company to build that ship railway. If that is all, and that seems to be all by the terms of this Bill, I do not propose to discuss the merits. I infer from the announcement of the hon. Secretary of State that it is the policy of the Government to renew that.

Mr. MULOCK. To renew the charter?

Mr. EDGAR. No, to renew the grant.

Mr. MULOCK. He said so.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That question is not before the House now.

Mr. EDGAR. Except as the Secretary of State introduces it by stating that the Government and the country were bound to supplement that legislation and argued the whole case. For my part I want to have it absolutely and distinctly understood that this House is in no sense or way committed to the policy of extending that grant. It may be right to do so or it may be wrong, but it is too important a question to have this House committed to it in any way by private legislation. If this Bill means anything of that kind, it must originate in a resolution of the House.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Quite so.

Mr. EDGAR. This is a private Bill, and I would suggest for your consideration, Mr. Speaker, whether, on that point, it is out of order or not. If there is anything in that Bill—as one would judge there was from the argument so far—that will involve the granting of public money, it is out of order. If you hold that it does not, then, of course, it is a piece of ordinary private legislation.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. If I may be allowed a moment's explanation—my hon. friend will see that if the reasoning of the hon. member who preceded me were to prevail, the House might be asked not to grant this Bill. But this Bill speaks for itself. It was introduced in the first place under an entire misapprehension. There was no intention to commit this House to anything more than is contained in the Bill itself. If the Bill is passed, the other matter remains sub judice, for the House to deal with when the Government bring down their policy on this question.

Mr. BAIRD. I have deep sympathy for the stockholders of the unfortunate company which has undertaken this work, and I know of no more tangible evidence of that sympathy that I can show, than to discourage, as far as I can, further legislation or further expenditure of money and further loss that must be involved by this work. Whatever may have been the redeeming features of this work at the time of its inception or prior to 1882, whatever may have been the inducements to enter upon the enterprise then, to my mind they have been completely swept away by the wonderful changes that have taken place in the ways of ocean traffic since that day. Whatever may have been the views of the gentlemen who made the surveys and reports of which the hon. Secretary of State has spoken, whatever may have been the wisdom of that day is the folly of to-day, the transportation of ocean freight has been so completely changed. At the present time there is absolutely no traffic between the ports of the Bay of Fundy and the ports of the Gulf of St. Lawrence and the River St. Lawrence. As a person engaged in the coastwise and carrying trade of Canada, I can say truthfully that for the past five years I have not had any proposal to charter, or any offer of freight of any kind between any of the ports of the Bay of Fundy and those of the St. Lawrence. The only trade that is left from the waters of the St. Lawrence would be that to the ports of the United States. And, Sir, I would call him an unwise mariner who, with his vessel loaded, if this marine railway were in actual operation, would cradle his ship, transport her across the isthmus and place her in the waters of the Bay of Fundy, where he would have to thread his course through currents and counter currents, by head winds and fair winds, sometimes in dense fogs, and beat his way from the Bay of Fundy and follow the coast to the ports of the United States whither the cargoes of lumber are sent,—when he has an open highway down through the Northumberland Straits, out of the Gut of Canso, and into the Atlantic Ocean, where he can give the coast of Nova Scotia a wide berth, and get plenty of sea room, and with a few tacks he finds himself in open sea, ready to make his destination. Now, I am speaking of the summer

months; as regards the winter months, I need not consider the Gulf of St. Lawrence at all. The Gulf of St. Lawrence is a prohibited water in every insurance policy that I know about that is issued in the commercial world. Every policy prohibits entrance into those waters from the first of November until the 10th May, and some of them, from first of October until the 10th May. In the Bay of Fundy you are prohibited by floating ice, so that in the winter months we have not to consider that. Well, Sir, this company have evidently met their fate, by the pure course of circumstances, by meeting changes in commercial enterprise. Changes have taken place that have completely revolutionized the business. This business was once great and profitable. In 1882, for instance, we were in the very zenith of our greatness as a maritime people. Canada, I think, was fourth in the world in commercial importance, and St. John was the fifth city in the registration of her merchant marine. That has entirely changed. The trade has been completely revolutionized, and almost swept away from us. The change has been very slow and simple, but it has wrought great differences in ocean transportation. But the greatest change has taken place in prices, or the rates of freights that we have had to deal with. Any hon. gentlemen who are acquainted with shipping, and can recollect the prosperous days of 1882, and can also recollect the change that took place from 1884 to 1888, will realize the wonderful depression that then existed. Many men who owned ships, and went through that day of depression, appeared to have entirely forgotten it, when another great change came on from 1888 to 1891, which may be called the day of greatest prosperity that we ever had in marine enterprise; and men were drawn from their bearings; lured by the prospect of gain, they forgot the adversity of the period between 1884 and 1888, and invested all the earnings they had made between 1888 and 1891, invested all their credit, mortgaged their future, to be able to carry on the trade that was then so profitable to them. But as quickly as the change came on in 1888, from adversity to prosperity, so quickly did the change come in 1891 from prosperity to adversity, and down through the range of prices, freights have fallen 25, 50, I will even say, 75 per cent. I think shipowners will agree with me in saying that in that day of prosperity we received as high as \$27 a thousand on lumber from Canadian ports to ports in Brazil and the Argentine Republic, but at present, and during the past year, we have been glad to get \$6.50, as compared with \$27, four years ago. Now, this is a revolution that we could not guard against, and many of our best men who had invested, could not stem the tide. They saw the fortunes of earlier days swept away, and everything engulfed in the vortex of financial ruin. There was no way they could

guard against it, and I say to this company that there is no way they can guard against the changes that have come over them. They are not to be laughed at; their misfortunes are the same as the misfortunes of others. There are financial wrecks as well as marine wrecks to be found on every shore. They need our sympathy. But from all I can gather, from all the information I can obtain in the few years that I have been engaged in commercial enterprises, I can see no future for the company, no hope of prosperity, no way that they can make up their lost ground. I feel that it is a matter of kindness to them to speak frankly, and I feel deeply in earnest when I urge them to abandon the scheme. As to the Parliament of Canada, well, I would ask them to be deeply in earnest when dealing with the people's millions in works of this kind that are of a doubtful character. They should guard, with jealous care, Canadian institutions when money is sought to be loaned upon them in the markets of the world. We have had some sad memorials of undertakings of this kind in the maritime provinces, and I suppose in the other provinces of Canada, when money was obtained on public credit. Credit of this kind is very sensitive as to how it is handled, and if once abused, the effect is apt to react upon others who go into the markets of the world with bona fide and meritorious schemes. From this standpoint, I would strongly urge upon the Government carefully to consider whether any more money, in future, or even on this occasion, is to be invested in this scheme. I say this in all earnestness. I know it is a disagreeable thing; I know it is an unpopular thing. But I do not propose to say it in a disagreeable way; I say it as a matter of advice, and I say it advisedly, from the best information I can gather. Sir, in conclusion, I must say that if we would honour our own judgment, if we would save the country from further expenditure and loss, if we would discourage the completion of the works that can never be profitable, if we would be kind to the company, in any sense or in any form, we would refuse further legislation upon this subject.

Mr. WELDON. The measure before the House can certainly not be objected to if it be in no way connected with the suggestion thrown out, as I gathered, by the hon. Secretary of State, that this private Bill might, during this session, be followed by a Government Bill asking for a vote of money. The simple request of this company that their franchises may be extended so that they may have an opportunity to go to the money markets of the world and raise money to complete their works, seems to be most reasonable. If, however, it is a case simply of the camel poking his nose into the tent, it is a question that we should argue now, on its merits. I will ask the leader of the House if he will be good

Mr. BAIRD.

enough to make a statement on that point; because, for my part, I can offer no opposition to the Bill in case we have the assurance of the leader of the House that it is not proposed, during the session, to ask for a grant of public money for this company.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I can only say that I am not in a position to give the hon. gentleman an assurance that the Government will not submit for the consideration of the House a measure implementing the Bill which has been brought down.

Mr. WELDON. On the assumption that we will be asked to vote public money to this company, I share very heartily the view of my hon. friend from Queen's, N.B. (Mr. Baird.) I may say that that hon. gentleman is one whose words in all matters of this kind will carry great weight in the province of New Brunswick. He is one of a number of managers of fleets of vessels who has had singular success, and who is understood by those who know him well, to speak only of those things that he knows well, to speak of things that he knows about. I represent a county, Mr. Speaker, which lies, as this atlas shows, but a very few miles west of the Bay of Fundy terminus of the Chignecto Ship Railway, and it ought, therefore, to be true that men in my own county engaged in the shipping interests, would have some knowledge of any possible advantage that this work was likely to afford. I must take the responsibility here and now of making this sober statement, that during these ten years that I have had a seat in this Parliament, during all of which this work has been more or less discussed in Albert county, I have talked with the managers of two or three of the largest fleets controlled in that county, and I have talked with a considerable number of masters and men engaged in shipping, and I have not yet met a single man in Albert county who has ever spoken even respectfully of the commercial prospects of this enterprise. It is only fair, I think, to the men who, having lost three millions and a half of good money, to say this, and as my hon. friend has just said, to warn them, that if they spend further money, they are throwing good money after bad. So much for the measure, with respect to its effect on the company. I think, as does my hon. friend from Queen's, that this Bill, if it is to carry with it a further grant of public money, should be killed. Now, as to the effect on the country. It was stated by the Secretary of State that it would be immoral, having regard to the past course of this Parliament in granting an extension of time in similar cases—that it would here and now be immoral, that it would practically be an act of repudiation, that it would be something closely related to a breach of faith, if we were not now again, in 1896, practically to renew the subsidies. I cannot agree with that view. Fourteen years

ago we began to legislate on this matter ; we have made two or three amendments to our law, we have given an extension of time. We have made in another statute, and in another year an alteration of the terms, by changing a twenty-five years' subsidy into a twenty years' subsidy of a larger amount. We must all agree that the time limit to these contracts has some significance. There must come a time, after repeated renewals and extensions, alterations and relaxation of terms, when the Finance Minister can say that these old obligations which have been binding upon the country can now be wiped off the slate. There must come a time when the Finance Minister comes forward to make a financial statement, and is desirous of entering into new undertakings and of pledging the faith of the Dominion to new ventures, that he may find himself prepared to state to Parliament that he is free to do so. Can he do so if after fifteen, twenty or twenty-five years there is some slumbering obligation, not a legal but a moral obligation, which may rise up and be fastened on the public treasury ? Can we afford to strike out of our public contracts, no matter how many years have elapsed, the time limit, which has a meaning and which was put there for a purpose ? I would be willing not to press this point in this case, if I did not share the view which has been presented by my hon. friend (Mr. Baird) that we would not be doing any good to anybody by revoting this subsidy. We will lead this country into a useless expenditure of \$3,400,000, and do no real service to any honest man now living. I confess that after considering the matter fully, I consider there is no question of good or bad faith involved. In regard to the effect on Canadian credit, it must be remembered that we have two hundred millions odd borrowed in London, and if our credit were to be in the slightest degree affected by throwing out this Bill, or the Bill which will follow this, it would be a matter of business for us to consider whether we could afford to do so or not. Last year when a discussion seemed imminent, I obtained the best information it was possible for a Canadian member to acquire on this side of the Atlantic, the opinions of men eminent in banking and stock-broking, and from the best information I could obtain last summer, I came to the conclusion that Canadian credit would not in the slightest degree be affected. I make that statement for what it may be worth, but I am not free to strengthen it by giving the names of my informants. As to the effect on other Canadian enterprises, if we were to assent to this proposition it would simply mean that we would induce the people who have already lost \$3,500,000 to lose another \$1,500,000, and perhaps more ; and, looking to the future, we will strengthen Canadian credit, we will give a better chance

to companies seeking to float loans in London for proper and what are likely to prove successful enterprises by declining to give any bonus to this company. I am thankful to say that I was not a member of this House when the subsidy was voted. I remember voting on one occasion for an extension of time, and I do not recall a vote with so much regret as that vote given some years ago, and I regret my silence on that occasion. If it was proper then that I should have spoken, it is much more incumbent upon me to do so to-day, and I declare that what I have said embodies statements that I have gathered from shipowners and captains of vessels. If this Bill is carried in spite of our protest—and I hope it will not be carried—I take it that if these subsidies are voted in the future, this House must be very vigilant in watching the terms of the contract and insisting upon alterations, so as to make it perfectly clear and certain what are the conditions of the contract which must be fulfilled before subsidies running over perhaps twenty years are due and payable. If we are overborne and this Bill goes through the House, I ask hon. gentlemen on both sides to watch this Bill so that the provisions may be clearly defined, so that the company shall not receive \$170,000 a year for twenty years without having during each of these twenty years shown itself to have performed a reasonable amount of work.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I do not share the hon. gentleman's objections to the Bill now before the House. As it was introduced by the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Powell) some time ago, it was open to the objection taken by the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) ; but that objection has been entirely removed since the Bill was recast, and in so far as the Bill stands now on its own bottom, I do not think any objection can be fairly taken to it. We should not object to an extension of time for the completion of this work unless such an extension necessarily involves the assent of this Parliament to further aid being given to the work. I would not have risen to take part in the debate, being satisfied with the assent of the leader of the House to the statement of the hon. member for West Ontario, but I do not think the hon. member for Cape Breton (Sir Charles Tupper) has fully and fairly stated the action of Parliament in respect to this great public work. The hon. gentleman has, in his usual forcible way, intimated that the credit of this Dominion has been pledged irretrievably to this undertaking, and that the application of the share and bondholders should be acceded to, if we were to act in an honourable manner. The leader of the House suggested that the measure brought in for pledging this country to the payment of the money named had never been challenged on the floor of Parliament.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, I did not say that.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Then, I did not understand the hon. gentleman.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I said the proposition received unanimous assent on several occasions. I did not say it was not challenged.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I specially remember the matter, because since 1882, I have taken part in every debate that has occurred with respect to the extension of time and the granting of a subsidy to this company. I remember very well, in 1888, when the promoters asked for further aid, and when the whole subject was discussed, my hon. colleague from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Welsh) expressed himself as strongly as a man could do against the practicability of the undertaking, the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) followed in the same language, and I expressed myself very strongly against the measure, because I had done what the hon. member for Albert says he has done, applied to a great many practical men in my part of the Dominion and obtained the opinions of shipowners and others in the shipping business, and I failed to find one man who said he would venture to place his ship on the slip or thought this was a practicable or feasible scheme. We went further, and divided the House on the second reading of the Bill. The shareholders and bondholders who come before Parliament urging the moral obligation to renew the money grant state almost directly that no expression of opinion was given in the Parliament of Canada as against the feasibility of the scheme and rather by the expression of opinions uttered in favour of the work lured the public into investing their money. A pamphlet has been placed in the hands of hon. members, and I find, at page 13, the following:—

Not a syllable tending to discredit its future was heard until after the investors had spent nearly \$3,500,000 on the enterprise, every dollar of which was laid out in Canada except the sums paid for hydraulic machinery and material which could not be obtained here.

Those who now make idle statements with the view of prejudicing the company are making a mistake, as they cannot harm it; but they may leave reckless and irresponsible persons to attempt to discredit their own people by imputations which, if true, could only show that the share and debenture holders had been too confiding, when they invested their money on the faith of statements of leading public men in Canada and on the acts of the Canadian Parliament.

I simply rose to say that so far as a very large section of the Canadian Parliament were concerned, in 1888, before these gentlemen, as I understand it, invested one dollar; before these share and debenture holders invested a dollar; the strongest expressions of opinion were given utterance to, by

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

men whose position in the House entitled these expressions of opinion to weight, declaring that this scheme was a wild-cat scheme in which no Canadian had ventured to put a dollar. And we went further: and we challenged the opinion of this House on the question, and actually divided the House upon it. I do not mean to say, that that ought to be conclusive, but I state the fact in answer to the statement made in this pamphlet, to show that if these gentlemen did place their money in this scheme, they placed it with the full knowledge, that at any rate, a large proportion of the Canadian people thought the scheme to be a wild-cat scheme, and an impracticable one. I do not wish, for one, to commit myself absolutely to the proposition, that this money should not be voted. I think it is a matter for the very gravest possible consideration. The Secretary of State (Sir Charles Tupper) has said, that in his opinion, the credit of Canada is somewhat at stake, and he thinks we ought to act in an honourable and fair way. I am quite sure the House will act in an honourable and fair way, and I think we are disposed to give every consideration to the question: Has, or has not, the credit of Canada been pledged to these people; not in a technical or legal sense alone, but substantially and morally. If these people who placed their money in this company, had reason to believe, that even if they were years and years beyond the time allotted to them, Canada was prepared at all hazards to give them the subventions which were contained in the original Act—

Mr. LISTER. That may be your view.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I do not express any view. I am guarding myself very carefully against expressing any view.

Mr. LISTER. It will be a robbery sanctioned by this Parliament.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I am calling attention to the fact that the Secretary of State (Sir Charles Tupper) has made that statement, and I want to analyse it for a moment, to see where we stand. The hon. Secretary of State emphasized the statement, that the Parliament of Canada has passed an Act in 1888, preventing bonds or debentures from being issued until 20 per cent of the cost had been actually expended on the work, and that as a consequence of this action on the part of Parliament, these people were thrown into financial difficulties. Now, I do not think, from reading the pamphlet which the shareholders have submitted to the members here, that that statement can be accepted fully, as a correct statement of the reasons why they were unable to go on with the work. I will quote from the pamphlet at page 6, where they refer to this action of the Parliament of Canada, and I believe I can show, that this action of Parliament was not the sole and only reason for the difficulties of the company. The company say:

The capital issues of the company were to be £700,000 in debenture bonds and £300,000 in preference shares. Early in March, 1889, the company was ready to place these issues on the market when it was discovered that after the company's Act had been passed in the previous year, a General Railway Act had also been passed, and in section 93, subsection 4 of this Act, it says, after defining the extent of borrowing powers:— "But no bonds or debentures shall be issued until 20 per centum of the cost has been actually expended on the work." On this account the directors could only issue the £300,000 in preferred shares, which were subscribed for on the 20th March, 1889. They had then to wait until the bulk of this money was expended on the work and could not issue any debentures until the 22nd November following, say eight months after, and on account of the change which had meantime come over the money market they could only succeed in obtaining subscriptions for £250,000 out of a total of £700,000 authorized.

Now, according to their own showing, they were delayed for more than eight months in issuing a portion of the stock which they proposed to issue. They issued the preferred stock £300,000 in the first instance, and they had to show that 20 per cent of the cost had been spent upon the work, before they were able to issue the other portion of the £700,000 authorized. But, eight months after, they did float £250,000 of it, and they were unable to float the rest, not because of the action of this Parliament, but on account of the extraordinary depression of the financial market at home. Well, Sir, I shall content myself by keeping an open mind upon this subject, and if the Government take the responsibility of bringing down a proposition to this Parliament to involve this country in the expenditure of two and a half million dollars, or whatever the sum may be—

Mr. WELSH. Five million dollars.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman puts it at five million dollars, but I take it at the capitalized value.

Mr. FOSTER. Two and one-third millions.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Yes. If the Government bring down a proposition, asking this House to involve this country in the payment of that money, I for one shall be prepared to give it every fair and reasonable consideration. There is one phase of the case, however, which we cannot deny. Whatever views may have been entertained years ago as to the feasibility of this scheme, those views are all dissipated now. We know that the scheme cannot be a paying one. We know that it is not a practical, nor feasible one from a business standpoint. We know that if it is constructed it will be a monument—as my hon. friend (Mr. Welsh) has said—of the folly of Parliament in voting the money; but nevertheless, if the honour and credit of this country have been pledged to the payment of this money, I think that this Parliament, notwithstanding that it may be an utter loss will vote it. But, Sir, I am

not at all satisfied at present. I have read the pamphlet very carefully with a view of coming to an honest conclusion upon the subject, and I will be prepared to keep an open mind to vote upon the question when it comes down. I admit that there are strong reasons for holding, that the time limit should not be too strongly relied upon. There is no doubt upon that. But, this is a peculiar case. Time and again, they have come before this Parliament; time and again they have got extensions, and every time they have come, and every extension they have got. I have been one of those who have protested against voting the money, and against the contract being carried out at the expense of the country at all. However, under these circumstances, I will be prepared to hold myself open until the Government bring down their proposition.

Mr. MULOCK. Mr. Speaker, when the question was put by my hon. friend from West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) as to whether this motion involved any more than the renewal of the charter, and when the answer was given, that it did not, then perhaps the House might have allowed the discussion to cease, but for the fact that the member for Queen's (Mr. Baird) added more testimony as to the unwisdom of the scheme. Since then, however, we have had a statement by the leader of the House, which is in fact a notice that this renewal of the charter, is to be supplemented at a later date, by a submission of the Government to Parliament, for a renewal of the old subsidy. It is impossible, of course, at this moment, in a side way, to discuss the merits or otherwise of that proposition. But, inasmuch as we learn that capitalists, on the very slightest grounds, would seek to involve the public credit upon the utterances of a public man, or, upon what has been said, or hinted, or left unsaid; I for one now, at this stage in the debate, in assenting, if I do assent, to the second reading of the Bill, wish it to be understood that I do not in the slightest degree compromise myself, as to a grant of public money to this enterprise. I listened to the Secretary of State (Sir Charles Tupper) when he asserted to-day, that he had complete confidence in the wisdom of this scheme. Now, if the hon. gentleman was in the witness box, and obliged to testify as to the grounds of his confidence, I would like to know how his evidence would harmonize with the testimony of the member for Queen's (Mr. Baird), an experienced ship-owner, who has told us that the scheme must result in financial ruin. What is the basis of the advice given by the Secretary of State to Parliament: That this scheme is financially sound, or is a wise scheme. Well, Sir, that is an illustration of the recklessness with which assurances are given to Parliament, leading up to the expenditure of public money. Now, Sir, the Secretary of State said, as an argument in favour of this

proposition, that the Parliament of Canada had intercepted the manoeuvres of this company in 1888, by passing an Act rendering it impossible for them to sell bonds and carry on the enterprise. I have turned up the statute incorporating the company, and I find that it was passed in 1882. I find that it required the company to go into operation and begin its work within three years, and to complete its work within seven years. It was obliged therefore, to begin the work in 1885, and to have it completed in 1889. It was an enterprise novel in its character. There was nothing on earth like it, or nothing in the waters under the earth like it, and it was to be completed in a year after the passage of the Act in question, which is said to have interrupted the enterprise financially. Is it credible, can anybody believe it, that the Act of 1888 prevented the company securing money to complete the enterprise, when the contract by Parliament required it to be completed within a year after the passage of that Act? Six years of the seven had run out before that Act had passed. The enterprise ought to have been begun within three years of 1882: and, if it had proceeded ratably in order of time, it ought to have been four-fifths completed when we passed the Act of 1888. But it was not until 1889, the year in which the law required the company to have the work completed, that they discovered that, in the previous year, Parliament had passed an Act preventing them floating any bonds without having put any money into the enterprise. So that the argument that the Act of 1888 was an obstacle in the way, has been removed from the debate by the statement of the company themselves. The hon. Secretary of State has told us, as an indirect argument to show the perils to the public, that the valueless bonds of this enterprise, so far as it has now progressed, are lying in the vaults of the Canadian bankers in London, and that they there confront the Finance Minister, whenever he goes to London to float any Canadian bonds.

Mr. FOSTER. You will not find many of them in the Canadian banks.

Mr. MULOCK. I did not say the Canadian banks. I said the bankers or financiers of the Canadian Government in London.

Mr. FOSTER. The Canadian Government has only one banker, that is, the Bank of Montreal.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. If the hon. member will allow me, I will explain what I said. I said, that the bonds were lying in the vaults of banks and other financial institutions, from which a Canadian Finance Minister would want support, when floating a loan in London.

Mr. MULOCK. I accept the hon. gentleman's statement as being, no doubt, correct; but I find no substantial difference

Mr. MULOCK.

between it and the inference I draw, that the existence of bonds of an enterprise such as this in London has a prejudicial effect when Canada is seeking to float her own bonds there. Is that not a reason why we should consider carefully how far we permit this company to increase the amount of profitless bonds in those London banks? If the testimony of the hon. member for Queen's, N.B. (Mr. Baird) is valuable, it means that we are going to allow this company to increase their bonds by 2,000,000 or 3,000,000, which, I suppose, will find their way into those banks in London, to the further prejudice of Canadian credit. The hon. Secretary of State is sanguine, and, I fear, has not learned caution with time. I have looked through the returns of the railways, laid on the Table of the House within the last few weeks; and I have in my hand at this moment—I do not know whether it is a complete list—the names of the defaulting railway companies up to the 30th of June last; and here I have a list representing millions of dollars of bonds, which are, no doubt, lying beside those Chignecto bonds in the vaults of the London banks. Here are twenty railways, practically insolvent, not earning working expenses, not earning a cent on debentures or a cent on stock—enterprises which from time to time have received the sanction of Parliament, the imprimatur of Parliament, and grants of money from Parliament, and on the strength of these have secured the moneys of unfortunate investors in England. The hon. Secretary of State will remember one among the many flowery speeches he delivered in Parliament, in regard to an enterprise something like this one. It is on record, and it will never disappear from the record. He was recommending the investment of public money in another enterprise down by the sea—the Caraquet Railway—and he told us that this railway, which connected with the Intercolonial Railway, would enable the people down by the sea to send their thousands and hundreds of thousands of quintals of fish to the west each year, and the people of the west each year to send their flour and manufactures to the east; and thus a grand interprovincial trade was to be developed. I find the name of that enterprise in this list of insolvent companies. The language in which the hon. Secretary of State to-day recommended this enterprise to the public was like a dull tale, compared with that with which he recommended us to grant public aid to the Caraquet Railway. We acted upon his proposal, with results most unfortunate to all concerned. Now, I submit, that the advice of the hon. member for Queen's, N.B. (Mr. Baird) ought to have weight with us. If the promoters themselves, having invested so many million dollars in the enterprise, and knowing the facts, say: We wish to follow up this enterprise and try to save our money by putting a little more into it,

perhaps we cannot, as a Parliament, refuse them the permission to do so by renewing their charter. That is one thing. But, knowing all that I know to-day of this enterprise, if this company were now for the first time asking recognition at the hands of this Parliament so that they might be enabled, by means of a charter, to float the scheme and invite public and private money into it, I think it would be my duty to raise my voice and vote against the granting of such a charter, knowing that it must result in disaster both to private capital and public credit. But, if it is understood that this renewal is at the request of these unfortunate investors, who wish to be allowed, at their own risk, to increase the amount of their funds put at jeopardy, that is the extent to which Parliament should be compromised; nothing being done to give them any legal or moral right or claim to a grant of public money out of the Treasury of Canada. I view with alarm this proposition. It seems to me the inauguration of a new era of extravagance, a new era of wild-cat schemes. A Chignecto Railway is a fitting companion to a Hudson Bay Railway. We are told, that millions are to be poured out, that there is to be a great Subsidy Act introduced at the close of this Parliament, that the people of Canada are not spending as much as they can afford to spend, that we cannot be less economical, that we must go in for more large enterprises. Well, Sir, if this is a forerunner of such a policy, I deplore it. I, therefore, rise in protest against such utterances, suggestions, or halting assents given and withdrawn, compromising Parliament in the slightest degree at this moment. This is not the time to discuss every suggestion—for instance, a suggestion of the Secretary of State, that Parliament is under some moral obligation—that Parliament had done wrong and was obliged to make compensation for that wrong, and might, at a little later date, be called upon by this Government to remove it. All these observations are irrelevant to the subject under discussion. For instance, the suggestion of the Secretary of State that Parliament was under some moral obligation, that Parliament had done a wrong, and was pledged to make it good, and that Parliament might, at a later date, be called upon by this Government to renew this grant—all those observations, I submit, were irrelevant to the matter under discussion, and ought not to have been made, except as feelers to ascertain what the sense of the House and the country might be. But lest inferences might be drawn and the promoters might take steps, relying upon the utterances of to-day, I conclude by saying that I view this discussion with more than an open mind. My mind is pretty nearly made up, and it will be somewhat difficult to convince me that it is in the public interests to grant a farthing of public money to this enterprise.

Mr. EDGAR. I venture to suggest that as I was interrupted by the hon. Secretary of State, when putting my point of order, a word or two might be allowed me on the question. This Bill says that certain Acts, among others, the Act of 1892, are hereby revived, and are to be in force. That is a very broad expression. The Act of 1892 provides for the issue of some new bonds, and these bonds have been issued, according to the Minister of Finance, in reply to a question I put him the other day. These bonds are declared, by that Act of 1892, which is now revived, to be the first preferential claim, and charge upon, not only the docks, and so on, but the interests of the company in any subsidy in land or money, now or hereafter granted to it, or which the company may receive. In 1892 there was no default, and the company was entitled to receive, under certain conditions, this subsidy from the Government. We are reviving that Act by this legislation, and, as a matter of fact, the public Acts, the Act of 1886, for instance, granting the subsidy, are so interwoven with these private Acts that it is very hard to tell one from the other, and it is exceedingly hard to tell, in my judgment, the effect of this clause, even as it is drawn. The intention is declared by the mover of the Bill, and by the leader of the House, to be that it shall not be held to be a reviving of the lapsed grant. That being the case, I could reasonably expect the hon. leader of the House to consent to a proviso being put in the Bill in committee, which would render it clear that we do not, by this legislation, revive that grant.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I have no objection to that. Before you leave the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I beg permission of the House to make a statement.

Mr. SPEAKER. This Bill has not been disposed of.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think that, with the consent of the House, I may make this statement.

Mr. SPEAKER. Is it with reference to this Bill?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No.

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not think it can be done.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am anxious to make a very brief statement to the House.

Mr. SPEAKER. It is clearly out of order, with a question before the House just now not disposed of.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am aware of that. My application is informal, but when the House consents, I did not think there would be any objection.

Mr. SPEAKER. It would be violating all parliamentary rules, and we would get our-

selves into interminable difficulties, if I were to consent.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Perhaps the question before the House may now be disposed of.

Mr. McMULLEN. I desire to address the House on this question.

Mr. LAURIER. If the hon. leader of the House has a statement to make, it might be done by moving the adjournment of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER. An adjournment of the House may be moved, but the discussion must be confined to the question before the House. The discussion must be relevant to the question before the House.

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. Secretary of State had better just realize that I have got the floor. I want to say, with regard to this question now before the House, that I wish to enter my solemn protest against countenancing, in any shape or form, the renewal of this charter, if it be understood that its renewal carries with it, in any shape or form a promise, implied or expressed, to renew the grant which this company has now forfeited. At the inception of this scheme, there was no expectation that it would take some fourteen years to complete the work. When the company got its charter, it was to complete the work in seven years. It came to this House, from time to time, for renewal and extension, and it is now fourteen years since the scheme was introduced and the company chartered. The enterprise was set upon all fours immediately before the election of 1883. The hon. Secretary of State (Sir Charles Tupper), in a very forcible and eloquent speech, presented to this House the advantages that would accrue to that particular section of country, and the shipping interests in the maritime provinces, by the construction of this work. In his speech to-day urging the renewal and reviving of the charter of this company, he intimated indirectly that the Government were disposed to renew the grant of \$170,000 a year for twenty years. I was very much pleased to hear the protests honestly and conscientiously made by hon. gentlemen behind the hon. Secretary of State with regard to carrying out the construction of this work. I think that from those statements it is quite clear that if ever there was a period in our history when money flowed from our country like water down the streets, we might at such periods be warranted in making an investment in an undertaking of this kind. But any shipping conditions that existed in 1882 have been so completely altered that there is not a vestige left which would warrant this House in committing this country to a renewal of this charter, which will carry with it an expenditure of public money equal to \$170,000 a year.

Mr. SPEAKER.

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

After Recess.

Mr. McMULLEN. When you left the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I was giving some reasons why, in my humble opinion, we ought to proceed very carefully and very slowly in reviving the charter of the Chignecto Ship Railway Company. If our action in this House is to be understood by the promoters of this scheme as any indication whatever of our intention to revive the grant that was made to them for the construction of the ship railway, we should hesitate to go a single step further. In my humble opinion, the country has already contributed altogether too much to schemes of that kind. I think the country already bears enough evidence on its surface of the folly of assisting undertakings such as the present. I notice from the history of this road that the Government have, by Orders in Council in past years, amended the grant or promise of a grant to this company. The original grant was of \$150,000 a year for twenty-five years, and this the Government changed to \$170,602 for twenty years. This would amount to about \$3,500,000. The estimated cost of this ship railway is something in the neighbourhood of \$5,000,000. A very considerable portion of that money has been spent already. If this House renewed the charter and revived the grant, the result would be that even though the present owners had to invest a considerable sum, say a million of money to complete it, it would be better for them than to have it an absolute and entire failure. If there were not two ships a year going across, so long as it was operated, so long as it was ready for the business that was offered, they would be entitled to get the \$170,602 a year. The probabilities are that it might earn operating expenses. If it did that, the annual subsidy would pay nearly 4 per cent upon the bonds. Now, it would be better for the company, if they could get this House and the Government to revive the charter, to spend a considerable amount of money to get this grant rather than lose only what they have put in and get no annual grant. At the end of the twenty years they would, of course, be entitled to lift the iron and sell everything that was there and divide the company's resources amongst themselves. In that case the country would have contributed this very large amount of money for the grossest piece of folly, according to my humble opinion, that has ever been brought under the consideration of this House. As I stated before six o'clock, this scheme was first laid before Parliament in 1882, just before the elections of that year. Of course, it was a matter of considerable encouragement, and also a matter of very great temptation to the electors in the vicin-

ity of the proposed work to have pointed out to them the prospect of the expenditure of about \$5,000,000. I presume the hon. member for Cumberland at that time was very glad to be able to point out to the people of that constituency that by supporting the Government and maintaining it in power they would have this very large amount of money expended there. Now, we are on the eve of another election, and I suppose the Chignecto Marine Railway will be made to do duty again. That work is to be revived, a large amount of money expended there, and the people in many cases relieved of their financial embarrassments by having the opportunity of making money on this work. As I have said before, it is quite time that we should determine to put an absolute stop to any encouragement in the way of subsidy to this scheme. I have no objection to granting these men their charter, but I do object most strenuously to our giving any indication of the revival of the grant that was given before. The Secretary of State this afternoon, presenting the case on behalf of the Government and on behalf of this scheme, stated that when it was brought before the House in 1882 there was no opposition to the grant. I desire at this stage of the proceedings to enter my solemn protest against that grant ever being revived. There can be no possible moral responsibility, there can be no possible legal responsibility, because when the grant was made before it was made with the distinct understanding that the ship railway was to be completed in seven years. It was not so completed. The promoters came to this House and got a revival of their charter and a readjustment of their grant in 1885. The work was then to be completed in some four years. Again they failed. They came back again and got another extension of time to 1892, with a conditional extension to 1894 under a penalty of some \$5,000 a month. And still, in the face of these extensions and with the penalty resting upon them, they failed again. Now, the Secretary of State said this afternoon that, owing to a change that was made in the Railway Act, the company had been hampered in floating their bonds. That was amended as soon as the attention of the House was called to it. It might possibly have caused a very short delay. But I contend that the fact that this scheme began with every prospect of success and with a Government bonus of over \$170,000 fourteen years ago, and up to the present time has never been completed, shows great evidences of weakness and procrastination on the part of the promoters. If there ever was a time when any reasonable argument could have been given in favour of the construction of this work, it was at the time when the charter was granted. Since that time, as has been intimated by the hon. member for Queen's, N.B. (Mr. Baird), year after year the volume

of shipping that would pass over this railway has been growing less and less, until now we find two men like the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Welsh), an experienced mariner for over fifty years, and the hon. member for Queen's, N.B., also a gentleman of great experience in these matters, expressing the same view as to the utter inutility and absolute folly of offering any further encouragement in any shape or form to the construction of this ship railway. Now, Sir, I think in face of those statements that the Government certainly should hesitate to offer the slightest inducement for a renewal of that subsidy. The charter, as I said before, I have no objection to give them; I have no objections to revive their charter for the purpose of enabling them to make the best use they can of the works they have, and in which they have spent a considerable amount of money. But I want to point out clearly and to warn the Government that they must not take the action of the Opposition in acquiescing in the revival of the charter, as any indication whatever that they admit any shadow of a moral responsibility to revive the annual grant. We do not do that, and the Government, in my humble opinion, will have very hard work. I am sure, in persuading the Opposition that it is a scheme that should get the slightest consideration in the matter of a grant. It is one of those things that unquestionably is no credit to us. The men that lent their assistance and their countenance to putting this scheme, in the first place, in such a position that its promoters could go to London and borrow money, certainly if they were men of sensitive conscience, would feel that they had been parties to a tempting offer being made to the London money-lenders to invest their money in what is no better than a sink hole without a bottom; because I am satisfied they never can possibly get anything out of it unless Parliament is fool enough to permit itself to be driven into a revival of the grant of \$170,000 a year. Now, Sir, we have a few of these things scattered around this country that certainly will be monuments, after we are all gone, more particularly to the memory of the hon. Secretary of State than to any other man in this House, and that will unquestionably be a reflection upon the statesmanship, and the ability of the men who have administered the affairs of this country. We have the Chignecto Ship Railway Company for one, we have the Caraquet Railway for another, we have the St. Charles Branch, that has cost this country an enormous amount of money. I can well remember being in this House when the Secretary of State made his very full statement—

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the hon. member had better confine himself to the question before the House.

Mr. McMULLEN. I am endeavouring, Mr. Speaker, with your permission, to point out

the history of other schemes as compared with this scheme.

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not think the hon. member can go that extent. He can refer to them as illustrations of his argument, but he cannot go into the merits of those other schemes.

Mr. McMULLEN. I will go no further than to say that I am sorry we have got so many of them. But I will confine my remarks to the Chignecto Ship Railway, because I think we may possibly have an opportunity to take up and discuss those other schemes before Parliament rises. Now, I must say that I was sorry this afternoon to understand my hon. friend from Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies) as making an admission that there was any shadow of a moral claim for a revival of the annual grant. I do not think he intended to do that. If he did, I can only say that I believe he did not reflect the feeling or sentiments of a single man on this side of the House except himself. However, I fancy that he had no intention of conveying the idea that he was at all disposed favourably to a consideration of the renewal of the grant of \$170,000 a year. Of course the Government may be able to show that there is some moral claim over and above anything we have yet seen. I do not know how they are going to be able to show that, but I can say that so far as I am concerned, they will have great difficulty in persuading me that the country, or this House, is so committed to a revival of that grant and to a continuation of the promised assistance to this scheme, as to secure my acquiescence in the revival of a grant of \$170,000 a year. I think if we grant the charter to the company, that is all they may fairly ask. They should be permitted to utilize the property that is there, if it is worth anything, to the best advantage. We have no objections to allow them to do that; but it must be with the understanding that the country shall not be called upon for any more money. When we come to consider the enormous annual expenditure of this country at the present moment, and the absolute necessity for reductions in every possible shape that reductions can be made, reasonably, and the affairs of the country properly conducted at the same time, it is unquestionably a piece of the greatest folly to attempt further to assist and encourage undertakings of this kind that bear upon their face evidence of a piece of folly, sacrificing the people's money in enterprises that will never give anything in the way of a return. Now, Sir, speaking on behalf of the constituency I have the honour to represent, I enter in my humble way, my solemn protest against a single dollar ever again being granted by Parliament to the Chignecto Ship Railway Company. I hope to-night we shall have heard the last of this scheme. I am sorry that it was ever launched before the English investors who have been induced to go into it. So far as we are concerned

Mr. McMULLEN.

there is nothing lost yet, and we are bound by every possibly parliamentary rule that we can bring to play, in the interests of this country to oppose to the last and to the bitter end one single brass farthing of the people's money being cast into this scheme.

Mr. LISTER. Mr. Speaker, when this innocent looking little Bill was introduced into the House it was scarcely thought it would evoke so much discussion. It seems remarkable, Sir, that the hon. Secretary of State, who is really the father of this Bill, should have entrusted it to the hon. member who introduced it. It is hardly necessary to say that, so far as the Chignecto Ship Railway Company is concerned, it is most unpopular in every section of the country; and from the speeches we have had from the other side of the House, it is clear that those who live in close proximity to the scheme are opposed to it as being a useless and a prodigal waste of public money. Sir, I had fondly hoped that we had heard the last of this scheme, when it was introduced some years ago. When afterwards a charter which had been granted in the first place was renewed, it was a subject of controversy from one end of the country to the other. I do not believe, Mr. Speaker, that any elector in this country can be found to approve of the scheme which is introduced and proposed to be carried out. When the charter was allowed to expire the last occasion, we thought that this Parliament would never be bothered with this question again. But, Sir, I call your attention to the fact that it is a remarkable coincidence that with the re-appearance of the Secretary of State in Canada and in this House, the old claim is revived. Three years ago, I believe, have passed since this charter expired. Three years have already run by during which we have heard nothing of it; but the moment the junior member for Cape Breton takes his seat in this House, we find this infant again cropping up, and with an innocence one would hardly expect, we find a Bill is introduced, not by the Secretary of State himself, but by perhaps the youngest member of this House, in a brief and very moderate speech. One would scarcely believe that there was anything wrong with the proposed legislation. It is not the Bill alone we have to consider, but I suppose hon. gentlemen opposite will do in this case what has been done in many others, renew a charter given by Parliament to a body of gentlemen for some enterprise public or private. But we have to fear the refusal to state whether this is to be supplemented by another Bill providing for a grant from the public funds of a very large sum, between two and three million dollars, in aid of an enterprise which is utterly and entirely worthless. Why, we might just as well spend the money of the people in hunting for the lost Atlantis as to spend it in this utterly worthless enterprise. Let me say to the Government if they attempt to introduce a measure ask-

ing this House to vote public money to this scheme, it will be the bounden duty of hon. members, at all events of those who think as I do, to oppose it to the utmost, and if possible save this country from a loss of between two and three millions, and if possible save the English investors from a further loss of a like sum. What is the scheme? One would think, upon its very face, it would not receive at the hands of intelligent men any consideration whatever, but in the good old boom days, when money flowed like water out of the treasury of Canada, there was no scheme too absurd to receive attention from hon. gentlemen leading the Government, one of whom was the present leader of the House and Secretary of State. Every scheme, for railroads or anything else you could think of, received the attention of the Government and substantial aid at the cost of the people. Hon. gentlemen opposite now say that the honour of this country is pledged to the renewal of this subsidy, which was granted under a preceding Act. This country is not bound legally, it is not bound morally, it is not bound in any way, to grant a single dollar to this enterprise; on the contrary, it is morally bound not to grant a single dollar. The Secretary of State told the House to-day that in the vaults of the Bank of London are to be found the bonds of this company, a company formed, I venture to say, by men who have now little, if anything, invested in this scheme. They floated the bonds of the company, no doubt, at a very heavy discount, and the banks of London bought them as a speculation, believing if it were carried out they would get their money back, and if not carried out they would lose every dollar put in the enterprise. In London the shrewdest business men in the world are to be found. Is any man credulous enough to believe that these business men would invest their money in bonds without examining with the greatest care every statute passed by Canada affecting them, and ascertaining the conditions on which the subvention is granted. They, no doubt, took the trouble to ascertain what was said during the debates in this House, and if they have done so they must have found that the representatives of half the people believe this was a boistered scheme, and that it was nothing but wasting the public funds. In view of these facts, how can these gentlemen come to this House and swear that we are bound in honour to subsidize the company again as it was subsidized in the first place? They bought the securities with their eyes open, they knew what they were doing, and there is no claim on the people morally or legally to grant a subvention to this company now, because they have failed in every contract they made. The Government provided that the company should pay a penalty for every month the work remained uncompleted beyond a fixed period. Years have passed and no claim has

been made by the Government on the company; on the contrary, the Government have foregone their claims and have even done so by Act of Parliament; and yet now the company have the effrontery to come before Parliament and say that the representatives of the people are morally bound to make good this subvention. For the sake of investors in England we would be doing a moral wrong if we acted as hon. gentlemen proposed. It is feared that this work cannot be completed for double the money this Government is asked to grant, and the proposal simply means that the people who have already invested in it must be allowed to invest a further sum of \$2,500,000, the effect of which will be merely to extend to those people more encouragement for the sinking of their money in a scheme that never can be carried out, and in this respect it closely resembles many of the railway projects of the Government. In considering the language used by the Secretary of State, bold as it is, full of adjectives, involving great promises, as it does, we must remember the Secretary of State in the past. We have a right, in drawing conclusions as to how much importance should be attached to his opinion given in this House to-day, to recall his statements of former years, and see how those statements have worked out. The hon. gentleman has promoted, urged and carried through this House over and over again schemes that would not have been carried through but for the positive assurances of the hon. gentleman that they would be profitable to the country, would develop our resources, would attract foreign investors, and upon these statements over and over again, the House has been foolish enough to yield to his importunities and grant the different corporations vast sums of public money. If Canada to-day owes an enormous debt, it is to the hon. gentleman more than to any other man in Canada is responsible for having loaded Canada with that debt. As one example, which bears a remarkable similarity to the statement made by the Secretary of State to-day, was the hon. gentleman's statement when promoting the Caraqueet Railway. Then he stated—

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman is referring to a matter which has no relation to the matter before the House.

Mr. LISTER. The Secretary of State made a statement to-day for the purpose of inducing Parliament to pass this piece of legislation. In order to show that the hon. gentleman's statement to-day is not reliable, I propose to show that he made a similar statement regarding another enterprise on another occasion; but if you rule, Sir, that this is not strictly in order, I submit.

Mr. SPEAKER. What I said is, that the hon. member (Mr. Lister) cannot enter into a discussion of these other matters. He

may refer to them, incidentally, for the purpose of illustrating his argument, as I have already ruled. But if he begins to discuss the Caraquet Railway, that would certainly be out of order because it has no bearing whatever on the question before the House.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. On that point of order, I would like to understand. It appears to me that it is a most proper thing, by way of illustration, to call attention to the fact that, on former occasions, promises were made to this House by the hon. gentleman referred to which have been signally unfulfilled. We have done that kind of thing very frequently, and it appears to me to be a thing which, in the very nature of the case, is most pertinent to the argument my hon. friend (Mr. Lister) is addressing to the House.

Mr. SPEAKER. As I have stated, that can be done incidentally; but if the hon. member begins to refer to a discussion which took place regarding the Caraquet Railway, that would be out of order.

Mr. LISTER. I have no intention of referring to that discussion at all. What I proposed to do was simply to call your attention, Sir, to the statement made by the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) respecting another matter. So far as these statements of the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) are concerned, I have this to say: That in connection with schemes promoted, and subsidies given by this House upon the representations of the Secretary of State, the representations made by him, and upon which he induced this Parliament to vote large sums of money, have not been borne out by the facts. We have, Sir, as a matter of fact, a subsidy of public money voted to the Caraquet Railway to the extent of over \$600,000, and we were told then that the construction of this railway would open up an enormous trade between the west and the east, that the fish of the Atlantic coast would be shipped to the far west, that the products of the far west would find an outlet on the Atlantic coast, and that the Intercolonial Railway would receive large additions to its freight, to the great profit of the people of this country generally. Sir, these were the striking words which the Secretary of State addressed to this House, and if we look at his promises and compare them with the results, one is struck by the fact that the Secretary of State (Sir Charles Tupper) was far afield in the statements he has made. Why, Sir, that road which has cost us—

Mr. SPEAKER. Order. The hon. member (Mr. Lister) cannot go on to discuss the Caraquet Railway on a motion for the second reading of a Bill respecting the Chignecto Marine Transport Railway Company. The rule is: That on the motion for the second reading of the Bill, it is not in order to refer to a subject which does not come within the scope of the Bill.

Mr. LISTER.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. With all due deference, I submit it does come within the scope of the Bill, and I must say that in all my parliamentary experience, I have never known such interference with a discussion of this kind.

Mr. SPEAKER. If the hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) wishes to appeal from my ruling, he is quite at liberty to do so.

Mr. LISTER. It is hardly worth while, Mr. Speaker, appealing from the ruling, in view of the fact that the object here is not to prevent the Bill getting into committee, but rather to give the House and the country to understand that any action on the part of the Government to supplement this legislation, by legislation giving a subvention to this company, will be opposed as far as it is possible to oppose it. The scheme, Mr. Speaker, is one that certainly cannot, could not, and ought not receive the approval of any person of ordinary understanding. It is proposed by this company to construct a railway for the purpose of transporting ships over dry land. I venture to say that in no part of the world is there such a railway in existence for the purpose of transporting such large vessels. It is proposed to carry these ships from one body of water and put them into another, and if any evidence at all were required as to the impossibility of the scheme, that evidence is given by the hon. gentlemen who to-day spoke in opposition to the measure. Even if the railway were capable of carrying ships from one water to another, as a matter of fact, there are no ships to be carried, so that all there is to be accomplished by the construction of this ship railway, is the sinking of the private moneys of the English people, and sinking of the public moneys of the people of Canada. A more visionary scheme was never presented to any Parliament, or to any people. Upon its face, the scheme carries its own condemnation, and yet, we find the leaders of the House, and we find, I have no doubt, the members of the Government, and a great portion of the Conservative members supporting that Government, prepared to vote away two and a half million dollars for the purpose of carrying on this most visionary scheme. And, Sir, let us consider, further, the time at which they propose to do this. In the last days of the last session of this Parliament, they introduce this measure, for the purpose, avowedly, of carrying on this work. Is this one of the boomster schemes that the Government is going to propose to Parliament, in view of the near approach of the elections? Is there any honest intention on the part of these promoters to carry out this work, or is it for the purpose of making the people of that section of the country believe that two or three millions of dollars of public money, and five million dollars of private

funds, are to be scattered broadcast throughout that section of the country? Let our gentlemen judge for themselves: the country shortly will judge them, if any such grant as this is made to this company. Sir, by granting this money, you are giving the promoters of this scheme a further opportunity to swindle the British public, because the scheme, upon its face, is a swindle. The men who are promoting this scheme do so in the face of the facts stated here, and in the face of the facts patent to everybody, that it can never be profitable, that it can never return any revenue, that it is not to be owned by the Government of the country, and operated free, as the canals of the country are, but that it is to be the property of a private company, who profess to construct it for the purpose of getting a return, in the shape of a revenue. It never can be profitable. It never can pay its running expenses, and I venture the prediction here to-night that it never will be operated, whether you give them the money or not. It will enable these people, with the promise of a subsidy from this Government, to issue bonds, and for a period, at all events, to guarantee the interest on these bonds out of the payment of the subsidy. You permit, by this legislation, the promoters of this scheme to further draw into their coffers the money of the people of England. I repeat, Mr. Speaker, there is no legal or moral claim on this Parliament to supplement this legislation by a subsidy. It would be an immoral act on the part of this Parliament to grant the money, because it would enable these people to further draw the money of the people of Great Britain into this utterly worthless enterprise.

House divided:

YEAS:

Messieurs

Amyot,	Lachapelle,
Belley,	Langevin (Sir Hector),
Boyd,	LaRivière,
Cameron (Inverness),	Macdonald (King's),
Carling (Sir John),	Macdowall,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	McAlister,
Coatsworth,	McDonald (Assinibola),
Costigan,	McDonald (Victoria),
Davies (P.E.I.),	McDougald (Pictou),
Davin,	McDougall (Cape Breton),
Desaulniers,	McKay,
Dickey,	McLean (King's),
Dyer,	McLennan,
Fairbairn,	McNeill,
Ferguson (Leeds and Grenville),	Miller,
Fraser,	Mills (Annapolis),
Fréchette,	O'Brien,
Gillies,	Ouimet,
Girouard,	Patterson (Colchester),
Grandbois,	Powell,
Haggart,	Pridham,
Haslam,	Stairs,
Hutchins,	Tisdale,
Jeannotte,	Tupper (Sir Charles),
Joncas,	White (Shelburne),
Kaulbach,	Willmot, and
Kenny,	Wood.—54.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Allan,	Lister,
Baird,	Macdonald (Huron),
Beith,	McGregor,
Boston,	McIsaac,
Bowers,	McMillan,
Bowman,	McMullen,
Brown,	Martin,
Bruneau,	Monet,
Cameron (Huron),	Mulock,
Campbell,	Paterson (Brant),
Carroll,	Perry,
Cartwright (Sir Rich'd),	Putnam,
Casey,	Rider,
Christie,	Rinfret,
Craig,	Roome,
Dawson,	Sanborn,
Fauvel,	Scriver,
Featherston,	Semple,
Flint,	Somerville,
Gillmor,	Stevenson,
Godbout,	Sutherland,
Guay,	Tarte,
Guillet,	Vaillancourt,
Harwood,	Weldon,
Innes,	Welsh,
Ingram,	Wilson, and
Landerkin,	Yeo.—55.
Legris,	

Motion negatived:

MANITOBA SCHOOL QUESTION.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to make the following statement to the House: Since answering the question asked a few days ago by the member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), the following telegram has been received by Sir Donald Smith:—

Winnipeg, 2nd March, 1896.

Your telegram has received most careful consideration of myself and colleagues. While fully appreciating all you say, it is quite clear to us that we can only proceed to Ottawa for the purpose of holding a conference upon the official invitation of the Dominion Government. I fully appreciate your kind offices in this matter.

(Signed) GREENWAY.

In view of the assurance that the government of Manitoba are willing to have a conference, the Government propose, so soon as the second reading of the Remedial Bill is carried, to have a conference with Mr. Greenway's government with a view to arrive at a settlement of this question on terms that will be satisfactory to his government and the minority of Manitoba, but in the meantime to proceed with the question before the House de die in diem as previously arranged.

SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 79) to incorporate the National Sanitarium Association.—(Mr. Roome.)

GERMAN LANGUAGE IN MANITOBA AND THE NORTH-WEST TER- RITORIES.

Mr. DAVIN asked :

Whether the hon. the Minister of the Interior is aware that the Manitoba government has had the provincial school laws translated into and published in the German language? Whether he intends to have a sum placed in the Estimates to provide for the translation and publishing in German the school ordinance of the North-west Territories?

Mr. DICKEY. The Minister of the Interior is not aware that the Manitoba government has had the provincial school laws translated and published in the German language. 2. He does not intend to have a sum placed in the Estimates to provide for the translation and publishing in German the school ordinances of the North-west Territories.

LOBSTER AND OYSTER PLANTING IN BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Mr. CORBOULD asked :

Is it the intention of the Government during this season to place lobsters or lobster spawn in the waters of the Pacific, in British Columbia? If so, what steps, if any, have been taken in the matter? Is it the intention of the Government, during the season to place eastern oysters in the waters of the Pacific, in British Columbia? If so, what steps, if any, have been taken in the matter?

Mr. COSTIGAN. It is the intention of the Government to introduce lobsters into the waters of the Pacific in British Columbia early during the coming season, probably in April or May, and arrangements are in progress for carrying out this intention. 2. It is the intention of the Government during this season to place eastern oysters in the waters of British Columbia, and instructions have been sent to the officer at Halifax to have a sufficient quantity of brood oysters ready to ship at the same time as the lobsters.

MANITOBA SCHOOL QUESTION.

Mr. EDGAR asked :

Has an invitation been extended by or on behalf of the Dominion Government, or by or on behalf of any member thereof, to the First Minister of Manitoba to come to Ottawa for the purpose of discussing any matters in connection with the schools of that province? Has such invitation, if given, been accepted?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. In answer to the hon. gentleman I beg to say that all the information I have to give to the House is already given in the statement just made.

NORTHUMBERLAND STRAITS.

Mr. PERRY asked :

Is it the intention of the Finance Minister to lay upon the Table of this House a map showing what borings have been made across the Straits

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

of Northumberland, as promised some time ago? If so, when?

Mr. FOSTER. I answered that question once before and asked the hon. gentleman to put a motion for a return to be brought down, and that motion would pass as a matter of form. And the information brought down would then be preserved by the House. If laid on the Table, in answer to a question, it is not taken into custody and the matter is too valuable to be lost.

CAPE BRETON RAILWAY.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness) asked :

What quantity—1, of solid rock; 2, of gypsum rock; 3, of loose rock; 4, of borrow pit; 5, of earth, and 6, of hard-pan—so-called respectively—was excavated on section from station 210 to 250, being from 28th to 29th mile whilst Sims & Slater and their sureties conducted the work on the Cape Breton Railway, east of the Grand Narrows, in 1887?

Mr. HAGGART. In reply I beg to say:—Excavated on section of the Cape Breton Railway of which Messrs. Sims & Slater were the contractors from station 210 to station 250, being on 28th and 29th miles, whilst Sims & Slater and their sureties conducted the work.

	Cubic yards.
Solid rock	1,873
Gypsum rock	Nil.
Loose rock	263
Borrow pit	70
Earth	2,374
Hard-pan (so-called)	Nil

LANDS TO FRENCH HALF-BREEDS.

Mr. O'BRIEN asked :

Has any proposal been made to the Greenway Government by the Rev. Father Lacombe for the setting apart of a tract of land in any portion of the North-west Territories, for the use of the French Half-breeds of Manitoba and the North-west? If so, has that proposal been agreed to? Has any Order in Council been passed, in pursuance of such proposal, and if so, what are the terms of such Order in Council?

Mr. DICKEY. The answer to all these questions is "yes," except as to the latter part of the last question, in reply to which it might be stated that the Order in Council will be laid before Parliament.

FISHERY LICENSE, CLEARVILLE, ONT.

Mr. CASEY asked :

1. Who applied this season for a fishery license or licenses at Clearville, West Elgin, Ontario, with residence of applicant and date of application, in each case?

2. Who have received a license or licenses?

3. What are the reasons for accepting or refusing the applications in each case?

4. Has there been correspondence with the Department of Marine and Fisheries on the subject?

5. With whom?

6. Will the Government lay it on the Table?

Mr. COSTIGAN. In reply to the hon. gentleman I beg to say :

1. Abraham Hoover, Clearville, 10th Dec., 1895. A. J. O'Brien, Clearville, 19th Dec., 1895.

2. Abraham Hoover.

3. The reasons for granting the license to Mr. Hoover and refusing Mr. O'Brien, are that it was shown by affidavit and agreement of Mr. O'Brien that he had formally transferred all his right or claim to the fishery, as well as the warehouse and dock to Mr. Hoover.

With regard to question 4, 5 and 6, this information would necessitate the papers being moved for.

MONTREAL CENTRE ELECTION.

Mr. BRODEUR asked :

Whether the accounts of the returning officers, poll clerks and others, who were employed at the last election for Montreal Centre, have been paid? If so, when were they paid; and if not, why not?

Mr. COSTIGAN. The accounts of the returning officers, poll clerks and others employed in the election, have been paid, partly on February 8th and partly on March 3rd, except the constable at nomination, whose account has not been sent in. Some accounts for supplies, travel, etc., were not paid in full as rendered. The reasons for the deductions are given on the attached sheets.

QUEBEC OBSERVATORY.

Mr. BRUNEAU for (Mr. Choquette) asked :

1. Whether Mr. Arthur Smith, who has charge of the Observatory at Quebec, is entitled to free quarters for himself and his father's family?

2. On whose recommendation was he appointed to the Quebec Observatory?

3. Does he hold a certificate of qualification?

4. Are the Government aware that the report made to Mr. Carpmael by the said Arthur Smith, was not prepared by him, but by a friend of his, who is a surveyor and geometrician, and that Mr. Smith does not possess the knowledge required to prepare such reports?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Mr. Arthur Smith has charge of the observatory at Quebec, and there is a dwelling house provided for him, attached to the observatory. The department has no knowledge of his father's family having free quarters. Mr. Smith was appointed on the recommendation of the late Prof. Carpmael, of Toronto, Director of the Meteorological Service.

Prof. Carpmael reported to the department that Mr. Smith, who had been assisting the late Observer, Mr. Ashe, was duly qualified to perform the duties. The Government are not aware that the report made to Mr. Carpmael by Mr. Smith was not prepared by him, and the Government has every reason to believe that Mr. Smith possesses the knowledge required to prepare his reports.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY RATES AND REBATES.

Mr. FRASER asked :

1. What was the amount of rebate paid back by the Intercolonial Railway to Hon. Josiah Wood, Senator, Sackville; Charles Fawcett, Esq., Wood Stone Point Quarries; Moncton Sugar Refinery, Moncton; A. Gunn & Company, Halifax, and J. A. Leaman, Esq., Halifax, during the years 1892-93-94-95 and 1896? How large a business must any person or persons or firm conduct with the Intercolonial Railway before a rebate is given?

2. What is the rate charged on a car-load or part car-load of sugar from the refinery at Moncton (a) to St. John, (b) Newcastle, (c) Quebec?

3. Is the same rate charged on coal from Springhill to Moncton sugar refinery as to smaller consumers in Moncton? What is the rate to the refinery and what to smaller consumers? What is the rate on coal per ton from Springhill (a) to Sackville, (b) Moncton?

4. What is the rate on car of hay or other farm produce from Farnham, Que., to Halifax, N.S., via St. John, N.B.? What amount of freight on such car goes (a) to Canadian Pacific Railway, (b) to Intercolonial Railway?

5. What is the rate of freight on car of iron from Londonderry, N.S., (a) to St. John, N.B., (b) Halifax, (c) Quebec, (d) Montreal?

6. Passenger rate first and second-class from Montreal to (a) St. John, N.B., (b) Halifax and Sydney, and amount of each paid to Intercolonial Railway?

Mr. HAGGART. During the years 1892, 1893, 1894, 1895 and 1896 no rebate was paid to the Honourable Josiah Wood, the Wood Point Stone Quarries, or J. A. Leaman. There was paid to Charles Fawcett, as rebate: In 1892, \$401.87; in 1893, \$892.32; in 1894, \$588.09; in 1895, \$393.74; in 1896, nil. There was paid to the Moncton Sugar Refinery, as rebate: in 1892, nil; in 1893, \$783.20; in 1894, \$210.75; in 1895, \$2,483.48; in 1896, \$39.38. There was paid to A. Gunn & Company, as rebate: in 1892, \$457.87; in 1893, \$3,232.76; in 1894, \$1,533.45; in 1895, \$168.82; in 1896, nil. There is no scale of rebate paid to persons or firms who conduct business with the Intercolonial Railway, excepting the case of coal for manufacturers at St. John and Halifax, in competition with the water. For some years a rebate was paid on corn to millers in competition with the Boston route, and a part of the rebate paid to A. Gunn & Company and Charles Fawcett was on corn, but this was discontinued in January, 1895. Where there are corn-mills and flour-mills along the line of the Intercolonial Railway, they are paid a rebate on flour and meal ground in the mills, provided the corn and wheat have been brought over the railway. Part of the rebate paid to A. Gunn & Company and to Charles Fawcett is for such product of their mills. In the case of the Moncton Sugar Refinery Company, all the raw sugar, as well as all the sugar refined by them has to pass over the Intercolonial Railway, which thus gets two freights out of it; hence the

rebate. The rate charged on sugar : By the car-load, from Moncton to St. John, 6 cents per 100 pounds ; less than car-load, from Moncton to St. John, 12 cents per 100 pounds ; by the car-load, from Moncton to Newcastle, 10 cents per 100 pounds ; less than car-load, from Moncton to Newcastle, 11 cents per 100 pounds ; by the car-load, from Moncton to Quebec, P.Q., 14 cents per 100 pounds ; less than car-load, from Moncton to Quebec, P.Q., 23 cents per 100 pounds. The same rate is not charged on coal from Spring Hill to the Moncton Sugar Refinery Company as to small consumers. The rate to the refinery is 50 cents per ton of 2,000 pounds ; to smaller manufacturers, 66 cents per ton, and to all other, \$1 per ton. The rate on coal from Spring Hill to Sackville, 60 cents a ton of 2,000 pounds ; rate on coal from Spring Hill to Moncton, \$1 a ton of 2,000 pounds. The freight rate on hay, by the car-load, from Farnham, P.Q., to Halifax, via St. John, N.B., is 19 cents per 100 pounds. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company receives 61 per cent of this, equal to 1159-100th cents, and the Intercolonial Railway receives 39 per cent, equal to 741-100th cents. The rate on iron from Londonderry to St. John is \$1.50 a ton of 2,240 pounds. The rate on the iron from Londonderry to Halifax is \$1 a ton of 2,240 pounds. The rate on iron from Londonderry to Lévis, P.Q., is \$2.50 a ton of 2,240 pounds. The rate on iron from Londonderry to Montreal is \$3.40 a ton of 2,240 pounds. The rate on pig iron and puddle bars from Londonderry to Montreal is \$2.94 a ton of 2,240 pounds. The first-class passenger rate from Montreal to St. John is \$14, of which the Intercolonial Railway receives \$10.75. The second-class passenger fare from Montreal to St. John is \$9.25, of which the Intercolonial Railway receives \$7.10. The first-class passenger fare from Montreal to Halifax is \$17.50, of which the Intercolonial Railway receives \$13.95. The second-class passenger fare from Montreal to Halifax is \$11.50, of which the Intercolonial Railway receives \$9.15. The first-class passenger fare from Montreal to Sydney is \$21.20, of which the Intercolonial Railway receives \$16.10. The second-class passenger fare from Montreal to Sydney is \$14.30, of which the Intercolonial Railway receives \$11.10.

SAMUEL DAVISON.

Mr. LANDERKIN asked :

Is Samuel Davison in arrears to the Customs Department at Toronto ? If so, how much, and when did he so become ? How did he get in arrears with the office ? Was an action taken against him ? If so, what was the result of it ? Has he made good any of the amount ? Has any action been taken to recover from him ?

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Samuel Davison defrauded the Customs Department, at the port of Toronto, out of duties estimated at \$2,750. in the year 1891, by entering silks on false

Mr. HAGGART.

invoices. No amount of the duty has been made good, as he fled the country, having no material assets. No action was taken to recover, as the claim stands good, should he return to Canada.

DURATION OF PARLIAMENT.

Mr. O'BRIEN (for Mr. McCarthy) asked :

1. When was the last Parliament of Canada dissolved, and was the dissolution thereof announced by proclamation, and at what date ?

2. When did His Excellency the Governor General by proclamation order the writs for the holding of the election of the present Parliament ?

3. When were the said writs issued and at what time were they made returnable, including in this inquiry the writ of election for the district of Algoma ?

4. Was the House of Commons summoned to meet on Saturday, the 25th day of April, 1891 ? Was it prorogued from that date and summoned to meet for the despatch of business on the 29th day of April, 1891 ?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I would answer the hon. gentleman's questions as follows : 1 The sixth, or last, Parliament was dissolved by a proclamation of His Excellency the Governor General, bearing date, February the 3rd, 1891. 2. His Excellency the Governor General gave orders for the issue of writs for calling a Parliament by a proclamation, bearing date the 3rd day of February, 1891. 3. By a proclamation, dated the 3rd day of February, 1891, His Excellency the Governor General ordered that the issue of the writs should bear date the 4th day of February, 1891, and be made returnable the 25th day of April, following. (No special mention was made of the district of Algoma.) 4. By a proclamation, dated the 3rd of February, 1891, His Excellency the Governor General summoned Parliament (pro forma) on the 25th day of April following ; and by a subsequent proclamation, dated 17th March, 1891, he summoned Parliament to meet on the 29th of April following, for the despatch of business.

SHIPMENTS PER SS. "ADMIRAL."

Mr. FAUVEL asked :

How many carloads of flour, pork, coal oil and mixed freight were shipped from the Intercolonial Railway at Dalhousie, N.B., on the SS. "Admiral," during the seasons of 1894 and 1895, to the Baie des Chaleurs and Gaspé points ?

Mr. HAGGART. There was shipped from the Intercolonial Railway at Dalhousie, on the steamer "Admiral" for Baie des Chaleurs and Gaspé points, during the season 1894 : 1,683 tons of flour, equal to about 112 carloads ; 34 tons of pork, equal to about 3 carloads ; 68 tons of coal, equal to about 5¼ carloads ; 1,206 tons mixed freight, equal to about 121 carloads. During the season of 1895 : 1,620 tons of flour, equal to about 108 carloads ; 24 tons of pork, equal to about 2 carloads ; 89 tons coal oil, equal

to about 7½ car-loads; 1,288 tons mixed freight, equal to about 129 car-loads.

HARBOUR OF PASPEBIAC.

Mr. FAUVEL asked :

Is it the intention of the Government to place in the Supplementary Estimates an amount towards making local harbour improvements at the port of Paspebiac, county of Bonaventure ?

Mr. OUMET. That subject is now under consideration.

GAS FOR GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS AT OTTAWA.

Mr. CAMPBELL asked :

1. Who has the contract for supplying the gas required for the Government Buildings at Ottawa ?

2. What price is paid for it per thousand feet ?

3. What quantity was used during the past year ?

4. Is it the intention of the Government to substitute electric light for gas, and what is the estimated cost of making the change ?

Mr. OUMET. The Ottawa Gas Company has the contract for supplying the gas required for the Government buildings at Ottawa. The price is \$1.50 per 1,000 cubic feet, if the quantity consumed during any one year exceed 8,000,000 cubic feet. If the quantity consumed be less than 8,000,000 cubic feet, the price paid is the same as that charged to the public, with the usual discount given to the public and an additional 5 per cent. The quantity used during the past year was 9,794,800 cubic feet. It is the intention of the Government to gradually substitute electric light for gas in places where gas is still used in Parliament buildings, but not at present in the other buildings.

CONTRACTS ON THE INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

Mr. FRASER asked :

1. Were tenders invited by the Government for green sand castings to be furnished for the use of the Intercolonial Railway at Richmond, (sound and clear) to be delivered at some station on the Intercolonial Railway ?

2. What is the name and address of each person or firm who tendered, and the amount of each tender ; giving price per pound ?

3. To whom was the contract awarded, and what is the price to be paid ?

4. Is scrap iron to be taken by the contractor as part payment ? If so, what proportion of scrap iron is to be taken by the contractor, and what price is to be allowed by him therefor ?

Mr. HAGGART. 1. Tenders were invited for iron castings to be furnished for the use of the Intercolonial Railway. 2. The Truro Foundry and Machine Company, Truro, 1½ cents per pound, taking equal quantity of cast scrap at \$15 per ton, 2,000 pounds.

Douglas & Co., Dartmouth, at 1½ cents per pound, taking equal quantity of scrap iron at \$10 per ton, 2,000 pounds. John A. Thompson, Halifax, at 1½ cents per pound, taking same weight cast scrap as castings, delivered at \$10 per ton, 2,000 pounds. Robert Brown & Sons, New Glasgow, N.S., at 1¼ cents per pound, taking one-half payment in scrap at \$12 per ton, delivered in New Glasgow, N.S. The Dartmouth Iron Foundry, Dartmouth, at 2 cents per pound, taking equal quantity of cast scrap at \$10 per ton. 3. To the Truro Foundry and Machine Company, at 1¾ cents per pound, taking equal quantity of cast scrap at \$15 per ton, 2,000 pounds. 4. Scrap iron is to be taken at \$15 per ton of 2,000 pounds.

DISEASED HORSES SHIPPED TO GREAT BRITAIN.

Mr. FEATHERSTON asked :

Has the Government had any information, official or otherwise, regarding disease in horses landed in Great Britain from the western states via Canadian ports ? If so, what is the nature of the disease and is it contagious ?

Mr. FOSTER. In answer to that question I beg leave to say that some allusion was noticed in the morning papers in reference to this matter, and I received a telegram from Dr. Montague, Minister of Agriculture, now in London, to this effect :

Think important all horses shipped Canadian ports should be subject veterinary inspection, same as cattle. Some American horses recently arrived found affected glanders.

But whether those horses went through Canadian ports or not, I can scarcely make out from the telegram, though the inference would be that they were horses that did go through Canadian ports.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). What date is that ?

Mr. FOSTER. 3rd March. The matter is being considered by the department at the present time.

JAMES F. HAMILTON, ST. JOHN, N.B.

Mr. DAVIES asked :

Has James F. Hamilton, of St. John, N.B., who on the 27th February was stated in the House not to be in the Government employ, since been appointed to any Government office or employment ?

If so, when was he so appointed, and to what office, and at what salary ?

Has he passed the Civil Service examination ? If so, when ?

Mr. WOOD. Mr. James F. Hamilton has been employed as acting appraiser in the customs service at the port of St. John, N.B., since 28th February, ult., at a salary of \$1,000 per annum. No examination was necessary in his case.

CUSTOMS DUTIES PAID IN BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Mr. HASLAM, for Mr. Mara, asked :

What amount has been paid in customs duties from 1st January to 31st December, 1895, at the following places, viz. : Nelson, Kaslo, Waneta, and Boundary (Kootenay River) ?

On what date was Rossland made an outpost of New Westminster ?

What amount has been collected at Rossland from the opening of the office to 31st December, 1895 ?

On what date was Trail made an outpost of Nelson ?

What amount has been collected at Trail from opening of the office to 31st December, 1895 ?

Mr. WOOD. Rossland was made a customs station under the port of New Westminster, on 31st December, 1894, and Trail was made a customs station under the port of Nelson, on 12th October, 1895. As to the collections at Trail from the opening of the office to 31st December, 1895, and at Rossland from the opening of the office there to 31st December, 1895, and at Nelson, Kaslo, Waneta and Boundary (Kootenay River) from 1st January to 31st December, 1895, it is not possible to furnish the particulars requested, inasmuch as departmental records only contain information as to collections each fiscal year. The return of collections at ports and outposts is an annual statement which each collector forwards at the close of the fiscal year.

RETURNS ORDERED.

Copies of all petitions, correspondence, telegrams and reports respecting the dredging of Liverpool Harbour ; together with all correspondence and telegrams from parties in Liverpool and elsewhere objecting to such dredging being done.—(Mr. Edgar for Mr. Forbes.)

Copies of all correspondence between the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and the Government relating to claims for an increase of the amount paid to that company for the carriage of mail matter, and for copies of any Orders in Council or departmental regulations respecting such claims.—(Mr. Edgar for Mr. Borden.)

Copies of Orders in Council appointing a Board of Customs, and assigning the powers and duties of such board as authorized by 58-59 Vic., Chap. 22, Sec. 2.—(Mr. Stairs.)

Statement showing the sums paid to H. C. Charland, of Sorel, by the several public departments, from 1st January, 1880, up to this date, with the dates of such payments, if any, and the object for which such payments were made.—(Mr. Bruneau.)

Statement showing the amounts paid to H. C. Charland & Co., of Sorel, by the several departments of the Government, from 1st January, 1880, up to this date, the date of such payments, if any, and the object for which the same were made.—(Mr. Bruneau.)

Copies of all letters, correspondence, applications, petitions, reports, orders, memoranda, minutes of Council and other paper writings emanating from, addressed to, or in the possession of the Government or any member thereof,

Mr. WOOD.

respecting, referring to or having connection with the dismissal of Richard John Wicksteed from the service of the House of Commons of Canada.—(Mr. McCarthy.)

Copies of all letters, correspondence, applications, petitions, reports, orders, memoranda, minutes of the Board of Internal Economy, and other paper writings or printed matter emanating from, addressed to, or in the possession of the Speaker of the House, any member of the Board of Internal Economy thereof, and the Clerk or Sergeant-at-Arms of the House, respecting, referring to or having connection with the dismissal of Richard John Wicksteed from the service of the House of Commons of Canada.—(Mr. McCarthy.)

Detailed statement of the cost of the Freight Rates Commission.—(Mr. Martin.)

Copies of all offers, tenders, reports, documents, correspondence and other papers in relation to the purchase of the J. U. Carter site for the proposed public building in Picton, and the proposed purchase of a site from David J. Barker.—(Mr. Dawson.)

Return showing : 1. The total amount of subsidies granted to railways yet unpaid.

2. The amount estimated as yet necessary to be expended to complete—

(a.) The several canals now in process of construction.

(b.) All other public works in process of construction or which are authorized to be constructed by any statute, in detail.

(c.) The total liability incurred on account of subsidies to the Atlantic Fast Service, the Chignecto Canal, and the Pacific Cable Service.

3. The amount authorized to be expended on capital account for any other purposes.—(Sir Richard Cartwright.)

Copies of all correspondence between the Ministers of Fisheries and Justice and Collector of Customs at St. John relating to the running of the ferry boats in St. John harbour.—(Mr. Davies, P.E.I.)

Copies of all papers, correspondence, petitions and telegrams relating to the superannuation of Allan McBeath, of St. John, N.B., appraiser, and his prayed for reinstatement.—(Mr. Davies, P.E.I.)

Copies of all papers, correspondence and reports relating to the claim of Dr. Wall, of Emerald, P.E.I., for damages for alleged injuries received by him on the Prince Edward Island Railway.—(Mr. Davies, P.E.I.)

Copy of all Orders in Council in reference to the construction of a railway bridge over the Red River, in or opposite the town of Emerson, in the province of Manitoba ; together with a copy of all correspondence, contract or agreement between the Dominion Government, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and the said town of Emerson, in connection with the construction and maintenance of said bridge. Also, a detailed statement of subsidy granted in aid of construction of said bridge, consideration thereof, and copy of report of engineer approving plans and reports of inspection after construction.—(Mr. LaRivière.)

Copy of the lease or other document relating to the present possession of the military grounds at Sussex, N.B., and all other correspondence, letters, telegrams, &c., relating thereto.—(Mr. Davies, P.E.I.)

Return showing the names of all parties and firms who have made claims on the Dominion

Government for what are known as "hard-pan claims," in the Cape Breton Railway; the amount of such claims, respectively, as made; the claims settled by arbitration, judgment, or otherwise, and paid; the claims still unsettled and unpaid, together with all correspondence, telegrams and other reports (not already brought down) relating to such claims.—(Mr. Davies, P.E.I.)

Copies of all contracts and correspondence between George Goodwin and the Department of Railways and Canals, or any other department of the Government, in connection with contracts 4, 5, 6, 7 and 12 on the Soulanges Canal. Also, copies of all correspondence between the Department of Railways and Canals and the Department of Justice in connection with said contracts. Also, copies of all Orders in Council bearing upon the claims of George Goodwin, in connection with such contracts. Also, copies of the reports to the Department of Railways and Canals, or to any other department, made by the Government engineer in charge of said works, bearing upon the work performed by contractor George Goodwin, and bearing upon said contractor Goodwin's claim against the Government for extra compensation in connection with water-tight embankment, or in connection with any other claim he has made relating to his contracts on the Soulanges Canal works.—(Mr. Davies, P.E.I.)

ADJOURNMENT—RAILWAY FREIGHT RATES.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. MULOCK. Mr. Speaker, before the House adjourns, I desire to call the attention of the Government to a matter of some importance. I do not know who is representing the Department of Agriculture in the House to-night, but the observations that I make have reference to that department. It appears, that the railway companies have recently issued a tariff rate, affecting the transportation of live stock which acts very hardly in the case of thoroughbreds used for pedigree purposes. Under the Railway Act, provision is made for the classification of freights, and that provision has been taken advantage of, and pedigreed animals are classified in such a way as to very seriously hamper their transportation throughout the country. For instance, take the ordinary matter of thoroughbred stock. Young bulls of six months and over, but under twelve months, are classified now on the Grand Trunk Railway and Canadian Pacific Railway—these are my instructions—as weighing 4,000 pounds each. You can readily see what an enormous tax that is upon the farmers, or the breeders, who are engaged in buying and selling cattle of that kind. The way this matter affects the Government is this: The Railway Act declares, that no railway company shall collect any toll on any freight, except according to the schedule approved of by the Government. No railway company can make a change in the schedule of rates, or by classification increase the burdens upon the customers of the railway, without that schedule being first sanctioned by the Gov-

ernment. The railway companies cannot charge rates now as common carriers. Formerly, they were able to evade the Railway Act as common carriers. That was done away by the Act of 1888, and now they are not entitled to collect a dollar on any freight unless their tariff rates, including the classification, have first been submitted to, and received the sanction of the Governor General in Council. If the Government have sanctioned the classification I refer to, I can only assume that they have done it under a mistake. I do not propose to make any observations in criticism of the Government. I simply call their attention to the matter, as the spring is now on, and the tariff is operating very prejudicially to the agricultural interests. Unless it is immediately changed, it is going to have a very injurious effect.

Mr. HAGGART. Are you aware when the change in the classification was made?

Mr. MULOCK. I am not aware of it.

Mr. HAGGART. Or that it was made?

Mr. MULOCK. No, I am not aware that it was made with the sanction of the Government at all. I am only informed—and I speak, of course, subject to correction—that the railway companies have issued a schedule of rates, making a six months' old bull-calf equivalent to a 4,000 pounds bull, for freight rate purpose. You can readily see how that affects a very important feature connected with farming, restricting the distribution of valuable pedigree stock throughout the country. The matter has been brought before various live stock organizations, and representations have been made to the public, and will now, no doubt, be made formally to the Government, in regard thereto. Whether the railway companies have made this change in classification of their own motion or not, I do not know. The Government will, of course, know. I need not, I presume, call the Minister's attention to the law. Section 226 of the Railway Act states that the classification must first have the sanction of the Governor in Council. The Government have also power under the Railway Act to amend the rates prescribed by the railways, if the schedule of rates submitted by them is not satisfactory to the Government. What I ask the Government to do is to inquire into this matter and see whether the railways are prescribing a rate, either by their system of classification or otherwise, that is not in the interest of the agriculturists, while, of course, fair to the railways, as well; and, if the railway companies are not prepared to adopt a fair schedule, then I ask the Government to exercise their power to amend the freight rates in regard to pedigree animals—at least, animals shipped for breeding purposes. It might, perhaps, be necessary to extend the request to include other animals; but, for immediate purposes, I think the Government should

see that the rates are made reasonable for the particular classes of animals to which I have alluded.

Mr. HAGGART. In reply to the hon. gentleman, I would state that my attention has not been called to this subject before. I hardly think the Government have sanctioned any rule of classification in the direction the hon. gentleman states. I know that the classification is a matter of agreement between the railway companies, and it is sometimes altered three or four times in a year. There are a great many articles that come up for reclassification, and all that I require from my officers is to see that the reclassification does not increase the rates charged. When they certify that to me, I get the sanction of the Council. The railway companies have no right to change the classification unless it is approved of by the Government. I am not so clear, however, that the Government have power to reduce the rates charged. I will make inquiries into the matter, and be prepared to make a statement in reference to it.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. leader of the House has moved the adjournment at a pretty early hour this evening. There is a good deal of important private business still on the paper. I was rather surprised at his moving the adjournment so early; but it may be that he desires time to consult his colleagues in regard to the result of the important vote that was taken this evening, in regard to which the whole weight of the Government—

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. CASEY. I am asking for a Ministerial explanation, Mr. Speaker, on the motion to adjourn.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 10.20 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 10th March, 1896.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 81) to revive and amend the Act to incorporate the Alberta Irrigation Company.—(Mr. Taylor.)

THE MANITOBA SCHOOL QUESTION.

Mr. LAURIER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the leader of the House
Mr. MULOCK.

to the statement he made yesterday with respect to the Manitoba school question. I happened to be out of the House when the statement was made, but I read to-day that the hon. gentleman read a telegram from Mr. Greenway, in which the following statement was made:—

While fully appreciating all you say, it is quite clear to us that we can only proceed to Ottawa for the purpose of holding a conference upon the invitation of the Dominion Government.

Then the hon. gentleman proceeded to say:

In view of the assurance that the government of Manitoba are willing to have a conference, the Government propose, so soon as the second reading of the Remedial Bill is carried, to have a conference with Mr. Greenway's government.

The House will be interested to know, and the whole public will likewise be interested to know, whether or no the official invitation of which Mr. Greenway speaks has been extended to him or not; if so, whether he has accepted it; and if so, for what time?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I desire to say, in answer to the leader of the Opposition, that my statement as read to the House has been sent by telegraph from the Premier to the Governor of Manitoba, with the request that he would submit it to Mr. Greenway and his government.

Mr. LAURIER. That is all the invitation that has been extended to Mr. Greenway?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is the present position. The arrangements for the conference have not been completed.

THE REMEDIAL ACT (MANITOBA).

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Sir Charles Tupper for the second reading of Bill (No. 58) the Remedial Act (Manitoba), and the proposed motion (six months' hoist) of Mr. Laurier in amendment thereto.

Mr. DALY. Mr. Speaker, I presume that members of the House are now perfectly conversant with all the facts in relation to the very important matter that has been under discussion in this chamber during the past ten days; but I may be able in the few remarks I shall offer to throw some new light into the discussion and answer some of the statements made, and reply to the position taken by the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin) in the speech he made the other night. Sir, the hon. gentleman referred at considerable length and with considerable warmth to the fact that the Government had incorporated in the printed copy of the proceedings before the Privy Council of Canada certain affidavits that had been put in evidence by Mr. Ewart, who was acting for the minority, which Mr. Ewart subsequently withdrew, but yet these affidavits were printed in the record of the proceedings. The hon. gentleman charac-

terized that as an outrage. He said it was petty, it was mean, and that an advantage should not have been taken under the circumstances to place on the record these affidavits, and give to the House and the country knowledge of their contents when they could not possibly be answered. The hon. gentleman quoted at length the statement made by the present Minister of Justice, then Secretary of State, as to how and by what means these affidavits were printed on the record. He said that was an honest explanation, and no person could gainsay it. But the hon. member for Winnipeg took exception to a statement made by the ex-Minister of Justice, the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper), that the Government had a perfect right to publish those affidavits in the record. I can understand perfectly well that the hon. member for Winnipeg considers that his feelings have been outraged by the publication of these affidavits, because the facts disclosed in them cut the hon. gentleman on the raw. And, Sir, if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Martin) tries to make the House believe, as he did the other evening, in answer to the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) that hon. members here were first seized of the facts contained in these affidavits on the publication of the blue-book, he is very much mistaken indeed. The members of this House, the people of Canada, and particularly the people of the province of Manitoba, knew all the facts contained in these affidavits long months ago, aye, and years ago. Those of us who live in the province of Manitoba, especially, knew the whole record of the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin) in connection with the St. François Xavier election, because the facts were long since printed in a pamphlet published by Mr. James Fisher. That pamphlet was published broadcast, and no reference has been made to these affidavits by any member of the Government, or by any other person on this side of the House, since this discussion commenced. These affidavits simply disclosed matters that do not go to the issue of the case itself. But, Sir, they disclose certain facts that are not creditable to the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin), and for which reason, no doubt, the hon. gentleman was actuated in using the strong language he did the other night. Sir, these are the facts in connection with the St. François Xavier election. At that time the government of Mr. Harrison was being weighed in the balance, and Mr. Burke was the government candidate in that constituency, and Mr. Francis was opposed to him as the Greenway candidate. Mr. Burke was a French-Canadian, and Mr. Francis was an English-speaking Protestant, and rumours had gone abroad in the constituency that if Mr. Greenway and Mr. Martin came into power they were going to wipe out the dual language, going to do away with separate schools, and otherwise going to interfere with the rights which

the Roman Catholic minority had enjoyed since confederation. The people of that constituency were consequently alarmed, and it was found necessary that that alarm should be allayed, and an explanation made by some person influential in the ranks of the Reform party, so as to contradict these rumours. According to the statement of Mr. Fisher, the member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin) was imported into that constituency, and at least upon two occasions when addressing the electors of St. François Xavier, he declared that there was no truth whatever in these rumours, but, on the contrary, he gave them his pledge as a man of honour, and as a member of the Reform party of Manitoba, that if he and Mr. Greenway came into power the rights of the minority would not be interfered with. There is not the slightest doubt in the world that on the strength of that representation made by the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin), Mr. Francis was elected. If Mr. Martin had not made that statement, there is no doubt that many who voted for Mr. Francis would have voted for Mr. Burke. And, Sir, the whole reason for the member for Winnipeg feeling so keenly that these affidavits have been placed on record is that the statements that were made publicly by Mr. Fisher and by others have been substantiated by affidavits. The member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin) had opportunity, time and time again, to contradict the statements made by Mr. Fisher, but I have failed to find, either in the press or in his utterances on the floor of the local legislature, that he has ever contradicted these statements. Sir, they remain on record to-day, and they reflect little credit on the member for Winnipeg. In addition, we find that these affidavits have reference to an interview that took place between Mr. Greenway and Mr. Alloway, then a supporter of Mr. Greenway, and the Rev. Father Allard, the representative of His Grace the late Archbishop Taché. The facts disclosed in these affidavits relating to that interview are of public notoriety. Most of the members of this House were aware of them long before these affidavits were published in the blue-books. They were facts that were disclosed to the people of Canada by the publication of Mr. Fisher, by the statements of the Rev. Father Allard, and by the statements of Mr. Greenway in the Winnipeg papers, long ago. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Martin) is simply stirring up a mare's nest; the hon. gentleman (Mr. Martin) is simply endeavouring to procure the sympathy of hon. members on the other side of the House, and of hon. members who are opposed to the Government, by trying to make out, from the indignation he showed here the other night, that he has been injured, and that the Government have been outraging him, and outraging all decency, by the publication of these affidavits. Why, Sir, it is a matter of notoriety to the people who are most interested, namely, the people of Mani-

toba, that neither the member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin), nor Mr. Greenway, the Premier of that province, have carried out in good faith the promises and the representations that they made to the Catholic minority, both during the St. François Xavier election, and in the statements of Mr. Greenway to the representatives of the Archbishop. And, Sir, it rankles in the bosoms of these people, and they feel keenly that men occupying the position of these hon. gentlemen should have made promises which were apparently made to be broken. Now, we find in this House to-day that singularly enough the last gentleman to speak upon this important question is the author of all the trouble that has brought about this debate, the author of this burning question which is now being discussed more fully, and is occupying the attention of the people of Canada from one end to the other, to a greater extent, than any public question that has arisen since confederation. I take it, Sir, that no more important debate has taken place in this House than this present one, and no more important question has been before the people of Canada to decide upon and to discuss, than this very question now before the House. Sir, we have in this very House the gentleman who is responsible for all the trouble, responsible for all the ills, and responsible for all the difficulties that have arisen out of this matter. It was that hon. gentleman who introduced this contentious legislation in the Manitoba local House in the year 1890. Sir, the action of that hon. gentleman in proposing this legislation was cruel, was heartless, and was heedless. It was cruel in this: that, after having made the representations he did to the electors of St. François Xavier, which enabled him and his friends to defeat the Harrison government and enabled Mr. Greenway and his party to come into power—after having done that, and Mr. Greenway further having made these representations to the Archbishop—I say it was cruel for Mr. Martin and for Mr. Greenway to have made these promises, and, having got into power because of these promises, it was cruel for them, after having been in power for two years, to ruthlessly set aside the promises they had made and by this legislation to wipe out the condition of things that had existed since Manitoba became a part of our confederation. And, Sir, it was heedless in this: that in proposing such legislation the hon. gentleman from Winnipeg (Mr. Martin) had apparently forgotten all that had taken place in the older provinces of Canada in connection with this vexed question of education. He had overlooked the fact that prior to confederation there was almost a deadlock in the old legislature of Canada between the representatives of Quebec and the representatives of Ontario, and that that deadlock was occasioned by this very question as to whether or not the Protestant mi-

Mr. DALY.

nority in Quebec and the Catholic minority in Ontario should enjoy the privileges that each of those minorities claimed. He overlooked the fact, as stated by the leader of the House (Sir Charles Tupper) here the other day, and as re-stated by the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Ives), that the one question which was discussed more than another during the consideration of confederation was this very question as to the rights of the minorities in the different provinces. He overlooked the fact entirely that Sir A. T. Galt, at that time a member of the Government, considered this question of so great importance that he went so far as to resign his position as a member of the Government because he believed he could not secure to the minority of the province of Quebec all these rights that they held dear. And, Sir, the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin) overlooked the fact that men who held such strong opinions upon this matter as the late Hon. George Brown and the late Hon. Alexander Mackenzie, in order to secure and bring about a solution of the difficulty, and in order to make confederation possible, had foregone their personal feelings, had foregone their wishes with reference to this question, and had united with Sir John A. Macdonald and the other leaders of the Conservative party at that time, to bring about confederation, and in bringing about confederation to do away with all these difficulties that had arisen, and which had engaged the attention of the people of Canada for years previously. The hon. gentleman was heedless of all that. He was heedless, also, of the fact—of which he must have been aware, of which any person who had read the history of Manitoba, must have been aware—that there was trouble in connection with the entrance of Rupert's Land into confederation. He forgot that, at that time, a delegation representing the people of that country came down here from Winnipeg, and entered into negotiations with the leaders of the Government, Sir John Macdonald and Sir George Cartier. He apparently overlooked the outcome of those negotiations, in what is now known as the Manitoba Act. He forgot the fact that the members of that delegation went back to Winnipeg with a copy of that Act in their hands, as a compact made between the Parliament and the people of Canada and the residents of Red River, or what is now known as Manitoba. He overlooked the fact that that Act was read before the legislative assembly of Assiniboine, or whatever the district was called at that time, that it was held to be satisfactory, and was adopted by that assembly, and that, consequently, they were willing to become a part of this confederation. The hon. gentleman evidently overlooked these. He did not reckon upon them, when he introduced his legislation of 1890, which has caused so much trouble in this country during the last five years. I have no doubt

that, if the hon. gentleman had to live over these five years again, he would not be guilty of the act he was guilty of in 1890, when he introduced this legislation, by which he wiped out the system of things that had existed in the province of Manitoba from 1871 up to 1890.

Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman, in the address he made the other night, quoted a letter written by him a year ago and published in the newspapers here. He says, that he stands by that letter to-day, and that the position he takes there has been misrepresented. Why, Sir, in that letter the hon. gentleman confesses that the present condition of things in Manitoba, so far as the educational law is concerned, is rank tyranny to the minority. Well, Sir, it seems to me extraordinary, that that hon. gentleman—who knew at the time that legislation was being passed, that he was inflicting upon the minority what he now believes to be rank tyranny—should have felt bound to go ahead with that legislation, without considering the feelings of the people against whom it was directed, or whether it was rank tyranny or not. If that was the feeling of the hon. gentleman at that time, I think we have reason to believe that, in introducing that legislation, he was not actuated by the motive stated by himself and by others on his behalf, namely, to do away with the inefficiency of the schools and give better educational facilities to the people of Manitoba. The position taken by the hon. gentleman to-day, in standing by that law, is rather in accordance with the statement he made at the time he introduced the Bill into the legislature—that he was actuated by only one motive, which was to wipe out the monstrous evil of separate schools, regardless of the fact, that he was going to inflict rank tyranny on the minority, and regardless of the fact, which was pointed out to him at the time, that those separate schools had been secured to those people by the Manitoba Act. That was not the action of a statesman, who had realized the highest ideal of a British statesman. Not only did the hon. gentleman rush ahead with that legislation, but he did so in spite of an amendment that was moved in the House at the time, declaring that it would be well to call a halt—declaring that, before changing the condition of things that had existed in the province for nineteen years, the legislature should ascertain, not by going to the people and getting an expression of public opinion, but from the courts of the land, whether the legislature was legislating within its powers or not in passing that Act. We find that, on the second reading of the Bill, an amendment was moved by Mr. Gillies, one of the leaders of the Opposition at that time. I will not quote the whole of that resolution; but I would call the attention of hon. members to one portion of it:

Whereas in view of such special provision, applicable to the province of Manitoba, grave doubts exist as to the validity of the legislation embodied in this Bill, the effect of which is practically to abolish the system of denominational schools existing in the province, at and since its formation, and it is inexpedient that such an important matter should be passed by this House before its legality has been authoritatively determined or the Manitoba Act so amended as to clearly provide for such abolition;

Therefore, be it resolved that the Bill be not read a second time, but that such steps be taken as will secure an amendment, by the Imperial Parliament, of the British North America Act or the Manitoba Act, whereby the right of the legislature of Manitoba to deal with educational matters in the province shall be firmly and clearly established without appeal to the Governor General in Council or to the Parliament of Canada.

That was the view expressed by the Opposition at that time. They asked Mr. Martin to call a halt. They said: "These people have enjoyed a system of denominational schools for nineteen years under the provisions of the Manitoba Act, and, surely, it is not too much to ask you, Mr. Greenway and Mr. Martin, to withhold this legislation until we obtain an opinion from the courts, whether it is legal or not, or until we make an application to the Imperial Parliament, from which we got our constitution, and ascertain whether that Parliament will amend our constitution or not." But Mr. Greenway and the hon. member for Winnipeg disregarded the position taken by the Opposition on that occasion. The hon. gentleman had undertaken this task, and he was evidently determined to go through with it, regardless of the legal question, regardless of the feelings of the minority, and regardless whether it would plunge Manitoba into the greatest difficulties that any young province could encounter—such difficulties as that province has encountered during the past five years.

Now, Sir, the first position taken by the hon. gentleman in the speech he made the other day, seems to me a very extraordinary one. You recollect, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. leader of the House, in moving the second reading of this Bill, and the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Ives) dwelt at considerable length on the position of the minority in Quebec, with regard to educational legislation in that province. The hon. member for East Lambton (Mr. Moncrieff) also dealt at considerable length with the same subject. In reply to the remarks of those hon. gentlemen, the hon. member for Winnipeg took exception to the position taken by them, and said he did not understand why any reference should be made to the question of education in the province of Quebec, or why it should be imported into this discussion, and he takes issue with the idea that it illustrates, by a parallel, the position that we occupy in Manitoba. Why, the hon. gentleman goes so far as to say that he did not think it would be

a matter of very great importance to the Protestants of Quebec, if they were denied representation on the Council of Public Instruction. Surely, the hon. gentleman could not have listened to the speech made by my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Ives), or to the quotation read by that hon. gentleman and the leader of the House (Sir Charles Tupper) from the speeches of and utterances of Sir Alexander Galt and other public men, regarding the position of education in the province of Quebec, because, if he had, he would have ascertained that the Protestant minority in Quebec held it very dear indeed that they should have representation on this Board of Public Instruction. Why, the hon. gentleman's reply to the position taken by the hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Dickey) and the hon. gentlemen I have mentioned, is, that the people of Quebec stand in the same position to-day as they did before 1867, with regard to the use of text-books in the schools. And he quoted the clause in the Acts of 1861 and 1867, which you will find in the Consolidated Statutes of Quebec, and cited the fact that the curé, the priest, or officiating minister, had the exclusive right of selecting the books having reference to religion or morality for the use of the pupils frequenting the schools of their own religious tenets, and he argued that, as that applied to Protestants as well as Catholics, therefore, the position taken by the Minister of Justice amounted to nothing. What the Minister of Justice said was this. He said: Suppose that the legislature of Quebec were to introduce and pass legislation, wiping out or interfering with the present Protestant representation upon the Board of Public Instruction of Quebec, in what position would that minority be? They would be placed exactly in the position in which the Catholic minority in Manitoba are now, and their only remedy would be an appeal, under the British North America Act, to the Privy Council of Canada, just as that is the only remedy of the minority in Manitoba. But the hon. gentleman showed his want of knowledge of the question by stating, in reply to the Minister of Justice: Why, such legislation by the Quebec legislature would be ultra vires. It seems extraordinary, that a gentleman who formerly held the position of Attorney General of Manitoba, and who introduced the Bill which has caused so much trouble, should display so little knowledge of the legislation and the condition of things that existed in Quebec in relation to education, as to take the stand he does to-day. Why, the veriest novice would know that such an Act would not be ultra vires. The hon. gentleman overlooks the fact, that the Privy Council, in the Barrett case, held that the legislation which the hon. gentleman introduced, the Act of 1890, was not ultra vires, but intra vires; and, equally, the legislation which the Minister of Justice suggested, might be

Mr. DALY.

introduced in the Quebec legislature, would be in exactly the same position as the Manitoba Act of 1890, and be intra vires; and the only remedy which the Protestant minority of Quebec would have against such a measure would be the appeal to the Governor General in Council.

But the hon. gentleman said, further on:

That the only change of importance to the Protestants of Quebec that was made since confederation was the change by which, under the law, they are entitled to a certain number of members on the Board of Public Instruction.

I shall not weary the House by repeating what was so well said, the other day, by the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Ives) and by the leader of the House of Commons (Sir Charles Tupper); but any one who has read the debates prior to confederation, and who is at all conversant with the history of education in the province of Quebec, knows very well that what the Protestant minority of Quebec were fighting for was a change in the representation of the Board of Public Instruction. That is what Sir Alexander Galt fought for, that is what he resigned his seat for, that is what he went to London for; and, having fought for that and secured it, after the Protestant school teachers of Quebec had petitioned the Queen for that right, we have the hon. member for Winnipeg, at this date in our history, telling this House that it would make little difference to the Protestant minority in Quebec whether these provisions were wiped out or not. He little knows how dear to the hearts of the Protestant minority of Quebec are the privileges that were secured to them by the action of the majority in that province. Why, does the hon. gentleman suppose, for one moment, that Sir Alexander Galt would have taken the position that he did, that the Protestant school teachers of Quebec would have petitioned the Queen as they did, and that hon. gentlemen representing the majority in that province, such as Sir George Cartier and Sir Hector Langevin, would have made the pledge they did, and honourably fulfilled it as they did, if they did not think that this was a matter dear to the hearts of the Protestant minority in that province. Why, the history of the matter shows that, although that legislation could not be carried into effect prior to confederation, Sir George Cartier and Sir Hector Langevin pledged themselves to remain in the local legislature of Quebec for the purpose of carrying out the promises made to Sir Alexander Galt and the Protestant minority, and they remained in the local House and honourably carried out their pledge. In fulfilment of that pledge, that legislation was introduced and carried into effect and has remained on the statute-book ever since. It is the safeguard of the Protestant minority in that province:

and, if any action should be taken by the Quebec legislature to wipe out this safeguard, the only chance that minority would have of getting a remedy would be by appeal to the Governor General in Council in the same way as the minority in Manitoba have appealed.

Without wearying the House, I might read a quotation or two, to give you an idea how dearly the Protestant minority of Quebec hold the position they occupy there to-day, in connection with education. I find that Dr. Davidson, one of the most prominent members of what was known as the Equal Rights Association in Montreal, in the year 1889, wrote a letter, which was read at the convention of that association held in Toronto. Here is what Dr. Davidson said :

It is very easy for you to say do away with separate schools—easy for you and your strong Protestant province of Ontario. But as you are strong be merciful, and remember your weaker brethren in the province of Quebec. While we may blot out the 238 separate schools occupied by Roman Catholics in Ontario, you also desire to blot out the 980 separate schools occupied by Protestants in the province of Quebec.

That appeal, which was made by Dr. Davidson, should have force with hon. gentlemen who are opposing the Government to-day in this question. In addition, Dr. Robbins, principal of the McGill Normal School of Montreal, said :

We are the minority of this province, but we know we are not regarded as a factious or insignificant minority. Our susceptibilities are considered, our educational rights are maintained by the majority.

In the Quebec legislature, at its prorogation, on 21st December, 1895, before closing, the following remarks were made :—

Before closing, Mr. Morris, Minister without a portfolio, said he wished to state that since his entry into the Cabinet every suggestion or representation made by him on behalf of the Protestant minority, had received the utmost consideration, and no reasonable demand had been refused. There had been on all sides a desire to recognize the rights of the minority.

Premier Taillon said he was glad to hear Mr. Morris' remarks, because it would tend to dispel the impression which it had been sought to create in some quarters.

Mr. Stephens said the Protestants never had much cause to complain, and he did not want another impression to go forth.

The Premier was happy to see such breadth of mind, and said some of the other provinces which he need not name, might draw a lesson therefrom. This closed the incident.

That closed the incident, but that indicates to the Protestants of Ontario and other provinces of the confederation the position that our Protestant friends enjoy in the province of Quebec. If so, Sir, every man having a voice in this House, every Protestant in Canada should consider well the position that is being taken in this House to-day upon the ques-

tion under discussion, and should remember that if we are endeavouring, as we are, to protect by legislation the rights of the minority in Manitoba, the day may come when the hon. gentlemen who are opposing the action of the Government upon this question to-day may be called upon to protect in a similar manner the rights of the Protestant minority in the province of Quebec. Now, I am not going to be content with the references I have made in this matter, but I desire to refer the hon. member for Winnipeg to a speech made by his leader in 1893. Those who were in the House at that time will remember it and will recollect how fully the hon. gentleman went into this very question. He said :

Suppose that to-morrow the legislature of Quebec were to abolish the Protestant School Board, then, by the effect of that law, the management of the Protestant schools would become vested in the Roman Catholic Board of the Council of Education, that is to say, practically in the hands of the Roman Catholic bishops. If such legislation were to be enacted by the legislature of Quebec, is there a man to say that it would not be a most infamous act of tyranny? Sir, if to-morrow such a law were enacted, the first thing that the Protestant population would do would be to come before this Government and ask this Government, in virtue of the powers vested in it by the constitution to abolish at once the obnoxious and tyrannical legislation. If the Protestant population were to come and represent to the Government that their schools, the Protestant schools, had been placed under the management of the Roman Catholic bishops of the province, I say that every man in this House, be he Protestant or Catholic, would at once call upon the Government to abolish the law and to pass remedial legislation for the Protestant minority.

And the position so handsomely taken by the hon. leader of the Opposition at that time is exactly the position the Government takes to-day in order to protect the minority of the province of Manitoba, and in view of that statement by the hon. gentleman at that time, in view of the eloquent plea I have just quoted, I cannot understand the position he takes to-day. Now that we are making an effort to protect the minority in Manitoba on exactly the lines that he said should be adopted to protect the minority in Quebec in such a case as he supposed, we find the hon. gentleman moving the six months' hoist, thus declaring that the principle of the Bill is wholly wrong, and seeking to prevent us from giving that protection to the minority which he says should be given to the Protestant minority in Quebec were they placed in a similar position. I would call the particular attention of the hon. member for Winnipeg to the utterances of his hon. leader of 1893, from which I have just quoted. I do not ask him to accept my argument, or that of others, with regard to the position of the Protestant minority in Quebec, but I ask him to read the statement of his leader. Had the hon. gentleman shown the same liberality of sentiment

and feeling when he introduced his legislation in 1890, as was shown in the speech of his leader in 1893, we should not have been discussing this question to-day, but the legislation then introduced would have shown the same regard for the minority in Manitoba that his leader, in 1893, expressed for the minority in Quebec. Now, by way of emphasizing how our Protestant friends in Ontario feel in connection with the position occupied by the minority in Quebec, I might quote a portion of an address that was signed by the Rev. Principal Caven and Mr. E. Douglas Armour, as president and secretary, respectively, of the Equal Rights Association that was formed by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) in 1889 :

The right of appeal to the Governor General which minority at present have must remain. The entire Dominion is a proper guarantee for the equality of dealing on the part of the provinces with the adherents of the various churches, and nothing beyond this should be sought.

Why, Sir, here was an agitation got up by the hon. member for North Simcoe, after the Jesuits' Estates Bill had been discussed in this House, and this statement was affirmed by him and his friends in Toronto, in an address of the Equal Rights Association, appealing to the people of Ontario. Does it not meet exactly the position we find ourselves in here to-day in regard to the province of Manitoba? We are well aware, from the history that has been quoted in this debate, that at the time Manitoba came into the confederation there was grave doubt whether the minority would be Protestant or Roman Catholic, but that the provision in the Manitoba Act was to protect the minority, whichever it might be. It turns out that the minority is Roman Catholic, and all that they ask to-day is that they should receive justice at the hands of this Government and this Parliament under the provisions of the Manitoba Act which gave them the right of appeal that the Rev. Dr. Caven and Mr. E. Douglas Armour and the Equal Rights Association of Ontario declared must remain upon the statute-book in order to protect these minorities.

Now, the next extraordinary position taken by the hon. member for Winnipeg is when he says that he fails to understand why the leader of the House should have taken up so much time in dealing with the question of negotiations that took place between the provinces prior to confederation. The hon. gentleman goes on to say that the constitution of Manitoba was established long after that time and was not established in pursuance of any provisions of the British North America Act. That seems to me a most extraordinary proposition. As to the leader of the House taking up time in dealing with the negotiations prior to confederation, I can only say that it is a pity that the hon. member for Winnipeg had

Mr. DALY.

not taken up more of his time in studying those negotiations before he introduced that legislation in 1890, for he would have found upon reading the discussion which resulted in the establishment of the Dominion, that of the questions that occupied the greatest minds of Canada at that time, nothing caused them more solicitude than this vexed question of education. When we find such leaders as Hon. George Brown, Hon. Alexander Mackenzie, Sir Oliver Mowat, Sir John Macdonald, Sir Alexander Galt, Sir John Rose, Sir Charles Tupper, Sir Hector Langevin—all the leading minds on both sides of politics—giving their time and best ability to the discussion of this question, surely the hon. gentleman should recognize the fact that it is a question larger than he supposed it was when he introduced his legislation in 1890. Sir, we find that the gentlemen to whom I have referred expressed very strong opinions upon this question at that time. Some of those opinions have been quoted already in this House; I will quote a few of them again. The reason that the Secretary of State, the leader of this House, referred at such great length to the negotiations, was to emphasize the fact, and to instruct the young people of Canada to-day, those who were not of an age to remember the discussion that took place at that time, how important this matter was then considered, and to what extent it engaged the attention of the leading men of that day, and how much trouble they took in order to settle it, and to assuage the feelings that had been excited, and to overcome the difficulty that had arisen from that vexed question. Sir, we find the Hon. George Brown saying :

Sir, here we sit patiently and temperately discussing how these great evils and hostilities can be justly and amicably swept away for ever. We are endeavouring to adjust harmoniously greater difficulties than have plunged other countries into all the horrors of civil war.

And again he says :

A most happy day will it be for Canada when this Bill goes into effect, and these subjects of discord are swept from the discussions of our legislature. I am further in favour of this clause as a remedial measure because it brings to an end the doubt that has so long hung over our position, and gives stability to our future in the eyes of the world that could not otherwise have been attained.

How much I regret that the hon. member for Winnipeg had not read the words of his late leader, the Hon. George Brown, before he introduced this legislation in Manitoba in 1890; because if he had read them he would have recognized the fact that those words came from the heart of a man who had struggled long and struggled ably and fiercely against the very position that he announced in that speech, and yet recognized the fact that he had to change his position, that he had to take back a great deal of what he had said, and a great deal that he had done,

recognizing that this question had to be settled, and, he hoped, settled for ever. And we all hoped that this subject was settled for ever. It laid dormant from the year 1867 to the year 1890; and it was left to the hon. member for Winnipeg to re-introduce into the arena of politics in this country this vexed question of education; it was left to the hon. member for Winnipeg to open up all the old sores that it had caused prior to confederation; it was left to the hon. member for Winnipeg to undo all the good that had been done by the grand old leaders of both parties prior to confederation. Why, Sir, I lose patience when I think that any man should ruthlessly and heedlessly do such an act as was done by the member for Winnipeg when he introduced that legislation, and threw this apple of discord into the politics of this country. Sir, I trust sincerely that if this question is settled, as I hope it will be, we will never again see a man rising in any legislature in this country of ours, from one end to the other, and re-introducing this vexed question, but that we will settle it now, and settle it for ever. Sir, in addition to the Hon. George Brown, in this country, we find men occupying high positions in the politics of the British Empire have had something to say upon this question. I will quote to the House what was said by Earl Carnarvon, on the second reading of the British North America Bill, on 19th February, 1867, when he said:

Lastly, in the 93rd clause, which contains the exceptional provisions to which I have referred, your lordships will observe some rather complicated arrangements in reference to education. I need hardly say that that great question gives rise to nearly as much earnestness and division of opinion on that, as on this, side of the Atlantic. This clause has been framed after long and anxious controversy, in which all parties have been represented, and on conditions to which all have given their consent. It is an understanding which, as it only concerns the local interests affected, is not one that Parliament would be willing to disturb, even if, in the opinion of Parliament, it was susceptible of amendment; but I am bound to add as the expression of my own opinion, that the terms of the agreement appear to me to be equitable and judicious. For the object of the clause is to secure to the religious minority of one province the same rights, privileges and protection which the religious minority of another province may enjoy. The Roman Catholic minority of Upper Canada, the Protestant minority of Lower Canada, and the Roman Catholic minority of the maritime provinces, will thus stand on a footing of entire equality. But in the event of any wrong at the hand of the local majority, the minority have a right of appeal to the Governor General in Council, and may claim the application of any remedial laws that may be necessary from the central Parliament of the confederation.

Then the Hon. Oliver Mowat, on 25th March, 1890, speaking in the Ontario legislature, says:

In what spirit was the language of the constitution framed? It was a compromise all

round, and an essential part of that compromise, so essential that without it confederation could never have taken place, was the provision by which the separate schools of Ontario and the Protestant dissentient schools of Quebec were guaranteed by Imperial enactment, and without these being guaranteed, we could have had no Dominion Parliament with its present limited powers, and no provincial legislatures with their powers.

Then we find the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie, when Premier, in the debate on the New Brunswick school question, saying:

I believe in free schools, in the non-denominational system; and if I could persuade my fellow-countrymen in Ontario and Quebec, or any other province to adopt the principle, it is the one I would give preference to above all others. For many years after I had a seat in the Parliament of Canada I waged war against the principle of separate schools. I hoped to be able, young and inexperienced as I then was, to establish a system to which all would yield their assent. Sir, it was found to be impracticable in operation, and impossible in political contingencies.

Now, Sir, these quotations indicate how much thought and how much consideration these gentlemen had given to this vexed question we are now discussing; and I regret very much indeed that the words uttered by the hon. gentleman's leaders, not only by the Hon. George Brown, but by Alexander Mackenzie and Sir Oliver Mowat, had not been read by the hon. gentleman before he introduced the legislation of 1890. Sir, in order to carry out the idea that was expressed by these hon. gentlemen, in order to do away with the possibility of this question arising again in the formation of other provinces out of that vast territory we had acquired from the Hudson's Bay Company, namely, Rupert's Land, there is not the slightest doubt in my own mind to-day that when the Manitoba Act was framed, and clause 22 was framed, with its subsections 1, 2 and 3, the men who were legislating for Canada at that time in this House, had in view the difficulties that existed in relation to this question of education prior to confederation, and they wanted to wipe out, to still for ever, any possibility of the re-opening of that question in those far off lands. Sir, by way of illustration, and proving that such apparently was the feeling of the legislators of the Dominion Parliament at that time, I will quote no less an authority than the Hon. William Macdougall, who, on the 1st August, 1892, in writing upon this question, said:

We certainly intended that the Catholics of Manitoba, or whichever denomination might be in a minority, should have the right to establish and maintain their own schools. You see the words "or practice" were inserted in the Manitoba Act, so that the difficulty which arose in New Brunswick, where separate schools actually existed, but were not recognized by the law, should not be repeated in Manitoba. And then the right of appeal to the Federal Parliament was given to make assurance doubly sure.

I will say for the information of the House, and as a matter of history, that if I recollect aright, it was within one month after the vote had been taken upon the motion of the present hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Costigan) upon the New Brunswick school question, that the Manitoba Act was introduced and passed in this legislature: so at the time of the passing of the Manitoba Act in 1870, all the discussion, all the doubts and difficulties that had arisen, had been ventilated by the several speakers who took part in the debate on that question, and were all fresh in the minds of the legislators who passed that Manitoba Act. Here we have the statements of hon. gentlemen who were members of the House at that time, and in addition to them I desire to quote some remarks made by the Hon. G. W. Ross. Mr. Ross, speaking in Montreal on 19th December, 1895, said:

As the Manitoba legislature had, beyond question, the right (and the Privy Council has so decided) to pass the School Act of 1890, I offer no observation with regard to it, except this, that I believe under the Act by which Manitoba entered the union, it was understood by all the other provinces that the minority, whether Protestant or Catholic, would have the right to establish denominational schools. It was the merest mockery to empower the Dominion Government to interfere for the protection of denominational schools, unless it was assumed that such schools existed, and that in the changes incident to the growth of a new country they might need protection from possible interference some time in the future.

Surely, if we have the opinions of men such as Hon. William Macdougall, Hon. George W. Ross, Hon. George Brown, Hon. Alexander Mackenzie and Sir Oliver Mowat, what more do we want to emphasize the fact that the position which this Government has taken on this matter is the correct one. The position taken by the Government of this country is, that they find the legislation introduced by the Manitoba government, in 1871, establishing a system of schools there, which permitted the minority to have their schools, and the majority their schools, was wiped out by the subsequent legislation in 1890; that those rights having been interfered with—rights which they enjoyed under the constitution from 1871 to 1890—should be restored, not upon the mere statement and action of this Government, but restored after we have had the benefit of the judgment of the highest court in this Dominion, and the judgment of the Privy Council in England. So we come here to-day with this Remedial Bill, fortified with the judgments of the different courts of Canada, and of the Empire, and having exhausted every possible effort to approach this matter in a non-partisan manner, and in a manner that should appeal to the people of Canada as proving that the Government are actuated by one desire, to restore to the minority of Manitoba their rights under the constitution, which consti-

Mr. DALY.

tion has been interpreted by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, the highest court in the Empire. It was to illustrate this position that the Secretary of State, in the speech which he delivered the other day, dwelt at length on the negotiations which occurred prior to confederation, to show the educational difficulties which prevailed prior to confederation, and to show that a settlement had been made. As the Hon. George Brown said "for all time this question has been taken out of the political arena," and it is to emphasize the position taken by the Secretary of State that I have wearied the House by the quotations I have made. In order to satisfy the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin) I will not rest content with having quoted the language of hon. gentlemen who have long gone, or who have passed out of political life, but I will place before him the position taken by his leader on this subject in 1893. The leader of the Opposition is reported in "Hansard," 1893, page 1994, as follows:—

It is manifest from the words spoken yesterday by the hon. member for Three Rivers (Sir Hector Langevin)—who can speak with authority on this subject since he was one of the delegates—the intention of the delegates to London was: that these securities, these guarantees, which had been devised by Mr. Galt, it is true, for the Protestant minority in Quebec should be extended to all minorities as well. My hon. friend from North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) tells us that, in his opinion, although this section may apply to Quebec, and may apply to Ontario, and perhaps to the older provinces of the Dominion, yet it should not apply to Manitoba. Well, Sir, I hope that my hon. friend on this occasion will not take a narrow construction of the law, and I say for my part, that the law has to be construed in a generous and liberal spirit, and whatever privileges are guaranteed to one minority in a province I claim in the name of justice and fairness for all minorities in all the provinces. My hon. friend spoke yesterday as a lawyer, and perhaps after all his contention as a lawyer may be true, that the Manitoba Act has limited the general Act.

The hon. member for Winnipeg said the other night:

The constitution of Manitoba was established long after that time and was not established in pursuance of any provision of the British North America Act.

Yet we have here the leader of the Opposition laying down as a principle that protection was given by the British North America Act to the minorities of Quebec and Ontario, and this was intended to be extended to the minorities in all the provinces. In order to show that so far as the Manitoba Act is concerned, it was based on the provisions of the British North America Act, I will quote the section referred to by the member for Three Rivers (Sir Hector Langevin), namely, section 2 of this Act. It is as follows:—

The provisions of the British North America Act, 1867, shall, except those parts thereof which

are in terms made, or by reasonable intendment, may be held to be specially applicable to, or only to affect one or more, but not the whole of the provinces now composing the Dominion, and except so far as the same may be varied by this Act, be applicable to the province of Manitoba in the same way and to the like extent as they apply to the several provinces of Canada, and as if the province of Manitoba had been one of the provinces originally united by the said Act.

The leader of the Opposition goes on to say :

It seems to me that this very section has imported into the Manitoba Act the whole of section 93 of the British North America Act, and that the privileges which are there guaranteed to the Protestant minority of Quebec are ipso facto to be extended as well to the Roman Catholic minority of Manitoba.

I think that, with the quotations made by the Secretary of State from the debates prior to confederation and after confederation, will prove to the hon. member for Winnipeg that the British North America Act has everything to do with the Manitoba Act, and with the constitution of that province.

The next point I desire to deal with is the question of an investigation. We find the position taken by the leader of the Opposition is, that the Government should investigate the facts, that they should have made an investigation long ago, before they passed the remedial order, before they introduced the Remedial Bill. The hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin) also asserted that there should be an investigation made; but, following the example of other hon. members on the opposite side of the House, he did not state what facts are to be investigated. I fail to find in any of the speeches made by hon. gentlemen opposite in this House, or speeches made by their friends in the legislature of Manitoba, or articles in the newspapers published throughout the Dominion, a single fact set out which the Government should investigate, and which is not within the knowledge of every hon. member at the present time. Do hon. gentlemen opposite forget the case of Barrett and the Queen? Have they read the affidavits of Archbishop Taché, of Archbishop Machray, of Dr. Bryce, and all the other affidavits cited by Barrett in the application to the Court of Queen's Bench? These set out all the facts material to the case. They are on record, and can be read by any hon. member, and they give full information as to the material facts on which the case of the Queen and Barrett was decided, facts as fully set out as could be ascertained by any investigation. But, Sir, strange to say, the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin) does venture a little further than some hon. gentlemen, and he gives us some things that he thinks should be investigated. For instance, he says :

It is our contention that the very first thing necessary, under the circumstances for the Gov-

ernor General in Council here, is to thoroughly understand all the circumstances. First, to take up the law as it was in 1871, and as it was amended from time to time up to 1890, and to consider the rights and privileges conferred upon the minority by these laws.

Well, any hon. gentleman can go into the Library and examine the statutes of 1871, and the amending Acts. They were all laid before the court in Barrett vs. Winnipeg, and in Brophy vs. Attorney General, and any gentleman can read the record in these cases, and can read the original Act of 1871 and amending Acts, and get all the facts pertaining to these cases, that he wants. In addition to that, if any hon. gentleman wants to know how the schools of Manitoba have been conducted during that time, he can go to the Library and find the reports of the Superintendents of Education, both of the Protestant and Roman Catholic boards. He can get from these reports, information as to the number of pupils attending the schools, as to the number of schools, as to the provincial grant, and as to every fact that it is material to ascertain. It is the veriest absurdity in the world, for a gentleman occupying the position of the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin), to say, that one of the things we have got to investigate, and one of the circumstances we have got to look into, is the legislation from 1871 to 1890. It is a great pity, indeed, that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Martin), before he introduced the legislation of 1890, did not pay a little more attention to the legislation that existed in other provinces in reference to education.

Now the second point the hon. gentleman (Mr. Martin) makes is :

To learn, on what pretext, the legislature of Manitoba, in 1890, took away some of these rights and privileges.

How are we to get at that fact, Mr. Speaker? I presume that the best way to get at that would be to ascertain what position the hon. gentleman (Mr. Martin) took himself, when he introduced the legislation of 1890; and what reasons he gave to the legislature, for doing away with previous legislation upon education. Why did the hon. gentleman appeal to the legislature to pass the Act of 1890. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Martin) no doubt did give reasons to the Manitoba legislature, and I say, that if that knowledge is within the breast of the hon. member, he should have been fair enough to give it to this House. But the hon. gentleman (Mr. Martin) does not enlighten us in any single particular as to the reasons which were then given by him. Well, Sir, we find that the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin), when he introduced the Act of 1890, in the legislature, had not much difficulty in finding a pretext for it. He did not enlarge very much upon that pretext. It was not because the schools were inefficient, as we have since learned. He did not say

then that the schools were inefficient. He did not prove that they were inefficient, but on the contrary, he paid a very high compliment to the condition of things which existed previously, and I will show this by a quotation from the speech made by the hon. member (Mr. Martin) in introducing his Bill. He said :

The government consider that they are under a very great deal of obligation to these gentlemen who have from time to time, for many years past, assisted in controlling and shaping the educational affairs, as members of the Board of Education. Their labours thus willingly given, had resulted in great good, and the government's action had not been determined because they were dissatisfied with the manner in which the affairs of the department were conducted under the system, but because they were dissatisfied with the system itself.

So, Sir, all we have to do to find a pretext for the introduction of the Act of 1890, by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Martin), is to find what the hon. gentleman said himself upon that occasion, and his pretext was :

That they were not dissatisfied with the conduct of the schools, but they were dissatisfied with the whole system.

That was his pretext in 1890. Now, Sir, what fact is there to investigate in that? The hon. gentleman (Mr. Martin) in that speech gives us the benefit of the pretext from his own knowledge. He said : That the action of the Board of Education had resulted in great good, and the only reason they were wiping out separate schools was that they were dissatisfied with the system itself. In addition to that, Sir, some weeks ago, I gave another quotation from the hon. gentleman's speech on that occasion, and I showed that another reason he gave was : That he wanted to do away with the monstrous evil of separate schools. Sir, we have the two pretexts from the mouth of the hon. gentleman himself, and yet he tells us to-day in the House, that one of the facts to be investigated is the pretext which gave rise to the legislation of 1890.

As a third reason for an investigation, he (Mr. Martin) says :

Whether the taking away of these rights and privileges, was an unfair oppression of the minority, or a legitimate exercise of the provincial jurisdiction in the matter of education.

Well, Sir, what is there to be investigated, as to whether the taking away of these rights and privileges was unfair to the minority? We have upon record, in the affidavit of Archbishop Taché, and in the affidavits of Barrett and others, the reasons why they applied for a remedy. They show that they are oppressed; they show that they are being taxed, as they say, unduly; they show that they have grievances, and the Privy Council has established the fact that they have grievances. I say, that no investigation which we can make, either by a commission, or by a committee of this

Mr. DALY.

House, would throw the slightest light upon this point, or give us any other fact, that has not been laid before the courts, in the cases of Barrett vs. Winnipeg, and Brophy vs. the Attorney General.

Mr. CHARLTON. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Daly) hold, that these past trials have furnished all the information; taking second-hand evidence without reinvestigation?

Mr. DALY. I hold, Sir, that all the facts that were necessary to decide the questions decided by the Privy Council in Barrett vs. Winnipeg and Brophy vs. the Attorney General, were before the court at that time; and more than that: that all the facts that could be given, and that could be ascertained by the counsel for the province of Manitoba, were laid before the Privy Council of Canada by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy).

Mr. CHARLTON. Was it possible to have ascertained later on, as to the working of this school system? Were there any facts to be brought out, after the period the case was tried, that had bearing on the question?

Mr. DALY. Not any facts that were not disclosed by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) in his argument before us. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton) will read the blue-book, and look at the pages and pages of the argument of the member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), he will find that that hon. gentleman discloses every possible fact he could, in order to sustain the case of his clients, the province of Manitoba. In addition to that, Sir, we have Mr. McCarthy on record in that matter. At Orangeville, on the 17th November, 1895, during the celebrated election that was going on at that time, we find that Mr. McCarthy the senior counsel for Mr. Greenway spoke as follows :—

I do not think there is a corporal's guard of men in Cardwell who want further information. If you do, we will supply it from the statistics of which we have an ample supply. So, if the Liberal candidate comes forward, without any policy except that which Mr. Stubbs supports, why should the forces be divided, and the Government candidate walk in between them. If the Liberal candidate, whoever he may be, wants further information, then you have these three positions to choose from. If you want the Government sustained in their determination to reimpose separate schools on Manitoba, you will vote for Mr. Willoughby; if you want further information you will vote for the Liberal candidate, and, if you are opposed to the re-establishment of separate schools, you will vote for Mr. Stubbs.

Now, Sir, we have Mr. McCarthy upon record, that there is not a corporal's guard of men in Cardwell who want further information. That same hon. gentleman said from his place in this House, that he does not want any more facts, that he has got all the

facts he wants to make up his mind on the question ; and you will find the hon. member from Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien), and the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill), saying the same thing. These men do not want an investigation. They do not want any further facts. But, most singular to say, Mr. Speaker, the only people we find who want further facts, and who want an investigation into this matter, are the great Liberal party of Canada.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. The hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) explicitly stated in the House, that he did require information, and he approved the policy, in that respect, of my leader.

Mr. DALY. No doubt the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davies) makes that statement from communication he has had with the member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill).

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) He said it in the House.

Mr. DALY. Then, we will include with the great Liberal party of Canada, the member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill), because I believe he is to be included with them on this vote. We find therefore, that the member for North Bruce, and the great Liberal party of Canada, require further information on this question, and that nobody else does. Singular to relate, we do not find the hon. member for Winnipeg, when he introduced this legislation in 1890, requiring any investigation into the facts. He did not want facts then. But, strange to say, along with his Liberal friends, he wants facts now ; and what are those facts ? I have shown you that the hon. gentleman gives only three reasons for wanting facts ; and every one of those facts is disclosed in the records, which are open to every hon. gentleman who chooses to go into the library and get them.

Now, I understand that one of the reasons given by the local government for abolishing separate schools—and, if I recollect aright, it was also given by Mr. Sifton, when he was addressing the electors of Haldimand—was that these schools were inefficient. As I have said, I defy any hon. gentleman to go through the debates of the legislature, when the Bill of 1890 was under consideration, and find the slightest reference there to the inefficiency of the schools, either Protestant or Roman Catholic. On the contrary, we had a certificate of the hon. member for Winnipeg himself, which I have read, stating that the efforts of the Board of Education had resulted in great good. But if the schools were inefficient, who was to blame for that ? Was it the Board of Education ? No ; it was the government of Manitoba ; for hon. gentlemen may not know that the hon. member for Winnipeg and another member of the Manitoba government, Mr. Prendergast, were members of

the Board of Education representing the government, the former being on the Protestant board, and the latter on the Catholic board. Therefore, if those schools were inefficient, these men were to blame, because they could easily have remedied that inefficiency. But we have Mr. Martin's own statement that the schools were not inefficient, but, on the contrary, that good results had come from the efforts of the Board of Education, and that the only reason that had moved him to wipe out those separate schools was that he was dissatisfied with the system and wanted to get rid of the monstrous evil of separate schools. It was not until Mr. Sifton, the Attorney General, came down to Haldimand that we heard anything about the inefficiency of those schools. Therefore, I think it would be well for the hon. member for Winnipeg to present further evidence to the House to establish that those schools were inefficient before he and his friends put that forward as a reason for an investigation.

Now, the hon. member for Winnipeg says that the only way in which the legislature of Manitoba could carry out the remedial order was by restoring the schools exactly to the condition in which they existed prior to the passage of the School Act of 1890. The hon. gentleman also says that the Government have presented a Bill that is not in the terms of the remedial order. Now, in reference to the first branch of this part of the hon. gentleman's argument, I may say that just as clearly as the English language can express it, the remedial order and the covering minute disclose the fact that we particularly included certain quotations from the judgment of the Privy Council to convey to the government and legislature of Manitoba that we did not require them to restore the schools exactly as they existed prior to 1890. But they chose to take that position. Their reply indicated, as I take it, that they did not want to act under the remedial order ; and now the hon. gentleman emphasizes the position they took by saying that there was nothing left to them but to restore the schools as they existed prior to 1890. I will not weary the House with reading the covering minute, which has already been placed upon the record ; but any hon. gentleman who will take the trouble to read it cannot resist the conclusion that it was the desire of this Government not to fasten the legislature of Manitoba down to passing an Act that would simply restore the schools as they existed prior to 1890.

In another portion of his speech the hon. gentleman refers to the answer that was made by the local government to the remedial order ; but he failed to quote the reply that was made by this Government in July, 1895. After the remedial order was passed and transmitted to the Lieutenant-Governor of Manitoba for the benefit of the local government and the local legis-

lature, a period of some months elapsed before a reply was made by the local government. They did not reply until the 25th of June, 1895. One month after the receipt of that reply, on the 27th of July, 1895, the Government of Canada transmitted to the Lieutenant-Governor of Manitoba a communication to be laid before his advisers and before the legislature. I am not going to read the recitals; but I will read what the Government said:

Fully appreciating the importance of the points involved in the above quoted paragraphs, the sub-committee beg leave to suggest that Your Excellency's Government should avail themselves of the invitation expressed in the memorial for further discussion of the subject, and that the attention of the provincial authorities of Manitoba should be invited to certain considerations suggested by the foregoing extracts.

In the interest of all concerned it will not be disputed that if possible the subject of education should be exclusively dealt with by the local legislature. Upon every ground in the opinion of the sub-committee this course is to be preferred, and with the hope that this course may yet be followed the sub-committee have now the honour to recommend that Your Excellency will be pleased to urge upon the government of Manitoba the following further views which may be pressed in connection with the remedial order.

The remedial order coupled with the answer of the Manitoba government has vested the Federal Legislature with complete jurisdiction in the premises, but it by no means follows, that it is the duty of the Federal Government to insist that provincial legislation to be mutually satisfactory should follow the exact lines of this order. It is hoped, however, that a middle course will commend itself to the local authorities, so that federal action may become unnecessary.

With a view to a settlement upon this basis, it seems desirable to ascertain by friendly negotiations what amendments to the Acts respecting education in public schools in the direction of the main wishes of the minority may be expected from the Manitoba legislature.

It is believed by the sub-committee that the religious opinions and rights which have been recognized in the judgment of the Judicial Committee of the Imperial Privy Council could be sufficiently met by the local legislature without impairing the efficiency or proper conduct, management and regulation of the public schools.

It is with the object of effecting some such changes in the educational system of Manitoba that the sub-committee desire that an expression of opinion be obtained from the government of Manitoba. It was with this view that the Canadian Government at the last session of the Federal Parliament made the following announcement:—

"Though there may be differences of opinion as to the exact meaning of the reply in question, the Government believes that it may be interpreted as holding out some hope of an amicable settlement of the Manitoba school question on the basis of possible action by the Manitoba government and legislature; and the Dominion Government is most unwilling to take any action which can be interpreted as forestalling or precluding such a desirable consummation. The Government has also considered the difficulties to be met with in preparing and perfecting legislation on so important and intricate a question

Mr. DALY.

during the last hours of the session. The Government has, therefore, decided not to ask Parliament to deal with remedial legislation during the present session. A communication will be sent immediately to the Manitoba government on the subject, with a view to ascertaining whether that government is disposed to make a settlement of the question, which will be reasonably satisfactory to the minority of that province, without making it necessary to call into requisition the powers of the Dominion Parliament. A session of the present Parliament will be called together, to meet not later than the first Thursday of January next. If by that time the Manitoba government fails to make a satisfactory arrangement to remedy the grievance of the minority, the Dominion Government will be prepared, at the next session of Parliament, to be called as above stated, to introduce and press to a conclusion such legislation as will afford an adequate measure of relief to the said minority, based upon the line of the judgment of the Privy Council, and the remedial order of the 21st March, 1895."

The sub-committee have, therefore, the honour to recommend that Your Excellency will be pleased to cause communication to be had through the Lieutenant-Governor of Manitoba with the government of that province, in order to ascertain upon what lines the local authorities of Manitoba will be prepared to promote amendments to the Acts respecting education in schools in that province, and whether any arrangement is possible with the Manitoba government, which will render action by the Federal Parliament, in this connection, unnecessary.

Now, you will find that clearly lays down, as the Government intended it should, in the minute covering the remedial order, that they did not exact that the government of Manitoba would re-enact the legislation which existed prior to 1890. The judgment of the Privy Council does not require that. All it requires is that the Act of 1890 should be supplemented; and I think the remedial order and the memorandum I have just read, of July, 1895, indicate to any fair-minded man that, so far as the Government of Canada is concerned, its desire all through this matter has been that the question should be dealt with by the legislature of Manitoba—that, in accordance with the decision of the Privy Council, the Manitoba legislature should supplement the Act of 1890 by such legislation as would restore the rights of the minority which the minority had prior to 1890. And that is borne out by the communication we made in July. Yet, strange to say, these gentlemen whom, according to the statement of the hon. leader of the Opposition, we are to approach in the sunny ways of patriotism, these gentlemen whom we did approach in these sunny ways—because the language cannot be taken exception to, in which this memorandum is couched—thought so little of the matter that this Government never received any reply to that communication of July, 1895, until December, 1895. Six months elapsed between the time we threw out the suggestion that a middle course should be adopted, before those hon. gentlemen replied; and then their reply was exactly in accord with the reply they made to

the remedial order, namely, that they would not recede from the position they had taken, and would not pass any legislation in accord with the judgment of the Privy Council. That shows the fact that, so far as the remedial order is concerned, it was not intended by this Government that the Manitoba government should restore the statutes as they were previous to 1890, but that the Manitoba legislature should supplement the Act of 1890 by such additions as would restore the rights the minority had enjoyed prior to 1890.

Now, the hon. gentleman made the broad statement that the Bill differs from the remedial order. That was a serious charge for him to make, and yet, strange to say, he does not disclose any facts supporting his charge. Where, I will ask him, or any hon. gentleman, does the Remedial Bill differ from the remedial order? As the hon. gentleman says, very truly, the legislation to be enacted should come under the provisions of the remedial order. Have we gone outside of the remedial order? The hon. gentleman had the Bill before him, can he quote any clause or provision of that Bill that is not supported by the remedial order? I think not. I think that any lawyer, going through that Bill, clause by clause, will find that those who framed it confined themselves strictly within the limits of the remedial order.

And then the hon. gentleman attacks us because he says that we have endeavoured by this Bill to make the schools efficient, and that, by our endeavour to make them efficient, we admit that they were inefficient prior to 1890. That seems to me very strange reasoning. Surely we have the right, and it is within the Remedial Bill, to make those schools efficient, if we possibly can. And if there is an enactment in this Bill which goes further towards making those schools efficient than the legislation prior to 1890, we are legislating in a direction that should meet the approval of every member of this House, whether on this or the opposite side, whether Roman Catholic or Protestant, whether a supporter or an opponent of separate schools. We want efficient schools; and if those schools were inefficient prior to 1890, the blame rests with the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin), and the government of which he was a member. I find no evidence to show that they were inefficient, but lest there should be any possibility of their being hereafter inefficient, the Government, by the provisions of this Bill, acting clearly within the lines of the remedial order, have endeavoured, so far as they can, to provide for the future efficiency of any schools that may be established in that country.

Now, the hon. gentleman next says that the Manitoba government will refuse to do anything. That seems to me an extraordinary statement for the hon. gentleman to make. We had read here yesterday even-

ing by the leader of this House a telegram from the Hon. Mr. Greenway, and we had a statement made by the hon. leader of the House to-day, in reply to the hon. leader of the Opposition, that negotiations are about to be opened with Mr. Greenway, or rather that Mr. Greenway has expressed his willingness to negotiate with this Government, and that there is a possibility of a settlement being arrived at. And yet we have the hon. member for Winnipeg, no later than last Friday night, saying that the Manitoba government will refuse to do anything. In support of that statement, he referred to the fact that Mr. Sifton came down here a year ago, between the passing of the remedial order and the reassembling of the Manitoba legislature, and had an interview with the Governor General, and that the Manitoba government refused to recede from their position then, that they refused, in their answer to the remedial order, to recede from their position, that they refused, in reply to the memorandum of July last, to recede from their position, and that they would persist in refusing to do anything. Why, it seems to me that the hon. gentleman takes upon himself to speak for a great many people. In the earlier part of his speech he spoke on behalf of the Protestant minority. A little later he spoke on behalf of the government of Manitoba, of which he is not a member, and said it would refuse to do anything. Well, we trust that the Manitoba government will do something. We trust that it will recede from the position it has unfortunately taken in this matter, and that at last it will come to its senses and realize what the judgment of the Privy Council means. That judgment means that the legislature of Manitoba should act in this matter. The Privy Council did not expect that this Parliament would be called upon to discuss remedial legislation or pass a Remedial Bill, but expected that its judgment being directed to the local legislature, that legislature would pass the necessary legislation accordingly. I do not agree with the hon. member for Winnipeg. I think the probability is that Messrs. Greenway and Sifton will do something, and recede from the position they have taken. If they do not, then the blame will rest with them for refusing the last opportunity that they will have to act in accord with the judgment of the Privy Council. The hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I., (Mr. Davies) looks at me very inquiringly.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) You have given so many last opportunities. I did not know that this was the finally final opportunity.

Mr. DALY. Unless it may be that the opportunity will come, to which the hon. member for Winnipeg referred very feelingly, and that was the opportunity which would come when the leader of the Opposition would be the leader of the Government.

It may be they will have an opportunity then. The hon. member for Winnipeg dwelt at considerable length upon that. But that is a long, long way off. I am afraid we shall be a good deal older than we are before that comes about. This is the last opportunity that is offered to Mr. Greenway and Mr. Sifton and the local government of Manitoba to act in accordance with the decision of the judgment of the Privy Council.

But, Sir, in connection with that feature of the case, the hon. member for Winnipeg took exception to the statement made by the Minister of Justice that all along the Greenway government had refused to act in accordance with the spirit that should have actuated them in connection with this important matter. The hon. Minister just quoted from the Speech from the Throne, and that quotation is repeated by the hon. member from Winnipeg. The words referred to occurred in the Speech from the Throne made by the Lieutenant-Governor of Manitoba a year ago last January. I think. The words are as follows:—

Whether or not a demand will be made by the Federal Government that that Act should be modified is not yet known to my government. It is not the intention of my government in any way to recede from its determination to uphold the present public school system which, if left to its own operation, would in all probability soon become universal throughout the province.

Now, the hon. member for Winnipeg says that that is "the only evidence that is put forward by the Government as to any indication of its attitude given by the legislature of Manitoba prior to the 21st March, 1895, when they, without any inquiry, on the shortest possible notice to Manitoba."—and so on. In a former part of his speech he says, referring to the hon. Minister of Justice:

In the first place, he said, it was well known that Manitoba intended to do nothing in the premises, and, as a proof of that very broad and, I must say, very untrue statement, he instances the fact that in 1894, a communication was sent from the Government here calling the attention of Manitoba, and also the North-west Territories to the unfair position of their school legislation—

And so on. Now, the hon. Minister of Justice did make that quotation. He quoted from the Order in Council of July, 1894, and the reply that was made by the local government. The hon. member for Winnipeg says: Oh, but when you quote that you quote from a document that was issued by the local government prior to the remedial order, and things are different since the passing of the remedial order; things are different since the deliverance of the judgment by the Privy Council, and the local government take a different position now from that which they took prior to that time. Let us examine whether they took a different position after the delivery of that judgment from that

Mr. DALY.

which they took before. Let us consider the position they have taken in this matter from its very inception, namely, since the appeal to the Privy Council in 1894, and we shall ascertain whether the statement by the Minister of Justice and referred to by the hon. member for Winnipeg was the only statement that had been made by the local government as to the position they took. I find that on the 30th January, 1895, Messrs. McMillan and Sifton, two members of the local government, were in Toronto. That was after the delivery of the judgment of the Privy Council. What position did they take at that time? Provincial Secretary McMillan said:

The decision is not unexpected. Our counsel advised us that the remarks of their lordships during the argument indicated that the appeal would be allowed. The decision does not affect us in the least. The people of Manitoba know what kind of school system they want, and any attempt on behalf of the Dominion to override their wishes in the matter of remedial legislation would be so much time thrown away.

Now, Mr. Sifton said:

The decision makes no difference to us. We have established a common school system for all, and we will maintain it. The Manitoba government was bound to have one efficient school system for all, and would treat all alike, and cared little whether the Dominion passed remedial legislation or not, as they had taken their stand, and it was a constitutional one, and they were perfectly satisfied.

Mr. Sifton was again interviewed in the same month, January, 1895, and said:

If such a right of appeal be granted by the decision of the Privy Council, then, practically, the immediate effect of the decision will be that the Dominion Government has legal power to restore the educational privileges which the Catholics of Manitoba enjoy under the provisions of the former school Act.

And how will the provincial government take that?

The provincial government will not take it at all.

There will be a deadlock, then, between the Dominion and provincial governments, if the former decides to interfere with our existing school Act?

If they undertake to interfere with the legislation in any way, shape or form, there will be a deadlock certainly. The province will resent any interference with provincial rights.

What form will the resenting of such interference probably take?

Can't tell. We don't know yet that there will be any interference. I don't think the Dominion Government will trouble us. It is a difficult nut for them to crack, but I do not think they will undertake to make any change in our provincial laws.

Now, these are statements made by these hon. gentlemen after the delivery of the Privy Council's judgment. But I am not going to be satisfied to rest the case upon statements made by members of the government. We can find the position taken by the legislature itself and by the government

itself in the legislature after the delivery of that judgment. We find, for instance, that, on the 27th of February, 1895, which was after the delivery of the Privy Council's judgment, and after the government of Manitoba were aware of the terms of that judgment, and, if I mistake not, at the time the hearing was going in Ottawa, for I think that hearing began on the 26th of February—in the local legislature of Manitoba, Mr. Fisher introduced a resolution, the concluding part of which reads as follows:—

And, having regard to the suggestions of the tribunal referred to, that "all legitimate" ground of complaint would be removed if the present system were supplemented by provisions which would remove the grievances upon which the appeal is founded, and were modified so far as might be necessary to give effect to those provisions, without a repeal of the present law, this House is ready to consider the grievances referred to, with a view to providing reasonable relief, while maintaining, as far as possible consistent with that object, the principles of the present Act in their general application.

Now, Sir, was that resolution supported by Mr. Greenway, by Mr. Sifton and the members of the government? They did not support it, but they spoke against it and introduced an amendment which was moved by Mr. Sifton, as follows:—

That all the words after the word "While," in the original motion, be struck out, and the following substituted therefor:—"this House loyally submits itself to the provisions of the constitution, as interpreted by the Judicial Committee of Her Majesty's Privy Council, it is hereby resolved that the exercise of appellate jurisdiction by the Governor General in Council in such a way as to lead hereafter to the alteration of such principles upon which the public school system of Manitoba is founded, will be viewed with grave apprehension. That an interference by the federal authority with the educational policy of the province is contrary to the recognized principles of provincial autonomy. That this House will, by all constitutional means, and to the utmost extent of its power, resist any steps which may be taken to attack the school system established by the Public Schools Act of 1890, which is believed to be conceived and administered in the highest and best interests of the whole population of Manitoba.

Does that amendment read like the utterance of men who were open to conviction? Does it disclose any desire to have this question decided? Does it show that these men were to be influenced by what the hon. leader of the Opposition calls "the sunny ways of patriotism?" Does it show that these hon. gentlemen recognized the force of the judgment of the Privy Council? On the contrary, it breathes the same spirit of defiance that has been shown by the government of the province of Manitoba in all the action they have taken in this matter from the time of the delivery of the judgment of the Privy Council up to this present moment. The amendment that was moved and carried by the govern-

ment, the amendment of Mr. Sifton I have read just now, fully answers the statement made by the hon. member for Winnipeg the other night that the government of Manitoba had not expressed itself as unwilling to settle this question. Why, Sir, if the government of Manitoba had been desirous of settling this question in accordance with the provisions of the judgment of the Privy Council, would they have indicated and passed such an amendment as I have read here? On the contrary, Mr. Speaker, that amendment is exactly in accordance with the position they have taken in this matter all through. They not only passed that amendment then, but since that time they have passed other resolutions in the same line. But, Sir, I am not going to be content even with quoting the interviews that were had with Mr. Sifton or Mr. Cameron or Mr. McMillan; I am not going to be content by quoting the amendments that were made by them in the House or the expression of their opinions as placed on record by those amendments, but I will take the position that their counsel took at the hearing before the Privy Council of Canada, and what was the position then? Why, Sir, we find on that occasion that Mr. McCarthy disclosed to the people of Canada; and disclosed to the committee, exactly the position that the government of Manitoba were going to take in this matter. He says, on page S3:

I have not seen the Queen's Speech, but I should think the Lieutenant-Governor would not be allowed to say that. But I understand that the position of the Manitoba government is that they will resist by every constitutional means in their power the passage of any remedial order, and that they will not obey the order, which is something that they have a perfect right to do.

So, Sir, we have these gentlemen, whom we are to approach in the sunny ways of patriotism, instructing their counsel, who appears before the Privy Council of Canada before any remedial order is passed, to say that they are going to resist by every constitutional means any remedial order, and that if a remedial order is made, they are not going to obey it. Now, that is the position taken by these hon. gentlemen who, we are told, are amenable to appeal, that is the position taken by the hon. gentlemen who have the responsibility upon their shoulders of governing the province of Manitoba; and those are the hon. gentlemen who the member for Winnipeg said in his speech the other night, had not given any indication of an attitude that would disclose an unwillingness to open negotiations, or to be appealed to. Why, Sir, I think these words conclusively prove, as I said before, that those gentlemen have been opposed to any settlement of this matter from its very inception.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It is singular that you should not have invited them down to a consultation.

Mr. DALY. I do not think it is singular at all. This Government invited them from the very first to look into this matter properly, they invited them from the very first to consider this matter. But those gentlemen have shown a spirit of defiance from the very inception of the trouble. My hon. friend beside me suggests the quotation I was going to make that :

While the lamp holds out to burn,
The vilest sinner may return.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Are you returning ?

Mr. DALY. You may return with me, and the crowds will exclaim :

See the mighty host advancing,
Satan leading on.

Sir, because Mr. Greenway, and Mr. Sifton, and Mr. Cameron, and Mr. McMillan have taken the position that I have shown they did take, and because the legislature backed them up, is no proof that these gentlemen are not still open to conviction ; and I hope and trust that they will recede from the position they have taken ; and I have no doubt that the hon. gentlemen opposite, who smile at my remarks, are also hoping and feeling that they are now open to conviction and to reason, and that they can be approached ; because I think that we all feel in this House, and the people of Canada feel, that if this matter is to be settled, it should be settled by the legislature of Manitoba. That was the position taken by the judgment of the Privy Council, that was the opinion expressed by Lord Herschell in his judgment, and that was the position taken by our late lamented leader, Sir John Thompson, in a speech that hon. gentleman made in this House in 1893 on this question ; and I cannot do better than to read his concluding words, indicating to you what his position on the matter was, and what he expected to come out of this appeal that was being made to the courts. Sir John Thompson said :

The hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte) challenges me, as he surely had no right to challenge me, to state in advance what the policy of the Government would be if such and so should happen. I tell him that the answer I can give him now, and the answer I shall be able to give him, if that event should happen, would be this, that the province of Manitoba is a constitutional province, and that whether it be in the hands of legislators opposed to us, or in the hands of legislators in sympathy with us, we have every reason to believe and to rest assured that she will obey the dictates of the highest tribunals of the Empire as to what the constitution is, regardless of consequences, regardless even of the displeasure of the majority if the decision should be against the majority ; and that, so far as the disposal of this appeal is concerned at any rate, the minority must bow to that decision, and the Federal Executive will advise His Excellency accordingly.

Now, those are words with which we can all agree. We all expected, and we all

Mr. DALY.

hoped, that when the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council gave its judgment, and that judgment came to the notice of the government and legislature of Manitoba, they would act in accordance with the principle laid down by Sir John Thompson, and that they would recognize and act in accordance with the decision of the highest judicial body in the Empire. Now, Sir, so positive was the member for Winnipeg that the Manitoba government would refuse to do anything, that he went so far as to say—and I want his words to go on record :

But I can say this, that if Mr. Greenway does come here, that will be no sign and no indication that there is any hope whatever that the government of Manitoba will do anything in the premises. They cannot do it ; the government there have rendered it impossible for them to do it. Every attempt has been made—

And so on. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman says that Mr. Greenway coming here will be no sign or indication that any settlement can be arrived at. I do not agree with the hon. gentleman. I hope that his statement is not true. But I wish to deal with the concluding portion of that quotation, in which he says that this Government has rendered it impossible for them to do anything. The hon. gentleman does not give his reasons. Why, have we rendered it impossible for them to do anything ? Surely, Mr. Speaker, it is just as much within the jurisdiction of the legislature of Manitoba to-day to supplement their school Act of 1890, and to provide such legislation as will remove the grievance of the minority, as it was for them to repeal the Acts that existed prior to 1890. They have just the same power to-day ; there is the same power to-day to enact legislation as there was in 1890, when those Acts were introduced by the hon. member for Winnipeg. Why, by our action up to this moment, we have not taken any power away from the Manitoba legislature. They are in just as good a position, legally and constitutionally, to legislate to-day, as they were before the judgment of the Privy Council was given, before the remedial order was made, or before this Remedial Bill was introduced ; and the second reading of this Remedial Bill will not affect the constitutionality of any Act that may be introduced and passed by them. So, Sir, without the hon. member for Winnipeg having disclosed any good reason why we have prevented them by our action from passing the necessary legislation to settle this question, the hon. gentleman boldly declares, in the first place, that if Mr. Greenway comes here, we cannot expect anything from him, and that we by our action have prevented them from legislating in the direction of a settlement. Now, the hon. gentleman also says :

Manitoba considered the remedial order a most harsh judgment, given against them in their absence, without any opportunity on their part to meet the case made against them, and they

believed that they were justified, in the interest of the province, in answering that remedial order by a dignified refusal to obey it.

How can the hon. gentleman say that the government of Manitoba had no opportunity to be heard? Does the hon. gentleman ignore the fact that the government of Manitoba had secured the services of one of the ablest counsel in Canada, that the government of Manitoba were represented before the Privy Council by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy); and that in accordance with the wishes of that hon. gentleman, a week's time was given him to get more information, to get better posted, and to bring down here, that he might appear before us, the Superintendent of Education, Mr. Blakeley? Every opportunity was given to the counsel appearing for the province to disclose and state before that committee every fact and every argument that could be adduced to sustain the position taken by the government of Manitoba. I cannot understand why the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin) should say, as he does state, that we only heard one side of the case, that Manitoba was not represented, that we adjudicated in her absence; and this statement is made in view of the fact that we have a blue-book, 120 odd pages of which are taken up mainly with arguments presented by Mr. McCarthy before the Privy Council. So the statement of the hon. member for Winnipeg cannot be sustained. The hon. gentleman read to the House a letter which he read a year ago, and, discussing it, he said that he did not take back any of the statements it contained: that he was opposed to any religious exercises in the schools, simply for the reason he considered we had no right, in the legislature, to deal with the question of religion. The question of religion in the schools was discussed at very great length in the press and by the people of Manitoba at the time of the passing of the Act of 1890. The hon. member for Winnipeg has stated as a fact that, when he introduced the legislation of 1890, he considered that we would have what are termed godless schools, non-sectarian schools, in which no religion should be taught; and it is borne out by the letter from which he quoted, and by the hon. gentleman's subsequent statement, that if legislation had been on those lines, possibly the minority would not have had the reason they have now to complain in regard to religious exercises in the schools. But the hon. gentleman had to bow to the tremendous pressure brought to bear on him by the leaders of the different churches in Manitoba at that time, and by public opinion, and he had to amend the Bill he introduced so as to permit religious exercises being held in the schools, and the Bill was so changed and gave rise to the very serious complaints made by the minority in regard to this ques-

tion. So, if the hon. gentleman, instead of pressing legislation, as he did, after eliminating that feature from the Bill, had waited until such time as he could frame a Bill that would meet the wishes of the minority, this trouble would not have arisen; but he was bound to push on legislation whether it affected the minority or not, whether the Roman Catholics were to have the right of holding religious exercises in the schools according to their own faith or not; he had no regard whatever for the consciences of the minority, but, apart from their interest altogether, the hon. gentleman was bound to push on the legislation to a conclusion, and he did it. The hon. gentleman, in the course of his speech the other day, grew very bold. He said:

I take this stand, Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Remedial Bill which is now before us for consideration is wholly unconstitutional and ultra vires, and I shall endeavour to satisfy the House of the correctness of that position from a constitutional standpoint.

Then the hon. gentleman quotes subsection 3 of the Act, and he takes this position:

Now, Mr. Speaker, has the legislature of Manitoba ever had the opportunity of passing, as a provincial law, the Remedial Bill which is proposed for our consideration? Never.

Could anything be more perfectly absurd? Surely, if the hon. gentleman has read, as he ought to have read, the remedial order and the covering minute, he would have seen that what the local legislature is called upon to do is to pass such legislation as is necessary to restore the rights of the minority. It may be as well for me to quote the enacting words of the remedial order. They are as follows:—

And whereas the 26th day of February, 1895, having been appointed for the hearing of the said appeal, and the same coming on to be heard on that day, and on the 5th, 6th and 7th days of March, 1895, in the presence of counsel for the petitioners (the said Roman Catholic minority of Her Majesty's subjects in the province of Manitoba) and as well for the province of Manitoba, upon reading the said petition and the statutes therein referred to, and upon hearing what was alleged by counsel on both sides, His Excellency the Governor General in Council was pleased to order and adjudge, and it is hereby ordered and adjudged, that the said appeal be, and the same is hereby allowed, in so far as it relates to rights acquired by the said Roman Catholic minority under legislation of the province of Manitoba, passed subsequent to the union of that province with the Dominion of Canada, and His Excellency the Governor General in Council was pleased to adjudge and declare, and it is hereby adjudged and declared that by the two Acts passed by the legislature of the province of Manitoba, on the first day of May, 1890, intitled respectively "An Act respecting the Department of Education," and "An Act respecting Public Schools," the rights and privileges of the Roman Catholic minority of the said province, in relation to education, prior to the 1st day of May, 1890, have been affected by depriving the Roman Catholic mi-

nority of the following rights and privileges, which, previous to and until the 1st day of May, 1890, such minority had.

And His Excellency the Governor General in Council was further pleased to declare and decide, and it is hereby declared that it seems requisite that the system of education embodied in the two Acts of 1890, aforesaid, shall be supplemented by a provincial Act or Acts which will restore to the Roman Catholic minority the said rights and privileges of which such minority has been so deprived as aforesaid, and which will modify the said Acts of 1890, so far and so far only as may be necessary to give effect to the provisions restoring the rights and privileges in paragraphs (a), (b), (c), hereinbefore mentioned.

So that, by the enacting words of the remedial order, the legislature of Manitoba has been called upon to pass a provincial law, and it has refused to do so.

Then, the next point made by the hon. gentleman is thus stated :

There should have been first a refusal of the legislature of Manitoba to enact such provincial law as seems to the Governor General in Council requisite for the due execution of the provisions of this section.

That reason cannot hold, in view of the fact that, by the enacting words of the remedial order, which I have read, the Manitoba legislature was called upon to pass such legislation as would restore the rights of the minority. But the arguments adduced by the hon. gentleman would lead one to the conclusion that it was necessary for this Government to prepare a Bill and send it to Manitoba, and the provincial government should refuse to pass the Bill, before we were in a position to introduce and pass a Remedial Bill. That position is untenable, because it is not necessary for us to prepare and forward legislation to that province. I do not want any better authority for my statement than the position taken by the hon. member for North Simcoe in the argument before the Privy Council. At page 54 of the Manitoba School Case, in reference to that feature, Mr. McCarthy says :

Another question is as to how remedial action is to be carried out. You will make a remedial order. I do not quite agree with my learned friend that you are to frame an Act of Parliament for the legislature of Manitoba. Your duty would be well performed, in case remedial action was to be taken, if you passed the remedial order and left the legislature of Manitoba to put that in the form they saw fit. That order would be an Order in Council upon the report, I suppose, of a committee or of the whole Council and approved of by the Governor General in Council in the ordinary way.

That is exactly what this Government has done. They passed the remedial order, and they have left the legislature of Manitoba to put that into the form of a statute if they saw fit. The legislature of Manitoba have not seen fit to put that remedial order in any form at all. The legislature of Manitoba have refused to do anything under that

Mr. DALY.

order. Sir, I do not know any person who would have been more ready than the hon. gentleman himself to take up the cudgels at once, and to have made an attack upon this Government, if we had taken the position he indicates. He now says that we should have prepared legislation and sent it to Manitoba. Suppose we had prepared an Act and sent it to the legislature of Manitoba, it would have indicated to them that they had to pass that law, and no other law. Then this Government would have been open to the charge that we had framed our legislation in such a way that we did not permit of it being changed, or altered, or amended, and that the government of Manitoba would have to pass that Bill or no Bill at all. No person more than the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin) would have been ready to have attacked this Government if they had taken that position. But, Sir, I have the authority of the counsel for Manitoba, who declared before the committee—and with that authority the committee and I agreed—that it was not necessary for us to prepare a Bill at all, and that all we had to do, if we were going to pass a remedial order, was to frame that order in such a way as to indicate what was required. We did that. The Manitoba legislature refused to act in accordance with that order, and to-day it does not lie in the mouth of the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin) to say that the Manitoba legislature should, first of all, have the opportunity to refuse to pass such legislation as we prepared for them.

Another reason given by the hon. member for Winnipeg is as follows :—

Another reason is, that the Governor General in Council has never determined that this Remedial Bill, which we are asked to pass, is requisite for the due execution of the provisions of section 22.

My only answer to the hon. gentleman is : Let him read the Order in Council, and let him read the accompanying minute, and he will see there that we have determined that this Bill, which we are asked to pass, is requisite for the due execution of the provisions of the section. But the hon. gentleman reads subsection 3 as if it were really two clauses. The first part of the section says :

In case such provincial law, as from time to time seems to the Governor General in Council requisite for the due execution of the provisions of this section, is not made, or in case any decision of the Governor General in Council on any appeal under this section is not duly executed by the proper provincial authority in that behalf, then, and in every such case, and as far only as the circumstances of each case require, the Parliament of Canada may make remedial law for the due execution of the provisions of this section, and of any decision of the Governor General in Council under this section.

Why, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me perfectly clear that so far as the remedial order it-

self is concerned, the terms in which it is couched cover the position that the hon. gentleman takes in connection with this subsection 3, and it is also clear that we have met all the objections he has raised as to the terms of the remedial order. The hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin) goes on further and says :

And another circumstance must intervene, and that is, that the order must be transmitted to the legislature of Manitoba and they must refuse to pass the Act.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we remitted the remedial order to the government of Manitoba, and they have refused to act. The hon. gentleman goes on to say :

Now, neither of these things has been done. There has been no Order in Council by the Governor General, providing that this provincial law shall be enacted by Manitoba, and there has been no refusal by the legislature of Manitoba to enact this law.

Our only reply to that is : That the remedial order was transmitted to the Lieutenant-Governor of Manitoba in the proper way, laid by him before his advisers, and laid by them before the legislature, and we have their reply. In their answer they refuse to do anything under the provisions of the Act. In their answer they say :

We are, therefore, compelled to respectfully state to Your Excellency in Council that we cannot accept the responsibility of carrying into effect the terms of the remedial order.

And as soon as that answer was received by this Government, and they choose to take that as final, then this Parliament would be vested with the authority to pass the Remedial Bill we now introduce. Mr. Speaker, I am hurrying on in order to get through before six o'clock. In the conclusion of the speech of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Martin), he makes this declaration, and he announces by this declaration that he takes the same position as was taken by the hon. member for Verchères (Mr. Geoffrion). He says :

I believe that there is no man in Canada better fitted to bring about a solution of this troublesome and burning question than the hon. gentleman whom the Liberals have the great fortune to have at their head. That gentleman has the confidence, I believe, of a large portion of his native province. He has also the confidence of a large portion of the people of Manitoba, the province particularly affected by this question.

* * * * *

I am satisfied that he will be able to settle this question, not, as I understand the cheers of hon. gentlemen opposite to mean, because the government of Manitoba happens to be Liberal and he is the Liberal leader ; not at all for that reason, but because he has taken a statesman-like view of this question.

And we find that the hon. member for Verchères (Mr. Geoffrion), in the concluding portion of his speech the other night, announces himself somewhat in the same style. He says :

Sir, having decided to vote against this Bill, I repeat that I shall do so, not because I am opposed to remedial legislation. On the contrary, I stated last year, that I had no confidence in the promises that were made on behalf of the Government by one of the Ministers ; but I have a strong faith that our leader will be able to succeed where the Government are sure to fail. I have full confidence in my party, and not only in the leader of my party, but in his lieutenants.

Now, Sir, these concluding remarks of the member for Verchères (Mr. Geoffrion), and of the member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin) indicate to me that there has been a pretty good understanding between the different members and branches of the Liberal party in Canada, from Quebec through to the province of Manitoba. The hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin) in the course of his address spoke of :

The splendid and patriotic stand that is taken by his leader on this question.

Now, Sir, there is no doubt that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Martin) may believe that his leader is taking a patriotic stand. But it has been pretty hard for some of us to find out exactly where the hon. gentleman (Mr. Laurier) has stood upon the question. For instance, we first find that the hon. gentleman said : The question was a legal one. He next said : It is a difficult question. He next said : It is a question of fact. He next said : It is not a political question ; and then he said : It is purely a judicial question. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Laurier) seems to think, judging by the positions he has taken, that this is a Chinese puzzle, because he first says : It is a legal question ; then he says : It is a question of fact ; then he says : It is a political question, and then : It is a judicial question. Now, where do we find the hon. gentleman ? It is either a legal question or a question of fact. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, as the question grew, and as the hon. gentleman's position grew more intelligible, that he shifted his ground. When he addressed this House in 1893, he said it was a question of fact, and the question of fact which the hon. gentleman then said should be investigated by this Government was the statement made by the Archbishop in his memorial, that the schools in Manitoba were Protestant schools. We all remember how vehemently the hon. gentleman spoke on that occasion. We all remember how he declared that if that was a fact, he would go to Manitoba and appeal to Mr. Greenway, and into every Orange lodge in the country, and appeal to their sense of fair-play. He said :

I would not hesitate, if the statement is true, to go ahead and plead the case of the Catholics in Winnipeg with the government of Mr. Greenway himself, because, if there is such an outrageous state of things prevailing in the province of Manitoba, not a moment is to be lost in coming to the rescue of the oppressed minority. These are my sentiments. That is the position

in which I stand at this moment, and that is the reason why I arraign the Government as I do. There was the fact which they should have investigated, and to which they should have addressed themselves; but, instead of investigating that fact, they tried every subterfuge in their power to delay investigation, because if they had studied the question, they would have to come to a decision.

The question of fact which the hon. gentleman wanted to investigate was whether or not those schools were Protestant. Why, Sir, it seems to me that no better opportunity could have been given to the hon. gentleman to ascertain that for himself than was given to him when he visited Winnipeg in 1894. The hon. gentleman was then on the same platform and face to face with Mr. Greenway; he was in communication with Mr. Greenway and the members of his government. More than that, he was waited upon and interviewed by a representation of his own co-religionists, who told him that those schools were Protestant. I quoted their statement before, and you will find it in the debates that took place in this House on the 21st of January, 1896. And yet, with that evidence disclosed to him by his own co-religionists on the spot, did we find the hon. gentleman taking the stand that he had declared he would take? He had said that he would plead the cause of the Catholic minority with Mr. Greenway himself. He had said:

I shall be prepared to repeat, and would repeat on every platform in Ontario, every platform in Manitoba, nay, every Orange lodge throughout the land, that the Catholic minority has been subjected to a most infamous tyranny.

Yet we do not find that the hon. gentleman has taken any steps in that direction from the day he made those declarations—and why? Is it because the hon. gentleman has found since then that the question is a legal one? Is it because he has found that it is purely a judicial question? Under these circumstances, it seems to me ridiculous for the hon. member for Winnipeg to say that the hon. leader of the Opposition has taken a patriotic stand on this question. In 1893 we had him declaring that not a moment was to be lost in coming to the rescue of the oppressed minority. That oppressed minority was the same minority that we find in Manitoba to-day; and when this Government are endeavouring to come to the rescue of that oppressed minority, where do we find the leader of the Opposition? We find him moving the six months' hoist to a Bill to give relief to that oppressed minority. At Morrisburg he said:

The question cannot be settled until there has been such an investigation. I would approach Greenway with the sunny ways of patriotism.

And when he puts up the hon. member for Winnipeg, who is supposed to be more conversant with the facts of this case than any other member of this House, that hon.

Mr. DALY.

gentleman cannot tell us what facts are to be investigated or what we require to have light upon. At Chicoutimi the hon. leader of the Opposition reiterated, amidst indescribable enthusiasm, his solemn engagement to re-establish the Catholic schools on his arrival in power; and I suppose that is what the hon. member for Verchères (Mr. Geoffrion) is looking for. Is that why he supports this motion for the six months' hoist? Because he thinks that the minority in Manitoba must wait for separate schools until his leader comes into power? Is the hon. gentleman playing to the galleries of the province of Quebec? Is he trying to make out to the people there that this Bill will not restore the rights of the minority, but that if they wait until his leader comes into power, he and he alone can restore those rights? Is that the position the hon. gentleman takes? The hon. leader of the Opposition has accused this Government of vacillation that was fast paralyzing and fast disintegrating the national life. This Government have taken, step by step, such a position as they thought was the correct one—first ascertaining the legal rights of the minority of Manitoba, and what should be done to remedy the grievance which the highest court of the Empire declared they were suffering under; and, Sir, they are prepared to stand by the position they have taken. They have never swerved or deviated from the plain path of duty laid down by Sir John Thompson, when the Barrett case was sent to the highest court in the Empire. Following that, when the Government received the petitions from the Archbishop and the minority, asking that they should be heard under section 22 of the Manitoba Act, the Government said to those gentlemen: "Wait until that decision is confirmed, and then will be the time for us to hear you." And when the decision in the case was given, and they made their appeal to us under the provisions of the Manitoba Act, then the question arose whether or not, in view of the decision in Barrett vs. Winnipeg, we could hear that appeal. We did not take upon ourselves to decide that question, but submitted it to the courts for their decision. We went first to the Supreme Court, which decided in one way; then we carried it to the Privy Council, which decided that we should hear the appeal. We then heard the appeal; both sides were represented; we gave our judgment; and we have followed up that judgment by this Remedial Bill. So, that our policy has not been vacillating and paralyzing; but the policy of the Liberal party has been vacillating, paralyzing, and fast disintegrating the national life of Canada, because it takes the position that this House should not proceed with this Bill and be for ever done with this question. If this legislation is enacted by this House, there is no doubt that the question will be settled in a very short time.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I have only to say that, speaking for the people of the province of Manitoba whom I represent, they regret exceedingly that this question has been kept open and alive so long. They think that the sooner it is settled the better it will be in their interest and in the interest of the people of Canada as a whole; and I am satisfied that when the matter is properly put before the people of Manitoba, they will agree with me that the question should be settled by the legislature of Manitoba—that they believe this question could have been easily settled by Mr. Greenway and his government, and there are no people in this confederation of ours who will hail with greater delight a settlement of this question than the people of Manitoba, more particularly if that question is settled by Mr. Greenway and his government; and I hope sincerely that the declaration which we have here in the telegram sent by Mr. Greenway, that he is willing to come down here and negotiate with this Government, will bear fruit. I hope that these negotiations will go on and that Mr. Greenway will arrive at the conclusion that it would have been better for him, better for Manitoba, and better for Canada, if he had taken the position a year ago which he takes to-day, and had settled this question by legislation such as I hope will be passed by the legislature of Manitoba during its ensuing session.

Mr. RINFRET. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, in rising to address this House, to-night, I do not intend to make any lengthy remarks. In order not to take up the time of the House beyond what is necessary, I shall content myself with giving the several grounds upon which I rely to support the amendment moved by the hon. leader of the Opposition. The question we have to deal with now, as all educational questions, is a complicated and difficult one. The first reason why it is so difficult to bring about a harmonious and satisfactory solution of the question at issue is inherent in the different views entertained by both Protestants and Catholics on the matter. There are in educational matters certain principles at stake on which they hold very strong and opposite views. It is not to be wondered at, Sir, if the Catholic hierarchy and the Protestant ministers have evinced such a lively interest in the question now under discussion in this House, and if there is strife between the different races and creeds arrayed in hostile camps. As to me, as a Catholic, I believe in the principle of denominational schools; I believe in the necessity of religious instruction in our schools. I coincide in the opinions the hon. member for Berthier (Mr. Beausoleil) has given expression to on the floor of this House, a few days ago, in the course of his speech, which has enlisted the attention of the hon. members, although I sincerely re-

gret to be unable to arrive at the conclusions he has reached. The hon. member for Berthier thus delivered himself:

Mr. BEAUSOLEIL. (Translation.) I am one of those who conscientiously believe in denominational schools for Catholics and for Protestants as well; for Manitoba Catholics as well as for Quebec Protestants; I believe in the inalienable right of the head of a family to decide in which school his children are to be educated, in which religion they will be brought up, and I look upon as an intolerable usurpation any attempt at infringing that right.

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. BEAUSOLEIL. (Translation.) In looking over the educational legislation of the province of Manitoba, I find that in 1870 a complete system of separate schools was set up in favour of Protestants, then in a minority, and in favour of Catholics, who were then in a majority. A council of public instruction was established, comprising a Catholic section, having under its control the Catholic schools, and a Protestant section, having under its control the Protestant schools. The public grants were distributed according to population, and the school taxes were appropriated to the maintenance of Catholic or Protestant schools, according to the religious tenets of the ratepayers.

That state of things continued for twenty years. In 1890, two Acts were passed, altogether doing away with that state of things, substituting for the separate schools a so-called system of public schools, but in reality Protestant, which despoiled the Catholics of all the rights they had hitherto enjoyed.

It was, in my humble opinion, an iniquity, an act of intolerable tyranny, which it was impossible to tamely acquiesce in. The Catholics vigorously protested, but it was of no avail. Vainly did they petition for the exercise of the federal power of disallowance. This action, had it been adopted, would, perhaps, have resulted in momentary commotion, but never would it have led to an agitation fraught with such danger as the one which we now witness with so much sorrow. After having twice run the gauntlet of the judicial tribunals, the Catholics now come before this House, with a judgment of the Privy Council to the effect that their most sacred rights have been infringed upon. They come before this House, asking that their schools be restored to them, that the imprescriptible rights of their conscience be respected, and that a stop be put to the tyranny, under the unbearable weight of which they have too long suffered. Are we to turn a deaf ear to their prayer? Shall we tell them in so many words by our vote that might is right, and that there are no longer any rights which the majority are bound to respect? Are we, then, to shrink from the most important, the most imperative, the most honourable duty which is incumbent upon this Parliament, that of extending our protection to the minority in the enjoyment of their rights?

We, as Catholics, Sir, have no right to turn a deaf ear to the prayers and entreaties of the Manitoba Catholics, and that is the reason why I hailed with delight the Order in Council of the 19th March, 1895, which recognizes that the minority had: (1) The right to build, maintain, equip, conduct and support their separate schools; (2) The right to share proportionately in any grant

made out of the public funds for the purpose of education; (3) The right of exemption of such Roman Catholics as contributed to Roman Catholic schools from all payment and contribution towards the support of any other schools. I have, on several occasions, publicly expressed my adhesion to that Order in Council, both on the public platform and in the press. I would have, at the session of 1895, willingly supported and given the support of my vote to a fair, sincere and practical enforcement of that Order in Council. I would again have been ready to give it my best support, at this session. Now, Sir, if I think it my duty to vote against the Bill which is now before the House, the reason is that, in my humble opinion, it will not secure an honest, fair and practical enforcement of the enactments of the Order in Council I have just quoted, and also because it can in no way remedy the grievances complained of by the Catholic minority nor will it restore to them the rights and privileges they have been so unjustly deprived of. Let me, Sir, refer again to the words fallen from the hon. member for Berthier (Mr. Beausoleil), who commented on the Bill, as follows:—

To my mind, it is beyond doubt that, whatever favours or concessions the Manitoba government may be disposed to grant to the Catholics in the administration of public schools, they will never agree to a restoration of denominational schools.

In consequence, I have reached the irrefragable conclusion that the only remedy calculated to restore to our compatriots their schools is a federal statute.

Now, Sir, having laid down these principles, and reached the conclusion I have just mentioned, I come to consider the Bill as it stands.

I, for one, do not look upon the Bill as an ideal one. The principles upon which it is grounded are, no doubt, excellent; but they have forgotten to draw from them all the conclusions. This I look upon as a very unfortunate idea, that of allowing the provincial government three months either to accept or ignore the Bill, to appoint the members of the School Board of Education, or in default of the provincial government to empower the Federal Government to make the appointments. Were any doubts left as to the tendencies of the local government, were not their hostility so open and so emphatic, there would perhaps be some excuse for that alternative. But, under the circumstances, it is, to say the least, an act of weakness.

The Bill recognizes to Catholics the right to share proportionately in any grant made out of public funds for educational purposes; but it fails to oblige the province to make such grants in proportion to those which may be granted to public schools. To my mind, that clause is entirely illusory.

Another defective provision is that which invests the provincial government with the exclusive power of appointing inspectors to whom is committed the duty of ascertaining the efficiency of the separate schools. It is quite clear that with such provisions as these, the separate schools will lack efficient visitation, and will not be subsidized by the provincial authorities. Evidently the Bill is based upon the false assumption that it will be accepted and fairly put in operation by the local government. How such an idea

Mr. RINFRET.

came to spring up in the minds of our Ministers is more than I can understand. It seems to me that the Bill ought rather to proceed from the principle that the provincial government, having shown openly, and reiterated their hostility to separate schools under any shape, the federal law should provide for their creation and their maintenance under the exclusive control and protection of the Dominion Government. In short, the separate schools should have been made a purely federal institution, until, at least, the local legislature had passed a new statute restoring to the minority the full enjoyment of all their rights.

Through their having adopted a different principle, the Dominion Government run the risk of securing from their legislation but partial and unsatisfactory results for the minority. Neither do I mean to take back or to mitigate any of the charges which I have made in regard to the unsettled and wavering government policy, which has only resulted in complicating the position, in fostering an agitation fraught with danger, and in making more difficult the adjustment of the matter. Far from taking back any of those charges, I make bold to arraign the government on a further ground still more serious; it is that of having endangered the passage of the measure in not having brought it down at the very outset of the session, in losing valuable time in intestine squabbles, and by throwing for a whole month as a bone of contention to the disputation of parties a budget which they had no intention to have voted by the House. If, owing to the threatened obstruction which the Government measure might be offered in the Committee of the Whole, both by their friends and my own friends who oppose the Bill, it could not be pressed through this House and made law before this Parliament has reached the natural term of its life, that is to say, before the 25th of April, the Government will be held responsible, and will warrant the belief of those who challenge the sincerity of the Ministers.

Mr. RINFRET. (Translation.) I think the hon. member would find it difficult to substantiate his statement, as to some of his friends intending to make obstruction. As to me, I must say that it is the first intimation I have of it, and I do not think our friends on this side of the House are harbouring any such thought. Whether the followers of the Government intend to pursue such a course is more than I can say.

Mr. BEAUSOLEIL. (Translation.) Well, then let us say that the obstructionists are among the followers of the Government.

Notwithstanding the shortcomings of the Bill, which may be corrected in the Committee of the Whole, through the amendments of which the hon. member for Bagot (Mr. Dupont) has given notice, I shall vote against the six months' hoist, and in favour of the second reading of the Bill.

Were the amendments given notice of by the hon. member for Bagot (Mr. Dupont) carried, not only would the Bill be improved, but it would also be materially altered. But the hon. member for Berthier should be aware of the fact that the amendments in question were several days ago, put on the Order paper; they have been brought to the notice of the Government and none of the Ministers have so far intimated their intention of accepting them. Those amendments are of such import that they cannot have escaped the attention of the Ministers before the Bill was brought down; and if they have not

been embodied in the measure now before the House, the reason is that the Government do not mean to accept them and to carry through the House and pass them into law. Moreover, my hon. friend from Quebec Centre has directly put a question to the hon. Postmaster General on that important matter, stating that he was ready to give his support to the Bill, were the Government willing to complete it in the direction mentioned. The hon. Postmaster General has declined to give any answer. This is an eloquent silence, Sir. Beyond any doubt, it is not to be expected that the Bill will be perfected and rendered more operative, during this session. At any rate, I think the objections raised by the hon. member against the measure now before the House carry a great weight with them. But there are many other objectionable features in this Bill. I am satisfied, that before I resume my seat, I shall have somewhat added to the list of objections and I will show without fear of contradiction that the so-called Remedial Bill does not award justice to the Manitoba Catholics, and further, that the enforcement of that Bill cannot but result most disastrously to the Catholic interests and imperil the great principle of denominational schools which we are here to uphold. But, previous to reaching that point of the question at issue, I think it my duty to arraign the Government, on the ground of not having done their duty by the Catholic minority in Manitoba. The fact is, Sir, that for six years back, during all the time that this question was before Parliament and before the country, the Government seem to have been actuated by no other concern but that of shirking their duty and their responsibility, and shifting it on the shoulders of others, by resorting to all kinds of subterfuges. The hon. Ministers seem to have devoted themselves, not to mete out justice, but to prevent the wrongs from being redressed. In order to substantiate this last proposition, I shall have to trespass upon the forbearance of the House, while I go a few years back, to review the history of the school question, in order to appreciate its most salient features.

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

After Recess.

Mr. RINFRET. (Translation.) When you left the Chair, at Six o'clock, Sir, I was about saying that I should have to trespass upon the forbearance of the House, while going a few years back, to make a retrospective review of the question under discussion. To begin with, Sir, on the 7th April, 1890, almost upon the enactment of the school laws, the following petition was sent to the Executive by Archbishop Taché and the leading members of the Catholic minority of Manitoba, praying for disallowance:—

To His Excellency the Governor General in Council:—

The petition of the Catholic section of the Board of Education in and for the province of Manitoba, doth hereby most respectfully represent; That

Whereas previous to and at the time of the union there existed by practice in the territory, which now forms the province of Manitoba, a system of denominational schools.

Whereas the maintenance of such system was made a condition of the union by clause 7 of the Bill of Rights upon which such union was negotiated.

Whereas, thereafter the legislature of the province of Manitoba has established a system of denominational schools which has been in existence since the union up to this year without being questioned or complained of.

Whereas the existence of such a system of denominational schools by practice previous to and at the time of the union, and by law since the union, has created rights and privileges in matters of education to Catholic and Protestant denominations alike.

Whereas a part of the protection afforded to all by clause 93 of the British North America Act, 1867, it has been enacted by clause xxii of the Manitoba Act, that:

"XXII. In and for the province, the said legislature may exclusively make laws in relation to education, subject and according to the following provisions:

"(1) Nothing in any such law shall prejudicially affect any right or privilege with respect to denominational schools which any class of persons have by law or practice in the province at the union.

"(2) An appeal shall lie to the Governor General in Council from any act or decision of the legislature of the province, or of any provincial authority affecting any right or privilege of the Protestant or Roman Catholic minority of the Queen's subjects in relation to education;"

Whereas two bills respectively intituled "An Act respecting the Department of Education," "An Act respecting Public Schools," have been adopted by the legislature of the province of Manitoba, at the session closed on the 31st day of March, A.D. 1890, and whereas such legislation has prejudicially affected the rights and privileges of the Catholic minority of this province with respect to Catholic schools, inasmuch as by said Acts the said Catholic schools of this province are wiped out.

The Catholic section of the Board of Education in and for the province of Manitoba, most respectfully and earnestly pray His Excellency the Governor General in Council, that said last mentioned Acts be disallowed to all intents and purposes, and your petitioners will ever pray.

ALEX., Archbishop of St. Boniface, O.M.I.,
President of the Catholic Section of Board of Education.

T. A. BERNIER,

Superintendent Dept. of Education for the Catholic Section.

Winnipeg, 7th day of April, 1890.

The undersigned, respectively members of the Senate and House of Commons of Canada, fully endorse the contents of the present memorial, and earnestly join in the prayer therein contained.

A. A. LARIVIERE,

M.P., for Provencher, Man.

M. A. GIRARD, Senator.

Ottawa, 26th April, 1890.

Other petitions were sent to Ottawa, later on, praying for interference by the central power. What were, under the circumstances, the Government bound to do? To my mind, that question admits of but one answer, and that is a simple one. Had the Government been disposed to do justice, they would have asked no other alternative but to hear forthwith the appeal of the minority. They had no other course open to them but to invite to Ottawa the representatives of the Catholic minority and those of the Greenway government; to take into consideration the grievances of the Catholics; to hear the reasons alleged in support of their law by the Greenway Cabinet; to forthwith appoint a commission of inquiry into all the facts at issue between the contending parties; to refer to the Supreme Court of Canada, all the questions of law and fact, which that high tribunal would have been called upon to determine, under the Blake resolution which had just then been passed by the Parliament of Canada, and, finally, to do justice, in accordance with the facts of the case. Had the Government done their duty under the circumstances, the school question would have been settled and set at rest five years ago, and it would have been long since buried into oblivion. Had the appeal then been heard, had an investigation been held, beyond the shadow of a doubt the facts elicited at that inquiry would have been so favourable to the cause of the minority that the Government could not have helped disallowing the law, and by the very fact all traces of wrong doing and injustice would have disappeared. It is within the recollection of this House that in the case of Barrett vs. the City of Winnipeg, the Supreme Court decided that the laws of 1890 were "ultra vires." Undoubtedly, upon reference made to that court by the Government, the same finding would have been reached. And strengthened by that judgment, the Government would have found themselves in the best position possible to disallow the law without in the least provoking a conflict with public opinion in the country. Why did not the Government resort to such a simple and expeditious proceeding which was at their disposal? The reason for the course they have followed is certainly not because they were opposed in principle to disallowance, since they disallowed two other acts that had been passed by the Manitoba legislature that very same year. The true reason for it was that the majority of the Government were then, as they now are, hostile to the Catholic minority, and that they never sincerely meant to do what was just to them. Here are the reasons, Sir, alleged by the Government press, to palliate the course pursued by the Government of the day. They say: (1) That Archbishop Taché and the Catholic minority in Manitoba had waived their claim to disallowance, because the Blake motion, adopted in 1890, precluded disallowance from

Mr. RINFRET.

being resorted to; (2) That disallowance would have proved useless, because the Greenway government could have re-enacted their law at every subsequent session. Let us then, Sir, scrutinize those two propositions and see whether they are well-founded. They say, first, that Archbishop Taché waived all claim to disallowance. Allow me, Sir, to refer here to what that distinguished prelate stated in a pamphlet which he published in 1893. It is but right that the House should be made acquainted with the means resorted to, in order to induce Archbishop Taché to waive his claim and let the Government have their own way. Let us hear what Archbishop Taché says in that connection in his pamphlet, page 101:—

I pray those who busy themselves about the disallowance of the school laws of Manitoba to pay special attention to what follows; in it there is something that deserves so much the more to be known, that the fact of not being aware of it has prevented even sincere men from fairly judging the question. To express myself more plainly and explicitly to those who ignore or forget what was done in Parliament, I say: "It is not the minority of Manitoba, nor Archbishop Taché that have abandoned the claim for disallowance. The granting of disallowance was made impossible by the unanimous vote of the Commons of Ottawa on Mr. Blake's resolution.

I want to be well understood; my words are not a reproach addressed to one of our public men, one of the most distinguished and the most generally esteemed. Hon. Edward Blake does not need my testimony in order that his superior intelligence be known and appreciated. I have no doubt of Mr. Blake's honesty, so that I am convinced that when he got up in the House it was not to add another difficulty to the solution of the question, no more than to diminish the responsibility of Sir John A. Macdonald and his government. In other words, Mr. Blake works neither against our schools nor in favour of his political adversaries. Nevertheless, he was the first to take in hand the question we now consider. Petitions asking for the disallowance of and every possible remedy against the legislation of which the Catholics complained, were hardly arrived at Ottawa when Mr. Blake rose in the Commons to move the following resolution:—

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

I pray those who charge us with the responsibility of not having obtained the disallowance of the Act to ponder over this resolution, and to read carefully the speech by which Mr. Blake supported it. That speech is found in "Hansard," 1890. As all my readers are not able to refer to this statement, I will make a few short quotations:

Here follow some extracts which it would be too long to quote and to which I shall refer again, later on:

All this is perfectly clear. Hon. Mr. Blake moved that in educational matters, as in the

Manitoba case, the Government should not resort to the power of disallowance in the case of provincial Acts, nor even of hearing the appeal against such laws, without having beforehand referred the matter to a high judicial tribunal, to receive light and a direction which, although it leaves a responsibility upon the Executive, may enable it to act more safely, with less passion, and thus make fewer victims of political expediency. It was therefore a new machinery which the Administration was invited to set in motion.

As it will be seen, by the above extract, Archbishop Taché did not wave his claim to disallowance,—at least not of his own accord—and if he deemed it unpracticable, it was merely owing to the fact that bogus papers had been communicated to his Grace, not only in connection with the Blake motion, but also with reference to that gentleman's address in support of his resolution. Let me give to this House and contrast the very words of the Blake resolution and of his address in support of the same :

Blake's motion from (Hansard).

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

Archbishop Taché's Pamphlet.

That under solemn occasions touching the exercise of the power of disallowance or the appellate power as to educational legislation, the Executive *should not act* without having previously referred important questions of law or fact to a high judicial tribunal, in such mode that the authorities and parties interested may be represented and that an opinion may be obtained for the information of the Executive.

It is quite easy for any intelligent man to see the difference between the two texts. I shall now proceed to contrast extracts from Mr. Blake's address :

From Archbishop Taché's Pamphlet.

It is now generally agreed that void Acts should not be disallowed, but should be left to the action of the Court.

From Hansard.

If it be *ultra vires*, the Act is void, and I think I may say that it is now generally agreed that void Acts should not be disallowed, but should be left to the action of the Courts. It is nevertheless, and I think with sound reason, contended, that circumstances of great general inconvenience or prejudice from a Dominion standpoint, and involving difficulty, delay or the impossibility of a resort to law, may justify the policy of disallowance, even in cases in which the Act is *ultra vires*, and therefore void.

When you act under the appellate educational clauses, as for example in the case of Manitoba. . . . It is important that the political executive should avoid, as much as possible, to arrogate to itself judicial powers. . . . It ought to have the power to call in aid the judicial department in order to arrive at a correct solution.

Now, I aver that in the decision of all legal questions, it is important that the political executive should not, *more than can be avoided*, arrogate to itself judicial powers ; and that when, in the discharge of its political duties, it is called upon to deal with legal questions, it ought to have the power in cases of solemnity and importance, *where it may be thought expedient to do so*, to call in aid the judicial department, in order to arrive at a correct solution.

I did not give, previously, the full text of Mr. Blake's address, as quoted by Archbishop Taché. I have given the page, in order that the hon. members may contrast the passage, as given in the Bishop's pamphlet and in "Hansard." It is a melancholy reflection to find out that such contemptible means should have been resorted to in order to bias Archbishop Taché's judgment and induce him to accept the reference to the judicial tribunals. As to the second pretext alleged, it is wholly groundless. It is easily understood that, if the law had been re-enacted at every subsequent session of the legislature, it should have been disallowed every time, and in the meantime the Catholic minority would have enjoyed their rights and privileges. The outcome of it would probably have been that, from one session to another, the law would have been amended so as to render it acceptable to both Protestants and Catholics. Be that as it may, the case was carried before the tribunals and regular proceedings were taken to test the validity of the educational acts by means of an application of Mr. Barrett, to quash a by-law of the city of Winnipeg. It has been contended that that action had been taken with the consent of the Catholic minority, and in compliance with the Blake motion. Those contentions are absolutely groundless. In the first place, a simple glance at the Blake motion suffices to show that all it does is to prove means whereby the executive may refer the question to a high judicial tribunal, and that it can in no wise be construed as in the least warranting such protracted and costly actions as those which have been taken at the instigation of the Government, with a view to shirk their responsibility. As to the other pretensions, it is flatly denied by Archbishop Taché himself, page 107 of his pamphlet, reads as follows :—

The minority in Manitoba and myself were charged with great responsibility for having allowed such a course to be taken. The fact is that my own attitude has been so absolutely passive on the matter, that I knew nothing of it until it was entirely settled and the counsel had been chosen for the case. The idea of this mode of action originated with the Government at Ottawa, who decided upon it, after Mr. Blake's

resolution had been carried. The Barrett case is not my doing. More than that, I dare say that it might have resulted in quite a different way, if my views had prevailed. I do not understand why the minority is charged with its responsibility, as the Premier, in a public meeting in Montreal, on 12th September last, stated: "I am ready to admit it as I have already admitted in Parliament, the case was laid before the tribunal by the Government in order to obtain a decision which would settle the affair by judicial proceedings."

These words need no comments. The issue of the trial is well known. After having been successively defeated before the Superior Court and the Court of Appeals at Winnipeg, the Catholics gained their case before the Supreme Court. But, unfortunately, that decision was reversed by the Privy Council of England, their Lordships having decided that the laws of 1890 were valid, although they recognized that the Catholics of Manitoba had a right to their separate schools, provided they were independent schools, maintained by their own taxes. No sooner had that judgment been rendered, than Arch-bishop Taché and the Catholic minority petitioned anew the Government, asking the Government to redeem their pledges embodied in the report of the 21st March, 1891, which reads as follows:

If the legal controversy should result in the decision of the Court of Queen's Bench being sustained, the time will come for Your Excellency to consider the petitions which have been presented by and on behalf of the Roman Catholics of Manitoba for redress under subsections 2 and 3 of section 22 of the Manitoba Act, quoted in the early part of this report, and which are analogous to the provisions made by the British North America Act, in relation to the other provinces.

Those subsections contain, in effect, the provisions which have been made as to all the provinces, and are obviously those under which the constitution intended that the Government of the Dominion should proceed, if it should at any time become necessary that the Federal powers should be resorted to for the protection of a Protestant or Roman Catholic minority, against any Act or decision of the legislature of the province, or of any provincial authority, affecting any "right or privilege" of any such minority "in relation to education."

It was upon that occasion that were seen in the most glaring way the bad faith and the bad dispositions of the Government towards the Catholic minority. We had a right to hope that, true to their promises, the Government would hear the appeal and interfere without delay in favour of the minority. But in order the better to understand the question, it is absolutely necessary to refer to the clause of the Manitoba Act relating to that appeal. Clause 22 reads as follows:—

In and for the province (of Manitoba) the said legislature (i.e., the provincial legislature) may exclusively make laws in relation to education, subject and according to the following provisions:

Mr. RINFRET.

(1) Nothing in any such law shall prejudicially affect any right or privilege with respect to denominational schools which any class of persons have by law or practice in the province at the union.

(2) An appeal shall lie to the Governor General in Council from any Act or decision of the legislature of the province, or of any provincial authority, affecting any right or privilege of the Protestant or Roman Catholic minority of the Queen's subjects in relation to education.

The decision had been rendered under subsection 1, of section 22, and it was under subsection 2 that the Catholic minority had a right of appeal. What did the Government do? Then was the time for them to do justice to the minority. Nothing can be clearer than that subsection 2 of clause 22. There were at that time in the Cabinet Sir John Thompson, Minister of Justice, Mr. Curran, Solicitor General, and half a dozen others more or less distinguished lawyers. The trouble was that they would not agree as to the meaning of that clause, to avoid doing justice to the minority, and they instituted fresh proceedings before the Supreme Court and the Privy Council to ascertain whether or not they had the right to interfere, after the decision which had just been given by the Privy Council of England. In December, 1894, the Catholics throughout the country hailed with delight the announcement that the judgment of the Privy Council favoured their contentions and that justice would be done to them. The two main points decided were the following: (1) The Government was invested with jurisdiction to hear the appeal and (2) the Catholics were entitled to the rights and privileges I have alluded to above, in referring to the conclusions of the Order in Council: (a) The right to build, maintain and support their separate schools; (b) The right to share proportionately in any grant made out of the public funds for the purpose of education; (c) the right of exemption from all payment and contribution towards the support of public schools. As I have just said, the judgment of the Privy Council was hailed with delight by all the Catholics throughout the length and breadth of the land, and there was a general cry that the time was at hand when justice would be done to the Catholic minority. From all parts of the country petitions were sent to Ottawa. One of those petitions was signed by a large majority of Catholics, praying for interference by the Dominion Government in favour of the Manitoba Catholics, and further asking for the disallowance of the Acts of 1894. The Government found themselves in a very favourable juncture to disallow the Act of 1894, owing to the fact that the Privy Council had just decided that they had the right to interfere. Why did the Ministers turn a deaf ear to the petitions of the Catholics? Upon one single ground, and that was because they did not want to right the wrongs of the

Catholic minority in Manitoba. We have now reached, Sir, the most critical and the most eventful period of the political history of the school question: the enforcement of the last judgment of the Privy Council. In order to give effect to that judgment, the Government had no other course open to them but to pass an Order in Council and send it over to the Manitoba government, or in case the latter declined to conform to it, to have enacted by Parliament a bill in every particular conformable to the Order in Council, in order to remove the grievances complained of by the minority and restore them the full possession of their rights and privileges. Such is the course clearly outlined by subsection 3 of section 22 of the Manitoba Act. The Government complied with the first part of their obligation: they passed the Order in Council, on the 19th March, 1895, the conclusions of which I shall now give:

The Committee therefore recommend that the said appeal be allowed and that Your Excellency in Council do adjudge and decide that by the two Acts passed the legislature of the province of Manitoba on the 1st day of May, 1890, intitled respectively "An Act Respecting the Department of Education, and an Act Respecting the Public Schools," the rights and privileges of the Roman Catholic minority of the said province in relation to education, prior to the 1st day of May, 1890, have been affected by depriving the Roman Catholic minority of the following rights and privileges, which previous to and until the 1st day of May, 1890, such minority had, viz.:

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

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

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

And the Committee also recommends that Your Excellency in Council do further declare and decide that for the due execution of the provisions of section 22 of the Manitoba Act, it seems requisite that the system of education embodied in the two Acts of 1890 aforesaid, should be supplemented by a provincial Act or Acts which would restore to the Roman Catholic minority the said rights and privileges of which such minority has been so deprived as aforesaid, and which would modify the said Acts of 1890 so far, and so far only, as may be necessary to give effect to the provisions restoring the rights and privileges in paragraphs (a), (b) and (c) hereinbefore mentioned.

The Committee, further and for the reasons hereinbefore stated, recommend that if Your Excellency in Council should be pleased to approve of this report, Your Excellency in Council do make an order in the premises in the form and to the effect as set forth hereunto submitted, and that a certified copy of this Minute and of the said Order be transmitted to His Honour the Lieutenant Governor of Manitoba for his information and that of his government and provincial legislature, also that a certified copy of this Minute and of the said Order be transmitted

to Mr. Ewart, Q.C., of Winnipeg, as representing the Roman Catholic minority of Her Majesty's subjects in Manitoba.

All of which is respectfully submitted for Your Excellency's approval.

JOHN J. MCGEE,
Clerk of the Queen's Privy Council
for Canada.

For the first time, within that period of four years, after hesitating during several months, the Ministers had at least agreed upon one point: it was to appeal to the country. The consequence was that the Order in Council was passed without one dissentient voice. All the Ministers voted in favour of the Order. Indeed, no better document was available in view of appealing to the people. The proof of it is to be found in what transpired in the by-elections of Verchères and Haldimand, when the Ministers showed the people how they meant to avail themselves of the Order in Council. Whilst, on the one hand, in Verchères they flourished the Order, telling the people that it was the law of the land, in Haldimand, on the other hand, they told the voters that it was not worth the paper it was written upon, that it would never be enforced and it was only meant as a snare to entrap the Catholic voters. As I have just said, Mr. Speaker, the Order in Council was passed with a view to the coming elections. The general elections, however, were not held for reasons it would be too long to go into at this phase of the debate; and the Government were obliged to call Parliament together. God alone and the Ministers know. Sir, the wrangles which took place in the Cabinet with reference to that Order in Council and the law which was to give effect to the same. The outcome of all those disputes was that the Ministers were unable to agree and a Cabinet crisis broke out during which three French Ministers from the province of Quebec threw up their portfolios. I do not intend here to expatiate on the motives which prompted two of the Ministers, the hon. Postmaster General and the hon. Minister of Public Works, to come back to the fold. It will answer my purpose to remind the House in this connection that, when he left his colleagues, the hon. Mr. Angers was truly a prophet when he predicted that the school question would not be settled in the life-time of this Parliament in a manner calculated to give satisfaction to the Catholics. However, it could have been settled, if the Government had drawn from the recent events the lessons which they involved. After what had transpired, there was but one conclusion reached, both by Mr. Angers, by the public in general and especially by the members of the House of Commons, it was that the Manitoba school question could not be settled, unless some of the difficulties the Ministers met with were smoothed down and removed from their path. What difficulties were they and what was the means to remove them? The difficulties met with in the Cabinet originated

from the same source as those experienced by the people of this country at large. They resulted, as I have said, from the fact that, upon that question, Protestants and Catholics hold different views and do not view the facts in the same light; and where there is question of disputed facts, Catholics and Protestants alike put their trust only in those who harbour in their breasts the same faith, who hold the same religious tenets which they themselves profess to believe. The only means of removing those difficulties would have been to appoint a commission of inquiry to investigate certain facts disputed between the interested parties and which are of the highest importance. Such are the following facts: (1) Whether the agreements entered into, at the entrance of Manitoba into the confederation were in any way binding, and are to be considered in the light of a treaty? (2) Whether the schools established in Manitoba are Protestant or public schools? (3) Another point which it would have been well to clear up, in order to give satisfaction to Protestant opinion is this: in what position would the province of Manitoba find itself from the standpoint of the establishment and operation of the present school system? Undoubtedly a commission of inquiry into these facts would have smoothed down, if not altogether removed all the difficulties encountered, at least some of them. But, of course, the Ministers did not want to accept my suggestions originating with the leader of the Opposition, and with one common accord the Government press ridiculed my hon. friend's proposal. It was really interesting, during the debate, to hear the ultras of the Tory party vying with each other to state that they did not require any investigation. We understand perfectly well their tactics; they do not want any investigation, because such an inquiry would set at naught all the calumnies uttered against the Manitoba Catholic minority. Some of our co-religionists do not want any investigation made, because they have made up their minds to accept any law dignified with the pompous title of remedial law, and provided that law may enable them to be returned to Parliament, at the cost of the sacrifice of the rights and privileges of their compatriots in Manitoba. But, Sir, there was a man who now sleeps the eternal sleep—a man who, a few years ago, was the most distinguished prelate who ever adorned the episcopal see in Manitoba and in the North-west Territories; a man who devoted all his energies and laid down his life, a holocaust to the cause of the Catholic minority. That man who was so sincerely devoted to the Catholic interests felt the need of an investigation. Listen to what he says, page 36 of his pamphlet above quoted:

There cannot be two opinions concerning the intention of the legislators at Ottawa, in voting the school case of the Manitoba Act, 1870. All proves evidently that the object of that legis-

Mr. RINFRET.

lation was to protect the minority, whether Protestant or Catholic. Every circumstance connected with that legislation points out in that direction; the negotiations asked for by the Imperial and Canadian governments to arrive at an understanding which will satisfy the people of the North-west and dispel their apprehensions; the requests of the delegates asking for separate schools; the satisfactory answers given to the delegates; the promises of the Government; the very fact, under such circumstances, of the introduction of the school clause in the Manitoba Act; the discussion in Parliament with regard to the same clause; everything goes to prove that the legislators were bound and willing to secure a protection for the minority in matters of education. The opinion here expressed has been fully endorsed by many eminent men, who took part both in the framing and discussing of this clause, and all are unanimous in stating that the clause was intended to protect the minorities.

Let an investigation take place, and I am sure that there is not a single witness that would dare to come, and on oath declare that the law as passed was in no way intended to secure the protection demanded. On the contrary, there are many witnesses who would unhesitatingly give sworn evidence that the clause 28 was introduced into the Manitoba Act, and was voted with the certainty that this said clause would secure to the minority of the new province rights acquired before, or to be acquired after the admission of the country into the Dominion. To deny this is simply to close one's eyes to the evidence. To refuse to draw the natural conclusions that such evidence dictates to all political parties, to all classes of citizens, of whatsoever origin or creed is a criminal abandoning of an imperative obligation.

It would be impossible to overstate the benefit that would accrue to the Canadian people from a fact of such importance. There are in the House of Commons Protestants and Catholic members; there are members who believe in separate schools, and there are others who are hostile to them; there are members who favour federal interference, and others still who deprecate it. But there is a point upon which all members are agreed and meet as upon a common ground: I mean to say the respect due to treaties and to pledges given by the Crown. This, Archbishop Taché understood perfectly, and that is why he asked for an inquiry. There is another point as to which a commission of inquiry would have been of incalculable benefit, and that is as to the working and the character of the Manitoba schools. On that point there are also differences of opinion, inasmuch as we may judge from the utterances of hon. members, in the course of this debate. I shall not insist upon that point, as it has been fully developed by the hon. members who addressed the House before me. It is really difficult to see, Sir, how it is that the Government have so stubbornly persisted in declining to make an inquiry after it had been asked both by Archbishop Taché and by the Manitoba government, and I may add by the mass of well meaning and disinterested voters in the Dominion. The Government have not busied themselves smoothing down the difficulties

they met on their path during the period that elapsed between the session of 1895 and the present session. It is no wonder that, as a natural outcome, they have met with much more considerable difficulties, in solving the school question. Public opinion, Sir, did not suffer itself to be misled into believing the explanations given by the Government as to the causes of the crisis that broke out at the beginning of the session. Nobody was fooled into believing that the only question at issue was as to whether an imbecile and incapable leader was to give way to a still more impotent one. And, moreover, as a matter of fact, the old leader has not been removed and the harmony still prevails in the happy family. There is but one and the same cause at the bottom of both crises: the Manitoba school question. It is no longer a mystery for anybody that the crisis came to an end and the bolters came back to the fold only after having won the game: that is to say, they came back to the Cabinet upon the express condition that this law should be as mild as possible and brought down in such a way as to postpone its enactments until after the general elections. To quote from the "Mail and Empire" of February 13th, 1896:

The Bill is obviously another remedial proposal—a milder proposal than that of the Remedial Order as interpreted at Winnipeg. It is a further invitation to Manitoba to take the matter over. Time should be given. Possibly it would be wise to insert a clause rendering the whole measure inoperative if conciliatory action be taken by the province.

Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to go through the whole Bill clause by clause. I shall content myself with walking in the footsteps of those eminent lawyers, the hon. members for Drummond and Arthabaska, for Verchères and for Quebec Centre. I am going to sum up the main objections raised against the Bill by the hon. members opposite: 1. The Bill does not afford a solution of the school question. 2. The Bill leaves entirely in the hands of the Greenway administration, which is hostile to Catholics, the enforcement of the law. 3. The Bill does not provide for the necessary appropriations for the working of the law and imposes extraordinary taxes upon Catholics. 4. The Bill, in some of its clauses, contains principles utterly condemnable from the standpoint of the Catholic dogmas; such as compulsory education and the right of sending one's children to schools where there is no religious teaching. 5. The Bill evidently places Catholics in a position of inferiority, from an educational standpoint. 6. The Bill is not conformable to the Order in Council of the 19th March, 1895, and therefore invalid. Before resuming my seat, I ask again the indulgence of the House for quoting an extract from a well-known paper in the province of Quebec, "La Vérité," an independent Conservative journal, which is being

patronized by a number of clergymen. In its issue of the 29th February, said:

The first section, to our mind, seriously endangers the interests of the minority. It says, in fact, that the Lieutenant-Governor in Council of the province of Manitoba shall appoint, to form and constitute the Separate School Board of Education for the province of Manitoba, a certain number of persons, not exceeding nine, all of whom shall be Roman Catholics. We know it, there is hardly any probability of the Manitoba government applying that clause of the law, and appointing themselves the Board of Education for the separate schools; but they may do so. And if they took a whim to enforce that provision of the law, they would certainly do it so as to render the law illusory. In order to accomplish that object, they would only have to appoint, as members of the new council, a certain number of persons nominally Catholic, in the eyes of the law, but utterly hostile to separate schools.

Under section 2, the Dominion Government reserve to themselves the right of making appointments to the Separate School Board, should the Manitoba government not comply with the law. Prudence requires, we think, that the Government should absolutely reserve to themselves that right. Should they not do it, they would open the door to very serious difficulties. For, as we have said, should the provincial government meddle with the appointment of members of the Separate School Board it will only be with a view to create troubles.

Section 3 seems even more dangerous, because it makes almost unavoidable the unfriendly intervention of the Manitoba government. That clause actually says that "the Department of Education may, for the observance of the separate schools, make regulations as they may think fit for the general organization of the separate schools." Now, the Department of Education in Manitoba is in reality nothing but the government itself. Under that clause, therefore the separate schools, as to their general organization, are under the control of the Administration that has just wiped them out! Moreover, that section 3 is as useless as dangerous.

Section 4 says that it shall be the duty of the Board of Education to have under its control and management the separate schools, and to make regulations for such schools. Therefore, there will be concurrent jurisdiction. Both the Department of Education for Public Schools and the Separate School Board shall have the right to make regulations in the matter of separate schools. Both sections 3 and 4 will, therefore, prove a source of endless conflicts.

Under section 4, the Separate School Board is authorized to select all the books to be used in the schools under its control, but restricts that selection to the books in use in the high or public schools of the province of Manitoba or in the separate schools of the province of Ontario. That limitation seems to us to be arbitrary and dangerous. A jurist told us in that connection: "I think, for my part, that the Dominion Parliament has no right to impose restrictions as to the use of books, if such restrictions did not exist in the Manitoba school law prior to 1890." Owing to that restriction, it will be very difficult, we think, to establish French schools—that is to say, schools in which the teaching will be given in French, for the Ontario separate schools are mostly English schools. The teaching of the French language is, to a certain extent, allowed; but even in the French districts, if we mistake not,

the English language is the official language, both in the separate and in the public schools. The text-books must, of necessity, be of the same nature as the schools themselves, that is to say, that the English language must prevail.

Moreover, we are all aware of the terrible war waged on our separate schools in Ontario. Should a government, inimical to our separate school system, come into power at Toronto, they could very materially modify the text-books of our separate schools. Granted that to-day those text-books are acceptable, to-morrow they may be no longer so. Why, then, tie down the very existence of the Manitoba schools to the vicissitudes which the Ontario separate schools may have to go through?

The famous clause 74 literally reads as follows:—

"74. The right to share proportionately, in any grant made out of public funds for the purposes of education having been decided to be and being now one of the rights and privileges of the said Roman Catholic minority of Her Majesty's subjects in the province of Manitoba, any sum granted by the legislature of Manitoba and appropriated for the separate schools shall be placed to the credit of the Board of Education in accounts to be opened in the books of the Treasury Department and in the Audit Office."

In plain English, it means this: As the Catholic minority has the right to share proportionately in any grant made out of public funds for educational purposes, they may accept what the legislature will grant them. As will be seen, this is no enormous concession. But, add the Ministerial organs, the Government can go no further; they have no right to dispose of one single cent out of the moneys of the province, nor take a portion of it to the Catholic schools. All they can do is to declare that the Catholics have the right to share proportionately in any grant made out of public funds for educational purposes.

Naturally, the Dominion Parliament have no right to appropriate any portion of the funds of the province to any particular use. But the Bill could go much further than it does. It could say, for instance, that the minority having the right to share proportionately in any grant made out of the public funds for educational purposes, there shall accrue to the minority a right of action against the province of Manitoba, if that share be not voted. That would be the logical outcome of the premises laid down. The clause would then have a sanction. What avails it to solemnly proclaim the right of the minority to a portion of the legislative grants, if no means is provided whereby that right may be respected?

The law could further say that in case the Manitoba legislature should not vote in favour of the minority the moneys to which that minority has a right, then the Governor General in Council may appropriate, out of the proceeds of the sale of the school lands a sum in proportion to the number of Catholics, and apply it to the purposes of the separate schools. But there is no such provision in the Bill. In short, from a financial stand point, the Bill under discussion relieves Catholics but on one single point: it exempts them from paying taxes for the support of Protestant schools. That is certainly a great deal, but it is not enough.

It seems to me, Sir, that this clause ought to have been so worded that if Catholics did not receive from the province the legislative grants, they should in no way be forced to

Mr. RINFRET.

pay taxes for the support of public schools. It is an actual iniquity to tax the ratepayers for contributing towards the support of public schools, when they receive no legislative grant, as, under the present law, they are bound to do, whenever, for some reason or another, they cannot establish separate school districts.

Catholics have a right to their share in the grant made out of public funds appropriated by the legislature for educational purposes. Now, that portion, the Bill does not give it to the minority.

Section 81 consecrates the principle of compulsory education. The separate school trustees, with the sanction of the board, may oblige all Catholic parents to send their children to the separate school or send them to some other school. A fine may be imposed upon refractory parents. We need hardly add that this clause infringes the father's rights on his children. Competent persons have pointed out to us other sections of the law which would need to be modified; but those are secondary points, and we thought it our duty to insist only upon the essentials.

And later on, on the 7th March:

If the law be not modified so as to make it absolutely similar to the remedial order of March last, it may be impugned as invalid. For, the Dominion Parliament has the right to legislate upon the school question only in as much as the Manitoba legislature has declined to do so. Now, the remedial order of March, 1895, stated that the minority had (a) the right to build, maintain, equip, manage, conduct and support Roman Catholic schools; (b) The right to share proportionately in any grant made out of the public funds for educational purposes; (c) The right of exemption of such Roman Catholic schools from all payment or contribution to the support of any other schools. It was those rights (a, b, c,) that the Government ordered the legislature to restore; and it was those same rights (a, b, c,) which the Manitoba legislature declined to restore. It is therefore a, b, c, which the Dominion Government, under the constitution, has a right to restore. But under the Bill now before the House, the Government invites Parliament to grant only a and c; for, say what you like, clause 74 is not the same as b, that is to say, it does not give the minority the right to share proportionately in any grant made out of the public funds for educational purposes. Winnipeg might then say: I declined to grant a, b, c, but I did not refuse to grant a, c. You have therefore the right to legislate on a, b, c, by reason of my refusal; but you have no right to legislate on a, c, because you have not beforehand, called upon me to legislate on a, c only.

It is no use doing like the ostrich which hides its head in the sand believing itself safe. If clause 74 is not modified so as to grant also b, the law shall probably be declared invalid.

I shall not extend any further my remarks. I shall vote for the amendment moved by the hon. leader of the Opposition, on the several grounds I have just mentioned.

Mr. JONCAS. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, in such a solemn opportunity as this, when we are discussing one of the most important questions ever referred to the consideration of the public men of this Dominion, I wish I could have expressed myself in the language

of the majority of the members of this House, but I fear that, should I use a language with which I am not quite familiar, I would be unable to do justice, almost as far as lay in my power, to the question we are now dealing with. It is not my intention, Mr. Speaker, to take much of the time of this House, for the question we are now considering has been so much discussed already, that there remains very little to say on this matter, which is, however, one of great importance. The question has been considered from a legal standpoint by the best legal shining lights on either side of the House, and I shall not venture on a ground which is a dangerous one for whoever has not a deep knowledge of the code and statutes. And then, what could I add to the eloquent pleas of my hon. friend the Minister of Justice and the hon. member for East Lambton in favour of a remedial law? But it might be interesting to review some of the arguments used by the hon. gentlemen opposite and their new allies, in their attempts to explain their vote and conduct, to compare their present with their past statements and to put face to face the inconsistent reasons alleged by those who have determined to vote for the amendment of the leader of the Opposition, the hon. member for Quebec East.

By what a stress of good will have all these gentlemen, whose opinions are diametrically at variance as to the very principle of the Bill, been able to meet on the same ground and vote for the six months' hoist? That is a question rather difficult to answer. That is a problem difficult to solve since, when the House shall divide on this question, we shall witness an exhibition for which our political history offers no precedent. We shall see, shaking hands together and embracing one another, those who in the province of Quebec were the loudest advocates of the Federal interference, and those who in the province of Ontario have been waging and are still waging a mischievous war against the restoration of separate schools in Manitoba. We shall see, folded in each other's arms and enjoying a piece of flirt, the fiery member for L'Islet, who on all the political platforms of the province of Quebec, thundered his invectives against the Ontario intolerants who declined to do justice to the minority in Manitoba, and the member for York (Mr. Wallace), the leader of the ultras, the man who went out of a Cabinet—where, as for that, his presence was of doubtful usefulness—because the members of that Cabinet were anxious to see the constitution obeyed and justice done to a minority harshly dealt with and deprived of their rights by an iniquitous, a nefarious law, a law subversive of the best interests of this country. We shall see the member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte) kissing the man whom, at Vaudreuil and elsewhere, he characterized as a physical, moral and intellectual cripple.

An hon. MEMBER. It is true.

Mr. JONCAS. (Translation.) We shall see the light-headed and turbulent member for Montmagny (Mr. Choquette) and the member for Lotbinière, who has just spoken, pressing to their hearts the member for North Simcoe, whom they formerly denounced in such violent words and in a language of which they have the exclusive secret—

Mr. RINFRET. (Translation.) You have been for a long while going hand in hand together with these people.

Mr. JONCAS. (Translation.) Yes, and we have them now, because they forsake the principles for which we are contending. We shall see those who, for these last three or four years, have most forcibly condemned the Government now in power, because they had not disallowed the laws of the Manitoba legislature and because they did not bring before Parliament a remedial law, joining hands with those who are utterly opposed to any principle of interference. Lastly, we shall see all those who find that the Bill goes too far in the way of coercion, agreeing to reject it with those who find it incomplete and not going far enough in the way of redress and justice. And what is this monstrous alliance for between those who, lately, professed to be the only defenders of our racial and religious rights upon this continent of America, and those who, consistent at least with themselves, would like to keep treating as outcasts and helots the French-Canadians and Catholics of this country, who deny them their place under the protection of the British flag and have sworn to enslave them?

Mr. LANGELIER. (Translation.) These are the people with whom you have been going hand in hand these last eighteen years.

Mr. JONCAS. (Translation.) They are the people who went hand in hand with us, but with whom you are now willing to associate, and what is this union for?

Mr. CHOQUETTE. (Translation.) To oppose a bad Government.

Mr. JONCAS. (Translation.) Is it at least for the triumph of a great principle, for the defence of a sound cause? On the contrary, Sir, they want to prevent, if possible, the Government now into power from carrying out one of the greatest acts of justice that ever were brought under their consideration, but they unite especially because the Liberal party, in their inability to lay before the electors of the country an acceptable political platform, hope that by working up prejudices and sacrificing the time and interests of the country, they will hoist themselves up to power with the help of those who are blinded and led by an ignorant fanaticism. History repeats itself, Sir. The late Mr. Mercier succeeded in hauling him-

self up to power in Quebec by climbing over the Regina scaffold; Mr. Laurier, his friend, thinks he can reach the Treasury benches at Ottawa by appealing to prejudices and relying upon a religious feud. Were not the Liberal party aiming at the enjoyment of power, do you think we would see such an exhibition as I have just described, do you think we would be witnesses to such an alliance as this?

It is not possible even to presume it; for, what have not the Liberal journalists and stumpers of our province said and written against those whose co-operation and support they are now seeking? They could not find words strong enough to denounce the fanaticism of the Wallaces and of the McCarthys. They could not find words strong enough to curse their cause. How has this valueless lead been suddenly converted into pure gold?

Mr. CHOQUETTE. (Translation.) By the same process that makes herrings out of sardines.

Mr. JONCAS. (Translation.) How is it that the leader of the Opposition now throws overboard—along with many others he has already hurled in the same direction—his platform with respect to a commission and an investigation, to seize upon the plain non-interference platform of which the members for York and North Simcoe were the authors? Why, it is because this platform, if brought forward by the leader of the Opposition and supported by his eloquent voice, would stand better chances of success with the Catholic Liberals of the province of Quebec than if brought forward by the member for York, Grand Master of the Ontario Orangemen, or the member for North Simcoe, counsel for Mr. Greenway and the Manitoba government. I have just referred, Sir, to the flagrant inconsistencies of those who will support the amendment moved by the leader of the Opposition. Are long researches necessary in order to find out these inconsistencies? Were I allowed to refer to the debate that has been going on in this House since Tuesday last, I would have only to quote from the speeches delivered by the leader of the Opposition and by one of his most able lieutenants, the member for Verchères (Mr. Geoffrion). We have all of us listened to these two gentlemen, favoured with unquestionable abilities and superior minds, but showing strange logic, the one turning round against coercion and asking, both by language and by his opposing the second reading of the Bill, that Manitoba be left with the management of her educational affairs, and the other reviewing and carefully examining the Bill, charging the Government with having been wanting to all their promises and having introduced an imperfect Bill and one not going far enough in the way of coercion. And for two reasons radically opposed one to the other, these two gentlemen will vote against the

Mr. JONCAS.

second reading of the Bill and reject its principle. And there is the same contradiction between the speeches of the Liberals and those of the dissentient Conservatives who have so far spoken upon that question. But it will be a matter of genuine surprise to me and to many others to see the Catholic Liberal members from the province of Quebec voting against the principle of a measure for which they have been clamouring all the time, and which has been very carefully drafted by the Government, with a view to accomplishing an important duty and protecting the minority to which the Liberals have been extending so many hypocritical marks of devotion. For, numerous indeed were the professions of devotion extended by these gentlemen to the Manitoba minority, and the more numerous and boisterous they were as they thought and hoped that never would the Government have courage enough to bring this Remedial Bill before Parliament. Let us, for the information of the House and the country see what those gentlemen said and wrote on the matter since 1892. Let us take first the "L'Electeur," the authorized organ of the leader of the Opposition, a paper edited by his most intimate friend, by men who enjoy his full confidence, and who even sit near him on the other side of the House. Here is an article published on the 8th March, 1894:

A LUGUBRIOUS ANNIVERSARY.

A record of two years of the Government of honest men.

When the enemy is at our doors, when secular hatreds prevail in the Dominion Council, our Government are dumb. In vain do our compatriots, in the far away plains of Manitoba and of the North-west clamour for our intervention, claim our help. They do not even receive a word of good cheer, not even a hope-inspiring word for the future.

And the hon. gentlemen opposite are now ready to vote against Federal intervention!

The Government flinch before the noble task which is incumbent upon them, to protect the oppressed people of our race and religious creed; they flinch before the duty of protesting against the flagrant and formal violation of the federal compact to which we had been one of the contracting parties. Forsooth, the Government did break their engagements, and give the lie to their pledges! And two years after their advent to power, the people find out to their grief that they had believed in a Government pledged to redress, but that they have only succeeded in bringing into power a government pledged to national decadence.

All these gentlemen were then clamouring for interference and, as you can see, I have only to quote from their written statements to prove my own statements. They charged the Government with cowardice because, according to their wishes, they did not interfere soon enough. But now that the Government, to the risk of their political existence, has brought down a measure with a view to the accomplishment of a great act

of justice, the hon. gentlemen opposite, the leader of the Opposition are the very people who stand up here and move the six months' hoist, that is to say, to put it off indefinitely. At another time, here is what "L'Electeur" said in an editorial whose heading was taken from the "Passion," and which was intitled: "Consummatum est":

Sir John Thompson said that the time for disallowance had lapsed. The Act being held constitutional by the courts of justice, will be carried out. The First Minister further stated that he made no promise to the effect that he would cause the Commons to adopt a Remedial Bill with a view to come to the relief of our compatriots. It is tantamount to saying that, from his standpoint, the Manitoba school affair is finally disposed of, and that this Government have determined to have nothing more to do with it.

Well, the Government of which the lamented Sir John Thompson was the leader at a time are now doing their duty. But what do we find? We are witnessing an exhibition that is a disgrace to the province of Quebec. We find English-speaking Protestants in this House, men who from conviction and principle, are opposed to separate schools, requesting the Government to do justice to the Catholic minority in Manitoba, because they are guaranteed certain rights by the constitution, while the Catholic and French-speaking Liberals of the province of Quebec are opposing it.

The last appeal to the Supreme Court, to obtain an opinion from that tribunal to the effect that this Government had no right to interfere, evinces the knavery of our Prime Minister; every body knew beforehand what would be the judgment of the Supreme Court, and the friends of the Catholic minority could not help saying that the only object Sir John had in view, in resorting to those appeals, was to mask his treason under a show of legality. Be that as it may, this last decision compromises the situation of the Manitoba Catholics.

Let us quote again from "L'Electeur":

The Conservative party will no longer be able to resort to shuffling, which has so far proved of such benefit to them in dealing with the electorate, and by which he has so long been kept in power. For many and many years, Sir John Macdonald, owing to his diabolical astuteness, succeeded, while working up the fanaticism, in passing for the best friend of Catholics. He had at his disposal a press subsidized by the jobbers, which deceived the public, and secured a large number of voters, through the appeal to religious prejudices. Sir John Thompson would be quite ready to walk in the footsteps of his predecessor; he has the duplicity and the hypocrisy of the old chieftain; the only thing he lacks is the shrewdness and the tact of his predecessor. He is going to keep the unbroken support of the Orange body; he will even get the support of the P.P.A., but the Catholics forsake him.

To-day, the parts are reversed, and it is now the turn of the Liberals to get the support of the P. P. A., of the fanatical Orangemen, as the hon. gentleman styles them. They

rely upon them to turn out the Government. It is not the Catholic Conservatives, as insinuated by "L'Electeur," who forsake the Conservative government, but it is the Catholic Liberals of the province of Quebec who, yielding to party considerations, join hands with those whom they have formerly so strongly opposed, to bring the downfall of the Government. On the 29th June, 1894, replying to an article that had been printed in the "Evenement," of which I have the honour to be the editor, the "Electeur" said:

Under that heading, the "l'Evenement" said, a few days ago:

While discussing the political questions which actually inflame public opinion in this country, the "Electeur," the "Patrie," and other public sheets of the same colour, try to make allowance for circumstances, and do not want to take into account the fact that the Canadian electorate, being composed of heterogenous elements, our policy must of necessity be one of compromise and concession, if we wish to preserve peace and harmony, which are essential to any good administration of affairs, and that mutual good feeling, which is the sine qui non condition of our progress and prosperity. Since through the vexed school question, raised by the Liberal government of Mr. Greenway, the two great races which form the confederation have been arrayed against each other, the Liberal press in the province of Quebec, instead of trying to bring about a peaceful solution of the social problem which imperils our national destinies, instead of endeavouring to reconcile the extremists of all shades, by resorting to calm and judicious arguments, has, on the contrary, made it a point to foment discord, by making heated appeals to popular prejudices and passions.

Let me quote one of those articles from the "L'Electeur."

"Will we allow ourselves to be robbed by a Tory-Orange majority? Are we going to give up our right to the French language and to our separate schools? Is it through this policy of concessions and compromise, is it at the cost of this national abasement that peace and prosperity will be secured? We are not of the same opinion as our contemporary. If the Orange-Tory yoke suits our confrère, let him bear it with the majority of the Tory members from the province of Quebec. Those people are quite free to sacrifice, if they wish to, the rights and privileges of our co-religionists in Manitoba and the Northwest Territories, in order to keep in power the famous Orange-Tory alliance. They will bear the responsibility of it before the country and before history.

But it is decidedly going too far to arraign the Liberal party for not having stood up as the protector of an oppressed minority, and having dared to say a few unpalatable truths to the fanatical Orange lodges.

"What have we seen, since the Manitoba school question was brought down before Parliament? Sir John Thompson, Mr. Costigan, all the French Ministers and the Conservative members, have aimed at nothing else but seeking to gain time by all means within their power. Their policy has been all the time to back down, to shift, to dilly-dally with the question, without ever evincing so much as the least desire to fight and resist. They are seemingly the slaves

of their allies, the Ontario Orangemen. They were, no doubt, afraid, like the editor of the "l'Evenement," to disturb the peace of the country and to interfere with our progress and prosperity. Mr. Clarke Wallace, their chief, does not seem to be of the same opinion as the editor of "l'Evenement." He loses no opportunity of insulting French-Canadians, or of stirring up the Orangemen. No doubt, in a country like ours, where are found so many heterogeneous elements, it is right that the different races and creeds should be represented in the Cabinet. We have no objection to that. What we wish is this: Let all races and creeds here be on a footing of equality. Let justice be equally and fairly dealt to all classes, to Englishmen, to Irishmen and to French-Canadians. But we absolutely decline being dictated to by Grand Master Clarke Wallace, as the Quebec Conservative members actually are.

Thus speaks the Liberal organ, and I answer that it is not the Quebec Conservatives, who actually sacrifice the rights and privileges of the Manitoba minority, in order to maintain in power a Tory-Orange alliance, but I say it is the members of the Opposition who now sacrifice the interests which they pretended to champion exclusively; it is they who ally themselves with those whom they formerly opposed. What can be, I ask, the object of the hon. leader of the Opposition in moving the six months' hoist? He hopes, no doubt, to be able to recruit enough adherents in our ranks to defeat the Government. But those are foolish hopes and he may as well give them up, once for all. I have too high an opinion of the patriotism of the largest number of Conservative members in this House to be led to believe that they will consent playing into the hands of the Liberals. I could indefinitely go on quoting extracts from the organs of the hon. leader of the Opposition; but I do not wish to trespass upon the forbearance of the House. Allow me, however, Sir, to give two more extracts from that journal, before I come to deal with another Liberal sheet, edited by the hon. member for L'Islet. With reference to the crisis that took place here a few months ago, the "L'Electeur" said:

Mr. Bowell and Mr. Foster are going to announce their policy on that subject, on Monday. True, but who is imbecile enough to fancy that a piece of legislation of that importance will be brought down on Monday, and that it will go through its different stages both in the Commons and in the Senate, when Parliament is about to be prorogued on Monday? But have not, forsooth, our Ministers and our members gallantly fought to obtain justice for the minority? A lot of wretches, they have cynically made political capital out of this question! If you are in earnest, why do you not carry out the threat which your allies were ready to carry out themselves, had not some small concession been made to Catholics? If you are in earnest, why did you not accept the Liberal vote, to make up the loss of your fanatical allies? Wherefore, through obedience to the commands of the lodges, have you availed yourselves of this circumstance to rush upon our eminent compatriot, Mr. Laurier, after you had rendered it impossible for the Catholic members to come

Mr. JONCAS.

to an understanding? The truth is, in connection with this crisis, that we have been once more sacrificed to the venality of the Conservative party. The candidates for judgeships, the plump monopolists, the close contractors, the owners of breeding studs, who are paid two thousand dollars a year for lending their horses to the Government, all those people have kept repeating to the Government. To the devil with the Catholic schools rather than losing our feed! What would we do without it? For these eighteen years we have lived at the public's charge, and we never relied upon our own personal initiative and exertions to earn a livelihood!

I am quite aware of the fact, Sir, that the Liberal members would have been but too glad to welcome us into their ranks; but, before throwing ourselves into the arms of the leader of the Opposition we wanted him to give us a political platform more acceptable than that offered by the Government. And the fact is that the leader of the Opposition would not give us any definite pledge on the school question. Ever since last year he has given us but vague and indefinite pledges, and dodging on the question. Now, Sir, let us refer to another political organ of the leader of the Opposition, a paper whose utterances entitle it to a greater consideration, from the fact that it is edited by the hon. member for L'Islet, the very same man who went round all the political platforms of the province of Quebec to display his devotion to the cause of the Manitoba minority and who is going round the platforms in Ontario and advocating the very opposite doctrines, which he had so far been preaching, and trying to rouse popular prejudices against the same minority. On the 8th of March, 1893, the hon. member for L'Islet proposed a colourless motion, with reference to the Manitoba school question by which he aimed at catching as many votes as possible.

Neither Sir John Thompson, nor any of his colleagues have defined their position on this question, nor would they make any more definite statement, should the Supreme Court decide that the Governor General in Council has the right to redress the wrongs of the minority; but, the Government followers, to begin with Mr. Hugh J. Macdonald, the son of Sir John, are a unit in stating that the Greenway legislation should not be interfered with. Practically, the appeal to the Supreme Court is but a snare, a delusion, and a lugubrious mockery, aiming at nothing else but shielding the Cabinet in their refusal to interfere in their official capacity.

My amendment arraigns the Ministers for having taken such an attitude, and for having failed, in their official capacity as advisers of the Crown, to restore to the minority their rights guaranteed by the constitution. The Conservative members give their support to the Government, who did not interfere as the constitution authorized them to do, and who eluded their responsibility by referring the question to high judicial tribunals, which so far have given decisions adverse to our cause, and which will turn out the same way in the future. I am quite safe in predicting such a result. The Government and their followers are quite aware of it, and I arraign them here, as I

have done from my seat in Parliament, for having wilfully sacrificed our rights, in order to keep themselves in power. The wording of my motion does not meet with their approval. I challenge them to propose another motion. I am ready to accept any proposition calculated to safeguard the interests of our race, which the Government have sacrificed, when allowing the French language to be abolished in Manitoba, and which they are again betraying in this school matter.

On the 16th March, he wrote again :

THE SCHOOL QUESTION.

We, French-Canadians, have been deprived of our rights on the 8th of March. The French Conservative members have bowed down before that flagrant injustice, before that affront, before that tyranny. I charge them with having failed to do their duty, and for their lack of energy, of foresight and of national dignity. They are the slaves of party spirit, instead of serving the interests of their compatriots. They are accomplishing and consummating, this session, the sacrifice to which they practically gave their consent in 1890, 1891 and 1892. The Government had pledged themselves to do justice to the minority, should the judicial tribunals decide that, under the law, as it stands, Mr. Greenway had the power to act as he did. The Privy Council of England, a tribunal where not a single Catholic does sit, of course gave a decision adverse to the claims of the minority. The Government declined to redeem their pledges and to interfere, as they have a right to do. They refer again the question to the Supreme Court, whence it will be removed to the Privy Council, whose final decision will seal the doom of our schools.

The hon. member had pledged himself to lend his support to the present Government, in order to reach a satisfactory settlement of the vexed question at issue ; we now see how he kept his promise. We will see later on, when I come to his motion, how he has kept the promises of which he was so lavish before the electors, when protesting of his devotion to the interests of the Manitoba Catholic minority. On the 1st July, 1893, he wrote again in his paper the following editorial ;

The " Cultivateur " still adheres to its opinion that the concessions, the shifting, which have been at the bottom of the policy of our Manitoba friends, have been fatal to the French interests in that province, and indirectly, throughout the whole Dominion. They should have told the Dominion Government : Do justice and enforce the constitution. What benefits did they reap from a contrary attitude ? Let them point them out to us, if they can. The Manitoba Catholics left to themselves, are unable to exercise any effective action. Still, they have entered upon their present course, without preconcerting their course with their brethren of the province of Quebec. The school question is one that interests the whole French race in Canada. Manitoba is far away from the centre of information and political action. Let us hope that all is not lost beyond redemption, but let us keep in mind that it is not by retreating before the foe that we shall inspire them with respect, and oblige them to give us back our rights.

On the 16th September, 1893, the " Cultiva-

teur." under the heading "From 1891 to 1893," said :

Sir John Thompson has spoken. I was too anxious to hear what he had to say on the school question. In 1891, Sir John Thompson gave in his report pledges which Archbishop Taché, on the 20th August, 1892, interpreted as follows :—

Sir John Thompson officially and publicly pledged himself.

Now, the First Minister is in a position to use, with the mass of the electoral gallery, the name of that Archbishop in order to prove that he is pledged to no one.

The French Ministers have consented to accept, and to cause to be accepted by their friends, if it be within their power, the policy of betrayal as to the rights of the minority adopted by the First Minister for the sole purpose of appeasing the fanatical elements of the party of which he is the leader. Of course, the French Ministerial members have assented to the action taken by their leaders.

In our province, party spirit is overpowering ; and when the Ministers have spoken, however weak, or incapable, or pusillanimous they may be, party men, with a few exceptions, at once join in the chorus without reasoning, without even suspecting that, in politics, liberty of thought is one of the most valuable guarantees of the rights of the people. The politicians from the other provinces know us, and they are aware that we will always give up.

They have had a new instance of it in this school matter.

Then, as you may see, the hon. gentleman was most favourable to interference : now his feelings have changed and he is for conciliation :

From 1890 to 1893 we have been receding and conceding, so much so that there is now nothing left for us to give up.

I claim for myself the credit of never having flinched.

It is rather amusing to read these past utterances compared with the present statements :

While I was unable to prevail upon the majority of my French colleagues in Parliament to join with me in claiming and resisting, I have at least proclaimed our rights and recorded a protest that will remain for the future and be useful to the future course I am determined to follow.

How fine were these statements. But they were made with a special view to win by captious means the confidence of the people who, fortunately, have now opened their eyes. When he stated that he had proclaimed our rights and recorded a protest that would remain for the future, he was, no doubt, far from suspecting that some day he would be called upon, through political circumstances which he could not then foresee, to attend political meetings in Toronto and Hamilton and give the lie to all his past declarations :

The Privy Council made it necessary for him to show his pluck.

I am just making in a few words the history of the Manitoba schools.

On the day following the political, or rather the British decision of the Imperial Council, Sir John Thompson was bound, both by pledges and by his duty, to officially interfere, to compel the Manitoba legislature to respect the rights of the minority.

He called upon Mr. Clarke Wallace, the representative of the most fanatical element of the whole Dominion, to join the Ministry.

I read in the "Cultivateur" of the month of September, 1894, the following editorial, of which I will give an extract:—

The promise of federal interference made by the Executive authority was formal, positive, solemn, public.

It was made during the lifetime of Sir John A. Macdonald, and at a moment when Sir John Thompson was only Minister of Justice.

Sir John A. Macdonald went to the great majority, was succeeded by Sir John Thompson.

Sir John Thompson is a Catholic, but he is not a Frenchman, and is little concerned about our schools and language.

He was not true to his word, and he caused the public to be deceived by the representative of the Queen.

I tell him in the face of the country: his being a Catholic is one of the surest sources of our school troubles.

Am I to be told that a subject of the Queen of French descent is less entitled to the respect of his rights than his neighbour of Anglo-Saxon origin?

Am I to be told by hon. gentlemen opposite that a British subject of French descent has less right to their respect and interference than his neighbour of Anglo-Saxon origin. I would go on quoting extracts indefinitely, but I wish now to quote from another paper, one which the hon. leader of the Opposition was compelled to disallow not long ago, but which was at the time his organ in the district of Montreal. I might say, in justice to the hon. leader of the Opposition, that he disallowed certain editorials of that paper because he found that it was going too far and that he might be compromised by it. I refer to "La Patrie" of Montreal:

Mr. LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. JONCAS. (Translation.) In its article of March 15th, 1895, "La Patrie" said, on the eve of the crisis:

The fact is that the school question was to be settled last week. * * * The whole country was looking in the direction of the capital, anxiously awaiting the settlement of this serious matter, but it has again been put off; to-morrow. * * * Why put off till to-morrow the decision promised for last week? * * * Mr. Bowell and his colleagues are surely in fault for leaving the country in an alarming and dangerous statu quo. All moderate people wish for an immediate settlement of the school question.

Now that we have the Bill, the Liberals no longer want it and they move the six months' hoist. Mr. Bowell and his colleagues are surely in fault, says the article. No doubt the Government would have been in fault for leaving the country in statu quo; after all the attempts made with the Manitoba

Mr. JONCAS.

government to come to a satisfactory settlement of the school question. But it is a matter for surprise to find these same Liberals who then laid a charge against the Prime Minister, trying to have put off a measure which brings to an end the statu quo. On March 21st, "La Patrie" said, in connection with the remedial order:

And they say: Here is an injunction. Forsooth, one must have much enthusiasm or a deep-laid confidence to believe that such an expression of opinion can have any weight with the Greenway government, whose decided intentions in connection with this matter are well known. There is no doubt whatever that this better appeal and these good advices will meet the same fate as the previous ones.

It is plain the editor of "La Patrie" had not converted his leader before penning these lines, since at the session of 1895, I distinctly remember, the leader of the Opposition found the remedial order drastic, while his organ found it honey-sweet. There you have, Sir, not the whole, but a part of what wrote and said the Liberal journalists and stumpers, previous to the introduction of the Remedial Bill in this House. And it is by carrying such arguments as these on every hustings throughout the country, by making a show of such a spurious patriotism, by proclaiming upon the house-tops their fullest devotion to the interests of Manitoba, by most assiduously asserting that never would the Government have the courage to bring down a Remedial Bill, that they succeeded in blinding the opinion and carrying the counties of Verchères, Montreal Centre and Jacques Cartier.

Mr. BERGERON. (Translation.) And Antigonish.

Mr. JONCAS. (Translation.) They forget now their former good resolutions, and when obliged to face the music, and to approve a Bill which they fancied would never be brought down, they make a change of front, and declare that they will oppose any Remedial Bill. Now, leaving the editorials published in the public prints, I come to the addresses made by Liberal members in this House, and I find here also the same contradiction. In 1893, the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte), as I just said, moved in this House the following colourless motion. The hon. member's conclusion was truly remarkable. But allow me first to quote the motion itself:—

That all the words after "That" in the main motion be erased, and the following substituted:—"That this House desires to express its disapproval of the action of the Government in dealing with the Manitoba school question, and in assuming to be possessed of the judicial functions conflicting with their duty as constitutional advisers of the Crown, which assumption is wholly unknown to the law, and, if now acquiesced in, would be entirely subversive of the principle of ministerial responsibility."

I will now give the conclusion of the hon. member's address:—

I understand, Mr. Speaker, that when the hon. the Minister of Public Works and the hon. the Minister of Agriculture went into the Government, they had pledged themselves, to the groups who support them, to require justice from the Government. They have done nothing, they will bear before the province of Quebec a heavy responsibility for their weakness and their faint-heartedness! If they think there is time yet to come to the assistance of those who suffer persecution, we offer them our help, we hold out our hands to them, with disinterestedness. If they should be willing to act like men and to fulfil their duty, I may assure them they would have the assistance of my friends on this side of the House, at least of my friends, the members of the province of Quebec. I am not making this statement without being sure my words are approved of.

The hon. member, undoubtedly, promised more than he could perform.

As for us, it is not a party question, it is a question of principle, a question of justice. Our race has equal rights to those of the other races and we want these rights to be acknowledged and respected.

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. JONCAS. (Translation.) What has become of all those declarations of the past? To-day the Government recognize and respect those rights, in bringing down a remedial law, while the hon. gentlemen, whose support the hon. member for L'Islet had given us the pledge, no longer want it. And on that same motion, Sir, what did the hon. leader of the Opposition say? His utterances, at the time, were re-echoed throughout the length and breadth of the land, and his political friends even wanted to frame a political platform out of them. In connection with the Manitoba schools and the contention that they were not neutral schools, but Protestant schools, the hon. leader of the Opposition said:

Sir, I heard the remark casually made yesterday in the House, that this statement was not true, and that the system of schools now prevailing in Manitoba was not a continuation of the Protestant system. I have looked over the whole blue-book, and all the correspondence brought down, and I fail to find any language there traversing that statement. It may or may not be true, but I deal with the case as I find it before the Government to-day, but if the statement is founded on fact which is made by His Grace Archbishop Taché, and which is repeated in all the petitions coming from the Roman Catholics of Manitoba, that, under the guise of public schools, Protestant schools are being continued, and that Roman Catholic children are forced, under that law, to attend what are, in reality, Protestant schools, I say this—and let my words be heard by friend or foe, let them be published in the press throughout the length of the land—that the strongest case has been made for interference by this Government. If that statement be true, though my life as a political man should thereby be ended for ever, what I say now I shall be prepared to repeat, and would repeat on every platform in Ontario, every platform in Manitoba, nay, every Orange ledge throughout the land, that the Catholic minority has been subjected to a most infamous tyranny. This is the case as I find it.

On that same motion, what did the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Brodeur) say:

I expected the Postmaster General would state whether the Government of which he is a prominent member, are determined to do justice to the Catholic minority of Manitoba, or whether they are determined to do nothing for them. I am satisfied, Mr. Speaker, that the Government are quite unwilling to do the best thing for them; that they have decided, even before now, not to interfere in favour of our co-religionists of Manitoba, and that all what they are doing presently is for the purpose of gaining time and shirking the responsibility that is incumbent upon them. I wish the position we are going to take in this case should not be likely to embarrass the Government. On the contrary, I am willing to help them in every possible way, even to the extent of voting with them on this question; but, before doing so, I beg to put a question to the hon. Minister who has just taken his seat. I understand the only reason why the Government are now unwilling to declare whether they can interfere is because they want it to be decided by the Supreme Court whether the British North America Act can apply. The Government want, first, to inquire from the Supreme Court whether the Catholics of Manitoba can avail themselves of the section of that Act under which any minority has a right to appeal to the Government whenever rights are violated that were acquired by laws subsequent to the union. I understand the Government intend to have it decided by that court whether the Catholics of Manitoba have a right to invoke as a privilege of the Act of 1871. Well, I beg to put a question to the hon. Postmaster General, and to ask him this: If the Supreme Court should decide that the Catholics of Manitoba have a right to invoke the privileges conferred by the Act of 1871, will the Government be willing, after the decision by the Supreme Court, to pass a remedial legislation, or to restore the Provincial Act of 1871, or in any way to do something likely to remedy the grievances of the Manitoba Catholics?

Further on, the hon. member said:

What will be the outcome of all this? Will the persecuted minority in Manitoba have dealt out to them every right to which they are entitled? Will the hon. Minister of Justice restore to the Catholic minority of the province of Manitoba their invaded rights as to separate schools? In the assumption that the claims of the Catholics of Manitoba shall be sustained by the judgment of the Supreme Court, shall the Government interfere in the matter, as in duty bound? I expected, Mr. Speaker, to hear the Ministers declare the policy of the Government on the matter under discussion. I expected, above all, to hear from the French-speaking members of the Cabinet, who are the representatives of the province of Quebec, a full and authoritative statement as to the duty of the Government towards the protection of the Catholic minority of the province of Manitoba. But, far from it, Mr. Speaker, we have heard no such utterances from the Ministers. The hon. the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Ouimet) and the hon. the Postmaster General (Sir Adolphe Caron), have stated, one after the other, on the floor of the House, that they were not aware what position the Government would take on this matter should the Supreme Court uphold the claims of the Catholic minority; they have not had the courage to pledge themselves to redress the wrongs inflicted on the Catholic minority of Man-

itoba, should the courts assert the federal right of interference. As already stated, I should willingly give my support to the Government, should they pledge themselves to mete out to the Catholics of Manitoba their just rights. But no, Mr. Speaker, they will take no such engagement, nor give any such pledge; they would rather be guided by men known for anti-Catholic leanings.

At that time, the hon. member was quite satisfied with promises. All he required then from the Government was a promise of interference, and if that were granted him, he was ready, he said, to vote with the Government, against the motion of the hon. member for L'Islet. But now, although I would not insinuate that the hon. member is opposed to the Remedial Bill, as he has not yet spoken out on the question, I am still inclined to think that he has made up his mind to vote in favour of the motion of the leader of the Opposition and against the second reading of the Bill. The hon. member for Rouville, I presume, in 1893, spoke out honestly, frankly and without disguise. Now, if he spoke from conviction, I would like to know how, in the face of such utterances, he feels warranted in voting against the Government and in favour of the motion of the hon. leader of the Opposition, which tends to defeat the principle involved in the Government Bill. Let us see what the hon. member for L'Islet said on another occasion. I am fond of resorting to the authority of the hon. member for L'Islet, because, since he has left the ranks of the Conservative party to join the hon. members opposite, he has assumed, in the party, such a prominent position that his utterances carry with them a great importance. The hon. member then said:

As to the other part of the question put by my hon. friend, I would like to know whether the Catholics in Manitoba and in the North-west are not deprived of the very same rights which the English Protestant minority enjoys in the province of Quebec. We had a right to our language; we had a right to our separate schools; and those rights have been taken away from us. The hon. members will perhaps say that those rights have been legally done away with. It is a well-known fact that quite a number of causes are lost before the judicial tribunals, but I never heard yet that a people had been deprived of its political rights by the courts. That is the reason why we insist so much upon the Government pronouncing themselves upon that question. I do not know whether any of the Ministers will vouchsafe a reply. The question I deal with is not one of private interest, but one which highly interests Canada. Would it not be better to discuss and settle that question in the House during this session, rather than allowing this agitation to perpetuate itself in the country?

The hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte), who, last year, wanted the Government to proceed without delay, apparently wishes now to continue the policy of delay and evasion, since he is disposed to vote in favour of the motion of the leader of the Opposi-

Mr. JONCAS.

tion. Last year, in July, when occurred the Cabinet crisis, during which two French Ministers from the province of Quebec felt it their duty to leave the Cabinet, what did they not say and print against him at a time when, at great personal sacrifice, they took back their portfolios, in order to safeguard the interests they had so much at heart. The hon. members opposite could not find words strong enough to condemn their action. The hon. leader of the Opposition then said:—

I am not surprised that those gentlemen who have at heart the restoration of the schools to the minority in Manitoba should have no faith whatever in the policy of the Government or in the promise of the Government, because it is a fact that upon no question—not merely this one, but upon no question whatever—have the Government ever had any settled policy of their own. They have no mind of their own, they cannot come to any decision whatever; or if ever they do take up a position, forthwith they proceed to undo what they have done before. Looking at their course, they would seem to be afflicted with some cerebral malformation which, as soon as they have taken any course upon any question crowds upon their attention all the objections against that course, and impels them forthwith to undo what they have done. Looking at their course, it would seem that their nights are haunted by the demon of doubt and vacillation. Look at their course during this very session, and what has that course been but a record of unfulfilled promises, a record of broken engagements, a record of decisions adopted and then abandoned, a record of conflicting determinations and of retrograde mollifications.

And further on:

Well, at all events, one of the dissenting Ministers stated his objection, that he had no faith in the sincerity of the hon. gentleman, and he stated, moreover, that if the promises made by the Government were not implemented this session he had reason to fear that they never would be implemented at all. Now, Sir, this is certainly most extraordinary language and conduct on the part of a member of the Administration, on the part of a gentleman who had been associated with them, and one of their prominent colleagues; and I must say that, according to my own judgment, the hon. gentleman had too good grounds to speak in the manner he did. Sir, I charge against the Government of the day, and I invite their answer, that they have dallied with this question, they never dealt with it frankly, fairly, sincerely; and, if I am allowed, by the rules of debate, I will say they never dealt honestly with that question. There are two elements on the other side of the House. There is a fraction of hon. gentlemen who support the Government, who are against separate schools; there is another fraction who are in favour of separate schools; and the policy of the Government upon this question has been to give hopes to both of these elements, thereby placing themselves in the impossibility of satisfying either of them.

Sir, I speak for myself alone; I have no right to speak for anybody else. But I say again that so far as I am concerned, let my hon. friends try to restore to my countrymen the official use of their own language, the teaching in the schools of their own language, and they will

have done a great deal. A great many suggestions have been made, and gentlemen opposite ask of this side of the House what suggestions we have to offer. I am making one. Why, my hon. friend is not ready to-day to go on with the measure his colleagues have promised the public. Six months hence, I say again, we shall be in a worse position. Passions will have been inflamed, speeches will have been made on one side in Ontario, and, it may be, in Quebec on the other. In Quebec we will preach the same doctrine we have preached in the past. The public press has, on many occasions, circulated false reports of meetings that we have attended. For my part, nearly every day I see my own words distorted. I suppose I can stand it—I must. The duty we have to perform, if you will allow me to say so, is to go calmly to work. These speeches made on the 12th July will not improve matters; and will you allow me to add, Sir, that the position taken by my hon. friends the French Ministers will not improve matters, either. If we could make up our minds to act like politic men; if, on both sides of the House, we decided to take the responsibility of our actions, a great many things would have been done that have not been done.

Now, Mr. Speaker, under what ground do the hon. gentlemen opposite base their opposition to the remedial law? Those grounds or pretenses may be classed under five heads if I understood the arguments so far put forth. To their mind, the Bill in coercive in that it imposes upon Manitoba a school legislation against the will of its inhabitants. Was not the Bill framed on the lines of the constitution? This is not the time, at this stage of the debate, to discuss the various clauses of the Bill; but let us take one of the first clauses, by which it is enacted that the Lieutenant-Governor may appoint nine persons, to form and constitute the separate school board. And if the Lieutenant-Governor does not, within three months after the coming into force of the Act, make the appointments, the Dominion Government shall make them. Where do you find any coercion in this clause? The Liberals contend again that, previous to bringing down their law before Parliament, the Government did not resort to all the means of conciliation within their power. But, I ask, what means have there been left untried? All the members of this House know that the Government of the day have done all what was humanly possible to do, to bring the Manitoba government to understand that it was in the interest of the country in general for the latter themselves to remedy the evils caused by the educational laws of 1890 and 1894. Do the hon. members opposite want the Government to go on bended knees to Winnipeg to obtain from Mr. Greenway what he has repeatedly declined to do? The Government are too anxious about their own dignity to submit to such a humiliation. Does not the crisis of last summer, through which the hon. members opposite cherished the hope of being borne into power, stand as an evidence that the Government resorted to all the means within their power to bring about a peaceful solution of this vexed

question? The French Conservatives in this House, who were asked to consent to a six months' postponement, felt apprehensive least this delay should prove fatal to the settlement of the question, and were at first loath to grant it; but finally they surrendered to the reasons urged by the French Ministers, and by their Protestant colleagues who were in sympathy with us, and who asked us to use all the means of conciliation that could be resorted to with Mr. Greenway, and who told us: If, after six months, we have not succeeded, then we will join hands with you to have justice dealt to the Catholic minority. More than that, Sir, the Government, after last session, passed, on the 27th July, 1895, the mildest Order in Council that could be drafted; an order, I dare say, which provoked a certain feeling of apprehension among the supporters of the separate schools and among those who want justice meted out to the Manitoba minority. If I refer to that Order in Council, it is merely to show that the Government did all what was humanly possible to do, and that they could go no further in the way of conciliation. Previous to bringing down the Remedial Bill before this House, the Greenway government was repeatedly called upon to redress the grievances complained of by the Catholic minority, but they declined to comply with the suggestions offered. What does the Order in Council of the 27th July last say:—

In the interest of all concerned it will not be disputed that if possible the subject of education should be exclusively dealt with by the local legislature. Upon every ground, in the opinion of the sub-committee, this course is to be preferred, and with the hope that this course may yet be followed, the sub-committee have now the honour to recommend that Your Excellency will be pleased to urge upon the government of Manitoba the following further views, which may be pressed in connection with the remedial order.

The remedial order, coupled with the answer of the Manitoba government has vested the Federal legislature with complete jurisdiction in the premises, but it by no means follows that it is the duty of the Federal Government to insist that provincial legislation to be mutually satisfactory should follow the exact lines of this order. It is hoped, however, that a middle course will commend itself to the local authorities, so that federal action may become unnecessary.

It is generally agreed and understood that, under the law which will be passed by the Dominion Government, the control of education in the province of Manitoba shall be partly taken away from the local authorities. That is the reason why the Dominion Government communicated with the Greenway government and urged them to settle the question. All are agreed that it would have been by far preferable for the Greenway government to have remedied the wrongs inflicted upon the minority by the laws of 1890 and 1894. But in the face of the denial of the Manitoba government to com-

ply with this request, the Government of the day decided to take action. The Order in Council goes on:

With a view to a settlement upon this basis, it seems desirable to ascertain by friendly negotiations what amendments to the Acts respecting education in public schools in the direction of the main wishes of the minority may be expected from the Manitoba legislature.

It is believed by the sub-committee that the religious opinions and rights which have been recognized in the judgment of the Judicial Committee of the Imperial Privy Council could be sufficiently met by the local legislature, without impairing the efficiency or proper conduct, management and regulation of the public schools.

It is with the object of effecting some such changes in the educational system of Manitoba that the sub-committee desire that an expression of opinion be obtained from the government of Manitoba. It was with this view that the Canadian Government at the last session of the Federal Parliament made the following announcement:—

“ Though there may be difference of opinion as to the exact meaning of the reply in question, the Government believes that it may be interpreted as holding out some hope of an amicable settlement of the Manitoba school question on the basis of possible action by the Manitoba government and legislature; and the Dominion Government is most unwilling to take any action which can be interpreted as forestalling or precluding such a desirable consummation. The Government has also considered the difficulties to be met with in preparing and perfecting legislation on so important and intricate a question during the last hours of the session. The Government has, therefore, decided not to ask Parliament to deal with remedial legislation during the present session. A communication will be sent immediately to the Manitoba government on the subject, with a view of ascertaining whether that government is disposed to make a settlement of the question which will be reasonably satisfactory to the minority of that province, without making it necessary to call into requisition the powers of the Dominion Parliament. A session of the present Parliament will be called together to meet not later than the first Thursday of January next. If by that time the Manitoba government fails to make a satisfactory arrangement to remedy the grievance of the minority, the Dominion Government will be prepared, at the next session of Parliament, to be called, as above stated, to introduce and press to a conclusion such legislation as will afford an adequate measure of relief to the said minority, based upon the lines of the judgment of the Privy Council, and the remedial order of the 21st March, 1895.”

It is within the recollection of this House, Sir, that the hon. leader of the Opposition stated here that the remedial order was too drastic, or, at least, too imperative. Now, Sir, could possibly the Government go any further in the way of conciliation? Could possibly a better means be suggested to the Manitoba government, whereby they could extricate themselves from the false position in which they had involved themselves, and in which they remained entangled through their own obstinacy? I maintain that the present Government went as far as their

Mr. JONCAS.

own dignity warranted them to go. What reply did the Greenway government make to that most conciliatory Order in Council? That answer is found in paper No. 39, and reads as follows:—

It is, therefore, recommended that so far as the government of Manitoba is concerned, the proposal to establish a system of separate schools in any form be positively and definitely rejected, and that the principle of a uniform non-sectarian public school system be adhered to.

It is further recommended that the Order in Council of July 27th, 1895, with the reply of Your Honour's government thereto be laid before the legislative assembly of the province with all convenient despatch at the next ensuing session thereof.

It may be pointed out that the legal position in regard to the proposed remedial legislation is far from clear. It has repeatedly been declared, according to reported utterances, that remedial legislation does not necessarily mean that the remedial order will be literally followed, or that the system of separate schools which existed prior to 1890 will be restored. It would appear reasonable to conclude that no one could seriously contemplate the restoration of that system. Yet if remedial legislation in any other form than a literal confirmation of the remedial order be introduced, a grave doubt arises as to the competency of Parliament to pass such legislation without the same being first submitted to the legislature of the province. On the other hand any proposed measure would require to be in accord with the order of the Governor General in Council, so that the first step required might be to amend the remedial order. Whether any power exists to amend or rescind the remedial order is also a subject of some doubt.

It is a matter of regret that the invitation extended by the legislative assembly to make a proper inquiry into the facts of the case has not been accepted, but that, as above stated, the advisers of His Excellency have declared their policy without investigation. It is equally a matter of regret that Parliament is apparently about to be asked to legislate without investigation. It is with all deference submitted that such a course seems to be quite incapable of reasonable justification and must create the conviction that the educational interest of the people of the province of Manitoba are being dealt with in a hostile and preemptory way by a tribunal whose members have not approached the subject in a judicial spirit or taken the proceedings necessary to enable them to form a proper opinion upon the merits of the question.

The inquiry asked for by the reply of the legislature to the remedial order should, in the opinion of the undersigned, be again earnestly invited, and in the event of the invitation being accepted the scope of the inquiry should be sufficiently wide to embrace all available facts relating to the past or present school systems.

The desire of the legislature and government of the province throughout the whole course of the proceedings, beginning with the enactment of the statutes of 1890, has been to provide the best possible means of education for the children of our citizens. To that end every possible effort has been put forth and every possible pecuniary sacrifice made in order that there might be established a school system based upon sound principles and equipped and administered in accordance with approved modern educational methods. Though very much remains to be accomplished it may be fairly asserted that a rea-

sonable measure of success has attended the efforts which have thus been put forth.

To those conciliatory suggestions of the Federal Government, and while the Minister of Justice suggested the means to reach a satisfactory solution of the question, the Greenway government replied by making a proposition altogether inadmissible. And the hon. members opposite contend that the Government did not go far enough in the way of conciliation! Even now, when, as a result of the repeated refusals and obstinacy of the Greenway government, the Federal Government are still endeavouring to have conciliation prevail, as shown by the statement made by the leader of the House, last night. The Greenway government seems disposed to enter upon a course of conciliation, a course which they should have pursued long ago. What does the Federal Government do? The Government here shows itself as conciliatory as ever. It was only when the Federal Government were satisfied that the Greenway government had made up their minds to make no concessions that they acted with the vigour with which their friends expected they would act. The Manitoba government seem disposed now to apply a remedy to the evil done, should they be invited to Ottawa, to hold a conference with the Federal authorities. I hope a means will be reached of bringing about a harmonious and satisfactory solution of the difficulty. The Federal Government have accepted the idea of holding a conference with the Manitoba authorities, but this time, they have insisted upon a previous condition, namely, that the Bill shall be read a second time. The Greenway government have too often denied the invitation of the Federal Cabinet; they have too often been called upon to give redress, for the position now taken by the Federal authorities being wondered at. But the Liberal organs will, no doubt, misrepresent again the intentions of the Federal Government; the fact is that they have already begun doing so, and to-morrow, Sir, you may read in those papers that the Government here are backing down, anxious to shirk their responsibility.

An hon. MEMBER. That is so.

Mr. JONCAS. (Translation.) No; but it will only be a first statement, in keeping with the falsehoods they have been uttering for months and months about the present Government. If the Government have agreed upon holding a conference with the Manitoba authorities, it is because they wish to meet the argument which the hon. member for Quebec Centre (Mr. Langelier), and other members, have resorted to in this debate, and it is this: That the Government have not exhausted all the means of conciliation within their power. It is in order to dispose effectively of this falsehood, that the Government have agreed upon holding a new conference.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. (Translation.) You have yourself opposed that idea, some time ago.

Mr. JONCAS. (Translation.) I come now to a third argument used by the hon. gentlemen opposite. They say: You take away from Manitoba the control over her schools. True, the present Bill takes away from the province the control over her schools, but, let me ask, whose fault is it? Are the Federal Government to blame, if they feel bound to press through the House the legislation now under discussion? Does not all the blame fall upon the Manitoba authorities who, in defiance of a solemn compact and of the very constitution, have taken away from the minority the schools which it had a right to? Another objection is supplied by the hon. leader of the Opposition himself, who contends that the facts are not sufficiently known, and that an investigation into them should be held. It was really amusing to hear the hon. member for Lotbinière state on the floor of this House that he was in favour of a commission of inquiry, but, still, that he was going to vote for the motion of the hon. leader of the Opposition, in favour of the six months' hoist. What, then, I should like to know, are the facts which should be inquired into, previous to granting the minority their schools? Is it not a well-known fact that the minority has been deprived of its schools? Have not all the facts set forth in the petitions presented to the executive and to Parliament been several times proven before the judicial tribunals here and before the Imperial Privy Council of England? What further evidence do they want to get? That argument, Sir, is but another pretext, added to all the others. A last argument urged by the hon. gentlemen opposite is that the law is incomplete, and that it does not afford an adequate measure of relief to the minority, from the grievances complained of. I may say, Sir, that although I could wish for a more complete law, still no legislation is perfect, when laid down upon the table of the House. But, I ask, Sir, because in their opinion a law is incomplete, is it a reason why those who ought to be in favour of the principle of interference, should vote the six months' hoist? The law may need to be amended, but, in my opinion, the hon. gentlemen would have been more consistent, if they had allowed it to go through its second stage, reserving their right to complete and amend it later on? Moreover, who are those, the more directly interested in having an adequate and complete law? It is the Catholics in Manitoba. Well, Sir, the argument urged by the hon. members opposite is pointless in face of the attitude taken by those who are the accredited representatives of the minority, both in the local legislature and in the Federal Parliament. I have here the statement made by Mr. Prendergast, one of the friends of the hon. gentlemen opposite, and

a supporter of Mr. Greenway. That gentleman gave it as his opinion that the law actually before the Federal Parliament was adequate and as complete as it could well be, within the provisions of the constitution. He said :

The Remedial Bill, he said, is apparently clumsy, but it could hardly be otherwise, considering that, in the drafting of it, great care had to be exercised not to give the minority any advantage which it did previously enjoy. This Bill recognizes the principle which we have been fighting for these six years past. Our right to share in the legislative grants is also sanctioned by this Bill. I am not ready to challenge the power of the Federal Government to grant us a share in the provincial grants. If I were a member of the House of Commons, I would support the Bill. If I were in the House of Commons, I would insist upon the Catholic schools receiving a share of the money to the credit of the land grant. Should the Manitoba government refuse to grant us our share in the legislative grant for school purposes, I say that the Parliament of Canada would act justly in amending the Dominion Lands Act so as to enable it to grant us our share out of the proceeds of the sale of the school lands. I think the Catholic schools might get along if necessary without the government grant ; but, from whatever source it may come, we will require money for organizing our school board.

Such is the opinion of a prominent Catholic Liberal in the province of Manitoba. Now, let me give you the opinion of two Conservative members, who also represent the Catholic minority in the local House. Here is what Messrs. Théophile Paré and Roger Marion have to say, in connection with Mr. Prendergast's statement :

Mr. Prendergast has rightly interpreted the views of the minority with reference to the legislation which now occupies the attention of the Federal Parliament. In doing so, he is not liable to be suspected of partiality towards the Federal Government. As stated by him in his address, Mr. Prendergast is a Reformer, one of Mr. Laurier's followers, and not one of Sir Mackenzie Bowell's followers.

The reports of the proceedings in our local House, on the 26th February last, as published in the Winnipeg papers, have already made known the attitude taken by Mr. Prendergast. In calling attention to that portion of Mr. Prendergast's address in the House, we wish thereby to emphasize the fact that the Catholic members of the Manitoba legislature hold the same views as those expressed by Mr. Prendergast on the school question and particularly on the Remedial Bill.

THEOPHILE PARÉ.
ROGER MARION.

Here we have the representatives of the minority in the local House, declaring that the Remedial Bill is adequate and satisfactory? Wherefore do the Liberals oppose it? Why do they find it inadequate? We have also representatives of the minority both in the Senate and in the House of Commons. I am in a position to state that these gentlemen find the Bill as adequate and satisfactory as it could possibly be, within the pro-

Mr. JONCAS.

visions of the constitution, and, moreover, that the Manitoba minority finds it satisfactory. I may say that the religious authorities, the most directly interested in having the grievances of the Catholic minority redressed and in having restored to them their rights, under this law, have also declared the Bill satisfactory. Let me now refer to the public prints of the province of Manitoba, and what do we find? The "Manitoba" is the only French journal published in that province, as the representative of the interests of the Catholic minority.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. JONCAS. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker. I am not authorized to state that the editorial in question has been approved by the religious authorities in Manitoba. But I have good grounds for believing that more authorities have approved of it. I am even inclined to think also, on good grounds, that the article I am about to read was submitted to the approbation of the religious authorities in question, previous to its being put in print. The editorial I am going to read appeared in the issue of the "Manitoba" of the 4th March instant :—

THE REMEDIAL BILL.

At last, after having waited and suffered six years, we have good grounds for believing that the hour of justice will soon come. We need hardly say that it is with a heart full of emotion and anxiety that we will watch the debates in the House of Commons, in the course of which will be disposed of a cause which confines to the innermost affections of our soul.

We have no hesitation in declaring that the Remedial Bill embodies in substance all the principles essential to the good working of our schools. We have the right to hope that all the members of this House, who have any concern for their duty, will give the measure the support of their vote. Being given the limits of federal jurisdiction, a careful perusal of the enactments of that Bill shows that it secures to the Manitoba Catholics as complete and independent an organization as possible, and that it effectively protects them against the ill-will of the provincial government. We are fully aware of all the difficulties that had to be warded off in the framing of this law. There was no question of framing at one cast a Bill which might give satisfaction to the Catholic minority. Allowance had also to be made for the Manitoba educational laws passed previously to 1890. We could neither claim any more rights than we enjoyed at the time, nor escape the control exercised at that time by the local government. So, for instance, we are obliged to leave in the hands of the Manitoba Executive the appointment of the members of the School Board and of the Superintendent, a right which has always been exercised by the government. The fact of taking away that right from the local government would have stamped the Remedial Bill with invalidity and jeopardized the measure.

So again with section 3 of the Remedial Bill, which enacts that the Department of Education may make such regulations as they may think fit for the general organization of the separate schools. That section is an exact copy of the enactment embodied in our statute previous to 1890.

The Government, however, exercises no control whatever over the powers of the Board of Education, and does not in the least interfere with the functions of that body, which are clearly defined under section 4. It is an elementary principle of law that a general clause does not restrict the meaning of another specific section, which goes into the details of the question. The latter always prevails in everything it particularly determines. Now, section 4 gives us an absolute control over everything connected with teaching and school organization. To recriminate upon those two points would be to render us a bad service. A federal law, from which sections 1 and 2 had been omitted, would necessarily have been *ultra vires*. As we said before, the law now under discussion in Parliament is a most desirable one. It embodies all the essential principles and the necessary mechanism for allowing the Manitoba Catholics to organize their school districts and insure their working. Certain public sheets, vexed at the fact that the firm stand taken by the Federal Government deprived them of the benefits they were in the hope of reaping from the school question, were suddenly smitten with a fine zeal for our interests. After having first arraigned the Ottawa Government for delaying to introduce their remedial law, and after, later on, insisting upon a commission of inquiry, they go to the expense of purposely magnifying the difficulties involved in it. If they sincerely wish to help us, why do they not seek to smooth down the difficulties? This is not the time to create further trouble by untimely recriminations, which savour too much of ill-humour to be of any weight.

As we said before, the law such as introduced in Parliament is satisfactory, and the Catholic minority in Manitoba accepts it, reserving to themselves meanwhile, the right to have it amended in the Committee of the Whole, as to certain details which leave something to be desired.

We ask all our true friends not to suffer under the plausible pretext that it is not perfect, to be battered and ruined, a law the main enactments of which are favourable to our rights and go as far as they can, within the jurisdiction of the Federal Parliament.

Some newspapers have sharply commented upon section 74 which sanctions our rights to a share in the legislative grant, and they rested their animadversions upon the ground that it does not provide for any means whereby we may wrest from the provincial Ministers the moneys to which we are entitled. We must confess that the Federal Parliament have no power to enforce that section. However that may be, undoubtedly Parliament will have to amend the School Lands Act so as to secure for us our legitimate share of the grant out of the proceeds of the sale of lands. Those lands have been appropriated to the support of the Manitoba schools, such as recognized by the constitution. Those lands are, so to say, mortgaged for that purpose. Now, the decision of the Imperial Privy Council binds the Government in that respect. The Manitoba schools which have a right to share in those funds, are both the separate and the public schools.

We have a vested right to those moneys. It is not in the power of the Federal Government to hand our share of those grants over to the provincial government. The Federal Government are trustees for those lands, and the findings of the Imperial Privy Council are binding upon the executive as to the management of those funds. The necessary conclusion, flowing from

the adoption of section 74 will be in the shape of an amendment of the School Lands Act, empowering the Government to give us our share of the moneys arising out of those sales of school lands. The just and firm stand taken by the Federal Government towards the Catholic minority warrants us in believing that they will not hesitate to perfect the Bill which is now before the House.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. (Translation.) That law enacts compulsory education.

Mr. AMYOT. (Translation.) Compulsory education is not forbidden by the religious authorities, when it is properly imparted.

Mr. JONCAS. (Translation.) Compulsory education is one of the planks of the platform of the radical school, which ranks among the Reformers, of course. Hon. gentlemen may laugh at their ease, but they laugh reluctantly. Such is my answer, Sir, to the quibbles of those hon. members who, on so many conflicting grounds will unite and vote in favour of the amendment of the hon. leader of the Opposition. One word more, Sir, and I am done. The question which is now before us is of such import to the future of the Canadian confederation, that I may be allowed to appeal to all those who have at heart the progress and the prosperity of our young country, and ask them to give their support to a legislation aiming at restoring to an oppressed minority the rights guaranteed to them by a solemn compact. It is not only the right but also our duty to support such a legislation. This is no national and religious question, but a constitutional question of the utmost importance. The minority, now claiming justice, is Catholic, it is true, but if we set up a dangerous precedent, if we allow any province to tear one of the finest pages of a constitution which has made Canada a great and prosperous country, it will be all over with peace and harmony between the different races inhabiting the Canadian confederation, and nobody can foresee where we shall stop. I freely confess that if the minority were Protestant instead of Catholic, we, Conservative French-Canadians from the province of Quebec, would fight their battle just the same as we fight for our co-religionists. As a proof of our disposition to respect the agreements entered into in 1867, at the time of the union, I refer the hon. gentlemen to the generosity with which the province of Quebec deals with the Protestant minority. As I said before, if we wish to make Canada a great and prosperous country, it is necessary that all unbiassed minds, to whatever race or creed they may belong to, should unite, in order to oppose a barrier to the ever rising flood of fanaticism and prejudices which threatens to break to pieces our political and parliamentary institutions.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman who has just spoken has charged the Opposition with having contradicted itself on this matter. I say that the Oppo-

sition has not contradicted itself on the school question. What the French-speaking Liberal members of the House asked for was a law, and not the shadow of a law. The hon. gentleman has had the audacity to speak about contradicting. Does he not remember that last session he himself said that he had no confidence in this Government, and no faith in its promise of a remedial law. What is it that has since given him this confidence? Is it the declaration which the leader of the House (Sir Charles Tupper) made yesterday? I would recall to the House what the hon. gentleman said last year. He said:

I was inclined to think, Sir, that the Government were in earnest when pledging themselves before the country, and I was prepared to oppose the motion of the hon. leader of the Opposition; but how can we take for serious a declaration which is not even accepted by as influential a government supporter as the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon)? The course followed by the hon. member is a blame cast upon the Government. This last challenge, Sir, fills the cup to the brim. I have relied so far on the pledges given by the Cabinet, up to the moment when their own friends repudiated those promises.

Further on, the hon. member said:

The very fact that the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) stands up and tells this House that he cannot support any remedial legislation which may be introduced, vindicates the statement that there is no longer any hope that the Government may succeed next session in passing a legislation which will afford relief to the minority in Manitoba.

Is it the conduct of the Government, as explained yesterday by the leader of the House which gives confidence to the hon. member for Gaspé (Mr. Joncas)? The hon. gentleman tells us that we are going to vote with the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), and the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace), but does he not remember that in the session of 1893 he himself voted to support the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) when a resolution was brought by the hon. member for Addington (Mr. Dawson) censuring his conduct. The hon. gentleman has spoken about the great principles involved in the Remedial Bill, but the fact is, as my hon. friend from West Lambton (Mr. Lister) says, there are no principles in this Bill. We on this side support the principle of remedial legislation—a principle which can be put into practice, but that principle cannot be put into practice under this Bill.

I shall not attempt to follow the hon. gentleman, for that would be rather difficult, as by far the greater part of his speech is made up of extracts from newspapers, but I shall confine myself to the Bill now before the House.

What strikes me in this measure, and what must attract the attention of everybody is the manner in which it has been drawn. Sir, the time which has elapsed

Mr. CARROLL.

since the ex-Minister of Justice ceased to be a member of the Cabinet is very short, indeed. The Bill itself is proof of this. What it proves, also, is that the ex-Minister of Justice (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) has been the Minister of Justice 'de facto' even since his official resignation. This project of law is his work; its diction is his; it betrays his skilful hand—skilful for election purposes.

In April last, the telegraph one day scattered the sensational information that the Minister of Justice (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) had given in his resignation. The cause of this action on his part was the problem which every one was asking everybody else to solve. But later on it was shown that the Minister had eyes to see, and that he desired to appeal to the electorate on the remedial order. Indeed, to his mind, the remedial order was a dish agreeable to all palates, and spiced with all sauces. To Catholics it meant intervention and justice; to Protestants it meant very little, if anything. Antigonish, Verchères and Haldimand prove what I say. The opinion of the ex-Minister of Justice did not prevail, Parliament was not dissolved, and, in the existing conditions, it was necessary to tack carefully, so that the wind, from whichever quarter it came, would drive the Government safely back into port. And the same ingenious hand which drew up the remedial order, prepared the Bill we have before us. This Bill is neither fish nor flesh. It may mean much and mean very little. To some it means everything, and to others, nothing. Let me illustrate what I mean by some expressions of opinion from different quarters. The "Mail" is the chief Government organ in Ontario, and the "Minerve" holds a similar position in Quebec. Well, on the 13th February last, the "Mail" contained an editorial on the remedial order, which, after stating the principal lines of this Bill, concludes thus:

The Bill is obviously another remedial proposal—a milder proposal than that of the remedial order as interpreted in Winnipeg. It is a further invitation to Manitoba to take the matter over.

On the other hand, the "Minerve" said:

The Bill is a complete restoration by the Federal Parliament of the rights of the minority.

The ex-Minister of Justice (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) who, I am sorry is not in his seat to-night, must see how diversely his Bill is considered in different quarters, even by the most influential friends of his own party. It is appreciated favourably in Ontario, where it is praised as meaning very little; and in Quebec it is favourably considered by those who extol it as meaning everything. It was an ingenious hand which traced this document—a document intended to rally the whole Tory phalanx, more susceptible to the use of expedients than anxious for the maintenance of principle.

For my part, I am against this measure because it is too coercive to be received with good faith and put into execution with good grace by the Manitoba government, and not coercive enough to be really useful and advantageous to the minority. On several occasions, the Government has declared, that this question has been forced upon them. Sir, in making this admission, the hon. Ministers are very frank. But even though they had not admitted it, it would not have been difficult to see that this question was to them not a welcome one. The fact is, that the Ministers spoke truly, but did not speak the whole truth. What they did not state was, that it never occurred to them that they would be called upon to take a single step in favour of intervention. If the Government had honestly intended to deal with this question, is it to be believed that they would have taken the course they have taken since the decision of the Privy Council? If the Government had honestly intended to deal with this question, are we asked to believe that the eve of a general election would have been the time chosen to give effect to that intention? The fact is, that before issuing this remedial order the Government should have tried conciliation with the Manitoba government. But they did nothing of the kind, for the reason, as I said before, that it never occurred to them that they would be called upon to deal with this question. Hon. gentlemen opposite pretend to think, that in this case arbitration was impracticable. Sir, every one knows that arbitration is the most rational, the most wise and the most honourable means of settling disputes, not only between individuals, but especially between states. As nations progress, as civilization is developed among the peoples of the world, arbitration tends to the maintenance of peace and harmony. Sir, it is in this century that the idea of arbitration has received its most practical application. In spite of the errors of kings and emperors and governments, people are showing themselves opposed to quarrels, so much so, that a leading thinker has been led to say, that it is no longer force, but intellect, or, better still, justice and humanity, that governs the world, and that war is no longer the last argument of nations. I contend, that conciliation, and not war, should have been the first argument of the Canadian Government in this case. Therein has the Ministry been at fault, but it is useless to recriminate. Let us turn from the past to deal with the future. The future! The Ministry offers it to us by the Bill which I hold in my hand. This Bill is a synopsis of all the arguments, of all the speeches, and, I should say, of all the boasts in which the Ministers have been indulging in the past few days. I have studied it carefully. The Government, by interfering, assumes that the intervention of this Parliament is necessary in order to restore to

the minority of Manitoba their rights. This Bill, therefore, sanctions the idea that the Manitoba legislature will not render the Catholics justice. So imbued is the Ministry with this idea, that one of them, I think it was the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Costigan), stated, that the only guarantee that the Manitoba minority had was the passage of a law by this Parliament, and that he would not leave it to Mr. Greenway to do justice to them. That being so, what, then, was the duty of the Government? Here is a province which, according to hon. gentlemen opposite, will not render justice to an important group of the subjects of Her Majesty. Here is a legislature to whom justice and reason are but empty words. If this Government has the power to do so, common sense requires, that it shall assume the cause of the oppressed, and not leave those oppressed longer under the control of their oppressors. The Government, by presenting this Bill to Parliament, formulate the idea, that Manitoba will not, or cannot, render justice. And yet, Sir, by a strange contradiction, though they have the power to enforce this law, they leave the enforcement of the law to the power that combats it. Under this Bill they only decree and proclaim the law, without taking the means to put it into execution. The Ministry reminds me of a schemer who, on one occasion, came to me and gave dazzling accounts of the immense fortune that could be realized by the working of a certain mineral. When pressed with the means to be taken to overcome difficulties, he said: "I bind myself to start the thing; as to its future working, I am not concerned." And so, when we ask the Ministry: How are you going to put this law into operation? They answer: Our duty is to pass this law; our duty is not to put it into operation. Or, as the Postmaster General did, they give no answer at all. The ostensible object of the law is to restore separate schools to the minority in Manitoba. It affirms, that the Greenway government is the enemy of these schools, and yet, by clause 4 of this Bill, it gives to that enemy of separate schools the power to make regulations concerning the organization of those schools. Do we not see immediately, not only the impropriety, as the "Moniteur de Lévis" says, but the danger of passing a coercive law, which will irritate the Manitoba government, while leaving in the hands of that same government the power to make regulations concerning these separate schools that we wish to establish? It is not necessary to study the details of the Bill; the broad lines upon which it is drawn are all that it is necessary to know. "The Ministry has restored separate schools to Manitoba," say the Quebec Conservative members. It is easy to create enthusiasm among those who, for two years, have been trembling at the idea of going before their constituents without having even the sen-

blance. to say nothing of the substance, of a law. And here, Sir, it is well to ask the Government: How do you propose to put this law into operation? Whence are the funds to come? Is it true, as rumour has told us for the last few days, or the last few weeks, that promises have been given to Archbishop Langevin, that, if Mr. Greenway does not do so, this Government, if it is maintained in power, will vote money at the next session for the support of the separate schools?

Sir, if this promise had not been given, I could not understand the position of the Archbishop of St. Boniface, but I will explain his position by saying that I think promises were given to him; because I find that on 4th May, 1895, following an interview with Mgr. Langevin, Mr. Tardivel wrote in his paper "La Vérité," an article from which I take the following extract:—

Without being indiscreet we can say, that those who speak of compromise do not meet the views of his Grace. As the Catholics of Manitoba do not ask any favour, but the enjoyment of a strict natural legal right, compromise is out of the question. All that the minority demands in virtue of its natural and legal right, is the control of its own schools, which it maintains after all with its own funds.

This extract very accurately represents the views of his Grace, for on 9th May, 1895, his Grace wrote to Mr. Tardivel a letter which was published in "La Vérité," and from which I quote this extract:

Please accept thanks for the article published in "La Verite" after our interview. You said just what was required, and I am sure you have rendered a very appreciable service to the cause which you are helping us to defend.

Mr. Tardivel thinking this letter important, I suppose, asked Mgr. Langevin for leave to publish it, and on the 17th May, 1895, the bishop answered him as follows:—

For four years our good Catholics of Winnipeg, without distinction of nationality, have been called upon to pay a tax amounting to \$3,500 per annum, in addition to the taxes paid for the schools with which the Protestant majority is satisfied, and which no one thinks of taking from it. We are in debt, crushed. Several of our young parishes have made for a year the same generous efforts as the Catholics of Winnipeg to maintain their schools. It is time, it seems to me, that our cause were vigorously taken in hand.

As the House will see at once, what Bishop Langevin will not have is a compromise. What Bishop Langevin complains of is that the Catholics of Manitoba have been obliged to make enormous sacrifices for the support of their schools, and he cites as an instance of those sacrifices the fact that the Catholics of Winnipeg were last year obliged to subscribe \$3,500 for the maintenance of their schools. What was our surprise then to read in the Montreal "Gazette" of 14th February last, the following interview with the same prelate, who is made to say:

Mr. CARROLL.

All the changes will be that there will be a little less money to carry on the public schools, but then we are very poor people, and the Protestants do not want the little money we contribute to help support their schools. All we want is to have our taxes for our own schools.

This interview has not been contradicted, and shows that his Grace must have considerably modified his views since the past few months. I do not say this to disparage in any way the Bishop of St. Boniface; I cite this as an instance to show that promises were certainly made to him, that if Mr. Greenway did not put into operation the law which would be passed by this Parliament, this Government, at the next session, would pass a law giving money for the support of their schools. Sir, I had thought that the Government's stock of promises was completely exhausted. I had thought that after the arrival in this House of the hon. gentleman whom the Conservative party call its saviour, they would proceed seriously to work, and that when we had a Bill, we would have a serious Bill. Sir, my friends warned me that the Secretary of State was exaggerating in Cape Breton; but I concluded that a statesman who did not leave to others the task of sounding his praises, who was himself the panegyrist of his great deeds, must be superior to ordinary mortals. The hon. leader of the House boasted of his great deeds, he boasted of his past successes, and he has had successes. But ordinary mortals who are not always free from envy, are more apt to forgive the success of those who possess the rare quality of silence. But all would have been forgiven to the hon. gentleman if he had kept his word, and if he had, as he stated he would, presented to this House a Bill which gave to the Catholics of Manitoba their rights. Sir, this Bill shows that the only logical position taken by a public man in this country was the position taken by the leader of the Opposition from the start. Not only was his position logical, but I say it was the only legal and constitutional position to take on this matter. In the first place, it is well to say that in certain parts of this country, there is a very mistaken idea as to the scope of the judgment of the Privy Council. Especially in the province of Quebec, the Tory press has said that the last decision of the Privy Council was purely and simply a judgment, and consequently that the Opposition was not logical in asking for an inquiry, since the Privy Council has pronounced on questions of fact and of law, and that its judgment had the force of a chose jugée. How could the Privy Council have given a judgment which had the force of a chose jugée? The statute of this Parliament says that questions shall be submitted to the Supreme Court of Canada for advice to the executive. The powers of the Supreme Court are limited by the statute which has been enacted by this Parliament. From the answers given by the Supreme Court, there is

an appeal to the Privy Council in England. Those who have the first notions of law, and every one here has, know perfectly well that a tribunal of appeal can only confirm and revise that which has been the subject of a judgment in the first instance. Therefore if the subject decided by the court in the first instance was purely and simply an advice, the jurisdiction of the court of appeal was limited to confirming or revising that advice. And this was the decision, this was the view, taken by the lords of the Privy Council. I will cite at page 209 of the papers in reference to the Manitoba school case :

The Lord Chancellor—All we have to say is what we think the jurisdiction of the Governor General is.

Mr. Blake—The question whether upon the whole, acting in their political capacity, the Privy Council believe that they ought not to act or to act in what we may consider a lame and half-hearted way, or to go the whole length of our demand, is no part of the question I have to submit to your lordships.

Lord Watson—If our duty is limited to that, it must also be limited to deciding whether a prima facie case has arisen.

Mr. Blake—Perhaps so.

And further :

Lord Watson—I suppose we are bound to give him advice on this appeal. He has asked nothing else but advice throughout. He has not asked for a political decision which shall fetter him in any way.

Mr. Blake—It could not be. The law which creates the tribunal for the purpose of giving advice, expressly states that in their political capacity they are not bound by that advice.

Lord Watson—That is a Canadian statute.

Mr. Blake—Yes.

Lord Watson—A Canadian statute which authorized the Governor General in Council to consult the Supreme Court, and lays a duty on the judges of the Supreme Court to give advice.

Mr. Blake—Yes.

As can be seen, the lords declared that what they were called upon to decide was this : was there a prima facie case for the Governor General to proceed ? I said before that the position taken by the leader of the Opposition was the only logical and legal one. He has declared from the first that the question was a question of facts ; his opinion is fully corroborated by the lords of the Privy Council, for on pages 306 and 307 we read as follows :—

Lord Watson—It had ceased to be a constitutional question, and resolved itself into a mere question of fact. The decision is such that in one way it necessitated the application of the Act which made the Act of the provincial legislature void. When that provision was made in subsection 1 that question appears to me to have ceased to be a constitutional question, and to have resolved itself into a simple question of fact.

Mr. Haldane—Take it upon the construction which has been expressed by some of your lordships, and which I am endeavouring to combat.

Lord Watson—What constitutional question has the court to consider when it is merely determining whether such privilege existed—

Mr. Haldane—Perhaps I used the word “ constitutional ” inaccurately there ; it is a question of law—

Lord Watson—Whether a state of things existed that brought into operation a condition of nullity imposed by Act of Parliament.

The Lord Chancellor—If you were once to concede that subsection 2 applied to rights and privileges acquired by post-union legislation, or including them at all events, the question whether a right or privilege had been affected really would be a question of fact in a sense. You may say it is a question of law possibly in a sense, but not in the ordinary sense, because there would be no difficulty in any person of common sense determining whether what had been given, which was for his benefit, was taken away. It would not be a question of law.

Now, if this is a question of fact, what is the position of the parties ? The minority has stated its grievances in its petition, and assuming these grievances to be true, they constitute a prima facie case that the Governor General ought to proceed with the appeal, as Lord Watson says. The minority, then, is exactly in the position of a petitioner who has obtained the issuance of a writ of mandamus or a writ of injunction. The petitioner draws up a libelled requisition, in which he advances the necessary facts to obtain the issuance of the mandamus. If these facts denote to the judge that there is a prima facie case, he orders the issue of the writ. Does this mean that the petitioner has gained his case ? Not at all. The writ is served on the party against whom the mandamus is directed. This party is ordered to appear before the tribunal. A day is fixed for the hearing of the parties on the facts which the parties have to advance in contradiction to each other. This is the procedure followed before the courts, and it is a reasonable procedure.

Well, the Privy Council, according to the language of Lord Watson, having only to decide if there was a prima facie case in favour of the minority, decided that there was such a prima facie case. The most elementary rules of procedure required that before the issuing of the remedial order, the facts mentioned in the petition of the minority, which facts were denied by Manitoba, should be established, since, as the lords of the Privy Council say, it was above all a question of fact. That is why I said that the position taken by the leader of the Opposition is the only legal and constitutional one ; the only one sanctioned by good sense, the only one which should have been followed. I know the sentiment of the majority of the members of this House. I am not speaking when I say that if the law of 1890 had been disallowed purely and simply it would have been to the advantage not only of the minority in Manitoba, but of the whole Dominion of Canada. I know perfectly well that this view is not that

of the majority of this House, and that the word disallowance is not a popular one. According to me, the present case was one which called for the exercise of this prerogative. The prerogative was not exercised because in this country the majority is opposed to the interference of the central power with provincial affairs. The two powers claim to be and in reality are sovereign within their respective spheres, and they look with a jealous eye on the encroachment, or even the appearance of encroachment, of the one on the other. The questions decided by the provinces interest the central Government in a greater or lesser degree, so that where the central power disallows a provincial law, it is often a judge in its own case. However, the right exists, and it should be exercised when the circumstances require it. But, Sir, realizing the danger which attaches to the exercise of this right, I now recognize the wisdom of the provincial ministers who took part in the labours of the Interprovincial Conference, held in Quebec in 1887. They wanted this right taken from the Federal Government and given to the Imperial Government. Truly, this change would not be spoken of if the federal authority had acted with discretion in the disallowance of provincial laws; if, during the twenty-five years which have elapsed since the establishment of the federative system, the federal power had shown itself impartial towards the provinces, if it had not encroached upon their rights and privileges, and if we had no reason to believe that it would continue so to act.

In the case of the licenses, it was proposed to deprive the provinces of their revenue from these sources. The provinces gained their point in spite of the bitter fight made by Sir John Macdonald, a fight which was ended by his defeat before the Privy Council. Every time the occasion has presented itself, we have seen the Federal Government take action against the province of Ontario to deprive it of as many immunities, of as many privileges as possible. It is those quarrels, it is those suits, which have stirred up public opinion in this country and caused the power of disallowance to become a dead letter, and that the Government dare not avail itself of it. I was very much surprised, Mr. Speaker, at the statements made by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) at the Toronto meeting lately. The hon. gentleman declared that there were better reasons for disallowing the Jesuits' Estates Act than for disallowing the Manitoba law of 1890. I ask myself by what process of logic the hon. gentleman could arrive at this conclusion. Probably he did so to hide a little the contradiction between the line of conduct he followed then and that which he is following to-day. The hon. gentleman demanded the disallowance of the law enacted by the legis-

Mr. CARROLL.

lature of Quebec. The Jesuits' Act was constitutional, nobody ever thought of denying this—the Jesuits' Act in no way wounded the susceptibility of the Protestant minority of Quebec, who through its representatives in Parliament accepted that Act. There was then in that Bill no injustice against any one, since the minority received its share of the sum voted by the legislature in respect of it. Every one in Quebec was satisfied, and in spite of this, the hon. member insisted on the exercise of the right of disallowance by the Federal Parliament. To-day everybody admits the grievances of the Manitoba minority, and yet all his eloquence and his influence are on the side of the majority against the minority. I do not accuse the hon. member of dishonourable motives. I prefer to believe that he is influenced by his education, which I hope he did not receive in any public school. If he had, he would be a living argument against the public school system. The hon. gentleman appears to me to be in the same disposition of mind in which fifty years ago was the one who is to-day the personification of Liberalism in the world. At that time, Mr. Gladstone was beginning his career, as Macaulay says, "as the rising hope of the unbending Tories of the day." His vast intellect grasped the most varied subjects, and he, the grand old man, on whom the eyes of the world are now fixed, published a book, "Church and State," which was the negation of the first notions of liberty. Mr. Gladstone wanted by force of law a state religion in England, not only in England, but wherever the British flag floated, a religion which was to be that of the subjects of Her Majesty, and which led to the negation of the liberty of conscience.

The English historian, Macaulay—the model of historians, in his memorable criticism of this book, said that Mr. Gladstone's systems would have produced a union which can be compared only to that which is the subject of a wild Persian fable. King Zohak gave the devil leave to kiss his shoulders, when instantly two serpents sprang out who, in the fury of hunger, attacked his head and tried to get at his brain. Zohak pulled them away, and tore them with his nails, but he found they were inseparable parts of himself, and that what he was lacerating was his own flesh. Perhaps we might be able to find, if we looked around the world, some political union like this, some hideous monster of state blessed with one principle or cursed with one principle of sensation, and two principles of volition, made up of parts which are driven by a frantic impulse to inflict mutual pain, yet are doomed to feel whatever they inflict; which are divided by an irreconcilable hatred, yet are blended in an indissoluble identity. Mr. Gladstone, for his tender concern for Zohak is unsatisfied, because the devil has as yet kissed only one

shoulder, because there is not a snake mangling and mangled on the left to keep in countenance his brother on the right.

The system of the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) would lead to such a union as this. He would have in this country that the law which suits Protestants should also suit the Catholics; that that which suits the English should also suit the French, without taking into account the leanings, the aspirations, and the sentiments of the latter. The hon. member (Mr. McCarthy), although he is engaged in law most of the time, must surely have read history, and history is there to proclaim, that whatever efforts may be made, whatever laws might be promulgated, they are condemned to impotence if they are not in accord with the spirit of the people which is subject to them. If the laws are but the isolated product of the dreams of an individual, no people can very long adapt itself to it. In a greater degree is this the case, if the laws come in conflict with the spirit, the manners, the religion, and, above all, with the language of a people. This applies most particularly to education, which is the work of the present for the future, and I may be allowed to cite what was said on this subject by an ex-Finance Minister, Sir A. T. Galt, speaking at Sherbrooke when the question of confederation was under consideration. Sir A. T. Galt said :

There could be no greater injustice than that which would force a population to educate its children in a manner opposed to its religious beliefs.

And Sir A. T. Galt was right, for, as I said before, "teaching is society in labour. It is the morals, the sentiments, the tendencies and the works of the generations which hasten towards the threshold of the future." It is impossible to encroach on these tendencies or these sentiments without striking a blow at freedom. Sir, I am glad to know that the ideas of the hon. gentleman (Mr. McCarthy) are not shared by the mass of the two political parties in this country. Sir, I do not despair, because I think the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) is influenced by his education. I do not despair that in the future, looking back on his past, he will make use of the noble language which one of his co-religionists in France made use of on the occasion of the reception of Father Lacordaire in the French Academy. Mr. Guizot was one of the descendants of those who had been forced to leave their country by the revocation of the Edict of Nantes. Father Lacordaire was a descendant of those who before had been the persecutors :

What would have occurred, Sir, if we had met, you and I, six hundred years ago, and if we had been, the one and the other, called upon to inflame our mutual distrusts ?

Six hundred years ago, Sir, if mine of those days had met you, they would have assailed you with anger, as an odious persecutor, and yours, eager to inflame the victors against the heretics, would have exclaimed, "Strike, strike, God will not fail to recognize his own." We are here, you and I, Sir, the living evidences and the happy witnesses of the sublime progress which has been accomplished among us in intelligence, respect of justice, conscience and right.

Sir, these are great words, great sentiments. Right, justice, fraternity, are, I regret to say, unknown in some parts of Canada. To cause them to penetrate in the population, the prestige, and the authority of those who command public confidence are required. In this sense, also, must the voice of the press be heard. The influence of the press is well known. The press is the weapon and sinew of modern society. A French writer said, in 1830 : That it was in France more of a social necessity than a political institution. Since these words were spoken the child of then has become a veritable giant, which, with steam and electricity its two agents henceforth sways the world. The press is the indispensable support of our political institutions; it exercises a supreme influence over the minds and movements of men, and on this occasion, I regret to say, it has not been equal to its mission.

Sir, at the present moment, in the province of Quebec—the dear French province of Quebec from which I come, we on this side of the House are accused of being opposed to doing justice to the minority in Manitoba.

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. CARROLL. The hon. gentleman says "hear, hear," but he must know better. In the province of Ontario we are accused of being extremists, wanting more than justice for the minority. In the province of Quebec hon. gentlemen opposite accuse us of waging war against the Catholic clergy, and in the province of Ontario we are accused of being tools in the hands of the same clergy. Sir, for my part, I say this—and I think I speak the voice of the French Liberals of the province of Quebec—we are not the enemies of the Catholic clergy. I speak here with all liberty, Sir. I speak as a Catholic, but as one who has received his early education from a Protestant mother and, consequently, I am above prejudice. I have made my education with Catholic priests, and, Sir, I found that they were good, they were disinterested, they were devoted, they were virtuous. But, Sir, the only fault I had to find with them—and I suppose hon. gentlemen opposite will not think it is a fault—the only fault I had to find with them was that the majority of them were more favourable to the Tory party than to the Liberal party. Sir, to conclude my remarks, I say that Mr. Greenway has committed a great fault.

Moderation is for all the supreme law; more particularly is it the supreme law for those who govern a country. If Mr. Greenway had not been so strongly entrenched in public confidence, I do not think he would have dared to put into practice the arbitrary formula, "The state—I am the state." The teaching of history shows us that whenever governments have the power to do all that they will, they almost always end by willing to do more than they should.

Mr. Speaker, I am against this law, because it is going to cause irritation without relieving the minority. I am against this law, because I think it is an appeal to expediency. I am against this law because I think it is the death-blow to the French language in the province of Manitoba. I am against this law because I do not think that this Government, even if they were sincere, could render justice to the minority while they command—oh, no, they do not command—the Tory phalanx behind them. Sir, I am in favour of the policy of the leader of the Opposition, because I believe it will result in the settlement of this question to the satisfaction of the minority, without disturbing the peace of the country. We are a united party in support of that policy. We want an inquiry, which is the legal and constitutional way to proceed. We want an inquiry; and we want the intervention of this Parliament, if Mr. Greenway is deaf to all sense of justice, as hon. gentlemen opposite seem to think. Sir, the future has not revealed to us the result of our attitude; but when an action is right, and when good sense alone is the condition of success, it is almost being a bad citizen to have any doubts of success. We are men of moderation and our task has for its aim, as it has for its effect, the prevention of the violence which is in preparation, by causing to be heard the voice of good sense and of reason. Sir, our policy is good; our leader the nation has proclaimed a great leader; and if, for defending one and the other, some of us must fall in the fray, at least our political life will not have been wholly in vain.

Mr. LACHAPELLE. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, in rising to reply to the speech just delivered by the hon. member for Kamouraska (Mr. Carroll), I am sorry I have not, in the first place the science of a lawyer to follow him with advantage on the ground upon which he stood in the greater part of his speech, and secondly the abilities of a master of rhetoric in order that I might reply to him with as much distinction as he has shown during the whole of his speech. However, it is not quite necessary to have these two qualities to discuss the important question now before us and upon which the eyes of the whole country are now set. There are two ways in which to explain this question: first, from an essentially legal standpoint, for there certainly exists a legal objection that ought to determine

Mr. CARROLL.

us to vote for the measure. Secondly, the question may be dealt with from a purely moral standpoint. That is to say, besides the legal objections, there exists the moral one upon which the Government and this whole House might ground their determination to agree to this Bill. It is from the latter standpoint that I wish to deal with the question, leaving the legal aspect to the professional men. Such as, for instance, the hon. the Minister of Justice who has given us already the results of a thorough study of it. In considering the moral obligation I hope, however, to find enough arguments to come to the conclusion that we ought to pronounce in favour of the Bill now before us which is intended to give back to the Catholics of Manitoba the rights and privileges of which they have been deprived since 1890 by a legislation which we are all agreed to characterize as iniquitous. A year ago, I attended the dinner tendered in Montreal to the hon. the present Minister of Marine (Mr. Costigan) by his compatriots and which was attended likewise by a great many French-Canadians who have as much sympathy for the hon. Minister as his own fellow-countrymen. The hon. the Prime Minister of the province of Quebec called upon to reply to the toast to his Government and having to reply to the school question, which was then as now interesting all the people, said: In the province of Quebec, we never open our statutes to ascertain the extent of our powers with respect to the Protestant minority. What the hon. the Prime Minister said on that occasion, many others had stated before. The province of Quebec always proved the same, at any time, towards the Protestant minority. That is to say, it never sought to ascertain the extent of her powers towards the Protestant minority which always enjoyed the greatest latitude with respect to their schools and their course of studies. If I insist upon this statement of the hon. the Prime Minister of Quebec it is because I wish to assert at once that it is quite in harmony with our education as Catholics, with our ideas as such to allow the greatest latitude, the fullest liberty as concerns the education of children. We are in duty bound to understand that the education must be essentially Christian and that, since the father of a family is bound to give to his child a Christian education, the same as he owes to him nutriment of the body, it is impossible to entertain for a moment the idea that we could allow the least obstacle to bear on the liberty of the father of a family, by compelling him to have his child educated in any other way than one dictated by his own will. We make a great distinction between education and instruction. We contend that instruction is not strictly necessary, but that education is a bounden duty, that it is a duty incumbent not only upon the State, but also upon the familyman,

that he should give to his son a Christian education, in harmony with the one he himself had. Why must education, in our judgment, prevail over instruction? It is because education consists in forming the child, in directing his mind and heart so that he may, through such a direction, have a thorough knowledge of his duties towards God, towards society and towards himself. Through education, we assist in the development of the faculties and in the culture of the mind and heart of the child, development and culture obtained by a good and wise direction given to that education. We consider these qualities are essential and indispensable in order to make good citizens. A good education inspires the man who received it, not only with the desire and the will to perform his duty towards himself, but also towards his family, towards society, towards his country, and that, in any circumstances throughout life. That is what is implied in education. Education is inherent to the development of the faculties of the soul, and I have no hesitation in saying that these faculties are very delicate in the organism of a young child. All the more reason to cultivate these qualities in a wise and proper way, so as to strengthen and develop them as much as possible. Such is the education, Sir, every family man is in duty bound to give to his children. From that point of view, I think the province of Quebec always did her duty, that is to say the education of youth in the province of Quebec was encouraged, divested, cultivated in such a way that our children receive the essentially wise education they should receive. Not only are the fathers and mothers bound to give that education, but the State compels them to perform that duty should they be inclined, either through ignorance or through negligence, not to perform it as they should. I say that in the province of Quebec through private or public action, the best possible direction was given to the education of youth, not only in the family, but likewise in the schools receiving public aid. I insist upon this, Sir, because it was hinted that the schools in the province of Quebec were inferior to those of the other provinces of the Dominion. No, Sir, our schools in the province of Quebec are not inferior to those of the other provinces, as I will show later on by unexceptionable evidences. Without any desire whatever to wound the susceptibilities of the other provinces, I am going to establish this fact in the most peremptory manner, for, when discussing a question such as the one now before us, it is proper that we should repel the attacks or the malignant insinuations directed against our schools in the province of Quebec. The opponents of separate schools in Manitoba are bent on having it believed that separate schools mean inferior schools. It is a serious mistake which I think it my duty to take up and point out to the attention of my hon. colleagues in

this House. When I hear such a charge preferred by representatives of the province of Quebec, under the present circumstances, I contend, Sir, that such insinuations and such a charge have no cause whatever. Two years ago, I had the honour to call the attention of the House to this question of instruction in the province of Quebec, and, on that occasion, I moved for important papers in relation to the World's Fair held in the city of Chicago. I had the honour to call the attention of the House to this fact: that the result of the school exhibit of the province of Quebec at Chicago was most favourable to that province. The contention that our schools are inferior is calculated to keep up an opinion most prejudicial to the inhabitants of this country, separated as they are by opinions of creed. I think it is the duty of every member of this House to do anything in his power to cause this prejudice to disappear, in the interest of truth as well as in the interest of harmony and good understanding between the different races which form the people of this Dominion. Last year, I moved for papers relating to the Chicago fair in so far as they related to the educational exhibition made by the province of Quebec. They have been brought up since, and they prove most conclusively the statement then made by me. I then stated that the educational exhibition held at Chicago had turned out to the whole advantage and honour of the province of Quebec. I have now the satisfaction to find out, from official evidence, that this statement was true in every respect. Effectively, there was a report made on the Chicago fair. We have been furnished with a copy of it by the Department of Agriculture. I find in that report the following paragraph which I would like to put before this House, because it goes to show to the whole country how wrong are those who assail the school system of the province of Quebec. I wish, moreover, to quote it here, in order to dispel the unfavourable impression that must have been caused by unfriendly statements against these very schools, which I am bound to defend with all the energy in my power. Here is the official report, of which we were furnished a copy of by the Government. I only give an extract of it:

The province of Quebec, in this, her almost first, exhibit, presented to the many millions who visited the fair an extensive, artistic, and instructive display. The "Révérend l'abbé Bruchési, chanoine de la Cathédrale de Montréal," had charge of the Quebec Roman Catholic schools. He was a most assiduous and enthusiastic worker, and ably represented Quebec's educational exhibits. He had under his charge nearly four hundred schools, representing various religious institutions throughout the province, the primary schools, the University of Laval, and Laval Normal School. The display made by the 100 schools of the convent of Notre-Dame of Montreal, representing 24,000 pupils, elicited much admiration. The excellence attained in those

studies peculiar to young ladies was the most characteristic feature of the exhibit. The Christian Brothers Schools were largely represented by exhibits in drawing, writing and studies in commercial work. They represented nearly 20,000 pupils, and their most marked characteristic was the excellence of the writing, penmanship that was equalled by none at the World's Fair. The primary schools had a good showing in every-day school work. The result of this exhibit made by Quebec must dispel the idea wherever it prevails that she is not progressing in education. There were over 10,000 separate exhibits, and they were grouped under 80 headings, and received 60 awards.

Such are the statements contained in the report of the Canadian Commissioner to the Chicago Fair. I might say, moreover, that the greatest number of prizes awarded at that exhibition were awarded to the province of Quebec. This being the case, I think it is impossible to find fault with our educational system, especially when it has given such favourable results. The province of Quebec was certainly well represented at Chicago, it was honourably represented. I would call the attention of the House to the character of the works exhibited. They were not special works, chosen designedly, and not likely to give a true idea of the ordinary works upon which one must base judgment in any exhibition. I find in the report of the Quebec Provincial Secretary, a paragraph clearly establishing that only ordinary and every day works were exhibited, works done by the pupils during the year previous to the exhibition :

In connection with that exhibition, we must manage matters so that our school works may be judged as a whole, without holding to a particular work, however creditable it may be. Indeed we have no intention to send there a special selection of exhibits, but we intend to prove that our system is as good as a whole from the university down to the humblest primary school. In order to do that, we must make it known, such as it is such as it works, that is to say exhibit the works to the teachers and the tasks of the pupils as done from day to day, with the corrections of the teacher.

This is how they prepared for that display. The report contains as well a great many very flattering appreciations by newspapers, from which I shall quote brief extracts. Thus the "Courier du Canada" said :

The general opinion here is that the province of Quebec made an excellent exhibit, especially as regards the practical every-day work of the pupils. The exhibits of work coming from the Brothers' schools, especially in penmanship, drawing and commercial work, were much admired.

The "True Witness" gives expression to the same opinion. Then I find the opinion of Mr. Serrurier, a distinguished French specialist, who says :

He said to me at one time : " If it were in France, what an immense success your schools would have ! I hope you will go there."

And, on August 23rd, he wrote to me :

I am bound to express to you the great satisfaction I felt when visiting your school exhibit.

Mr. LACHAPPELLE.

* * * Your books are the only ones, I think, that are headed in a full, definite and clear way with informations showing the name of the school, the class, the number and age of pupils, etc. Your methods are ours, so much so that, at first, I thought I was in France.

Then comes the opinion of Mr. Morton, which I am pleased to quote. This gentleman had been given charge by the Dominion Government of the whole Canadian Department of Education :

He wrote to you, Sir, from Chicago : " It is the general opinion here that the province of Quebec made a very good exhibit, especially as regards the every-day practical work in the classes. The exhibits of the Brothers' schools, particularly in penmanship, drawing and commercial work, are much admired. The display of the Sisters' schools attract a great many admirers, men and women. All the preceptors who visited this section are never tired of praising the works they saw. The province of Quebec has reason to be proud of her exhibit."

I take it, therefore, for granted, after such evidences, that the insinuation that the schools of the province of Quebec are inferior ones, is one which I would qualify, to say the least, as very malignant. They wanted to make it appear from the last census that the standard of education in the province of Quebec was below that of the other provinces. The census shows, it is true, a difference to the advantage of the other provinces, but we know very well that the return is divided into groups of ages, and we find that the difference, as far as the groups of advanced ages are concerned, is much more unfavourable to us. However, by analysing these various groups of ages, we find that as regards the groups of young people, from five to fifteen years, for instance, this difference is much less marked. The difference is almost trifling between the groups from five to fifteen years. It follows therefrom, and I call the attention of the House to that point, that education is the more and more cultivated in the province of Quebec, and that if it was neglected twenty-five years ago, it is impossible to sustain such a contention as regards our existing schools. That is the evidence I wish to adduce. It might seem out of place in this discussion, but I am pleased to think it will be useful all the same. I will quote, besides, the statement of Mr. de Laveleye, a high French pedagogical authority, which I find, in a speech of the late Hon. Mr. Chauveau, in relation to the movement of education in the province of Quebec. That gentleman made the following table showing the number of pupils attending the schools in 1872, according to the population of the various countries to which he refers :

	Pupil.	Inhabi- tants.
Upper Canada schools	1 to	4
Lower Canada	1 to	6
France, 1864	1 to	9
England, 1870	1 to	13
Italy	1 to	19
Russia	1 to	116

This table quoted by Mr. de Laveleye, goes to show that Canada is far from cutting a sad figure in the group of nations mentioned; it shows, on the contrary, that the province of Quebec comes second, next to Upper Canada, as far as the percentage of pupils according to population is concerned. If I lay such stress upon that part of the Chicago Fair, if I thought it my duty to deal at such a length with this question, it is that I wish to be understood that the matter of education is particularly dear to us of the province of Quebec, and that we consider education as more necessary than instruction. Now, Sir, you must understand how we look upon that question in the province of Quebec, and why we insist so much upon having a control over education. It is for us a matter of the highest importance as to which we cannot possibly make the concessions which we might, perhaps, be called upon to make. It is why we sympathize so much with the Catholic minority in Manitoba, who have been deprived of their schools since the passing of the Act of 1890. We all know, Sir, under what circumstances that law of 1890 was imposed upon the people of Manitoba. It is a well-known fact that there are among our population moderate people who have opposed it, and to whom it was repulsive. If there had been no fanaticism somewhere, one might say without fear that never would the law of 1890 have been passed, that never would the troubles we have been witnessing have happened. I find the proof of this in a speech delivered by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). That gentleman made the following statement previous to the passing of the law. This speech was delivered in 1889, at Portage la Prairie :

Do you tell me that the Equal Rights Association had nothing to do with that question? Of course, the feeling was there; the grievance existed, her people's minds had only to be directed to it, and the moment attention was drawn to it, the province of Manitoba rose as one man and said: We want no dual language, and away with separate schools as well.

This speech was delivered in 1889, as an answer to the Jesuits' Estates Bill passed by the legislature of the province of Quebec. I find that when the Manitoba school question came before the Privy Council, both sides were represented by counsel, and the hon. member for North Simcoe was counsel for the Greenway government. I also find that the hon. gentleman made the following statements at two different times, in answer to the hon. the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Ouimet). The hon. gentleman then stated that the object of the iniquitous law of 1890 was to deprive the minority in Manitoba of their French characteristics. Here is what the hon. member for North Simcoe stated before the Privy Council for Canada :

Hon. Mr. OUIMET. The restoration of separate schools would not be likely to cause much disturbance in the working of the existing school system.

Moreover, the Remedial Bill would not concern the majority in any way; therefore they are not interested in opposing it.

Mr. McCARTHY. That depends upon what you call concerning them. They may be largely concerned in having the minority identified with themselves, in having them cease to be French.

Mr. OUIMET. Therefore, the object of the Manitoba school law is to have the minority cease to be French and Catholic?

Mr. McCARTHY. Catholic, no; French, yes. * * * The object of the Manitoba legislature is to make the people of the province homogeneous. And it is a laudable object, says Mr. McCarthy, in a province where the population belongs to such various elements. The majority are interested in a process of assimilation, through which the population will cease to be French.

Hon. Mr. OUIMET. Thus one of the objects of the law of 1890 was to cause the French element to disappear?

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes.

These statements, Sir, prove what I have just stated that had we had only moderate people in this country and no fanaticism, we would not be compelled now to deal with such a thorny question, we would not be seeking a way to solve such a difficult question as that of the Manitoba schools. But I may be told that it was the legislature of Manitoba that passed the law of 1890. I admit it is not the hon. member for North Simcoe who voted that law, but I say that the speech delivered by that gentleman, in 1889, at Portage la Prairie, was the spark that kindled the fire, and surely did, as suggested to me by my hon. friend the member for Lévis (Mr. Guay), in flames, to begin with, the whole North-west, and then spread elsewhere. The hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin) is the author of this law. What did he say in this respect? His words are well known, but I will in a moment put them before the House. From the statement he made, we are bound to come to the conclusion that such a legislation was not required by the public interest of the province of Manitoba. Both these hon. gentlemen—I refer to the members for North Simcoe and Winnipeg—are opponents of the French language, as well as of Catholic teaching in our schools. The hon. member for Winnipeg uttered, in the course of a speech delivered before the Manitoba legislature, the following words, which I find reported in the Winnipeg "Tribune," under date of March 5th, 1890 :

The Government consider that they are under a very great deal of obligation to those gentlemen who had from time to time for many years past assisted in controlling and shaping the educational affairs as members of the Board of Education. Their labours, thus willingly given, had resulted in great good. The Government's action had not been determined because they were dissatisfied with the manner in which the affairs of the department are conducted under this system, but because they are dissatisfied with the system itself.

What did the hon. gentleman mean by that? It means, Sir, that the hon. gentleman is opposed to separate schools, that he is the determined opponent of the separate schools system. What he wants is a public school system, where there would be no religious teaching whatever. I think they call such schools neutral schools. That, Sir, is the statement made by the hon. gentleman. It is for this reason, and because the hon. member for Winnipeg wants nothing short of neutral schools, that is to say, schools without any religious teaching whatever, schools where no notion of God, no notion of the Christian doctrine, would be imparted to the pupils, I say the hon. member for Winnipeg has committed, through this law, the greatest possible outrage, by seeking, through such a legislation, to establish neutral schools, schools adverse to the Catholic faith. It is for the same reason that the Manitoba Catholics, as well as those of the province of Quebec, and of every other province in the Dominion, wish to protect the consciences of their children by rejecting such schools as those from which God is banished. We are opposed to neutral schools because we contend that it is not possible to have efficient schools for the education of childhood by adopting this system of so-called neutral teaching. Such a teaching could only produce, in our opinion, ill-balanced minds. And then, are they quite sure that they could establish a thoroughly neutral teaching? How is teaching imparted, Mr. Speaker? It is imparted by gestures, by signs, by the expression of the face, by reading, by writing, by copying models. This is how teaching is performed. Now, with teaching thus understood, is it possible to believe that the teacher, the preceptor, the schoolmaster could always teach without expressing an opinion? Would he be able to give lessons without having recourse to talking with his pupils during the class? And then, there would be circum-preceptor, for the schoolmaster to abstain from having an opinion. Such is our contention. We contend it is impossible for the preceptor, for the schoolmaster to abstain from giving his opinion, from making his own appreciations. Now, Sir, the appreciations of the schoolmaster are always in harmony with his personal education, closely connected with his own religious convictions, with his own ideas in matters of religion and morals. And, Sir, after thus asserting the impossibility of having an education such as they choose to call neutral, the impossibility of having such a neutral teaching, I say this system of so-called neutral schools is impossible in principle. But, Sir, I go still further and I say that, even supposing it possible, we should surely draw this conclusion, that such a teaching could not give fair results and could not be accepted. It is for this reason, Sir, that we strongly protest against such a kind of teaching, deprived of Christian notions. We cannot be of the

Mr. LACHAPPELLE.

same opinion as those who want to coerce us into committing the care of our children to the charge of teachers who have no religious opinion. Such a course, Sir, would be simply infamous.

Mr. AMYOT. (Translation.) They have legislated God away.

Mr. LACHAPPELLE. (Translation.) There is nothing extraordinary in the fact that we hold such pronounced views as to educational matters, and that we come out so strongly against the iniquitous legislation which has been imposed upon the Catholic minority in Manitoba. That is also the reason why we insist upon that minority being restored the rights and status they enjoyed previous to 1890. The Catholic minority are entitled, under the educational sections of the constitution, to separate schools where the children of that minority may receive a sound religious education. We insist upon restoring to that minority their schools in which religious instruction will be imparted to their children, under the state of things which obtained in the province from time immemorial. I find in the third volume of the history of the North-west, written by Alexander Begg, a chapter about the Catholic schools in Manitoba, in which the school question is summarized. There is in that chapter a passage which shows that there had been in existence for a long time, schools established by the missionaries, and in which children were taught in accordance with the religious tenets of the parents. That passage contains the instructions given by Bishop Plessis in 1818 to the Rev. M. Provencher and Dumoulin, missionaries:—

Missionaries will take a particular care of Christian education among children, and for this they will establish schools and catechisms in all the localities they may have occasion to visit.

In 1818, Messrs. Provencher and Dumoulin were sent to the North-west, and in obedience to the instructions issued to them, established the first school at St. Boniface. These missionaries not only had the countenance and support of the Governor General of Canada in their work, but also the confidence and aid of the Hudson's Bay Company. That they were worthy of the trust reposed in them by the representative of His Majesty the King of Great Britain may be judged by another quotation from the instructions issued to them by Bishop Plessis, as follows:—

"The missionaries will make known to the people the advantage they enjoy in remaining under the government of His Majesty; will teach them by word and example the respect and fidelity they should have for the Sovereign; will accustom them to offer to God fervent prayers for the prosperity of His Most Gracious Majesty, of his august family, and his empire."

As early as 1816, Lord Selkirk urged the Catholic church to send missionaries to Red River for the double purpose of teaching the Gospel to the people and establishing schools for the young. In 1817, His Lordship visited the settlement, and on that occasion set apart one block of land for a Catholic, and another for a Protestant school; thus countenancing and assisting denominational instruction. Indeed, Lord Selkirk, in 1817, en-

dorsed a petition to the Bishop of Quebec for a Catholic school at Red River, and it was in answer to it that Messrs. Provencher and Dumoulin were sent in 1818. In 1820, Rev. Mr. West arrived in the country, and began the work of establishing Protestant schools, and thus the separate school system was established.

Further on, I find the following resolution proposed by Sir George Simpson :

Great benefit being experienced from the benevolent and indefatigable exertions of the Catholic mission at Red River, in the welfare, and the moral and religious instruction of its numerous followers, and it being observed with much satisfaction that the influence of the mission under the direction of the Right Reverend Bishop of Juliopolis has been uniformly directed to the best interests of the settlement, and of the country at large, it is

Resolved,—That in order to mark our approbation of such laudable and disinterested conduct on the part of said missionaries, it be recommended to the Honourable Committee that a sum of £50 per annum be given towards its support.

Following in the footsteps of the Hudson's Bay Company, the Council of Assiniboia, on the 1st May, 1851, passed the following resolution :—

That £100 be granted from the public funds to be divided equally between the Bishop of Rupert's Land and the Bishop of the North-west (St. Boniface), to be applied by them at their discretion for the purpose of education.

By these and other acts, it is clear that the Earl of Selkirk, the Hudson Bay Company, and the Council of Assiniboia, each in succession, recognized the separate school system, and immediately preceding the transfer of the country, the latter was the acknowledged government in the Red River Settlement.

Thus, separate schools existed by custom, and it is a matter of regret that facts of such importance were not brought out when the case was carried in appeal and argued for the first time before the Privy Council of England. Their lordships were ignorant of that practice, when they rendered their first decision which was considered by many people as erroneous, and which gave rise to the second appeal, by which the rights of the minority were restored. The law of 1890, therefore, was unjust, and infringed the right of the minority to their separate schools. That is the reason why the case was taken to the Privy Council, by whose decision the rights of the minority have been re-established. That question was made to run the gauntlet of the judicial tribunals for five years, apparently to the utter dissatisfaction of the hon. gentlemen opposite, but in following that course, the Government only fulfilled their duty.

Several hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. LACHAPELLE. (Translation.) The hon. gentlemen always say : no, no ; they are bound to die impenitent. I say that the Government have pursued the right and proper course, in having determined by the tribunals the rights of the minority.

Mr. AMYOT. (Translation.) That is our bulwark to-day.

Mr. LACHAPELLE. (Translation.) When the hon. member for L'Islet appealed to our faith and to our patriotism—

Mr. BRODEUR. (Translation.) You have none.

Mr. LACHAPELLE. (Translation.) If we had listened to those appeals, what would have happened, had the question been introduced in Parliament, previous to its being determined by the judicial tribunals ? I am safe, I think, in stating that the hon. gentlemen opposite would have raised the same objections as now. I could easily understand such objections coming from hon. members in this House who have religious opinions and ideas in educational matters, different from ours. Had we appealed to the House, previous to having the question settled by the tribunals, the hon. gentlemen might have said : Let us first have the question determined by the tribunals, and should the issue prove favourable to our cause, we shall make a strong appeal to the majority in this House. Well, Sir, the question is set at rest, and we are now appealing to the majority in this House, and I am satisfied that—although the majority of the hon. members have different opinions from ours in educational matters—they will not hesitate, in accordance with the judgment of the Privy Council, to co-operate with us in having the constitution respected and obeyed in the far-away North-west, as in the province of Quebec. It is a matter of regret, Sir, that we should be unable to agree upon such an important issue. We had long cherished the hope that all the hon. gentlemen, irrespective of political affiliations, would sink party differences, and would, in a friendly spirit, unite in settling once for all this vexed question. I cannot help recalling to mind a period of our history similar to the present one. It was away back in 1863, under the administration of Sandfield Macdonald, at a time when the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Scott), now leader of the Opposition in the Senate, rose in the House to introduce the Separate School Bill. Now, Sir, when the hon. gentleman introduced his Bill, the Hon. John A. Macdonald, the then leader of the Opposition, did not hesitate to cross the floor of the House and to extend his co-operation to the Government whom he opposed, but with whom he thought fit to make an alliance, because, in his opinion, he held it necessary, in the interest of Canada, that both political parties should co-operate together in order to set at rest a question fraught with danger, and a fruitful source of sectarian agitation. That question, however, did not intrude itself upon the attention of the House, under the same circumstances as we now witness. When it first came up before the House, it was not backed up by a judgment which made it imperative upon the Government to follow the course they had agreed upon.

But the then leader of the Opposition, the very statesman who was to play later on such a grand role, at the head of the Conservative party, had the manliness to relegate into the background his hostility to the administration of Sandfield Macdonald, in order to set at rest a question fraught with such danger to the interests of Canada. Now, Sir, I cannot refrain from saying that we had long cherished the hope that the present leader of the Opposition would follow the noble course pursued in 1863 by Sir John A. Macdonald. We had fancied that he would accede to the invitation extended to him by the ex-Minister of Justice (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) and lend his generous and active concurrence to the Government, in order to set at rest once for all that vexed question which has proved such a fruitful source of racial and religious differences. The hon. leader of the Opposition did not deem it fit to accede to the tacit wishes of a large number of his colleagues. I am not here to judge his conduct in the matter, but time will tell whether the extraordinary attitude which he has taken will prove beneficial, both from the standpoint of the party of which he is the leader and from that of the general interests of the country, interests which all the hon. members, irrespective of party affiliations, have so much at heart to secure and to promote.

Mr. JEANNOTTE. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, if there be a subject which has been discussed to the very limit of human patience it is truly this everlasting question of the Manitoba separate schools. How many speeches have been made about it, both in the arena of Parliament and at public meetings. How many pages cast by the press to the wind of publicity? It has been said of the learned Origen that to read the works of him alone, one would require more than the ordinary life of man. To read everything that has been said and written on what we have agreed to call the school question, two Methuselahs juxtaposed—according to the original expression of a writer—would not suffice. Therefore, I have no idea of inflicting on you the detailed story of the varying phases which have marked this question any more than I have of giving you an estimate of each of them. I take my stand at once on the domain of the actual and at the very outset I think it is my duty, here and now, to warmly congratulate the Government for its noble determination to render justice to those to whom justice is due. For nearly six years, the Manitoba minority have kept their eyes fixed on Ottawa in the expectation of a remedy promised for those evils from which that minority suffer in regard to the education of their children. And although at times the firmament was covered with clouds, never has the star of hope disappeared from sight, the sweet radiance of which, with

Mr. LACHAPPELLE.

genial light, has always illuminated the heart of those who waited. That heart to-day beats more steadily because it sees that the night of oppression is fading away and the dawn of deliverance appears, because the people have confidence that the hour has struck when truth and justice will shine in the sunlight, the hour when the constitution and the holiest of causes shall triumph. And not only the Catholics of the Red River, but the Catholics all over the length and breadth of Canada, and not only all the Catholics of Canada, but all upright men, all those who are not blinded by party spirit or by fanaticism, who believe that the constitution is not a worthless parchment, but who, on the contrary, believe that it provides for the equal protection of all races and all creeds, all those I say, wait impatiently for the result of the deliberations of the national council. The Government have understood that with appeals to tolerance and to loyalty, they could not unravel the school question—a veritable Gordian-knot—and after the fashion of Alexander, they have taken the resolution to cut it with the legislative sword. Thanks then to each and every one of the hon. Ministers who preside over the destinies of the country. I applaud with pleasure the courageous act of the Ministry, who, by their Remedial Bill, constitute themselves the champions of justice, of right, and of the constitution. Yes, I am proud and happy that the Conservative party, under whose banner I have walked since I have attained the age of manhood, responds to my hopes and shows itself worthy of the great role and of the noble mission which have devolved upon it. And I have so much the more right to rejoice in the realization of my wishes inasmuch as I have not hesitated to speak my thought boldly, and even to give a hostile vote every time that the circumstances of the contest called for a protest. But I wish to pay an altogether special tribute of eulogy to the venerable old man, who with so firm a hand guides the Ministerial bark. Impartial history will record that he has had the noble courage of sinking his own preferences and his personal antipathies in order to remain faithful to his duty as guardian of the constitution, because his enlightened intelligence and his generous heart have seen what justice is and wish to do it. There are people who have a singular faculty of recognizing the merit of a man and of working to appease the discords which divide our population. Instead of the tactics of conciliation so as to bring out whatever is good in the life and actions of a man, they look for some fistfuls of mud to cast in his face. Instead of respecting the religious convictions of men, they make of them a heinous crime and so foment dissensions the gravest and most dangerous. For my part, I cannot approve of Sir Mackenzie Bowell's belonging to the Orange order. But his membership in that associa-

tion which, to be perfectly candid, has too often shown a blind and reckless zeal, only increases the admiration engendered in me by his manly conduct and by that energy which does not quail before the excitements of intolerance and of fanaticism. I do not forget that in 1863 the hon. Prime Minister who now is, canvassed, for the first time, the votes of the electors of the county of Hastings. They required from him a pledge to vote against the incorporation of religious societies and to vote for the abrogation of the laws establishing separate schools in Ontario. "This country," replied Mr. Bowell "cannot be governed according to our principles; and if I am elected in such a county as this, it will not be by taking such engagements as you demand from me." And he was defeated. He was defeated for having proclaimed the principle of liberty and of equal rights for all races and for all creeds. Ever since Sir Mackenzie Bowell has not departed from that way. He has, on the contrary, emphasized his frank and resolute attitude. Therefore it is that all Catholics and all good citizens mindful of the rights of others have noted with pleasure the declaration made by him in the Senate on the 22nd April, 1895:

I hope sincerely with the mover and seconder of the Address that the people of Manitoba may see their way clear to settle this question among themselves, and to relieve the Parliament of Canada from the serious obligation which will devolve upon them otherwise. It is a very serious matter for the Government of the Dominion to undertake to deal with a question which affects solely any one section of the country. If the people of Manitoba are patriots they will keep this question out of the arena of Dominion politics, but if they desire to continue flinging fire-brands among the electorate of this country (who I am sure are desirous of living in peace and harmony), if they reject all overtures and act upon the suggestions of those who are leading the Opposition throughout the country, I can only say that when the time comes, if it should come, for action by this Government, the people of Canada will find that the present Administration are quite prepared to assume the responsibility which may fall upon them, no matter what the results may be.

To-day the Government of which he of whom I have just spoken is the leader undertake to worthily crown the work which despite appearances of doubt and passing hesitation they have steadily pursued. I must thank and congratulate the Government. In everything that concerns the Remedial Bill, they may rely on the loyal support of all men of order, friends of true liberty, of the equality of all before the constitution, of conciliation, and of peace. The congratulations and the thanks which I have just addressed to the Government and to their respected heads, I would I could extend them also to all the hon. members of this House. I regret to state, Mr. Speaker, that there are here men who have done all in their power to hinder and delay the

definite settlement of the Manitoba separate school question. Among these men some are opposed to all intervention of the central power, others effect, it is true, to lean to a contrary teaching, but they strive to attain the same result, by suggesting means which constitute a veritable lure, an open mockery. They first proclaim themselves defenders of the provincial autonomy which they allege is attacked by the federal authority. In the name of provincial rights, they adjure the Government to halt and not to lay their hands upon I know not what ark of the covenant. Certainly provincial autonomy and provincial rights should be respected, but the very constitution which the provinces have accepted and under which we are all living should not be trailed and trampled on. Therefore, the interference of the federal power in educational matters, the protection due by them to provincial minorities, all that is provided for, settled, regulated, by our Constitutional Charter, and far from being a culpable encroachment, this interference exercised within the limits of the law is nothing but the fulfilment of an imperative duty. Moreover, these provincial rights of which we hear so much are not the exclusive property of the majority; they belong also and by the selfsame title to the minority. If, then, a majority impelled whether by fanaticism, by hatred, or by any other motive take upon themselves by force of numbers to crush a minority whose rights are guaranteed by the constitution, surely it is this majority who attack provincial rights. And if the central authority interferences to protect a minority attacked in their provincial rights, all they do is to maintain the latter in their integrity and not to wound them. Behold, Mr. Speaker, what logic and common sense force us to admit. Ah! if less formal declarations left us no doubt of the real dispositions of our adversaries we would easily have the better of them in argument. But what animates their acts is not the love of national institutions, the desire of safe-guarding the principles of the constitution which governs us, no, it is hatred of everything that is Catholic and French Canadian. The hon. member for North Simcoe acting as counsel for the Government of Manitoba before the Council of Federal Ministers acknowledged that the Catholic minority of Manitoba had grievances; but he is vehemently opposed to every measure which can give them redress. The hon. gentleman went much farther and while he was in a vein of freedom, he unveiled the goal which they wished to attain by means of the school law of 1890. He established, by statistics, that the Catholic population of Manitoba, is but a feeble fraction of the total population. The hon. Mr. Ouimet replied to him:

Hon. Mr. OUIMET. The legislation would not concern the majority in any way?

Mr. McCARTHY. That depends upon what you call concerning them. If the majority are concerned in having the Catholics identified with themselves, if they are concerned in having these Catholics cease to be French and English.

Hon. Mr. OUMET. Would that be the object?

Mr. McCARTHY. Undoubtedly, I think that would be a great object, and I think the object.

Hon. Mr. OUMET. That they may cease to remain French and Catholic?

Mr. McCARTHY. Let them remain Catholic, but not French.

All that is very clear, is it not? Nevertheless, the hon. member did not push his frankness to the very end, and very vainly he concealed his real thought behind a big falsehood, by pretending that the aim of the school law was not to Protestantize Catholics. If, in reality, it were sought mere to anglicize Canadians of the French race they would have been contented with the law abolishing the teaching of the French language in the schools and its official use in the Government. By abolishing the Catholic schools they simply wished to make a Protestant proselytizing. If the hon. member for North Simcoe had dared to tell the whole truth, he would have repeated what so many of the ultra-Protestant organs have long since declared: "We wish Canada to be a British and Protestant country." We know all that. That is not precisely a new thing. That is the system of politics inaugurated by the conquerors the morning after the cession of Canada, although the French Canadians were then only six thousand and although they had then but a single bishop whom the British government refused to recognize. This style of politics has not been always affirmed brutally as it was under the Military government, but it has never varied. All of which, however, has not hindered the French race and Catholicity from growing and propagating. Despite the emigration of our people to the United States, the French Canadians, whom they are so anxious to make real English people of, are to-day nearly two millions in Canada, all as French as on the first day of the English domination, and the Catholics have thirty-one dioceses or apostolic prefectures. Such is the result of persecution whether open or concealed. If our enemies imagine that they can at last accomplish what so many others before them have failed in, they are very naive. Let them well understand, Mr. Speaker, that the French Canadians will remain as they are. The fusion of races in this country is a chimerical dream: there is not a sensible man who can reasonably entertain the idea of it. This is what Sir George Etienne Cartier thought of the matter:

The fusion of the races into a single one is a utopia; it is an impossibility. Distinctions of this kind will always exist; diversity seems to be a trait of the physical, moral and religious order.

Mr. JEANNOTTE.

There is only one means of making peace reign between the races, and that is to leave upon the beautiful soil of our Dominion the two races to develop and grow side by side in full liberty guaranteed by the laws which do not prevent any person from exercising his rights and the duty of well-doing. It is not indispensable to speak only English and to be Protestant in order to be a loyal subject of Her Britannic Majesty, and to be a good citizen. We are British subjects by cession and not by conquest, and for that reason we have a right to the civil and religious liberty promised to us by treaty. French Canadians ask in this country the place which is their due, no more; and when they insist on the maintenance of Catholic schools in Manitoba, it is not a favour which they are soliciting but a right which they demand for their brethren. All that they desire for themselves and for those yonder is the liberty of clearing the soil watered by the sweat and by the blood of their ancestors, to speak the beautiful French language, to practice the consoling and divine Catholic religion, and to live peaceably and honestly in the midst of their fellow-citizens of foreign origin. Certainly nobody will deny that the Catholics of Manitoba have the incontestable right of being treated by the Protestants in the same manner as these last are treated in the Catholic province of Québec. What, then, have the French Canadians done, Mr. Speaker, to be the object of the concentrated rage of a certain number of their English and Protestant fellow-citizens? Of what black treasons, of what execrable crimes, have they rendered themselves guilty, to be treated in confederation as if they were scabby sheep? Have they ever failed in loyalty towards the institutions granted to them? Listen to the testimony of a man whose name still loudly resounds in this country. Speaking at the banquet given in Ottawa in honour of the delegates from England and from the different colonies, at the time of the Intercolonial Conference, Sir John Thomppson exclaimed:

I would fail in my duty were I to let this occasion pass by without publicly rendering homage to the loyalty of French Canadians. Had it not been for the devotedness, the heroism, the loyalty of the French race in this country, there would be no Canada to-day. True to their faith, faithful and loyal to their princes, they laid the foundation of civilization in all the different parts of America. From the shores of the Atlantic to those of the Pacific, their footprints are marked by heroic and genial works, and there is no race in the world can boast of a nobler and more glorious past. The finest pages of our history are those which relate the patriotism and the loyalty of French Canadians.

And I will add with a celebrated orator of my own race:

We have neither numbers nor strength, nor influence, nor riches; nor as a French nationality the province of Quebec is still but a little child.

But if they wish to tear from him the treaties which protect us, if they wish to throw to the winds of heaven the constitution that defines our rights, if, in fine, they are going to submit to a decisive test our faith, our patriotism, and our national aspirations, they will see this little child take on the proportions of a giant. * * *

"The guard is dead and does not surrender," said a brave commander on a celebrated field of battle, but our cry will be more potent, for we shall say, "The French Canadian does not surrender, and he is not dead." Never shall this be read upon a tomb-stone: "Here lies the last French-Canadian!"

Mr. Speaker, I signalized at the commencement of my speech, the presence in this House, of men who, to settle the thorny school question have only the expedients of mountebanks and a policy of deceit. I wish to speak of the famous project of investigation of the hon. leader of the Opposition and his followers. The plank of salvation of the Manitoba minority would be, according to them, an investigation. But why this investigation? Is it to establish that the actual schools of Manitoba are Protestant? The proof of that has been made on many occasions, and the hon. member for Winnipeg, author of the school law, has admitted that they are. Let us suppose, however, that such a proof has never been made. For what good purpose try to make it? That is not the question at all. The question—the sole question—of facts prior to an investigation of the right of the Manitoba minority—is to know if before 1890, that minority had Catholic schools, and if since, on account of the new laws, that minority has lost them. Well, if the hon. leader of the Opposition, an advocate; if the hon. leader of the Opposition, a public man of thirty years experience; if the hon. leader of the Opposition directing a great party, has not been able for six years, taking the two laws, that of 1890 and that which preceded it, to discover on comparison of them, that the Catholics of Manitoba have been despoiled of schools which they enjoyed and which they had controlled for twenty years, then he is not worthy of the high position that he holds in Canadian politics. Well, then, let the hon. gentleman in all good faith take the last judgment of the Privy Council and he will find decided in it not only this question of fact, but also the question of right. And although that judgment does not go so far as to indicate to the Federal Government how it ought to proceed—a very useless thing indeed, since the constitution declares it in plain letters—it nevertheless separately mentions a minimum of grievances calling for remedial legislation. The question of fact and the question of right are established by that judgment; what need of more? Must we recommence a season of disputing which has been only too prolonged already? Must the Catholics of the west suffer still troubles and sacrifices which have marked the past five years? Justice and imprescriptible rights demand a more prompt solution. And let us

suppose the investigation were made, would we be any nearer a solution? To be convinced of the contrary, it is only necessary to reflect that Mr. Greenway himself demands an investigation. And he demands it not with a view of inquiry into the grievances of the minority but to withdraw himself from such an inquiry; not with the thought of doing justice later on—he forbears carefully from saying that—but to put the Catholics on the bench of defendants; not with the view of bringing about an equitable settlement, but to render permanent the order of things now established; not to repair but to consummate injustice; not to mark his respect for the constitution, but to justify his violation of it; not to obey the judgment of the Privy Council and the mandate of Her Majesty, but to quibble about one and the other and to frustrate both. Such are the intentions so often manifested, and he says as much formally, notably in his reply to the Orders in Council of March, 1895, and December of the same year, as well as in the Speech from the Throne which he has just put into the mouth of the Lieutenant-Governor of Manitoba at the opening of the session of the provincial legislature. This is the manoeuvre of a guilty fellow who seeks to escape from trouble by back doors without offering to his victims any satisfaction other than splashes. Do we see gleaming anywhere in the distance at the close of such an investigation, a ray of justice for the Catholic minority in Manitoba, should the result of such investigation be favourable to them? There is not even a hint of a promise nor the least indication to that effect. Those who are unwilling to bow to the final judgment of the Privy Council, would submit still less to a simple commission. If such a report was favourable to them, they would post it everywhere in big letters. But if it were the contrary, they would tear it to pieces, or they would tell it to go to the devil, in default of other jurisdiction. Every kind of after-thought flutters around this proposal. It is a subterfuge, a piece of party tactics, a means of putting off the solution of the school question until the Greek Kalends, and, consequently, it is out of the question. That the hon. leader of the Opposition should make himself an accomplice of Greenway and Sifton, is a complaisance which, to say the least, lowers him in the eyes of his contemporaries, and which in history will cast a thick shadow over his reputation. Now it may be asked of me how it happens that the hon. leader of the Opposition, a French Canadian, a Catholic, refuses to aid the Government in the efforts which it is making to do justice to the Catholic minority of Manitoba. The answer seems to me easy enough. It is because the abolition of the Catholic schools and the beautiful French language is the work of his political friends and receives the general approval of the Liberals; it is because the

Liberals have not changed their programme. Such as they were in 1855, in 1863, when they voted for the abolition of Catholic schools and the establishment of godless schools, such they are still to-day. The Liberal party having no principles, and consequently, no settled, well-defined, policy, sees no other way to climb into power but by stirring up questions of race and religion. Wretched politics this which consists in sowing the wind in the hope that the whirlwind will bear them into power! Ah! well, Mr. Speaker, have we not just assisted at a very sad spectacle which should suffice to convince us that the proposal of the leader of the Opposition is not only a huge mockery, but that it is also an act of cowardice? In effect, we have just seen persons who reciprocally detest one another, our most implacable enemies, hugging each other before a public meeting held recently in Toronto, and denouncing, with fanatical hatred, the Remedial Bill re-establishing separate schools. And what is still more painful is that among the orators of this assembly there were some who said that they were authorized to speak with the consent of the leader of the Opposition. Let me here open a parenthesis: The ground of this assembly should represent a very original tableau in which different colours mixed and formed a curious blending. The ex-Controller of Customs represented the bright yellow orange; the member for North Simcoe the light yellow, mixed with blue and pale red; the member for Winnipeg, scarlet; the member for North York, the fixed yellow red; the member for East Durham, the dull orange blue; the member for East York, the "dyed-in-the-wool" yellow blue. With such men as these whom I have just mentioned and their compeers, who declare themselves in favour of an investigation, have we not reason to say with the poet, "Timeo Danaos et dona ferentes?" I fear fanatics even when they speak of equal justice for Catholics in the near future. I can only regret the obstinate blindness of the hon. leader of the Opposition, who thinks himself, doubtless, in good company with such members to seize the reins of power. The concert of these men may rejoice Liberals without alarming Conservatives. History repeats itself, that is all. For ever since political parties existed here it has always been the same thing. Those Conservatives who are unwilling to respect either law, or constitution, or treaties, or the word of honour, and who trample upon these great principles of the natural law, "live honestly, render to every man his own, and do unto others as you would wish others to do unto you." All such, I say, are not in their place in the great Conservative party. And so they go out of it, one after another, to enter the ranks of the Liberals, where they are always sure of a welcome, and where they

Mr. JEANNOTTE.

find themselves perfectly at home. This it is which explains the tender harmony existing between the member for L'Islet, the member for North Simcoe, the ex-Controller of Customs, the member for Winnipeg, and the member for Quebec East. Their rallying cry is always the same: "No separate schools"; the same cry which they uttered when they abolished separate schools in the provinces of New Brunswick, of Nova Scotia, and of Prince Edward Island. Permit me, Mr. Speaker, to note the inconsistency of the member for North Simcoe, and of some others of the "noble thirteen" who are still in this House. I mean to speak of the Jesuits' Estates question. The legislature of Quebec had just made a tardy restitution; it was well within the limits of its jurisdiction, it had done wrong to no person, and the parties directly interested had accepted the settlement which was offered to them in discharge of their just and legitimate claims. Who could have believed that men who wished to be taken seriously when they speak of the autonomy of the provinces, as did the hon. member for North Simcoe and his friends, would have been able in this case to blame the Federal Government for not having intervened to disallow this Act based upon justice, equity, honour, and the natural law, "render to every man his own." And to-day, when there is question of a law contrary to equity, to justice, and in direct violation of the constitution, and in contempt of treaties, and of solemn covenants, we see these same members, supported by the hon. leader of the Opposition, by the member for L'Islet and their friends, rising and protesting against the just act of the central power, tending to the redress of the evils and of the general unrest caused by the conduct of the Liberal legislature of the province of Manitoba, conduct at once unworthy and ultra vires. It is enough to mention the fact to be satisfied as to the motives animating the conduct of these gentlemen. The hon. leader of the Opposition commenced his speech on the project of the Remedial Bill by pretending that the Act was not mandatory enough: that the Greenway Liberal government would never be willing to submit to it, and that thus it would be useless; that coercive law never did any good. Probably he was alluding to the school law of 1890. For I know of nothing more coercive than the laws which abolished Catholic schools in Manitoba; which stole Catholic school-houses and Catholic money, and forced Catholics themselves to pay taxes for the maintenance of Protestant schools which they cannot frequent without violating their consciences. Surely, if that is not the most pronounced coercion, we must change the meaning of the words. The hon. leader of the Opposition has also repeated what he has been saying for more than five years; he has, I repeat, reproach-

ed the Government with not having made an inquiry into the causes which have brought about the abolition of separate schools in Manitoba, then to the general surprise of this House and of the country, he finishes by proposing the six months' hoist of the Remedial Bill without giving any reason whatever, valid, serious, and worthy of the leader of a party. He proposes neither more nor less than that the school question should receive the honours of a first-class funeral. What then has become of the fine promises and the public engagements of the leader of the Opposition and of his followers? If the law, in the opinion of the member for Quebec East, is insufficient to do justice to the minority oppressed by the Liberals of Manitoba, the friends of the Liberals of this House, there is only one thing to be done and that is to propose amendments or another law according to his own views and not to run away by a hidden door. One of the reasons given by the hon. leader of the Opposition for opposing the Remedial Bill, is that the Parliament of Manitoba had not been made a party to the inquiry before the committee of the Federal Privy Council. The hon. gentleman who is a lawyer, cannot be taken seriously. This objection is too silly to be invoked in a cause based ever so little on common sense. For those who are lawyers it is a fact known and undeniable that the plaintiff, as the petitioner, must rest his plea either upon right, or upon the common law, or upon facts. On whom does the burden of proof lie? On the plaintiff or petitioner, that is an elementary fact, and the defendant has nothing to do but to say: prove your case. If the plaintiff does not prove the facts alleged in his plea, it is dismissed without the defendant's having produced a single witness, for there is no proof to disprove. If on the contrary the plea is based only on right, on law, no proof is necessary, because then it is a question of knowing if the plaintiff or the defendant has transgressed the law or has well or ill-construed the law which should govern their case. When the plaintiff refuses to make an inquiry, it is because his plea on its very face, in his opinion, bears a proof *prima facie* of the solid foundation of his claims. Then it is a very great advantage for the opposite party since it has only to say: you have proven nothing. This is exactly what happened in the case with which we are dealing. Mr. Ewart, the advocate of the Manitoba minority, not having wished to enter into a proof, having the confidence which every honest man naturally has that the victory cannot be doubtful, when he defends a person persecuted and tyrannized over in violation of all law and of all justice. There at last we know the great secret which the hon. leader of the Opposition has been hawking about for over five years in all parts of the country and which should, as if by the stroke of a fairy's wand, re-estab-

lish Catholics in the enjoyment of their legitimate and sacred rights. The secret is very simple, and certainly did not deserve to be kept so long under a bushel. Here it is: it is to abandon the Catholic minority to its wretched lot and to leave it alone to the mercy of a hostile majority which has no other end in view than to render its life impossible. If this great secret had been disclosed before the elections in Verchères, Montreal Centre, Jacques Cartier, and Charlevoix, the result would have been quite different. The success of the Liberals was due only to the colossal fraud perpetrated by them. In every one of these elections the Liberal speakers and candidates asseverated with so much persistence that the Conservatives would never bring down the Remedial Bill, because the Prime Minister was an Orangeman, but that the Liberals having at their head a French Canadian Catholic, that the Liberals alone were capable of settling and would settle the school question in such a manner as to render justice full and complete to the Catholics of Manitoba. These things have been said and repeated so many times and with the aplomb which the Liberals alone know how to put in them that the electors ended by believing them. Before going further, I desire to speak of a very delicate subject which I would have preferred to pass over in silence, but since the hon. leader of the Opposition has wished, without any sufficient cause, to complain of a letter which a venerated and a venerable member of the clergy had privately written to him, I believe it my duty to give my opinion. The letter in question was written to a friend by a friend, exposing to him his views if a Remedial Bill were submitted to the House, expressing the desire of seeing him support it, and showing him the danger to which he would be exposed in combatting this law. It was one friend who was warning another, and we know that a man warned is worth two. Far from finding cause of complaint in the conduct of this good missionary, I see in it only a friendly service; it is a disinterested fellow countryman who sees the danger and who wishes to forewarn his friend of it, and the member for Quebec East has no reason to exclaim about threats and undue influence. Therefore, I regret infinitely the inconsiderate, unseasonable, and hysterical attacks of a certain section of the press against that which we have been accustomed to love, to pay court to, to respect, and to venerate. Who can forget the eminent services rendered by the Catholic clergy, which no other person would have been able to render to our fellow-countrymen when they were abandoned by those who had been accustomed to direct them, to conduct them? Who hindered Canadians from accepting the alluring offers of the Americans if it be not the clergy by causing the French Canadians to learn the short catechism? It is thence that

they drew these grand principles, the putting of which in practice suffices to render nations happy: "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself for the love of God." "Thou shalt live honestly, thou shalt pardon the offences which have been committed against thee, and thou shalt return good for evil." It is with these great principles which are learned in our schools that the Catholic clergy brought French Canadians to remain faithful to England, to not take vengeance on the English who so unjustly and so brutally maltreated them, and to be faithful and loyal subjects of the British Crown. I do not hesitate to say that if the ex-Controller of Customs and some of his friends had learned the short catechism, they would find themselves the better of it, as well as would those who are obliged to meet them in the transactions of life. It is only corrupt or ill-formed hearts that are without gratitude. Mr. Speaker, the priest's mission is grand, noble, and divine: it can be summed up as follows:—To remove men from sin, to cause them to practice the good, to lead virtuous lives, and to conduct them to heaven. For us Catholics who have the advantage of knowing the immense amount of good which our clergy do daily and the signal services which they render in all the situations of life, one would need to be an ingrate or a very evilly disposed person to belittle those whom we should hold in the highest esteem. Moreover, no person will dare to maintain that the priest who is an educated Canadian, intelligent and disinterested, so far as political parties are concerned, has not as much patriotism, as much knowledge of the true interests and of the affairs of the country as the first individual who hardly knows how to read and who, nevertheless, has the right to talk politics, to vote, to be elected, and to come to this House to make laws for the good conduct of the electors, the well-being of the country. I protest energetically against these unjustifiable attacks, and I make it a glory and an honour to walk under the fatherly, friendly direction of the ecclesiastical authorities, certain as I am that they will teach me nothing but what is right, for our clergy well know their short catechism, which I recall to myself still with a very genuine satisfaction. Walking side by side with the hon. leader of the Opposition, and indeed hand in hand is to be found the hon. member for L'Islet, the valiant lieutenant. The conduct of this hon. gentleman is a real puzzle: "Close your eyes," say the "Canard," with humour, "take two turns to the right and two turns to the left, and you will have the right to a subscription to the "Canard," if you can tell what is the position of Mr. Tarte upon the school question." Having passionately preached the policy of disallowance and having incessantly reproached the Government for what he called its policy of delays, the hon. member for L'Islet has finally discovered that the Government was going too

Mr. JEANNOTTE.

fast * * * * * no coercion, and disavowal. What is that, if not the most radical of coercions? No delays! and this commission of inquiry which, like his leader, the hon. member demands, is not this the open door to new delays and new procrastinations? Admire, Mr. Speaker, the suppleness of the hon. member's backbone, and with what astonishing ease he turns his breeches inside out! In 1892, when the cause of the Manitoba minority was lost in the first instance, before the Privy Council of England, and when the hon. member for Provencher, hardly believing in the possibility of succeeding in a new suit, proposed an investigation as the last means of saving the situation, the hon. member for L'Islet did not wish to hear mention made of this investigation. "To name a Committee of the House," he wrote in the "Cultivateur," "to inquire into the circumstances which accompanied the passing of the Manitoba Act," this is what the member for Provencher suggests. Who does not know these circumstances? Do not the official documents contain the history of them as clear as complete?

Instead of demanding justice, Mr. LaRivière does the business of the Ontario fanatics, by taking the means of burying the question.

The hon. member for L'Islet then traced the way to be followed:

The constitution is formal; it belongs to the Governor General in Council to take the initiative, to decide and to communicate his decision to the Manitoba Cabinet and to demand of it to do justice. If that Cabinet refuses, then, and then only, commences the right of interference and of action by the Parliament of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, has not the Government followed this programme to the letter? But he, the hon. member, what is he doing to-day? He denounces the line of conduct of which but lately he demanded the adoption. If this was a subterfuge in 1892 to speak of an investigation when the tribunals had decided against the Manitoba minority, what must we think of the manœuvres of the hon. member enrolling himself now against Federal intervention and holding the same language which he condemned so energetically four years ago? If ever a like proposition had been put forward with the view of burying the question out of sight and doing the work of fanatics—according to the expression of the hon. gentleman—it is truly in the present instance. Not content with having deserted the cause of the Manitoba Catholics, his brethren by blood and by faith, the hon. member for L'Islet has publicly denounced the system of education of the province of Quebec and has seen fit to cast discredit upon the Canadian hierarchy and clergy. Nevertheless, this is the same gentleman who wrote in "Le Canadien," under date of the 28th of June, 1871:

Let us rally around our clergy and let us fight as men of faith know how to fight. It is at such a cost only that we shall save our society.

And again :

The day when the sympathies and the approval of the clergy shall be withdrawn from us will be that of our retreat from public life. If it is ever found that we are incapable of worthily defending the church we shall pass on to others the so weighty burden that circumstances have imposed on us.

Mr. Speaker, parliamentary language has no expressions strong enough to justly qualify the attitude of the hon. member for L'Islet. I can do no better than to here let one of the principal journals of my province speak for me :

Behold the odious role which Mr. Tarte is playing in Parliament. Not content with betraying a sacred cause, that of the Catholics of Manitoba, he takes a place in the ranks of radicals and joins his voice to that of the rouge newspapers to proclaim what he calls the rights of "free citizens" in matters of religion. These are the doctrines which Voltaire and his disciples preached. Continue, Mr. Tarte; your name will go down to posterity graven in letters of gold in the aurore.

But this is enough to show the inanity or rather the iniquity of the opposition to the remedial measure which has been submitted for the approval of the representatives of the people. I do not doubt that it will be adopted by this House by a large majority. I do not doubt that good sense and a spirit of justice will prevail in the councils of the nation, and that the Catholics of the west will obtain the legitimate power of having their separate schools. And to dissipate, if that be possible, all the prejudices which people may be able to have against the rights of my compatriots and co-religionists in Manitoba. I request, Mr. Speaker, that I may be allowed to read the very beautiful letter which the Rev. Robert Kerr, an Anglican clergyman at St. Catharines, Ont., addressed, under date of the 8th of March, 1895, to the "Mail and Empire," upon the school question. The Rev. Mr. Kerr among other things, says :

In order to state the question as clearly and as simply as possible, I may say that the Protestants in Manitoba have apparently come to the conclusion that the less religion is taught in the schools the better it is for them; and if it is better for them, it is necessarily so for everybody. It is evident that they wanted to force the minority to accept under the guise of religious teaching a kind of "olla-podrida." * * * They style that school folly a "national system," and the legislature passes coercive Acts in order to force everybody to accept that system. The minority contend that they have natural and constitutional rights which have been infringed by that godless legislation. They contend further that if Protestants are satisfied with this diminution which goes the length of destroying all religious teaching, such a course is not lawful for Catholics, who cannot in conscience divest themselves of the trust conferred on them by God as to the proper education of their children.

All the actual school difficulty, Mr. Speaker, comes from a false principle too universally

diffused. Behold this false principle: the education of children is a political function, a business which belongs to the State, a thing which the Government should organize, direct, control. Against this false principle it is proper to apply the true doctrine which can be thus formulated: by the natural law, the education and the intellectual and moral training of the child belong exclusively to the parents, in the exercise of this natural law, which no human power can take from them, in the accomplishment of this duty from which no human power can dispense them. Catholic parents should be submissive to the high direction of the church, and non-Catholic parents should act according to the lights which they have received, but in either case the State cannot take the place of the parents in the work of education. The role of the State, in matters of education should be limited to the protection of the school, just as it protects the family itself, to help to facilitate the work of education and to repress the flagrant attacks against the natural law. This I do not fear to affirm, Mr. Speaker, is the true educational teaching. For Catholics it does not admit of doubt. And I am glad to find also a clear statement of this doctrine in the important journals of our separated brethren. The "Citizen," in the course of the month of August, 1895, has this to say on the subject :

It should not be lost sight of that the State, properly speaking, has no right to interfere with the control which parents have over the education of their children. * * * The privilege and the duty of educating children naturally belong to the parents. As a matter of fact, the strong Conservative opinion which impels men like Goldwin Smith to antagonize gratuitous popular instruction is that, while freeing the parents from the responsibility of educating their children, the State invades in an unwarrantable manner the domain of domestic authority.

What conclusion must be drawn from what precedes, Mr. Speaker? It is that we must leave the Catholic minority of Manitoba to educate their children as they understand that duty. But, it will be said, nothing hinders the existence of voluntary schools in Manitoba. Yes, something hinders it: it is the crying injustice of the law which taxes the minority for the maintenance of a system of schools which this minority cannot make use of without doing violence to its religious beliefs. When they have paid their quota for the maintenance of public schools, people have not always the means wished for to found and keep up voluntary schools. And even if these means were forthcoming, the people would be no less the victim of a grave injustice when it is forced to pay twice for the same service. It is then in all equity needful that liberty of education which no longer exists in Manitoba be re-established there. Such is the goal to which the project of law now before

this House tends. No doubt this Bill is not perfect—that I know. Still, in order that it receive my sincere support, it is enough for me that it safeguards the great principle of separate schools, which, as I have just said, is the consecration of the natural rights of parents in the education and the intellectual and moral training of their children, to the exclusion of any human power, and that it is accepted by the parties whom it most especially affects. I have no doubt that the House will be disposed to amend the Bill and to do away with certain sections in it which are not to be commended. It is time for men of good-will to take their stand on the side of the Government, to silence party spirit, to show uprightness, and to do their duty. "Do what you should, let the consequences be what they may," says an old French adage. Let this fine maxim but animate the resolutions and the acts of hon. members of this House, and the people will reward them for it. The people love manly acts, firm attitudes and strong resolutions. It admires men of character, those who know how to rise above vulgar prejudices, to listen only to the great voice of patriotism. "Patriotism well understood," as Cartier has said, "is that which does not fight with a spirit of fanaticism, but which, while safeguarding what it loves, wishes also that the neighbour be no more molested than oneself." "Joined one to another as the branches of a great tree," will I cry in concluding, with one of the most celebrated French Canadian tribunes, "the different races who live in Canada should accept this being bound for the whole of their existence, which circumstances rather than their will have imposed on them; they ought to be nourished from the same sap, and our soil is rich enough to furnish them abundantly with it. And since the one is forced to renounce the hope of reigning upon the ruins of another, they ought always to unite in a sympathetic manner, with a noble and generous openness, and work in harmony to assure the destiny which Providence lays up for us. The general interest of Canada, which is our common country, ought to dominate the interests of caste; we should not forget, we, the inhabitants of this country, called to found a great nation, that if we are French, English, Scotch or Irish, we are also Canadians; and that this title can suffice for our pride as it ought to satisfy our legitimate ambition. We are descended from the strongest races of the world, and we are called, not to perpetuate on this continent antiquated hatreds, but to build up here a great nation, whose destinies are glorious, in the designs of Providence."

Mr. CAMPBELL moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

Mr. JEANNOTTE.

Mr. IVES moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 2 a.m. (Wednesday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 11th March, 1896.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

CANADIAN CATTLE IN GREAT BRITAIN.

Mr. DAVIN. Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to ask the attention of the House to a matter that is of great importance to the North-west Territories and to Canada generally, and if necessary, to put myself in order, I will conclude with a motion. In to-day's "Citizen" there appears a despatch from Montreal, dated March 10th, which is as follows:—

A special cable to the "Star" says: Mr. J. G. Colmer, temporarily in charge of the Canadian High Commissioner's office here, with the approval of Dr. Montague, Canadian Minister of Agriculture, has submitted a strong despatch to the Colonial Office against the permanent exclusion of cattle proposed in the bill. On behalf of the Canadian Government, Messrs. Colmer and Montague will interview the Right Hon. Joseph Chamberlain on Thursday. The exclusion bill is delayed in the Commons, and it is suggested that the Canadian House of Commons pass a strong resolution against it. The Liberal Opposition in the Imperial Commons and that of the press increases on the ground that the step is an infraction of free trade principles.

This is a subject, Mr. Speaker, that has occupied the attention of the House time and again, and it is a subject that has occupied the serious and fruitful attention of the hon. baronet who now leads the House, when he occupied a high position in London. It seems to me, Sir, and it has struck other gentlemen interested in this question, that the suggestion contained in that telegram, and which appears to come from a Minister of the Crown, should be acted upon. If it were practicable, I should have put a motion on the paper to the following effect—which, of course, is not the motion with which I intend to conclude. But, if this motion should strike the House favourably, there can be no difficulty in having it passed in time to have due influence in London; or, if it should strike the Government favourably, then I will leave it in their hands. This is the motion that I suggest we ought to pass:

That, in the opinion of this House, the scheduling of Canadian cattle at the ports of Great

Britain is a harsh proceeding, seeing that Canadian cattle, though free from pleuro-pneumonia, are thus not only shut out from Great Britain, but also from the countries which are alarmed by the action of the Imperial authorities; and is detrimental to Imperial interests. That the passing of an Act of Parliament looking to such exclusion of Canadian cattle as a permanent policy is to be deprecated on every ground of fairness and sound commercial principles, and is contrary to the large and varied interests of the colonies and the mother country, considered as an Imperial whole."

Mr. Speaker, it is not necessary for me to dwell on the importance of doing all in our power, to, if possible, divert the Imperial Government from the course that it is now about to take. It was a very bad thing to have our cattle scheduled, but if an Act of the Imperial Parliament is to be passed, and it is to be made a permanent policy to exclude Canadian cattle, then it will be still more serious. I am, of course, in the hands of the House. If the House was willing to suspend the Standing Orders, instead of moving the adjournment of the House, I would move the motion I have read, and if the House is not prepared to do that, then I will leave the matter in the hands of the Government. I conclude, Sir, with moving the adjournment of the House.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) that this is a very important matter, and I may say that when this Bill was introduced in the Imperial Parliament the Government instructed Mr. Colmer, secretary of the High Commissioner's office in London, in conjunction with Dr. Montague, the Minister of Agriculture, to enter the strongest possible protest against the proposed legislation, and against the grounds upon which it was based. They were instructed to state that so far as Canada was concerned, it could scarcely be disputed by anybody that the evidence was entirely conclusive that pleuro-pneumonia had never existed and does not now exist in Canada. I would suggest to my hon. friend that as this matter is a very important one, and is now being carefully considered by the Government, he should for the present leave it in that position, as it is quite possible we may feel it our duty to call the attention of the House to some such measure as is suggested.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, it is well that the attention of the House should be drawn to this matter by my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Davin); but it is a pity that action taken by the Government in the meantime should have done so much to justify the exclusion of our cattle from the British market, and to tie our hands in applying for the removal of that exclusion. Not long before the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Montague) left for Great Britain, he had obtained the passage of an Order in Council allowing United States cattle to be shipped from the port of St. John to Great Britain. He

had done so on the statement made by himself, that it appeared to be hopeless, now, to obtain the removal of the scheduling of Canadian cattle, and that he thought therefore it was unnecessary to continue any longer the precautions which we had been observing to prevent our cattle being tainted with pleuro-pneumonia. In effect, the argument was that, as our cattle were scheduled at any rate, our steamboat lines and railways might as well as not have the privilege of carrying United States cattle to the old country.

That was a very peculiar line of policy from the farmers' point of view, to begin with. It authorized subsidized lines to carry United States cattle in competition with Canadian cattle. But, so far as the present subject is concerned, I have only to speak of its effect upon the request that Canadian cattle should not be excluded from Great Britain. I say that that act of the Government, allowing cattle from the justly suspected United States, to go by Canadian lines to England, has done a great deal to weaken our case, when we ask that the exclusion be removed. It is a very peculiar thing that the same Minister of Agriculture who obtained the passage of that Order in Council, here, should now be applying to the home government to remove the exclusion for which his own action has given grounds that never existed before in the history of our cattle export trade.

The recurrence of this question at this moment calls our special attention to the inconvenience of our not having a High Commissioner in London. We have, it seems, a clerk there in charge of the High Commissioner's office. It may be that this clerk is quite as efficient for all purposes as the High Commissioner himself would have been; it may be that he has been in the habit of performing all the duties of that office; but certainly it does not lie in the mouths of the Government or their friends to make that assertion. It must be admitted, therefore, from a Government point of view, that it is extremely inconvenient to have the gentleman who is nominally High Commissioner in London, sitting in this House as Secretary of State. The commission under which the High Commissioner is appointed makes it his duty to attend to all matters of this kind, and a number of other matters to which I shall not call the attention of the House just now, because I shall have a further opportunity of showing the inconvenience of having a High Commissioner who is not a High Commissioner.

The hon. High Commissioner who sits in this House as Secretary of State has told us that he has called the attention of the secretary of the High Commissioner's office to the matter, and has instructed him in conjunction with the Minister of Agriculture to protest. I have shown the House that the position of the Minister of Agri-

culture in the matter is vastly weakened by the action he himself adopted before he left these shores. The House will also admit that the action of the clerk in the office cannot be nearly so effective as the action of the High Commissioner himself. After all the blunders that have been made in connection with this cattle trade, after the Government have given up in despair the hope of obtaining the removal of the scheduling of Canadian cattle, it still seems to me possible that something might be done by united effort on the part of this House. If the obnoxious Order in Council allowing suspected United States cattle to be shipped by Canadian lines, were withdrawn, and if the Government would obtain a vote of this House, based on evidence laid before it, and setting forth the undoubted fact that Canadian cattle are not infected, and would renew their promise to exclude United States cattle from all danger of infecting our own, I do not believe yet that it is impossible to get rid of this obstacle in the way of our trade.

We have one fact in our favour, Sir, as shown by the reports in the old country press. We have the fact that the Liberal party in Great Britain oppose this Exclusion Bill as being a piece of protective policy. With their assistance, and with the assistance of action on the part of this House, which I think should be solicited and carried through by the Government. I have hopes that something may yet be done to obtain that entry into the United Kingdom for our cattle which they undoubtedly deserve on the grounds of their health. The High Commissioner, I think, would be more usefully employed here in promoting this expression of opinion, and in promoting action on the part of the Canadian Government, which would lead to this result, than in promoting private Bill legislation, with the promotion of which he was also concerned on the other side of the water. I do not think the House needs to be reminded of the Bill to which I refer.

An hon. MEMBER. Name.

Mr. CASEY. The name is the Chignecto Marine Transport Railway Bill, which this House dealt with the other day. Hoping that action will be taken in the line suggested by the hon. member for Assiniboia, I leave the matter with the Government.

Mr. SPROULE. Mr. Speaker, in agreeing to second the motion made by the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), I did so after a hurried consultation with my hon. friend when we agreed that provided the House would assent to it, the resolution which has been read would be moved. I regard it as a matter of the utmost importance that action should be immediately taken on this subject. It was not with any disposition to forestall a declaration of what the Government might propose to do that this motion is made, but because we had not

Mr. CASEY.

an opportunity of consulting them after we saw the intimation in the papers that the subject was under serious discussion. We believed the matter was of such vital importance that the House would readily consent to the passage of such a resolution unanimously, so that it might come with the greatest force to those parties who are looking after our interests over there. I do not agree with the hon. gentleman who has just sat down, that there has been any dereliction of duty on the part of the Government, or that there have been blunders made from which resulted the scheduling of our cattle. It is quite plain to any one who has kept track of the history of the case, from the first time the embargo was placed on, in 1892, to the present, that the Government cannot fairly lie under any such charge. But at present there is a very strong feeling in the country that great injustice is being done Canada by England. We used to enjoy the English market for our live cattle, but upon the plea, in 1892, that our cattle were affected with pleuro-pneumonia, they were scheduled. In every possible way our Government have made efforts to prove conclusively to the British Board of Agriculture and Parliament that pleuro-pneumonia did not exist in Canada, but without success. I intend to recapitulate very briefly a few of the efforts made. In 1892, when the cases of pleuro-pneumonia were said to have been found on board the "Hurons" and "Monkseaton," we endeavoured to demonstrate in the following ways the absence of pleuro-pneumonia in Canada: 1. By the examination of the herds from which these cattle came. They were traced directly back to the herds out of which the cattle were purchased, and the fact was conclusively established that there was no evidence of the existence of pleuro-pneumonia or other contagious disease in those herds or any other cattle found in the district. 2. The examination of herds of cattle all over the country by competent veterinary surgeons and the demonstration that we had no contagious diseases of that nature in our cattle. 3. The examination of cattle slaughtered at the abattoirs in the large cities and towns of this country. They were slaughtered by hundreds and thousands, and yet no evidence of this disease was found. 4. We had an inquiry by cattle dealers and purchasers of cattle in every part of the country where they were buying; and when the returns came in, there was no evidence of disease. 5. We had an examination of the live cattle shipped at the port of Montreal in 1894. Out of 99,606, only 140 were rejected. Of these 67 were rejected for actinomycosis or lump jaw; 51 lame, 15 too lean for shipment. There was no evidence whatever of either pleuro-pneumonia or other infectious disease among them. 6. We had the slaughter at the ports of landing in England of 193,860 head in 1892, and of that large number only two cases were selected as showing any evidence whatever

of diseases. It was said that in these two there were some signs of something apparently resembling pleuro-pneumonia, but this was not by any means successfully proven. That was reported by Mr. Gardner and assessors. 7. As many as 1,493,145 head of cattle were shipped from Canada between 1880 and 1892, the date of the first scheduling; and in all these, no case of pleuro-pneumonia or other contagious disease was discovered. The injury that is being done Canada to-day is not confined to the injury of our trade with Great Britain. That of itself is bad enough, but the injury is also, as the hon. member for Assiniboia has said, much wider than that, because the scheduling has resulted in other countries imposing the same embargo on Canadian cattle, on the plea that England has done so after full and fair inquiry. That is an injustice we ought not to suffer under at present. The proposal now to pass a Bill to permanently prohibit the importation of live animals, if based on the assumption that disease exists in cattle imported from Canada, is most unfair, ungenerous, and unjust to Canada. If the proposed legislation is intended to protect the British farmer, as a line of protection, then we cannot reasonably complain; but if it is intended for the other purpose, it is very unfair and ungenerous to Canada. I hope the Government will take up the question at the earliest possible moment and endeavour, as far as possible, to show the British Parliament that the unanimous opinion of this House and people is that the British Parliament will act most unjustifiably in passing any such law, if they pass it on the ground that our cattle are infected with pleuro-pneumonia or other infectious disease, and that there is danger of their carrying such infection into England.

Mr. McMULLEN. I agree with the hon. gentleman that our herds in Canada are free from pleuro-pneumonia, but I most decidedly dissent from his proposition that the Government are entirely free from blame for the exclusion of our cattle from England. Why, time and again, on the floor of this House, the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) has shown most clearly and distinctly to any unbiassed mind that the loose manner in which the Government handled the trade of the export of cattle from the United States through Canada was what led up to the scheduling of our cattle in England. I am amazed to find the hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Sproule) reiterate the same statements that he has made before, in the face of the positive undeniable evidence, which has been frequently adduced to show that the absolute neglect of the Government is the cause of the existing condition of things. Will any man dare to deny that the binding bargain, the honourable contract entered into with the Crown of England that no cattle would

be admitted into Canada, unless on certain stipulated conditions, was openly violated by the admission of thousands of cattle into the North-west from the United States? The hon. Minister of Agriculture tried, on a previous occasion, to evade the direct charge made by my hon. friend from North York, by raising the question that those cattle, which were brought in from the United States, had been brought in from states that were not afflicted by pleuro-pneumonia. No one dares to say that they were or were not, but that is no answer to the charge. We can say that the English government drew the attention of the Canadian Government to the fact that pleuro-pneumonia did exist in the United States, and that it would be well and prudent for the Canadian Government to watch most vigilantly the export of American cattle through or into Canadian territory in order to discover if any of the herds were diseased. But the Government did not take the warning. They did nothing. For six months that remonstrance lay in one of the pigeon-holes of the Agriculture Department without a single effort being made, and yet we have men who will state in this House that the Government are free from any blame. I am amazed to find that a man will dare to stand up in this House and repeat and reiterate such statements, in the face of the positive evidence that has been produced to the contrary from time to time. Sir, at the door of hon. gentlemen opposite lies the responsibility. Had this been a matter affecting the interests of the sugar refiners or of the cotton weavers of this Dominion, the united efforts of the whole Cabinet would have been brought to bear to secure for them the advantages they wanted to enjoy. But now that a question affecting the agriculturists of the Dominion demands immediate and prompt attention, impotency appears to have struck every man of the Cabinet. They are unable to do anything. They do not move, but allow anything to happen, no matter what it is, exhibiting the utmost indifference. But they hope they will be able to mislead and deceive the farmers into believing that their interests are being attended to. What do we see to-day? The hon. Secretary of State and leader of this House stated a few moments ago that a message had been sent to Mr. Colmer, the secretary of the High Commissioner's office in London, to formulate a remonstrance and present it to the Cabinet in England to try to secure an escape from the permanent scheduling of our cattle by the British authorities. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, that the whole ability of the Cabinet, limited as it may be, has not been concentrated upon this important question, and that a despatch embodying the remonstrance for presentation to the British Cabinet has not been prepared, and Mr. Colmer merely made the bearer of that remonstrance, instead of leaving it to an offi-

cial of the High Commissioner the grave responsibility of preparing that remonstrance. Again we are told that the Minister of Agriculture is in England. If we understood aright, that hon. gentleman left here to seek health. He was supposed to be a man suffering under illness for whom complete rest was absolutely necessary, and he went to London, no doubt, for the purpose of seeking medical advice. I would like to know if in such a grave juncture as this our affairs in this important matter are to be left to an underling of the High Commissioner's office and a sick man. I would like to know if the Minister of Agriculture is in a position efficiently to perform the very responsible duty of remonstrating with the Cabinet of Great Britain with regard to this very grave question. If when the Government issued their remedial order to Manitoba, the High Commissioner had remained in England and secured a remedial order that would permit our cattle to enter the English market, it would have been a matter well worth his personal attention; and it would have been a great relief to the stock-raisers of this country if this had been done. But from time to time difficulties have arisen to prevent the farmers of Canada from enjoying the advantages they formerly enjoyed in this market. To-day we are face to face with a proposal in the British Parliament to make permanent the exclusion of our cattle from the English market, and the whole responsibility of remonstrating with the Cabinet in England on that point is allowed to rest upon an underling of the High Commissioner's department and a sick man who has gone to England for his health. The Government have not formulated and cabled any remonstrance. The Secretary of State does not dare to say that he has done so. Though we have seventeen Ministers, instead of calling them together and uniting their influence and brain power, whatever it may amount to, and getting up a well-prepared remonstrance to the English Cabinet in the interests of the farmers, practically nothing has been done. Well, Sir, we express regret on behalf of the farmers of this country. The hon. leader of the House may possibly escape here the condemnation that his mismanagement deserves. But he must distinctly understand, and every member of the Cabinet must distinctly understand, that we shall endeavour to enlighten the country as to the neglect of the Cabinet in this matter.

Mr. McSHANE. I am very glad indeed, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member for Abyssinia, or Assiniboia, or whatever it is (Mr. Davin), has brought this matter up, and I desire to say a word or two upon it, with the permission of the House. I attended a meeting of the Agricultural Committee a few days ago at which the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule) presided. At that meeting Prof. Robertson introduced a proposal that the Government of this country

Mr. McMULLEN.

should spend \$300,000 in order to ship dead meat from this country to England, and showed in glowing terms on paper the great profit that would be realized in this trade. In fact, one example that he gave went to show that some \$15 or \$16 more per head could be made by slaughtering cattle in Canada and exporting the meat than by exporting the live animals. I do not know how he could have figured that out. We know that, unfortunately for the farmers, unfortunately for those who deal in cattle and export cattle, and unfortunately for the whole Dominion, England has closed her market against the cattle exported from Canada. Recently this House declared by unanimous resolution that Canada was loyal to Great Britain, and was ready, if necessary, to take up arms in defence of the Empire. It is unfortunate that such an important industry which is so likely to assist in strengthening the trade relations between England and Canada should be thus destroyed. Let me say to you, Mr. Speaker, that the loss to this country can be hardly known. Take the case of Chicago, where many houses, including the millionaires Armour, Swift and others have been for years engaged in exporting beef. We all know that to that great centre of Chicago from all parts of the western country come hundreds and thousands of animals every week. Beef cattle are sold there for from 1½ cents to 4 cents and 5 cents a pound live weight. We know that the men who export beef not only are millionaires, but that they are in with every great railway monopoly in that country, and they can export their beef or their live animals from the furthest part west through New York or Boston, almost as cheaply as you can send animals from Toronto to Montreal. These men are now giving up the dead meat export, so unprofitable is it, and are exporting live animals instead. I do not reproach the hon. gentleman who did us the honour to represent us as High Commissioner for the Dominion of Canada. No doubt he tried to do his best. I have had great trust in the gentleman appointed by this Government to inspect the animals at Montreal—Dr. McEachren. That gentleman has frequently stated, and I know well myself, that there does not exist any disease in cattle in this country. I think this Parliament cannot express itself too strongly in telling Mr. Chamberlain, the Colonial Secretary, that if he expects Canada to be faithful to England, we want fair play, we want justice, and we want nothing more. I believe this trouble has been caused by English politicians and perhaps by farmers who have not made as much money out of their cattle as they wished, owing to the immense amount of meat which comes into England from Brazil, from Australia, and from other parts of the world, and for which modern improvements afford great facilities by enabling shippers to keep dead meat in good condition perhaps two or three months,

so that they can put it upon the market as fresh as if it were slaughtered the day before. I must say that this scheme of the Government to ship dead meat from Canada, will fail, and they might just as well throw their money into the broad Atlantic. I wish that the hon. Secretary of State, who was performing the duties of High Commissioner for the Dominion of Canada in England, had remained there in order to settle this important question, because this business of cattle exportation is the life of this country. The export of cattle was only in its infancy when this trouble arose. I saw lately that Mr. Armour, of Chicago, had secured a large contract of some millions of dollars with the British Government for canned meats; and in view of the importance of this business, I hope the Government will bring every possible influence to bear on Mr. Chamberlain in order to obtain justice for Canadian exporters and Canadian farmers. We want such arrangements with the British Government as that our cattle can be disembarked at an English port, and driven from one place to another, and then the farmers of this country will get back again that which has been taken from them. This is a matter which specially interests the farmers, and the farmers' representatives in this House should look after it. I have great respect for the honest farmers of Canada. I have dealt with them for twenty-five or thirty years, and I say that the farmers are honest men. I know that there are some hon. gentlemen in this House who have led the farmers to believe that the merchants in the cities try to hurt them. Sir, when the farmers prosper, the city merchants prosper, and the poor men everywhere will prosper. I am glad that the hon. gentleman who brought this matter before the House has given me this opportunity of expressing again my hope that the Government will take such measures as will enable our cattle to be shipped alive to England as they were before.

Mr. McMILLAN. A good deal has been said with respect to the action of the Government in this matter, and I must say that there is not the least doubt that a certain amount of blame is to be attached to the Government. Two years ago I asked whether cattle had been allowed to come into Canada from the United States, upon inspection only, and the Minister of Finance rose in his place and stated that strict quarantine regulations had been enforced. But when the leader of the Opposition got up and asked him how long the strict regulations had been in force, my question having been put and answered upon a Monday, his reply was that the Order in Council was passed upon the preceding Saturday, and the strict regulations were only enforced from that day; so that after all, United States cattle had been allowed to come across. I wish to re-

mind the Government that the matter came up lately in the British House of Commons, and the question being put whether they intended to allow Canadian cattle to enter the British market again, I see that Mr. Chamberlain, the Colonial Secretary, answered that the matter was under the consideration of the government. Now, Mr. Speaker, I consider this is an opportune time, if the Government wish to do anything on behalf of the farmers of this country, to send just as strong a remonstrance to the British Government as they possibly can. It is not alone by the British Government that our cattle have been scheduled, for in consequence of that action we find that Belgium and France have also scheduled our cattle. I think a few were allowed to go into France last year. Those are markets that we could have cultivated with great benefit to Canada. It is true that there is a scheme on foot to spend \$300,000 in buying Canadian cattle and slaughtering them for export; but I must say, as one deeply interested in this cattle trade, that it is more to the interest of Canadian farmers that British ports should be open to our live cattle than that the Government should spend any amount of money in sending dead meat to that market. From my knowledge I am convinced that we will get better profits from our cattle when they go in alive than if they were sent in slaughtered. The statement has been made time and again that our cattle shrink in crossing the ocean. I admit that in a stormy passage cattle will shrink; but I have shipped cattle during the last eight years, and only once during that period have I known cattle to suffer in a vessel shipped from Montreal to the old country. It is when cattle are carried in cars to Montreal that they suffer the greatest hardship. In crossing the ocean in an ordinary vessel, I have found cattle to gain on the voyage from Montreal to the old country. I say it is of more importance for us to get the British markets open for our live cattle than it is for this Government to take up the dead meat trade; and I am convinced if they take it up, it will end in disaster, as almost every other scheme they have gone into in the interest of the farmers. Last summer I watched the markets closely, we made five or six shipments to the old country, and I am convinced we came out better than if we had sent dressed meat there. I am altogether opposed to the Government entering into the business of a common trader, and purchasing cattle in the country and exporting them to the British market. The statements that have been made to us with respect to the prices of dressed meat in the British market, do not give a fair representation of the true state of things. I procured lately a report of this trade for the last ten years, both in dressed meat and in live meat, and I can say that the live animal trade will yield the most benefit to the farmers of this country. I believe it would be in the interest of this country that

some strong private corporation should go into the business of slaughtering cattle and exporting the meat; but even in that case, I believe it is the duty of the Government to send as strong a remonstrance as they can to the British Government. I do not see why it should be left to the secretary in the office of the High Commissioner to send a remonstrance; if that is the only remonstrance that is sent, Parliament being in session, it will appear that this Government and this Parliament take very little interest in the matter. It is to be remembered that we are on the eve of a general election, and I believe that this dead meat scheme of the Government is got up for the purpose of hoodwinking the farmers. But if the Government will take this matter up and deal with it in the manner I have suggested, they will be conferring upon the farmers a lasting benefit.

Mr. LISTER. It is hardly necessary to say, that the question now before the House is one of vital importance to farmers in western Ontario. Of all parts of the Dominion, with the exception of the North-west, and I will say, even including the North-west, Ontario is the largest exporter of live cattle. Anything and everything that it is possible for the Government to do to enhance the price to the farmers of these products, would, of course, benefit the farming community. To-day, the price of live cattle is lower than it has been during the last fifteen years, notwithstanding the National Policy, notwithstanding the fact, that we have had a High Commissioner, or ought to have had one, in London, during all that time. I repeat, that the price in Ontario and in Canada is less to-day than it was fifteen years ago. This is one of the largest interests in the whole Dominion. It overshadows the manufacturing industry, so far as exports are concerned, it overshadows almost every other industry, for, if you take the Trade and Navigation Returns, we find that the value of the exports of live cattle is almost fabulous. A very small reduction represents in the aggregate an enormous sum, because, as the member for Montreal (Mr. McShane) has eloquently told the House, unless the farmers are in a prosperous condition, it is impossible that the merchants and the rest of the community can be prosperous, the prosperity of the farmers being the foundation stone of all prosperity in this Dominion. One cannot shut one's eyes to the fact, that the position occupied by the Secretary of State to-day is a most anomalous one. This country thought it would be in the interest of Canada that there should be a representative in Great Britain, and that a gentleman should be sent there to look after our trade and commercial interests. The present Secretary of State some years ago was appointed to that high position; and yet we find him abandoning the interests of this great country at the most

Mr. McMILLAN.

critical time in its history, for, if there ever was any work to be done by the High Commissioner during the last ten years, the time is now. He abandoned his position and came to Canada, for the purpose of doing—what? Why, for the purpose of saving the most rotten political Government that ever governed a country. Sir, he came here for the purpose of saving the Conservative party. The then Prime Minister, the Finance Minister and all these men with extraordinary abilities that are to be found in the Cabinet, are mere nothings, so to speak; the Government and the party would have drifted on the rocks and be stranded and wrecked, but for the appearance of the High Commissioner on the scene, so they think. Time will tell whether the presence of the High Commissioner will save the ships from drifting on the rocks and being wrecked. At this time the High Commissioner is found in Parliament, when he ought to be in London. That is where he should be, that is where the people expect him to be, watching the interests of Canada at this critical period and looking after the cattle trade, upon which the prosperity of Canada so much depends. We find the hon. gentleman here, instead of being in London; he is quietly seated in an arm-chair in this House, directing the fortunes of the Conservative party here and in the country.

An hon. MEMBER. Second in command.

Mr. LISTER. Yes. We were told, when the hon. gentleman went to England as High Commissioner, that great things were to be accomplished. He was to help our people, his actions were to increase the trade of the country, great things, I say, were to be accomplished. We gave him a princely salary; we furnished him with a palace; we paid the taxes and all expenses, even down to the smallest amounts, and we expected to receive compensating advantages. What have those advantages been? We know, that a few years ago there rang through the Conservative press of this country reports of what the hon. gentleman had done for this country. A car-load of cattle was sent over to England. The animals were quarantined, they were slaughtered for pleuropneumonia. The papers told us, that our High Commissioner, with that courage which characterizes him, at once took the train and went to the place; that he pulled off his coat, rolled up his sleeves, and stuck his hands down into the lungs of the animals, to see if there was anything wrong. There was nothing wrong with them. Who is to do that work now? I will venture to say, that the secretary of the department, with his trousers turned up above his boots, will not pull off his coat and shove his hands down into the lungs of animals to see if there is anything wrong. No, Canada is not represented as it should be. Who is to negotiate with the British Government? Do you suppose that Joseph Chamberlain will

receive the secretary of the hon. gentleman's department? No, Joseph Chamberlain's secretary will probably receive that secretary. He will have a right to say: Where is your High Commissioner? What is he doing over in Canada? Why is he not here, looking after the interests of the Canadian people and promoting this great trade and preventing enormous injury being done to the people of the country? What answer is there to be made, what answer can the Government make, when the people consider that the High Commissioner should be at his post in London, and not sitting in an easy chair in the Parliament of Canada? Surely, there are men in Parliament who can lead the party, who can help to govern the country in a sort of way, and it is doubtful whether the hon. gentleman will help in that direction or not. The hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule) does not like this embargo business. He does not see that it is one species of protection. It is all right to add 100 per cent on importations, but it is all wrong to do something else. I have no hesitation in saying, and I believe I utter the exact truth, that there is no pleuro-pneumonia in this country from one end to the other; but I believe, at the instance of the British farmer, the Government have had to yield, and, while they would not impose an import tax, they passed a regulation which amounts to the same thing, as it practically prevents the importation of cattle into that country. The hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule) may take a lesson. That is one species of protection; another is distance; another is attacks on whatever is imported. The Government, as the hon. member for York (Mr. Mulock) has stated, over and over again, and has proved, were derelict in their duty; they were as neglectful of the interests of the farmers as any persons could be. They entered into an agreement with the British Government, and then they wantonly violated it, as I distinctly assert here. This gave Great Britain an opportunity, whether they were justified in taking advantage of it or not, of breaking the contract with us, and saying: We cannot trust you, and we insist on the regulations which we now have in force, and which, no doubt, seriously interfere with the live stock trade of Canada. Why, Sir, the carrying out of the regulations was a delusion. It was the merest pretense, and England was looking for something to justify regulations which would prevent, or diminish, at all events, the importation of live stock into that country. Why, Mr. Speaker, in 1891 these gentlemen opposite travelled through the country from one end of it to the other, and they told the farmers of Canada: If you let these Grits be elected, and if you defeat us, your cattle will be scheduled within one month after the election. In my county, and in every other county, the threat rang out to the farmers, that the result of the defeat of the Conservative Gov-

ernment would be the scheduling of Canadian cattle. These gentlemen opposite said to the farmers: Return us to power, and the same privileges which you have to-day will be continued to you. Sir, they were returned to power. They were returned upon the cry of reciprocity, they were returned upon the fears of a portion of the electorate, but shortly after they were returned, we find that the English Government did not think that they were such great fellows, after all, because within three months quarantine regulations and other regulations were instituted by the English Government, which had the effect of diminishing our cattle trade with England. And, while these hon. gentlemen opposite professed to be the friends of the farmers, they had other considerations behind them. They bonused and subsidized steamers from St. John and other places. They propose to subsidize a line of steamers from Great Britain at \$750,000 a year, for the purpose of carrying the products of Canada to that country. Perhaps, if they were severe in carrying out the regulations, the railways of this country might not get the American travel, because we were told by the member for St. John (Mr. Hazen), that the cattle shipped from the port of St. John are principally American cattle. We have subsidized these steamers to carry, not Canadian cattle, but the cattle of our neighbours to the south. The railways of the country and the steamships of the country, are a consideration with the Government, and the influences behind these great corporations may be stronger than the Government are able to resist. Mr. Speaker, I think that the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) is entitled to the thanks of the country for bringing this matter before the attention of the House. It is, as I said in the opening of my remarks, a matter of the most vital importance to the farming classes, and to all other classes of this country.

Mr. MULOCK. Mr. Speaker, I entirely concur in the last remark of my hon. friend (Mr. Lister), that this is a matter of very great importance, and if Parliament can, in any way, strengthen the hands of the Administration, whereby the Imperial Government may be induced to again throw her markets open to Canadian cattle, we will be doing a good service. Now, there are two reasons assigned to the public for the maintenance of the embargo. One of these is the suggestion, by the supporters of the Government, that the embargo is a measure of protection, and that the English Government have resorted to this measure in order to protect the English farmers. It is said by these hon. gentlemen, that the English Government have been simply carrying on a fraudulent deception, in pretending that our cattle are in any way diseased. I am not here to discuss that feature of the question. I hope that the contention that our cattle are free from disease, is founded in fact. I am

not, as I say, here to defend the action of the Imperial Government, when it has been charged on the floor of this House with resorting to a course of conduct that would be most discreditable to any Administration. Sir, I question if any member of this House in a responsible position, would care to assert in England that successive Governments there had done this without evidence, and for the purpose of going against the settled policy of free trade in that country. But, if it should be the case, that the scheduling of our cattle in England is maintained in the interests of the English farmer, on the principle of protection, in what position are the Canadian people, who have adopted the principle themselves, when they approach the English Government and ask them not to treat us in the same manner as we are treating them. We have directly invited protection from the English Government towards us. We have closed our markets largely against English manufactures. How can we complain, then, if England chooses to give us some of our own medicine? But, Sir, suppose that we abandon that idea. I have too high an opinion of the English people; I have too high an opinion of the honour of the English statesmen; I have too high an opinion of their sense of fair-play; I have too high an opinion of their courage, to believe that there would be found public opinion, either within or without the Parliament of England, that would warrant the English Parliament or the English Government in resorting to a cowardly, underhand, and dishonest course, in order to accomplish such a measure of protection as is here suggested.

Sir, without going, for a moment, into the cause of this embargo, and taking it as an existing fact, as we find it, I will tell the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) now the proper step which he should take, in order to get it removed. And, Sir, I will tell him upon evidence that he will find in the Department of Agriculture, I will detail to him the evidence that was given to the High Commissioner himself, in London, in his own office. In the year 1893, in the month of June or July, the English Government, through the Colonial Office, communicated to us the first step that we should take, in order to get the removal of this embargo, and when I mention the matter, I am sure that the Secretary of State (Sir Charles Tupper) will be reminded of the fact. In a record which is bound up among the records of our own department, and among the Imperial records, as well, they said: We have established an embargo because, under the provisions of the Contagious Diseases Act of England, evidence has been given to us that satisfies us, that Canada is not a country free from disease. That was the finding of their experts, and it gave no option at that moment to the Government to do anything but schedule Canada. They scheduled Canada, and they made a report in June or July,

Mr. MULOCK.

1893, saying: The first step for you to take in Canada in order to have the scheduling removed, is to adopt a certain course. I do not pretend to give all the details, but the character of them is as follows:—"Let the Canadian Government establish throughout Canada a system of examination of all herds in which they think there is disease, or a chance of disease. Let them go further; let them slaughter certain cattle; let them take an average of the slaughtered cattle; let them send over to the English experts, portions of the lungs of any animals that may be suspected; let them adopt a certain course of action, such as is suggested in the report; and if, after a period, we are satisfied that the cattle of Canada are in a healthy condition, this course will go a long way towards convincing us that we ought to remove the embargo." That report was presented to the High Commissioner's Department in July, 1893. Now, I am going to ask the Secretary of State, or any member of the Government, this question—and I want a categorical answer, if I may be considered entitled to it: Has the Canadian Government, from that time to this, adopted the course asked for by the English Government? I understand that the Bill alluded to, that has been introduced into the English Parliament by Sir John Leng, provides for the permanent exclusion of Canadian cattle.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Not Sir John Leng, but Mr. Long. Sir John Leng is the other way; he is resisting it.

Mr. MULOCK. Very well. On the 4th of November, 1894, Sir John Leng, being extremely anxious for the removal of the embargo, wrote the Hon. Herbert Gardner, then President of the Board of Agriculture, asking him whether or not the embargo would be removed, what progress was being made, and generally for information on the subject. That letter was written seventeen or eighteen months after the Imperial Government had asked the Canadian Government to adopt a certain course. The Hon. Herbert Gardner replied to the following effect: "In June, 1893, being desirous of assisting in the elucidation of the truth, with a view to the removal of this embargo if Canadian cattle were in a good state of health, my department suggested in writing what course was necessary as a first step to that end. That communication was placed within reach of the Canadian Government at once; and, although eighteen months have elapsed, I have to tell you that the Canadian Government have not, up to this moment, taken the first step to comply with the reasonable request of the Department of Agriculture." Now, I want to know from the hon. Secretary of State whether, since the 4th of November, 1894, when that letter was written, either he or the Government have done anything to comply with the request of the Imperial Government.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I may say to the hon. gentleman that the difficulty in carrying out the suggestion of the Department of Agriculture was this: They proposed that we should do in this country what, under the law, the Board of Agriculture do in England, that is to say: wherever pleuro-pneumonia is suspected, and there is reason to believe it would attack a herd, they slaughter it out, and the Government pay the parties who own the cattle their value. They asked us, wherever there was suspicion of pleuro-pneumonia in this country, to slaughter out the herd in the same way as was done in England, and the answer given by the Government of Canada and by myself was that as pleuro-pneumonia had never existed and did not now exist, and as no suspicion of pleuro-pneumonia could be detected in Canada, it was impossible to carry out the suggestion they had made.

Mr. MULOCK. I am aware that the hon. gentleman did send an answer of the character he states. That answer was sent very shortly after the issue of the Imperial order or request, and it was not accepted as a satisfactory reply. If the hon. Secretary of State will refresh his memory upon the matter, he will find that the communication did not require the slaughtering of all herds that might be suspected. It required certain precautionary measures to be adopted, certain inquiries to be made, and reports to be sent to the authorities in England; and after eighteen months, Mr. Gardner, with such an answer before him, stated, on the 4th of November, 1894, that that answer was not the proper answer, that it did not meet the requirements of the English Government, that their request was a reasonable one, and that it must be met as a first step towards satisfying them. He assured the people of England, in a letter to Sir John Leng, of the bona fides of his department. He maintained, rightly or wrongly, that their court of inquiry had correctly found the facts.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The veterinary surgeons' department.

Mr. MULOCK. Yes. He submitted the findings of the veterinarians to a court composed of men of high standing and of unimpeachable integrity; and a large number of witnesses—learned men from the learned institutions, bacteriologists who stand at the head of their professions—were subpoenaed to give evidence; and, as a result of their evidence, rightly or wrongly, the court confirmed the report of the veterinary surgeons, and found against the Secretary of State. Am I not right in my statement as to the finding of the board?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Quite correct.

Mr. MULOCK. So that that finding, whether right or wrong, was a serious and deliberate finding, and was confirmed by sub-

sequent inquiry. It is idle for us, in the face of that finding, to say to the English Government: "Your experts, your veterinarians, are all wrong, and that is an unfounded report." That has been the attitude of the Canadian Government, instead of trying to get the embargo removed by complying with the reasonable request of the Department of Agriculture, and giving the President of the Board of Agriculture a justification for its removal. How could he, as a representative of the people, ignore the finding of the report, except upon our being able to prove that whatever may have been the state of affairs at that time, it had changed. At the same time, we could have asserted that if the facts were such as were reported, those were isolated cases, and such a state of affairs existed no longer. If our Government would simply take the case presented to them, instead of saying that the court was all wrong, and would comply with the request of the English Government. I think my hon. friend would find that would be the first step towards the removal of the embargo. Now, I trust that in what I have said, I have helped to guide the Government aright. I do not believe that you will succeed in a course which really asserts that the English Government, all these years, have been doing an injustice. It is against human nature to suppose that the English Government will, at our assertion, recede from its position—a position which has cost the people of Canada a very large sum. The embargo has been enforced four seasons, and we have lost during that time directly probably four million dollars. I hear that Prof. Robertson has said that there would be a profit of \$16 per head on a fat bullock, slaughtered and dressed in Montreal and shipped to England, instead of shipping the live stock to England without an embargo. If Prof. Robertson has said this, then there is a very serious conflict of testimony between him and the late Deputy Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Lowe). In the report of the latter, you will find that, writing to the Grand Trunk Railway Company, informing them that the Government had received an intimation from the English Government that pleuro-pneumonia existed in the western states, he said: We trust you will adopt all precautions to prevent any laxity in connection with the transit trade, which might afford a justification for the imposition of an embargo on Canadian cattle. This was a letter from Mr. Lowe to Sir Joseph Hickson, the then manager of the Grand Trunk Railway. Mr. Lowe added that if an embargo were imposed, it would remain imposed for a sequel,—that is the word he used—and that it meant a loss of at least a penny a pound—he did not say live or dead weight, but take the most favourable view and say dead weight—on every head of cattle sent to England and slaughtered at the point of landing. Everybody who is engaged in the

shipping trade knows that whether the loss be a penny a pound or not, there is very considerable loss. It was that loss which urged the Government to make energetic efforts, which urged the High Commissioner (Sir Charles Tupper) to do everything possible to obtain a removal of the embargo. If there were not a loss, why all these efforts to remove the embargo? A short time ago I had an interview with a shipper of cattle, and he gave me this illustration. He said, there are two markets on the Thames where cattle are sold. One of them is the market for Canadian and American cattle, which have to be slaughtered within ten days of their landing. The other is the market where cattle from England and Ireland are brought for sale. You can go to the Canadian market and buy a beast there for several pounds according to the weight, £4 or £5 per head, less than you would have to pay for the same beast raised in England or Ireland and sold in the other market, only a couple of miles away on the Thames, simply because the butchers who purchase the Canadian beasts have to slaughter them at once, whereas the butchers who purchase the English fed cattle can take them into the interior and keep them until they require to slaughter them. How does Mr. Lowe's statement coincide with that of Prof. Robertson, who is supposed to be advising the Government with regard to its parental course in becoming butchers and dealers in live stock, butter and cheese. There is no doubt that this embargo is causing us a direct loss of at least \$10 a head, which is not more than half what Mr. Lowe put it at; or on 100,000 head, which we export to England per year, that loss amounts to at least one million dollars. In addition to that, it discourages export and depresses business in Canadian markets. The result is it not only causes our farmers to lose the full value of the English market but it also deprives them of the full value of the Canadian market as well. I shall not enter into any details as to the cause of this unfortunate condition of things to-day; but I would tell the hon. Secretary of State (Sir Charles Tupper) this, because I have no doubt he is anxious to have the embargo removed. I have never been able to get a proper hearing from the Administration on these points; and I may give the hon. gentleman another point which I trust he will take into consideration, because it is necessary for the Government to obtain a variation of the engagement with England on this other point or we will not get the schedule removed. If I might suggest to the hon. gentleman, without being open to a charge of egotism, an admirable source for correct information, I would refer him to an address which I delivered on this question in this House in July, 1894, in which he will find set out at length the agreement under which the British Government promised not to schedule Canadian cattle, and which agreement has never yet been varied by the Imperial authorities. One

Mr. MULOCK.

of the terms of that agreement is that no American cattle are to be allowed into Canada at all except in transit, and then under certain conditions. And by way of parenthesis—for this does not concern the Secretary of State at this moment,—let me say in answer to the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) who asserted that that agreement had never been violated, that it was violated from the very start. If the hon. gentleman will take the trouble to turn up the reports in the Department of Agriculture, he will find that, from year to year, after that agreement the Canadian Government allowed the American cattle to come into Canada from the western states, uninspected, not quarantined, entirely untrammelled by any regulations or restrictions of any kind. The figures in the department show that cattle came in from the American states to Manitoba and the Territories to the enormous number of at least 50,000, which were never quarantined nor inspected but allowed at once to enter our country and mingle with our herds. The hon. gentleman will find that there never was an Order in Council passed taking the most elementary precaution for protecting Canadian herds in all those years. To quote again the language of the late Deputy Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Lowe), he said that, so far as the importation of American cattle into Canada was concerned, for many years there was untrammelled importation. Since then the department have from time to time, I think, tried to quarantine American cattle, but that will not meet the case because the agreement, which is a condition of England not scheduling Canada, and which will stand in our way if we ask the English authorities to remove the scheduling, says not only shall there be no untrammelled importation, but there shall be no importation at all. The words are "total prohibition." There is to be total prohibition of American cattle coming into Canada, except in transit. Although this matter has been before Parliament for a long while, I do not find that any member of the Government has ever yet given to the country the statement that the agreement to which I refer has been modified by the British Government. I tell the hon. Secretary of State, because I know he is not yet familiar with the history of this transaction, that one of the great mistakes of his department was this. I will tell the Secretary of State one of the great mistakes that his Government has made. He will find that, instead of the Canadian Government recognizing the terms of the agreement to which I have alluded, they proceeded to pass an Order in Council, framed in a very different way, ignoring the stringent provisions assented to by the English Government, and suggesting and adopting others instead. But the Canadian Order in Council had no effect whatever upon the bargain. It was never assented to by the English Government, it never con-

trolled that Government, and it was either laxity, oversight, or bad faith, choose as you may—at all events, it allowed the trade to be conducted at our peril, so that when the incidents that have led to the embargo occurred, we were at their mercy for having violated the agreement. So that I say that in order to accomplish the purpose, either we should get the English Government to relax the terms of the agreement to which I have referred, or we should comply with them. Now, that seems reasonable, and I trust that the hon. Secretary of State will give consideration to what I have said, and at once. I may say that if he does so, he will find that action on the part of our Government seeking to comply with the requirements of the English law will go a long way to remove the embargo. I am glad to see the hon. gentleman here, because he is familiar with the requirements of the English Act. He will remember that that Act declares that the British Government may schedule not only a country where disease is known to exist, but also a country contiguous to it, if there is any danger of the disease being imported from one country into the other, and thus into Great Britain. And under that provision of the English Contagious Diseases Act, Great Britain will not remove the scheduling from Canadian cattle unless fully satisfied, not only that Canada is free from disease, but that we have such regulations as will render it impossible for the disease to get into the Canadian herds from the United States. I have never learned that the Canadian Government have directed their attention to the simple, plain methods of the removal of this embargo. The Secretary of State, we have been told and I believe rightly, was able, on one occasion, to accomplish great good in the interests of our cattle trade. I would ask him if he would be good enough to search the records of the Government and see if possibly the English Government have, at any time, assented to a modification of the terms to which I have alluded. The hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule) is continually asserting that there was no violation of the agreement. But I have never yet heard any member of the Canadian Government venture to say that the agreement with Great Britain had been modified, and if not, the cases that I have referred to were clear violations of that agreement, and, perhaps, had to do with the imposition of the embargo. We might as well look at it in a business way, and you will see, Mr. Speaker, that there is a good deal that is plausible in the position, from the English point of view. They say that the first cattle that were found to be diseased, came from Pilot Mound, Manitoba, or rather our Government traced them to that point, as shown by the records of the Department of Agriculture. Then, you see, the English Government established a connection at once between pleuro-pneumonia in the cattle of the States and in the two cattle from Pilot Mound,

which were the first suspects. For it is in evidence that the herds in southern Manitoba, as in many of the western states, were largely filled up with cattle from Montana, Dakota, and elsewhere, in which places pleuro-pneumonia was supposed to exist. It is to be remembered that there are no quarantine regulations between different states of the union, so that where pleuro-pneumonia exists in one state, there is every danger—for on these great prairies of the United States the cattle roam and are driven northward and southward according to the season—that it will ultimately find its way to widely-separated portions of the country. While we assert with all positiveness that no pleuro-pneumonia exists in Canada, and while I hope that that is true, yet I must be frank, and admit that it is an assertion that presents some difficulties when we try to convince the English people, particularly when they can turn up our public records and show that thousands of cattle from the western states found their way into southern Manitoba. So we might as well look the situation in the face, and try to remedy it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Did I understand the hon. gentleman to say that the cattle in the western states adjoining Manitoba had pleuro-pneumonia?

Mr. MULOCK. No, I did not say that. I speak from memory as to the states in which it existed, but I think you will find, on reference to the records, that Illinois was one of the states in which the English Government advised the Canadian Government, pleuro-pneumonia existed. But, at any rate, the fact of the existence of pleuro-pneumonia in the United States was communicated to the Canadian Government. And the British Government scheduled the United States because of the existence of pleuro-pneumonia there, and, because of our contiguity to the United States, they were about to schedule Canada. Subsequently, they agreed not to schedule Canada, but they wrote to the Canadian Government, informing them that pleuro-pneumonia had broken out in certain states of the union. My hon. friend from North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) informs me that there were three states, but I cannot recall the names at the moment. The fact that there is no interstate quarantine, as I understand, in the United States—but that is not material, it is sufficient for the purposes of the English Act, and that is what you have to consider if a disease is found in a contagious country, the United States, for example. Now, the Secretary of State has told us, and perhaps rightly—I trust rightly, for the purpose of what I am about to say—that he has been able in his life to accomplish great things, and I trust that his usefulness is not gone, and that he is still, as he indicated a short time ago, a lion. He said he was a lion in the path of the Grit party. I trust he will

be able to use his great powers, not only for the Grit party, but for the Tory party, and for the whole country, to secure the removal of this embargo. Surely, what he did once he can do again, if not so well. The hon. gentleman stated, when he came to Canada, and assumed the high position he has now, that he was able to fill this position and the office of High Commissioner, as well, and that the department in England would not suffer by his absence. Well, now, if it is not going to suffer by his absence, we are going to have the full benefit of this lion's services in the High Commissioner's office. Even though bodily he is here, spiritually, potentially and politically, perhaps, he is in the High Commissioner's office, as well, issued in duplicate, in fact. So, under the circumstances, inasmuch as he has stated, that the public interests will not suffer by the office remaining nominally occupied by a 'locum tenens,' and that he will be still presiding over it here; and inasmuch as this is a subject that has been in his hands a long time, and to which he has given a great deal of attention, although I think his course was not always the wise one, still, he is so familiar with it that I have ventured, at further length than I intended in the first place, to dwell upon the subject, in order to let him know what I think are some of the difficulties to be removed; and, if these points are attended to, I believe he will find the English Government yielding and restoring to us our suspended advantages. I cannot sit down without repudiating the idea as strongly as I can, that the imposition of this embargo is one not sustained by the spirit of the law in England. As a loyal citizen and subject of the Empire, I cannot admit for a moment, that the statesmen of Great Britain would deliberately and fraudulently impose and maintain, knowingly, a tariff and regulation such as this, to the injustice of a great colony like the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. LANDERKIN. This question is of such serious import to the trade of this country, that I desire to say a few words upon it. It has been a great misfortune to the trade of this country, that this embargo was placed upon our cattle; and I understand, that we are threatened by a Bill, which has been introduced into the English Parliament, further to prohibit the importation of our cattle into that country. Although I do not like to blame the Government in connection with this matter, it does appear to me, that somebody has blundered. I cannot get over the conclusion I have arrived at, that the regulations in the contract that was made between the mother country and Canada, have not been duly enforced; and that is one of the reasons why England resorted to this measure of slaughtering our cattle on landing at their ports. I have an idea, that the English Government to-day are satisfied that the regulations were not carried out in their entirety. I understand,

Mr. MULOCK.

that they caused an investigation to be made of the mode in which the regulations were carried out, and they found it so faulty and so fraught with danger to the trade of Great Britain, that they thought necessary to schedule our cattle. I believe no other conclusion than that can be arrived at. It is also somewhat to be regretted, that, at this stage, when a measure so drastic is introduced into the English House of Commons, we have no one there representing this Government at the present time. Our High Commissioner is not there. Our High Commissioner—where is he? Our High Commissioner is here; and just at a time and at a crisis when, if the High Commissioner ever could have been of any use to Canada, he might be of use in this important crisis in the history of the cattle trade of Canada, we find that he is absent. There never was a time when he might be more useful. It has been said, in the past, that he was useful to the cattle trade; but it will be noted, that he had been in England only a few years before our cattle were scheduled. During all the years before we had a High Commissioner in England, our cattle were allowed to enter freely into that country; but, notwithstanding the usefulness, and the power, and the ability, of the High Commissioner, shortly after he went there, our cattle were scheduled. It may be, that this Bill has been forced upon the British Parliament with a desire further to limit our importations into Great Britain; possibly, there may be a provision in the Bill to prevent High Commissioners going over there, and spasmodically staying there. It has not been found in the interest of the Empire, I think; because our High Commissioner, when he was in England, sought to convey to the people of England the idea, that one-half of the country, a little more than one-half, those who represent more than half of the wealth of this country, were not loyal to the mother country. The High Commissioner was not well employed when he made that statement; and, when he came back to Canada in order to make the Liberal party tremble at his gaze, he was obliged, the first thing he did, to retract that statement, and withdraw that calumny against the most important party in the Dominion of Canada.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Mr. Speaker. I think I can hardly allow the hon. gentleman to make that statement in this House without giving it a most emphatic contradiction. I never in my life made such a statement, and, therefore, it was impossible that I could ever have retracted it.

Mr. LANDERKIN. If I am not mistaken, I read the statement myself, in an article written by the hon. gentleman in an American magazine.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, no.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Well, will the hon. gentleman tell us, then, what he did say in that article?

Mr. FOSTER. Question.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The hon. gentleman, at all events, made a reflection, and a reflection I have no doubt he feels sorry for at the present time.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, I deny most emphatically ever having made such a statement in my life ; and I challenge the hon. gentleman, or any other hon. gentleman in this House, to prove that there is any foundation for his statement.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Very well ; I am obliged to accept the hon. gentleman's retraction. I congratulate him in making the retraction, because, in his long parliamentary history, I have scarcely ever known him to make a retraction before. I have known him to be charged with serious affairs before, and he turned round and said these were only a strong vindication of the high policy and the high course he pursued in Parliament. That was his course in other days. Now, Sir, as to this matter, we have, I think, seventeen members of the Government. There is a great crisis going on, affecting the trade of Canada in England ; there is another crisis going on here. The Government, I understand, are to have a conference with one of the provincial governments. Now, we have enough members in this Government to conduct two conferences. We could spare three or four of them to go to England, where we have no High Commissioner ; we could spare three or four more of them to attend this other conference, and, I believe, the parliamentary proceedings would go on uninterruptedly. I do not think there would be any hitch in the proceedings, if we had about six or seven Ministers less. One wing of them might take charge of one conference, and another wing of the other conference. The wing that the Premier described as a nest of traitors, would be admirably adapted for one, and the wing that they denounced as imbecile and incompetent, would be admirably adapted for the other. They can carry on the two conferences at the same time, and then, at all events, there will be peace in the Government for the time being. That will be a satisfactory thing. Possibly, this complication that has arisen may have called forth the remarks from the Premier of Canada, that, had he been supported loyally, as he should have been, he could have done many things that he was unable to do. This is one thing that could have been done and if the party had been led by any one but an old granny, as Foster said, much would have been done. Now difficulties have arisen, trade complications are ensuing, and our business is threatened, the peace of the country is endangered, and all these results have followed the course pursued by the Government. If we had had a Government united the members of which were friendly to one

another, and were not occupied in stabbing each other in the back whenever there was a chance, if we had had a Government united in the interests of Canada and the Empire, these difficulties would not have occurred. Hon. gentlemen opposite are united for office only. The Government goes on under the same incompetent leader. The leader of this House has been called upon to vacate his seat in favour of the Secretary of State, who comes here ostensibly to lead the party, and the Finance Minister is called upon to take one seat further back in the councils of his party and the country. If we do not need a High Commissioner in London, the office should be vacated and abolished. If it is necessary to have a High Commissioner he should be there and he should be there now, because this is a crisis in the history of this country in regard to an important trade. The Minister of Agriculture is in England, we understand ; but it is said he went there for his health. He caught cold while he was here—there were some very cold days before he left—and then he went away. I am sorry he did not take the opportunity, for he said he would avail himself of the earliest possible moment to do so, to vindicate his honour against charges made by hon. gentlemen on his own side of the House, by the hon. member for East York and the hon. member for West York. He went away, and nothing has been done towards vindicating the honour of the Minister of Agriculture ; his health is broken, and he left the country before the vindication took place. It is said that charges were made against him by the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean) in his paper, and the hon. Minister was going to reply to these people who made an assault on his honour ; but unfortunately he got sick, and I hope his health is now restored. It is unfortunate. I hope the Government will not use his services, when rest is absolutely and imperatively required, to look after this great question. At the present time it is relegated to the clerk in the High Commissioner's office. The High Commissioner and the Secretary of State appear to think that he is a satisfactory agent for Canada at the present time. It appears to me, however, that if we need a High Commissioner, he should be in England. If the Conservative party want the ex-High Commissioner here, by all means get him here ; but it seems strange that the great Conservative party can find no other man qualified to fill the position of High Commissioner, and when the hon. gentleman comes here the high and responsible duties of the office are entrusted to a clerk. I am really surprised that the Conservative party has only one gentleman in its ranks qualified to fill that position, and when the High Commissioner comes here to help his political friends in a campaign, the office is closed or run by a clerk. I fancy this action lowers the dignity of the office in England and in the eyes of public men when they ascertain

that the office is being run by a clerk. It is time this farce should be stopped. The question as regards the cattle embargo is one of vital importance to this country. Prof. Robertson says that \$16 per head could be saved by turning the cattle into dead meat, while the hon. member for Huron (Mr. McMillan) states that more money can be made by shipping live cattle, if the embargo is removed. It can be easily understood that a great loss has accrued to the people in consequence of this blunder made by the Canadian Government. It is time these matters should receive careful attention, and that the Government should unite on a policy on this question, and should stand united, working in harmony one with another in their efforts to preserve our interests, which have been slaughtered like our cattle, in the British market. It is high time, indeed, that this Government should understand that the eyes of the people are upon them, that their movements are being watched both as regards this and other matters, and that they should decide on a policy which, while saving money to the farmers, would at the same time preserve the honour, dignity and respect of the Government and the country. I am deeply interested in this question, and in my opinion the time has arrived when something should be done by this House. If the Government are powerless to deal with the subject, then let them say so, and let this become an open question in Parliament; then let the House take it up and deal with it in such a manner as to impress on the British Government the desire and the wishes of our people, so as to preserve this great trade for Canada.

Mr. FEATHERSTON. I feel deeply interested in this question, having been many years engaged in the trade, and I do not want this opportunity to pass without saying something in regard to it. It is a great pity that our cattle have been scheduled by the British authorities, and undoubtedly greater loss will be sustained by this country if they are altogether excluded from British ports as live cattle. This is a question which the Government should deal with energetically, for it affects not only the farmers, but the business men of the country generally. It is now the duty of this Government to show the Government of Great Britain that we have a healthy class of cattle here. No doubt disease has been introduced among our herds owing to our cattle coming in contact with American cattle. The first proof of disease occurred after American cattle were permitted to cross the line and enter Manitoba, and it was from that province the first case of disease was found in our cattle on board steamships going to Great Britain. If anything can possibly be done to prevent the British authorities depriving us of the benefit of the markets of the old country for our live cattle, it should be carried out. I have always been in favour

Mr. LANDERKIN.

of prosecuting the dead meat trade; but the reason I favour it is, that the cattle west of Winnipeg should be slaughtered and shipped as dressed meat to England, thus giving the Ontario stock-raisers the benefit of the market for their live cattle. What was our experience last year? When we were shipping cattle during the season we found that the freights were very much raised when the Manitoba and North-west cattle came to our ports for shipment. The reason was that there was competition between Manitoba and the North-west and Ontario at the port of shipment. No doubt the steamship companies like to obtain good freights and the railway companies also desire good freight rates. It is all very well for them to get high rates, but it is not in the best interests of the country, that they should be getting very high rates, while our farmers are deprived of making the money they ought to make out of their stock. I think, Mr. Speaker, that if we ever intend to do anything, we should make an effort at this very moment to convince the people of England that our cattle are healthy, and that we are prepared to protect our cattle by inspection, both on board the trains, and when they are being put on board the vessel at the port of shipment. Last year I had the honour of moving for papers with reference to the disease existing amongst sheep. I warned the Government at that time that if something were not done, our sheep would be scheduled in England, and shortly after I brought that question before the House, my fears were realized, and our sheep were scheduled. I am sorry that such has occurred, because it has proved a great loss to the farmers of our country. They cannot raise sheep now with any profit, and they will consequently have to abandon that industry altogether. We should encourage the raising of stock in Canada, because if we do not raise plenty of stock, our farmers will get poor. They cannot grow grain as they did in years gone by when the land was new. We should follow the example of the British farmers, and try to put back on the land as much as we take off, and if we do that, it will make money for the farmers, it will make business for the country, and it will make trade for the railway and steamship companies. Now, Mr. Speaker, I put a notice on the paper the other day, with reference to the disease that has broken out amongst horses. I have witnessed these American horses going aboard steamers, and any practical man must know, that the disease which has broken out amongst them is attributable to the way in which they are managed, and the manner in which they are raised. They raise a great many of them very cheaply on the prairies. They never take them into a stable, or never do anything to them until they are ready to ship them to Great Britain. Then a number of cowboys lasso these horses and break them in, within a few days. Inside of two weeks, they have

these horses so tractable that they can halter them and put them into the cars, and when they get to a shipping port, it is dangerous for a man to walk through the stables, so fierce are these animals. These horses are not properly broken, and they are not fit to sell. They get disease on account of the rough usage they are subjected to, because they are bruised and knocked about without any care or attention being paid to them. That is one of the reasons why I object to the regulations recently adopted by the Government, with reference to shipping from the port of St. John, and by which regulations our cattle, horses, and sheep, are allowed to come into contact with these American cattle, on board ship. It is a great mistake to allow American cattle to be carried on the same ship as Canadian cattle. I remember that some years ago there was an order that no vessel carrying American cattle could carry Canadian cattle, until sixty days afterwards, and even then, the ship had to be thoroughly disinfected. These regulations have been infringed upon, and Canadian cattle and American cattle alike, are to-day carried on the same steamers. That is a very foolish thing for any country to do, which is anxious to secure that its cattle shall be healthy. The time has now arrived, Mr. Speaker, when we should make some strong effort to prevent animals from the United States coming into this country and going over on the same vessels as ours, thus causing our animals to be diseased when they land in England. This gives Canadian stock a very bad name in the English market. The English people are very careful about their stock. They do not want any animals to come in contact with them that will breed disease, and they are taking precautions to prevent disease from spreading in that country. We in Canada should imitate the British people in that respect, and try to keep our stock as healthy as the English people are trying to keep their stock.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). Mr. Speaker, just a few words on this question. I hold that the scheduling of Canadian cattle has been a great damage to the Canadian farmers, and through them to the Canadian people at large. I believe, Sir, that the Canadian Parliament should do everything possible to prevent the continuance of that scheduling. At the same time, I cannot shut my eyes to the fact that the Canadian Government have themselves been largely to blame for the scheduling of Canadian cattle in the English market. They know just as well as I do, that an agreement was entered into in 1883, with the English Government, by which the Canadian Government were to carry out certain engagements. There was a cry from the English farmers, who are, to a certain extent, protectionists, and they brought strong influence to bear on the English Government to schedule Canadian cattle. I remember well, when, in

1887, the Reform party advocated reciprocity, that it was pointed out by the Conservative press at that time, that if Canadian cattle were scheduled in England, the Canadian farmers would lose at least 3 cents per pound on all the beef they sent to Great Britain, which, in the aggregate, amounted to three-quarters of a million dollars per year. If the Canadian Government knew that the English farmers were anxious to schedule Canadian cattle, they should have taken greater precaution to keep intact the agreement they entered into with the Imperial Government, in 1883. What was this agreement, Sir? The Canadian Government agreed to be as careful as possible that no diseased cattle would pass from the United States through Canadian territory on their way to the English market. And, in order to avoid any danger from pleuro-pneumonia to Canadian cattle, our Government agreed to take certain precautions, some of which I will mention to the House. They agreed that they would appoint veterinary surgeons on the boundary line to examine American cattle, previous to their crossing into Canadian territory. There were three of these veterinary surgeons appointed, one at Sarnia, one at Detroit, and one at Sandwich. They were ordered, by the arrangement with the English Government, to have the cattle untrucked and to examine them carefully when they were off the cars, so as to render it impossible that any animal at all diseased, should enter Canada. The railway companies made representation to the Government that this regulation interfered with their traffic, and with their profits. It is here that I blame the Canadian Government, because they considered the interests of the railways in preference to the interests of the Canadian farmers. They relaxed the order so as to allow the veterinarians to examine the animals at night; and when the cattle were in the trucks they could only be seen through the railings which constitute the box of the car. Now, I ask you, Mr. Speaker, or any reasonable man, if it is possible for any veterinary surgeon to ascertain the condition of animals when they are all standing together inside of a car and you can only see their heads and tails. But it was upon such an examination that the cattle were given a bill of health and passed through Canadian territory. Again, it was a part of the agreement made between the Canadian Government and the English Government that no examination should take place at night. That rule was also relaxed, and the veterinarians were allowed to examine the animals at night and pass them through Canadian territory. I am giving facts which can be substantiated by reference to official documents which any man can see in a blue-book published by this Government. These relaxations in the agreement were made at the solicitation of the Canadian railways, which made representations to the Government of Canada that

it was a great inconvenience to them to have the cattle remain over night, to be inspected in the day time. Afterwards, it was represented that it would be an inconvenience to have the animals examined on the American side, and the rules were relaxed to permit them to be examined on this side. The consequence was that a large number of animals passed through Canadian territory which were liable to communicate disease to Canadian herds. Then, under the agreement the Government was to name an inspector and the railway company was to pay him; and he was to travel with the cattle from the western boundary until they reached the eastern boundary and entered American territory again. Whom do you think the Government appointed to look after the cattle in the interests of the Canadian people? The conductors of the trains. Do you really suppose for one moment that a conductor, receiving his wages from the railway company, would not overlook violations of the rules in favour of the company rather than in favour of the Government? And that is really what they did, because the human nature of conductors is very much like human nature in this Parliament or in this Government. The result was that these facts came to the ears of the British farmers, and the British Government, in obedience to the strong pressure brought to bear upon them, were forced to schedule our cattle. Another point in the agreement between the Canadian Government and the English Government was that the cars which carried American cattle, before being returned for other loads, should be thoroughly cleansed and disinfected. But it is on record that those cars repeatedly returned through Canadian territory without being cleansed or disinfected at all. In this way Canadian herds were exposed to danger. Another thing: under the agreement the cars which carried American cattle were not to be used for carrying Canadian cattle through Canadian territory. That rule was violated, because the cars were marked with the letter "V," and it was found that Canadian cattle were being conveyed in cars so marked. The Government also agreed to construct, midway between Windsor and Montreal, at a station called Lynn, a certain enclosure for the purpose of protecting Canadian cattle from coming into contact with American cattle. The American cattle, while being transported across Canadian territory, required to be taken from the trucks at Lynn for the purpose of feeding, watering and rest; and while off the trucks, they were to be kept in this enclosure. In order that the saliva of these cattle should not be licked up by cattle from the outside, and that they should not come into contact with each other, a second fence was constructed around the enclosure, about 10 feet from the inner fence; but the outer fence became so dilapidated and broken down that it did not fulfil the purpose intended, and the cattle from

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron).

the outside came into contact with the cattle in the enclosure, and, it was said, contracted disease from them. All these things were known to the Government, because their officers reported them from time to time; and yet they did not move one finger to correct this state of things. It was further agreed that the manure gathered around the places where the cattle were kept should be buried. Instead of that, it was taken and sold to the farmers in the neighbourhood, to be used as manure upon their lands. The result was, as the testimony goes to prove, that disease broke out among the cattle of that neighbourhood. All these facts became known to the English people, and the English Government, and were used as a strong argument for scheduling Canadian cattle. How can the Government, looking at the whole history of this case, justify themselves for the position they have taken? I am sorry to say that the English people, becoming aroused to the danger of their herds becoming infected, have excluded our cattle to such an extent that our people do not realize the profit which they would otherwise realize from this trade, and I think that our people when they come to know all the facts, will hold this Government responsible.

Motion to adjourn, negatived.

FAST ATLANTIC SERVICE.

Mr. BORDEN. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I desire to call the attention of the Government to a cablegram which appeared in the Toronto papers—the "Mail and Empire" and the "Globe"—of yesterday, to the following effect:—

Right Hon. R. W. Handbury, Parliamentary Secretary to the Treasury Department, replying to John Henniker Heaton, M.P. for Canterbury, said that the Imperial Government had not consented to contribute £75,000 towards a subsidy for a steamship service between Canada and England, but have intimated to the Canadian Government their readiness under certain conditions to make some contribution. They suggested to the Canadian Government that by calling for tenders they might ascertain the probable cost of the service. The Imperial Government would then decide the amount of British aid to the scheme.

I would like, in view of this statement, to ask the Government whether this statement is substantially correct, and whether that is the understanding of the Government of Canada as to the amount of aid which the Imperial Government is to give to the fast line service?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. In answer to the hon. gentleman, I may say that the reply given by Mr. Handbury in the House of Commons no doubt is correct. The matter stands in this position. Canada voted the sum of £150,000, speaking in sterling money, for this fast service. The Government made application to the Imperial Government to

assist to the extent of £75,000, or practically one-third of the total subsidy. Her Majesty's Secretary of State for the Colonies informed me that Her Majesty's Government had decided to give the required assistance, but that it would be necessary, as a new phase was given to the enterprise by the assistance of the Imperial Government, to call for new tenders, and it was understood that the amount given by the Imperial Government would be in the proportion of £75,000 to £150,000. But as the service might be taken for a smaller amount than the two together, it was impossible to say what the amount of Imperial assistance would be, until the tenders were sent in, so that practically the Government of Canada are relying, if it be found necessary to require the £75,000 in addition to the £150,000, on the Imperial Government for that assistance; but if we can obtain the service for a smaller amount, of course that would reduce the amount asked from the Imperial Government.

Mr. BORDEN. Would the hon. gentleman say whether tenders have been asked for or what steps have been taken?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. A draft of the invitation to tender has been forwarded to Her Majesty's Secretary of State for the Colonies for his approval, and he has been asked to cable us if it is satisfactory. If so, it will be immediately published. If not, Her Majesty's Government will suggest any alterations that they propose should be made in the form of invitation for tenders, which, of course, would have to be considered before publishing.

MANITOBA SCHOOL QUESTION—CONFERENCE WITH MR. GREENWAY.

Mr. LAURIER. I will take advantage of the presence of my hon. friend from Montreal West (Sir Donald Smith) to bring again to the attention of the House the statement made by the hon. leader of the House the other day, with regard to the opening of negotiations with Mr. Greenway concerning the school question. The action of the Government, if any action was taken, was based upon this telegram said to have been forwarded by Mr. Greenway to Sir Donald Smith:

Winnipeg, 2nd March, 1896.

Your telegram has received the most careful consideration of myself and colleagues. While duly appreciating all you say, it is quite clear that we can only proceed to Ottawa for the purpose of holding a conference, upon the official invitation of the Dominion Government. I fully appreciate your kind offices in this matter.

GREENWAY.

There is nothing in this telegram to suggest what was the matter of communication between the hon. member for Montreal West and Mr. Greenway. It might have been concerning wheat, or transportation, or the

school question, and I believe it was the last. I submit there can be no doubt that my hon. friend from Montreal West handed over this telegram from Mr. Greenway to himself and at the same time the telegram which he has sent to Mr. Greenway to the Government, and the Government must be in possession of both; and the House, under such circumstances, would be entitled to be put in possession of the communication which was sent by my hon. friend from Montreal West to Mr. Greenway, as well as the answer of Mr. Greenway. Having the answer alone, without the communication itself which prompted this answer, it is obvious that we have only part of the information, and it is equally obvious that the House is entitled to full information on this important subject.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. In reference to the hon. gentleman's request, I may say that I have not yet had an opportunity, since the return of the hon. member for Montreal West, of conferring with him on this subject; and after communicating with him, I will be in a position to say to the hon. gentleman whether I can give any further information.

THE REMEDIAL ACT (MANITOBA).

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Sir Charles Tupper for second reading of Bill (No. 58) the Remedial Act (Manitoba), and the proposed motion (six months' hoist) of Mr. Laurier in amendment thereto.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I cannot, in the absence of the information for which my hon. friend (Mr. Laurier) asked, just now, feel quite as certain as to what passed between my hon. friend from Montreal West (Sir Donald Smith) and Mr. Greenway as I could desire; but viewing the matter in the light of the information we do possess, that is to say, by the light of the statement made on Monday last and on Tuesday by the hon. Secretary of State (Sir Charles Tupper), I think I can say this, that if there were one thing necessary to illustrate in the clearest light the utter absurdity of the position which the Government have assumed with regard to this question, it was furnished us by the remarkable declaration made by the hon. Secretary of State two days ago. We may well be at some loss, on this side, to understand exactly where the Government are placed with regard to the school question, because we find that, at one time, in their various pilgrimages throughout the country, they tell the people of Ontario at any rate, that their action in this matter has been purely mechanical, that they were mere transmitters of the message from the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council to the parliament of Manitoba. But, Sir, on other occasions and in other places, we find these same gentlemen posing as martyrs to the

constitution, as men who are actuated by the sternest sense of duty in all they do in this matter, and who only undertook the perilous task to which they have committed themselves under the impulse of high patriotic motive. Sir, we find on one and a very important occasion that this Government found it impossible to grant an hour's delay, when asked for delay by the government of Manitoba, under circumstances which most amply warranted their request. But we find, on other occasions, that this Government was able to contemplate with equanimity the possibility of practically throwing this Bill over altogether for a whole year and, in all probability, for ever. I should like to know what these hon. gentlemen intend by the proposition which they have lately submitted to us. I should like to know what they mean by suggesting to this House that they will hold a conference with the government of Manitoba, after they have had the second reading of this Bill. What do they wish their followers, and particularly their followers from Ontario, to understand? Is it that this second reading is a mere formality intended to impose upon or to terrify the people of Manitoba, but a thing which, after all is said and done, means nothing. Sir, I should like to ask this House and the followers of the hon. gentleman, if, in all their experience, they have ever known a great question as mis-handled as this has been, from start to finish, by these hon. gentlemen? In this present instance, what is their plain duty in the premises, supposing that, at long last, they are going to adopt the policy advocated by my hon. friend (Mr. Laurier) and to do now what they should have done before they passed the remedial order—hold a conference with the government of Manitoba and attempt to arrive at an amicable settlement. Sir, what is their plain duty in the premises? Their plain duty is this—if they desired to conciliate Manitoba, if they desired to confer with the government of Manitoba, they should have at once adjourned this debate until such time as they have had their conference and until such time as they were able to come down to us with something like a reasonable proposition for the settlement of this question, with the goodwill of the people of Manitoba.

Now, Sir, if they refuse to take this course, what must the House conclude? We can only judge of these gentlemen's intentions by their past acts. It appears to me, that they must be conspiring against somebody now, or that some part of them must be conspiring against some other part of them now. Sir, treachery is afoot. Whether treachery is intended against the Prime Minister, who, I believe, has been honestly endeavouring from the first to redeem his pledges in this matter, or whether they are endeavouring to delude their supporters from Ontario, whom they are leading like sheep to the shambles—and they know it—or whe-

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

ther they are attempting to delude their followers from the province of Quebec, to whom they are offering a stone in place of bread, as the "Vulgate" puts it—because this Bill, as they well know, is an utter mockery and sham, so far as it is likely to afford any genuine or substantial relief to the Catholic minority in Manitoba—which of these objects they have in view, I cannot say. Possibly, they have not made up their minds which it would be safe to mislead and deceive on this occasion. Or, Sir, is it that these gentlemen, in their cowardice and incapacity, are unable to decide upon any policy at all? Have they arrived at the state described by the great Florentine, where they are "hateful to God and to the enemies of God?" Or, is it, peradventure, Sir, a fear of the displeasure of that dread grand sovereign who has just returned from his tour in the west, with the scalps of certain delinquent brothers at his belt? Or, peradventure—because I wish to give these gentlemen the benefit of every doubt—is it that they have just waked up to a realizing sense of the grave difficulties which attend a settlement of this question? Sir, knowing something of the hon. gentlemen, I am not disposed entirely to disregard that hypothesis. I think I know their limitations; I admit their skill in the conduct of a gerrymander; I admit very frankly, that they are able to carry out a fiscal policy which was in vogue four hundred years ago, when piracy was an honourable profession; but I have my doubts, Sir, whether they understand, or ever did understand—not excepting even the "father of confederation," as he calls himself, the hon. Secretary of State—a real important constitutional question. And, that being so, I can well comprehend how the discussion that has taken place on this question has been really a revelation to those hon. gentlemen, and they have at last woke up to what they might well have known, that, in attempting to settle this question, they have undertaken one of the most difficult problems that it is possible for a federal legislature to address itself to. Sir, there is one statement of these hon. gentlemen in which, I am bound to say, in very great part, I concur. I have noticed, that all these gentlemen have prefaced their remarks on this subject by declaring, that this was a very important question.

Mr. FOSTER. That is a very general fault.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is a very general statement. The Secretary of State, for instance, said:

Mr. Speaker, in times past I have had occasion to propose to this House the consideration of measures of very great importance, but I confess that I have never risen to propose the second reading of a Bill under the same deep sense of responsibility that I feel on the present occasion. The question that is now submitted for the consideration of this House is one which, in my judg-

ment, transcends in importance any measure that has ever been submitted to this House during its existence.

Strong words. I do not entirely dissent from them, though I am not ready to subscribe to them to the full extent. But let me ask, Sir, What does all this prove? These gentlemen, one and all, tell us, that this is the most important question—at least one of the most important questions—that we have ever been called upon to decide. Why, Sir, if they used their greatest ingenuity to find an argument to justify the position taken by my hon. friend beside me (Mr. Laurier), that is the very argument I would have liked them to adduce. The more important the question, the more time it requires; the more important the question, the more need of investigation; the more important and the more irrevocable the step proposed, the more reason why we should go slowly in dealing with a matter of such gravity. Sir, that would be a reason for caution—and hon. gentlemen opposite know it, and the House knows it, and the country knows it—even if this Bill were as good as I believe it to be bad. But, 'a fortiori,' in the present case it does appear to me, that, in calling upon us to give a decision at this time and under these circumstances, in a question which they admit to be of such transcendent importance, they are doing a thing which no government, except themselves, would attempt to do under such circumstances. So far, Sir, I am sorry to say that the arguments which the Government have used appear to me to be utterly and entirely beside the question. The hon. Secretary of State was good enough to devote an hour or more to certain interesting facts in ancient history, with which, as he says, the younger members of the House could not be presumed to be acquainted. I will not dispute these facts. They were not very new to me, but, then, my record in this House is almost as long as that of the hon. gentleman himself. The hon. Minister of Justice occupied even a longer time in assuring us, that we had the power to legislate upon this question. Well, Sir, I never heard that anybody disputed that. Certainly, none of the gentlemen who have spoken on this side, disputed our right to legislate upon this subject, under certain conditions. The government of Manitoba, and the parliament of Manitoba, as I read their statements, fully admit the power of Canada, as the Dominion of Canada, to legislate in this case, under certain conditions. The Minister of the Interior, whom I do not see in his place at present, spent twice as long as both the other gentlemen put together; but, as his subject was the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin), I do not feel disposed at the present moment to notice his remarks more fully.

But, Sir, these hon. gentlemen have left the real points of the question wholly untouched. What are we asked to decide?

What is the object of this Bill? Sir, the questions which are proposed for the consideration of this House, and of Canada, as I understand them, are these two: First, Shall we act in this matter without hearing the people and parliament of Manitoba; and next—a question to which I shall address myself more fully later on—Has this House, under existing circumstances, at this stage of its own existence, a right to act in this grave matter at all without an appeal to the people, from whom alone they can derive the right to act? Perhaps, I might add a third, but, in view of the statement, that a suspension of the Bill will take place after the second reading, it may be hardly worth while. The third question would be: Is this Bill as we have it fit to pass in any case; is it not so faulty as to be utterly incapable of amendment; is not the kindest and most humane thing that its putative fathers can do for it to withdraw it and strangle it without more ado?

Now, Sir, I am not going to deal with the innumerable legal technicalities of this measure. When it gets into committee, these, no doubt, will be fully dealt with. But there are certain things which all men of affairs, which all business men in Canada know, and can perfectly appreciate, quite irrespective of the legal considerations involved in this measure. Sir, this a subject which, in the very nature of the case is in the highest degree contentious, is in the very highest degree a matter of controversy. Every human being who has had anything to do with questions of education, with questions in which the religious element comes in, knows perfectly well that you cannot possibly select a subject as to which there will be more hard feeling elicited, as to which there will be more occasion of continual dispute and controversy. Then, Sir, do we not know, is not every lawyer in this House, indeed, is not every business man able to tell the Government that if there is one thing more than another which is certain to breed an endless train of litigation, it is just these questions of joint jurisdiction, every one of which, mark you, Sir, under the most favourable circumstances, even supposing you were acting with the government of Manitoba and not against the government of Manitoba, would be elicited by a proposal to pass a School Act regulating the mode in which education should be administered in any province of this Dominion. If that be the case, where the parties are agreed, what is it likely to be when we know from the very outset that the rival authorities are utterly and bitterly opposed? Why, Sir, I know—and I have paid for my knowledge somewhat dearly, because, although I have not the honour of being a lawyer, I have had the honour of paying very heavy law fees in my time—I know this is a case in which a single careless phrase, a single ill-turned sentence, may well produce a

dozen years of costly litigation. If ever there was a Bill submitted to Parliament which needed the most careful drafting, which required the most mature consideration; if ever there was a Bill in which it was necessary that every word should be carefully weighed before it is put on the statute-book, it is the Bill which is submitted for our consideration to-day. Now, Sir, let us ask ourselves what possible chance this Bill has of receiving that mature consideration; what chance this Bill has of being weighed, of being considered as such a measure should be considered. I take the Bill itself as it stands, and I can define it as nothing but a parliamentary scarecrow. Sir, this Bill is simply an imposture. There is no motive power in this Bill whatever. It threatens what it cannot perform; it promises what it can never implement. It may be, and very likely will be, a bonanza for the lawyers of Manitoba and elsewhere; but it assuredly will be a very Pandora's box for public men of all kinds and description if it is placed on the statute-book in its present shape. Sir, this is a Bill, in one word, for the purpose of disturbing everything, and settling nothing; this is a Bill which can satisfy nobody; this is a Bill which those very persons at whose instance it is brought in, do not pretend to accept as final or complete. The best word they can say for it is that it is an instalment; the best word they can say for it is that it is the entering of the wedge; the best thing they can offer to us is that if we pass this Bill and establish its principles, we will be opening an era of fighting and wrangling, and arguing. I verily believe, not only 'de die in diem,' but 'in sæcula sæculorum.'

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

After Recess.

CANADIAN JOCKEY CLUB.

House again resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 48) respecting the Canadian Jockey Club.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. MARTIN. I am still without any advice from Winnipeg with regard to this Bill.

Mr. TISDALE. Would you like it to stand over until Friday night?

Mr. MARTIN. Yes.

Mr. TISDALE. I hope you will let us go on then, because everybody else is ready.

Mr. MARTIN. I fully expect to have advice by that time.

Mr. TISDALE. All right. Let it stand.

Committee rose and reported progress.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 32) respecting the Winnipeg-Great Northern Railway Company.—(Mr. Boyd.)

Bill (No. 36) to incorporate the South Shore Suburban Railway Company.—(Mr. Lachapelle.)

Bill (No. 50) respecting the South-western Railway Company and the St. Lawrence and Adirondack Railway Company.—(Mr. Bergeron.)

Bill (No. 54) to incorporate the Edmonton District Railway Company.—(Mr. Davis.)

Bill (No. 56) respecting the Montreal Island Belt Line Railway Company.—(Mr. Lachapelle.)

Bill (No. 60) respecting the Thousand Islands Railway Company.—(Mr. Taylor.)

Bill (No. 62) to incorporate the Canadian Peat Fuel Company.—(Mr. Boyle.)

THE REMEDIAL ACT (MANITOBA).

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, when the House rose at six o'clock, I had been pointing out the extreme inexpediency, from all points of view, of proceeding with this Bill under existing conditions, and at this present moment. In my opinion, there is but one argument which could under any conceivable condition justify us in proceeding at this moment, and that would be, if it were possible by this measure to get rid of this question once and for all. But, Mr. Speaker, this Bill itself, in express terms, absolutely negatives the idea that by passing it you get rid of the question. The very last clause, in so many words, declares that this question is to be kept open, and that the Government arrogates to itself—whether legally or not, I am not prepared to say—the Government arrogates to itself the right to tinker and meddle with this legislation again and again, if they are called upon to do so. Now, Sir, we know positively that the government of Manitoba and the parliament of Manitoba refuse to accept this Bill. They have already informed us that this measure as it stands, is one to which they refuse concurrence. Under these circumstances, the difficulty and the inexpediency of meddling with this question grow more and more manifest with every step; and I may add, also, my conviction that the Government never took the trouble to think this measure out before they laid it on the Table. Sir, if the Government have been utterly unsuccessful in making any other point plain, I think they have made plain the almost intolerable difficulty of interfering with any effect; and, Sir, I will venture to say that to every man in this House who sits down calmly and deliberately to study this problem, the more he studies it, the more the difficulty will appear, that is to say, if the province intended to be coerced is adverse.

Now, it appears to me, and it has appeared to me all through, that there were but two effective remedies in the case of a wrong being done to the Catholic minority. One of these is the remedy afforded by the constitution in the ordinary courts of law, wherever a province has exceeded its legitimate authority in passing an Act of this kind. The other is the veto power which is vested in the Government of Canada with respect to all Acts of provincial legislatures. Now, Sir, I want to call the attention of the House to the fact that in the case of the appeal to the courts of law, so far, it has gone chiefly—I do not say altogether, but chiefly—in favour of Manitoba, which has been declared by the supreme tribunal of the Empire to have acted *intra vires* in passing the measure in question. The other power, Sir,—as to which I shall have something to say presently—is a power which the Government dared not use. They may or they may not be blameworthy—that is an open question—for having declined to use the veto power. At any rate, Sir, and it is well that their supporters in this House and the country should understand this—they had the opportunity; and, for reasons best known to themselves, they chose to let that opportunity pass away for ever.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I desire to review the circumstances which have led us to the situation in which we find ourselves placed to-day. I propose, in the first place, to review the conduct of the Government. I propose, in the second place, to consider the right of this House to act at all; and I want also to call the attention of every man in this country who desires to see this question settled equitably and fairly, to the effect that certain proceedings of the Government are likely to have on the province of Manitoba.

With respect to the conduct of the Government, it appears to me that their best friends must admit that it has been hopelessly contradictory. Sir, under what conditions and what conditions alone could their action in passing the remedial order have been justified? Recollect, a remedial order, or an Act passed upon a remedial order, is an extreme measure; it is a thing of last resort—a thing which every constitutional lawyer and every statesman will admit should, under no circumstances, be done if there was any possible way of avoiding collision between provincial and federal authority. That, I believe, every man in this House on either side will admit to be the truth. If I am correct in my definition of a remedial order, it follows that such a measure should never be passed except after the fullest possible investigation in the first place; it should, in the next place, never be passed until every effort at conciliation and negotiation had been exhausted; and, in the last place, it should be passed only after proof adduced of grievous wrong. Sir, what were the conditions under which the remedial order was

passed by the present Government? In the first place, they would have absolutely no investigation. They refused to proceed with the investigation when asked by the government of Manitoba to do so. The Manitoba government were haled like a culprit before their bar. The commonest courtesy which might have been expected to exist as between a provincial and a federal government, was refused to that government. I can only say, with respect to the mode in which the remedial order was passed, that it displayed, on the part of the Government of Canada a desperate and indecent haste; and the terms of peremptory command in which it was conceived were of the most unfortunate possible character. Then, Sir, what followed? Why, Sir, what followed might have been expected. What did this Government do? Mind, Sir, when Manitoba appealed for delay, when its counsel pleaded that they should wait, at any rate, until the provincial legislature had closed its session, and the government of Manitoba could appear before them, the Government of Canada refused to grant them the common courtesy of three weeks' delay, and issued their remedial order. But the Government of Canada, which could not grant three weeks' delay to investigate the case, found it convenient to wait a whole year before introducing an Act in pursuance of the remedial order. Sir, we have been told—I do not know whether by the Secretary of State or by some of his colleagues—that the Government of Canada issued the remedial order under the sternest sense of duty to their country. But, Sir, under a still sterner sense of duty to themselves, three months afterwards they found it necessary, practically, to abandon it and to beg for any concessions which the government of Manitoba would make, if only they would enable them to recede from their remedial order. Here is the dilemma of the Government, which I have never yet seen answered, but which there is yet time to answer before this debate closes. If the Manitoba government did such grievous wrong as to justify the issuing of the remedial order—if its acts were so plain and glaring, as these gentlemen contend, that the idea of a delay of even three weeks was improper to their just and conscientious minds—why did they not impose their veto five years ago? If, on the other hand, the matter was, as I think all fair-minded men will admit, a matter of difficulty and complexity in which the respective rights of the majority and of the minority were hard to determine—if it was a case on which tribunals of the very highest rank differed in toto, as we know they differed—why that outrageous haste in passing the remedial order? Those who know the real motives of the Government can, I think, supply an answer to that question. Sir, the veto was not used in 1890, and why? Because a general election was at hand, and they had trouble enough, as

the Secretary of State knows, in maintaining themselves in the general election of 1891, without importing into it a quarrel with Manitoba. Why was the remedial order passed in March, 1895? Sir, I am sorry that I have to say that the evidence there is equally clear and conclusive. The remedial order was passed a year ago in the hottest haste, because they then expected that they would never meet Parliament—because they then expected that a general election was imminent, and because they purposed to deceive the electors on both sides. Sir, it is known what hon. gentlemen opposite stated in Verchères, it is known what the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Ouimet) declared to the electors in Verchères, it is known that he pledged himself that a Bill would be instantly introduced, identical with the words and on the lines of the remedial order. And it is known to-day what passed in the county of Haldimand, when a Minister of state was seeking re-election there. Why is it we have not the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Montague) here to-night? I have no doubt that the hon. Minister is a sick man, but I should be sorry to think that his illness is so severe as to disable him from being present. I have no doubt that he is very sick of the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace), and still sicker of the prospect of having to eat his own words, and to swallow the remedial order or the Bill based thereon. Now, that plot was frustrated, and hence this useless muddle in which we find ourselves, hence the vacillation which has marked the conduct of the Government, hence the dishonest conspiracy with which this session was inaugurated, for the purpose of getting rid of the man who had pledged himself to carry out the statement made by the Government when we parted last, and who, to do him justice, I believe is honestly attempting to carry out that pledge.

Now, I wish to take this Bill itself and to call your attention to one of the vital questions connected with it, which, so far as I have heard, has been altogether, or almost altogether, ignored, by the hon. Ministers, at least. Why, we have in a Bill of forty pages and 112 clauses, a complicated scheme proposed for our adoption. If there be one thing clearer than another, it is that if this Bill is to be anything more than what I describe it, if it is to be anything but a dead letter, if it is not literally, as I have described it, a parliamentary scarecrow, it is necessary that money, and a considerable sum, should be provided to work this scheme to any practical effect. Who is going to provide that money? Before we are asked to proceed with this Bill, we ought to have that question answered, because that is of the very essence of the contract. The Government of Canada dare not, for good reasons, propose to this Parliament, at any rate, to appropriate the funds of the province of Manitoba; and any lawyer will see that if they attempt to appropriate these

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

funds, they will have intolerable difficulty in carrying out their intention. And the Government, although they dare to bring in this Bill, dare not ask a grant from this House for the purpose of carrying it into effect. What will they do? If they attempt to take money from the revenues of Manitoba, then they propose for themselves endless trouble. If they attempt to ask this House for it, what a vista will they open up—what confusion worse confounded? Are they going to introduce state church into Canada? Will the hon. gentlemen dare to ask for federal aid to assist one particular church to educate its children in its own way? I know that the hon. Secretary of State is a bold man. So, for that matter, is the Postmaster General, whom I do not see here in his place. But I doubt whether either of them would have the courage to come before Parliament and make the demand that we should furnish from our funds, money to carry this out; and yet, I repeat, if that money is not provided, this Bill is utterly dead and worthless. Let us consider this Bill like men of business. Without money, and money liberally supplied, the separate schools in Manitoba will be helpless and hopeless. Every one knows the peculiar conditions that prevail in that country; every one knows that, at the best, it is matter of extreme difficulty, in the greater part of Manitoba, to provide proper educational facilities for the children of the settlers. Save in a few special localities, under this Bill, separate schools are an impossibility; and even in those few special localities, they would be carried on at extremely heavy odds. Now, I will take the other alternative. I will suppose, although the language of the hon. Secretary of State renders it a very doubtful thing indeed, that the Government succeed in passing this Bill as it stands. All that they really can do so far as I can see—though here I am open to correction on the part of my legal friends—all the Government can do is this. I think they can exempt the Catholic minority in Manitoba from taxation for school purposes. But it is a very doubtful point, indeed, I believe—again speaking under correction—looking at the peculiar construction of our federal system, if they can legally empower the minority to tax their own people for the benefit of their own schools under our constitution. What follows? Why, this follows: If you pass this Bill as it stands, making no further provision than you make now, what you do is this: You condemn the children of the Catholic minority of Manitoba to hopeless illiteracy. You will do your best to turn them into hewers of wood and drawers of water. Is that the boon you propose to give the Catholics of Manitoba? Is that what my hon. friends from the province of Quebec desire should be granted them? Is that just? Is it right? Is it in the interests of the public? And yet I well believe that is all you can possibly give, without the aid of Manitoba, by any such

measure as you have now submitted to the House. It cannot be too clearly pointed out that this business of joint jurisdiction is an absurdity on the face of it, and that it will merely provide the opportunity for interminable strife and litigation.

Sir, my hon. friend (Mr. Laurier) has pointed to you a more excellent way. Let us look to the example of our own two great provinces. I do not know that separate schools are particular favourites either in Quebec or in Ontario, but I put it to my friends in Ontario whether the Protestant minority in Quebec is not fairly and generously treated by the Catholic majority of that province? And I put it to my friends in the province of Quebec whether the Catholic minority in Ontario is not fairly and generously treated, too, by the Protestant majority in that province. These are proofs and instances of what can be done, and ought to be done, when the provinces are left to their own devices. And it is no small matter in connection with this question, it is a thing which ought to have very considerable weight with this House, that one of our most eminent statesmen, my esteemed friend, Sir Oliver Mowat, has already publicly recorded his opinion, that this Bill, based on the remedial order, which the Government propose to pass, is to the last degree ill-considered and ill-advised.

I have another criticism yet to make on the conduct of the Government in this matter. I have looked over the documents which they have laid before us, and in which they have embodied their proceedings with respect to this same remedial order, and I find to my astonishment that a large part of this document, formally laid on the Table of this House, widely circulated throughout this country, consists of ex-parte affidavits which had been ruled out of court, which had been deliberately withdrawn by the counsel for the minority in Manitoba. We know what apology the hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Dickey) made for that. What does it prove? Giving him the benefit of his own apology, it simply proves that this whole proceeding was conducted with such shameful haste that these affidavits were published without the slightest consideration, on his part, and that he is heartily ashamed of the thing to-day. What had the hon. Minister of the Interior to say for it? He was good enough to tell us that he thought it was all right, because it enabled him to insinuate nasty things against my hon. friend the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin). To my mind, both the present Minister of Justice (Mr. A. Dickey), and the former Minister of Justice (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) deserve very severe censure for their conduct in this matter. The present Minister of Justice deserves censure for allowing it to be done, and he takes the responsibility of it in part, and the former Minister of Justice deserves severe censure, likewise, because it was his special duty I conceive, to see that all the

documents in such a case as this were duly and properly in order, just as they would have been if presented in a court. Let me ask one question. Had the case been reversed, had a number of affidavits been presented on the part of the province of Manitoba, and afterwards withdrawn by the counsel for Manitoba, is there one human being within the sound of my voice who thinks that those affidavits would have found their place in the blue-book printed by the Government of Canada? Sir, I will ask my legal friends another question: Did they, in all their experience, ever know any such thing to occur in any court of justice, as evidence of this class, which had been expressly withdrawn, which, it was stated, was to have no effect whatever upon the minds of the judges, appearing in the records of the case sent out as being a true statement of what passed before that court? And remember that, according to these gentlemen's statement, their Committee of the Canadian Privy Council sat as a judicial body in this case. Now, Sir, I say, that that one fact is enough to damn the remedial order.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is perfectly clerical, I beg to inform the hon. gentlemen—perfectly clerical, if not parliamentary—and it is good sound Saxon English, into the bargain. Sir, I say more—that that document, printed, as it has been, with these ex-parte affidavits in it, would go very far indeed to justify the assertion made by the government of Manitoba, that they had had no fair hearing before the Privy Council. Their case was prejudged, Sir. Now, one of two things—either this was a most unfair attempt to prejudice the case of Manitoba, or it is a proof of the extremest carelessness in a matter which, of all others, demanded the greatest prudence and care at the hands of the Government. I repeat, that it is not to be forgotten, that these records were scattered all over Canada. Is there one man in ten thousand, not being a lawyer, who, taking up that book and seeing these documents, would understand that they are, from a legal point of view, absolutely worthless, that, though they appear to be sanctioned by being printed in the Government Printing Bureau and bound up with the proceedings, they are really not part of the case. I think the government of Manitoba have a right to demand a formal apology from the Government of Canada for the introduction of these affidavits in this blue-book that they have disseminated throughout the country.

And now, Sir, I come to another and important side of this question. I do not deny, I do not dispute, that this House has a right, if it pleases—and it may be it is well that it should exercise that right—to discuss this question very fully. But I must say, that I most gravely impeach the right of this

House, except on the strictest and most constrained construction, to decide in a matter of such magnitude at this moment. I dispute that right on moral grounds; I dispute it on equitable grounds; above all, I dispute it on constitutional grounds. What is our position to-day? Sir, five years and one month have elapsed since, on the 3rd of February, 1891, the House that preceded us was dissolved. Five years have elapsed since the overwhelming majority of the members of this House were elected. It is perfectly well known that we met on the 29th of April, 1891, and it is perfectly well known, too, that by the terms of the proclamation of the Governor General the writs for this House were returnable on the 25th April, 1891. More, Sir; this House is known to everybody not to represent the electorate of Canada to-day. This House was elected on lists that were prepared from the voters' lists of 1888, some seven or eight years ago. Now, it is a mathematical fact, capable of being demonstrated in any way you please, that there is no possibility that we represent more than 60 per cent of the existing electorate. An immense number of men who were on the election rolls have died, an immense number of others have grown to manhood, a very large number have been admitted under our several Acts, and, I am sorry to say, a very considerable number have left this country. On what ground do we assume to pass laws? The ground is, that we represent the electorate of Canada, and that the majority in this House represent the majority of that electorate. How can we say that that is the case, when the whole of us put together represent very little more than half the existing electorate? Then, there is the constitutional ground, which ought to weigh with a parliament like this, if it has any regard for our federal constitution. Since the last House was dissolved, a census was taken, in April, 1891. The results of that census show, that there are to-day four provinces out of the seven improperly represented on the floor of this House. The three maritime provinces are represented in excess of their right to the extent of something like 10 per cent, and the province of Manitoba is largely under-represented. The Redistribution Act was passed, I believe, in 1892, so that it is more than three years since that Act was passed. Sound constitutional usage would have dictated that, in all conscience, we should have a dissolution within a reasonable time after the passing of that Act. This Parliament is the last Parliament that ought to attempt to avail itself of a technicality to prolong its existence far beyond the time for which the people intended to trust them. More, under these circumstances, this is the last Parliament that ought to legislate for Manitoba, in a matter specially affecting that province. On every ground, if we legislate, our Act would be inequitable, practically immoral, and entirely unconstitutional. Everything

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

forbids our availing ourselves of our technical legal right, everything points to the soundness and wisdom of the position taken by my hon. friend, in favour of forbearing from legislation, until we have a mandate from the people to take the matter into consideration. For let it be well remembered, this question has never been before the people of Canada. I do not think that in one single constituency in 1891 was this a vital issue. I doubt that it was raised at all.

Now, I take it, that the constitutional doctrine is the same as the common sense doctrine in a matter of this kind. The rule is well established, that it is not expedient that in a Parliament whose term is nearly run, new and important legislation should take place on questions as to which the people's voice has not been heard, except in extreme cases. It may be well, that we should discuss the question, as I have said. But, surely, it is not well, that we should attempt to decide a question of this kind under such circumstances as these. I will grant, that, in cases of extreme emergency, in cases where it is obvious the public interests would suffer seriously by delay, such a thing might be done. But, dare any man pretend, dare the Government themselves pretend, after their conduct, that this is a case of extraordinary urgency, or that any interest will suffer irrevocably by delay. More than that, it is quite possible, and I believe that the best lawyers of Canada are very much of that opinion, that any action we take may be absolutely irrevocable, that, when we have exercised our function on this head, we shall have completely tied our own hands, and that it will be impossible for us either to add to or to take from the Bill, except, perhaps, with the assistance of the Imperial Parliament. I think here I may well point out to the House that Manitoba has set them an excellent example. The government of Manitoba have appealed to the people; they come from the people fresh with their mandate on this particular question; and the House will do well to remember that in slighting the wishes of the government of Manitoba, it does not slight merely the government, or merely the legislature of Manitoba, but it slights a united province. There is another consideration to which I allude with some little delicacy; but it is perfectly well known to every man in this House that there are scores of hon. members now present who never intend to face their constituents again; and it is more than rumoured, it is known, that among them are a considerable number of gentlemen who have promises of offices from the Government of the day. Now, I say that under these circumstances, it is in the highest degree inexpedient that a measure of this kind should be carried by the votes of men who, practically, are the paid servants of the Government, who are violating by their

presence here the spirit if not the letter of the Independence of Parliament Act. Sir, I warn hon. gentlemen that although I for one would be most loth to see the American system introduced into Canada, that to the victors belong the spoils, yet there is a point at which forbearance ceases to be a virtue; and if men violate their trust, if men with the promise of office in their pockets, vote on a question like this under such conditions, let me tell those hon. gentlemen that public opinion will demand, and it may be the painful duty of future Governments to see that the demand of public opinion is carried out, that they shall not be allowed to profit by the wages of their shame. Sir, let all such, if such there be, be wise in time, and abstain from voting at all; or, if this Government, which acts under such a stern sense of duty, whose ideals are so high, if they wish to remove a stumbling block from their own friends, and from our way, too, let them give us their promise that no appointments of any members of Parliament will be made to office until three months after the next Parliament assembles. Now I come to the third question that I raised—I wish the House to consider what is the effect of all this on the province of Manitoba? Mr. Speaker, we may as well recognize once for all that physical coercion of Manitoba is an impossibility; and in my judgment, you will find that interference with the revenues of Manitoba is practically nearly as impossible. Now, it is quite likely, I believe it is quite probable, that the government and the people of Manitoba would be disposed to bow to the opinion of the people of this Dominion, fairly and honestly expressed; and I have shown you the reasons why no human being can pretend that a vote on this Bill at present can be taken as the expression of opinion of the majority of the existing electorate, and I defy any man on either side of the House successfully to controvert that statement. And what is the result? Sir, I say that all these considerations show that it is necessary for us to pause; all these considerations show that we have really and truly no right to act irrevocably in a matter of this kind, for we are setting usage, we are setting tradition, we are setting British constitutional maxims and common equity at defiance, all at one time. We are sitting here to-day by straining a special technical clause which was granted for no such purpose as that to which the Government are attempting to put it. And all for what? Why, Sir, all to pass a measure which can never be successfully worked, which, as I said, its own friends talk of as simply an instalment. Sir, it is the most idle delusion. I would say to any hon. gentleman who cherishes the vain hope that if this Act goes on the statute-book it will be an easy task to amend it to suit themselves, that they know little of the feelings that have been evoked from one

end of this Dominion to the other, if they think that any Government that values its own existence will rashly meddle with that Manitoba Act once these elections are out of the way. Sir, this measure would be a fruitful source of endless and eternal litigation, and it would intensify and exaggerate racial and religious disputes among us for ever. Now, I do not for one moment pretend to say that the Catholic minority in Manitoba have not a grievance; they have a right to be heard on that grievance, which, if well established, should be redressed. But I do say this, that there is no proof whatever that the Catholic laity, whatever some of their spiritual advisers may do, would approve of such a Bill as this; and we have a right to know that the Catholic laity as well as the few individuals who speak for them, do approve of such a measure as this before we are called upon to pass it. Now, Sir, I would like briefly to summarize the proceedings of the Government in this matter. If the aims of the Government had been to complicate this question, then I think we will all admit that they have been eminently successful. Here is a question, a question of all others which have been submitted in my time in Parliament, which needs that it should be approached in a calm, judicial frame of mind; and the Government bring it forward at a time when a calm and judicial decision is absolutely impossible. There is no man, let him be as upright and pure-minded as you please, who can vote on this question without bearing in mind that in a few weeks he will have to face his constituents. Here is a question which of all others needs ample time for consideration, if it were for no other reason than this, that there is the strongest ground for believing that if you make a mistake or an error now, that error is irrevocable. The Government bring this question forward—when? At the latest possible date that they can bring it forward. They bring it forward at a time when the days and the very hours of this Parliament are numbered, when at best we can only sit six weeks longer. Why, Sir, we were summoned here on the 2nd January expressly to consider this Bill. Had the Government been genuinely in earnest in their desire to pass this Bill, would not this Bill have been laid on the Table as soon as the Address had been got rid of? When is it presented? It is presented for its second reading on 3rd March, and this is 11th March, five years and two months since the Parliament of 1891 was dissolved. Sir, here is a question which, of all others, needs all possible moral support in order to induce the people of Manitoba to yield obedience to our direction in this matter, and the Government bring it forward under conditions which not only excuse but justify the people of Manitoba in disregarding it; because I say, that on constitutional and moral grounds this House, as I pointed out, has

absolutely no right to dictate to Manitoba at present. Sir, this is a question which of all others needs the fullest information that could be laid before us in all details with respect to its practical working, and with respect to the practical working of the system which it is sought to amend; yet we have absolutely, so far as the Government are concerned, no information whatever. More than that, the Government deliberately prevented this information being got when the counsel for the province of Manitoba tendered it to them. Sir, one thing we do know, and that is, that by their conduct they have made the province of Manitoba unprecedentedly unanimous in declining and refusing to consider their propositions: aye, Sir, and perhaps we know this other thing, that if there be any further mistakes to make, these hon. gentlemen are the men to make them. Now, I would like to say one word to my hon. friends from the province of Quebec. Sir, in this matter, their position has been one of uncommon difficulty and uncommon delicacy. We know well that they have exposed themselves to much misconstruction; and I am happy to say that under those circumstances their conduct has been loyal and courageous in no ordinary degree. Sir, I will not minimize the danger to which those hon. gentlemen have exposed themselves, but I say to them, with some experience behind me, that in a case like this the boldest course is always the wisest course. To the French Liberals of the province of Quebec, Canada owes a very deep debt, and they are doing more by their action to reconcile the two races and disabuse men's minds of prejudice than by anything that has occurred perhaps since the confederation became a reality. More than that. Sir, I believe my excellent friends from the province of Quebec will before many weeks elapse find that the policy that they have adopted is the policy which more than all others is likely to bring redress for their friends the Catholic minority in Manitoba. Sir, I cannot doubt, I should be ashamed to doubt, that the people of Manitoba as a whole will recognize the obligations which they are under to the French Liberals of the province of Quebec, and that they will do more for those who have refused to condemn them unheard than they would do for a whole army, even if it were led by such a courageous warrior as the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot), and I was going to add, and the still more daring hero, the Minister of Public Works, whom I do not see in his place. Mr. Speaker, in no terms of fulsome compliment do I say to my friends from the province of Quebec that they have done a great deal to redeem this Parliament and ennoble its dying hours. They have proved themselves true friends of liberty in this country. I grant that in Ontario and elsewhere our task has been easy; we have been swimming with the stream, we have taken no risk, we have

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

rather strengthened our hands; but it was not so with my friends in the province of Quebec, for the moment at all events, and the least we from the other provinces can do is to recognize and proclaim our high appreciation of the conduct of our friends and of their action in this matter; and I will add, that I have more hope of confederation to-day than I have had for many long years past, I have more hope of seeing our various provinces welded into one harmonious whole and bringing about that consummation which alone can make this confederation a success, when every man in this House and out of it will feel that he is a Canadian first and a Frenchman or an Englishman, a Protestant or a Catholic afterwards.

Mr. MACLEAN (York). Mr. Speaker, I must confess at the outset that I am one of those irreconcilables referred to the other day by the Minister of Trade and Commerce, and I am willing to be so termed by him if he will allow me to use that same term to describe Ministers who failed to agree with their chief on every point of his policy, as well as to apply it to those private members who disagree with their party on one plank of its platform and that a fortuitous plank, as this happens to be. I came to this House four or five years ago with the idea that I was coming to Parliament to hear questions discussed concerning the progress and welfare of the country, the development of our resources, the increase of our population, the settlement of our wild lands. But ever since I have had a seat in this House I have heard these questions discussed but little. On the contrary, we have had the time of the House occupied more or less by this question now before us. It has been a spectre before us all the time, and unless we take a firm stand now and put these race and creed questions out of this House, as I think they should be put out, they will continue from year to year and be a bar to the progress of any legislation of the kind to which I have referred. We have a splendid iron industry in Hamilton and elsewhere, we have a great lumbering industry, an extensive pulp industry, great agricultural resources and mining possibilities, and hon. members of this House should be concerned in extending these industries and extending our trade by appointing consuls in other countries, and in every way devoting the energies of the House to building up our industries, increasing our trade, and consequently increasing our population instead of wasting the time of the House in discussing race and creed questions. The necessity of rejecting the consideration of such subjects is seen in the statement that this question will take up all our time, as a great many speakers have already said, and the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) stated, "this is only the beginning of the question." The last clause of the Bill provides for amending legislation, and we

were told by the hon. member for Kamouraska (Mr. Carroll) last night and the hon. member for South Oxford to-day that if we pass this Bill the time of the House next session will be taken up in amending this Act; and we know, from a question placed on the paper the other day, that the bishops of the North-west Territories have a school grievance, and if this legislation is passed to remedy the grievance in Manitoba there will assuredly be a school question in the North-west Territories, and if we continue to entertain these proposals there will be nothing discussed in this House for some sessions except race and creed issues. As a young man and a Canadian proud of my country, I appeal to this House to bar the door against these questions, and keep them out, and devote our energies to the improvement of our country, the promotion of our industries, and the building up of this great Dominion. No party, whether it be the Conservative party or the Reform party, can stand the strain of such questions as this which we have had before us during the last three or four years. What is the fact with regard to our own party—and I still call myself a Conservative? That all the divisions we have seen of late have turned on this question. There have been twelve ministerial defections from the Cabinet, and I venture to say that every one of these defections has turned on a creed or race question. Is it not a fact that there are hon. gentlemen in this House who would not enter the Cabinet because of these issues? Were they not prevented doing so simply by these race and creed questions? So it will be from year to year, and therefore it is in the interest of the Conservative party and it is equally in the interest of the Liberal party, to have it understood that we will keep out of the House these issues; for if we pay any attention to reports that are current, we know that hon. gentlemen opposite are as much disturbed by this question, and the speech delivered by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) confirms this, as are hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, and that a creed question is a menace to both parties, a menace to the Dominion, and at all hazards should be kept out of the House. Why should this Parliament settle the question? Is it not a fact that the provinces have power to settle questions of this kind, and that they have been so settled heretofore? As the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) pointed out, have not the Protestant majority in Ontario treated the Catholic minority generously? Is it not a fact, as has been claimed in this House, that the Roman Catholic majority in the province of Quebec has treated generously the Protestant minority in that province? Is it not a fact that this question or a similar one has arisen in Prince Edward Island and in New Brunswick, and that the local legislatures of those provinces settled it? And why cannot this be done in

Manitoba? If the remedial order had not been issued, even if the present Bill were withdrawn, I believe the good sense of the people in Manitoba would rectify this difficulty, would remedy the grievance of the minority and would do justice under the circumstances; but I do not believe that the province of Manitoba under the present circumstances will do anything to remove the grievance in question. There is just another matter in connection with this question, and it is this. If we set the example now of allowing any one province to create a disturbance of this character, and if that province happens to be under the control of a political party opposed to the dominant party at Ottawa, is it not a fact, that the party in power in the several provinces will be continually bringing up these questions, in order to cause a disturbance in the ranks of the party in control of federal affairs and opposed to the provincial government in politics? The Liberal party in Manitoba are not acting beyond their powers or beyond what political parties do, and for that very reason they think they can aid their friends here at Ottawa by keeping this question alive. If they succeed in doing that, Sir, every other province which happens to have a government opposed to the dominant party at Ottawa, will be continually trying to raise these disturbances, and by sending them to Ottawa we will be kept here in a hotbed of race and religious issues.

Now, the question has been raised here in regard to the constitution and in regard to the right of the Manitoba minority to claim a remedy under the constitution. It is a fact, as has been said, that our Canadian constitution is a written one. We are told, that we must live up to the spirit and letter of that constitution in every line and in every clause. I do not claim to be posted very deeply as regards the constitution, but I have at least read in the works dealing with the constitution: That the constitution is a matter of growth, is a matter of progression, and that, if you attempt to make it cast-iron, and to insist upon every clause being carried out, you will fail. The British constitution, which is the finest constitution in the world, and upon which ours is modelled—

Mr. GILLIES. No.

Mr. MACLEAN (York). I hope the hon. gentleman (Mr. Gillies) does not deny that we have British constitutional practices in this country.

Mr. GILLIES. Does the hon. gentleman mean to say, that the constitution of Canada is the same as the British constitution?

Mr. MACLEAN (York). The very first clause of our constitution says that. If the hon. gentleman will read the Act, he will see it in the very first clause, and my hon.

friend (Mr. Gillies) is a lawyer, and I am not.

Mr. GILLIES. The Canadian constitution is written, and the British constitution is not.

Mr. MACLEAN (York). Certainly, I did not need to be told that. I will tell the hon. gentleman in what the two constitutions are alike. The British constitution is a progression, a development, and it is the great constitution it is to-day because there were any number of rights guaranteed to the king, guaranteed to the nobility, guaranteed to the universities, guaranteed to the great corporations, guaranteed to the trade guilds, and they were a part of the constitution, just as much as any provision is in our constitution. But, in the interests of the people, and in the interest of progressive government, these rights and these privileges were withdrawn, were left in abeyance, or were silenced, in the public interest. I say, Sir, that, notwithstanding the fact, that a certain provision may be in our constitution, yet, if it is in the public interest, we would be justified in allowing whatever rights the minority claim in Manitoba to remain in abeyance. Certainly, there is no great public reason why they should be dealt with at the present time, and in the manner in which it is proposed now to deal with them. Sir, I throw out the idea, that the Canadian constitution is just as much subject to the law of development, just as much subject to the law of progression, just as much subject to the rights of this one or that one going into abeyance, as were subject to go into abeyance the rights guaranteed under the British constitution. The same thing has happened in the United States, which has a written constitution, and the same thing is happening every day in regard to our own Canadian constitution, whether we like to confess it or not.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to make a long speech. But I desire, on this occasion, to protest against this Parliament coercing a great and free province like Manitoba in the matter of education. I protest against this Parliament coercing the province of Manitoba in the matter of education until this Parliament, as previous speakers have said, has had a mandate from the people in a general election to interfere in that respect. The hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) who preceded me, has referred to the sacrifices which the Liberals have made in Quebec in regard to this question. Well, Sir, there are others on this side of the House who are making great sacrifices too. I say for my own province—and I speak for my own province—I say for the Conservatives of Ontario, that they protest against this interference with the province of Manitoba under existing circumstances. The province of Ontario regards her relations to the province of Manitoba in the light of the ancient Greek idea. Ontario

Mr. MACLEAN (York).

regards herself as the metropolis, the mother city, the mother state, and Manitoba as her child, her offspring, and her colony. And, Sir, the province of Ontario will resent—and I say it after a thorough knowledge of what the opinion of my province is—the province of Ontario will resent such interference as is proposed under this Bill and under existing circumstances. I say further, Sir, that, as a young Conservative, as one who regards the great Northwest as the hope of this country, as one who regards that part of the Dominion, which, when developed, will give us our greatest strength, will give us that great increase of population we desire; as a young Conservative, I say this to the Government to-night: I say, forbear. I repeat it, forbear before you attempt to interfere with the province of Manitoba; forbear before you compel a province of its standing and of the character of its people, to adopt a school system which they have declared at the polls they do not want, and which I know they are supported in resisting by the people of Ontario and a large proportion of the people of Canada.

Mr. McLEOD. Mr. Speaker, I rise, Sir, to support the second reading of this Bill, and I shall give a few reasons for doing so. The question has been admitted on all hands to be an important one. It is indeed the most important question that can very well come before this Parliament. The amendment which has been moved to the motion for the second reading of this Bill, is instructive, in this particular, that it shows how in a case like this extremes can meet. On the one hand, we have the hon. gentleman from York (Mr. Maclean) and others who are with him, declaring that they will support the amendment because they are entirely opposed to remedial legislation. It matters not to them what the grievance is. It matters not as to how the minority may be treated in reference to the schools. The hon. member for York (Mr. Maclean) will sweep out of the constitution the protection given to the minority, and will pay no attention to the provisions of that constitution. On the other hand, we have the other extreme represented by the gentleman from Verchères (Mr. Geoffrion) and by others of his friends, who say that they will vote for the amendment, but on entirely different and opposite grounds. These gentlemen say they will vote for the amendment, because the Remedial Bill is not a Remedial Bill at all, and because it is not as strong as it should be in support of the claims of the Catholic minority in Manitoba. They go further, and they say, that the Government was wrong in not disallowing the Manitoba School Act of 1890. Yet, Sir, these two extremes meet, in support of this amendment. We have also the leader of the Opposition and some who are with him, taking a middle course, which is

calculated to catch both parties. The leader of the Opposition does not say, that the constitution should be entirely overlooked, but he says we should consider this matter a little more; give us time, give us a commission, give us an opportunity to investigate, forgetful entirely of the fact, or, it may be, overlooking the fact, that investigation of the subject and discussion of the subject has been going on in all parts of this country for over six years. If the hon. gentleman has not full information in regard to the question now, after six years of discussion and investigation, it seems somewhat questionable whether he would understand it any better, or be able to come to a more intelligent conclusion in regard to it after six or seven months of further delay.

For myself, I feel, as I have always felt, that the rights guaranteed under the constitution to the minority, whether in Manitoba, Ontario, Quebec, or any other province, are sacred and should be properly and carefully guarded. I differ entirely from any hon. gentleman who says that we should so construe those provisions of the constitution as to give the least amount of benefit to an aggrieved minority that could be given. I say that we should give liberal, fair and proper consideration to the complaints of a minority; we should construe those provisions of the constitution according to its spirit and letter. I also differ from those who say that the time has come when we may regard the solemn compact entered into with the minority as being no longer binding upon us. I dissent entirely from that view. I say that we should give fair force and effect to that compact.

But let me consider briefly the three objections which have been urged against this Bill. The first is that it is not strong enough, not remedial enough, so to speak, in its provisions. Now, Parliament has the right, only so far as the circumstances of each case may require to make remedial laws for the due execution of the provisions of the Act. So that whether this law is remedial enough or not, whether it goes sufficiently far to protect the rights of the minority, is a question for Parliament here and now to determine. I admit that. Those who support the Act believe that it does. And while it may be said, not to be a complete answer, yet the minority who are affected by the Act are satisfied with it, and think it is sufficiently strong to remedy the grievance of which they complain. That being the case, it does not lie in the mouths of the gentlemen who are endeavouring to defeat the legislation sought, to say that it is not sufficiently strong and does not provide a remedy. The people of Manitoba who are asking for this legislation are better able to determine that, and they say it is sufficient. That, I think, is a complete answer to the statement that the Bill is not remedial enough.

As to the middle course suggested by the leader of the Opposition and supported, I think, by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), I ask, why should we have a further investigation? As I have said, this question has been under discussion for six years. The Act complained of was passed in 1890, prior to the elections of 1891. It was then more or less discussed throughout the country. It has been discussed from time to time ever since. The Act itself was before the courts—first, before our own courts and afterwards before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council—on the question as to whether it was ultra vires or not. The complaints of the minority were discussed then, and they have since been discussed from time to time throughout the country. The question again came up when the appeal was made to the Governor General in Council. So that, after all these discussions, I cannot see what further investigation is required. Let us for a moment look and see what is to be investigated. We have this fact, that down to 1890 the minority were entitled to separate schools under the laws which existed prior to that time. In 1890 the Act in question was passed, by which every vestige of right which the minority had to separate schools was entirely swept away. That is not disputed; nobody pretends that that was not done. What further does the hon. gentleman wish to have investigated? That is what the minority complain of. It is that and that alone that entitles them to come here for a remedy. And Parliament has a right to pass a law that will so far, and so far only as is necessary, remedy that grievance. In proposing to do this, the Government have said, and have said very wisely: "We will remedy the grievance, but we will see also that the schools we establish shall be efficient. We will not re-establish inefficient schools, but will see that the real grievance complained of shall be remedied, and at the same time efficient schools shall be established." A good many people have gone abroad saying that the Government want to bring back the old inefficient schools; but that is not the case. We know that the Catholic minority wish to have their religion taught in their schools. That is a matter which they consider a right—a right which, under the constitution, they enjoyed prior to 1890; and this Bill restores that right, while providing for the efficiency of the schools. Now, why should this question be kept open any longer, a disturbing element in the politics of this country? The sooner it is settled the better. It should be settled now. Parliament should at once, and as quickly as possible, deal with it. That is the great reason for which we met this year, and it would seem unworthy of Parliament to separate and still leave the question open to continue to disturb the country. The reason given by the hon. gen-

tleman who has just taken his seat, and some others for delay is that he does not want this or any other Remedial Bill passed because they wish to give no effect to the provisions of the Act for the protection of the minority. Is it a good reason? It is an intelligible reason, but not one which ought to commend itself to any man who has any regard for the rights granted to the minority under the constitution. It is not a reason which should commend itself to any man who feels like legislating fairly between the majority and the minority. Whether rightly or wrongly, the minority have had that right granted to them by the constitution, and it would be unworthy of Parliament, if Parliament were, for one moment, to say: Notwithstanding all that, we will disregard that right, and do away with it; we will treat you as if no such right existed.

That brings us to the question that we have to consider, and I must say that, in discussing it, I am not taking into account my own private opinion with regard to separate schools. I do not feel at liberty to determine the question on that basis at all. I am here to give effect to this provision in the constitution. What is the provision:

In case any such provincial law as from time to time seems to the Governor General in Council requisite for the due execution of the provisions of this section is not made, or in case any decision of the Governor General in Council on any appeal under this section is not duly executed by the proper provincial authority in that behalf, then and in every such case, and as far only as the circumstances of each case require, the Parliament of Canada may make remedial laws for the due execution of the provisions of this section, and of any decision of the Governor General in Council under this section.

As I understand that, it means that when a minority have a grievance and appeal for remedy to the Governor General in Council, and when that appeal is allowed, then Parliament is seized with jurisdiction. And what then is the duty of Parliament? Not to legislate originally, if I may so speak, not to legislate according to what the majority may believe should be done if no privilege had been granted by the constitution—it is not for us to say whether there should be separate schools or not, but to decide whether the minority did have separate schools and whether these were improperly taken away from them, whether they were taken away in such a manner that the minority are entitled to come to the Government and ask that their schools be restored. It is for us to consider the question in a judicial capacity, and not from the point of view of personal opinion. It is for us to fairly remedy the grievance of which they complain, and give them back fairly what was wrongfully taken from them. That is the question we have to consider. They come to us and ask us in our judicial capacity—semi-judicial capacity, at all events—to restore to them the separate schools which

Mr. McLEOD.

were guaranteed or continued to them under an express provision of our constitution, and if they prove their case, it is our bounden duty to restore these schools, no matter what our personal opinions may be as to the advisability of having separate schools or not. At all events, that is my opinion. The only limitation on our right of restoring them is as to the extent to which we will restore them. We cannot say that we will not restore them at all, or that we will make them inoperative altogether; but we can decide, because we are the judges in that matter, how far it is necessary to restore them, how far we think they ought to be restored. That, at all events, is the view I have always entertained.

I regret exceedingly that this question should be considered as one of Government policy. It is unfortunate that it has to be considered as a question of party politics. It ought to be outside of and beyond party politics, and should be considered entirely on its merits irrespective of Government policy. Because it is no part of the policy of the Government, but it is a question which has been forced upon the Government, and which it is the bounden duty of the Government to deal with. The minority have a grievance, and they appeal to the Governor General in Council for redress; and if the appeal be well founded, the Government is obliged to allow it. So that it seems to me a question of this kind ought to be outside of party politics, and Parliament should rather consider it from a judicial than a political standpoint. Now, then, what are the merits of the case? Going back to the formation of the province, we find that a certain class of schools was in existence then; and the first question that arises is whether these schools are protected and guaranteed by the constitution itself, so that they could not be affected by any subsequent legislation on the part of the province. I have come to the conclusion, after carefully studying the question, that it was the intention of the parties connected with the negotiations by which Manitoba entered confederation that these separate schools should be continued and secured. It is true that the Privy Council has declared that the Act was not sufficiently strong; but in considering this question, I think we ought to endeavour to discover whether there was sufficient in the negotiations to lead to the conclusion that the parties to them intended, at all events, to secure the continuance of these separate schools. I think I speak correctly when I say that there are only four men living to-day who were then members of the Government. Two of them are in this House, and the other two are the Hon. Mr. Mitchell and Sir Leonard Tilley, I know that the opinion of both Mr. Mitchell and Sir Leonard Tilley is that they intended that the schools then existing in Manitoba should be preserved to the people, and I believe that is the opinion of the two gentlemen who are members of this House.

So that we have that much evidence to go upon; but I go further, and I say that the Act itself is some evidence that they intended to preserve them, that the words in the Act are sufficiently strong to show that the intention was to guarantee and continue these separate schools. Bear with me while I just call attention to this clause:

Nothing in any such law shall prejudicially affect any right or privilege with respect to denominational schools which any class of persons have by law in the province at the union.

That was with reference to schools that were then in existence, and it differed from the wording of the British North America Act in having the words "or practice" as well as the words "by law." Now, it is a proper rule of construction that when a change in words is made in an Act it is to be presumed that it is done for a purpose. The words "or practice" must have been added for a purpose. That purpose was either to extend or to limit a right. I think the intention was to extend it. These people felt that they had schools there which were in effect separate schools, though, perhaps, not such in the legal sense of the term, and the words "or practice" were specifically introduced to cover the case of those schools. I think that is a fair construction. In further evidence that these schools were intended to be protected though not covered by law was the fact that, as soon as Manitoba became a province of the Dominion, a law was passed establishing these separate schools. I am satisfied that all parties to the negotiations so interpreted the agreement. And the fact is that the schools remained in existence for nineteen years, until 1890, when the Public Schools Act was passed. Then arose the questions as to whether that Act was ultra vires or not, and for the first time it became necessary to give a legal interpretation to the words, "or practice" in this clause. The parties went before the courts, and it is significant that our own Supreme Court unanimously took the view that these schools were guaranteed by agreement embodied in the constitution. I thought I had here the decision of the Supreme Court and regret that I have not it, as I would like to read a portion of the judgment of Chief Justice Ritchie, one of the most eminent jurists that ever sat upon the Canadian bench. But if hon. gentlemen will look up that judgment they will find that the learned chief justice holds that the words "or practice" were words of limitation put in there for a purpose. The minority had not legal separate schools that time but the words "or practice" were put in to cover the case of these schools as they were not covered by law. It is true that that decision was subsequently reversed by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council and by that decision we must abide. And yet, though it may seem im-

pertinent, I am bound to say that, having read very carefully both the decision of our own Supreme Court and that of the Judicial Committee, in my humble judgment, the reasoning of the former is far more conclusive and satisfactory than that of the learned judges of the Judicial Committee.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Do you mean in both cases?

Mr. McLEOD. No, I mean in the Barrett case.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Oh, I thought you overruled the Privy Council altogether.

Mr. McLEOD. I do not overrule it at all, but I venture to give an opinion in which I have heard other members of the bar concur, that the reasoning of the Supreme Court of Canada judgment is more satisfactory than that of the judgment of the Privy Council.

This is important in this way: If it is true that these people thought they had protected their rights prior to confederation, and had failed, if the words they used were insufficient for the purpose and they were therefore without that guarantee of their rights, it seems to me it makes their claim for remedy and relief here, much stronger than if those rights had been acquired altogether after the province became a part of the Dominion. To illustrate, if, before Manitoba became a province of the Dominion this matter had not been thought of, and separate schools had been subsequently established and the Act establishing them repealed years afterwards, I do not think their claim would have been so strong as it is when it is shown that they tried to protect their rights prior to the province being established. So far as their legal right to appeal is concerned, of course that cannot be questioned. That question has been before the courts and there can be no question about it. I never heard anybody seriously put forward the idea that the Governor General in Council was not right in allowing that appeal. Considering the case in a quasi-judicial capacity, and seeing the rights of these people had been entirely swept away. I do not see how they could have decided the case otherwise. Then it is remitted to us. I come back then to the question I referred to some time ago. It is said we are not obliged to pass this legislation. I admit that. But I say there is a moral obligation resting upon Parliament to give back to the minority the rights that were improperly taken away. Then, finding that in 1890 these rights were entirely swept away, rights that they thought were guaranteed to them, rights, in fact, that were given to them by the Act of 1870 and subsequent amending Acts, I say, finding that, it becomes the moral duty of this Parliament to remedy that grievance so far as we can. I know that some hon. gentlemen take a different view. It has been said by the hon. gentleman who last preced-

ed me (Mr. Maclean), that the province of Manitoba was unanimously opposed to this measure. I have also heard it stated that there are men in my own province who are opposed to it, and I presume there are. But on this question, and on all similar questions, I have great confidence in the fair and honest spirit of the electors, which is sure to manifest itself on sober second thought. I think, when this question is fairly presented before the people, they are intelligent enough to understand its merits, and will be disposed to render justice to the minority in Manitoba. I think we may safely go before any intelligent constituency in Canada and say to the electors: Here is the constitution of Manitoba; these rights were guaranteed to the Catholic minority, rights which they believed were guaranteed to them prior to the union, rights which they thought were provided for prior to Manitoba becoming a province; rights that are absolutely fixed and given to them by the law itself of 1870 and amending Acts. But in 1890 these rights were ruthlessly taken away from them, and they were stripped of every vestige of what they supposed was guaranteed to them by the law and the constitution. Under our constitution, an appeal is allowed to an aggrieved minority to the Governor General in Council; that appeal was taken, and immediately thereafter Parliament was seized of jurisdiction, and it then became the moral duty of this Government to give back to the Catholic minority of Manitoba the rights of which they had been deprived. I believe, if these facts are clearly set before the people, there is not a constituency in Canada to which that appeal cannot be successfully made and who would not sanction this legislation. Sir, I intended to speak but briefly on this question, but I thought it my duty to give to Parliament the reasons which will impel me to vote against the amendment and in support of the motion for the second reading of this Bill.

Mr. DEVLIN. I rise for the purpose of explaining, in as few words as possible, the vote which I propose giving in favour of the second reading of the Bill now under discussion. Perhaps, it would be unnecessary for me to offer any explanation, were it not for the fact that my position has been misrepresented by the ex-Controller of Customs (Mr. Wallace) in his speech, delivered some days ago in this House, and also by certain newspapers edited in the interest of the party with which I am allied. The ex-Controller of Customs stated in his speech, that I had changed my position, and, speaking of the interference, as he put it, of the clergy in regard to this question, he said, that their action had made me change my position in connection with the question now before the House. He said:

I am afraid it does strike some in this House, because I remember hearing that the hon. mem-
Mr. McLEOD.

ber for Ottawa County (Mr. Devlin) who went down to Cape Breton, was one of the loudest there in his desire to resent any attempt at interference.

I asked him, if he had been there, and he answered that he had not, but that he held this upon the authority of a member of Parliament. In answer to that, I wish to say, Mr. Speaker, that at no time in the last five years have I spoken against remedial legislation. I could not do so. Five years ago, when I came to this House first, I had occasion to speak, as I thought at all events, in the interest of the minority of Manitoba, and at that time I strongly denounced the Government for not having disallowed what I felt compelled to call the infamous Acts which had been introduced into the Manitoba legislature by the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin). I denounced the Government for not having disallowed those Acts. So that at that time I was in favour of intervention, immediate, direct intervention; and I hardly think it will be possible for me to-day, after having contended for disallowance, to take any other course than to ask the Parliament of Canada to intervene in behalf of the minority in Manitoba. I meet the charge made against me by the ex-Controller of Customs, thus: I did go down to the county of Cape Breton to take part in the contest in which the present hon. Secretary of State was a candidate, and Mr. Murray, of Sydney was the Liberal candidate. I went down there, not because of the position of the school question, but rather as a Liberal, anxious to give aid and assistance to a Liberal friend. The school question did come up; but, Mr. Speaker, you will bear this in mind, that at the time there was no Bill before this House: the present Remedial Bill had not yet been introduced; and, consequently, it was impossible for me to speak against a measure which had not been made known to Parliament. I blamed the Government for not having introduced that Bill, and that was the ground I took. I blamed the Government for having, as I believed, trifled with this very question. Why, Sir, what is the history of this case? We well remember, when the remedial order was issued, the promise was made, in the county of Verchères, I believe that if that order were not complied with by the Manitoba government, a session would be almost immediately called, during which remedial legislation would be passed by the Government. It was about that time, I think, that the then Minister of Justice (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) resigned. The real reasons of that resignation have never transpired; Parliament and the country have been left in the dark as to the causes which led up to that resignation. I believe that the cause was, that the then Minister of Justice thought it well, after issuing the remedial order, that an appeal should be made to the people of Canada. Be that as it may, a

session was called, and for ten days during that session we expected that a Remedial Act would be introduced. Day after day during those ten days, statements were made by the Government, and day after day the public of this country were left under the impression that an Act would be brought into the House that would do full justice to the minority of Manitoba. One day, however, we were taken by surprise. Three Ministers resigned, the Minister of Agriculture, the Minister of Public Works and the Postmaster General. They resigned because of this very question. They felt that they could not have that confidence which they should have in their colleagues, because of the refusal of their colleagues to bring in a Remedial Act during that session. Three days afterwards, two of these Ministers returned, and a pledge was made by the leader of the House, that another session, the one which is now going on, would be called, at which an ample measure of relief and of remedial legislation would be proposed by the Government and carried through. The most important of the three, the man whose position stood highest of the three in the province of Quebec could not accept this promise of the Government, and refused to return to the fold of the faithful and accept the portfolio he had resigned. I believe that he knew perfectly well what was transpiring in the inner circles; I believe he knew that the cause of remedial legislation was hopeless in so far as the present Government was concerned. That such was his impression is shown by the fact that notwithstanding the pressure brought to bear on him frequently, he refused at any time to give an expression of opinion in favour of the Government, and he believed that in so far as the present Government were concerned, the cause of remedial legislation was hopeless. Had I not, then, reason to denounce the Government during the campaign in Cape Breton? And, after all, was I doing any worse than members of the Government themselves, when I said that they were not sincere in respect to this measure? I held that belief even then, because of the words uttered by the Secretary of State during that campaign. When the hon. gentleman and his friends came to a Protestant section, very little was said in regard to the school question; when they reached a Catholic section, very much was said in regard to that question, and when they entered upon a section where the population was mixed, they assured the people that the difficulty would be settled in a plain and easy manner. I had my doubts, and consequently I expressed them publicly.

The session was called for the 2nd January. The date was fixed for this memorable session when remedial legislation was to be introduced. The House met on 2nd January. The Speech from the Throne was delivered, and the House adjourned. If my memory deceives me not, to 7th January.

When we met again, what was the declaration made by the Government? Was it that the Remedial Bill was then ready? Were the Government then prepared to go on and pass the legislation which had been promised in the most solemn manner during the previous session? No. We found that the Government were divided. On the one hand there were seven members who opposed the other seven, and there were seven who proclaimed the first seven incapables. This was the situation which confronted us, the cause being, I believe, that these members of the Government could not agree upon the Bill which is before the House to-day. I therefore had difficulty in believing that the Government were perfectly serious in introducing this Bill for remedial legislation. However, the day came and the Bill was introduced, and then at once, and without delay, I expressed my determination to support it, as it is my intention to support it by my vote. I simply wish to correct the impression created by the ex-Controller of Customs in regard to the position which I occupied in Cape Breton on this question. I explained my position there as I do here to-night, and at no time in my life, at least no time during the last five years have I uttered one word against remedial legislation. True, we had not a Remedial Bill before the House, we had promises, oft repeated, promises made in high and low places, promises made by high and ordinary politicians; but the promised Bill did not appear, although the moment it did appear I explained that I would vote for it. I explained that through the press. The first or second day I was in Cape Breton I explained the position of my leader, according to my knowledge as to what his position was. Remember we had no Remedial Bill before the House, and I had the very faintest hope that the Government ever would introduce such a Bill. Finding we had not such a Bill before us, a measure which was to me a long-cherished hope, I explained what the policy of the leader of the Opposition was, namely, that it was a policy to appoint a commission, a policy of investigation. Sir, only a few months ago, I think, three or four months ago, the leader of the Opposition held a meeting in the county which I represent in this House, in that portion which will constitute the county of Labelle. He spoke in the town of Buckingham. I was present at the meeting, and on the platform—and that was three months ago—I then and there declared that if remedial legislation were proposed by the Government I would support the measure. True, I qualified my statement. I said I should like to have a measure that would be, in truth, remedial legislation, and would afford to the minority that relief to which, in my opinion, they were entitled. Although I have not the pleasure of seeing my old friend the ex-Controller of Customs in his seat, I hope he will do me the pleasure and honour of reading

the few remarks I have made in regard to his statement concerning my position in Cape Breton. Sir, he also pointed out that the dignitaries of the church had spoken, and consequently we had to bow. All I can say is that I have the highest respect for the bishops of the church to which I belong; and I unhesitatingly declare that when the bishops of the church speak on this question of education, I will listen to them with all possible respect, knowing that by their vocation, by their mission, and by their attainments they are well qualified to speak on this subject. It would be an unfortunate day when, in order to please the ex-Controller of Customs, or any other hon. gentleman who entertains his opinions on this subject, I should speak lightly of the bishops of the church, or receive with disrespect the utterances they might make on the school question. Sir, the hon. gentleman went from Spain to Italy and travelled from one country to another in order to find material with which to assail the Catholic church and the cause of Catholic education. He spoke of the threats and menaces of the Catholic church. Does he imagine for a moment, that we ignore history, even history as it exists in this country? Does he ever hear us recall to him the fact that ministers of his church and the ministers of every Protestant denomination have spoken from the platform on this question in such a way that nothing but a threat could be inferred? Statements made in such a way, Sir, that no other inference could be drawn from their remarks than that if members of this House did not vote as they wished, they would find arrayed against them the Protestant electorate of Ontario. He (Mr. Wallace) drew attention to the utterances of the Catholic bishops. The Catholic bishops of the province of Quebec, aye, and of Ontario, did speak upon this question. And how did they speak? Did they speak in a tone of threat. No, Sir, they did not. They spoke in the form of a petition to the Government some few years ago, asking, praying, that certain amendments, cruel and unnecessary amendments, to the school law, might be disallowed. It was not in the form of a threat. It was not in the form of a menace. It was in the form of a prayer to the Government, and I think that is the only declaration in recent years which we have had from the bishops of the Catholic Church of Canada, speaking collectively, and speaking with authority, on this question. There are no threats, Sir. None have been made by the dignitaries of the Roman Catholic Church, and no insinuation in that sense can rightly be conveyed by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace). He speaks of the state of education in Italy and in Spain. It is unnecessary, in connection with this debate, that any defence should be made of the cause of Catholic education, or of the cause of Catholicity in Spain or in Italy. Sir, we are long accustomed in this country to such

Mr. DEVLIN.

attacks. When in the province of Ontario war was made at different elections upon the separate school system, the Roman Catholics of this country had to put up with such attacks. I go this far, and say: that it is by the use of such attacks that the ex-Controller of Customs (Mr. Wallace) has attained eminence in this country—sad and sorrowful eminence, I must say. He denounced the Catholic Church. Has he read the history of his own Canadian home? Has he read the history of Canada? Knows he not, Sir, that there is not one stain upon the Catholic Church, or upon its history in this country, a country of which he expresses himself proud? Does he forget the sacrifices made in the interests of Christianity by the noble missionaries who crossed the ocean and here planted the sign of faith? Does he forget the deeds of Catholic missionaries who brought to the uncivilized the first glad tidings of the gospel; aye, brought them, Sir, at the expense of every comfort, and heedless of every sacrifice possible, sacrifices which few men could make, sacrifices which alone martyrs of their grand noble character could make. That is the history of the beginning of the Catholic Church in this country, and step by step, from that day to this, these missionaries and their successors, and the bishops, have fought for the grand and noble cause of education. Sir, if that hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) wants to know what the Catholic Church has done for education in this country, I will invite him to go into the city of Quebec, and there he will see one of the grandest monuments of education—I will not say in Canada alone, I will not say on this continent of America alone, but one of the grandest educational institutions in the world, the great University of Laval. Side by side with that university he will behold the Seminary of Quebec, and he will see at almost every corner the magnificent educational institutions of which Canadians, whether Catholic or Protestant, have just reason to feel proud. And, Sir, let him come to the city of Montreal, let him come to this very city of Ottawa, let him go where he will, he will find that the Catholic Church, instead of doing harm or damage to the cause of education, is in every way and at every step, and during every day of the year, and during all the days of all the years of our Canadian history, promoting this glorious, humane and ennobling cause. I do not wish to dwell upon this. I speak, perhaps, not with the authority I would like to enjoy in this matter, because I am a Roman Catholic myself, and I may be partial to the faith of which I am proud. But, as a Roman Catholic I cannot allow him (Mr. Wallace) or any other member holding the principles which he does, to insult that grand old faith which has resisted the storms of nineteen centuries, and which to-day is shining forth in every part of the civilized

world. I cannot allow him to make such attacks without, at all events, giving him a short answer.

Sir, what is the question before the House? It is not the one exactly to which I have been referring; the question of education in Spain or in Italy, or in those countries which were mentioned by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace). But, Sir, it is the question of the rights of the minority in one of our own provinces. We are told that the minority in Manitoba are making a great mistake in asking this Parliament to intervene. We are told that they should place faith in the spirit of justice and in the generous treatment which would surely be accorded them by the government of Manitoba.

Sir, what is the history of the events connected with that government? What is the source of all the trouble which is to-day disturbing this country? It was in the year 1890 that the trouble first arose. Some time before that, when the Harrison government was in power, an election, as it was told in this House, occurred in St. François-Xavier. The Harrison government had their candidate, and the Greenway government, which succeeded that Harrison administration, the Greenway party, at all events, the Liberal party of Manitoba, had their candidate there present. It was circulated abroad that if the Liberal party in Manitoba came into power the French language would be in danger, Catholic separate schools would be in danger, and every right which they enjoyed might be taken away from them. Then it was, Sir, that the statement was made in St. François-Xavier that it was no part of the programme of the Liberal party of Manitoba to interfere either with the separate school system or with the French language of that province. That promise was made during the election.

An hon. MEMBER. Who made it?

Mr. DEVLIN. Perhaps my friend could tell who made it if he looks in this direction.

An hon. MEMBER. The hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin) is not in his seat.

Mr. DEVLIN. Mr. Speaker, the Catholic minority of Manitoba placed faith in the declaration which was then made, and what was the result? Did the province clamour for a change in the separate school system? In 1890 an Act was introduced doing away with Catholic separate schools, notwithstanding the declarations which had been made. Sir, the Roman Catholic minority was deceived, and cruelly deceived, and we are asked now to go and place faith in these gentlemen who then deceived the Catholic minority. I for one have lost faith in them when they broke their own pledge and went back on their own platform. I venture to say, Mr. Speaker, that was not the only time the Catholic minority have been deceived.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. The Government are going back to these very people you despise so much.

Mr. DEVLIN. Does the hon. member interrupt. I would be very glad to hear the interruption.

Mr. BELLEY. Parlez M. Choquette.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. The Government are going back to these very people.

Mr. DEVLIN. Well, if the hon. gentleman had waited a little bit, perhaps I would have told him about that, too. At all events, Mr. Speaker, this was the treatment at that time accorded to the Catholic minority. The Act of 1890 was passed, and we know that separate schools were abolished. I should not forget perhaps to mention an instance in connection with this, which may to a certain extent—I won't say justify—but explain the conduct of the Greenway government. During the campaign of 1886 the present member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), speaking at Barrie, referred to the French element as a great danger to the confederation. Some time afterwards he proceeded to Portage La Prairie, and there delivered one of those nice, quiet, calm speeches which he alone can deliver, explaining that the curse of this country was separate schools and that the danger to this country was no doubt the existence of the French language. And I am informed that a member of the Greenway government was present at that meeting; and it was shortly afterwards that we were told that the Acts of 1890 would be introduced. Sir, I make the statement here, that the people of Manitoba—the Protestant majority of Manitoba—never asked that the Catholic minority should be treated as they have been treated during and since 1890. I venture the statement that it was a matter of expediency upon the part of the local government, and not a matter of principle—that that government were simply anxious to retain power, and knew well that a powerful means of retaining power was to appeal to the prejudices of the people of that province, arouse their passions, and stir up their religious feelings. Thus it was that they did retain power, and thus it is that they are to-day very powerful. An hon. gentleman, speaking in this House the other day, said, "Why would you interfere with this system of education, which has the approval of at least nineteen-twentieths of the population of Manitoba?" I have no doubt that it has, because those nineteen-twentieths constitute the Protestant population of Manitoba, which has been aroused against the Catholic minority; and the other twentieth constitutes the feeble Catholic minority. Strange, indeed, if that great and powerful majority, after all the cruel and unwarranted misrepresentations which had been made of the Catholics of Manitoba and of their institutions, would not listen to

that appeal, and accord to those gentlemen that confidence which they enjoy. Sir, that was the source of the trouble; that was the point where the whole trouble arose. That was why the public schools were established and the separate schools abolished. We are told to-day that we should not interfere, because interference on our part will constitute coercion of the majority of the province of Manitoba. Bear in mind, I do not think there is a member of this House who will contend, in view of the judgment of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, that we have not the right to intervene. I am not going to-night to read any portion of that judgment, nor is it necessary; and it would be absurd on my part, not being a lawyer, to go into the law of the Manitoba Act bearing on this question. I simply say this, that I think there is hardly a member of this House who will claim that we have not the right to intervene. That we have such right under the constitution has been fully granted by both sides of this House. It is also admitted on both sides of this House that a grievance exists, and that we have the power to remedy that grievance. Of course, a contention is held that it is unwise at the present moment by action on our part to attempt to remedy that grievance. Nevertheless, these two great points stand out before us—that the Parliament of Canada has the right to intervene, and that the Catholic minority of Manitoba have a grievance. All that remains is this: Is it in the interest of that minority that we should interfere? We are told that we do not know the facts. I share not that belief. I know one fact, which is made known to me by the Acts of 1890—that the separate school system in Manitoba has been ruthlessly destroyed. That is the great fact, Sir.

Mr. DUPONT. That is the fact.

Mr. DEVLIN. That is the fact that every man in this House knows who knows anything at all about the history of the province of Manitoba during the last five years. I am wrong in making that statement. In so far as public legislation is concerned, that system has been done away; but the separate schools are there still. They are maintained in Manitoba, because the Catholic parent there holds dear to the right of educating his child. He knows that that child was given to him, not by the state, but by God. He knows that he was given the care of educating and instructing that child and looking after it, and that the state has not the right to exercise any interference with him other than what I might term the interference of the policeman. If the parent wantonly and cruelly neglected that child, then the state could interfere. If the parent taught that child immorality, then the state could interfere. But, Sir, the parent has the right to dictate the form of education his child shall receive. Hence it is we Roman Catholics in Canada are so anxious that our

Mr. DEVLIN.

children shall be brought up in the faith to which we belong—not that we are anxious to incur the enmity or hatred or hostility of our Protestant fellow-citizens—not that we bear ill will against them; but because we claim for ourselves what Sir Alexander Galt was bound that his Protestant fellow-citizens in this country should have. That is our position. Why, Sir, it has been pointed out in this House that it was not the Roman Catholics of Canada who struggled so fiercely for separate schools. It has been pointed out that when the great work of confederation was going on, Sir Alexander Galt insisted that the saving clauses with regard to minorities should be put into the constitution in order that the Protestant minority of the province of Quebec should be protected. Sir, from that day to this that minority have enjoyed every right that was conceded to them at that time. Rights have been taken away from minorities in this country; but as a Roman Catholic and as a member representing a constituency of the province of Quebec, I am proud to say here that no Catholic has ever attempted to take from his fellow Protestants any right they have possessed. But I am sorry to say that it was in the province of Manitoba, which should be the home of good feeling,—in that province, which has the promise of such a grand future before it—in that province, for which Canada has spent so much money—that prejudice was stirred up to such a fever heat as to enable the Protestant majority there to crush the Catholic minority, and to rob them of their rights. Sir, I do not ask you to coerce Manitoba. I do not ask that. I would be sorry to ask this Government to coerce Manitoba. What we ask you is that the coercion imposed on us five years ago shall be done away. What we ask is that the chains laid upon us by the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin) five years ago shall be broken. We should be sorry indeed to ask this Government to coerce Manitoba or any other province. What we ask is that the rights of which we have been robbed—and the term is not too strong—that the rights of which we have been despoiled—those rights which we enjoyed from 1871 to 1890—shall be given back to us. Let me remind you of this, Sir, that this is not a question confined solely to the province of Manitoba. This, it is true, is a question in which, I am glad to say, the minority in Manitoba have the sympathy of innumerable Protestants throughout Canada. I am proud to see that they have spoken on various platforms through their representatives and public men, and in various newspapers, also, they have given expression to feelings of sympathy with the minority in Manitoba. Aye, but I venture to say that to-day in the whole Dominion, from Cape Breton away up to Vancouver, there is not a Catholic home—and I want you to understand that Roman Catholics constitute 42 per cent of the population of

Canada—there is not a Catholic home in this country which has not heard of the sufferings to which our fellow Catholics in Manitoba have been subjected. The Catholics of Canada feel that when the Catholics of Manitoba are coerced, it means that the Catholics of Canada are coerced. We are bound together by the ties which have united the members of the Catholic church from the first days of Christianity, we feel in this matter, and we are bound, whether this Parliament will settle the matter or not, to pursue the struggle until the last chain is broken, and until we have acquired our rights; and I say it here, knowing whereof I speak, that the Catholics in Manitoba have the sympathy of the Catholic people of Canada. No, we are not anxious to coerce Manitoba. All that we are anxious for is to be treated as our Protestant fellow-citizens are treated.

Let me put the question to my Protestant fellow-members of this House. What have we done that we should be singled out, as we have been at various times, for misrepresentation and for cruel treatment? Let me ask my fellow Protestant members of this House, if the Catholics have not loyally supported this country, and done all in their power to promote progress and help on the development of Canada. Let me ask this House if it is not true that in 1775 and again in 1812, aye, and at other times, those at the head of the Catholic church have warned their flocks that they must stand by the British constitution, that not only must they seek the protection of the British flag, but that they must see to it that that British flag shall float proudly over this country and continue to be the emblem and the ensign of power in Canada. We obey the laws of this country. We are proud—not of all the laws, not of the Act of 1890—but we are proud of the laws of this country that generally exist. We do our best, we share even in these grand sentiments which are uttered in this House from time to time on the all-important and absorbing subject of loyalty. But let me ask you, Sir, do you imagine that if the Catholics of this country, in the person of the minority of Manitoba, are to be trampled upon, if they are to be outraged, if they are to have no consideration, do you expect that they can be as loyal as they would be if they were treated on the same footing as their Protestant brethren are treated? Why, it was only a short time ago when there was a sign of trouble between England and the United States, and the feeling was abroad that perhaps Canada would be the battle field. Would you not then have been proud to have had our people united, to have had this Canadian people all enthusiastic in the defence of British power? And do you imagine for a moment that you are going to render that enthusiasm certain by trampling, in the name of British fair-play and in the name of British law and British justice, upon 42 per

cent of that population? It is impossible. I see the ex-Controller of Customs (Mr. Wallace) smile—the man who was ready to carry war into the very heart of Great Britain if justice were done to Ireland—that representative who spoke the other day of the condition of the schools in Ireland, and who was most anxious that five millions of the Irish people shall not obtain home government for no other reason than this, that he is afraid to confide to the majority the care of the minority, that he is afraid that the educational rights enjoyed by the minority might, perhaps, suffer at the hands of the majority, if that majority were to obtain power. And sooner than see such a thing consummated, he was ready, sword in hand, to go across and give his aid to disrupt the Empire.

Mr. WALLACE. I have no Fenian connections whatever.

Mr. DEVLIN. I do not believe the hon. gentleman is a Fenian. The Fenian in his opinion may be a desperate man, but I put him even ahead of the hon. gentleman. I do not think that any Fenian in Canada—if there be any Fenian in Canada—or any man enjoying the protection of our law and the advantages given to this country, would go across to wage war against England and Her Majesty in her declining years.

Sir, I propose to vote in favour of this Bill, because I believe in the right of intervention and because I believe that intervention is necessary. Why, I was astonished when I heard that the Government were going to invite the Premier of Manitoba in order to treat with him again. Over and over again, Mr. Greenway has said, through his Attorney General, Mr. Sifton, through the "Tribune," and through every possible means of communication, that it is out of the question to restore separate schools in Manitoba, and I am sorry, indeed, that he should be again approached. I say that he has treated this Government with contempt, that he has treated the Parliament of Canada with contempt, and that he has treated the Privy Council of England with contempt. I say that his contempt for the Government and the Parliament of Canada is almost equal to his contempt for the minority in Manitoba. He has been approached in every possible way. He was approached by Catholic deputations in Manitoba, and he treated them with scant courtesy, indeed. He was approached by Catholic members; he was approached by Mr. Prendergast, who was the representative of the Catholic minority in his Government, and who, rather than lend himself to the piece of treachery which was performed in 1890, gave up office. He was approached by Mr. Prendergast many times, and strong appeals were made to him on behalf of the Catholic minority, but in vain. He was approached by means of the remedial order, and that order he treated with contempt. He was approached

again by means of the second message sent in July, and that message he treated with contempt. Why, every request made by the Government or Parliament has been treated with contempt, and I confess I am sorry indeed that it should be thought necessary to go on the knee again before this high and mighty gentleman. I vote for the Bill because we have the right to intervene, and because it is absolutely necessary that this Parliament should intervene. I have no hope of justice from Mr. Greenway or his Government. I know his past history. I know what we have received from him and his friends in the past, and I cannot hope for any other treatment in the future than what he gave us in the past. I vote for the principle of this Bill because it declares the right of the minority to separate schools, and God forbid that the day should ever come when, in this House, or out of it, holding the belief which I do, I should refuse to vote in favour of the principle of restoring to the Catholic minority, separate schools. There are certain clauses in this Bill which are, in my opinion, imperfect. I regret that such clauses should be found in it. But, Sir, if I give this vote in favour of the Bill, it is because that, in my opinion, we should intervene, that there is a necessity to interfere, that minorities have rights in this country, as well as majorities, that the rights of the minority should be protected and because this Parliament alone can protect that minority. The cause of the minority in Manitoba is unpopular. I am sorry to say, it has been rendered unpopular by means of falsehoods circulated by gentlemen supporting the Greenway government there. It has been rendered unpopular by the misrepresentations concerning them at all times. It has been rendered unpopular by the crusade made by the ex-Controller of Customs himself. No man denies the power which that hon. gentleman holds in this country. He is at the head of a numerous and powerful institution. You doubt his power. Did not the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) tell you of the scalps that the ex-Controller of Customs had brought back; and, if there were necessity for it, the hon. gentleman could prove that history in this matter would repeat itself. He has a large following at his back, I know, and at all times he has engaged in special pleading against the Catholic minority in Manitoba. I myself, Sir, felt that faith could not be placed in the Government in regard to the settlement of this question, when I saw that hon. gentleman retain his position in the Government even up to the very last moment. But, at all events, that day is gone. He is out of the Government, and the Bill is on the Table. And, moreover, he and I stand in the same relation as before—he is voting on one side and I am voting on the other. I wish to say in concluding my remarks, that I do not consider the Bill perfect; there are many

Mr. DEVLIN.

clauses in it to which I take serious objection. But when we reach, if we ever do reach, the happy day of committee, amendments can be made in the Bill, and I feel confident, that, if the amendments are sound and in accordance with the principle of justice and fair-play, the Government will accept them. I have that much confidence in them.

An hon. MEMBER. Oh, oh.

Mr. DEVLIN. Some hon. gentleman is astonished that I should have confidence in the Government. But I must tell him, that I had not that confidence until the Bill was on the Table. Now, he must let me enjoy a few days of happiness and peace and indulge my confidence in the Government. I will support all amendments that seem to me good, and I will do all in my power to make the Bill one which will correct the injustice that has been done to the minority.

Sir, I have been charged, in connection with the vote which I am to give in support of this Bill, with being a traitor to my party. I resent that. I do not think, that that charge will be brought against me by my Liberal friends in this House, nor will it be brought against me by those Conservative members who know me. I know, that I am doing myself a great injury personally by the vote I am giving.

An hon. MEMBER. How is that?

Mr. DEVLIN. How is that? asks the hon. gentleman. He has only to read certain articles appearing in prominent Liberal newspapers, to learn. Why, Sir, I have received remonstrances from every quarter, explaining to me exactly the position which I occupy in connection with this matter. I am sorry indeed to be obliged to vote against my party. But, after all, I am sure my party will not bear me such malice, when it is a vote only against an amendment, an amendment for the six months' hoist. Surely, I shall not create that feeling that will cause my Liberal friends to turn against me. I wish to be in sympathy with the Liberal party, and, when this question will have been disposed of, I am quite sure that I shall be in sympathy with my party. I have worked in the interest of that party as hard as I could and as well as I knew how. Thirteen years ago I first stood upon the public platform, and, from that day to this, I have been bending my energy to the service of the Liberal party. And, when certain papers in this country tell me, that I am a traitor to my party, I throw the charge back upon them. I give this vote because I believe I am doing my duty, and in obedience to my conscientious convictions. I give this vote because I believe I am working in the interests of the minority. I give this vote because I am in favour of separate schools, and because of the fact, that those who are

suffering to-day could get no protection from the government of Manitoba, and have to come to the Government of Canada to ask for, and, I hope, obtain, that protection. I give this vote because I believe it is in the interest of Canada that this question should be settled now, and that its settlement should not be retarded. I believe we have had trouble enough over it. I believe there has been animosity long enough over this question, and my prayer to-night is, that Protestant and Catholic in this country may join hands over this subject which has separated them so long, and may see to it that minorities shall receive justice. My prayer is, that a lesson may be taught, that who ever shall strain the constitution, or destroy the constitution, to attack a minority, be that minority Catholic or Protestant, will find that the strong arm of the law can reach him, will find the flag of Britain floats here not in vain, but that it gives that protection which gentlemen here so often make their boast it does, the protection that every British subject should enjoy.

Mr. MARTIN. I hesitated, Mr. Speaker, to interrupt the hon. gentleman, but I desire to say that, so far as he charged me with getting or seeking the support of the Roman Catholic minority in Manitoba by promises and afterwards going back upon those promises, his statements were entirely inaccurate, and without any basis of fact, and that the only evidence that can be offered in support of any such statement is to be found in the affidavits published in the Government's blue-book, which I have never had the opportunity to correct—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. MARTIN. Yes, and which are untrue.

Mr. DEVLIN. I simply wish to repeat the statement I made. The statement I made was that the hon. gentleman had declared that it was no part of the Liberal programme to interfere with the French language or with the religious institutions of the minority. That was my statement, and I hold to it.

Mr. MARTIN. It is not true.

Mr. O'BRIEN. No one in this House, I think, will be inclined to doubt the sincerity of the hon. gentleman who has just spoken. I believe that he has spoken with and possesses the full courage of his convictions. Nor will I for one question even the propriety of his language, even though in some respects it was rather warm and excited, but that was natural and to be expected. But there are one or two statements that he made to which I desire to refer briefly, and one of them was with reference to the possible attainment of any compromise by means of a conference with Mr. Greenway. Sir, I think the language used

by the hon. gentleman and the manner in which it was received by a number of hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House, render it tolerably certain that the childish proposal which was laid before us a day or two ago by the hon. gentlemen on the Treasury Benches will meet with the fate which I think it richly deserves. I think it can only confirm the conclusion of hon. gentlemen in this House and of people throughout the country, that there is nothing sincere or honest about it, that it was simply a dodge to accomplish one or two objects, either, as was stated this afternoon, to force the supporters of the Government to vote, or rather give them an excuse for voting for the second reading, on the pretext that after the second reading was accomplished, then they would so modify the Bill that they might reasonably support it. Well, Sir, such a proposition is about equivalent to the intelligence which seems to actuate some hon. gentlemen who imagine, from reports that are going about the House, that they can save the Government by voting against the amendment of the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier), and then save their own skins by voting against the second reading of the Bill afterwards. Now, those two ideas are just about on a par; one is about as unreasonable and unlikely to lead to any practical results as the other. Sir, the hon. gentleman spoke with perhaps justifiable warmth on behalf of the system of education to which he is attached. Unfortunately the facts are against him; unfortunately the census returns, which have never been questioned, so far as I am aware in that particular, show that under the system of education he so warmly admires, the province of Quebec stands lowest in the scale of all the provinces of this Dominion. Certainly evidence has been adduced to prove that so far as the twenty years experience in the province of Manitoba goes, the results there of the separate school system were sadly inadequate to the necessities and requirements of the people, and far inferior to the results produced by the system of education which was in force in the other schools. Now, the hon. member for St. John (Mr. McLeod) treated us to some very extraordinary arguments. When the judgment of the Privy Council did not suit him, he swept it aside as a piece of bad law, and preferred to rest his case upon the judgment of the Supreme Court; but when the judgment of the Privy Council did suit him, then he wanted to carry it a great deal further than anybody else ever thought of doing. He strained the doctrine as to the necessity of obeying the remedial order, further than either the introducer of the Bill had done, or any one who has spoken with regard to it. Sir, when an hon. gentleman professing to belong to the legal profession makes the statement that that judgment was binding and compelled this House to act,

whether it would or not, it is hardly worth while to argue with him upon the subject. Now, the hon. gentleman who moved the second reading of this Bill spoke with more than usual accuracy of statement and with more than his usual moderation of language, when he said that the importance of this Bill transcended that of any measure of legislation previously introduced into this House. Well, Sir, that statement was true, and why? Not because the Bill possesses any merits of its own, not because the Bill is one which can be of any practical value for those in whose behalf it is introduced, but because of its mischievous purpose; because not of its value for good, but because of its capacity for mischief; and because, as has already been said in this House, it settles nothing and unsettles everything; still more, because of its ultimate results upon the future of this country, which have also been so fully described and so ably pointed out that it seems almost an impertinence to again refer to these matters. But I do not deny the importance of this Bill, even as stated in the language of the hon. gentleman who introduced it. If this Bill is important—again I am afraid I am repeating language that has already been used in this House in better terms than I can use it—how much more necessary was it that it should be dealt with by a House in the full vigour of its age, and not in the last hours of its decrepitude, not in the dying hours of a dying session when a few weeks, at any rate, must see the end of it, and not by a Parliament, many of whose members can no longer be said to be responsible to the people. Sir, there is another remark that I wish to make, and to which I desire to call the attention of the leader of the Opposition. The statement has been made, in answer to an observation from an hon. gentleman, that this House is not even complete in itself, that even old, decrepit and dying as it is, it is still wanting in numbers, and that there are three constituencies which ought to have a voice in settling a matter of this kind, that are unrepresented; and the public and the House naturally want to know how it is that they are unrepresented. Well, Sir, the insinuation was made that it was by virtue of an arrangement between the leader of the Government and the leader of the Opposition. Now, I would like the leader of the Opposition, if he will do me the courtesy of paying attention to what I am saying, to answer the insinuation that he was a party to any arrangement by which the constitution of this country should be so violated, and whether he is a party to an arrangement by which three constituencies are unrepresented in this House; because if so, certainly parliamentary government has come to an extraordinary pass in this country. However, be that as it may, I will simply repeat the argument which, as I say, has already been fully stated in this House, that it is not by a decrepit and dying Parliament that a question of this im-

portance should be discussed; it is not by a Parliament, many of whose members have ceased to be responsible to the people, that this question ought to be decided. Now, Sir, as a question of practical value, let us examine this Bill a little. The hon. gentleman who moved the second reading thought to influence this House by quoting the opinion of a distinguished educationalist, Sir William Dawson. Well, Sir, as to the practical value of this Bill, I could reply by quoting the opinion of another distinguished educationalist, Principal Grant, of Queen's University, Kingston. I am unable to lay my hands on the paper containing the opinion of Dr. Grant, but I imagine most hon. members have read it. He points out that the very initial stage connected with carrying out this Bill, if passed, could not be accomplished, simply because there would be no money even to lease a room in which the committee could sit, no money to pay the necessary officials, that therefore the very first step towards carrying out this law could not be accomplished, because no means were provided whereby this could be done. If that is the case I need not go further into the merits of the Bill—it is quite sufficient to show how valueless it is from any practical point of view.

The hon. gentleman spoke about the importance of this measure. On many occasions Acts of provincial legislatures have been disallowed by the executive authority, but this is the first time that the Parliament of the Dominion has undertaken to interfere in the legislation of a province with respect to a subject clearly admitted to be within its jurisdiction, and to accomplish that by means which seem to prevent, according to the best opinions, any possibility of alteration. If the Governor General disallows an Act of the Provincial legislature, if there is anything lacking in any essential point, the Bill can be re-enacted, or perhaps the circumstances which gave rise to the disallowance ceased to exist, as was the case with respect to the attempt made to coerce Manitoba with respect to railway legislation. But when we come to pass a Bill like this under consideration there is no possibility of remedying any evil which may be found to exist. The provincial legislature cannot repeal or amend an Act of this Parliament, and it is questioned by some of the best authorities whether this Parliament has not exhausted its power on this subject when it has passed this Act, and no further legislation in regard to it can be enacted. There is one thing very certain, and it is that after the adoption of this Act, it will be very hard to find a Government bold enough to undertake to discharge any such duty as this Government has undertaken.

If this Bill has no practical value it possesses importance of a very serious character in another direction. We have the opin-

ions given by hon. gentlemen who are anxious to see this Bill passed, to have remedial legislation adopted, and we find that those hon. gentlemen are entirely opposed to the Bill because it has no practical value. We find the passing of the Bill will accomplish nothing. It will not please the hierarchy, who have demanded it, because they regard the Bill simply as a stepping-stone to further legislation. What does that mean? It means a continuance of this agitation, that what we are doing now is not, as hon. gentlemen desire, a final settlement of the question; it is simply setting a stone rolling which will continue to roll for years to come, and the results we cannot foresee.

Mr. MULLOCK. That is the beginning of it.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Yes. While this Bill does not satisfy the hierarchy, it is naturally opposed by those who think that no public funds should be devoted to further the ends or interests of any particular denomination or church. It does not satisfy the minority of Manitoba, but it renders the majority still more hostile to any proposal which might be made for the advantage of the minority. So in every possible way it antagonizes every interest which might otherwise serve the minority, while it gives the minority no possible advantage. Instead of bringing peace, it will bring the sword of discord in a variety of ways; it will excite animosities without settling the law; it will give rise to frequent and continued agitation, and not only agitation such as is carried on on the platform, but it will lead to contests in the courts.

I have a still more decided objection to this Bill than any that has yet been taken. I object to this Bill because it legislates for a minority. The time has come when this doctrine of legislating for a minority should cease in this country. It is the bane of our constitution that instead of treating the whole population of the country as a homogeneous population which ought all to be under the same law, we have adopted the rule of legislating for a minority, and having entered on that mischievous and dangerous course, it is difficult to escape it. I oppose this Bill because it legislates for a minority, and therefore, the very first line, in my opinion, condemns it. When we come to look at the Bill itself, we find that as regards the appointment of a separate school board of education the only qualification provided is that the members shall be Roman Catholics. There is not a single safeguard of the interests of the minority as regards the educational status of those through whom the instruction is to be procured; in fact there is nothing in that regard such as is contained in every Bill dealing with the education of the people. The simple qualification of members of the board, that will have entire control over the schools, is that they shall be Roman Catholics. Can hon. members imagine a system logically more objectionable,

first, recognizing that the minority are to be legislated for altogether irrespective of the rights of the majority, and when we come to carry out the measure in its practical details the only qualification required of those who are to carry out the law is that they are to be members of the particular church interested in its legislation. To go into details is unnecessary. If we ever pass the second reading, the time for the consideration of details will come. But supposing it does come and we do go into committee on the Bill, then the practical defects will be so apparent that the authors will be very sorry they ever introduced the measure as it is pregnant with mischief and devoid of any practical results. The great argument that has been used throughout the whole of the discussion—it was used by the Minister of the Interior, it was specially used by the Minister of Trade and Commerce, and it was used by the introducer of the Bill—is based on the old exploded theory that justice is to be done to the minority of Manitoba because justice was done to the minority in the province of Quebec. It seems almost impossible to eradicate the erroneous ideas that prevail on this subject. There is no analogy whatever between the two cases. Surely at this day it is not necessary to point out to hon. members that the public schools so-called in the province of Quebec, are sectarian schools. Surely it is not necessary to point out what an outrage it would be to compel the Protestants of any denomination to attend schools in which doctrines were taught to which they were opposed. Even were it otherwise, it is not worth while to go into the question, because it rests on totally different grounds, and whatever advantage was given to the Protestant minority in Quebec was amply repaid by the privileges given the Roman Catholic minority in Ontario, and those rest on Acts of Parliament, on our constitution, with which we have no power to interfere.

So far as that is concerned, the argument is absolutely valueless, and must fail of effect. I trust it will not be necessary to refer again to that subject. No analogy had ever been shown to exist between the two. Now, Sir, with regard to the question as it stands before the House to-day. We have on the one side the declaration, that more information is sought for. Well, Sir, from my point of view, as I said on a previous occasion, I want no information. I am prepared to oppose this Bill because it is in every respect objectionable in principle. It matters not to me how far in detail it is objectionable, or how far in other respects it may be advantageous, for I am opposed to any legislation whatever upon this subject. But, Sir, those who desire to legislate, whether they are those among the Quebec Liberals who would like to see some advantage given to their fellow-subjects in Manitoba, or whether they are Conservatives who are determined to give these advantages, we have

enough evidence from the discussion which has taken place in this House, to show, that the contention of the Opposition is unanswerable, and that no practical statesman would attempt to legislate upon a subject on which they are—I will not say, confessedly ignorant—but on which they have been shown to be ignorant. To attempt to legislate under the circumstances is a piece of presumption. If hon. gentlemen wish to legislate upon this question, surely they ought to understand the subject upon which they are to legislate, and it has been shown by remarks made in the course of this debate, that ignorance does prevail on the matter, even among hon. gentlemen who have given the subject some consideration. That is an unanswerable argument, why gentlemen who wish to legislate upon this subject, should ask for delay. It proves that they are consistent in opposing the second reading of this Bill. I say, that the Opposition are perfectly consistent and logical in the course they have taken. Some of them are not opposed to legislation. But they cannot accept this legislation, which they see is evidently valueless, and they do not wish to attempt to legislate without knowing what they are going to legislate upon. The same remark applies with still greater force to those who are forcing this Bill through the House. I say, that the course of the Opposition is just as reasonable and logical as is my own course, when I say, that I intend to resist this legislation, being opposed as I am, to separate schools. That, however, is not the real issue before the House. If the Manitoba government wish to establish separate schools, they have a perfect right to do so, and I, for one, would not interfere. But I maintain, that we should not compel them to do so against their will, and especially should this House not compel them to do so, when it is ignorant of the whole subject. There is no inconsistency nor divergence on the part of those men who vote for this amendment because they are opposed to legislation altogether, nor is there inconsistency on the part of those who vote for the amendment, who think that legislation is desirable, who yet are unwilling to accept useless and valueless legislation, and who are in favour of thoroughly understanding the subject. Many of those hon. gentlemen have also a reasonable hope, that, if the matter is left where it ought to be left, namely, to the provincial authorities, then, if grievances exist, these grievances will be ameliorated. Now, Sir, we have arrived at a most extraordinary state of this most extraordinary proceeding, and of all the blunders which have been committed by this babyish, blundering Government, from first to last, this is the most glaring, this childish attempt to get over the difficulty in an indirect way, through the mediation of an hon. gentleman (Sir Donald Smith), not of the Government, asking Mr. Greenway to

Mr. O'BRIEN.

come down here and do what he has repeatedly said he will not do. Blunders enough have been committed, promises enough have been made, which never could have been fulfilled, and which, I believe, never were intended to be fulfilled, because, when many of these promises were made, in the earlier part of these proceedings, those who made them thought they had a reasonable method of escape from the dilemma in the judgment that might be given by the courts. Undertakings have been entered into, out of which it was hoped a similar method of escape might be found, and at last the Government had to come face to face with the question. What is the result? The Conservative party is rent asunder; the Government is broken up and practically dissolved. Such a disruption of the Conservative party has been brought about that all the talents and ability, such as it is, on the Treasury benches, will not be able to heal it, either by this measure or by anything that will follow it. Under these circumstances, while the Bill is practically valueless, while it does not do what it pretends to do, it has done immense mischief already, and is pregnant with untold mischief in the future. I, for one, feel that I am justified in voting in favour of the amendment, and in opposing the Bill in every possible way it can be opposed. So far as my voice and vote are concerned, the people of Manitoba shall never be troubled with having to resist the operation of a Bill to which they are opposed, and which, if passed, they must either submit to at the risk of all kind of confusion in their own laws, or else place themselves in the position of rebels against the Dominion authority. Opposition is due to this Bill, no matter from what point of view I regard it. Opposition is due to it from the Conservative party, because, as has been well said by the member for East Durham (Mr. Craig) he, as a Conservative, does not want to see the Conservative party tainted with the reproach of having coerced the province of Manitoba, as this Bill proposes to do.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). What is the good of that, if, as you say, the Conservative party is torn asunder.

Mr. O'BRIEN. We will have a better idea of the good of it by and by. The Conservative Government is in the position of the king who ruled but did not govern. That is the position of the present Administration. It has one policy to-day and another to-morrow. It is so weak that its members had to send for one of their own servants to lead them, a thing unheard of before in political history. It is so weak, that with a majority of sixty in this House, they could not find a man capable of controlling the Cabinet. It is so weak that when six of its members resigned and were taunted as traitors, they were pusillanimous enough to go back again when they

found that if they did not go back, a Government could be formed without them. Under these circumstances, it ill-becomes any one to talk about the Conservative party. There was a time when the Conservative party had power in this country. There was a time when the Conservative party had a Government whose followers were not ashamed of it. That day has gone by. It may return—I hope it will some day—but at the present moment, it is little consolation that hon. gentlemen on this side of the House can find, by looking at the personnel or the character of those who now administer their affairs. Holding these views, Sir, I shall vote most heartily and resolutely against every process by which it may be attempted to carry this Bill into law.

Mr. FRECHETTE. (Translation.) I have attentively listened to the utterances of hon. members on both sides of this House on the Manitoba school question, a problem which is of the utmost interest to the citizens of this country. I hope, Sir, that the Bill now before the House will be placed upon the statute-book, as promised by Sir Mackenzie Bowell, the Prime Minister, in July last. I give credit to the Government for having so nobly redeemed their pledge on that vital issue. I intended to take part in the Budget debate, but at this advanced stage of the session, being apprehensive lest that would impede the progress of the debate on the present Bill in which such interests are involved, I made up my mind to postpone to another year the remarks I intended to make on that subject. On the school question public attention is now riveted. Well, Sir, I say that if we wish to make this Canada of ours a great and prosperous country, it is absolutely necessary that racial and religious questions should be thrust into the back ground. I have the honour to represent here a constituency composed of Protestants and Catholics alike, and all classes live in peace and harmony together. I know that the English-speaking citizens in my constituency entertain liberal views upon the school question, and should I cast my vote against the Government Bill, I am positive that they would be sorely disappointed. I have been brought up in their midst; I am intimately acquainted with them, and I have but encomiums to bestow upon them, as regards their dealings with their French-Canadian fellow-citizens. There is an entente in the constituency which I represent and which has been created over thirty years ago. The English-speaking element send a representative of their own nationality to the Quebec legislature, and the French-speaking voters select a man of their own race to represent them here. That agreement has always been strictly adhered to. That goes to prove that the English-speaking voters in my constituency are broad-minded and like fair play. The same remark holds good with respect to our muni-

cipal affairs. In the parish where I live, there are but from twenty-five to thirty English families; still we allow them a representative in the municipal council. In the county council, with a population, the three-fourths of which are of French-Canadian origin, we allow the English minority to appoint the warden every second year, alternately with the French-Canadians. That, again, shows that we mean to be just and fair towards the Protestant minority. I have been accused in my constituency and by the Liberal papers in the province of Quebec, of being a traitor to my race, because I voted, in 1893, against Mr. Tarte's motion on the Manitoba school question. Now, I may say that the motion of the hon. member for L'Islet was a motion against which I could well afford to cast my vote, owing to the fact that the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) voted for it. These hon. gentlemen could never agree; one of them said that the Government were bound to interfere, while the other held the very opposite opinion. Now, Sir, I stated, at the time, that the motion of the hon. member for L'Islet was not worth the paper it was written on, and that it would not promote the interests of the Catholic minority. The hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte) wrote editorially in his paper, "Le Cultivateur," in March, 1895, the following article:—

The Catholic minority has been struggling these five years past against the unjust laws which the Federal Government have it in their power and are bound to disallow.

French Canadians in the west have, within the last five years, lost their school system and been deprived of the rights of using the French language.

The Dominion Government have allowed fanaticism free scope.

Now, the Imperial Privy Council drives the Government to their last entrenchment, and force them to take action.

But what could Messrs. Bowell, Angers, Caron, and Ouimet do in presence of the Imperial Privy Council?

So long as they could back down, elude their responsibility, avoid coping with the difficulties, they did so.

One day they found themselves shut in, and entrapped into their own nets! They were forced to move on!

The hon. member has changed his mind since that time. He then stated that the Government were bound to exercise their power of interference without delay; and that delay was fraught with danger, and now he is opposed to intervention in any shape. In the course of a speech delivered here, the hon. member stated further that the educational system of the province of Quebec was below the standard. Well, Sir, let me ask the hon. gentleman how it comes that at the great World's Fair, held in Chicago, the province of Ontario received only fifty-four awards, while the province of Quebec received seventy-two? His object,

Sir, is to belittle the country for the benefit of his own party. They say that the hierarchy should abstain from interfering in active politics. I believe, Sir, that under the present circumstances the clergy should interfere, because this is no mere political or party question. The trouble is that the Liberal party have made it a purely political issue. The hon. gentlemen opposite may laugh, but they cannot gainsay it. I may here, Sir, say a word in connection with what the clergy have done for the country; for instance, they have materially helped the colonization of the country, and they have also exercised a beneficial influence in the field of education and have contributed to the aggrandizement of the nation. I consider that it would be very unfair to deny that enlightened class of citizens the right to express their opinion as to the party which is the best qualified to administer the affairs of the country. I know that my hon friends opposite are not over-confident that the opinion of the clergy is favourable to their party. Mr. Speaker, where is now that great champion of the Manitoba separate schools, the hon. member for L'Islet? Where does he stand upon that question? When that great upholder of the Catholic schools was satisfied that the Government had decided to introduce the Manitoba School Bill, he was the first to declare himself in favour of a commission of inquiry, which was but a means of shelving the Bill and putting it off for another year. On the other hand, his leader moves the six months' hoist, which is but another way of killing the Bill. The hon. gentlemen opposite have declared before the country that never would the Government pass their Remedial Bill, and it was with that platform that they succeeded in carrying several elections. Had the hon. leader of the Opposition told us at least that the day he could come into power, he would introduce a Remedial Bill in favour of the Catholic minority in Manitoba, we might have accepted that pledge. But on the contrary, Sir, the hon. gentleman declined to pledge himself; he lost himself in the clouds. The hon. gentlemen want to ride into power over that issue, at the next general elections. They want to make it subservient to their party interests, and nothing else. They are in hopes, were it not settled now, of carrying the next elections, on that issue. In its issue of the 7th instant, the Quebec "L'Electeur" tried to attenuate the disastrous effect, by publishing an elaborate editorial, commenting upon an article from the Toronto "Globe" against federal interference in Manitoba school affairs.

The "Globe," we may remark, is of opinion that our co-religionists are aggrieved. But, as our contemporary remarks, any attempt at interference ought to be avoided, for it would be the signal for a long and bitter struggle, the extent and gravity of which it would be difficult to foretell. Would it not be a wiser policy to make fur-

Mr. FRECHETTE.

ther attempts at having the evil remedied by the very authority who is responsible for it? The contemplated object would thus be reached without any friction.

The article winds up with an appeal to the Manitoba government to condescend to set at rest the dispute, by making the necessary concessions to Catholics.

We do not approve of the position taken by the "Globe." Our contemporary has, no doubt, allowed its judgment to be swayed by the cries and threats of the sectarian element of the province. Our contemporary has felt that it was in the interests of our party to make certain concessions previous to the monster Tory meeting, called together for next Monday at Toronto.

As will be seen from the above, the organ of the Ontario Protestants and of the Reform party is opposed to separate schools, and deprecates federal interference. On the 7th of March, 1895, "L'Electeur" said:

The public still recollect, no doubt, the commotion created by the "Globe's" editorial a fortnight ago. The "Electeur" published at the time the article in question. The great Liberal organ, although it recognizes the injustice perpetrated upon the Catholic minority, was of opinion that further attempts should be made at having the Manitoba government remedy the evil for which they are responsible.

While we are grateful to the "Globe" for its advocacy of the rights of our co-religionists, we gave expression at the time to our dissent from the suggested mode. The Federal Government, as we remarked, ought simply to comply with the judgment of the Privy Council, and pass the Remedial Bill, enforcing it without either the intervention or the aid of the Manitoba government.

For our part, we decline to compromise. The "Electeur" is of opinion that from the refusal of the Manitoba government to surrender, last year, from the attitude taken by them before the Privy Council of Canada, through their counsel, Mr. McCarthy, there is no longer any hope to be entertained from that quarter, and that the time has come to force the central power to interfere and do justice to the minority.

Whatever may be the influence and position of the "Globe," the "Electeur," we think, in giving expression to these views, is as much the representative of Mr. Laurier and of the Liberal party as any Ontario journal.

Now, what do we see, Sir? "L'Electeur" advocates what the "Globe" to a certain degree advocated, and it declares now against what he advocated at the last session. Then, according to "L'Electeur," it was necessary to pass a Remedial Bill without delay. Now, it charges the Government with proceeding with undue haste. The hon. gentlemen ask for a commission of inquiry, but what do they want an investigation for? The Liberals only want the question to be investigated, or rather wanted so. The hon. leader of the Opposition moves now the six months' hoist, without any further investigation. As to the Conservative party, we want the Manitoba government to modify their law. We want the Catholic minority to be restored to their former state previous to 1890. We want a Bill restoring to the minority the rights

guaranteed by the constitution. Nobody calls in question the fact that, from 1870 to 1890, the Catholic minority had their separate schools; and that, under the constitution, prior to 1890, those schools were separate. Those facts have been recognized by the judgment of the Imperial Privy Council, the highest tribunal in the Empire. Nobody calls in question the fact that the Greenway government, through their law of 1890, have taken away from the Catholic minority their separate schools, and set up in their stead public and Protestant schools. Nobody calls in question the fact that petitions have been sent in by the Catholic minority, praying for the restoration of the separate school system, and that their demand was denied by the Greenway government. The Liberals are quite aware of those facts. We should not lose sight of the Blake-Laurier motion, adopted in 1890, aimed at providing the means whereby the Government might be empowered to refer questions of law or fact, in educational matters, to the judicial tribunals, previous to exercising their right of interference. With the consent of Archbishop Taché, the question was submitted to the courts. I happened to meet Archbishop Taché in 1891, and he told me that the best means of finally settling the question was by appealing to the tribunals for a decision on the matter. Had the Government disallowed the law of 1890, Archbishop Taché told me that the Greenway government would have re-enacted it. I do not rely now on bogus statements. I do not resort to the argument used by the hon. member for Lotbinière, last night. My authority is Archbishop Taché himself who made the statement I have just given, on the 11th April, 1891.

Mr. RINFRET. (Translation.) Will the hon. gentleman allow me to interrupt him? Let me read to the House what Archbishop Taché says. Page 107 of his pamphlet of 1893:

The minority in Manitoba and myself were charged with great responsibility for having allowed such a course to be taken. The fact is, my own attitude has been so absolutely passive in the matter, that I knew nothing of it until it was entirely settled and the counsel had been chosen for the case. The idea of this mode of action originated with the Government at Ottawa, who decided upon it after Mr. Blake's resolution had been adopted. The Barrett case is not my doing. More than that, I dare say that it might have resulted in quite a different way if my views had prevailed. I do not understand why the minority are charged with its responsibility, as the Premier, in a public meeting in Montreal, on 12th September last, stated: "I am ready to admit it, as I have always admitted in Parliament, the case was laid before the tribunal by the Government, in order to obtain a decision which would settle the affair by judicial proceedings."

Mr. FRECHETTE. (Translation.) That is perhaps a portion of the spurious documents you read to the House the other day?

Mr. RINFRET. (Translation.) That statement will be found, page 107 of the pamphlet published by Archbishop Taché on the Manitoba school question.

Mr. FRECHETTE. (Translation.) Archbishop Taché was always in favour of a Remedial Bill, and I believe that the Liberal party, on that point, do not want to defer to the wishes of Archbishop Taché. The Archbishop appealed to all the judicial tribunals. The first appeal was taken to the Manitoba Court of Queen's Bench, and the case was lost. Then an appeal was taken to the Supreme Court of Canada, and the Court unanimously reversed the decision of the Court of Queen's Bench. It was believed at the time that no further proceedings would be taken. The majority in Manitoba, however, took the appeal to the Privy Council of England, and their lordships reversed the judgment of the Supreme Court. Then the only course left open to the minority was to appeal to the Governor General in Council on the ground of justice and equity. Who supplied the necessary funds to carry the appeal to the Privy Council? It was the Conservatives who gave Mr. Ewart \$8,000 to defray the judicial costs in England. Such was the help proffered to the minority by those very same Conservatives, who for several years, have been condemned for the course pursued on the Manitoba school question. Now, they charge the Government with not having disallowed the Act of 1890. Disallowance would have proved of no avail, for the Greenway government would have re-enacted it as often as it had been disallowed. The Government whom I have the honour to support have promised to pass a remedial law, as soon as the Privy Council would have rendered a decision in favour of the minority. That judgment was sent to the Federal Government in February, 1895, and an Order in Council was forthwith sent on to the Manitoba government asking for a reply no later than the 11th May, 1895. The answer was a fiat denial. The Manitoba government declined to interfere. There was no other alternative left than for the Federal Government to pass a remedial law. That law was to have been passed during the last session, but Mr. Greenway's answer having been received at the end of the session, the Government thought it best to put it off to six months, the passing of the law. Here is the statement made in the House, at the latter part of last session by the hon. leader of the House:

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to state that the Government has had under its consideration the reply of the Manitoba legislature to the remedial order of the 21st March, 1895, and, after careful deliberation has arrived at the following conclusion:—Though there may be differences of opinion as to the exact meaning of the reply in question, the Government believes that it may be interpreted as holding out some hope of an amicable settlement of the Manitoba school question on the basis of possible action by the

Manitoba government and legislature; and the Dominion Government is most unwilling to take any action which can be interpreted as forestalling or precluding such a desirable consummation. The Government has also considered the difficulties to be met with in preparing and perfecting legislation on so important and intricate a question during the last hours of the session. The Government has, therefore, decided not to ask Parliament to deal with remedial legislation during the present session. A communication will be sent immediately to the Manitoba government on the subject, with a view to ascertaining whether that government is disposed to make a settlement of the question, which will be reasonably satisfactory to the minority of that province, without making it necessary to call into requisition the powers of the Dominion Parliament. A session of the present Parliament will be called together to meet not later than the first Thursday of January next. If by that time the Manitoba government fails to make a satisfactory arrangement to remedy the grievance of the minority, the Dominion Government will be prepared, at the next session of Parliament, to be called, as above stated, to introduce and press to a conclusion such legislation as will afford an adequate measure of relief to the said minority, based upon the lines of the judgment of the Privy Council, and the remedial order of the 21st March, 1895.

Last year, the hon. gentlemen opposite wanted by all means the Government to pass without delay a remedial law. They said that another six months' delay would undoubtedly expose the country to an agitation fraught with danger. Now, the leader of the Opposition moves the postponement of the Bill, and does not seem to apprehend any agitation. We, on this side, want to pass the Bill now, and those very men who deprecated delay now ask for delay, and want the measure to be put off indefinitely. We gave our consent to the six months' delay last session, only after the Government had pledged their word that there would be held another session, in January, 1896, in order to introduce and press through the House a Remedial Bill. The hon. leader of the Opposition, who censures the Government for having postponed the question, now moves the six months' hoist. But will he pledge his word, in behalf of his party, that if he comes into power, he will introduce a Remedial Bill? Here is the principle of the Bill now before the House:

Whereas the Roman Catholic minority of Her Majesty's subjects in the province of Manitoba appealed to His Excellency the Governor General in Council under the provisions of section twenty-two of chapter three of the statutes of 1870, intituled: "An Act to amend and continue the Act thirty-two and thirty-three Victoria, chapter three, and to establish and provide for the government of the province of Manitoba," from certain Acts of the legislature of the province of Manitoba, passed in the fifty-third year of Her Majesty's reign, chaptered thirty-seven and thirty-eight, affecting the rights or privileges of the said Roman Catholic minority in relation to education, namely: "An Act respecting the Department of Education" and "An Act respecting Public Schools," and where-

Mr. FRECHETTE.

as such appeal having been duly heard and decided by His Excellency the Governor General in Council, such provincial law as seems to the Governor General in Council requisite for the due execution of the provisions of the said section twenty-two of the said first mentioned Act has not been made, and the circumstances of the case require that the Parliament of Canada should make a remedial law as hereinafter enacted for the due execution of the provisions of the aforesaid section twenty-two: Therefore Her Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and House of Commons of Canada, enacts as follows:—

1. The Lieutenant-Governor in Council of the province of Manitoba shall appoint, to form and constitute the Separate School Board of Education for the province of Manitoba, a certain number of persons not exceeding nine, all of whom shall be Roman Catholics.

Under that law, we give the Manitoba minority their separate schools. They say that this law is not a good law. But, if the law is not good, because incomplete, the principle of it, at least, is good. Does the hon. leader of the Opposition approve of the principle of that law? I say the principle is good, and that we should approve of it. Do not the Government, under that law, remedy the grievances complained of by the minority? I consider that the objection raised by those who contend that the law is not a good one, as utterly groundless. The Bill may be amended in committee as any other Bill that comes before the House. So long as the principle is good, as the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Devlin) remarked, we ought to accept it, under correction or amendment in Committee of the Whole. None of the hon. gentlemen opposite have made any suggestions as to how it shall have been framed or amended. Clause 4 of the Bill reads as follows:—

4. It shall be the duty of the Board of Education,—

(a.) To have under its control and management the separate schools and to make from time to time such regulations as may be deemed fit for their general government and discipline and the carrying out of the provisions of this Act;

(b.) To arrange for the proper examination, grading and licensing of its teachers, and for the withdrawing of licenses upon sufficient cause; provided that the standard of qualification for teachers shall be in secular matters the same as that at any time prescribed for teachers of other schools of a public character established under the statutes of the province of Manitoba. Provided further, that all teachers' certificates issued by or under the authority of the Department of Education shall be recognized by the Board of Education;

(c.) To select all the books, maps and globes to be used in the schools under its control; provided however that no book, map or globe shall be selected unless such book, map or globe has been authorized for use either in the high or public schools of the province of Manitoba or in the separate schools of the province of Ontario.

As I just said, Sir, under this Bill, the Manitoba Catholic minority are given the rights

asked for. The minority had three grievances. (1) The law of 1890 took away from them their separate schools. (2) Under that law they were not allowed the choice of their own text books, and they had no control over their schools. (3) Under the same law, they could neither build nor buy any school houses. Now, under the present Bill, those rights are restored to them. This Bill also exempts them from paying taxes for the support of Protestant schools. That is an important point gained by them. I am no lawyer, but I think this Bill gives the minority what they asked for. The interested parties declare that the Bill gives them satisfaction. Now, if those who are to benefit by it say so, I do not see why we should not be also satisfied with it. Archbishop Langevin, Senator Bernier, Mr. LaRivière, the member for Provencher, and Mr. Prendergast declare that the Bill gives them satisfaction, and that they accept it. The hierarchy also accepts it. Why should the Opposition not also accept it? I consider that it is not the business of the Opposition to say whether the Bill is satisfactory or not. It is not the business of those who are not interested in it, but of the men who are going to benefit by it, to complain about it or to state that they are satisfied with it. It is no use being more Catholic than our own bishops. Clause 74 reads thus :

74. The right to share proportionately, in any grant made out of public funds for the purposes of education having been decided to be and being now one of the rights and privileges of the said Roman Catholic minority of Her Majesty's subjects in the province of Manitoba, any sum granted by the legislature of Manitoba and appropriated for the separate schools shall be placed to the credit of the Board of Education in accounts to be opened in the books of the Treasury Department and in the Audit Office.

I believe that the Government could go no further, because they cannot coerce the Manitoba legislature into appropriating votes for such purposes. I consider that under that clause, the right of the Catholic minority to share proportionately in the legislative grants is recognized. Should the Bill go any further, the leader of the Opposition, who is always ready to find fault with the Government, would say that the Government had no right to make such an enactment. Clause 112 contains the following provision :—

112. Power is hereby reserved to the Parliament of Canada to make such further and other remedial laws as the provisions of the said section twenty-two, of chapter three, of the statutes of 1870, and of the decision of the Governor in Council thereunder may require.

Under that clause, this law may be amended as any other law passed by Parliament. The Government explicitly reserve that right to themselves. I am not a legal man, but I am satisfied that the Bill now before this House restores to the minority their separate schools. Under the Bill they are restored

their right to separate schools ; they are exempted from contributing towards the support of Protestant schools, and authorized to choose their own text-books. Well, Sir, I think the minority never asked for more than that. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that if the hon. leader of the Opposition had been anxious to do justice to the Manitoba minority, he would have refrained from proposing the six months' hoist, because this shelving of the Bill is equivalent to killing a child, before it has reached the age of majority and is able to provide for itself. Now, the six months' hoist is equivalent to killing the Bill. I could understand the hon. leader of the Opposition coming before this House and stating that, in case he should be Prime Minister, after the next elections, he would be ready to make the necessary corrections to the Bill, so as to secure its full enforcement, but he did not commit himself in that way at all. I also believe that the Conservatives are going to have another lease of power, and we pledge ourselves to perfect the Bill, if necessary. Now, I wish to call the attention of the House to the sixth question submitted for hearing and consideration by the Supreme Court. It reads as follows :—

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

Now, let us refer to the answer given by the Privy Council to the sixth question :

6. In answer to the 6th question : That the Acts of Manitoba relating to education passed prior to the session of 1890, did confer on the minority a right or privilege in relation to education within the meaning of subsection 2 of section 22 of "The Manitoba Act" which alone applies ; that the two Acts of 1890 complained of did affect a right or privilege of the minority in such a manner that an appeal will lie thereunder to the Governor General in Council.

More than this, the Lord Chancellor, in giving his decision, thus delivered himself :

The sole question to be determined is whether a right or privilege which the Roman Catholic minority previously enjoyed has been affected by the legislation of 1890. Their lordships are unable to see how this question can receive any but an affirmative answer. Contrast the position of the Roman Catholics prior and subsequent to the Acts from which they appeal. Before these passed into law there existed denominational schools, of which the control and management were in the hands of Roman Catholics, who could select the books to be used and determine the character of the religious teaching. These

schools received their proportionate share of the money contributed for school purposes out of the general taxation of the province, and the money raised for these purposes by local assessment was, so far as it fell upon Catholics, applied only towards the support of Catholic schools. What is the position of the Roman Catholic minority under the Acts of 1890? Schools of their own denomination, conducted according to their views, will receive no aid from the State. They must depend entirely for their support upon the contributions of the Roman Catholic community, while the taxes out of which State aid is granted to the schools provided for by the statute fall alike on Catholics and Protestants.

I consider, therefore, that the Bill restores to the minority their separate schools, as they existed previous to 1890. The Opposition have made up their minds to prevent the passing of the Bill, in order to make it an issue at the next electoral contest. The hon. gentlemen opposite are anxious to come into power by foul or fair means, and that would be an acceptable political platform for the party, who are in sore want of a programme. As to us, Catholics, were we obliged to send our children to Protestant schools, it would be, to our mind, a more arbitrary measure than the closing of our churches. Further, the fact must not be lost sight of, that it was a Liberal government who inflicted that injustice upon Manitoba. It must be kept on record that Her Majesty's loyal Opposition in this House support and approve that policy, and cheer the framer of that law, as I happened to remark the other day, when the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin) was addressing the House. That gentleman is the real promoter and framer of the law of 1890; I do not blame him on that score, as he belongs to a religious creed different from ours, and he is free to take on that question any stand he likes; but, I blame the French Liberal members who cheer him to the echo when he champions his law in this House. Where are they now, those great champions of separate schools of 1893, the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Brodeur), the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte), the hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. Choquette), and the hon. member for Drummond and Arthabaska (Mr. Lavergne)? Those great champions of separate schools are the first to inveigh against the remedial law, and to say that it is a clumsy law, which should be shelved without delay. The hon. leader of the Opposition stated last year that delaying the matter to another session would involve the country in trouble and foster a dangerous agitation. But the times are changed. Then the hon. gentleman believed that the Government would never introduce a Remedial Bill, and they wanted to make political capital out of the question. The hon. leader of the Opposition is fond of putting on record the examples and utterances of the great English statesmen. Well, Sir, I am going to quote the words fallen from a

Mr. FRECHETTE.

great English statesman, and I hope they will elicit his approval. Mr. Balfour said at Manchester:

I say it is a monstrous thing to coerce parents whose children attend school all day long, to send them to institutions where those children cannot receive such religious training as their parents want them to receive.

Yes, cries out the "Verité," it is a monstrous thing, and it exists here in Canada.

We call the attention of Mr. Laurier to Mr. Balfour's speech. He will find it in the North-west "Review" of the 21st August, reproduced from the "Nor-Wester."

Let Mr. Laurier mark it well. Mr. Balfour does not deal with Protestant schools to which Catholic parents would be morally forced to send their children, and vice versa; but with neutral schools, to which Catholic or Protestant parents of religious minds, would be constrained to send their children.

Yes, Mr. Balfour thinks it is a monstrous thing to attempt imposing the neutral school upon those who are unwilling to accept it. He says, in substance, in the speech now before us:

"Those who like that system are free to adopt a school where religious teaching is entirely divorced from secular teaching, where the child is taught but purely human sciences; but I deny that this is the best system, and I hold that it is a crying injustice to impose that system upon parents who entertain other notions."

So speaks the English statesman in question. It is too bad that Mr. Laurier, who professes to draw his inspirations from British wisdom, did not these four years past, speak out as clearly and judiciously as Mr. Balfour. Instead of repeating on all the tones of the scale that, if the Manitoba national schools were Protestant schools, Catholic parents should not be forced to send their children to those schools, wherefore did he not say, as Mr. Balfour did, that it is a monstrous thing to impose such schools upon a Catholic population, no matter whether they are Protestant or really neutral schools? Why did not Mr. Laurier speak out like Mr. Balfour? The reason is that Mr. Laurier is a Liberal doctrinaire, and the supporters of Liberal doctrinarianism actually want the neutral school, the secularized, the godless school, from which religious dogmatical teaching is banished, and which all classes, Catholic, Jews and Protestants may attend, as no religious tenets are inculcated on the children. It is far easier for Catholics to stand on the ground taken by Mr. Balfour than on that taken by a Liberal Catholic of the school which Mr. Laurier belongs to. I contend that by their legislation of 1890, the Greenway government perpetrated a crying injustice. Even supposing that there were no enactment embodied in the constitution providing for separate schools, reason would still be our guide. The golden rule applies here: Do by others as you would be done by. The majority should remember that might is not right. We may safely vote the second reading of the Bill, and should Mr. Greenway

come to Ottawa, then will be the time for him to accept the Bill and to have it passed by the Manitoba legislature. In that case, the Greenway government will have to enact a law similar to the Bill now under discussion. Otherwise, no arrangement could be entered into. The other day, we heard with pleasure the words fallen from the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Ives) and the representative of the English Protestant element in the province of Quebec made a remarkable speech on that day. He said that if ever the time would come when the majority in the province of Quebec perpetrated an injustice on the Protestant minority, that, in the event of Parliament refusing now to interfere in favour of the Manitoba minority, it would be impossible for him, as a representative Englishman, to come before this House and claim justice for that minority. We have now to give relief to the Manitoba minority, in order that later on the Protestant minority in Quebec, if ever their rights were infringed upon, may have their grievances righted. The hon. Minister urged and insisted upon the English members voting in favour of the Bill now before the House. Mr. Speaker, let us for the moment sink party interests; let all the members, irrespective of nationality, English, French Canadian, Irish and Scotch, unite in order to remove from the political arena that Manitoba school question which has occupied the attention of the country these five years past; and then, I venture to say, that peace and harmony will once more prevail among us. I believe that the Prime Minister and his colleagues have redeemed their pledges, in connection with the remedial law. I have to congratulate the Government for the firm stand they have taken, and I am positive that the Canadian electors at the next general elections will show that they know how to appreciate it. The law will be voted by a pretty good majority, with the help of the Government friends. The fair-play of our English colleagues and their respect for the constitution are too well known to admit of the contrary. Before I sit down, I declare that I shall vote for the Bill now before the House, because I believe that it restores to the Manitoba minority their right to separate schools, as they existed previous to 1890, and which they have been claiming these five years past. I believe that this Bill will remove the present contention from the arena of public discussion, and dispose once for all of all racial and national feuds, a consummation devoutly to be wished for, if we want to make this country of ours a great and prosperous country.

Mr. MONET moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

Mr. DICKEY moved the adjournment of the House.

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 12th March, 1896.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

THE REMEDIAL ACT (MANITOBA).

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Sir Charles Tupper for second reading of Bill (No. 58) the Remedial Act (Manitoba), and the proposed motion (six months' hoist) of Mr. Laurier in amendment thereto.

Mr. MONET. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I listened with much attention last evening to the speech of the hon. member for Megantic (Mr. Fréchette). Three-quarters of his speech I had already read in the newspapers of the province of Quebec, in the course of the last six months. As to the rest, I regret to own that the hon. member spoke so low that I could not make anything of it. I, therefore, apologize to him, if, in order to find anything to refute, I have to pass him over and go back to the speech of the hon. member for Ottawa, who spoke before him. The hon. member for Ottawa spoke more distinctly than the member for Megantic, and I regret that the delicate task of answering him has not fallen to one more able than I am, who might have succeeded in removing, perhaps, the line of demarcation which the hon. member has drawn between himself and the Liberal party in his speech of last night. The hon. member said he hoped that the Liberal party would continue him its sympathy in spite of the position he was taking on the school question. If the hon. member means by this that we regret his desertion, he certainly is right. But as to sympathy, I think that in the future he will have to depend mainly on the other side of the House, for I noticed he was warmly applauded by the hon. gentlemen opposite. In listening to the eloquent voice of the hon. member, I remembered an incident, the recalling of which will not, I hope, be too harsh on my friend's ear. One evening last year, ten thousand persons had gathered in Sohmer Park Hall, in Montreal, to hear the hon. leader of the Opposition, the Hon. Mr. Joly deLotbinière and the hon. member for Ottawa, on the question which occupies our attention to-day. After having explained how hard and difficult this question was: after having pointed out how the French Ministers seemed to allow themselves to be deceived by the Orangemen in the Cabinet; after having shown that only one man—the hon. leader of the Opposition—could settle this question, he then turned towards Hon. Mr. Laurier, and, addressing us all: Behold, oh, French Canadians, said he, behold the one who is to be your chief.

It is to be supposed that from Sohmer Park Hall to Cape Breton, and thence to Ottawa is a long road; for last night it was no more the leader of the Opposition who was to be the French Canadian's chief, it was, forsooth, the hon. Secretary of State (Sir Charles Tupper). The hon. member may have changed his views, but we Liberals have not; we still hold that there is but one man who can bring about the settlement of this question, and that man is the hon. leader of the Opposition. At the meeting to which I refer, an incident happened. The hall was crowded with people, and no sooner had the hon. member uttered the eloquent words which I have reported, than the floor of the first platform gave way and a man fell to the ground. Naturally, this made some commotion, but the hon. member, getting upon a table, and covering the noise with his voice, said: Take no alarm, gentlemen, it is only a man leaving. I will not say to-day, repeating the words of the hon. member, there is only a man leaving, for the hon. member for Berthier (Mr. Beausoliel) has gone on the same errand as he, but I will say that although two gentlemen are dropping out through the same hole, the hole will not grow much larger. The hon. member gave us the reasons for which he thought he should support the Government on this question. "In the first place I have always, said he, declared in favour of the disallowance of the Manitoba school laws; secondly, the Catholic people are in favour of a remedial law, and, finally, it is for me more a question of conscience than of party."

Mr. AMYOT. (Translation.) Very good.

Mr. MONET. (Translation.) The hon. member for Bellechasse says, very good; has he always consulted his conscience when he had to deal with the questions which came before Parliament?

Mr. AMYOT. (Translation.) Yes.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. (Translation.) Well, then, he has two.

Mr. MONET. (Translation.) I am bound by parliamentary rules to accept the hon. member's statement; but if he will do me the honour of a visit during the coming election, so that I may on the hustings show him my way of thinking, I promise him another answer. When the hon. member says that he was always in favour of disallowance, I can tell him that the whole province of Quebec was also in favour of disallowance. We have followed the wishes of the episcopacy on the question of disallowing the laws of 1890 and 1894. There cannot, therefore, be anything exceptional in the hon. member being favourable to disallowance. But is that a reason why he should give his support to the Government who refused to disallow these laws?

Next, he says he is in favour of a remedial law; but are we not, are all the French

Mr. MONET.

Canadians not in favour of a remedial law? We are in favour of a remedial law, and believe that it may be necessary when all the means of a settlement by conciliation shall have been exhausted. Thirdly, he says he finds it a matter of conscience. I will take the liberty of asking him if his conscience advised him otherwise, when he went to Montreal Centre and Jacques Cartier, and more recently still, when he went to support the candidate of the Opposition in Cape Breton? I know that at these several elections, the Government candidates pledged themselves to support a remedial law to be presented by the Government at the present session. At the last election, that in Cape Breton, the Government had pledged themselves to present a remedial law. We all knew that a remedial law would be introduced, and the hon. member must have known it as well. But what we had to fear, what he feared himself at Sohmer Park, was that this law, drafted by the Orangemen of the Ministry, could give no satisfaction to the episcopacy, and to the Catholic minority of Manitoba. The position is not changed in regard to the law. We do not find that it affords as much justice and security as we could give ourselves to the Manitoba minority. No, there must be another reason for the position he has taken. I think he has simply been struck with political fright. Had he been sure of re-election after voting against the Bill, I think he would never have taken the position he took. For my part, I will not only say that I am as independent as a large number of the members of this House, but I think that the election which sent me here justifies me in saying that I am altogether independent of parties. I am a Liberal, but I was not the candidate of the Liberal party. On the contrary, the leader of the Liberal party has never been willing to accept my candidature. I do not make a boast of it, for I would have prized his good will, but I say so to show that I am really independent of all the parties. I am a Liberal though, and as such I want the largest possible sum of justice rendered to the minority. In this I agree with the hon. member for Ottawa. I am ready to grant the hon. member for Ottawa, that for the last five years the Federal Government has not ceased to promise that justice would be rendered to the Manitoba minority. On another hand, the Liberal party and the press of that party pledged themselves to do full justice to the same minority, if the present Government continue to neglect their duty, and to deny that justice which they have so many times promised. I do not question here the existence of the evil. I do not question the necessity and the possibility of a remedy; what I consider here is simply the nature of the remedy offered, and on another hand who could more efficiently apply a remedy to the situation. The Liberal party has at its head, I do not fear to assert it, the one man best qualified to apply an

efficient remedy, the most distinguished and most popular man the French Canadians have ever had to boast of, and the hon. leader of the Liberal party has many and many a time, as often as he spoke on this question of the schools, declared himself firmly resolved to act in accordance with the principle of separate schools. On the other hand, what do we see? The Conservative party, on the contrary, is represented in this House, or rather in the Senate, by the hon. Prime Minister, who is an Orangeman, as every one knows, who is a former Grand Master of the Orange order. Now, as an Orangeman, the hon. Prime Minister, as well as all the members of his order, has taken an oath which partly reads as follows :—

I swear that I am not and never will be a Roman Catholic or a papist; and that I am not and never will be married to a Roman Catholic or a papist.

To carry fanaticism even into love is rushing it very far :

That I will not bring up my children nor will I permit them to be brought up in the Roman Catholic faith, if I can prevent it; that I am not and never will be a member of a society or a body of men who are enemies of Her Majesty.

Such is the oath which the Prime Minister has subscribed to, and this Prime Minister is supported by twelve or thirteen members who all have taken the oath of the Orange order. The hon. Prime Minister is supported by the Conservative party, which has the confidence of the nine-tenths of the Orangemen of this country, who have all taken the same oath. How can the hon. member for Ottawa conscientiously believe that we may obtain justice, full and complete justice for the Manitoba minority at the hands of such men? I do not share the hon. member's opinion, and I prefer to trust the hon. leader of the Opposition, who, I believe, offers greater guarantee. For, Mr. Speaker, we must not delude ourselves with this. The proposed legislation, of which the only remedial feature is the title of the Bill, will, if once voted, be final, and can never be amended hereafter. It therefore behooves us to consider what legislation we are going to pass, and see if the measure proposed is calculated to give full justice to the Manitoba minority. When I give as my opinion that this law, when once voted, will be final, and can never be amended, I do not expect it to have necessarily great weight, but it is also the opinion of the hon. member for Verchères, the most eminent lawyer of Montreal, and it is the opinion of a newspaper which is in high favour with the clergy in the province of Quebec. I know, moreover, that the ex-Minister of Justice, when the question was decided before the Privy Council of Canada, considered that very point. For I read in the report made by the former Minister of Justice the following expression of opinion :—

In this respect, the counsel for the province of Manitoba has contended that if Parliament should legislate under those circumstances, such legislation would be absolute and irrevocable.

As I said before, the Conservative party have for five years promised justice to the Manitoba minority. I know, as my hon. friend from Ottawa (Mr. Devlin) does, that the Conservative party accept this Bill, that they declare themselves satisfied with it, but there are grounds for suspecting the motives of this readiness on the part of the friends of the Government. We only knew the title of the new Bill, we only knew it was called a Remedial Bill, when already, in the province of Quebec, the Conservative party were shouting that the Catholics were saved. Even an ecclesiastical personage was writing to the leader of the Opposition that he should support this measure, before having seen it, for it had not yet been presented to the House. All the official press already proclaimed the excellence of the new Bill; and, as the hon. member for Quebec Centre (Mr. Langelier) said the other day, the members of this House were expected to support it before having seen it. But the only remedial thing in this Bill is the title; and according to my way of thinking this is not sufficient. If the Conservative party is satisfied therewith, the Liberal party, which faithful to its traditions, goes beyond the names and titles of men and things, wants to judge men independently of the titles they have and things according to their value. It is what I have done with the would-be Remedial Bill.

Does this remedial measure consecrate an intervention favourable to the Manitoba majority? What reparation does it offer? To begin with, of what grievance do the Catholics of Manitoba complain. They have not complained by their petition of having been despoiled of their rights and privileges by the school law of 1890. They have not complained of having lost their separate schools, of having lost their Catholic schools, of having lost the episcopal control of these schools, but only of not receiving local government grants any longer. Such is the grievance complained of by the Catholics of Manitoba. Now, let us see what remedy is offered to the minority by means of this Bill. I could say that the Bill now before us offers no remedy, because it is unconstitutional. But, supposing it to be constitutional, what remedy does it afford to the Manitoba minority in respect to the grievances which it sets forth before the Privy Council of Canada. I heard, the other evening, the hon. member for Berthier (Mr. Beausoliel) say that he favoured the Bill because, as a whole, the legislation which is offered us recognizes for the Catholics the right of having their own schools. But, Mr. Speaker, the law of 1890 has not taken away from them the right of having their separate or Catholic schools. They have a right to these schools by virtue of the freedom of teaching guaranteed to Canada by

the treaty of 1763. This freedom was guaranteed to them before the Act of 1890, and they still have it to-day as they had it before. It is common law. Our ancestors have won this right on battle fields, and it is therefore not this Remedial Bill that guarantees the privileges of teaching in accordance with the Catholic faith. The freedom of teaching has existed a long time and the hon. member for Berthier cannot be serious when he pretends that the Catholics will only have a right to have their own schools by virtue of this law. They had before 1890, as they still have to-day, the right of opening Catholic schools, and all they need is the Manitoba government grant. What the Catholics claim is a share of the subsidies voted by the provincial legislature to help them keep up their separate schools. That is what the Dominion Government should have provided for, and that is what they have not done.

As long as the Government will not introduce a measure giving the Catholics a share of the moneys voted for educational purposes, the Catholics will remain without efficient protection. I cannot, therefore, vote for this Bill. I will vote for it when it is amended to this effect, and made constitutional. The second right that the member for Berthier believes this Bill would give, is the right of establishing a school system and controlling and maintaining such schools. This is exactly the same argument as the first, and my answer applies to it as well. The episcopacy has to-day the right of controlling these schools in Manitoba just as the episcopacy has the control of the Catholic schools in the province of Quebec. Here again all that is needed is money to keep these schools going. The third consideration set forth by the hon. member for Berthier is, that the Bill relieves the Catholics from paying taxes to public schools. I know that there is in this a real advantage if the proposed legislation be constitutional. But the Catholics are not exempted from the whole tax by the measure. An absolute condition indispensable to the Catholics, if they are to profit by this exemption is that there must be ten children capable of going to school within a radius of three miles; then the Catholics can avail themselves of this provision of the law. But if there is not a sufficient number of children to establish a separate school, they cannot take advantage of this provision. I call the attention of the hon. member to this disposition of the Bill concerning the creation of the school districts. Finally, the Catholics, by the same clause, are only exempted from the municipal tax. They will have to pay like all other citizens, their shares of taxes to the common funds of the Manitoba government. Now, the provincial government gives a grant of one hundred and forty to one hundred and fifty dollars per year to each school in Manitoba. Well, to this grant taken from the public treasury of the pro-

Mr. MONET.

vince, the Catholics, as well as the Protestants, are obliged to contribute; and they are in no way exempted from paying such taxes by the present Bill. As to the last clause of section 28 of the Bill, paragraph 3, which permits the Catholics to tax themselves for the maintenance of separate schools, the point made by the hon. member for Berthier does not seem to be very serious; for if it is a matter of consent for the Catholics to pay money for the separate schools, there is no need of a federal law to compel them to do it. Will the hon. member contend, however, that if they are not willing to pay such taxes they will have no way to escape them? One has only to read section 28 to see that they have the choice of paying either for the public or for the separate schools. Now, the moment they have the option of refusing to allow themselves to be incorporated into a separate school district, the law that would provide for their paying taxes for separate schools becomes inefficient. Let us read the third paragraph of that section:

3. But any Roman Catholic who is possessed of property liable to assessment, within a separate school district, which is also within the limits of some public school district, established by or under the provisions of the legislature of the province of Manitoba, may, at his option, require that such property shall not be levied upon for the support of separate schools, by giving to the secretary-treasurer of the separate school district and the clerk of the municipality a written notice to that effect.

So, it would only be necessary for Catholics to give such notice, and they would avoid paying the taxes that might be imposed under this clause. The moment they are given an option all the efficiency of the remedy is taken away.

Mr. ROBILLARD. (Translation.) The same option exists in Ontario, and that does not destroy the separate schools.

Mr. MONET. (Translation.) I do not say that the separate schools are thereby destroyed. I do not know whether the hon. member has understood me. I say that the Bill does not provide for an absolute right of taxation for separate schools, and that it will be sufficient that advantage be taken of section 28 to render the law inefficient. Besides, as the hon. member for L'Islet points out to me, in Ontario, the Catholics have a government grant, which allows them to keep their schools on a good footing.

But, Mr. Speaker, we hear the Conservatives say, it is very curious to see the Liberals so zealous with regard to this politico-religious question; the bishops are satisfied with the Bill as it is, and we do not understand why the Liberals should be more Catholic than the bishops. I deny this. I deny that the bishops are satisfied. At any rate, they have not declared themselves to be, particularly Mgr. Langevin, who, among the bishops, is certainly the most interested one

in the question. I say among the bishops, because the parent is more interested than he is. Now, Bishop Langevin has never declared himself satisfied with the Bill. We have grounds to believe, on the contrary, that he is not satisfied at all. Let us see, first, what he wanted. I will show next what was given him. By comparing what he demanded with what he got, one will judge whether he can be satisfied. In a sermon pronounced from the pulpit of Notre Dame, in Montreal, here is what he said :

After having asked all the Catholics of the Dominion to sign a petition praying for the full freedom of our schools, it would be very strange for us to accept a half freedom. Once more, no compromise ! Our rights such as guaranteed by the constitution ! We do not want to accept an inferior position to that occupied by the Protestant minority in the province of Quebec. I repeat it, the Catholics have but one thought, but one conviction, that is, that we must claim our rights in their entire fulness.

And further :

I emphatically declare that in the matter of education the Catholics of Manitoba will never accept the crumbs from the table when the Protestants of Quebec are seated at the banquet. No, never.

Mr. Speaker, if there is for Mgr. Langevin to feast upon, only the money which the government will vote, I believe that it will be no feast of Lucullus.

We are neither slaves nor sons of slaves, and so long as the Protestant minority of Quebec will enjoy the fulness of their rights, we, western Canadians, will never consent to half measures.

And at Edmonton, a few days afterwards, from the sacred pulpit, he said :

We will have our rights if we die in obtaining them.

Let us now examine the Remedial Bill, and see if it gives the Manitoba minority all the rights enjoyed by the Protestant minority in Quebec. I hold in my hand the code of Public Instruction for Quebec, in which are stated the rights of the Protestant minority. I also have the Remedial Bill which contains what is called the guarantees offered to the Catholic minority of Manitoba. Article 10 of the Quebec code provides for two committees of the Council of Public Instruction. Article 15 reads as follows :—

Everything within the scope of the functions of the Council of Public Instruction, which especially concerns the schools and public instruction generally of Roman Catholics, is within the exclusive jurisdiction of the Roman Catholic Committee of such Council. In the same manner, everything within the scope of such functions, which generally concerns the schools and public instruction generally of Protestants, is within the exclusive jurisdiction of the Protestant Committee.

Consequently the Protestant committee on Public Instruction in the province of Quebec have the absolute control of all matters

connected with Protestant education. The clause which I could call the corresponding provision in the Remedial Bill, is thus :

1. The Lieutenant-Governor in Council of the province of Manitoba shall appoint, to form and constitute the Separate School Board of Education for the province of Manitoba, a certain number of persons not exceeding nine, all of whom shall be Roman Catholics.

I admit that at first sight, this seems to give the Catholics of Manitoba the same guarantee as the Protestants have in the province of Quebec ; but it must not be forgotten that, while drafting this clause, the Dominion Government is aware that the Manitoba government is opposed to this law, and they give it the right to itself to appoint the persons that shall form this council. As has been pointed out by Conservative papers in the province of Quebec, the Manitoba government is thus given the absolute right of making this council inefficient by its composition. Such a council might certainly do some good, were it not that the Manitoba government holds the appointment of its members. Why has not the Government protected the Catholic minority in Manitoba in the same manner as the Protestant minority is protected in the province of Quebec ? In fact, article 91 of the code of Public Instruction, says :

—and such dissentient proprietors, occupants, tenants or ratepayers may, by the intervention of the trustees, establish in the manner provided with regard to other schools, one or more schools which shall be subject to the same provisions, duties and supervision, and they shall be entitled to receive from the Superintendent—

I call particularly the attention to this :—

—or from the School Commissioners, a sum out of the general or local school fund, proportionate to the dissentient population they represent.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, under this article, the Protestant minority in the province of Quebec has a right to a grant proportionate to its numbers in any parish where a dissentient school exists. Mgr. Langevin asked for the same enactment in favour of the Catholics and the French of Manitoba, and he plainly declared that the Manitoba minority would not be content with the crumbs from the table while the Protestant minority in Quebec were sitting at the banquet.

What was given in answer to this demand from the minority ? Section 74 is offered, and it reads as follows :—

74. The right to share proportionately, in any grant made out of public funds for the purposes of education having been decided to be and being now one of the rights and privileges of the said Roman Catholic minority of Her Majesty's subjects in the province of Manitoba, any sum granted by the legislature of Manitoba and appropriated for the separate schools.

And if the local legislature vote no funds, the consequence will be that the separate

schools will have no grant. Such is the provision made in this clause. It goes on :—

—shall be placed to the credit of the Board of Education in accounts to be opened in the books of the Treasury Department and in the Audit Office.

No wonder that "La Verité," a paper patronized by the clergy in the province of Quebec, quotes this section and condemns it in the following terms :—

It will be noticed that this section of the Bill does not give a cent of the provincial grant to the separate schools ; it only states that the separate school council will have the right to receive whatever the Manitoba legislature will be willing to give it. Should the legislature vote nothing to the separate schools the latter will have to be content with the municipal taxes ; for in what the newspapers have published of the Bill, there is nothing to indicate that the Dominion Government propose to grant any subsidy to the separate schools in case the Manitoba legislature refuse to do so.

It amounts to this, Mr. Speaker, that this section simply permits the Catholic minority to receive the money which the province of Manitoba will be willing to grant them. It is exactly as if a municipal council should pass a by-law to allow the poor of the parish to receive alms that the rich may be willing to give them.

However, the hon. members for Ottawa and Berthier have seen in this clause a great boon to the minority in Manitoba, the protection which this minority have so earnestly asked for.

The hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) has attempted to forestall this argument against the Bill now before us ; he has tried to cover this financial flaw of the Bill by saying that while no money is provided for the separate schools, the Bill declares that the Catholics have a right to a proportionate share of the grants voted by the local legislature, and he hopes that they will get it when a Conservative government comes to power in Manitoba. Then the Catholics may have a legislative grant. It is to be observed, Mr. Speaker, that my hon. friend's trust rests on the Conservative party coming to power. I do not know that the Manitoba Conservatives would be more favourable to the Catholics than the Liberals. The "Nor'-Wester," the organ of the Conservative party in Manitoba, on the last days of the electoral campaign, on the eve of the last election, contended that Mr. Greenway was not to be trusted, and put the voters on their guard against the government. I quote from that paper :

If Mr. Laurier comes into power Mr. Greenway will yield. Mr. Greenway will pass such remedial legislation as will be dictated to him by his lord and master, Mr. Laurier. Each of his acts, and of those of his principal followers, point to that conclusion and no other, in spite of his non-committing answers, his provocative speech and his boasted stalworthness. Will Mr. Greenway, in order to give consistency to the

Mr. MONET.

spirit of his answer and of his speech, declare that he will resign rather than ever consenting to a remedial legislation either in the Dominion Parliament or the local legislature ? He will not dare to do so, for he knows full well that, once the elections over, he will, if returned to power, agree to a certain measure of remedial legislation. This is no idle prophecy. The acts of Mr. Greenway and of his lieutenants indicate that, or else the support they give to Mr. Laurier is so flagrantly inconsistent that it is ridiculous. It is but an old Grit game.

I understand by that that the Conservative party in Manitoba is still more antagonistic to the Catholics than the Liberal party in the matter of a legislative grant. But let us suppose that the Conservative party be favourable to the minority. My hon. friend the member for Bellechasse says that that section 74 will render a great service to the Catholics ; but that only is if a Conservative government consents to vote them a grant. Now, if such a government is generous enough to make such a grant, there is no need of a law to compel it to do so. The last part of section 14 says that the money voted by the legislature and appropriated to the separate schools will go to the Board of Public Instruction. This is common law, and there was no need of a Remedial Bill for that. Let us now compare the rights of the Protestants in the province of Quebec as to the school books with the position made to the Manitoba minority. Article 214 of the Code of Public Instruction for the province of Quebec reads as follows :—

The curé, priest or officiating minister, shall have the exclusive right of selecting the books having reference to religion and morals, for the use of the schools for children of his own religious faith.

Mgr. Taché was by right a member of the old Board of Education in Manitoba. I know that Mgr. Langevin wanted to be ex-officio member of the education board, and that requests have been made to friends of the government for a provision declaring the bishops of the province of Manitoba, ex-officio members of the board, intrusted with the control of the Catholic schools. Here is my answer : If Archbishop Langevin were satisfied with the Bill, from a religious standpoint, he is welcome to it ; but as a French Canadian, I am entitled to discuss the question, from a national and constitutional standpoint. From that standpoint, I decline to be dictated to by Archbishop Langevin. I say that if he were satisfied with the Bill, from a religious standpoint—which remains to be shown, and it is a point of some importance to the issue—then, I would ask the hon. member for Bellechasse to tell us whether Archbishop Langevin is satisfied with the Bill, as it stands.

Mr. AMYOT. (Translation.) I could even, if necessary, read the telegram sent by Archbishop Langevin, in which he declares

to one of his friends here, that he is satisfied with the Bill, and asks all Catholics to support it.

Mr. MONET. (Translation.) Will the hon. gentleman please read it?

Mr. AMYOT. (Translation.) I am going to read an extract of the telegram.

Mr. MONET (Translation.) I call upon the hon. gentleman to read that telegram. My hon. friend is too good a lawyer not to know, that he cannot make use of mutilated evidence.

Mr. AMYOT. (Translation.) I shall mutilate nothing. Here is a copy of the telegram in question. It is written in Latin; I am going to read it in Latin:

St. Boniface, 22nd February, 1896.

Reverend Father Lacombe,
Residence of the Oblate Fathers,
Ottawa.

Lex applicabilis, efficax et satisfactoria. Probo illam. Omnes episcopi et veri Catholici approbare debunt. Vita in lege. Euge tibi et Larivière. I entirely approve of your written statement.

ARCHBISHOP LANGEVIN.

Which means: The law is applicable, operative, satisfactory. I approve of it. All the bishops and all true Catholics should approve it. Salvation is in that law.

Mr. MONET (Translation.) Would the hon. gentleman tell me to whom that despatch was directed?

Mr. AMYOT. (Translation.) I have just read it, and, if my hon. friend would pay attention to what is going on, instead of listening to the suggestions which come to him from the back benches, he would only be the better for it. It was sent to the Rev. Father Lacombe, and it bears the date of the 22nd February.

Mr. LANGELIER. (Translation.) The Bill did not exist at the time.

Mr. MONET. (Translation.) Let the hon. member allow me to tell him this: As I just said, the Bill may be considered from a threefold point of view: from a political, national or religious standpoint. Previous to the hon. gentleman's reading that despatch, I had already stated—and I repeat the statement—that, if Archbishop Langevin were satisfied with the Bill, viewed from a religious standpoint, we are not satisfied with it at all, both from a national and from a political standpoint. I am sorry I cannot read to the hon. gentleman a letter which was communicated to me. It comes from a high dignitary of the church in Quebec, and he says that the Bill, which he has carefully scanned, is not worth the parchment it is written on. How is it possible for the hon. members not to feel embarrassed in the presence of such conflicting opinions?

In connection with the question of disallowance, a well-known Quebec journal, "La Verité," an influential clerical organ, in its issue of the 7th March, made the following charge against the Government and the Conservative party:—

NO DISALLOWANCE.

The twelve months' delay during which the Dominion Government could disallow, or nullify the Manitoba law of 1894, expired on the 6th instant without the law having been disallowed. However, we had been given to understand, by certain Conservative papers that the Government would not exercise their power of disallowance.

The denial of the Federal Government to obliterate from the statute-book the infamous law of 1894, as they have the indisputable power to do, under the constitution, was a serious mistake which the Conservative party will find it difficult to redeem, and still more to obtain forgiveness for.

That party, at least in the province of Quebec, boast of following the orders of the bishops, and of being in reality, the only Catholic party. To pretend to be more Catholic than the Conservative party, is, according to the "Minerve" tantamount to attempting what cannot be done.

Now, it just happens that the bishops in the Dominion formally ask for the disallowance of a legislation which they declare oppressive for the Manitoba minority. Never did the hierarchy in Canada formulate a more solemn demand in favour of a juster cause. And yet, the Conservative party disregard their prayer. Such is the unvarnished truth. Let the Conservative organs explain away if they can the denial of their leaders to comply with so legitimate a request from the Canadian hierarchy, they can no longer boast of following the orders of the bishops in matters within the sphere of action of the latter.

It will be recorded that the bishops did their duty, their whole duty, but that our public men failed to do their own duty.

We repeat it, disallowance was, politically speaking, the only efficacious remedy that could be applied to the odious legislation of the Manitoba government, which is a political crime, a violation of the federal compact and of the fundamental principles of the constitution. Had the Government disallowed the laws of 1890, the question would now have been set at rest; for, never could the Manitoba government have defiantly resisted the central authority, had the Government, grounded as they were upon the right, stood to their guns.

Now, as I said, in view of this opinion of a Conservative paper, enjoying such high credit among the clergy of the province of Quebec, is it possible, I ask, for the French Liberal members from Quebec to take upon that school question a different stand?

Now, coming back to the freedom of political action, both from a national and political standpoint, how is it possible to reconcile the position taken by the Catholic clergy—provided that the telegram just read by the hon. member for Bellechasse be authentic—with that taken in 1872? At that time, a similar question was agitating public opinion in the country.

There was several available means for reaching a settlement of the question. Here

is what Cardinal Tachereau, the Archbishop of Quebec at the time, stated, in confirming the opinion of the late Bishop Langevin, of Rimouski, with reference to the attitude of Catholics under the circumstances :

1. Catholics are, undoubtedly, bound to disapprove of the principle of the New Brunswick School Act, and even to secure a remedy for that deplorable state of things within the limits of their power and complying meanwhile with the rules of prudence.

2. Catholics, however, are free to adopt, in order to reach that desirable end, the means which they deem, to the best of their knowledge, the best adapted to the accomplishment of that object, coupled with the least danger possible to the religious peace of the country.

3. The validity of the Act in question and the timeliness of provoking the intervention of the Imperial Parliament or of the Dominion Government, are open questions from a religious standpoint, and our Catholic legislators can, without infringing their religious principles, vote in either direction.

I call the attention of the hon. member for Bellechasse to what I have just read. And the Bishop of Rimouski, further says :

Such are the principles which must guide you in governing the souls committed to your charge, under the present circumstances.

Catholics have, from the decision given by the hierarchy in 1872, the right to exercise their judgment as to every national or political question, will any man in his sober senses, I ask, deny the fact that we are confronted by the same question that cropped up in 1872? Why, I ask, should the members of the Liberal party be precluded from exercising their own judgment on the matter and from voting against the Bill now before the House? In 1872, it was declared that we were free to exercise our own judgment and to settle that question as we thought fit. At that time as now, the separate school question was at issue. We were to judge as to the best means to be resorted to for obtaining separate schools. We now find ourselves in a position exactly similar to that one. I am in favour of separate schools, and I believe that the best means of restoring the separate schools in Manitoba is not to adopt the so-called Remedial Bill which is invalid. The hon. leader of the Opposition has always declared that he wanted an investigation to be made into the facts of the case, in order to frame the best and most adequate legislation. He has always declared that he wished to probe and sift the facts to the bottom, by means of an inquiry. I do not say, Sir, that an inquiry is absolutely necessary, but that it will be very useful for the better understanding of the question, and further, it would result beneficially to the Manitoba minority. Archbishop Taché himself asked for it. I believe that there are two kinds of inquiry to be made on that question. The first one will have to be made, in order to render valid the contemplated remedial legislation. A second inquiry should be made about the

Mr. MONET.

facts, with a view to make the legislation as complete and as operative as possible. An investigation should also be made into the petitions, memorials and other papers laid upon the Table of this House in connection with the Manitoba school law, as pointed out by the Privy Council judgment. We are called upon to legislate on the lines of the judgment of the Privy Council. That judgment is on the lines of the question which had been put to the tribunal and which is this: "Supposing all the facts alleged in the petitions to be true, the Governor General has the right to interfere. But the Privy Council never stated that the facts alleged were true, because there was no evidence taken before that tribunal. The Privy Council did simply declare that the Governor in Council could interfere, if the facts alleged in the memorial presented by the Manitoba hierarchy were true. Now, no proof of these facts was ever made before the Government. That judgment, if I interpret it aright, is in every point similar to a plea of justification at law, before a tribunal. If the court ordered that the evidence should be produced previous to the petition being acted upon, would the man in favour of whom that decision was rendered have a right to hope, if he neglected to produce the evidence, that the final finding of the court would be favourable to him? Not by any means. In the case at issue, the facts were not proved, and now the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) asked the Privy Council of Canada for leave to contradict the so-called evidence which had been produced by the other side. And not only was his demand rejected, but the evidence was withdrawn upon which rested the case and which the hon. gentleman wished to contradict. I believe with the hon. leader of my party, that for want of any such evidence, this Bill will prove invalid.

Archbishop Langevin is quite free, as such, to approve of this Bill, from a religious standpoint, but we have the same right to vote it down from a national standpoint. What we do want is a constitutional law, an operative law, a law so framed as to mete out justice to a minority whose rights have been overlooked for over five years by the present Government. We want an operative law, which may later on be modified. That cannot be brought about without political evolution which will bring into power men strongly determined to deal to the minority full justice. That political evolution will bring about a change in relations between Manitoba and the central government. I do sincerely hope, under the circumstances, for a change in that direction. But I may say that the Conservative party have done all they could to entangle the question, and however anxious we may be to settle it, possibly we might be precluded from doing them as full justice as we might have done at the outset.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Mr. Speaker, I would request that the indulgence of the House be extended to the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) so far as to allow him to remain seated while addressing the House.

Mr. SPEAKER. Is it the pleasure of the House that the hon. member be allowed to remain seated while addressing the House?—Carried.

Mr. CHARLTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the members of this House most heartily for the courtesy they have extended to me in allowing me to keep my seat because of the physical disability which prevents me standing for any length of time. I desire to address myself to the discussion of this most important topic which is at this time engaging the attention of this House and the entire Dominion. This is, perhaps, the most important epoch in the history of this confederation. For the first time this Parliament is called upon to act under the power which it undoubtedly possesses to override the legislation of the provinces under certain circumstances. The question as to the wisdom of this power being vested in us is one that I do not pretend to discuss. It has been held that it is contrary to the spirit of federal institutions that the powers vested in a province and exercised constitutionally by that province should be overridden by the central power. Whether that is the case or not is beside the question now, because the power is vested in this Parliament, and it is proposed that this House should exercise its power by the legislation now under consideration. This power, Sir, is granted to this Parliament by the 93rd section of the British North America Act; and I take it from the reading of that portion of the section conveying the power, that it is permissive—that this Parliament is not obliged to exercise it, but can exercise its discretion in the matter. The language of the section is “may”—not shall—“make remedial laws;” and I take it that it is fair to infer from that language that the power exercised by this Parliament is a power which it may or may not exercise, according to its discretion, having regard to the promises.

Now, Sir, this Government have not always manifested this degree of anxiety with regard to the constitutional phase of this question that they profess at this moment. When the law of 1890 was passed, it would have been perfectly constitutional and perfectly proper for the Government of this Dominion to have disallowed that law. They were asked to do it. They were then as fully in possession of all the facts pertaining to the question as they are now; but they declined, or failed, to exercise their clear constitutional privilege to disallow the law. They shirked responsibility in reference to that law until responsibility was thrust upon them by the decision of the Judicial Com-

mittee of the Privy Council. When the responsibility was thrust upon them, they proceeded to act in a manner which I am about to describe. This question was under consideration by our own highest judicial tribunal. The Supreme Court of Canada gave a decision in regard to it on the 20th of February, 1894. Their decision was, that no appeal lay; and, with all due deference to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, if my own opinion were consulted in the matter, I should say, that the Supreme Court of Canada, possessed, as its members were, of an intimate knowledge pertaining to our institutions, our laws, and the Dominion of Canada in all the phases of its institutions, constitution and laws, was more capable than any other body of jurists in existence to pass upon this question. The judgment of the Judicial Committee recites briefly one of the reasons that had weight with the Supreme Court in giving their decision that an appeal did not lie in this case. It is as follows:—

The learned Chief Justice of the Supreme Court was much pressed by the consideration that there is an inherent right in a legislature to repeal its own legislative Acts and that “every presumption must be made in favour of the constitutional right of a legislative body to repeal the laws which it has itself enacted.”

This, among other reasons, was given in the judgment of the Supreme Court for deciding that no appeal lay in this case, but the case was carried to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, and the decision of that committee was that an appeal did lie. And it is fair to say that in the appeal before that Council the case went practically by default. The minority had the benefit of the talents of one of the most eminent lawyers in the British Empire. Mr. Blake, and associated with him was a lawyer thoroughly conversant with every phase of this case, Mr. Ewart, of Winnipeg, while the Manitoba government was practically unrepresented by counsel during that trial. At the eleventh hour, certain English barristers, entirely ignorant of all the phases of the case, were employed, and I think I may say, without disrespect to these gentlemen, that their services were almost entirely useless. The Privy Council gave its decision, and that decision, we must bear in mind, was that the power conferred upon the Privy Council of Canada was purely and entirely a political power. It was not a mandate which the Privy Council gave by their decision, it was a permission to the Privy Council of Canada to make, in its discretion, regulations with regard to this matter. It was a judgment that permitted the Privy Council of Canada, in its discretion, to refuse to do anything in this matter. It was left to them purely as a political question. I find on page 209 of the blue-book laid before Parliament, that Lord Shand asked:

If the appeal is before the Governor, would he be entitled to take political considerations into view ?

It would seem, Sir, as if Lord Shand was asking the direction of Mr. Blake with regard to this matter; and I have no doubt that the talents and well-known reputation of Mr. Blake had a very great influence with the four lords of the Privy Council who sat in judgment upon the case. Mr. Blake replied: "Doubtless." Then Lord Shand asked :

It is not a mere construction. That is out of it. It would be purely political. I suppose ?

Mr. Blake—It is not out of it. That is one of the reasons we are here. Suppose the case of post union privileges granted and retracted, more or less, then the Council has to decide, first of all, whether the case comes within the law at all; secondly, whether there has been such a retraction, and then they proceed to decide what they think ought to be done in order to give the minority substantially the position which has been withdrawn from them.

Lord Shand—Surely, if it were not a question of a political character, to some extent, that would be determined by the courts of law ?

Mr. Blake—In my conception, after His Excellency in Council has got rid of this preliminary question and by the light that the courts of justice throw upon the construction of the statutes, has found that there is a case for entertaining an appeal, he proceeds to deal with that ex necessitate rei in a political sense, because what is to be done ? Council is to say to the legislature of Manitoba, we think such and such things should be done in order to restore to the minority the rights which we think they had and which we think they ought to have back again.

The Lord Chancellor—All we have to see is what we think the jurisdiction of the Governor General is.

Mr. Blake—The question whether upon the whole, acting in the political capacity, the Privy Council believe that they ought not to act, or to act in what we may consider a lame and half-hearted way, or to go the whole length of our demand, is no part of the question I have to submit to your lordships.

Lord Watson—I suppose we are bound to give him advice in this appeal. He has asked nothing else than advice throughout. He has not asked for a political decision, which can fetter him in any way.

Mr. Blake—It could not be. The law which creates the tribunal for the purpose of giving advice expressly states that, in their political capacity, they are not bound by that advice.

Then Mr. Ewart, on page 236, in summing up the case, uses this language :

Before closing, I would like to say a word or two as to what we are seeking. As it has been already remarked, we are not asking for any declaration as to the extent of the relief to be given by the Governor General. We merely ask that it should be held that he has jurisdiction to hear our prayer, and to grant us some relief if he thinks proper to do so.

It is to be left entirely to his discretion to grant us some relief if he thinks proper to do so.

Mr. CHARLTON.

Mr. Blake says, on page 328, the last remark but one made by that gentleman during this trial :

What we ask your lordships is, what the privileges were, how far they have been infringed, and then we propose to ask the Governor General to determine how far he will go. I do not ask your lordships to make any suggestion as to his action, which I conceive from the beginning is political.

This, then, is a political question, clearly defined to be such by the lords of the Privy Council, clearly admitted to be such by Mr. Blake and Mr. Ewart, the counsel for the appellants in the trial before that judicial body. The question is a political one, and the Privy Council of Canada, when it proceeded to act upon this question assumed to act judicially, when, in fact, it was acting politically. It assumed functions which it did not fulfil. It assumed judicial functions which it did not perform, and it acted purely and entirely in a political sense. What was the character of the trial or the hearing ? The minority, of course, was heard. Mr. Ewart, who was thoroughly familiar with the question, was there. He was prepared to proceed with the investigation. He had no reason to ask for delay. The Manitoba government had been summoned, and they appeared in the person of my hon. friend from North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). The necessary adjournment for hearing fully this case was denied. In fact, the Privy Council heard the minority and refused to hear the majority, and proceeded to give its decision without having permitted the majority to present its case; and after having done this, it printed evidence which was not in evidence, and virtually the whole transaction betrayed its purpose to act not only in a political, but in a partisan sense, and in an unfair, partisan sense. It has acted from the lowest possible motives, while assuming to be a court of justice.

The remedial order was issued on the 21st March, 1894, and that remedial order, in substance, commands the government of Manitoba to restore to the Catholics of that province the privileges they had enjoyed under the law of 1871. It required, in short, that legislature to re-enact a most obnoxious school law, which had been abolished by the Act of 1890, and left the legislature of Manitoba no discretion in the premises. The answer of Manitoba, made June 19th, 1895, should, I imagine, have called a halt. It ought to have impressed upon the Government of this country the propriety, not only the propriety, but the necessity of proceeding in this matter cautiously, and of informing themselves as to all the facts connected with it. That answer set forth the following facts, and contained the following allegations :—

We labour under great difficulties in maintaining an efficient system of primary education. The school taxes bear heavily upon our people. The large amount of land which is free from

school taxes and the great extent of country over which our small population is scattered present obstacles to efficiency and progress.

The reforms effected in 1890 have given a strong impetus to educational work, but the difficulties which are inherent in our circumstances have constantly to be met. It will be obvious that the establishment of a set of Roman Catholic schools, followed by a set of Anglican schools and possibly Mennonite, Icelandic and other schools, would so impair our present system that any approach to even the present general standard of efficiency would be quite impossible.

We contemplate the inauguration of such a state of affairs with very grave apprehension. We have no hesitation in saying that there cannot be suggested any measure which, to our minds, would more seriously imperil the development of our province.

We believe that when the remedial order was made, there was not available then to Your Excellency in Council full and accurate information as to the working of our former system of schools.

We also believe that there was lacking the means of forming a correct judgment as to the effect upon the province of changes in the direction indicated in the order.

Being impressed with this view, we respectfully submit that it is not yet too late to make a full and deliberate investigation of the whole subject. Should such a course be adopted, we shall cheerfully assist in affording the most complete information available. An investigation of such a kind would furnish a substantial basis of fact upon which conclusions could be formed with a reasonable degree of certainty.

It is urged most strongly that upon so important a matter, involving, as it does, the religious feelings and convictions of different classes of the people of Canada and the educational interests of a province which is expected to become one of the most important in the Dominion, no hasty action should be taken, but that, on the contrary, the greatest care and deliberation should be exercised and a full and thorough investigation made.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the reasons set forth in this answer to the remedial order of this Government made by the government of Manitoba are unanswerable. In my estimation, the setting forth of the facts which are contained in this answer rendered it necessary, imperatively necessary, that the Government, if they desired to act in a fair and judicial spirit, if they professed to be a judicial body, to have listened to these suggestions, and to have accorded to Manitoba what they had not been given before—a fair trial, granting its representatives the opportunity to present the facts which were alleged in this answer to the remedial order, and other facts bearing upon the case. Why, Sir, it was alleged that a large proportion of the children of the province were growing up in illiteracy; it was alleged that the sparseness of the population made the double schools practically impossible. It was alleged that the Catholics were accepting the public school system, and that thirty-seven Catholic separate schools had come under the public school system, and were satisfied with the amendment. It was shown that there were 196 schools in the

province of Manitoba, in which the average attendance ran from 4.4 pupils up to a fraction less than ten pupils. At the time of the hearing before the Privy Council, there appeared a gentleman, a Catholic from Manitoba, Mr. O'Donohue. We have no reason to suppose that Mr. O'Donohue was not a representative Catholic, or that he did not voice the wishes and opinions of a very large proportion of the Catholic laity of the province of Manitoba. He tells us that he ran for school trustee in Winnipeg in opposition to Father Langlois, and was elected by an overwhelming majority, that he received 90 per cent of the Roman Catholic vote. He said, in substance, before the Privy Council:

He was a resident of Winnipeg, a public school trustee, a member of the Roman Catholic Church, and a regular attendant. On behalf of a large number of Catholics of that province, he declared that the French schools of Manitoba are not in so satisfactory a state as the Protestant schools. Seldom had he found a French teacher who could speak or teach English. He had made representation to the Archbishop about the matter, and also to the late Premier Norquay. He did not think that 25 per cent of the French youths could write their names, whereas 75 per cent of the Protestant natives could read and write. When the Greenway government came into power he urged Mr. Joseph Martin to try and do something for the separate schools. At that time Mr. Martin did not think the matter was within the power of the province. When the School Act of 1890 was passed he gave it his support, and had no reason to regret his action. He believed if the clergy would allow the people to accept the present system they would do so. Efforts had been put forward by him to obtain a compromise, but his Grace the Archbishop would not consent to it, having been advised by eastern friends to accept nothing short of the repeal of the Act of 1890. There is scarcely a day that passes, but Catholics call upon me to express wishes that matters will shape themselves so that they may be able to send their children to the public school. They do not like to express themselves publicly for the fear of coming into conflict with the clergy. In his election he had been opposed by Father Langlois, who denounced the government as thieves and scoundrels—and yet he had been elected.

Now, if these representations made by Mr. O'Donohue were correct, and if it is a fact that a large majority of the Catholic laity of Manitoba were satisfied with the school system, if it was a fact that thirty-seven Catholic separate schools had passed over and were counted on the roll of public schools, certainly these were matters that demanded the courtesy of an investigation. These were allegations that had a bearing upon this question, these were allegations that this Government, if they acted in fairness, were bound to investigate. They were bound to possess themselves of full knowledge as to the state of public sentiment in Manitoba in this matter, and they were incapable of giving an intelligent decision until such investigation had been made. It was said that the public school system was Protestant. This was

denied, and an investigation as to that matter was challenged. It was alleged that the scripture selections used in the public schools were substantially the compilation of selections known as the "Ross Bible," of Ontario, which had been sanctioned by that enlightened prelate, Archbishop Lynch. It was alleged that the form of prayer was entirely undenominational. There are seventy-one selections from the Old Testament, and sixty-six selections from the New Testament, and these were entirely unsectarian, none of them could be said to redound to the benefit of one sect more than to another; they taught morality, the fear of God, the existence of an immortal soul in man. And the form of prayer used was as follows:—

Most merciful God, we yield thee our humble and hearty thanks for thy fatherly care and preservation to us this day, and for the progress which thou hast enabled us to make in useful learning; we pray thee to imprint upon our minds whatever good instructions we have received, and to bless them to the advancement of our temporal and eternal welfare; and pardon, we implore thee, all that thou hast seen amiss in our thoughts, words and actions. May thy good providence still guide and keep us during the approaching interval of rest and relaxation; also that we may be prepared to enter on the duties of the morrow with renewed vigour, both of body and mind; and preserve us we beseech thee, now and for ever, both outwardly in our bodies and inwardly in our souls, for the sake of Jesus Christ, Thy Son, our Lord, Amen.

Now, is there anything objectionable in that form of prayer? Can that be said to be a Protestant prayer? It is a Christian prayer, a prayer that can be used by every man who believes that there is a Lord and Saviour. The allegations that these schools were Protestant schools is denied, and that denial and the facts upon which it is based ought to have been investigated by this Government. The hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Daly), in his speech a day or two ago, said that the province of Manitoba, though they asked an investigation, did not say what they wanted to have investigated. He said, moreover, that the facts were all known, and that there was no need of an investigation. Now, who knows the facts as to the condition of public sentiment among the Catholic laity of Manitoba? Who knows the facts as to the character of the scripture reading, the character of the prayer? Who knows anything of the many other facts that are pertinent to this question, and that must be known and understood before an intelligent answer can be given? The Minister is entirely mistaken when he says that the facts are known; the material facts are not known, they are in dispute. The government of Manitoba says the material facts require investigation before this Government is in a position to give an order. The hon. Minister says, also, that they had an entire week, that they had most eminent counsel, and every opportunity to make

Mr. CHARLTON.

known their case. When the member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) first appeared before the Privy Council, he asked for a stay of proceedings until the case for Manitoba could be presented. The first remarks made by that hon. gentleman before the Privy Council, were as follows:—

Mr. McCarthy—Mr. President and gentlemen of the Privy Council, I appear here for the province of Manitoba, and before the argument is entered upon, I desire to state on behalf of the government of Manitoba that they have had no opportunity of making any preparation for this argument, that the notice of this meeting was only received by them by telegraph on Saturday week. As you know, the provincial government are now busily engaged in the work of conducting the session; under the circumstances they say that there is no possibility for them to prepare an argument, or to give that attention to the matter which its importance demands. I am desired, therefore, by the Attorney General "to protest," to use his own language, "and most vigorously, against the absolutely short notice which has been given." I do that now respectfully, before the argument is entered upon, as of course it would not be fair to my learned friend, who appears for the minority, to allow him make his argument, and then for me to make this statement.

Well, how was that received by the Privy Council? Here is the fact set forth that the legislature of Manitoba is in session, that the Attorney General of that province is unable to leave his sessional duties and proceed to Ottawa. It is quite evident, I imagine, to any person that it would be a matter of importance to have the Attorney General of Manitoba present at a trial that affected so seriously the interests of his province. He was naturally more familiar with the circumstances of the case than even my learned friend, the counsel who appeared on behalf of that province, because he was an actor in all these scenes, and he knew exactly what the position and the contention of Manitoba was. The Premier asked Mr. McCarthy:

Sir Mackenzie Bowell—I was going to ask you, Mr. McCarthy, what time would you require to prepare your argument?

Mr. McCarthy—It is not so much for myself I am speaking as for the Attorney General; and what I rather gathered from him, though he has not said so in words, was that he desired to have been here himself. It is a matter which involves the educational system of the province, a question which, of course, has attracted a great deal of attention in Manitoba, and has been a subject of discussion in more than one session. I think what he would like is such a postponement as would enable him to go on with the work of the session and to come here after the session. You are aware, of course, that Mr. Greenway, the First Minister, is ill, and the leadership of the House, I suppose, devolves upon Mr. Sifton, the Attorney General. He instructed me that he telegraphed to this effect on Saturday, to the Secretary of State.

Now, I would like to inquire, Mr. Speaker, what possible reason, that would be a reasonable one, could be assigned for refusing a postponement of this hearing long enough to

allow the Attorney General of Manitoba, who was leading the legislature in that province, to remain there the few days that would elapse before the close of that session, and then come to Ottawa and proceed to act as the counsel for Manitoba in that trial? If any reason could be assigned, that would be a reasonable one, I am unable to understand it. The Government refused this request. They gave to the counsel who appeared on behalf of Manitoba, time to telegraph to Winnipeg, time to have some documents sent down, and one or two persons to come here, the Minister of Education and Mr. O'Donohue, to assist him in the investigation; but they gave no adequate time for the preparation of the case of Manitoba in this most important trial; and the decision arrived at was distinctly upon the ground that they could not wait, that they must have the hearing concluded before the Manitoba legislature adjourned, in order that that legislature might have time to act upon its deliverance before its adjournment. Is there not some significance in that? Does that not imply that the decision the Privy Council were to arrive at was a foregone conclusion that they had decided beforehand to issue a remedial order, and that they must sit and finish the investigation and issue that order before the legislature of Manitoba had adjourned? If they were in uncertainty as to what their order would be, if it was just as likely to be a conclusion not to meddle with the matter as a conclusion to meddle with it, it would not have made any difference. But for some reason, they must have that order issued before the Manitoba legislature adjourned, that adjournment was a few days off, and consequently they could not allow the counsel for Manitoba more than three or four days to prepare their case. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the issuing of that order was decided upon before the case was heard; I believe that it was perfectly useless for Mr. McCarthy, or Attorney General Sifton, or anybody else to have appeared before that Privy Council, because no earthly power, and no amount of reasoning, no amount of proof, could have changed the order that that Privy Council had decided to issue.

Now, Sir, in connection with the constitutional question we are considering here, let me call attention for a moment to the American federal example. Of course, the American system is the pattern of all federal systems. It was the first federal system devised, it is a federal system which has been found to be in the highest degree advantageous to the states living under it. It has worked smoothly; and its general provisions, as bearing upon this case, are perhaps worthy of a moment's notice. Under that system there is no federal veto of a state law. The government at Washington cannot interfere with a state law; it is beyond their powers. Under that system

there is no federal supervision of state legislation; the government and congress at Washington can under no circumstances review the legislation of a state. Under that system an unconstitutional law, whether federal or state, may be set aside by the Supreme Court of the United States. Any law that is unconstitutional—and it is worth while bearing in mind that the Manitoba law is declared to be constitutional by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council—under that system every state law was left untouched; under that system all the reserved powers belong, not to the general government, but to the state; and as I said, the test of experience has proved that that is a wise and smoothly working system. Whether our own system is as good, I do not pretend to say; but it does strike me that the decision of the Supreme Court of Canada, taking the ground that it is impossible to believe that the legislature should not have power to repeal its own enactments, is a sound and constitutional one. But as I said, our constitution unquestionably vests in this Government and in this Parliament the powers that are sought to be exercised upon this occasion under the decision of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council.

I think it must be apparent to any person who is conversant with the state of public opinion in this country, who is conversant with the ease with which racial and religious animosities are aroused in this country, I say I think it must be apparent to any person who is conversant with these facts, that the gravity of the situation which we are facing to-day, demands prudence and forbearance upon the part of the Government; and I declare that in my belief the Government have neither exercised prudence or forbearance in this matter. They have acted hastily, they have acted precipitately, they have placed themselves in a false position; and the consequences may be very serious to this country. Conciliation should have been exhausted, entirely exhausted, before the last resort was taken, instead of taking the last resort at the very commencement, without any attempt at conciliation. No attempt at conciliation had been made, the remedial order was issued at once, and when the legislature of Manitoba asked for a stay of proceedings, asked that the government might be heard, which had not yet been heard, their petition was treated with contempt.

Now, Sir, when this case came before the Government, there were three courses open to them, and either one of these courses was strictly constitutional. The first course open to the Government was to refuse action. The judgment of the Judicial Committee established that this was a political question, and that the matter was in the discretion of the Privy Council of Canada. The clause in the British North America Act which gives this power, says "may make;" it is permissive; and the

Government has in all these cases the right to act upon its own judgment. They could then, either have refused action ; or, in the second place, they could have acted upon the lines of conciliation ; they could have decided to learn fully the facts, they could have proceeded slowly, proceeded to learn what the condition of public sentiment was in Manitoba, proceeded to learn what Manitoba had to offer as a reason for the repeal of the law of 1871 ; and having exhausted all the resources of conciliation, they could then, as a last resort, have proceeded to do what they did at the outset. Or they could, in the third place, do exactly as they have done, pursue the course they have pursued. Each of these courses would have been constitutional, but the last certainly was not advisable.

The Government's situation, I must confess, is not a very desirable one, and I do not accuse the Government of having reached this situation by premeditation. I do not believe that the Government anticipated the turn of affairs that has occurred. I believe the remedial order was predicated upon the decision to have an immediate dissolution of Parliament. I believe that the Government expected to go immediately to the country ; they expected to secure the support of the hierarchy, they expected to be able to conciliate their supporters in the west, as the Minister of Agriculture did in Haldimand. They probably would have been able to do it ; that was their design. It was a good plan, and, if carried into effect, they might have carried the country ; but an accident occurred—at least, I imagine so.

Mr. CAMERON. There will be another soon.

Mr. CHARLTON. It is necessary to have funds in going to elections, especially with a Government like this. An Order in Council had been passed before the remedial order, by which Order in Council \$2,500,000 were granted to the Hudson Bay Railway Company, for the purpose of constructing a portion of that line which would cost not to exceed \$1,600,000. That would leave a surplus of \$900,000. I do not know that I have the evidence, but I imagine that the arrangement with the Government was, to get the election fund out of the surplus of \$900,000, and that arrangement being made the remedial order being issued, they were ready to drop the hat and go into the race. But a screw got loose. The men who had to put up the money had their doubts ; they doubted whether the Order in Council was as good as a statute ; they doubted whether the Government would win the elections or not, and, if the Government were defeated, they had doubts as to whether they would get their money back. So they concluded, that there would have to be a statute passed before they would advance the funds. The remedial order was issued. It was just a little too soon. The plan went astray, and the Govern-

Mr. CHARLTON.

ment were in trouble both as to lack of funds and as to having issued the remedial order, which has come home to vex them, which has proved a curse to them.

This political move having been made, the Government must justify it. They could not accept the petition of Manitoba on 19th January, asking that the false step might be retraced, asking that an investigation, which should have been made at the outset, should then be made, asking that the fact should be laid bare by an inquiry. False pride deterred the Government from listening to this reasonable request, and they decided to justify the political move they had made. And how did they proceed to do it ? They said : We were sitting in Council as a judicial body ; we had presented to us a mandate from the highest judicial body in the Empire, the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council ; that mandate commanded us to do certain things ; it commanded us to relieve the minority of Manitoba from the grievances under which they laboured ; we had no choice, we had to proceed at once with action, without permitting Manitoba to be heard before us, without deigning to listen as to what the facts were—we had to proceed at once to issue this remedial order for adjusting the grievances under which the minority of Manitoba laboured, and we have been acting under constraint, we have been acting as a judicial body under a mandate of a higher judicial body. The position is false—the premises and the conclusions are false. There was no mandate of the Privy Council, there was nothing but a permissive declaration from that body, which expressly stated, that the action of the Privy Council would be political in its character, and the Governor in Council might give or might not give, the redress which the minority might choose to ask. This statement was expressly made by the lords of the Privy Council ; it was expressly made by both of the counsel on behalf of Manitoba before that body ; and, when the Government assumed this position with respect to acting as a judicial body and being constrained by virtue of the order issued to act as they have done, they took a false position and one calculated, whether designedly or not, to deceive the electorate of this country.

There is great solicitude for the constitution. It must be preserved. But there is no particular solicitude for the people. There is great solicitude for the Protestants of Quebec. If we do not give to the minority of Manitoba a remedy for their grievances, the interests of the Protestant minority in Quebec, they say, might suffer, they might even be swept away, and the people of Quebec might rise in consequence of the feeling of hostility engendered, and deprive the Protestant minority in Quebec of their rights. There is no parallel between the cases. The Protestants in the province of Quebec enjoy the privileges they possess on the same

terms as the Catholic minority in Ontario enjoy their privileges. Those privileges were a matter of treaty, a matter of negotiation, a matter of compromise; they were secured for the respective minorities of those two provinces long anterior to confederation. They were ratified by the British North America Act, they are part of the constitution of this country, they cannot be touched. If the rights of the minority in Quebec or in Ontario were infringed by legislation in either of those provinces, it would be the duty of the Government instantly to disallow such legislation. Such legislation would be clearly unconstitutional. The separate school system could not be legally abolished without amending or modifying the British North America Act, and to secure such modification would require the action of this Dominion Parliament, the concurrence of the provinces interested and the action of the Home Government. The cases are entirely dissimilar. When the British North America Act was promulgated and its provisions with respect to separate schools were made, there were only four provinces in the Dominion. The Act primarily applied to those provinces; it actually applied to but two of those provinces, Ontario and Quebec. There are at this moment five provinces in the Dominion without separate schools. In one of the provinces the question is at stake now. If we are to favour separate schools in Manitoba, ought we not, as a matter of justice, to favour separate schools in British Columbia, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island? Is there not danger that, if we favour separate schools in Manitoba, forced upon that province in the manner now proposed, that the next turn of the wheel, if the present party remains in power, may be to force separate schools on the other provinces? This is a dangerous question. It has been decided that there were no privileges enjoyed by the Catholic minority in Manitoba at the time of the union that were infringed upon by the School Act of 1890. But it cannot be said, that there were no privileges enjoyed by the Catholic minority in Ontario and the Protestant minority in Quebec at the time of the union that would not be infringed upon, because those privileges are enjoyed under the constitution and existed before and were embodied in the constitution and are a part of the constitution.

This movement, Mr. Speaker, is a purely political one. It has been taken for the purpose of securing political support; it has been taken for the purpose of securing success in the coming general elections. It has been taken, I repeat, precipitately and unadvisedly. It has been taken in a way likely to stir up religious animosities, and worse yet, to stir up racial animosities. The advisers of the Crown who have chosen to take this course, actuated by the motives that have actuated

them, are not the friends of this country; they are the enemies of this Dominion. They are taking a course that may result in serious disaster to this Dominion. Have the minority sustained a grievance? It has not been proved. That is one of the things that require investigation. It has not been proved that the minority in Manitoba esteem that they have sustained a grievance. That is one of the things which the government of Manitoba ask to have investigated. They say that thirty-seven of these separate schools have become public schools, and if Mr. O'Donohue is the mouthpiece of the majority of the Catholics of Manitoba, as he professes to be, then these people do not esteem that they have sustained a grievance. There should have been at least the courtesy of an investigation extended to a sovereign province of this Dominion. We should have learned by investigation, what were the views entertained, what were the motives that actuated them, what were the purposes that they proposed to follow, what were the considerations that influenced the Manitoba majority in the legislation of 1890. We should have given the courtesy of consideration and of investigation to these views, these motives, these purposes, and these circumstances. And, in the absence of the extension of that courtesy to this province, this measure must create—I do not say it may create, I do not say it is probable that it will create—but I say it must create discord and enmity. It will do it. Is it not of some importance to maintain this confederation? Does any reasonable man suppose that the province of Manitoba, with the character of the population which it possesses, will ever be dragooned or coerced into obedience to this remedial order? Do the Government of the day desire to drive Manitoba and the great North-west, the future seat of empire in this Dominion, into secession? Do they desire to render it probable, that these people will begin to consider the geographical and natural affinity that exists between that great region and the Mississippi valley? Why, these men are the enemies of Canada? These men are trifling with interests, the magnitude of which they fail to comprehend. These men are facing a danger that may shatter this confederation into fragments. I can tell you, Sir, that the state of sentiment that exists in the Dominion with regard to this matter, although it may be, in a degree, slumbering at the present moment, may be roused into a condition that will threaten this confederation. We do not know, Sir, to what extent this flame may burn. We do not know how far this wave of indignation may run, and this Government that issued this remedial order at the commencement instead of at the end of investigation, this Government that refused to take into consideration the reasons that actuated the province of Manitoba, that refused an adjournment for a few days, in

order that the Attorney General of Manitoba who was then leading the legislature of that province, and could not leave, might be in Ottawa to represent his province; I say that this Government that adopted this scheme of forcing Manitoba into the traces, without listening to her reasons for having passed the legislation it did; this Government has outraged decency, and insulted Manitoba, and insulted every citizen in this country who entertains a sense of justice. This Government, Sir, is clearly and absolutely in the wrong. If we are to become a nation, we have got to have harmony. We have got to secure harmony. We have got to move in a direction that will result in a greater assimilation of the people of this Dominion, and in a greater degree of homogeneity than exists at the present moment. We have got to smooth down racial disturbances, and religious disturbances, and in order to do that, it is necessary to adopt a policy of conciliation, a policy of mutual regard, a policy that will command us at all times, and compel us at all times, to listen to the just objections and reasons that may be urged by any section of the people of this Dominion.

And, Sir, this debate has developed one circumstance that will stand as an epoch in the history of this Dominion, the attitude taken by the leader of the Liberal party. He has deliberately placed country before race. He has deliberately placed country before religion, before sect. He has deliberately taken his position as a patriot, with the patriotic desire to act in the interest of all the people of Canada. He has, while affirming the right of every individual in Canada, whether lay or clerical, to his political opinions, and to his right to act upon his political opinions; he has, while expressing the greatest reverence and regard for his church, distinctly and emphatically repudiated ecclesiastical dictation in political affairs. He stands upon the principles of liberty, of equality, of justice, of recognition of the great fact, that civil rights and civil power must be superior to all other powers in civil affairs. Now, Sir, this example set by the leader of the Liberal party, points the way to the realization of that condition of things in this country, that will make of Canada a nation. The course taken by my hon. friends in the Government, in the matter of the remedial order, points the way to a condition of things that will set race at war with race, religion at war with religion, faction at war with faction, province at war with province, and may result in the disruption of this confederation. The Government, Mr. Speaker, have not only proceeded with rashness, with precipitancy, and without sense, in the issuing of the remedial order, and in their subsequent conduct, but they are prepared to enter upon a system of deception, by assuring the west that this Bill is entirely useless, that there is no need to pay any attention to it, that it

Mr. CHARLTON.

does not amount to anything at all, and that it is merely a tub thrown to the whale. I can foresee, by indications I have seen in this House, that this is the course that every Protestant supporter of this Bill will take when he goes back to his constituents in the west. I can foresee, that he will say that the Bill does not amount to anything, that the party, for party purposes, had to conciliate the ecclesiastical power, and that they have passed a Bill which amuses them and does not hurt us.

Mr. FOSTER. All that you would have to do to prove that, is to quote some of your own people.

Mr. CHARLTON. Perhaps so. All that they would have to do would be to tell the truth, as it exists to-day, with regard to my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) and his colleagues. There are certain features in connection with this Bill that are very grave features, indeed. I suppose the legislation, if it passes this House, is irrevocable. Whether it is right or wrong, judicious or injudicious, we can deal with it no more. That is said to be the case. This Bill will inevitably produce serious strife in this Dominion. It is a Bill that will be the beginning of a crop of litigation, the end of which no man can see. Manitoba may, as a first move, take an appeal against this Bill on the ground that it is not in the terms of the order. If it loses that appeal, it may next take an appeal against this Bill on the ground that the legislation was not submitted to Manitoba, and that this Government superseded the exercise of provincial legislative functions, before having given Manitoba an opportunity to say whether she would accept this condition or not. And when these two appeals are heard, if both are dismissed, the ingenuity of lawyers would concoct a dozen more reasons, and would keep this matter in litigation until the middle of next century, if necessary. And this measure, even if a grievance exists, even admitting that a grievance exists, this measure of coercion will inflict a greater grievance than the grievance it is designed to remedy. The grievance it is designed to remedy is a minor grievance compared with the grievance it will create.

Some of our friends from Ontario manifest a very inconsistent attitude on this matter. For instance, my hon. friend from East Lambton (Mr. Moncrieff) was the associate of a P.P.A., and his colleague in the local legislature is this same P.P.A., who denounces Sir Oliver Mowat because he permits separate schools to exist in Ontario, and demands their abolition in that province. That gentleman is a representative in the local House of the same party of which the hon. member for East Lambton is a representative in this House; and yet the hon. gentleman stands up here and advocates the forcing of the separate schools on a province, while his colleague in the local legislature demands the abolition of separate schools in

a province where they existed anterior to the constitution, and where they are recognized by the constitution.

There is another feature of this matter which is as grave as any that I have yet alluded to. I refer to the attack on the independence of Parliament—the revamping of old tactics; placing financial considerations before members; dangling before their eyes judgeships, senatorships, collectorships, places in the Civil Service—reminding me of the old days when members of this House were given timber limits, grazing leases, colonization grants and other considerations to make them solid. To those members who have promises of judgeships, senatorships, collectorships or offices in the Civil Service, it does not matter whether they are going back to their constituents or not. It does not matter to them whether they are recreant to their constituents—whether they have violated the wishes of their constituents in the most flagrant manner. They do not care; they will support the Government in this scheme; they will receive their reward.

Mr. FOSTER. I am glad to see that the hon. member's health is improving.

Mr. CHARLTON. The system is, in short, a refined and decorous mode of bribing. We come to bribery at last, though covered up, sugar-coated, decorous in its character. Every member of this House who votes for this Bill against the wishes of his constituents, and afterwards receives an appointment from this Government, has been bribed. He has been bribed to violate the principles on which he was elected; he has proved recreant to the principles of free government; he is a traitor to the wishes of the people whom he represents. There ought to be a way of curing this, and I believe there is a way of curing it. That way would be simply by a cancellation of those appointments. And, when the day comes, as it is coming very soon, when the Liberal party will be in power, it will be worth the while of that party to consider whether those appointments, made after a moribund Parliament had ceased to be a moribund Parliament—because they will not be made until after this Parliament is prorogued—made by a Government that is living, not on borrowed time, but on purloined time—should be recognized or not. I hold that justice would be vindicated and a wholesome example set for the future if every one of those appointments were cancelled; and I pledge myself to use every influence I possess to have every one of them, to the last one, cancelled. Every one who becomes a judge, or a senator, or a collector, or an office-bearer of any kind under the Government, after having voted for this Bill will have justly excited suspicion and should be made an example of by the cancellation of his appointment. Hon. gentlemen may laugh, but the time is coming when this

will not, perhaps, be laughed at. The legislation of this Parliament has been tampered with long enough by the corrupt influences of a corrupt Government.

The advocacy of this measure, whether it passes or not, is a fitting close to the career of an Administration marked by such legislation as the gerrymander Act, which enables one-half of the electors of Ontario to elect two-thirds of the representatives in this Parliament; the Franchise Act, which places in the hands of the appointees of the Government the making of the lists, and permits the printing of those lists in the Government's own office here, under the supervision of their own officials, where they may be stuffed to any extent the Government please, without any power to remedy the outrage. It is a fitting close to the career of a Government who have practised the system of boodling scientifically and by wholesale; who have made gifts of timber limits and colonization lands to its friends in this House; who have bribed ridings, not in one case or in a dozen cases or in a score of cases, but in fifty or a hundred cases by the appropriation of money for the construction of useless public works, their only motive being to influence votes in the ridings where the grants were made.

Now, Sir, this motion for the six months' hoist, which I shall support, demands the support of every advocate of provincial rights, whether he believes interference with provincial legislation should be permitted or not. It demands the support of those who believe in a thorough and impartial investigation of all the facts of the matter before action is taken. It demands the support of those who believe that the Bill affords no adequate remedy for an assumed grievance. All three of these classes, if they act on their convictions, will vote for the six months' hoist.

At what stage of the life of this Parliament is this Bill under consideration? Is this the fourth or fifth session? It is the sixth session of this Parliament. This House was elected five years ago on the 5th of this month. It has lived out its day. The Government should have gone to the country before this time. In 1891, after Parliament had held four sessions, the Government dissolved it on the false pretext that they were negotiating a reciprocity treaty with the United States, and were about to submit that treaty to Parliament, but did not wish to submit it to a moribund House. That House had still one session before its term expired. Yet here is a measure infinitely more important to the future of this country than any reciprocity treaty—a measure which may seal the doom of this confederation if it is successful, and this same Government, whose conscientious scruples would not permit them to refer a reciprocity treaty to a moribund House four years old, are referring this measure of infinitely greater importance to a moribund

House which is now in its sixth year. Sir, the Government's assumptions in 1891 were false assumptions, I judge, from the course they have taken in this case. If the statements made by the Government in 1891 were true, the reference of a reciprocity treaty to Parliament at that time would have been proper; but the reference of this Bill to this Parliament is improper. Its five years have expired; its time has come; and it ought before this to have been sent about its business. This question ought not to have been referred to this moribund House. It is a question upon which the Government ought to have been informed by the people. It is a question that should have been referred to the people at the polls. A question so vital to the future of this Dominion should have been dealt with by a Parliament fresh from the people, and not by a Parliament in which it is reported twenty or thirty members have promises in their pockets of judgeships, senatorships, collectorships or other offices, and in which the will of the people will be defied by the corrupt tactics of a corrupt Government.

Mr. FORBES. It has occurred to me that the Government should have ere this put their position more clearly on the records of this country showing why this Bill should carry. I was in hopes that another section of the Government, those who pretend to uphold this Bill as a satisfaction of the demands of the minority of Manitoba, would have expressed their views, so that we could have seen wherein the Government were making efforts to justify this Bill as a full and ample satisfaction of the demands of the minority of Manitoba. But they have not seen fit to do so. They have, by their action, conveyed the impression that the members of the Government, representing the faith of the minority in Manitoba, have lent themselves to the tactics of the Government in covering up and hiding out of sight the scheme initiated and endeavoured to be perpetrated for the purpose of keeping the minority from obtaining what they claim to be their just rights. Sir, if the representatives in the Cabinet, who pose as the champions of the alleged oppressed minority, saw fit to explain wherein this measure would carry out fully the promise made to the minority, we would have had the arguments on both sides of the case. The hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Dickey) really represented the views of the Government when speaking on this Bill, because the hon. Secretary of State (Sir Charles Tupper) did nothing but relate matters of ancient history which had no bearing on it. In one point alone did the hon. Secretary of State speak with any relevancy to this Bill before us; but to do justice to the Minister of Justice, he really made an endeavour by argument to sustain the Bill. But he failed to satisfy this House and the country that the arguments he put forth were such as

Mr. CHARLTON.

should convince self-thinking men that this measure should become law.

Great stress, Mr. Speaker, is laid on the fact that the Government are compelled to enact a Bill similar in terms to the remedial order of the 21st March, or so framed as to embrace the chief and salient points of that celebrated Order in Council, in order to remedy, as they allege, the grievances under which the minority in Manitoba are suffering. In other words, they claim that the minority have a legal and just claim to come to this Parliament and demand a remedy in the exact terms of the Order in Council of the 23rd March last. Except the Government take the ground that the right of the minority exists by virtue of our constitution and that the Privy Council have decided that this Bill should be enacted, the contention of the Minister of Justice, who was the legal mouthpiece of the Government, is absolutely without foundation. I know that it has been asserted, every six months or every three months, for the past five or six years, that there is a legal constitutional right for the oppressed minority to come to this Parliament and demand remedial legislation. But that contention has, to a great extent, been upset by the various arguments which have been advanced from day to day during this debate; and it will only require a few words from me—if the Minister of Justice is not already convinced of the error of his ways by the arguments which have been adduced by able constitutional authorities in this country—to convince him that there is no legal obligation on the part of Canada to restore those rights to the same extent—I am even prepared to go so far as to say that there is no legal obligation on the part of Parliament to restore those rights to any extent, as they existed before the Act of 1890 was passed. Let me refer for a few moments to the several sections of the argument made before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in England, where the Hon. Edward Blake handled the case, as senior counsel on behalf of the minority. The right of appeal is made under section 22 of the Manitoba Act and section 93 of the British North America Act. They differ very slightly in words but materially in fact. Section 22 of the Manitoba Act, says:

In and for the province, the said legislature may exclusively make laws in relation to education, subject to and according to the following provisions:—

1. Nothing in any such law shall prejudicially affect any right or privilege with respect to denominational schools which any class of persons have by law or practice in the province at the union.

2. An appeal shall lie to the Governor General in Council from any act or decision of the legislature of the province, or of any provincial authority, affecting any right or privilege of the Protestant or Roman Catholic minority of the Queen's subjects in relation to education.

3. In case any such provincial law, as from time to time seems to the Governor General in

Council requisite for the due execution of this section is not made, or in case any decision of the Governor General in Council on any appeal under this section is not duly executed by the proper provincial authority, in that behalf, then, and in every such case, and as far only as the circumstances of each case require, the Parliament of Canada may make remedial laws for the due execution of the provisions of this section, and of any decision of the Governor General in Council under this section.

Now, the Act of British North America is practically the same with the exception of section 2, which says :

All the powers, privileges, and duties at the union by law conferred and imposed in Upper Canada on the separate schools and school trustees of the Queen's Roman Catholic subjects, shall be and the same are hereby extended to the dissentient schools of the Queen's Protestant and Roman Catholic subjects in Quebec.

Where in any province a system of separate or dissentient schools exists by law at the union, or is thereafter established by the legislature of the province, an appeal shall lie to the Governor in Council from any act or decision of any provincial authority affecting any right or privilege of the Protestant or Roman Catholic minority of the Queen's subjects in relation to education.

Then, subsection 4 gives the remedy, in the event of a provincial law taking away any of these privileges. It provides :

Then, and in every such case, and as far only as the circumstances of each case require, the Parliament of Canada may make remedial laws for the due execution of the provisions of this section, and of any decision of the Governor General in Council under this section.

The hon. Secretary of State, in quoting that section, claimed that there was legal obligation upon Parliament to enact the proposed legislation, because, he said that the word "may" is used, and he asked whether we were going to refuse justice to the minority because the option of refusing it was given Parliament. Sir, the Parliament of Canada does not stand in the position of being obliged to take away what was an alleged right because the word "may" is used in the constitution; because it has the discretion of granting or refusing to grant that remedy to the minority. No, Sir; we go further than that. We say that there stands behind the constitution of Canada an undoubted right of the minority of any province in this confederation to have its rights protected so far as those rights have been guaranteed by the Act of union when the provinces formed the union known as the Dominion of Canada. This section 22 of the Manitoba Act and section 93 of the British North America Act differ in the use of the words "by practice" in addition to the words "by law." Now, it has been decided that these words mean practically nothing; they have no legal effect whatever. Yet we find the hon. Minister of Justice in his speech saying that coercion was justifiable and necessary in order to maintain rights acquired "by practice" under these words. In order to make this phase of the question more emphatic and

more clear I will read what a distinguished Queen's Counsel of Nova Scotia has lately written for the public press, in commenting upon the speech of the hon. Minister of Justice. I refer to Mr. Benjamin Russell, Q.C., Professor in Dalhousie Law University. Mr. Russell, in his exhaustive letter upon the speech of the Minister of Justice as referring to this section, says :

We do not, however, advance the argument very far when we have settled this point, for I freely grant that it is not a conclusive answer to a proposed measure of legislation to show that it involves coercion. Coercion may be justifiable and necessary, and the whole question at issue at the present moment is whether the present condition of the Manitoba school legislation is such that the coercive proceedings now proposed by the Federal Government and recommended to the Dominion Parliament for its adoption are justifiable and necessary. Mr. Dickey contends that they are, and as he is the highest legal authority in the House of Commons, as well as one of the most fair-minded and reasonable men on either side of the House—

I quite concur in which

—we may expect to find in his speech the strongest presentation of the case for coercion that can possibly be made. * * * * *

The Act by which Manitoba became a province of the Dominion provided that nothing in any law passed by the Manitoba legislature should prejudicially affect any right or privilege with respect to denominational schools which any class of persons had by law or practice in the province at the union. It was thought that by virtue of this provision, differing as it does from the general provision of the British North America Act with reference to the rights and privileges of minorities by the addition of the words "or practice," which are not used in the British North America Act, the Roman Catholic minority in Manitoba were entitled to separate schools supported by public grants of money, or at all events to be exempted from taxation for the support of national schools, although at the date of the union it is admitted as one of the unquestioned facts of history that there were no school laws within the boundaries of the province, no public school tax and no public schools, whether Protestant, Catholic or secular, all the schools in the province being purely private enterprises supported by fees and out of church funds. The Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, the highest court in the Empire for us, negatived this contention and decided that the Public School Act of Manitoba did not prejudicially affect any right or privilege of the Roman Catholic minority with respect to denominational schools, enjoyed at the union either by law or practice, that no such rights or privileges existed, and therefore the Manitoba School Act was perfectly constitutional and valid. As to this Mr. Dickey says that "if the Parliament of Canada had properly expressed its meaning at that time," the time when the Manitoba Act of 1870 was passed—"there would have been no Manitoba school question now on our hands, because the Act of 1890 would have been declared ultra vires of the province."

I do not know what the hon. Minister of Justice means us to infer from that, unless it be that he would have vetoed the Act of 1890. Mr. Russell continues :

The decision of the tribunal of last resort is the best and only authority as to the meaning of Parliament. No doubt those who secured the insertion of the words safe-guarding the rights or privileges enjoyed "by practice" attached importance to them, and supposed that they conferred on the minority in Manitoba some advantages which would not have been acquired by the adoption of the provisions contained in the British North America Act. But the Dominion Parliament can no more be held, by the use of these words, to have affirmed a proposition that there were rights or privileges enjoyed "by practice" at the time of the union than they can be held to have affirmed the existence of rights or privileges enjoyed "by law" at the time of the union by the use of the latter term, which also occurs in the Manitoba Act. Nobody pretends that there were any such rights or privileges enjoyed "by law" at the time of the union in Manitoba, because there was no law in relation to the question. The only inference that can be drawn from the insertion of the words in question is that the Dominion Parliament was willing and desirous in 1870 of giving the minority or whatever class in the community might thereafter in the mutations of time become the minority, whatever protection such a provision would afford *valet quantum*, to secure to them any rights or privileges that they might be held to have enjoyed at the time of the union, leaving it entirely an open question whether any such rights or privileges actually existed or not—a question which the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council has answered emphatically and clearly in the negative.

The Manitoba School Act having been thus determined to be absolutely valid and constitutional, it is not easy to understand Mr. Dickey's contention that it is necessary for Parliament to interpose for the purpose "of redressing a substantial wrong that has been properly proved." In making that contention, Mr. Dickey is surely begging the question, as he is also, in another form of words, when he says that "the Manitoba minority have come to sue for justice," and asks "if the House will refuse them justice." Certainly if there is a wrong it must in some way be redressed, and certainly no Parliament can be got together in this Dominion that will not on such a subject as this do justice. But where is the wrong, and where is justice? A wrong, as I understand it, is the violation or refusal of a right. If there be no right there can be no wrong. The Privy Council has decided that the Roman Catholic minority have no right to claim the establishment of a separate school system. How then can there be any wrong done them in the abolition of that system? It would certainly be a very strange constitution that would enact that a system of separate schools established by a provincial legislature in 1870 could not be legally abolished by the same legislature in 1890. Mr. Dickey's theory of our constitution involves this monstrous proposition, that if the legislature of Nova Scotia should at its next session establish a system of separate schools for Roman Catholics and the provincial government should be defeated on that issue at the ensuing general election, the incoming legislature could not properly or effectively repeal the Act and take away the right or privilege which its own legislation had created. An appeal would lie to the Dominion authorities in such a case as it lies to the Dominion authorities in the present case. The argument would be precisely the same. The cases would be absolutely identical. The aggrieved minority

Mr. FORBES.

would have precisely the same rights that it has in the present instance. The decision of the Privy Council would be precisely the same as in the present case and would possibly be accompanied by the same extrajudicial advice to the Canadian Parliament as to the mode in which it should deal with the subject.

The cases are identically parallel. If the minority of Manitoba had any right at the time of this union "by law," it is clearly established by the Privy Council of England declaring that the Act of 1890, which took away the privileges which they enjoyed by virtue of the statute, was a perfectly constitutional Act that they have lost those rights "by law" also cannot therefore claim any "legal right" to have them restored. The same English Privy Council, in the case of *Barrett vs. the City of Winnipeg*, decided that the words "by practice" had no effect and are a nullity; and section 22 of the Manitoba Act gives them a right of claim on the ground of justice to the minority by virtue of the words "by law or by practice at the time of the union" in that section. If, I say, it has been decided by the Privy Council of England that these two collections of words, "by law" and "by practice," practically mean nothing, then I say I am correct, and the Minister of Justice is wrong, and the minority have no right to come to Parliament and say they should have what they claim to be their grievances redressed by Parliament as a matter of "constitutional right," and by virtue of the agreements and compacts made with them at the time of union, and subsequently incorporated into their written constitution. Sir, I claim that the Government have no right, "constitutional" or "legal," to demand of Parliament that the passage of this Act is the bounded duty of Parliament, or an act of justice, as the Minister of Justice puts it. I say that there is nothing of the kind, that the authorities will not warrant it; and therefore we are thrown back exactly into the position which is exemplified in the remarks of Mr. Russell, of Halifax, when he says that the position of Manitoba to-day is exactly parallel with that of Nova Scotia if the legislature of the latter province were to pass a law practically to abolish the Free School Act, and were to pass a separate school Act, and if that Act was then to be—

An hon. MEMBER. Abolished?

Mr. FORBES. Certainly, and if there were to be a general election, and if the opponents of those who had repealed the separate school law in Nova Scotia were to come to this Parliament and demand the restoration of the pre-existing rights and the repeal of the Act, I say the position would be identically the same.

Mr. DICKEY. The position would be exactly the same if those rights had endured for twenty years, and a generation had grown up under them.

Mr. FORBES. The Minister of Justice cannot make the contention good that because that privilege existed in Manitoba for twenty years, it became a right by law.

Mr. DICKEY. I am speaking of the similarity of the cases. The cases are not similar in point of time. We have had national schools in Nova Scotia since 1864.

Mr. FORBES. Manitoba has only had her national system about nineteen years, and yet the Minister of Justice will admit that my contention is right as regards the supposed position in Nova Scotia, namely, if the incoming local legislature were to repeal the present national school system in Nova Scotia it would be parallel to that in Manitoba. Yet the Minister of Justice says that because Manitoba had a national school system for nineteen years, therefore no local government succeeding the present one would have the right to repeal that local Act.

Mr. DICKEY. No.

Mr. FORBES. Then my hon. friend cannot hold that his position is sound. The claim of the minority in Manitoba to come to this Parliament as a matter of justice, can only be by virtue of rights established under the Act of Union; and if it is decided by the decision of the Privy Council in England that they have not any such rights "by practice," and that they have no such rights "by law," therefore, I ask the Minister of Justice where do they get their right? Upon what ground does he claim that "in justice" to the minority the Parliament of Canada is bound in honour to pass this Bill? I cannot understand that the minority have any "right," or "legal" justice, to demand from this Parliament the passage of this Bill.

Mr. TAYLOR. You are not open to conviction.

Mr. FORBES. I am as much open to conviction as any free citizen in the country. If I can be convinced that the minority are entitled "by law" or "by practice" to have the whole of their alleged grievances redressed by Parliament, or to have a part of them redressed, I am willing and ready at any moment to support the law proposed by this Government to that effect. But I cannot be convinced; and I take the same ground that was taken by Benjamin Russell, professor of law in Dalhousie University; and in opposition to the contention of the Minister of Justice, I have supposed a case in which the school law in Nova Scotia could be exactly in the same position as the school law in Manitoba to-day. Yet no one would disturb the condition of affairs there to-day. The school law of the province of Quebec is vastly different, because section 93 of the British North America Act protects the Protestant minority in Quebec. Subsection 2 says:

All the powers, privileges and duties of the union by law conferred and imposed in Upper Canada on the separate schools and school trustees of the Queen's Roman Catholic subjects shall be the same as hereby extended to the dissentient schools of the Queen's Protestant and Roman Catholic subjects in Quebec.

Mr. KENNY. Does my hon. friend contend that the position in Nova Scotia and the position in Manitoba, on educational questions, are similar?

Mr. FORBES. They both have national systems of schools. In other words, I say the province of Manitoba to-day has neither "by law" nor "by practice," any stronger claim upon this Parliament for legislation to change the provincial legislation of that province as regards education, than a Nova Scotia minority would have if the legislature of that province was to repeal the existing school law there. I say, in other words, that the repeal of the present school law in Nova Scotia would put that province in a parallel position to-day, as regards the jurisdiction of this Parliament, as the province of Manitoba is in. I say that there is no constitutional obligation upon this Parliament to legislate.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). It is not necessary to repeal the law in order to establish separate schools.

Mr. FORBES. In Nova Scotia it would not be.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). We have separate schools there now.

Mr. FORBES. If the hon. gentleman knows as little about the Manitoba law as that, that is another reason why we should have an investigation on the line of the policy laid down by the leader of the Opposition. The hon. member for Inverness must know that there is no separate school law in Nova Scotia.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). There are many of them.

Mr. FORBES. The hon. member for Inverness is not only entirely out of order, Mr. Speaker, in interrupting me, but he is entirely ignorant of the law of his own province. There is not a single statute giving separate schools.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). The hon. gentleman is not free to answer my question.

Mr. DICKEY. My hon. friend meant to say that there were many separate schools.

Mr. FORBES. The hon. member for Inverness is not only ignorant of the school laws of that province—

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). You cannot answer the question.

Mr. FORBES—but I say he is ignorant of the way in which the present school law

there is operated. There is no such thing as separate schools established by law in Nova Scotia. The statutes of Nova Scotia do not permit them.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). But they exist all the same.

Mr. FORBES. There are separate schools in Nova Scotia by a sort of compromise. In certain districts there is a practice of allowing Roman Catholic teachers to teach Roman Catholic children, and it works most harmoniously and satisfactorily.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). Why not establish that by law?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Do you want this Parliament to force them on Nova Scotia by law?

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). Certainly. They were claimed in 1868, and they would claim them yet if they could get them.

Mr. FORBES. I understand the hon. member for Inverness would abolish the present national school system in Nova Scotia and would enact a separate school law by this Parliament.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). No, that is not at all necessary.

Mr. FORBES. We have in Nova Scotia one of the most successful systems of school laws in the Dominion of Canada, just such a system as, I do not hesitate to say, the minority in Manitoba would be willing to accept, and such as all the people of Manitoba would accept, a perfectly workable system, giving full and complete satisfaction to all classes in the community, whereby no race nor religious warfare exists, whereby Protestants and Catholics work side by side to promote the best interests of the community. Education is free, and is taught to the highest and lowest alike. That system is sustained by the province of Nova Scotia to-day. If any hon. gentleman representing Nova Scotia in this Parliament were to advocate a repeal of the present school law in that province, and were to seek election at the hands of any constituency there, he would soon find himself relegated to obscurity. Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to emphasize the point by quotations from the argument made before the Privy Council in England that there is, as I said before, neither a legal right nor obligation on Parliament to interfere with the school law of Manitoba, and to force upon that unwilling province an unsatisfactory law.

The Lord Chancellor—Then you say there is a case for the jurisdiction of the Governor General, and that is all you have to decide?

Mr. Blake—That is all your lordships have to decide. What remedy he shall propose to apply is a different thing. (P. 62.)

Mr. Blake—In case the provincial legislature does not act in pursuance of the views of the Governor in Council it depends on the determination of the Canadian Parliament whether or not

Mr. FORBES.

they will pass a remedial law—make remedial laws. (P. 90.)

The Lord Chancellor—It is not before us what should be declared, is it?

Mr. Blake—No; what is before your lordships is whether there is a case for appeal.

The Lord Chancellor—What is before us is the functions of the Governor General.

Mr. Blake—Yes, and not the method in which he shall exercise them—not the discretion he shall use, but whether a case has arisen on these facts on which he has jurisdiction to intervene. That is all that is before your lordships. (P. 26.)

Lord Watson—I suppose we are not asked to give any such finding or opinion as would tie the Governor General to follow any recommendation of the Canadian Parliament.

Mr. Blake—I do not think your lordships are, I do not like to make an absolute concession at this time.

Lord Watson—I suppose we are bound to give him advice in this appeal. He has asked nothing else throughout. He has not asked for a political decision which shall fetter him in any way.

Mr. Blake—It could not be. The law which creates the tribunal for the purpose of giving advice expressly states that in their political capacity they are not bound by that advice. (P. 39.)

Mr. Ewart—As has been already remarked, we are not asking for any declaration as to the extent of the relief to be given to the Governor General. We merely ask that it should be held that he has jurisdiction to hear our prayer and grant us some measure of relief, if he thinks proper to do so. (P. 183.)

Lord Watson—What is given to the Governor is a discretion to do what he thinks fit in appeal.

* * * I apprehend that the appeal to the Governor is an appeal to the Governor's discretion. It is a political administrative appeal, and not a judicial appeal in any proper sense of the term, and in the same way, after he has decided, the same latitude of discretion is given to the Dominion Parliament. They may legislate or not as they think fit. (P. 193.)

Mr. Blake—Only within the limits of his discretion.

The Lord Chancellor—He (the Governor) cannot do anything of himself. At the last resort the only person or body who can do anything more are the Parliament of Canada, who are certainly not under legal compulsion to act, and certainly would not act unless there was some substantial ground for it. (P. 259.)

It is true that the minority has the right to come to this Parliament, as any corporation may come here, and ask by petition that an Act be passed to give it corporate existence for the purpose of carrying on more efficiently its operations. I think the minority have rights far superior to any such body of persons as an ordinary corporation; but I submit, that Parliament should not be dictated to by the Government and told, as the Secretary of State told this House, that there is a legal obligation to pass this Bill in favour of the minority. The remedy is at our discretion, and, when it has been established, by investigation before an impartial tribunal, that a wrong has been done to the minority in Manitoba and that we should enact measures to relieve them, then such measures should be adopted. But I do not believe that the Bill under consideration

should become law. In my opinion, a Bill can be passed through the legislature of Manitoba which will satisfy all contending parties, and quiet the fierce passions that have been created there, a measure that would restore harmony through that fair province, and bring about a peaceable and satisfactory solution of the difficulty. I contend, therefore, that there is no obligation, legal or otherwise, resting upon Parliament, as the hon. Minister of Justice stated. It has been said, that the position of the Opposition in this House, so ably presented by its leader, is not a favourable position, and is not one which will bring about a solution of the difficulty, but that it is, rather, a position taken by a political party which seeks to disregard the rights of an oppressed minority. I deny that charge altogether. I assert, that the only wise and statesman-like course that can be pursued on this question, is that laid down so ably by the leader of the Opposition, himself a Roman Catholic of French descent, sitting here, pleading on behalf of the better judgment of this country, and entertaining feelings more or less inclining to those of his own nationality. It would be natural for that hon. gentleman to say: My compatriots in religion, I think you can place confidence in me and consider that I will do justice; and to my compatriots from the province of Quebec I can say: If you have confidence in me, you will ultimately have your reward; let us not prejudge the case, but let our Protestant friends in other parts in the Dominion join with us in educating the people of Manitoba who may be opposed to my policy, so that some measure of justice, great or small, as the circumstances of the case may require, will be given to the Manitoba minority. I believe the course laid down by the leader of the Opposition is the most wise one, and that it is one which will receive the unanimous support of the people of the country, whenever an opportunity is given them to express their opinion at the polls.

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

After Recess.

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, when you left the Chair at six o'clock, I was proceeding to say that the Minister of Justice (Mr. Dickey) was presenting to Parliament the argument: that the minority of Manitoba had come to Parliament for "justice," and he asked: Would anybody in Parliament refuse them "justice." That contention of the Minister of Justice could only be based upon the supposition that a right had existed, and that a wrong had been done. I trust I have shown clearly to the House that the decision of the Privy Council in England in 1892 laid down that by the passing of the Act of 1890, no wrong had been done the

minority in Manitoba, and that they had not been deprived "illegally" of any right. That, Sir, was the decision of the English Privy Council, in *Barrett vs. City of Winnipeg*, and the contention of the Minister of Justice to the contrary cannot be sustained by the decision in the case of *Barrett vs. The Attorney General of Manitoba*. I have also asserted, and I challenge contradiction, that if there is no right taken away, there can be no wrong done by any law, and if there is no wrong done, it was improper for the Minister of Justice to urge upon Parliament that he was coming here 'ex justitiae debito,' claiming from Parliament that "justice" should be done to the minority. It is beyond doubt, Sir, that the only right that a minority in any province, whether Protestant or Catholic, would have to ask the interference of the Parliament of Canada on behalf of their educational matters, would be entirely dependent upon the discretion of this Parliament. I claim that no person has a right to present this case to us, as if there had been an infringement of the constitution of the country. I protest against that, Sir, I ask that after the evidence is taken on the subject the House and the province should have an opportunity to say whether they are willing to restore, or to grant to the Manitoba minority separate schools, pure and simple, for the benefit of a certain class of citizens in that province. It may be that upon the investigation of the facts, enough could be said on behalf of such a cause as to almost compel any fair-minded man to grant the request set forth in their petitions. For my part, I am willing and anxious to have the matter thoroughly investigated, and if the Manitoba minority—or, for that matter, the minority in any province of the Dominion—can establish that they have a right to ask the interference of this Parliament, and to appeal to the better judgment of this Parliament, I, for one, am prepared to bring an unbiassed mind to deal with the case. I ask that we be left to judge upon the matter, without being compelled to prejudice ourselves by a strained interpretation of the decision of the Privy Council. I had also said, Sir, that the position of Manitoba, according to the contention of the Minister of Justice, would be exactly similar to that of the province of Nova Scotia, or Quebec, or New Brunswick, or Prince Edward Island, under the same circumstances. If, for instance, the local legislature of Nova Scotia passed an Act to abolish the national school system, and if general elections were to take place, and the incoming local government were to pass an Act repealing that Separate School Act of that province, and by which the alleged rights of the minority which may have accrued to them would be swept away, then that minority might come to this Parliament and claim what the Minister of Justice calls "justice." The cases

are exactly parallel, and is it within the ability of any Minister of Justice, or any legal man of standing, to say that any such party would be "legally" oppressed—and that they would have a "legal" right to come to this Parliament and ask interference in a matter of that kind? Does the Minister of Justice think that they would be listened to for one moment under such circumstances? Would the member for Inverness (Mr. Cameron) go on any platform in Nova Scotia and advocate such a thing as that? No, Sir, his position would be untenable, and he would be hooted off the first platform on which he advocated such a condition of things.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). What condition is that?

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Your usual condition.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). And your usual understanding.

Mr. FORBES. I further say, Sir, that the judgment of the Privy Council was, that the subsections of section 22 of the Manitoba Act, whereby rights were obtained by the minority in that province, "by law or by practice," had practically amounted to nothing. One decision of the Privy Council said that the words "by practice" really amounted to nothing. With that view of mine, the Minister of Justice concurs. I also stated that the last decision of the Privy Council had decided that the minority in Manitoba had lost no rights "by law," and that the passing of the Act of 1890 was entirely within the purview of the constitutional jurisdiction of that province. It therefore remains that if the minority in Manitoba are deprived of any rights by the Act of 1890, they were deprived of them "legally and constitutionally." Consequently, under the law, there was no wrong done, and there was no illegal deprivation of any rights. In the decision of the Privy Council which is to be found on pages 2 and 3 of the Manitoba School Case, question 6 is as follows:

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

Their lordships gave answer to that question as follows:—

In their lordships' opinion, therefore, it is the 22nd section of the Manitoba Act which has to be construed in the present case, though it is of course legitimate to consider the terms of

Mr. FORBES.

the earlier Act, and to take advantage of any assistance they may afford in the construction of enactments with which they so closely correspond and which have been substituted for them.

Consequently it is section 22 of the Manitoba Act which governs this case. Section 22 of the Manitoba Act, subsection 3, says that in every such case, and as far only as the circumstances of each case require, the Parliament of Canada may make remedial laws with respect to schools which exist by law or by practice. Section 93 of the British North America Act limits interference to cases where in any province a system of separate or dissentient schools exists by law at the union. The point I am making is that subsection 3 of the Manitoba Act has been practically eliminated from this discussion by the decision of the Privy Council. Therefore it is fair to say that, as a result of that decision, there is no right or claim to interference from this Parliament of Canada belonging to any minority.

Now, Sir, reference was made to the position of the Protestant minority in the province of Quebec; and I think it was clearly established by the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin), when he addressed this House the other evening, that the rights of that minority were firmly fixed by legislation previous to confederation. Section 93, subsection 2, of the British North America Act clearly provides that any educational rights which the provinces of Upper and Lower Canada had at the time of the union shall remain. I have already cited that clause. Therefore, when the hon. member for Winnipeg proved conclusively that the rights of the Protestants of Quebec, as regards morals and education, were preserved to them by an Act of that province passed in 1861, just six years before confederation. I contend that there is no danger of those rights being in any way interfered with by legislation of the province of Quebec. Their rights are irrevocably fixed and established, and cannot be taken away or infringed upon without violating the terms of the British North America Act irrespective of the argument—which was a most valuable one—presented by the hon. member for Three Rivers (Sir Hector Langevin) the other night, when, in addressing the House, he said that the Catholic majority in the province of Quebec would never under any circumstances attempt to infringe on the rights of the Protestant minority of that province. I know that the Catholics of that province, broad-minded, generous and fair as they are, would fully coincide in that statement of the hon. member for Three Rivers. That statement, by such a high authority, added to the law as it stands in the books, firmly established, beyond any likelihood of infringement upon the rights of the Protestants of Quebec.

Now, I come to another contention put forward by the advocates of this Remedial Bill,

namely, that the powers of Parliament are so full and ample that if this Bill is not sufficient, subsequent legislation may be passed to implement it. Sir, that idea is combatted by the best legal authorities in the land. It is not safe to put forward such a contention, nor do I believe that the Government have any heart in setting it up; because the constitutional authorities of this country acknowledge the right of this Parliament only to pass one Remedial Bill. I contend that this Parliament cannot go on year after year tinkering with this question by such legislation as they may see fit to pass. They have no right, after passing a Bill this year, to go on afterwards amending it year after year. Once they invoke their legislative power, they must do it in as ample and full a manner as the constitution will warrant them; and if they fail in that attempt, they can never again have recourse to the same authorities to grant them further power. That is a principle of constitutional law which I venture to say no authority in this House will contradict.

Further, it is contended by the Minister of Justice that if Parliament in this case fails to interfere on behalf of the minority of Manitoba, and in the line of their petition, its jurisdiction to interfere on behalf of an oppressed minority in any other province of this Dominion at any subsequent time, would be lost to it. Sir, I contend that that is perfectly untenable, because the circumstances surrounding the several cases may not be alike. The minority in the province of Nova Scotia may have their rights trampled upon at some subsequent day. Then it would be perfectly legal, under a different condition of affairs, for that minority to appeal to this Parliament, and it would be upon stronger grounds than the minority of Manitoba have to-day; and I do not doubt that fair justice would be done to any minority from the maritime provinces that might appeal to this Parliament.

It may be contended that the position taken by the Liberals in this House, and so ably presented by the leader of the Opposition, is not such as to allow the case of the minority of Manitoba to be heard. Sir, that is a perfectly erroneous contention. The position of the leader of the Opposition, supported by his followers in this House, and I venture to say by the great majority of the people of Canada, is simply that a right exists in the Parliament of Canada to grant such a measure of relief as it may in its wisdom see fit to grant, without coercion by any judicial tribunal, or by any biased authority such as the Minister of Justice; and the minority of Manitoba, so far as obtaining permanent justice for their wrongs and grievances is concerned, are much safer in the hands of the Liberals of this House and this country, when those grievances are properly proven, than they are in the hands of their pseudo friends of to-day, the members of this Government. This Govern-

ment are not using the minority of Manitoba in a just and fair way. They have no intention of granting them such a full measure of relief as they have led them to believe they are entitled to. We have had members of this Government, from the time this question first appeared in the political arena, holding in one section of the country that the duty of the Government was fulfilled when they transmitted to the government of Manitoba the decision of the Privy Council of England, and that there they intended to stop—they intended to pass no remedial legislation. We have had them in another part of the country proclaiming that they intended to fully carry out the remedial order, and grant to the minority all the requests they made to Parliament. We have had them going further—deliberately refusing investigation. We have had them bringing down a Remedial Bill which in itself is an unworkable Bill—which in itself is not complete, which is incapable of enforcement, which has no provisions for giving redress to any of the alleged grievances of the minority. We have no statement from any Minister of the Crown that they intend to implement that Bill by a subsequent Bill. All we have in that regard is a clause added to the Bill which simply says that the Government hold themselves free to pass subsequent legislation. We have no declaration from the Government or any member of it that they intend to do that. We have simply the statement, that the Parliament of Canada holds itself free to implement this Bill as it may see fit to do. In view of the fact, that the best constitutional lawyers of this country have declared, that, once Parliament has exercised its power in this direction, it cannot subsequently pass any legislation on the same subject, the Government brings in the hollow mockery of a clause to induce the Catholic minority to believe, that what is wanting in the Bill to-day will be supplemented by future legislation. Sir, it is a mockery to Parliament to have the Government taking this course. The only way in which the people of Canada will uphold the Parliament of Canada in granting such remedial legislation as the Catholic minority, probably justly and rightly, claim, is, by convincing the fair-minded majority of the country that these rights are a part of those to which the minority are entitled, and that Parliament is doing the best it can in the interests of that province and of the country as a whole. Sir, the Government positively refuse to take such steps as will induce this House or the country to back up the legislation now submitted to Parliament. I contend, therefore, that what the Government desire is to have public opinion brought to bear upon them in order to prevent their passing this Bill. They do not want to pass it. They are not anxious to hear the evidence which might give them reason for passing it. I claim, that it would be in the

interests of the minority in Manitoba to bring forward evidence which would convince Parliament and the Government, that this measure is not sufficient, and will not effect any good. If it is not just under the constitution of our country, that we should pass this law, and if we are not compelled to pass it, why should we interfere unless a good Bill is presented? If there is no constitutional obligation on us to pass the law, why is it thrust upon us so frequently, that we are compelled to do this? Are the laws of the land to be evaded in order to subserve a party purpose? Behind all this, let me point out, there lies the principle of infringement upon the provincial autonomy. If that argument be not sufficient to offset the contention of the Government, that constitutional right does not compel them to present this measure to Parliament and force it through, how is it, Sir, that the provincial autonomy, in the matter of education, is to be invaded and the rights of the province trampled upon? If, under our constitution, the laws with regard to education are within the jurisdiction of the provinces, surely the same constitutional authority which declares this, cannot have intended us to understand that that jurisdiction can be infringed upon by this Parliament, except under the constitution. If it were pretended that, in the working of the Nova Scotia school law, the rights of the Catholics were invaded or infringed upon, I take it that no member on the Government side from Nova Scotia would dare to present a petition to this Parliament, asking us to relieve those people. They would not be given the opportunity to present it on any platform in Nova Scotia. In the province of Nova Scotia we have a peculiar system. We have a system of national schools passed about the year 1864. In 1859, when the hon. Secretary of State (Sir Charles Tupper) was leading the Opposition in that province, the Liberal party, which was in power, undertook to present a national School Bill in the provincial legislature. The Liberal party had a majority of only one or two in the House at the time, and the hon. Secretary of State fought against the enactment of a national school law most bitterly. Subsequently, at the elections of 1863, the Liberal party were defeated, and the hon. Secretary of State (Sir Charles Tupper) was returned with a large majority at his back. He took up the School Bill, which had been submitted by the Liberals, and, with the consent of the Liberal party, it went through the legislature and became law. The hon. Secretary of State then bitterly denounced the system of separate schools. He stood up for equal rights all round, and the state system of schools was introduced. Separate schools he frowned down and would have no part in, and he introduced the law which wiped them out of existence. From that day to this, that Act has worked satisfactorily to

Mr. FORBES.

all classes in the province. In many of the counties, there is a large number of Catholics, principally in the counties of Halifax, Richmond and Antigonish. Perhaps, in Inverness and Cape Breton and one or two others there are sections of several counties where the Catholics largely predominate. The system was adopted, under that Act, of each county being divided into school districts. Each district appointed trustees, and these trustees would appoint teachers who had the necessary qualifications and diplomas, or had passed the necessary examinations, as laid down by the school system. The Council of our Board of Education approve of the working of the trustees in the several sections. The Inspector of Education resides in Halifax, and has complete supervision of the whole system. Now, in Halifax, where there is a large number of Roman Catholics, these people naturally like to have Catholic teachers for their children, and a system of this nature has there grown up. In a district where there is a large number of pupils attending the common schools, and these schools become congested or overcrowded, Catholics are allowed to take whatever number of scholars they may have in that congested district, and put them into a separate school. As the school trustees would be obliged to find accommodation for these extra scholars, the Catholics simply ask, if they provide a school-house, will the Council of School Instruction or the Board of Trustees for that district, appoint Catholic teachers for this school, which is solely attended by Catholic scholars. The Board of School Commissioners at Halifax invariably agree to this. There is upon this board a fair representation of Catholics, who are appointed by the government and the city council, and, when a number of Catholic scholars is taken out of an overcrowded school and given a separate school, a Catholic teacher is allowed to be appointed. The question presents itself, how are these schools conducted? Do the Catholic children in these separate schools get as good a training as those in the Protestant schools? Do they receive an education in conformity with the school law of that province? I say, yes, they do, most certainly. I have in my hand a letter giving a conversation between the chairman of the Board of School Commissioners of the city of Halifax and a gentleman of the city of Halifax, and, as I am at liberty to use it, I take pleasure in giving it to the House, because it will be much stronger and more to the point than anything I can say, in fact it must be absolutely conclusive:

I had a talk a day or two ago with Mr. W. I. Stewart, the chairman of our city school board. He is, as you know, a strong Conservative, and I should add an equally strong opponent of remedial legislation in any form. I asked him about the practical working of the schools here. "What difference," I said, "is there between

the Catholic and Protestant schools" ? "None whatever" he answered. "Isn't that going too far" ? I asked him. "No," he said, "there is no practical difference whatever between the schools. All that is done is this : We have a certain number of Catholic teachers. Instead of spreading those among the schools at large we appoint them to some half dozen of the schools. The teachers in those schools are altogether Catholic, and these schools are chiefly attended by Catholic children. The teachers give no religious instruction, they simply serve as a guarantee to the Catholic parents that there will be no tampering with the religion of their children." "Is there no religious instruction in the Catholic schools ?" I asked him. "I understand that in some of the schools the priest attended after school hour a couple of days in the week and gave religious instruction for half an hour." "Not in any of the boys' schools," he said, "so far as I am aware. But there would not be the slightest objection made by the board to that being done if the Catholic clergy asked for it. It is done, I believe, in some of the girls' schools. The Protestant children retire and the Catholics stay behind." "There are Protestant children in the Catholic schools" ? "Plenty of them, there are also Catholics at the Protestant schools, but not so many as there used to be, there has been a little pressure put on them about that lately." "How are the Catholic teachers selected" ? I asked him. "Just the same way as the Protestant, by the board, which in this matter acts through the committee on teachers and the supervisor. Naturally the Catholic members of the board take a greater interest in the appointment of the Catholic teachers, but the whole board can and does discuss their qualifications and fitness." "In all respects then, curriculum, text books, &c., &c., the schools are identical" ? "Absolutely." "How do the schools compare as to efficiency" ? I asked. "The boys' schools not so good, the girls' schools better. The sisters are capital teachers ; and appear to have the knack of giving more refinement to their scholars than the Protestant lady teachers."

Now, there is an opinion from a Conservative and the chairman of the school board of the city of Halifax as to the working of the school system in Nova Scotia. I contend that the Catholics of any province in the Dominion would be content with just such a system, if it was probably worked under their own supervision or under the general supervision of the Protestants and themselves, jointly. It is only because the Minister of Justice and others have been impressing upon the Catholic minority of Manitoba that there is an obligation upon this Parliament to give the full measure of their demands, that such demands are insisted upon. But the Privy Council of Great Britain decided that they have no legal ground for those demands. Sir, if there is a serious grievance, if the Catholic children are obliged to attend Protestant schools, I, for one, as a member of this House, will join in redressing that grievance. It would be a gross imposition upon our fellow-citizens in the province of Manitoba that Roman Catholics should be compelled to submit to teaching to which they have conscientious objections. Now, with

the lesson we have before us in the refusal of this Parliament to interfere in the case of New Brunswick, because, to do so would be an infringement of provincial autonomy, with the lesson before us of the refusal of this Parliament to interfere with Quebec when it made a disposition of its funds for religious purposes, because it would be an interference with provincial autonomy, with the fact which cannot be gainsaid that no member from Nova Scotia would dare to contend that this Parliament would interfere where the plea raised that rights of the minority in that province had been interfered with, why should this Parliament be called upon to interfere in this case ? There is nothing in the nature of this case to justify the contention that we are bound to interfere. The hon. Minister of Justice puts this forward as a demand for justice. We are perfectly willing to do justice, but in order to accomplish that end, we must be sure of our facts. Before Parliament is asked to pass this Bill we should be put in possession of the facts of the case, as presented by the government of Manitoba. We do not know to-day that the majority of the minority of that province are asking for this Bill. We do not know that there is any strong public demand for this Bill. I have not heard of any public meetings in Manitoba addressed by members of the minority urging the people of that province to insist upon Parliament passing this Bill. I have heard of no public discussions in the press in that province, showing that, as a matter of justice to the minority, this Bill should be passed. I have found no public men who, having looked into the matter, put forward the claim for this Bill likely to impress fair-minded men in this House with the belief that this measure should be pushed through, as demanded by the Government. All that we ask for is an investigation of the facts. All we ask is that the Government take this matter out of the arena of politics. All we ask is that the assumed facts, dwelt upon so eloquently by the leader of the Opposition, should be proven before Parliament, and not assumed, as they were before the Privy Council. All we ask is that the bogus affidavits presented before the Privy Council of Canada, upon which the ex-Minister of Justice based his remedial order, should be answered by the province of Manitoba. I ask that the Government stay its hand. If there is any intention on the part of the Government to call upon Premier Greenway to meet a representative of this Government and discuss the details of the Bill, or investigate the facts upon which the Bill is based, let us have the Bill withdrawn. Let them hold the investigation. Let us know what is the outcome of the inquiry that is to be made. Was it a farce when the Secretary of State stood up and read us the telegram that he had caused the member for Montreal West (Sir Donald Smith) to send to Winnipeg ?

Did he intend anything by it? Or was it a snap of the whip to bring into line the discordant element from Ontario that is behind him? Was it the holding out of an olive branch in order to make votes to sustain this Bill in Parliament, or was he honest in his contention? If he was honest, there is only one legitimate way in which he can prove it, and that is to withdraw the Bill, and plead the excuse that he was too hasty, and apologize to Parliament for his action. If he does not want to humble his knee so much as that, let him show that he is only too glad to have an inquiry with Manitoba on this question, and withdraw the Bill. We are debating this matter day after day, endeavouring to get at facts, endeavouring to find out where we are on this question, and what Manitoba has to say with respect to it; and yet we are told that the matter has been before the country for five or six years. The Secretary of State says that he is going to send a commission to Winnipeg, or he is going to invite the Manitoba government here to discuss this matter. Sir, it is too late to do that, unless he restores the parties to the position in which they were before he commenced this suit. The position of the parties to-day is exactly that described by the hon. member for Kamouraska (Mr. Carroll) when he said that the position was that of a litigant appealing to court for a rule nisi for a writ of mandamus. He alleges his facts in affidavits, and asks for a rule nisi, or a summons in the first instance, for a mandamus to issue, calling upon somebody to do a certain thing. Surely not even a layman, let alone a Minister of Justice, would contend that upon these affidavits, without hearing the parties summoned, judgment should pass. No, Sir, no court, no tribunal of any legal standing in this country, will contend that after the plaintiff makes his affidavit, and he gets his summons in the first instance, and serves the papers upon the defendant, that the defendant should not have ample and full opportunity to answer them. If a defendant goes into a court of justice, and asks for time, saying he has not had an opportunity of looking into the case of the plaintiff, no court, however prejudiced, however anxious to gain a point, would refuse to the defendant an opportunity to answer the contention. And yet, in the month of February, 1895, as soon as the decision of the Privy Council was telegraphed to this country, the ex-Minister of Justice saw fit to issue his summons in the first instance, his rule nisi, calling upon Manitoba to appear within twenty-four hours, or else he would give judgment against her; and when Manitoba appeared in the first instance and asked for time to prepare her case, the Minister of Justice says: No, go ye hence, you have had time enough, obey the summons, and go on at once, or I will give judgment against you. Sir,

Mr. FORBES.

to show that the Government were biased, that they intended to do what they did, with malice aforethought, with the evident intention of gaining a political advantage in that case, the ex-Minister of Justice agreed, that the plaintiff could withdraw his affidavits which he had filed when he obtained his rule nisi. He, the ex-Minister of Justice, as one of the judges, however, did not withdraw them, and yet he goes to work and gives judgment without a scintilla of evidence before him, except hearsay evidence which would be ruled out in the meanest court in any British community. He never asked the defendant if he wanted time to answer the affidavits. He practically said to the plaintiff: Take your case away, take away the case for which you prepared in the first instance, for which I have granted you a rule nisi; I give judgment in your favour against defendant. Sir, the ink was hardly dry upon the notes of evidence taken before the Privy Council before judgment was given, and the judgment on the mandamus, on the 21st March, was sent to Manitoba post haste, and Manitoba was called upon to obey the judgment of the court. Manitoba was not called upon to show cause why that mandamus should not have issued; Manitoba was called upon to comply with the judgment, to do the three things laid down here in this order. Manitoba had no alternative; she was told by an order of the Privy Council of this Government: You shall grant to the minority of Manitoba:

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

Notwithstanding that the Privy Council of England has decided that as a matter of right and of law, those Acts were constitutional.

The right to share proportionately in any grant made out of the public funds for the purposes of education; and third, the right of exemption of such Roman Catholics as contribute to Roman Catholic schools, from all payment or contribution to the support of any other schools.

Sir, those three things were the substance of the judgment of the Privy Council of Canada, passed illegally, without any evidence, without a hearing whatever, and without giving an opportunity of appeal after judgment was given. Sir, I say it was quite in keeping with the whole bungling proceedings of this Government, with the evident intention of pulling the wool, if I may use that phrase, over the eyes of our Catholic friends in the province of Quebec, with the evident intention of befooling them, with the evident intention of leading them to believe that the Government were doing something for them, while at the same time they said to the opponents of the remedial

order: "Steady, boys, we will do nothing of the kind, we will burk the measure yet." That is what they are to-day anxious to do. Otherwise what position do we find them in? Why, twenty-four hours ago the Secretary of State stated that he was about to ask Mr. Greenway, through the hon. member for Montreal West and the Lieutenant-Governor of Manitoba, to come to a conference with the Government of Canada upon this question; and yet almost while he was talking, or within a few hours afterwards, the Minister of the Interior, the Protestant member of the Government from Manitoba, got up here and gave the most tremendous tirade against that very Mr. Greenway and the government of Manitoba, practically blackguarding them out of court. He says: We send you an invitation, but don't you dare to accept it, because we won't listen to you. He entered into a tirade of abuse against their legislation on the subject, and did everything he could to prevent the two parties coming to terms. What was the object of that? Was it not apparent to our Catholic friends in this House that the intention of the Government, from the Secretary of State down, was to say to the disappointed element behind him: "Gentlemen, we are going to remedy this measure, we are going to offer the olive branch to Manitoba." But the Minister of the Interior gets up and turns to his Catholic friends behind him, and says: "Don't you hear what the Secretary of State says? That olive branch is no good at all; Greenway is a villain; it was he that passed this law and stole away your rights; but we will give them back for you, we will compel him, at the point of the bayonet of legislation, to give you what you want." And why did the Government put up the Minister of the Interior to tell them that? Why did not the Minister of Trade and Commerce tell them that? Why did not the Postmaster General tell them that; or the Minister of Public Works? Why were not those gentlemen put up to tell the members from Quebec: We do not care what comes of the olive branch, we are going to coerce the government of Manitoba, we are going to get this legislation forced through Parliament. Sir, it was because they thought that coming from the Manitoba Minister in this Government, coming from the Protestant Minister of the Interior, it would have more effect than if it came from any one else. That is the reason. The whole thing is a snare and a delusion to both the parties supporting the Government in this House. Openly to-day we have the two factions of the Government's party supporting them upon other questions. We have the true yellows from Ontario and we have the true blues from Quebec combining to burk this measure in this House. It is said that this measure will never get through Parliament; it is said by supporters of the Government that they will vote against the amendment of the leader of the

Opposition in order that the Bill may get its second reading; then, if the Bill ever gets into committee, they intend to talk it out and burk it.

The whole of the proceedings of the Government with respect to this matter are inconsistent, I might say dishonest. If the Government were to adopt the true policy of not interfering in matters which belong exclusively to the provinces, but appealed to the manhood of the province they would receive justice and fair-play at the hands of the people. This result has been brought about in Nova Scotia. There Catholics and Protestants sit side by side in the schools. Where the Catholics cannot get sufficient scholars to fill a school-house they accept instruction from the teachers in the common schools of the province, side by side with their fellow-Catholic children. Nothing can be more desirable in the province of Manitoba or elsewhere than such a system. Let it never be said that members of this House endeavour to make political capital out of the sufferings of their fellow Canadians. Such capital is, however, being sought to be made by the Conservative party. They are using this question as a lever wherewith to divide the great Liberal party; they are playing battledore and shuttlecock with this important issue; they expect by creating divisions in our ranks to cement together the different sections of their own party, well knowing that the measure introduced by them will prove abortive for the purpose for which it was laid before Parliament, but with the assurance that they will gain political capital at the coming general elections.

Mr. KENNY. Mr. Speaker, I have listened with attention to the arguments of my hon. friend who has just taken his seat (Mr. Forbes). He blames the Government for introducing the measure which is now under consideration, for the reason, as he alleges, that no grievance exists in the province of Manitoba, that the Roman Catholic minority in that province have no grievance, that they have never been able to establish that a grievance exists. With all due deference to my hon. friend, I must tell him that I consider that the Roman Catholic residents of the province of Manitoba are better judges on that point than my hon. friend. As my hon. friend should know, because he has heard the statement made repeatedly in this Parliament, great and grievous wrongs and prejudices have been inflicted on the Roman Catholic minority of the province of Manitoba.

Mr. FORBES. So they have in Nova Scotia.

Mr. KENNY. The existence of these grievances in Manitoba is indisputable. But my hon. friend has this great advantage over me, that he is a lawyer and must be much more familiar with the value of legal documents than I am. I have taken some

pains to inform myself on this question, for I recognize fully its gravity and importance, and I find on page 10 of the judgment of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, given on 29th January, 1895, that the Lord Chancellor in delivering judgment made this statement :

The sole question to be determined is whether a right or privilege which the Roman Catholic minority previously enjoyed has been affected by the legislation of 1890. Their lordships are unable to say how this question can receive any but an affirmative answer. Contrast the position of the Roman Catholics prior and subsequent to the Acts from which they appeal. Before they passed into law there existed denominational schools, the whole control and management of which were in the hands of the Roman Catholics, who could select the books to be used and determine the character of the religious teaching.

Although the hon. gentleman has not been able to satisfy himself after this question has been before the Canadian people for five years, yet the Lord Chancellor of England and the members of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council were satisfied that a wrong does exist and they expressed their opinions in the statement I have read. Let me add while I am dealing with this point, that the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), when he was arguing this question before the courts, referring to the statement in the judgment of the Privy Council which I have just read, said, that that expression of opinion in the judgment precluded him from denying that any grievance does exist.

My hon. friend (Mr. Forbes) said that the Bill which is now on the Table is not a measure of relief to the injured Roman Catholic minority in Manitoba. On that point I have only to say that if the people who are affected, the Roman Catholics of the province of Manitoba who are sufferers by the legislation of 1890, assert, as they do assert and as has been affirmed over and over again during this debate in this House, that the Bill is to them a satisfactory measure of relief, I think that statement disposes of that argument made by my hon. friend that the Bill is remedial. My hon. friend at one moment accused the Government of making a deliberate attempt to burk the measure, and the next moment he accused them of a determined effort to enforce coercion on the province of Manitoba. I do not know how my hon. friend is going to reconcile those two very divergent opinions. I may say that I regret very much the fact that this Parliament has to deal with questions of this character. I regret it because in a country like Canada, I recognize that we have many people who are thoughtless and who are emotional, and a question of this character is calculated to arouse race antagonisms and religious prejudice. But, Sir, whilst I feel, that to some extent that may be the result of the agita-

Mr. KENNY.

tion of this question in the country, yet I know, that no such result can follow in this assembly of politicians, that it would not be possible to find in the Dominion of Canada a like number of men who are so free from all sectarian prejudices. Our avocation as politicians, and our position as public men, bring us into contact with all classes and conditions of the population, and that intercourse with the people is calculated to smooth the rough edges of isolation and of individual environment and training. I am, therefore, sure, that in this House a question of this character will be fairly and justly discussed, and will receive careful consideration. It was stated by the hon. Secretary of State (Sir Charles Tupper), in moving the second reading of this Bill, that in pre-confederation days when Canada was composed of the provinces of Ontario and Quebec, that owing to the race and religious differences which then existed, it was exceedingly difficult to carry on the public business of the country, and that so great was this antagonism, that the progress and advancement of the country was thereby retarded. That was the unhappy condition of things in the Parliament of Old Canada. It is today, Sir, our proud boast, as Britons, that so vast is the domain of our Queen, that the sun never sets on her possessions, and it is our equally proud boast, as Canadians, that in all that vast Empire you cannot find a people so contented and happy as are the people of this Dominion. I am ready to admit, that this great improvement is due to the tendency of these last days of the century towards a greater toleration and a more comprehensive spirit of liberality. But it is also due, mainly, to the fact, that the members of this Parliament recognize, that in all questions of race and religion it is necessary to deal with them in a spirit of generosity and with an earnest desire to settle them in an amicable, a just and a fair manner. I am quite sure, that hon. gentlemen approach the consideration of this question, animated with that spirit. I recognize fully, Mr. Speaker, the gravity and importance of the question which is now before us. Entrusted, as we are, with the maintenance of the constitutional rights and privileges of the people of Canada, I realize that it is our first duty to safeguard those rights and to remedy all wrongs. While I may regret that the time of Parliament, which should be devoted to the consideration of measures for the improvement and development of the material resources of our country, is so much absorbed in the discussion of a question of this character, yet, I recognize that this is a duty which the constitution of our country imposes upon us. I have no sympathy with gentlemen who argue, that we should close the door to the introduction of all such appeals. That we cannot do, if we are to be guided

by our constitution. Personally, Sir, I dislike very much indeed to hear the term "Catholic," or "Protestant," used in this House. I wish these words were never uttered here, but I do realize that in this free assembly questions of the character of this remedial legislation must be introduced and must be heard and must be decided. As regards this question which is now under discussion, the constitution, as expressed in the Manitoba Act, provides specially for its presence in this House, under certain conditions. My hon. friend (Mr. Forbes) has referred to the fact, that the Secretary of State (Sir Charles Tupper) made the announcement recently, that, as soon as the second reading of this Bill is passed, that, as soon as the principle of the Bill is affirmed, that, as soon as the constitutionality of the question is upheld, that as soon as the duty of this Parliament to redress a constitutional wrong is affirmed—so soon will an effort be made by the Dominion Government to have a conference with Mr. Greenway.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. KENNY. That seems to be amusing to my hon. friends opposite.

Mr. FORBES. I did not assert that the constitutional power was not in this Parliament. I know well, the constitutional power is in Parliament. I never denied that.

Mr. KENNY. I am not a lawyer, but I know that this Parliament has the power to deal with this question, and so does every other hon. gentleman in the House. My hon. friend (Mr. Forbes) said, however, that no grievance exists, and that, even if we had the power to deal with the question, the possession of that power does not impose upon us the duty of remedying the grievance. That was the contention of the hon. member. Sir, referring to the announcement made by the hon. Secretary of State (Sir Charles Tupper), that, as soon as the principle of this Bill was affirmed, it was the intention of the Government that a conference shall take place with Mr. Greenway, in the hope that some settlement may be arrived at. I share in the hope, as I believe most members of this House do, that some such solution of the difficulty may thus be attained. This troublesome question was started by the Liberal party in the province of Manitoba for party purposes. Mr. Greenway is the Liberal leader in that province, and it is certainly the duty of the provincial legislature, led by him, to dispose of this question fairly and equitably and promptly. But, as they have refused to do so, and, as they have inflicted this wrong on the minority, it is regrettably our duty to have to deal with the question here. My hon. friend (Mr. Forbes) has referred to the condition of our schools in the province of Nova Scotia. I am happy to say, that, al-

though occasionally there may be instances of friction in the administration of the school laws in that province, yet the law is administered satisfactorily. Its administration is a matter of compromise, and it is creditable to the people of Nova Scotia, that such a settlement and adjustment of the question has been made. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) told us, as a free translation of the Latin words "arida nutrix leonum," that we, Nova Scotians, were the greatest boodlers in the universe. That is his opinion of us. I have to say to him that in matters of religious liberality and toleration, we set a good example to the other provinces of the Dominion. I wish sincerely that the Protestant majority of Manitoba would follow the example of the Protestant majority of Nova Scotia, and so adjust the educational matters under their own provincial laws that they could be conducted fairly and satisfactorily, and that the rights of minorities would be respected, which is all that any public man, or any portion of the population of Canada, desire. And if the people of Manitoba would only act fairly to the minority, would only give them the rights which are guaranteed to them by the legislation under which they entered the Dominion, and which they enjoyed till the Liberal party came into power in that province, we should have no further question of this kind. I believe that if a settlement is to be made by Mr. Greenway and the representatives of the minority, it must be by mutual concession and mutual forbearance; it must be to a great extent by compromise, without, of course, sacrificing any principle.

It is my belief that on educational matters there is a difference between the constitutional and legal position of Nova Scotia and the position of Manitoba. When Manitoba entered the confederation, special legislation was enacted, which accorded to the minority of that province a protection which does not exist in the province of Nova Scotia. When the satisfactory condition of matters in the province of Nova Scotia, which I have described, is chiefly due to the causes which I have enumerated, I consider that it is also largely due to the wisdom and moderation which have characterized the administration of the different churches by the prominent clergymen connected with them. I think it is due, also, very largely to the school law which was introduced in Nova Scotia by my hon. friend the hon. Secretary of State (Sir Charles Tupper), who now leads this House. It must be said for that hon. gentleman that, during all the time he was connected with the public life of Nova Scotia, his tact, his wisdom, and his influence, were exercised in order to preserve peace, harmony, and contentment among the population, and to remove and avoid all religious strife; and in this laudable work he was eminently successful.

I repeat that I should be glad, indeed, if this difficulty were settled, as it should be, by the government of Manitoba; but I very much fear that will not happen. I do not want to prejudge the case, but after what we have heard in this House, after what we heard last night from the hon. member for Ottawa county (Mr. Devlin), in the forcible and eloquent speech he made, we are driven to the conclusion that the manner in which this legislation was introduced in the province of Manitoba, and the purpose for which it was introduced, as a piece of mere party tactics, to preserve the Liberal party in power, do not justify us in expecting redress from that quarter.

I will, Sir, briefly pass in review a phase of this question to which I attach great importance; that is, what was the intention of the people of Manitoba, and the intention of the Parliament of Canada when the Manitoba Act of 1870, which is the charter of that province, was passed by the Parliament of Canada and accepted by the legislature at Fort Garry? We know that in the days when that territory was owned by the Hudson Bay Company, denominational schools existed there. We are familiar, too, with the fact that previous to the entrance of the province of Manitoba into the confederation, or about that date, there were disturbances there which were exalted by the title of rebellion; and we know that in the settlement of those difficulties the hon. gentleman who now represents Montreal West (Sir Donald Smith) took a prominent part. We also know that Mgr. Taché, who was then the Roman Catholic Archbishop of St. Boniface, who was the successor of the men who first planted the symbol of Christianity in that land, was solicited by the Government of Canada to lend his influence in bringing peace and harmony among the population, and that that gentleman exercised his great influence successfully in that direction. We know, that it was at his instance that delegates came down to Ottawa from the Red River country to confer with the Government of Canada in regard to that country joining the confederacy; and we are all aware that those delegates brought with them a statement embodying the views of the people they represented as to the terms on which they would consent to join the Dominion of Canada. That document is now known as the bill of rights. Clause 7 of that bill of rights, which expressed the wishes of the population of the Red River territory at that date with regard to education, reads as follows:—

That the schools be separate, and the public moneys for schools be distributed among the different religious denominations in proportion to their respective populations.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). What bill of rights are you reading from?

Mr. KENNY. Clause 7 of the bill of rights brought down by the delegates from the

Mr. KENNY.

Red River settlement, when they came here to arrange the terms of confederation. And let me here say, Mr. Speaker, that when the Manitoba Bill was before the Parliament of Canada within these walls, the Hon. Mr. McDougall, who took a prominent part in the discussion of that question, on the 7th of May, 1870, gave the Government notice that when the Bill went into committee of the whole he would move for the obliteration of the educational clauses; and any gentleman who takes the pains to read the history of this case will find that three days later, on the 10th of May, 1870, when the Bill was in committee, and when clause 22, the educational clause, was reached, Mr. Oliver, a member of this House, rose in his place and moved that the clause be expunged. I have in my hand the "Hansard" of that date, and I find that Mr. Oliver moved that the educational clause be struck out. When Hon. Mr. McDougall gave the notice to the Government, which I have just mentioned, he said he would move for the abolition of the clause which guaranteed separate schools to Manitoba, I find that when the Bill was in committee, and this motion had been made by Mr. Oliver, the following debate took place:—

Mr. McDougall said that the effect of the clause, if not struck out, would be to fix laws which the local legislature could not alter in the future, and that it would be better to leave the matter for the local authorities to decide as in the other provinces. He quite agreed with his hon. friend in giving the same powers to this province as the others had, and it was for that reason he desired to strike out the clause.

The Hon. Alex. Mackenzie was prepared to leave the matter to be settled exclusively by the local legislature. The British North America Act gave all the protection necessary for minorities; and the local authorities understood their own local wants better than the general legislature. It was his earnest desire to avoid introducing into this new province those detrimental discussions which had operated so injuriously on their own country, and, therefore, he hoped the amendment would be carried.

However sound that doctrine of Hon. Mr. Mackenzie may have been, we are face to face with the fact that when that amendment was proposed, it was defeated by a majority of 50, which meant that the Parliament of Canada was desirous that the contract which had been made with the delegates from the Red River country and which is referred to in this very decision of the Judicial Committee of January, 1895, should be adhered to. When that compact was made, it was the intention of this Parliament that the people of that country should have secured to them all the rights which they then possessed, including the important right to separate schools. I am disposed to attach importance to that compact for this reason. I believe that we, as successors of those who made that agreement, should see that the compact, the bargain which was made by our predecessors should be honourably adhered to. Further than that, if the school

question should become ever again a matter of discussion in the Dominion—and so far as my own province is concerned, until very recently we have not heard very much about it—I recognize that it is a matter which must be settled by the Protestants of this country, because they are the vast majority of the population. If that should happen, I say that as a Canadian who is proud of Canada, as a Roman Catholic who is proud of his church, I am not afraid, at any time, to leave the decision to the sense of fair play and justice which actuates the majority of my Protestant fellow-citizens. I urge then that this contract which was entered into, should be adhered to in the spirit as well as in the letter. I find, that this matter as referred to in the judgment of January, 1895, in the following terms, by the Lord Chancellor :—

As a matter of fact, the objection of Roman Catholics to schools such as alone receive state aid under the Act of 1890, is conscientious and deeply rooted. If this had not been so, if there had been a system of public education acceptable to Catholics and Protestants alike, the elaborate enactments which have been the subjects of so much controversy and consideration would have been unnecessary. It is notorious that there were acute differences of opinion between Catholics and Protestants on the education question prior to 1890. This is recognized and emphasized in almost every line of these enactments. There is no doubt either what the questions of difference were, and it is in the light of these that the 22nd section of the Manitoba Act of 1870, which was in truth a parliamentary compact, must be read.

Here are the words of the highest judicial court in the realm, and it is their opinion that the compact was a parliamentary compact, and it is a compact which I contend should be adhered to by this Parliament of Canada.

I have referred to the fact that the delegates from the Red River settlement came down here. They returned to their own country, and took with them the Manitoba Act, as the arrangement which had been made between them and the Dominion of Canada. And that arrangement was submitted to the legislature at Fort Garry and accepted by it in good faith. It is now a matter of history, it is a matter of common notoriety, that Mgr. Taché was exceedingly active in his efforts to induce the population of that country to accept that charter, and we all know that the right reverend gentleman took a great interest in educational matters. It is not at all likely, therefore, that he would have accepted an arrangement which exposed the schools which he had worked so long and so earnestly to establish, to be easily destroyed and his people to be deprived of educational advantages to which they attached very great importance. In addition to the contract with the Parliament of Canada, the people of the Red River settlement had beyond that the assurance of the representative of Her Majesty in Canada that their rights and privileges would be regarded.

They had also the statement of the Imperial authorities, the statement of the Colonial Minister, that their rights and privileges would not be prejudiced by any arrangement they might make with the Dominion of Canada.

In 1871, at the first meeting of the legislature of the new province of Manitoba, as evidence of what the people understood and desired; a law was passed establishing denominational schools. I do not think it is important for us to discuss the relative merits of public or denominational schools. That is a question on which we may conscientiously differ; and if I refer to it later, it will only be due to this fact, that other gentlemen who have preceded me in this debate have thought it necessary to attack the system of denominational schools. I suppose I shall be told, if anything that I say is considered worthy of criticism, that we have not separate schools in the province of Nova Scotia. We have not. At all events we have an arrangement whereby the religious wishes of the different denominations in the larger centres of population are respected, and a system which works satisfactorily to all classes of the community. If the minority in Manitoba say that a certain class of schools is satisfactory. I am prepared to favour its adoption. If my voice could reach to the province of Manitoba, I would say to the Roman Catholics of that province: Unless the people there are very different from the people in other parts of Canada, you should be able to settle this question as a matter of mutual concession and compromise.

Mr. FORBES. Will you vote for the amendment, then?

Mr. KENNY. No, I could not vote for the amendment because it would impose a further flagrant injustice upon the minority of the population of Manitoba. I could not vote for that amendment because I think it is a dishonest proposition. I could not vote for that amendment because it has been moved by a gentleman who has used all his power, all his influence and all his eloquence to excite his compatriots and co-religionists of the province of Quebec against the Government of this country on the ground that they refused and delayed to do justice to the minority in Manitoba, whom he has now deserted. I could not vote for that amendment because it was moved, as I believe, to please the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) and the triumvirate who follow him in this House. I could not vote for that amendment because I believe it is most desirable, in the public interests of Canada that, as soon as possible, this question should be finally removed from our political arena. I could not vote for that amendment because it provides for the perpetuation of an injury to the minority of Manitoba who have suffered for five years, while waiting

for this tardy act of justice, and because it keeps open this sore in the political body of Canada. In answer to the question which has been put to me from the other side of the House, I give these as some of the reasons why I could not vote for the amendment moved by the hon. leader of the Opposition.

Sir, I have referred, in passing, to the establishment of denominational schools in Manitoba in 1871, when the population was about equally divided between Protestants and Catholics. My hon. friend to my right (Mr. Cameron, Inverness) says that the majority of the population was Catholic. I did not think that that was the case. I understood that one moiety was Catholic, and one moiety was Protestant. However that may have been, schools were established, and we gave our legislative bond to the people of Manitoba that no matter whether the majority should be Catholic or Protestant, the rights of the minority should be respected and preserved. Our predecessors in this Parliament made special provision in the Manitoba Act to carry out the bargain. They actually refused, by a large majority, to put the people of Manitoba in the position in which Nova Scotia and New Brunswick were under the British North America Act, but gave them special legislation with regard to educational institutions. So it would be unfair of us, and unworthy of us, not to carry out the arrangement made with Manitoba in 1870. This system of schools prevailed in Manitoba from 1871 to 1890, and in the meantime there were certain minor changes in the provincial laws indicating that the Protestant majority in the province was steadily increasing. We now come down to 1890 when, as we know, two Acts were passed by the local legislature of Manitoba which did violence and injury to the rights of the Catholic minority of the province. I have sometimes asked myself whether, had the trend of population been reversed, had injury been done to the Protestant minority, and had that Protestant minority appealed to us and asked for us to redress their grievances, would some hon. gentlemen who want the door closed against the consideration of this question be so anxious then that the bar should be put up. Whatever may be our individual views upon questions of one or another class of schools, it seems to me that as members of this Parliament we cannot refuse to deal frankly with this question. In 1890 this objectionable legislation was passed by the legislature of Manitoba. The hon. member for Ottawa County in his convincing speech last night told us very frankly and very forcibly that that legislation was enacted to gain party advantage for the Greenway government. He also told us that the legislation was passed by deception, and that the Roman Catholics of that province had been publicly, by prominent Liberals, promised that if the Liberal party came into power, no change would be made in the school system, and no injustice done to the

Mr. KENNY.

minority. On the strength of that promise, a certain important constituency was carried. It was largely through the influence of the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin) that that constituency was carried, and the statement of the hon. member for the county of Ottawa, a Liberal, was made recently in his presence. But it is a matter of common notoriety that this fraud was practised. It was by this deception that the Liberal party secured their majority. The manner in which the legislation was enforced was described by Mr. Hugh J. Macdonald in this House as barbarous, brutal, and butcherly, inflicting not only injustice, but insult, upon the Catholics of the province. That legislation being so offensive and cruel, is it any wonder that the minority appealed?

Mr. Speaker, since we met here last session, this question of the Manitoba schools, although, as I said, we have not heard so much of it in the province of Nova Scotia, has been the subject of very frequent discussion upon the platforms throughout the provinces of Ontario and Quebec. The hon. leader of the Opposition, who moved the six months' hoist, addressed frequent meetings all over the country on this subject. Considering the important position which that gentleman occupies as the recognized leader of a great party, I felt, as a citizen of Canada, and as a public man, a very natural desire to inform myself as to his views upon that question, and upon the remedies that he might recommend. But I must say, Sir, that the more I read his speeches, the more I was puzzled as to his intentions. At one time he told the country the question was a difficult one; at another time the question was a simple one. At one time it was only a question of fact; at another time it was only a question of law. The hon. gentleman had the happy faculty of making speeches which somewhat resembled the famous shield of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). That shield, as I have heard it described, was gold on one side and silver on the other.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds). Brass.

Mr. KENNY. Brass or the other. But there was this difference between that shield and the shield of the leader of the Opposition. The speeches of the leader of the Opposition were of such a character, that in Quebec they were interpreted by the organs of his party as showing his earnest desire and determination to enforce remedial legislation. The same speeches, exactly the same words, were carried to Ontario and Manitoba, and were there explained to mean, that the hon. gentleman was determinedly opposed to all remedial legislation. Indeed, Sir, I do not know anything more difficult than to attempt to find out what are the views of the leader of the Opposition on this question, by reading his speeches on the subject. When reviewing the speeches of the hon. leader of the Opposition, I am reminded of a description given by

Lord Beaconsfield of a prominent public man in England; and to paraphrase it, I might say, that it would seem, that the qualifications for a leader of the great Liberal party in Canada are, that he should be a gentleman of an agreeable presence, of eloquence of speech, and that he shall have no inconvenient convictions. Now, coming here with this state of uncertainty in my own mind as to the intentions and desires of the hon. leader of the Opposition, on this question, which concerns particularly the French Catholic population of Manitoba, and which has naturally excited so much sympathy and interest in the province from which he comes, I listened with great attention to the speech which he delivered on this debate, expecting that we would have from him a supreme and patriotic effort, and some statesman-like proposal for the solution of this long-pending difficulty. Sir, I find in that speech, as reported in the "Hansard," that the hon. gentleman said:

It must be evident that while you redress the grievance of the minority by such active interference, you run great risk of creating a grievance on the part of the majority. But the remedy of interference is found in the constitution, and being there, it must be applied by those who love the constitution.

Sir, the leader of the Opposition tells us the remedy is in the constitution, and it must be applied by those who love the constitution. Well, certainly, we are all lovers of the constitution, we are sent here to uphold the constitution, that is our first duty; and as I listened I was wondering how he would propose to deal with this question in a constitutional manner. He says distinctly, that grievances exist, that the power of interference exists, that the grievances are of such a character that they demand interference. And yet he proposes, not to remedy the grievance, but to throw the whole matter out of Parliament, leaving it a disturbing element in our body politic; not only that, but to subject the weak, unprotected minority to a perpetuation of the grievance which he says exists. Further on, the hon. gentleman said:

This remedy must be granted or denied—
That is, the legislative remedy.

—according as the circumstances of each case require. And that, Sir, is the very language of the statute the hon. gentleman cited a few moments ago. The remedy is to be sought and applied as the circumstances of the case require; and it can be intelligently applied only after full and ample inquiry into the facts of the case, after all means for conciliation have been exhausted, and only as a last resort.

Sir, any one who listened attentively to that argument of the leader of the Opposition, must have expected, that he was going to propose what he had been contending for for many months, that the matter should be a subject of investigation and a

subject of inquiry. Therefore, it was with great surprise that I heard him cravenly abandon his own policy which he had been advocating for many months, and adopted the policy of the hon. member for North Simcoe, who had stated distinctly, some months ago, that it was absurd to have an investigation, that it was unnecessary to have an investigation, that every man in Canada knew that the matter had already been thoroughly investigated. Further on in his speech the hon. leader of the Opposition insinuates that he had been threatened and dictated to by the hierarchy, and that he was not the man who would allow any body of people, no matter what their position, to dictate to him. Sir, so far as I know, so far as I have read the public documents, and having read the memorial of the Roman Catholic archbishops and bishops of the Dominion, which is published in this blue-book, I can detect no threat, or any disposition to dictate, either to the hon. gentleman or to any other member of this Parliament, or to any in Canada. In fact one is surprised when reading the closing sentences of the hon. gentleman's speech to notice how far he goes out of his way to make that attack upon the hierarchy. One is puzzled in seeking a reason for that attack. But, reviewing the hon. gentleman's whole career and, especially his recent conduct, and the way he has treated this question, one is forced to the conclusion, that, as the changes in the Manitoba school laws were made to gain party advantages, so this irritating question has been kept open in order to secure party advantages for hon. gentlemen opposite. I say further, that I believe that reference to the hierarchy was made to obtain political support for the Liberal party. Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) in the course of the speech which he delivered in this debate, intimated that several members who were going to vote on this measure had promises of positions in their pockets. He did not tell us on which side of the House they sat; and, when I consider the wonderful and abrupt changes which some hon. gentlemen opposite have made, I am forced to the conclusion, that there must have been some very remarkable proposals made to them before any such change could be accomplished. The hon. gentleman made use of this language, that it might be the duty of future governments to see to it, that they should not be allowed to profit by the wages of their shame. We all know the hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) is a violent man. I use the words in a parliamentary sense. He is violent in his language, he is violent in all his utterances and attacks on his political opponents. He calls the people of one province boodlers, and, if there are a few hon. members who happen to be connected with any manufacturing enterprises, he calls them thieves and robbers. He is violent in his language—he

does actual violence to the ordinary laws of nature. When, Sir, people attain the age of the hon. member for South Oxford and myself, they usually acquire a moderation in language and form charitable judgment for their neighbours, and, in fact, they attain all the virtues which become the aged; but, as regards the hon. member for South Oxford, the older he gets the more violent he becomes, and the more reckless in his assertions, and of all his reckless assertions, I think this is one of the most reckless. Such a statement is not only improper and offensive, but it is unwise, and I say more, it was unwise, because it was sure to evoke retaliation. Do hon. gentlemen suppose for one moment, that we, who come to discharge our public duties here, will permit any one among them, no matter how prominent or exalted his position, no matter how superior his oratory, to attack us, without receiving a reply? When that hon. gentleman goes out of his way, wantonly, to attack hon. gentlemen who are here to perform their duty fairly and honestly, I tell him distinctly, that, just as sure as he does it, so sure will retaliation follow, and it must be so in common justice to ourselves and to the leaders of our party.

The hon. gentleman, in the course of the debate, has, very unwisely, as I think, threatened the Government with the hostility and opposition of the Protestant majority of Ontario. There was a positive threat. He said, in effect, the province of Ontario is largely a Protestant province, and we are going to arouse Protestant prejudices to such an extent that we will injure you thereby. In fact, the hon. gentleman made a distinct appeal, from his place in this House, to religious prejudice and passion. What followed? The echo of that appeal had hardly died away in this Chamber when he turned around to the French Liberal representatives of the province of Quebec, and made an appeal to them. I will paraphrase his appeal thus: You heard me just now threaten the Government with the hostility of the Protestants of Ontario because they recommend justice be done to Manitoba; but you are Liberals, you must not forget that fact, and must not ignore it. You have heard your leader all over the province of Quebec proclaim, that a gross injustice has been done to the minority in the province of Manitoba.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Is the hon. gentleman quoting, or paraphrasing?

Mr. KENNY. Paraphrasing. I said, that this, in effect, was what his language meant. To continue the paraphrase: Not alone your leader, but all of you pledged your word and your honour to obtain justice for this injured minority in the province of Manitoba. I address you as Liberals; you are members of the great Liberal party of the province of Quebec; you must recognize, as I do, and as we all do, the desperate straits

Mr. KENNY.

in which the Liberal party of the Dominion now finds itself; a desperate condition requires a desperate remedy. Be Liberals, but do not be so particular about promises and principles; the great Liberal party of Canada will never accomplish anything, if it adheres to promises and principles. See what your leader has done; he has not only abandoned the policy of remedial legislation, but he has actually placed himself under the tutelage of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). See too what I have done; you heard me proclaim in Parliament, that I had nailed the flag of unrestricted reciprocity to the mast, to float there until it carried us to victory. I have hauled down that flag. You heard me contend in this House, that the best thing for Canada was continental free trade, the highest form of protection in the world. I have abandoned that, too, and now I am advocating free trade as it is understood in Great Britain. Members of the great Liberal party of the province of Quebec, I ask you to ignore all the rights of your country-men, break all your promises, abandon all your principles, and vote for the amendment of the leader of the Opposition. The speech delivered by the hon. gentleman may be thus interpreted. I never heard an appeal from a leader which demanded from its followers so thorough a sacrifice of principle than that which the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) addressed to the Liberal members of the province of Quebec. As I watched the Liberal members from that province, while the hon. gentleman was addressing them in that strain, as I watched them with their subdued demeanour and bowed heads, I saw they realized the humiliating position in which they were placed, and that they knew the hon. member for South Oxford, when he was uttering those words, was making the funeral oration of the Liberal party in the province of Quebec.

Some hon. gentlemen oppose the Bill because they say it is an attempt to coerce the province of Manitoba. Sir, where does the coercion come from? Nineteen-twentieths of the population of Manitoba are Protestant, and the people who have been coerced are the remaining one-twentieth. Really, as regards this bugbear of coercion, it is too ridiculous to suppose, that such a small minority can coerce such an immense majority. I understand that the Catholic minority of Manitoba desire separate schools. They had them prior to 1890. That question is with many people a matter of conscience. Many people desire that their children shall be instructed in their religion during school hours, and that is a desire which is not confined to Catholics, but which is shared in by Protestant denominations. As far as I am concerned, I should be very sorry indeed to see the Protestant schools of Manitoba secularized. I should be very sorry to see religious instruction removed from the teachings of the Protestant schools, because

I do believe, and the longer I live the more convinced I am, that a non-religious school means an irreligious school, and that a godless school produces a godless people. Sir, it is within the knowledge of hon. members in this House that at the last general elections in England the question of voluntary and board schools was a prominent issue before the people. In fact, Sir, the large majority which the Conservative party have in the Imperial House of Commons today, is due to the fact that they were in favour of what are called voluntary schools. I may be told that in Liberal-Unionist sections of the country, especially in Birmingham, represented by the present Colonial Secretary, the Rt. Hon. Mr. Chamberlain, that issue did not prevail. But throughout England generally the large majority which the Conservative party have in the House of Commons, is due mainly to the fact that they were in favour of the voluntary school system. I will quote, Sir, one or two statements bearing on this question made by the Right Hon. Mr. Balfour, the leader of the Conservative party in the House of Commons, a thoughtful man, a man who has given to this question great consideration, and who is known as the author of a recently-published book, "The Foundations of Belief," which has attracted much attention. At Manchester, Mr. Balfour said :

I never will admit that it is not the grossest of injustice to compel parents who take a different view to put their scheme of education into that which happens to harmonize with the secular view which I have just explained to you. I say it is a monstrous thing to compel parents whose children are at school all day long to send them to schools where the religious training and the religious education which they desire to see instilled in their youthful minds, cannot be instilled, cannot be taught. Those who are parents, will I am sure, sympathize with me. Those who take my view of what is due to the rising generation, those who hold, with the strength of conviction which animates me that it is not merely by passing a number of standards or by satisfying a certain number of Government inspectors that you are going to raise up a generation worthy to be the successors of those who have made England what it is—those who hold that conviction will, I am sure, work shoulder to shoulder with those who desire to preserve as an integral, healthy and prosperous part of our educational system, the voluntary schools by which alone, in my opinion, the best ideal of education can be carried out.

Again, speaking at another public meeting at Alnwick, he said :

It would be a melancholy day, in my judgment, for this country if parents were deprived of the right which, surely, they have by a law higher than any law which Parliament can pass to bring up their children in those religious surroundings which conform to their own highest religious convictions.

It may be said, Sir, that this is simply the Anglican view of the question, but I find that recently—

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I gather, from the quotation, that Mr. Balfour was referring to the compulsory clauses of the School Act in England.

Mr. KENNY. Pardon me. He was advocating a further grant of public funds to the voluntary schools. It is contended that the grant which is now made from the Treasury to the voluntary schools is not sufficient. It is about 17s. 6d. per head, and the voluntary schools ask for 21s., the same as the board schools receive.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) That quotation evidently refers to the injustice of compelling a child to attend the schools where religious exercises are repugnant to the views of the parent. That would be so in England, if there were no voluntary schools, and a conscience clause in the Act, which exempts them from these religious exercises.

Mr. KENNY. The argument of the Right Hon. Mr. Balfour is, that it is unjust to parents to deprive their children of the advantages of religious education in the schools. I find, further, Sir, that in November last, a large and important deputation from the Wesleyan Conference waited upon Lord Salisbury to place before him their views in the matter of primary education. The deputation was introduced by Sir Henry Fowler, who made this statement :

There were practically one million scholars attending their Sunday schools, and that shows the importance of the population, and the numerical strength of the people which they represent.

The Rev. Dr. Waller, President of the Wesleyan Conference, then addressed the Prime Minister, and said :

Dr. Waller said that he should not like to say that. With regard to religious education, the Methodists held that no system of education was perfect which did not include the Bible and religious instruction therefrom, suited to the capacities of children, and given by the teachers.

The Marquis of Salisbury—Does that include Roman Catholics ?

Dr. Waller said that no schools, Roman Catholic or otherwise, would put in the best representation if it excluded religious teaching, and he was not aware that Roman Catholics admitted that they discarded the Bible. It would be a national calamity if religious instruction were banished from the schools, and they believed that the teacher was the proper person to impart the instruction.

The Marquis of Salisbury—No matter to what denomination he belongs ?

Dr. Waller said no matter to what denomination he belonged. They believed that it would detract from the dignity and the usefulness of the teacher if the highest subject of all were taken out of his hands.

That is the opinion, as I have said, of the president of the Wesleyan Conference ; and the gentlemen who have argued in this House against religious instruction in the schools must recognize that in England, where the

standard of education is very high, there is a strong sentiment in favour of religious instruction in the schools. And religious instruction, as stated by Dr. Waller, to be effective, must be continuous and authoritative; and it can be best given in the schools, and by the teachers. Therefore hon. gentlemen must not find so much fault with their Roman Catholic fellow-citizens if they desire to have their children instructed in religion in their schools. I might give other extracts pointing in the same direction from the utterances of the Prime Minister of England. But let me just say that this matter of religious instruction is one that concerns the poor man more than the man who is better off. We have no rich people in Canada; but to some has been accorded greater material wealth than to others. My contention is that there is no portion of our population so much interested in the preservation of religious instructions in the schools as the poorer people; for this reason, that the poorer people have not the time, even if they had the ability, to give their children that instruction; and unless those children receive it in the schools, they will grow up in ignorance. The better we can make our population, the more morally and religiously we can bring up our children, the more satisfactory they must be to us as parents and the better Canadians they will become. I have no sympathy with the men who would exclude religious instruction from schools. I am told that even in this Manitoba case—I do not speak of my own personal knowledge—when the Act of 1890 was introduced, the Catholic schools were first assailed because they were the weakest and that one spirit that animated some at any rate of the men who introduced that measure, was that they would gradually exclude religious instruction from all the schools.

Mr. Speaker, it is needless for me to take up the time of the House upon the question of coercion or upon the question of an inquiry. As regards the question of a commission or an investigation, the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) who is evidently the tutor of the leader of the Opposition in this matter, has stated distinctly that there is nothing to investigate, that the whole question is known, as it has been before the courts for years. It now becomes a question whether this Parliament, having the power placed in our hands by the constitution to redress this grievance, shall honestly, fairly and justly administer that power. I do not for my part see how we can in all fairness refuse to do so in view of the pre-confederation compact entered into by the Parliament of Canada with the people of the then Red River settlement, now the province of Manitoba. I think it would be in the public interest that this question should be disposed of by the men who caused the trouble, if they will do so. I am anxious, for the peace of Can-

ada at home and for the credit of Canada abroad, that this question should be disposed of; and I believe that if this Parliament refused to deal with it in the manner in which the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council has intimated we should deal with it, we should be doing an injustice to the people who have been aggrieved and an injury to Canada. My hon. friend the leader of the House said that he would be glad to see confederation rounded off by the ancient colony of Newfoundland entering the union. Nova Scotia is the nearest part of the Dominion to that colony, we are naturally more familiar with the sentiments of its people on that question than our friends who live in other more distant parts of the Dominion; and I say, speaking of my own knowledge, that the fact of this injury being inflicted by a majority on a minority in the province of Manitoba, is used by the opponents of confederation in Newfoundland as an argument against that colony joining Canada. Gentlemen who occupy prominent positions in Newfoundland, and who take a great interest in educational matters, have also admitted to me that their judgment on the question of confederation was influenced by the fact that the Parliament of Canada had refused to redress the grievances of the minority in Manitoba. Therefore, if that injury has resulted to Canada in the case of the neighbouring colony of Newfoundland—if the people there, who know so much more about us than the people of Great Britain do, if they point to the existence of discord and ill-feeling in the Dominion of Canada—I contend that it is a greater injury still to us as regards immigration into this country. We desire to see the province of Manitoba prosper; we desire to see its population increased; and we believe that can be helped by settling this difficulty. We desire it to be settled, because not only is immigration prevented, but the British investor and the British public generally are unfavourably influenced towards Canada by the prolongation of this grievance. The question has been so long disturbing our politics that it is desirable that it should be removed. While the Roman Catholic minority in Nova Scotia have no such legislative protection as that of Manitoba, yet we have a *modus vivendi* which works satisfactorily, and as a consequence of that happy condition of things, Nova Scotia is a model province, and Halifax is a model provincial capital. We have in the province of Nova Scotia no place for firebrands and fanatics. We can only offer them early and commodious graves. Down by the sea we do not unduly disturb ourselves about questions of religious belief, nor do we value our associates less because they do not happen to kneel at the same altar as we do. I sincerely hope that the happy condition of things which has so long prevailed in the province of Nova Scotia, may be extended

to Manitoba, and that it may also become a characteristic of the other provinces of our Dominion that they may :

Like the rainbow's light,
Their various tints unite,
And form, in Heaven's sight,
One arc of peace.

Mr. CASEY. A good old Methodist hymn, which refers to the conditions of those who have gone before into a better world, speaks of their troubles on earth in this wise :

They wrestled hard, as we do now,
With sins and doubts and fears.

That reminds me very much of the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Kenny's) position while he was making his speech. He was wrestling very hard with difficulties of that kind, and I am sure that when he brought upon the desk those last three sheets which contained his beautiful peroration, he must have been as much relieved as the rest of the House were at the happy event. The hon. gentleman set out by telling us that he was no lawyer, and he proved that statement most conclusively before he got through. But he also proved that he was a special pleader, and that in dealing with speeches which have been delivered, and facts that have been ascertained, his ordinary manner—I suppose I must speak of it in a parliamentary way—is ingenious. He gave us, in his own ingenious way, his version of the remarks of those who preceded him, and the facts of the case. He told us that he did not want to hear the words "Catholic" and "Protestant" in connection with this debate, but his whole speech, from beginning to end, was an ingenious attempt to wrest arguments, statements and facts for the purpose of rousing the religious prejudices of Catholics. He told us that he objected to violence of statement in men of his age and the age of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), and that such violence always met with retaliation. I have no doubt the hon. gentleman has got that fact fully established in his own mind. For this session he has had an experience of the retaliation that follows violent, abusive, and ingenious remarks, directed against other members of the House. He had so much of that retaliation that it is a considerable time since we have seen him on the floor of this House, or heard his melodious voice. He is going to suffer on this occasion from another species of retaliation, which, perhaps, he may feel more deeply than any he has deserved by the ingenuity of his remark, and that is, that no one will take the trouble to follow him through the windings of his alleged arguments, or attempt to answer his alleged statements of fact.

There is one admission he has made, however ; and as we can afford to use so much of his speech as gives away his case, that must be noticed. He told us that the pre-

sent public school system in Nova Scotia has been a success, that the *modus vivendi* has been a success there, and that he would advise the minority in Manitoba to agree to a similar arrangement in that province. And yet he intends to vote for a Bill which makes *modus vivendi* impossible, and which will impose on the people of that province a school system which is not of their own devising.

Now, I notice that he is not the only gentleman on that side of the House who is wrestling with sins and doubts and fears. The whole Government have been in great difficulty about this measure ever since it has come upon the carpet. They have endured it long and now wish to make an end of the agony. When the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) concluded his remarks, the hon. Minister of Finance called "question," intimating that he did not wish any further discussion of the question, but to have an immediate vote. I am astonished that he should so far underrate the importance of this great question, and the desire of members of this House to discuss it, as to make that demand. He knew that at the time he called "question," the House was thin, and that a large number of members were engaged on the Railway Committee, which was somewhat irregularly sitting while the House was in session. He knew that one at least of the most prominent speakers on this side, the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), was ill and not able to speak, and he knew, personally, very well that that gentleman intended to speak, and was fully prepared to do so. He knew all this, and yet he called "question." It showed an impatience of suffering with which I would hardly have credited the hon. gentleman.

But there are other reasons why we should not come to a vote for some time yet, besides the considerations of fair-play to which I am alluding. We have not heard from the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster) himself on this question. He is one of the central figures in connection with this issue in the eyes of the country. It has long been known, he has made no secret of it, that he never wished to have a Bill of this kind brought before the House by a Government of which he was a member. It is known that he is, in heart, opposed to it, and opposed it in Council since the inception of the idea. We also know that no man in the House has such a facility for composing ingenious excuses for his own conduct, and for the conduct which he wishes his supporters to practice, and we are awaiting his remarks with great interest. We are waiting to hear from the brains of the party, because we have not heard from the brains of the party yet, to any great extent. We have heard from the Master-Mind on the subject, but he gave very little attention to the question in hand, and told us nothing whatever new or useful

about it, when he introduced the Bill. He took the job of introducing the Bill out of the hands of the Minister of Justice (Mr. Dickey), who had given notice of the Bill, and had helped to prepare it.

To sustain his position in the Cabinet, and his pretensions to a still higher position in it, the hon. Secretary of State (Sir Charles Tupper) took away the job of explaining the Bill from his subordinate, and made such an explanation of it as the House has already heard. I am not going to qualify or describe that explanation further. It was quite clear, that this hon. gentleman had come out here as the liquidator of a bankrupt government. He had no interest in this Bill, he did not care anything about it, and did not know anything about it, but took it over as part of the bankrupt stock of the concern which he had come to liquidate, and, when he brought it before the public view, he was unable to show off his goods to any great advantage. Now, Sir, for that reason we want to hear from these brainy members of the Government who do know something about the Bill. Besides the gentleman whom I have already named, we want to hear from the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Costigan); we want to hear from the ex-Minister of Justice (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) who really had most to do with the framing of the Bill; we want to hear from the hon. Minister of Railways (Mr. Haggart), who has had something to say upon the subject elsewhere than in this House. We want to hear from every one who belongs either to the bolting or to the remaining wing of the Government, what they think of this Bill, and how they justify their conduct.

To come back to my subject, they have been in great difficulties in regard to the measure. In fact, the Conservative party, at the present time, is somewhat in the position of a certain hero of old, to whom I may refer, as a reverend old friend of mine used to do, as belonging to ancient history. My good old friend used to speak of all those of whom we read before the Christian era, as belonging to ancient history, and he spoke of Neptune, Caesar and Nebuchadnezzar as of equal reality. He used to tell us about Hercules, and, in one respect, the story of Hercules resembles the plight of the Conservative Government to-day. Hercules, as we all know, was a long-suffering and powerful hero of mythology, who came to his end in a very tragic way. One of the wives of his bosom sent him, as a present, what she supposed to be a clean shirt, but it turned out to have been poisoned with the blood of something or other—a hydra, I think, or some other creature that was prolific in microbes—and, when Hercules donned his present, he found himself in trouble. He writhed, groaned, shrieked, wriggled and yelled, until, finally, he died. And I think the Conservative Government is in the same

position to-day. They have put on what they supposed to be a beautiful new garment, which they call Remedial Policy, but they find that it burns like fire, and they are now writhing in agony. I do not wonder that, like the Finance Minister, they are anxious to have the agony over and to be through with it and with life together.

They have one last hope, which has been referred to to-night, the hope of a conference with Mr. Greenway on this subject. They declare, that they intend to have this conference after the Bill has passed its second reading. The question naturally arises: Why should not that conference be held before the second reading? Is it sensible, is it reasonable, to ask Mr. Greenway to come down here and consult in this matter after it is practically all finished? Is it not an insult to him and to his government to ask them to come here and then propose to meet them with a loaded gun—to say to them: “We have passed this Bill on its second reading, we have got the assent of the House to the principle, and now, if you do not go down on your marrow bones, if you do not knuckle down to us, we will fire the gun and blow you and your legislation out of existence, and impose our will upon the people of your province?”

That is the meaning of the proposition for the conference which the Secretary of State said he was going to have—that is the meaning of it, as it refers to Manitoba. What is the object of the proposal, from the point of view of party tactics? It is quite clear. The object is to tell the bolters from Ontario and other provinces: There is no fear that the Bill will become law. They are told almost in so many words by the press, they will be told privately by members of the Government and the party whips, and dear knows, by whom else: “Don’t fret; you are all right; vote for the second reading of the Bill, for it will not become law: we are going to get Greenway down and get a promise from him to do something that will enable us to drop the Bill or burk it in committee; you may vote for the second reading with a clear conscience, for there is no danger of Manitoba being coerced.” But the bolter may look at it in another way, and he may say: “If the Bill is not going to pass, if you are going to have a conference with Mr. Greenway, why commit me to the principle of coercion, by forcing me to vote for the second reading? Why not postpone the second reading until after you have seen Mr. Greenway, and unless it is necessary to pass the Bill, let us not commit ourselves before our constituencies by this unpopular vote.” That is how it will strike the bolter—the bolter for what I may call Protestant reasons.

But will it so strike the supporters of the Government who, like my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Kenny), really wish to have remedial legislation? It is impossible that a

gentleman of his acuteness should fail to see, that this proposition of a conference is a confession of failure on the part of the Government. It is an adoption, but too late to be of any use, of the policy which the leader of the Opposition has been urging upon them for five years, ever since this question became a question—the policy of inquiry before final action. It is a confession of failure, in not having done it before. It is a confession that they do not want the Bill passed, if, by any possibility, it can be got rid of. That is the way in which it must strike all those who really wish remedial legislation.

Coming to the Bill itself, and the interests involved, I think, that this is, undoubtedly the most important question that has ever arisen in Canada. It is a question upon the solution of which depends the answer to the query, whether the people who now compose the confederation, can live together any longer as Canadians. I do not pretend that any immediate rupture would follow any course that might be taken in regard to this Bill. But I do contend, that, if this question is not settled in consonance with sound constitutional ideas, and with sound policy, for the good of Canada at large, it will open a breach between the different classes in the confederation that may never be healed. We must approach the consideration of this question with such coolness and calmness as party feeling will allow us to exercise. I hope, for my own part, that, in discussing this question, I am as far from feeling the prejudices of a Stewart Mulvey, on one hand, as I am from entertaining the same opinions as Bishop Cameron does, in regard to those who oppose the Bill, on the other. Personally, I have equal opportunities, through relationship, and so on, to understand the views of both Protestants and Catholics on the matter, and I think I can view the question with a fair mind.

The history of the case has been gone over pretty frequently, and I need not go into that in detail. There were petitions from Manitoba alleging grievances. There was a reference to the Supreme Court for its opinion, merely, as to whether those grievances constituted ground for appeal to the Privy Council of Canada. There was an appeal from the opinion of the Supreme Court on that question, to the Privy Council of England.

I wish to make it clear that that appeal merely carried over the same questions that were before the Supreme Court here, in order to get the opinion of the English Privy Council upon them; and the decision of the Privy Council had no more the effect of law in the matter, had no more directive or compulsive power than the opinion of the Supreme Court had in the first instance. And, as was well pointed out by my hon. friend from Kamouraska (Mr. Carroll), whose speech on that subject cannot be too highly praised, the opinion either of

the Supreme Court or of the Privy Council on that matter was purely advisory under the terms of the reference, and had really no more binding effect on the Government than the opinion of the Minister of Justice himself could have had.

Now, the Privy Council gave a different answer, as its opinions on the points submitted, from that given by the Supreme Court, holding that there was a prima facie case for an inquiry by the Privy Council of Canada. That is another point I wish to make clear. The decision of the Privy Council was that there was a case for inquiry and possible action. They did not pretend that they had made any inquiry, they did not pretend to dictate what the action should be. To make that clear, I wish to quote a sentence or two of the reference on which they decided. Question 2 submitted to the Privy Council reads as follows:—

Are the grounds set forth in the petitions and memorials such as may be the subject of appeal under the authority of the subsections above referred to, or either of them?

Question 5 was:

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

There is a complete answer to the statement of the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny) that the Privy Council of England had decided that there was a grievance requiring a remedy. The point has been made by the hon. member for Kamouraska (Mr. Carroll); I merely repeat it to answer the hon. gentleman's repetition of the other charge. Those were the questions asked them, and they decided that, "assuming the facts stated in the petition" there was ground for a hearing. A great deal has been made of the concluding clause of the Imperial Order in Council based upon the decision of the Privy Council in England. The great bulk of that Order in Council, of course, simply embodied the words of the finding of the Committee of the Privy Council, the judges, in other words, who heard the case. But at the close are added the usual words with which an Order in Council always concludes, namely:

Her Majesty having taken the said report into consideration, was pleased by and with the advice of Her Privy Council to approve thereof and to order, as it is hereby ordered, that the recommendations and directions therein contained be punctually observed, obeyed and carried into effect in each and every particular. Whereof the Governor General of the Dominion of Canada for the time being, and all other persons whom it may concern are to take notice and govern themselves accordingly.

We have heard no end of times, all over the country, that these words constitute a

distinct order, to our Government here, to enforce a remedy for certain grievances in Manitoba. They constitute nothing of the kind, as every lawyer ought to know, but as some lawyers have pretended to ignore. But these words were quoted in the election of Haldimand somewhere about a year ago, as a proof that the remedial order, which had been passed already, was not a declaration of policy on the part of this Government, and was merely handing on the decision of the Privy Council to the government of Manitoba. How hollow that claim is, will appear from reading the decisions of the Committee of the Privy Council itself, which are embodied in this Order in Council. In answer to the 5th question, which I have just read, they say :

In answer to the fifth question :—That the Governor General in Council has jurisdiction and the appeal is well founded, but that the particular course to be pursued must be determined by the authorities to whom it has been committed by the statute ; that the general character of the steps to be taken is sufficiently defined by subsection 3 of section 22 of the Manitoba Act, 1870.

I will read from the judgment as contained in the report of the Canadian case, as edited by their counsel in England, to show what the concluding words of the Order in Council mean.

Their lordships have decided that the Governor General in Council has jurisdiction, and that the appeal is well founded, but the particular course to be pursued must be determined by the authorities to whom it has been committed by the statute. It is not for this tribunal to intimate the precise steps to be taken. Their general character is sufficiently defined by the 3rd subsection of section 22 of the Manitoba Act.

So far, it is similar to what I have quoted from the blue-book, but the original report goes on :

It is certainly not essential that the statutes repealed by the Act of 1890 should be re-enacted, or that the precise provisions of these statutes should again be made law. The system of education embodied in the Acts of 1890 no doubt commends itself to, and adequately supplies the wants of the great majority of the inhabitants of the province. All legitimate grounds of complaint would be removed if that system were supplemented by provisions which would remove the grievance upon which the appeal is founded, and were modified so far as might be necessary to give effect to these provisions.

Then the Order in Council states what the grievance was, assuming the facts alleged in the petition to be true, as follows :—

Before this passed into law—

(Referring to the Act of 1890 and amendments.)

—there existed denominational schools of which the control and management were in the hands of the Roman Catholics, who could select the books to be used, and determine the character of the religious teaching. These schools received their proportionate share of the money contributed for school purposes out of the general tax-

tion of the province, and the money raised for these purposes for local assessment was, so far as it fell upon the Catholics, applied only towards the support of Catholic schools.

These are the three provisions so often referred to as A, B and C, securing the control and management of separate schools the supply of their proportionate share of the public money, and exemption from taxation for public schools.

Now, that was the condition of things when the Privy Council of Canada began to inquire into the matter. And what did they do ? Instead of inquiring into the facts which had been alleged —by the petitions which had been assumed by the British Privy Council, and which had been transmitted to them for their judgment, they came to a decision without having before them as evidence a single proven fact in regard to this alleged grievance, or a single answer to the allegations of the petitioners. We all know that certain evidence on behalf of the petitioners was put before them, that they refused time to Manitoba to reply to that evidence, that thereupon that evidence was withdrawn for the purposes of the suit. But those same affidavits have irregularly, improperly and scandalously been since published in the official blue-book, as if they had been part of the case before the Privy Council, and had been decided upon by that body. I say that such action was scandalous, because it leads the public to believe that this was in evidence before the committee of the Privy Council, and had to be taken into account in the decision, when such was absolutely not the fact.

Then they concluded this farcical proceeding, miscalled an inquiry, by passing an order which granted all that the petitioners asked. I remind you, Sir, that the British Privy Council had told them that they need not grant all the petitioners asked. But this Government, without having any evidence, legally, before them, did grant all the petitioners asked, and put it in the Order in Council. My contention is that there and then was the time when not only questions of fact, but questions of policy should have been entered into by the Government of Canada, before they issued any order to the government of Manitoba. If I understand the Manitoba Act, it was the duty of the Privy Council of Canada to consider, first, all questions of fact relating to grievances alleged to exist ; second, all questions of policy as to how the grievances may be best remedied, without involving undue interferences with existing legislation. We contend that this Government did not look into these matters at all ; that they merely made themselves machines for registering the demands in full of the petitioners.

The order subsequently published by the Governor in Council refers to the three classes of privileges to which I have re-

Mr. CASEY.

ferred, and sets them out under headings, "A," "B" and "C," in this form :

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

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

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

I make this quotation in order to maintain my contention that the Order in Council directed and implied the restoration of the Manitoba separate schools, as they existed before 1890.

It has been contended that that order is the judgment of a court. It is not the judgment of any court. There was no consideration of evidence, there was no decision on facts ; it was a declaration of policy, a declaration binding the Cabinet as a whole, to the policy that the separate school system of Manitoba should be restored to the full extent in which it existed before 1890. That order was served on Manitoba, and the province made a reply, refusing to accept it in that shape, but urging certain important considerations in regard to it, to some of which I must refer. It points out many valid reasons why the law of 1890 was passed, among others, that the separate schools were defective, and allowed the people to grow up illiterate. It took objection on the ground of principle to any change been made. Then it pointed out particular difficulties, in this manner :

Objections upon principle may be taken to any modification of our educational statutes which would result in the establishment of more sets of separate schools. Apart, however, from the objections upon principle there are serious objections from a practical educational standpoint. Some of these objections may be briefly indicated.

We labour under great difficulties in maintaining an efficient system of primary education. The school taxes bear heavily upon our people. The large amount of land which is free from school taxes and the great extent of country over which our small population is scattered present obstacles to efficiency and progress.

Hon. members will see that the land policy of the Government in the North-west is involved in this manner, that their action in exempting railway lands from taxation has, to a large extent, prevented the establishment of schools. Then the reply touches on this important point :

We believe that when the remedial order was made, there was not available then to Your Excellency in Council full and accurate information as to the working of our former system of schools.

We also believe that there was lacking the means of forming a correct judgment as to the effect upon the province of changes in the direction indicated in the order.

Being impressed with this view, we respectfully submit that it is not yet too late to make a full and deliberate investigation of the whole subject. Should such a course be adopted, we shall cheerfully assist in affording the most complete information available. An investigation of such a kind would furnish a substantial basis of fact upon which conclusions could be formed with a reasonable degree of certainty.

But the Government rejected that offer, as they had refused the advice of the leader of the Opposition to the same effect long before.

Then this reply from Manitoba points out the two essentials to any effective and substantial restoration of Roman Catholic privileges, in this way :

1. The right to levy school taxes.
2. The right to participate in the legislative school grant ; without these privileges the separate schools cannot be properly carried on, and without them, therefore, any professed restoration of privileges would be illusory.

There is some argument put forward as to the legality of legislating in this Parliament with respect to levying school taxes ; but in regard to the second point, the right to share in the legislative grants, there is no room for argument. It is clear to every one that without a share in the public funds of the province, the restoration of separate schools in Manitoba must be perfectly illusory, and the framers of the present Bill have confessed it by the manner in which they have framed the Bill, for evidently, they are unable to see any way of providing public funds for those schools.

Then there was the memorandum, dated 27th July last, adopted by the Committee of the Privy Council, here, making certain suggestions. This was not a new remedial order addressed to Manitoba, directing it to do certain things, but a memorandum making suggestions to Manitoba, and setting forth that something less than what was demanded by the remedial order might be satisfactory to the minority. It was an inquiry as to what Manitoba would be willing to do about the matter. It contained no indication as to what the Government here intended to do. In reply to that memorandum, and forwarded a good deal later, there was another memorandum from the Government of Manitoba, sent on 21st December, 1895, covering a good deal of ground, and I wish to call attention to one of its phases. It contains a distinct repetition of the invitation to inquire further into the facts of the case. It says :

It is a matter of regret that the invitation extended by the legislative assembly to make a proper inquiry into the facts of the case has not been accepted, but that, as above stated, the advisers of His Excellency have declared their policy without investigation. It is equally a matter of regret that Parliament is apparently about to be asked to legislate without investigation. It is with all deference submitted that such a course seems to be quite incapable of reasonable justification, and must create the con-

viction that the educational interest of the people of the province of Manitoba are being dealt with, in a hostile and peremptory way, by a tribunal whose members have not approached the subject in a judicial spirit, or taken the proceedings necessary to enable them to form a proper opinion upon the merits of the question.

The inquiry asked for by the reply of the legislature to the remedial order should, in the opinion of the undersigned, be again earnestly invited, and in the event of the invitation being accepted the scope of the inquiry should be sufficiently wide to embrace all available facts relating to the past or present school systems.

I do not think the position could have been stated in more correct and statesman-like language. The Privy Council, here, had failed absolutely in its duty to consider the facts and the policy of the case, before framing its order. The legislature of Manitoba had, in reply, invited inquiry, and by that invitation had practically pledged itself to abide by the result of the inquiry. Again, as late as the 21st December last, it repeated the invitation with the same implication involved in it. Even then, the Government here would not accept it. It is only now, when they find how slippery is their hold upon the majority in this House, when they find how thoroughly unpopular their policy is with the country, that they are holding out an olive branch, with a sword point concealed among the foliage, inviting Manitoba to a conference about the details of this question, after the matter has been settled by the Bill passing its second reading in this House.

By this last concession, the Government have confirmed the stand of the Manitoba legislature, and confirmed the stand taken by the leader of the Opposition, that there should have been more investigation and consultation about the matter, and that it is even yet not too late, to have that consultation. The only difference between their position, as modified by this confession of failure, and our position, is, that they propose to act before having a consultation, and that we propose to defer action until there has been time for a consultation. We propose to give this Bill what is called the six months' hoist, to give it a clear negative, for the time being; but that action certainly does not prevent, as has been alleged, an inquiry and a consultation with the Manitoba government, as to what that government should do in regard to the schools in that province. I have no doubt that the influence of this Government, exerted in that way, could have long ago settled this question, and could have kept it out of politics for years back, if it had not been supposed to be the interest of hon. gentlemen opposite, to keep the question in politics for party purposes, for the sake of the votes they thought they could make out of it.

I come now to consider, briefly, the provisions of the Bill itself. I will not go into the details now, but certain broad facts

stand out in regard to the principle of the Bill. In the first place, the Bill is, in its terms and in its intentions, coercive. It has been denied that it is coercive, because it provides the nominal alternative, that the Manitoba government may, itself, do a great many things ordered therein, and so prevent their being done by this Government. But I say that a Bill which is intended, or supposed to be intended, to secure the performance of certain things in Manitoba, which the government of that province do not wish to be done, is, in its essence, a coercive Bill. This Bill, in regard to some things, provides, that if they are not done by the local government they shall be done by the Governor in Council here. In regard to other things, it directs the Lieutenant-Governor in Council to do them, but provides no alternative in case they refuse to do them. According to the strictest definition of the word "coercion," this Bill is strictly a coercive Bill in its intention, and in its language, and yet those in this House who sympathize with the position of the minority in Manitoba, who feel that something ought to be done for them, have the additional fault to find with it, that while the Bill is coercive in language and intention, it is not remedial. This point was well brought out, like so many others, by the hon. member for Kamouraska (Mr. Carroll); but it cannot be too often impressed upon the House, that the Bill is, at the same time, coercive and ineffective.

Before calling attention to its defects as an Act for establishing separate schools in Manitoba, I wish to emphasize the argument that the Bill is, in its essence, unconstitutional, and is one which this House has no right to pass. It must be remembered that our jurisdiction is a special one in regard to separate schools in Manitoba. It is a jurisdiction forming an exception to the rule of the constitution, which gives educational matters to the control of the province. It is, therefore, limited to the exact wording of the constitution, which creates that exception, and endows us with power to act. Under the 3rd subsection of section 22 of the Manitoba Act, the circumstances which give rise to our jurisdiction are clearly defined. There must be, first, an appeal from the aggrieved minority to the Governor General in Council. There must be an Order in Council, demanding certain relief from the government of Manitoba for that aggrieved minority. There must be a refusal by the government of Manitoba to grant that relief, and the measure of our jurisdiction—and this is a point to which I wish to call special attention—the measure of our jurisdiction in this matter is the degree in which Manitoba has refused to carry out our demands.

There is a theory, that, if your remedial order directs Manitoba to do a large numbers of things, and she refuses

to do those things, you may then legislate to carry out a smaller number of objects, and justify it by the pretense, that the greater includes the less. No argument could be more absurd and rotten. Our jurisdiction only begins when Manitoba has refused to do certain particular things, and it is only with regard to those certain particular things that we are able to legislate. I do not think that argument could be expressed any better than was done in the columns of "La Vérité" of last week. "La Vérité" is an acknowledged clerical organ in the province of Quebec, an organ which I am told goes practically to every priest in the province, an organ which is looked to, as its name indicates, to tell the truth on everything in which the interests of religion are involved. By a strange coincidence "La Vérité" on the 7th of March and the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin) on the 6th of March in this House put forward almost exactly the same argument in regard to the unconstitutionality of this measure. When you find the hon. member for Winnipeg, the author of the Act of 1890, the man who is supposed to be the champion of Mr. Greenway in this particular matter, and "La Vérité," the organ of the clerical party in Quebec, and supposed to be the champion of the hierarchy and the priesthood in that province, agreeing exactly in the same argument—

Mr. AMYOT. If the hon. gentleman will allow me—

Mr. CASEY. Order. Only one conclusion remains, Mr. Speaker, and that is, that this argument is so incontrovertibly and absolutely true that it cannot be got around by anybody. Now, if my hon. friend wants to ask me a question, I will hear it.

Mr. AMYOT. I say that the hon. gentleman is entirely mistaken about the position of "La Vérité" in Quebec.

Mr. CASEY. What is its position, then?

Mr. AMYOT. It is an ordinary paper, without any authority more than any other paper.

Mr. CASEY. Others of my hon. friends from Quebec, who are equally able to speak of "La Vérité" such as my hon. friend from Montmagny (Mr. Choquette), and my hon. friend from Bagot (Mr. Dupont), have told me that it is, I do not say an inspired paper, but one that is looked upon as a clerical paper which goes practically to every priest in the province of Quebec.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. And has great influence.

Mr. CASEY. I have no doubt that my hon. friend who interrupts me (Mr. Amyot) thinks that "La Vérité" is a very ordinary paper when it disagrees with him, but that it is a very extraordinary paper when it agrees with

him and with the Government which he supports. "La Vérité" is not as loyal to the Government as the hon. member for Beilechasse (Mr. Amyot) is for the moment. There have been times when he has not been loyal to the Government; but he is now extremely loyal to them, and he does not like to be told that an independent paper, which consults the church authorities, but does not consult him or the Premier of this country, has pronounced against this Bill. I propose to read to you as correct a translation as I can make of the argument in "La Vérité." It says:

The parliamentary correspondence of the "Trifluvien" considers that the present time is not well chosen for discussing the merits of the Remedial Bill. We believe it is infinitely better worth our while to examine this Bill now, when it is, at least theoretically, possible to modify it, than to pass it first, and then to estimate its shortcomings. It will be said, "If there are shortcomings, they will be removed by subsequent legislation." Let no one create this illusion for himself. Such as the Act is when passed, such will it remain. Never can Parliament be led to legislate twice on this question. It is enough to remember what is going on at Ottawa to convince one of this.

If the Bill is not modified so as to make it conform entirely to the remedial order of last March, it can be attacked as unconstitutional. In effect, the Federal Parliament has no right to legislate on the school question except in so far as the Manitoba Legislature has refused to legislate itself. Now, the remedial order of March 21st, 1895, declared that the minority had a right to three things: A, B, C, viz., (A) to construct, maintain, manage, Roman Catholic schools; (B) to receive a proportional share of every subsidy granted from the public funds for educational purposes; (C) finally, exemption for the Catholics from taxes imposed for the maintenance of public schools. It is A, B, C, which the Federal Government ordered the legislature to do. It is, therefore, A, B, C, which the Manitoba Legislature has refused to do. It is, therefore, A, B, C, which the Federal Parliament has the right to do, in virtue of the constitution.

But, by the Bill actually before the public, the Government only invites Parliament to do A and C; for, no matter what one may say, clause 74 does not do B;—that is to say, it does not give the minority a proportional part of every grant made for educational purposes out of public funds.

Winnipeg may then say:—"I have refused to do A, B, C;—but I have not refused to do A, C. You have, therefore, the right to legislate on A, B, C, because of my refusal; but you have not the right to legislate on A, C, because you have not, in the first place, given me legal notice to legislate, myself, in regard to A, C, alone."

It is useless to do like the ostrich: to hide one's head in the sand, and believe oneself under shelter. If clause 74 is not modified so as to do B, the Act will probably be declared unconstitutional.

There is the opinion of an independent, respected, influential, clerical authority, on the constitutionality of this measure. It is remarkable that the same argument should have occurred to the hon. member for Winnipeg at the same time, and should have

been put forward on the same day without any knowledge of the coincidence or part of either. The conclusion, I say, is clear that that argument is incontrovertible. Both the Greenway side of this question and the clergy of the province of Quebec are agreed in thinking that this Act is defective and will probably be unconstitutional.

Nay, Mr. Speaker. I will go further than that; I believe the Government meant this Act to be unconstitutional. Nobody believes for a moment that this Government, now consolidated, with the brains back in it, and the imbecile head, as he was described by his subordinates, not cut off—nobody believes that this two-headed Government really wish to restore separate schools to Manitoba. Everybody knows that all they wish to do is to pass a Bill through this House which shall nominally assert the right of the Catholics of Manitoba to separate schools, which shall make a show of coercing Manitoba, which shall be sufficient to secure the support of the Catholic church in the next election. That is all they want to do. They are comforting themselves and their Ontario followers with the assurance that after all it does not matter. They know that the Privy Council will declare the Act in its present shape to be ultra vires. They know that Parliament will never venture to attack the question again. They know that it is a dead issue if this Bill passes. They know more than that; they know that if this Parliament forces separate schools on Manitoba, it will prevent the legislature of Manitoba from establishing separate schools itself. They are afraid like the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Costigan) that the Manitoba government will re-establish those schools and get the credit of that act. They would rather see it done from here, and the result of an attempt to do it from here by a Bill in any such shape as the one before the House would be to make Catholic separate schools in Manitoba impossible for generations yet to come.

It is a serious question for our French and other Catholic friends whether they should vote for a Bill of that kind, in view of the consequences to their co-religionists.

Mr. CAMERON. Hear, hear.

Mr. CASEY. My hon. friend from Inverness gives his dry "hear, hear" as a criticism on my remarks; but I am glad to be able to oppose to that little interruption of his the opinion of as good a Catholic, as good a Nova Scotian, and as good a lawyer as he is. I refer to Senator Power, of Halifax. His catholicity will not be denied by any one who knows him.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). Nor his Grittism.

Mr. CASEY. Strange as it may seem to the hon. member for Inverness, it is quite possible to be a good Grit and a good Catholic at the same time. We may say one thing

Mr. CASEY.

for Senator Power's catholicity, which I am afraid will never be said for the catholicity of the hon. member for Inverness. More than twenty years ago, certain writings of Senator Power on the relations of the church to politics, which were published in our papers here, were sent to Rome, and submitted to the college of cardinals; and they were declared by the cardinal whose special duty it was to look into the matter to be sound in theology, although there was a slight leaning to Grittism in the writings. And as a result of the writing of those articles, an ablegate was sent from Rome to this country, and an important revision of the relations between church and state in this country, followed his mission. Senator Power's catholicity, therefore, cannot be denied, and I will give you some idea of his opinions on this Bill. I will read you one or two of his conclusions, first, and then one or two quotations in support thereof. I shall read you first the conclusion of his valuable pamphlet:

Having looked at the record of the Government in connection with the Manitoba school question and having examined the Remedial Bill, I return now to the question stated at the beginning of this paper, and say that in my humble opinion, the Bill in question, is not such a measure as a Catholic member of either House of Parliament should vote for. It is calculated to do no good, but rather harm to Catholic interests in Manitoba, and to cause serious injury to the Canadian people as a whole. While I do not question the right of any Catholic member, who can satisfy himself that the Bill is likely to improve the position of his co-religionists in the matter of education, to vote for it, I shall feel it my duty, as a Catholic and as a citizen, to vote against it, should it come before the Senate, in anything like its present condition.

L. G. POWER.

Ottawa, 3rd March, 1896.

He finds that a great many defects in the Bill, some of which I have pointed out, and others to which I have not referred. He says, after a good many criticisms, which I shall not read in full:

In short, the Bill is such as one would naturally expect to result from the contest of two hostile sections of a Cabinet, warring over the remedial order, one striving—probably honestly—to restore to the Catholic minority, the rights of which they were unjustly deprived by the Manitoba Act of 1890, and the other determined that nothing should be done to alienate the large section of the population which is opposed to any concession to the minority, and believes that in the matter of education, the majority in Manitoba should have a perfectly free hand.

Let us suppose the Remedial Bill to have become law, and try to foresee the probable result. Certain school districts, in which a majority of the voters are Catholics, have accepted the Acts of 1890 and are now working under them. The people assess themselves under the law and receive their proportion of the legislative grant. The teachers say Catholic prayers, and give instructions in the doctrines of their church after the regular school hours.

This is in the much-abused Protestant schools of Manitoba!

The attitude of the schools in Catholic districts towards the existing law and their present condition are reported on by Mr. A. L. Young—an officer of the Manitoba government.

He then goes on to quote the report of Mr. Young, but, as Mr. Young will be suspected of favouring the Government, I prefer to quote from the speech of Senator Bernier, which he gives later on :

However, I find that he is to a great extent confirmed by Senator Bernier, late superintendent of Catholic schools in Manitoba. Speaking of the Catholics of that province he said, in addressing the Senate on 25th April, 1895 :

"Inducements were offered to them by the local government through their officers to attend the schools without entirely sacrificing their views ; and they thought they might try the new system. It is not on account of any preference for the public schools but because of their poverty and of the peculiar inducements offered to them. The local government were anxious to have some of our schools brought under the law in order to be able to base an argument upon the change. An inspector was sent to them who told them that if they wanted to keep up their schools the government would not be too exacting about compliance with the regulations. He told them that they might quietly give any religious instruction in the school after school hours. He told them that they could begin and close school work by saying the ordinary Catholic prayers and even suggested how it should be done."

This is sufficient proof out of the mouth of Senator Bernier, late superintendent of separate schools in Manitoba, that the local government has made it as easy as possible for the Catholic minority there to avail themselves of the ordinary public schools. Senator Power goes on to comment as follows :—

It is hardly to be expected that the districts in question will give up the advantages which they now enjoy, for the purpose of coming under the operation of the Remedial Bill, if it become law ; and I do not believe that Senator Bernier will seriously blame them if they fail to do so. They would gain nothing and lose a great deal.

Amongst other things they would lose their share of the public grant for educational purposes, which this Bill finds no means of giving them.

Whatever we may think of the local government's action in this connection, it cannot be said that it shows any hostility to Catholic schools as such ; and it perhaps indicates that, if the existing contest with the Dominion Government were at an end, a settlement or modus vivendi satisfactory to all concerned might be found without any radical change in the existing law. In the rural districts, where the law of 1890 has not been accepted, the Catholics as a rule are not well enough off to maintain their schools satisfactorily with their own funds, without a share of the legislative grant and without exemption from taxation for the public schools.

It is clear that in Manitoba the passing of the Remedial Bill will be of no substantial benefit to

the Catholic minority, while it will tend to prevent a friendly settlement of the question and to antagonize the local government and the Protestant majority, who might otherwise be willing to make such modifications in the existing law as to legalize concessions similar to those tolerated in Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island, and recognized as being on the whole fairly satisfactory.

Mr. CAMERON. Hear, hear.

Mr. CASEY. They were so recognized tonight by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny) and now by the hon. member for Inverness (Mr. Cameron).

Mr. CAMERON. If legalized.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. member for Halifax declared that they were satisfactory as they stood. Senator Power goes on to say :

Outside of Manitoba, persistence by the Dominion Government is likely to have injurious effects, more especially in Ontario, where it may lead to a renewal of the warfare waged for so many years against Catholic separate schools by the Conservative party under the leadership of Mr. (now Chief Justice) Meredith. The number of Catholic children of an age to attend separate schools in Manitoba, was, as appears from the official report for 1886, the last to which I have had access, about 4,100.

Now comes a passage to which I would call the attention not only of every Catholic, but of every Protestant who, like myself, wishes to see no disturbance of the existing relations between Protestants and Catholics in Ontario :

The prospects of a successful campaign against separate schools in Ontario would be much increased if the Catholic electors of that province were now by transferring their support to the Conservatives, to alienate the Liberals, who, under Sir Oliver Mowat, have been their staunch friends in the past. In any case, the passing of the Bill will cause a continuance of the present mischievous and regrettable agitation, which is prejudicial to the interests of all classes.

I skip again a little and quote further. After saying that he does not object to the Remedial Bill on the ground of provincial rights, he says :

At the same time, I am convinced that, under all the circumstances of the case—some of which I have discussed—Mr. Laurier's policy of inquiry and conciliation would, if adopted, be far better for Catholics as well as Protestants, not only in Manitoba but in Ontario and all the other provinces of the Dominion, than that of the Government, as embodied in the attempt to pass the Bill. I was for thirteen years a commissioner of schools for the city of Halifax ; and my experience in that capacity has satisfied me that good tempered appeals to the generosity and sense of justice of our Protestant fellow-citizens will nearly always gain recognition for our reasonable claims and due regard for our conscientious convictions ; while, on the other hand, anything in the nature of aggression or coercion is almost certain to lead to resistance and failure. In Ontario the experience has been much the same. Various amendments to the original Separate School Act, which were needed to place the Catholic schools upon a satisfactory footing, have

been made from time to time, without appeals to any power other than the spirit of toleration and the sense of justice of the overwhelming Protestant majority of that great province. Human nature is much the same in Manitoba as in Nova Scotia or Ontario; and the attempt by the Dominion Parliament at the present time to set up separate schools in Manitoba under the provisions of the so-called Remedial Bill, against the strong protests and hostility of the Government, legislature and electorate of that province, is fore-doomed to failure.

I will not quote any more, though it is all valuable.

I will say in conclusion to the Catholics in Ontario, and to those who know what has taken place in Ontario, that they should know who are their friends, they should know perfectly well who have stood up for their rights, so far as those rights could be obtained without adopting a policy that would injure the country at large. They know whether the P.P.A.'s, the associates of my hon. friend from East Lambton (Mr. Moncrieff), who spoke in favour of this Bill, or the associates of those on this side of the House have done justice to the Roman Catholics in Ontario. To our French friends I do not need to say anything.

An hon. MEMBER. They are not here.

Mr. CASEY. No, but they are within hearing. The people of Quebec know who is their friend. They know in whom they are trusting. They know that they have a man who understands them, who understands their views and their interests. And, by a strange coincidence, we of Ontario find in the same individual one who understands us and our views and our interests. In spite of all attempts by such speakers as my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Kenny), who seems to feel a natural antipathy to our leader—and I do not wonder at it—in spite of all attempts to raise religious prejudices against him amongst the Catholics of Quebec and the Protestants of Ontario, our leader stands out as the only man who has taken a manly straightforward, upright course in regard to this question, the only man who by any possibility can settle this question.

I said a moment ago that I need not say anything to our Liberal French friends, but I cannot help saying one thing to them. They may be sure that those who have taken a broad and statesmanlike view of this question, who have refused to take advantage of a constitutional technicality to pursue a course that would stir up divisions of race and creed in Manitoba, who have refused to take advantage of the weapons placed in their hands, will find that the people of Manitoba are human like the people of the rest of Canada. Whatever the feeling has been there, up to the present time, it will be impossible for any ordinary British or French people in Manitoba to refuse to do something in return for the magnanimity which these gentlemen are showing. I say that those French Canadians and Irish Cath-

Mr. CASEY.

olics who are supporting the policy of the leader of this side of the House—and they are a vast and increasing number—are doing more to save the future of Canada, are doing more to make the continuance of confederation possible, are doing more for the welfare of their co-religionists in the province of Manitoba, than can be done by any Government in Canada taking the fullest advantage of the weapons afforded by the constitution.

And when I say that this Bill is a failure, I am not imputing any special blame to the Government, because I am quite convinced that any Bill that could be framed in this House must be a failure. I am convinced that no means exist for enforcing the will of this Parliament upon Manitoba in opposition to the will of its legislature and the majority of its people. What we can blame the Government for, is not their inability to do the impossible, but their dishonesty in pretending to do what their common sense should have told them was impossible, and for seeking to make capital out of religious differences and for keeping the country in a turmoil over a question that could have been settled long ago by conciliatory and peaceful methods.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I wish to engage the attention of the House for a short time only, for the purpose of making a few observations on the very important question that is now before us. In doing so, I do not propose to deal with this subject from a legal point of view, because, Sir, being a layman, I am not competent to do so. But I purpose discussing it from a practical common sense view of the situation as we find it to-day. You have in your hands, Mr. Speaker, a motion moved by the Hon. Sir Charles Tupper, Bart., the leader of the Government in this House, which is in effect that this Bill be now read a second time and referred to a Committee of the Whole House. When the Bill is before the committee this House is competent to deal with it, to offer suggestions, to move amendments, so that the measure may be altered and made satisfactory to the majority of the House, and such as to meet the views of those who think and believe honestly that there is a grievance that this House is called upon to settle. For myself, I am opposed to separate schools. I live in a town with a population of over 4,000, one-fifth of whom are French and Irish Roman Catholics. We have but one school there, a public school. The children of Catholics and Protestants alike go to that school and sit there side by side. On leaving that school boys and girls, young men and young women, they take their places in the factory or the workshop or engage in other occupations, they fight the battle of life and are good friends all the way through. Therefore, I think we are all the better for not having separate schools there.

But our Roman Catholic friends there, as all over the province of Ontario, have a right to have separate schools if they choose. But, so far at least as our town is concerned, they have not chosen to exercise that right. But, if the province of Ontario was to take away that right from our Roman Catholic fellow-citizens, they would then have a constitutional grievance. All parties in this House are agreed that the minority in Manitoba have a grievance. The decision of the Privy Council has settled that question. It says that a grievance does exist on the part of the minority in Manitoba. There have been no two opinions expressed on that subject since this debate began. All parties are also agreed, that this Parliament has the right to deal with and settle that grievance, in case the legislature of Manitoba fails to do so. They have not done so, they have refused to do so. Then all agreed that this Parliament has the right to settle it, and can do so. But all are not agreed as to the kind of remedy that should be applied. Some favour the restoration of the schools as they existed in that country prior to 1890; others favour the Bill now before the House to restore the privileges that were taken away by the Act of 1890, and to relieve the minority from paying taxes to the schools that they cannot avail themselves of, and thus establish the right of the minority to separate schools under government inspection, qualified teachers, etc. For myself, I think the requirements of the constitution and the decision of the Queen's Privy Council would be fully met, if, when the Bill gets into committee, it is amended in this way: That in the province of Manitoba there shall be one national school system, that there shall be one school, and that in that school no religion shall be taught that will be offensive to the consciences of the parents of any child. That would be my view: that, I believe, would settle the constitutional grievance, because it would place the whole of the community on the same footing. That is the view I shall take, when we get into committee on the Bill. But, I presume, the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) would oppose that view, because he says, that he prefers separate schools to secular schools; and I believe there are others in this House who take a similar view. But, in my opinion, the requirements of the constitution would be met, if this Parliament passed a Bill of that nature; because, if the Christians in that country, Catholic and Protestant, cannot agree on a form of religion that will not be offensive to the conscience of any man's child, then, let them wipe it out and let the religious training be given in the churches and Sabbath schools. Sir, I think it is a reflection on the pious fathers and mothers, on the clergymen of all denominations alike, and on the Sabbath school teachers of all denominations, if the religious

training of our children has to depend on twenty or thirty minutes daily of state-aided religion taught in the schools. That is my view, although others take a different view. The hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin) who was the father of this Manitoba Act passed in 1890, said, that the religious exercises provided for in the schools of that province, constituted rank tyranny towards the Roman Catholics who had to support those schools.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Where did he say that?

Mr. TAYLOR. I will read what he said before I sit down. This being the case, I cannot help but think, that it is the duty of every loyal man in this country to assist in removing that part of the educational system in Manitoba which constitutes rank tyranny towards the Roman Catholics. When this is done, in my opinion, the grievance complained of would disappear. Then, the committee, if it thought wise when dealing with this Bill, might add another clause to the effect that this Act should not come into force for a term of three or six months, whichever term the committee might, in its wisdom, think best to fix, provided, that, in the meantime the legislature of Manitoba did not so legislate as to meet the requirements of the decision of the Privy Council, and remove the grievance. Now, Sir, that is my opinion of what could be done, and what ought to be done by this Parliament, after passing the motion moved by the leader of the Government. Now, let us look at the other side. You hold in your hand, Mr. Speaker, an amendment moved by the leader of the Opposition, that this Bill be not read now, but that it be read this day six months. If that amendment passes, will it settle this question? If it did, Mr. Speaker, we ought to pass it. If it will remove the question from this Parliament and settle it for ever, then, let us adopt the amendment proposed by the leader of the Opposition. But will it do this?

Mr. WALLACE. It will settle it so far as this Parliament is concerned.

Mr. TAYLOR. Will it settle the question? That is the point.

Mr. WALLACE. You asked, if this Parliament could settle it in that way. I say it will.

Mr. TAYLOR. I will show how Parliament will settle it by that amendment. If the amendment moved by the leader of the Opposition is carried, it will have the effect of defeating the Government, and that is the only effect it will have, so far as I can see, in settling the question.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) That is all you want to know.

Mr. TAYLOR. Well, we will see. It will lead to the resignation of the Government led by Sir Mackenzie Bowell, and that is the only effect of the amendment, so far as I can see.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Or go to the people.

Mr. TAYLOR. But it is expected by my hon. friend who wants to go to the people, that the adoption of that amendment would place the leader of the Opposition in power as Premier of this country. Then, if he gets into power, how would he settle the question? The hope of the leader of the Opposition, in moving this amendment, is, that, if carried, it would put him in power, and then he will settle the question by a still stronger Bill. Does he promise, either in his speech or in his amendment, that, if he were in power, and the government of Manitoba refused to settle this question, he would not come to this Parliament and ask us to pass a stronger Bill, a Bill that will restore the schools as they existed previous to 1890? No, Mr. Speaker, he says just the contrary; he says, and his supporters from Quebec who have thus far spoken on the subject, also say, that this Bill is no good, that it is not strong enough; and they will support his motion with the object, that, when he gets into power, he will bring in a stronger Bill. They can go back to their constituents and say, we did not vote against the Bill, we voted to put the Government out and to put the leader of the Opposition in, and he will give us a better Bill. He is reported—and I never heard him contradict it—to have said, "I thank God that among us Liberals there are no Orangemen."

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). How could he have said that, for there are as many Orangemen in our party as in yours.

Mr. TAYLOR. He has never denied it.

Mr. FOSTER. It was read to him twice and he never denied it.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). You had better take it back.

Mr. TAYLOR. I take nothing back. I propose making my speech. If I get out of order the hon. gentleman has the right to call me to order, but if he wants to interrupt me he will simply keep hon. members here that much longer.

Mr. FORBES. As hon. gentlemen are aware, the leader of the Opposition contradicted that statement over his own handwriting.

Mr. TAYLOR. No, I am not aware of it, nor are the people of this country aware of it, because it has never been published.

Mr. FORBES. Yes.

Mr. BELLEY. The leader of the Opposition said it in the town where I reside.

Mr. TAYLOR.

Mr. SPEAKER. I must ask hon. gentlemen to refrain from these interruptions.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. gentleman is going to speak, and as he has said he heard him, then let him make the statement. This, so far as I can gather from supporters of the leader of the Opposition from his own province who have spoken on the subject, is their object in supporting his amendment and in killing this Bill—that they hope it will place their leader in power, who will give them a stronger Bill and restore separate schools in Manitoba as they were prior to 1890. This is what they expect will be the result if the amendment for the six months' hoist is carried. In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, it is merely a trap to try and catch those hon. members who are opposed to separate schools. Why did not the leader of the Opposition move his commission resolution, the resolution he has talked about from one end of the country to the other, the idea he has conveyed in every speech made throughout the Dominion, that when the House met he would move for a commission to settle this question. Why did he not move that resolution, Mr. Speaker? He found out that many hon. members who were opposed to separate schools would not vote for a commission, because the idea of a commission was to bring about the restoration of the separate schools in Manitoba as they existed prior to 1890. Why did not the hon. gentleman allow the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) to move his amendment, which would not only give the Bill the six months' hoist, but would commit this House never to deal with the question again? Because he found that if the hon. member for Simcoe moved that amendment, he (Mr. Laurier) could not get his followers from Quebec to support it. The idea which prevailed was that if it was moved by any one except himself it would not carry, but if he moved the six months' hoist his supporters would all say, we supported it with one object in view, to defeat the Government and put the leader of the Opposition in power for the purpose of obtaining a stronger and better Bill. If the leader of the Opposition wants to settle the question for all time to come, and remove it from this House, not to remain as a question, as the hon. gentleman has often said, out of which political capital could be made, then let him withdraw his amendment and substitute one reading like this: That this House is of the opinion that this Bill or any other Bill dealing with this question be not read now or six months hence or at any future time, but that the question be left to the province of Manitoba to deal with it as it may deem best. Let the hon. gentleman move such an amendment, and he will satisfy the House that if the question is not settled now, we at all events will not deal with it, and it will be left to the province of Manitoba. If the leader of the Opposition

moved an amendment like that, he might reasonably expect the support of hon. members in this House who are opposed to the re-establishment of separate schools as they were prior to 1890. But the hon. gentleman cannot expect that hon. members entertaining such opinions will support a motion for the six months' hoist preceded by a speech to the effect that the grievances in Manitoba must be removed, and that the claim of the minority that separate schools be established must be conceded and attended to. This being the case I cannot support the amendment. I cannot do so in view of the statement made by the leader of the Opposition and repeated by his followers that the only object they have in view is to defeat the present Bill with the hope of being able to pass a stronger Bill. Last session I addressed a few words to this House when this subject was before it, and in my speech I made the following statement:—

Ever since I was 18 years of age I have been an Orangeman, and I am now representing perhaps the strongest Orange constituency in the province of Ontario, containing more Orangemen, more Protestants, than many, if not any other constituency in the province of Ontario; and for these reasons I think it but right that I should say a few words on this question. Orangemen are not constitution wreckers. Orangemen, if true to themselves, if true to their obligations, must uphold the constitution of our country. It is true we have some men in this country, and I am sorry to say we have them in this House, who pretend to be more Orange than King William ever was; and, although they have never joined an Orange lodge in their lives, yet they would willingly wreck the constitution and wreck the country, if they could, to make some party capital out of it. Orangemen are not made of that kind of material.

The remarks I made then I repeat to-day. This, in my opinion, is the germ of our constitution. The decisions of the Privy Council form part and parcel of our constitution, and the decision given by the Privy Council in this case says: There is a grievance, and it is the duty of this Parliament to remedy that grievance; and, Sir, the minority of Manitoba, having acted upon the decision of the Privy Council, and having knocked at the door of this Parliament for relief, is it the right of this Parliament to say: We do not recognize treating this question respectfully, and discussing it on its merits, but we will take every opportunity to drive it out of Parliament. Sir, at the same time, I made that speech last year, I also made these observations:

But there are times in the history of every man when he should rise above party feeling in the interest of his country, and when he should take, not only his political life, but, if necessary, his physical life, in his hands, for the salvation of his country and the maintenance of the constitution.

These words I again repeat to-day, because if there ever was a time when, in my opinion, they were applicable, that time is now.

We are dealing with the most serious question that has ever engaged the attention of this Parliament, or of any other Parliament in this country. It goes, as I have said, to the very root of our constitution, which it is our duty to uphold and obey. In the speech that I made in the House last year, I quoted from the speech that I delivered when this question first loomed up, some four or five years ago. Addressing my constituents then, I made this statement:

Now, when Parliament meets, I expect that some French member will move a resolution similar in every respect to that moved by Colonel O'Brien on the Jesuit question, to the effect that the Government ought to have disallowed the Act. It would, however, defeat the Government and cause it to resign, as it would be a vote of censure. How will my friends who found fault with me for voting as I did on the Jesuit question, wish me to vote on this? If they are consistent, they will have to find fault with me again, for I intend to vote on this question in just the same way as I did on the other, seeing that, so far as our House is concerned, they are exactly parallel questions. I will again vote and say that the Government did right in not disallowing the Act. I intend to be consistent, whether those who find fault with me are so or not, but I do not blame any one for finding fault, as many were misinformed and did not understand the question.

It is said by some and believed by many that the Government will introduce legislation to override the provincial Act and to grant separate schools to Manitoba. I do not know what the Government may do or intend to do, but I do know the course that I, as your representative, intend to pursue. As a supporter of the Government and as my duty demanded, I notified my leaders over two months ago that, if they introduced any legislation to interfere with or override that of the province of Manitoba, I feel it to be my duty to vote against them. I now tell you, the members of this association, that this is the course I have marked out for myself, and, if I am not, on this question, in accord with the majority of my party, I will feel it to be my duty to tender you my resignation, as I claim that the provinces alone have the right to settle these local questions. If the Jesuits' Estates Act is to be repealed, it must be by an Act of the local legislature of Quebec, and if separate schools are to be recognized by the government of Manitoba, it must be by an Act of the legislature of the province. But the same law must apply to all provinces, that each shall have the power to deal untrammelled with its own local questions, a power to which they all have a right by virtue of the constitution granted under the British North America Act.

That was a speech that I made four or five years ago, when this question first loomed up. Last year, when I read this to the House, I made the following remarks:—

That was a speech that I made two years ago, and before the last decision of the Privy Council was rendered, and on which decision the remedial order now under discussion was based. The decisions of the Imperial Privy Council are part and parcel of our constitution in this country, and since I made that speech to my constituents the Privy Council have rendered their judgment. They have said by that judgment that grievances exist in Manitoba, and that by the

Act of 1890 the Manitoba government have perpetrated an injustice on the minority in that province. That decision of the Privy Council was signed by Her Majesty the Queen and was sent to our Government, and in turn it was the duty of the Governor General in Canada and his advisers to pass that remedial order on to the Manitoba government. That was the constitutional way of doing it.

That is what I stated last year, and that is what I state to-day. That decision of the Queen's Privy Council says that the Manitoba government, by its legislation in 1890, overstepped its legislative authority, and perpetrated a grievance upon the minority in that province.

Mr. FORBES. No.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Yes.

Mr. TAYLOR. That is in effect what the Privy Council said, and it said further, that the minority in Manitoba have the right to appeal. Well, Sir, they did appeal to the Governor General in Council, and the Governor General in Council has given a decision. As they had a right to do, they have asked the legislature of Manitoba to remedy the grievance. The sending of that order from this Government has unlocked the door of this Parliament, and enabled it to act, and if the government of Manitoba failed to remedy the grievance, then the minority have the right to come to this Parliament, the high inquest of the nation, to appeal to them to settle this question, as, in its wisdom, it may deem best to settle it. The question before us now is: Are we going to give this Bill the six months' hoist, and say: We will not deal with the question now, but we will throw it back, and make a little more capital out of it at the next elections.

Mr. WALLACE. Would the hon. gentleman read the circular letter he sent to his constituents a short time back?

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) asks me if I will read the circular letter I sent to my constituents a short time back. I never sent a circular letter to my constituents at any time. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) has been so informed, the only letter he can refer to is that, when my hon. friend from Wentworth (Mr. Bain) called a meeting in my constituency to discuss a question there, and called it where he thought he would be surrounded by three or four Grits to one Tory, I addressed a circular letter—and the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) may refer to that, because it is the only one I ever sent—I addressed a circular letter to a few of my friends, saying that my friend (Mr. Bain) had invited me there, and I wanted two or three of my friends in that Grit hive to give me a cheer occasionally. That is the only circular letter. If my hon. friend (Mr. Wallace) refers to circular letters, I have one in my desk here, which he sent to one of my constituents—

Mr. WALLACE. Many a one I sent.

Mr. TAYLOR.

Mr. TAYLOR. I know that you have; but don't charge me with having sent any, when I have not sent them.

Mr. WALLACE. I was misinformed. If the hon. gentleman has any of mine, I will not repudiate them.

Mr. TAYLOR. This remedial order was sent on by this Government to the Lieutenant-Governor of Manitoba, to be laid before his advisers and the legislature, with a request that they should remedy the grievance. That remedial order asked that the legislature of Manitoba should amend their law, in accordance with the decision of the Queen's Privy Council. Shortly after this was done, the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin), who was the father of this Act of 1890, passed by the legislature of Manitoba, wrote a letter to the press, in which the following passage occurs:—

When I introduced the School Bill of 1890, I pointed out that in so far as it provided for religious exercises in the schools, it was in my opinion defective. I am one of those who deny the right of the state to interfere in any way with matters of religion. I said then, and I still think that the clause of the 1890 Act, which provides for certain religious exercises, is most unjust to Roman Catholics. If the state is to recognize religion in its school legislation, such a recognition as is acceptable to Protestants only, and in fact only to a majority, of Protestants, is, to my mind, rank tyranny. The desire of those with whom I think in this matter is to eliminate every question of a religious nature from the school laws and to make the school laws purely secular. This has not been done in Manitoba, and that course is apparently not supported by a majority of the people there. That being so, surely it will be admitted that the nature of the religious exercises or religious teaching (I am unable to make any clear distinction between the two) should be such as is agreeable to the consciences of those whose money is taken to support the schools. I have sufficient faith in the liberality of the Manitoba people to declare on their behalf that if a final settlement of this question can be reached upon the lines suggested by Col. Oulmet, they will do their part. What Manitoba has insisted upon is that the Roman Catholics shall not have a system of separate schools such as existed prior to 1890, which were exempt from the general laws as to efficiency. If the Roman Catholics are willing to accept the schools as they exist at present and as they may from time to time be modified with the addition of such religious teaching as they may desire, then there should be and I am sure would be no difficulty in reaching a settlement of the whole question without any legislation on the part of the Dominion Parliament.

Yours truly,
JOSEPH MARTIN.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what has this Government done since to try to induce the legislature of Manitoba to obey the constitution and remedy the grievance? They admit, as the hon. member for Winnipeg admits, that there is a grievance; yet, in order to make political capital for the leader of the Opposition, they refused to remedy that grievance. True, the constitution forces this

question into this House to be dealt with and the Government have done what they believed to be their duty; they have introduced a Bill, but not to restore the schools as they were previous to 1890—a Bill which the hon. leader of the Opposition and his colleagues, from his own province say is no good. The Government have introduced a Bill which, in their opinion, meets the requirements of the decision of the Privy Council. If the object of this Bill was to restore separate schools as they existed prior to 1890, I would give it as strong opposition as any other member of this House.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What is the distinction between the schools as established—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. TAYLOR. What is the distinction between the schools as established prior to 1890, and as provided by this Bill? There is this difference: They are to be under the control of the Government, so far as qualified teachers and inspection go. But the Bill, even as it is, does not meet my view, and when we get into committee, I will have something more to say as to that, by moving an amendment; but I do not expect that my hon. friend opposite will support it.

Mr. FORBES. What is it?

Mr. TAYLOR. I told my hon. friend a few moments ago what my view was—that we should have one school without any religion in it that would be offensive to the conscience of any person's child, and that will contain what the hon. member for Winnipeg says their schools do contain—rank tyranny, so far as the Roman Catholics of Manitoba are concerned. After quoting the letter written by the hon. member for Winnipeg last year, I made the following remarks:—

If I can understand the English language, and if my hon. friend from Winnipeg speaks, as he professes to speak, for the legislature and the people of that province, then there will be no difficulty in the government of Manitoba adjusting the difficulties that are claimed to exist in that country. I may just say for myself that had the government done as it had been rumoured two years ago they would do—had they introduced an Act to override the Act of the Manitoba legislature, I would then, as I notified them, have voted against them. Had they introduced it at the session a year ago, I would have done the same; the decision of the Privy Council had not then been rendered. Had they introduced it this session, I would have voted against them. And, in pursuance of my duty as whip, I found that if the Government introduced legislation this session to override Manitoba, and if enough Government supporters voted against them, it was the intention of all the Liberal members of this House, whether Protestant or Catholic, to down the Government for it.

Last year, shortly before the session met, the remedial order had been sent to Manitoba. The Remedial Bill would then have been called coercion; but the Government

said: We will not introduce it this session, but we will call a special session to deal with the subject. Then they issued an Order in Council and sent it up to the government of Manitoba, asking that government to deal with the question. The conclusion of that Order in Council, which was sent to Manitoba in July last, read as follows:—

The sub-committee have, therefore, the honour to recommend that Your Excellency will be pleased to cause communication to be had through the Lieutenant-Governor of Manitoba with the government of that province, in order to ascertain upon what lines the local authorities of Manitoba will be prepared to promote amendments to the Acts respecting education in schools in that province, and whether any arrangement is possible with the Manitoba government, which will render action by the Federal Parliament, in this connection, unnecessary.

The legislature of Manitoba is now in session, and have they done anything towards meeting that reasonable request of the Dominion Government? They have not; and yet our friends talk about this measure as being coercion now, after the Government here had sent the respectful request which I have read, to the Manitoba government to regulate their own affairs, to amend their own law to comply with the decision of the Privy Council, and not oblige this Parliament to deal with the question. They paid no attention to that communication. They thought they could make some political capital for our friends on the other side of the House by letting the House meet and letting this Bill be introduced; and if the Government should be beaten on the motion for the six months' hoist, the friends of Mr. Greenway in this House might get into power. I went on to state in my speech delivered last session, that, in my opinion:

Every possible effort should be made by this Government to have the matter adjusted amicably, on the lines of the letter of the hon. member for Winnipeg, by the local legislature, which, by the constitution of this country, has exclusive jurisdiction to deal with such matters. Like the hon. member for Winnipeg, I have faith in the people of Manitoba. I believe the people of Manitoba and the government of Manitoba will obey the remedial order, and the decision of the Queen's Privy Council, which is part and parcel of our constitution. I have no reason to doubt that they will not obey that order, for the word sent down here by the Manitoba legislature was to the effect that they were willing to try and adjust the matter. The hon. member for Winnipeg says his letter has a different meaning from what I take from it, and from what the people of this country will take from it. But you may take the same meaning from the answer of the Manitoba legislature to the remedial order. If I can read and understand the English language, it says: We are willing to negotiate further. Then I say it is the duty of this Government to meet them on that ground. Had the Government introduced and tried to pass legislation at this session, I believe they would have been acting wrongly and contrary to the true meaning of the constitution; but they have delayed the matter to another session, in order to try to adjust it, as I believe they will; because I believe and

accept the statement of the hon. member for Winnipeg that the people of that province are just as loyal and true, and as ready to uphold the constitution of this country, as any other community under the sun.

That is the statement I made last year, and, after the House had closed, the Order in Council, a portion of which I have read, was sent to the Manitoba government, and six months have since elapsed. Have the Manitoba government tried to adjust the matter in any way satisfactorily to the minority or to meet the requirements of the decision of the Privy Council? No; and yet we are asked to give another delay of six months, not for the purpose of removing the Bill from this Parliament for all time, but to turn out the Government and to give the Opposition a chance to pass a Bill strong enough to meet the wishes of those who want the schools restored as they were previous to 1890. As I have stated before, I do not see how I or any other hon. gentleman, entertaining the views I hold, could do otherwise than vote against the amendment of the hon. leader of the Opposition, and vote for the second reading of this Bill, in order that it may be discussed by the House in committee and there remodelled to suit my views, if I can get it remodelled in that way, or, if not, to suit the views of the majority in this House, who are willing, as I trust they are, to obey the constitution of this country and try to remove the grievance, in accordance with the judgment of the Privy Council. Then, so that there might not be any excuse for charging that we are, in any way, attempting to coerce Manitoba, the House might add the clause in committee which I have suggested, providing that the Act shall come into force after a certain delay, say, three or six months, if necessary, so that Manitoba may have ample opportunity of legislating in the matter, and not lose for all time the power of legislating on the separate school question. We shall thus give the legislature of Manitoba the right to do what it ought to do, and, as I trust, it even yet will do, namely, so legislate as to remedy the grievance complained of and obey the command of the Queen's Privy Council, by removing a grievance declared by the hon. member for Winnipeg, in the speech which he delivered but a few days ago, when he read the letter that I have just quoted, to be a grievance amounting to rank tyranny.

I have had placed in my hand some affidavits, which I shall not take up the time of the House with reading now, to show that, although the Act of 1890 removed separate schools in Manitoba, that Act is not enforced. I have had placed in my hands some six or seven affidavits from residents in that country. One is from a gentleman who has been teaching schools out there since 1871, and here is a portion of it:

Late in the fall of 1894, Mr. Young, Government inspector, called at my place of residence

Mr. TAYLOR.

in the parish of St. Laurent, and entered into conversation with me regarding the schools in general and the French schools in particular. In the course of the conversation, he spoke to this effect:

I have been visiting several French schools along the Red River, out at St. Anne's and other places. We are not hard on them.

Mind you, Mr. Speaker, this is the government inspector of schools in Manitoba, acting under the Act of 1890, who speaks thus:

We are not hard on them. They use the books they like. They conduct the schools as formerly. They receive the government grant, and we do not interfere with them.

Thus you will see, that, although Mr. Greenway, by his Act of 1890, and his speeches, has wiped the whole thing out, yet none the less he allows the inspector to go round and pay the government money to schools which are following the old system. While the Roman Catholics in that country are getting from Mr. Greenway what pittance he likes to give them. Their constitutional right has been taken away from them, according to the decision of the court, but these affidavits show Mr. Greenway's duplicity. He has wiped out the schools by law, but he still allows them to continue and pays them the government money all the same. This is the way my hon. friend from Winnipeg thinks the grievance probably has been adjusted.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. member for Halifax says that is all they want.

Mr. CAMERON. They want it legally, as the constitution says they are entitled to it.

Mr. KENNY. I did not say that was what Manitoba wants.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) You said that Nova Scotia gave you that, and you are satisfied.

Mr. TAYLOR. As I have said, all parties appear to agree, that this Parliament has the right to deal with this question. All parties appear to agree, that the minority in Manitoba have a constitutional grievance, inflicted on them by the Act of 1890, but all do not agree as to the course to be taken to remove the grievance, except that it is the duty of the government of Manitoba to remove it, if they will do so. But they have been requested, not only by the Order in Council, but by other communications—there have been three requests made by this Government to the Manitoba government to adjust the grievance, and without avail. And the question now is, what is the duty of this Parliament? Is it the duty of this Parliament to throw out the Bill submitted to it on a motion for the six months' hoist? Is it our duty to say, that because we are opposed to separate schools, we will do nothing? I regret to find, that some Conservatives are so prejudiced, or so bigoted, that they will vote against anything or everything, and even go so far as to support the

amendment of the leader of the Opposition, which has only one object in view, and that is to defeat this Government and leave the question unsettled. I am, thank God, no bigot. I believe in equal rights in the broadest and fullest sense of the term. I believe in living within the lines of the constitution, which I, as an Orangeman, am bound to uphold. Therefore, in my opinion, the constitution will be fully obeyed, if this Bill is read the second time and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, where it will be so amended as to meet my view or the view of the majority of this Parliament. This House has the right to settle the question for ever, provided, in the meantime, the government of Manitoba do not settle it, as they ought to do, by complying with the decision of the Queen's Privy Council, and amending the public school law so as to remove the grievance which the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin) has declared to be rank tyranny. This, in my opinion, is what this Parliament ought to do, and what every loyal man in this country, I do not care to which party he belongs, ought to try to do, and so settle the question in accordance with the action of the Privy Council.

Mr. GRANDBOIS. (Translation.) The members of the House will, no doubt, be pleased to hear that at this late hour, it is not my intention to deal at great length with the question now before the House. I wish, however, to express my opinion on this question and state the reasons which, in my judgment, justify the vote I intend to give. I might say at once that I do not approve of the proposition of the leader of the Opposition for the six months' hoist and that I will give my whole support to the measure now before us. This I will do because I think the Bill is constitutional, operative and just. The Catholic minority were granted the right to their separate schools by a statute passed in 1871. We shall see, later on, what were the privileges. Amendments were made, from year to year, to the Separate School Act and in 1881, the Act of 1871 was repealed and all the school laws consolidated. But, in 1890, the Greenway government introduced and caused to be passed a law abolishing separate schools, and establishing public schools. Under the statute, the public schools were unsectarian or neutral, but, as proved by Archbishop Taché and admitted in the House by the author of the Act, the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin), the public schools were in fact Protestant schools. The Roman Catholics at once sounded an alarm. They protested and appealed to the courts to have the Act declared unconstitutional. After undergoing various successes and defeats, they finally lost their suit before the Privy Council and the Act of 1890 was held to be *intra vires*. Beaten on this ground, but strong in the consciousness of their right and not at

all discouraged, the Catholic minority then appealed to the Government of Canada. Petitions very numerous signed were presented, containing a statement of the grievances of the minority. It is proper to say, at this moment, that as soon as 1890, one of the most prominent men in this House, the Hon. Mr. Blake, had moved a motion, the object of which was to facilitate the settlement of these appeal questions in connection with education. I have not here the French version of this motion. I have only the English one. This motion, agreed to on April 29th, 1890, reads as follows:—

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

The motion of the Hon. Mr. Blake was agreed to without a dissenting voice and, in the following year, the Right Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald, in accordance with the Blake proposition had an Act passed "(to amend the Act concerning reference to the Supreme Court." Thus the whole course to be followed by the Government was laid out to them. The claim of the minority had reference to the cases provided for and the question was referred to the Supreme Court in the first instance, and then to the Privy Council, whether the Government ought to hear the appeal. The following questions were submitted to the courts:—

(1) Is the appeal referred to in the said memorials and petitions, and asserted thereby, such an appeal as is admissible by subsection 3 of section 93 of the British North America Act, 1867, or by subsection 2 of section 22 of the Manitoba Act, 33 Victoria (1870), Chap. 3, Canada?

(2) Are the grounds set forth in the petitions and memorials such as may be the subject of appeal under the authority of the subsections above referred to, or either of them?

(3) Does the decision of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in the cases of *Barrett vs. The City of Winnipeg*, and *Logan vs. The City of Winnipeg*, dispose of or conclude the application for redress based on the contention that the rights of the Roman Catholic minority, which accrued to them after the union under the statutes of the province, have been interfered with by the two statutes of 1890, complained of in the said petitions and memorials?

(4) Does subsection 3 of section 93 of the British North America Act, 1867, apply to Manitoba?

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

(6) Did the Acts of Manitoba relating to education, passed prior to the session of 1890, confer on or continue to the minority a "right or privi-

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

The Lords of the Privy Council answered as follows to each of these questions:—

(1) In answer to the first question:—That the appeal referred to in the said memorials and petitions, and asserted thereby is such an appeal as is admissible under subsection 2 of section 22 of the Manitoba Act, 33 Vic. (1870), Chap. 3, Canada.

(2) In answer to the second question:—That grounds are set forth in the petitions and memorials, such as may be the subject of appeal under the authority of the subsection of the Manitoba Act immediately above referred to.

(3) In answer to the third question:—That the decision of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in the cases of *Barrett vs. The City of Winnipeg*, and *Logan vs. The City of Winnipeg* does not dispose of, or conclude the application for redress based on the contention that the rights of the Roman Catholic minority, which accrued to them after the union under the statutes of the province, have been interfered with by the two statutes of 1890 complained of in the said petitions and memorials.

(4) In answer to the fourth question:—That subsection 3 of section 93 of the British North America Act, 1867, does not apply to Manitoba.

(5) In answer to the fifth question:—That the Governor General in Council has jurisdiction and the appeal is well founded, but that the particular course to be pursued must be determined by the authorities to whom it has been committed by the statute; that the general character of the steps to be taken is sufficiently defined by subsection 3 of section 22 of the Manitoba Act, 1870.

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

The Privy Council therefore held that there was a grievance, that there lay an appeal, and, in conclusion, their Lordships added:

For the reasons which have been given, their lordships are of opinion that the 2nd subsection of section 22 of the Manitoba Act is the governing enactment, and that the appeal to the Governor General in Council was admissible by virtue of that enactment on the grounds set forth in the memorials and petitions, inasmuch as the Acts of 1890 affected rights or privileges of the Roman Catholic minority in relation to education within the meaning of that subsection.

The further question is submitted whether the Governor General in Council has power to make the declarations or remedial orders asked for in the memorials or petitions, or has any other jurisdiction in the premises.

Mr. GRANDBOIS.

Their lordships have decided that the Governor General in Council has jurisdiction, and that the appeal is well founded.

Supported by this judgment of the highest court of the Empire, the Government of Canada heard the appeal of the Catholic minority. After an elaborate argument by the counsel for the Catholic minority and the counsel for the Greenway government, judgment was rendered for the Catholic minority in the way of a Remedial Order in Council of which the following are the conclusions:—

His Excellency the Governor General in Council was pleased to order and adjudge, and it is hereby ordered and adjudged, that the said appeal be, and the same is hereby allowed, in so far as it relates to rights acquired by the said Roman Catholic minority under legislation of the province of Manitoba, passed subsequent to the union of that province with the Dominion of Canada, and His Excellency the Governor General in Council was pleased to adjudge and declare, and it is hereby adjudged and declared that by the two acts passed by the legislature of the province of Manitoba, on the first day of May, 1890, intitled respectively "An Act respecting the Department of Education," and "An Act respecting Public Schools," the rights and privileges of the Roman Catholic minority of the said province, in relation to education, prior to the 1st day of May, 1890, have been affected by depriving the Roman Catholic minority of the following rights and privileges, which, previous to and until the 1st day of May, 1890, such minority had, viz.:—

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

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

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

And His Excellency the Governor General in Council was further pleased to declare and decide, and it is hereby declared that it seems requisite that the system of education embodied in the two Acts of 1890 aforesaid, shall be supplemented by a provincial Act or Acts which will restore to the Roman Catholic minority the said rights and privileges of which such minority has been so deprived as aforesaid, and which will modify the said Acts of 1890, so far and so far only as may be necessary to give effect to the provisions restoring the rights and privileges in paragraphs (a), (b), (c), hereinbefore mentioned.

The remedial order was based upon section 22 of the Manitoba Act. It is this section 22 that gives jurisdiction to the Federal Parliament, and limits its powers as well as defines its duties. In the whole course of these proceedings the Government never gave up their moderation and wisdom and they always held to the law and constitution. From the beginning to the end, they always show a spirit of conciliation. I say that in answer to the charges made against the Government by the hon. gentlemen opposite. The Cabinet used the greatest mod-

eration, and to prove it, I point out to the attention of the hon. gentlemen the fact that, several months previous to the passing of the remedial order of March, 1895, the Government of Canada had sent the authorities in Manitoba an Order in Council or memorial relating to the complaints of the Catholic minority in the province of Manitoba, accompanied by the request that they should be pleased to remedy the grievances of the Catholics. That Order in Council was under date July 26th, 1894. I have not the French revision and therefore I am obliged to read the English text. I will not read the whole Order in Council, but only the last paragraph, which I find in a series of letters published in connection with the school question by Mr. James Fisher, M.L.L.:

I refer to an Order in Council, passed at Ottawa, on the 26th of July, 1894, which recited the memorial presented to the Government of the Dominion on behalf of the Roman Catholic minority of Manitoba, complaining of the law of 1890, and praying for relief. That Order in Council set out with considerable fulness the grievances complained of by the minority, and it was communicated along with a copy of the memorial itself, by the authorities at Ottawa, to those of Manitoba. From the concluding paragraph of that order I take the following extract:—

"The statements contained in this memorial are matters of the deepest concern and solicitude in the interests of the Dominion at large, and it is a matter of the utmost importance to the people of Canada that the laws which prevail in any portion of the Dominion should not be such as to occasion complaint of oppression or injustice to any class or portion of the people, but should be recognized as establishing perfect freedom and equality, especially in all matters relating to religion and to religious belief and practice, and the committee therefore humbly advise that Your Excellency may join with them in expressing the most earnest hope that the legislature of Manitoba may take into consideration at the earliest possible moment, the complaints which are set forth in this petition and which are said to create dissatisfaction among the Roman Catholics, not only in Manitoba, but likewise throughout Canada, and may take speedy measures to give redress in all the matters in relation to which any well-founded complaint or grievance be ascertained to exist."

That Order in Council was rather an entreaty. It was not drafted in any harsh language. The Government of Canada sent to Manitoba government a memorial of grievances of the minority in Manitoba. They pointed out these grievances to their attention; they expressed the hope that the Manitoba government would take the matter under their consideration, and they requested the latter government to communicate the Order in Council to the legislature. Now, the Greenway government never did, that I know of, communicate this order to the legislature. They were satisfied with keeping up their work of persecution and with contending that the minority were not in-

jured. I find the following words in their reply to the Federal Government:—

The formal reply therefore was, that the executive of the province see no reason for recommending the legislation to alter the principle of the legislation complained of.

And further on:

It is clear that there was no grievance. The complaints of the minority are groundless, and we will make no alteration in the law.

I make those few quotations in answer to the charge that the Federal Government were wanting in conciliation. Well, as I already stated, this quiet conciliating memorial was sent to the Manitoba government long before the opening of the first remedial order. There is the first reason why I say that the Government of Canada were never wanting in moderation and wisdom. A second reason is that during last summer in the course of the session, when there was talk of passing the Bill now before us, the Government of Canada, in order to defer to the wishes of a good many members, in order not to be charged with having taken Manitoba by the throat consented to the granting of a postponement of six months. Therefore, instead of introducing the Remedial Bill, they then announced that there would be another session in 1896, in order to settle the question if, in the meantime, the Manitoba government had not settled it. What has happened? Nothing whatever was done. The Manitoba government persisted in their course. Mr. Greenway instead of doing something for the relief of the Catholic minority, dissolved the legislature. By appealing to prejudices, it was an easy matter for him to obtain the result which we all know. Well, when comparing the course of the Federal Government with that of the Manitoba government, I may ask: Where do conciliation and moderation stand? Now, what do we find? We find the Federal Government stating that they are ever ready, should the Manitoba government be willing to it, to have a conference so that they may be able to settle the school question themselves, for it is admitted on all sides that it would be better should the Manitoba government settle the question themselves. There are no two opinions as to that, but should they not settle it, the Government here are willing to do it with the assistance of this House. Before considering whether the Bill would be practical, I wish to try and reply to a few objections raised by its opponents. Many gentlemen opposite, if not all, blame the Government for not having opposed their veto to the Act of 1890 or disallowed it. This objection is very easily answered. In the first place, the Catholic minority were themselves adverse to a veto; if they suggested it at the outset, they soon renounced it, and to apply it would have been going against their interests. The minority

themselves chose the ground upon which they wanted to stand during the contest; they wanted first a recourse to the courts, to have the Act declared unconstitutional, which would have settled the matter for ever according to their contentions; having failed in this, they used the appeal to the federal executive which was allowed them by their own constitution. Would the disallowance have had any result? None whatever, for the Manitoba government would have had the Act passed anew. The ever-recurring conflict necessarily following from this could only aggravate the position of the Catholics. It is plain the Act might have been disallowed, but it would have been doing an injustice to the majority in Manitoba who, as is well known, would rather have a system of public schools than separate schools. Had the veto been applied to the Act of 1890, the majority could have complained of coercion; they could have said that we wished to deprive them of such schools as were convenient to them. And now, in the face of what has happened since, who does not plainly see how wise it was not to have recourse to disallowance, but to have obtained for the benefit of the cause of the Catholic minority the favourable judgment of the highest court in the Empire, one which is deemed to be always respected throughout the breadth and length of the Empire? If, with that judgment, it is difficult to get justice, how much more difficult would it have been without the judgment of the Privy Council? They also talk about an investigation and they blame the Government for not allowing one to be made. But, Sir, could there be any fairer or fuller investigation than that made before the courts these last five or six years? What new facts could they disclose? The investigation proposed would have been made, of course, by a committee. Had its decision been in favour of Mr. Greenway, its report would have been accepted, and the rights of the minority would have been over. But had it decided against him, who will believe that he would have submitted more readily than he submitted to the judgment of the Privy Council? We have heard, during the session, the hon. member for L'Islet propose an investigation, in a speech rather astonishing at the time it was delivered, and still more astonishing by the statements it contained, in order to know whether the public schools in Manitoba were actually Protestant schools. Assuming that they would have shown these schools to be neutral schools, the position of the minority would not have been bettered, for we know the attending of neutral schools to be repugnant to a Catholic conscience. The hon. leader of the Opposition seconded the proposition of the member for L'Islet. The hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Costigan) has triumphantly refuted the proposition of the hon. member for L'Islet. The hon. leader of the Opposition, seeing in what a false position

Mr. GRANDBOIS.

his friend was involved, came to his rescue. He endeavoured to explain the proposition of the hon. member for L'Islet, who had asked for a committee of the House, and that Archbishop Langevin and Mr. Greenway be summoned to Ottawa. The hon. leader of the Opposition stated that, personally, he was not wedded to a commission of inquiry, and that he would accept as well a Royal Commission. It is but too evident that there was nothing serious in those suggestions. The hon. leader of the Opposition, in moving that the Bill be not read the second time but this day six months, has displayed before the House and the country a sad lack of consistency; he has shown that it was not the inquiry he was aiming at, but at reaching power. As to the hon. member for L'Islet, he had himself given, four years ago, in the "Canadien," the best reply to his proposal of inquiry. In 1892, the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. Larivière) having suggested the expediency of having the whole matter investigated, the hon. member for L'Islet wrote in the "Canadien" of the 2nd November of the same year, that the fact of asking for an inquiry was only a miserable make-shift. Would not the fact of asking for an inquiry be equivalent to inviting the minority, who have won their case, to waive their claim to redress and begin all over again? What would a litigant say, under similar circumstances, if he were invited to waive his claim confirmed by a judgment of the tribunal, and to consider it as null and void, and if he were told: Let us hear again the evidence and begin all over the trial. He would simply laugh at you in your face. I understand that an investigation, at this late stage of the debate, would result in making us lose time and jeopardizing the chances of a Remedial Bill. And I believe that would be playing the game of the hon. gentlemen opposite who want to prevent the Remedial Bill from being carried. The law, however, is operative. It in no way affects the public schools, which have been established under the Act of 1890; it only restores the separate schools. The machinery of that law is based upon the laws of 1871 and 1881 and upon the Bill drafted by Mr. Ewart. That law will restore to the Catholic minority their separate schools, with a Board of Public Instruction composed of nine Catholic members. Those schools will share proportionately in the legislative grants; the minority shall be exempted from paying any taxes for the support of Protestant schools; they will have the right of taxing themselves for their own schools. Therefore the law is quite operative in that it revives the separate school law, in vigour previous to 1890. The hon. member for Vercherès, one of the luminaries of the bar of the province of Quebec, it appears, was forced to speak out on the question and to declare against the law. The hon. member has stated that, during the electoral contest in his constituency, he publicly declared

that he was in favour of a remedial law. He told us the other day that the Bill now before the House was not worth the parchment it was written on; he graphically described it with one single word, 'nihil.' A strange subterfuge, forsooth, for a member to resort to, in order to break his pledged word. The hon. member for Kamouraska (Mr. Carroll), in the course of an eloquent address, summed up the grounds upon which he rests his opposition to the Bill, and said that not a single principle was involved in it. But I hold that there is one principle involved, that of the separate schools; and I see in it the guarantee for the Catholics that they will have their own schools and that they will no longer be forced either to attend Protestant schools or to pay twice for the instruction of their children. The Bill is on the lines of the remedial order, which has been passed in order to give effect to the Privy Council judgment. Now, what is the opinion of those who are directly interested in having a good law enacted? What is the opinion of the representatives of the Catholic minority in Manitoba? Mr. Prendergast gave expression to his views before the Manitoba legislature as to the merits of the Remedial Bill. He said:

The Remedial Bill, he said, is apparently clumsy, but it could hardly be otherwise, considering that, in the drafting of it, great care had to be exercised not to give the minority any advantage which they did not previously enjoy. This Bill recognizes the principle which we have been fighting for these six years past. Our right to share in the legislative grants is also sanctioned by this Bill. I am not ready to challenge the power of the Federal Government to grant us a share in the provincial grant. If I were a member of the House of Commons, I would support the Bill. If I were in the House of Commons, I would insist upon the Catholic schools receiving a share of the money to the credit of the land grant. Should the Manitoba government refuse to grant us a share in the legislative grant for school purposes, I say that the Parliament of Canada would act justly in amending the Dominion Land's Act so as to enable it to grant us our shares out of the proceeds of the sale of the school lands. I think the Catholic school might get along if necessary without the government grant; but, from whatever source it may come, we will require money for organizing our school board.

Mr. Theophile Paré and Mr. Roger Marion, members of the legislative assembly, also gave expression to their views in the columns of the "Manitoba," as follows:—

Mr. Prendergast has rightly interpreted the views of the minority with reference to the legislation which now occupies the attention of the Federal Parliament. In doing so, he is not liable to be suspected of partiality towards the Federal Government. As stated by him in his address, Mr. Prendergast is a Reformer, one of Mr. Laurier's followers, and not one of Sir Mackenzie Bowell's followers.

The reports of the proceedings in our local House, on the 26th February last, as published in the Winnipeg papers, have already made known the attitude taken by Mr. Prendergast. In

calling attention to that portion of Mr. Prendergast's address in the House, we wish to emphasize the fact that the Catholic members of the Manitoba legislature hold the same views as those expressed by Mr. Prendergast on the school question and particularly on the Remedial Bill.

On the other hand, the "Manitoba," of the 4th March, 1896, said:

We have no hesitation in declaring that the Remedial Bill embodies in substance all the principles essential to the good working of our schools. We have the right to hope that all the members of the House, who have any concern for their duty, will support the measure by their vote. Being given the limits of federal jurisdiction a careful perusal of the enactments of the Bill shows that it secures to the Manitoba Catholics as complete and independent an organization as possible, and that it effectively protects them from the ill-will of the provincial government. We are fully aware of all the difficulties that the course of the Ministry was beset with, in the framing of this law. There was no question of framing at one cast a Bill, which might give satisfaction to the Catholic minority. Allowance had also to be made for the Manitoba educational laws passed previous to 1890. We could neither claim any more rights than we enjoyed at the time nor escape the control exercised at that time by the local government. So, for instance, we were obliged to leave in the hands of the Manitoba executive the appointment of the members of the school board and of the superintendent, a right which had always been exercised by the Government. The fact of taking away that right from the local government would have stamped the Remedial Bill with invalidity and jeopardized the measure.

As will be seen from the above, the law is operative, and is approved of by the representatives of the Manitoba Catholic minority, who are the most directly interested in it. That is the reason why we should not hesitate in this House to give the Bill our support, as it restores to Catholics their separate schools, while Protestants keep their own schools. The Catholic minority in Manitoba turn their eyes towards the representatives of the great and generous province of Quebec. Shall our Catholic brethren in Manitoba be denied the right that we so willingly grant to Protestants in our province, the right to their separate schools? Most certainly not. I hold that the Remedial Bill is fair and just, because it is based upon the federal compact, upon natural law, and in harmony with the principle of freedom of conscience, and, last, because it tends to foster sentiments of loyalty and of devotion to the crown. All the hon. members know that the Red River troubles of 1869-70 originated from the fact that the French half-breeds first, and later on the English half-breeds, strongly opposed the taking possession of the country by the Canadian officers. After different parleys, the Red River delegates were invited to come and confer with the Ottawa Government. The conditions of the admission of the Red River country into the confederation were discussed and an understanding was arrived at. A Bill was drafted, introduced in Parlia-

ment and passed into law. It is the Manitoba Act. It was, therefore, in virtue of a pact or treaty that Manitoba was made part of the confederation. From the fact that the Remedial Bill is framed in accordance with the educational clauses of the Manitoba Act, it follows that it is just. The justice of the law may also be argued from another standpoint. Clause 93 of the British North America Act, and clause 22 of the Manitoba Act, were both framed with a view to securing the right of minorities. Clause 93 alone would have fully met the exigencies of the case. But the framers of the constitution were not satisfied with that clause alone; they went further, and with a view to rendering more explicit and less liable to conflicting constructions, and placing beyond the reach of any interference for the future, the rights of minorities, they inserted clause 22 into the Manitoba Act, which provides for the right of minorities to schools established by practice. And I call here the attention of the champions of Protestantism, whether they sit on this side or the other side of the House—I call their attention, I say, to the fact that, at the time in question, the prevailing belief was that Manitoba would become another province of Quebec, and that the minority would, therefore, be Protestant. In contrasting this fact with this other fact that Sir John Macdonald, a Protestant whose religious fervour cannot be called in question, was the then Prime Minister, and that upon him, more than any one else, devolved the charge of framing the Manitoba Act, it is easily understood how he took good care to make the wording of the law as clear as possible as regards the protection of the future Protestant minority. That such was the intention of Sir John Macdonald, is evidenced by a letter which that great statesman wrote, in 1889, to a member of the Manitoba legislature, who asked him for his advice on the matter. He said :

You asked me for advice as to the course you shall take upon the vexed question of separate schools in your province. There is, it seems to me, but one course open to you. By the Manitoba Act, the provisions of the British North America Act (section 93), respecting laws passed for the protection of minorities in educational matters are made applicable to Manitoba, and cannot be changed, for, by the Imperial Act confirming the establishment of the new provinces, 34 and 35 Vict., Chap. 28, section 6, it is provided that it shall not be competent for the Parliament of Canada to alter the provisions of the Manitoba Act in so far as it relates to the province of Manitoba. Obviously, therefore, the separate school system in Manitoba is beyond the reach of the legislature or of the Dominion Parliament.

In support of that view, I may further quote the opinion expressed by the Hon. Mr. McDougall, the very same gentleman who played such an important role, at the time of the union of the Red River settlement with Canada. Here is what he says :

We certainly meant that the Catholics of Manitoba (or whatever denomination might be the
Mr. GRANDBOIS.

minority) should have the right of establishing and maintaining their schools. You see that the words "or by practice" were inserted in the Manitoba Act, so that the trouble which had arisen in New Brunswick, where separate schools actually existed, but were not recognized by law, might not be renewed in Manitoba. And then the right of appeal to the Federal Parliament was given in order to make that assurance doubly strong.

And I may add that we have in this House two actors of that grand drama of confederation, the hon. Secretary of State (Sir Charles Tupper) and the hon. member for Three Rivers (Sir Hector Langevin), who both confirm the construction I put on those words. They rank among the fathers of confederation; they attended conferences which took place between the government and the Red River delegates. These hon. gentlemen have stated here that it was undoubtedly the intention of the Government to give a sufficient protection to the minority in educational matters. The remedial law is just, because it is grounded upon natural law and in harmony with the principles of liberty of conscience. What is natural law, but the notion of right and duty, of right and wrong, a notion which Almighty God has implanted in man's heart. And liberty of conscience may be looked upon as a political right guaranteed by constitutional liberties. Nobody can deny that parents are bound to provide their children with food, clothing and education. It is their right to give that education, according to the dictates of their own conscience. Now, separate schools alone can accomplish that object. Well organized public schools are either Protestant or unsectarian, and in both cases they are repugnant to the Catholic conscience. But I may be told that by the fact of public schools being created, separate schools are not done away with; you may, if you feel bound in conscience to do so, establish separate schools where you may send your children. But that is a fallacious argument. What you offer Catholics is practically impossible. When you force them to contribute to the support of either public, Protestant or unsectarian schools, you take away from them money intended to support their separate schools. Why, Mr. Speaker, is it not a monstrous thing to coerce a minority, no matter how small it may be, to pay for the support of schools of what they cannot avail themselves and to pay in addition to that, taxes for their own schools? I appeal to conservative minds on both sides of the House,—and I know that they are numerous in this House,—I appeal to the members from Quebec, and I ask them to vote down the motion of the leader of the Opposition, which is directed against the remedial law; I request them to support that law, which is just and founded on natural law and which will restore to the minority in Manitoba the rights which they hold dearer than life. Finally, Sir, I find that the law is just, because it goes to develop a

teaching saturated with patriotism and loyalty to the institutions of our country and to the crown. Catholicism is a school of obedience, of devotion, of respect to the authorities that are; there is no better citizen than a Catholic truly worthy of the name. Good Catholic is but another name for good citizen. It may be truly said that Catholicism is a school of patriotism and of loyalty to the institutions of our country and to the Crown. Let the hon. gentlemen refer to the records of Canadian history, and they will find that in troubled times, the Catholic hierarchy and the clergy did always play the role of moderators and peace-makers. The signal services rendered by Archbishop Taché, at the time of the first rebellion, are still with in the recollection of this House. Archbishop Taché was in Rome when the troubles broke out. The Canadian Government, aware of the powerful influence which the Archbishop enjoyed over the half-breeds, invited him to come back to Canada. In spite of his advanced age and of the fatigues of a long journey, he did not, a single moment, hesitate to comply with the wishes of the Canadian Government and to return to the Red River settlement, where he succeeded in re-establishing peace, a task which the Government had failed to accomplish. Upon another occasion, at the time of the rebellion in the North-west, were not the Catholic missionaries seen using their influences to check the Indians and the half-breeds during the revolt? History will record the names of the brave and holy missionaries who fell under the bullets of the Indians, martyrs to their devotion to Canadian interests. Before I sit down, Mr. Speaker, I desire to appeal to Protestant members, whose minds are unbiassed by prejudices, and who love justice and fair-play. The question here is not whether separate schools are efficient or inefficient, better or worse than unsectarian or Protestant schools. Protestants have their own views and freedom of choice in the matter. What we are asked is to vote for a law which will restore to the Catholic minority in Manitoba, a right to which they are entitled under the constitution, as decided by the highest tribunal in the Empire. Let them help us to accomplish that object. I make a special appeal to the members from the province of Quebec. Let them ponder over the responsibility which they assume. This is, perhaps, the last opportunity which is offered us to do justice. Let them improve the occasion, and join with us in order to bring about the triumph of the cause both of the Catholic minority and of the constitution.

Mr. GIROUARD. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, at this advanced stage of the debate, I shall not assume upon my shoulders the responsibility of protracting the debate, in reviewing the question at issue, and recalling the sacrifices which we have im-

posed on ourselves in behalf of the British flag, in order to build up the Canadian confederation.

We have placed our confidence in the English Protestant majority; we have made a compact and we must stand by it. All that has been so well said, argued and evinced that I think it unnecessary to revert to the subject. I will, therefore, content myself with briefly giving the grounds of the vote I am about to give, and dealing more directly with the attitude of the different parties towards the Remedial Bill which is before the House. We know now what to think about the disallowance of the law of 1890. Undoubtedly, if the Federal Government had disallowed the law of 1890, the Manitoba Government would have re-enacted it. And they would have had that right, as under the Privy Council judgment it had been decided that the law in question was *intra vires* of the legislature, and that the Manitoba government had the right and power to do so. I do not know how the hon. members opposite and their party press can censure the Government for not having resorted to the exercise of their powers of disallowance, when their very leader seconded, in 1891, the Blake motion, their then chief, a motion whereby, under similar circumstances, the educational Act of the provincial legislature may be referred to the tribunals, rather than resorting to disallowance. I now give the motion as proposed by the Hon. Mr. Blake:

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

In the course of the debate on the motion, Mr. Blake said:

The first of the two classes to which I allude is that in which the proposal comes before the executive, to disallow an Act of the provincial legislature on the ground that the Act is *ultra vires*. If it be so, the Act is void. And I think I may say that it is now generally agreed that void Acts should not be disallowed, but should be left to the action of the courts.

During the interprovincial conference convened in Quebec by the Hon. Mr. Mercier, from the 20th to the 28th October, 1887, a special resolution was carried, giving expression to the opinion of the conference against the exercise of the power of disallowance.

Here is the resolution of the interprovincial conference, held at Quebec:

1. That this power of disallowance may be exercised so as to give to the Federal Government arbitrary control over legislations of the provinces within their own spheres.

R

2. That it is important to the just operation of our federal system, as well as that the Federal Parliament should not assume to exercise powers belonging exclusively to the provincial legislatures, as that a provincial legislature should not assume to exercise powers belonging exclusively to the Federal Parliament, and that to prevent any such assumption, there should be equal facilities to the Federal and provincial governments for promptly obtaining a judicial determination respecting the validity of the statutes of both the Federal Parliament and provincial legislatures; that constitutional provision should be made for obtaining such determination before as well as after a statute has been acted upon; and that any decision should be subject to appeal as in other cases, in order that the adjudication may be final.

The exercise of that power would further have been undesirable on the ground that the Federal Government, if they had vetoed the Bill, would also have disallowed that portion of the law, under which the schools of the majority were established. It would have been an encroachment on Manitoba's self-government. We are then left the choice between the Blake motion, seconded by Mr. Laurier, providing means whereby reference may be made to a high judicial tribunal, rather than resorting to the power of disallowance, between the opinion of the hon. member for L'Islet and of the whole Liberal party, who, since 1892, charge the Governments with not having disallowed the school laws of Manitoba. Moreover, I contend that the Manitoba government were in favour of reference to the courts in preference to disallowance, for, it is the prevailing opinion among them that, had the law been disallowed it would have resulted in bringing about disastrous consequences for the population. I received, lately, an interesting letter on the question under discussion, from a citizen of high standing in Manitoba. That letter deals mainly with the question now before the House, and reviews the troubles which were forestalled in Manitoba, as a result of the exercise of the power of disallowance. I crave, Sir, the indulgence of the House, while I read part of that letter:

On the day following the enactment of the famous school law, we asked ourselves with anxiety what were the means to be resorted to in order to nullify those iniquitous laws.

Now, Sir, my correspondent describes the grounds upon which a reference to the judicial tribunals was advocated:

With one or two exceptions, we were all agreed as to the advisability of a reference to the courts. We had just been eye-witnesses to a spectacle unheard of in the records of the country. A few months previous to the enactment of the school law, the Attorney General Martin—

I believe, Sir, that this is the same Mr. Martin who is now in this House, the right hand of the hon. leader of the Opposition—

—had decided to build the Northern Pacific Railway and to cross, within a few miles from Winnipeg, the Canadian Pacific Railway. The Federal Government who alone could give the necessary authority, refused to grant it. Martin

Mr. GIROUARD.

took no notice of it. They were on the point of crossing the Canadian Pacific Railway when the latter company got an injunction from the court. The sheriff, charged with the execution of the order of the court, proceeded to the contemplated junction with special constables. Martin had 700 or 800 provincial constables sworn in, and in defiance of the Federal Government and of the tribunals crossed the way of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Those high-handed proceedings of an Attorney General, setting an example of revolt against the law and against public order were still within our recollection, when that sinister individual trampled under foot our religious and national rights. Under similar occurrences, we were of opinion that the exercise of the right of disallowance would only result in exasperating that passionate men who, unfortunately, had just stirred up a considerable group of the English population against us.

In short, we were of opinion that the best means for us to adopt was reference to the judicial tribunals.

But before leaving that part of the subject, let me quote a despatch which was circulated in the press at the time, and we will see what Mr. Watson told his friends in the county of Marquette, to induce them to vote for him at the election of 1891:

I have Mr. Laurier's promise and that of the Liberal members of the province of Quebec that they will oppose the disallowance of the Manitoba school law.

So there is evident contradiction in the principle of the Liberal party on this question of disallowance.

Now, what causes more surprise in that affair is the course pursued by the leader of the Opposition. In 1893, he visited Manitoba, and after having had every opportunity to get the necessary information, he could only repeat, after returning from that province, what he had said in the House, during the previous session: I say, that, if those schools are Protestant schools, it is an intolerable injustice. He was always in the same unsettled state of mind, and kept asking for information. Still, about the same time, he was ready to pass condemnation on the Government for what he called their unwarrantable delays, and he wanted the question to be settled at once. On the 15th July, he said:

I charge against the Government of the day, and I invite their answer, that they have dallied with this question, they never dealt with it frankly, fairly, sincerely, and if I am allowed by the rules of debate, I will say, they never dealt honestly with that question.

And further on:

Let hon. gentlemen opposite settle that question. I will be most happy to give them my support, but they must settle it in some other manner than they have tried heretofore. Something must be done, and done at once, because this policy of delay, this policy of vacillating is not only paralyzing, but it is fast disintegrating national life; fast disintegrating national life, I say, because it is arraying creed against creed and race against race. What should be done? I have no hesitation in saying for my part, speaking my own personal sentiment, to say that I do

desire and do wish that the minority in Manitoba may be allowed the privilege of teaching their children their duties to God and man as they understand these duties, and as their duties are taught them by their church.

As will be seen from the above, at that time the leader of the Opposition insisted upon the question being settled at once; he would suffer no delay, nor admit of any postponement; the time for temporization was passed—"Something must be done, and done at once," he then exclaimed. But he has quite altered his mind since, and we will soon see him turn right about face. No sooner had he understood that the Government meant to bring in their remedial law, than he changed his attitude and began preaching conciliation and about the necessity of inquiry. I charge against him, that he is responsible for that notion of inquiry spreading about; he it was that suggested it to the Manitoba government, who now use it as a quibble. Besides, if ever there existed a party that resorted to conciliation, it is, surely, the party now in power. Was it not the course followed by the Government, when, in 1892, they sent to the Manitoba government the petition by which the Catholic minority prayed for the redress of their grievances? Did not the Government resort to conciliation, when they signed, in July last, an Order in Council whereby they asked the Manitoba authorities to restore to the oppressed minority the privileges they had been deprived of? Was not conciliation again resorted to, when the Governor General extended, in July last, to the Manitoba government an invitation to come and consult with him with reference to the school troubles? What can be more conciliatory than the statement read before the House by the hon. Secretary of State, on the 9th instant, and which reads as follows:—

In view of the assurance that the government of Manitoba are willing to have a conference, the Government propose, so soon as the second reading of the Remedial Bill is carried, to have a conference with Mr. Greenway's government with a view to arrive at a settlement of this question on terms that will be satisfactory to his government and the minority of Manitoba; but in the meantime to proceed with the question before the House *de die in diem* as previously arranged.

Conciliation having failed again, now they fall back on the commission of inquiry. Of what avail would that committee have been? What are the facts of importance to be brought out by a committee, which are not already known? The question has now been six years before the country; it has been thoroughly ventilated and sifted, both in the Commons and in the Senate and elsewhere; it has run the gauntlet of the courts of justice, and I do not see what new facts are to be brought out or what new light could be thrown upon the subject. The Greenway government themselves admit all the facts.

The questions which are raised by the report now under consideration, have been the subject of most voluminous discussion in the legislature of Manitoba, during the past four years. All of the statements made in the memorial addressed to His Excellency the Governor General, and many others, have been repeatedly made and considered by the legislature.

There is still another person who is now held in very high esteem by the hon. leader of the Opposition, who will certainly vote for the amendment to the motion proposed by the leader, and who also finds that there is no need of any inquiry. It is the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), who said:

There is not a man sitting at this Council who does not hold a pronounced opinion as to the respective merits of the two systems. The question has not the merit of novelty for us. I do not think there is a single man in public life who has not formed his opinion on the subject.

From the very outset of the debate, the country expected the hon. leader of the Opposition to have proposed that a committee of inquiry be appointed which he had advocated in all the public meetings held last fall. Instead of that, he only proposes that the Bill be not read now a second time but be read this day six months. Mr. Speaker, I am at a loss now how to qualify the attitude taken by the leader of the Opposition. To propose the six months' hoist is equivalent to shelving the Bill, to putting it off indefinitely; and it is depriving our co-religionists in Manitoba of the redress of the grievances complained of. Why, Mr. Speaker, we have a Bill carefully framed, on the lines of the judgment of the highest tribunal in the Empire, a Bill which embodies the great principle of separate schools, a Bill which atones for the wrongs committed by a government of persecutors, a Bill which gives back to the minority what they have been deprived of by an unjust majority, and lo! the leader of the Opposition finds no better occupation than killing that same law! Now, should any hon. gentleman, a year ago, last session, have foretold such a course, he would have been looked upon as a liar and a slanderer. Never would the followers of the hon. leader of the Opposition have agreed that such an intention could be presumed on his part. If, at least, the hon. gentleman had a reasonable plea or excuse to explain his position, but he has none. He cannot invoke the insufficiency of the Bill, for it is as complete as circumstances would allow. And besides, that law is framed for the Manitoba minority, and up to date, no competent voice has been heard against it. It has not been condemned by any organ of the minority. It is approved by everybody, and the Archbishop of St. Boniface accepts it, as shown this afternoon by the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot), when he read a telegram sent by that prelate to Rev. Father Lacombe. Moreover, the "Manitoba," the authorized

organ of the minority in that province, in a carefully written article, in its issue of the 4th March, completely endorses the Remedial Bill. I shall content myself with reading a portion of it :

We do not hesitate in declaring that the Remedial Bill contains in substance all the principles essential to the good working of our schools. We hope that all the members who have a concern for their duty, will give it the support of their vote.

We ask all those who are our true friends not to barter in breach under the fallacious pretense that it is not as perfect as might be desired a law, the main features of which are so favourable to our cause and go as far in the direction of justice as the jurisdiction of the Federal Parliament will allow.

I do not know whether the hon. leader of the Opposition has read the article in question ; at any rate, he ought to read it. Why, Mr. Speaker, the very friends of the hon. leader are forsaking him, and the number of his followers is decreasing every day. The hon. member for Berthier first set the example in a magnificent address. He was closely followed by the hon. member for Ottawa County, who made a splendid speech, the secret way of making which he knows alone. Another journal, "Le Temps," edited here, a Liberal organ, quite in sympathy with the leader of the Opposition and devoted to him, a journal, I say, whose editor is in the confidence of the hon. leader, was forced to abandon him, owing to the attitude taken by him in the House on the school question. Here is what says the journal in question, in its issue of the 9th March :

The amendment moved by Mr. Laurier to the Remedial Bill involves a denial of the object which Mr. Dickey wishes to accomplish : the re-establishment of the Manitoba schools, and at the same time it involves a denial of the principle upon which the law is grounded, namely, federal interference.

The liberal leader, it is true, has eloquently spoken of a commission of inquiry, pointing out the benefits which would flow from an amicable settlement. But he has declared against the commission of inquiry, and against means of conciliation, when proposing the six months' hoist. All the eloquence of the silver-tongued speaker was wasted, because he did not succeed in convincing anybody.

In its issue of the 11th March, the same journal published the following editorial :—

Why does Mr. Laurier ask now the House of Commons to vote in favour of the six months' hoist ? Why does he force his party to assume an attitude which is inconsistent with the contemplated commission of inquiry which he has ably advocated before the country ? Not one of those who intend voting for the amendment of the liberal leader, not one solitary French paper has, as yet, attempted to explain that forsaking of programme, that impassioned advocacy suddenly transformed into a cold denegation.

Sir John A. Macdonald told us once : "Laurier is one of the brightest jewels that the French Canadian race has produced, but those Grits will suck his last drop of blood, and then they won't

Mr. GIROUARD.

have heart enough to give him a decent burial."

We could stop here and rest contented with this graphical definition of the present state of the Opposition. The Grit element of Mr. Laurier's party is formed of irreconcilables, of narrow-minded egotists, who have not the least notion of true liberalism ; in short, they are ultra-Tories reversed. Their mind does not spread its wings beyond the limits of their constituency. There is among them neither brotherly spirit, nor spirit of discipline ; it is they who carry to its extreme limit the doctrine of self. We do not mean to say that the whole English portion of the Opposition belong to this wretched school. There are some very striking exceptions in the persons of Messrs. Edgar, Cartwright and others, but the bulk of the party is composed of Grits who are easily known from their particular bearing.

At the beginning of winter two elections took place in the province of Ontario ; one of them in North Ontario, the other in Cardwell. In one of those elections the Grit candidate lost his deposit, and in the other the deposit of the candidate came within an inch of being lost. Mr. McCarthy conducted the contest for his party in both constituencies. In North Ontario the Equal Rights candidate had made an alliance with the Patrons of Industry, but in Cardwell Mr. McCarthy had brought his own candidate forward. After having experienced those two defeats, the Grits were scared. After the crushing defeat inflicted upon them by Mr. McCarthy they were ready to turn their back to their chief, Mr. Laurier, to throw themselves into the arms of the Equal Rightist leader, and to make but one mouthful of his programme.

After having advocated his scheme of commission in all the public assemblies which he addressed, Mr. Laurier saw himself threatened, in the House of Commons, of being deserted by the Grits, unless he would give up his programme, in order to accept that of Mr. Clarke Wallace and Mr. McCarthy.

It has, therefore, come to this, that the Liberal party is in the power of the Grits, that is to say, it follows in the wake of the most anti-Liberal, anti-French and anti-Catholic element, Mr. McCarthy and Equal Rightism, and Mr. Wallace and his Orange lodges.

Necessity makes, indeed, strange bed-fellows.

The man who penned these lines is intimately acquainted with the leader of the Opposition. From what I have said, it is not to be wondered at if the country reposes no confidence in the hon. leader of the Opposition, for the settlement of the question. I believe, Sir, that the Government in dealing with this vexed question have acted with prudence, disinterestedness and without any party spirit. I believe that under the circumstances they have pursued a wise course and exhausted all the means of conciliation within their power. Their line of action is approved of by the hierarchy. The Bill which they have brought in is accepted by the Manitoba clergy as well as by the chief representatives of the minority in the provincial legislature, Messrs. Prendergast, Marion and Paré. The Bill is approved of by the hon. Senator Bernier and the hon. member for Provencher, who are the authorized representatives of the Manitoba minority in the Federal Parliament. Now, in deal-

ing with this question, the Government not only command the support of their French and Catholic followers, but are also seconded and approved by a large number of Protestant members who represent here electoral divisions belonging to a different creed, and also by all the Catholic Irish members. I can, therefore, have no confidence in the vacillating policy of the hon. leader of the Opposition who has been unable so far to take a solid stand on the matter and who sees himself forsaken by a large number of his followers in this House, until he is forsaken by the electors of the country. Before I sit down, Sir, allow me to give communication to the House of a letter which I have just received from a friend in Manitoba, a man who occupies a high position, who commands the confidence of the Catholic minority and who is well informed on the question at issue :

St. Boniface, 9th March, 1896.

My Dear Friend,—Your letter just at hand. You will find in the editorial of the "Manitoba" (4th March) which Archbishop Langevin had directed to you, a correct and reliable statement of the attitude of the Catholic minority in Manitoba. That article is approved of by the Archbishop. You may state without the least hesitation that we give our support to the Bill, as it stands. Any opposition calculated to jeopardize the existence of the Bill can only result in disastrous consequences to us, and is condemnable. We ask all our friends to vote in favour of the Bill, reserving to themselves the right to amend it in Committee of the Whole. I speak whereof I know.

The Bill contains the principles that are essential to the resurrection and good working of our schools. It gives us life, not comfort. But that recognition of our rights is an immense step in the direction of complete justice. The law sanctions our right to a share in the legislative grant; therefore, in giving it their support, the members of Parliament sacrifice nothing, yield nothing. Archbishop Langevin, whom I have seen to-day, and with whom I had a long interview, approves this law, and would like to see it supported by all the members. You may state without hesitation that the Catholic minority strongly advocates the adoption of the Bill. I sincerely hope that the hour of justice will soon strike for us; and Heaven's blessing will be for those legislators who will have helped to restore our rights to us, and in the records of the Northwest will be found a page full of emotion, which will tell to future generations our gratitude to those who shall have nobly done their duty.

Laurier's commission of inquiry is ridiculous. In 1890 we have flooded the Legislative Assembly with our petitions, asking the government not to allow the Act of 1890 to pass into law and tyrannize over our consciences. Later on, subsequently to the last decision of the Privy Council, we went again, a deputation of over 800 citizens, composed of delegates from all the Catholic groups, praying for justice.

Greenway, who received the deputation brutally, replied that we had no ground to complain. The legislature has always voted resolutions over resolutions stating that we had no grievances, and that we would never have any separate schools.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I am going to say very little on this question. I am not going to tell you what I do not know about constitutional law. That side of the question has been pretty well discussed. But I am going to tell the members of this House what I think is necessary in order to render justice to all, and what I consider, as an English Protestant representing a Quebec constituency, justice in this matter is as we in the province of Quebec ask that it shall be meted out to us. Take my county, for instance, the county of Richmond and Wolfe. We have always had the best of feeling between both races and both religions. We have a Catholic majority of about 16,000. The French-Canadians have always accorded us our representation in this House as we have accorded them their representation in the local legislature. We ought to be in a better position to judge how justice should be rendered toward a minority than the Protestant representatives of Ontario. The Protestants of Manitoba had no fear of the Catholic majority in the early seventies. But now that the Catholics are so greatly in the minority they seem to be fearful of according them their rights. I do not regard this as a question of law, but as a simple matter of justice to this people. I do not think that the English people of any part of the world ever wish to try to keep down the minority. The minority is so small that certainly the majority of Manitoba have nothing to fear from them and Ontario certainly has not. I would like to quote from the census of 1891 two or three groups of counties in our province of Quebec and to show the way they are represented. There was one group of five Protestant counties with a Catholic population of 37,522 and a Protestant population of 85,098. On the other hand we have seven counties with a Catholic majority of 61,818. In this present Parliament every one of those constituencies with a Catholic majority is represented by a Protestant, who was elected by Catholic votes cheerfully given. Let me mention the case of a by-election in 1874 to show the good feeling and freedom from race prejudices of the French-Canadians in my constituency of Richmond and Wolfe. In that election there were two English-speaking candidates in the field, and a French-Canadian came in between them, but he only got 400 votes out of a total of over 6,000. Why, Sir, the English-speaking representative in the Quebec government of the Protestant minority in that province is an Irish Roman Catholic, and I do not think that the Protestants suffer any grievance thereby. He was elected in a Protestant county by a majority of over 7,000. Now, I think if Ontario could exhibit such cases of toleration, it would do more for the maintenance of good feeling between the people of this Dominion, and more to cement the various provinces together than weeks of talk on constitutional points which have been

decided in England long ago. Now, let us look at several Catholic counties in Ontario that are represented by Protestants. North Essex has a large Catholic majority; Gengarry has a large Catholic majority; Ottawa city, on the borders of Quebec, has one Protestant and one Catholic representative. The people in these counties agree to disagree on many things, but they agree to work for the best interests of Canada. The county of Russell also has a Catholic majority of over 5,000. I may also refer to the hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Sanborn), whose county has a Protestant population of only 3,868 as against a Roman Catholic population of 19,395. Now, I would ask what should be that hon. gentleman's duty in a case like this, how should he vote? I believe in principle and in voting for principle, and although I told my electors last winter that I felt specially bound to vote for measures which I knew were approved by the people whom I represent, still if I could not do so, I would resign my seat and give them an opportunity to elect one of their own faith who would represent their wishes more closely in Parliament. Sir, there are townships in the county of Wolfe where there is not a single English-speaking voter, but where I had a majority from the French-Canadian voters, and where there were no appeals to religious or racial prejudices. Again, I would ask the French-Canadian members from the province of Quebec what they can expect from the leader of the Opposition. If Sir Mackenzie Bowell, Protestant as he is, Orangeman as he is, cannot give them relief, what can they expect from the leader of the Opposition, surrounded as he is by members of the most diverse sentiments? I refer, more particularly to the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien), the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace), the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean), and the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin). Now, I ask the French-Canadians from Quebec and the Catholic minority of Winnipeg, if they expect to get relief from such an aggregation as that. If the hon. leader of the Opposition had moved for a commission, we could at least have felt that he was honest, but it is surprising that he of all men should move the six months' hoist to this Bill. If many of us in this House do not know the wants of Manitoba, do not know how they are situated, and want more information on the matter, certainly the leader of the Opposition ought to be the last man to need enlightenment. We know that he went through the length and breadth of Manitoba not long ago, and spoke in every constituency and every hamlet of any importance, and certainly he had ample opportunity to glean all the information that was necessary to enable him to move such an amendment in this House as would at least have had the ring of honesty. I would again appeal to

Mr. CLEVELAND.

the Protestant majority in this Parliament to stand by the Catholic minority of the province of Manitoba, and give them the rights of which they have been despoiled. If the time should ever come, I hope it never will, when the Catholic majority of Quebec should be provoked to make reprisals, and if the Protestant minority from that province should come here asking for redress, could they complain of being told: You must not come here, we do not interfere with provincial rights. Now, Sir, I wish to quote from an article published by an Eastern Townships newspaper, edited by the oldest journalist in Quebec:

We write this before we can know what will be the fate of the Remedial Bill, but we are buoyed up with the hope that it will pass. What will be its fate afterwards, it is impossible to predict. Should Manitoba continue her resistance, it is obvious that there are troublous times in store for the Dominion.

I do not agree with him there, I do not expect any trouble.

It has become a religious question, and the gravest consequences may result,—not to Manitoba so much as to the peace and concord of the people of this province, for to deny to the minority of the prairie province what is accorded to the minority of Quebec, might produce reprisals, and how these people who are resisting the Remedial Bill could consistently complain if that should happen, we cannot understand. Our separate school system here is at the mercy of the Roman Catholic majority; it is quite true that the legislature of Quebec cannot intra vires of its powers legislate it out of existence, but it can emasculate it, and be within its rights in doing it, so as to make it wholly unworkable. The Protestants would of course appeal under the constitution; would these people then say, "You must not coerce Quebec, she is within her rights in legislating according to the will of the majority as expressed by her legislature; interference with the autonomy of a province must not be allowed." Yet are not the cases parallel ones? The Protestants of Quebec will never consent to surrender the right of appeal to the Federal Parliament; but what is the use of appealing if the majority of the House of Commons holds to the non-interference policy?

We have no fear of reprisals on the part of the Roman Catholics of this province, but that is no reason for withholding from the minority of another province the same privilege we claim for ourselves; on the contrary, it is a good reason for supporting them in the demand for it. This aspect of the question seems to have been completely ignored by the Protestant anti-remedial party, and we are grieved that any considerable number of our co-religionists should be found arrayed against the aggrieved minority of Manitoba.

I think it is useless for me to go over the ground that has been gone over so often during the past week. I will simply content myself by renewing my appeal to the House to pass this Bill in the name of the Protestant minority of Quebec as well as the Catholic minority of Manitoba.

Mr. BOYLE moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

Mr. DICKEY moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 2.10 a.m. (Friday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 13th March, 1896.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 82) respecting the Kingston, Smith's Falls and Ottawa Railway Company.—(Mr. Taylor.)

Bill (No. 83) to incorporate the Manitoba and North-west Millers Association.—(Mr. Mills, Annapolis.)

REPORT.

Summary Report of the Geological Survey Department, for the year 1895.—(Mr. Daly.)

MANITOBA SCHOOL QUESTION—MR. GREENWAY'S TELEGRAM.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I wish to call the attention of the hon. leader of the House to a remarkable statement which is alleged to have been made by Mr. Greenway, reading as follows:—

Winnipeg, March 12, 1896.

In the legislature to-night, Premier Greenway called attention to the fact that a sentence had been omitted from his telegram to Sir Donald Smith, as read by Sir Charles Tupper in the House of Commons. Mr. Greenway considered the sentence important, and read the telegram to the legislature. The missing words were, "As you are aware, we are not to blame for the present situation."

I would like to inquire whether those words were in the telegram which the hon. Secretary of State read to the House on Monday?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Those words were in the telegram, and they were omitted because they did not seem to have any special bearing upon the question. It was a mere matter of opinion, which no one would be surprised that Mr. Greenway should entertain; but I would like, while making that admission—and certainly I was not under the impression that it was at all

garbling the telegram to omit something which had no special reference to the main point, and that was whether Mr. Greenway was willing to have a conference with the Dominion—I would like to take the opportunity of answering the question which was put to me by the hon. leader of the Opposition, who, I observe, is not in his place to-day. That hon. gentleman asked me if I was prepared to lay upon the Table the message from Sir Donald Smith to Mr. Greenway, to which Mr. Greenway's telegram of the 2nd instant, which I read to the House, was a reply. I said that I would communicate with Sir Donald Smith and be in a position to answer the question put to me. I may say that I was most anxious to be in a position to read the telegram to the House from Sir Donald Smith to Mr. Greenway, to which that was a reply, but I am unable to do so for the reason which I shall state.

Without Mr. Greenway's consent, Sir Donald Smith will not allow the communication of his telegram to Mr. Greenway, to which that of 2nd March read to the House by me on 9th inst. was a reply.

All telegrams and other communications between Sir Donald Smith and Mr. Greenway were regarded by them as confidential and were imparted by Sir Donald Smith to the Government as strictly such.

Our intention was to obtain Sir Donald Smith's consent to communicate the telegram of 2nd March to the House, but, on inquiry, the Premier found he was in New York, and not knowing his address there, we could not reach him for that purpose by telegraph. Considering that, under the circumstances, I could properly use the telegram, I did so, and for this alone I am responsible. I now express my sincere regret, that this was done without the consent of those gentlemen.

I felt it due to myself to make this frank explanation to the House as to why a telegram, which I regarded as virtually a communication to the Government from Mr. Greenway, was used, to which I thought there could be no possible objection.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Did I understand the hon. gentleman correctly, that this telegram was used without Mr. Greenway's consent?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Certainly.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. And a garbled—well, I will not say that—but a mutilated version of it at that. I shall leave the House and the country to consider whether that was treating us with the respect with which, in so grave a matter, this House should be treated.

DURATION OF PARLIAMENT.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There is another question I should like to put to the hon. gentleman. I should like to ask him

if he is prepared to inform the House whether there is any ground for the statement circulated widely in the press that the Government have such doubt as to whether this House expires on the 25th April that they propose to submit a case to the Supreme Court to resolve their doubts?

Mr. DICKEY. The Government is considering the desirability of doing that, but nothing has been done yet.

EMPLOYMENT OF GOVERNMENT ENGINEERS.

Mr. BERGERON. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I desire to bring to the notice of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, a small paragraph which I find in the "Gleaner," published in Huntingdon. I should like to have the hon. gentleman's statement upon this subject:

For two weeks past a staff of engineers have been taking measurements and levels between Valleyfield and the Chateauguay River. People became curious, and some person started a rumour that they were working in the interests of a proposed canal from the St. Lawrence to Lake Champlain. The facts are, they are a staff of engineers in the pay of the Federal Government, and are only making their usual visit prior to a general election.

I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals the explanation of this, because I have never heard of it before.

Mr. HAGGART. The engineering staff of the Soulanges Canal are sometimes not very busily engaged for two or three weeks during the winter. This year I ordered the engineer to make accurate surveys of what may be probable canals. The Caughnawaga is one that would afford communication from Lake St. Louis to the lake at Plattsburg, and from Plattsburg to the Hudson. I wanted to have plan and specification on file so that I might judge accurately of the feasibility of such a canal.

MANITOBA SCHOOL QUESTION—COMMUNICATION WITH MR. GREENWAY.

Mr. MARTIN. I would like to ask the hon. Secretary of State if the Government have applied for permission from Mr. Greenway to lay before the House the telegrams and other communications that have passed between the hon. member for Montreal West (Sir Donald Smith) and Mr. Greenway's government?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. member for Montreal West did communicate with Mr. Greenway on the subject of asking his permission, or asking whether he was willing that the telegram from the hon. member for Montreal West to Mr. Greenway, to which that laid before the House was a reply, should be laid before the House and I have just stated to the House that consent has not been obtained from Mr. Greenway for that purpose.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

REMEDIAL ACT (MANITOBA).

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Sir Charles Tupper for second reading of Bill (No. 58) the Remedial Act (Manitoba), and the proposed motion (six months' hoist) of Mr. Laurier in amendment thereto.

Mr. FOSTER. I venture to ask the House for its consideration for a few moments of some remarks, even at this late stage in the discussion of a pretty thoroughly discussed subject, even at the risk of repeating and reviewing arguments and facts which probably have not the merit of complete novelty to the members present. I think I shall commence my remarks by being a little unorthodox, and that may be pleasant to my hon. friend (Sir Richard Cartwright) who sits just opposite to me. The remark I shall commence with is this—that I am not of the opinion that the question at present before the House is intrinsically either the most important or the most difficult question that has engaged the attention of this Parliament from confederation up to the present time. My view is that the question is a plain and simple one, and that the great difficulty which surrounds it, and the importance which attaches to it at the present time is due rather to the complication with it of side issues, which, in a legitimate sense, do not belong to the question at all. And before I proceed to a discussion of the question proper, I wish to eliminate these, and to make a few remarks upon each. The first of these questions which is brought up in connection with the case properly before the House is that of provincial rights. The assertion is made in this House, and in the country as well, that for the Dominion Parliament to attempt to legislate on this subject is to interfere with and invade provincial rights. I beg to state my humble opinion that it cannot be fairly maintained either in this House or in the country, looking to the distribution of powers by the Confederation Act where the jurisdiction is plain and unequivocal, that for this Parliament to exercise its powers, to exercise its jurisdiction is to interfere with any rights that belong to the province in question, at this time, or of any other province, if this question touching any other province, were to come up. This side issue has taken the popular form of a cry, "Hands off Manitoba." In reality it seems to me the proper opinion, that contemplated by the constitution, that carried out by the practice of this country up to the present time is not embodied in that cry, but would be better expressed in the statement that the majority of Manitoba should have kept "hands off" the privileges of a minority, which privileges were given under the constitution, and were supposed to be secured to them by the constitution. Another side issue that is brought up is the question of separate schools, and men

range themselves in opposition to remedial legislation, because, forsooth, they do not believe in the principle of separate schools. Sir, the question whether separate schools should, or should not, be established is one which might well have been debated in 1863 when that system was adopted for the province of Ontario; it is one which might well have been debated upon principle in 1867 and 1870, when these schools were being perpetuated under the Confederation Acts. But it is not a principle which is at stake to-day in the least degree; and, for my own part, I believe that I have no right to take my preference on that principle into consideration in the least on this occasion, but that I am now called upon to deal with the question of a clause of the constitution, and a case which arises out of it, in which that principle was settled once and for all in regard to the minority's right by the fathers of confederation, and embodied in the constitution itself. It is also stated as a side argument, but which influences some people in this House, and is meant to influence more people outside this House, that this is but the first step in a separate school crusade, and that if this legislation takes place for the province of Manitoba, upon that result will be built an aggressive campaign for the adoption of separate schools in the other provinces. That was expressed by my hon. friend from West York (Mr. Wallace); that was also given voice to by my hon. friend from Grey (Mr. Sproule) who made, I think, a somewhat important and a somewhat venturesome assertion; and I call it to his mind now, in the interest of fair and just debate. I find that in his address to this House, as printed in the "Hansard," he made this statement, after advancing the argument that this was but the first step in a crusade for the pressing of separate schools upon the North-west, and then upon the other provinces:

The School Bill passed in the North-west assembly has been held in abeyance, and has not yet received the assent of the Dominion Government. Why is it held in abeyance? Because the clergy do not approve of it.

I ask my hon. friend now to give to this House the ground for his assertion as there made.

Mr. SPROULE. The ground of my assertion is a reply made by Archbishop Langevin at, I think, either Prince Albert or Edmonton, saying that it was not acceptable, and that the same principle was at stake there as here.

Mr. FOSTER. Then I wish to tell my hon. friend that he never should have made a statement of that kind. The fact that Archbishop Langevin said in the North-west that a school ordinance was not acceptable to the clergy may be a fact; that this ordinance was not assented to by the Lieutenant-Governor may be a fact; but when

my hon. friend puts those two facts together as cause and sequence, I wish to tell him that he is not warranted in doing so by any rule of logic, and I wish to tell him more, that there is not the first scintilla of truth in his statement.

Mr. SPROULE. The report of his speech must be all wrong then.

Mr. FOSTER. The report of whose speech?

Mr. SPROULE. Archbishop Langevin's.

Mr. FOSTER. Who made that speech? It is well to ask whether the speech if made by Archbishop Langevin bears out the charge of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. SPROULE. It was reported to be made by Archbishop Langevin.

Mr. FOSTER. If made by Archbishop Langevin or if made by ten thousand archbishops, the hon. gentleman would yet have no ground in logic or in truth for making the assertion he made here the other day, which was, not that Archbishop Langevin did not agree with the ordinance, but that the Government held it in abeyance because the clergy did not approve of it. This assertion, carried as broadly as newspapers will carry his speech, was meant, and will have the effect of raising prejudice and opposition to his legislation amongst the Protestant people of this country, and fan those fires which my hon. friends there and my hon. friends here so much deplore.

Mr. SPROULE. If the speech was not correct, why was it not contradicted?

Mr. BERGERON. There were so many lies said about him, that he could not contradict them all.

Mr. FOSTER. Another question was brought up, both incidentally and directly in this House, by my hon. friend from West York, and caught up in the country, and I am sorry to say, is used by a great many respectable papers of the country, and that is that this Bill as it is presented to Parliament, is but another phase of the old strife and the old war between creeds. I refuse to look upon this question in that light in the least degree. This is not a question of Catholics and Protestants, it is a simple question of the right of minorities, some of those minorities being Protestant and some of them being Catholic. I am sorry that men in this House, and men outside of the House, cannot approach a simple question of fact of that kind without importing into it the spirit of that discussion which raged with virulence in past years, but which we were hoping, in these more advanced years, would find less food for its sustenance, and less scope for its work. This question is also complicated by the strife of partisanship, and I am not satisfied that parties on both sides have not contributed to

the difficulties of settling this question. I have no hesitation in saying that 100 or 200 sensible men brought together free from these side issues and prejudices and partisanship, meeting together and taking up this question, thoroughly and judiciously considering it, would come to a conclusion in a very short time as to the rights of the question, and would settle it as it ought to be settled, and as I believe it will yet be settled. So I say that what we ought to do in a discussion of this kind, having the responsibility of members of Parliament, is to brush aside all side questions of interference with provincial rights, the suggestion of its being a first step in a crusade for the establishment of separate schools in other provinces, the suggestion of its being a decision to be made on the merits of separate schools or otherwise or the side issue that this is a question which should marshal the old strife between Protestant and Catholic. I say that we ought to brush aside partisanship as well; that we ought to come down to the discussion and settlement of this question as it arises under the constitution, and as it affects the rights of minorities which were legislated for under that constitution. It seems to me, Sir, that there are but three points of view from which it would be possible to discuss a question of this kind. One is to take up the question *de novo*, and I think we are precluded from doing that, because it was discussed before, and as a result of that discussion it has been embodied in two compacts which now have force in this country, the confederation compact and the Manitoba compact. Or we could take it up as a question which has come to us under a constitution which is binding, but in which constitution this is an unwise provision. If we look upon it in that light, it seems to me that we ought not to deprive a minority of its rights under that constitution, which is binding, because we think one of its provisions is unwise; but we should go to the constitution itself, and discuss and settle the question as to whether it is better, in the light of thirty years' experience that has been shed upon it, that that constitution should be revised. The third point of view, and which seems to me to be the only practical point of view, is to discuss it in the light of a clause in the constitution which is binding, and which, taking all the circumstances of this country into account, is not only binding, but is a wise provision of the constitution as well. Now, Sir, with these preliminary remarks, I wish to proceed a little nearer to the discussion of this question, and in doing that, let me premise one thing. I believe every member in this House will agree with me when I say that good faith is an absolutely essential condition of social, commercial, political and national life the wide world over. The forms of law, the contracts between indi-

Mr. FOSTER.

viduals, the agreements between parties, the treaties which bind nations together, are after all, simply the partial and fragmentary embodiment of that great principle of good faith which, the wide world through, forms the effective and the absolutely necessary basis of social and commercial and national progress and advancement. Sir, this principle of good faith is magnified in the case of a nation which is composed of different classes, different creeds and different races; and it becomes more sacred when it has effect as a principle in the transactions of nations with nations, and is raised, as you may say, up to an international plane. Along with that element of good faith there is the accompanying principle or element of a broad and generous toleration, which must have place in social life, which must have place in every phase of life, and without which the work of the world and the progress of the world would be poor and meagre indeed. These two principles of good faith and of a broad and generous toleration are principles which have nowhere been more strongly illustrated than in the growth, in the progress and in the present condition of the greatest empire in the world. I mean the British Empire. Great Britain is a nation which has been distinguished by the tenacity with which she held to every compact and every agreement. She has been distinguished no less by that spirit of generous and broad toleration with which she has treated every religion, every class of nationality which form the components of her great Empire. Now, Sir, these two principles of good faith and toleration are the very principles which underlie our constitution, and especially those clauses of the constitution under which the present question arises, and which have to do with the educational rights of minorities in the different provinces of the Dominion.

The first question, then, for me to solve when I approach the consideration of this subject is this: Is there any compact or agreement arrived at in this country and embodied in the constitution under which we live which has first to be considered before we can give our decision upon this question? The answer is plain and definite. There is a compact in the constitution of confederation; there is a second compact in the constitution of Manitoba, ratified by the British Parliament, and under which she became a part of this Dominion. It is an idea which has currency in the country, that for these compact clauses in the constitution and for the protection of minority schools in this country the Catholics were sole movers, and are responsible for their introduction into this constitution. The question has been so threshed out in this House that I imagine there is no hon. member sitting within these walls who for a moment takes that view. But the idea is yet prevalent in the country, and it is necessary that it should be properly and thoroughly under-

stood before we can get at the proper basis for a settlement of this matter. What are the facts of the case? That this question of a guard in the constitution, in the form of an appeal clause, in favour of religious minorities, as regards educational work was not raised in any case by the Catholics of any province which came into confederation in 1867. It was not a question raised by the Catholic people of Nova Scotia, it was not a question raised by the Catholic minority in New Brunswick, it was not a question raised by the Catholic majority in the province of Quebec, and it was not a question raised by the Catholic minority in the province of Ontario. By whom was it raised? Simply and solely by the Protestant minority in the province of Quebec, and that point is one that must be settled and thoroughly settled in our minds as being a necessary basis for the consideration of the question.

Mr. WALLACE. Permit me to ask a question. If it was not asked by the Protestant majority of Ontario, how did it become part of the constitution contrary to the wishes of Hon. George Brown and others?

Mr. FOSTER. If the hon. gentleman will allow me to proceed I will answer that question in due course, and I will answer it thoroughly. Arising out of long years of sectarian and religious strife under United Canada, opinions and convictions in reference to this matter became gradually modified, and when the representatives of the four provinces came together at Quebec to take up, discuss and settle articles of confederation, these convictions rapidly and definitely resolved themselves into the determination that it should be laid down in the constitution of the country that whatever rights and privileges religious minorities had in the provinces at the time of confederation should maintain their status quo and should not be changed. And so the first paragraph of the educational clauses of the confederation resolutions gave by general consent to the provinces the power to deal with respect to education:

Saving the rights and privileges which Catholic or Protestant minorities in both Canadas may possess as to their denominational schools at the time when the union goes into operation.

The only change which took place in that clause was this, that instead of its being confined to both Canadas, it was broadened to include the provinces which entered confederation. But, Sir, was that satisfactory to the Protestant minority of the province of Quebec? It was not. The Protestant minority of Quebec, led by Hon. Mr. Galt and others, refused to discuss the articles of confederation, refused to accept the fact of confederation unless something else was done to make the Protestant minority secure not only in the rights which they possessed, for this security was fairly well given to them by the clause I have

read, but in those for which they had been agitating, which they did not then possess and which they wished to possess. There were only two ways by which these additional powers could be got: either by legislation in the Parliament of United Canada before confederation came into operation, under which state of things they would have been secured by the general clause I have read; or else by placing another clause in the constitution, so that when they got those rights after confederation they would have them secured to them by the dominant power of confederation, acting through the Federal Parliament. This was a question brought up, as I have said, by the Hon. Mr. Galt. And how was it settled in the end? It was attempted to be settled by legislation in the provincial parliament which was promised in 1865, but which was not brought down; which was brought down in 1866, but which, owing to complications which arose, was not passed; which it was then promised by Sir George Cartier and other French leaders would be enacted by the Quebec legislature after confederation had gone into force. On the strength of that promise, evincing again the good faith which existed between parties at that time as regards promises made one to the other, on the good faith of that promise for efficient and full legislation for the Protestant minority confederation was accepted, and a clause was placed in the constitution which should make this post-union legislation secure for all time to come. This clause which was proposed by Mr. Galt and unanimously agreed to by the other delegates reads as follows:—

And in any province where a system of separate or dissentient schools by law obtains, or where the local legislature may hereafter adopt a system of separate schools, an appeal shall be made to the Governor in Council of the general government from the acts and decisions of the local authorities which may affect the rights or privileges of the Protestant or Catholic minority in the matter of education. And the general parliament shall have power by the last resort to legislate on the subject.

The effect of embodying this clause in the constitution is that any post-union legislation such as had been promised to the Protestant minority, consummated after confederation would be secured through the appeal to the general Parliament and through the dominant power in that Parliament, which was supposed at that time to be sufficient and to be relied upon to protect the rights of the minority thus confided to its care. Hon. Mr. Galt and the Protestants of Quebec accepted that settlement, and accepted it loyally. It was the sine qua non of the Protestant minority of their entrance into confederation. I want to make this point as clear as it is true, that Quebec Protestants refused to enter into confederation unless the way of separate schools, and which

could only be granted by the Quebec legislature after confederation, was absolutely secured to them by such a clause.

Now, Sir, this, as I have stated, was an article which was placed in the constitution of Canada, not smuggled into it, but placed in it after years of discussion, and with the unanimous assent of the fathers of confederation. More than that, Sir, this clause was not only put in that way, but the whole educational section was put in against the protest of one of the most prominent Catholics in the province of Ontario, John Sandfield Macdonald, who objected to it, and who was quite willing, as far as the Catholic minority in the province of Ontario and elsewhere was concerned, that their rights should rest upon the good feeling and the sense of fair-play of the local legislatures. But, Sir, the whole educational section was confirmed and included the additional guard pressed for as a *sine qua non* by the Protestant minority of Quebec, and that *sine qua non* is simply, as I have stated, of value and worth to them, as it depends upon an appeal to this Parliament, and the good faith and power of this Parliament to protect them in the matter of their appeal.

Mr. McCARTHY. Where does the hon. gentleman mean that Mr. Sandfield Macdonald moved and spoke about that? My recollection is, that he was not one of the fathers of confederation.

Mr. FOSTER. He was not, but he was a member of the United Parliament, where this was discussed.

Mr. EDGAR. He was strongly opposed to confederation.

Mr. FOSTER. That may be, but he discussed the articles of confederation. He expressed opinions with regard to them, and no doubt he expressed the opinions of the Roman Catholic minority of the province of Ontario in reference to them. And, since the hon. gentleman (Mr. McCarthy) wishes to know what John Sandfield Macdonald stated, it is this:

I, as a Catholic, take the ground that I prefer my people to trust to the good sense of the majority in Ontario, as the minority in Quebec should trust to the majority there, rather than to have any divided power on the question of education.

And he moved:

That the following words be added to the original motion:—"And that it be an instruction to the said committee to consider whether any constitutional restriction which shall exclude from the local legislature of Upper Canada the entire control and direction of education, subject only to the approval or disapproval of the general Parliament, is not calculated to create widespread dissatisfaction, and tend to foster and create jealousy and strife between the various religious bodies in that section of the province."

That amendment was debated, and, Sir,

Mr. FOSTER.

the result of the debate in the vote was, that it was negatived by an almost overwhelming majority, the figures standing 8 for and 95 against. Now, Sir, not only was that article put in the constitution after discussion, and after an antecedent strife of half a century in this country, but, Sir, it was put in by and with the full consent of men of both shades of politics, and of men of the very strongest personal feeling in opposition to the principle of separate schools. To show the importance of the question to the Québec minority, and the views of the strong men of the time, let me quote. Sir A. T. Galt said:

This was a question in which in Lower Canada they must all feel the greatest interest, and in respect to which more misapprehension might be supposed to exist in the minds, at any rate of the Protestant population, than in regard to anything else connected with the whole scheme of federation.

Mr. Holton, representing the English Protestants, said:

The English Protestants of Lower Canada desire to know what is to be done in the matter of education before the final voice of the people of this country is pronounced on the question of confederation.

Sir John Macdonald replied:

Before confederation is adopted the Government would bring down a measure to amend the school law of Lower Canada, protecting the rights of the minority.

Sir John Rose said:

I know you must satisfy them that their interests for all time to come are safe, that the interests of the minority are hedged round with such safeguards that those who come after us will feel that they are protected in all they hold dear.

Sir George Cartier, a Catholic and a Frenchman, in reply to a question of Sir John Rose, said:

It is the intention of the Government that in that law there will be a provision that will secure the Protestant minority in Lower Canada such management and control over their schools as will satisfy them.

Sir E. P. Tache said:

Mr. Sanborn gave expression to the fear that the Protestant English element of Lower Canada would be in danger if this measure should pass. But if the lower branch of the legislature were insensate enough and wicked enough to commit some flagrant act of injustice against the English Protestant portion of the community they would be checked by the general—that is the Federal Government.

Hon. Mr. Laframboise said:

There is one certain fact, and that is that the Protestants of Lower Canada have said to the Government "Pass a measure which shall guarantee to us the stability and protection of our educational system and of our religious institutions and we will support your scheme of confederation; unless you do we will never support

you, because we do not wish to place ourselves at the mercy of a local legislature, three-fourths of the members of which will be Catholics." I admit that in doing this they have only done their duty, for who can say after all what ten years may bring forth.

Hon. George Brown said :

It is confessedly one of the concessions from our side that have to be made to secure this great measure of reform. But surely, I for one have not the slightest hesitation in accepting it as a necessary condition of the scheme of union, and doubly acceptable must it be in the eyes of gentlemen opposite, who were the authors of the Bill of 1863.

Hon. Sir Oliver Mowat, who was one of the fathers of confederation, and who took part in these discussions, said, as late as March, 1890 :

In what spirit was the new constitution framed? It was a compromise all round, and an essential part of that compromise—so essential that without it confederation could never have taken place—was the provision by which the separate schools of Ontario, and the Protestant dissentient schools of Quebec, were guaranteed by the Imperial enactment.

But for this being guaranteed, we would have had no Dominion Parliament with its present limited powers, and no provincial legislatures with their powers.

Hon. Alexander Mackenzie, not an upholder of the separate school system, said when speaking against John Sandfield Macdonald's motion :

Though I am against the separate school system, I am willing to accept this confederation even though it perpetuates a small number of separate schools. Under the present legislative union we are powerless in any movement for the abrogation of the separate system; it is even very doubtful if we could resist the demands for its extension. We will not be in a worse position under the new system, and in one respect we will have a decided advantage, in that no further change can be made by the separate school advocates. We will thus substitute certainty for uncertainty. I deeply regret that the hon. member should have thought it necessary for any purpose to move this resolution.

And Sir Alexander Galt, who headed this agitation, who was the prime mover in bringing this question to its final resting place in the constitution of this country, in his pamphlet, published afterwards, referring to the circumstances, said :

Much of the principle and mode of taxation, separate management and other important points are not secured by the Act of confederation, but rest upon the provincial statute of Quebec; that is subject to repeal.

And the only certainty for the enjoyment of these privileges lies in their appeal to this Parliament and in the good faith and dominant power of this Parliament. So, Sir, what I wish to draw from this is that in the Confederation Act itself there is this compact, deliberately entered into, and acquiesced in by men of all shades of party politics and religious belief; and what I

want to add to that is this, that the very essence of the Quebec Protestant minority's demand is post-union legislation, which depends entirely on the article of the constitution which is concerned in the appeal before us at this moment.

Nothing more than the above can fitly exemplify the good faith and the toleration, leading to compromise and to harmony, which distinguished the fathers of confederation, growing up as they did in a troubled period, having experience of strifes that arose from contested religious beliefs, and meeting on this common ground of permanent security for the good of the confederation and for its advancement thereafter.

But, Sir, there is a second compact which has to be taken into account in the discussion of this question, that is, the Manitoba compact. Now, let us look for one moment at what took place when Manitoba came into this confederation. I will not recount the history of the events which took place in that northern country immediately before confederation. There was trouble. That great wide country had been sold by the company that owned it to the Dominion Government. But there was not only land in that country. There was a handful of people there as well—Protestants and Catholics, English, Scotch and French—living along the Red River and the Assiniboine River; the denizens and citizens of that land, who were not conquered by Canada nor sold to Canada by the company at the time they sold the land to the Dominion Government. Those men came into and became a part of this confederation after negotiations had taken place, after those negotiations had resulted satisfactorily, and after the results of those negotiations had been settled in black and white in the articles of confederation upon which Manitoba was taken into confederation. Is there any doubt about that?

Mr. MARTIN. Yes, great doubt.

Mr. FOSTER. There is doubt that negotiations preceded the passage of the Manitoba Act?

Mr. MARTIN. Nobody representing Manitoba ever agreed to the Confederation Act.

Mr. FOSTER. My statement is true, absolutely true, that negotiations took place, and that the final issue resulted from the bringing of those negotiations to a successful and satisfactory conclusion between the negotiating parties. And, Sir, those negotiations were accompanied by distinct assurances of the Government of Canada as to what would be done. These negotiations were watched with a most jealous and careful eye by the Home Government; and the Home Government followed their course, and sanctioned them at the last. Recollect that the people who lived there were few in number, and were a people who had not the advantages

of education and refinement such as we have at this time—a simple-minded people, having their modes of life, their religious customs, their school privileges; intensely suspicious as to what might happen to them if they came under the dominancy of a greater power and intensely careful that they should know, before they were handed over to the Dominion of Canada, that their customs, their rights, their privileges, their status, should be well defined, and should be favourable and satisfactory to them.

I have said that those negotiations were accompanied by assurances from the Dominion Government—assurances which were calculated to settle in the minds of a simple-minded people such as they, that good faith would be kept and security would belong to them if they became a component part of confederation. In the instructions of the Governor General to Colonel de Salaberry, to the Rev. Mr. Thibault and to Mr. Donald A. Smith, that is plainly set forth. The instructions to the two first-named state:

You will not fail to direct the attention of the mixed society inhabiting the cultivated borders of the Red River and Assiniboine, to the fact which comes within your daily knowledge and observation, and is patent to all the world, that in the four provinces of this Dominion, men of all origins, creeds and complexions, stand upon one broad footing of perfect equality in the eye of the Government and the law; and that no Administration could confront the enlightened public sentiment of this country, which attempted to act in the North-west upon principles more restricted and less liberal than those which are fairly established here.

In the instructions to Mr. Donald A. Smith, the third commissioner, this sentence appears:

The people may rely upon it that respect and protection will be extended to the different religious denominations, and that all the franchises which have existed, or which the people may prove themselves qualified to exercise, shall be duly continued or liberally conferred. That "right shall be done in all cases."

The Governor General, writing to Mr. McTavish, the Governor of the Hudson Bay Company, on December 6th, 1869, said:

And the inhabitants of Rupert's Land, of all classes and persuasions, may rest assured that Her Majesty's Government has no intention of interfering with or setting aside, or allowing others to interfere with the religions, the rights, or the franchises hitherto enjoyed, or to which they may hereafter prove themselves equal.

The Canadian Secretary of State, writing to Governor Macdougall in December, 1869, said:

You will now be in a position to assure the residents of the North-west Territories that all their civil and religious liberties will be sacredly respected. That the country will be governed, as in the past, by British law, and according to the spirit of British justice.

Mr. FOSTER.

The Governor General, in a proclamation issued on the 6th of December, 1869, said:

By Her Majesty's authority, I therefore assure you that, on the union with Canada, all your civil and religious rights and privileges will be respected, your properties secured to you, and that your country will be governed, as in the past, under British laws and in the spirit of British justice.

Now, Sir, I say that the tenor of these assurances and communications to a simple-minded people, intensely jealous of the rights, privileges and customs they had enjoyed, unlearned in forms of law or diplomacy, could convey to them and did convey to them, nothing else than that on their union with Canada their status, their civil and religious rights, their customs, so far as they prevailed, should be respected and should be maintained for them, entire and unabridged, on their union with the Dominion of Canada.

But, Sir, I have said that Her Majesty's Government also took an interest in those negotiations. On the 9th day of April, 1870, Earl Granville, while following the negotiations as they were being carried on here in the city of Ottawa, cabled to the Governor General:

Let me know as soon as you can by telegram the result of the negotiations with the Red River delegates.

Earl Granville, on 23rd April, informed the Governor General:

The Canadian Government to accept decision of Her Majesty's Government on all portions of the settlers "bill of rights."

The Governor General was able to cable, on 3rd of May, to Earl Granville:

Negotiations with the delegates closed satisfactorily.

And on 16th March, Earl Granville replied:

I take this opportunity of expressing the satisfaction with which I have learned, from your telegram of the 3rd inst., that the Canadian Government and the delegates have come to an understanding as to the terms on which the settlements on the Red River should be admitted into the union.

Now, I think this is conclusive as to my general proposition, that the terms of the confederation were preceded and accompanied by negotiations, that they were the result of these negotiations, that they were satisfactory to both sides, and so were made a part of the Manitoba Act and the constitution of this country.

Mr. MARTIN. Might I ask the hon. gentleman whether the bill of rights referred to in the despatch just read contained any request or any reference to the question of separate schools?

Mr. FOSTER. I am not discussing, nor do I intend to discuss anything in controversy with reference to the different bills of rights or what they contained.

Mr. MARTIN. That is most important.

Mr. FOSTER. I am simply giving the general tenor of what preceded the union. I am not establishing definite special details by definite special proof, but I am impressing upon the minds of those who listen to me the general tenor and import of what took place prior to confederation, and this carries a meaning to members of this House and the people of this country which no specialization would carry—a stronger meaning, a better meaning and a more conclusive meaning.

After these negotiations had taken place—and I now come to something which will be special enough for my hon. friend—there was introduced into this Parliament a Bill providing for the confederation of Manitoba with this Dominion. And one clause of that Bill was known as the educational clause, which contains within it a rescript of the education clause in the British North America Act, extended in order to meet the special condition of the people of Manitoba, who were soon to be brought into this union. I said a moment ago that I was not concerned to dig into this controversy about the bills of rights. What I am concerned to know is that these negotiations took place, that they were incident to the Act, that the Act embodies a measure of guard and a measure of security to the religious minority, whatever it might be, in the province of Manitoba, equal to, in all respects, and stronger in some respects, than the compact which was put into the British North America Act of 1867, in its 93rd clause.

Mr. SPROULE. It says nothing at all about separate schools.

Mr. FOSTER. It most certainly does. Now, let me go one step further. When that Act came down to this Parliament and was discussed—and I hope my hon. friend from Grey (Mr. Sproule) will listen now while I am speaking—when that Act came down and was discussed in this Parliament, it was not put through in a lone and dark hour, when nine-tenths of the members were away and when no discussion could be raised upon it. On the contrary, it was discussed, and ably discussed, in this Parliament. What was done was done in the light of day, open to the people of this country from one end to the other. And what took place? This very clause was debated, it was actually contested, and when those particular words in it which extended protection to Manitoba, over and above the protection which was given in the first item of the education clause in the British North America Act—when that extension came down, objection was made to it, and a motion was made by Mr. Oliver that it should not be conceded. Mr. Oliver thought it should be cut out, but after full discussion it was actually embodied in, and remains now, as a part of the Manitoba Act. Now, Sir, that

is my answer to my hon. friend over there (Mr. Martin) and to my hon. friend here (Mr. Sproule), that whatever view they may take of the bills of rights and of communications and negotiations that took place, in the letter of the law there is a provision made for the rights of the minority. Whether these separate schools were to be Protestant or Catholic depended on which should be the minority, and the provision which was made in that constitution to secure these schools, was thought to be sufficient and was so considered by all.

After debate was had in this House, and after a vote was called, an overwhelming majority decided that that clause, as extended, should go into the Manitoba Act, and if my hon. friend thinks that that does not show that there was a minority guarantee to Manitoba, perhaps I can convince him by some independent testimony. First, I take the statement made by Hon. G. W. Ross, Minister of Education for Ontario, 19th December, 1895, in Montreal:

I believe, under the Act by which Manitoba entered the union, it was understood by all the other provinces that the minority, whether Protestant or Catholic, would have the right to establish denominational schools. It was the merest mockery to empower the Dominion Government to interfere for the protection of denominational schools unless it was assumed that such schools existed and that in the changes incident to the growth of a new country they might need protection from possible interference some time in the future.

That is strong testimony. It is not testimony from a political adherent of this Government.

Mr. SPROULE. He only gave it as his belief.

Mr. FOSTER. The Hon. Wm. Macdougall, who was one of the members of Parliament in 1870, and an actor later in the bringing of Manitoba into this Dominion, said in 1892:

We certainly intended that the Catholics of Manitoba, or whichever denomination might be in a minority, should have the right to establish and maintain their own schools. You see the words "or practice" were inserted in the Manitoba Act, so that the difficulty which arose in New Brunswick, where separate schools actually existed but were not recognized by law, should not be repeated in Manitoba. And then the right of appeal to the Federal Parliament was given to make assurance doubly sure.

Only an opinion, says my hon. friend from Grey (Mr. Sproule), but it is the opinion of a man who was a prime actor in the actual circumstances of the day, and I put that as against the opinion of even my hon. friend from Grey, who is living some twenty-five or twenty-six years later.

Mr. McCARTHY. Where did Mr. Macdougall make that statement?

Mr. FOSTER. In his own house, to a reporter, and it was published in the news-

paper and was authorized. But I do not know that I might not have a higher authority still, in the opinion of my hon. friend, for I think that Mr. Dalton McCarthy, Q.C., who spoke for and was the attorney for the province of Manitoba, admitted before the Privy Council committee that this minority had rights. Unfortunately, he did not go so far as to admit that the rights which they undoubtedly had ought to be preserved to them. He stopped short of that; but he did absolutely admit and confess that they undoubtedly had rights. And he did more; he confessed and admitted that if it had not been for bad clerical work in drafting they would have had still stronger rights than they have now to present to Parliament and to the country. For, in the opinion of very eminent legal men sitting in this House, whatever was the decision of the Privy Council in Great Britain on the Barrett case, the minority had before confederation practically in operation what were the equivalent of separate schools; that if it had not been for bad drafting or bad judgment, that first appeal to the Privy Council of Great Britain would have kept this question out of Parliament, because it would have established the unconstitutionality of the Act passed by the Manitoba legislature in 1890, and given the Manitoba minority their schools under the first section of article 22. But, Sir, I may give further authority, the authority of the Equal Rights Association, voiced by Mr. E. Douglas Armour, Q.C., who says:

It was supposed that the italicized words—that is the words “by practice”—would save the right or privilege of keeping up separate or denominational schools.

The constitution of Manitoba did not guarantee separate schools. It was supposed to do so.

The constitution of Manitoba was supposed to have established separate schools perpetually in Manitoba.

The only point I wish to make on this is one that can be given what weight it is worth—and it will have weight—that a compact having been entered into, which all supposed guaranteed to the minority certain pre-union rights, if by reason of faulty drafting or the failure of words to carry out the well understood and complete agreement on the point they failed to get those rights, it stands for nothing in point of law I grant you, but it carries weight with every honest man when he comes to discuss the question of the infringement of post-union rights. But, Sir, more than that, the Privy Council judgment, given by men of the highest legal ability, removed from prejudices and strife, in Canada, makes this matter plain in two senses. It shows that the terms upon which Manitoba was to become a province of the Dominion were matters of negotiations between representatives of the province of Manitoba and the Dominion Government, and that the Manitoba Act was a Parliamentary compact. It says:

Those who were stipulating for the provisions of section 22 as a condition of the union and those who gave their legislative assent to that Act, by which it was brought about, had in view the perils then apprehended.

The terms upon which Manitoba was to become a province of this Dominion were matters of negotiation between representatives of the province of Manitoba and the Dominion Government. The terms agreed upon, so far as education was concerned, must be taken to be embodied in the 22nd section of the Act of 1870.

There is no doubt either what the points of difference were, and it is in the light of these that the 22nd section of the Manitoba Act of 1870, which was in truth a parliamentary compact, must be read.

It was not to be doubted that the object of the first subsection 22 was to afford protection to denominational schools.

Now, Sir, I think I have given proof sufficient, but if more is needed it can be had from the sequence of events following the passing of this Act and the entry of Manitoba into the confederation. What were these events? Why, Sir, immediately upon that province being formed—following exactly upon the lines of the negotiations, following exactly upon terms of the section of the Manitoba Act, the legislature, as soon as it was convened, adopted a system of schools, providing in the completest manner for the separate schools of the minority which at that time was found to be Catholic instead of a Protestant minority. More than that, a significant circumstance took place at a later period. In 1876 the question was raised in Manitoba as to the abolition of the Senate of Manitoba on the ground of greater economy in administration. What is the Senate supposed to be in this country? What was it supposed to be, what was the reason for its existence in the provinces of the Dominion? The Senate was looked upon as a guard against sudden impulses and passions of the people. The Senate was looked upon as a protective power to the minorities of the country. They possessed a Senate in Manitoba. When the question as to its abolition was brought up, the Catholics objected to its abolition on the ground that it would diminish their security for two things, their language and their schools. And, Sir, they were promised in the most explicit way by the Premier of the province at that time, by Mr. Luxton, who was an influential member of the legislature at that time, and by others, that if they would consent on the ground of economy to do away with the Senate, they need have no fear that they would not be amply protected both as to their schools and as to their language.

Mr. McCARTHY. Does the hon. gentleman think it right to make that statement upon affidavits that were put in and afterwards withdrawn?

Mr. FOSTER. I am not relying upon affidavits. I am taking the debates which actually occurred in the Manitoba legisla-

ture. My hon. friend must not go insane over the matter of affidavits. I read here, Sir, the report of a debate which took place just immediately precedent to the Bill abolishing the provincial Senate, Premier Davies said :

It may be said that the council is a safeguard to the minority. He could assure the minority that their rights would never be trampled upon in this province. There would always be sufficient English-speaking members in this House, who would insist on giving their French fellow-subjects their rights to protect them.

Mr. Luxton said :

There were some questions of sentiment which lay close to the hearts of the French people, and he could assure them that the English-speaking members would not ruthlessly deal with these, if the French representatives were sufficiently patriotic to support the measure before the House. They would recognize their generosity and not forget it.

Mr. Frank Cornish, then a prominent lawyer, said :

He believed the old settlers and the French would make a common cause if their rights were infringed upon ; and he could assure them that when the Canadian, that is the English-speaking party, became the great majority it would not be found oppressive.

So strong, so hearty, so generous and so general were these expressions that Mr. Royal felt them and rose to express his feeling in this way :

But there was something else, for himself, which had not been guaranteed by any Act ; he found it yesterday in the remarks of the Hon. Messrs. Davis and Norquay, in the applause given by Mr. Brown to the sentiments of Mr. Luxton, and in the expressions of Mr. Cornish.

There is something that is stronger than compacts, stronger than parliamentary law, stronger than constitution in the world's work—the good faith, the pledged faith, born from a generous hearty feeling of goodwill which one man expresses to his brother, which one set of men in the country express to another set of men. That is what seemed more estimable to Mr. Royal than even Acts of Parliament. And Mr. McKay, speaking, said :

He was very much pleased to hear the generous and just remarks of the hon. Premier, the hon. Provincial Secretary, and also of the hon. member for Rockwood, which gave the minority in the House that confidence, which the members of this House by their vote on this Bill would express, that security they felt in the hands of that majority.

The Senate was abolished with the consent of the French members, and two or three years afterwards, both those rights, one of their language, the other to their educational system, were ruthlessly abolished by the Act of 1890.

Mr. MARTIN. Does the hon. gentleman know that Mr. Luxton, who was referred to in that debate, was at that time strongly

urging the abolition of separate schools, that he was elected two years prior to that time pledged to do all he could to abolish separate schools ?

Mr. FOSTER. Whether I know that or not, it is quite conceivable that a gentleman of honour and good faith can have the strongest possible opinion with reference to separate schools, and yet when he comes to a number of gentlemen, his fellow-members, and asks them to give up their opposition to the abolition of the Manitoba legislative council which they looked upon as the guardian of their special rights in language and schools, and pledges his word that they will not regret it, that he will act like a gentleman and respect his promise. And to-day this same Mr. Luxton is strongly in favour of restitution to the minority in Manitoba. There was more. There was another episode which took place in 1888 ; and in mentioning this I am not dealing with affidavits which were put in and which were then withdrawn. I ask the attention of this House to the facts given in a speech of Mr. Fisher in the legislature of Manitoba, an old-time Liberal, and a Liberal to this day. I do not intend to go into the circumstantial parts of the statements in this speech, they have been stated over and over again in this House ; but this was another instance where faith was pledged in a certain contest, where faith was pledged and a contest was run upon it, and a contest was gained upon it, and a government was formed in consequence of it ; where the pledges which Mr. Fisher said were made were not carried out ; where Mr. Fisher was impelled to rise in the legislature of Manitoba, and say that the schools were taken away from the minority by an act of bad faith which he could not but reprobate, and which he could not but deplore. This is additional evidence that the pledge and compact in the Manitoba Act was something really lived upon, acted upon, acquiesced in, for over twenty years, until circumstances arose which made it expedient, in the opinion of the dominant party in Manitoba, to abolish the system of separate schools. Sir, I say that the Manitoba compact was another instance of toleration and compromise, looking towards peace and harmony, and in the best interests of the province and of the Dominion at that time, a duplication of the action which took place some years before in the Confederation Act with reference to the other provinces of the Dominion.

Now, Sir, I wish to come to another point of view. The Government is attacked in this House and in the country for its action with reference to this question. Men meet me every day and say : Why did you raise this question at all ? Why did you bring it up ? I am speaking to that class of men now particularly, when I ask : Who raised this question ? It was not raised, but settled, by the men of 1867, in the Confederation Act ; it was not raised, but settled by the

men of 1870 in the Manitoba Act. It has not been raised by the province of Nova Scotia for thirty years ; it has not been raised by the province of New Brunswick for thirty years ; it has not been raised by the province of Ontario for thirty years ; it has not been raised by the province of Quebec for thirty years. There is an even harmony of peace, and of security, and of contentment, so far as that clause of the Act is concerned in its relation to the provinces, for all that period, broken but once, but broken in Manitoba, and broken by whom? To-day, Sir, no indignation is too strong to be hurled against the Liberal-Conservative Government and party because they are endeavouring to settle this question. Let men consider as well why that question has to be settled by us. Let them clearly see whence it comes, and however strong their opinion may be, give to a Government and a party who happen to be in power when this question comes up for settlement, their good feeling, their utmost charity, and their honest and hearty support, if they believe that we are honest and sincere in attempting to meet and settle this question. Who raised it? Sir, it was raised by a segment of a hostile party, the party opposite to us; and but for the action of that segment of a hostile party, there would have been no question here to-day for the Liberal-Conservative party to settle, and even peace and harmony in the west would have gone on side by side with the even peace and harmony in every other province of this Dominion. How did they raise this question? We all know—simply by abolishing the system of schools which was established in 1871, and sweeping away every right which the minority in Manitoba confidently supposed was secured to them, and which they had enjoyed for twenty years. I venture to deplore the action of the Manitoba government and legislature—I wish to speak with no harshness, it is not proper or right for me to do so. I speak simply of a question of fact, and, Sir, I firmly believe that there are few men in this country to-day who do not deplore the action which the Manitoba government and legislature took in 1890 on this question. The Rev. Principal Grant, who went up to Manitoba, and later to the North-west, as an independent inquirer to look into the question, and whose opinion is not, on the whole, at all favourable to the Dominion Government, was constrained to say this :

The government of Manitoba made a great mistake in summarily abolishing instead of reforming the old school system. They have been at war ever since 1890, with the prejudices, and feelings, and even religious convictions of a section of the population that deserved to be treated with the utmost consideration. This war will end only when they make concession which, to the mass of the people interested, will seem reasonable. The sooner these are made the better.

And to make his appeal as emphatic as possible, he says :

Mr. FOSTER.

The onus lies on the provincial government to make concessions to meet the views of the reasonable members of the aggrieved minority.

Sir, I believe it is true, as I stated a moment ago, that in this House and in the country there is a feeling of regret that the action of the Manitoba government in 1890 was either taken at all, or if action was taken, that it was not action upon somewhat different lines, and of a less drastic character. The ostensible reasons which are urged in this House and in the country, are these : First, that the system was faulty. But it is not necessary to cut a man's head off in order to heal a sore upon his body. The system was faulty, but that is no argument that the system must be abolished. It could be reformed ; and the Manitoba government and legislature had full and absolute power to reform it. The schools were inefficient, but that is no argument that they should be abolished. If all the inefficient schools in Manitoba had been abolished, I think a good many more would have suffered a like death. The power lay in the hands of the government and legislature of Manitoba to make those schools efficient. The money was badly managed, but the absolute power lay in the hands of the government of Manitoba to see that it was rightly managed, and all these reforms could have been made without abolition, and without contravening the rights and privileges which have been enjoyed so long by the minority. Why, Sir, is it contended that separate schools cannot be made efficient schools? That contention is not confirmed by the opinions of men who lived in Manitoba and who had something to do with the schools of that province. I find the superintendent of schools, Mr. Somerset, made a report in 1888, in which he said :

In connection with its working (the law) during the last seventeen years, it may be pointed out that the schools of the province have been managed without a particle of the denominational friction that has caused disturbance and bitterness in other provinces of the Dominion.

The past history of the province encourages the hope that perfect justice to each interest shall result in a continuance of the harmony that now exists.

Rev. Dr. Bryce, of Winnipeg, who is no friend of the Dominion Government in this case, wrote before 1890 :

The separate school supporters are viewed in the light of being exempt from the general law which establishes a national system of education. In Manitoba, the Roman Catholic schools are as much national as the Protestant. No special rights are given to either Catholics or Protestants. * * * The government grant is voted for one system of schools, and is divided according to the population of children. No special rights are given either Catholics or Protestants. All moneys are equitably distributed.

* * * Lord Selkirk's scheme of perfect religious equality and toleration is that still subsisting in Manitoba.

* * * There is no bone of contention to disturb the prevailing harmony. No church is given any place of precedence.

Rev. Peter Wright, who takes a lively interest in this question, at Portage la Prairie, says :

In Ontario very excellent work is being done in many of the separate schools. The late Prof. Young, when Inspector of the High Schools of Ontario, was asked by the Government to inspect such separate schools as he conveniently could. I remember a conversation I had with him in which he bore testimony to the excellent condition in which he found many of them.

More yet. Let us take the Toronto "Globe" of 1895. What does it say ?

We advocate the Ontario system, not because it is fixed by the constitution, but because we consider it to be a good system, embodying a satisfactory settlement of a vexed question.

If this province were making a fresh start to-day, absolutely untrammelled by constitutional restrictions, we do not know that it could do better than continue that arrangement without any material change.

Hon. David Mills, in 1892, said :

The course taken in the province of Ontario, on the whole, produces the most satisfactory results on this continent, of the educational question.....I say there is no public school system on this continent, producing more satisfactory results, and that works out with less friction than the separate school system of Ontario.

Then, I say, my position is abundantly proved, if indeed it did require to be proved, that it was possible for other action to have been taken for inefficient separate schools to have been made efficient and workable, short of the abolition of those schools and the raising of this vexed question. These were the ostensible reasons put forward, but if the leader of the Opposition, who says he demands separate schools, were present, I would draw his attention most closely to another point.

What was the real reason for abolishing separate schools in Manitoba ? I will quote three authorities. The first authority is the hon. gentleman who introduced the Bill abolishing the separate schools. In introducing the Bill, he is reported to have said :

The Government's action had not been determined because they were dissatisfied with the manner in which the affairs of the department are conducted under the system, but because they are dissatisfied with the system itself.

Dr. Grant, after making his investigation, said :

The men responsible for the change did not attack the old system for faulty administration or poor results ; but they took the ground that it was wrong in principle.

Mr. McCarthy, who spoke by the book, for he had the whole case of Manitoba under his charge, said :

Do you tell me that the Equal Rights Association had nothing to do with that question ? Of course the feeling was there ; the grievance ex-

isted ; here people's minds had only to be directed to it, and the moment attention was drawn to it, the province of Manitoba rose as one man and said : We want no dual language, and away with separate schools as well.

That is food for reflection for the leader of the Opposition and the hon. gentlemen who follow his leadership, who has stated, over and over again, that he is intensely desirous for the restoration of the privileges of the minority to them, in so far as separate schools are concerned, that he believes the adoption of sunny ways would have brought about such a conclusion of this matter ; yet we stand face to face with the declaration of the mover of the Bill, of the hon. gentleman who had Manitoba's case under his direct charge, and, from what is well and widely known, that it was not because they objected to the inefficiency or lack of efficiency of minority schools, but they objected to the principle, and separate schools was the thing that had to march out of the Manitoba domain. The leader of the Opposition says that the demon of discontent is roaring, blowing the winds of strife. Who has unchained that demon ? It was chained down by the fathers of confederation by the clause in the Confederation Act, and the compact that resulted from it. It remained chained down for twenty-five years, until the bolts were drawn by the Liberal party ; since then it has gone about and through this country, this demon of discord, blowing the winds of strife, and hon. members opposite now deplore that state of affairs. The evil spirit has been summoned. Who will exorcise it ? Not the Manitoba government, it seems, for during six years they have had the power at will to exorcise the evil spirit and settle the question, and bring peace where discord reigns : but they have not, as yet, taken one single step towards the attainment of that end. Who is responsible for it ? Hon. gentlemen opposite and their party, as a whole, are responsible for it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. FOSTER. I say it, and I adhere to it as strongly as I possibly can. A section of that party unchained this demon of discord, which is roaring around, blowing the winds of strife, and the party as a whole has been the most powerful factor in preventing Manitoba from settling this question. From the day it arose, from the Toronto "Globe" down, they have backed up the province of Manitoba, and called on her to be staunch and firm in resisting the tyranny of the Dominion. In the province of Quebec they carried on a crusade against this Government, as they did in the province of Ontario, because they at first declared the Government would do nothing, and because afterwards they feared the Dominion Parliament would intervene to secure a settlement of the question. In every way they have kept the agitation alive, they have fanned the

flames and added to the difficulties of settlement. They have the odium of being the party which unchained the demon, and which has been helping to blow the winds of strife through the country from that time on.

Now, Sir, what has been the course of the Dominion Government with reference to that question? And first, its legal course. On this question, arising from the constitution which the Government was sworn to maintain and uphold, a question which was thrown into their midst by this segment of a hostile party, dogged, as every movement of the Government has been by this party, and for partisan purposes; what has the Government done? It was well aware of the perils of the voyage. It knew the quicksands and hidden reefs, but what this party and Government did, was to nail their compass to the standard of the law and the constitution, and to steer by that towards the port of restitution; restitution, if possible, by the power which could best do it; restitution, if necessary, by the power in whose hands it ultimately was vested by the constitution of the country. They were clamoured with to exercise the veto power. They refused to exercise the veto power, taking the consistent ground that the constitutionality of the Act should be fought out in the courts, and as they did in the case of the New Brunswick schools, they gave a sum of money for testing the constitutionality of that Act. Afterwards, they sought the decision of the courts as to their powers in accordance with the Blake Act, so-called, which was acquiesced in for this special purpose by both sides of the House of Parliament, and passed as a means to be taken advantage of, in this case, and in cases of this kind, never stopping in their even course, until they had the rights and powers as to appeal, as to grievances, and as to the restitution in the case of these grievances, carefully and fully confirmed by the highest tribunal in the British Empire; and, after that, they heard the appeal, making their judgment under the remedial order, and sending it forward to the province which was chiefly interested.

I ask any man here: If that was not the course which the Government followed, consistently, and without deviation, from the very moment this question came into the arena.

Politically, what was the action of the Government? It first invited Manitoba to redress the grievances complained of—and here I have to complain of one thing, which hon. gentlemen opposite, and the leader of the Opposition, especially, have distinctly and constantly ignored, namely, the first communication which was sent by this Government to the Manitoba government and legislature on the 24th July, 1894, inviting them to the consideration of the grievances complained of, and expressing the strongest

hope that they would take these matters into consideration and remedy these grievances. This was done, Sir, in 1894, before the decision of the Privy Council. This Government asked the Manitoba government, moreover, that they should lay that request before the legislature of Manitoba. But the government of Manitoba refused the invitation to consider the grievances; they said none existed, and they absolutely neglected to lay the communication before the legislature of Manitoba, and it has not been put before that legislature to this day. The Government then sent forward the remedial order, making it just as wide as the grievances which were complained of. They conveyed to the Manitoba government, at the same time, the intimation, that though that order was made so wide as to cover the fullest possible allegation of grievances, yet, at the same time, a proposition could fairly be made within the lines of that order which might be reasonably satisfactory, and which would be satisfactory, so far as the Dominion Government was concerned. The Manitoba government refused to carry out the terms of that order. What happened thereafter? We came up to the session of Parliament. We had this refusal to act under the remedial order. Our whole course had been an intimation that legislation by this Parliament must follow, if no restitution was made by the Manitoba government. But, instead of driving matters to the extreme, even then, and trying to pass the legislation, the Dominion Government held out the olive branch once more, and postponed legislation for one session on this matter. They again addressed the Manitoba government, asking them to take into reconsideration the whole question, and to make a proposal upon which they could agree, as to some arrangement which would reasonably satisfy the minority. In doing that, Sir, there was an acute difference of opinion in the Government and in the party as to whether it was wise or not; but, for the sake of giving every possible chance to the government of Manitoba and the legislature of Manitoba to settle the question, that acute difference of opinion, and that dissatisfaction which arose in the party, was braved, for the time being, for the sake of the result which all of us would be glad to have happened, namely, the settlement of this question by Manitoba itself. Now, Sir, having given that delay, and having no answer, acceding to even a proposition upon the matter, we came face to face with this Parliament, under the pledge to legislate if the Manitoba government had not arranged the matter. We are carrying out that pledge. We are asking this Parliament to pass the second reading of this Bill. We have staked our existence as a Government upon that measure; but even yet, in answer to the plea—a plea of great force—that if this could be arranged by the Manitoba government and legislature, it would be far better, we

have still, even at this late period, asked for a conference, and will meet in conference in order that, if it is possible to arrange it, the Manitoba government and legislature may yet settle this question, as they can easily do, on the principles of fair-play to the minority.

I say that the Government, in acting on these lines, has acted with dignity. It has acted with prudence. It has acted with forbearance, and now, after six years, it comes to the time and the place, where it thinks that in justice to the minority and to the duties which the constitution lay upon us, it is impossible to further postpone settlement, and that, therefore, during this session of this Parliament, a final settlement must be made in one way or the other.

What, Sir, has been the action of the Manitoba government? They broke the spirit of the confederation compact, as I have shown, in 1890 and 1894. They have refused, in the least degree, to make any concession to the minority or to mitigate the severity of their legislation with reference to that minority. They have refused our invitations, refused to act upon the order. They have declared, over and over again, by their counsel, and by themselves, that they did not, in the first place, recognize any wrong, and that they did not propose, therefore, to attempt to settle any alleged grievances. They affirm, in short, that no wrong has been committed, and that they will not change the present system of education. That may have been their determination up to the present time. That may be their determination, even when this conference takes place. I hope it will not be; I hope that the matter, having come to this stage, when one way or the other it must be settled, I hope, I say, that the Manitoba government will take the matter in its own hands, and by a reasonable arrangement concede to the minority what they reasonably ought to have, and so settle this question, and take it out of the arena of politics.

And, as to the Manitoba minority. I must say it, and I say it here, that the minority deserves a meed of praise for its attitude, under these long six years, of what they consider a grievance and a deferred right. That Manitoba minority waited with patience the decision of the Privy Council, and when the decision was given, they murmured a little, but they abided by it, and they respected it. They took up the second branch of what they thought was the charter of their minority rights. They carried it from the Supreme Court in Canada to the Privy Council in Great Britain at their own cost and charges. There they got this judgment, saying that they had a grievance and a right of appeal, and that we had the power to remedy the grievance. They brought that appeal to us; they have waited patiently during delay after delay; and now, after six years, it does not seem more than fitting and right that their

patience and the Government's forbearance should meet in a measure which may adequately restore those rights and remedy that grievance in harmony with the purpose of the constitution.

Now, Sir, there are certain objections made to this measure. One is that Parliament is free as air and not bound, and that consequently we are not compelled to legislate. My hon. friend from West York (Mr. Wallace) advanced that view, and he is right to a certain extent. Parliament is free as air and unbound. So far as this case is concerned, there is no judgment of a court which compels it to do one thing or the other. There is no superior parliamentary power which is able to coerce us. But I want to say to my hon. friend, that as in the case of an individual, so in the case of society and a country, the highest form of freedom is invariably surrounded with the strongest limitations. Above the compelling powers of the courts of law, and above the compelling power of superior parliaments, there is a sentiment of justice and fair-play which compels where there is no legal instrument;—which compels by the very force of the appeal which that sentiment carries to the heart and the conscience of a parliament and a people to do justice and to exercise that unrestrained and unrestricted freedom in the interests of a minority or of any class of people plainly aggrieved and asking redress.

But we are told that the majority should rule. The majority should rule, says my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule). That all depends. Does the majority in a small municipality rule in a contest where the jurisdiction as between the provincial legislature and that small municipality lies with the former? Majorities rule under an even and coterminous jurisdiction, that is all. But, Sir, it would be a veritable tyranny not to be endured for an instant, that a majority should rule, to the oppression of a minority in a small section of country, against the vast majority of a Parliament like this, which has undoubted jurisdiction, and in whose keeping these minority rights that have been infringed upon are placed in the most solemn manner by the constitution. Majorities rule, each in its proper plane and sphere; but the majority of the superior jurisdiction must always rule the majority of the smaller section.

There is no parallel between the case of Quebec and the case of Manitoba, says my hon. friend from Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien); they are not alike at all. No parallel? Why not, Sir? Because one minority is Protestant and the other is Catholic? Is that it? That is not the question. You are out of court in making that distinction. The rights of these minorities, which were recognized as legal rights, were settled at confederation. There was a Catholic minority, using Catholic schools, and there was

a Protestant minority using Protestant schools. The right of each was conceded ; under the law, as adopted, those minorities were both to have their protection. It is too late in the day now to raise the question, as to whether you must give force to the law with regard to the Protestant minority, forsooth ; but must put out of court another minority, because it is Catholic. The Catholic minority look on their schools in a certain conscientious and religious way. They may not, in the opinion of some, be right in that, but in the confederation compact their opinion prevailed, and their right was guaranteed to them. The Protestants looked on their schools in a certain way. Some Catholics may have said they were all wrong, and they may have combatted that idea at the time ; but the right of the Protestants was conceded, and that right is protected by the constitution. Another says : You are going to mutilate and destroy the system of public schools in Manitoba. I deny it. I ask the educationalists of the province of Ontario to answer me this question : Is the Ontario system of education destroyed and mutilated because separate schools exist there ? You cannot find an educationalist of repute in the province of Ontario, or one who has inspected the system of education in that province, who will give you an affirmative answer to that question. The public school system of Manitoba would be destroyed, if hon. gentlemen opposite had had their way. The leader of the Opposition, who either believed in the argument, or was ungenerous enough to use against us an argument in whose validity he himself did not believe, said that the Catholics of Manitoba are suffering an injustice to-day, because we did not exercise the veto power in 1890.

Mr. GUAY. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend says, "Hear, hear ;" but I invite him down to the seat in front, beside the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), who yesterday made that bitter anti-remedial speech, and I will leave them to fight the matter out between them. If we had vetoed the Act of 1890, what would we have done ? Smashed irremediably a system of public schools, which is in accord with the majority of opinion in the province of Manitoba, and created a veritable grievance. To-day, by this legislation, you leave the public school system virtually intact. You simply strive to give back to a minority the privileges guaranteed them, which can be done without disturbing, to any appreciable extent, the beneficence and value of the public school system in the country. Why, Sir, look at the distribution of the population of the country, and tell me how you can maintain the public school system. One says : You will take taxes that ought to go to support it, and that will maintain it. How many people are there in the province ? Some

200,000. How many Catholics ? Some 20,000. So that only one-tenth of the population, at the most, could be withdrawn from the support of the public schools, so far as tax contributions are concerned. How are the Roman Catholics grouped in the province ? The Rev. Dr. King, late moderator of the Presbyterian Assembly, tells us :

A large portion of the Roman Catholic population is situated along the two rivers, where there are almost no Protestants. Accordingly, in nine cases out of ten the trustees would be Roman Catholic, and Roman Catholic teachers could and would be chosen.

The census, also, and every man who knows Manitoba, and has studied its geography, can tell you the same thing. Put your system of separate schools in those parts of the country where nine-tenths of the Catholic population are congregated together, and you have not an iota of difference in the tax contributions, whether you have the separate school system, or whether you have the public school system. You would not take the taxes of the Catholics gathered together along the banks of the Red River, and send them to Brandon, or somewhere else, to swell the public school contributions of that portion of the country. No. Then, I say, establish your separate schools, if you wish, and nine-tenths of the minority will be just the same, as regards the tax contributions, as they will be under the public school system, but better—why ? Why, to-day, Sir, they both carry on their own schools, and pay taxes to the public school system, having a grievance, depleting their earnings by paying a second tax into their own private schools, and it is thus impossible for them to keep up schools of at all like efficiency they would have, if they did not have to pay double taxes out of their pockets. You would have better separate schools. What about the remaining one-tenth of the minority ? In the majority of cases, I venture to say, it is so scattered that in practical working, of necessity, they would not form separate schools, but would do, as they do in Ontario, go in with the public schools. Sir, this plea that you would destroy the public school system is a perfect bugbear and nothing else. When you come to analyse it, a system of separate schools, giving the minority their fullest rights in the province of Manitoba would not disarrange matters materially, but would make the schools, on the average, more efficient in every possible way—and the grievance would be removed.

But there are some strictly Liberal objections. I venture to say that in this House there are just two classes of opinions ; and if its members were polled, it would be found that these classes of opinion would be in the proportion of ten to one. One, and the smaller class, believes in the repudiation of the compact clauses of the Confederation Act and of the Manitoba Act—

Mr. FOSTER.

and which, despite this compact, would do away with separate schools entirely. The other, and the larger class, is made up of men who believe in remedial legislation as a principle either in the first or in the last application; and as far as the principle goes, it does not make a bit of difference. The distinction between the Liberal-Conservatives who support remedial legislation, and the Liberals who to-day wish to give it the six months' hoist and kick it out of this Parliament is simply a question as to time of action—not as to principle. Did you hear what the hon. member for Verchères (Mr. Geoffrion) said? Did you hear what other members on the benches opposite said? All, without exception, from the province of Quebec said: Let us have an investigation, let us have a commission; let us have Manitoba settle this thing, if she will. But if she will not settle it, what did they say? What will my hon. friend there (Mr. Davies) say? He is a remedialist in the last analysis. I am a remedialist at this present time. On principle there is not the least difference between us. He is putting the question over on an insufficient plea for delay, on the ground of an investigation. I say it is better for Parliament and the country it should be settled now. But the platform on which they stand in their plea for a commission of investigation. Let us analyse it. My hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Laurier) moves the six months' hoist to a Bill which embodies the principle of remedial legislation. Therefore he and his party are opposed to that principle. My hon. friend, in the very same breath, says: I go for an investigating commission; and he is applauded to the echo by the hon. gentlemen who sit beside him and who follow him. And yet there can be no standing ground for a commission of investigation, unless the principle of absolute remedial legislation underlies it. What business have you investigating if you do not intend to exercise the remedial power should the investigation establish a grievance? The only logical position of anti-remedialists is that taken by the "Globe" and by the third party, viz.: to say you do not want any commission. But the moment you appoint a commission, on your own showing, you are either poking your noses into something you have no business with, or you are standing on a principle which will pledge you to legislate if the commission shows that there is a grievance. That is the consistent platform enunciated by a party which at one and the same minute declares against remedial legislation—kick it out; for remedial legislation—let us have a commission of inquiry. Inquiry is the general cry. The Manitoba government raised it to call off public attention from the act they had committed. My hon. friend the leader of the Opposition raises it in order to keep his party in unison. My hon. friend from L'Islet (Mr. Tarte) follows him a long way off. He

was not there a few years ago, he was not there a few months ago, but the crack of the party whip has been heard, and my nervous and excitable friend feared the lash and came into line, and he calls out for delay and investigation as sturdily as the best of them. Sir Oliver Mowat adopts it to keep the party within line. It is like a vast umbrella under which they all gather and are sheltered from the pelting rain of criticism, as they think, but beneath which they quarrel like cats and dogs. It is the party shibboleth. Whispered in lowest tones by the remedialists—it is a precedent for legislation later; shouted in stentorian tones from the housetops by the anti-remedialists—it is an absolute negative of the principle of remedial legislation.

What is there to investigate? Do we require an investigation into the compacts? There are the documents—the confederation compact and the Manitoba compact. Read them, if you want to know what they mean. There are the pre-union rights, the privileges which everybody knows existed, though legally they are decided not to be, and we throw that out of the question. There were post-union rights and privileges. Are these not known. And they were taken away. The law of 1870 shows what was given, the law of 1890 shows what was taken away—and what now remains? "Scripta manent"—gather those and read them, if you want to know what was given and what was taken away and what remains. Does anybody doubt that? Not the Manitoba government surely. That government gave them, it took them away, and it gave its reasons. Not the courts. They heard the cases, fully investigated the facts, and gave their decisions. There is not a member of this Parliament who does not know the facts and who has not made up his mind with reference to it. There is not an intelligent Canadian who does not know the facts; the facts are sufficiently known without further investigation. What are the facts? There was a compact which, it was thought, secured the minority privileges, and the minority have not those privileges now. There were separate schools for the minority; there are none now. The taxes of the Catholic minority formerly went to support separate schools; they now go to the public schools, and besides this, the minority have to pay for their private schools. The minority had a share of the public funds; they have none now. They had denominational education then; they have not got it now. They had the selection of their own books and so forth then; now they have not. All these things are known. They are to be found in the books of the statutes; they are in the reports of the inspectors of schools; they are in the statistics of the schools; they are in the census returns: they are in the groupings of population. Appoint your commissioners, send them up there, let them in-

investigate, and when they have done their work and come back, what will we have? We will simply have a collection of the very information which we have at hand to-day. A commission will not boil down all this information and put it into homeopathic pills, so that one can take two or three, and, without any effort on his part, have the whole information spread to his brain. There are the documents; they have to be examined. The investigating commission could only gather the documents which we have before us now, and lay them before you for examination. That is all. But my hon. friend who sits opposite me, says the Bill is a bad bill.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Worthless.

Mr. FOSTER. He says we want a good Bill, if we are to have any. Another gentleman says: You have given us the shadow but we want the substance. Another gentleman says it will produce law-suits. Most legislation does.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Bad legislation does.

Mr. FOSTER. What I want to say to the hon. gentleman is that this is simply trifling. The principle of remedial legislation is in that Bill as the gold is in the nugget.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Very refractory gold.

Mr. FOSTER. It may be so, Sir. But the man who wants to get pure gold does not kick aside the nugget with its rough encasement, but he says: Let me have that and, with the help of others, I can refine it into the pure gold. The man who is in favour of remedial legislation accepts that Bill, and does his best in committee to make it as effective as he can, according to his views—I mean the man who is honestly in favour of it. It never has been heard of that a Bill which does not go as far as you wish it to go, but still embodies the principle you desire to have adopted should be kicked out by a motion for the six months' hoist, because it does not cover quite as much as you wish. If you are against remedial legislation, say so, and show it by your vote. If you are honestly in favour of remedial legislation, say so, adopt the principle of this Bill, and then go to work to make it as effective as possible.

Another objection is that this is our sixth session, and we have no right, constitutional or other, to legislate as is proposed. We have every right. The law of this country fixes the term of Parliament, a duration of a certain period—one session every year during that period and within that it is perfectly legal for us to act. We are within the strict letter of that law. More than that, Sir, there is no constitutional requirement which makes it necessary that a ques-

Mr. FOSTER.

tion like this should be submitted to the people. For this is not a new question.

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. Does my hon. friend say it is? This is a question that had agitated this country for years, that was settled in the Confederation Act, and in the Manitoba Act. My hon. friend scored the hon. Secretary of State because he did not take the question of confederation before the people of Nova Scotia, and ask them to pass upon it. The hon. gentleman spoke in sublime forgetfulness of the fact that neither did the province of Ontario, nor the province of Quebec. The important time with reference to this matter was when it was being put in the bed-rock of the constitution. Then was the time for the people to have had a chance to state their convictions. They did discuss the whole question then, they accepted confederation, and we have loyally lived under it for twenty-nine years. We are now upon a specific case which grows out of this adopted constitution, and we have sufficient power to settle it. And our constituencies might well call us poltroons if we refused to deal with the question here to-day. The demon of discord is abroad blowing the winds of strife, say hon. gentlemen. And they get up, and with tears in their eyes, deplore this strife. And yet they want to throw this apple of discord into the general elections, and thus all the more inflame prejudices and passions. It is my belief that it is wise as well as constitutional to settle this question and take the responsibility before our constituents.

But, Sir, are these gentlemen opposite playing a part? I do not ask that in an offensive sense. Are they playing a part? Let us see. I think they are, and I submit my opinion. The stake that they are playing for, I know, and so do our friends here. They are playing for power. They are desperate players. I do not play myself, but I take leave to ask those who do a question. If they had been playing all night, and had been losing continually, and had got to the last cent they had in their pockets, would they not become desperate? Cards up their sleeves, cards in their laps, cards all around—anything to win. These hon. gentlemen have been out for over eighteen years. They have been playing for power and they have lost every time. Their last nickel is invested. If they are desperate players, can we wonder at it? Let me ask my hon. friend from L'Islet (Mr. Tarte) is he playing a part. In 1893 he said in this House:

Can it be true, Mr. Speaker, that because the Parliament of Canada were unable to find a correct term to define the rights of the minority, this minority would have to be crushed under feet? Can it be true that the Crown in Canada has gone that far, that it would avail itself of a clause improperly drawn up to disregard and overlook the rights of the minority?

Again, in 1893, he said :

It is a censurable and a criminal manoeuvre, not only from the point of view of the minority who are now suffering, but also from the point of view of the general interests and the most dear to the country.

I throw aside party ties and I call upon the Government to preserve the rights confessedly granted to the minority by the constitutional charter.

It is our duty to defend them and to take every possible means offered to us by the law and constitution to preserve them inviolate.

Our only wish is that a principle of equal justice to all be applied ; that the compacts, the agreements made be respected by both parties.

The Catholic schools were abolished and instead of taking a firm stand, worthy of true statesmen, they refer the question to the courts of justice.

After a solemn compact, after arrangements were accepted by the majority guaranteeing the rights of the minority, without any notice being given, without any regard for the negotiations which took place these guarantees are thrown aside which protected the rights of the minority, and they would have us believe that Parliament is powerless to do justice to those who suffer.

One more. On January 29th, 1895, the hon. gentleman said :

I say that the position of the Catholic minority is no better as long as the present Government remain in power, for the reason that the members of that Government, and nearly all their supporters, have declared themselves for non-intervention.

How is it now ? May I ask my hon. friend from L'Islet, when the Government and the members of the Cabinet have staked their lives upon the principle of intervention ? Where is the hon. gentleman now ? He was not thirsting for information then. He had no doubts as to the grievances of the minority, as to the powers of Parliament, as to the duty of the Government. Did he say "Hands off Manitoba" ? No, but to Manitoba he said, "Hands off the minority." And to the Government he said, "Hands upon" that majority to compel hands off the minority. The veto is the club you should use. Strike ! thrust ! destroy ! What has become of the hon. member for L'Islet ? Was he right then ? If so, is he right now, or is he only playing a part ? Let me ask what was said by my hon. friend from Berthier, and we will have a contrast.

Mr. LANDERKIN. You will have a conference with him.

Mr. FOSTER. Not necessarily. His opinions are very frank and frankly given. Here they are :

In the third place, we contend that the time for disallowance having once expired, it was the duty of the Government to enact such remedial laws as were calculated to redress the grievances complained of by the Catholics of Manitoba, instead of resorting to various shifts and subterfuges, to avoid dealing with the just claims of the latter.

Again, my hon. friend from Berthier (Mr. Beausoleil) says :

I, for one, am ready to assume my own share of responsibility, and to give my support to any Government whose first article shall be the redress of the wrongs inflicted upon Manitoba. On the same ground, I would pledge myself to support no government whose programme would be to withhold from the Catholics of Manitoba the just treatment they are entitled to and which they are denied to-day.

Again he said :

On the other hand, should the hon. the Minister of justice pledge himself to adopt such remedial legislation as might be calculated to redress the grievances complained of, in accordance with his report of the 21st March, 1891. I am ready with a large number of my friends, from this side of the House, to lend him a loyal support, thus making up the loss of a few votes among his own friends, brought about by this honest course of action.

That was applauded by the leader of the Opposition, and every member of the party opposite, just as my hon. friend's (Mr. Tarte's) statements were applauded by the leader of the Opposition and every other member of the party who sits behind him. But let us take another, and that is the statement made by the hon. gentleman from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), who spoke yesterday. At Bracebridge, on December 3rd, 1895, he is reported as follows :—

Mr. Charlton was received with loud applause. At the outset he accepted Mr. Bennett's challenge and declared that he would vote against remedial legislation next session if it were proposed, and every other session in which he should be a member and a proposition for the coercion of Manitoba should be introduced. He would do so because he believed that although it might be that the minority in Manitoba had suffered injury, it would be the worst kind of a remedy to shackle and bind a province in the control of its education.

Yet my hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) speaking yesterday on those same lines, received the same Liberal applause from the hon. gentlemen sitting around him. Let us take another hon. gentleman who sits now in this House, but has not been here for a long time previously, I mean the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Cameron), who, when he speaks, will take the same line, and will get the same applause. At Goderich that hon. gentleman said :

First he gave an explicit declaration of his stand on the Manitoba school question. "I shall vote against the remedial order," he said, "I do not care who is Premier of Canada, or who is ruffing the country, I shall vote against coercing Manitoba, against taking her by the throat." He would, if necessary, be the only one to stand up single-handed for provincial rights. "Hands off Manitoba" was his watchword.

Now, Sir, all of these have been applauded. Which was right ? The one consistent utterance that I find amongst them is the utterance of the hon. member for Berthier (Mr. Beausoleil), with which I may couple the utterance of the hon. member for Ottawa

(Mr. Devlin), whose declarations of one or two years ago, square exactly with their declarations now. Now, let us go a little further. "Le Monde," a Liberal paper in Quebec, says :

Before the electors assembled at the Forfar Street and Ste. Etienne Street meetings, Mr. Mc-Shane declared himself for the re-establishment of the Catholic schools in Manitoba. "Good."

Sir William Hingston does not say anything. He is the candidate of the Orange administration that will give Catholics the shadow for the reality, that is to say, nothing at all.

The people's Jimmy has the courage of his opinions, and we congratulate him.

We shall see later whether we can join in these congratulations. Coming down to another province, what do we find? The "Globe" newspaper speaks as to what is going on in Quebec :

As to what is going on in Quebec, we believe that left to himself, the French Canadian citizen cares very little about the question of separate schools in the North-west ; but it is quite possible that he may be worked into a state of excitement by the appeals of politicians who will tell him that the French Canadians of Manitoba are being oppressed by the majority, that it is possible to coerce the majority from Ottawa, and that unless this is done the next point of attack by the "Protestant bigots" will be the customs, language and religion of the people of Quebec. Manitoba cannot be compelled to obey the mandate of Ottawa in educational matters, and the best service that can be rendered the people of Quebec at this juncture is to tell them plainly that the attempt at coercion must be futile.

And again the "Globe" says :

It will, sooner or later, appear that no course is open but to leave the legislature of Manitoba to manage the public education of the province, free from control or interference by any other authority in Canada.

Now, Sir, here are your different sets of opinions ; which are right? All are equally applauded by the party opposite. Why, Sir, am I not justified in saying that they are playing a farce? Take an audience in a theatre. They are facing the boards. The actor comes forward ; as clown, as tragedian, as comedian, he successively comes forward and receives an equal meed of applause, represented as black, or white, as Englishman or as Frenchman, as foreigner or as native—in each character, when he comes forward, he performs his part, and in each is equally applauded. That audience is there simply to be amused, and they are amusing themselves. Here the actors come forward. My hon. friend from L'Islet (Mr. Tarte), and my hon. friend from Winnipeg (Mr. Martin), and other hon. gentlemen, the one black, the other white, with opinions as diverse as the equator is different to the pole, and they are all equally applauded. What is the solution of it? They are simply amusing themselves, there is no principle in the matter. They are playing a part, and they are amusing themselves in the play.

Mr. FOSTER.

Mr. Speaker, I had intended to address a few words to my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition. He is not here to-day ; an inefficient substitute (Mr. Flint) I fear I must say, sits in his place ; but if he will take one message to his chief, I will be glad to send it. Let me take, then, the leader of the Opposition himself. In 1893 he said :

That while in all other matters the powers of the local legislature are almost independent, in the matter of education, a supervisory power has been given to this government, in so far as separate schools are concerned. Whatever privileges are guaranteed to one minority in a province I claim in the name of justice and fairness, for all minorities in all of the provinces.

Again, he said :

If the Supreme Court should decide that the Government have the power to interfere with the legislation of Manitoba, and the Government should not obey the legal mandate which they themselves had sought, there would be a powerful and a rightful agitation in some parts of the country against the Government.

He says again :

The Catholic minority has been subject to most infamous tyranny, if the statement is true as given by Archbishop Taché that Protestant schools are being continued under the guise of public schools, and that Roman Catholic children are forced under that law to attend what are in reality Protestant schools.

Again, he says, still later :

If he ever reached power, and he hoped the time was not far distant when that would become a fact, he had reason to believe that this question would be settled.

If the electors gave him such men as Mr. Charbonneau in Jacques Cartier, and Mr. Mc-Shane in Montreal Centre, and other Liberals of that stamp, it would put him in a position to handle this question.

We favour Christian education, but we want the parent to say which religion should be taught to their children.

The Manitoba Catholics were suffering an injustice now, because the Ottawa Government had not done its duty.

I can say that had I been in power I believe that the school question would now have been settled. The appeals by Archbishop Taché and Archbishop Langevin were not made to me, but give me the power and I will undertake to do justice, and come what may I can do no worse than the Government has done. If I fail to keep my promises you can take me and my friends and throw us into the St. Lawrence.

And so on as to the right and the duty. I might read endless quotations in the same line.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. You are reading a very good speech.

Mr. FOSTER. I read them for this purpose only, to show that on the ground of the right of Parliament to interfere, on the ground of the duty of this Parliament to interfere, on the ground of a well established grievance suffered by the minority, the leader of the Opposition had declared over and

over again that this party, led by the Government in power, have been insufficient, in that they did not redress that grievance, and did not remove that wrong; that if he had been in power he would have redressed that wrong, coupled with the assertion that he makes over and over again that his inmost belief is that the Catholics of Manitoba have a right to their separate schools, and that they should get those separate schools. All these, taken together, form a strong commentary on his position to-day, when the Government having introduced a measure for restoring those rights and removing that grievance, he meets it with a six months' hoist. Sir, this hon. gentleman has argued in favour of the veto, and he has argued against the veto. He has been against any delay and he has rated the Government for delay; yet to-day he is in favour of delay. He has said that investigation is necessary; and he has declared in this chamber that investigation is not necessary. In an exactly parallel case, what is his statement?

As you know, we have in Quebec no schools but religious schools—Roman Catholic schools and Protestant schools. Suppose the legislature of Quebec were to-morrow to abolish the system of separate schools existing there, so that the Protestant population would have either to send their children to the Roman Catholic schools or bring them up in ignorance or tax themselves a second time to establish schools of their own.

Sir, if under the circumstances, an appeal were brought to this Government, is there a man in this House who would not say at once to the Government: It is your bounden duty at once to interfere and make away with this obnoxious and tyrannical legislation.

There is an exactly parallel case here; but the hon. gentleman, with that declaration hot from his mouth, now affirms that we must have investigation and delay, and that remedial legislation must not be given, and he moves the six months' hoist.

The hon. gentleman made a speech at the opening of the debate, in reply to the Secretary of State, a speech that has been much lauded and much read; but a speech which, in my humble opinion, will not bear very much dissection. I wish to direct attention to three or four points in it. The first statement he made was that to proceed with this Bill and make it law

Would be a most violent wrench of the principles upon which our constitution is based.

And yet I have read to this House statement after statement in which the hon. gentleman acknowledged the undoubted right and jurisdiction of this Parliament to so legislate. How can you wrench the constitution by adopting action that is strictly within the powers which the constitution gives? The hon. gentleman went into a long disquisition as regards the excellence of the United States constitution, particularly on the line, that under the United States constitution the state legislation was not supervised by

the federal legislation, and bitterness was therefore not imported in such questions there, and while lauding that feature of the United States constitution he called our own "a very great mistake." For what purpose? A minute afterwards he declared:

But the remedy of interference is found in the constitution, and being there it must be applied by them who love the constitution.

Why was he talking about the beauties of the United States constitution as distinguished from those of our own? We are not living under the United States constitution; and he himself when he came back to his subject had to discuss it in the light of the Canadian and not the United States constitution. Further on in his speech he said:

The minority have a right to have their own schools, that I admit.

If then we live under the Canadian constitution, if this constitution gives a remedy that should be applied, and if the minority have a right to their own schools, what then was the object of bringing the matter up at all? The hon. gentleman then went on to say that we must not force public opinion. He said:

It is the part of statesmanship not to force upon the people the views of any section, but to endeavour to bring them all to a uniform standard and conception of what is right.

And five minutes afterwards he came to the conclusion that a time would arrive, some time, when you must legislate, and you must legislate for the majority and against the minority. Again, he said that we were guilty of deception in the statement of the case which was submitted to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, inasmuch as we asked their opinion upon a state of assumed facts. Does the hon. gentleman deny the facts? Does anybody deny the allegations in the petition? Does anybody deny the broad statement of facts gathered together as the basis of an appeal to the law courts and carried through court after court, being dissected by lawyers on both sides, to the highest court. This was a legal phrase: "assuming the material facts to be as stated therein," which in reality declared that the facts are not in dispute, and after the criticism of counsel, the judgment of the Privy Council was given on them.

But at last the hon. gentleman tried to play the role of a martyr. He said that some one in ecclesiastical authority had written that if he would not vote for remedial legislation, he would subject himself to the animadversion of the church. I have not seen any Catholic mandament, no one has seen it; but if every man is to make himself a martyr who receives a vigorous letter intimating that if he does not vote so and so on this question, he will have to meet with opposition from different sources, there

are a great many martyrs on this side of the House, and a great many martyrs on that side of the House. There are ecclesiastical opinions, and ecclesiastical opinions, and there are also opinions which are not ecclesiastical, but which are being manufactured against us in the country and brought to bear on every independent member. We might all make ourselves martyrs if we wished to become martyrs every time we received a strong letter or strong resolution threatening us with pains and penalties if we did not do thus and so.

One word more, if you please, Mr. Speaker, and that is a word to the Conservatives in this House and outside of the House. My word to the Conservatives is simply this: For eighteen years we have supported a certain policy; we have given to it our means, we have given to it our energies, we have worked out that policy in the country, and we have during these eighteen years affirmed our full faith in the effects of that policy and its superiority to any other policy. For eighteen years we have seen progress and development in this country under that policy and under the administration of the Liberal-Conservative party, and we believe that a continuation on the same lines is the best for the future of this country. You see the compacts of 1867 and 1870 and know how they arose. They are written into the constitution, they face your Government as well as yourselves. They would have tested any Government that had been in power. You see the appeal, the decision, the grievance, the power of restitution defined by the highest court of the land. That highest court has remitted to your Government, which you have supported, a question which was not asked for by them; a something which arises out of the constitution, and by circumstances over which they have no control, this question was thrown upon them for solution. Are there not other portions of the Liberal-Conservative policy of some importance as well as this? Is it not well for Conservatives in this House, and outside of this House, to take the broader, and greater, and wider interests into consideration, and, at the same time, to ask themselves whether it is worth while, for a point of well-held sentiment, for a point, may be, even, of well-held principle on a single position, to go against the party and the policy which they have supported for eighteen years, and which they believe has been the best party and policy, and is to-day the best party and policy for this country.

You see the Liberal party utterly discredited in the country. You see that party without any policy which can appeal to the business interests and the solid common sense of the electors of Canada. You see that Liberal party to-day, marching up to a test before the people of this country, and their whole hope of victory—I say it

earnestly and honestly—is that they may get into power, not because of the strength of their own arms and batteries, but because they hope for some desertions from the citadel of their opponents, which shall sally out to their help, and enable them to take the position to which they aspire.

What answer is it to the country's best interests, if we go back to them with a defeated policy and a defeated Government; putting into power a policy and a Government in which we do not believe, but which we do believe will not be for the best interests of Canada. If we have nothing to place against such action but this one question, upon which we hold honest beliefs, may be, can we not to some certain extent, subordinate one opinion, strong though it be, for the greater good, the larger policy, the more valuable and the more precious interests of the whole. What will it have profited us, even if we gain a point of sentiment or of principle in one respect; what will it have profited us, if we lose the soul of a progressive policy and a wise administration of affairs.

After six years, Sir, we stand here under circumstances such as I have detailed. What is it, then, for this Parliament to do? On the one hand, there is a well-founded repugnance to interfere, and do what, even though clearly within our right to do, the province can do more easily and far better than ourselves. There is along with that a number of subordinate reasons arising, either from considerations of principle or of personal concern, or of party interest, that tend to induce some to vote against this Bill and against remedial legislation.

On the other hand, what is there? There is the genius and spirit of the constitutional compacts of this country. There is the splendid lesson of toleration and of compromise which has been read to you in that constitution, and which has been evidenced in its harmonious workings for nearly thirty years. There is the cry of the minority, small in the area of those who directly suffer, but large, let me tell you, in the area of those who sympathize with it in this country from one end to the other. There are the minorities in other provinces demanding of you where they shall stand, and how they shall be treated, if in future years their time of trial comes, and they will have to appeal to this same high court of Parliament, and invoke this same jurisdiction. There is the Parliament, Sir, invested, knowingly, definitely, positively invested by the fathers of confederation in the constitution with the jurisdiction to maintain these rights, and to restore them if they are taken away. This Parliament is appealed to. It is watched by Canada, it is watched by the world. On grounds of courage, on grounds of justice, on grounds of good faith, make your answer to those who appeal, make your answer to Canada which is watching you, and to the world which will judge of your actions.

History, Sir, is making itself in these eventful days. Shall the chapter be a record of nobleness and adequacy, or a record of weakness and inefficiency? Shall we stamp ourselves as petty and provincial, or shall we be recorded to future ages as magnanimous and imperial? Let us plant our feet in the firm paths of constitutional compact and agreement, of good faith, and of honest, fair dealing. Let us take and pass on that gleaming torch of prudent compromise under whose kindly light the fathers of confederation marched safely through in times far more troublous and far less advanced than ours, into an era of harmony and continued peace.

Let us do justice to a weak and patient minority, and thus settle for ever the question of the sufficiency of the guarantees of confederation. Let us follow with cheerful emulation the shining example of our great mother country, whose foundations were laid on the solid granite of good faith, and whose world-wide and wondrous superstructure has been joined together with the cement of a strong and generous toleration.

Let us prove ourselves now, in the thirtieth years of our existence, as in the stress of our natal days, a people fit for Empire, and worthy to rank amongst the best and greatest of nations.

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

After Recess.

CANADIAN JOCKEY CLUB.

House resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 48) respecting the Canadian Jockey Club.

(In the Committee.)

On section 3,

Mr. TISDALE. I move to amend this by providing that the affairs of the club shall be administered by a club committee instead of by a board of directors.

Amendment agreed to.

On section 4,

Mr. TISDALE. I wish to move to amend this section by striking out subsection 2, and inserting the following:—

2. The club committee shall consist of twelve members of the club and shall be elected as members of the club committee by the shareholders annually at the annual general meeting of the club to be held on the last Wednesday in the month of May in each year, and in addition to that number each duly incorporated racing company and club throughout Canada being the owner or lessee of a race track, and each duly incorporated hunt club throughout Canada, upon affiliation with the club shall be entitled to have one member on the club committee, which member shall be elected or appointed in such manner as each such racing company or club or hunt club shall decide on or before the date of the said annual meeting in

each year, and each such racing company or club or hunt club may become so affiliated upon giving to the club a written notice to that effect and upon the payment of the regular fees and upon complying with all such general regulations of the club as may be in force in respect to affiliation, provided that if any affiliated club be at any time expelled it shall not again be entitled to affiliation, except with the consent of at least three-fourths of the whole committee.

3. The next club committee shall be elected in the manner above provided on or before the last Wednesday in the month of May, 1896.

4. If at any time the election of that portion of the club committee to be elected by the shareholders of the club is not made at the proper time, or if for any cause the annual general meeting of the club shall not be held on the appointed date, neither the club nor the committee shall be held to be thereby dissolved, but such general meeting and such election may take place at any time subsequent appointed by the club committee of which due notice shall have been given, and the shareholders of the club on such committee shall continue in office until their successors are elected.

5. Provided, and it is hereby enacted, that the club committee may by by-law passed by a two-thirds vote change the date of the annual meeting of the club.

Mr. MARTIN. I have previously taken objection to this clause. There seems to be no good reason at all why in a club of this kind there should be such a thing as stock. I understand this to be a club for the purpose or regulating races. To its general objects I have no objection whatever. It seems to be an association similar to the Medical Association, the Law Society, or any other of the numerous associations that we have for the purpose of regulating particular trades or professions. In none of these societies is such a thing as stock known. It would not be tolerated, for instance, in the Medical Society, that a certain number of doctors should be allowed to subscribe for a certain amount of stock, and in consideration thereof should have representation on the club committee. That would be considered absurd; and I have yet to hear a reason why this course is adopted in regard to this association. There seems to be no reason for it whatever. In order that it should be successful, its management should be representative. What do these directors represent? They represent only \$550. There is no reason why the affairs of the club should not be conducted as the affairs of other associations are, by a committee appointed by the different affiliated clubs. By this Bill, each affiliated club has a representative on the committee; but in addition to these there are twelve members who represent nothing, but who are elected by the shareholders. Why should there be shareholders in an institution of this kind? It has been suggested that it is a necessity of having some one to start the club and manage its affairs until the different clubs can be affiliated with it. If that be the reason, let it be confined to that, and let these twelve

men hold office only until such time as there are a certain number, say twelve or fifteen clubs affiliated. As it is, they may go on for all time, and the shareholders will have the right of electing the twelve members, who will have really the balance of power. Take the very case referred to in this section. If a club is expelled from the association, it requires three-fourths of the members of the committee to restore it. For what reason should they have such power in the affairs of an association like this? I cannot understand it. It has been suggested that, because this club was incorporated under letters patent; the Joint Stock Companies Act referred to it, and it was necessary to have directors. Well, we have changed that, and the affairs of the club are to be managed by a committee. It has been suggested that it is necessary to have the provisions of the Joint Stock Companies Act applied to this club. I say no. The provisions of the Joint Stock Companies Act are intended to regulate the affairs of commercial companies. This club is not engaged in any money making business. Its business is the general affairs of the association, just as that of the controlling board of the medical profession or the dental, or any other profession. So that, I object very strongly, indeed, to this proposition to hand over such a large share of control of an association which is to be representative. This will practically force every racing association in Canada, including that in Winnipeg, into its ranks, because, while the provisions of this Bill are not imperative, they practically become so, if the association is going to become a success. If the racing men of Canada determine to make this association a success, it will become necessary for every racing club in Canada to become an affiliated part of it. Why twelve gentlemen, living in Toronto and Montreal, who have collectively subscribed a sum of \$550 to this association, should for all time to come have twelve votes on the club committee, as something for which there is no warrant or reason whatever, especially, when we consider the fact, that these twelve men came here and asked for powers so outrageous and absurd that the committee would not consider them for a moment. The moment the search-light of criticism was turned upon them, these powers had to be abandoned. It seems to me, that it is very material, that we should keep the affairs of the association fairly representative, and prevent these particular persons getting the very strong control which the present provisions give them.

Mr. TISDALE. There are two very good reasons that ought to satisfy the hon. gentleman. First of all, these amendments were agreed to at a meeting representing all of the clubs of Ontario and Quebec, perhaps a couple of hundred, altogether. In addition

to that, they are approved by the representatives of the Horse Breeding Association of Ontario. These clauses are perfectly satisfactory to the whole of them. In addition to that, this Act confirms the letters patent and the powers given under letters patent to the twelve gentlemen mentioned, which powers it is necessary they should have for the business management and success of the association. It is not intended that there should be, nor will there be, any money in it; but we all know that an association like this must be put on a business basis, and for that reason it is brought under the clauses of the Companies' Act. Any amendment that would interfere with that, would interfere with the whole scope and object of the Bill, and require the whole thing to be recast. I confess, that I do not believe I am as competent to judge in this matter as the horse-breeding associations are, and when these associations have agreed upon this Bill, I think we are quite safe in adopting it. It is only fair to say, that the names of these twelve gentlemen are recognized by all horsemen and breeders of horses throughout the country as being names of the highest respectability and as being the names of men, many of whom have invested a great many thousand pounds in horses. These gentlemen desire to have no power, except what is satisfactory to the racing and horse-breeding associations. It was with that object, and that alone, that they inaugurated the association by letters patent, and not out of any desire to acquire any power which they did not feel was absolutely necessary for carrying out this object. It is true, that some of the clauses were of a nature which these gentlemen did not expect would be granted to them, but they were put in to promote discussion, to induce the horsemen and horsebreeders to discuss the whole matter. The whole matter was discussed by those interested, and it is the consensus of their opinion, that this Bill should become law.

Mr. MARTIN. With regard to the point made by the hon. gentleman, that the horsemen have agreed to this, of course, that has great force; but, so far as the horsemen of my locality are concerned, they have not agreed to it, and, in the absence of any reasons given for this feature of the Bill, it is possible, that it was not brought before the horsemen. I do not consider, that any argument has been advanced to show, that the Joint Stock Companies Act should be applied to this association. That Act is not applied to the Law Society or the medical profession. This is not an association for trading purposes. There is really no business to be done by this association. All it has to do, is to make provisions for registering horses and racing, and so forth, and that does not require the application of the provisions of the Joint Stock Act. And, in the absence of any reasons why the horsemen

Mr. MARTIN.

at this meeting to which the hon. gentleman refers, were induced to assent to these provisions, I am not able to attach the same degree of importance to what the hon. gentleman has said, as I otherwise would.

Section agreed to.

Mr. DICKEY. At the request of the Ontario government, I desire to add a clause as follows :—

Constables and police officers appointed under the laws of this Dominion or any province shall, at all times, on duty, have access to the race tracks and grounds of the club or of any club affiliated with it, for the purpose of ascertaining whether the laws in connection with racing, betting or otherwise, are duly observed, or for the purpose of enforcing the due observance of those laws.

Mr. TISDALE. I have no objection.

Mr. MARTIN. I would like to ask the promoter of this Bill if this club is permitted to have a race ground? That would apply rather, I should think, to the affiliated clubs. But this amendment refers to the race grounds of the club. If this club is to govern the race tracks, it surely is not intended that they should own a race track. That would be an invidious thing.

Mr. TISDALE. I have no objection to the proposed amendment. As I understand it, the Ontario government wish it, and it is in the right direction.

Mr. MARTIN. What I object to is allowing them to have a race track. I think they should be confined to the tracks of affiliated clubs.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I think there can be no objection to the clause. There can be no necessity for it, as the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin) points out. The tracks are those of the clubs affiliated with this jockey club, which only exists for the purpose of regulating racing, and has nothing whatever to do with controlling the grounds themselves. If they should have one they would have the same powers as they have now on the associated tracks.

Mr. DICKEY. I understand that the Ontario government asked this to be put in because their power to enter these tracks had been challenged, and they wished to have any doubts settled. As to the objection raised by the hon. member for Winnipeg, I think it is well to provide for the possible contingency of this club owning a track. I do not think that this clause would give them power to acquire a track.

Mr. EDGAR. Do I understand the hon. member moving the Bill to say that the club is to own any tracks?

Mr. TISDALE. I do not say that they are to own any tracks. It would be for the club committee to decide as to that. There is no reason that I can see why they should not own a track if they see fit.

Mr. EDGAR. Section 5 in several subsections speaks of the "race track or tracks of the club," as well as of the affiliated clubs.

Mr. TISDALE. It does not follow that they are to have a track. This Bill was made satisfactory to all those interested.

Mr. MARTIN. I did not before notice this feature of the Bill. It seems to me it would be an objection to the whole scheme if this club is to own a race track. They are merely a body appointed to control race tracks, and it seems to me they should be prohibited from owning one.

Mr. TISDALE. Almost every member of the committee, probably, will be the president of a local club. If they see fit, I do not see why they should not have a track. I believe the New York Jockey Club do own a track or two.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. No, no.

Mr. TISDALE. At all events this club is controlled by the members of the different associations. And they were all satisfied with the shape in which this Bill was put. They know their own business, as I said, better than I do. It seems to me that if we attempt to curtail the authority which was quite satisfactory to these gentlemen who understand the matter, in trying to do good—if we are trying to do good—we might do harm. I prefer to leave it as it is.

Mr. SPROULE. It does seem to me most undesirable that we should give this club power or powers to own a track. Take subsection B of section 5, which gives them power to regulate :

The number, duration, time and period of all race meetings to be held on the race track or tracks of the club, and on the race track or tracks of any incorporated company or club affiliated with the club.

If they intend to make a close corporation, and get hold of a sufficient number of clubs, they might control the racing of the country. This might be very detrimental to some outside clubs that wished to affiliate with them. I do not see why they should wish to control tracks of their own.

Mr. EDGAR. In the schedule of the Act we find the letters patent, the charter already held by the club. The powers given under these letters patent include :

The investigating, ascertaining and keeping a record of the pedigree of horses, the instituting, maintaining, controlling and publishing of a Stud Book or Book of Registry of Horses in Canada, the promoting and holding of exhibitions for the purpose of improving the breed of horses, the holding of contests, race meetings and other exhibitions of horses, the acquiring and maintaining of grounds and premises for the purposes of the club.

That, I take it, gives them the right to hold race meetings and to own grounds and premises for that purpose.

Amendment agreed to, and Bill as amended reported.

SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 81) to revive and amend the Act to incorporate the Alberta Irrigation Company.—(Mr. Davis.)

THE REMEDIAL ACT (MANITOBA).

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Mr. Speaker, the generous measure of applause which greeted the Finance Minister when he resumed his seat this afternoon indicated that at least a large portion of his followers in this House were well satisfied with his forensic effort. And I am free to say, Sir, that, as an elocutionary effort it deserves no small praise. The manner in which it was delivered, the voice, the diction, the emphasis given to the several sentences, were deserving of admiration. But when one comes to examine calmly and coolly into the propositions which the hon. gentleman asked this House to support, when one comes to analyse quietly the gist of the speech to find out what the speaker was attempting to prove and what arguments he advanced to prove it, there comes upon one an intense feeling of disappointment.

As a speech to be delivered upon a public platform, what is called a stump speech, in which a large amount of claptrap necessarily must find place, I think the speech of the hon. gentleman would be entitled to very high praise, indeed. But, Sir, I venture to say that to those cool and calm members of Parliament who desire to inform their minds clearly and distinctly upon the important and grave issues which they are called upon to decide, very little comfort can be found in that speech. The hon. gentleman commenced by telling us in a casual kind of way, that after all said and done, the issue was not so very important, and that it was rather a trivial matter; and he wound up with telling us, not like Napoleon told his troops, that forty centuries looked down upon them, but that the eyes of the world were centred upon the vote which this Parliament was about to give. The hon. gentleman told us, in opening, that the question of separate schools was not an issue here at all, that it was imbedded in the constitution itself, and could not be eradicated; and then the hon. gentleman went on to say that we had a right in approaching this question, to brush to one side altogether the question of provincial rights, and the question of precedents, so far as they might affect the other provinces of the Dominion, and the question of separate schools. But, notwithstanding that in his exordium he asked us to brush these important matters all to one side, seventenths of the hon. gentleman's speech was taken up with endeavouring to show that this was not an invasion of provincial rights, that this was not a bad precedent for Parliament to adopt; and that separate schools

Mr. EDGAR.

themselves were excellent things, which had the approval of very distinguished men, and should receive the approval of both sides of this House. Sir, I could have pardoned the hon. gentleman if he has spared me at least that homily which he delivered upon the necessity of public men keeping good faith towards those with whom they were associated. He told us that the observance of good faith was absolutely essential to social, commercial, national, but he had the courage to omit, political, welfare. Sir, this comes from an hon. gentleman who, twelve months ago, joined the ranks of a Premier who was forming a Cabinet, pledged his honour and good faith to deal squarely, honestly, and above-board, with that Premier, and spent twelve months in undermining the Premier he had sworn to defend, and uphold, and after he had agreed upon the Governor's speech to be submitted to Parliament, and had himself placed his name on the paper to move its adoption, suddenly constituted himself the chief of what was termed by his Premier, a nest of traitors, resigned his place in the Government, tried to assassinate his chieftain, by poignarding him in the back, and was thus guilty of the blackest treachery that any public man has ever shown towards his chief in this or any other country. And after vainly endeavouring to destroy the chieftain he had sworn to support, he crawled back into office for the purpose of obtaining his salary and appointment, which he now holds at the beck and will of a gentleman he practically declared was an imbecile, and unfit to lead a Government. For that hon. gentleman to read this House a homily upon good faith, is a little too much for me to stand.

Sir, the hon. gentleman, at any rate, has a certain amount of courage. He did not scruple in this House to-day to defend a political outrage committed in this country some twenty-five years ago, which few other public men have ever had the hardihood to speak in defence of. The leader of the Opposition, in his remarks the other day, referred to the ill effects which flowed from a policy of coercion towards any particular province, and to the good effects which flowed from conciliation and fair treatment to the people. And he pointed out the effect of confederation in Ontario, Quebec and New Brunswick, and the different effect which a different policy had in the province of Nova Scotia. He showed, Sir, that in the province of New Brunswick, the question had been fairly and honestly submitted to the people, and the people, having had a chance to pass judgment upon it, had loyally submitted to the effect of their verdict ever since; while in the adjoining province of Nova Scotia, where the opposite policy was adopted, there is rankling in the breast of every elector who was then living, and is living still, a feeling of resentment and hatred towards

confederation, which a quarter of a century has not served to eradicate. That hon. gentleman now comes forward to-day and justifies that action by saying that the same policy was pursued in the provinces of Ontario and Quebec. Why, Sir, he ought to know, as every one else knows, that in the province of Ontario and Quebec, the leading public men and the several parties were united upon this great policy of confederation, and were backed up by an enormous majority of the people. There was not, I am told, from the great province of Ontario, a single petition laid upon the Table against it; whereas, in Nova Scotia, from one end of that province to the other, the people rose up almost in practical rebellion against the measure. But during the last hours of a dying Parliament, by means alone known to those who carried it, a majority of the people's representatives were obtained, against the will of the people, and in violation of their understood pledges, to destroy the old constitution of Nova Scotia, and to force this new measure down the throats of the people against their will. The result has been, as I said before, that to this day you cannot travel through any single part of that great province without finding in the hearts of the people who then were electors, the bitterest feeling against confederation, caused, not by confederation itself, but caused by the dastardly way in which it was forced upon them.

Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman, in addressing himself to what he thought was the question before the House, indulged in a style of argument which I think is hardly creditable to a man occupying his high position. The hon. gentleman read here by the hour scrap-book quotations showing what this public man said many years ago, and what he said afterwards; and how there was this inconsistency and that inconsistency. Sir, I think we should have got beyond that style of debating on this great and grave question. It is not a question of whether Mr. A. has been strictly consistent, or whether Mr. B. has been strictly consistent; no doubt each of them would be able to show, if occasion required, that there was no inconsistency between the two statements quoted. But I say that scrap-book quotations are not the arguments that we require when we are approaching a question which his leader designated the other day as one of the most transcendent importance that had ever engaged the attention of this Parliament since confederation. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman referred to the great debates which took place in the old Parliament of Canada, known as the confederation debates, to statements which were made in those debates by leading public men as to their intentions with regard to the school question, and the question of education in the two larger provinces of the Dominion. He quoted from Sir Alexander

Galt, and from Mr. Sandfield Macdonald, and other leading men, to show that there was an understanding at that time, an understanding firmly come to before the Bill passed, that in the great provinces of Ontario and Quebec this question of education should be settled once for all; and that that understanding resulted in a compact being come to whereby the Protestant minority in the province of Quebec and the Catholic minority in the province of Ontario were to be secured in certain educational rights.

With what object were these speeches quoted? I have sat for thirteen or fourteen years in this House; I have been a pretty constant and assiduous reader of the newspaper press, and I never yet heard any public man in his place in this House, nor have I ever known any one of the leading newspapers of the country, assert that the solemn compact entered into at that time with respect to the rights of the minorities of Ontario and Quebec, as regards education should be interfered with. Why, we know, and every one knows, that the rights which were granted to those minorities were assured to them by compact contained in the British North America Act, which it is not within the power of either the legislature of Ontario, or the legislature of Quebec to contravene, abridge, or interfere with. We know, that, if the province of Ontario attempted to-day to pass a law which would abridge in any respect the pre-union educational rights of the Roman Catholics, as secured to them by the Confederation Act, that Act would be held by the courts to be ultra vires. It would not require an intervention by this Parliament, it would not require any assistance from politicians, it would be outside of the power of the legislature to attempt it, for the rights of the minority were secured, not by this or that political party, but by the constitution itself, and the courts would interpret and enforce the constitution. The hon. gentleman spent some time in showing, or attempting to show, that the Protestant minority in Quebec held the rights which they enjoy to-day, by some such compact as he says exists with Manitoba, and that, if the rights of the Protestant minority there were interfered with, there would be an uprising of the members of this House to enforce coercion on that province and compel them to keep the compact. The hon. gentleman did not hesitate to impute a dishonest motive to members of this House, in being animated by a desire to keep the compact as far as regards Protestants and annihilate it and repudiate it as regards Catholics. So far as I am concerned, I say that such an accusation is deserving of no other answer than silent contempt. I do not believe there are any hon. members surrounding the hon. gentleman, or sitting on this side of the House, who

would be found so base and regardless of honour and of the highest motives which should prompt and control public men as to be willing to give one measure of justice to the Roman Catholics of Manitoba and another measure of justice to the Protestants of Quebec. The Protestants in Quebec to-day hold their educational rights, not by virtue of any post-union legislation. The separate schools which are enjoyed to-day in that province were enjoyed by the Protestants there before confederation ever took place.

An hon. MEMBER. No.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) All I have to tell the hon. gentleman is, that, if he says "no," he cannot have read the statutes.

Mr. MASSON. The rights enjoyed by the Protestants of Quebec to-day depend entirely on the Act of 1869. Those existing before that time, were condemned by the Protestants as being only rights in name.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The only change made with respect to the educational rights of the Protestants of Quebec, was a change made with respect to the Board of Education, giving them a separate board; but the right to separate schools and the existence of separate schools, and the choosing of the books on morals and religion were rights which they acquired and held before confederation, and are not in any way derived from, or attributable to, post-union legislation. I affirm, that the legislature of Quebec has no legal right to interfere in the slightest degree with those rights, any more than the legislature of Ontario has a right to interfere with the pre-union minority rights of Roman Catholics in that province. Sir, it should be so. That was a solemn compact agreed to between the two great provinces of the Dominion. It would be a gross violation, a violation so gross that no honest man would stand up and defend it, if any legislature were to try and break that compact; I do not believe there are to be found in this House, or out of it, a dozen men who would justify such a breach. But why are we anticipating anything of that kind? Has anybody, any public man in the legislature of Quebec, attempted to take away from the Protestants the rights which they enjoy under the Confederation Act? I never heard of it, nor do I believe there are any persons in Quebec who would desire to do it, nor do I believe that there can be found any one who will propose a measure depriving the Roman Catholic minority in Ontario of the rights which the constitutional compact of the union gives them.

An hon. MEMBER. How about Mr. Marter?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I do not know about Mr. Marter or Mr. Meredith having desired to do so.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

An hon. MEMBER. Mr. Marter admitted it.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I draw a broad distinction between post-union and pre-union rights. Rights given after confederation stand on a very different footing; they can be taken away by the legislature, subject only to the right of appeal to the Government and this Parliament. But what I want to lay down is this, and it is an incontrovertible proposition, which should be understood in this House and out of it, that the pre-union educational rights of a minority in a province cannot be interfered with by any legislation. Therefore, all the time taken up by the Minister of Finance to show that there was this compact with respect to Manitoba, by which statement he endeavoured to arouse a feeling of danger in the minds of Protestants and Catholics, was time wasted, and was a dangerous exercise of demagogic argument, to which the hon. gentleman should not have descended. I think, if we get into our minds that one fact, we will approach one step nearer to the real question which this House has to determine; and I beg to say just here, that the remarkable agility, the wonderful power displayed by the hon. gentleman this afternoon, in evading the only issue which is before the House, excited my wonder and my admiration. For two hours and a half, he thundered out here, talking about breach of faith, talking about compacts; talking about bills of rights, talking about appeals, talking about what this man said, and that man said, and the other man said, and constantly, and continuously, and persistently, avoiding the only issue which this House is called upon to decide, and upon which the electors we represent will in a short time be called upon to vote. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) spoke of the negotiations which took place in Manitoba, and he quoted certain assurances which he alleged were given to the original inhabitants of Manitoba, which in some way, he desired the House to understand, afforded some argument—how I do not know—for a decision, one way or the other, upon this question. Now, Sir, what were these assurances? The assurances he read, were general assurances that they would be protected in their religious exercises, and privileges, and that their franchises were to be respected. Sir, has there been any attempt to interfere with these? The rights which they possessed before confederation have been decided upon by an authority, which even the Minister of Finance must respect, although he tried to ignore it. I heard a great deal of talk from him this afternoon about the highest judicial tribunal of the Empire, about the independence of that tribunal, about the weight that ought to be attached to any judgment that tribunal gave, and I subscribe to every statement he made in that regard. But, Sir,

I ask him : what was the decision of the Privy Council of the Empire with respect to the alleged educational rights which these people held at the time of confederation, and which he tried to lead the House to believe had been invaded ? What was the judgment of the Privy Council in that regard ? We may agree with that judgment or we may not. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) quotes the opinion of the Hon. Wm. Macdougall as to what he thought was intended by the Act. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) quotes the opinion of somebody else, as to what he thought was intended by the Act, and he quotes the motion made by Mr. Oliver, in the House, at the time the Manitoba Act was going through. What has all that to do with it ? The Privy Council have taken the educational code to be found in the Manitoba Act, and they have on appeal determined, that these alleged religious privileges and exercises and franchises, have not been interfered with, directly or indirectly, by the School Act of 1890. Now, Sir, that has been absolutely determined by the highest tribunal of the Empire, in language which cannot be misunderstood. One would suppose, that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster), who professes so much respect and regard for the decision of that tribunal, would have been prepared to accept that judgment. But instead of that, he asked this House to do—what ? To go behind that judgment, and to overrule that decision ; to decide this question on the ground, that there were rights, although the Privy Council determined there were none ; to decide this question on the ground that there were privileges, although the Privy Council determined that none were invaded ; and to decide this question upon the ground that there were guarantees given, although the Privy Council determined that the guarantees did not exist. Sir, I ask the House now, in gauging the weight which is to be attached to any single argument or quotation made by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster), as to what was said at the time of confederation, as to what was intended by one man or the other ; I ask hon. gentlemen this question : has not the Privy Council of England in the decision they gave on the constitutionality of the Act of 1890, finally, and for ever, determined beyond the possibility of argument, what these rights were ? Whatever we may think ourselves, I ask : is it honest for a public man to try and lead this Parliament to legislate on the assumption, that the judgment of the Privy Council was an incorrect and a false judgment ?

Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) spoke in the same way, about certain bills of right. What did he mean by referring to these bills of rights. Sir, he either meant to lead this House to believe that there was something in these bills of rights guaranteeing to the Roman Catholic minority separate schools or educational privileges ; or his references to them were entirely irrelevant.

What did he mean ? If there is a bill of rights, pledging the honour of the Crown to these people, if there is a constitutional compact in any bill of rights by which the honour of the Crown is pledged to maintain separate schools or educational privileges, which have been withdrawn ; then, I say, let us have an inquiry and have that examined. I venture to say, Sir, that if on that inquiry, a compact is proved, and if the honour of the Crown is pledged, there will not be many men found on either side of the House who will be prepared to withhold their influence, so as to restore these privileges back to them. And, Sir, why is this quoted now by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) ? Was it quoted before the Privy Council ? Did not the Privy Council finally and for ever determine, that all the rights which the minority had on the question of education in Manitoba, must be found in the educational code of the Manitoba Act, and not outside of it ? Did not they determine, in one or other of the judgments, that even the British North America Act itself has no reference whatever to the educational rights of the people there, and that they have to be determined solely and simply by the Manitoba Act ? Sir, if that is so, why go back and make a general reference to negotiations said to have taken place before confederation, or to a bill of rights said to have been submitted, or to assurances given by one man or the other. If the highest tribunal of the Empire has decided that these must not be looked to, and that you must take your legal and constitutional stand upon the consideration of the words of the legislative enactment contained in the Manitoba Act, what is the use of referring to outside issues.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Will the hon. gentleman pardon me for a moment. If I understand the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davies) correctly, he stated, that if the bill of rights No. 4, or any bill of rights on behalf of the people of Manitoba, contained express stipulations for the safeguard of these educational privileges, that then there would be no objection to remedial legislation. Am I right in that ?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Certainly not.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Would the hon. gentleman explain then, because it occurred to me as an important statement.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) will see, that if there was a bill of rights guaranteeing separate schools, we would have no power by remedial legislation to give them. Our power under the remedial legislation clause, is strictly confined, as the hon. gentleman as a lawyer well knows, to post-union rights.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I do not wish to interrupt the hon. gentleman

(Mr. Davies) in that line of his argument at all. It was only as to what I understood him to say in discussing this question of a compact. I understood him to say, that if it were found that a compact had preceded the Manitoba Act, under which there was an agreement, whether in a bill of rights or in some other document, that these rights should be safeguarded; then there would be no difference between us, I understood him to say.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What I said was: if on inquiry it was found there was a bill of rights to which the honour of the Crown was pledged, granting to these people educational privileges, it must enormously influence the voice of public opinion throughout this Dominion in determining that these rights should be guaranteed in their integrity. I know it would very largely influence my opinion.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. And yet the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davies) opposes the Bill.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) But, not on this Bill, as I pointed out to the hon. gentleman. Why, it is trifling with the House, and trifling with every lawyer who has ever studied the question, to say that because there might or might not be ante-union pledges or guarantees that would afford any argument whatever, or confer any power whatever on this House to grant remedial legislation under the second subsection of the Act. That comes under another power altogether, to which I will refer directly. But, talking of the influence that such a compact must necessarily have on public opinion, it is perfectly plain to my mind, and I think it will strike many thousands of other minds in the same way, that if you can show that these people were lured, so to speak, into this union with Canada on a bill of rights guaranteeing certain educational privileges to them, and that the credit of the Crown was pledged to that, it must necessarily largely influence public opinion in compelling whatever legislation is necessary for the concession of those rights to them.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) There is no doubt about that. But, Sir, who dares to say that to-day? Where is the evidence to be found that any such bill of rights exists? It is denied. It is asserted, perhaps, by some, though I do not know that anybody in this House is prepared to assert it. I saw it asserted in a pamphlet which some one did me the honour of sending me. But I saw it denied in another pamphlet. It did not appear in evidence before the Canadian Privy Council; it is not in evidence before this House; and it would be a monstrous thing to ask this House to accept as true what has never yet been proved and has never yet been investigated. But what I do say is that if any hon. gentleman can

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

show prima facie that such a bill of rights exists, he will have afforded the strongest argument in favour of a thorough investigation into this subject that has yet been presented.

The hon. gentleman went on to argue that the Senate of Manitoba had been abolished, but that certain pledges were given that there was to be no oppression of the minority, and that their rights were to be protected. Well, supposing that is so, I do not understand that it has any weight or influence or bearing on the particular question before this House. I do not understand Sir, that the question whether some gentleman in the Senate of Manitoba made a general statement that there was to be no oppression of the minority affords any ground, constitutional or legal, for this Parliament passing a coercion Bill without investigation, and forcing it upon that province.

The hon. gentleman asked who introduced this question into Canadian politics for the first time? And he pointed to the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin), and held him up as a culprit. He told us that this confederation had gone for twenty-five or thirty years, and that heretofore never had such a question as this roused up race and religious passions until the hon. member for Winnipeg had introduced this question in Manitoba. Is that the truth? Why, Sir, I am old enough to remember when the present Mr. Justice King introduced into the legislature of New Brunswick a national school Bill; when that measure was said to interfere with minority rights in New Brunswick, just as this Bill of 1890 is said to interfere with minority rights in Manitoba, when that question was dragged into the arena of Dominion politics, and for years constituted a menace to the peace and prosperity of New Brunswick and the rest of the Dominion—and, as I am reminded by one of my hon. friends, it was brought into this House by a member of the present Government. I would like to say, Sir, that fortunately for the peace, prosperity and happiness of the minority in the province of New Brunswick, that hon. gentleman's efforts to force the will of this House upon that province were frustrated. Fortunately for the minority of that province, the people there were allowed to settle this question themselves; and the good sense, the magnanimity, and the sense of justice and fair-play, which I am proud to say permeates every class of people in this Dominion, impelled the people of New Brunswick to give such a measure of justice and fair-play to the minority there that to-day in that great province not a man can be found to stand up and utter a protest against the national school system of the province. There are those who contend too much has been conceded to the minority, but the minority do not and cannot complain. Sir, what would have been the case had this abominable principle of coer-

cion been introduced then? What would have been the case if the hon. Minister of Marine (Mr. Costigan) had then been listened to, and his advice taken, and this Parliament had interfered and forced upon that province a separate school system? Would the minority there be in the full enjoyment of the rights they enjoy to-day? No, Sir; instead of peace, he would have brought a sword, and he would have rent that fine and fair province from one end to the other.

The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) quoted a sentence from the report of a very eminent educationist in this country, Dr. Grant, as showing, in his opinion, that the present system of education in Manitoba works an injustice to the minority. But, Sir, supposing that to be true, what was Dr. Grant's conclusion? Did he ask this Parliament to intervene? Did he justify such a Bill as we have before us? Did he tell us that that was the remedy for the grievance? No, Sir; the strongest supporter of the policy propounded by the leader of the Opposition in this Dominion that I know of is Dr. Grant himself. If the hon. gentleman had quoted the strong argument which Dr. Grant submitted in the public press to show that instead of coercion we should adopt investigation, conciliation and amicable settlement, he would have shown that, so far from that reverend gentleman being an authority in support of the position the Government takes, he is identically the opposite, because he supports the policy of the Opposition.

Then, the hon. gentleman goes on to say that we have had enough dilly-dally—that there have been five years to remedy this evil, and it has not been done. I ask any independent or honourable man in this House, is that a fair or honest statement of the case? Why, Sir, six years ago this Bill of 1890 was passed. The Government were asked to veto it. They declined. They invited the minority to enter upon litigation to test the validity of the law; they supplied them with money for that purpose; it took five years to carry the case through the courts; and at the end of the five years the highest tribunal in the realm pronounced the Act to be *intra vires*—perfectly constitutional and in every way defensible. I ask you, is that period of time to be taken as a period during which the province was to undo the work it did? It may have been right or it may have been wrong. The highest tribunal in the Empire has declared that so far as the Act is concerned, it is *intra vires* and perfectly proper, and does not interfere with the minority's rights.

Mr. OUMET. Not proper, but legal.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Well, before I am through I will read the language they used. I say that it did not interfere with the minority's rights, because they still have the remedy which the constitution allows them, of appealing to the Privy Council.

But while this question was in the courts, and while at the expiration of the litigation Manitoba was declared to be in the right, it is a monstrous argument to say that Manitoba has for five years persistently refused to do right. Sir, I say that until the second judgment of the Privy Council was given in the month of February, 1895, the province of Manitoba cannot be said to have been in the wrong for a single instant. She had the judgment of the highest court in her favour. You may or I may think that she acted harshly or wrongly, but she has been declared by the highest court of the land to have acted constitutionally; and to condemn her for not having repealed or amended the very Act which the courts said she was right in passing, is to take a position which certainly does not commend itself to my judgment at least.

Then the hon. gentleman wound up with saying that the Liberal party is responsible. Sir, the Liberal party and the Liberal leader, from the very first time this question entered into the arena of party politics, gave the same counsel and advice that we give now. My hon. friend (Mr. Laurier) counselled investigation and an amicable settlement—a settlement by means of the provincial authority—as the only possible and real settlement which could give the minority the privileges they believed they ought to have. And that proposition which he made, when the question was first brought up, is the proposition he so forcibly and clearly enunciated on Tuesday last, and which, if the majority of the Dominion back him up by their votes, he will be prepared to carry out when he comes into power.

But the hon. gentleman says that the House is divided into two or three classes. He says that the Government are remedialists and propose to apply the remedy now. And he says that the Opposition propose to apply the remedy at some future time. They are remedialists, too, he declares, but they do not propose to remedy the grievance now. Well, what is involved? He says there is no difference at all in principle. I say there is a very marked difference. I say that the policy of introducing and carrying remedial legislation now, under existing circumstances, involves blind legislation to be followed by chaos—to be followed by bitter racial and religious feeling, religious and racial rancor, which will rend Manitoba asunder and spread all over the Dominion. But the other policy involves intelligent inquiry, the ascertainment of the real facts, the ascertainment whether there is substantial injury or not, and it involves further that when it is found that substantial injury does exist, it shall be followed by a remedial settlement and a measure of justice to the minority, which generous measure of justice will be administered by the local authorities themselves. That is the answer I give to the hon. gentleman's argument.

Now, let me for a few moments bring the attention of this House to what I humbly consider the real question which Parliament has to decide. The question, as I understand it, is whether it is in the interests of the minority of Manitoba, whether it is in the interests of the province of Manitoba itself, whether it is in the interests of the whole Dominion, that we should legislate to impose, as the hon. gentleman says he desires to do, state-aided separate schools upon Manitoba. That is the real issue before this House to-day. The other issue involved is whether the hon. gentleman is honestly carrying out what he says is his desire. There are gentlemen on both sides who challenge issue with him upon both questions, who say that it is not in the interests of the minority or of Manitoba or of the Dominion at large, that at the present stage of this question any such Bill should be introduced, and who say further that if such Bill be carried as being in their interests, it will be a political fraud, a piece of parliamentary jugglery, a delusion and a snare.

My hon. friend the Minister of Justice spent an hour the other day, in a speech to which I can take no exception whatever, as to its matter or manner, in proving that there exists in this Parliament a power to legislate upon this question. Where is the man inside of Parliament, where is the lawyer inside or outside of Parliament who ever questioned that power? This is not a question of our power to act, but is entirely a question of policy and statesmanship to be decided, as the statute says, looking at all the circumstances of the case. Did the counsel of the Manitoba Government, before the Privy Council here, challenge the right of the Privy Council to make a remedial order? Not at all. He admitted its undoubted power to do it. He only questioned the policy, the prudence, the statesmanship of such action. He never denied the power. When that gentleman, himself the leader of the irreconcilables, headed a public meeting in Toronto and moved a resolution some years ago, in which he denounced the policy of interference, in that very resolution, he expressly admitted the power in cases of urgent necessity.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Who is the leader of the irreconcilables?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I suppose the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) would be so termed. The language he used at that time was that where there was a flagrant abuse of provincial power, the right of the Privy Council and this Parliament to interfere was undoubted. Then we have the province of Manitoba itself, did it question the power? Why, in these remarkable minutes of Council, which were forwarded from Manitoba, the power of this Government to interfere is admitted expressly in cases of urgent necessity. I have not heard any lawyer who valued his repu-

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

tation, any lawyer of standing, or any constitutional authority, ever express the doubt that there is a power constitutionally vested in the Government of Canada to hear an appeal, and that after they have heard and allowed the appeal, there is power on the part of this Parliament to intervene and enact, a remedial order, if it chooses.

That being the case, we are getting to a narrower issue; and just at this stage, I desire to challenge, right upon the very threshold, the law laid down by the hon. Secretary of State (Sir Charles Tupper), when he moved the second reading of this Bill, as the controlling law was which should guide us in this matter. The hon. gentleman then laid down certain propositions which, if they were correct in whole or in part, would fully justify, if not compel, this House to proceed upon the course he has invited us to take. The hon. gentleman, after giving a history of confederation and reading very largely from the judgment of the Privy Council, wound up by declaring what, according to his view, was the law; and as he moved the second reading, upon the statement he then made the policy of carrying this Bill must largely depend, I will trouble the House while I read a quotation from his remarks to show why that hon. gentleman at least asked the House to adopt the course which he did when he moved the second reading:

I think it would be impossible to find any terms in the English language that would more thoroughly establish the position that the right exclusively of the province of Quebec, or the province of Ontario, or the province of Manitoba to legislate in reference to education is not confined to the case in which they have not taken away any of the rights enjoyed by any one of these provinces at the time they entered confederation; that is to say, that if it can be shown that any right enjoyed by any province at the time it entered confederation has been infringed upon, if it be shown that the privileges that were enjoyed under that right, whether by Roman Catholics or Protestants, have been interfered with and removed, the moment that took place, under the Imperial Act of Confederation, under the law as it stands upon the statute-book, the right is transferred 'ipso facto' from the local legislature, because the local legislature hold that exclusive right, subject to the fact that they shall not invade the privileges of the minority, to the Parliament of the Dominion. And holding that under these circumstances, the moment it can be shown that the provincial legislature have invaded that right and have used the power entrusted to them contrary to the spirit of the Act of union, the Imperial Act of 1867, and to the law under which Manitoba came into the confederation—the moment it can be shown that the rights and privileges enjoyed have been infringed, that moment their power to legislate exclusively in regard to the question ceases and is transferred 'ipso facto' to the Parliament of the Dominion of Canada. I would not say that I hold that to be an incontrovertible position if I were not fortified in it by the highest authority in the British Empire, the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council.

I did not conceive it to be possible to em-

brace within so few words so much bad law as the hon. gentleman has given us here. It is absolutely the reverse of what the law is. The idea that because a provincial legislature infringes upon a right which post-union legislation has given to a minority, that moment the exclusive power of the province in respect to education is transferred to this Parliament, is so monstrous an absurdity, so ridiculous a travesty, of what the law is that I am not surprised that the hon. gentleman who held it should reach the conclusion he did, and should urge this House to pass this Bill. Why, Sir, if that were the law, if Manitoba had lost its right to legislate by reason of infringing the rights of the minority, and that right was, ipso facto, transferred to this Parliament, of course we should legislate. We should do something at once. But, Sir, that is not the law. I will ask the hon. gentleman's attention for one moment to the law as laid down by the Privy Council of England upon that point. The Privy Council says :

Subsection 3 reserved certain limited powers to the Dominion Parliament in the event of the provincial legislature failing to comply with the requirements of the subsection.

That contains the whole of it in a nutshell. As for there being any transfer of power to this Parliament because the provincial parliament interferes with the right of a minority, the thing is too ridiculous for argument. Sir, the true rule is this—that while a latent power exists in Parliament to legislate on the subject of legislation, to carry out a remedial order adopted by the Privy Council on an appeal to them by an aggrieved minority, it ought only to be resorted to in a case of urgent necessity after such case has been fairly established, and then only in the last resort and after the provincial government have declined to act in the matter. But, Sir, when the provincial government has refused to act, and full investigation has been held, and a case of urgent necessity fully made out, then, Sir, we are to exercise our full parliamentary discretion, and legislate just so far as the circumstances of the case require.

Now, Sir, let us try to get a fair idea of how this question really stands at this time. What is the first proposition we start with? We start with the proposition I referred to a moment ago, that the Act of 1890 was finally determined by the Judicial Committee to be strictly constitutional and *intra vires*. As this matter seems to be called in question by the general trend of the argument of the hon. Finance Minister, and others who have followed on that side, let me read for a moment, because I think it is right that it should go upon record again, what the Privy Council of England did say in regard to the Act of 1890. After giving the main provisions, they go on to say :

Such being the main provisions of the Public Schools Act, 1890, their lordships have to determine whether that Act prejudicially affects any right or privilege with respect to denominational schools which any class of persons had by law or practice in the province at the union. Notwithstanding the Public Schools Act, 1890, Roman Catholics and members of every other religious body in Manitoba are free to establish schools throughout the province; they are free to maintain their schools by school fees or voluntary subscriptions; they are free to conduct their schools according to their own religious tenets without molestation or interference. No child is compelled to attend a public school. No special advantage other than the advantage of a free education in schools conducted under public management is held out to those who do attend. But then it is said that it is impossible for Roman Catholics, or for members of the Church of England (if their views are correctly represented by the Bishop of Rupert's Land, who has given evidence in Logan's case), to send their children to public schools where the education is not superintended and directed by the authorities of their church, and that, therefore, Roman Catholics and members of the Church of England who are taxed for public schools, and at the same time feel themselves compelled to support their own schools, are in a less favourable position than those who can take an advantage of the free education provided by the Act of 1890. That may be so. But what right or privilege is violated or prejudicially affected by the law. It is not the law that is in fault; it is owing to religious convictions, which everybody must respect, and to the teaching of their church, that Roman Catholics and the members of the Church of England find themselves unable to partake of advantages which the law offers to all alike. Their lordships are sensible of the weight which must attach to the unanimous decision of the Supreme Court. They have anxiously considered the able and elaborate judgments by which that decision has been supported. But they are unable to agree with the opinion which the learned judges of the Supreme Court have expressed as to the rights and privileges of Roman Catholics in Manitoba at the time of the union. They doubt whether it is permissible to refer to the course of legislation between 1871 and 1890, as a means of throwing light on the previous practice or on the construction of the saving clause in the Manitoba Act. They cannot assent to the view, which seems to be indicated by one of the members of the Supreme Court, that public schools under the Act of 1890 are in reality Protestant schools. The legislature has declared in so many words that the public schools shall be entirely unsectarian, and that principle is carried out throughout the Act. With the policy of the Act of 1890 their lordships are not concerned. But they cannot help observing that, if the views of the respondents were to prevail, it would be extremely difficult for the provincial legislature, which has been entrusted with the exclusive power of making laws relating to education, to provide for the educational want of the more sparsely inhabited districts of a country almost as large as Great Britain, and that the powers of the legislature, which on the face of the Act appears large, would be limited to the useful but somewhat humble office of making regulations for the sanitary conditions of school-houses, imposing rates for the support of denominational schools, enforcing the compulsory attendance of scholars, and matters of that sort.

That was the first judgment given in 1892. I want to establish the proposition, if I can, that the Privy Council have set at rest once and for all the constitutionality of the Act of 1890, have declared that it was perfectly within the powers of the legislature, and that its passing did not violate any privilege or right which the minority had before the union. So that we will start with that proposition as incontestably proved. Then, Mr. Speaker, if that is so, what is the use of going behind that judgment to try and show that privileges were given to them, when the Privy Council said they were not? Surely we can start from that basis. Now, I may have held, and there are many other gentlemen who did hold, views entirely opposed to the Privy Council. They thought, I thought myself, that the minority had certain privileges and rights which the Act of 1890 deprived them of; but what is the use of my clinging to that when the highest law by which we are bound says they have not, and says that the province was perfectly within its rights, says, therefore, that no pre-union rights or privileges existed, that is affected, directly or indirectly, by the law of 1890? But while that is true, it is equally true, and decided by the same judicial body in 1895, that the legislation of 1890, by interfering with post-union privileges granted to the minority by the legislature of Manitoba, created a grievance which gave the aggrieved minority a right of appeal.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say, with reference to the Barrett case, that he was of a contrary opinion to that decision before the decision was delivered?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I said that was my impression, that the decision was rather a surprise to me. I have no hesitation in saying that at all: I want to deal with this question frankly and fairly. But what I say is this, that while I find myself bound by the decision of the Judicial Committee in 1895, I also find myself bound by their solemn decision of 1892. It would not be honest for me, and I humbly submit that it is not honest for hon. gentlemen opposite, to try and create the impression in this House or out of it, that there exists a pre-union right on the part of the minority, which has in any way been interfered with by the Act of 1890. I say it is settled that there is not such right. The only right they have is the right of appeal in case privileges granted to them by the legislature of Manitoba after the union, have been interfered with. Now, I want to come down to this point—what was the real question submitted and determined by the Privy Council of 1895? And what were the petitions praying for an appeal, and what grievances did they say they suffered? I turn to the blue-book upon this subject, at page 198, where I find the substance of these petitions summarized.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

Mr. DAVIN. Before my hon. friend goes away from that point, which is a very interesting one from whatever point of view this question is looked at, I should like to have this cleared up. Is it held that if a member of Parliament comes to the conclusion, or if a Parliament comes to the conclusion, that the Act of 1890 was ultra vires until that decision was given, is the Parliament estopped as a court of justice would be estopped, from considering those facts that would establish to one's judgment that it was ultra vires?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Most assuredly, I think Parliament is estopped, for this reason, that the Manitoba Act of 1890 has become part of the constitution of this country, and when that constitution is interpreted by the highest tribunal of the Empire, this Parliament, and every loyal man in it, is bound by the decision. I may regret it, I may have hoped differently, I may have thought differently, I may have shared the views of some of the judges of the Supreme Court here. I did share them, but I am bound to argue this question as a lawyer, as a politician, and as a member of this House, on the lines of the constitution, and am bound by the constitution. When you tell me I am bound by the decision of 1895, I say I am, but I am equally bound by the decision of 1892. Now, I am going to call the attention of the House to what this decision of 1895 was, because, upon that point, a great deal is going to depend. What was the decision given by the Privy Council in 1895? That depends very much upon the petitions presented by the minority, praying for an appeal, and on the questions referred by the Canadian Privy Council to the court for their decision.

Mr. McNEILL. Would the hon. gentleman allow me to ask him a question? Do I understand his argument to be that this House could not constitute itself a court of appeal to review the decision of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman has expressed my argument very neatly and very well. If I am stating correctly what the decision of the Privy Council was in 1892. If the language I have read is not capable of two constructions, if they did, in clear and unmistakable language, say that the Act of 1890 was constitutional and intra vires of the legislature of Manitoba, and that there were no rights and privileges whatever of a pre-union character which were interfered with, then I say every member of this Parliament, and the Parliament as a whole, is bound by that judgment; I go further, and I say it is politically dishonest to ask Parliament to try to go behind it. Now, Sir, let us see what the other decision was. We have certain memorials presented to the Canadian Privy Council, asking that they hear an appeal against that Act on the ground that certain post-

union privileges were conceded to the Roman Catholics, and had been interfered with. What is the substance of those petitions? They are summarized on page 198 of the blue-book, as follows:—

1. The statutes complained of had deprived the Roman Catholic minority of the rights or privileges of a separate condition as regards education and of organizing their schools under the system of public education in the province which they had previously enjoyed by the Education Acts passed since the union.

2. That their schools had been merged with those of Protestant denominations.

3. That they are required to contribute through taxation to the support of schools which are called public schools, but are in substance a continuation of the old Protestant schools.

4. That the religious exercises in the public schools are not acceptable to them.

Now, Sir, that is the substance of the petitions which were presented to the Canadian Privy Council praying for an appeal, and they contain allegations of a very grave and serious character; they contain allegations which, if true, went to show that a grievous wrong had been committed upon the Roman Catholic minority, that there was a case of urgent necessity requiring the intervention of the Privy Council of Canada, and of this Parliament. Now, let us see what was done. Upon the very threshold of the inquiry on the appeal, there arose the question: have we got the power to hear it? I want to let the House understand that the Privy Council of Canada did not at first enter upon the consideration of the merits of the appeal at all. They were met at the threshold with the objection that they had no right to hear it, and that question whether they had a right to hear it was the question which was remitted to the court. How was it remitted to the court? It was remitted to the court in the form of several questions which the court was asked to answer, and I will have to trouble the House, in order to make my argument intelligible, with reading those questions, or a majority of them:

1. Is the appeal referred to in the said memorials and petitions, and asserted thereby, such an appeal as is admissible by subsection 3 of section 93 of the British North America Act, 1867, or by subsection 2 of section 22 of the Manitoba Act, 33 Victoria (1870), Chap. 3, Canada?

The answer is: Yes, it is by virtue of the Manitoba Act. Mind you, that is the appeal referred to in said memorials and petitions. The second question is:

Are the grounds set forth in the petitions and memorials such as may be the subject of appeal under the authority of the subsections above referred to, or either of them?

The answer is: Yes, under the last Manitoba Act. Sections 3 and 4 do not refer to it. Question 5 says:

5. Has His Excellency the Governor General in Council power to make the declarations or remedial orders which are asked for in the said

memorials and petitions, assuming the material facts to be as stated therein, or has His Excellency the Governor General in Council any other jurisdiction in the premises?

The answer is yes. I have given the answers to the House in substance, and I hold in my hand the reasons rendered by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council for their answers. The answers in order to be intelligible must be read in the light of the questions which were asked. The case submitted did not involve, nor did it justify any inquiry as to the truthfulness of the facts. The Privy Council were asked to assume the facts stated in the petition to be true, and assuming them to be true, they were asked whether there was an appeal allowable. They decided that the appeal was admissible under subsection 2 of section 22 of the Manitoba Act, 1870, and not under the section of the British North America Act which did not apply. At page 272 of their judgment they state the reasons for giving these answers, as follows:—

The terms on which Manitoba was to become a province of the Dominion were matters of negotiation between representatives of the inhabitants of Manitoba and of the Dominion Government. The terms agreed upon, so far as education was concerned, must be taken to be embodied in the 22nd section of the Act of 1870. Their lordships do not think that anything is to be gained by the inquiry how far the provisions of this section placed the province of Manitoba in a different position from the provinces, or whether it was one more or less advantageous. There can be no presumption as to the extent to which a variation was intended. This can only be determined by construing the words according to their natural signification.

They find that when you want to ascertain what the rights and privileges of the minority of Manitoba, or what the rights and privileges of the majority are, or what the powers of that province are to legislate on the subject of education, you must go to the 22nd section of the Manitoba Act of 1870, and not to the British North America Act or any other source. That being the case, what did they next decide? In finding out, they said, what was the meaning of the statute, you must confine yourself to the meaning of the words of the statute itself. You are not permitted to go to the statements of what one or another legislator thought might be its meaning when the Bill was being enacted. We have had hon. gentlemen quoted and their opinions cited as to what they thought was intended when the Bill was submitted to the legislature. Every constitutional lawyer will tell you, Mr. Speaker, how absurd that view is. The Privy Council spoke as follows:—

It may be that those who were acting on behalf of the Roman Catholic community in Manitoba, and those who either framed or assented to the wording of that enactment were under the impression that its scope was wider, and that it afforded protection greater than their lordships held to be the case. But such considerations

cannot properly influence the judgment of those who have judicially to interpret a statute. The question is, not what may be supposed to have been intended, but what has been said.

And so we find two things. We find the highest court in the Empire determined that we must confine ourselves exclusively to the Manitoba Act of 1870, and to the very words of the 22nd section of that Act; and yet it is thought proper to endeavour to interpret it by the hasty expressions or ill-considered opinions of politicians or statesmen in the House when the Bill was going through. If you claim to be bound by the constitution, to be acting here simply in pursuance of a constitutional duty, are you justified in appealing to arguments directly at variance with the decision of the Privy Council, and although that body states that you shall not go outside the Manitoba Act or outside its language to find out what it means, are you justified in going outside of the words and relying upon the opinions of individual legislators? The Privy Council goes on to determine next that subsection 2 of that statute is a substantive enactment by itself, and that is a most important consideration. I speak as a lawyer, a very humble one I admit, and I say that I shared entirely the view of this case which was enunciated with such great ability by Sir Henry Strong, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Canada. I did not think that subsection 2 of the Manitoba Act was a substantive section, but I thought it was ancillary to section 1, and was intended to carry it out. I thought section 1 conferred privileges and rights on the minority in Manitoba. On both those points it appears I was wrong; but I am bound to bow to the decision of the Privy Council. At page 26, the Privy Council say:

The question then arises, does the subsection extend the rights and privileges acquired by legislation subsequent to the union? It extends in terms to "any" right or privilege of the minority affected by an Act passed by the legislature, and would therefore seem to embrace all rights and privileges existing at the time when such Act was passed. Their lordships see no justification for putting a limitation on language thus unlimited.

So we have arrived at this stage. In the decision of the Privy Council subsection 2 does cover cases where rights and privileges have been given by the legislature of Manitoba after the union to the minority in that province. That being so, the sole question to be determined is, has a right or privilege been affected? In order to give a fair and proper meaning to the judgment the House will pardon me if I make another quotation to show that in the opinion of the Privy Council these rights were affected. At page 284, they say:

The sole question to be determined is whether a right or privilege which the Roman Catholic minority previously enjoyed has been affected by the legislation of 1890. Their lordships are

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

unable to see how this question can receive any but an affirmative answer.

On page 285, they say:

For the reasons which have been given their lordships are of opinion that the second subsection of section 22 of the Manitoba Act is the governing enactment, and that the appeal to the Governor General in Council was admissible by virtue of that enactment, on the ground set forth in the memorials and petitions, inasmuch as the Acts of 1890 affected rights or privileges of the Roman Catholic minority in relation to education within the meaning of that subsection.

Their lordships have decided that the Governor General in Council has jurisdiction, and that the appeal is well founded, but the particular course to be pursued must be determined by the authorities to whom it has been committed by the statute. It is not for this tribunal to intimate the precise steps to be taken. Their general character is sufficiently defined by the 3rd subsection of section 22 of the Manitoba Act.

It is certainly not essential that the statutes repealed by the Act of 1890 should be re-enacted, or that the precise provisions of these statutes should again be made law. The system of education embodied in the Acts of 1890 no doubt commends itself to, and adequately supplies the wants of the great majority of the inhabitants of the province. All legitimate grounds of complaint would be removed if that system were supplemented by provisions which would remove the grievance upon which the appeal is founded, and were modified so far as might be necessary to give effect to these provisions.

I have read all that part of the judgment, because it is the part always relied upon, in support of the position which the Government took, and for the purpose of justifying their action to-day. Their lordships say: Assuming the facts stated in the petition to be true. Assuming it to be true, that the Roman Catholic minority have been deprived of rights and privileges as regards education, and of organizing their schools. Assuming it to be true, that their schools have been merged with those of Protestant denominations; assuming it to be true, that they are required to contribute their taxation to the schools which are called public schools, but are, in substance, Protestant schools; and, assuming it to be true, that the religious exercises in these schools are not acceptable to them. Assuming all these things to be true, then, their lordships say: An appeal lies to the Governor General in Council of Canada against these grievances.

Now, Sir, if that is so, what was the clear, palpable, plain duty of the court to which the appeal was to be made? The order comes back here from the English Privy Council, in answer to the questions put to them: You have the power to hear the appeal of the minority. The Privy Council determined no more, and the Privy Council could determine no more. There was nothing else referred to them. It is perfectly true, that some dicta were given by the Lord Chancellor, as to what, in his opinion, might be a good course to adopt. But, Sir, I

do not think there is a man in this House who will contend, that these dicta form any part of the answers to the questions which they were asked to answer. The dicta of the Lord Chancellor, as to what policy we are to adopt, should not control any man in this legislature, nor any man of the Canadian Privy Council. The policy of this country must be determined by those to whom is entrusted the responsibility for carrying on the government of the country. The policy for the legislation we may enact must be determined by us, and, while I am prepared for one, to give implicit obedience to the judgment of the Privy Council upon questions of law which are properly before them, and, while in this case I am prepared to give, and think both Opposition and Government should give, absolute and implicit obedience to that judgment of the Privy Council, so far as it was a judgment, so far as it was an answer to the questions put by the court, I decline to be controlled or guided by a passing opinion, as to what policy we should adopt on a matter, not of law, but on a matter entirely of policy, which should be determined by the people, by the representatives of the people, and by the Government of the country, who are entrusted with the responsibility.

Now, Sir, the power to hear the appeal being determined, what came before this Government? They had to determine the time to hear it, the manner in which to hear it, and whether it was to be a political or judicial hearing. Sir, what should have been done by this Government? I say here, that the initial wrong, the wrong which it is almost too late to remedy, was committed by the Government of this country towards the minority of Manitoba, when, with an indecent haste, which I cannot sufficiently condemn, they passed that drastic remedial order, which they are now trying to make the basis of legislation in this House. I appeal to the members of this House, as men of common sense; and I ask: What was the first thing this Government should have done. They admit, that this matter of education was exclusively within the jurisdiction of the province of Manitoba. They had an appeal presented to them on the ground that an injustice was done to the minority. They did not know whether they had the power to hear the appeal or not. They referred the question, and the highest court of the Empire told them they had that power, and that being decided, one would have supposed, that the very first action they would have taken, would have been to have passed on by a despatch, the judgment and the answer of the Privy Council of England, and said to the province of Manitoba: Now, the doubt which has existed as to whether we have the right to hear and determine this appeal, has been solved by the highest court of the Empire. If you do not take it up and deal with it, as you have the

power and the duty to do, then, we must proceed, in justice to those who have appealed to us to hear their appeal.

Sir, if that step had been taken; if no coercion had been attempted in the first place; if common sense had been used, if the smallest ounce of conciliation had prompted the men who were then controlling Dominion affairs, there would have been no trouble in the Dominion of Canada to-day. The initial wrong, which, I say, it is almost impossible to overcome, was committed against the minority in Manitoba, when, with indecent haste, which, I say, I cannot too severely reprehend, instead of passing on by an amicable despatch the judgment of the Privy Council, calling the attention of the Manitoba government to it, and inviting them to remedy the wrong of which the minority complained, they took the people of Manitoba by the throat, and said: We will now proceed to hear this appeal, without giving you even time to prepare yourself. The indecent haste with which that appeal was pushed forward, while the legislature was sitting, and before the official report of the judgment was received in this country at all, was not creditable to a court which said they were sitting as a judicial body. Before, I say, the official report of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council was received in this country at all, and simply on a telegraphic report which they had of what the Privy Council had decided, they hailed the province of Manitoba before them, as if the province of Manitoba was a culprit, and they said: Although your Premier is sick, and your Attorney General is engaged, we will not give you time for these gentlemen to prepare, but we will force you to answer and defend yourselves without any delay. I say, Sir, that it was an indecent haste, which could only have been prompted by a political motive. It is as plain to my mind as the sun in the heavens, when it is shining, that the hon. gentlemen opposite, at that time, intended, not to give relief to the Manitoba minority, but to pass formally a remedial order, and then go to the country and invite the votes of the Roman Catholics of the whole Dominion on the ground that they were seeking to do justice. They were going to snatch an unrighteous verdict, and to depend upon subsequent events to carry out their pledge, when they got into power. That was the policy. They contended that they were sitting judicially. On the preliminary question of their right to hear the appeal at all they might have been sitting judicially; but when they came down to the question of fact, they were sitting as a political body, determining on the policy they should adopt. In the language of Lord Watson and Lord Macnaghten, and by the admission of Mr. Ewart and Mr. Blake, they were not sitting as a judicial body at all, but simply and solely as a political body, acting on their political discretion, and doing what in

their political judgment was best in the interests of the country at large. If this is doubted, turn to the controversy that took place before the Privy Council. During the argument on the appeal, Lord Watson interposed to say :

I apprehend that the appeal to the Governor is an appeal to the Governor's discretion. It is a political administrative appeal, and not a judicial appeal in any proper sense of the term, and in the same way after he has decided the same latitude of discretion is given to the Dominion Parliament. They may legislate or not as they think fit.

You will find the Lord Chancellor asking Mr. Blake this question :

The question seems to me to be this : If you are right in saying that the abolition of a system of denominational education, which was created by a post-union legislation is within the 2nd section of the Manitoba Act and the 3rd subsection of the other if it apply, then you say there is a case for the jurisdiction of the Governor General, and that is all we have to decide.

And Mr. Blake replies :

That is all your lordships have to decide. What remedy he shall purpose to apply is quite a different thing.

Mr. Ewart says :

Before closing I would like to say a word or two as to what we are seeking. As it has already been remarked, we are not asking for any declaration as to the extent of the relief to be given by the Governor General. We merely ask that it should be held that he has jurisdiction to hear our prayer, and to grant us some relief if he thinks proper to do so.

And Lord Watson says :

The power given of appeal to the Government, and upon request of the Governor to the legislature of Canada, seems to be wholly discretionary in both.

Mr. Ewart—No doubt.

Lord Watson—Both in the Governor and in the legislature.

Mr. Ewart—Yes.

Sir, these dicta and admissions, one and all, together show what ? That the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council were determining a merely legal point ; after they had determined that point and referred the question back again to the Privy Council of Canada, that Privy Council had to take it up as a political administrative appeal, and decide what they would do. Now, Sir, what should they have done ? Surely, after having sent that decision to the Manitoba government, they should have waited a reasonable time to see whether the Manitoba government would do right in the premises. They did not do so. On the contrary, they took the Manitoba government by the throat. If the Manitoba government did not act, then what should they have done ? They should have negotiated with the Manitoba government ; and if their negotiations were ineffective, they should have proceeded with the appeal. But if they determined to proceed

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

with the appeal, how should they have proceeded with it ? There was only one way to proceed. Certain allegations were made in the petitions on which the appeal was made. Were those allegations true ? That was the first thing for the Privy Council of Canada to inquire. Did they inquire ? The judgment of the Privy Council of Great Britain was given on the assumption that those allegations were true. The matter was referred to the Privy Council of Canada to find out whether they were true or not, and, if they were true, to apply the remedy. I ask, was any investigation made ? As a fact, not a scintilla of evidence was given of the truth of those allegations, and the affidavits submitted by Mr. Ewart in support of his contention were one and all withdrawn. Now, Sir, what were those affidavits ? I refer to them because the allegations made in them have been the subject of argument, and have been appealed to by hon. gentlemen in this House in support of their arguments. Why, my hon. friend from St. John, a lawyer of high standing in his own province, did not scruple to refer to statements made in those affidavits as facts which had influenced his mind on this question.

Mr. McLEOD. Excuse me. I did not put it on that ground at all.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I do not say that the hon. gentleman referred to the affidavits themselves, but he referred to the facts which were supposed to be proved in them as matters which influenced his mind. Now, Sir, what are the allegations contained in those affidavits ? 1st. That the Manitoba bill of rights contained a special clause guaranteeing the Roman Catholics separate schools, and the distribution of the school money amongst the different denominations according to population. 2nd. Gross breach of faith on the part of the Greenway government, in attaining power on solemn pledges that they would not interfere with Roman Catholic separate schools as they existed in 1888, and in afterwards repudiating pledges and abolishing schools. 3rd. Confiscation of a reserve fund belonging to the Roman Catholic separate school board. When Mr. Ewart came to present his case before the Privy Council, he submitted to them five or six contentions as reasons why they should grant the appeal and make the remedial order. He addressed a solemn argument to them in favour of separate schools. He referred to those affidavits in proof of his assertion that assurances had been given and promises had been made of the nature of those to which I have just referred. He contended that apart from agreements and promises relief should be given on the merits. He argued, finally, that the schools were sectarian and Protestant, adding :

I feel certain that the settled belief of the people of Canada that such liberty (that is, separate

state-aided schools) ought to be accorded to Roman Catholics everywhere throughout the Dominion.

I am not concerned just now with the latter part of his argument; but I want to ask—with respect to the arguments advanced on the serious and grave statements made in the affidavits submitted, which, if true, would undoubtedly influence largely the minds of the Privy Council—what was the result? After he had submitted his argument, the counsel for the other side said he was prepared to rebut and contradict every one of those statements in toto; and then Mr. Ewart rose, and rather than have them contradicted, or have time given for contradictions to be obtained, he absolutely withdrew them from the court altogether. And here we are sitting in Parliament legislating, and those affidavits are submitted to us as part of the record; and there are hundreds of men in this country, and numbers of men in this House, who have read that record and those affidavits, and have had their minds largely prejudiced by the statements contained in them. Why, Sir, the Minister of Justice (Mr. Dickey) apologized in this House last session for their having allowed these affidavits to appear in the blue-book, saying that it was a mistake of his own; and his apology was accepted at the time, because it was put forward in a manly and honest way. But what do we find this year? We find the blue-book re-published, with the error which was pointed out last year repeated. I find in this blue-book, printed in 1896, this very year, circulated among the members of this House, and sent by the thousand among our constituents, these damaging statements, every one of which was withdrawn, and not one of which formed part of the record before the court. These are circulated throughout this country for the purpose of wrongly influencing public opinion. I cannot conceive of a more disgraceful attempt to mould public opinion in a false direction than is made by means of this trick, for it is nothing more or less. If the same thing took place in a lower court, and you went before a court of appeal and proved it, the man guilty of such conduct would receive severe condemnation at the hands of the court. And how is it here to-day? The hon. gentleman knows that men's minds are being influenced largely by those statements, that men are found in this House now to stand up and make use of them and say openly that their minds are influenced by them, when, as a matter of fact the statements are denied to be true, were as a fact withdrawn, and the counsel for Manitoba declared that if time had been given them they would have refuted every one of them.

Now, the question comes up are these schools sectarian or Protestant schools as alleged? I do not know, I cannot tell, I have never been in Manitoba. It is one thing to point out to me what is the school

system, as contained in the four walls of a statute, but that gives me no idea of how that school system is administered. I do not want to know alone what the law says, but how it is practically administered; and if there is one thing that requires examination more than any other before this House attempts to legislate, it is the facts with regard to the practical working of the schools, under the old system, between 1870 and 1890, and their practical working under the system established in 1890, from 1890 to 1895. Unless that practical working is inquired into and ascertained, it is absolutely impossible for this House to come to an honest and just conclusion as to how far we should interfere to remedy the alleged injustice. The question is not whether the schools are non-sectarian or Protestant, but whether they should be imposed by a central power upon the province or voluntarily given by the province itself. I am not going to discuss whether a separate school system is the best or not. That is a matter for the province to determine. If the province determines that a separate school system is the best I certainly am not going to interfere. It is none of my business. It is a matter that has been relegated to the province; and unless the province interferes with a right guaranteed by the constitution, and I am called upon to apply a remedy, I have no right to interfere at all.

Now, I repeat that no evidence was taken upon the merits. Mr. Ewart challenged the judgment of the Canadian Privy Council on the merits of his petition, but not a scintilla of evidence was given to show what the merits were. How am I, how is any member of this House, coming from any part of Canada, to determine upon those merits without investigation? Some hon. gentlemen say we have the Acts of 1870 and 1888, and we have the Act of 1890, and that is enough for us. Sir, it is not enough. It does not touch the fringe of the question, because the question is: what substantial injustice has been perpetrated upon the minority? What was the actual working of the old schools and what is the actual working of the new schools? How far were they acceptable to and accepted by the people? Was the law being applied rigorously or otherwise? What is the grievance? Is it a nominal one or a substantial one? On this last point we have differences of opinion, but I call your attention to one piece of evidence, which was submitted to the Canadian Privy Council, and which will be found on pages 172 and 173 of the report, as showing, at any rate to my mind, some doubt as to how far this grievance went, and as convincing me of the strong disposition on the part of the Manitoba government to deal generously with the minority, if they were not interfered with. I call your attention, Sir, to the report on the French schools submitted by Mr. Ewart to the Canadian Privy Council, and put in the blue-book

as Exhibit Q. What does that exhibit show? It shows that there were ninety-one Catholic schools of the old school board; it shows that the total number of districts disbanded for various reasons was twenty-four. In the majority of these, the Catholics attended the public schools, where it was possible for them to do so. Twenty-seven of these old districts together with nine newly formed ones accepted the public school system, making a total of thirty-six school districts now under Government control. That fact is an important one; that thirty-six separate schools have come voluntary under the new school Act; and it is evidence, in its face, that the working of the Act of 1890 is not as drastic or as obnoxious as the Act itself might seem by simply reading it to be. And I say that while the Act itself may have largely interfered with the separate school system, if the practical working of it out is such as to give satisfaction to the minority, surely we would not interfere. Whether it be so or not, I do not know; but I find that Senator Bernier, who was a superintendent of the Roman Catholic schools, comments in his speech to the Senate upon that report of Inspector Young and upon the statement of fact contained in the report that thirty-six schools came under the new government school law. He gives his reasons as follows:—

The local government were anxious to have some of our schools brought under the law in order to be able to base an argument upon the change. An inspector was sent to them who told them that if they wanted to keep up their schools the government would not be too exacting about compliance with the regulations. He told them that they might quietly give any religious instruction in the school after school hours. He told them that they could begin and close school work by saying the ordinary Catholic prayers and even suggested how it should be done. Instead of opening the school at a certain hour, they might open some few minutes before, and at the closing they might close a few minutes after the regular hour, so that they might be able to say that there had been no prayer during the school hours. There are forms of report provided by the government. I have been informed by certain parties that the teachers of those schools were advised that if the clause as to religious instruction was embarrassing to their conscience, as this report has to be under oath, they might strike out that clause.

* * It might be said that the local government, being disposed to shut their eyes to the management of their schools, we might be satisfied and let the matter drop. My reply is that there are principles involved that we cannot overlook.

Why do I quote that? I quote it to show that there is evidence of a strong disposition on the part of the local government to concede to these outlying schools privileges which were not strictly within the letter of the law. I quote it to show that they were allowed to teach what religious instruction they pleased before and after school hours. I quote it to show that the Manitoba govern-

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

ment were willing that the provision requiring an affidavit to be made that no religious instruction had been imparted, might be eliminated. I quote it to show that the government of Manitoba were prepared to settle the question by amicable agreement, if they had been approached in that spirit; and I have no doubt, in the face of those statements, if they be true,—and I do not think anybody will question them—that if the Manitoba government, imbued with the ideas I find they were imbued with, determined to concede to the French schools, a very large measure of the demands that were being made on their behalf there would not have been, there ought not to have been, there could not have been any difficulties whatever in settling the matter to the entire satisfaction of the minority and on a basis similar to that on which the school question has been settled in the maritime provinces.

Mr. McNEILL. Does the hon. gentleman know the date of those concessions?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) They are referred to in the school inspector's report for 1894, and Senator Bernier's speech was made in 1895. So that, up to the very time the judgment of the Privy Council was given, we find, that, by a system of concessions, concessions which everybody would say were fair and just, the Roman Catholics congregated together in settlements by themselves, were permitted to teach their religious exercises, and the disposition of the government was, that they should have the fullest latitude in this regard, and that the strict letter of the law of 1890 should not be enforced, as against them. Now, what did we hear last night? We heard the speech of my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Kenny), a speech marked, I will say for him, by broad statesmanship and stamped with the mark of toleration and fair-play. He told us, that he came from a province where intolerance in religious matters was unknown. He told us, that the Roman Catholic minority in Nova Scotia, under a *modus vivendi* which has not the sanction of the law, but which has the sanction of a quarter of a century's practice, are enjoying a measure of religious liberty as large as they desire. He told us, that no man could be found in that province to-day to raise his voice against the manner in which the public school law of that province is being carried out. He told us, that, while under the strict letter of the law they have no rights at all with respect to religious education in the schools under the practical application of the law, under the *modus vivendi* which justice and conciliation has brought about, there is such a measure of fair-play extended to them that no injustice can be charged; that there is all the religious education in the schools which they desire, and that, as a Canadian, he is willing to leave these educational matters to the majority in each province, feeling confident that they

will give a fair, honest measure of justice. He says, that, where there is a parliamentary compact, it should be observed. That part of his argument is all very well. But what I wish to point out is, that the people of Manitoba are sprung from the same stock, are imbued with the same spirit of fair-play as the people of Nova Scotia are, and that, if justice has been done by the Protestant majority of Nova Scotia to the Catholic minority there, the same people in Manitoba, under similar circumstances, will give a similar measure of justice there.

Mr. KENNY. They have not done it yet.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman says they have not done it yet. And we have heard a similar argument advanced, time and again, during this debate. Let me ask the hon. gentleman, what opportunity have they had? How many months elapsed after it was first known that their law infringed upon the privileges or rights of the minority before they were called upon to remedy it?

Mr. KENNY. Five years.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I am glad the hon. gentleman has brought this question up, because I wish this argument to be settled once and for ever. Until the month of February, 1895, it was not known, it was not believed by a lawyer in this Dominion, that the judgment of the Privy Council would be as it was. It was believed by everybody, that the judgment of 1892 had for ever settled the question. It was not known, it was not believed, that the law was an infringement upon post-union privileges. I believe petitions had been presented to the Council before that, but the Council did not act, and would not act, because they were not sure of their power. As soon as it was determined, that this legislation of Manitoba did infringe upon the privileges of the minority, then, and not till then, the time began to run when Manitoba might fairly be expected to remedy the wrong, if wrong there was. But I have pointed out to the hon. gentleman, that the ink was not dry upon the judgment before the government of Manitoba, instead of being invited to do justice to the minority, were hailed as culprits before the bar of the Privy Council and threatened with coercion, if they did not restore the separate schools to these people.

Mr. KENNY. The majority coerced the minority in Manitoba.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman sees—and no man has a clearer mind—that it was not till the Privy Council's judgment was given in 1895, that it was known, that there was any infringements of the rights of the minority. The judgment of the Privy Council in 1892 had run in an entirely different direction, and had shown that the Act of 1890 did not infringe any privilege which

our Roman Catholic friends were supposed to have. But, Sir, I want nothing more than the main lines laid down by the hon. gentleman in his speech last night. Sir, I come from a province where the Free School Act was introduced as far back as the year 1877. I had the honour of introducing that Act myself. I was charged with doing an act of grievous injustice to the Roman Catholic minority of that province. Nothing was ever further from my thought and wishes than to do an injustice to anybody, minority or majority. I knew I had not done an injustice. Petitions were sent from all over this Dominion to the Federal Government to disallow the law, but the Dominion Government refused to disallow it. I was attacked venomously by my opponents for having dealt a cruel blow at the Roman Catholic separate schools. I was told, that I was the enemy of the church; I was told that I was a Protestant bigot; I was told that I was a man who had not the interest of the people at heart. I was denounced, day in and day out, until, I fancy, a large number of people must have thought that I was a kind of ogre, ready to do wrong wherever I could against those of a different faith from my own. I had the privilege of meeting with the predecessor of the present Archbishop of Halifax, the Right Reverend Dr. Hannan, who talked the whole matter over with me. He had the matter submitted to him by the then Bishop of Prince Edward Island. I submitted to him, the provincial government's side of the story. The Archbishop talked it over with the Right Reverend Bishop McIntyre. And what was the result? The result was a settlement upon lines so broad, so tolerant, so generous and so just, that, twenty years after that Act was passed, although there has hardly been an amendment, even to the extent of dotting an "i" or crossing a "t," and, although, when it was passed, nearly half the population were up and denouncing it, I stand here proudly, in this House, and say, that not a man can be found in Prince Edward Island to-day who will say, that a scintilla of injustice is being perpetrated upon the Roman Catholics of that province. And why is that? If we Prince Edward Islanders had been taken by the throat then and told: We will coerce you into yielding this, that and the other; if the minority of Prince Edward Island had been taken under the wing of a majority of this Parliament; if this Parliament had then attempted to dictate to us—

Mr. WELSH. They couldn't do it.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)—how we should act, what concessions we should make, is there a man here who imagines that we would be living in the blissful state we are to-day, under a system which gives even-handed justice to all, and which is complained of by none? Sir, do you doubt that the same results which flowed from the policy of con-

cillation in Prince Edward Island and in Nova Scotia would also follow the adoption of the same policy towards Manitoba? Do you doubt, Sir, that if you do to them as you did to us—if you adopt towards that province the statesmanlike policy which was adopted towards New Brunswick in its day of trial, and which was adopted towards Prince Edward Island in its day of trial—the bitterness, and the strife, and the party, racial and religious differences which threaten to divide and dismember this new confederacy altogether, will be entirely allayed and done away with? Sir, I appeal against the whole policy of coercion, to the experience of a quarter of a century in the maritime provinces; and I say that you are not statesmen if you ignore it. I say if you adopt a policy of coercion which is hateful to this age, you are adopting a policy which will undermine the foundations upon which this great confederation has been established. We are a country of different races, of different creeds; we cannot live together except we are prepared to extend to each other reasonable toleration, fair-play and even-handed justice. I re-echo the words which the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny) uttered last night, that in his opinion, the people of all parts of this Dominion, the majority of every province, is prepared to extend that toleration, that even-handed justice, if they are only permitted to do so. Why, then, interfere just now by adopting this hateful principle, repugnant to every British mind, repugnant to every French mind, repugnant to every Canadian mind, a policy which, as I said just now, may result—I hope to God it won't—in disrupting this new confederacy from one end to the other? Now, Sir, it is said that this remedial order was not a drastic order, that Manitoba should not have taken offence at it, that it was in itself really a species of conciliation. Why, Sir, any man in his senses who takes up that remedial order, will see that nothing could be more peremptory, nothing could be more arbitrary, nothing could be more drastic. The hon. Minister of Justice intimated, and the Minister of the Interior followed him, that the remedial order must be read in connection with the covering reasons—the covering order, I think they called it—the reasons given by the Council for its passage. Sir, the province of Manitoba had simply to do with the remedial order itself, and that remedial order in its terms was as severe, as drastic, and as arbitrary as the English language could make it. It ordered, and required, and adjudged that they should restore, without further inquiry, and without reference to the facts, every right or privilege which the petitions alleged the Roman Catholic minority of the province had received by post-union legislation. It gave no room for conciliation, it gave no room for compromise; it gave no room for treating as between the contend-

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

ing parties and seeing if a fair and just basis could not be arrived at, which would do even-handed justice to both parties. Instead of negotiations, you had judgment; instead of conciliation, you had this peremptory order; instead of discussion, you had this absolute decree; and in face of that, what could the Manitoba legislature do, but resent it? You did not give them a chance to do otherwise. There was nothing left for them but to say what they did say. And what did they say? They said: In our judgment, we doubt very much whether you have examined into the facts; you cannot have known the facts; if you had the facts before you, you never would have made such an order. Sir, let me call attention to the reply given by the Manitoba legislature to that drastic order of the Privy Council, in order to see whether there was that bitter spirit of animosity prevailing in that country which it is alleged there was; or whether, on the contrary, there was a desire to settle this question upon a fair, a just, and an equitable basis. Sir, I find, at page 355 of this blue-book, that in the following month of June, the legislature of Manitoba met, and in replying to the remedial order, they state:

The privileges which by the said order we are commanded to restore to our Roman Catholic fellow-citizens are substantially the same privileges which they enjoyed previously to the year 1890. Compliance with the terms of the order would restore Catholic separate schools with no more satisfactory guarantees for their efficiency than existed prior to the said date.

The educational policy embodied in our present statutes was adopted after an examination of the results of the policy theretofore followed under which the separate Roman Catholic schools (now sought to be restored) had existed for a period of upwards of 19 years. The said schools were found to be inefficient. As conducted under the Roman Catholic section of the Board of Education they did not possess the attributes of efficient modern public schools. Their conduct, management and regulation were defective; as a result of leaving a large section of the population with no better means of education than was thus supplied, many people grew up in a state of illiteracy. So far as we are aware there has never been an attempt made to defend these schools on their merits, and we do not know of any ground upon which the expenditure of public money in their support could be justified.

And further down:

We believe that when the remedial order was made, there was not available then to Your Excellency in Council full and accurate information as to the working of our former system of schools.

We also believe that there was lacking the means of forming a correct judgment as to the effect upon the province of changes in the direction indicated in the order.

Being impressed with this view, we respectfully submit that it is not yet too late to make a full and deliberate investigation of the whole subject. Should such a course be adopted, we shall cheerfully assist in affording the most complete information available. An investigation of such a kind would furnish a substantial basis of fact

upon which conclusions could be formed with a reasonable degree of certainty.

Well, Sir, I submit this reply was calculated to promote a conciliatory settlement, and that the olive branch which was held out by the Manitoba legislature in the words I have just read should have been accepted by our Government. They say: We cannot conceive that in making that drastic order you really understood the whole case. We do not want to do injustice, we invite you to examine what was the character and working of the old school system, and we invite you to examine what was the effect of the new system. We do not dispute your power to interfere, but do not interfere, do not order us to do anything, until you find out the facts. Could anything be more in accordance with common sense? Could anything be plainer? Could anything be more reasonable? I say that if the Government had been animated by any desire to do what was right and fair, they would have accepted the invitation, and would have entered upon the inquiry; and I venture to say that if they had done so, we would not be to-day in the miserable condition in which we find ourselves, with parties divided upon the eve of an election by racial and religious differences fanned to white heat. Now, Sir, what was done then? For the first time, the Government of Canada began to discover that they had done wrong. There was an honourable backdown on their part. It is well known that the Cabinet is entirely divided as to the manner of dealing with this matter. The members of the Cabinet who desired to settle the matter on a conciliatory basis were for the moment in the ascendancy. They determined to negotiate. They practically withdrew the remedial order. They penned an Order in Council which indicated a desire to settle this matter by means of a compromise. They did not want to carry out the remedial order of July. They were perfectly satisfied then to get a half loaf. They seemed to be on the eve of accepting the offer which the Manitoba government had made them, and I have never been able to find out why, having written the Order in Council they did in July, 1895, they afterwards retreated to the coercive policy which they had adopted in February, 1895. What do they say:

In the interest of all concerned it will not be disputed that if possible the subject of education should be exclusively dealt with by the local legislature. Upon every ground in the opinion of the sub-committee this course is to be preferred, and with the hope that this course may yet be followed the sub-committee have now the honour to recommend that Your Excellency will be pleased to urge upon the government of Manitoba the following further views which may be pressed in connection with the remedial order.

The remedial order coupled with the answer of the Manitoba government has vested the Federal Legislature with complete jurisdiction in the premises, but it by no means follows that it

is the duty of the Federal Government to insist that provincial legislation to be mutually satisfactory should follow the exact lines of this order. It is hoped, however, that a middle course will commend itself to the local authorities, so that Federal action may become unnecessary.

With a view to a settlement upon this basis, it seems desirable to ascertain by friendly negotiations what amendments to the Acts respecting education in public schools in the direction of the main wishes of the minority may be expected from the Manitoba legislature.

That is all which could be desired. There is a disposition shown to accept the offer for inquiry. What became of it? Why did they not act upon it? No investigation was held, nobody was sent. Why did not a member of the Government go out to Manitoba? Why was this movement not followed up with an inquiry of some sort? No one knows, no explanation has been given. The only explanation is that the coercive branch of the Government again gained the ascendancy, and the olive branch which they had been willing to hold out was again withdrawn.

Then we have the final reply of the Manitoba government, dated December, 1895, in which they say:

It is a matter of regret that the invitation extended by the legislative assembly to make a proper inquiry into the facts of the case has not been accepted, but that, as above stated, the advisers of His Excellency have declared their policy without investigation. It is equally a matter of regret that Parliament is apparently about to be asked to legislate without investigation. It is with all deference submitted that such a course seems to be quite incapable of reasonable justification and must create the conviction that the educational interest of the people of the province of Manitoba are being dealt with in a hostile and peremptory way by a tribunal whose members have not approached the subject in a judicial spirit or taken the proceedings necessary to enable them to form a proper opinion upon the merits of the question.

The inquiry asked for by the reply of the legislature to the remedial order should, in the opinion of the undersigned, be again earnestly invited, and in the event of the invitation being accepted the scope of the inquiry should be sufficiently wide to embrace all available facts relating to the past or present school systems.

The desire of the legislature and government of the province throughout the whole course of the proceedings, beginning with the enactments of the statutes of 1890, has been to provide the best possible means of education for the children of our citizens. To that end every possible effort has been put forth and every possible pecuniary sacrifice made in order that there might be established a school system based upon sound principles and equipped and administered in accordance with improved modern educational methods. Though very much remains to be accomplished it may be fairly asserted that a reasonable measure of success has attended the efforts which have thus been put forth.

In amending the law from time to time and in administering the system it is the earnest desire to remedy every well-founded grievance and to remove every appearance of inequality or injustice that may be brought to notice.

With a view to so doing, the government and the legislature will always be ready to consider any complaint that may be made in a spirit of fairness and conciliation.

Nothing could be more commendable than the language of this Order in Council, nothing could evince a more strong or sincere desire and disposition on the part of the Manitoba government to do what was right, and to submit to any order that might be made by this Government, or any legislation that might be carried by this Parliament, provided only they were granted what was asked, namely, a full and proper investigation of the facts. Now, we have this Bill before Parliament, and hon. members are bound to ask themselves: Are we bound to legislate? Everybody says, certainly not. The Lord Chancellor says, certainly not, unless Parliament is convinced that there is a substantial ground for their action. Nobody denies that. But how are we to be convinced? Is it to be by speeches delivered across the floor by hon. members of this House, or is it to be by the production of evidence? There is no evidence on which we can arrive at an honest conclusion. I do not deny the power of this Parliament to legislate; I do not deny that under certain circumstances we ought to legislate; but I assert that our right to legislate depends entirely on the decision as to whether the case is one of urgent necessity, whether there has been a flagrant injustice committed. If Manitoba had declined absolutely to remove that grievance, I say we ought to legislate. Our powers are to be exercised as a last resort, and as a last resort only, and the best remedy we can apply will be a poor and impotent remedy, compared with that which can be given by the local legislature. The Minister of Justice and the Minister of the Interior admit that one ounce of a remedial proposition carried out by the provincial legislature is worth more than one pound of remedial measure attempted to be carried out by this Parliament. It is admitted on all hands that even if you approach the subject with a fervent and strenuous determination to do right, it is the most difficult matter possible to carry out. You are beset with difficulties on all sides, and when you pass your law there are no means of carrying it into effect. What have we here? We have urgency denied, we have injustice denied, we have investigation asked for, we have the promise of fairness and conciliation by the local government, and if, on investigation, any injustice is shown, we have the pledge of the local legislature, reiterated by the government of Manitoba that they will apply a remedy. Under such circumstances, it will be a high-handed act on our part, it will be a tyrannical exercise of our constitutional rights, and an abuse of those rights to endeavour to force a coercion Bill through Parliament, and impose on that pro-

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

vince a system which the enormous majority of the people say they are opposed to. How can we impose such a system against the wishes of the people. Can it be successfully argued that you can do so in the interests of the minority? No. The interests of the minority are not subserved by passing an abortive law which can never go into effect; the interests of the minority are not conserved or preserved by attempting to pass a law which is admittedly ineffective and which, unless supplemented by further legislation, will not be worth the paper on which it is written. But, Sir, the hon. gentleman who moved the Bill (Sir Charles Tupper), and the hon. gentleman who spoke this afternoon (Mr. Foster), both appealed to this House in warm and impassioned language, not only to pass this law because it was within our competence, not only to pass this law because the constitutional duty lay upon us; but they appeal to the higher law, to the golden rule, to do unto others as we would that others should do unto us. And by virtue of that higher rule, they ask us to force this coercive law upon the people of Manitoba. How can any maritime province man, who remembers the history of his own province vote for this Bill on any such plea? Sir, if I adopted the higher rule of doing unto others as I would be done by, then I must refuse to vote for a coercive Bill, carried in Parliament without investigation, and in the face of the denial by the province to be coerced that any injustice exists. I must refuse to do towards Manitoba what I would resist if other people tried to do towards the province I represent, and inasmuch as I would resist coercive legislation being applied under similar circumstances to Prince Edward Island, I should according to the higher law and the golden rule, refuse to apply coercion to a people who are piteously imploring us to investigate the alleged injustice and pledging that they will do justice if you only give them a chance.

Now, Sir, let us look at the legal aspect of this law which is now proposed. Is the law in itself of any use? Can it legally be made of any effect? Is it a final law or can you legislate afterwards upon it? Sir, is our legislation in this matter final and irrevocable, or not? The question is an important, if not a vital one. If the answer is in the affirmative few would care to pass it now in the dying hours of a moribund Parliament, just before an appeal is to be made to the people. If, on the contrary, it is ordinary legislation, amendable and repealable from session to session the evils, the defects and the dangers are neither so great nor so grave. But our jurisdiction is neither exclusive nor general nor concurrent with the provinces. We possess simply a limited power, absolutely dependent upon certain necessary antecedent conditions and once exercised it cannot

be recalled. The Bill once passed, cannot by us or by our successors be repealed. When we properly legislate, our legislation becomes part of the educational law of Manitoba. As such it would seem to follow that it must be open to amendment from time to time by the Manitoba legislature, subject, like the rest of the educational laws of the province, to an appeal to the Privy Council by an aggrieved minority. But if our power is a strictly limited, conditional one, then it follows that once exercised it could not by us be recalled, the power once crystallized into law the law could not afterwards by us be repealed. A fortiori, it could not be repealed in part by amendment or modification. To justify a subsequent interference, we must show some general power. We have none. If we can amend we can repeal; if we can recall in part, we can in whole, and that necessarily implies a general, if not an exclusive, jurisdiction. Nor does it seem we can reserve our powers in part for a future Parliament to exercise. In my opinion, it is a power to be exercised 'ad hoc.' We cannot delegate it, neither can we reserve it wholly or partially. In so far as we fail to legislate for the remedy of any grievance, whether A, B or C, adjudged by the remedial order, just in so far do we and have we exercised and exhausted our discretion. By the very act of accepting and enacting "A," and declining to accept or enact "B," we have exercised and exhausted the limited statutory jurisdiction vested in us. We can determine to postpone action, or we can decline to act at all, but if we do act, our action will be final and must be complete.

Does the Bill exceed our jurisdiction? Our power to legislate is based entirely on the remedial order. It is argued with much force that we can only legislate to carry out the identical findings and decrees of the remedial order, neither less nor more, and that only if and when the legislature refuses to carry out these findings. It is denied that we have power to legislate to carry these findings out in part for the reason that the legislature might have carried that part out if ordered so to do. In other words, if the remedial order directs "A," "B" and "C" to be done, and the legislature declines to carry "A," "B" and "C" out, then this Parliament has not power to enact "A" alone, or "A" and "B" alone, for the reason that the legislature, if it had been required to carry out such a limited remedial order, might have been perfectly willing to do so. It is said that it is only the legislature's refusal to act which gives us jurisdiction at all, and as there has been no refusal to remedy grievance "A" alone or grievance "B" alone, or "A" and "B" alone, we have no jurisdiction to do so. The argument is a very strong one, and has the sanction of eminent legal authorities. If sound it is absolutely fatal to this Bill. But whether this be so

or not, and on that I express no opinion, at any rate, it is plain beyond dispute that this Parliament cannot legislate beyond the very terms and specific adjudications or findings of the remedial order. In my opinion, such an order, being the controlling basis of all legislation, never ought to be made without a thorough investigation into all the disputed facts. The Privy Council, to which the appeal is made, must first determine what facts are proved, what grievances actually exist, and then, as a matter of state policy, how far it is proper or wise or prudent to go in ordering redress. The extent of their decision necessarily limits our powers, and we cannot act as a court of appeal with unlimited jurisdiction and decide on adopting other or different modes of redress to those decreed and adjudged by the remedial order. We can determine, under the circumstances, not to act for the present, not to exercise at this particular time our statutory discretion, or we can determine to exercise it in whole or in part, but our statutory discretion is necessarily limited by the terms of the order. Now, look at this order. It prescribes as a remedy "A," "B" and "C," and those only. It does not in any other respect alter, abridge or amend the Acts of 1890. It authorizes us to enact such legislation as is necessary to carry "A," "B" and "C" into effect, but nothing beyond that. We cannot interfere with the general scope of the educational machinery of Manitoba, except to the extent that is essential and necessary to carry out "A," "B" and "C." The remedial order says nothing about establishing a separate Board of Education. It is absolutely silent on the subject. Unless it is necessarily implied in "A," "B" and "C," we cannot legally constitute such a board. All the rights and privileges conceded to the Roman Catholic minority by the remedial order can as well be carried out by the existing Board of Education of Manitoba as by a separate board. If the contrary was thought, the remedial order should have expressly mentioned it. But a separate board is not necessary to give the minority "A," "B" and "C." If the Manitoba legislature had by legislation of its own, in obedience to the remedial order, conceded the Roman Catholic minority the right to build, maintain, equip, manage and conduct and support Roman Catholic schools under the supervision of the existing Board of Education, we could not interfere to supplement their legislation by establishing such a separate board. Neither can we do so unless such is adjudged and ordered by the remedial order. The establishment of such a board is neither expressly adjudged by the remedial order, nor necessarily to be implied from the three specific rights adjudged nor essential effectually to confer those rights. This being so, we have no power to constitute such a board, and the Act before us being ultra vires in that respect, will be only useful as a source of unlimited litigation.

I have reduced my views on that abstract legal question to writing with very great care, and I commend them to the hon. Minister of Justice or to any other legal gentleman on the other side of the House who feels disposed to controvert them. If I am right in my conclusion, the measure you have before you, if passed, will not be worth the paper on which it is written. I may be wrong; I am open to conviction if I am wrong. That, of course, is a practical legal question which only legal gentlemen will indulge in. I am satisfied that the reasoning cannot be controverted; and unless you can show conclusively that involved and necessarily involved in A, B, and C, is the constitution of a separate board of education, then you have no power whatever to constitute it. I have argued, and I am satisfied beyond a doubt, that A, B, and C can be carried out successfully by the present Board of Education as established. That being so, A, B, and C is the extent of the remedy you can propose, and you cannot add to that remedy an additional one. You cannot constitute a board which the remedial order did not call into existence or require.

Now, Sir, I ask the Government what are they doing in the matter of conciliation? In July they were prepared to conciliate. Where do we stand to-day? We stand here, with the Secretary of State inviting urging, almost imploring, this House to pass a coercion Bill in one breath, and in the next breath telling us that he is about to invite the Premier of Manitoba to enter into consultation with him for the purpose of coming to an amicable settlement. Sir, he asks us to forge a club for him which he may hold over the head of the Manitoba Premier, and, with that club in his hand, say to him: "Now, Sir, I want you to come to an amicable settlement with me." Does he suppose that it is within the bounds of possibility to reach an amicable settlement in that way? And what did we hear to-day? That there was not a scintilla of basis for the statement he made to the House the other day, as to any proposition have been initiated by Mr. Greenway at all. The very telegram he quoted was only quoted in part, and Mr. Greenway has complained bitterly in the local legislature that the whole of it, which he deems important, was not quoted. But, Sir, if the Government are only discharging their duty under the constitution, if what they are doing is imperative upon them, and they are not going further than the constitution requires them to go, I ask, what do they want with consultation, with conciliation? If they are being impelled by a stern sense of duty under the constitution, how dare they hesitate? How dare they retract or withdraw? It shows the utter fallacy, the ridiculously nonsensical fallacy, of the arguments behind which they seek to shelter themselves for want of better. It shows their want of sincerity. I say that these gentlemen are acting in a way which, if human nature

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

is the same in Manitoba as elsewhere, must prevent a frank, friendly, and final settlement of this difficulty. Sir, what is their true policy? If they want to settle it, they can honourably withdraw the Bill yet. There is no dishonour in withdrawing the Bill. They have been told, time and again, and I repeat the statement, that on this side of the House we want to make no political capital out of this question. We are anxious to have it withdrawn from the arena of Dominion politics. We are sincerely desirous of having conceded to the minority in Manitoba the rights and privileges which they ought to enjoy; and we think that can be done, and will be done, if you abandon coercion and enter upon a policy of negotiation and conciliation. We know that conciliation has marked out satisfactory results elsewhere, and we believe that if you adopt it here, an honourable and lasting arrangement, based upon truth, honour and righteousness—which alone can make such an arrangement permanent—can be entered into. You can make an arrangement, which, while doing justice to the minority, will not violate the conscience of the majority or unnecessarily invade the autonomy of the province. You can recognize provincial rights, while, at the same time contending that injustice has been done to the minority which should be remedied; and when you come to determine just how far that ought to be done, it must necessarily be a matter of compromise, and be done in a conciliatory spirit, if done at all.

Holding these views, I oppose this Bill. I oppose this Bill because it is a political fraud, a parliamentary juggle; because it embodies the maximum of evil with the minimum of good; because, while applying a coercion hateful to all Canadians, it is confessedly inefficient and unworkable; because, in its very face, it lacks finality, and by calling for further amendments must necessarily rekindle and encourage racial and religious disputes. I oppose it because it involves an interference with provincial rights, only to be tolerated in the last resort, and after careful investigation proves the existence of well-founded grievances, which the legislature will not remedy. I oppose it because, while technically within our powers, it is, under present circumstances, morally outside them, and because it is an uncalled-for and arbitrary exercise of a limited constitutional privilege or power only to be resorted to when all other means have failed. I oppose it because, while ostensibly pretending to remedy the grievances of the minority, it gives them no effectual relief, and while creating a vast and obnoxious machinery, provides no motive power, either to start it going, or keep it moving. I oppose it because the experience of all the provinces has shown that the majority in each province will, if left to themselves, do even-handed justice to the minority. I oppose it because, while violating the established practice of a quarter of a century, it

creates a precedent which, if followed, may eventually disrupt and destroy the confederacy. I oppose it because, involving one of the gravest questions of state policy, ever brought before us, a question pregnant with most far-reaching and dangerous results, it is beyond the moral competence of this dying Parliament, in its dying hour to enact. I oppose it because in my judgment it is more than doubtful whether, once passed, it can afterwards be altered or amended by this Parliament, because the power given to us to legislate at all strictly limited and dependent upon certain necessary antecedent conditions once exercised is exhausted and cannot be again acted upon, because it is probably final and irrevocable, so far as we are concerned, and, therefore, doubly calls for prudence, care, time, and investigation on our part before being made the law of the land. I oppose it because the present exercise by us of the power is bitterly opposed to the wishes and desires of the vast majority of the Manitoba people. I oppose the Bill because the higher law, and the golden rule bids me do unto others as I would be done by, and as I would bitterly resent coercion being applied under similar circumstances, to my province, so I will decline, unless in the last resort, and after fullest investigation, to join in applying it to another province. I oppose it because I do not believe in force as a remedy for wrong.

But while I oppose this Bill, I know there is a better way, a nobler path to follow, a simpler and more British method by which the grievances may be removed, and justice for the minority obtained. That way, that path, that method, is the equitable and British method proposed by the leader of the Liberal party. His earnestness, his sincerity, his ability, are beyond cavil or doubt. His race, his creed, his experience render his position unique, and his powers in such a case as this, very great. His noble statesmanlike views put forward in his speech during this debate have established for him a reputation and a confidence rarely before enjoyed by a Canadian public man. His proposition for a settlement commends itself to our common sense, and involves an amicable settlement through provincial legislation, based on conciliation and compromise, and after thorough discussion and investigation. Sir, I cannot but believe that with coercion abandoned and conciliation substituted the Protestant majority of Manitoba will be ready to accord to their weaker brethren a full measure of justice, pressed down and running over.

Mr. POWELL. I have had the pleasure, on numerous occasions, of listening to the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat. I have heard him, at times, speak more recklessly than to-night, but I have scarcely ever heard him make a speech in which he has been more regardless of the rules—I might almost say, of propriety. In starting,

he complained of the language of the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster). He complained, that the Minister of Finance had accused the Opposition of almost every crime in the calendar. I think this is an instance in which the wicked flee and no man pursueth. He was also pleased to pay his respects to the hon. leader of the House (Sir Charles Tupper). Sir, the leader of the House has been too long in public life, has earned too well his spurs, to need any commendation from the hon. gentleman; and, his character and ability are so recognized in this country that I can with confidence leave him to his own fate. I am but expressing the opinion, not only of our own side of the House, but the real opinion of the other side of the House, that what troubles the gentleman is not his character, but his strength, that what inspires him is not a feeling of hate, but a sense of fear; and, when he tells me in this House, that Sir Charles Tupper has not the confidence of his province, and that his course with respect to confederation has begotten an enmity which has never yet been allied, I can point him to the election of 1878, when he swept his native province of Nova Scotia; I can point him to the election of 1882, when he again swept that province; I can point him to the election of 1887, when he swept it by a still more increased majority; I can point him to the election of 1891, when that province returned the large following which he has in this House to-day.

An hon. MEMBER. They will do it again.

Mr. POWELL. Do it again? Of course, they will do it again.

Mr. LANDERKIN. They will never do it again.

Mr. POWELL. I have heard the cries of "never do it again" on the eve of every election. I heard it on the eve of the election of 1882 and on the eve of the election of 1887; and on the eve of the election of 1891, Opposition papers teemed with the strongest prophecies of coming glory. He and his party were to be swept from power; and, Sir, when the smoke of battle had cleared away on election day, they were as dumb as mummies in the tombs of the Pharaohs; they were inanimate as the hordes of Sen-nacherib.

I shall not follow the hon. gentleman in—I can not call it his argument—but in his semblance of argument. I shall only incidentally touch any point he made. The main burden of his song is, that we should have a commission. Pray heaven, what do we want of a commission? The hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Laurier) says we want it for three things: First, to establish the policy of the Roman Catholic Church—to establish the fact, that, with Roman Catholics separate schools are a matter of conscience. Secondly, to establish the fact, that the edu-

educational system of Manitoba is a system of Protestant schools; and, thirdly, to establish whether there was or not an agreement in respect to educational matters at the time that province entered confederation. Now, I shall take those up seriatim. In respect of the policy of the Roman Catholic Church, is there a man in this House, is there a boy attending a college or an academy, who does not know the policy of that church? Why, does it need any investigation? The attention of every man has been called more or less to the history and policy of that church which has lived so long and whose greatness has been such as to warm the imagination, if it does not captivate the heart of every man, that institution which, at times, has been so great in its strength that it played with monarchs as with chessmen, and assumed to dole out empires beyond the unknown seas. Why, the very existence of British law, as a separate system, distinguished from the system of Roman law, is due to her policy. It is due to the fact that the Catholic Church, even in the days of the early Plantagenets, in the reign of Henry II, desired to control education. She thrust her favoured tenets into Bologna, Padua, Paris, Oxford and Cambridge; and it was the rebellion of our Catholic forefathers, who favoured the old laws as against the canon law, which established British law. Why, our forefathers, when Catholics, invariably pursued that policy, and I may say to-day, that, in respect of higher education, we ourselves pursue that policy, just as they did in olden times, and as the Catholic Church desires to pursue it to-day, in respect to elementary education as well. And, in respect to this matter, I claim that they are more logical. Every Protestant church has decided, as a matter of policy, to take charge of higher education, to see to it that young men should be trained under Christian influences. This is precisely the object of the Roman Catholic Church. But, while extreme Protestants, and they are only extreme Protestants, are exciting animosities against Catholics for meddling with education, let them reflect upon the fact that their policy is identically the same, the only difference being that the Roman Catholics are more logical than the Protestants. They say: Give us the child while he is young, while his mind is plastic, while we can mould his character. We are unwilling that he should grow up to be infidel, or atheistic, or agnostic. The Protestant says: Leave the child to the tender mercies of the public school where religion is not taught, and after his views are comparatively set we will endeavour in our denominational colleges to supply the want or to undo the wrong done in the early days of his education. We know that, the world over, the Roman Catholic Church is anxious that religion should be taught in the school. That is their policy.

Mr. POWELL.

We need no commission to enlighten us as to that point. As to the schools of Manitoba, where, I ask, are we to learn their character? We must take what is sanctioned by the statute and regulations of the educational authorities. Those are open to every member of this House. All you have to do is to get the statute and the school regulations. Is a commission necessary in order to discover where the statute is? Must we have a commission to find out where the office of the educational authorities of Manitoba is, so as to send a messenger there for a copy of the regulations? It is perfect nonsense; it is perfect subterfuge.

Now, as to whether there was an agreement or not, I am thoroughly convinced that there was, so fully convinced that my mind has not a shadow of a doubt upon the question. In respect to that matter, Mr. Speaker, four contentions have been put forth. Three were touched upon and set forth to-night by the hon. member for Queen's, the other has been put forth by the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). There are: 1. That the Manitoba Act was not a legislative compact, but a legislative concession. 2. That there was no agreement at all respecting denominational schools. 3. That if there was an agreement, it cannot prevail as against the written constitution; and, 4. even if there was an agreement, we are not obliged under the constitutional provisions relating to appeal to grant any measure of relief. Let me deal with the contentions of the hon. member for Simcoe first. Now, Sir, was the Manitoba Act a parliamentary compact or was it a legislative concession? If the Parliament of Canada, having the right of sovereignty over that country, assumed to extend certain privileges to the minority gratuitously, it had the right to recall these privileges. I acknowledge that as a fundamental principle of ordinary parliamentary jurisdiction. But, Sir, the hon. member for Simcoe last year entirely misrepresented the case to the House when he concealed the fact that Canada had not the right of sovereignty in Manitoba at the time the Manitoba Act was passed, nay, when he actually stated to the House that at that time Canada had the right of sovereignty in Manitoba. Canada did not acquire the right of sovereignty until after the passing of the Manitoba Act itself. Let us digress here for a moment—and I hope I shall not weary the House if I give the facts relating to this matter. Before the passing of the confederation there was a feeling of unrest among the people there. They actually at one time held a convention of the inhabitants, and wrote to an hon. member of this House who represented Toronto, urging the necessity of incorporating that territory with Canada, presenting the alternative of annexation to the United States. Canada determined to acquire the territory. In 1867 a joint address was sent by the House of

Commons and the Senate of Canada to the Queen asking that the North-west Territories should be incorporated under the provisions of section 146 of the British North America Act. The Queen in Council took this matter into consideration, and in April, 1868, replied signifying her willingness to grant the prayer of the joint address. However, there was a difficulty in the way. They could not transfer the territories without violating the rights of the Hudson Bay Company. On 31st July, 1868, there was passed in the British Parliament, an Act which authorized the Queen to negotiate with the Hudson's Bay Company and to accept the surrender of the franchise of government and the territorial rights which they had in that country. Canada was notified of this. Canada hastily, without the slightest authority in the world, without any more authority than a convention of the Esquimo would have, passed a statute making provision for the government of the country. This excited the people of those territories and rebellion ensued—at least we call it rebellion, but it was not a rebellion, Sir, I say boldly on the floor of this House that Riel's first action in Winnipeg excepting the murder of Scott and other crimes, was a justifiable action. It was the action of a man defending his hearth and home against the intruder. Canada went in there without the slightest shadow of right, and the resistance met was offered to trespassers and interlopers. When the trouble arose, our astute chieftain, Sir John Macdonald cried a halt in the proceedings until the British government should have peace established in the country, by England or the Hudson Bay Company. Negotiations were set on foot. These negotiations ended in an Act of Parliament which we know as the Manitoba Act. But still Canada had no power over the territory. On the 23rd June, 1870, not less than a month and ten days after the passage of the Manitoba Act, the Queen, under the terms of the Act of 1868, took a surrender of the rights and franchises in these territories of the Hudson Bay Company. The very next day the Order in Council was passed and the proclamation issued joining that country with Canada, and giving Canada for the first time any right there. In the face of these facts the Manitoba Act, passed the 12th day of May, 1870, could not be a legislative concession. There could have been no concession because there was no sovereignty. Canada had nothing to concede. The Manitoba Act was purely and simply a legislative compact, which was, after the acquisition by Canada of the Red River settlements, on June 23rd, 1870, made valid as a statute by the Imperial Act of June 29th, 1871, confirming it. The second point is as to whether there was an agreement made as respects the public schools. The hon. Minister of Finance has gone into the telegrams, despatches and memorials that passed backwards and for-

wards, and I am sorry to weary the House with repeating them. I shall supplement his statement, however, with others. When the trouble arose Canada sent a commissioner, Mr. Donald A. Smith, now Sir Donald Smith, the hon. member for Montreal West, to the North-west. Two others went with him. The proposals they made resulted in commissioners being sent from Manitoba to Canada—Father Richot, Mr. John Scott and Dr. Black, to negotiate a treaty on the terms of which the Red River Settlements should come into confederation. Difficulties delayed their coming. During all this time negotiations were going on between the Hudson Bay Company, England, Canada and the people of the west. England was informed of every step of the negotiations, and of the object of Mr. Smith going there; and she sent anxious telegrams from time to time inquiring as to the progress of negotiations. Earl Granville, on 25th February, 1870, telegraphed Sir John Young, then Governor General of Canada:

Hudson Bay Company are anxious about the negotiations at Ottawa with the delegates from Red River. The settlement would probably be facilitated if Northcote were with you with full powers entrusted by the company. If so, what would be the best time for his arrival?

Recognizing the negotiations. Then again in a despatch, the contents of which were sent to the home government, dated 16th February, 1870, Sir John Young wrote a letter of instructions to Bishop Taché, in which occurs the following words:—

In this last letter I wrote: All who have complaints to make, or wishes to express, to address themselves to me, as Her Majesty's representative, and you may state with the utmost confidence that the Imperial Government has no intention of acting otherwise, or permitting others to act otherwise, than in perfect good faith towards the inhabitants of Red River district, and of the North-west.

The people may rely that respect and attention will be extended to the different religious persuasions, that title to every description of property will be carefully guarded, and that all the franchises which have subsisted, or which the people may prove themselves qualified to exercise, shall be duly continued, or liberally conferred.

This despatch was ratified by the home government. Afterwards, anxious that the negotiations between these delegates representing the North-west Territories and Rupert's Land and the Government of Canada, should be brought to a successful issue and anxious to be kept informed of every step, on the 17th March, 1870, Earl Granville sent the following telegram to Sir John Young:

Let me know by telegram when you know delegates have started from Fort Garry.

Not only that, but Earl Granville sent a special messenger, Sir Charles H. Murdock, with private instructions to Sir John A. Macdonald, and sent also a despatch to the Governor General of Canada in which occurred these words:

But I have also informed him unreservedly of the views of Her Majesty's Government in relation to the Red River settlement; and I think that if, after free communication with him, you entertain any apprehension as to the conclusion of explicit and satisfactory arrangements, especially with regard to the question to which I have above adverted, you will be at liberty to detain him at Ottawa until all such apprehensions are removed.

After this Granville telegraphs to Young on 18th March:

I have the honour to send your lordship to-day the following telegraphic message:—

Received your telegram of yesterday. No news from Red River settlement as yet of delegates starting.

After that, on 31st March, 1870, Young telegraphs to Granville:

I had the honour to send to your lordship the following telegraphic message:—

Mr. Smith from Red River is on his way to Ottawa, and expected to arrive on Saturday next. He reports all quiet up to the 14th inst. Bishop Taché arrived on the 11th. The convention are in session, discussing plans of adjustment, with Canada. Smith says nothing about delegates.

Afterwards in the extreme anxiety prevailing the propriety of sending troops was discussed. Granville says in a dispatch to the Governor General:

With regard to the conditions on which Imperial troops may be allowed to co-operate with the Canadian force, in supporting order in that settlement. I refer you to the telegram which you have already received, and to the oral explanations which you will receive from Sir C. H. Murdock, who is in possession of the views of Her Majesty's Government.

Subject to these conditions, the number of Imperial troops sent may be 200 or 250 as General Lindsay shall think best. They must, however, be accompanied by such a Canadian force as will enable the Government of Red River to bring together in case of emergency 800 trained volunteers and militia, besides the Imperial troops.

The expense fairly attaching to such British contingent as may be sent will be borne by this country. The rest must be defrayed from the Canadian exchequer.

Young replies to Granville on 4th April, 1870:

Smith came here on Saturday from Fort Garry with bad news. A Canadian, called Scott, was by Riel's orders tried by court martial and shot, with the view, it is supposed, of compromising Riel's followers before Taché had arrived. They say delegates are coming, but it is quite clear Riel will yield to nothing but force. Things now look, I think, very bad.

Young kept the home government posted and sent to Granville the following message on 7th April, 1870:

Last of the delegates is expected at St. Paul's on Thursday the 14th. The others arrived there to-day and may reach Ottawa on Saturday the 9th.

Granville replies to Young on 9th April, 1870:

Mr. POWELL.

Let me know as soon as you can by telegram, result of negotiations with Red River delegates, and immediately whether our conditions as to time of transfer and apportionment of cost of troops are accepted by your Government.

In the meantime Father Richot and Scott were arrested at the instance of the inhabitants of Sarnia. This had been telegraphed to the home government, and so anxious were they about this matter, anxious that a successful issue should be the result of the negotiations that Granville sent the following telegram to Young on 18th April:

Was arrest of delegates authorized by Canadian Government? Send full information by telegram.

Young replies to Granville on 19th April, 1870:

Arrest of delegates was not authorized by Dominion.

Young forwarded to Granville, 21st April, 1870, the following despatch:—

Judge Black has arrived, and I have had two unofficial interviews with him, and perused the papers with which the delegates have been furnished by Riel and his advisers.

These papers were first a letter of instructions, secondly, a bill of rights, and thirdly, a certificate of the delegates appointment. Granville replies to Young on 23rd April, 1870:

On the following conditions troops may advance:—

1. Rose to be authorized to pay £300,000 once, and Her Majesty's Government to be at liberty to make transfer before end of June.

2. Her Majesty's Government to pay expense of British troops only, not exceeding 250, and Canadian Government the rest, sending at least 500 trained men.

3. Canadian Government to accept decision of Her Majesty's Government on all disputed points of the settlers' bill of rights.

Sir, that shows that the settlers' rights were the one thing that was in negotiation between them, and so strong and anxious was the British Government that the rights of these people should be respected, that they actually put the screws on the Dominion and said you must negotiate with the people of Manitoba as your equal, and if any trouble arises between you as respect the terms of the agreement, you shall accept the umpirage of Great Britain, and if you do not the English troops will not proceed and the North-west will not go into the union. Young replied to Granville on 29th April:

No other proceedings have been instituted, or are pending, against the Rev. Mr. Richot or Mr. A. H. Scott, and they together with their colleague, Judge Black, have been in conference with Ministers for several days past in their capacity of delegates from the convention of the people at the Red River.

I think it right to forward to your lordship a copy of the terms and conditions brought by the delegates from the North-west, which have formed the subject of conference.

The rights claimed by the Red River settlers formed the subject matter of the conference. Then Granville replies to Young, April 30th, 1870 :

Your telegraphic proposal is accepted by Her Majesty's Government, provided Canadian Government accepts in other respects mine of 23rd, which ought to have been answered.

On 3rd May, 1870, Young telegraphs to Granville :

Negotiations with delegates closed satisfactorily. A province named Manitoba erected, containing eleven thousand square miles. Lieutenant-Governor appointed by Canada, representative institutions Upper House 7, not exceeding 12 members nominated lower, 24 elected by people, 2 senators in Dominion Senate, 4 representatives in House of Commons, to increase hereafter in proportion to population, pecuniary terms, population taken at 15,000 to be credited in lieu of debt per head \$27.27, annual subsidy, as to other provinces, 80 cents per head until population increases to 400,000, further provision of \$30,000 a year for expenses of Government ; lands to belong to Dominion, but one million two hundred thousand acres reserved to extinguish claims of half-breeds and Indian titles ; all existing titles and possessions to be quieted, in various other respects same terms as to other provinces ; the rest of the territory, the vast extent unsettled and unpeopled to be governed by the Lieutenant-Governor under instructions from the Canadian Government.

Granville had refused to allow troops to proceed to Red River unless these negotiations were closed, and as soon as they were closed, on 6th May, 1870, Young replies to Granville as follows :—

I may now, I suppose, give final orders for the military to start for Red River ? General Lindsay has asked me for such orders.

On 6th May, 1870, Granville telegraphed Young in reply :

Troops may proceed. Who is in command of expedition ; and what is name of Governor of the Territory.

On 12th May, Young telegraphs to Granville :

Bill for the government of North-west passed, sanctioning conditions agreed upon with delegates. Parliament prorogued to-day.

Granville replies on May 18th, 1870 :

I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your despatches (Nos. 85 and 87) of the 25th and 29th April last, inclosing documents connected with the recent disturbances in the Red River territory.

I am glad to learn that the proceedings adopted against the Rev. Mr. Ritchot and Mr. Scott were promptly disposed of and had not been renewed, and I take this opportunity of expressing the satisfaction with which I have learned from your telegram of the 3rd instant that the Canadian Government and the delegates have come to an understanding as to the terms on which the settlement on the Red River should be admitted into the Dominion.

Granville responds in a dispatch on May 19th, 1870 :

I have received with much satisfaction your telegram of the 12th instant announcing that the Bill for the government of the North-west Territory had passed sanctioning the conditions agreed upon with the delegates from the Red River settlement.

After the agreement arrived at between the delegates and the Canadian Government, Father Ritchot took the draft Bill home, laid it before the convention in Rupert's Land, and it was adopted unanimously by the convention. In the face of this what shall we say ? Certainly the Manitoba Act is a legislative contract.

Now, with respect to the educational features of the contract. The hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies) has been pleased to throw reflections on Father Ritchot. I have not the honour of that gentleman's acquaintance. It is sometimes cowardly to prefer a charge, and of course I am not allowed to say in Parliament that on this occasion it is a cowardly act to prefer the charge. Four bills of rights were prepared by the inhabitants of Red River. The first one was in December, 1869. In that bill of rights references were made to schools. What schools ? At that time there was no statute law in the country : what law they had was the common law which every lawyer knows goes with settlement of a colony. They had that, of course, but there was no legislature to enact any statutes. They had, however, educational institutions. What are they ? The only educational institutions at that time were schools of three kinds, Roman Catholic schools, Presbyterian schools and Church of England schools, there were no Methodist or Baptist schools. Then what is meant when the bill of rights speaks of lands being given by the Canadian Government for schools ? It means for denominational schools. It is a principle of law and of common sense that language must be construed with regard to the subject to which it is applied. The only schools were denominational schools, and the bill of rights referred to them. The second bill of rights was dated 5th February. In that bill of rights, which was handed over to Mr. Smith, and every item of which he subsequently answered in the convention, there is an express demand that a certain amount of money should be given annually by the Canadian Government to the inhabitants of that country in order to maintain their schools before they would enter into confederation. To maintain what schools ? The denominational schools—the people of that country knew of none other. Next in order of time was the bill of rights known as No. 4 which the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) insinuated was a bogus bill of rights. The last bill of rights, which Mr. McCarthy claims was the correct bill of rights, which the hon. member for Queen's also says was the correct bill of rights, was prepared on the eve of the departure of the delegates from the North-west to Ottawa, to hold a conference with members of the Canadian

Government. Hon. members will find in the "Nation," a newspaper published in the city of Winnipeg at that time, that after the delegates returned, and a question arose in regard to varying the bill of rights, it was explained by the man who drew it up that there was so much hurrying in order to send the delegates to Ottawa that it had been changed, and there was not time to lay it before a convention before the delegates departed. Bear in mind that the letter of instructions in regard to the last bill of rights was dated 22nd March. Was there another bill of rights—No. 4. One of the resolutions passed by what is known as the January convention was to the effect that the people should appoint a joint commissioner—that was the term used—to frame a bill of rights. This was done in the early part of February. On February 12th there was a letter of instructions given to Father Ritchot, which he swears was given to him with bill of rights No. 4 by Thomas Bunn, secretary of the commission. It may be asked, how do I know these facts? In 1874, Lepine was tried for murder in connection with the murder of Scott. At that trial, Father Ritchot was sworn, and I have a copy of his evidence here. He said: "I received from Thomas Bunn the copy of the bill of rights that was adopted by the convention which met on 25th January and continued until some time in February." If that statement be true, why all the mystery is cleared up. He swears under oath that that was the bill of rights which was given to him, and it contains the section relating to separate schools. As hon. gentlemen know, immediately after the trial of Lepine, application was made to the Governor General for the commutation of his sentence and release from prison. He was released, and, Sir, it is no secret that Lepine was released from prison, on this ground mainly that Canada had, without the slightest jurisdiction whatever, attempted to thrust herself into that country. A copy of the minutes of trial was prepared in 1874 and sent forward to the Government, and that certified copy of the trial, the minutes of evidence, and all the exhibits, are to-day to be seen by any gentleman who chooses to go to the office of the Secretary of State and see them. Every page of them is certified by the official of the court, and among these papers filed in that office in the early part of 1874 is a certified copy of this document, which my hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Davies) says no reasonable man attempts to put forward as genuine.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Will the hon. gentleman allow me? Was that document submitted to the Privy Council as one of the grounds on which they should give relief? Was it mentioned at all?

Mr. POWELL. I may come to that later. You do not think the Privy Council had

Mr. POWELL.

anything to do with that question, and so it is not pertinent to your argument.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) On the application to the Privy Council of Canada for leave to appeal, and in the application which set forth the grievances which these people said they were labouring under, was this bill of rights referred to?

Mr. POWELL. My friend, if you ask something pertinent to your argument or to my argument, I will be pleased to answer it. Father Ritchot was sworn, and gave his testimony in 1874. These sectarian schools were supposed to be settled and established in the North-west, beyond peradventure, at that time. Now, if a man commits perjury, or if a man commits forgery, there must be some motive for it, and I ask you, Mr. Speaker, what possible motive could the ingenuity of man attribute to Father Ritchot, that he should deliberately commit perjury and forgery, and substitute a forged document for a genuine document, when by so doing there was not the slightest object to be accomplished in the world. It is easy to throw out insinuations. As I said, I have not the pleasure of this gentleman's acquaintance, but I will say:

There is no might or greatness in humanity,
Censure can 'scape back wounding calumny;
The whitest virtue strikes
No King so strong can tie the gall
Up in a slanderous tongue.

Mr. MARTIN. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Powell) if he is aware—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. MARTIN. Of course, I always notice that if any one on this side of the House interrupts, it is very wrong, but hon. gentlemen on the opposite side of the House are continually interrupting, and there is no fault found with them on this side of the House.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Chair.

Mr. MARTIN. I wish to make a reference to the argument of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Powell). Is the hon. gentleman aware that at the convention which he speaks about, and of which Mr. Thomas Bunn was secretary, that the proceedings and papers and minutes of that convention are all in existence, certified to by Thomas Bunn, including the bill of rights which was passed by that convention; and that bill of rights differs from the bill of rights offered by Father Ritchot, and filed in the Lepine trial? Father Ritchot's bill contains a clause asking for separate schools, while the bill of the convention which is in existence, and signed by Mr. Bunn, omits entirely that clause which regard to separate schools.

Mr. POWELL. I will say to the hon. gentleman from Winnipeg, that it is only fair to assume that a man who attempts to

discuss this matter is not so culpably negligent of his duty to this Parliament and this country as not to inquire into a question like that. There is a difference between bill of rights No. 3 and bill of rights No. 4. In No. 3 there is no clause relating to sectarian schools, and in No. 4 there is, and while the hon. gentleman (Mr. Martin) says that the minutes of that convention are in existence—I do not know whether they are or not—this particular bill of rights No. 3, which was given to Dr. Black on the 22nd March, 1870, is not given in the minutes of the convention, and, doubtless, this bill of rights No. 4 was prepared by these joint commissioners, who were directed to prepare it for the purpose of being forwarded to Ottawa. That which he speaks of as No. 3 was not prepared until the time, from the 12th day of February until the 22nd day of March had elapsed, after the appointment of Father Ritchot as a plenipotentiary on their behalf to Ottawa. Is there any inconsistency in the statements that Thomas Bunn on the 12th day of February handed over to Father Ritchot the bill of rights that was presented by this joint commission, that was delegated to prepare it by the convention itself, and that on the 22nd day of March, bill of rights No. 3 was handed to Dr. Black with a letter of instructions, and that both bills of rights were at the conference in Ottawa.

That brings me down to the consideration of the statute itself. There is one thing, that I have no doubt the hon. gentleman from Winnipeg (Mr. Martin) and the men who oppose this Bill, would be very desirous, indeed, to see proved, and that is, that these people in convention at Ottawa never discussed the educational problem at all. When these people thought of schools in the first bill of rights, and thought of schools in the second bill of rights, is it not the most natural thing in the world that they should think of schools in another bill of rights? Is there anything extraordinary about that? Is there any indication of fraud about it? Not the slightest in the world. But here is the end of the whole matter. When they met to mould their legislative compact, when they prepared a Bill to be put through this House, what did they do? Sir, if there is anything very serious it is the constitution of a country. If there is one thing that such an accomplished statesman as Sir John Macdonald, such an astute man, such an able lawyer—and I am informed he drafted that Bill himself—if there is one thing he would be more careful about than another, surely it would be the preparation of the constitution of a country. They had a constitution for Canada with which country Manitoba was to be united. But a change was made in the constitution of Canada, on the application of it to Manitoba. Under the constitution of Canada, the British North America Act, as it stood, only

these rights which existed "by law" were to be stereotyped—if I may use that term—but under the Manitoba Act, what do we find? The language is changed. There is introduced into it a new term, and it provides for the maintenance of these rights and privileges which existed "by law or by practice." Now, Sir, would a man astute as Sir John Macdonald was, have introduced that word practice into the compact, unless it meant something? Does it not show that education was not only thought of, but thought of most carefully.

Now, Sir, my hon. friend (Mr. Davies) says that we must construe that statute with reference simply to the words that are in it. I am not going to quarrel with that statement. He and I are both lawyers. Any man must, by strict rules of evidence, take a written contract as it is. Any man must, in construing a contract, not go beyond the four corners of the document itself. That is clear, and for strict law purposes, I would say to the hon. gentleman that the verbal negotiations that led up to the contract are by the strict rules of evidence, not part of the contract itself, when the contract is written. But I will say to him further, and he knows it well, that if there is in any written contract, a mistake, or omission, if it is between private parties, the courts of this country will compel it to be reformed. And, the reason why this parliamentary compact cannot be reformed, is, that there is no power in the constitution, there is no court in the land, which has the authority to reform an act of Parliament. It stands for better or for worse absolutely binding until Parliament changes it, no matter what mischief it may work or how opposed it may be to the intentions or agreements which it was suppose to embody.

Now, Sir, in respect to these words, "by practice," let us see just what the Privy Council says about it. I am not referring to the dicta of the judges, but I am referring to the carefully-prepared judgment. In Barrett's case, the sole question raised was, whether the Public Schools Act of 1890 prejudicially affected any right or privilege that the Roman Catholics "by law or practice" had in the province at the union. I ask hon. gentlemen to follow this carefully, and see if every line of it is not permeated with this conviction; that the agreement was not fully implemented in this statute:

Their lordships arrived at the conclusion that this question must be answered in the negative. The only right or privilege which the Roman Catholics then possessed, either by law or in practice, was the right or privilege of establishing and maintaining for the use of members of their own church such schools as they pleased. It appeared to their lordships that this right or privilege remained untouched, and therefore could not be said to be affected by the legislation of 1890. It was not doubted that the object of the first subsection of section 22 was to afford protection to denominational schools, or that it was proper to have regard to the intent of the

legislature and the surrounding circumstances in interpreting the enactment. But the question which had to be determined was the true construction of the language used.

The function of a tribunal is limited to construing the words employed ; it is not justified in forcing into them a meaning which they cannot reasonably bear. Its duty is to interpret not to enact. It is true that the construction put by this board upon the first subsection reduced within very narrow limits the protection afforded by that subsection in respect of denominational schools. It may be that those who were acting on behalf of the Roman Catholic community in Manitoba, and those who were acting or assented to the wording of that enactment, were under the impression that its scope was wider, and that it afforded protection greater than their lordship held to be the case. But such considerations cannot properly influence the judgment of those who have judicially to interpret a statute. The question is, not what may be supposed to have been intended, but what has been said. More complete effect might in some cases be given to the intentions of the legislature, if violence were done to the language in which their legislation has taken shape, but such a course would on the whole be quite as likely to defeat as to further the object which was in view.

My hon. friend is a lawyer, and should be very careful of his statements. Does he not know, that the court there based their decision on a strict statutory construction? They said: We cannot, as lawyers, spell out of the four corners of that statute the stereotyping of the denominational school system in Manitoba; but it is clear, we can see through and beyond the statute, that it was intended by the parties to this statutory compact, that these denominational schools should be preserved. And I was pleased, indeed, in reading carefully the speech of my hon. friend from Albert (Mr. Weldon), of last year, to note that he said—I am not quoting his exact words, but the substance of them: "If I could be thoroughly satisfied, in my own mind, that there was an agreement which was not fully embodied in this statute, and that that agreement guaranteed denominational schools, I would vote for this Parliament giving those schools to them." And even the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) was apparently willing to go to the extent of supporting remedial legislation, if he were satisfied of this, for he said in this House last year:

But, Sir, I go a long way with those who say: If the constitution by a slip of the pen has omitted to guarantee rights which were intended to be guaranteed by this Parliament and which were the result of a treaty between the settlers at that time and the authorities here, and because the strict letter of the law does not give that right would you deny it to the people of that province?

I am a Protestant, but I represent a constituency in which there are 13,000 or 14,000 Roman Catholics. But I am not taking my present stand in hope of any favour or reward. Those people are an in-

Mr. POWELL.

telligent people, and I feel proud of them in respect of their economy, their frugality their honesty, their fair-mindedness, and their respect for law. But, Sir, they are divided in politics, and the majority which I had at my back last year of about 800 justifies me in saying, that, under present circumstances, unless some great revolution of feeling takes place, my seat is fairly safe. Supporting and voting for this measure may do me more injury than good. My stand on this question is dictated by my convictions. If I felt sure, as I do feel sure, that a fair and square agreement was made between those people of Manitoba and the Parliament of Canada, under which they forsook their direct allegiance to the British Crown, and threw in their lot with us, both parties intending it to be part of that agreement, that denominational schools should be maintained, I would not be true to the traditions of the British race, if I did not support legislation carrying out that agreement. If there is one thing which we, Englishmen, feel proud of, it is our respect for law and our genius for government; and our political instincts are founded on the eternal principles of right and justice. These principles shall ultimately prevail in Manitoba, as well as in every other portion of Canada.

Now, Sir, the only way that effect can be given to that agreement which the draughtsman of the Manitoba Act thought he had sufficiently provided for, but which he did not sufficiently provide for, is by this Parliament passing remedial legislation, since Manitoba will not. Every principle of British fair play demands that such legislation should be passed.

There is another view of this question. Apart from the documents, the best evidence as to what this compact really was, is the testimony of the men who were parties to the agreement. Let us take the statement of Sir John Macdonald, in his letter, which is contained in Pope's "Life of Sir John Macdonald," at page 249, as follows:—

You ask me for advice as to the course you should take upon the vexed question of separate schools in your province. There is, it seems to me, but one course open to you. By the Manitoba Act the provisions of the British North America Act (section 93), respecting law passed for the protection of minorities in educational matters, are made applicable to Manitoba and cannot be changed, for by the Imperial Act confirming the establishment of the new provinces (34-35 Vict., section 6) it is provided that it shall not be competent for the Parliament of Canada to alter the provisions of the Manitoba Act in so far as it relates to the province of Manitoba. Obviously, therefore, the separate school system of Manitoba is beyond the reach of the legislature, or of the Dominion Parliament.

Mr. Macdougall, who was in the House at the time, was acquainted with the troubles in Manitoba, had been appointed Governor of that province, and had gone there to investigate the whole matter, is of the same opinion:

We certainly intended that the Catholics of Manitoba, or whichever denomination might be in a minority, should have the right to establish and maintain their own schools. You see the words "or practice" were inserted in the Manitoba Act, so that the difficulty which arose in New Brunswick, where separate schools actually existed, but were not recognized by the law, should not be repeated in Manitoba. And then the right of appeal to the Federal Parliament was given to make assurance doubly sure.

I quote that statement for another purpose. When the hon. member for North Simcoe comes to speak, I have no doubt, from the attention he was directing to the speech of my hon. friend the Finance Minister, this afternoon, that he will attempt to demolish this opinion of Mr. Macdougall by stating, that there is an anachronism in his statement. He will claim, that, at the time the Manitoba Act was passed, the New Brunswick school law had not been passed, and, therefore, Mr. Macdougall must have been mistaken. I will explain the apparent error. In 1870, before the passage of the Manitoba Act by the Parliament of Canada, Mr. King, the present Judge King, who was then the leader of the Conservative party in the legislature of New Brunswick, introduced that Bill into the New Brunswick House.

Mr. McINERNEY. He introduced it in 1869.

Mr. POWELL. Yes, in 1869, and in 1870 the Bill was considered in Committee of the Whole. Mr. King withdrew the Bill, or, at any rate, did not carry it that session, and the government went to the country on the Protestant horse.

Sir, great uneasiness was then felt in New Brunswick, and anxiety was felt, by sympathy, in Quebec. Everybody knew about it at the time, and therefore it was that Mr. Macdougall makes the statement which he makes here. I have another statement from another individual, the Hon. Peter Mitchell, who was a member of the Government of that day. Now, Mr. Mitchell is very strongly opposed to this Government, and therefore the opinion expressed by him on this matter is of great weight. In his declaration speech in the county of Northumberland he said :

He had already stated his opinion of what the Catholic party's rights were in that province. He had stated what took place in 1869 when Archbishop Taché came down to Ottawa from that country at a time when Canada had no way opened up by which she could get into it and when it was important that Louis Riel should be got out of it. One of the conditions agreed to with the Archbishop at that time was that the Catholic schools should be maintained. He, himself, was one of the Cabinet of Canada, who made that agreement, and it was kept for twenty-one years.

Not only that, but we have the testimony in this House of Sir Charles Tupper and Sir Hector Langevin, and my hon. friend the representative of St. John, stated posi-

tively the opinion and recollection of Sir Leonard Tilley. Sir Leonard Tilley says that unquestionably it was understood at the time that Manitoba was to have these denominational schools and he himself feels it would be an outrage, a reflection on the character of our politicians in this country, and upon the country itself if this Parliament did not observe the sanctity of this solemn statutory compact.

Now, I come to another matter, and that is the legal construction. I am not going into this question at any length. I think that while the constitution must be, as Sir John Thompson said, the pole star of our national life, I feel with my hon. friend from Albert (Mr. Weldon) that the main ground in this matter—for after all we must appeal to the common sense of the country and not to the refined legal sense of lawyers, who are a very small portion of the community, we must satisfy the people generally—the main ground is that of a compact. However, I shall discuss for a moment these constitutional provisions. My hon. friend says we must not interfere with the majority. The majority must control. I say that is a doctrine which finds no place whatever in our constitution, so far as these appeal provisions concerning education are concerned. Why, just look for one moment. An appeal lies from the action of whom? It cannot lie from that of the minority; it must lie from that of the majority and nobody else. And if it lie from that of the majority, we recognize that the will of the majority in this matter need not prevail—that, Sir, is the constitutional doctrine. In what case does an appeal lie? If the majority are working an injury by robbing the minority of their rights and privileges. That is the constitution of this country, and the other doctrine is foreign to our constitution. In construing this, they say that Parliament is not bound. I can see that in a certain sense Parliament is not bound. You cannot bind Parliament, you cannot bind the highest courts of Canada. Take the courts of original jurisdiction in the provinces. There is no law under heaven that compels a judge of the Supreme court in New Brunswick or Ontario or any other province to decide a question according to law. He is thrown upon the principles of honour that are in him to work out his duty. There is only one instance that I can at present recall in which a judge does his duty under penalty, and that is in the issuing of a writ of habeas corpus. If he does not issue it when he should, he is subjected to a heavy penalty. In one sense the judges are not forced and Parliament is not forced, but that I do not presume is the sense in which the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) desires his argument to be taken. Now, is Parliament compelled, using the word in the sense the hon. gentleman used it, or I presume use it, to pass a remedial law? The power of Parliament in this matter, according to my

view, is in a certain sense a discretionary power. It is a discretionary power, however, in affording relief. A discretion to be exercised both as to the measure and nature of the relief in view of the circumstances of each case. It is idle to argue that under all circumstances relief should be given. The legislation granting rights and privileges may have been hasty and inconsiderate, or passed under circumstances which would shock the sense of right and justice. No reasonable man would contend that in such a case it is the duty of Parliament to pass remedial legislation restoring these ill-advised and injudicious concessions. Again, the circumstances of a country may so change that a separate school law would inflict financial or other burdens upon a people too grievous to be borne. In such a case also no reasonable man would contend that remedial law should be passed. The growth of the country would thereby be retarded and disturbance fomented. On the other hand where a legislature ruthlessly and arbitrarily abolishes rights and privileges, it is equally clear that it is the duty of Parliament to pass remedial legislation. In all cases falling between these extremes Parliament should exercise its discretion, in view of all the circumstances of the case, both as to the desirability of remedial legislation, its measure and nature, always bearing in mind that, *prima facie*, it is the duty of Parliament to afford relief. This is the position which is supported by the views of our most eminent public men, both at the time of and since confederation. I do not hesitate to say that it is the view borne out by the constitution itself, and no man can read either the judgment of the Privy Council, or the dicta of the judges on the argument without being firmly convinced that this is the view of the very eminent jurists who compose the Privy Council, and heard the case. I say that our leading statesmen, both at the time of confederation and since, took this view of the matter. Such, Sir, was the view of Mr. Mackenzie. Such was the view of Sir John Macdonald and Sir John Thompson. It was also the view of Mr. Blake. I have not heard Mr. Blake's opinion in this matter quoted before the House during the debate, and I failed to find it during former debates, strange to say. Now, Mr. Blake has given an opinion on a state of facts similar to those before this House. On page 108 of the "Hansard" of 1872, which is composed of "Globe" reports, we find that speaking on the New Brunswick school laws under consideration, he said :

He gave notice that it was intended at a later stage to move an addition to the motion of Mr. Colby, if that should be adopted, in the following sense:—"And that this House deems it expedient that the opinion of the legal authorities in England should be obtained as to the rights of the New Brunswick legislature to make such changes in the school law as to deprive the Roman Catholics of the privileges they enjoyed at the time of the union, in respect of religious

Mr. POWELL.

education in the public schools, with a view of ascertaining whether the case comes under the terms of the fourth section of the 93rd clause of the British North America Act, 1867, which authorized the Parliament of Canada to enact remedial laws for the due execution of the provisions respecting education in the said Act." If the local Act did come within the provisions of that section, it would be found quite competent for this Parliament to do that justice which was necessary in case the legislature of New Brunswick declined to act, but he would fain believe, he did from his heart hope that that legislature would be disposed by its voluntary action to make such an alteration as to enable the minority to enjoy those principles which they enjoyed at the period of the union.

If they should fail, however, to do this it would be the incumbent duty of this Parliament, should the local law be a violation of the constitution, so to act as to restore the rights of which the minority would in that event have been unjustly deprived.

So, Sir, this is the suppositious case he put. Then, if the case fell within these sections, and if it was so decided, as the case before the House does fall, and it has been so decided, then Parliament would have the power and it would be the incumbent duty of Parliament to exercise that power, and give the necessary relief. Mr. Mackenzie made a speech on the same occasion, which is reported at page 108 and 109 of the same "Hansard." He said :

He believed then, as he had always believed, that a system of secular education was the one best adapted to promote the education of the people. But they were then creating a constitution which in itself was a compromise of political views, and in preparing the way for that constitution, it became necessary in the one case to agree to the construction of the great Inter-colonial Railway as one of the terms of the inter-provincial agreement required. It also became necessary in the other case to agree to continue the system of separate schools for the Roman Catholics, then in operation in Upper Canada, as a perpetual principle of our common school system. He could not help feeling that it would be but fair that so far as the terms of the constitution would allow it the same rights should be extended to the Roman Catholic minorities in the other provinces, if we did not in extending those rights, infringe upon the peculiar province of the local legislatures. Whether they had done that or not he could not say; but it seemed to him, from very careful reading of the Union Act, and the New Brunswick School Act that there was at least much room for doubt and the weaker party ought to have, as far as possible, the benefit of that doubt. Under these circumstances he had been led to give the vote he had given to-night, although in the last vote, if the Government had not agreed to accept the amendment that had been read by the hon. member for West Durham, and which he was about to offer, the vote might have very materially differed from what it actually was. Many on his side, would have preferred voting for the extreme measure of recommending a disallowance of the Act rather than deprive the minority in New Brunswick of all possible chance of redress for the wrong committed, but he had confidence in the deliverance of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, and if it should turn out that

there had been a mistake committed in dealing with this question by the present Administration the Judicial Committee would undoubtedly give such an opinion as would compel the Administration of this House to do justice in this particular. He did not propose to detain the House by discussing this subject as it had been very fully discussed in its legal aspect by the hon. member for West Durham, with whose opinion he fully concurred.

Now, Sir John Macdonald has given expression to his opinion—very strong expression. Speaking of the Roman Catholics in New Brunswick in 1872, he said :

The true course was to fight in the local legislature for separate schools. If they wanted them let them follow the example of the Catholics of Ontario. He believed they had a just cause, and it was for the interests of education if the Catholics wanted separate schools, to grant them. An important body like the New Brunswick Catholics could succeed if they struggled for their object like the Catholics elsewhere. If they obtained separate schools the Confederation Act would guarantee them in their possession.

Sir John Thompson had the same view of the constitution. In order to settle the question whether the Government had power to hear the appeal or not, he referred the matter to the courts. This course, which was also endorsed by this House, shows his opinion to be that Parliament should interfere—otherwise what sense would there be in putting the country to the expense of deciding whether Parliament had the right to interfere or not, unless he was of the opinion and decided to act on the opinion that it was the duty of Parliament to grant remedial legislation if the Privy Council should decide that we had the power.

The Privy Council, in their judgment, by the most unmistakable implication, say it is the duty of Parliament to grant remedial legislation :

Their lordships have decided that the Governor General in Council has jurisdiction, and that the appeal is well founded, but the particular course to be pursued must be determined by the authorities to whom it has been committed by the statute. It is not for this tribunal to intimate the precise steps to be taken. Their general character is sufficiently defined by the 3rd section of section 22 of the Manitoba Act.

It is certainly not essential that the statutes repealed by the Act of 1890 should be re-enacted, or that the precise provisions of these statutes should again be made law. The system of education embodied in the Acts of 1890 no doubt commends itself to, and adequately supplies the wants of the great majority of the inhabitants of the province. All legitimate grounds of complaint would be removed if that system were supplemented by provisions which would remove the grievance upon which the appeal is founded, and were modified so far as might be necessary to give effect to these provisions.

On the authority, therefore, of Canada's greatest statesmen of both political parties, and of the highest court for England's colonial Empire, this Parliament is bound to pass such a measure of remedial legislation as in our discretion under all the circum-

stances of the case will afford in a proper way an ample measure of relief. If this Parliament declines to interfere, we are ignoring, nay, practically eliminating from the constitution all the provisions relating to appeal which in good faith were incorporated therein, to stand to, abide by and perform which this Dominion, including Manitoba, is solemnly pledged as the basal law of our national life.

I feel, like gentlemen opposite, who gave strong expression to their views, that it is a matter that should be left, as far as possible, to the province of Manitoba. I always held that view: The reason why I favour Parliament taking up the question is that Manitoba will not do anything. She has announced her intention of not doing anything. Talk about scant courtesy. My hon. friend talks about animosity and about the terrible treatment that this Government has meted out to Manitoba. Gentlemen opposite use very strong terms. If the Government were thieves and traitors, they could hardly meet with more vituperation from hon. gentlemen. Let us look at the facts and see what the course of Manitoba has been. When the matter came up, the Roman Catholic bishops, to the number of thirty-one, laid a memorial before the Government of Canada, asking their interference in this matter and their good offices with the province of Manitoba. Now, this was before there was any trouble at all, and this Government set forth a full statement of facts in a message to the Manitoba government, the closing paragraph of which was as follows:—

The committee beg to observe to Your Excellency that the statements which are contained in this memorial are matter of deep concern and solicitude in the interests of the Dominion at large, and that it is a matter of the utmost importance to the people of Canada that the laws which prevail in any portion of the Dominion should not be such as to occasion complaint of oppression or injustice to any class or portion of the people, but should be recognized as establishing perfect freedom and equality, especially in all matters relating to religion and religious belief and practice; and the committee therefore humbly advise that Your Excellency may join with them in expressing the most earnest hope that the legislatures of Manitoba and of the North-west Territories respectively, may take into consideration at the earliest possible moment the complaints which are set forth in this petition, and which are said to create dissatisfaction among Roman Catholics, not only in Manitoba and the North-west Territories, but likewise throughout Canada, and may take speedy measures to give redress in all the matters in relation to which any well-founded complaint or grievance be ascertained to exist.

There was no coercion in that. That is one of the most polite missives that possibly could have been sent. And what did the government of Manitoba do? They took the stand they now take. They said: We repudiate any idea of injustice in our legislation; we will pay no attention to

your complaints ; we will stand or fall squarely by our legislation. After the first decision of the Privy Council, the Government undertook to hear this appeal. They invited Manitoba in the first place to argue the question whether the minority had a right to appeal. But the government of Manitoba treated the invitation with contempt, and would not even appear to argue the matter. What did the Government of Canada do? In order that there should be fair-play, at the expense of the people of Canada, they employed Mr. Christopher Robinson to argue the case on that province. The second judgment has decided that we had the power, under the provisions, of appeal in this particular case. The Government then decided to hear the appeal. It is complained, that the time allowed to Manitoba was short. Unfortunately, the time between the receipt of the judgment and the sitting of Parliament was very short indeed. But the Government gave them fair notice. The hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) appeared as their advocate. He was completely conversant with their case. He had argued the first appeal before the Privy Council. So that no wrong was done, not the slightest. These affidavits were submitted but they were not used, and so there was no need to rebut them. Fully instructed the hon. and learned gentleman went on and argued the case like any other counsel. After that what took place? After the order was passed last year, explanations were given on the floor of this House. Mr. Greenway and the members of his government must read the papers. They must have known, then, that the Government announced that they were not going to stand upon the letter of the Order in Council, that they intended to be moderate and did not intend to implement that order fully in a statute. They adopted the course of sending a conciliatory letter to the government of Manitoba. That letter was sent in July, 1895, and Mr. Greenway had July, August, September, October and November to answer it. He did not answer it but kept it back for the express purpose, in league, I have no doubt, with hon. gentlemen opposite, of submitting Manitoba's answer just on the eve of the sitting of Parliament, so that no negotiations could be carried on. They allowed all these months to go by, and four days before Parliament met, the document reached this Government in Ottawa. What was this for? They knew Parliament was convened, and the Remedial Bill was to be submitted to Parliament, and they only left the Dominion Government four days to act. Their whole policy was to embarrass this Government. Hon. gentlemen opposite may take what course they please in this matter ; but I would refer them to the course pursued by Sir John A. Macdonald, when in Opposition in 1875 ; I would refer them to the course

Mr. POWELL.

pursued by Mr. Mackenzie and Mr. Blake in Opposition to the Macdonald Government in 1872. These gentlemen on both sides took a noble and patriotic stand. They did not attempt to make any political capital out of the trying circumstances in which the Government was placed, in respect to the New Brunswick school difficulty, but with instincts true to the interests of the country, and true to the peace, safety and good government of the Dominion, they bent all their energies to assisting the Government of the day to carry out a policy which they thought would be in the best interests of Canada. Now, the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), who I see has this moment taken his seat, also belongs to the illustrious roll of gentlemen who are in favour of what they are pleased to call coercion. He is an eminent authority in its favour. Sir, if you will consult the confederation debates what will you find? I am not referring to the point made by the Minister of Finance, that the provinces of Ontario and Quebec were not consulted as to this great constitutional scheme, involved in confederation ; but I am calling attention to this fact, that when it was brought expressly by resolution before this House, and to the knowledge of the hon. member for South Oxford and his colleagues, that an attempt was being made to throttle—I have heard the word used on the other side—the province of Ontario in respect to educational matters, and to stereotype the rights and privileges of the minority there, so that thereafter there could be no change that would prejudicially affect them, the hon. gentleman was one of the men who voted for arbitrarily depriving the province of Ontario of its authority in that respect. By his vote he said to that province : You cannot manage your own business, we will prevent you from doing it. Now, Sir, I intend to vote for the second reading of the Bill. I think this matter has been dangled before Parliament and the country long enough. It is time some action was taken. As long as it remains were it is, the unrest that exists in this country—I am using, probably, too strong a term—will be prolonged. The Bill that is before the House, hon. gentlemen opposite complain, does not afford a full measure of relief. By that agreement that was entered into at the time of confederation between the provinces of Ontario, Manitoba and the Dominion of Canada, it was provided that the right previously existing should continue to exist, namely, that the different denominations should, at their own expense, maintain their own schools, and be under no liability to contribute to the support of other schools. Now, the relief which is given here amounts to this : In that province the school fund comes from three sources, from the province, from the municipality and from the district. The great bulk of the funds come from the district and from the municipality ; and

amounts of those two funds that are contributed by Roman Catholics, are to go back to them for the purpose of maintaining their schools, and to this extent it is fully on the lines of the agreement that was arrived at when Manitoba entered confederation. This Parliament has gone further and done what it has a right to do, it declares that the Roman Catholics are entitled to their share of the provincial funds devoted to education. The hon. gentleman from Queen's thinks the Bill should have commanded Manitoba to pay over the moneys. It is useless to attempt to lay down rules for the guidance of Manitoba in respect to grants of public money. They have power to frustrate any legislation of this Parliament in that respect. This Bill has not undertaken then to go further than to make a statutory declaration. This Bill is a splendidly conceived Bill. It gives the maximum of relief with the minimum of interference. There is not the slightest principle of coercion in it. It does not compel the majority of Manitoba to do a single thing with respect to the Roman Catholics; but it says to the Roman Catholics: If you want separate schools, you can take your own money and pay for them, and you may have your fair share of the provincial funds. The Bill provides for efficiency of the separate school and leaves the matter there. I shall have much pleasure in voting for the second reading of the Bill as a measure wise in design, conciliatory in purpose, well calculated to ensure the peace and harmony of the people of the most promising province of the Dominion.

Mr. FRASER. At this late hour I shall not detain the House very long; but I wish to make a few remarks on this question that has been engaging the attention of this legislature and of the people of Canada for the last two or three weeks. First, let me call the attention of the House to one very remarkable thing. When this question was first brought before the people of Canada, the friends of the Government said they were forced to do it in obedience to the constitution. That was the only ground. But if the position of the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Powell) is correct, we must do this because there was a bill of rights that was not included in the statute that binds us. Now, the Minister of Finance leaves every other ground aside and appeals to party loyalty. When he felt that he had no case, he turned and in his most pathetic tones, he implored his followers, on account of the party, to stand by the Government, even if they did not want to, for fear the great party should be destroyed. Those were the closing words that rang through this building as he implored and besought them to vote for the Bill on account of the party that for 18 years had directed the destinies of this country with such remarkable success. Although they might not see their way clear, they should

forego their conscientious convictions, and vote to support the party and swallow their convictions. Those are the two grounds they have now. Driven from every point that the Government attempted to take, they come down now to the fact that a bill of rights existed, and secondly, that the party must be sustained. Sir, I must say that there have been some amusing incidents in this debate, but of all the speeches we have heard, none was so amusing as the speech of the hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor). That hon. gentleman, if the papers reported him correctly, after having said that he would never support this Bill, vaulted last night in true acrobatic style. He first stood on his head, then stood on his feet, then he went through the high bar practice, and then through the low bar practice, and finally he fell on a cushion prepared for such men. He rose again, and then he waved his hand to the audience in order that he might obtain their approbation. He is ready to vote for this Bill in order that, when it gets into committee, he may take out of it everything except national schools, leaving nothing for the Catholics. He says he would have voted with the leader of the Opposition if that hon. gentleman had only asked for an investigation, or had done anything else except move the six months' hoist. This was a feat worthy of the hon. member for Leeds, and worthy of this Parliament. I could not help thinking, as I listened to him, to what straights, after all, party fealty will bring a man. I never saw such an exhibition in my life as I did from that hon. gentleman. He had made a statement outside that he would not support the Bill; in effect he said so in the House; but he has been assiduously worked upon by the Government since then, and now he finds that he must say something, and to save himself, he pretends that when the Bill gets into committee he will eliminate everything that savours of Catholicism in the schools, so that there shall be no religion at all in them. How he can square himself with his constituents is something that I will not undertake to answer. Now, coming to the main question, I wish to refer to some things said by the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Powell). It will be noticed that the whole argument of the hon. gentleman was confined to one point, that there had been bills of rights, No. 1, No. 2, and No. 3, and when confronted by the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin) with the fact that the minutes of the meetings authorizing these parties to conduct negotiations contained no word of such a document, what had the hon. gentleman to say? He said that the instructions must have been given beforehand, and the delegates were sent away in a hurry, evidently to do something which they were not authorized to do. If that is an argument, I hold, as has been shown by the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies), that it must

be eliminated from the discussion. What have we? If there be two, three or four bills of rights affecting this question, and there is such a difference of opinion existing respecting them, no stronger argument could be submitted in favour of investigation. Certainly there is no other method of ascertaining whether bills of rights No. 1, 2, 3, or 4 is the correct one. Has any one come to a conclusion in regard to them except the hon. member for Westmoreland? It is, however, in my opinion playing with the question to talk about bills of rights having anything to do with it.

The hon. member for Westmoreland began his speech by eulogizing the present leader of the House. As a young man he evidently wishes to ingratiate himself with that hon. gentleman. He then proceeded to deal with mummies, next he went to the house of the Pharaohs; he then proceeded to Barcelona; then he posed as an ecclesiastical authority and ended with a homily on juvenile education. All this was gravely gone over in this House when the only question before it is as to which of two measures is the better one to adopt to remove the difficulty. There has been more discussion on the real issue from the other side of the House than was necessary for transacting the whole business of Parliament. What is the issue? It is this: it being agreed that there is a grievance and that a remedy should be applied, which is the better method of rectifying the wrong? The hon. gentlemen opposite have spent more time in proceeding to sustain a truth that was admitted than was ever used by any individual in trying to support a paradox. Why discuss these immaterial matters when we are face to face with an important issue? How shall we meet it? The hon. member for Westmoreland spoke about three positions taken by the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Laurier). Speaking of the agreement if there was such an agreement why should it not have been put into a statute and made clear so that the public would be aware of it. If it is admitted that the Privy Council did not deal with it in the first judgment, why did they not deal with it in the second judgment, and let Parliament redress the wrong which prevails. They had the chance then. What did Lord Watson say? It was not that there was a bill of rights or an agreement under a statute, but he said that this Parliament may legislate in the matter if it pleases. It was the same court that gave decisions in both of the cases. The hon. member for Westmoreland referred to the language used by Mr. Blake in the New Brunswick case. Mr. Blake said "if the local government fail." That is what the Opposition say to-day. It is not a question as to whether or not this Parliament has authority. That is admitted. It is not a question whether or not in order to remedy an injustice action should be taken. That is admitted. The whole question, and it cannot be brought before the public too prominently

Mr. FRASER.

or too frequently is, as to which is the better method to carry out this matter. The hon. gentleman said that no doubt it should be left to be dealt with by Manitoba, but Manitoba would do nothing. Any one who has read the documents cannot say that Manitoba has not declared she would do nothing. It might be said that Manitoba might go further; that would be a legitimate argument, but to say that Manitoba will do nothing shows that the hon. gentleman either has not read the evidence or has given to it a wrong construction. This question of method is one possessing a good deal of importance. The method by which we do anything is important. The way you woo a maid is important. The lover may attempt to carry her off according to the style of the ancients, or he may appeal to her as young men do nowadays and gain her assent. Once on a time the King of England sent to the King of Scotland a message to this effect: I am going to send an army to take your daughter and marry her to the Prince of Wales, so as to join the two nations. A lord in parliament rose and said: I do not so much object to the match as to the mode of the wooing. The question of method in this question now under consideration is an important one. I will not enter into a discussion as to the steps taken or as to the documents which have passed between the governments, but evidence is coming to the front every day to strengthen the position of the Opposition. We have had two scenes in the play to-day. We have had the Finance Minister appealing to the noble sentiments of the Conservative party to stand by him in this ditch in which he is placed, and to stand by him whether the Government are right or wrong.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). Hear, hear.

Mr. FRASER. The hon. gentleman is always ready to support his party; he is always ready to support them first and last, whether they are right or wrong. Then another scene in the play was acted by the hon. member for Westmoreland, who urged that the question of the bill of rights was everything. I met a gentleman on the platform, the hon. ex-Minister of Justice, who stated that the Government were bound by the constitution and they could not avoid issuing the remedial order. But if the Government were bound to act, no credit rests with them for having acted. So it appears that the Government were simply acting as a machine to register what the Privy Council declared they should do. Now this position is abandoned. Reference has been made to changes which have taken place in the opinions of members on this side of the House; but hon. gentlemen opposite have also changed in opinion. When an hon. gentleman said that the action taken by this side of the House resembled the last throw of the gambler, he should have remembered that circumstances indicate that this ques-

tion has been taken up by hon. gentlemen opposite only for the purpose of gaining votes. There are Conservatives to-day who consider the action of the Government was a blunder, and the only answer which those who favour it can make is that they intended to have an election and gain the Roman Catholic vote.

But whether that be true or not, it is the evidence given by our Conservative friends themselves. Driven to the last ditch, disagreeing amongst themselves, kicking out one and taking in another, the head where the tail should be, and the tail where the head should be, they find that the country is not with them, and they attempt to snap a catch vote from the Catholics, by holding themselves up as martyrs for the Catholic religion. Great heavens, has it come to this? Has it come to pass that such men as are on the other side—no worse and no better than others of their kind—that Sir Adolphe Caron, and others such, are to be the only men who will stand up in Canada for the rights of the Catholics. Sir, I tell them, they are reckoning without their host. The Catholics of Canada are not the people to be caught with such chaff as that. Our Catholic citizens are as intelligent as our Protestant citizens, and these gentlemen do no great honour to the Catholics, when, as members of this House have boasted to me, they think that the action of the Government on this occasion, and the action of the Liberal party to the contrary, is not going to leave a corporal's guard of Liberals in the province of Quebec. They hope that this method will gain Quebec to them, and they expect by a double shuffle, to retain their friends in Ontario, by saying, that they had to pass this legislation to sustain the Conservative party. They use the same arguments in Ontario, as the woman caught in the crime did, when she said: it was not a big baby after all. Sir, if this were not a serious question it would be so farcical as to create shouts of laughter. The position of these gentlemen of the Government is such, that one cannot view them as having any regard at all for statesmanship. I venture to say, Mr. Speaker, that never in the history of our Parliament had we such an exhibition as was presented to-day, and I am sorry for it. It is bad enough when consent is obtained to publish correspondence, to suppress a portion of it, because the consent may imply authority to use such parts of the correspondence as suited; but, when a great question is agitating this country, concerning which only part of a public paper is published and a part left out, and, published without even the consent of the party sending it, then it goes to show the desperate straits which hon. gentlemen opposite are in. We know that the whole purpose of publishing that telegram was to attempt to strengthen the backs of hon. gentlemen opposite who are not inclined to vote with the Government in this matter. They did it in

order to say to those gentlemen: Vote for the second reading, sustain the party on the second reading of this Bill, and we can say afterwards that we brought Manitoba to her knees, and that it was a good thing, for we gained the end that we desired, namely, to get the question out of the way. I submit, Sir, that these are the last shifts of desperate men, who find themselves standing on unsheltered ground. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, this question is now brought before the House under compulsion. It should have been before the House last session, but it is brought before us now when there is some doubt as to whether there will be time enough to pass it. I verily believe, Sir, that there may be enough ingenuity on the other side of the House, to evade this spirit of Christian purpose on behalf of the minority, and to make it impossible to pass the Bill this session. Last year the hon. Mr. Angers left their Cabinet, because the Bill was not submitted to the House. Why was it not presented to us last year, when something might have been done in the meantime to bring about a reconciliation. Are nations to deal with one another as individuals might. Should it not be generous for the greater to take the first step towards conciliating the lesser. Manitoba is a new province. Perhaps they may not have the same views of what they ought to do, as the Dominion of Canada has. Surely the very fact that they may fall short if they do fall short, ought to be the very best argument why the Dominion of Canada should say: we will treat you in a different way from that in which we have treated you. Why did the Dominion not say, to Manitoba: You are wrong, let us reason out this matter together, and try and settle it. But, Sir, the Dominion Government have done the very reverse of that. Let there be no misunderstanding about this point. I speak here as a Protestant, and I say, that while there is a grievance, and when that grievance is well established, that grievance ought to be rectified. I say here to-night, lest there should be misunderstanding: that when Manitoba refuses to rectify that grievance, after the grievance has been established, I for one pledge myself, if I am here, and I pledge myself to-night even if I never come here again, that I will be the first to stand up and say, that a province that will not do the right when properly approached, shall be coerced into doing it. Why did not this Government take the same position. If they had done that, they would have been so powerful, that there would be scarcely a voice raised against them to-day. But, Sir, they have not taken such a course, and that is the reason that there is such division at the present time; division not between both parties, but division of opinion among hon. gentlemen opposite and among some hon. gentlemen on this side. I can very well understand how gentlemen taking strong views,

feel that these views ought to be presented in this House, and ought to colour the votes they give. I can understand why some hon. gentlemen are led that way, and led honestly, I have no doubt. But surely, a great nation like Canada, ought to deal with this question in a broad and generous spirit. Are we to treat national matters of this kind, as if we were dealing with a man who refuses to pay a little account. Should we not act in a more magnanimous spirit?

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to this legislation until such time as we have exhausted every means of arriving at a satisfactory conclusion with Manitoba. I am opposed to it on four grounds. First: I oppose the Bill for the reason that the Bill is not in the interest of the minority. Hon. gentlemen may say, that this Bill is in the interests of the minority. I claim, Sir, that it is not. The other night the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny) tried to sail north by south, attempting to be very strong in one way, but at the same time speaking strongly on the other. When he said that he wanted this matter for ever settled, did it strike him that the passing of this Act was the very thing that would never settle it. Sir, it can only be settled in one way, and that is, by getting the majority of the province of Manitoba, the neighbours of the minority with whom they live, to come to such an agreement as will make the settlement permanent. Is the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny) going to settle it in the way he proposes. Sir, there is going to be lawsuits after lawsuits before this Act, which is altogether unintelligible to any man is going to settle the question. In the meantime are not hard feelings likely to be kept in most active operation during all these years? What will be the disposition of our Catholic friends if the minority there, after years of contest over this Act, when it is declared, as I believe it will be declared, to be of no value or help to them. Driven from post to pillar, and finding that the act they had trusted a great government to pass—a government weeping for their woes and longing to help them—is no good, will not the feeling of those people be ten-fold worse than they are to-day, not only towards the Conservative party, but towards every party in Canada? Do you not suppose that this Act will be taken from court to court? The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny) wants peace; he wants this question settled. Does he think such a measure will bring peace or settle the question? He will not have peace until the question is sent to the court of last resort, the legislature of Manitoba, and settled there. He will never obtain a peace which is lasting except by going to the people of Manitoba; and when you appeal to the people of any province there is generosity enough in them, as there is in an individual, to do the right thing. Nothing worse could happen to the

Mr. FRASER.

minority than the passing of this Act. It will not gain them what they want; it will be barren of results. They will find themselves in this position; they will have to support their schools out of their own pockets without any aid whatever. They will find the Act so inoperative that they will feel that they came here and asked for bread and received a stone; and that feeling will so rankle in their breasts that they will give no peace—

Mr. KENNY. The hon. gentleman has referred to me. He manifests an anxiety to protect the minority. I would ask him, if the Bill is acceptable to the minority, why should we interpose?

Mr. FRASER. There is no evidence that it is acceptable to the minority. But even if it were, I would express my opinion as to whether it would gain the end.

Mr. KENNY. But you put your opinion against theirs.

Mr. FRASER. If the hon. gentleman is speaking for the whole body of the minority of Manitoba, I accept his statement. If he has been commissioned to say here that it is acceptable to the whole minority or the greater portion of them, I will accept his statement. But what proof have we that it is acceptable to the minority? Here is one of the clearest-headed men in the Government ranks, the hon. member for Bagot (Mr. Dupont), who declares that it is not acceptable to him. He has given notice of amendments which, if carried, would revolutionize this Bill. It is not acceptable to this gentleman who knows more about the race, the language and the religion of those people, a great deal, than the hon. member for Halifax; and if it is not acceptable to that hon. gentleman, who I believe conscientiously wants to help the minority, all I have to say is that the hon. member for Halifax had better keep silent instead of making himself the self-constituted champion of the minority of Manitoba. I might give other reasons to show that it is not acceptable to the minority. It may be acceptable to a minority who are hide-bound to the Government, who are ready to help the Government out of the strait they are in by everything and anything. It may be satisfactory to the hon. member for Halifax and to others like him. But to the well-wishers of Manitoba this Bill is not acceptable, I am sure. If time permitted, I could quote the opinion of some of the best papers representing the Catholics in Canada that it will not gain the end and will not be operative.

I am opposed to the Bill, in the second place, because it is not in the interest of the majority. Majorities have rights as well as minorities. I maintain that in a province where there is a majority and a minority, there is only one method by which they can be welded together, that is, by the good feeling that ought to exist between them. I

maintain that the majority ought to have the fullest possible opportunity of rectifying the wrong that is said to exist before being compelled by an Act of Parliament. Surely the majority have a right to come here and say: We are ready to rectify any wrong that exists and do the right thing by our neighbours who are living amongst us, and we ask you as a Government, before you undertake to bring compulsion upon us, to investigate this matter. Let it not be forgotten that the Government themselves, while pretending to throw off all responsibility for it, have sent a plenipotentiary to Winnipeg in this direction. I could not help thinking, as the hon. Secretary of State read the telegram of Mr. Greenway, how altogether independent of the action of the hon. member for Montreal West (Sir Donald Smith) the Government must have been, though they were ready to take advantage of it. Does any man think that that hon. member would go to Winnipeg without the concurrence of the Government? Was he going to imperil the interests of the majority or the interests of the minority in that province? He has great interests there himself; was he going to imperil them? Was he going to imperil the interests of the Government he supports? Does any man in his reason think that he would not know the exact ground on which he stood? Does any man believe that he did not go there with the tacit consent—nay, more—with the approbation of the Government? And if that commission was taken with the knowledge and approbation of the Government, by that one act they have given the greatest possible argument to prove that the position of the leader of the Opposition is correct. Were they simply playing a game and acting a part—allowing this man to go as a free lance, to see what he could do himself? As was very well said by the hon. member for South Oxford, the hon. member for Montreal West, finding the Government acting so strangely, might very well believe that he had more wisdom to settle this matter than they. I believe this was simply an attempt made by the Government to get out of the difficult position in which they have placed themselves.

I shall oppose this Bill, in the third place, because it is not in the interest of Manitoba. The minority have interests; the majority have interests; Manitoba as a whole has interests. That is a great province. The hon. member for Halifax said he wanted this Bill, a coercive Bill, passed, as if it was to be the nicest piece of taffy to send to Manitoba; and British gold would pour into that province as soon as it was coerced. A fine place for a man to settle in—a province up in arms against the Central Government. I say that the passing of this Act is going to be the worst thing that could happen to Manitoba, because it will put that province into such a state of ferment that men will not want to go there. Men want to go where they will have peaceful surroundings and live on pleasant relations with their neigh-

bours. Would any man in his senses go to Cuba to-day? No. You want peace and quietness in Manitoba. You want every man to believe that when he goes there he is going to a province where he will not only have the fruit of his labour, but where he will be surrounded by such conditions and such influences as will enable him to labour in peace. I oppose the Bill in the interest of that bright young country, which, perhaps, being new, may not have the same quiet habits and disposition, may not receive an affront with the same equanimity which an older province would display, for there is such a thing as youth not listening as calmly as age—a man of years will listen to an insult which a young man will be quick to resent, and I know that the brightest young men of Canada who have gone to Manitoba are not as well calculated perhaps as older provinces like Quebec or Ontario, or even the lower provinces, to listen to and accept what may be done or said by this Parliament. I think the passage of this Act will have results exactly the reverse of what the hon. member for Halifax thinks it will. Just now we want to do something for that country. In Winnipeg, a few days ago, there was a large gathering of farmers who passed resolutions condemning the Government policy, so far as immigration was concerned, and, as I understand it, the Government themselves have almost admitted that their policy has failed. Are you to add to disappointment of these people and their feeling of rancour on this subject, the more intense agitation which is bound to develop if the course contemplated by the Government under this Bill is persisted in? Will not the hon. member for Halifax take the lesson to his heart that however kindly his disposition may be, however plausible and fascinating may be his speech, this Act, if put in force, is likely to work most mischievously in that province, particularly as regards the minority whose cause the hon. gentleman seeks to defend. Manitoba will resist, and while we may regret that the issue was raised, we cannot help thinking that after all Manitoba will have some right in doing so.

I oppose the Bill, lastly, because it is opposed to the best interests of the people of Canada as a whole. We hear a good deal from time to time about building up a young nation, and about nationality, race and religion. Does not the course of the Government indicate that a dangerous time has come? Does not the fact that we find Protestants, on the one side, saying things they should not, and our Catholic friends on the other side giving utterance to sentiments they should not, indicate that we have reached a serious condition of things which ought to make the Government pause and consider. Are they going to persist, before they have exhausted the methods to which they should have resorted and which true statesmanship would have suggested to them, are they going to persist in a course

which must result in intensifying the disposition of the people of Canada—a disposition for which I offer no apology whatever, because I regret that it exists—to excite province against province, race against race and religion against religion. In the interests of Canada, in the interests of all that is best and fairest in Canada, I would plead with this House that we should take some other method of settling this wrong. Wrong if it exists, let us meet it in a higher and better way. Do you think that the fact that on every hustings we shall have this question discussed, that we shall have men violently contradicting each other on a question that touches the very deepest fibre of their being, is going to promote a reasonable and proper consideration by the people of the proper issues which alone ought to come before the electorate? I have no doubt that the Government courts that kind of thing. I have no doubt that they court it now, as they have courted it at other elections, in order to conceal the real issues from the people. I should ask the Government earnestly to consider that if Canada is ever going to become a nation, it will never become a nation by coercion. The history of the world proves that. Coercion has been attempted in every land under the sun, and everywhere it has signally failed. When England attempted to coerce Scotland either by forcing her to become a part of the union or imposing a religion upon her, she failed. When England was for centuries attempting to coerce Ireland, she failed. If she had approached that generous nation in the spirit apparently exercised by the hon. member for Halifax, if she had gone to that nation with kindly words and acts, do you think that we should have had the revolutions in that country we have had? Do you think that we should have had sore hearts and bitter words in that noble nationality, wherever they are, against the wrongs inflicted on them by a coercion similar to that which the hon. member for Halifax now boasts he is going to inflict on Manitoba? You can never do anything by coercion. The quicker new nations learn that lesson from the history of the world the quicker they shall attain their full growth and earn the respect of all that is best in the history of civilization. I am reminded of that period in the history of Nova Scotia when feelings ran high, and my hon. friend from Inverness (Mr. Cameron) will remember that period too, for he was then an ardent anti-confederate. He will remember when the local legislature of Nova Scotia, with the concurrence of the Dominion members then supporting the anti-Conservative party, passed repeal resolutions and set the heather on fire. He can remember very well the spirit that was then excited in that province, and I would recall the memorable occasion when this chamber heard for the last time the words of the greatest Irishman Canada ever produced. Were those words for coercion, although rebellious resolutions

had been passed in Nova Scotia? No, Thomas D'Arcy McGee's last words in this chamber were impregnated by the spirit of kindness. They breathed the most kindly spirit of conciliation, he urged that the last feeling of irritation that existed in the minds of the people of Nova Scotia should be removed by generosity and forbearance on our part; and he went out from this building after delivering that speech, only to lose his valuable life at the hands of an assassin. Shall we be less willing than were the men of that day to put in practice the noble principles to which he gave utterance? Now, after twenty-eight years in the history of Canada, are we going to attempt to coerce this young province of Manitoba? Are we going to approach it with the bludgeon in our hand? If we do, we will find that what they would be willing to grant, if properly approached, they will refuse to grant at the mouth of the pistol. I think that we ought to redress this wrong by the method proposed by the hon. leader of the Opposition. Whatever that wrong may be, we should, when we have discovered it, redress it by the method he proposed. Surely if anything gives hope to Canada, it is the fact that the leader of a great party, himself more interested in this question on account of race and religion, than the majority in this House, should stand up in this House and proclaim to the free men of Canada principles which I believe will find acceptance in the heart of every one who rightly values his own liberty and desires that Canada should increase and prosper. I say that for those reasons and others, which I might give if the hour were not so late, I shall vote against this Bill. I shall vote in favour of having an investigation and approaching Manitoba in a spirit of conciliation and peace. And I believe, if we approach Manitoba in that spirit, we will have a response that will settle this question upon such terms as may not only do the minority justice, but weld them to the people of Canada and show by an object-lesson to both Catholics and Protestants that the higher is the better law. I hope that we shall not again be troubled with questions which affect men so deeply, and which, when used as the Government use them solely for the purpose of gaining votes, can only have one result, and that is not the betterment of Canada but rather its destruction.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 84) further to amend the Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act—(from the Senate).—(Mr. Dickey.)

Mr. DICKEY moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 1.30 a.m. (Saturday).

INDEX

SIXTH SESSION—SEVENTH PARLIAMENT, 1896.

Abbreviations of well known words and Parliamentary expressions are used in the following:—1^o, 2^o, 3^o, First Reading, Second Reading, Third Reading; 3 m. h., 6 m. h., 6 w. h., Three Months' Hoist, Six Months' Hoist, Six Weeks' Hoist; *, without remark or debate; Acts., Accounts; Adj., Adjourn; Adjd., Adjourned; Amt., Amendment; Amts., Amendments; Analg., Amalgamation; Ans., Answer; Ass., Assurance; B., Bill; B.C., British Columbia; Can., Canada or Canadian; C.P.R., Canadian Pacific Railway; Com., Committee; Co., Company; Conc., Concur, Concurred, Concurrence; Consd., Consider; Consdn., Consideration; Cor., Correspondence; Deb., Debate; Dept., Department; Depts., Departments; Div., Division; Dom., Dominion; Govt., Government; His Ex., His Excellency the Governor General; Hse., House; H. of C., House of Commons; Incorp., Incorporation; Ins., Insurance; I.C.R., Inter-colonial Railway; Man., Manitoba; Mess., Message; M., Motion; m., moved; Neg., Negatived; N.B., New Brunswick; N.W.T., North-west Territories; N.S., Nova Scotia; O.C., Order in Council; Ont., Ontario; P.E.I., Prince Edward Island; P.O., Post Office; Par., Paragraph; Prop., Proposed; Q., Quebec; Ques., Question; Recom., Recommit; Ref., Refer, Referred, Reference; Rep., Report, Reported; Reps., Reports; Res., Resolution; Ret., Return; Ry., Railway; Rys., Railways; Sel., Select; Sen., Senate; Sp., Special; Stmt., Statement; Sup., Supply; Suppl., Supplement, Supplementary; Wthdn., Withdrawn; Wthdrl., Withdrawal; Y.N., Yeas and Nays; Names in *Italic* and parenthesis are those of the mover.

Allan, Mr. H. W., *South Essex.*

Sessional Employees, non-payment, on M. to adjn. Hse. (remarks) 4906 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Fisheries (Licenses to U. S. Vessels) 7103 (ii).

Amyot, Mr. C., *Bellechasse.*

Algoma Election (1891) Returning Officer's Ret. (Ques.) 2179 (i).

Hudson's Bay Canal and Nav. Co.'s incorp. (B. 52) 1^o*, 1182 (i).

Remedial Act (Man.) B. 58 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) 6 m. h. to M. for 2^o, 2854 (i).

Scrip for Scouts during N. W. Rebellion, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 3640 (ii).

Angers, Mr. C. A., *Charlevoix.*

La Malbaie, St. Urbain and St. Alexis Mail Contract (Ques.) 2340 (i).

Remedial Act (Man.) B. 58 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) 6 m. h. to M. for 2^o, 4027 (ii).

— in Com., 5314, 6010 (ii).

Simard, Arthur, Lighthouse-keeper, Dismissal (Ques.) 4380 (ii).

Bain, Mr. T., *Norfolk Wentworth.*

Budget, on The, 1919 (i).

Butter Exports and Imports, Quantity and Value (Ques.) 4380 (ii).

Cold Storage, Govt. Expenditure on Butter and Cheese (Ques.) 1619 (i).

Labour on Public Works, Govt. Liability, B. 4 (Mr. *McLennan*) on M. for 2^o, 865 (i).

Militia, Efficiency of Infantry (Ques.) 4556 (ii).

Remedial Act (Man.) B. 58 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) in Com., 5321, 5467, 5630 (ii).

Saturday Sittings, on Amt. (Mr. *O'Brien*) 5181.

Baird, Mr. G. F., *Queen's, N.B.*

Chignecto Marine Transport Ry. Co.'s B. 75 (Mr. *Powell*) on M. for 2^o, 3073 (i).

St. John, (N.B.) Winter Port, Ocean SS. Contract on M. for copy, 2715 (i).

Barnard, Mr. F. S., *Cariboo.*

B. C. Southern Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, on M. for O. C., 3664 (ii).

Beausoleil Mr. C., *Berthier.*

Remedial Act (Man.) B. 58 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) 6 m. h. to M. for 2^o 2952 (i).

Bechard, Mr. F., Iberville.

- Ry. Act, further Amt. (B. 80) 1^o*, 3046 (i).
 Remedial Act (Man.) B. 58 (Sir Charles Tupper)
 on Amt. (Mr. Laurier) 6 m. h. to M. for 2^o,
 4196 (ii).
 Salaries of Public Employees, Assignment, &c.
 (B. 57) 1^o*, 1511 (i).

Belley, Mr. L. de G., Chicoutimi and Saguenay.

- Remedial Act (Man.) B. 58 (Sir Charles Tupper)
 on Amt. (Mr. Laurier) 6 m. h. to M. for 2^o,
 4015 (ii).
 ——— in Com., 5947, 5882, 5908, 5967 (ii).

Bennett, Mr. W. H., East Simcoe.

- Budget, on The, 2045 (i).
 Quarantine Regulations, Can. and U.S. (Ques.)
 638 (i).
 Remedial Act (Man.) B. 58 (Sir Charles Tupper)
 in Com., 5657, 5936, 6071 (ii).
 Toronto, Hamilton and Niagara Falls Ry. Co.'s
 incorp. (B. 61) 1^o*, 1775 (i).
 Voters' Lists B. 87 (Mr. Dickey) in Com., 6616 (ii).

Bergeron, Mr. J. G. H., Beauharnois.

- Baie des Chaleurs Ry. (Ques.) 636 (i).
 Debates, Official Rep., Inaccuracy in unrevised
 Ed. (remarks) 5208 (ii).
 Gaspé Basin and Grand Greve Mail Service
 (Ques.) 639 (i).
 Govt. Engineers' Surveys on probable Canals
 (remarks) 3471 (ii).
 Grand Trunk Ry. and St. Lawrence and Adiron-
 dack Ry. Co.'s (B. 37) 1^o*, 958 (i).
 International Exhibition, proposed (remarks)
 6876 (ii).
 Montreal and Ottawa Ry. Co.'s (B. 38) 1^o*, 958 (i).
 Paspebiac Piers and Breakwaters (Ques.) 636 (i).
 ——— Winter Port (Ques.) 639 (i).
 Privilege (Ques. of) Article in Montreal Star
 (remarks) 6113 (ii).
 Ste. Anne des Monts Mail Service (Ques.) 639 (i).
 St. Lawrence and Adirondack Ry. Co.'s (B. 39)
 1^o*, 958 (i).
 Shortis, Valentine, commutation of Death Sent-
 ence (M. for Ret.) 827 (i).
 ——— on Prerogation (remarks) 7171 (ii).
 South-western Ry. Co. and St. Lawrence and
 Adirondack Ry. Co.'s (B. 50) 1^o*, 1088 (i).
 SUPPLY :
 Canals—Income (Beauharnois) conc., 7149 (ii).

Bergin, Mr. D., Cornwall and Stormont.

- Remedial Act (Man.) B. 58 (Sir Charles Tupper)
 in Com. (Ques. of Order) 5661 (ii).

Borden, Mr. F. W., King's, N.S.

- Adams, E., Charges against T. Donnelly (M. for
 copies*) 4596 (ii).
 Address, on The, 276 (i).
 Atlantic (Fast) SS. Service (remarks) 3272 (i).
 Budget, on The, 1423 (i).

Borden, Mr. F. W.—Continued.

- Can. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Claims for increased Mail
 Matter (M. for Cor.*) 3167 (i).
 Murray, Lt.-Col., Charges against, on M. for
 Com. of Sup., 7007 (ii).
 Personal Explanation, Ministers during Mr.
 Mackenzie's regime, on M. for Com. of Sup.,
 7043 (ii).
 Pork, Salt, Imports and Duty collected (Ques.)
 2179 (i).
 Remedial Act. (Man.) B. 58 (Sir Charles Tupper)
 on Amt. (Mr. McCarthy) to M. for Com., 4480.
 ——— in Com., 5537, 5913, 6219, 6418 (ii).
 St. John (N.B.) Winter Port, Ocean SS. Contract,
 on M. for copy, 2706 (i).
 Saturday Sittings, on Amt. (Mr. Ouimet) 5159 (ii).
 SUPPLY :
 Collection of Revenues (Post Office) 7138 (ii).
 Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (St. John and
 Digby) 7099 (ii).
 Public Works—Income : Harbours and Rivers
 (Mar. Provs.) 7095 (ii).

Boston, Mr. R., South Middlesex.

- Remedial Act (Man.) B. 58 (Sir Charles Tupper)
 in Com., 6215 (ii).
 Volunteers, 1837-38, Money or Land Grants
 (Ques.) 1025 (i).

Bowers, Mr. E. C., Digby.

- Bounty (Fishery) Frauds in N.S. and N.B. (M.
 for Cor.) 1051 (i).
 Brier Island Fog Alarm Building, Replacing
 (Ques.) 6816 (ii).
 Fishing Bounty Cheques Issued in Digby (Ques.)
 644 (i).
 Lobster Fishery Regulations (Ques.) 822 (i).
 Postal Delivery System, Names of Cities, &c.
 (Ques.) 1625 (i).
 SUPPLY :
 Collection of Revenues (Post Offices) 7138 (ii).
 Public Works—Income : Buildings (N.B.) 7069 (ii).
 Weaver Settlement (N.S.) Postmaster's Salary
 (Ques.) 2002 (i).

Bowman, Mr. I. E., North Waterloo.

- Remedial Act (Man.) B. 58 (Sir Charles Tupper)
 in Com., 5767 (ii).

Boyd, Mr. N., Marquette.

- Hudson's Bay Canal and Nav. Co.'s (B. 52) M.
 for Com., 4788 (ii).
 Winnipeg and Great Northern Ry. Co.'s (B. 32)
 1^o*, 958 (i).

Boyle, Mr. A., Monck.

- Detective Corporations and Mercantile Agencies
 B. 11 (Mr. Sproule) on M. for 2^o, 4621 (ii).
 Masson, Mr. ex-M.P., Appnmt. as Judge (re-
 marks) 6975 (ii).
 Ont. Peat Fuel and Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 62) 1^o*,
 1775 ; 2^o m., 2370 (i).
 Ry. Act Amt. (B. 77) 1^o*, 2987 (i).

Boyle, Mr. A.—Continued.

SUPPLY :

Collection of Revenues (Electric Light Inspection)
7133 (ii).

Brodeur, Mr. L. P., Rouville.

Debates, Official Rep., Inaccuracy in unrevised
Ed. (remarks) 5207 (ii).

Govt. Business, precedence on Thursdays, on
prop. M. (Mr. Foster) 1164 (i).

Montreal Centre Election, Returning Officers,
&c., Accounts (Ques.) 3101 (i).

Remedial Act (Man.) B. 58 (Sir Charles Tupper)
in Com., 5044, 5232, 5552 (ii).

Shortis, Valentine, commutation of Death Sen-
tence, on Amt. to M. for Ret., 847 (i).

SUPPLY :

Militia (Arms and Ammunition) 7060 (ii).

Brown, Mr. J. P., Chateauguay.

B. C. Penitentiary, Management, &c., Justice
Drake's Investigation (Ques.) 6117 (ii).

Bruneau, Mr. A. A., Richelieu.

Beliveau, Joseph, Indemnity for Injuries (M. for
Ret.) 5077 (ii).

Catellier, L. A., Superannuation (Ques.) 4379 (ii).
Charland, H. C., Sorel, Payment to (M. for
Stunt. *) 3107 (i).

Gaspé Harbour Improvements (Ques.) 4378 (ii).

Quebec Observatory, Mr. Smith's Quarters
(Ques.) 3101 (i).

Remedial Act (Man.) B. 58 (Sir Charles Tupper)
on Amt. (Mr. Laurier) 6 m. h. to M. for 2°,
3976 (ii).

— Govt. support to proposed Amts. (Ques.)
3631 (ii).

St. Rochs de Richelieu Mail Contract (Ques.)
1446 (i).

Sorel Illicit Whisky Stills, Prosecutions (Ques.)
1677 (i).

Superannuations in Dept. of Agriculture (Ques.)
1861 (i).

SUPPLY :

Militia (Arms and Ammunition) 7066 (ii).

Public Works—Capital: Harbours and Rivers
(Ques.) 7086 (ii).

Voters' Lists, Richelieu County, Total Cost
(Ques.) 1621 (i).

Yamaska River Bridge (M. for Ret.) 4589; deb.
resmd., 5059 (ii).

Burnham, Mr. J., East Peterborough.

Peterborough Postmaster, Reduction of Salary
(M. for Ret.) 5081 (ii).

Cameron, Mr. H., Inverness.

Budget, on The, 1845 (i).

Cape Breton Election, Expenditure of Money
(remarks) 1646 (i).

Cape Breton Ry., Hard-pan Contract (Ques.)
637 (i).

—Rock, &c., Excavated (Ques.) 1862, 3100 (i).

—Sims & Slater Contract (Ques.) 2004 (i).

Cameron, Mr. H.—Continued.

Mabou Breakwater at Coal Mines, Payment for
Labour (Ques.) 2174 (i).

Remedial Act (Man.) B. 58 (Sir Charles Tupper)
in Com., 4993, 5896, 6006 (ii).

Senate and House of Commons Act Amt. B. 7
(Mr. Mulock) in Com. (Ry. Passes) 904 (i).

Cameron, Mr. M. C., South Huron.

Combinations in Restraint of Trade B. 12 (Mr.
Sproule) on M. for 2°, 4654 (ii).

Goderich Harbour, Repts. re Piers and Break-
water (Ques.) 2340 (i).

Poupore, W. J., Contracts with Govt. (Ques.)
2175 (i).

Rapide Plat and Soulanges Canals, Mr. Poupore's
Contracts, Assignment (Ques.) 6505 (ii).

Remedial Act (Man.) B. 58 (Sir Charles Tupper)
in Com., 5668 (ii).

Return Fare Ry. Tickets B. 6 (Mr. McLennan)
on M. for 2°, 2372 (i).

Tay Canal, Claims for Land Damages (Ques.)
2177 (i).

Voters' Lists B. 87 (Mr. Dickey) in Com., 6609 (ii).

Campbell, Mr., A., Kent, Ont.

Budget, on The, 2447 (i).

Detective Corporations and Mercantile Agencies
B. 11 (Mr. Sproule) on M. for 2°, 2402 (i), 4615.

Drainage on Ry. Co.'s Properties B. 3 (Mr. Casey)
on M. for 2°, 626 (i).

Dredging at River Thames, Expenditure (M. for
Ret.) 5084 (ii).

Fishery Overseer, County of Kent, Licenses
Issued (Ques.) 1615 (i).

— River Thames District (Ques.) 1445 (i).

Flour and Wheat, Imports for Consumption
(Ques.) 2651 (i).

Gas Contract, Govt. Buildings, Ottawa (Ques.)
3105 (i).

Grain Imports from Buffalo, Remission of
Duties (Ques.) 1866 (i).

Interest B. 8 (Mr. Mulock) on M. for 2°, 241 (i).

Masson, Mr., ex-M.P., Appnt. as Judge (Re-
marks) 6976 (ii).

Man. and Nelson Valley Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 65
(Mr. Davis) in Com., 5096, 6637, 6809 (ii).

Queen vs. Larkin, Connolly & Co., Sale of Plant
&c. (Ques.) 3635 (ii).

Remedial Act (Man.) B. 58 (Sir Charles Tupper)
in Com., 5458, 5676, 5859, 6018 (ii).

Soulanges Canal, Mr. Goodwin's Contracts, on
M. for Com. of Sup., 6831 (ii).

SUPPLY : on M. (Mr. Foster) for Com., 800 (i).

Canals—Income (Beauharnois) conc., 7149 (ii).

Public Works—Income: Buildings (N.B.) 7145.
Dredging, 7097 (ii).

Cargill, Mr. H., East Bruce.

Remedial Act (Man.) B. 58 (Sir Charles Tupper)
in Com., 5817 (ii).

Carling, Hon. Sir J., K.C.M.G., London.

Huron and Erie Loan and Savings Co.'s (B. 49)
1st, 1088 (i).

Caron, Hon. Sir A., K.C.M.G., Rimouski.

Adjournments (Ms.) 6, 31, 62, 1859 (i).

Anonymous Letters *re* Ministerial Resignations,
on personal explanation (Mr. Wallace) 23;
(remarks) 67 (i).

Arthabaskaville and St. Paul de Chester Mail
Contractor, Complaints, &c. (Ans.) 5036 (ii).

Batiscan Postmaster and Lighthouse-keeper (Ans.)
1447 (i).

Battleford and Saskatoon Mail Contract, on M.
for Com. of Sup., 7004 (ii).

Beer License in Neepawa (Man.) on M. for Cor.,
1078 (i).

Carmunrock Postmaster, Appnmt., &c. (Ans.)
5051 (ii).

Christmas Island, &c., Contracts for Mail Ser-
vice (Ans.) 2410 (i).

Controllers as Privy Councillors, on M. for O.C.,
&c., 1070 (i).

Detective Corporations and Mercantile Agencies
B. 11 (Mr. Sproule) on M. for 2^d, 2407 (i).

Dom. Reformatory, Disbursements (Ans.) 2653. (i).

Experimental Farm, Ottawa, Expenditure, on M.
for Stmt., 1087 (i).

Fergus Mail Service Contract (Ans.) 4555 (ii).

Gaspé Basin and Grand Greve Mail Service
(Ans.) 639 (i).

Govt. Business, on M. to adjn. (remarks) 29,
1087 (i).

— precedence on Thursdays, on prop. M.
(Mr. Foster) 1164 (i).

Grande Greve Postmaster, Resignation (Ans.)
1625 (i).

High Commissioner's Duties in London, on M.
for Ret., 704 (i).

Keswick and Roach's Point Mail Contract (Ans.)
6120, 6505 (ii).

Kildare Station (P.E.I.) Postmastership (Ans.)
635 (i).

La Malbaie, St. Urbain and St. Alexis Mail
Contract (Ans.) 2340 (i).

Letter Postage, Reduction (Ans.) 4556 (ii).

Linkletter Road P. O., Establishment (Ans.)
1446 (i).

— on M. for Ret., 2368 (i).

Magdalen Islands Mail Service (Ans.) 1865 (i).

Military College, Board of Visitors' Rep. (pre-
sented) 4558 (ii).

Militia, Efficiency of Infantry (Ans.) 4556 (ii).

Ministerial Resignations since Opening of Parlt.
(Stmnt.) 6 (i).

— (further Stmnt.) 13 (ii).

— Reorganization of Cabinet, adjnmt of Hse.
(M.) 31 (i).

— (remarks) 34, 38, 62 (i).

— Cabinet as reconstructed (Stmnt.) 69 (i).

Caron, Hon. Sir A.—Continued.

Newspapers, Free Transport by Mail (Ans.)
2178 (i).

Padlocks for Mail Bags, Purchase (Ans.) 1027 (i).

Personal Explanation, Par. in Toronto *Globe re*

Verchères Election, 1347 (i).

Peterborough Postmaster, Reduction of Salary,
on M. for Ret., 5083 (i).

Pictou and Madalen Islands bi-weekly Mail
(Ans.) 1866 (i).

Postage on Newspapers, Free Transmission (Ans.)
2005, 2012 (i).

Postal Delivery System, Names of Cities, &c.
(Ans.) 1625 (i).

Postmaster at Sudbury, Resignation (Ans.) 4556

Post Office (Branch) Crown St., Que. (Ans.) 5347

Princess Louise Dragoons (N.B.) and Soudan
Expedition (remarks) 5058 (ii).

Remedial Act (Man.) B. 58 (Sir Charles Tupper)
on Amt. (Mr. Laurier) 6 m. h. to M. for 2^d,

2814 (i).

— in Com., 5560, 5908 (ii).

Rifle Ranges, Montreal, Repairs, &c. (Ans.)
4556 (ii).

Roach's Point and Keswick Mail Contract (Ans.)
5051 (ii).

Ste. Anne des Monts Mail Service (Ans.) 639 (i).

St. Roches de Richelieu Mail Contract (Ans.)
1446 (i).

School Ordinance (N.W.T.) Premier's Remarks
(Ans.) 819 (i).

Souris Breakwater, Tender and Contract (Ans.)
2650 (i).

Standing Committees (Sel.) Names added (M.)
2006, 2172 (i).

SUPPLY:

Civil Government (Post Office) 7032 (ii).

Collection of Revenues (Post Office) 7133 (ii).

Public Works—Income: Repairs, Furniture, &c.,
(Ottawa, &c.) 7095 (ii).

Tignish Post Office, Revenue (Ans.) 1865 (i).

Victoria (B.C.) Post Office, Contracts and Sureties
(Ans.) 2652 (i).

Volunteers for Soudan Expedition (Ans.) 4786 (ii).

Weaver Settlement (N.S.) Postmaster's Salary
(Ans.) 2003 (i).

Carroll, Mr. H. G., Kamouraska.

Remedial Act (Man.) B. 58 (Sir Charles Tupper)
on Amt. (Mr. Laurier) 6 m. h. to M. for 2^d,
3193 (i).

Superannuations in Dept. of Agriculture (Ques.)
1861 (i).

Voters' Lists, Richelieu County, Total Cost
(Ques.) 1621 (i).

**Cartwright, Hon. Sir R., K.C.M.G., South
Oxford.**

Address, on The, 182 (i).

— (Personal Explanation) 239 (i).

Cartwright, Hon. Sir R.—Continued.

- Adulteration of Food, Drugs, &c. (Honey) Act Amt. B. 10 (Mr. *Sproule*) in Com., 1017; on M. for 3^d, 1659 (i).
- Animals Contagious Diseases Act Amt. B. 95 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 6823 (ii).
- Auditor General's Rep. (remarks) 604 (i).
- B.C. Southern Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, on M. for O.C., 3663 (ii).
- Behring Sea Claims Convention B. 100 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 6819 (ii).
- British American Coal and Transportation Co.'s incorp. B. 76 (Mr. *Powell*) in Com., 6812 (ii).
- British Connection and Imperial Defence, on prop. Res. (Mr. *McNeill*) 1195 (i).
- Budget, The (reply) 1001, 1255 (i).
- Cabinet Reorganization (Ques.) 821 (i).
- Can. Credit, on M. for Com. of Sup., 7043 (ii).
- Cape Breton Election, Expenditure of Money (remarks) 1524 (i).
- Cattle (American) Transit through Can. (remarks) 717 (i).
- on M. for O.C., 753 (i).
- Cattle (Can.) in England, on Amt. (Mr. *Mulock*) to prop. Res. (Mr. *Foster*) 4738 (ii).
- Cheese (Govt.) in Store (Ques.) 1025 (i).
- Consolid. Fund, Receipts and Expenditures (M. for Ret. ^s) 1087 (i).
- Customs Tariff (1894) Act Amt. B. 23 (Mr. *McMullen*) on M. for 2^d, 4683 (ii).
- Dairy Products Act (1893) Amt. B. 67 (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for 1st, 1997 (i).
- Debt of Dominion, Ret. *re* (Ques.) 3816 (ii).
- Defence of Dom., Order for Com. on prop. Res. (objection) 6826 (ii).
- in Com. on Res., 6903, 6939 (ii).
- Election Literature, Distribution by Govt. (remarks) 6769 (ii).
- Estimates, Suppl., 1895-96 (Ques.) 2988 (i), 3815, 4654, 4697, 5207, 5343 (ii).
- Good Friday, Sitting of Hse. (remarks) 4917 (ii).
- Govt. Business (remarks) 1017 (i).
- precedence on Thursdays, on prop. M. (Mr. *Foster*) 1124, 1134 (i).
- Mondays, on prop. M. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 4254 (ii).
- Mondays, on Amt. (Mr. *Choquette*) 4269 (ii).
- Hamilton, Lt.-Col., Investigation *re*, on M. for Com. of Sup., 7022 (ii).
- Imperial Life Ins. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *Coatsworth*) on M. for 2^d, 2129 (i).
- Man. Schools, Mr. Greenway's Telegram (remarks) 3469 (ii).
- Masson, Mr., ex-M.P., Appmnt. as Judge (remarks) 6959 (ii).
- Members' Indemnity and Accountant (remarks) 7110 (ii).
- Militia Grievances, Col. Hamilton, Military College, &c., on M. (Mr. *Mulock*) to adjn. Hse., 6722 (ii).

Cartwright, Hon. Sir R.—Continued.

- Ministerial Resignations, on M. (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) to adjn. Hse., 10 (i).
- Cabinet as reconstructed, on M. (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) to adjn. Hse., 75 (i).
- Montreal Harbour Commissioners Loan, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Foster*) 4254; in Com. on Res., 6827.
- Montreal Turnpike Trust Debentures B. 107 (Mr. *Foster*) prop. Res., 2229 (i); in Com. on Res., 6626, 6639 (ii).
- N.W.T. Representation Act Amt. B. 22 (Mr. *Martin*) on M. for 1st, 558 (i).
- Ocean SS. Service (France and Belgium) in Com. on Res., 6658 (ii).
- Ocean SS. Subsidies Act Amt. B. 106 (Mr. *Ives*) in Com. on Res., 6982, 7113 (ii).
- Parliament, Duration of (Ques.) 3470 (i).
- Privilege (Ques. of) communicating O.C. to Newspapers (remarks) 825 (i).
- Public Accounts Com., Meetings (remarks) 1551, 1678 (i).
- Remedial Act (Man.) B. 58 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) 6 m. h. to M. for 2^d, 3274.
- Vote (remarks) 3668 (ii).
- on M. for Com., 4338 (ii).
- on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to M. for Com., adjnmt. of deb. (M.) 5373 (ii).
- on M. (Mr. *McNeill*) that Com. rise, 4931, 4943 (ii).
- Long Sittings (remarks) 5481 (ii).
- in Com., 5208, 5224, 5234, 5390, 5526, 5709, 5891, 5992, 6053, 6077, 6319, 6379, 6416 (ii).
- Saturday Sittings, on Amt. (Mr. *Ouimet*) 5132 (ii).
- Senate and House of Commons Act Amt. B. 7 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com. (Ry. Passes) 895 (i).
- Sessional Employees, non-payment, on M. to adjn. Hse., 4915 (ii).
- Smith, Sir Donald, Visit to Winnipeg, adjnmt. of Hse. (M.) 4274 (ii).
- Soulanges Canal, Mr. Goodwin's Contracts, on M. for Com. of Sup., 6591, 7016, 7115 (ii).
- Subsidies (Unpaid) granted to Rys., &c. (M. for Ret. ^s) 3108 (i).
- Supreme Court Reps., Delay in Publication (Ques.) 637 (i).
- SUPPLY: on M. for Com. (objection) 766 (i).
- Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Export Can. Products) 7140; (Man. Census) conc., 7165; (N.W.T. Exhibition) 7141 (ii).
- Canals—Capital (Sault Ste. Marie) 7145. Income (Beauharnois) conc., 7161; (Deep Waterways Commission) 7080; (Rideau, land damages) 7078 (ii).
- Civil Government (Agriculture) 6957, 7080; (Civil Service Examiners) 7033; (Customs) 7036; (Indian Affairs) 7031; (Interior) 7036; (Post Office) 7032; (Public Works) 7038 (ii).
- Collection of Revenues (Electric Light Inspection) 7132; (Post Office) 7135 (ii).
- Indians (Man. and N.W.T.) 7125 (ii).
- Militia (Arms and Ammunition) 7053; (contingencies) 7075; (Military Schools, &c.) 7070 (Stores, salaries, &c.) 7070 (ii).

Cartwright, Hon. Sir R.—Continued.

SUPPLY—Continued.

Miscellaneous (J. L. P. O'Hanly's services) 7128;
(Travelling Expenses, Dep. Min. Marine) 7129.

Mounted Police, 7124 (ii).

Pensions, 7052 (ii).

Public Works—Income: Buildings (Man.) 7094;
(N.B.) 7089. Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 7096.

Railways—Capital (Gov. Gen.'s Car "Victoria")
7076 (ii).

Supply B. 112 (Mr. Foster) on M. for 3^d, 7170 (ii).

Voters' Lists B. 87 (Mr. Dickey) in Com., 6601 (ii).

Votes and Proceedings, omission of M. (remarks)
5222 (ii).

Ways and Means—The Tariff, in Com. on Res.,
6664 (ii).

Winnipeg and Pilot Mound Mail Contract (M.
for copy*) 4596 (ii).

Casey, Mr. G. E., West Elgin.

Address, on The, 320 (i).

— Unparliamentary Language, 286 (i).

Adulteration of Food, Drugs, &c. (Honey) Act
Amt. B. 10 (Mr. Sproule) in Com., 1021 (i).

Alien Labour Prohibition B. 24 (Mr. Taylor) on
M. for 1st, 816 (i).

Auditor General's Rep. (explanation) 854 (i).

Berlin Customs Collector (Ques.) 4554 (ii).

British Connection and Imperial Defence, on
prop. Res. (Mr. McNeill) 1205 (i).

Budget, on The, 2533 (i).

Can. Jockey Club's B. 48 (Mr. Fisdale) in Com.,
2647 (i).

Can. Sheep scheduled by Great Britain (Ques.)
633 (i).

Cape Breton Election, Expenditure of Money
(remarks) 1530 (i).

Cattle (American) Shipments from Can. Ports
(Ques.) 1618 (i).

— Transit through Can. (prop. Ques.) 1184;
(Ques.) 1252 (i).

— Embargo by Great Britain, on M. (Mr.
Davin) to adjn. Hse. (remarks) 3241 (i).

Chignecto Marine Transport Ry. Co.'s B. 75 (Mr.
Powell) on M. to restore to Order Paper, 4639.

Clearville Fishing Licenses, Applications (M. for
Ret.*) 4596 (ii).

Columbia River, Improved Navigation, Engineer's
Rep., on M. for Ret., 5071 (ii).

Commissioner on Sweating System, Appmnt.
(Ques.) 1620 (i).

Defence of the Dom., in Com. on Res., 6905 (ii).

Drainage on Ry. Co.'s Properties (B. 3) 1st, 6; 2^d
m., 613 (i).

Exhibition in N.W.T., Unpaid Claims (remarks)
612 (i).

Fishery and Alien Labour Law, Negotiations
with U.S. (Ques.) 1027 (i).

Fishery License, Clearville (Ques.) 3100 (i).

Govt. Dredge at Port Stanley, Sale (Ques.) 3333.

Gov.-Gen., ref. to in deb., on Ques. of Order (Sir
Charles Tupper) 4287 (ii).

Casey, Mr. G. E.—Continued.

High Commissioner's Duties in London (M. for
O.C.) 687, 700 (i).

— Visit to Can. (M. for Cor.) 647 (i).

— Ret. respecting (Ques.) 1255, 1515, 1679,
2012, 2987, 3047 (i).

House of Commons (Issue of Writs) B. 16 (Mr.
McCarthy) in Com., 5113 (ii).

Hudson's Bay Canal and Nav. Co.'s B. 52 (Mr.
Boyd) on M. for Com., 4870 (ii).

Immigration of Boys to Can (M. for Cor.)
5074 (i).

International Exhibition, proposed (remarks)
6898 (ii).

Lake Erie Fisheries, Nets and Licenses (Ques.)
3633 (ii).

Man. and Nelson Valley Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 65
(Mr. Davis) in Com., 5088, 6630 (ii).

Militia Grievances, Col. Hamilton, Military
College, &c., on M. (Mr. Mulock) to adjn. Hse.
6763 (ii).

Ministerial Resignations, on M. (Sir Adolphe
Caron) to adjn. Hse., 25 (i).

— Cabinet as reconstructed, on M. (Sir
Adolphe Caron) to adjn. Hse. 136 (i).

Montreal Port, Proceedings at Conference re
Traffic, on M. for copy, 4583 (ii).

Montreal Turnpike Trust Debentures, in Com.
on Res. (Mr. Foster) 6642 (ii).

Order (Ques. of) Saturday Sittings, on Amt. (Mr.
Ouimet) 5128, 5131 (ii).

— Unparliamentary Language, 5139 (ii).

— (Mr. McLeod) in Com. on Remedial Act,
5341 (ii).

Port Stanley Harbour, Expenditure of \$5,000 (M.
for Stmt.*) 4596 (ii).

Prohibition, Cost of Royal Commission (Ques.)
632 (i).

Public Works, Govt. Liability for Labour B. 4
(Mr. McLennan) on M. for 2^d, 863 (i).

Remedial Act (Man.) B. 58 (Sir Charles Tupper)
on Amt. (Mr. Laurier) 6 m. h. to M. for 2^d,
3413 (i).

— Draft copy (Ques.) 1625 (i).

— on M. for Com., reference to Official Re-
porters, 4340 (ii).

— in Com., 4951, 5001, 5292, 5450, 5684, 5731,
5784, 5976 (ii).

Rifles for Volunteers, Improved (Ques.) 3532 (ii).

Ry. Employees and Passengers Safety (B. 2) 1st,
6; 2^d m., 909; 2^d and M. to ref. to Com. on
Ry's., 932 (i).

Senate and House of Commons Act Amt. B. 7
(Mr. Mulock) in Com. (Ry. Passes) 893 (i).

Sessional Employees, non-payment, on M. to adjn.
Hse. (remarks) 4903 (ii).

Smith, Sir Donald, Visit to Winnipeg, on M. (Sir
Richard Cartwright) to adjn. Hse., 4287, 4328.

Soulanges Canal, Sections 4, 5, 6, 7, Contractor's
Claims (Ques.) 2005 (i).

Casey, Mr. G. E.—Continued.

- SUPPLY: on M. (Mr. Foster) for Com., 802 (i).
 Tupper, Sir Charles, Official Status (Ques.) 639 (i).
 ——— Offices and Salary since 1883 (Ques.) 888 (i).
 ——— Travelling at Govt. Expense, adjnmt. of Hse. (M.) 959 (i).
 ——— Allowances as Acting High Commissioner (Ques.) 4376 (ii).
 U. S. Alien Labour Law, Reciprocal relaxation (Ques.) 1623 (i).
 Victoria (B.C.) Electoral District Lists B. 108 (Mr. Prior) on M. for 2^d, 6805 (ii).
 Voters' Lists B. 87 (Mr. Dickey) on M. for 2^d, 6595, 6611 (ii).
 Worsley, Lt.-Col., Charges against Lt.-Col. Murray, on M. for Com. of Sup., 7009 (ii).

Charbonneau, Mr. L., Jacques Cartier.

- Remedial Act (Man.) B. 58 (Sir Charles Tupper) on Amt. (Mr. Laurier) 6 m. h. to M. for 2^d, 4217 (ii).
 ——— in Com., 5317 (ii).

Charlton, Mr. J., North Norfolk.

- Armenian Atrocities, Res. passed by British H. of C. (remarks) 4916 (ii).
 ——— Res. on Order Paper (remarks) 6113, 6514.
 ——— Sympathy (M.) 6593 (ii).
 Assets of Doan., par Value on Investments (Ques.) 5053 (ii).
 Can.-Alaska Boundary Surveys (Ques.) 4377 (ii).
 Cayuga, Sale of Village Lots (M. for Ret. *) 3636.
 Criminal Code (1892) Act Amt. B. 102 (Mr. Dickey) on M. for 1st, 6501 (ii).
 ——— Seduction and Abduction (B. 73) 1st, 2172.
 Dom. Reformatory, Disbursements (Ques.) 2652.
 Govt. Business, precedence on Mondays, on prop. M. (Sir Charles Tupper) 4256 (ii).
 Govt. Ry. Cars for Officials (Ques.) 4379 (ii).
 Half-breed Allotments, Man. and N.W.T. (Ques.) 5057 (ii).
 Hudson's Bay Canal and Nav. Co.'s B. 52 (Mr. Boyd) on Mr. Speaker's ruling (remarks) 4790.
 Keswick and Roach's Point Mail Contract (Ques.) 5051, 6120, 6505 (ii).
 Lord's Day Observance (B. 74) 1st, 2333 (i).
 Militia, Permanent and Active, &c., Expenditure (M. for Ret. *) 3636 (ii).
 Order (Ques. of) Saturday Sittings, on Amt. (Mr. Ouimet) 5131 (ii).
 ——— Hansard Reporters, 4210 (ii).
 Port Dover District Fishing Licenses (Ques.) 2654 (i); (M. for Ret. *) 3636 (ii).
 Preferential Trade and Imperial Defence, on prop. Res. (Mr. McNeill) 4412 (ii).
 Private Cars, Official, Haulage on Rys. (Ques.) 5050 (ii).
 Prohibition of the Liquor Traffic, on prop. Res. (Mr. Flint) 2203 (i).

Charlton, Mr. J.—Continued.

- Remedial Act (Man.) B. 58 (Sir Charles Tupper) on Amt. (Mr. Laurier) 6 m. h. to M. for 2^d, 3353 (i).
 ——— on M. (Mr. McNeill) that Com. rise, 4927.
 ——— in Com., 5506, 5532, 5659, 5804, 5953, 6050, 6306, 6386, 6405 (ii).
 Saturday Sittings, on M. (Sir Charles Tupper) 5125, 5131 (ii).
 Skeena River Fishermen, Sunday Rest (Ques.) 3632 (ii).
 SUPPLY:
 Casals—Facone (Beauharnois) conc. 7150 (ii).
 Miscellaneous (J. L. P. O'Hanly's services) 7128 (ii).
 Tay Canal, Tolls Collected, &c., 1895 (Ques.) 5346 (ii).
 ——— Cost of Management, &c. (Ques.) 6116 (ii).
 Victoria (B.C.) Electoral District B. 108 (Mr. Prior) on M. for 2^d, 6863 (ii).
 Voters' Lists B. 87 (Mr. Dickey) in Com., 6597, 6614 (ii).
 Votes and Proceedings, omission of M. (remarks) 5218 (ii).

Chesley, Mr. J. A., St. John (N.B.) City and County.

- St. John (N.B.) Winter Port, Ocean S.S. Contract, on M. for copy, 2691 (i).

Choquette, Mr. P. A., Montmagny.

- Baie de Chaleurs Ry., Negotiations for Purchase (Ques.) 1447 (i).
 Canal, Montreal to St. Johns, Survey (Ques.) 3634 (ii).
 Catholic Schools in the N.W., Letter from Clergy to Sir John Thompson (Ques.) 2408 (i).
 Gaspé Harbour Improvements (Ques.) 4378 (ii).
 Govt. Business, precedence on Mondays, on prop. M. (Sir Charles Tupper) (Amt.) 4269 (ii).
 ——— Thursdays, on prop. M. (Mr. Foster) 1170.
 Grande Greve Postmaster, Resignation (Ques.) 1625 (i).
 I.C.R. Workshops at Rivière du Loup, Apprentices (Ques.) 1446 (i).
 Parliament, Duration of, on M. (Mr. Edgar) to adjn. Hse., 3625 (ii).
 Quebec Observatory, Mr. Smith's Quarters (Ques.) 3101 (i).
 Remedial Act (Man.) B. 58 (Mr. Dickey) on M. for 1st, 1514 (i).
 ——— in Com., 5832, 5838, 5860, 5967, 6300 (ii).
 Rice Meal, Exports by Mount Royal Milling Co. (Ques.) 3634 (ii).
 Voters' Lists, Montmagny, Cost of Preparation (Ques.) 1251 (i).

Christie, Mr. T., Argenteuil.

- Prohibition of the Liquor Traffic, on Amt. (Mr. Guillet) 2223 (i).

Cleveland, Mr. C. O., Richmond and Wolfe, Q.

- Remedial Act (Man.) B. 58 (Sir Charles Tupper) on Amt. (Mr. Laurier) 6 m. h. to M. for 2^d, 3466.

Coatsworth, Mr. E., Jr., East Toronto.

- Building Societies and Loan and Savings Companies Act Amt. (B. 99) 1st, 6499 (ii).
 Denison, Lt.-Col., late M.P., deceased (remarks) 6513 (ii).
 Detective Corporations and Mercantile Agencies, Bill 11 (Mr. *Sproule*) on M. for 2^d, 4609 (ii).
 Imperial Life Assurance Co.'s incorp. (B. 64) 1st, 1775; 2^d m., 2129; deb. rsund., 2173 (i).
 Insolvency B. 51 (Mr. *Martin*) on M. for 1st, 1116 (i).
 Interest B. 8 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2^d, 1241 (i).
 International Exhibition, Proposed (remarks) 6883 (ii).
 Public Accounts, ref. to Com. (M.) 1775 (i).
 Remedial Act (Man.) B. 58 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) in Com., 5592, 5611, 5889, 6192 (ii).
 Trade Marks and Designs Act Amt. (B. 18) 1st, 216 (i).

Cockburn, Mr. G. R. R., Centre Toronto.

- Banking Act Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Jennette*) on M. for 2^d, 4669 (ii).
 British Connection and Imperial Defence, on prop. Res. (Mr. *McNeill*) 1193 (i).
 Denison, Lt.-Col., late M.P., deceased (remarks) 6512 (ii).
 Detective Corporations and Mercantile Agencies B. 11 (Mr. *Sproule*) on M. for 2^d, 4706 (ii).
 Gov. Gen., ref. to in deb., on Ques. of Order (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 4283 (ii).
 Interest B. 8 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2^d, 1233 (i).
 International Exhibition, Proposed (remarks) 6882 (ii).
 Ministerial Resignations, Reorganization of Cabinet, on M. (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) to adjn. Hse., 47 (i).
 Ry. Employees and Passengers Safety B. 2 (Mr. *Casey*) on M. to ref. to Ry. Com., 946 (i).
 Remedial Act (Man.) B. 58 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) 6 m. h. to M. for 2^d, 3970 (ii).
 ——— in Com., 5855 (ii).
 Smith, Sir Donald, Visit to Winnipeg on M. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) to adjn. Hse., 4283 (ii).

Colter, Mr. N. R., Carleton, N.B.

- Bonded Warehouse, between N.B. and Maine, Abolition (Ques.) 1869 (i).
 Gibson's Creek, Expenditure (M. for Stmt. *) 1509 (i).
 Maduxnekeag Fishway, Cost and Repairs (Ques.) 1623 (i).
 Remedial Act (Man.) B. 58 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) in Com., 5773 (ii).
 St. John River, Improved Navigation (Ques.) 232
 ——— Expenditure (M. for Stmt. *) 1509 (i).
 St. John River Improvements, Ret. *re* (inquiry) 3316, 6115 (ii).

Corbould, Mr. G. E., New Westminster.

- Lobster and Oyster Planting in B. C. (Ques.) 3099.
 Yukon and B. C. Trading and Development Co. of Can. incorp. (B. 89) 1st, 4788; 2^d m., 6811 (ii).

Costigan, Hon. J., Victoria, N.B.

- Address, on The, 582 (i).
 Adulteration of Food Rep. (presented) 31 (i).
 Alert, Str., Sale and Amount realized (Ans.) 644.
 Batican Lighthouse, Purchase of Right of Way (Ans.) 1447 (i).
 Behring Sea Claims Convention (B. 100) 1st, 6499; 2^d, 6819 (ii).
 Bounties to Fishermen, Payments (Ans.) 4557 (ii).
 Bounty Cheques Issued in Digby, 644 (i).
 ——— Fishing Schooner *Pioneer*, 1184 (i).
 ——— Frauds in N.S. and N.B., on M. for Cor., 1062 (i).
 Bridgewater Harbour master, Dismissal (Ans.) 2508 (i).
 Brier Island Fog Alarm Building, Replacing (Ans.) 6816 (ii).
 Can. Sealers, Duties on Stores exacted by Nfld. (Ans.) 5055 (ii).
 Fisheries and Alien Labour Laws, Negotiations with U. S. (Ans.) 1027 (i).
 Fishery Commission (Joint) Can. and U. S. (Ans.) 5346 (ii).
 ——— Overseer, County of Kent, Licenses Issued (Ans.) 1615 (i).
 ——— River Thames District (Ans.) 1445 (i).
 Fishing Licenses (Nfld.) Refund by Govt. (Ans.) 645 (i).
 ——— License, Clearville (Ans.) 3100 (i).
 ——— County of Lennox (Ans.) 889 (i).
 ——— Pound-net Licenses in B. C. (Ans.) 820, 1625 (i).
 Fish Island Lighthouse-keeper, Appmt. (Ans.) 1623 (i).
 Fish Warden, Bideford (P.E.I.) Appmt. (Ans.) 1624 (i).
 Fishways in North River, Terrebonne (Ans.) 4377, 5349 (ii).
 Hospital Dues, Abolition of Tonnage Tax (Ans.) 1620 (i).
 Inland Revenue Deptl. Rep. (presented) 31 (i).
 Lake Erie Fisheries, Nets and Licenses (Ans.) 3633 (ii).
 Lobster and Oyster Planting in B. C. (Ans.) 3099
 Lobster Fishery Regulations (Ans.) 822 (i).
 ——— change *re* Close Season (Ans.) 3054 (ii).
 Maduxnekeag Fishway, Cost and Repairs (Ans.) 1623 (i).
 Mail Service, P. E. I. and Mainland (Ans.) 891, 2011 (i).
 Marine and Fisheries Deptl. Rep. (presented) 1509 (i).
 ——— (Fisheries Branch) Deptl. Rep. (presented) 2572 (i).
 ——— Appmt. of Dep. Minister (Ans.) 6509 (ii).
Mary E. Harlow, Schooner, Wreck (Ans.) 2177 (i).

Costigan, Hon. J.—Continued.

- Modus Vivendi (Treaty, 1888) Withdrawal, on M. for Cor., 1065 (i).
 Montreal Centre Election, Returning Officers, &c., Accounts (Ans.) 3101 (i).
 Navigable Waters Protection Act Amt. (B. 98) 1st, 6499 (ii).
 Newfoundland Bait Act, Refund for Can. Licenses (Ans.) 1252 (i).
 ——— Fishing Licenses, Refund (Ans.) 6115 (ii).
 Order (Ques. of) Interpretation of remarks, 3033.
 Port Arthur District Fishing Licenses (Ans.) 6116 (ii).
 Port Dover District Fishing Licenses (Ans.) 2654
 Quebec Observatory, Mr. Smith's Quarters (Ans.) 3101 (i).
 Remedial Act (Man.) B. 58 (Sir Charles Tupper) on Amt. (Mr. Laurier) 6 m. h. to M. for 2^d, 3920 (ii).
 St. John (P.Q.) Assistant Harbour Master Appoint. (Ans.) 2341 (i).
 San Pedro, Removal of Wreck (Ans.) 821, 2180.
 Simard, Arthur, Lighthouse Keeper, Dismissal (Ans.) 4380 (ii).
 Skeena River Fishermen, Sunday Rest (Ans.) 3632 (ii).
 Smelt Fishing, Extension of Close Season (Ans.) 3632 (ii).
 Spence's Bridge and Kamloops (B.C.) Mail Contract (Ans.) 1186 (i).
 Steamboat Inspection and Examination, &c., of Engineers (B. 96) 1st, 6499 (ii).
 Stanley, Str., Magdalen Islands Mail Service (Ans.) 1866 (i).
 ——— P.E.I. and Mainland (Ans.) 2409 (i).
 SUPPLY: on M. (Mr. Foster) for Com., 777 (i).
 Civil Government (Post Office) 7031 (ii).
 Fisheries (Licenses to U. S. Vessels) 7102 (ii).
 Miscellaneous (J. L. P. O'Hanly's services) 7123
 (Travelling Expenses Dep. Min. Marine) 7129 (ii).
 Ocean and River Service (Dom. Steamers) 7100 (ii).
 Tupper, R. La Touche, Fishery Inspector, Charges against (Ans.) 6509 (ii).
 ——— Fishery Inspector, Complaints against (Ans.) 6507 (ii).
 U. S. Alien Labour Law, Reciprocal relaxation (Ans.) 1623 (i).
 Weights and Measures and Gas. Rep. (presented) 31 (i).
 Wrecks, Casualties and Salvage Act Amt. (B. 101) 1st, 6499 (ii).

Craig, Mr. T. D., East Durham.

- British Connection and Imperial Defence, on prop. Res. (Mr. McNeill) 1203 (i).
 Budget, on The, 1737 (i).
 Insolvency R. 31 (Mr. Martin) on M. for 1st, 1117.
 Prohibition of the Liquor Traffic, on prop. Res. (Mr. Flinn) 2194 (i).

Craig, Mr. T. D.—Continued.

- Remedial Act (Man.) B. 58 (Sir Charles Tupper) on Amt. (Mr. Laurier) 6 m. h. to M. for 2^d, 2905 (i).
 ——— in Com., 3409, 5663, 5949, 6479 (ii).
 Sessional Employees, non-payment, on M. to adjn. Hse. 4911 (ii).

Daly, Hon. T. M., Selkirk.

- Address, on The, 365 (i).
 Agricultural Implements, Free Entry from U. S., on prop. Res. (Mr. McMillan) 674 (i).
 Barristers (Ont.) employed in Quebec Cases (Ans.) 5124 (ii).
 Battleford and Saskatoon Mail Contract, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 6309 (ii).
 B. C. Penitentiary, Management, &c., Justice Drake's Investigation (Ans.) 6117 (ii).
 Binding Twine, Output of Kingston Penitentiary (Ans.) 4652 (ii).
 ——— Sales and Moneys Unpaid (Ans.) 4652, 5050, 5122 (ii).
 Can.-Alaska Boundary Surveys (Ans.) 4377 (ii).
 Census of N. W. T. taken by Mounted Police, on M. for Ret., 1504 (i).
 Columbia River, Improved Navigation, Engineer's Rep., on M. for Ret., 3070 (ii).
 Dom. Police, Rep. of Commissioner (presented) 289 (i).
 Exhibition in N. W. T., Unpaid Accounts, on M. for Cor., 659 (i).
 Geological Survey, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 3469.
 Govt. Property in Moose Jaw, on prop. Res. (Mr. Durrin) 1437 (i).
 Half-breed Allotments, Man. and N. W. T. (Ans.) 5057 (ii).
 House of Commons (Issue of Writs) B. 16 (Mr. McCarthy) in Com., 5100 (ii).
 Hudson's Bay Canal and Nav. Co.'s B. 52 (Mr. Boyd) on M. for Com., 4824; in Com., 4898, 5344 (ii).
 Immigration of Boys to Can., on M. for Cor., 5075 (ii).
 Interior Deptl. Rep. (presented) 1675 (i).
 ——— Indian Affairs, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 1346 (i).
 Land Grants to Militia (B. 94) 1st, 5343 (ii).
 Man. and Nelson Valley Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 65 (Mr. Macdonald) on Amt. in Com., 6793 (ii).
 Man. School Law, German Translation (Ans.) 4380 (ii).
 Mounted Police, Commissioner's Rep. (presented) 4463 (ii).
 N. W. T. Representation Act Amt. B. 22 (Mr. Martin) on M. for 1st, 536 (i).
 ——— (B. 104) 1st, 6593 (ii).
 ——— Increased Representation (B. 94) 1st, 6111.
 Remedial Act (Man.) B. 58 (Sir Charles Tupper) on Amt. (Mr. Laurier) 6 m. h. to M. for 2^d, 3112 (i).

Daly, Hon. T. M.—Continued.

- Remedial Act (Man.) on M. (Mr. McNeill) that Com. rise, 4942 (ii).
 — in Com., 5032, 5210, 5225, 5241, 5256, 5302, 5585-93, 5623, 5801, 5859, 5860, 5915, 6013, 6335, 6390 (ii).
 — Papers re Winnipeg Commission, on M. (Mr. McCarthy) to adjn. Hse., 6149 (ii).
 St. Andrew's Rapids, Improvements, on M. (Mr. Martin) for copy, 3649 (ii).
 Scrip for Scouts during N. W. Rebellion, on prop. Res. (Mr. Davin) Amt. 3639 (ii).
 Solicitor Gen. (ex.) Private Sec. (Ans.) 4373 (ii).
 SUPPLY:
Civil Government (Indian Affairs) 7031; (Interior) 7036 (ii).
Dominion Lands—Capital (Surreys, &c.) 7139 (ii).
Geological Survey, 7125 (ii).
Government of N. W. T. (Schools, &c.) 7129 (ii).
Indians (Man. and N. W. T.) 7124; (Ont. and Que.) 7124 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Boundary Survey, Can. and U. S.) 7125; (Seed Grain, &c., distribution, N. W. T.) 7126 (ii).
Mounted Police, 7123 (ii).
Pensions, 7052 (ii).
 Voters' Lists, 1896 (B. 87) F, 4650 (ii).
 Walpole Island, Lease or Sale of Marsh (Ans.) 642 (i).
 Yale and Cariboo Electoral Lists, on M. for copy, 3655 (ii).

Davies, Mr. L. H., Queen's, P.E.I.

- Address, on The, 265 (i).
 — Mr. McShane's alleged Disqualification (remarks) 471 (i).
 Animals Contagious Diseases Act Amt. B. 95 (Mr. Foster) in Com., 6824 (ii).
 Behring Sea Claims Convention B. 100 (Mr. Costigan) in Com., 6821 (ii).
 Binding Twine, Sales, &c., Moneys Unpaid (remarks) 4652 (ii).
 Breakwaters and Piers in Prince County, on M. for Stmt., 2363 (i).
 British American Coal and Transportation Co.'s incorp. B. 76 (Mr. Powell) in Com., 6813 (ii).
 British Connection and Imperial Defence, on prop. Res. (Mr. McNeill) 1190 (i).
 Bounty (Fishery) Frauds in N. S. and N. B., on M. for Cor., 1060 (i).
 Budget, on The, 2583 (i).
 Cape Breton Election, Expenditure of Money (remarks) 1515, 1626 (i).
 — par. in *Montreal Herald* re \$25,000 Expenditure (remarks) 1348 (i).
 Cape Breton Ry., Hard-Pan Claims (M. for Ret. *) 3108 (i).
 Chignecto Marine Transport Ry. Co.'s B. 75 (Mr. Powell) on M. for P, 3078 (i).
 Christmas Island, &c., Contracts for Mail Service (Ques.) 2410 (i).

Davies, Mr. L. H.—Continued.

- Constitutionality of Clause 1, B. 58, in Com., 4944 (ii).
 Controllers as Privy Councillors, on M. for O. C., &c., 1076 (i).
 Defence of Dom., in Com., on Res. (Mr. Foster) 6903, 6923, 6941 (ii).
 Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 14 (Mr. McCarthy) on M. for P, 4625 (ii).
 Ferry Boats in St. John Harbour (M. for Cor. *) 3108 (i).
 Good Friday, Sitting of Hse (remarks) 4918 (ii).
 Goodwin, Geo., Contract, inquiry for Ret., 4375.
 Govt. Business, precedence on Thursdays, on prop. M. (Mr. Foster) 1138 (i).
 — Mondays, on Amt. (Mr. Choquette) 4271 (ii).
 Gov. Gen., ref. to in deb., on Ques. of Order (Sir Charles Tupper) 4281 (ii).
 Hamilton, James F., St. John, Emplmt. by Govt. (Ques.) 3106 (i).
 Hamilton, Lt.-Col., Investigation re, on M. for Com. of Sup., 7022 (ii).
 Harris Property, St. John (N.B.) Govt. Purchase for I. C. R. (Ques.) 2410 (i).
 High Commissioner's Duties in London, on M. for Ret., 699 (i).
 House of Commons (Issue of Writs) B. 16 (Mr. McCarthy) in Com., 5104 (ii).
 Hudson's Bay Canal and Nav. Co.'s B. 52 (Mr. Boyd) on M. for Com., 4857 (ii).
 Imperial Life Ins. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. Coatsworth) on M. for P, 2173 (i).
 I. C. R., Employees, Rolling Stock, &c., on M. for Ret. *, 709 (i).
 Insolvency B. 51 (Mr. Martin) on M. for P, 1108.
 Kelly, Jas., and Hamilton, Jas. H., Appmnts. to Civil Service (Ques.) 2409 (i).
 McBeath, Allan, Appraiser St. John, Superannuation (Ques.) 2409 (i).
 — (M. for Cor. *) 3108 (i).
 Mail Service between P.E.I. and Mainland (remarks) 834 (i).
 Marine and Fisheries, Appmnt. of Dep. Minister (Ques.) 6309 (ii).
 Masson, Mr., ex-M.P., Appmnt. as Judge (remarks) 6968 (ii).
 Military Grounds, Sussex (N.B.) Lease (Ques.) 3628 (ii).
 — (M. for copies*) 3108 (i).
 Ministerial Resignations, Cabinet as reconstructed, on M. (Sir Adolphe Caron) to adjn. Hse., 85 (i).
 — Reorganization of Cabinet, on M. (Sir Adolphe Caron) to adjn. Hse., 35 (i).
 Negotiations at Winnipeg, in Com. on B. 58, 4919 (ii).
 N. W. T. Representation Act Amt. B. 22 (Mr. Martin) on M. for P, 346 (i).
 Princess Louise Dragoons (N.B.) and Soudan Expedition (remarks) 5037 (ii).

Davies, Mr. L. H.—Continued.

- Privilege, *Ques.* of (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) communicating O. C. to Newspapers (remarks) 825.
- Public Works, Govt. Liability for Labour B. 4 (Mr. *McLennan*) on M. for 2^d, 870 (i).
- Ocean SS. Subsidies Act Amt. B. 106 (Mr. *Ives*) in Com. on Res., 6982 (ii).
- Order, *Ques.* of (Mr. *Casey*) Saturday Sitings (remarks) 5130 (ii).
- Parliament, Duration of, on M. (Mr. *Edgar*) to adju. Hse., 3607, 3618 (ii).
- Preferential Trade and Imperial Defence, on prop. Res. (Mr. *McNeill*) 4441 (ii).
- Remedial Act (Man.) B. 53 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) 6 m. h., to M. for 2^d, 3319 (ii).
- in Com. 4919, 4944, 5211, 5233, 5250, 5358, 5412, 5393, 5620, 5864, 5995, 6073, 6180, 6348 (ii).
- on M. to adju. deb., 4232 (ii).
- Robinson, Geo. F., P.E.I. Customs, Superannuation (*Ques.*) 6817 (ii).
- Saturday Sitings, on Amt. (Mr. *Quimet*) 5134 (ii).
- Senate and House of Commons B. 7 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com. (Ry. Passes) 894 (i).
- B. 111 (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for Com. on Res., 6979 (ii).
- Shortis, Valentine, commutation of Death Sentence, on Amt. to M. for Ret., 849 (i).
- (remarks) 7180 (ii).
- Smelt Fishing, Extension of Close Season (*Ques.*) 3632 (ii).
- Smith, Sir Donald, Visit to Winnipeg, on M. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) to adju. Hse., 4281, 4330 (ii).
- Soulanges Canal, Geo. Goodwin's Contract (M. for copies*) 3109 (i).
- on M. for Com. of Sup., 6514, 7114 (ii).
- Stanley, Str., Mail Service, P. E. I. and Mainland (*Ques.*) 2409 (i).
- SUPPLY: on M. (Mr. *Foster*) for Com., 771 (i).
- Canals—Income* (E. aubarnois) conc. 7151; (Deep Waterways Commission) 7081; (St. Peter's) 7079.
- Civil Government* (Public Works) 7040 (ii).
- Collection of Revenues* (Post Office) 7137; (Railways, I.C.R.) 7087 (ii).
- Fisheries* (Inspection) 7164 (ii).
- Justice, Administration of* (Supreme Court) 7047.
- Mail Subsidies and S.S. Subventions* (Liverpool and St. John) 7093 (ii).
- Militia* (contingencies) 7076 (ii).
- Miscellaneous* (Seed Grain, distribution, N.W.T., &c.) 7126 (ii).
- Public Works—Income: Dredging*, 7097 (ii).
- Supreme Court Reps. Delay in Publication (*Ques.*) 637 (i).
- Volunteers for Soudan Expedition (remarks) 4638 (ii).
- (*Ques.*) 4786 (ii).
- Wall, Dr., Claims for Damages against P. E. I. Ry. (M. for Cor. *) 3108 (i).

Davies, Mr. L. H.—Continued.

- Worsley, Lt.-Col., Charges against Lt.-Col. Murray, on M. for Com. of Sup., 7008 (ii).
- Davin, Mr. N. F., West Assiniboia.**
- Agricultural Implements, Free Entry from U. S., on prop. Res. (Mr. *McMillan*) 679 (i).
- Removal of Duty (prop. Res.) 850, 1029 (i).
- Alien Labour Prohibition B. 24 (Mr. *Taylor*) on M. for 1st, 815 (i).
- Battleford and Saskatoon Mail Contract, on M. for Com. of Sup., 7000 (ii).
- Brandon and South-western Ry. Co.'s (B. 47) 1st*, 1023 (i).
- British Connection and Imperial Defence, on prop. Res. (Mr. *McNeill*) 1217 (i).
- Budget, on The, 1892 (i).
- Butter Exports, prop. Res. withdr., 2334 (i).
- Cape Breton Election, Expenditure of Money (remarks) 1641 (i).
- Cattle Embargo by Great Britain (M. to adju.) 3240 (i).
- Creameries in N. W. T., Money Grant (prop. Res.) 2654, 2668 (i).
- Debates, Official Rep., inserting Tabulated Stmts. (remarks) 2008 (i).
- Exhibition in the N. W. T., Unpaid Claims (remarks) 608 (i).
- on M. for Cor., 661 (i).
- German Language in Man. and N. W. T., Translation of School Laws (*Ques.*) 3099 (i), 4379 (ii).
- Govt. Business, precedence on Mondays, on prop. M. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 4269 (ii).
- Thursdays, on prop. M. (Mr. *Foster*) 1146.
- Govt. Property in Moose Jaw (prop. Res.) 1433, 1463 (i).
- Gov. Gen., ref. to in deb., on *Ques.* of Order (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 4301 (ii).
- Grain Standards in N. W. T. (*Ques.*) 1863 (i).
- Insolvency B. 51 (Mr. *Martin*) on M. for 1st, 1115 (i).
- Man. School Law, German Translation (*Ques.*) 3099 (i) 4379 (ii).
- Ministerial Resignations, Reorganization of Cabinet, on M. (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) to adju. Hse., 42 (i).
- Cabinet as reconstructed, on M. (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) to adju. Hse., 82 (i).
- Mounted Police, Engagement of Criminals (remarks) 1346 (i).
- N. W. T. Representation Act Amt. (B. 20) 1st*, 216.
- B. 22 (Mr. *Martin*) on M. for 1st, 359 (i).
- Increased Representation Act Amt. B. 94 (Mr. *Daly*) on M. for 1st, 6112 (ii).
- North-west Territories (prop. Res.) 1871 (i).
- Order (*Ques.* of) Member requested to withdr. remarks, 2339 (i).
- Preferential Trade and Imperial Defence, on prop. Res. (Mr. *McNeill*) 4397 (ii).
- Ry. Employees and Passengers Safety B. 2 (Mr. *Casey*) on M. for 2^d, 923 (i).

Davin, Mr. N. F.—Continued.

- Remedial Act (Man.) B. 58 (Sir Charles Tupper) on Amt. (Mr. Laurier) 6 m. h. to M. for 2^o, 4159 (ii).
 — in Com., 5495, 5662, 5826, 6071, 6409, 6471
 School Ordinance (N.W.T.) Premier's remarks (Ques.) 818 (i).
 Scrip (Scouts) during N. W. Rebellion (prop. Res.) 3637 (ii).
 Seed Grain Standards (Ques.) 2411 (i).
 Senate and House of Commons Act Amt. B. 7 (Mr. Mulock) in Com. (Ry. Passes) 898 (i).
 Sheep Scab, Introduction from U.S. into N.W.T. (Ques.) 1029 (i).
 Smith, Sir Donald, Visit to Winnipeg, on M. (Sir Richard Cartwright) to adjn. Hse., 4301, 4334 (ii).
 SUPPLY:
 Arts, Agriculture, &c. (N.W.T. Exhibition) 7142 (ii).
 Government of N.W.T. (Schools, &c.) 7132 (ii).
 Territorial Exhibition, Rep. of Lieut.-Gov., N.W.T. (Ques.) 1447 (i).
 Wheat Grading Frauds, Man. and N.W.T. (prop. Res.) 1031, 1049 (i).

Davis, Mr. D. W., Alberta.

- Controller of Inland Rev., Position in Cabinet (Ques.) 647 (i).
 Edmonton District Ry. and Improvement Co.'s (B. 54) 1^o*, 1182 (i); Sen. Amts., 6811 (ii).
 Man. and Nelson Valley Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 65) 1^o*, 1775 (i); in Com., 5087 (ii).

Dawson, Mr. G. W. W., Addington.

- Benjamin, E. W., Payments to Inland Rev. *re* Weights and Measures (Ques.) 2339 (i).
 Budget, on The, 2241 (i).
 Cabinet Reorganization (Ques.) 640, 641 (i).
 Elections since Jan., 1893, Districts and Candidates (Ques.) 1614 (i).
 Farmers, &c., in Can. (Census, 1891) Number (Ques.) 1861 (i).
 Picton Public Building, Purchase of Site (Ques.) 646, 890, 1251, 2339 (i).
 — Rents, Arrears (Ques.) 891 (i).
 — (M. for Ret. *) 3108 (i).
 Remedial Act (Man.) B. 58 (Sir Charles Tupper) in Com., 6371 (ii).
 Saturday Sitings, on Amt. (Mr. Ouimet) 5162.
 Sugar Imports for Consumption (Ques.) 1183 (i).

Desaulniers, Mr. F. S. L., St. Maurice.

- Montreal and Province Line Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 85) 1^o*, 4254 (ii).

Devlin, Mr. C. R., Ottawa County.

- Barristers (Ont.) employed by Govt. in Quebec Cases (Ques.) 5123 (ii).
 B. C. Penitentiary, Management, &c., Justice Drake's Investigation (Ques.) 6117 (ii).
 Cape Breton Election, Expenditure of Money (remarks) 1527 (i).

Devlin, Mr. C. R.—Continued.

- Hudson's Bay Canal and Nav. Co.'s B. 52 (Mr. Boyd) on M. for Com., 4788 (i).
 Interprovincial Bridge, Nepean Point (Ques.) 1625 (i).
 — (M. for Cor., &c.) 5078 (ii).
 McGahey, John, Emplmt. on Dom. Police Force (Ques.) 2179 (i).
 Ministerial Resignations, reorganization of Cabinet, on M. (Sir Adolphe Caron) to adjn. Hse., 56 (i).
 Newspapers, Free Transport by Mail (Ques.) 2178, 2004, 2012 (i).
 Quebec North Shore Ry. Subsidy, 1884 (Ques.) 1622 (i).
 Remedial Act (Man.) B. 58 (Sir Charles Tupper) on Amt. (Mr. Laurier) 6 m. h. to M. for 2^o, 3303 (i).
 — in Com., 5020, 5550, 5707 (ii).
 Rockway Valley Improved Mail Service (Ques.) 3629 (ii).
 SUPPLY:
 Collection of Revenues (Post Office) 7135 (ii).

Dickey, Hon. A. R., Cumberland.

- Address, on The, 195 (i).
 Adjutant General, Superannuation, &c. (Ans.) 6505 (ii).
 Behring Sea Claims Convention B. 100. (Mr. Costigan) in Com., 6821 (ii).
 Bounty (Fishery) Frauds in N. S. and N. B., on M. for Cor., 1063 (i).
 Can. Copyright (Ans.) 2338 (i).
 Can. Jockey Club's B. 48 (Mr. Tisdale) in Com., 2648 (i), 3517 (ii).
 Cape Breton Election, Expenditure of Money (remarks) 1629 (i).
 Catholic Schools in N. W., Letter from Clergy to Sir John Thompson (Ans.) 2408 (i).
 Chamberlin, commutation of Sentence (Ans.) 634 (i).
 Connolly, N. K. and M., Crown's Claim *re* Judgment (Ans.) 1449 (i).
 Controllers as Privy Councillors, on M. for O.C. &c., 1074 (i).
 Criminal Code (1892) Act Amt. (B. 102) 1^o, 6499.
 Curran Bridge, St. Louis *vs.* Crown (Ans.) 5348.
 — Suit against St. Louis (Ans.) 5348 (ii).
 Defence of Dom., in Com. on Res. (Mr. Foster) 6905, 6922 (ii).
 Dixon, Capt., 63rd Batt., Complaint against (Ans.) 6505 (ii).
 Dom. Elections Act B. 14 (remarks) 6594 (ii).
 Drainage on Ry. Co.'s Properties B. 3 (Mr. Casey) on M. for 2^o, 617 (i).
 German Language in Man. and N.W.T., Translation of School Laws (Ans.) 3099 (i).
 Govt. Business, precedence on Mondays, on Amt. (Mr. Choquette) 4270 (ii).
 Gov. Gen., ref. to in deb., on Ques. of Order (Sir Charles Tupper) 4284 (ii).

Dickey, Hon. A. R.—Continued.

- Hamilton, Lt.-Col., Resignation (Ans.) 5345 (ii).
 — Investigation *re*, on M. for Com. of Sup., 7018 (ii).
 High Commissioner's Duties in London, on M. for Ret., 697 (i).
 Independence of Parliament B. 9 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 2377 (i).
 Infantry Schools, Non-coms. and Men admitted (Ans.) 6510 (ii).
 Labour on Public Works, Govt. Liability B. 4 (Mr. *McLennan*) on M. for 2°, 881 (i).
 Lands to French Half-breeds in Man. and N.W. T. (Ans.) 3100 (ii).
 Legal Fees, &c., Paid in Montreal and Quebec Districts (Ans.) 2651 (i).
 McGahey, John, Emplmt. on Dom. Police Force (Ans.) 2179 (i).
 Man. Penitentiary, Land Purchase (Ans.) 3629.
 Masson, Mr. ex-M.P., Appmt. as Judge (remarks) 6965 (ii).
 Military College, Kingston, Board of Visitors (remarks) 853 (i).
 Military Grounds, Sussex (N.B.) Lease (Ans.) 3628 (ii).
 Militia and Defence, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 957 (i).
 Militia Grievances, Col. Hamilton, Military College, &c., on M. (Mr. *Mulock*) to adjn. Hse., 6692 (ii).
 Mounted Police, Engagement of Criminals (remarks) 1347 (i).
 Order, Ques. of (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to Remedial B., 4356 (ii).
 Parliament, Constitutional Term (Ans.) 819 (i).
 — Duration of (Ans.) 3471 (i).
 — on M. to adjn. (remarks) 3606 (ii).
 Penitentiary Acts Amt. (B. 103) 1°, 6503 (ii).
 Penitentiaries Rep. (presented) 1346 (i).
 Personal Explanation *re* Cape Breton Election deb., 1659 (i).
 Provincial Court Judges, Quebec, Additional (prop. Res.) 6594 (ii).
 Queen *vs.* Larkin, Connolly & Co., Sale of Plant, &c. (Ans.) 3635 (ii).
 Queen *vs.* St. Louis *re* Curran Bridge Contracts (Ans.) 2006 (i).
 Remedial Act (Man.) B. 58, 1°, 1511 (i).
 — on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) 6 m. h. to M. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) for 2°, 2773 (i).
 — Draft copy (Ans.) 1625 (i).
 — Distribution of copies to Press (remarks) 1889 (i).
 — Govt. support to prop. Amts. (Ans.) 3631 (ii).
 — M. to adjn. deb., 4233 (ii).
 — on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) 4370 (ii).
 — in Com., 5351, 5551, 5564-5580, 5854-5874, 5994, 6011, 6057, 6084, 6417, 6459 (ii).
 Rifles for Volunteers, Improved (Ans.) 3632 (ii).
 Rogers, Robt., Amount due Govt. (Ans.) 822 (i).

Dickey, Hon. A. R.—Continued.

- Royal Can. Infantry and Imperial Govt. (Ans.) 1617 (i).
 St. Louis *vs.* The Queen, Claim *re* Curran Bridge (Ans.) 2177 (i), 3631 (ii).
 — Award by Supreme Court (Ans.) 6505 (ii).
 Senate and House of Commons Act Amt. B. 7 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com. (Ry. Passes) 897 (i).
 — B. 111 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com. on Res., 6980 (ii).
 Shortis, Valentine, commutation of Death Sentence (Ans.) 818, 1026 (i).
 — on M. for Ret., 836 (i).
 — (remarks) 7179 (ii).
 Smith, Sir Donald, Visit to Winnipeg, on M. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) to adjn. Hse., 4284 4330 (ii).
 Soulanges Canal, Geo. Goodwin's Contracts, on M. for Com. of Sup., 6589, 7017, 7114 (ii).
 — on Amt. (Mr. *Edgar*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 7121 (ii).
 Statutes, Revision (B. 86) 1°, 6499 (ii).
 SUPPLY: on M. (Mr. *Foster*) for Com., 810 (i).
 Civil Government (Militia) 7033 (ii).
 Dominion Police, 7051 (ii).
 Justice, Administration of (Supreme Court) 7046 (ii).
 Militia (contingencies) 7073; (Drill Pay) 7069; (Major Guy, services *re* Rebellion) 7142; (Military Schools, &c.) 7070; (Military Stores, salaries, &c.) 7070 (ii).
 Supreme and Exchequer Courts Acts Amt. (B. 84) 1°, 3596 (ii).
 Supreme Court Reps., Delay in Publication (Ans.) 637 (i).
 Victoria (B.C.) Electoral District B. 108 (Mr. *Prior*) on M. for 2°, 6861 (ii).
 Voters' Lists (B. 87) in Com., 6595 (ii).
 Wilson, Lt.-Col., R.C.A., Instructions *re* Visit to England (Ans.) 2003 (i).
 Yale and Cariboo Electoral District (B. 109) 1°, 6868 (ii).

Dugas, Mr. L. E., Montcalm.

- Butter and Cheese, U. S. Exports as Can. (Ques.) 5052 (ii).
 — Preferential Duty (Ques.) 5055 (ii).

Dupont, Mr. F., Bagot.

- Remedial Act (Man.) B. 58 (Mr. *Dickey*) on M. for 1°, 1514 (i).
 — on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) 6 m. h. to M. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) for 2°, 4171 (ii).
 — in Com., 5043, 5320, 5873, 6005, 6464 (ii).

Edgar, Mr. J. D., West Ontario.

- Animal Contagious Diseases Act Amt. B. 95 (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for 1°, 6113 (ii).
 British American Coal and Transportation Co.'s incorp. B. 76 (Mr. *Powell*) in Com., 6813 (ii).
 Can. Copyright (Ques.) 2338 (i).
 Can. Jockey Club's B. 48 (Mr. *Tisdale*) in Com., 2645, 3049, 3517 (i).

Edgar, Mr. J. D.—Continued.

- Cape Breton Election, Expenditure of Money (remarks) 1544, 1634 (i).
- Chamberlain, Chas., commutation of Sentence, on M. for O.C., 1501 (i).
- Chignecto Marine Transport Ry. Co.'s Preferential Mortgage Bonds (Ques.) 2006 (i).
- B. 75 (Mr. *Powell*) on M. for 1°, 2572; on M. for 2°, 3071 (i).
- Dairy Products Act (1893) Amt. B. 67 (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for 1°, 1997 (i).
- Deptl. Employees, O. C.'s *re* Payment (Ques.) 2650 (i).
- Election Literature, Distribution by Govt. (remarks) 6768 (ii).
- Foresters, Supreme Court of Independent, B. 29 (Mr. *McGillivray*) on M. for Com., 1861 (i).
- Govt. Business, on M. to adjn. (remarks) 30 (i).
- Hamilton, Lt.-Col., Resignation (Ques.) 5345 (ii).
- Investigation *re*, on M. for Com. of Sup., 7020 (ii).
- Insolvency B, 51 (Mr. *Martin*) on M. for 1°, 1105.
- International Arbitration (remarks) 2011 (i).
- (Ques.) 2337 (i).
- Res., copy to H. M.'s Govt. (M.) 4559 (ii).
- Man. and Nelson Valley Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 65 (Mr. *Davis*) in Com., 5090 (ii).
- Man. School Question, invitation to Man. First Minister to Visit Ottawa (Ques.) 3099 (ii).
- Militia Grievances, Col. Hamilton, Military College, &c., on M. (Mr. *Mulock*) to adjn. Hse., 6700 (ii).
- Ministerial Resignations, reorganization of Cabinet, on M. (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) to adjn. Hse., 41 (i).
- Ocean SS. Subsidies Act Amt. B. 106 (Mr. *Ives*) in Com., 7113 (ii).
- Ont. Peat Fuel and Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 62 (Mr. *Boyle*) on M. for 2°, 2370 (i).
- Order (Ques. of) in Com. on Remedial B. 5961.
- Parliament, Duration of, adjmnt. of Hse. (M.) 3598, 3626 (ii).
- Queen *vs.* St. Louis *re* Curran Bridge Contracts (Ques.) 2406 (i).
- Remedial Act (Man.) B. 58 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) 6 m. h. to M. for 2°, 2797 (i).
- on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to M. for Com., 4508 (ii).
- in Com., 5209, 5308, 5573, 5586, 5750, 5961, 6660, 6195, 6329 (ii).
- St. Louis *vs.* The Queen, Claim *re* Curran Bridge (Ans.) 2177 (i).
- Saturday Sittings, on Amt. (Mr. *Ouimet*) 5157 (ii).
- Smith, Sir Donald, Visit to Winnipeg, on M. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) to adjn. Hse., 4278 (ii).
- Soulanges Canal, Geo. Goodwin's Contracts, on M. for Com. of Sup., 6568; (Amt.) 7118 (ii).
- SUPPLY:
- Canals—Income (Beauharnois) conc., 7149 (ii).
- Collection of Revenues (Post Office) 7134, 7137 (ii).

Edgar, Mr. J. D.—Continued.

- Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Ry. Co.'s B. 70 (Mr. *McKay*) on M. for 2°, 2370 (i).
- Victoria (B.C.) Electoral Lists B. 108 (Mr. *Prior*) on M. for 2°, 6845 (ii).
- Post Office, Contract and Sureties (Ques.) 2652 (i).
- Voters' Lists B. 87 (Mr. *Dickey*) in Com., 6603 (ii).
- Votes and Proceedings, omission of M. (remarks) 5216 (ii).
- Worsley, Lt.-Col., Charges against Lt.-Col. Murray, on M. for Com. of Sup., 7010 (ii).
- Edwards, Mr. W. C., Russell.**
- Budget, on The, 2464 (i).
- Ministerial Resignations, reorganization of Cabinet, on M. (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) to adjn. Hse., 60 (i).
- Remedial Act (Man.) B. 58 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) 6 m. h. to M. for 2°, 3946 (ii).
- Fairbairn, Mr. C., South Victoria.**
- Remedial Act (Man.) B. 58 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) in Com., 5021 (ii).
- Fauvel, Mr. W. Le B., Bonaventure.**
- Admiral, SS., Shipments by I.C.R. (Ques.) 3104.
- Cabinet Resignation, Mr. Angers (Ques.) 638 (i).
- Paspebiac Harbour, Improvements (Ques.) 3105.
- Featherston, Mr. J., Peel.**
- Brampton Postmaster, Appnmt. (Ques.) 888 (i).
- Cattle (Can.) in England, on Amt. (Mr. *Mulock*) to prop. Res. (Mr. *Foster*) 4770 (ii).
- Embargo by Great Britain on M. (Mr. *Davin*) to adjn. Hse. (remarks) 3267 (i).
- Experimental Farm, Live-stock Manager, Appnmt. (Ques.) 888 (i).
- Horses (Diseased) Shipped to Great Britain from Western States *via* Can. (Ques.) 3106 (i).
- Remedial Act (Man.) B. 58 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) in Com., 6216 (ii).
- St. John (N.B.) Winter Port, SS. Contract on M. for copy, 2717 (i).
- Ferguson, Mr. C. F., Leeds and Grenville.**
- Remedial Act (Man.) B. 58 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) in Com., 5432, 5891 (ii).
- Flint, Mr. T. B., Yarmouth.**
- Adulteration of Food, Drugs, &c. (Honey) Act Amt. B. 10 (Mr. *Sproule*) in Com., 1228 (i).
- Cape Breton Election, Expenditure of Money (remarks) 1534 (i).
- Customs Tariff (1894) Act Amt. B. 23 (Mr. *McMullen*) on M. for 2°, 4682 (ii).
- Fishing Licenses (Nfld.) Refund by Govt. (Ques.) 645 (i), 6114 (ii).
- Guevremont, J. B., Superannuation (M. for O.C. *) 711 (i).
- Insolvency B. 51 (Mr. *Martin*) on M. for 1°, 1116

Flint, Mr. T. B.—Continued.

- Man. and Nelson Valley Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 65 (Mr. *Macdowall*) in Com., 6629 (ii).
 Montreal Turnpike Trust Co., in Com. on Res. 6656 (ii).
 Prohibition of the Liquor Traffic (prop. Res.) 1648, 2180; (reply) 2222, 2228 (i).
 ——— Cost of Royal Commission (Ques.) 632 (i).
 Public Works, Govt. Liability for Labour B. 4 (Mr. *McLennan*) on M. for 2^o, 864 (i).
 Remedial Act (Man.) B. 58 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) 6 m. h. to M. for 2^o, 3949 (ii).
 ——— in Com., 5573, 5776, 5977, 6193, 6453 (ii).
 Restaurant of Hse., Clerical Imputations against Members *re* Intoxicants (remarks) 6326 (ii).
 Smith, Sir Donald, Visit to Winnipeg, on M. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) to adjn Hse., 4336 (ii).
 SUPPLY : on M. (Mr. *Foster*) for Com., 795 (i).
 Civil Government (Agriculture) 6958 (ii).
 Justice, Administration of (Supreme Court) 7050,
 Militia (contingencies) 7074; (Military Schools, &c.) 7071 (ii).
 Voters' Lists B. 87 (Mr. *Dickey*) in Com., 6617.

Forbes, Mr. F. G., Queen's, N.S.

- Address, on The, 401 (i).
 Bridgewater Harbour Master, Dismissal (Ques.) 2408 (i).
 Controller of Inland Rev., Position in Cabinet (Ques.) 823 (i).
 Customs Tariff (1894) Act Amt. B. 23 (Mr. *McMullen*) on M. for 2^o, 4682 (ii).
 Drill Shed, Halifax, Inspector (Ques.) 6817 (i).
 Liverpool Harbour, Dredging (M. for Ret.*) 3107 (i).
 London Custom-house, Charges against Officials (Ques.) 1677 (i).
 ——— (M. for Ret.*) 1889 (i).
 Man. and Nelson Valley Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 65 (Mr. *Macdowall*) in Com., 6634 (ii).
 Ministers during Mr. Mackenzie's regime, on M. for Com. of Sup., 7044 (ii).
 Remedial Act (Man.) B. 58 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) 6 m. h. to M. for 2^o, 3371 (i).
 St. John (N.B.) Winter Port, Ocean SS. Contracts, on M. for copy, 2710 (i).
 SUPPLY :
 Fisheries (Licenses to U.S. Vessels) 7100 (ii).
 Voters' Lists B. 87 (Mr. *Dickey*) in Com., 6619.

Foster, Hon. G. E., King's, N.B.

- Address in Ans. to His Ex.'s Speech (Res.) 5.
 ——— on The, 173 (i).
 ——— Reply from His Ex. (presented) 1254 (i).
 Adulteration of Food, Drugs, &c. (Honey) Act Amt. B. 10 (Mr. *Sproule*) in Com., 1023, 1225.
 Agriculture, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 2095 (i).
 Animal Contagious Diseases Act Amt. (B. 95) 1^o, 6113; 2^o m., 6822 (ii).

Foster, Hon. G. E.—Continued.

- Appointments and Superannuations (Ans.) 6510.
 Archives, Rep. of Archivist (presented) 4463 (ii).
 Assets of Dom., par Value on Investments (Ans.) 5053 (ii).
 Auditor General's Rep. on adjnmt. (Ans.) 289; (remarks) 605 (i).
 ——— Part I. (presented) 826 (i).
 ——— Part II. (presented) 1892 (i).
 Battenberg, Prince Henry, Address to Her Maj. on death (Res.) 601 (i).
 ——— Reply from Her Maj. to Address, 766 (i), 3597 (ii).
 Beatrice, H.R.H. Princess, Mess. of Condolence. *re* Death of Prince Henry of Battenberg (Res.) 602 (i).
 Behring Sea Claims Convention B. 100 (Mr. *Costigan*) (remarks) 6819 (ii).
 British Connection and Imperial Defence, on prop. Res. (Mr. *McNeill*) 124, 1214 (i).
 Bryson, Mr., late M.P., deceased (remarks) 346.
 BUDGET, The (Financial Stmtnt.) 961 (i).
 ——— (remarks) 711 (i).
 Business of the Hse. (M.) 144 (i).
 Butter and Cheese, Preferential Duty (Ans.) 5055 (ii).
 ——— U.S. Exports as Can. (Ans.) 5052 (ii).
 Cabinet Crisis, alleged (remarks) 1255 (i).
 ——— Reorganization (Ans.) 640, 641 (i).
 ——— Resignation, Mr. Angers (Ans.) 638 (i).
 Can. Militia, increased Defences (remarks) 1255 (i).
 Cattle (American) Transit through Can. (M. for O.C., &c.) 720 (i).
 ——— Shipments to Eng. (remarks) 3816 (ii).
 ——— (Can.) Exclusion from Great Britain (remarks) 4467 (ii).
 ——— (Can.) in England (prop. Res.) 4686; agreed to on div., 4781 (ii).
 Centennial Exhibition, Can. Commissioners' Expenditure (Ans.) 5054 (ii).
 Central Experimental Farm, Hay Sales (Ans.) 2651 (i).
 Cheese (Govt.) in Store (Ans.) 1025 (i).
 ——— Manufactured in P.E.I., Quantity, Disposition, &c. (Ans.) 6504 (ii).
 ——— Unsold on Govt. Account (Ans.) 6116 (ii).
 Chignecto Marine Transport Ry. Co.'s Preferential Mortgage Bonds (Ans.) 2006 (i).
 Civil Service Act Amt. (B. 97) 1^o, 6499 (ii).
 Commissioner on Sweating System, Appnmt. (Ans.) 1621 (i).
 Controller of Inland Rev., Position in Cabinet (Ans.) 647, 823 (i).
 Creameries in N.W.T., Money Grant, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 2664 (i).
 Customs Tariff (1894) Act Amt. B. 23 (Mr. *McMullen*) on M. for 2^o, 4681 (ii).
 Customs Act Amt. (B. 105) Res. conc. in and 1^o of B., 6819 (ii).

Foster, Hon. G. E.—Continued.

- Dairy Products Act (1893) Amt. (B. 67) 1°, 1996.
 Debates, Official Rep., Sel. Com. (M.) 601 (i).
 ——— inserting Tabulated Stmnts. (remarks) 2010 (i).
 Debenture and Loan Companies (B. 93) 1°*, 5343.
 Defence of Dom. (prop. Res.) 2230 (i).
 ——— Order for Com., on objection (remarks) 6826 (ii).
 ——— in Com. on Res., 6901, 6936 (ii).
 Deptl. Employees, O. C.'s *re* Payment (Ans.) 2650 (i).
 Detective Corporations and Mercantile Agencies B. 11 (Mr. *Sproule*) on M. for 2°, 4619 (ii).
 Dewdney, Lieut.-Gov., and late Election in B.C. (Ans.) 638 (i).
 Drainage on Ry. Co.'s Properties B. 3 (Mr. *Casey*) on M. for 2°, 631 (i).
 Election Literaturz, Distribution by Govt. (remarks) 6768 (ii).
 Elections since Jan., 1893, Districts and Candidates (Ans.) 1614 (i).
 Exhibition in N.W.T., Unpaid Claims (remarks) 608 (i).
 Estimates, The, Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 687 (i).
 ——— Suppl. (Ans.) 3815, 4654, 5343 (ii).
 Failures (Commercial) in Ont. and Que. (Ans.) 1446 (i).
 Farmers, &c., in Can. (Census, 1891) Number (Ans.) 1861 (i).
 Foreign Relations to the Empire, *re* Mr. McNeill's Res. (M.) 893 (i).
 Foresters, Supreme Court of Independent, B. 29 (Mr. *McGillivray*) on M. for Com., 1861 (i).
 Govt. Business (remarks) 1016 (i).
 ——— precedence on Thursdays (prop. M.) 1123, 1129 (i).
 ——— Mondays, on prop. M. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 4264 (ii).
 ——— Mondays and Thursdays, on M. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 4464 (ii).
 Hamilton, Lt.-Col., Investigation *re*, on M. for Com. of Sup., 7028 (ii).
 Harbour Commissioners, Montreal, in Com. on Res., 6828 (ii).
 High Commissioner, Ret. respecting (Ans.) 1515.
 Horses (Diseased) Shipped to Great Britain from Western States *via* Can. (Ans.) 3106 (i).
 Interest B. 8 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 632, 1246.
 International Exhibition, prop. (remarks) 6876, 6898 (ii).
 Internal Economy Commission, Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 346 (i).
 Interprovincial Bridge, Nepean Point (Ans.) 1625.
 Library, Joint Com., Mess. to Senate (M.) 888 (i).
 Little Metis Bay, Harbour of Refuge, on Order for Ret. (remarks) 3657 (ii).
 Live Stock Exclusion B., Imperial Parlt. (remarks) 2173 (i).

Foster, Hon. G. E.—Continued.

- Man. Schools Question, Mess. from His Ex., (presented) 892 (i).
 Members' Indemnity and Accountant (remarks) 7110 (ii).
 Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 346, 687, 892, 1254 (i).
 Ministerial Resignations, on M. (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) to adjn. Hse., 9 (i).
 ——— Cabinet as reconstructed, *ca* M. (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) to adjn. Hse., 92 (i).
 ——— Cor., &c., with Premier (Ans.) 647 (i).
 Montreal Gazette, Payments for Advertising (Ans.) 3634 (ii).
 ——— Harbour Commissioners' Loan (prop. Res.) 4254 (ii).
 ——— Port, Proceedings at Conference *re* Traffic, on M. for copy, 4585 (ii).
 ——— Turnpike Trust Debentures (prop. Res.) 2229 (i), 6626; in Com. on Res., 6639; (B. 107) 1°*, 6831; on 3°, 7112 (ii).
 Morning Sittings (M.) 6767 (ii).
 Northumberland Straits, Expend. *re* Borings (Ans.) 644 (i).
 ——— Map *re* Borings (Ans.) 3100 (i).
 Ocean SS. Subsidies Act Amt. B. 106 (Mr. *Ives*) in Com., 6985 (ii).
 Personal Explanation *re* Mr. McShane's alleged Disqualification, 471 (i).
 Printing, Joint Com., Mess. to Sen. (M.) 887 (i).
 ——— Papers between Dom. Govt. and Man. (remarks) 1892 (i).
 Private Bills Pets., Extension of Time (M.) 524.
 Privilege, Ques. of (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) communicating O. C. to Newspapers (remarks) 825.
 Prohibition, Cost of Royal Commission (Ans.) 632 (i).
 Public Accounts of Can. Rep. (presented) 289 (i).
 ——— Com., Meetings (remarks) 1551, 1678 (i).
 Public Moneys invested in certain Securities (Ans.) 1870 (i).
 Public Works, Govt. Liability for Labour B. 4 (Mr. *McLennan*) on Sen. Amts. 6959 (ii).
 Quebec North Shore Ry. Subsidy, 1884 (Ans.) 1622 (i).
 Remedial Act (Man.) B. 58 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) 6 m. h. to M. for 2°, 3472 (i).
 ——— Distribution of copies to Press (remarks) 1890 (i).
 ——— precedence for 2° (M.) 2095 (i).
 ——— Vote (remarks) 3668 (ii).
 ——— length of deb. (remarks) 3670 (ii).
 ——— (explanation) 3726 (ii).
 ——— on M. (Mr. *McNeill*) that Com. rise, 4933.
 ——— in Com., 5876, 5969, 6289, 6468.
 Saturday Sittings, on Amt. (Mr. *Ouimet*) 5140 (ii).
 Select Standing Committees (prop. Res.) 5 (i).
 ——— Com. to prepare Lists (M.) 601 (i).
 ——— Rep. of Sel. Com. (Lists presented) 882 (i).

Foster, Hon. G. E.—Continued.

- Senate and House of Commons Act Amt. (B. 111) Res. prop., 6979; 1st of B., 6980 (ii).
 — Deductions for non-attendance (prop. Res.) 6818 (ii).
 Senatorial Appointments, Jan., 1896 (Ans.) 1024.
 Sessional Employees, non-Payment, on M. to adjn. Hse., 4915 (ii).
 Sheep Scab, Introduction from U.S. into N.W.T. (Ans.) 1029 (i).
 Superannuation (Civil Service) Abolition B. 19 (Mr. *McMullen*) on prop. M. for 2^d, 1663 (i).
 Superannuations in Dept. of Agriculture (Ans.) 1862 (i).
 SUPPLY: (Res. for Com.) 601, 766 (i).
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (N.W.T. Exhibition) 7141; (Man. Census) conc., 7165 (ii).
Canals—Capital (Lachine) conc., 7166. *Income* (Beauharnois) conc., 7150 (ii).
Civil Government (Customs) 7036; (Indian Affairs) 7031; (Post Office) 7032 (ii).
Collection of Revenues (Post Office) 7137, 7146 (ii).
Indians (Man. and N.W.T.) 7146 (ii).
Legislation (Senate) 7051 (ii).
Militia (Arms and Ammunition) 7053; (Drill Pay) 7069; (Military Stores, salaries, &c.) 7070 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (N.B.) 7090 (ii).
Railways—Capital (Gov. Gen.'s car "Victoria") 7076 (ii).
 Supply (B. 112) 1st, 7170 (ii).
 Sweating System, Appnt. of Commissioner (Ans.) 1621 (i).
 Tarte, J. L., Payments to by Pub. Depts., on M. for Stmt., 1451 (i).
 Territorial Exhibition, Rep. of Lieut.-Gov. N. W. T. (Ans.) 1449 (i).
 Three Rivers Harbour Commissioners (Ans.) 642.
 — Debentures (Ans.) 641 (i).
 Tunnel P. E. I. and Mainland, Borings (Ans.) 2012 (i).
 Tupper, Sir Charles, Official Status (Ans.) 640 (i).
 — Travelling at Govt. Expense, on M. (Mr. *Casey*) to adjn. Hse., 959 (i).
 Victoria (B.C.) Electoral District B. 108 (Mr. *Prior*) on M. for 2^d, 6849 (ii).
 Volunteers, 1837-38, Money or Land Grants (Ans.) 1025 (i).
 Voters' Lists, Cost of Revision since 1885 (Ans.) 824 (i).
 — Dom., Total Cost, &c. (Ans.) 1621 (i).
 — Montmagny, Cost of Preparation (Ans.) 1251 (i).
 — Richelieu County, Total Cost (Ans.) 1621.
Ways and Means (Res. for Com.) 601 (i); in Com. on Rea., 6664 (ii).
 Wheat Grading Frauds, Man. and N. W. T., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) for Sel. Com., 1047 (i).
 Worsley, Lt.-Col., Charges against Col. Murray, on M. for Com. of Sup., 7013 (ii).

Fraser, Mr. D. C., Guysborough.

- Bounties to Fishermen, Payments (Ques.) 4557 (ii).

Fraser, Mr. D. C.—Continued.

- Budget, on The, 2423 (i).
 Cape Breton Election, Expenditure of Money (remarks) 1520, 1644 (i).
 Customs Collector, Sudbury, Resignation (Ques.) 4557 (ii).
 Govt. Property in Moose Jaw, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 1472 (i).
 House of Commons (Issue of Writs) B. 16 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5110 (ii).
 Hudson's Bay Canal and Nav. Co.'s B. 52 (Mr. *Boyd*) on M. for Com., 4874 (ii).
 I. C. R., Contracts for Green Sand Castings, &c. (Ques.) 3105 (i).
 — Rates and Rebates (Ques.) 3102 (i).
 Lobster Regulations, Change *re* Close Season (Ques.) 5054 (ii).
 Man. and Nelson Valley Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 65 (Mr. *Davis*) in Com., 5095, 6629, 6770, 6796 (ii).
 Postmaster, Sudbury, Resignation (Ques.) 4556 (ii).
 Remedial Act (Man.) B. 58 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) 6 m. h. to M. for 2^d, 3585 (ii).
 — in Com., 4977, 5504, 5566, 5664, 5801, 5886, 6015, 6179, 6417 (ii).
 St. Peter's Canal (C.B.) Expenditure for 1895 (Ques.) 1870 (i).
 Saturday Sittings, on Amt. (Mr. *Quimet*) 5136 (ii).
 — on Amt. (Mr. *O'Brien*) 5187 (ii).
 Sessional Employees, non-Payment, on M. to adjn. Hse. (remarks) 4910 (ii).
 Whitehead Canal, Completion (Ques.) 1677 (i).

Frechette, Mr. L. J. C., Megantic.

- Remedial Act (Man.) B. 58 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) 6 m. h. to M. for 2^d, 3325 (i).

Fremont, Mr. J. J. T., Quebec County.

- Remedial Act (Man.) B. 58 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) in Com., 5227, 5419, 5437, 5852, 5998, 6007 (ii).

Geoffrion, Mr. C. A., Verchères.

- Remedial Act (Man.) B. 58 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) 6 m. h. to M. for 2^d, 2846 (i).
 Winding-Up Act Amt. (B. 68) 1st m., 2002 (i).

Gibson, Mr. W., Lincoln and Niagara.

- Adulteration of Food, Drugs, &c. (Honey) Act Amt. B. 10 (Mr. *Sproule*) in Com., 1226 (i).
 Carmuncock Postmaster, Appnt., &c. (Ques.) 5051 (ii).
 I. C. R., Employees, Rolling Stock, &c., on M. for Ret., 709 (i).
 Man. and Nelson Valley Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 65 (Mr. *Macdonnell*) in Com., 6636 (ii).
 Remedial Act (Man.) B. 58 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) in Com., 5724, 5911, 6042 (ii).
 Saturday Sittings, on Amt. (Mr. *Quimet*) 5149 (ii).
 Senate and House of Commons Act Amt. B. 111 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com. on Rea., 6980 (ii).

Gibson, Mr. W.—*Continued.*

Sessional Employees, non-Payment, on M. to adjn. Hse. (remarks) 4902 (ii).

Soulanges Canal, Geo. Goodwin's Contracts, on M. for Com. of Sup., 6665 (ii).

SUPPLY :

Canals—Income (Beauharnois) conc., 7157 (ii).

Collection of Revenues: (Railways, I.C.R.) 7088 (ii).

Militia (Arms and Ammunition) 7055 (ii).

Ocean and River Service (Dom. Steamers) 7100 (ii).

Public Works—Income: Buildings (N.B.) 7091.

Dredging, 7097. Roads and Bridges, 7097 (ii).

Welland Canal, Claims for alleged Damages (M. for Stunt. *) 1889 (i).

— Damages by Shipping (Ques.) 3816 (ii).

— Thorold Cement used in Building, &c. (Ques.) 3630 (ii).

Gillies, Mr. J. A., *Richmond, N.S.*

Fishery Commission (Joint) Can. and U.S. (Ques.) 5346 (ii).

Remedial Act (Man.) B. 58 (Sir Charles Tupper) on Amt. (Mr. Laurier) 6 m. h. to M. for 2°, 3798 (ii).

— in Com., 5798 (ii).

Saturday Sittings, on Amt. (Mr. Ouimet) 5151 (ii).

Gillmor, Mr. A. H., *Charlotte.*

Alien Labour Prohibition B. 24 (Mr. Taylor) on M. for 1°, 816 (i).

Girouard, Mr. T., *Two Mountains.*

Centennial Exhibition, Can. Commissioners' Expenditure (Ques.) 5054 (ii).

Fishways in North River, Terrebonne (Ques.) 4377, 5349 (ii).

Fort Francis Locks, Expenditure from 1874 to 1878 (Ques.) 5054 (ii).

Neebing Hotel, Purchase by Govt. (Ques.) 5054.

Remedial Act (Man.) B. 58 (Sir Charles Tupper) on Amt. (Mr. Laurier) 6 m. h. to M. for 2°, 3457 (i).

Tea, Coffee and Sugar Importations (Ques.) 1864.

Godbout, Mr. J., *Beauce.*

Wilson, Lt.-Col., R. C. A., Instructions *re* Visit to England (Ques.) 2003 (i).

Grandbois, Mr. P. E., *Temisconata.*

Remedial Act (Man.) B. 58 (Sir Charles Tupper) on Amt. (Mr. Laurier) 6 m. h. to M. for 2°, 3445 (i).

Grant, Sir J. A., *K. C. M. G.*, *Ottawa City.*

Address, on The, 456 (i).

British Connection and Imperial Defence, on prop. Res. (Mr. McNeill) 1211 (i).

Exhibition in N. W. T., Unpaid Accounts, on M. for Cor., 655 (i).

Hudson's Bay Canal and Nav. Co.'s B. 52 (Mr. Boyd) on M. for Com., 4839 (ii).

International Exhibition, prop. (remarks) 6895 (ii).

Grant, Sir J. A.—*Continued.*

Ottawa Gas Co.'s Unpaid Claims (M. for Ret. *) 3637 (ii).

Pontiac Pacific Junction Ry. Co.'s (B. 53) 1°, 1182 (i).

Remedial Act (Man.) B. 58 (Sir Charles Tupper) on Amt. (Mr. Laurier) 6 m. h. to M. for 2°, 4067 (ii).

— B. 58 in Com., 5989 (ii).

Superannuation Fund, Officers Contributing, Names, &c. (M. for Ret.) 1508 (i).

Yale and Cariboo Electoral Lists, on M. for copy, 3655 (ii).

Grieve, Mr. J. N., *North Perth.*

Agricultural Implements, Free Entry from U.S., on prop. Res. (Mr. McMillan) 680 (i).

Budget, on The, 2484 (i).

Butter and Cheese Manufactured in Can. (Ques.) 645 (i).

Carmuncock Postmaster, Appnt., &c. (Ques.) 5051 (ii).

Farmers, &c., in Can. (Census, 1891) Number (Ques.) 1861 (i).

Live Stock Exclusion B. Imperial Parlt. (remarks) 2172 (i).

Ministerial Resignations, Cor., &c., with Premier (Ques.) 646 (i).

Rogers, Robt., of Man., Amount due Govt. (Ques.) 822 (i).

Guay, Mr. P. M., *Lévis.*

Catholic Schools in the N. W., Letter from Clergy to Sir John Thompson (Ques.) 2408 (i).

Grande-Greve Postmaster, Resignation (Ques.) 1625 (i).

Guillet, Mr. G., *Northumberland, Ont.*

Prohibition of the Liquor Traffic, on prop. Res. (Amt.) 2214 (i).

Haggart, Hon. J. G., *South Lanark.*

Admiral, SS., Shipments by I. C. R. (Ans.) 3104.

Baie des Chaleurs Ry. (Ans.) 636 (i).

— Negotiations for Purchase (Ans.) 1447 (i).

Canal, Montreal to St. Johns, Survey (Ans.) 3634 (ii).

Cape Breton Ry., Hard-Pan Contracts (Ans.) 637 (i).

— Rock, &c., Excavated (Ans.) 1862, 3100 (i).

— Sims & Slater Contract (Ans.) 2004 (i).

Curran Bridge, original Estimate of Costs, &c. (Ans.) 5348 (ii).

Drainage on Ry. Co.'s Properties B. 3 (Mr. Casey) on M. for 2°, 621 (i).

Fort Francis Locks, Expenditure from 1874 to 1878 (Ans.) 5054 (ii).

Freight Rates on Ry. Trunk Lines, Classification (Ans.) 3815 (ii).

Galop Rapids, Contract Price, &c. (Ans.) 6118 (ii).

Govt. Engineers, Surveys on probable Canals (remarks) 3471 (ii).

Haggart, Hon. J. G.—Continued.

- Govt. Rys. Act Amt. (B. 88) 1st, 4659 (ii).
 Govt. Ry. Cars for Officials (Ans.) 4379, 5051 (ii).
 Harris Property, St. John (N.B.) Govt. Purchase for I. C. R. purposes (Ans.) 2410 (i), 5347 (ii).
 Hudson's Bay Canal and Nav. Co.'s B. 52 (Mr. *Boyd*) on M. for Com., 4866 (ii).
 I. C. R., Contracts for Green Sand Castings, &c. (Ans.) 3105 (i).
 ——— Employees, Rolling Stock, &c., on M. for Ret., 708 (i).
 ——— Officials in Municipal Elections (Ans.) 2004 (i).
 ——— Rates and Rebates (Ans.) 3102 (i).
 ——— Workshops at Rivière du Loup, Apprentices (Ans.) 1446 (i).
 Interprovincial Bridge, Nepean Point, on M. for Cor., 5080 (ii).
 Irrigation in N.W.T., Legislation respecting (remarks) 4597 (ii).
 Man. and Nelson Valley Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 65 (Mr. *Macdowall*) in Com., 5088, 6631 (ii).
 Neebing Hotel, Purchase by Govt. (Ans.) 5054.
 Niagara Central Ry., Application for Subsidies (Ans.) 6508 (ii).
 P. E. I. Ry., Branch Lines (prop. Res.) 6876 (ii).
 Poupore, W. J. Contracts with Govt. (Ans.) 2176 (i) 6506 (ii).
 Private Cars, Official, Haulage on Rys. (Ans.) 4379, 5051 (ii).
 Public Works, Govt. Liability for Labour B. 4 (Mr. *McLennan*) on M. for 2^o, 868 (i).
 Ry. Act Amt. (B. 90) 1st*, 5050; 2^o m., 6943 (ii).
 Ry. Employees and Passengers Safety B. 2 (Mr. *Casey*) on M. for 2^o, 929; on M. to ref. to Com. on Rys., 940 (i).
 Ry. Freight Rates, on adjnmt. (remarks) 3111 (i).
 Ry. Return Fare Tickets B. 6 (Mr. *McLennan*) on M. for 2^o, 2372 (i).
 Ry. and Canals, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 1254 (i).
 Rapide Plat and Soulanges Canal, Mr. Poupore's Joint Contracts, Assignment (Ans.) 6506 (ii).
 Remedial Act (Man.) B. 58 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) 6 m. h. to M. for 2^o, 3757 (ii).
 St. Charles Branch Ry., Estimated Cost (Ans.) 5348, 6119 (ii).
 St. Peter's Canal (C.B.) Expenditure for 1895 (Ans.) 1870 (i).
 Saturday Sittings, on Amt. (Mr. *O'Brien*) 5203.
 Sheik's Island Dam, Lease of Water Power (Ans.) 6120 (ii).
 Soulanges Canal, Geo. Goodwin's Contracts, on M. for Com. of Sup., 6578 (ii).
 ——— Sections 4, 5, 6, 7, Contractor's Claims (Ans.) 2005 (i).
 Subsidies to Rys. (prop. Res.) 6871 (ii).

Haggart, Hon. J. G.—Continued.

SUPPLY:

- Canals—*Capital* (Lachine) 7143. *Income* (Beauhar-
 nois) 7077, conc., 7149, 7152; (Deep Waterways
 Commission) 7080; (Rideau, land damages) 7077;
 (St. Peter's) 7078 (ii).
Collection of Revenues: Canals (Cornwall) 7088;
 (Railways, I. C. R.) 7087 (ii).
Public Works—Capital: Harbours and Rivers
 (Que.) 7085 (ii).
Railways—Capital (Gov. Gen.'s car "Victoria")
 7076 (ii).
 Tay Canal, Claims for Land Damages (Ans.)
 2177 (i).
 ——— Cost of Maintenance, &c. (Ans.) 1865 (i),
 6116 (ii).
 ——— Original and Estimated Cost, &c. (Ans.)
 5348 (ii).
 ——— Revenue and Expenditure (Ans.) 1867 (i).
 ——— Tolls Collected, 1895, &c. (Ans.) 5346, 6116.
 Tupper, Sir Charles, Bart., Offices and Salary
 since 1883 (Ans.) 888 (i).
 ——— Travelling at Govt. Expense (Ans.) 891 (i).
 Welland Canal., Damages by Shipping (remarks)
 3816 (ii).
 ——— Thorold Cement used in Building, &c.
 (Ans.) 3631 (ii).
 Wellington Bridge, Lachine Canal, Cost of Con-
 struction (Ans.) 6118 (ii).

Haslam, Mr. A., Vancouver Island.

- Customs Duties Paid in B. C. (Ques.) 3107 (i).
 Hudson's Bay Canal and Nav. Co.'s B. 52 (Mr.
Boyd) on M. for Com., 4872 (ii).
 Remedial Act (Man.) B. 58 (Sir *Charles Tupper*)
 on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to M. for Com.,
 4552 (ii).
 ——— in Com., 6491 (ii).

Hazen, Mr. J. D., St. John, N.B., City and Co.

- British American Coal and Transportation Co.'s
 incorp. (B. 76) 1st*, 2640 (i).
 Can. Jockey Club's B. 48 (Mr. *Tisdale*) Com. to
 sit during Session (M.) 2532; in Com., 2646 (i).
 Cattle (American) Transit through Can., on M.
 for O.C., 723 (i).
 Customs Returns, Preparation by Collectors (re-
 marks) 712 (i).
 Ministerial Resignations, Cabinet as recon-
 structed, on M. (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) to adjn.
 Hse., 105 (i).
 Parliament, Duration of, on M. (Mr. *Edgar*) to
 adjn. Hse., 3622 (ii).
 Remedial Act (Man.) B. 58 (Sir *Charles Tupper*)
 in Com., 5587 (ii).
 St. John (N.B.) Winter Port, Ocean S.S. Contract
 (M. for copy) 2670 (i).
 Steamship Subsidies and Ocean Mail Service, &c.
 (Quea.) 821 (i).
 SUPPLY: on M. (Mr. *Foster*) for Com., 791 (i).

Henderson, Mr. D., *Haltou.*

- Budget, on The, 1968 (i).
 Lindsay, Bobcaygeon and Pontypool Ry. Co.'s (B. 27) 1st, 958 (i).
 Remedial Act (Man.) B. 58 (Sir Charles Tupper) in Com., 5392, 5455, 5678, 5800 (ii).

Hughes, Mr. W. H., *North Middlesex.*

- Hamilton, Lt.-Col., Investigation *re*, on M. for Com. of Sup., 7022 (ii).
 Lindsay, Bobcaygeon and Pontypool Ry. Co.'s B. 27 (Mr. Fairbairn) on M. for Com., 1860 (i).
 Remedial Act (Man.) B. 58 (Sir Charles Tupper) on Amt. (Mr. Laurier) 6 m. h. to M. for 2^o, 4220 (ii).
 ——— in Com., 5285, 6332, 6428 (ii).

SUPPLY :

- Militia* (Military Schools, &c.) 7072 (ii).

Ingram, Mr. A. B., *East Elgin.*

- Alien Labour Prohibition B. 24 (Mr. Taylor) on M. for 1^o, 815 (i).
 Can. and Michigan Bridge and Tunnel Co.'s (B. 42) 1st, 958; in Com., 2127 (i).
 Public Works, Govt. Liability for Labour B. 4 (Mr. McLennan) on M. for 2^o, 875 (i).
 Remedial Act (Man.) B. 58 (Sir Charles Tupper) in Com., 5023, 5296, 6365 (ii).
 Ry. Employees and Passengers Safety B. 2 (Mr. Casey) on M. for 2^o, 925; on M. to ref. to Com. on Rys., 944 (i).
 Senate and House of Commons Act Amt. B. 7 (Mr. Mulock) in Com. (Ry. Passes) 901 (i).
 Sweating System, Govt. action *re* A. W. Wright's Rep. (Ques.) 5052 (ii).

Innes, Mr. J., *South Wellington.*

- Adulteration of Food, Drugs, &c. (Honey) Act Amt. B. 10 (Mr. Sproule) in Com., 1017, 1223.
 Militia, Efficiency of Infantry (Ques.) 4556 (ii).
 Orders in Council, Number increasing Salaries (Ques.) 2650 (i).
 Remedial Act (Man.) B. 58 (Sir Charles Tupper) in Com., 5634 (ii).

Ives, Hon. W. B., *Sherbrooke.*

- Agricultural Implements, &c., Free Entry from U.S., on prop. Res. (Mr. McMillan) 671 (i).
 Cabinet Reorganization (Ans.) 821 (i).
 Chignecto Marine Transport Ry. Co.'s B. 75 (Mr. Powell) on M. to restore to Order Paper, 4644.
 Chinese Immigration (Ans.) 1183 (i).
 Flour and Wheat, Imports for Consumption (Ans.) 2651 (i).
 Imports from Australia and New Zealand (Ans.) 1679 (i).
 International Exhibition, prop. (remarks) 6880 (ii).
 Montreal Port, Proceedings at Conference *re* Traffic, on M. for copy, 4573 (ii).
 Montreal Turnpike Trust Debentures, in Com. on Res. (Mr. Foster) 6653 (ii).

Ives, Hon. W. B.—Continued.

- Ocean SS. Subsidy, France and Belgium (prop. Res.) 2230 (i); in Com. on Res., 6658; (B. 106) 1st, 6831 (ii).
 Pulp Wood, Imposition of Export Duty (Ans.) 5052 (ii).
 Remedial Act (Man.) B. 58 (Sir Charles Tupper) on Amt. (Mr. Laurier) 6 m. h. to M. for 2^o, 2893 (i).
 ——— on M. (Mr. McNeill) that Com. rise, 4941.
 ——— in Com., 5037, 5900, 6189 (ii).
 St. John (N.B.) Winter Port, Ocean SS. Contract, on M. for copy, 2705 (i).
 Saturday Sittings, on Amt. (Mr. Ouimet) 5127 (ii).
 Steamship Subsidies and Mail Service, &c. (Ans.) 822 (i).
 SUPPLY : on M. (Mr. Foster) for Com., 801 (i).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Liverpool and St. John) 7098; (St. John and Digby) 7099 (ii).
 Trade and Commerce Rep. (presented) 1346 (i).

Jeannotte, Mr. H., *L'Assomption.*

- Banking Act Amt. (B. 12) 1^o, 435 (i); 2^o m., 4657 (ii).
 Fishways on North River (Ques.) 5349 (ii).
 Remedial Act (Man.) B. 58 (Sir Charles Tupper) on Amt. (Mr. Laurier) 6 m. h. to M. for 2^o, 3223 (i).
 ——— in Com., 5595, 6371 (ii).
 Tobacco, Raw Leaf, Importations (Ques.) 637 (i).

Joncas, Mr. L. Z., *Gaspé.*

- Baie des Chaleurs Ry. (Ques.) 636 (i).
 ——— Purchase by Govt. (M. for Ret. *) 1888 (i).
 Gaspé Basin and Grand Greve Mail Service (Ques.) 639 (i).
 Paspébiac Harbour of Refuge (Ques.) 1027 (i).
 ——— (M. for Ret.) 2342 (i).
 ——— Piers and Breakwaters (Ques.) 636 (i).
 ——— Winter Port (Ques.) 639 (i).
 Remedial Act (Man.) B. 58 (Sir Charles Tupper) on Amt. (Mr. Laurier) 6 m. h. to M. for 2^o, 3172 (ii).
 ——— in Com., 5559, 5834 (ii).
 Ste. Anne des Monts Mail Service (Ques.) 639 (i).

Kaulbach, Mr. C. E., *Lunenburg.*

- Newfoundland Bait Act, Refund for Can. Licenses (Ques.) 1252 (i).
 Public Works, Govt. Liability for Labour B. 4 (Mr. McLennan) on M. for 2^o, 859 (i).

Kenny, Mr. T. E., *Halifax.*

- Address, on The, 243 (i).
 Remedial Act (Man.) B. 58 (Sir Charles Tupper) on Amt. (Mr. Laurier) 6 m. h. to M. for 2^o, 3394 (i).
 Unparliamentary Language (explanation) 279; withdn., 288 (i).

Lachapelle, Mr. S., Hochelaga.

- Montreal Island Belt Line Ry. Co.'s (B. 56) 1^o*, 1510 (i).
 — (B. 72) 1^o*, 2096 (i).
 Prohibition of the Liquor Traffic, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Flint*) 2206 (i).
 Remedial Act (Man.) B. 58 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) 6 m. h. to M. for 2^o, 3211 (i).
 South Shore Suburban Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 36) 1^o*, 958 (i).

Landerkin, Mr. G., South Grey.

- Address, on The, 308 (i).
 Adjutant General, Superannuation, &c. (Ques.) 6505 (ii).
 Alien Labour Prohibition B. 24 (Mr. *Taylor*) on M. for 1^o, 817 (i).
 Benda and Ry. Station Mail Service (Ques.) 2178.
 Bridgewater Harbour Master, Dismissal (Ques.) 2408 (i).
 Cabinet Crisis, alleged (remarks) 1255 (i).
 Cattle (American) Transit through Can., on adjnmt (remarks) 643 (i).
 — on M. for O. C., 741 (i).
 — (Can.) in England, on Amt. (Mr. *Mulock*) to prop. Res. (Mr. *Foster*) 4765 (ii).
 — Shipments *via* U.S. Ports (Ques.) 892 (i).
 — Embargo by Great Britain, on M. (Mr. *Davin*) to adju. Hse. (remarks) 3263 (i).
 — Shipments to Eng. (remarks) 3816 (ii).
 Conspiracies and Combinations in Restraint of Trade B. 12 (Mr. *Sproule*) on M. for 1^o, 30 (i).
 Curran Bridge, Original Estimate of Cost, &c. (Ques.) 5348 (ii).
 — St. Louis *vs.* Crown (Ques.) 5348 (ii).
 — Suit against St. Louis (Ques.) 5348 (ii).
 Davison, Samuel, Customs Frauds at Toronto (Ques.) 3103 (i).
 Debates, Official Rep., inserting Tabulated Stmtns. (remarks) 2010 (i).
 Dixon, Capt., 63rd Batt., Complaint against (Ques.) 6505 (ii).
 Fishing Licensees, County of Lennox (Ques.) 889.
 Galops Rapids, Contract Price, &c. (Ques.) 6118.
 Harris Property, St. John, Purchase by Govt. (Ques.) 5347 (ii).
 House of Commons (Issue of Writs) B. 16 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5119 (ii).
 Hudson's Bay Canal and Nav. Co.'s B. 52 (Mr. *Boyd*) on Amt. (Mr. *Macdonald*, *Huron*) to M. for Com., 4894 (ii).
 Langevin Block, Estimated Cost (Ques.) 6119 (ii).
 Little Rapids Lock, Cost of Construction (Ques.) 6118 (ii).
 Macpherson, Lt.-Col., Superannuation (Ques.) 2339 (i).
 Peterborough Customs Collector (Ques.) 635 (i).
 Post Office (Branch) Crown St., Quebec (Ques.) 5347 (ii).

Landerkin, Mr. G.—Continued.

- Remedial Act (Man.) B. 58 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) in Com., 5737, 6402 (ii).
 Returns Ordered in 1894, non-production (Ques.) 822 (i).
 — Number presented (Ques.) 1026 (i).
 St. Charles Branch Ry., Estimated Cost (Ques.) 5348, 6119 (ii).
 St. Louis *vs.* The Queen, Claim, *re* Curran Bridge, (Ques.) 2177 (i).
 — Award by Supreme Court (Ques.) 6505 (ii).
 Senatorial Appointments, Jan., 1896 (Ques.) 1024
 Tay Canal, Original and Estimated Cost, &c. (Ques.) 5348 (ii).
 Wellington Bridges, Lachine Canal, Cost of Construction (Ques.) 6118 (ii).

Langelier, Mr. F., Centre Quebec.

- Alert*, Str., Sale and Amount realized (Ques.) 644
 — (M. for Cor.*) 2370 (i).
 Chambly Canal, Vessels through from '92 to '95 (M. for Ret.*) 2370 (i).
 Fillion, Philias, alleged Appropriation of Govt. Property (Ques.) 1868 (i).
 Magdalen Islands Mail Service (Ques.) 1865 (i).
 Pictou and Magdalen Islands bi-weekly Mail (Ques.) 1866 (i).
 Remedial Act (Man.) B. 58 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) 6 m. h. to M. for 2^o, 2960
 — in Com., 5547, 5564, 5840, 5847, 5868, 5877, 5981, 5996, 6085, 6180 (ii).
 St. Laurent Wharf—Philias Fillion (Ques.) 1868.
Stanley, Str., Magdalen Islands Mail Service (Ques.) 1866 (i).
 Three Rivers Harbour Commissioners (Ques.) 641
 — Debentures (Ques.) 641 (i).

Langevin, Hon., Sir H., K.C.M.G., Three Rivers.

- British Connection and Imperial Defence, on prop. Res. (Mr. *McNeill*) 1295 (i).
 Remedial Act (Man.) B. 58 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) 6 m. h. to M. for 2^o, 2918 (i).
 — in Com., 5557, 5884 (i).

LaRivière, Mr. A. A. C., Provencher.

- Address, on The, on M. to adju. Hse. (remarks) 594 (i).
 Debates, Official Rep., 1st Rep. of Com. (presented) 814 (i).
 — 2nd Rep. of Com. (presented) 1774 (i).
 Man. Schools Question, Papers respecting (M. for Ret.*) 853 (i).
 "McCarthy Act," Claims under (M. for Ret.) 826.
 Red River Ry. Bridge at Emerson (M. for O.C.*) 3108 (i).
 Remedial Act (Man.) B. 58 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) 6 m. h. to M. for 2^o, 4084 (ii).
 — in Com., 5048, 5266, 5426, 5562-5577, 5847, 5995-6006, 6384-6393, 6462 (ii).
 Voters' Lists B. 87 (Mr. *Dickey*) in Com., 6604 (ii).

Laurier, Hon. W., East Quebec.

- Address, on The, 160 (i).
 — on M. to adjn. Hse. (remarks) 590 (i).
 Amyot, Mr., late M.P., deceased (remarks) 4890.
 Atlantic Fast Service and Pacific Cable (M. for Cor.) 1087 (i).
 British Connection and Imperial Defence, on prop. Res. (Mr. *McNeill*) 1214 (i).
 Bryson, Mr., late M. P., deceased (remarks) 347 (i).
 Cattle (American) Transit through Can., on M. for O.C., 721 (i).
 Chignecto Marine Transport Ry. Co.'s B. 59 (Mr. *Powell*) on M. for 2^d, 2128 (i).
 Connolly, N. K. and M., Crown's Claim *re* Judgment (Ques.) 1449 (i).
 Controllers as Privy Councillors (M. for O.C., &c.) 1065 (i).
 Debates, Official Rep., inserting Tabulated Stmnts. (remarks) 2009 (i).
 Defence of the Dom., on Order for prop. Res., on objection (remarks) 6827 (ii).
 — in Com. on Res., 6827 (ii).
 Denison, Lt.-Col., late M.P., deceased (remarks) 6511 (ii).
 Disallowance of Man. Act (Ques.) 6115 (ii).
 Drainage on Ry. Co.'s Properties B. 3 (Mr. *Cusey*) on M. for 2^d, 631 (i).
 Election Literature, Distribution by Govt., 6769.
 Exhibition in N.W.T., Unpaid Claims (remarks) 609 (i).
 Good Friday, Sitting of the Hse. (remarks) 4917.
 Govt. Business, on M. to adjn. (remarks) 29 (i).
 — (remarks) 1017, 1087 (i).
 — precedence on Thursdays, on prop. M. (Mr. *Foster*) 1123, 1125 (i).
 — Mondays and Thursdays, on M. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 4464 (ii).
 Govt. Property in Moose Jaw, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 1469 (i).
 Hamilton, Lt.-Col., Investigation *re*, on M. for Com. of Sup., 7029 (ii).
 Hudson's Bay Canal and Nav. Co.'s B. 52 (Mr. *Boyd*) on appeal from Chair (remarks) 4790 (ii).
 Internal Economy Commission (remarks) 288 (i).
 International Exhibition, prop. (remarks) 6881 (ii).
 Interprovincial Bridge, Nepuan Point, on M. for Cor., 5080 (ii).
 Man. Schools, Conference with Mr. Greenway (remarks) 3273 (i).
 — Govt. Commission to Man. (remarks) 4375.
 — Papers respecting (Ques.) 893 (i).
 — Telegram from: Mr. Greenway (remarks) 3111 (i).
 — Winnipeg Commission (remarks) 5343 (ii).
 Ministerial Resignations, on M. (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) to adjn. Hse., 14 (i).
 Reorganization of Cabinet, on M. (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) to adjn. Hse., 31, 68, 71 (i).
Modus Vivendi (Treaty, 1888) Withdrawal (M. for Cor.) 1064 (i).

Laurier, Hon. W.—Continued.

- Montreal Port. Proceedings at Conference *re* Traffic, on M. for copy, 4587 (ii).
 Ocean SS. Service (France and Belgium) in Com. on Res., 6659 (ii).
 Order, Ques. of (Mr. *Landerkin*) 246 (i).
 — in Com. on Remedial Act (obstruction) (Mr. *Sproule*) 4962 (ii).
 Printing Papers between Dom. and Man. Govt. (M.) 1891 (i).
 Privilege, Ques. of (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) communicating O. C. to Newspapers (remarks) 825.
 Remedial Act (Man.) B. 58 (Mr. *Dickey*) on M. for 1st, 1514 (i).
 — on M. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) for 2^d, 2736; (Amt.) 6 m. h., 2759 (i); neg. (Y. 91, N. 115) 4250 (ii).
 — in Com., 5408, 5424, 5517, 5566, 5691, 5966, 6284, 6459 (ii).
 — Distribution of copies to Press (remarks) 1890 (i).
 — Vote (remarks) length of deb., 3670 (ii).
 Restaurant of Hse., Clerical Imputations against Members *re* Intoxicants (remarks) 6325 (ii).
 Saturday Sittings, on prop. M. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 5124 (ii).
 — on Amt. (Mr. *Quimet*) 5127, 5139 (ii).
 Sessional Employees, non-Payment, on M. to adjn. Hse. (remarks) 4902 (ii).
 Shortis, Valentine, commutation of Death Sentence, on M. for Ret., 838 (i).
 — on Prorogation (remarks) 7178 (ii).
 SUPPLY :
 Canals—Capital (Lachine) 7143 (ii).
 Unparliamentary Language (remarks) 279 (i).
 Victoria (B.C.) Electoral District B. 108 (Mr. *Prior*) on M. for 2^d, 6847 (ii).
 Voters' Lists B. 87 (Mr. *Dickey*) on M. for 2^d, 6594 (ii).
 Wheat Grading Frauds, Man. and N.W.T., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) for Sel. Com., 1048 (i).
Lavergne, Mr. J., Drummond and Arthabaska.
 Arthabaskaville and St. Paul de Chester Mail Contractor, Complaints, &c. (Ques.) 5055 (ii).
 Bounty to Fishing Schooner *Pioneer* (Ques.) 1184.
 Gov. General, ref. to in deb. (remarks) 4259 (i).
 Govt. Business, precedence on Mondays, on prop. M. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 4259 (ii).
 — Thursdays, on prop. M. (Mr. *Foster*) 1158.
 Remedial Act (Man.) B. 58 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) 6 m. h. to M. for 2^d, 2865 (i).
 — in Com., 5859 (ii).
 St. Johns (P.Q.) Assistant Harbour Master Appmt. (Ques.) 2341 (i).
 Saturday Sittings, on Amt. (Mr. *Quimet*) 5148 (ii).
 Seed Grain to Alberta Settlers, Distribution (Ques.) 2341 (i).
 SUPPLY :
 Canals—Income (Beaubarnois) conc., 7163 (ii).

Lavergne, Mr. J.—Continued.

Yamaska Bridge, Subsidy for Repairs, &c., on M. for Ret., 5060 (ii).

Leduc, Mr. J. H., Nicolet.

Three Rivers Weights and Measures Inspector (Ques.) 641, 823 (i).

Legris, Mr. J. H., Maskinonge.

Budget, on The, 2013 (i).

Houde, Leandre, Emplmt. by Govt. (Ques.) 1622 (i).

Remedial Act (Man.) B. 58 (Sir Charles Tupper) on Amt. (Mr. Laurier) 6 m. h. to M. for 2^d, 4050 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Militia (Arms and Ammunition) 7063 (ii).

Voters' Lists for Dom., Total Cost, &c. (Ques.) 1621 (i).

Lepine, Mr. A. T., East Montreal.

International Exhibition, prop. (remarks) 6896 (ii)

Labour on Public Works, Working Day (B. 13) 1st, 31 (i).

Sessional Employees, non-Payment, on M. to adjn. Hse. (remarks) 4909 (ii).

Sweating System, Action of Govt. *re* A. W. Wright's Rep. (Ques.) 5052 (ii).

Lister, Mr. J. F., West Lambton.

Adulteration of Food, Drugs, &c. (Honey) Act Amt. B. 10 (Mr. Sproule) in Com., 1230 (i).

Budget, on The, 1800 (i).

Can. Jockey Club's B. 48 (Mr. Tisdale) in Com., 2640 (i).

Cattle Embargo by Great Britain, on M. (Mr. Davin) to adjn. Hse. (remarks) 3251 (i).

Chamberlain, Chas., commutation of Sentence, on M. for O. C., 1493 (i).

Chignecto Marine Transport Ry. Co.'s B. 75 (Mr. Powell) on M. for 2^d, 3092 (i); on M. to restore to Order Paper, 4630 (ii).

Columbia River, Improved Navigation, Engineer's Rep., on M. for Ret., 5072 (ii).

Defence of the Dom., in Com. on Res., 6933 (ii).

Detective Corporations and Mercantile Agencies B. 11 (Mr. Sproule) on M. for 2^d, 2400 (i).

Hamilton, Lt.-Col., Investigation *re*, on M. for Com. of Sup., 7025 (ii).

High Commissioner's Duties in London, on M. for Ret., 701 (i).

Hudson's Bay Canal and Nav. Co.'s B. 52 (Mr. Boyd) on M. for Com., 4841 (ii).

Independence of Parliament B. 9 (Mr. Mulock) on M. for 2^d, 2384 (i).

Interest B. 8 (Mr. Mulock) on M. for 2^d, 1236 (i).

Man. and Nelson Valley Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 65 (Mr. Davin) in Com., 5088, 6800 (ii).

Masson, Mr., ex-M.P., Appamt. as Judge (remarks) 6961 (ii).

Lister, Mr. J. F.—Continued.

Militia Grievances, Col. Hamilton, Military College, &c., on M. (Mr. Mulock) to adjn. Hse., 6733 (ii).

Ministerial Resignations, Reorganization of Cabinet, on M. (Sir Adolphe Caron) to adjn. Hse., 48 (i).

Order, Ques. of (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 4335 (ii).

Ry. Act Amt. B. 90 (Mr. Huggart) on M. for 2^d, 6943 (ii).

Remedial Act (Man.) B. 58 (Sir Charles Tupper) on M. to adjn. deb., 4222 (ii).

— on M. to adjn. deb. on Mr. McCarthy's Amt., 4374 (ii).

— in Com., 6971, 6486 (ii).

Sessional Employees, non-Payment, on M. to adjn. Hse. (remarks) 4904 (ii).

Soulanges Canal, Geo. Goodwin's Claims, on M. for Com. of Sup., 6944 (ii).

Unleavened Bread, Importations, Free Entry, (Ques.) 6119 (ii).

Macdonald, Mr. A. C., King's, P. E. I.

Dairy Stations in P. E. I., Supervision by Govt. (Ques.) 824 (i).

Macdonald, Mr. P., East Huron.

Address, on The, 435 (i).

Binding Twine, Output of Kingston Penitentiary (Ques.) 4652 (ii).

Budget, on The, 1608, 1679 (i).

Cattle Embargo by Great Britain, on M. (Mr. Davin) to adjn. Hse. (remarks) 3269 (i).

Hudson's Bay Canal and Nav. Co.'s B. 52 (Mr. Boyd) on M. for Com., 4876 (Amt.) 6 m. h., 4882 (ii).

Militia Grievances, Col. Hamilton, Military College, &c., on M. (Mr. Mulock) to adjn. Hse., 6752 (ii).

Order (Ques. of) Saturday Sittings, 5156 (ii).

Queen *vs* Larkin, Connolly & Co., Sale of Plant, &c. (Ques.) 3635 (i).

Remedial Act (Man.) B. 58 (Sir Charles Tupper) in Com., 3939, 5607, 6009, 6108, 6333, 6356 (ii).

Restaurant of Hse., Clerical Imputations against Members *re* Intoxicants (remarks) 6327 (ii).

Saturday Sittings, on Amt. (Mr. Ouimet) 5137 (ii)

Macdonell, Mr. G. H., Alyona.

Hudson Bay and Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 31) 1st, 958 (i).

Remedial Act (Man.) B. 58 (Sir Charles Tupper) in Com., 6197, 6211 (ii).

Saw-logs, Exports (remarks) 1891 (i).

Macdowall, Mr. D. H., Saskatchewan.

Detective Corporations and Mercantile Agencies B. 11 (Mr. Sproule) on M. for 2^d, 4613 (ii).

Exhibition in N. W. T., Unpaid Claims (remarks) 611 (i).

House of Commons (Issue of Writs) B. 16 (Mr. McCarthy) in Com., 5112 (ii).

Macdowall, Mr. D. H.—*Continued.*

- Hudson's Bay Canal and Nav. Co.'s B. 52 (Mr. Boyd) on M. for Com., 4836 (ii).
 Insolvency B. 51 (Mr. Martin) on M. for F., 1120
 Man. and Nelson Valley Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 65)
 in Com., 628 (ii).
 Ry. Employers and Passengers Safety B. 2 (Mr. Casan) on M. to ref. to Ry. Com., 947 (i).
 Remedial Act (Man.) B. 58 (Sir Charles Tupper)
 in Com., 5923, 6478 (ii).
 Saturday Sittings, on Amt. (Mr. O'Brien) 5183 (ii).

Maclean, Mr. W. F., *East York, Ont.*

- Insolvency B. 51 (Mr. Martin) on M. for F., 1114.
 Interest B. 8 (Mr. Mulock) on M. for F., 1239 (i).
 Ry. Employers Safety (B. 46) 1*, 958 (i).
 Remedial Act (Man.) B. 58 (Sir Charles Tupper)
 on Amt. (Mr. Laurier) 6 m. h. to M. for F.,
 3292 (i).
 — in Com., 5436, 5473, 6486 (ii).

McAlister, Mr. J., *Restigouche.*

- Paspébiac Harbour of Refuge, on M. for Ret.,
 2352 (i).

McCarthy, Mr. D., *North Simcoe.*

- Dom. Elections Act Amt. (B. 14) 1*, 60 (i); 2
 m., 4624; (remarks) 6514, 6594 (ii).
 Govt. Business, precedence on Mondays, on prop.
 M. (Sir Charles Tupper) 4266 (ii).
 — on Amt. (Mr. Choquette) 4276 (ii).
 — Mondays and Thursdays, on M. (Sir
 Charles Tupper) 4465 (ii).
 Gov. Gen., ref. to in deb., on Ques. of Order (Sir
 Charles Tupper) 4279 (ii).
 House of Commons Act Amt. (B. 16) F., 61 (i); in
 Com., 5099 (ii).
 Internal Economy Commission, Papers re Dis-
 missal of R. J. Wicksteed (M. for copies*) 3108.
 Man. Schools, Commission to Winnipeg (Ques.)
 5208 (ii).
 Ministerial Resignations, Reorganization of Cabi-
 net, on M. (Sir Adolphe Casan) to adju. Hse.,
 88 (i).
 Montreal Turnpike Trust Debentures, in Com. on
 Res. (Mr. Foster) 6651 (ii).
 N.W.T. Act Amt. (B. 15) F., 61 (i).
 Order (Ques. of) in Com. on Remedial B., 5732,
 6459 (ii).
 — (Mr. Charlton) Saturday Sittings, on Amt.
 (Mr. Ouimet) 5131 (ii).
 Parliament, Duration of (Ques.) 3104 (i).
 Port Arthur District, Fishing Licenses (Ques.)
 6116 (ii).
 Remedial Act (Man.) B. 58 (Sir Charles Tupper)
 on Amt. (Mr. Laurier) 6 m. h. to M. for F.,
 3710 (ii).
 — on M. (Sir Charles Tupper) for Com., 4338
 (Amt.) 4370 (ii).
 — in Com., 5233, 5253-5275, 5297, 5349-5914,
 5530, 5563-5572, 5848, 5880, 5982, 6188, 6293,
 6340, 6356, 6399, 6466 (ii).

McCarthy, Mr. D.—*Continued.*

- Remedial Act (Man.) Appeal from Chairman's
 Ruling, in Com., 5734; Ruling sustained (Y.
 93, N. 25) 5736 (ii).
 — Papers re Winnipeg Commission, adju. of
 Hse. (M.) 6121 (ii).
 Saturday Sittings, on Amt. (Mr. Ouimet) 5186.
 — on Amt. (Mr. O'Brien) 5197 (ii).
 Smith, Sir Donald, Visit to Winnipeg (Ques.)
 2653 (i).
 — on M. (Sir Richard Cartwright) to adju.
 Hse., 4317 (ii).
 Soulanges Canal, Geo. Goodwin's Contracts, on
 M. for Com. of Sup., 6584 (ii).
 — on Amt. (Mr. Edgar) to M. for Com. of
 Sup., 7118 (ii).
 Tupper, R. L., Official Fishery Inspector, Com-
 plaints against (Ques.) 6507 (ii).
 Wicksteed, Richard J., Dismissal from House of
 Commons Service (M. for Cor.*) 3107 (i).

McDonald, Mr. J. A., *Victoria, N.S.*

- Cape Breton Election, Expenditure of Money
 (remarks) 1551 (i).
 Remedial Act (Man.) B. 58 (Sir Charles Tupper)
 in Com., 5628 (ii).

McDougall, Mr. H. F., *Cape Breton.*

- Budget, on The, 2096 (i).
 Can. Sealers, Duties on Stores exacted by Nfld.
 (Ques.) 5055 (ii).
 Cape Breton Election, Expenditure of Money
 (remarks) 1519 (i).
 — (Personal Explanation) 1544 (i).
 Loan Companies Debentures (B. 66) F*, 1859 (i).

McGregor, Mr. W., *North Essex.*

- Agricultural Implements, &c., Free Entry from
 U.S., on prop. Res. (Mr. McMillan) 668 (i).
 Can. and Michigan Bridge and Tunnel Co.'s B.
 42 (Mr. Ingram) in Com., 2128 (i).
 Can. Jockey Club's B. 48 (Mr. Tisdale) in Com.,
 2649 (i).
 Detective Corporations and Mercantile Agencies
 B. 11 (Mr. Sprout) on M. for F., 4618 (ii).
 Dredging at River Thames, Expenditures, on M.
 for Ret., 5085 (ii).
 Lake Erie and Detroit River Ry. Co.'s (B. 41)
 F*, 958 (i).
 SUPPLY:
 Canals—Income (Deep Waterways Commission)
 7081 (ii).
 Fisheries (Licenses to U. S. Vessels) 7103 (ii).

McGillivray, Mr. J. A., *North Ont.*

- Address in Ans. to His Ex.'s Speech (seconded)
 152 (i).
 Budget, on The, 2566, 2572 (i).

McGillivray, Mr. J. A.—*Continued.*

Creameries in N. W. T., Money Grant, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davies*) adjunt. of deb. (M.) agreed to (Y. 64, N. 25) 2670 (i).

Detective Corporations and Mercantile Agencies B. 11 (Mr. *Sproule*) on M. for 2^d, 2400 (i), 4616 (ii).

Foresters, Supreme Court, Independent Order incorp. Act Amt. (B. 29) 1st, 958 (i); M. for Com., 1861 (i).

Infantry Schools, non-coms. and Men admitted (Ques.) 6510 (ii).

Personal Explanation, Par. in Ottawa *Citizen* (remarks) 3814 (ii).

Railways (B. 91) 1st, 5050 (ii).

Remedial Act (Man.) B. 58 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) 6 m. h. to M. for 2^d, 4211 (ii).

— on M. to adjn. deb., 4239 (ii).

— in Com., 5841, 5957, 6494 (ii).

McInerney, Mr. G. V., *Kent, N.B.*

Budget, on The, 1384 (i).

Chignecto Marine Transport Ry. Co.'s (B. 59) 1st, 1775 (i).

— B. 75 (Mr. *Powell*) M. to restore to Order paper, 4627; agreed to (Y. 80, N. 63) 4649 (ii).

Female Offenders in N.B. (B. 78) 1st, 4686 (ii).

St. Lawrence and Ottawa Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. *McLeod*) 1st, 937 (i).

McIsaac, Mr. C. F., *Antigonish.*

Cape Breton Election, Expenditure of Money (remarks) 1547 (i).

Remedial Act (Man.) B. 58 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) 6 m. h. to M. for 2^d, 3778 (ii).

McKay, Mr. A., *Hamilton.*

Alien Labour Prohibition B. 24 (Mr. *Taylor*) on M. for 1st, 816 (i).

Hamilton Blast Furnace Co.'s incorp. (B. 69) 1st, 2096; 2^d m., 2174 (i).

International Radial Ry. Co.'s Act, Amt. (B. 63) 1st, 1775 (i).

Public Works, Govt. Liability for Labour B. 4 (Mr. *McLennan*) on M. for 2^d, 859 (i).

Remedial Act (Man.) B. 58 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) in Com., 6049 (ii).

Sessional Employees, non-Payment, on M. to adjn. Hse. (remarks) 4910 (ii).

Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Ry. Co.'s (B. 70) 1st, 2096; 2^d m., 2370 (i).

McLennan, Mr. R. R., *Glenegarry.*

Dairy Products Act Amt. (B. 5) 1st, 13 (i).

— (1893) Amt. B. 67 (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for 1st, 1997 (i).

Labour on Public Works, Govt. Liability (B. 4) 1st, 13; 2^d m., 835; ref. to Ry. Com., 882 (i); in Com., 4398 (ii).

Ry. Return Fare Tickets, Sale (B. 6) 1st, 13; 2^d m., 2371 (i).

McLeod, Mr. E., *St. John, N.B., City.*

Imperial Life Ins. Co. of Can. incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *Coutsworth*) on M. for 2^d, 2173 (i).

Order (Ques. of) in Com. on Remedial B., 5340.

Remedial Act (Man.) B. 58 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) 6 m. h. to M. for 2^d, 3296 (i).

— in Com., 5292, 5340, 5589, 6191, 6195, 6349.

St. Lawrence and Ottawa Ry. Co.'s (B. 25) in Com., 1812 (i).

McMillan, Mr. J., *South Huron.*

Address, on The, 333 (i).

Adulteration of Food, Drugs, &c. (Honey) Act Amt. B. 10 (Mr. *Sproule*) in Com., 1224 (i).

Agricultural Implements, &c., Free Entry from U.S. (prop. Res.) 666, 677 (i).

Animals Contagious Diseases Act Amt. B. 25 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 1825 (ii).

Budget, on The, 1352 (i).

Butter (Creamery) Exports to England (Ques.) 1617 (i).

— Shipments to England by Govt., Date of Sale (Ques.) 1622, (i).

Cattle (American) Transit through Can., on M. for O.C., 722 (i).

— (Can.) in England, on Amt. (Mr. *Mulock*) to prop. Res. (Mr. *Foster*) 4742 (ii).

— Embargo by Great Britain, on M. (Mr. *Davies*) to adjn. Hse. (remarks) 3249 (i).

Central Experimental Farm, Hay Sales (Ques.) 2651 (i).

Creameries in N.W.T., Money Grant, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davies*) 2667 (i).

Customs Tariff (1894) Act Amt. B. 23 (Mr. *McMullen*) on M. for 2^d, 4677 (ii).

Dairy Products Act (1893) Amt. B. 67 (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for 1st, 2001 (i).

Drainage on Ry. Co.'s Properties B. 3 (Mr. *Cosway*) on M. for 2^d, 630 (i).

Experimental Farm, Ottawa, Expenditure (M. for Stunt.) 1085 (i).

Imports and Exports, 1891 to 1896, Rebates (M. for Stunts. *) 3636 (ii).

— Value, Duty and Rebates (M. for Ret. *) 3636 (ii).

Masson, Mr., ex-M.P., Appunt. as Judge (remarks) 6975 (ii).

Remedial Act (Man.) B. 58 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) in Com., 5461, 5632 (ii).

Saturday Sitings, on Amt. (Mr. *O'Brien*) 5195.

School Ordinance of N.W.T., Lt.-Gov.'s Rep. (M. for copies *) 3636 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Experimental Farms) 7141.

McMullen, Mr. J., *North Wellington.*

Address, on The, 206, 217 (i).

Adulteration of Food, Drugs, &c. (Honey) B. 10 (Mr. *Sproule*) on M. for 2^d, 1660 (i).

Agricultural Implements, Free Entry from U.S., on prop. Res. (Mr. *McMillan*) 669 (i).

McMullen, Mr. J.—Continued.

- Animals Contagious Diseases Act Amt. B. 95
(Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 6825 (ii).
- Auditor General's Rep. (remarks) 607 (i).
- B. C. Express Co., Contracts, &c. (M. for Ret. *)
1888 (i).
- Mail Service, Ret. *re* (inquiry) 3048 (i).
- Southern Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, on M. for O.
C., 3663 (ii).
- Binding Twine, Sales and Moneys Unpaid (Ques.)
4652, 5050, 5122 (ii).
- Budget, on The, 2120, 2129 (i).
- Cape Breton Election, Expenditure of Money
(remarks) 1539 (i).
- Cattle (American) Transit through Can., on M.
for O.C., 720, 750 (i).
- (Can.) in England, on Amt. (Mr. *Mulock*)
to prop. Res. (Mr. *Foster*) 4748 (ii).
- Embargo by Great Britain on M. to adjn.
Hse. (Mr. *Davin*) (remarks) 3245 (i).
- Cheese Unsold on Govt. Account (Ques.) 6115.
- Chignecto Marine Transport Ry. Co.'s B. 75 (Mr.
Powell) on M. for 2^d, 3088 (i).
- on M. to re tor to Order Paper, 4635 (ii).
- Corn Grinding for Human Food (Ques.) 823 (i).
- (M. for Ret. *) 1087 (i).
- Customs Act (1894) Amt. (B. 23) 1st, 643 (i) 2^d m.,
4676 (ii).
- Employees at Toronto, Number, &c. (Ques.)
4380 (ii).
- and Inland Revenue Deptl. Acts, prop.
Amt. (Mr. *Wood*) on M. to introd., 4651 (ii).
- Service, Toronto, Appmnts. and Salaries
(M. for Ret. *) 711 (i).
- Dairy Products Act (1893) Amt. B. 67 (Mr.
Foster) on M. for 1st, 1997 (i).
- Debates, Official Rep., inserting Tabulated
Stmnts. (remarks) 2007 (i).
- Defence of Dom., in Com. on Res. (Mr. *Foster*)
6931 (ii).
- Detective Corporations and Mercantile Agencies
B. 11 (Mr. *Sproule*) on M. for 2^d, 4622 (ii).
- Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 14 (Mr. *McCarthy*)
on M. for 2^d, 4626 (ii).
- Drainage on Ry. Co.'s Properties B. 3 (Mr.
Casby) on M. for 2^d, 628 (i).
- Exhibition in N.W.T., Unpaid Accounts, on M.
for Cor., 665 (i).
- Galops Rapids, Contract Price, &c. (Ques.) 6118.
- Govt. Business, precedence on Mondays, on prop.
M. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 4256 (ii).
- Govt. Dredge at Port Stanley, Sale (Ques.) 3633
(ii).
- Harris Property, St. John, Purchase by Govt.
(Ques.) 5346 (ii).
- House of Commons (Issue of Writs) B. 16 (Mr.
McCarthy) in Com., 5120 (ii).
- I. C. R., Employees, Rolling Stock, &c. (M. for
Ret.) 707 (i).

McMullen, Mr. J.—Continued.

- Lake Erie Fisheries, Nets and Licenses (Ques.)
3633 (ii).
- Little Rapids Lock, Cost of Construction (Ques.)
6118 (ii).
- Live Stock Exclusion B., Imperial Parlt.
(remarks) 2173 (i).
- Mail Service in B.C., Tenders, &c. (M. for Ret. *)
1888 (i).
- Man. and Nelson Valley Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 65
(Mr. *Davis*) in Com., 5091, 6634, 6787 (ii).
- Montreal Customs, Officials Salaries, &c. (M. for
Ret. *) 3637 (ii).
- Turnpike Trust Debentures, in Com. on
Res. (Mr. *Foster*), 6657 (ii).
- Niagara Central Ry., Application for Subsidies
(Ques.) 6508 (ii).
- Ocean SS. Service (France and Belgium) in Com.
on Res., 6661 (ii).
- Orders in Council, Number increasing Salaries
(Ques.) 2650 (i).
- Public Works, Govt. Liability for Labour B. 4
(Mr. *McLennan*) on M. for 2^d, 876 (i).
- Remedial Act (Man.) B. 58 (Sir *Charles Tupper*)
Vote (remarks) 3669 (ii).
- on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to M. for Com.,
4468 (ii).
- in Com., 5514, 5536, 5740, 5904, 6023, 6273,
6342 (ii).
- Restaurant of Hse., Clerical Imputations against
Members, *re* Intoxicants (remarks) 6327 (ii).
- Rifles for Volunteers, Improved (Ques.) 3632 (ii).
- St. Charles Branch Ry., Estimated Cost (Ques.)
6119 (ii).
- St. Louis, E., Claims against Govt. *re* Curran
Bridge (Ques.) 3631 (ii).
- Scrip for Scouts during N. W. Rebellion, on
prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 3640 (ii).
- Senate and House of Commons Act. Amt. B. 7
(Mr. *Mulock*) in Com. (Ry. Passes) 894 (i).
- Act Amt. B. 111 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com. on
Res., 6979 (ii).
- Sessional Employees, non-Payment, on M. to adjn.
Hse. (remarks) 4914 (ii).
- Solicitor Gen. (ex.) Priv. Sec. (Ques.) 4378 (ii).
- Spence's Bridge and Kamloops (B.C.) Mail Con-
tract (Ques.) 1186 (i).
- Soulanges Canal, Geo. Goodwin's Contracts, on
M. for Com. of Sup., 6840 (ii).
- Sugar Imports, ex SS. *Cynthia* (Ques.) 3629,
5345 (ii).
- Superannuation (Civil Service) Abolition (B. 19)
1st*, 216; 2^d m., 1661, 1663 (i); deb. rsmd.,
neg. (Y. 61, N. 72) 4655 (ii).
- Fund, Contributions by Deptl. Employees
(M. for Ret. *) 711, 288; (inquiry) 3047 (i).
- SUPPLY :
- Arts, Agriculture, &c. (N. W. T. Exhibition)
7142 (ii).

McMullen, Mr. J.—Continued.

SUPPLY—Continued.

- Canals—Capital* (Lachine) conc., 7169. *Income* (Beauharnois) conc., 7160; (Deep Waterways Commission) 7080 (ii).
Civil Government (Agriculture) 6953, 7030; (Public Works) 7041 (ii).
Collection of Revenues (Electric Light Inspection) 7133; (Post Office) 7136 (ii).
Indians (Man. and N. W. T.) 7146 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Seed Grain, distribution, N.W.T.) 7126 (ii).
Railways—Capital (Gov. Gen.'s car "Victoria") 7077 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 7096 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Repairs, Furniture, &c. (Ottawa) 7095 (ii).
 Voters' Lists B. 87 (Mr. *Dickey*) in Com., 6595, 6613 (ii).
 Wellington Bridges, Lachine Canal, Cost of Construction (Ques.) 6118 (ii).
 Worsley, Lt.-Col., Charges against Lt.-Col. Murray, on M. for Com. of Sup., 7014 (ii).

McNeill, Mr. A., North Bruce.

- Address, on The, 273; (personal explanation) 277 (i).
 Adulteration of Food, Drugs, &c. (Honey) Act Amt. B. 10 (Mr. *Sproule*) in Com., 1021, 1229.
 British Connection and Imperial Defence (prop. Res.) 1186 (i).
 Foreign Relations to the Empire (remarks) 892 (i).
 Govt. Business, precedence on Mondays, on Amt. (Mr. *Choquette*) 4270 (ii).
 Insolvency B. 51 (Mr. *Martin*) on M. for 1^o, 1120.
 Ministerial Resignations, reorganization of Cabinet, on M. (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) to adjn. Hse., 44 (i).
 Preferential Trade and Imperial Defence (prop. Res.) 4381, 4461 (ii).
 Public Works, Govt. Liability for Labour B. 4 (Mr. *McLennan*) on M. for 2^o, 878 (i).
 Remedial Act (Man.) B. 58 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) 6 m. h. to M. for 2^o, 4145.
 ——— on M. for Com., 4784 (ii).
 ——— (M.) Com. rise and rep., 4923; neg., 4944 (ii).
 ——— in Com., 4973, 5214, 5244, 5337, 5484, 5590, 5599, 5822, 5861, 5853, 5947, 6015, 6264, 6485 (ii).
 ——— Papers *re* Winnipeg Commission, on M. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to adjn. Hse., 6164 (ii).
 Ry. Employees and Safety Passengers B. 2 (Mr. *Casey*) on M to ref. to Ry. Com., 940 (i).
 Saturday Sitings, on Amt. (Mr. *Ouimet*) 5162; on Amt. (Mr. *O'Brien*) 5173 (ii).
 Senate and House of Commons Act Amt. B. 7 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com., (Ry. Passes) 900 (i).

McShane, Mr. J., Centre Montreal.

- Address, on The, 467; Disqualification denied, 467 (i).
 Barristers (Ont.) employed in Quebec Cases (Ques.) 5123 (ii).

McShane, Mr. J.—Continued.

- Battleford and Saskatoon Mail Contract, on M. for Com. of Sup., 7005 (ii).
 British Connection and Imperial Defence, on prop. Res. (Mr. *McNeill*) 1216 (i).
 Budget, on The, 2478 (i).
 Canal, Montreal to St Johns, Survey (Ques.) 3634 (ii).
 Cattle Embargo by Great Britain on M. (Mr. *Davin*) to adjn. Hse. (remarks) 3247 (i).
 Chinese Immigration (Ques.) 1182 (i).
 Dairy Products Act (1893) Amt. B. 67 (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for 1^o, 2000 (i).
 Hospital Dues, Abolition of Tonnage Tax (Ques.) 1619 (i).
 International Exhibition, prop. (remarks) 6877, 6900 (ii).
 Legal Fees, &c., Paid in Montreal and Quebec Districts (Ans.) 2651 (i).
 Letter Postage, Reduction (Ques.) 4556 (ii).
 Lévis Graving Dock and new Fast SS. Service (Ques.) 6817 (ii).
 Little Metis Bay Harbour of Refuge (M. for Cor., &c.) 4560 (ii).
 Mill Street, Montreal, Ownership (remarks) 6978.
 Montreal Harbour, Govt. Expenditure (Ques.) 1676 (i).
 ——— Port, Proceedings at Conference *re* Traffic (M. for copy, &c.) 4568 (ii).
 ——— Turnpike Trust Debentures B. 107 (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for 3^o, 7112 (ii).
 Rice Meal, Exports by Mount Royal Milling Co. (Ques.) 3634 (ii).
 Rifle Ranges, Montreal, &c., Repairs (Ques.) 4556.
 Sessional Employees, non-Payment, on M. to adjn. Hse. (remarks) 4903 (ii).

SUPPLY:

- Arts, Agriculture, &c.* (Experimental Farms) 7141 (ii).
Canals—Capital (Lachine) conc., 7166 *Income* (Deep Waterways Commission) 7082; (St. Peter's) 7078 (ii).
Civil Government (Agriculture) 6955; (Civil Service Examiners) 7034 (ii).
Collection of Revenues (Post Office) 7136 (ii).
Public Works—Capital: Harbours and Rivers (Que.) 7084 (ii).
 Theatrical Scenery, &c., Duties (Ques.) 4378 (ii).
 Unleavened Bread, Importations, Free Entry (Ques.) 6119 (ii).

Mara, Mr. J. A., Yale.

- Battleford and Saskatoon Mail Contract, on M. for Com. of Sup., 7001 (ii).
 B. C. Southern Ry Co.'s Subsidy, on M. for O.C., 3664 (ii).
 Columbia River, Improved Navigation, Engineer's Rep. (M. for Ret.) 5067 (ii).
 Customs Collections, Kootenay District (Ques.) 4558 (ii).
 ——— Duties Paid in B.C. (Ques.) 3107 (i).

Mara, Mr. J. A.—Continued.

- Duncan and Lardo Mining Districts, Engineer's Reps. (M. for Ret.) 5061 (ii).
 Gov. Gen., ref. to in deb., on Ques. of Order (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 4291 (ii).
 Mining Machinery, Free Entry by Provinces, Value (Ques.) 4558 (ii).
 Nelson and Fort Sheppard Ry. Co.'s (B. 26) 1st, 957 (i).
 Order, Ques. of (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com. on Remedial B. (ruling sustained) 5734, 5790 (ii).
 Remedial Act (Man.) B. 58 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) in Com. (remarks) 6227 (ii).

SUPPLY :

- Justice, Administration of* (Supreme Court) 7049 (ii)
 Voters' Lists B. 87 (Mr. *Dickey*) in Com., 6604 (ii).
 Yale and Cariboo Electoral District B. 109 (Mr. *Dickey*) on M. for 1st, 6869 (ii).
 ——— Lists, on M. for copy, 3653 (ii).
 ——— Nominations, on M. for Com. of Sup., 7645 (ii).

Martin, Mr. J., Winnipeg.

- Address, on The, 257 (i).
 Battleford and Saskatoon Mail Contract, on M. for Com. of Sup., 6992 (ii).
 B. C. Mail Service, Contracts, Expenditure, &c. (M. for Ret. *) 1888 (i).
 ——— Southern Ry. Co.'s Subsidy (M. for O. C.) 3658 (ii).
 Beer License in Neepawa, Man. (M. for Cor.) 1078 (i).
 Budget, on The, 2054 (i).
 Can. Jockey Club's B. 48 (Mr. *Tisdale*) in Com., 2646, 3048, 3279, 3514 (i); on Amts., 3628 (ii).
 Cattle (Can.) in England, on Amt. (Mr. *Mulock*) to prop. Res. (Mr. *Foster*) 4775 (ii).
 Census of N. W. T. taken by Mounted Police (M. for Ret.) 1502 (i).
 Chamberlain, Chas., commutation of Sentence (M. for O. C.) 1475, 1487 (i).
 Chignecto Marine Transport Ry. Co.'s B. 75 (Mr. *Powell*) on M. to restore to Order Paper, 4645 (ii).
 Columbia Exhibition, Ret. *re* (inquiry) 1892 (i).
 Columbia River, Improved Navigation, Engineer's Rep., on M. for Ret., 5068 (ii).
 Customs Tariff (1894) Act Amt. B. 23 (Mr. *McMullen*) on M. for 2nd, 4685 (ii).
 Dewdney, Lieut.-Gov., and late Election in B.C. (Ques.) 638 (i).
 Duncan and Lardo Mining Districts, Engineer's Reps., on M. for Ret., 5064 (ii).
 Exhibition in N. W. T., Unpaid Accounts (remarks) 610 (i).
 ——— (M. for Cor.) 648, 657 (i).
 Failures (Commercial) in Ont. and Que. (Ques.) 1446 (i).

Martin, Mr. J.—Continued.

- Fishing (Pound-net) Licenses in B. C. (Ques.) 820, 1624 (i).
 Freight Rates Commission, Cost (M. for Stmt. *) 3108 (i).
 Gov. Gen., ref. to in Deb., on Ques. of Order (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 4285 (ii).
 Govt. Business, precedence on Mondays, on prop. M. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 4268 (ii).
 Govt. Property in Moose Jaw, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 1460 (i).
 Hudson's Bay Canal and Nav. Co.'s B. 52 (Mr. *Boyd*) on M. for Com., 4788; on Amt. (Mr. *Macdonald*) 4882; in Com., 4897 (ii).
 Insolvency (B. 51) 1st, 1088, 1121 (i).
 ——— French copy (remarks) 4653 (ii).
 Interest B. 8 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2nd, 1240 (i).
 Little Métis Bay Harbour of Refuge, on Order for Ret. (remarks) 3657 (ii).
 Man. and Nelson Valley Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 65 (Mr. *Davis*) in Com., 5097, 6770 (ii).
 Man. Penitentiary, Land Purchases (Ques.) 3629.
 Man. Schools, Telegrams, &c., Sir Donald Smith and Mr. Greenway (Ques.) 3471 (i).
 N.W.T. Representation Act Amt. (B. 22) 1st, 524, 554 (i); 2nd m., 4671 (ii).
 ——— (Ques.) 5344 (ii).
 ——— Increased Representation Act Amt. B. 94 (Mr. *Daly*) on M. for 1st, 6112 (ii).
 Order (Ques. of) ref. to previous deb. objected to, 1454 (i).
 ——— unparliamentary Language, 1148 (i).
 ——— in Com. on Remedial B., 6272 (ii).
 Parliament, Duration of, on M. (Mr. *Edgar*) to adjn., 3616 (ii).
 Personal Explanation, Mr. Weldon's Vote on Mr. Turcotte's Disqualification, 1186 (i).
 Privilege (Ques. of) Members' Indemnity, 7109.
 Remedial Act (Man.) B. 58 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) 6 m. h. to M. for 2nd, 3013, 3572 (i).
 ——— in Com., 4785, 5372, 5449, 5476, 5543, 5558, 5661, 5788, 5847, 5869, 5885, 6011, 6021, 6173, 6272, 6361, 6475 (ii).
 ——— Papers *re* Winnipeg Commission, on M. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to adjn. Hse., 6155 (ii).
 Returns *re* N.W.T. and B.C. (inquiry) 6513 (ii).
 St. Andrew's Rapids, Improvements (M. for Cor.) 3643 (ii).
Sun Pedro, Removal of Wreck (Ques.) 821; (remarks) 2180 (i).
 Scrip for Scouts during N. W. Rebellion, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 3642 (ii).
 Sheik's Island Dam, Lease of Water Power (Ques.) 6120 (ii).
 Smith, Sir Donald, Visit to Winnipeg, on M. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) to adjn. Hse., 4285, 4297.
 SUPPLY :
Militia (Arms and Ammunition) 7057; (contingencies) 7074; (Drill Pay) 7068; (Military Schools, &c.) 7071 (ii).

Martin, Mr. J.—Continued.

SUPPLY—Continued.

- Govt. of N. W. T.* (Schools, &c.) 7129 (ii).
Justice, Administration of (Supreme Court) 7050.
Miscellaneous (Seed Grain, distribution, N.W.T.) 7127 (ii).
Railways—Capital (Gov. Gen.'s car "Victoria") 7076 (ii).
 Tupper, R. La Touche, Fishery Inspector, Charges against (Ques.) 6509 (ii).
 Victoria (B. C.) Electoral Lists B. 108 (Mr. *Prior*) on M. for 2°, 6845 (ii).
 Wheat Grading Frauds, Man. and N. W. T., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) for Sel. Com., 1034 (i).
 Wolseley (N. W. T.) Court-house, Completion and Cost (Ques.) 3629 (ii).
 Yale and Cariboo Electoral District B. 109 (Mr. *Dickey*) on M. for 1°, 6868 (ii).
 ——— Electoral Lists (M. for copy) 3652 (ii).
 ——— Nominations, on M. for Com. of Sup., 7045 (ii).

Masson, Mr. J., North Grey.

- Address, on The, 290 (i).
 Customs Tariff (1894) Act Amt. B. 23 (Mr. *McMullen*) on M. for 2°, 4683 (i).
 Detective Corporations and Mercantile Agencies B. 11 (Mr. *Sproule*) on M. for 2°, 4599 (ii).
 Guelph Junction Ry. Co.'s (B. 30) 1°, 958 (i).
 House of Commons (Issue of Writs) B. 16 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5099 (ii).
 Labour on Pub. Works, Govt. Liability B. 4 (Mr. *McLennan*) in Com., 4598 (ii).
 Remedial Act (Man.) B. 58 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) 6 m. h. to M. for 2°, 2879 (i).

Metcalf, Mr. J. H., Kingston.

- Remedial Act (Man.) B. 58 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) 6 m. h. to M. for 2°, 4135 (ii).

Mignault, Mr. R. M. S., Yamaska.

- I. C. R., Officials in Municipal Elections (Ques.) 2004 (i).
 Yamaska Lock, Tolls Collected, Cost of Repairs and Administration (Ques.) 6508 (ii).

Mills, Hon. D., Bothwell.

- Address, on The, 348 (i).
 Adulteration of Food, Drugs, &c. (Honey) B. 10 (Mr. *Sproule*) on M. for 3°, 1660 (i).
 Animals Contagious Diseases Act Amt. B. 95 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 6823 (ii).
 Beet-Root, Bounty*to encourage Production (M. for Ret. *) 1509 (i).
 Behring Sea Claims Convention B. 100 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 6822 (ii).
 British American Coal and Transportation Co.'s incorp. B. 76 (Mr. *Powell*) in Com., 6811 (ii).
 Budget, on The, 2633 (i).
 Can. Defence and Imperial Assistance (Ques.) 1254 (i).

Mills, Hon. D.—Continued.

- Cape Breton Elections, Expenditure of Money (remarks) 1631 (i).
 Cattle (American) Transit through Can., on M. for O.C., 722 (i).
 Census of N.W.T. taken by Mounted Police, on M. for Ret., 1505 (i).
 Controllers as Privy Councillors, on M. for O.C., &c., 1071 (i).
 Corn, &c., Imported by Distillers (M. for Ret. *) 1509 (i).
 Criminal Code (1892) Act Amt. B. 102 (Mr. *Dickey*) on M. for 1°, 6502 (ii).
 Drainage on Ry. Co.'s Properties B. 3 (Mr. *Casau*) on M. for 2°, 620 (i).
 Debates, Official Rep., inserting Tabulated Stmnts. (remarks) 2010 (i).
 Defence of Dom., in Com. on Res. (Mr. *Foster*) 6919 (ii).
 Dredging at River Thames, Expenditure, on M. for Ret., 5086 (ii).
 Exhibition in N.W.T., Unpaid Claims (remarks) 610 (i).
 ——— on M. for Cor., 656 (i).
 Govt. Business, precedence on Thursdays, on prop. M. (Mr. *Foster*) 1131 (i).
 ——— Mondays, on prop. M. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 4266 (ii).
 Govt. Property in Moose Jaw, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 1474 (i).
 Govt. Rys. Act Amt. B. 88 (Mr. *Haguart*) on M. for 1°, 4650 (ii).
 Grain Imports by Distillers (Ques.) 289 (i).
 High Commissioner's Duties in London, on M. for Ret., 694 (i).
 House of Commons (Issue of Writs) B. 16 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5100 (ii).
 Hudson's Bay Canal and Nav. Co.'s B. 52 (Mr. *Boyd*) on appeal from Speaker's ruling, 4791 (ii).
 I. C. R., Employees, Rolling Stock, &c., on M. for Ret., 711 (i).
 Imports from Australia and New Zealand (Ques.) 1678 (i).
 Interest B. 8 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 632, 1244 (i).
 Insolvency B. 51 (Mr. *Martin*) on M. for 1°, 1118.
 Irrigation in N.W.T., Legislation respecting (remarks) 4597 (ii).
 Lindsay, Bobcaygeon and Pontypool Ry. Co.'s B. 27 (Mr. *Fairbairn*) on M. for Com., 1860 (i).
 Man. Schools Case, Papers respecting (remarks) 813 (i).
 Militia Grievances, Col. Hamilton, Military College, &c., on M. (Mr. *Mulock*) to adjn. Hse., 6743 (ii).
 Ministerial Resignations, on M. (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) to adjn. Hse., 14 (i).
 ——— Reorganization of Cabinet, on M. (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) to adjn. Hse., 39 (i).

Mills, Hon. D.—Continued.

- Ministerial Resignations, Cabinet as reconstructed, on M. (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) to adjn. Hse., 99 (i).
- Montreal Harbour Commissioners, in Com. on Res., 6829 (ii).
- Port, Proceedings at Conference *re* Traffic, on M. for copy, 4588 (ii).
- Turnpike Trust Debentures, in Com. on Res. (Mr. *Foster*) 6654 (ii).
- Nelson and Fort Sheppard Ry. Co.'s B. 26 (Mr. *Mara*) in Com., 1812 (i).
- N. W. T. Representation Act Amt. B. 22 (Mr. *Martin*) on M. for 1°, 543 (i).
- Order, Ques. of (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) on Remedial B., 4355 (ii).
- (Mr. *Ouimet*) in Com. on Remedial B., 4922 (ii).
- Parliament, Duration of, on M. to adjn. Hse. (remarks) 3610 (ii).
- Prohibition of Liquor Traffic, on Amt. (Mr. *Guillet*) adjnmt. of deb. (M.) 2224; agreed to (Y. 56, N. 47) 2228 (i).
- Public Works, Govt. Liability for Labour B. 4 (Mr. *McLennan*) on M. for 2°, 879 (i).
- Remedial Act (Man.) B. 58 (Mr. *Dickey*) on M. for 1°, 1514 (i).
- Distribution of copies to Press (remarks) 1889 (i).
- on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) 6 m. h. to M. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) for 2°, 3816 (ii).
- on M. for Com., 4339 (ii).
- on M. (Mr. *McNeill*) Com. rise and rep., 4937 (ii).
- in Com., 5030, 5208, 5238, 5258, 5352, 5540, 5561, 5647, 5867, 5994, 6008, 6064, 6091, 6178 (ii).
- Saturday Sittings, on Amt. (Mr. *Ouimet*) 5135 (ii).
- Shortis, Valentine, commutation of Death Sentence, on M. for Ret., 845 (i).
- Smith, Sir Donald, Visit to Winnipeg, on M. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) to adjn. Hse., 4277 (ii).
- Soulanges Canal, Geo. Goodwin's Contract, on M. for Com. of Sup., 7117 (ii).
- Superannuation, Civil Service, Abolition B. 19 (Mr. *McMullen*) on prop. M. for 2° (remarks) 1662 (i).
- SUPPLY: on M. (Mr. *Foster*) for Com., 769 (i).
- *Collection of Revenues* (Railways, I.C.R.) 7088 (ii).
- *Justice, Administration of* (Supreme Court) 7048.
- *Militia* (Arms and Ammunition) 7053 (ii).
- *Public Works Income: Buildings* (B.C.) 7094; (Que.) 7093. *Dredging*, 7097 (ii).
- Tarte, J. I., Payments to by Pub. Depts., on M. for Stmt., 1451 (i).
- Venezuelan Question, Maps on record in Library (remarks) 2006 (i).
- Walpole Island, Lease or Sale of Marsh (Ques.) 642 (i).
- (M. for Ret. *) 1889 (i).
- Winding-Up Act Amt. B. 68 (Mr. *Geoffrion*) 1°, 2002 (i).

Mills, Hon. D.—Continued.

- Yale and Cariboo Electoral District B. 109 (Mr. *Dickey*) on M. for 1°, 6870 (ii).

Mills, Mr. J. B., Annapolis.

- Budget, on The, 2614 (i).
- Man. and North-west Millers Association incorp. (B. 83) 1*, 3469 (ii).
- Order (Ques. of) in Com. on Remedial B., 5947.
- (Mr. *Ouimet*) in Com. on Remedial B. (ruling) 5895 (ii).

Moncrieff, Mr. G., East Lambton.

- Public Works, Govt. Liability for Labour B. 4 (Mr. *McLennan*) on M. for 2°, 877 (i).
- Remedial Act (Man.) B. 58 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) on 6 m. h. to M. for 2°, 2988 (i).
- in Com., 5931, 5991, 6190 (ii).

Monet, Mr. D., Napierville.

- Legal Fees, &c., Paid in Montreal and Quebec Districts (Ques.) 2651 (i).
- Remedial Act (Man.) B. 58 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) 6 m. h. to M. for 2°, 3338 (i).
- Voters' Lists, Cost of Revision since 1885 (Ques.) 824 (i).

Montague, Hon. W. H., Haldimand.

- Adulteration of Food, Drugs, &c. (Honey) Act Amt. B. 10 (Mr. *Sproule*) on M. for 2°, 955 (i).
- Animals Contagious Diseases Act Amt. B. 95 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 6824 (ii).
- Anonymous Letters *re* Ministerial Resignations (remarks) 66 (i).
- on Personal Explanation (Mr. *Wallace*) 22.
- Butter and Cheese Manufactured in Can. (Ans.) 646 (i).
- (Creamery) Exports to England (Ans.) 1617 (i).
- Shipments to England by Govt., Date of Sale (Ans.) 1623 (i).
- Can. Sheep scheduled by Great Britain (Ans.) 633.
- Cattle (American) Exports from St. John (remarks) 1515 (i).
- Shipments from Can. Ports (Ans.) 1618 (i).
- Transit through Can. (remarks) 643, 718 (i).
- on M. for O. C., 742 (i).
- (Can.) Shipments *via* U.S. Ports (Ans.) 892 (i).
- Cold Storage, Govt. Expenditure on Butter and Cheese (Ans.) 1619 (i).
- Dairy Stations in P.E.I., Supervision by Govt. (Ans.) 824 (i).
- Exhibition in N.W.T., Unpaid Accounts, on M. for Cor., 654 (i).
- Experimental Farm, Live-stock Manager, Appnmt. (Ans.) 888 (i).
- I. C. R., Employees, Rolling Stock, &c., on M. for Ret., 710 (i).

Montague, Hon. W. H.—Continued.

P. E. I. Cheese, Expense for Freight, &c. (Ans.) 6817 (ii).

Quarantine Regulations, Can. and U.S. (Ans.) 638 (i).

SUPPLY :

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Experimental Farms) 7141.

Civil Government (Agriculture) 653, 7030: (Civil Service Examiners) 7033 (ii).

Quarantine (Cattle Quarantine) 7052 (ii).

Mulock, Mr. W., North York, Ont.

Alien Labour Prohibition B. 24 (Mr. *Taylor*) on M. for 1°, 815 (i).

Banda and Ry. Station Mail Service (Ques.) 2178 (i).

Banking Act Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Jeanotte*) on M. for 2°, 4668 (ii).

Can. Militia, increased Defences (remarks) 1254.

Cape Breton Election, Expenditure of Money (remarks) 1536, 1638 (i).

Cattle (American) Transit through Can. (remarks) 642, 719 (i).

— on M. for O. C., 724 (i).

— Exclusion from Great Britain (remarks) 4467 (ii).

— on prop. Res. (Mr. *Foster*) 4691; (Amt.) 4720; neg. on div., 4781 (ii).

— Embargo by Great Britain, on M. (Mr. *Davin*) to adjn. Hse. (remarks) 3254 (i).

Chamberlain, Chas., commutation of Sentence (Ques.) 634 (i).

— on M. for O. C., 1478 (i).

Chignecto Marine Transport Ry. Co.'s B. 75 (Mr. *Powell*) on M. for 2°, 3082 (i).

Dairy Products Act (1893) Amt. B. 67 (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for 1°, 1999 (i).

Dom. Reformatory, Establishment and Expenditure (Ques.) 2174, 2652 (i).

Drainage on Ry. Co.'s Properties B. 3 (Mr. *Casey*) on M. for 2°, 622 (i).

Freight Rates on Ry. Trunk Lines, Classification (Ques.) 3815 (ii).

Gov. Gen., ref. to in deb., on Ques. of Order (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 4289 (ii).

Govt. Business, precedence on Thursdays, on prop. M. (Mr. *Foster*) 1151 (i).

Govt. Property in Moose Jaw, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 1461 (i).

Grain Standards, Rep. of Meeting in Winnipeg (remarks) 2007 (i).

Hamilton, Lt.-Col., Investigation *re*, on M. for Com. of Sup., 7017, 7123 (ii).

Hudson's Bay Canal and Nav. Co.'s incorp. B. 52 (Mr. *Boyd*) in Com., 5344 (ii).

Independence of Parliament (B. 9) 1°, 80; 2° m., 2372 (i)

Insolvency B. 51 (Mr. *Martin*) on M. for 1°, 1111.

Interest (B. 8) 1°, 13; 2° m., 631, 1247 (i).

Man. and Nelson Valley Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 65 (Mr. *Davis*) in Com., 5087 (ii).

Mulock, Mr. W.—Continued.

Masson, Mr., ex-M.P., Appunt. as Judge (remarks) 6971 (ii).

Military College, Kingston, Board of Visitors (remarks) 853 (i).

— Rep., omission in Ret. (remarks) 3048 (i).

— Recommendations (remarks) 4559, 4654 (ii).

— (Ques.) 4787 (ii).

Militia Grievances, Col. Hamilton, Military College, &c., adjunt. of Hse. (M.) 6679, 6762 (ii).

Ministerial Resignations, reorganization of Cabinet, on M. (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) to adjn. Hse., 44 (i).

— Cabinet as reconstructed, on M. (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) to adjn. Hse., 107 (i).

N.W.T. Representation Act Amt. B. 22 (Mr. *Martin*) on M. for 1°, 552 (i).

Ocean SS. Subsidies Act Amt. B. 106 (Mr. *Ives*) in Com., 6987 (ii).

Order, Ques. of (Mr. *Martin*) unparliamentary language, 1149 (i).

— (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to Remedial B., 4355 (ii).

Public Moneys invested in certain Securities (Ques.) 1869 (i).

Queen's Own Rifles, Investigation *re* Complaints (remarks) 6818 (ii).

Ry. Freight Rates, on adjnmt. (remarks) 3109 (i).

Remedial Act (Man.) B. 58 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) 6 m. h. to M. for 2°, 4187 (ii).

— on M. to adjn. deb., 4221 (ii).

— in Com., 5280, 5421, 5434, 5606, 5624, 5807, 5950, 6011, 6358, 6498 (ii).

Saturday Sitzings, on Amt. (Mr. *Ouimet*) 5132 (ii).

Senate and House of Commons (B. 7) 1°, 13; in Com., 894; M. to restore to Order Paper 1510 (i).

Sessional Employees, non-Payment, on M. to adjn. Hse. (remarks) 4906 (ii).

Sheik's Island Dam, Lease of Water Power (Ques.) 6120 (ii).

Shortis, Valentine, commutation of Death Sentence, on M. for Ret. (Amt.) 847 (i).

Smith, Sir Donald, Visit to Winnipeg on M. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) to adjn. Hse., 4289 (ii).

Soulanges Canal, Geo. Goodwin's Contract, on Amt. (Mr. *Edgar*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 7119.

SUPPLY: on M. (Mr. *Foster*) for Com., 779, 785.

Canals—Capital (Rideau) 7144. *Income* (Beauharnois) conc., 7153 (ii).

Dominion Lands—Capital (Surveys, &c.) 7139.

Collection of Revenues (Post Office) 7146 (ii).

Justice, Administration of (Supreme Court) 7047.

Tay Canal, Properties Expropriated by Govt. (M. for Strmt.) 1507 (i).

— Revenue and Expenditure (Ques.) 1867 (i).

Voters' Lists B. 87 (Mr. *Dickey*) in Com., 6606 (ii).

Worsley, Lt.-Col., Charges against Lt.-Col. Murray, on M. for Com. of Sup., 7011 (ii).

Northrup, Mr. W. B., East Hastings.

Address, on The, 416 (i).

Bay of Quinte Ry. Co.'s Amalgamation (B. 71)
1*, 2096 (i).

O'Brien, Mr. W. E., Muskoka.

Address, on The, 559 (i).

Cattle (Can.) in England, on Amt. (Mr. *Mulock*)
to prop. Res. (Mr. *Foster*) 4758 (ii).

Defence of Dom., in Com. on Res., 6906 (ii).

Hamilton, Lt.-Col., Investigation *re*, on M. for
Com. of Sup., 7019 (ii).

House of Commons (Issue of Writs) B. 16 (Mr.
McCarthy) in Com., 5101 (ii).

Illicit Still at Oka (Ques.) 2338 (i).

Lands to French Half-breeds in Man. and
N.W.T., &c. (Ques.) 3100 (i).

Militia Grievances, Col. Hamilton, Military Col-
lege, &c., on M. (Mr. *Mulock*) to adjn. Hse.,
6708 (ii).

Ministerial Resignations, reorganization of Cabi-
net, on M. (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) to adjn. Hse.,
51 (i).

Parliament, Duration of (Ques.) 3104 (i).

Personal Explanation, Imperial Appnmts. to
Military Service (remarks) 6978 (ii).

Preferential Trade and Imperial Defence, on
prop. Res. (Mr. *McNeill*) 4459 (ii).

Remedial Act (Man.) B. 58 (Sir *Charles Tupper*)
on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) 6 m. h. to M. for 2*,
3317 (i).

— on M. (Mr. *McNeill*) Com. rise and rep.,
4930 (ii).

— in Com., 5226, 5378, 5519, 5652, 5782, 5882,
6025, 6182, 6195, 6373 (ii).

— Papers *re* Winnipeg Commission, on M.
(Mr. *McCarthy*) to adjn. Hse., 6170 (ii).

Ry. Employees and Safety Passengers B. 2 (Mr.
Casey) on M. to ref. to Ry. Com., 942 (i).

Royal Can. Infantry and Imperial Govt. (Ques.)
1617 (i).

Saturday Sittings, on M. (Sir *Charles Tupper*)
5156; (Amt.) 5169; neg. (Y. 30, N. 96) 5205 (ii).

Shortis, Valentine, commutation of Death Sen-
tence (remarks) 847 (i).

SUPPLY :

Militia (Arms and Ammunition) 7055; (conting-
encies) 7073; (Military Schools, &c.) 7071 (ii).

Voters' Lists B. 87 (Mr. *Dickey*) in Com., 6602.

Ouimet, Hon. J. A., Laval.

Brampton Postmaster, Appamt. (Ans.) 888 (i).

Breakwaters and Piers in Prince County (P.E.I.)
on M. for Stmt., 2361 (i).

British American Coal and Transportation Co.
incorp. B. 76 (Mr. *Powell*) in Com., 6812 (ii).

Cascumpec Harbour, Rock Blasting (Ans.) 1253.

Civil Service List of Can. (presented) 289 (i).

Columbia River, Improved Navigation, En-
gineer's Rep., on M. for Ret., 5068 (ii).

Ouimet, Hon. J. A. — Continued.

Customs Tariff (1894) Act Amt. B. 23 (Mr.
McMullen) on M. for 2*, 4684 (ii).

Dom. Reformatory, Establishment and Expen-
diture (Ans.) 2175 (i).

Drainage on Ry. Co.'s Properties B. 3 (Mr.
Casey) on M. for 2*, 627 (i).

Dredging at River Thames, Expenditure, on M.
for Ret., 5086 (ii).

Drill Shed, Halifax, Inspector (Ans.) 6818 (ii).

Duncan and Lardo Mining Districts, Engineer's
Reps., on M. for Ret., 5064 (ii).

Fillion, Philius, alleged Appropriation of Govt.
Property (Ans.) 1868 (i).

Gas Contract, Govt. Buildings, Ottawa (Ans.)
3105 (i).

Gaspé Harbour Improvements (Ans.) 4378 (ii).

Goderich Harbour, Reps. *re* Piers and Break-
waters (Ans.) 2340 (i).

Govt. Business, precedence on Mondays, on Amt.
(Mr. *Choquette*) 4274 (ii).

Govt. Dredge at Port Stanley (Ans.) 3634 (ii).

Gov. Gen., ref. to in deb., on Ques. of Order (Sir
Charles Tupper) 4280 (ii).

Houde, Léandre, Emplmt. by Govt. (Ans.)
1622 (i).

House of Commons (Issue of Writs) B. 16 (Mr.
McCarthy) in Com., 5107 (ii).

Labour on Public Works, Govt. Liability, B. 4
(Mr. *McLennan*) in Com., 4598 (ii).

Langevin Block, Estimated Cost, &c. (Ans.) 6119.

Lévis Graving Dock and new Fast SS. Service
(Ans.) 6817 (ii).

Little Metis Bay Harbour of Refuge, on M. for
Cor., 4568 (ii).

Little Rapids Lock, Cost of Construction (Ans.)
6118 (ii).

Macpherson, Lt.-Col., Superannuation (Ans.)
2339 (i).

McKie's Pier (P.E.I.) Expenditure, &c. (Ans.)
1253 (i).

Mabou, Breakwater at Coal Mines, Payment for
Labour (Ans.) 2174 (i).

Magog Wharf, Govt. Purchase of Property (Ans.)
633, 820 (i).

— Govt. Aid (Ans.) 3635 (ii).

Mill Street, Montreal, Ownership (remarks) 6979.

Montreal Harbqur, Govt. Expenditure (Ans.)
1676 (i).

— Turnpike Trust Debentures, in Com. on
Res. (Mr. *Foster*) 6645 (ii).

Order (Ques. of) ref. to past deb., 4303, 4921, 5895.

Paspebiac Winter Port (Ans.) 639 (i).

— Harbour of Refuge (Ans.) 1027 (i).

— Piers and Breakwaters (Ans.) 636 (i).

— Improvements (Ans.) 3105 (i).

Picton, Govt. Rents, Arrears (Ans.) 891 (i).

— P.O., Purchase of Site (Ans.) 646, 891,
1251, 2339 (i).

Poupore, W. J., Contracts with Govt. (Ans.)
2176 (i).

Quimet, Hon. J. A.—Continued.

- Public Works, Govt. Liability for Labour B. 4 (Mr. *McLennan*) on M. for 2^o, 872 (i).
 ——— Deptl. Rep. (presented) 2337 (i).
 ——— Prince County (P.E.I.) on inquiry for Ret. (remarks) 4467 (ii).
 Returns Ordered in 1894, non-production (Ans.) 822 (i).
 ——— Number presented, &c. (Ans.) 1026 (i).
 ——— on inquiries (remarks) 6115 (ii).
 Remedial Act (Man.) B. 58 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to M. for Com., 4537.
 ——— in Com., 5040, 5209, 5440, 6178, 6358, 6468.
 Rimouski Wharf, Extension, Tenders (Ans.) 1029.
 St. Andrew's Rapids Improvements, on M. (Mr. *Martin*) for Cor., 3648 (ii).
 St. John River, Improved Navigation (Ans.) 892.
 St. Laurent Wharf, Repairs (Ans.) 1028 (i).
 ——— *Philias Fillion* (Ans.) 1868 (i).
 Saturday Sittings, on M. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) Amt., 5127; agreed to (Y. 91, N. 44) 5165 (ii).
 Senate and House of Commons Act Amt. B. 7 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com. (Ry. Passes) 895 (i).
 Smith, Sir Donald, Visit to Winnipeg, on M. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) to adjn. Hse., 4280 (ii).

SUPPLY:

- Canals—Capital* (Lachine) conc., 7167. *Income:* (St. Peter's) conc., 7164 (ii).
Civil Government (Public Works) 7037 (ii).
Public Works—Capital: Harbours and Rivers (Que.) 7086. *Income:* Buildings (B.C.) 7094; (Man.) 7094; (N.B.) 7089, 7145; (Que.) 7092. Dredging, 7097. Harbours and Rivers, 7095; (B.C.) 7096; (Ont.) 7096. Roads and Bridges, 7098 (ii).
 Three Rivers Harbour Commissioners (Ans.) 642.
 Tignish Breakwater, Engineer's Rep., on M. for copy, 1084 (i).
 ——— Inspection and Repairs (Ans.) 1253 (i).
 ——— *Pets. re Repairs* (Ans.) 2180 (i).
 ——— Surveys, &c. (Ans.) 634 (i).
 ——— Wharfage Dues (Ans.) 643 (i).
 Whitehead Canal (N.S.) Completion (Ans.) 1677.
 Wolseley (N.W.T.) Court-house, Completion and Cost (Ans.) 3629 (ii).
 Yamaska Lock, Tolls Collected, Cost of Repairs and Administration (Ans.) 6509 (ii).

Paterson, Mr. W., South Brant.

- Budget, on The, 1369 (i).
 Exhibition in N.W.T., Unpaid Claims (remarks) 611 (i).
 Govt. Business, precedence on Thursdays, on prop. M. (Mr. *Foster*) 1178 (i).
 Ministerial Resignations, Cabinet as reconstructed, on M. (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) to adjn. Hse., 127 (i).
 Remedial Act (Man.) B. 58 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) 6 m. h. to M. for 2^o, 4077 (ii).
 Remedial Act (Man.) B. 58 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) in Com., 4970, 5491, 5529, 5718, 5917, 6224, 6396 (ii).

Paterson, Mr. W.—Continued.

- SUPPLY: on M. (Mr. *Foster*) for Com., 807 (i).
 Victoria (B.C.) Electoral District B. 108 (Mr. *Prior*) on M. for 2^o, 6865 (ii).

Pelletier, Mr. L. C., Laprairie.

- Remedial Act (Man.) B. 58 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) 6 m. h. to M. for 2^o 3809 (ii).

Perry, Mr. S. F., Prince, P.E.I.

- Breakwaters and Piers in Prince County, Tenders, &c. (M. for Stmt.) 2354 (i).
 Budget, on The, 2151 (i).
 Cascumpec Harbour, Rock Blasting (Ques.) 1253.
 Kildare Station, Postmastership (Ques.) 635 (i).
 Linkletter Road Post Office, Establishment, on M. for Ret., 2368 (i).
 Mail Service, P.E.I. and Mainland (Ques.) 891.
 Northumberland Straits, Borings for Tunnel, Expenditure (Ques.) 643, 2012 (i).
 ——— Map *re* Borings (Ques.) 3099 (i).
 ——— (M. for copy*) 4596 (ii).
 Public Works in P.E.I., Expenditure Ret., *re* (inquiry) 4467, 6115 (ii).
 Tay Canal, Maintenance, &c., Cost (Ques.) 1865.
 Tignish Breakwater, Engineer's Rep. (M. for copy) 1079 (i).
 ——— Inspection and Repairs (Ques.) 1253, 2180.
 ——— Survey, &c. (Ques.) 634 (i).
 ——— Wharfage Dues (Ques.) 643 (i).
 Tignish Post Office, Revenue (Ques.) 1864 (i).
 Tunnel, P.E.I. and Mainland, Borings (Ques.) 2012 (i).
 Tupper, Sir Charles, Bart., Travelling at Govt. Expense (Ques.) 891 (i).
 Souris Breakwater, Tender and Contract (Ques.) 2650 (i).

Préfontaine, Mr. R., Chambly.

- International Exhibition, prop. (remarks) 6884 (ii).

Prior, Mr. E. G., Victoria, B.C.

- Adulteration of Food, Drugs, &c. (Honey) Act Amt. B. 10 (Mr. *Sproule*) on M. for 2^o, 954 (i).
 Appointments and Superannuations (Ans.) 6510.
 B.C. Southern Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, on M. for O.C., 3660 (ii).
 Benjamin, E. W., Payments to Inland Revenue *re* Weights and Measures (Ans.) 2339 (i).
 Defence of Dom., in Com. on Res. (Mr. *Foster*) 6929 (ii).
 Grain Standards in N.W.T (Ans.) 1864, 2411 (i).
 ——— Rep. of Meeting in Winnipeg (remarks) 2007 (i).
 Illicit Still at Oka (Ans.) 2338 (i).
 Remedial Act (Man.) B. 58 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) 6 m. h. to M. for 2^o. 4115 (ii).
 Seed Grain Standards (Ans.) 2411 (i).
 Sorel Illicit Whisky Stills Prosecutions (Ans.) 1677 (i).

Prior, Mr. E. G.—Continued.

Spirits (U.S. or Can.) Refund of Duties (Ans.) 5123 (ii).

SUPPLY :

Collection of Revenues (Electric Light Inspection) 7133 (ii).

Three Rivers Weights and Measures Inspector (Ans.) 641 (i).

Tobacco, Raw Leaf Importations (Ans.) 638 (i).

Victoria (B.C.) Electoral District (B. 108) 1°, 6844 (ii).

Wheat Grading Frauds, Man. and N. W. T., on prop. Res. (Mr. Davin) for Sel. Com., 1032.

Powell, Mr. H. A., Westmoreland.

Address in Ans. to His Ex's Speech (moved) 144.

British American Coal, &c., Co.'s B. 76 (Mr. Hazen) in Com., 6811 (ii).

Budget, on The, 1406 (i).

Chignecto Marine Transport Ry. Co.'s (B. 59) 1°, 1775; 2° m., 2128 (i); Order for 2° dschgd., 2572.

— (B. 75) 1°, 2572; 2° m., 2650, 3051 (i); 2° neg. (Y. 54, N. 55) 3097 (i).

Militia Grievances, Col. Hamilton, Military College, &c., on M. (Mr. Mulock) to adjn. Hse., 6748 (ii).

Preferential Trade and Imperial Defence, on prop. Res. (Mr. McNeill) 4463 (ii).

Remedial Act (Man.) B. 58 (Sir Charles Tupper) on Amt. (Mr. Laurier) 6 m. h. to M. for 2°, 3561 (i).

— in Com., 5227, 5562, 5582, 6181.

Rider, Mr. T. D., Stanstead.

Alcoholic Liquors, American Imports (Ques.) 633, 819 (i).

— Imports, Remission of Duty (Ques.) 1867.

Auditor General's Rep., on adjmnt. (Ques.) 289.

Budget, on The, 1831 (i).

Cheese Manufactured in P.E.I., Quantity, Disposition, &c. (Ques.) 6503 (ii).

Coal Oil, Imports, &c., Duty (Ques.) 1865 (i).

Cheese Unsold on Govt. Account (Ques.) 6115 (ii).

Federal Elections, Voting by Employees (B. 17) 1°, 62 (i).

Interprovincial Bridge, Nepean Point (Ques.) 1625 (i).

Magog Wharf, Govt. Purchase of Property (Ques.) 633, 820 (i); 3634 (ii).

Maple Sugar, Exports and Imports (Ques.) 819.

Montreal Gazette, Payments for Advertising, &c. (Ques.) 3634 (ii).

Parliament, Constitutional Term (Ques.) 819 (i).

P. E. I. Cheese, Expense Account for Freight, &c. (Ques.) 6816 (ii).

Pulp Wood, Imposition of Export Duty (Ques.) 5052 (ii).

Quebec North Shore Ry. Subsidy, 1884 (Ques.) 1622.

Shortis, Valentine, commutation of Death Sentence (Ques.) 818, 1025 (i).

Rider, Mr. T. D.—Continued.

Spirits (U.S. or Can.) Refund of Duties (Ques.) 5123 (ii).

Stanstead Customs Collectorship (Ques.) 1026 (i).

Three Rivers Weights and Measures Inspector (Ques.) 641 (i).

Rinfret, Mr. C. I., Lotbinière.

Cabinet Resignation, Mr. Angers (Ques.) 638 (i).

Catellier, L. A., Superannuation (Ques.) 4379 (ii).

Remedial Act (Man.) B. 58 (Sir Charles Tupper) on Amt. (Mr. Laurier) 6 m. h. to M. for 2°, 3153; (remarks) 3329 (i).

SUPPLY :

Militia (Arms and Ammunition) conc. (Amt.) neg. (Y. 35, N. 67) 7147 (ii).

Three Rivers Harbour Commissioners (Ques.) 641.

— Debentures (Ques.) 641 (i).

Robillard, Mr. H., Ottawa.

Remedial Act (Man.) B. 58 (Sir Charles Tupper) in Com., 5996 (ii).

Roome, Mr. W. F., West Middlesex.

National Sanitarium Association incorp. (B. 79) 1°, 2893 (i).

Ryckman, Mr. S. S., Hamilton.

Public Works, Govt. Liability for Labour B. 4 (Mr. McLennan) on M. for 2°, 868 (i).

Scriver, Mr. J., Huntingdon.

Little Metis Bay Harbour of Refuge, on Order for Ret. being called (remarks) 3657 (ii).

— on M. for Cor. 4567 (ii).

Ministerial Resignations, on M. (Sir Adolphe Caron) to adjn. Hse., 24 (i).

Shortis, Valentine, commutation of Death Sentence., on Amt. to M. for Ret., 850 (i).

— Printing Papers *re* Case (M.) 1996 (i).

Semple, Mr. A., Centre Wellington.

Budget, on The, 1754 (i).

Remedial Act (Man.) B. 58 (Sir Charles Tupper) in Com., 5331, 5747, 5935, 6450 (ii).

Saturday Sitzings, on Amt. (Mr. O'Brien) 5194.

Smith, Sir D., K.C.M.G., West Montreal.

Remedial Act (Man.) B. 58 (Sir Charles Tupper) on Amt. (Mr. Laurier) 6 m. h. to M. for 2°, 4122 (ii).

SUPPLY :

Canals—Capital (LaShine) conc., 7163 (ii).

Visit to Winnipeg, on M. (Sir Richard Cartwright) to adjn. Hse., 4295 (ii).

Smith, Mr. W., South Ont.

Budget, on The, 2230 (i).

Quarantine Regulations, Can. and U. S. (Ques.) 638 (i).

Sommerville, Mr. J., North Brant.

- Appointments and Superannuations (Ques.) 6509.
 Bounties to Fishermen, Payments (Ques.) 4557 (ii)
 Customs Collector, Sudbury, Resignation (Ques.)
 4557 (ii).
 Order (Ques. of) in Com. on Remedial B., 5973.
 Postmaster at Sudbury, Resignation (Ques.) 4556.
 Remedial Act (Man.) B. 58 (Sir Charles Tupper)
 in Com., 5579, 5758, 5848, 5937 (ii).

Speaker, Mr. (Hon. PETER WHITE) North Renfrew.

- Address, The Reply from His Ex. (read) 1254 (i).
 Adjnt. of Deb. (ruling) 4226 (ii).
 — of Hse., on objection (Mr. Laurier) 7.
 — on M. (Mr. Davies, P.E.I.) 1626 (i).
 Battenberg, Prince Henry. Reply through Col.
 Sec. from H. M. to Mess. of Condolence (read)
 3597 (ii).
 Cattle (American) Transit through Can., on Amt.
 (Mr. Mulock) 749 (i).
 — on prop. Ques. (ruling) 1185 (i).
 Customs and Inland Revenue Acts Amt., on M.
 to introd. (ruling) 4652 (ii).
 Customs Tariff (1894) Act Amt. B. 23 (Mr.
 McMullen) on M. for 2^o, 4685 (ii).
 Govt. Business, precedence on Thursdays, on
 prop. M. (remarks) 1142 (i).
 — Mondays (ruling) 4270 (ii).
 — Mondays and Thursdays (remarks) 4467.
 Governor General, ref. to in deb. (ruling) 4258,
 4290, 4293 (ii).
 House of Commons (Issue of Writs) B. 16 (Mr.
 McCarthy) in Com., 5105 (ii).
 Hudson's Bay Canal and Nav. Co.'s B. on M. for
 Com. (ruling) 4788, 4798, 4829, 4883 (ii).
 Internal Economy Commission, Mes. from His
 Ex. (read) 346 (i).
 Library of Parlt., Joint Rep. (presented) 5 (i).
 Mess. from His Ex. (read) 346, 687, 892, 1254 (i),
 3594, 6110 (ii).
 Members, New, Ret. of (notification) 2, 5, 13, 69,
 435, 1626 (i).
 Members' Indemnity and Accountant, 7109 (ii).
 — Interruptions (remarks) 255 (i), 4216 (ii).
 — Remarks checked, 611, 703, 744, 850, 1147,
 1254, 1500, 1544, 1546, 2539, 3041, 3086, 3090, 3094
 (i); 3646, 3664, 3733, 3796, 4312, 4641, 4467, 4482,
 4510, 4641, 4895, 4904, 4912, 6879, 7083 (ii).
 Murray, Lt.-Col., charges against (remarks) 7008.
 Obstruction, Member called to Order, 535 (i).
 Order, Ques. of (Mr. Charlton) Official Reporters,
 4210 (ii).
 — (Mr. Charlton) Saturday Sittings of Hse.
 (rulings) 5126, 5128, 5132 (ii).
 — (Mr. Davin) deb. on the Address, 223 (i).
 — (Mr. Davin) Policy of His Ex., 4290 (ii).
 — (Mr. Edgar) unparliamentary Expressions,
 3734 (ii).
 — (Mr. Landerkin) on M. to adjn. Hse., 246.
 — (Mr. Macdonald, Huron) Saturday Sittings
 of Hse. (ruling) 5157 (ii).

Speaker, Mr.—Continued.

- Order, (Mr. Martin) Govt. Property in Moose
 Jaw, 1454 (i).
 — (Mr. Ouimet) ref. to past deb. (ruling)
 4301 (ii).
 — (Sir Charles Tupper) ref. to Gov. Gen. in
 deb., 4290 (Stmnt) 4293 (ii).
 — (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) on Mr.
 McCarthy's Amt. to Remedial B. (ruling) 4350,
 4356, 4367 (ii).
 — (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) Col. Worsley
 (ruling) 7012 (ii).
 Personal Explanation (Mr. McDougall) 1544 (i).
 Prorogation, Com. from Gov. Gen.'s Sec. (read)
 7147 (ii).
 Remedial Act (Man.) B. 58 on Mr. McCarthy's
 Amt. (ruling) 4510, 4515 (ii).
 — on Appeal (Mr. McCarthy) from Chair-
 man's Ruling in Com. (ruling) 5735 (ii).
 Restaurant of Hse., Clerical Imputations against
 Members *re* Intoxicants (remarks) 6322 (ii).
 Saw Logs, Exports (remarks) 1891 (i).
 Speech from the Throne (rep.) 2 (i).
 Supperannuation, Civil Service B. 19 (Mr. Mc-
 Mullen) on prop. M. for 2^o, 1661 (i).
 Tarte, J. I., Payments to by Pub. Depts., on
 Ques. of Order (ruling) 1451 (i).
 Tupper, Sir Charles, Travelling at Govt. Expense
 (remarks) 959 (i).
 Unparliamentary Language, 223 246, 472, 476,
 744, 1148, 1550, 1629, 2618, 2626 (i), 3734, 4953,
 4959, 6852 (ii).
 Vacancies (notification) 1, 144, 346, 1509 (i).
 Victoria (B.C.) Electoral District B. 108 (Mr.
 Prior) on M. for 2^o, 6846 (ii).
 Votes and Proceedings, omission of M. (remarks)
 5218 (ii).

Speaker, Mr. Deputy (Mr. J. G. H. BERGERON)*Beauharnois.*

- Man. and Nelson Valley Ry. Co.'s incorp. B.
 65 (Mr. Macdowall) in Com. (ruling) 6629 (ii).
 Members' Remarks checked 3983, 4010, 4671, 6047.
 Order (Ques. of) in Com. on Remedial B. (rulings)
 4922, 4960, 5807, 5951, 5961, 6399, 6459, (ii).
 Unparliamentary Language, 5832 (ii).
 [See BERGERON, MR. J. G. H.]

Sproule, Mr. T. S., East Grey.

- Adulteration of Food, Drugs, &c. (Honey) Act
 Amt. (B. 10) 1^o, 30; 2^o m., 947; in Com., 1019,
 1224; 3^o m., 1659 (i).
 Agricultural Implements, Free Entry from U. S.,
 on prop. Res. (Mr. McMillan) 672 (i).
 Alien Labour Prohibition B. 24 (Mr. Taylor) on
 M. for 1^o, 815 (i).
 Budget, on The, 1776 (i).
 Can. Jockey Club's B. 48 (Mr. Tisdale) in Com.,
 2646, 3518 (i).
 Cattle (American) Transit through Can., on M.
 for O. C., 723, 736 (i).

Sproule, Mr. T. S.—Continued.

- Cattle Embargo by Great Britain, on M. (Mr. *Davin*) to adjn. Hse. (remarks) 3243 (i).
 Conspiracies and Combinations in Restraint of Trade (B. 12) 1^o, 30 (i); 2^o m., 4654 (ii).
 Creameries in N. W. T., Money Grant, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 2666 (i).
 Detective Corporations and Mercantile Agencies (B. 11) 1^o, 30; 2^o m., 2387 (i); on M. to adjn. deb., 4601 (ii).
 Drainage on Ry. Co.'s Properties B. 3 (Mr. *Casey*) on M. for 2^o, 616 (i).
 Huron and Ont. Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 28) 1^o, 958 (i).
 Immigration of Boys to Can., on M. for Cor., 5076 (ii).
 Independence of Parliament B. 9 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2^o, 2381 (i).
 Insolvency B. 51 (Mr. *Martin*) on M. for 1^o, 1114.
 Interest B. 8 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2^o, 1239 (i).
 International Exhibition, prop. (remarks) 3897 (ii).
 Order (Ques. of) in Com. on Remedial B. (obstruction) 4958 (ii).
 Remedial Act (Man.) B. 58 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) 6 m. h. to M. for 2^o, 2924 (i).
 ——— in Com., 5338, 5396, 5426, 5513, 5945, 5952, 5964, 6009, 6071, 6102, 6225, 6359, 6484 (ii).
 St. John (N.B.) Winter Port, Ocean SS. Contract, on M. for copy, 2709 (i).
 Saturday Sittings, on Amt. (Mr. *Ouimet*) 5146 (ii).
 Sessional Employees, non-Payment, adjmnt. of Hse. (M.) 4900 (ii).
- SUPPLY :**
Collection of Revenues (Electric Light Inspection) 7132 (ii).
 Wheat Grading Frauds, Man. and N. W. T., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) for Sel. Com., 1040 (i).

Stairs, Mr. J. Fitz-W., Halifax.

- Agricultural Implements, Free Entry from U.S., on prop. Res. (Mr. *McMillan*) 684 (i).
 Board of Customs, Appnmt. and Powers, &c. (M. for O.C.*) 3107 (i).
 Budget, on The, 2411 (i).
 Detective Corporations and Mercantile Agencies B. 11 (Mr. *Sproule*) on M. for 2^o, 2405 (i).
 Militia Grievances, Col. Hamilton, Military College, &c., on M. (Mr. *Mulock*) to adjn. Hse., 6719 (ii).
 Preferential Trade and Imperial Defence, on prop. Res. (Mr. *McNeill*) 4454 (ii).

Stubbs, Mr. W., Cardwell.

- Fergus Mail Service, Contract (Ques.) 4555 (ii).
 Remedial Act (Man.) B. 58 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) 6 m. h. to M. for 2^o, 4058 (ii).
 ——— in Com., 5756, 6213, 6359, 6426 (ii).

Sutherland, Mr. J., North Oxford.

- Address, on The, 269 (i).
 Adulteration of Food, Drugs, &c. (Honey) Act Amt. B. 10 (Mr. *Sproule*) on M. for 2^o, 955 (i).
 British Connection and Imperial Defence, on prop. Res. (Mr. *McNeill*) 1213 (i).
 Can. Jockey Club's B. 48 (Mr. *Tisdale*) in Com., 3517 (i).
 Cattle (Can.) in England, on Amt. (Mr. *Mulock*) to prop. Res. (Mr. *Foster*) 4780 (ii).
 Defence of Dom., in Com. on Res. (Mr. *Foster*) 6930 (ii).
 Dewdney, Lient.-Gov., and late Election in B.C. (Ques.) 638 (i).
 Govt. Business, precedence on Mondays, on Amt. (Mr. *Choquette*) 4271 (ii).
 ——— Saturday Sittings, on M. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 5124 (ii).
 ——— on Amt. (Mr. *Ouimet*) 5144 (ii).
 Man. and Nelson Valley Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 65 (Mr. *Macdowall*) in Com., 6630 (ii).
 Remedial Act (Man.) B. 58 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on M. for Com., 4340 (ii).
 ——— in Com., 5600, 5657, 5880 (ii).
 South Ont. Pacific Ry. Co.'s (B. 40) 1^o, 958 (i).

Tarte, Mr. J. I., L'Islet.

- Address, on The, 567 (i).
 Appointments to Public Offices since Dec., 1895 (M. for Stmt.*) 1509 (i).
 Batiscan Lighthouse, Purchase of Right of Way (Ques.) 1447 (i).
 ——— Postmaster and Lighthouse-keeper (Ques.) 1447 (i).
 Bouchard, Theodore, Emplmt. by Customs Dept. (Ques.) 102 (i).
 Girouard, Hon. Désiré, Appmnt. as Judge of Supreme Court (M. for O.C.*) 1509 (i).
 Govt. Business, precedence on Mondays, on prop. M. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 4264 (ii).
 High Commissioner's Duties in London, on M. for Ret., 705 (i).
 Ministerial Resignations, reorganization of Cabinet, on M. (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) to adjn. Hse., 53 (i).
 Montreal Drill Shed, Amount Paid (M. for Stmt.) 1509 (i).
 Padlocks for Mail Bags, Purchase (Ques.) 1027 (i).
 Rimouski Wharf, Extension, Tenders (Ques.) 1028
 St. Laurent Wharf, Repairs (Ques.) 1028 (i).
 Saturday Sittings, on Amt. (Mr. *Ouimet*) 5152 (ii).
 Senators, Appnmts. since Jan., 1896 (M. for O. C.*) 1509 (i).
 Smith, Sir Donald, Visit to Winnipeg, on M. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) to adjn. Hse., 4314 (ii).
- SUPPLY :**
Canals—Income (Beauharnois) conc., 7150 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Que.) 7092 (ii).
 Tarte, J. I., Payments to by Pub. Depts. (M. for Stmt.) 1450 (i).

Tarte, Mr. J. I.—Continued.

- Winnipeg Collector of Customs, Inspector Young's Instructions (M. for copies*) 3637 (ii).
 Young, Geo. H., Repts. *re* Thos. Scott's conduct (M. for copy*) 3637 (ii).

Taylor, Mr. G., South Leeds.

- Alberta Irrigation Co.'s Act Amt. (B. 81) 1st, 3111 (i).
 Alien Labour Prohibition (B. 24) 1st, 814 (i).
 Cape Breton Election, Expenditure of Money (remarks) 1636 (i).
 Customs Tariff (1894) Act Amt. B. 23 (Mr. *McMullen*) on M. for 2nd, 4679 (ii).
 Equitable Benefit Co. of Can. incorp. (B. 33) 1st, 958 (i).
 Huron and Erie Loan and Savings Co.'s (B. 49) 1st, 1088 (i).
 Kingston, Smith's Falls and Ottawa Ry. Co.'s (B. 82) 1st, 3469 (i).
 Members' Indemnity and Accountant (remarks) 7112 (ii).
 Order (Ques. of) in Com. on Remedial B., 5725.
 Remedial Act (Man.) B. 58 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) 6 m. h. to M. for 2nd, 3432 (i).
 — in Com., 5719 (ii).
 Saturday Sitzings, on Amt. (Mr. *Ouimet*) 5155 (ii).
 Senate and House of Commons Act Amt. B. 7 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com. (Ry. *Passes*) 907 (i).
 Thousand Island Ry. Co.'s (B. 60) 1st, 1775 (i).

Tisdale, Mr. T., South Norfolk.

- Board of Trade of Toronto (B. 44) 1st, 958 (i).
 Can. Electric Ry. and Power Co.'s (B. 35) 1st, 958.
 Can. Jockey Club's (B. 48) 1st, 1088; in Com., 2640, 3050, 3279, 3513 (i).
 Can. and Michigan Bridge and Tunnel Co.'s B. 42 (Mr. *Ingram*) in Com., 2126 (i).
 Detective Corporations and Mercantile Agencies B. 11 (Mr. *Sproule*) on M. for 2nd, 4599 (ii).
 Drainage on Ry. Co.'s Properties B. 3 (Mr. *Casey*) on M. for 2nd, 624 (i).
 Interest B. 8 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2nd, 1242 (i).
 Man. and Nelson Valley Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 65 (Mr. *Macdowall*) in Com., 6629, 6797 (ii).
 Nipissing and James Bay Ry. Co.'s consolid. (B. 34) 1st, 958 (i).
 Private Bills, placing Bs. 31 and 85 on Order Paper (M.) 6593 (ii).
 Queenston Heights Bridge Co.'s incorp. (B. 43) 1st, 958 (i).
 Ry. Employees and Passengers Safety B. 2 (Mr. *Casey*) on M. for 2nd, 916 (i).
 Remedial Act (Man.) B. 58 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) in Com., 6067, 6482 (ii).
 Schomberg and Aurora Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 45) 1st, 958 (i).
 SUPPLY: on M. (Mr. *Foster*) for Com., 782 (i).

Tupper, Sir Charles, Bart., Cape Breton.

- Algona Election (1891) Returning Officer's Ret. (Ans.) 2179 (i).
 Amyot, Mr., late M.P., deceased (remarks) 4898.
 Armenian Atrocities, on Res. passed by British H. of C. (remarks) 4916 (ii).
 — on Res. on Order Paper (remarks) 6113 (ii).
 — Res. respecting (remarks) 6514 (ii).
 — on M. of Sympathy, 6593 (ii).
 Atlantic (Fast) SS. Service (remarks) 3272 (i).
 Battenberg, Prince Henry, Reply to Message of Condolence (presented) 3597 (ii).
 Behring Sea Claims Convention (B. 100) 1st, 6499 (ii).
 Cape Breton Election, Expenditure of Money (remarks) 1517, 1526 (i).
 Catellier, L. A., Superannuation (Ans.) 4379 (ii).
 Cattle (Can.) in England, on Amt. (Mr. *Mulock*) to prop. Res. (Mr. *Foster*) 4720 (ii).
 — Embargo by Great Britain, on M. (Mr. *Durin*) to adjn. Hse. (remarks) 3241 (i).
 Chicago Exhibition, Ret. *re* Expenses (remarks) 2532 (i).
 Chignecto Marine Transport Ry. Co.'s B. 59 (Mr. *Powell*) on M. for 2nd, 2129, 3065 (i).
 Civil Service Examiners Rep. (presented) 4253 (ii).
 Columbia Exhibition, Ret. *re* (remarks) 1892 (i).
 Debates, Official Rep., inserting Tabulated Stmts. (remarks) 2000, 2010 (i).
 Denison, Lt.-Col., late M.P., deceased (remarks) 6510 (ii).
 Estimates, Suppl., 1895-96 (remarks) 5207; (presented) 6110 (ii).
 Good Friday, Sitting of Hse. (remarks) 4917 (ii).
 Govt. Business, precedence on Mondays (M.) 4254; withdn., 4269 (ii).
 — precedence on Mondays and Thursdays (M.) 4463 (ii).
 High Commissioner, Ret. *re* (remarks) 2012 (i).
 — Allowances, Sir Charles Tupper as Acting (Ans.) 4376 (ii).
 Hudson's Bay Canal and Nav. Co.'s B. 52 (Mr. *Boyd*) on M. for Com., 4848 (ii).
 — on Appeal from Chairman's Ruling (remarks) 4790 (ii).
 International Arbitration (Ans.) 2337 (i).
 McConuell's Letter to R. C. Weldon, M.P., and C. H. Cahan (personal explanation) 2335 (i).
 Man. and Nelson Valley Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 65 (Mr. *Macdowall*) in Com., 6530 (ii).
 Man. Schools, Conference with Mr. Greenway (remarks) 3274 (i).
 — Govt. Commission to Man. (remarks) 4375, 5353 (ii).
 — invitation to First Minister to visit Ottawa (Ans.) 3099 (ii).
 — Papers *re* Man. Schools (presented) 6110.
 — Telegram from Mr. Greenway (read) 3096 (remarks) 3111, 3469 (i).

Tupper, Sir Charles—Continued.

- Man. Schools, Telegrams, Sir Donald Smith and Mr. Greenway (Ans.) 3471 (i).
 Members' Indemnity and Accountant (remarks) 7109 (ii).
 Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 3597, 6110 (ii).
 Military College, Board of Visitors' Recommendations (remarks) 4787 (ii).
 Ocean S.S. Service (France and Belgium) in Com. on Res., 661 (ii).
 Orders in Council, Number increasing Salaries (Ans.) 2650 (i).
 Order (Ques. of) ref. to Gov. Gen. in deb., 4278, 4291 (ii).
 — (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com. on Remedial B., 5732 (ii).
 Parliament, Duration of (Ans.) 3104 (i).
 — on M. (Mr. *Edgar*) to adjn. Hse., 3617 (ii).
 Preferential Trade and Imperial Defence, on prop. Res. (Mr. *McNeill*) 4424 (ii).
 Printing and Stationery Deptl. Rep. (presented) 3046 (i).
 Remedial Act, Man. (B. 58) 2^d m., 2719 (i); agreed to (Y. 112, N. 94) 4251 (ii).
 — on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) 6 m. h. to M. for 2^d, 3878 (ii).
 — (M. for Com.) 4338 (ii).
 — on M. to adjn. deb. on Mr. *McCarthy's* Amt. (remarks) 4374 (ii).
 — on M. (Mr. *McNeill*) Com. rise and rep., 4926 (ii).
 — on Ques. of Order, in Com. (Mr. *Sproule*) 4959 (ii).
 — in Com., 4786, 4920, 5208, 5519, 5420, 5691, 5847-5081, 5992, 6088, 6265, 6317, 6348, 6457 (ii).
 Rockway Valley (P.O.) Improved Mail Service (Ans.) 3629 (ii).
 — on Amt. (Mr. *Quimet*) 5137, 5207 (ii).
 — Saturday Sittings of Hse., on objection (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 5049; (M.) 5124 (ii).
 — on Amt. (Mr. *O'Brien*) 5170 (ii).
 — Secretary of State's Rep. (presented) 4375.
 Seed Grain to Alberta Settlers, Distribution (Ans.) 2342 (i).
 Sessional Employees, non-Payment, on M. (Mr. *Sproule*) to adjn. Hse. (remarks) 4902 (ii).
 Sittings of the Hse. (Morning) 6943 (ii).
 Smith, Sir Donald, Visit to Winnipeg (Ans.) 2653 (i).
 — on M. to adjn. Hse. (remarks) 4275, 4320.
 Soulanges Canal, Geo. Goodwin's Contract, on M. for Com. of Sup., 7115 (ii).
 Supply B. 112 (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for 3^d, 7170 (ii).
 Sweating System, Govt. action *re* A. W. Wright's Rep. (Ans.) 5052 (ii).
 Venezuelan Question, Maps on record in Library (remarks) 2007 (i).
 Volunteers for Soudan Expedition (remarks) 4654.
 Voters' Lists B. 87 (Mr. *Dickey*) in Com., 6602 (ii).

Tupper, Sir Charles—Continued.

- Votes and Proceedings, omission of M. (remarks) 5219 (ii).
 — (Amt.) 5221; agreed to (Y. 99, N. 7) 5223.

Tupper, Hon. Sir C. H., K.C.M.G., Pictou.

- Address, on The, 242, 494 (i).
 Budget, on The, 1309, 1349 (i).
 Chamberlain, Chas., commutation of Sentence, on M. for O. C., 1481 (i).
 Dom. Elections Act Amt. (B. 55) 1^o, 1251 (i).
 Govt. Business, precedence on Thursdays, on prop. M. (Mr. *Foster*) 1136 (i).
 Gov. Gen., ref. to in deb., on Ques. of Order (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 4282 (ii).
 Hamilton, Lt.-Col., Investigation *re*, on M. for Com. of Sup., 7020 (ii).
 Masson, Mr., ex-M.P., Appmt. as Judge (remarks) 6971 (ii).
 Ministerial Resignations, Cabinet as reconstructed, on M. (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) to adjn. Hse., 122 (i).
 Order (Ques. of) on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to Remedial Act, 4349; "May" quoted, 4354 (ii).
 — Murray, Lt.-Col., Charges against, 7008.
 Parliament, Duration of, on M. (Mr. *Edgar*) to adjn. Hse., 3623 (ii).
 Remedial Act (Man.) B. 58 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) 6 m. h. to M. for 2^d, 3671 (ii).
 — in Com., 5361, 5403, 6061, 6381, 6421 (ii).
 Shortis, Valentine, commutation of Death Sentence, on M. for Ret., 841 (i).
 Smith, Sir Donald, Visit to Winnipeg, on M. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) to adjn. Hse., 4282 (ii).
 Soulanges Canal, Geo. Goodwin's Contracts, on M. for Com. of Sup., 6547, 7116 (ii).
 — on Amt. (Mr. *Edgar*) 7122 (ii).

Tyrwhitt, Mr. R., South Simcoe.

- Militia Grievances, Col. Hamilton, Military College, &c., on M. (Mr. *Mulock*) to adjn. Hse., 6731 (ii).
 Remedial Act (Man.) B. 58 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) in Com., 5455, 5744, 5927, 6016, 6214, 6371 (ii).

Wallace, Mr. N. C., West York, Ont.

- Agricultural Implements, &c., Free Entry from U.S., on prop. Res. (Mr. *McMillan*) 668 (i).
 Anonymous Letters *re* Ministerial Resignations (personal explanation) 22 (i).
 — Article in *Mail-Empire* (remarks) 62 (i).
 Cape Breton Election, Expenditure of Money (remarks) 1530 (i).
 Customs Tariff (1894) Act Amt. B. 23 (Mr. *McMullen*) on M. for 2^d, 4682 (ii).
 Detective Corporations and Mercantile Agencies B. 11 (Mr. *Sproule*) on M. for 2^d, 2405 (i).
 Duncan and Lardo Mining Districts, Engineer's Reps., on M. for Ret., 3062 (ii).

Wallace, Mr. N. C.—Continued.

- Montreal Port, Proceedings at Conference re Traffic, on M. for copy, 4385 (ii).
 Remedial Act (Man.) B. 58 (Sir Charles Tupper) on Amt. (Mr. Laurier) 6 m. h. to M. for 2°, 2759 (i).
 — on M. to adjn. deb., 4233 (ii).
 — (remarks) 4344 (ii).
 — on M. (Sir Charles Tupper) for Com., 4781.
 — in Com., 5003, 5029, 5213, 5276, 5385, 5430, 5441, 5566, 5601, 5662, 5680, 5724, 5814, 5851, 5916, 5980, 6010, 6079, 6093, 6195, 6355, 6364, 6429, 6441, 6481 (ii).
 Saturday Sittings, on Amt. (Mr. Ouimet) 5135 (ii).
 — on Amt. (Mr. O'Brien) 5189 (ii).

Weldon, Mr. R. C., Albert.

- Address, on The, 225 (i).
 Cape Breton Election, Expenditure of Money (remarks) 1633 (i).
 Chignecto Marine Transport Ry. Co.'s B. 75 (Mr. Powell) on M. for 2°, 3075 (i).
 Ministerial Resignations, reorganization of Cabinet, on M. (Sir Adolphe Curran) to adjn. Hse., 39 (i).
 Parliament, Duration of, on M. (Mr. Edgar) to adjn., 3618 (ii).
 Personal Explanation, Par. in *Mail-Empire* re strained relations with Sir Charles Tupper 2411 (i).
 — Par. in *Toronto News*, re Cabinet position, 3046 (i).
 Preferential Trade and Imperial Defence, on prop. Res. (Mr. McNeill) 4407 (ii).
 Remedial Act (Man.) B. 58 (Sir Charles Tupper) on Amt. (Mr. Laurier) 6 m. h. to M. for 2°, 3206 (ii).
 — on (Ques. of Order (Mr. Edgar) 4517 (ii).
 — on Amt. (Mr. McCarthy) 4344 (ii).
 — in Com., 4985, 5082, 5040, 5486, 5595, 5605, 5626, 5715, 5854, 6017, 6366, 6480 (ii).

Welsh, Mr. W., Queen's, P.E.I.

- Chignecto Marine Transport Ry. Co.'s B. 75 (Mr. Powell) on M. for 2°, 3051 (i); on M. to restore to Order Paper, 4630 (ii).
 Dairy Products Act (1893) Amt. B. 67 (Mr. Foster) on M. for 1°, 2002 (i).
 Hudson's Bay Canal and Nav. Co.'s B. 52 (Mr. Boyd) on M. for Com., 4834 (ii).
 Ocean SS. Subsidies Act Amt. B. 106 (Mr. Ives) in Com., 6982 (ii).
 Remedial Act (Man.) B. 58 (Sir Charles Tupper) in Com., 6041, 6221, 6414 (ii).

White, Mr. N. W., Shelburne.

- House of Commons (Issue of Writs) B. 16 (Mr. McCarthy) in Com., 5103 (ii).
 Mary E. Harlow, Schooner, Wreck (Ques.) 2177.
 Ministers during Mr. Mackenzie's regime, on M. for Com. of Sup., 7044 (ii).

White, Mr. N. W.—Continued.

- Remedial Act (Man.) B. 58 (Sir Charles Tupper) on Amt. (Mr. McCarthy) to M. for Com., 4504.
 — in Com., 6421 (ii).

Wilson, Mr. U., Lennax.

- Remedial Act (Man.) B. 58 (Sir Charles Tupper) in Com., 5683 (ii).

Wood, Hon. J. F., Brockville.

- Alcohol, Imports, Remission of Duty (Ans.) 1867.
 Alcoholic Liquors (American) Imports (Ans.) 633, 819 (i).
 Appointments and Superannuations (Ans.) 6510.
 Berlin Customs Collector (Ans.) 4534 (ii).
 Bonded Warehouse between N.B. and Maine, Abolition (Ans.) 1869 (i).
 Bouchard, Theodore, Emplmt. by Customs Dept. (Ans.) 1027 (i).
 Butter, Exports and Imports, Quantity and Value (Ans.) 4381 (ii).
 Coal Oil, Imports, &c., Duty (Ans.) 1865 (i).
 Corn Grinding for Human Food (Ans.) 823 (i).
 Customs Collections, Kootenay District (Ans.) 4558 (ii).
 — Peterborough, Collector (Ans.) 635 (i).
 — Sudbury, Collector, Resignation (Ans.) 4557 (ii).
 — Duties Paid in B.C. (Ans.) 3107 (i).
 — Employees at Toronto, Number, &c. (Ans.) 4380 (ii).
 — Returns, Preparation by Collectors (remarks) 716 (i).
 Customs Tariff (1894) Act Amt. B. 23 (Mr. McMullen) on M. for 2°, 4681 (ii).
 Customs and Inland Revenue Depts. Act, Amt. (remarks) 4651 (ii).
 Davison, Samuel, Customs Frauds at Toronto (Ans.) 3103 (i).
 Grain Imports from Buffalo, Remission of Duties (Ans.) 1866 (i).
 Hamilton, James F., St. John, Emplmt. by Govt. (Ans.) 3106 (i).
 Kelly, Jas., and Hamilton, Jas. H., Appmnts. to Civil Service (Ans.) 2409 (i).
 London Custom House, Charges against Officials (Ans.) 1678 (i).
 McBeath, Allan, Appraiser St. John, Superannuation (Ans.) 2409 (i).
 Maple Sugar, Exports and Imports (Ans.) 819 (i).
 Mining Machinery, Free Entry by Provinces, Value (Ans.) 4558 (ii).
 Montreal Port, Proceedings at Conference re Traffic, on M. for copy, 4582 (ii).
 Pork, Salt, Imports and Duty collected (Ans.) 2179 (i).
 Rice Meal, Exports by Mount Royal Milling Co. (Ans.) 3634 (ii).
 Remedial Act (Man.) B. 58 (Sir Charles Tupper) in Com., 5414, 5556, 6178 (ii).

Wood, Hon. J. F.—Continued.

Robinson, Geo. F., P.E.I. Customs, Superannuation (Ans.) 6817 (ii).

Stanstead Customs Collectorship (Ans.) 1026 (i).

Sugar (Raw) Imports SS. *Cynthania* (Ans.) 3630, 5346 (ii).

—— Imports for Consumption (Ans.) 1183 (i).

Tea, Coffee and Sugar Importations (Ans.) 1864

Theatrical Scenery, &c., Duty (Ans.) 4378 (ii).

Trade and Navigation Rets. (presented) 603 (i).

Unleavened Bread, Importations, Free Entry (Ans.) 6119 (ii).

Wheat Grading Frauds, Man. and N.W.T., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) for Sel. Com., 1032, 1044 (i).

Yeo, Mr. J., Prince, P.E.I.

Breakwaters and Piers in Prince County, on M. for Stmt., 2359 (i).

Yeo, Mr. J.—Continued.

Fish Island Lighthouse-keeper, Appnmt. (Ques.) 1623 (i).

Fish Warden at Bideford, Appnmt. (Ques.) 1624.

Linkletter Road P. O., Establishment (Ques.) 1446.

—— (M. for Ret.) 2366 (i).

McKie's Pier, Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 1253 (i).

Magog, Public Wharf, Govt. Aid (Ques.) 3634.

Mail Service, P.E.I. and Mainland (remarks) 2011 (i).

Montreal *Gazette*, Payments for Advertising, &c. (Ques.) 3634 (ii).

Remedial Act (Man.) B. 58 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) in Com., 5770 (ii).

Stanley, Str., Cape Tormentine and Cape Traverse Service (M. for Ret. *) 4596 (ii).

Summerside Harbour Breakwaters, Construction (M. for Ret. *) 4596 (ii).

INDEX.—PART II

SUBJECTS

- Abduction.** See "CRIMINAL CODE."
- ABOLITION OF TONNAGE TAX ON HOSPITAL DUES:** Ques. (Mr. *McShane*) 1619 (i).
- ADAMS, E., CHARGES AGAINST T. DONNELLY:** M. for copies* (Mr. *Borden*) 4596 (ii).
- ADDRESS IN ANS. TO HIS EX.'S SPEECH:** Res. (Mr. *Foster*) 5 (i).
- moved (Mr. *Powell*) 144; seconded (Mr. *Gillivray*) 152; agreed to, 600 (i).
- Deb. (Mr. *Laurier*) 160, 590; (Mr. *Foster*) 173; (Sir *R. Cartwright*) 182 (personal explanation) 239; (Mr. *Dickey*) 195; (Mr. *McMullen*) 206, 217; (Mr. *Weldon*) 225; (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 239, 494; (Mr. *Kenny*) 243; (Mr. *Martin*) 257; (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 265; (Mr. *Sutherland*) 269; (Mr. *McNeill*) 273 (personal explanation) 277; (Mr. *Borden*) 276; (Mr. *Masson*) 290; (Mr. *Landerkin*) 308; (Mr. *Casey*) 320; (Mr. *McMillan*) 333; (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 348; (Mr. *Daly*) 365; (Mr. *Forbes*) 401; (Mr. *Northrup*) 416; (Mr. *Macdonald, Huron*) 435; (Sir *James Grant*) 456; (Mr. *McShane*) 467; (Mr. *O'Brien*) 559; (Mr. *Tarte*) 567; (Mr. *Costigan*) 582; (Mr. *La Rivière*) 594 (i).
- REPLY FROM HIS EX.: presented (Mr. *Foster*) 1254 (i).
- ADJOURNMENT:** Ms. (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) 6, 31, 62, 1859.
- ADJOURNMENTS:**
- ADDRESS IN ANS. TO HIS EX.'S SPEECH: Personal Explanation (Mr. *Laurier*); M. (Mr. *Sutherland*) 961 (i).
- AUDITOR GENERAL'S REP., DELAY IN PRESENTING: M. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 607 (i).
- CAPE BRETON ELECTION, MONEY EXPENDITURE: M. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 1517, 1626 (i).
- CATTLE (CAN.) IN GREAT BRITAIN: M. (Mr. *Davin*) 3241 (i).
- DEBATES, OFFICIAL REP., INSERTING TABULATED STMENTS.: M. (Mr. *Gibson*) 2007 (i).
- HAMILTON, LT -COL.: M. (Mr. *Mulock*) 6679 (ii).
- INTERNATIONAL EXHIBITION: M. (Mr. *McShane*) 6880 (ii).
- MASSON, MR., EX-M. P., APPOINTMENT: M. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 6679 (ii).
- MINISTERIAL RESIGNATIONS: M. (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) 31 (i).
- PERSONAL EXPLANATION (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) re ATTACK ON N.S. POLITICIANS: M. (Mr. *Langelier*) 240 (i).
- REMEDIAL ACT: M. (Mr. *Foster*) 1889 (i).
- Remarks (Mr. *Charlton*) Official Reporters: M. (Mr. *Lister*) 4210 (ii).
- Papers re Conference at Winnipeg: M. (Mr. *McCarthy*) 6149 (ii).
- SATURDAY SETTINGS: M. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 5124.
- SESSIONAL EMPLOYEES, NON-PAYMENT: M. (Mr. *Sproule*) 4902 (ii).
- ADJUTANT GENERAL, SUPERANNUATION: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 6505 (ii).
- ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE: in Com. of Sup., 7046.
- Administration of Oaths of Office B. No. 1** (Mr. *Foster*). 1st, 2; *pro forma* (i).
- "ADMIRAL," SS., SHIPMENTS BY I. C. R.: Ques. (Mr. *Fauvel*) 3104 (i).
- ADULTERATION OF FOOD, DEPT., REP.: presented (Mr. *Costigan*) 31 (ii).
- Adulteration of Food, Drugs, &c. (Honey) B. No. 10** (Mr. *Sproule*). 1st, 30; 2^d, 947; in Com., 1222; 3^d, 1659. (59 *Vic.*, c. 12.)
- ADVERTISING IN MONTREAL "GAZETTE", PAYMENTS, &c.: (Ques. (Mr. *Rider*) 3634 (ii).
- ALASKA. See "Boundary."
- AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENTS, &c., FREE ENTRY FROM U.S.: prop. Res. (Mr. *McMillan*) 666, 677 (i).
- Deb. (Mr. *Wallace*) 668; (Mr. *McGregor*) 668; (Mr. *McMullen*) 669; (Mr. *Ives*) 671; (Mr. *Sproule*) 672; (Mr. *Daly*) 674; (Mr. *Davin*) 679; (Mr. *Grieco*) 680; (Mr. *Stairs*) 684.
- REMOVAL OF DUTY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 850, 1029 (i).
- AGRICULTURE AND COLONIZATION, SEL. COM.: List of Members, 886 (i).
- AGRICULTURE, DEPT. REP.: presented (Mr. *Foster*) 2095 (i).
- DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 7030 (ii).
- SUPERANNUATIONS IN DEPT.: Ques. (Mr. *Bruncau*) 1861 (i).
- AGRICULTURE:**
- BEE-ROOT SUGAR, BOUNTY TO ENCOURAGE PRODUCTION: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 1509 (i).
- BUTTER AND CHEESE, EXPENDITURE ON COLD STORAGE: Ques. (Mr. *Bain*) 1619 (i).
- MANUFACTURED IN CAN.: Ques. (Mr. *Grieco*) 645 (i).
- PREFERENTIAL DUTY: Ques. (Mr. *Dugas*) 5055.
- U. S. EXPORTS AS CAN.: Ques. (Mr. *Dugas*) 5052 (ii).
- EXPORTS AND IMPORTS, QUANTITY AND VALUE: Ques. (Mr. *Bain*) 4380 (ii).
- SHIPMENTS TO ENGLAND BY GOVT., DATE OF SALE: Ques. (Mr. *McMillan*) 1622 (i).
- (CREAMERY) EXPORTS TO ENGLAND: Ques. (Mr. *McMillan*) 1617 (i).
- (P.E.I.) EXPENSE ACCOUNT FOR FREIGHT: Ques. (Mr. *Rider*) 6816 (ii).
- GOVT., IN STORE: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1025 (i).
- MANUFACTURED IN P.E.I., QUANTITY, DISPOSITION: Ques. (Mr. *Rider*) 6303 (ii).
- CATTLE. See general heading.

AGRICULTURE—Continued.

- CATTLE UNSOLD ON GOVT. ACCOUNT: Ques. (Mr. McMullen) 6115 (ii).
- CREAMERIES IN N.W.T., MONEY GRANT: prop. Res. (Mr. Davin) 2654, 2668 (i).
- CORN, GRINDING FOR HUMAN FOOD: Ques. (Mr. McMullen) 823 (i).
- M. for Ret. (Mr. McMullen) 1087 (i).
- DAIRY STATION, P. E. I., SUPERVISION BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonald) 824 (i).
- EXPERIMENTAL FARM BULLETINS: in Com. of Sup., 7141 (ii).
- HAY SALES: Ques. (Mr. McMillan) 2631 (i).
- LIVE-STOCK MANAGER, APPNMT.: Ques. (Mr. Featherston) 888 (i).
- EXPENDITURE: M. for Stmt. (Mr. McMillan) 1085 (i).
- HORSES (DISEASED) SHIPPED TO GREAT BRITAIN FROM WESTERN STATES *via* CAN.: Ques. (Mr. Featherston) 3106 (i).
- IMMIGRATION OF BOYS TO CAN.: M. for Cor. (Mr. Casey) 5074 (ii).
- LIVE STOCK EXCLUSION B., IMPERIAL PARLT.: Remarks (Mr. Griève) 2172 (i).
- MEATS AND PERISHABLE FOODS: in Com. of Sup., 7140 (ii).
- QUARANTINE: in Com. of Sup., 7051 (ii).
- REGULATIONS, CAN. AND U. S.: Ques. (Mr. Smith) 638 (i).
- SHEEP SCAB, INTRODUCTION FROM U.S. INTO N.W.T.: Ques. (Mr. Davin) 1029 (i).
- SHEEP SCHEDULED BY GREAT BRITAIN: Ques. (Mr. Casey) 633 (i).
- [See "ARTS AND STATISTICS."]
- Alberta Irrigation Co.'s Act Amt. B. No. 81** (Mr. Davis). 1^o, 3111; 2^o, 3519 (i); in Com. and 3^o, 4597 (ii). (59 *Vic.*, c. 44.)
- ALBERTA SETTLERS, DISTRIBUTION, SEED GRAIN: Ques. (Mr. Laverne) 2341 (i).
- ALCOHOL, IMPORTS, REMISSION OF DUTY: Ques. (Mr. Rider) 633, 819, 1867 (i).
- "ALERT," STR., SALE AND AMOUNT REALIZED: Ques. (Mr. Langelier) 644 (i).
- M. for Cor. (Mr. Langelier) 2370 (i).
- ALGOMA ELECTION (1891) RETURNING OFFICER'S RET.: Ques. (Mr. Amyot) 2179 (i).
- Aliens and Foreigners, prohibition of Importation under Contract, &c., B. No. 24** (Mr. Taylor). 1^o, 814 (i).
- ALIEN LABOUR LAWS AND FISHERY, NEGOTIATIONS WITH U.S.: Ques. (Mr. Casey) 1027 (i).
- RECIPROCAL RELAXATION: Ques. (Mr. Casey) 1623 (i).
- AMERICAN CATTLE, EXPORTS FROM ST. JOHN: Remarks (Mr. Montague) 1515 (i).
- SHIPMENTS FROM CAN. PORTS: Ques. (Mr. Casey) 1618 (i).
- TRANSIT THROUGH CAN.: prop. Ques. (Mr. Casey) 1184 (i).
- Ques. (Mr. Casey) 1252 (i).
- Remarks (Sir Richard Cartwright) 717 (i).
- AMYOT, MR., LATE M.P., DECEASED: Remarks (Sir Charles Tupper) 4898 (ii).
- ANGERS, CHAS., ESQ., MEMBER FOR CHARLEVOIX: Introduced, 1510 (i).

ANGERS, HON. MR., RESIGNATION FROM CABINET: Ques. (Mr. Rinfret) 638 (i).

Animals Contagious Diseases Act Amt. B. No. 95 (Mr. Foster). 1^o, 6113; 2^o and in Com., 6822; 3^o, 6826 (ii). (59 *Vic.*, c. 13.)

ANONYMOUS LETTERS *re* MINISTERIAL RESIGNATIONS: Personal Explanation (Mr. Wallace) 22; Article in *Mail-Enpire* (remarks) 62 (i).

APPNMTS. AND SUPERANNUATIONS: Ques. (Mr. Somerville) 6509 (ii).

— M. for Stmt.* (Mr. Tarte) 1509 (i).

APPRENTICES AT I. C. R. WORKSHOPS, RIVIÈRE DU LOUP: Ques. (Mr. Choquette) 1446 (i).

ARBITRATION, INTERNATIONAL: Ques. (Mr. Edgar) 2337 (i).

ARCHIVES, REP. OF ARCHIVIST: presented (Mr. Foster) 4463 (ii).

ARMENIAN ATROCITIES, RES. PASSED BY BRITISH H. OF C.: Remarks (Mr. Charlton) 4916 (ii).

— RES. ON ORDER PAPER: Remarks (Mr. Charlton) 6113, 6514 (ii).

— SYMPATHY: M. (Mr. Charlton) 6593 (ii).

ARMS AND AMMUNITION: in Com. of Sup., 7053; conc., 7147 (ii).

ARTHABASKAVILLE AND ST. PAUL DE CHESTER. MAIL CONTRACTOR, COMPLAINTS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Laverne) 5056 (ii).

ARTS AND STATISTICS:

ARCHIVES, REP. OF ARCHIVIST: presented (Mr. Foster) 4463 (ii).

CENSUS OF MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 7140; conc., 7165.

— N. W. T. TAKEN BY MOUNTED POLICE: M. for Ret. (Mr. Martin) 1502 (i).

— (1891) FARMERS IN CAN., NUMBER: Ques. (Mr. Dawson) 1861 (i).

CENTENNIAL EXHIBITION, CAN. COMMISSIONER'S EXPENDITURE: Ques. (Mr. Girouard) 5054 (ii).

CHICAGO EXHIBITION, RET. *re* EXPENSES: Remarks (Sir Charles Tupper) 2532 (i).

COLUMBIA EXHIBITION, Ret. *re*: inquiry (Mr. Martin) 1892 (i).

INTERNATIONAL EXHIBITION: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 6876 (ii).

N. W. T. EXHIBITION, REP. OF LIEUT. GOV.: Ques. (Mr. Davin) 1447 (i).

— UNPAID ACCOUNTS: M. for Cor. (Mr. Martin) 648, 657 (i).

— Remarks (Mr. Davin) 608 (i).

— in Com. of Sup., 7141 (ii).

STATISTICAL YEAR BOOK: in Com. of Sup., 7140 (ii).

[See "AGRICULTURE," &c.]

ASSETS OF DOM., PAR VALUE ON INVESTMENTS: Ques. (Mr. Charlton) 5053 (ii).

ATLANTIC FAST SERVICE AND PACIFIC CABLE: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Laurier) 1087 (i).

— Remarks (Mr. Borden) 3272 (i).

AUDITOR GENERAL'S REP., PART I: presented (Mr. Foster) 926 (i).

— PART II: presented (Mr. Foster) 1892 (i).

— Explanation (Mr. Casey) 854 (i).

— Ques. (Mr. Rider) 289 (i).

— Remarks (Sir Richard Cartwright) 604 (i).

AUSTRALIA AND NEW ZEALAND, IMPORTS FROM: Ques. (Mr. Mills, Bothwell) 1678 (i).

- BAIE DES CHALEURS RY., NEGOTIATIONS FOR PURCHASE: Ques. (Mr. Choquette) 1447 (i).
 — PURCHASE BY GOVT.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Joncas) 1888 (i).
 — Ques. (Mr. Joncas) 636 (i).
- BAIT ACT. See "Newfoundland."
- BANDA AND RY. STATION MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. Landerkin) 2178 (i).
- Bank Act Amt. B. No. 21** (Mr. Jeannotte). 1°, 435 (i); 2° m., 4657; deb. adjd., 4671 (ii).
- BANKING AND COMMERCE, SEL. COM.: List of Members, 886 (i).
- BARNARDO, DR. See "Immigration."
- BARRISTERS (ONT.) EMPLOYED BY GOVT. IN QUE. CASES: Ques. (Mr. Devlin) 5123 (ii).
- BATISCAN LIGHTHOUSE, PURCHASE OF RIGHT OF WAY: Ques. (Mr. Tarte) 1447 (i).
 — POSTMASTER AND LIGHTHOUSE-KEEPER: Ques. (Mr. Tarte) 1447 (i).
- BATTENBERG, PRINCE HENRY, ADDRESS TO HER MAJ. ON DECEASE: Res. (Mr. Foster) 601 (i).
 — CONDOLENCE TO PRINCESS BEATRICE: Res. (Mr. Foster) 602 (i).
 — TEL. IN REPLY TO ADDRESS TO HER MAJ.: (Mr. Foster) 766 (i).
 — REPLY THROUGH COL. SEC., MESS.: presented (Sir Charles Tupper) 3597 (ii).
- BATTLEFORD AND SASKATCHEWAN MAIL CONTRACT: Remarks (Mr. Martin) 6992 (ii).
- Bay of Quinte Ry. and Nav. Co.'s amalgamation B. No. 71** (Mr. Northrup). 1°, 2096; 2°, 2371 (i); in Com. and 3°, 4597 (ii). (59 Vic., c. 15.)
- BEATRICE, PRINCESS. See "Battenberg, Prince Henry."
- BEAUHARNOIS CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 7077; conc., 7149 (ii).
- BEER LICENSE IN NEEPAWA, MAN.: M. for Cor. (Mr. Martin) 1078 (i).
- BEEF-ROOT, BOUNTY TO ENCOURAGE PRODUCTION: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Mills, Bothwell) 1509 (i).
- Behring Sea Claims Convention B. No. 100** (Sir Charles Tupper). 1°, 6499; 2° and in Com., 6819; 3°, 6822 (ii). (59 Vic., c. 2.)
- BELIVEAU, JOSEPH, INDEMNITY FOR INJURIES: M. for Ret. (Mr. Bruneau) 5077 (ii).
- BENJAMIN, E. W., PAYMENTS TO INLAND REVENUE *re* WEIGHTS AND MEASURES: Ques. (Mr. Dawson) 2339 (i).
- BERLIN CUSTOMS COLLECTOR: Ques. (Mr. Casey) 4554.
- BIDEFORD FISH WARDEN, APPOINTMENT: Ques. (Mr. Yeo) 1624 (i).
- BILL No. 1** Respecting the Administration of Oaths of Office.—(Mr. Foster.)
 1°, 2; *pro forma*.
- BILL (No. 2)** Further to secure the safety of railway employees and passengers.—(Mr. Casey.)
 1°, 6; 2° m., 909; 2° neg., 909; 2° and M. to ref. to Com., 932; ref. to Com., 947 (i).
- BILL (No. 3)** Concerning drainage on the property of Railway Companies.—(Mr. Casey.)
 1°, 6; 2° and ref. to Ry. Com., 613 (i).
- BILL (No. 4)** Respecting the liability of Her Majesty and public companies for labour used in the construction of public works.—(Mr. McLennan.)
 1°, 13; 2° m., 855; 2° and ref. to Sel. Com., 882 (i); in Com. and 3°, 4598 (ii). (59 Vic., c. 5.)
- BILL (No. 5)** To amend "The Dairy Products Act."—(Mr. McLennan.)
 1°, 13 (i).
- BILL (No. 6)** Respecting the sale of railway return-fare tickets.—(Mr. McLennan.)
 1°, 13; 2° and ref. to Com. on Rys., 2371 (i).
- BILL (No. 7)** Further to amend the Act respecting the Senate and House of Commons.—(Mr. Mulock.)
 1°, 13; 2°, 882; in Com., 893; Com. rose, 909; M. to place on Order Paper for Com., 1510; neg. (Y. 49, N. 104) 1510 (i).
- BILL (No. 8)** Respecting Interest.—(Mr. Mulock.)
 1°, 13; 2° m. and deb. adjd., 631; rsmd., 1233; 2°, 1250 (i).
- BILL (No. 9)** Further to secure the Independence of Parliament.—(Mr. Mulock.)
 1°, 30; 2° m., 2372; Amt. (Mr. Dickey) 3 m. h., 2380; agreed to, 2387 (i).
- BILL (No. 10)** Further to amend the Act respecting the Adulteration of Food, Drugs and Agricultural Fertilizers.—(Mr. Sproule.)
 1°, 30; 2°, 947; in Com., 1222; 3°, 1659 (i). (59 Vic., c. 12.)
- BILL (No. 11)** Respecting Detective Corporations and Mercantile Agencies.—(Mr. Sproule.)
 1°, 30; 2° m., 2387; deb. adjd., 2408 (i); rsmd., 4598; 2° and ref. to Sel. Com., 4624 (ii).
- BILL (No. 12)** To amend the law relating to conspiracies and combinations formed in restraint of trade.—(Mr. Sproule.)
 1°, 30 (i); 2°, 4654 (ii).
- BILL (No. 13)** To determine the length of the working day for workmen and labourers employed on public works.—(Mr. Lépine.)
 1°, 31 (i).
- BILL (No. 14)** To amend the Dominion Elections Act.—(Mr. McCarthy.)
 1°, 60 (i); 2° and ref. to Sel. Com., 4624; remarks *re* placing B. on Govt. Orders, 6594 (ii).
- BILL (No. 15)** Further to amend the North-west Territories Act.—(Mr. McCarthy.)
 1°, 61 (i).
- BILL (No. 16)** Respecting the House of Commons.—(Mr. McCarthy.)
 1°, 61 (i); 2°, 4655; in Com., 5099 (ii).
- BILL (No. 17)** To facilitate voting by employees at the elections of Members of the House of Commons.—(Mr. Ridcr.)
 1°, 62 (i); 2°, 4655 (ii).
- BILL (No. 18)** Further to amend the Trade Mark and Design Act.—(Mr. Coatsworth.)
 1°, 216 (i).

- BILL (No. 19)** To abolish the Superannuation as applied to the Civil Service of Canada.—(Mr. *McMullen*.)
1^o, 216; objection (Mr. *Speaker*) to 2^o, 1661; deb. adjd., 1675 (i); rsund. and 2^o m., neg. (Y. 61, N. 72) 4655 (ii).
- BILL (No. 20)** To amend the North-west Territories Representation Act.—(Mr. *Davin*.)
1^o, 216 (i).
- BILL (No. 21)** Further to amend the Bank Act.—(Mr. *Jeannotte*.)
1^o, 435 (i); 2^o m., 4657; deb. adjd., 4671 (ii).
- BILL (No. 22)** Further to amend chapter seven of the Revised Statutes of Canada, being the "North-west Territories Representation Act."—(Mr. *Martin*.)
1^o, 524 (i); 2^o, 4671 (ii).
- BILL (No. 23)** In further amendment of the Customs Tariff, 1894.—(Mr. *McMullen*.)
1^o, 643 (i); 2^o m., 4676; ruled out of Order (Mr. *Speaker*) 4685 (ii).
- BILL (No. 24)** To prohibit the importation and immigration of foreigners and aliens under contract or agreement to perform labour in Canada.—(Mr. *Taylor*.)
1^o, 814 (i).
- BILL (No. 25)** Respecting the St. Lawrence and Ottawa Railway Company.—(Mr. *McLeod*.)
1^o, 957; 2^o, 1023; in Com. and 3^o, 1812 (i). (59 *Vic.*, c. 33.)
- BILL (No. 26)** Respecting the Nelson and Fort Sheppard Railway Company.—(Mr. *Mara*.)
1^o, 957; 2^o, 1023; in Com., 1812; 3^o, 1860 (i). (59 *Vic.*, c. 29.)
- BILL (No. 27)** Respecting the Lindsay, Bobcaygeon and Pontypool Railway Company.—(Mr. *Fairbairn*.)
1^o, 958; 2^o, 1023; in Com. and 3^o, 1860 (i). (59 *Vic.*, c. 24.)
- BILL (No. 28)** To incorporate the Huron and Ontario Railway Company.—(Mr. *Sproule*.)
1^o, 958; 2^o, 1023 (i); in Com., 4376; 3^o, 4724 (ii). (59 *Vic.*, c. 20.)
- BILL (No. 29)** To amend the Act incorporating the Supreme Court of the Independent Order of Foresters.—(Mr. *McGillivray*.)
1^o, 958; 2^o, 1023; M. for Com., 1861; in Com. and 3^o, 2128 (i). (59 *Vic.*, c. 51.)
- BILL (No. 30)** Respecting the Guelph Junction Railway Company.—(Mr. *Masson*.)
1^o, 958; 2^o, 1024; in Com. and 3^o, 1860 (i). (59 *Vic.*, c. 19.)
- BILL (No. 31)** To incorporate the Hudson Bay and Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. *Macdonell, Algoma*.)
1^o, 958; 2^o, 1024 (i); M. (Mr. *Tisdale*) to place on Order Paper for Com., 6593; in Com., 7042 (ii).
- BILL (No. 32)** Respecting the Winnipeg Great Northern Railway Company.—(Mr. *Boyd*.)
1^o, 958; 2^o, 1024; in Com. and 3^o, 3280 (i). (59 *Vic.*, c. 40.)
- BILL (No. 33)** To incorporate the Equitable Benefit Company of Canada.—(Mr. *Maclean, York*.)
1^o, 958; 2^o, 1024 (i).
- BILL (No. 34)** To consolidate and amend certain Acts relating to the Nipissing and James Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. *Tisdale*.)
1^o, 958; 2^o, 1024; in Com. and 3^o, 2128 (i). (59 *Vic.*, c. 30.)
- BILL (No. 35)** To incorporate the Canadian Electric Railway and Power Company.—(Mr. *Coatsworth*.)
1^o, 958; 2^o, 1024 (i).
- BILL (No. 36)** To incorporate the South Shore Suburban Railway Company.—(Mr. *Lachapelle*.)
1^o, 958; 2^o, 1024; in Com. and 3^o, 3280 (i). (59 *Vic.*, c. 36.)
- BILL (No. 37)** To confirm a certain lease and agreement between the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada and the St. Lawrence and Adirondack Railway Company.—(Mr. *Bergeron*.)
1^o, 958; 2^o, 1024; in Com. and 3^o, 1860 (i). (59 *Vic.*, c. 18.)
- BILL (No. 38)** Respecting the Montreal and Ottawa Railway Company.—(Mr. *Bergeron*.)
1^o, 958; 2^o, 1024; in Com. and 3^o, 2571 (i). (59 *Vic.*, c. 25.)
- BILL (No. 39)** Respecting the St. Lawrence and Adirondack Railway Company.—(Mr. *Bergeron*.)
1^o, 958; 2^o, 1024; in Com. and 3^o, 1860 (i). (59 *Vic.*, c. 32.)
- BILL (No. 40)** Respecting the South Ontario Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. *Sutherland*.)
1^o, 958; 2^o, 1024; in Com. and 3^o, 1860 (i). (59 *Vic.*, c. 35.)
- BILL (No. 41)** Respecting the Lake Erie and Detroit River Railway Company.—(Mr. *McGregor*.)
1^o, 958; 2^o, 1024; in Com. and 3^o, 2128 (i). (59 *Vic.*, c. 23.)
- BILL (No. 42)** Respecting the Canada and Michigan Bridge and Tunnel Company.—(Mr. *Ingram*.)
1^o, 958; 2^o, 1024; in Com., 2126; 3^o, 2128 (i). (59 *Vic.*, c. 42.)
- BILL (No. 43)** To incorporate the Queenston Heights Bridge Company.—(Mr. *Coatsworth*.)
1^o, 958; 2^o, 1024; in Com. and 3^o, 2572 (i). (59 *Vic.*, c. 43.)
- BILL (No. 44)** Relating to the Board of Trade of the City of Toronto.—(Mr. *Coatsworth*.)
1^o, 958; 2^o, 1024; in Com. and 3^o, 2572 (i). (59 *Vic.*, c. 45.)
- BILL (No. 45)** To incorporate the Schomberg and Aurora Railway Company.—(Mr. *Coatsworth*.)
1^o, 958; 2^o, 1024 (i); in Com. and 3^o, 3848 (ii). (59 *Vic.*, c. 34.)
- BILL (No. 46)** To promote the safety of railway employees.—(Mr. *Maclean, York*.)
1^o, 958 (i).
- BILL (No. 47)** Respecting the Brandon and South-western Railway Company.—(Mr. *Davin*.)
1^o, 1023; 2^o, 1222; in Com. and 3^o, 1861 (i). (59 *Vic.*, c. 16.)

- BILL (No. 48) Respecting the Canadian Jockey Club.**—(Mr. *Tisdale*.)
1°*, 1088; 2°*, 1222; in Com., 2640, 3048, 3279, 3513 (i); 3°, 3628 (ii). (59 *Vic.*, c. 53.)
- BILL (No. 49) Respecting the Huron and Erie Loan and Savings Company.**—(Sir *John Carling*.)
1°*, 1088; 2°*, 1222; in Com. and 3°*, 2572 (i). (59 *Vic.*, c. 49.)
- BILL (No. 50) Respecting the South-western Railway Company and the St. Lawrence and Adirondack Railway Company.**—(Mr. *Bergeron*.)
1°*, 1088; 2°*, 1222; in Com. and 3°*, 3280 (i). (59 *Vic.*, c. 37.)
- BILL (No. 51) Respecting Insolvency.**—(Mr. *Martin*.)
1°, 1088 (i).
- BILL (No. 52) To incorporate the Hudson's Bay Canal and Navigation Company.**—(Mr. *Boyd*.)
1°*, 1182; 2°*, 1386 (i); M. for Com., 4788; Amt. (Mr. *Flint*) 6 m. h., 4879; neg. on div. and in Com., 4897; again in Com., 5344 (ii).
- BILL (No. 53) Respecting the Pontiac Pacific Junction Railway Company.**—(Sir *James Grant*.)
1°*, 1182; 2°*, 1386 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 4376 (ii). (59 *Vic.*, c. 31.)
- BILL (No. 54) To incorporate the Edmonton District Railway and Improvement Company.**—(Mr. *Davis*.)
1°*, 1182; 2°*, 1386; in Com. and 3°*, 3280 (i); Sen. Amts. conc. in, 6811 (ii). (59 *Vic.*, c. 17.)
- BILL (No. 55) Further to amend the Dominion Elections Act.**—(Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*.)
1°, 1251 (i).
- BILL (No. 56) Respecting the Montreal Island Belt Line Railway Company.**—(Mr. *Lachapelle*.)
1°*, 1516; 2°, 1659; in Com. and 3°*, 3280 (i). (59 *Vic.*, c. 27.)
- BILL (No. 57) Respecting the assignment and attachment of the salaries of public employees.**—(Mr. *Béchar*d.)
1°*, 1511 (i).
- BILL (No. 58) The Remedial Act (Manitoba).**—(Mr. *Dickey*.)
1°, 1511; M. to make B. first Order of the Day, 2095; 2° m. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 2719; Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) 3 m. h., 2736, 2759; deb. rsmd., 2797, 2893, 2988, 3112, 3274, 3338, 3472, 3519 (i), 3671, 3816; Amt. neg. (Y. 91, N. 115) 4250; 2° agreed to (Y. 112, N. 94) 4251; M. for Com. and Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) 4338, 4370; deb. adjd., 4374; rsmd., 4468; neg. on div., 4553; Amt. (Mr. *Wallace*) 4781; neg. on div., 4785; in Com., 4786, 4919; M. (Mr. *McNeill*) Com. rise and rep., 4923; neg., 4944; again in Com., 5208, 5224, 5349-6110 (April 6-11 incl.); Order for Hec. again in Com., 6120; Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to adjn., 6120, 6149; neg., 6172; again in Com., 6173-6498 (April 13-15 incl.); M. that com. rise and rep. (Mr. *McNeil*) 4923, 6015; (Mr. *Martin*) 5450; (Mr. *McCarthy*) 5880; (Mr. *Fraser*) 5896; (Mr. *O'Brien*) 6195; (Mr. *Stabbs*) 6364; (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 6457 (ii).
- BILL (No. 59) Respecting the Chignecto Marine Transport Railway Company (Limited).**—(Mr. *Powell*.)
1°, 1775; 2° m., 2128; withdn., 2572 (i).
- BILL (No. 60) Respecting the Thousand Islands Railway Company.**—(Mr. *Taylor*.)
1°*, 1775; 2°*, 2129; in Com. and 3°*, 3280 (i). (59 *Vic.*, c. 38.)
- BILL (No. 61) To incorporate the Toronto, Hamilton and Niagara Falls Railway Company.**—(Mr. *Bennett*.)
1°*, 1775; 2°*, 2129 (i).
- BILL (No. 62) To incorporate the Ontario Peat Fuel and Railway Company.**—(Mr. *Boyle*.)
1°*, 1775; 2°, 2370; in Com. and 3°*, 3280 (i). (59 *Vic.*, c. 47.)
- BILL (No. 63) To amend the Act incorporating the International Radial Railway Company.**—(Mr. *Masson*.)
1°*, 1775; 2°, 2173 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 3848 (ii). (59 *Vic.*, c. 21.)
- BILL (No. 64) To incorporate the Imperial Life Assurance Company of Canada.**—(Mr. *Coutsworth*.)
1°*, 1775; 2° m., 2129; 2°, 2173; in Com. and 3°*, 3050 (i). (59 *Vic.*, c. 50.)
- BILL (No. 65) To incorporate the Manitoba and Nelson Valley Railway Company.**—(Mr. *Davis*.)
1°*, 1775; 2°, 2370 (i); in Com., 5087, 6627, 6770 (ii).
- BILL (No. 66) Respecting debentures of Loan Companies (from the Senate).**—(Mr. *Tisdale*.)
1°*, 1859 (i); 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 7170 (ii). (59 *Vic.*, c. 11.)
- BILL (No. 67) To amend the Dairy Products Act.**—(Mr. *Foster*.)
1°, 1996 (i).
- BILL (No. 68) To amend the Winding-up Amendment Act, 1889.**—(Mr. *Geoffrion*.)
1°, 2002 (i).
- BILL (No. 69) To incorporate the Hamilton Blast Company (Limited).**—(Mr. *McKay*.)
1°*, 2096; 2°, 2174; in Com. and 3°*, 3016 (i). (59 *Vic.*, c. 48.)
- BILL (No. 70) Respecting the Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Railway Company.**—(Mr. *McKay*.)
1°*, 2096; 2°, 2370 (i); in Com. and 3°, 3848 (ii). (59 *Vic.*, c. 39.)
- BILL (No. 71) To provide for the amalgamation of the Bay of Quinté Railway and Navigation Company and the Kingston, Napanee and Western Railway Company, under the name of "The Bay of Quinté Railway Company."**—(Mr. *Northrup*.)
1°*, 2096; 2°*, 2371 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 4597 (ii). (59 *Vic.*, c. 15.)
- BILL (No. 72) Respecting the Montreal Park and Island Railway Company.**—(Mr. *Lachapelle*.)
1°*, 2096; 2°*, 2572 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 4597 (ii). (59 *Vic.*, c. 28.)

- BILL (No. 73)** To amend the Criminal Code, 1892, for the purpose of making more effectual provision for the punishment of seduction and abduction.—(Mr. *Charlton*.)
1°, 2172 (i).
- BILL (No. 74)** To secure the better observance of the Lord's Day.—(Mr. *Charlton*.)
1°, 2333 (i).
- BILL (No. 75)** Respecting the Chignecto Marine Transport Railway Company (Limited).—(Mr. *Powell*.)
1°, 2572; 2° m., 2650; deb. rsmd., 3051; 2° neg. (Y. 54, N. 55) 3097 (i); M. to restore to Order paper, 4627; agreed to (Y. 80, N. 63) 4649 (ii).
- BILL (No. 76)** To incorporate the British American Coal and Transportation Company.—(Mr. *Hazen*.)
1°, 2640; 2°, 3016 (i); in Com., 6811, 7042 (ii).
- BILL (No. 77)** To amend "The Railway Act"—(from the Senate).—(Mr. *Boyle*.)
1°, 2987 (i).
- BILL (No. 78)** Respecting certain female offenders in the Province of New Brunswick—(from the Senate).—(Mr. *McInerney*.)
1°, 4686 (ii).
- BILL (No. 79)** To incorporate the National Sanitarium Association.—(Mr. *Roomc*.)
1°, 2893; 2°, 3098 (i); in Com. and 3°, 3848 (ii). (59 *Vic.*, c. 52.)
- BILL (No. 80)** Further to amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. *Bécharde*.)
1°, 3046 (i).
- BILL (No. 81)** To revive and amend the Act to incorporate the Alberta Irrigation Company.—(Mr. *Davis*.)
1°, 3111; 2°, 3519 (i); in Com. and 3°, 4597 (ii). (59 *Vic.*, c. 44.)
- BILL (No. 82)** Respecting the Kingston, Smith's Falls and Ottawa Railway Company.—(Mr. *Taylor*.)
1°, 3469 (i); 2°, 3628; in Com. and 3°, 4597 (ii). (59 *Vic.*, c. 22.)
- BILL (No. 83)** To incorporate the Manitoba and North-west Millers' Association.—(Mr. *Musson*.)
1°, 3469 (i); 2°, 3628; in Com. and 3°, 7042 (ii). (59 *Vic.*, c. 46.)
- BILL (No. 84)** Further to amend the Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act—(from the Senate).—(Mr. *Dickey*.)
1°, 3596 (i); 2°, in Com. and 3°, 7170 (ii). (59 *Vic.*, c. 14.)
- BILL (No. 85)** To incorporate the Montreal and Province Line Railway Company.—(Mr. *Fréchet*.)
1°, 4254; 2°, 4597; M. (Mr. *Tisdale*) to place on Order paper for Com., 6593; in Com. and 3°, 7042 (ii). (59 *Vic.*, c. 26.)
- BILL (No. 86)** Respecting the Revision of the Statutes—(from the Senate).—(Mr. *Dickey*.)
1°, 6499 (ii).
- BILL (No. 87)** Respecting the Voters' List of 1896.—(Mr. *Dickey*.)
1°, 4650; 2° and in Com., 6594; 3°, 6625 (ii). (59 *Vic.*, c. 6.)
- BILL (No. 88)** Further to amend the Government Railways Act.—(Mr. *Haggart*.)
1°, 4650 (ii).
- BILL (No. 89)** To incorporate the Yukon and British Columbia Trading and Development Company of Canada, (Limited)—(from the Senate).—(Mr. *Corbould*.)
1°, 4788; 2°, 6811; in Com., and 3°, 7042 (ii). (59 *Vic.*, c. 41.)
- BILL (No. 90)** Further to amend the Railway Act—(from the Senate).—(Mr. *Haggart*.)
1°, 5050; 2°, in Com., and 3°, 6943 (ii). (59 *Vic.*, c. 9.)
- BILL (No. 91)** Further to amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. *McGillivray*.)
1°, 5050 (i).
- BILL (No. 92)** Respecting the Canadian Historical Exhibition—(from the Senate).—April 1st.
- BILL (No. 93)** To make further provision respecting grants of land to members of the Militia Force on active service in the North-west.—(Mr. *Daly*.)
1°, 5343 (i).
- BILL (No. 94)** Further to amend the North-west Territories Representation Act.—(Mr. *Daly*.)
1°, 6111 (i).
- BILL (No. 95)** To amend the Animal Contagious Diseases Act.—(Mr. *Foster*.)
1°, 6113; 2° and in Com., 6822; 3°, 6826 (ii). (59 *Vic.*, c. 13.)
- BILL (No. 96)** Respecting the inspection of Steamboats and the examination and licensing of Engineers employed on them—(from the Senate).—(Mr. *Costigan*.)
1°, 6499 (ii).
- BILL (No. 97)** Further to amend the Civil Service Act—(from the Senate).—(Mr. *Foster*.)
1°, 6499 (ii).
- BILL (No. 98)** To amend the Act respecting the Protection of Navigable Waters—(from the Senate).—(Mr. *Costigan*.)
1°, 6499 (ii).
- BILL (No. 99)** Further to amend the law respecting Building Societies and Loan and Savings Companies carrying on business in the Province of Ontario—(from the Senate).—(Mr. *Coatsworth*.)
1°, 6499 (ii).
- BILL (No. 100)** Respecting the Behring Sea Claims Convention—(from the Senate).—(Sir *Charles Tupper*.)
1°, 6499; 2° and in Com., 6819; 3°, 6822 (ii). (59 *Vic.*, c. 2.)
- BILL (No. 101)** To amend the Act respecting Wrecks, Casualties and Salvage—(from the Senate).—(Mr. *Costigan*.)
1°, 6499 (ii).

- BILL (No. 102)** Further to amend the Criminal Code, 1892.—(Mr. *Dickey*.)
1°, 6499 (ii).
- BILL (No. 103)** Further to amend the Penitentiary Act.—(Mr. *Dickey*.)
1°, 6502 (ii).
- BILL (No. 104)** To amend the Act respecting the Representation of the North-west Territories in the Senate of Canada—(from the Senate).—(Mr. *Daly*.)
1°, 6593; 2° and in Com., 6819; 3°, 6822 (ii).
- BILL (No. 105)** Further to amend the Customs Tariff, 1894.—(Mr. *Foster*.)
Res. prop. and in Com., 6664; 1° of B., 6819; 2°, in Com. and 3°, 6980 (ii). (59 *Vic.*, c. 8.)
- BILL (No. 106)** Further to amend the Act relating to Ocean Steamship Subsidies.—(Mr. *Foster*.)
Res. prop., 2230 (i); in Com., 6658; rep., 6663; 1° of B., 6831; 2° and in Com., 6980; again in Com. and 3°, 7114 (ii). (59 *Vic.*, c. 3.)
- BILL (No. 107)** Respecting certain debentures of the Montreal Turnpike Trust held by the Government of Canada.—(Mr. *Foster*.)
Res. prop., 2229 (i); in Com., 6626, 6639; rep., 6657; 1°, 6831; 2° and in Com., 6992; 3°, 7112 (ii). (59 *Vic.*, c. 4.)
- BILL (No. 108)** To make special provision with respect to the election to be held in the Electoral District of Victoria, British Columbia, at the next general election—(from the Senate).—(Mr. *Prior*.)
1°, 6844; 2° m., 6845; 2°, 6868 (ii).
- BILL (No. 109)** To make special provision with respect to the election to be held in the Electoral District of Yale and Cariboo at the next general election.—(Mr. *Dickey*.)
1°, 6868 (ii).
- BILL (No. 110)** Respecting the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal.—(Mr. *Foster*.)
Res. prop., 4254; in Com., 6827; 1°, 6901; 2° and in Com., 6992; 3°, 7113 (ii). (59 *Vic.*, c. 10.)
- BILL (No. 111)** Further to amend the Act respecting the Senate and House of Commons.—(Mr. *Foster*.)
Res. prop., 6818; in Com., 6979; 1° of B., 6980; 2°, in Com. and 3°, 7108 (ii). (59 *Vic.*, c. 7.)
- BILL (No. 112)** For granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money required for defraying certain expenses of the Public Service, for the financial years ending respectively the 30th June, 1896, and the 30th June, 1897, and for other purposes relating to the Public Service.—(Mr. *Foster*.)
1°, 2°, and 3°, 7170 (ii). (59 *Vic.*, c. 1.)
- BINDING TWINE, &c.** : Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 5122 (ii).
- **OUTPUT OF KINGSTON PENITENTIARY** : Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald, Huron*) 4652 (ii).
- **SALES AND MONEYS UNPAID** : Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 4652 (ii).
- **SALES, MONEYS DUE GOVT.** : Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 5050 (ii).
- Board of Trade, City of Toronto, B. No. 44** (Mr. *Coatsworth*). 1° 958; 2°, 1024; in Com. and 3°, 2572 (i). (59 *Vic.*, c. 45.)
- BOARD OF VISITORS**: See "Military College."
- BOARD OF CUSTOMS, APPNMT. AND POWERS, &c.** : M. for O.C.* (Mr. *Stairs*) 3107 (i).
- BONDED WAREHOUSE BETWEEN N. B. AND MAINE, ABOLITION** : Ques. (Mr. *Colter*) 1869 (i).
- BOUCHARD, THEODORE, EMPLOYT. BY CUSTOMS DEPT.** : Ques. (Mr. *Tarte*) 1026 (i).
- BOUNDARY, CAN. AND U. S., DELIMITATION** : in Com. of Sup., 7125 (ii).
- **CAN. AND ALASKA, SURVEYS** : Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 4377 (ii).
- BOUNTIES TO FISHERMEN, PAYMENTS** : Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 4557 (ii).
- BOUNTY (FISHERY) FRAUDS IN N. S. AND N. B.** : M. for Cor. (Mr. *Bowers*) 1051 (i).
- **BEEET-ROOT SUGAR, TO ENCOURAGE PRODUCTION** : M. for Ret.* 1509 (i).
- **FISHING SCHOONER "PIONEER"** : Ques. (Mr. *Lavergne*) 1184 (i).
- BOY IMMIGRATION TO CAN.** : M. for Cor. (Mr. *Casey*) 5074 (ii).
- BRAMPTON POSTMASTER, APPNMT.** : Ques. (Mr. *Featherston*) 888 (i).
- Brandon and South-western Ry. Co.'s B. No. 47** (Mr. *Davin*). 1°, 1023; 2°, 1222; in Com. and 3°, 1861 (i). (59 *Vic.*, c. 16.)
- BREAD, UNLEAVENED, FREE ENTRY** : Ques. (Mr. *McShane*) 6119 (ii).
- BREAKWATERS AND PIERS IN PRINCE COUNTY, TENDERS, &c.** : M. for Stimt. (Mr. *Perry*) 2354, 2363.
- BRIDGES**, See "Nepean Point," "Yamaska," &c.
- BRIDGEWATER HARBOUR MASTER, DISMISSAL** : Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 2408 (i).
- BRIER ISLAND FOG-ALARM BUILDING, REPLACING** : Ques. (Mr. *Bowers*) 6816 (ii).
- British American Coal and Transportation Co.'s incorp. B. No. 76** (Mr. *Hazen*)
1°, 2640; 2°, 3016 (i); in Com., 6811, 7042 (ii.)
- BRITISH CONNECTION AND IMPERIAL DEFENCE** : prop. Res. (Mr. *McNeill*) 1186 (i).
- **DEFENCE AND IMPERIAL ASSISTANCE** : Ques. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 1254 (i).
- **PREFERENTIAL TRADE AND IMPERIAL DEFENCE** : prop. Res. (Mr. *McNeill*) 4381, 4461 (ii).
- BRITISH COLUMBIA** :
- **CAN.-ALASKA BOUNDARY SURVEYS** : Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 4377 (ii).
- **CARIBOO AND YALE ELECTORAL LISTS** : M. for CODY (Mr. *Martin*) 3652 (ii).
- **NOMINATIONS** : on M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Martin*) 7045 (ii).
- **COLUMBIA RIVER, IMPROVED NAVIGATION, ENGINEER'S REP.** : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Mara*) 5067 (ii).
- **CUSTOMS COLLECTIONS, KOOTENAY DISTRICT** : Ques. (Mr. *Mara*) 4558 (ii).
- **DUTIES PAID IN B.C.** : Ques. (Mr. *Mara*) 3107 (i).
- **DEWDNEY, LT.-GOV., AND LATE ELECTION IN B.C.** : Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 638 (i).
- **DUNCAN AND LARDO MINING DISTRICTS, ENGINEER'S REP.** : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Mara*) 5061, 5064 (ii).
- **EXPRESS CO.'S CONTRACTS, &c.** : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Martin*) 1888 (i).
- **FISHING (POUND-NET) LICENSES IN B.C.** : Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 820, 1624 (i).

BRITISH COLUMBIA—Continued.

KAMLOOPS AND SPENCE'S BRIDGE MAIL CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. McMullen) 1186 (i).

KOOTENAY RAPIDS NAVIGATION: in Com. of Sup., 7096 (ii).

LOBSTER AND OYSTER PLANTING: Ques. (Mr. Corbould) 3099 (i).

MAIL SERVICE, TENDERS, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. McMullen) 1883 (i).

— Ret. re: inquiry (Mr. McMullen) 3043 (i).

MINING MACHINERY, FREE ENTRY BY PROVS., VALUE: Ques. (Mr. Mara) 4538 (ii).

PENITENTIARY, JUSTICE DRAKE'S INVESTIGATION: Ques. (Mr. Declin) 6117 (ii).

"QUADRA," STR., REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 7100 (ii).

"SAN PEDRO," REMOVAL OF WRECK: Ques. (Mr. Martin) 321; Remarks (Mr. Martin) 2180 (i).

SKEENA RIVER FISHERMEN, SUNDAY REST: Ques. (Mr. Charlton) 3632 (ii).

SOUTHERN RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: M. for O. C. (Mr. Martin) 3638 (ii).

VICTORIA ELECTORAL DISTRICT, VACANCY: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 2 (i).

— RET. OF MEMBER: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 69 (i).

— POST OFFICE, CONTRACT AND SURETIES: Ques. (Mr. Edgar) 2552 (i).

— in Com. of Sup., 7094 (ii).

[See DEPARTMENTS, &c.]

BRYSON, MR., LATE M.P., DECEASED: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 346 (i).

BUDGET, THE, FINANCIAL STMT. (Mr. Foster) 961 (i).

— Reply (Sir Richard Cartwright) 1001, 1255 (i).

Deb. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 1349; (Mr. Paterson, Brant) 1369; (Mr. Powell) 1406; (Mr. Borden) 1423; (Mr. McMillan) 1552; (Mr. McInerney) 1584; (Mr. Macdonald, Huron) 1608, 1679; (Mr. Craig) 1737; (Mr. Semple) 1754; (Mr. Sproule) 1776; (Mr. Lister) 1800; (Mr. Rider) 1831; (Mr. Cameron, Inverness) 1845; (Mr. Davin) 1892; (Mr. Bain) 1919; (Mr. Henderson) 1968; (Mr. Legris) 2013; (Mr. Bennett) 2045; (Mr. Martin) 2054; (Mr. McDougall, Cape Breton) 2096; (Mr. McMullen) 2120, 2129; (Mr. Perry) 2151; (Mr. Smith, Ont.) 2230; (Mr. Dawson) 2241; (Mr. Stairs) 2411; (Mr. Fraser) 2423; (Mr. Campbell) 2447; (Mr. Edwards) 2464; (Mr. McShane) 2478; (Mr. Grieve) 2484; (Mr. Casey) 2533; (Mr. McGillivray) 2566, 2572; (Mr. Davies, P.E.I.) 2583; (Mr. Mills, Annapolis) 2614; (Mr. Mills, Bothwell) 2633 (i).

— Remarks (Mr. Foster) 711 (i).

BUFFALO, GRAIN IMPORTS FROM, REMISSION OF DUTIES: Ques. (Mr. Campbell) 1866 (i).

Building Societies and Loan and Savings Co.'s (Ont.) Amt. B. No. 99 (Mr. Coatsworth). 1*, 6499 (ii).

BURLINGTON CANAL SWING BRIDGE: in Com. of Sup., 7097 (ii).

BUSINESS OF THE HSE: M. (Mr. Foster) 144 (i).

— Remarks (Mr. Laurier) 29 (i).

— See "Govt. Business."

BUTTER AND CHEESE, EXPENDITURE ON COLD STORAGE: Ques. (Mr. Bain) 1619 (i).

— MANUFACTURED IN CAN.: Ques. (Mr. Grieve) 645 (i).

BUTTER AND CHEESE, PREFERENTIAL DUTY: Ques. (Mr. Dugas) 5055 (ii).

— U. S. EXPORTS AS CAN.: Ques. (Mr. Dugas) 5052 (ii).

— EXPORTS AND IMPORTS, QUANTITY AND VALUE: Ques. (Mr. Bain) 4380 (ii).

— EXPORTS: Res. withdn. (Mr. Davin) 2354 (i).

— SHIPMENTS TO ENGLAND BY GOVT., DATE OF SALE: Ques. (Mr. McMillan) 1622 (i).

— (CREAMERY) EXPORTS TO ENGLAND: Ques. (Mr. McMillan) 1617 (i).

CABINET CRISIS, ALLEGED: Remarks (Mr. Landerkin) 1255 (i).

CABINET POSITION, PAR. IN TORONTO "NEWS": Personal Explanation (Mr. Weldon) 3046 (i).

— REORGANIZATION: Ques. (Mr. Dawson) 640, 641 (i).

— Ques. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 821 (i).

— RESIGNATION, MR. ANGERS: Ques. (Mr. Rinfret) 638 (i).

— See "Ministerial Resignations."

CABLE. See "Atlantic."

CAMERON, MALCOLM C., ESQ., MEMBER FOR WEST HURON: Introduced 435 (i).

CAN.-FRANCE, &c., SS. SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 7099 (ii).

CAN.-ALASKA BOUNDARY SURVEYS: Ques. (Mr. Charlton) 4377 (ii).

Can. and Michigan Bridge and Tunnel Co.'s B. No. 42 (Mr. Ingram). 1*, 958; 2*, 1024; in Com., 2126; 3*, 2128 (i). (59 Vic., c. 42.)

CAN. AND U. S. QUARANTINE REGULATIONS: Ques. (Mr. Smith, Ont.) 638 (i).

CAN. CATTLE, SHIPMENTS via U.S. PORTS: Ques. (Mr. Landerkin) 892 (i).

CAN. COPYRIGHT: Ques. (Mr. Edgar) 2337 (i).

CAN. CREDIT: on M. for Com. of Sup. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 7043 (ii).

CAN. DEFENCE AND IMPERIAL ASSISTANCE: Ques. (Mr. Mills, Bothwell) 1254 (i).

Can. Electric Ry. and Power Co.'s incorp. B. No. 35 (Mr. Coatsworth). 1*, 958; 2*, 1024 (i).

Can. Jockey Club's B. No. 48 (Mr. Tisdale). 1*, 1088; 2*, 1222; in Com., 2640, 3048, 3279, 3513 (i); 3*, 3628 (ii). (59 Vic., c. 52.)

CAN. HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION. B. from Senate.

CAN. MILITIA, INCREASED DEFENCES: Remarks (Mr. Mulock) 1254 (i).

C. P. R. CO.'S CLAIMS FOR INCREASED MAIL MATTER: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Borden) 3107 (i).

— MAIL SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 7133 (ii).

Can. Peat Fuel Co. See "ONT."

CAN. SEALERS, DUTIES ON STORES EXACTED BY NFLD.: Ques. (Mr. McDougall) 5055 (ii).

CAN. SHEEP SCHEDULED BY GREAT BRITAIN: Ques. (Mr. Casey) 633 (i).

CANALS:

- BEAUBARNOIS CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 7077; conc., 7149 (ii).
- BURLINGTON CANAL SWING BRIDGE: in Com. of Sup., 7097 (ii).
- CHAMBLY CANAL, VESSELS THROUGH FROM 1892-95: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Langelier) 2370 (i).
- CORNWALL CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 7143 (ii).
- DESP WATERWAYS COMMISSION: in Com. of Sup., 7080 (ii).
- ENGINEERS' SURVEYS OF PROBABLE CANALS: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 3471 (ii).
- FORT FRANCIS LOCKS, EXPENDITURE FROM 1874 TO 1878: Ques. (Mr. Girouard) 5054 (ii).
- GALOPS RAPIDS, CONTRACT, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Landerkin) 6118 (ii).
- LACHINE CANAL BRIDGES, COST OF CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. Landerkin) 6118 (ii).
- in Com. of Sup., 7143; conc., 7166 (ii).
- See "Curran Bridge," "St. Louis," &c.
- LAND DAMAGES: in Com. of Sup., 7077 (ii).
- LITTLE RAPIDS LOCK, COST OF CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. Landerkin) 6118 (ii).
- MONTREAL TO ST. JOHNS, CANAL SURVEY: Ques. (Mr. McShane) 3634 (ii).
- RAPIDE PLAT AND SOULANGES CANAL, MR. POUPORE'S CONTRACTS: Ques. (Mr. Cameron, Huron) 6505.
- in Com. of Sup., 7144 (ii).
- RIDEAU CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 7077, 7144 (ii).
- ST. ANDREW'S RAPIDS, IMPROVEMENTS: M. for Cor. (Mr. Martin) 3643 (ii).
- ST. PETER'S CANAL (C.B.) EXPENDITURE FOR 1895: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 1870 (i).
- in Com. of Sup., 7078; conc., 7164 (ii).
- SAULT STE. MARIE CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 7145 (ii).
- SHEIKS' ISLAND DAM, LEASE OF WATER POWER: Ques. (Mr. Mulock) 6120 (ii).
- SOULANGES CANAL. See general heading.
- TAY CANAL. See general heading.
- WELLAND CANAL, CLAIMS FOR ALLEGED DAMAGES: M. for Stmt.* (Mr. Gibson) 1889 (i).
- DAMAGES BY SHIPPING: Ques. (Mr. Gibson) 3816 (ii).
- THOROLD CEMENT USED IN BUILDING, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Gibson) 3630 (ii).
- WHITEHEAD CANAL, COMPLETION: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 1677 (i).
- YAMASKA LOCK, TOLLS COLLECTED, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Mionault) 6508 (ii).
- CAPE BRETON ELECTORAL DISTRICT, VACANCY: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 144 (i).
- Member introduced, 1510 (i).
- CAPE BRETON ELECTION, EXPENDITURE OF MONEY: Remarks (Mr. Davies, P.E.I.) 1348, 1515, 1626; (Mr. Speaker) 1626; (Mr. Dickey) 1629; (Mr. Mills, Bothwell) 1631; (Mr. Weldon) 1633; (Mr. Edgar) 1634; (Mr. Taylor) 1636; (Mr. Mulock) 1638; (Mr. Davin) 1641; (Mr. Fraser) 1644; (Mr. Cameron, Huron) 1646 (i).
- PAR. IN MONTREAL "HERALD" re EXPENDITURE OF \$25,000: Remarks (Mr. Davies, P.E.I.) 1348 (i).
- Personal Explanation (Mr. Dickey) 1659 (i).
- CAPE BRETON RY., "HARD-PAN" CONTRACTS: Ques. (Mr. Cameron, Inverness) 637 (i).
- CLAIMS: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Davies, P.E.I.) 3108 (i).
- CAPE BRETON RY., ROCK, &c., EXCAVATED: Ques. (Mr. Cameron, Inverness) 1862, 3100 (i).
- SIMS & SLATER CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. Cameron, Inverness) 2004 (i).
- CAPE TORMENTINE AND CAPE TRAVERSE SERVICE: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Yeo) 4596 (ii).
- CARDWELL, ELECTORAL DIST.: Member introduced, 6 (i).
- VACANCY: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 1 (i).
- CARMUNNOCK POSTMASTER, APPOINTMENT, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Grievé) 5051 (ii).
- CARRIBOO AND YALE ELECTORAL LISTS: M. for copy (Mr. Martin) 3652 (ii).
- NOMINATION: on M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. Martin) 7045 (ii).
- CASCUMPEC HARBOUR, ROCK BLASTING: Ques. (Mr. Perry) 1253 (i).
- CATELLIER, L. A., SUPERANNUATION: Ques. (Mr. Bruneau) 4379 (ii).
- CATTLE (AMERICAN) EXPORTS FROM ST. JOHN: Remarks (Mr. Montague) 1515 (i).
- SHIPMENTS FROM CAN. PORTS: Ques. (Mr. Casey) 1618 (i).
- TRANSIT THROUGH CAN.: M. for O. C., &c. (Mr. McMullen) 720, 750 (i).
- Remarks (Mr. Mulock) 642; (Sir Richard Cartwright) 717, 753; (Mr. Montague) 718, 742; (Mr. Mulock) 719, 724; (Mr. Foster) 720; (Mr. McMullen) 720, 750; (Mr. Laurier) 721; (Mr. Mills, Bothwell) 722; (Mr. McMillan) 722; (Mr. Hazen) 723; (Mr. Sproule) 723; (Mr. Landerkin) 741 (i).
- prop. Ques. (Mr. Casey) 1184, 1252 (i).
- CATTLE (CAN.) EXCLUSION FROM GREAT BRITAIN: Remarks (Mr. Mulock) 4467 (ii).
- prop. Res. (Mr. Foster) 4686; Amt. (Mr. Mulock) 4720; neg. on div. and Res. agreed to, 4781 (ii).
- Deb. on Amt. (Sir Charles Tupper) 4720; (Sir Richard Cartwright) 4738; (Mr. McMillan) 4742; (Mr. McMullen) 4748; (Mr. O'Brien) 4758; (Mr. Landerkin) 4765; (Mr. Featherston) 4770; (Mr. Martin) 4775; (Mr. Sutherland) 4780; (Mr. Mulock) 4691, 4720, 4781 (ii).
- SHIPMENTS via U. S. PORTS: Ques. (Mr. Landerkin) 892 (i), 3816 (ii).
- EMBARGO BY GREAT BRITAIN: M. (Mr. Davin) to adjn. Hse., 3240 (i).
- Remarks (Sir Charles Tupper) 3241; (Mr. Casey) 3241; (Mr. Sproule) 3243; (Mr. McMullen) 3245; (Mr. McShane) 3245; (Mr. McMillan) 3249; (Mr. Lister) 3251; (Mr. Mulock) 3254; (Mr. Landerkin) 3263; (Mr. Featherston) 3267; (Mr. Macdonald, Huron) 3269 (i).
- CAYUGA, SALE OF VILLAGE LOTS: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Charlton) 3636 (ii).
- CENSUS (1891) FARMERS IN CAN., NUMBER: Ques. (Mr. Dawson) 1861 (i).
- MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 7140; conc., 7165 (ii).
- N. W. T. TAKEN BY MOUNTED POLICE: M. for Ret. (Mr. Martin) 1502 (i).
- CENTENNIAL EXHIBITION, CAN. COMMISSIONERS' EXPENDITURE: Ques. (Mr. Girouard) 5054 (ii).

- CHAMBERLAIN, CHAS., COMMUTATION OF SENTENCE :**
M. for O. C. (Mr. *Martin*) 1475, 1487 (i).
— Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 634 (i).
- CHAMBLY CANAL, VESSELS THROUGH FROM 1892-95 :**
M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Langelier*) 2370 (i).
- CHARBONNEAU, NAP., ESQ., MEMBER FOR JACQUES CARTIER :** Introduced, 13 (i).
- CHARLAND, H. C., SOREL, PAYMENTS TO :** M. for Stimat.* (Mr. *Bruncau*) 3107 (i).
- CHARLEVOIX ELECTORAL DIST., VACANCY :** Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 2 (i).
— Member introduced, 1510 (i).
- CHEESE, EXPENSE ACCOUNT FOR FREIGHT :** Ques. (Mr. *Rider*) 6817 (ii).
— GOVT., IN STORE : Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1025 (i).
— MANUFACTURED IN P. E. I., QUANTITY, DISPOSITION : Ques. (Mr. *Rider*) 6303 (ii).
— UNSOLD ON GOVT. ACCOUNT : Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 6115 (ii).
— See "Butter."
- CHICAGO EXHIBITION, RET. *re* EXPENSES :** Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 2532 (i).
- Chignecto Marine Transport Ry. Co.'s B. No. 59** (Mr. *Powell*). 1°, 1775 ; 2° m., 2128 ; withdn., 2572 (i).
— **B. No. 75** (Mr. *Powell*). 1°, 2572 ; 2° m., 2650 ; deb. rsmd., 3051 ; 2° neg. (Y. 54, N. 55) 3097 (i) ; M. to restore to Order Paper, 4627 ; agreed to (Y. 80, N. 63) 4649 (ii).
Deb. on M. for 2° (Mr. *Welsh*) 3051 ; (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 3065 ; (Mr. *Edgar*) 3071 ; (Mr. *Baird*) 3073 ; (Mr. *Weldon*) 3075 ; (Mr. *Davies, P. E. I.*) 3078 ; (Mr. *Mulock*) 3082 ; (Mr. *Speaker*) 3086 ; (Mr. *McMullen*) 3088 ; (Mr. *Lister*) 3092 (ii).
Deb. on M. to restore to Order Paper (Mr. *McInerney*) 4627 ; (Mr. *Welsh*) 4630 ; (Mr. *Lister*) 4630 ; (Mr. *McMullen*) 4635 ; (Mr. *Casey*) 4639 ; (Mr. *Speaker*) 4641 ; (Mr. *Ives*) 4644 ; (Mr. *Martin*) 4645 (ii).
— PREFERENTIAL MORTGAGE BONDS : Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 2006 (i).
- CHINESE IMMIGRATION :** Ques. (Mr. *McShane*) 1182 (i).
- CHRISTMAS ISLAND, & C., CONTRACTS FOR MAIL SERVICE :** Ques. (Mr. *Davies, P. E. I.*) 2410 (i).
- CIVIL GOVT. :** in Com. of Sup., 7030 (ii).
- Civil Service Act Amt. B. No. 97** (Mr. *Foster*). 1°, 6499 (ii).
— EXAMINERS : in Com. of Sup., 7033 (ii).
— REP. : presented (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 4253 (ii).
— LIST : presented (Mr. *Ouimet*) 289 (i).
- CLASSIFICATION OF FREIGHT RATES ON TRUNK LINES :** Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 3815 (ii).
- CLEARVILLE FISHERY LICENSES :** Ques. (Mr. *Casey*) 3100 (i).
— APPLICATIONS : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Casey*) 4596.
- CLERICAL IMPUTATIONS AGAINST MEMBERS *re* INTOXICANTS :** Remarks (Mr. *Speaker*) 6322 (i).
- CLOSE SEASON, CHANGE *re* LOBSTER REGULATIONS :** Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 5054 (ii).
— EXTENSION TO SMOKE FISHING : Ques. (Mr. *Davies, P. E. I.*) 3632 (ii).
- COAL OIL, IMPORTS, & C., DUTY :** Ques. (Mr. *Rider*) 1865.
- COFFEE, SUGAR AND TEA IMPORTATIONS :** Ques. (Mr. *Girouard*) 1864 (i).
- COLD STORAGE, EXPENDITURE ON BUTTER AND CHEESE :** Ques. (Mr. *Bain*) 1619 (i).
- COLEBROOKE, LATE SERGT. N. W. M. P. :** in Com. of Sup., 7052 (ii).
- COLUMBIA EXHIBITION, RET. *re* :** inquiry (Mr. *Martin*) 1892 (i).
- COLUMBIA RIVER, IMPROVED NAVIGATION, ENGINEER'S REP. :** M. for Ret. (Mr. *Mara*) 5067 (ii).
- COMMERCIAL FAILURES IN ONT. AND QUE. :** Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 1446 (i).
- COMMISSIONER ON SWEATING SYSTEM, APPNMT. :** Ques. (Mr. *Casey*) 1620 (i).
— GOVT. ACTION *re* REP. : Ques. (Mr. *Ingram*) 5052 (ii).
- COMMITTEES :** See
- DEBATES, OFFICIAL : M. for Com. (Mr. *Foster*) 601 (i).
EXPIRING LAWS, SEL. COM. : List of Members, 883 (i).
LIBRARY, JOINT COM., MESS. TO SEN. : M. (Mr. *Foster*) 888 (i).
PRINTING, JOINT COM., MESS. TO SEN. : M. (Mr. *Foster*) 888 (i).
— SEL. COM. : List of Members, 885 (i).
PRIVATE BILLS, SEL. COM. : List of Members, 884 (i).
PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS, SEL. COM. : List of Members, 883 (i).
PUBLIC ACCOUNTS, SEL. COM. : List of Members, 885.
RAILWAYS, CANALS AND TELEGRAPHS, SEL. COM. : List of Members, 883 (i).
SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES : prop. Res. (Mr. *Foster*) 5 (i).
— COM. TO PREPARE LISTS : M. (Mr. *Foster*) 601 (i).
— LISTS PRESENTED (Mr. *Foster*) 882 (i).
— NAMES ADDED : M. (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) 2095, 2172 (i).
STANDING ORDERS, SEL. COM. : List of Members, 885 (i).
- COMPANIES :** See
- ALBERT IRRIGATION CO.
BRITISH AMERICAN COAL AND TRANSPORTATION CO.
CANADA AND MICHIGAN TUNNEL AND BRIDGE CO.
CANADIAN ELECTRIC RY. AND POWER CO.
EDMONTON DISTRICT RY. AND IMPROVEMENT CO.
EQUITABLE BENEFIT CO. OF CAN.
HAMILTON BLAST FURNACE CO.
HUDSON'S BAY CANAL AND NAVIGATION CO.
HURON AND ERIE LOAN AND SAVINGS CO.
IMPERIAL LIFE ASSURANCE CO.
LOAN COMPANIES DEBENTURES.
MAN. AND NORTH-WEST MILLERS ASSOCIATION.
NATIONAL SANITARIUM ASSOCIATION.
ONTARIO PEAT FUEL AND RY. CO.
QUEENSTON HEIGHTS BRIDGE CO.
TORONTO, HAMILTON AND BUFFALO RY. CO.
YUKON AND B. C. TRADING, & C., CO.
[See "RAILWAYS."] *re* JUDGMENT : Ques. (Mr. *Laurier*) 1449 (i).
— See "Larkin."
- CONSOLID. FUND, RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES :** M. for Ret.* (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1087 (i).
- Conspiracies and Combinations, Restraint of Trade Act Amt. B. No. 12** (Mr. *Sproule*). 1°, 60 (i) ; 2°, 4654 (ii).
- Contagious Diseases.** See "ANIMALS."

CONTINGENCIES : in Com. of Sup., 7030 (ii).
 CONTROLLER OF INLAND REV., POSITION IN CABINET :
 Ques. (Mr. *Davis, Alberta*) 647 (i).
 — Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 823 (i).
 CONTROLLERS AS PRIVY COUNCILLORS : M. for O.C.
 &c. (Mr. *Laurier*) 1065 (i).
 COPYRIGHT, CAN. : Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 2337 (i).
 CORN, &C., IMPORTED BY DISTILLERS : M. for Ret.*
 (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 1509 (i).
 CORN, GRINDING FOR HUMAN FOOD : Ques. (Mr.
McMullen) 823 (i).
 — M. for Ret.* (Mr. *McMullen*) 1087 (i).
 CORNWALL CANAL : in Com. of Sup., 7143 (ii).
 CREAMERIES IN N. W. T., MONEY GRANT : prop. Res.
 (Mr. *Davin*) 2654, 2668 (i).
 CREAMERY BUTTER, EXPORTS TO ENGLAND : Ques.
 (Mr. *McMillan*) 1617 (i).
 — See "Butter."
Criminal Code (1892) Amt. B. No. 102 (Mr.
Dickey). 1°, 6499 (ii).
 — **Seduction and Abduction B. No. 73**
 (Mr. *Charlton*). 1°, 2172 (i).
 CURRAN BRIDGE CONTRACTS, QUEEN vs. ST. LOUIS :
 Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 2006 (i).
 — ORIGINAL ESTIMATE OF COST, &C. : Ques. (Mr.
Landerkin) 5348 (ii).
 — ST. LOUIS' CLAIMS AGAINST GOVT. : Ques. (Mr.
McMullen) 3631 (ii).
 — SUIT AGAINST CROWN : Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*)
 2177 (i), 5348 (ii).
 — See "St. Louis," "Justice."
CUSTOMS :
 ALCOHOLIC LIQUORS, AMERICAN, IMPORTS : Ques.
 (Mr. *Rider*) 633, 819 (i).
 — REMISSION OF DUTY : Ques. (Mr. *Rider*) 1867
 (i), 5123 (ii).
 BERLIN CUSTOMS COLLECTOR : Ques. (Mr. *Casey*) 4554
 BOARD OF CUSTOMS. APPNMT. AND POWERS, &C. : M.
 for O.C.* (Mr. *Stairs*) 3107 (ii).
 BOUCHARD, THEODORE, EMPLOYMT. BY CUSTOMS DEPT :
 Ques. (Mr. *Tarte*) 1026 (i).
 B. C. CUSTOMS, DUTIES PAID : Ques. (Mr. *Mara*) 3107.
 CHINESE IMMIGRATION : Ques. (Mr. *McShane*) 1182.
 COAL OIL, IMPORTS, &C., DUTY : Ques. (Mr. *Rider*)
 1865 (i).
 CORN, &C., IMPORTED BY DISTILLERS : M. for Ret.*
 (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 1505 (i).
 EXPORTS AND IMPORTS 1892 TO 1896, REBATES : M. for
 Summt.* (Mr. *McMillan*) 3636 (ii).
 — See "Butter," "Cheese," &c.
 FLOUR AND WHEAT, IMPORTS FOR CONSUMPTION :
 Ques. (Mr. *Campbell*) 2651 (i).
 GRAIN IMPORTS, DISTILLERS : Ques. (Mr. *Mills,*
Bothwell) 289 (i).
 GRAIN IMPORTS FROM BUFFALO, REMISSION OF
 DUTIES : Ques. (Mr. *Campbell*) 1866 (i).
 HAMILTON, JAMES H., APPNMT. TO CIVIL SERVICE :
 Ques. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 2409 (i).
 HAMILTON, JAMES F., ST. JOHN, EMPLOYMT. BY GOVT. :
 Ques. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 3106 (i).
 IN COM. OF SUP., 7036 (ii).
 KELLY, JAS., APPNMT. TO CIVIL SERVICE : Ques. (Mr.
Davies, P.E.I.) 2409 (i).
 KOOTENAY (B.C.) DISTRICT, CUSTOMS COLLECTIONS :
 (Mr. *Mara*) 4553 (ii).

CUSTOMS—Continued.

LONDON CUSTOM HOUSE, CHARGES AGAINST OFFICIALS :
 Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 1677 (i).
 — M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Forbes*) 1889 (i).
 McBEATH, ALLAN, SUPERANNUATION : M. for Cor.*
 (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 3108 (i).
 MINING MACHINERY, FREE ENTRY BY PROVINCES,
 VALUE : Ques. (Mr. *Mara*) 4558 (ii).
 MONTREAL CUSTOMS OFFICIALS, SALARIES, &C. : M.
 for Ret.* (Mr. *McMullen*) 3637 (ii).
 N. B. AND MAINE BONDED WAREHOUSES, ABOLITION :
 Ques. (Mr. *Colter*) 1869 (i).
 PETERBOROUGH COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS : Ques. (Mr.
Landerkin) 635 (i).
 PORK, SALT, IMPORTS AND DUTY COLLECTED : Ques.
 (Mr. *Borden*) 2179 (i).
 PULP WOOD, IMPOSITION OF EXPORT DUTY : Ques.
 (Mr. *Rider*) 5052 (ii).
 RETURNS, PREPARATION BY COLLECTORS : Remarks,
 (Mr. *Hazen*) 716 (i).
 ROBINSON, GEO. F., SUPERANNUATION : Ques. (Mr.
Davies, P.E.I.) 6817 (ii).
 SEALERS, DUTIES EXACTED ON STORES BY NFLD. :
 Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*) 5055 (ii).
 SPIRITS, REFUND OF DUTIES (U. S. OR CAN.) : Ques.
 (Mr. *Rider*) 1867 (i), 5123 (ii).
 STANSTEAD CUSTOMS COLLECTOR : Ques. (Mr. *Rider*)
 1026 (i).
 SUDBURY COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS : Resignation (Mr.
Fraser) 4557 (ii).
 SUGAR IMPORTS, EX-SS. "CYNTHANIA" : Ques. (Mr.
McMullen) 3629, 5345 (ii).
 THEATRICAL SCENERY, &C., DUTIES : Ques. (Mr.
McShane) 4373 (ii).
 TORONTO CUSTOMS EMPLOYEES, NUMBER, &C. : Ques.
 (Mr. *McMullen*) 4380 (ii).
 — APPNMTS. AND SALARIES : M. for Ret.* (Mr.
McMullen) 711 (i).
 — FRAUDS, SAMUEL DAVISON : Ques. (Mr. *Lan-*
derkin) 3103 (i).
 UNLEAVENED BREAD IMPORTATIONS, FREE ENTRY :
 Ques. (Mr. *McShane*) 6119 (i).
 WINNIPEG COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS, INSPECTOR
 YOUNG'S INSTRUCTIONS : M. for copies* (Mr.
Tarte) 3637 (ii).
 [See "TRADE AND COMMERCE," "INLAND REV."]
Customs Tariff (1894) Amt. B. No. 105
 (Mr. *Foster*). Res. prop. and in Com., 6664 ; 1°
 of B., 6819 ; 2°, in Com. and 3°, 6980 (ii). (59
Vic., c. 8)
 — (1895) **Amt. B. No. 23** (Mr. *McMullen*).
 1°, 643 (i) ; 2° m., 4676 ; ruled out of Order (Mr.
Speaker) 4685 (ii).
 "CYNTHANIA," SS., SUGAR IMPORTS : Ques. (Mr.
McMullen) 3629, 5345 (ii).
Dairy Products Act Amt. B. No. 5 (Mr.
McLennan). 1°, 13 (i).
 — **B. No. 67** (Mr. *Foster*). 1°, 1996 (i).
 DAIRY STATION (P.E.I.) SUPERVISION BY GOVT. :
 Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald*) 824 (i).
 DAVIS & SONS : in Com. of Sup., 7144 (ii).
 DAVISON, SAMUEL, CUSTOMS FRAUDS AT TORONTO :
 Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 3103 (i).
 DEBATES, OFFICIAL REP., M. for Com. (Mr. *Foster*)
 601 (i).

DEBATES, OFFICIAL, 1ST REP. OF COM. : presented (Mr. *LaRivière*) 814 (i).
 — 2ND REP. OF COM. : presented (Mr. *LaRivière*) 1774 (i).
 — INSERTING TABULATED STMENTS. : Remarks (Mr. *McMullen*) 2007 (i).
 — REPORTING STAFF : in Com. on Remedial Act, Ques. of Order (Mr. *Charlton*) 4210 ; (Mr. *Casey*) 4340 (ii).
 — INACCURACY IN UNREVISED ED. : Remarks (Mr. *Brodeur*) 5207 (ii).
Debentures. See "LOAN CO.'S," "MONTREAL TURNPIKE TRUST," "THREE RIVERS."
DEBT OF DOM., RET. re : Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 3816 (ii).
DEEP WATERWAYS COMMISSION : in Com. of Sup., 7080.
DEFENCE OF THE DOM. : prop. Res. (Mr. *Foster*) 2280.
 — See "Imperial Defence," &c.
DENISON, LT.-COL., LATE M.P., DECEASED : Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 6310 (ii).
Detective Corporations and Mercantile Agencies B. No. 11 (Mr. *Sproule*). 1^o, 30 ; 2^o m., 2387 ; deb. adjd., 2408 (i) ; rsmd., 4598 ; 2^o and ref. to Sel. Com., 4624 (ii).
Deb. on M. for 2^o. (Mr. *Tisdale*) 4599 ; (Mr. *Masson*) 4599 ; (Mr. *Sproule*) 4601 ; (Mr. *Cockburn*) 4602 ; (Mr. *Coatsworth*) 4609 ; (Mr. *Macdowall*) 4613 ; (Mr. *Campbell*) 4615 ; (Mr. *McGillivray*) 4616 ; (Mr. *McGregor*) 4618 ; (Mr. *Foster*) 4619 ; (Mr. *Boyle*) 4621 ; (Mr. *McMullen*) 4622 (ii).
DEWDNEY, LT.-GOV. AND LATE ELECTION IN B.C. : Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 638 (i).
DISALLOWANCE OF MAN. SCHOOL ACT : Ques. (Mr. *Laurier*) 6115 (ii).
DISTILLERS, GRAIN IMPORTS : Ques. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 289 (i).
DISTRIBUTION OF ELECTION LITERATURE BY GOVT. : Remarks (Mr. *Edgar*) 6768 (ii).
DIVISIONS :
CHIGNECTO MARINE TRANSPORT Ry. Co.'s B. 75 : on M. (Mr. *Powell*) to resume adjd. deb. for 2^o, 3051 ; neg. (Y. 54, N. 55) 3097 (i).
 — M. (Mr. *McInerney*) to restore to Order Paper for 2^o, 4627 ; agreed to (Y. 80, N. 63) 4649 (ii).
CONCURRENCE IN REP. FROM COM. OF SUP. : Amt. (Mr. *Rinfret*) Vote re Arms and Ammunition, neg. (Y. 35, N. 67) 7147 (ii).
CREAMERIES AND CHEESE FACTORIES IN N.W.T. : on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davis*) advocating Financial Aid, 3654 ; Amt. (Mr. *McGillivray*) to adjn. deb., agreed to (Y. 64, N. 25) 2670 (i).
PROHIBITION OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS : on prop. Res. (Mr. *Flinn*) 2180 ; Amt. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) to adjn. deb., 2024 ; agreed to (Y. 56, N. 47) 2228.
REMEDIAL ACT (MAN.) B. 58 : on M. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) for 2^o, 2719 ; Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) 6 m.h., 2736 (i) ; neg. (Y. 91, N. 115) 4250 ; 2^o, agreed to (Y. 112, N. 94) 4251 (ii).
 — on appeal (Mr. *McCarthy*) from ruling of the Acting Chairman in Com., Chairman's ruling sustained (Y. 93, N. 25) 5736 (ii).
SATURDAY SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE : prop. M. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 5124 ; Amt. (Mr. *Owens*) 5127 ; agreed to (Y. 91, N. 45) 5165 ; on main M., Amt. (Mr. *O'Brien*) 5166 ; neg. (Y. 30, N. 96) 5205 (ii).

DIVISIONS—Continued.

SENATE AND HOUSE OF COMMONS ACT AMT. (Rt. PASSES) B. 7 : M. (Mr. *Mulock*) to restore to Order Paper for further consda. in Com., neg. (Y. 49, N. 104) 1500 (i).
SUPERANNUATION SYSTEM, ABOLITION B. 19 : M. (Mr. *McMullen*) to resume adjd. deb. for 2^o, neg. (Y. 61, N. 72) 4655 (ii).
VOTES AND PROCEEDINGS OF THE HOUSE : on prop. M. (Mr. *Charlton*) that same should record proceedings correctly, 5216 ; Amt. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) Hse. proceed to Orders of the Day, agreed to (Y. 99, N. 7) 5223 (ii).
DIXON, CAPT., 63RD BATT., COMPLAINTS AGAINST : Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 6505 (ii).
DOM. CREDIT : on M. for Com. of Sup. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 7043 (ii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. No. 14 (Mr. *McCarthy*). 1^o, 60 (i) ; 2^o and ref. to Sel. Com., 4624 ; remarks re placing B. on Govt. Orders, 6594 (ii).
 — **B. No. 55** (Sir *Charles Hilbert Tupper*). 1^o, 1251 (i).
DOM. ELECTIONS ACT : Remarks (Mr. *McCarthy*) 6514
DOM. LANDS : in Com. of Sup., 7139 (ii).
DOM. AND MAN. GOVTS., PRINTING PAPERS : M. (Mr. *Laurier*) 1891 (i).
DOM. POLICE : in Com. of Sup., 7051 (ii).
 — **REP. OF COMMISSIONER,** presented (Mr. *Daly*) 289 (i).
DOM. REFORMATORY DISBURSEMENTS : Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 2652 (i).
 — **ESTABLISHMENT AND EXPENDITURE :** Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 2174 (i).
DOM. VOTERS' LISTS, TOTAL COST : Ques. (Mr. *Legris*) 1621 (i).
DONNELLY, T. See "Adams E."
Drainage on Railway Company's Property B. No. 3 (Mr. *Casey*). 1^o, 6 ; 2^o and ref. to Ry. Com., 613 (i).
DRAKE, MR. JUSTICE, INVESTIGATION re MANAGEMENT OF B.C. PENITENTIARY : Ques. (Mr. *Devlin*) 6117.
DREDGE, GOVT., SALE AT PORT STANLEY : Ques. (Mr. *Casey*) 3633 (ii).
DREDGING LIVERPOOL HARBOUR : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Forbes*) 3107 (i).
 — **RIVER THAMES, EXPENDITURE :** M. for Ret. (Mr. *Campbell*) 5084 (ii).
 — in Com. of Sup., 7097 (ii).
DRILLSHED, HALIFAX, INSPECTOR : Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 6817 (ii).
 — **MONTREAL, AMOUNT PAID :** M. for Stmt.* (Mr. *Tarte*) 1509 (i).
DUNCAN AND LARDO MINING DISTRICTS, ENGINEER'S REP. : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Mars*) 5061 (ii).
Edmonton District Ry. and Improvement Co.'s incorp. B. No. 54 (Mr. *Davis*). 1^o, 1182 ; 2^o, 1386 ; in Com. and 3^o, 3280 (i) ; Sen. Amts. conc. in, 6311 (ii). (59 Vic., c. 17.)
Elections Act. See "DOMINION."
ELECTIONS SINCE JAN., 1893, DISTRICTS AND CANDIDATES : Ques. (Mr. *Dawson*) 1614 (i).

- ELECTION LITERATURE, DISTRIBUTION BY GOVT. :** Remarks (Mr. *Edgar*) 6768 (ii).
- ELECTRIC LIGHT INSPECTION :** in Com. of Sup., 7132.
- ELECTORAL LISTS FOR YALE AND CARIBOO :** M. for copy (Mr. *Martin*) 3652 (ii).
- EMERSON, RY. BRIDGE ACROSS RED RIVER :** M. for O.C.* (Mr. *LaRiviere*) 3108 (i).
- EMPLOYEES, DEPTL., O.C.'s re PAYMENT :** Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 2650 (i).
- Employees Voting at Election of Members B. No. 17** (Mr. *Rider*). 1st, 62 (i); 2nd, 4655 (ii).
- Equitable Benefit Co. of Can. incorp. B. No. 33** (Mr. *Maclean, York*). 1st, 958; 2nd, 1024 (i).
- ESTIMATES, THE :** presented (Mr. *Foster*) 687 (i).
- SUPPL., 1895-96: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2988 (i), 3815, 4597, 4652, 5207, 5343 (ii).
- presented (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 6110 (ii).
- EXHIBITION, CHICAGO, RET. re EXPENSES :** Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 2532 (i).
- INTERNATIONAL: Remarks (Mr. *Bergeron*) 6876.
- N.W.T., UNPAID ACCOUNTS: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Martin*) 648, 657 (i).
- Remarks (Mr. *Davin*) 608 (i).
- REP. OF LIEUT.-GOV.: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1447.
- EXPENDITURE, GOVT., ON COLD STORAGE FOR BUTTER AND CHEESE :** Ques. (Mr. *Bain*) 1619 (i).
- PERMANENT AND ACTIVE MILITIA: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Charlton*) 3636 (ii).
- EXPERIMENTAL FARM BULLETINS :** in Com. of Sup., 7141 (ii).
- HAY SALES: Ques. (Mr. *McMillan*) 2651 (i).
- LIVE STOCK MANAGER, APPNMT.: Ques. (Mr. *Featherston*) 888 (i).
- EXPENDITURE: M. for Stmt. (Mr. *McMillan*) 1085 (i).
- EXPIRING LAWS, SEL. COM. :** List of Members, 883 (i).
- EXPORT DUTY ON PULP WOOD :** Ques. (Mr. *Rider*) 5052 (ii).
- EXPORTS AND IMPORTS, 1891 TO 1896, RERATES :** M. for Stmt.* (Mr. *McMillan*) 3636 (ii).
- EXPORTS AND IMPORTS OF BUTTER :** Ques. (Mr. *Bain*) 4380 (ii).
- MAPLE SUGAR: Ques. (Mr. *Rider*) 819 (i).
- EXPORTS TO ENGLAND OF CREAMERY BUTTER :** Ques. (Mr. *McMillan*) 1617 (i).
- See "CUSTOMS," "TRADE AND COMMERCE," &c.
- EXPRESS CO. (B.C.) CONTRACTS, &c. :** M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Martin*) 1888 (i).
- FAILURES, COMMERCIAL, ONT. AND QUE. :** Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 1446 (i).
- FARMERS, &c., IN CAN. (CENSUS, 1891) NUMBER :** Ques. (Mr. *Dawson*) 1861 (i).
- Female Offenders in N.B. B. No. 78** (Mr. *McInerney*). 1st, 4686 (ii).
- FERGUS MAIL SERVICE, CONTRACT :** Ques. (Mr. *Stubbs*) 4555 (ii).
- FERRY BOATS, ST. JOHN HARBOUR :** M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 3108 (i).
- FILLION, PHILIAS, ALLEGED APPROPRIATION OF GOVT. PROPERTY :** Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 1868 (i).
- FINANCE :**
- ASSETS OF DOM., PAR VALUE ON INVESTMENTS :** (Mr. *Charlton*) 3652 (ii).
- BANKING AND COMMERCE, SEL. COM. :** List of Members, 886 (i).
- BUDGET, THE :** Financial Stmt. (Mr. *Foster*) 961 (i).
- CAN. CREDIT: on M. for Com. of Sup. (Sir Richard Cartwright)** 7043 (ii).
- CONSOLID. FUND, RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES :** M. for Ret. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1087 (i).
- DEBT OF DOM., RET. re: Ques. (Sir Richard Cartwright)** 3816 (ii).
- DOM. CREDIT: on M. for Com. of Sup. (Sir Richard Cartwright)** 7043 (ii).
- ESTIMATES, THE :** presented (Mr. *Foster*) 687 (i).
- SUPPL., 1895-96: presented (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 6110 (ii).
- FAILURES, COMMERCIAL, ONT. AND QUE. :** Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 1446 (i).
- MONTREAL HARBOUR, GOVT. EXPENDITURE :** Ques. (Mr. *McSane*) 1676 (i).
- TURNPIKE TRUST DEBENTURES: drop. Res. (Mr. *Foster*) 2229 (i).
- PUBLIC ACCOUNTS, REF. TO COM. :** M. (Mr. *Coatsworth*) 1775 (i).
- MONIES INVESTED IN CERTAIN SECURITIES: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1860 (i).
- SUPERANNUATION. See general heading.**
- THREE RIVERS HARBOUR DEBENTURES :** Ques. (Mr. *Rinfret*) 641 (i).
- [See "SUPPLY," &c.]
- FISHERIES :**
- ALIEN LABOUR LAWS AND NEGOTIATIONS WITH U. S. :** Ques. (Mr. *Casey*) 1027 (i).
- BIDEFORD FISH WARDEN, APPNMT. :** Ques. (Mr. *Yeo*) 1624 (i).
- BOUNTIES TO FISHERMEN, PAYMENTS :** Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 4557 (ii).
- BOUNTY CHEQUES ISSUED IN DIGBY, N.S. :** Ques. (Mr. *Bowers*) 644 (i).
- FRAUDS IN N. S. AND N. B. : M. for Cor. (Mr. *Bowers*) 1631 (i).
- FISHING SCHOONER "PIONEER" : Ques. (Mr. *Laverque*) 1184 (i).
- CLEARVILLE FISHERY LICENSES :** Ques. (Mr. *Casey*) 3100 (i).
- APPLICATIONS: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Casey*) 4596.
- IN COM. OF SUP., 7100; conc. 7164 (ii).**
- FISHERY COMMISSION (JOINT) CAN. AND U. S. :** Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 5346 (ii).
- FISHWAYS, MADUXNEKAG, COST OF REPAIRS :** Ques. (Mr. *Colter*) 1623 (i).
- NORTH RIVER, TERREBONNE: Ques. (Mr. *Girouard*) 4377, 5349 (ii).
- KENT COUNTY, FISHERY OVERSEER, LICENSES ISSUED :** Ques. (Mr. *Campbell*) 1615 (i).
- LAKE ERIE FISHERIES, NETS AND LICENSES :** Ques. (Mr. *Casey*) 3332 (ii).
- LENNOX COUNTY, FISHING LICENSES :** Ques. (Mr. *Lunderkin*) 889 (i).
- LOBSTER AND OYSTER PLANTING IN B. C. :** Ques. (Mr. *Corbould*) 3099 (i).
- FISHERY REGULATIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Bowers*) 822 (i).
- CHANGE re CLOSE SEASON: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 5054 (ii).

FISHERIES—Continued.

- “MODUS VIVENDI,” TREATY (1888) WITH DEL.: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Laurier*) 1064 (i).
- NEWFOUNDLAND BAIT ACT, REFUND FOR CAN. LICENSES: Ques. (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 1252 (i).
- FISHING LICENSES, REFUND: Ques. (Mr. *Flint*) 645 (i), 6114 (ii).
- PORT ARTHUR DISTRICT FISHING LICENSES: Ques. (Mr. *McCarthy*) 6116 (ii).
- PORT DOVER FISHING LICENSES: Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 2654 (i).
- M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Chamom*) 3636 (ii).
- POUND-NET LICENSES IN B.C.: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 820, 1624 (i).
- RIVER THAMES DISTRICT, FISHERY OVERSEER: Ques. (Mr. *Campbell*) 1445 (i).
- SEALERS, DUTIES ON STORES EXACTED BY NFLD.: Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*) 5055 (ii).
- SEBENA RIVER FISHERMEN, SUNDAY REST: Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 3632 (ii).
- SMELT FISHING, EXTENSION OF CLOSE SEASON: Ques. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 3632 (ii).
- TUPPER, R. L., FISHERY INSPECTOR, COMPLAINTS AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. *McCarthy*) 6507 (ii).
- Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 6509 (ii).
- [See PROVINCES.]
- FISH ISLAND LIGHTHOUSE KEEPER, APPNMT.: Ques. (Mr. *Yeo*) 1623 (i).
- FLOUR AND WHEAT, IMPORTS FOR CONSUMPTION: Ques. (Mr. *Campbell*) 2651 (i).
- FOG ALARM, BRIER ISLAND, REPLACING BUILDING: Ques. (Mr. *Bowers*) 6816 (ii).
- FORAN, W.: in Com. of Sup., 7033 (ii).
- FOREIGN RELATIONS TO THE EMPIRE: Remarks (Mr. *McNeill*) 892 (i).
- See “Imperial Defence,” “Preferential Trade.”
- Foresters (Supreme Court) Independent Order, Act Amt. B. No. 29** (Mr. *McGillivray*). 1*, 958; 2*, 1023; M. for Com., 1861; in Com. and 3*, 2128 (i). (59 *Vic.*, c. 51.)
- FORT FRANCIS LOCKS, EXPENDITURE FROM 1874 TO 1878: Ques. (Mr. *Girouard*) 5054 (ii).
- FRANCE AND BELGIUM, OCEAN SS. SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Ives*) 2230 (i).
- FREE ENTRY OF MINING MACHINERY BY PROVINCES, VALUE: Ques. (Mr. *Mara*) 4558 (ii).
- FREIGHT RATES COMMISSION, COST: M. for Stmt.* (Mr. *Martin*) 3108 (i).
- ON RYS.: Remarks (Mr. *Mulock*) 3109 (i).
- TRUNK LINES, CLASSIFICATION: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 3815 (ii).
- GALOPS RAPIDS, CONTRACT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 6118 (ii).
- GAMBLE, F. C. See “Columbia,” “Duncan and Lardo.”
- GAS CONTRACT, GOVT. BUILDINGS, OTTAWA: Ques. (Mr. *Campbell*) 3105 (i).
- GASPE BASIN AND GRAND GREVE MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Joncas*) 639 (i).
- GASPE HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 4378 (ii).
- “GAZETTE,” MONTREAL, PAYMENTS FOR ADVERTISING, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Rider*) 3634 (ii).
- GEOLOGICAL SURVEY, DEPTL. REP.: presented (Mr. *Daly*) 3469 (ii).
- in Com. of Sup., 7125 (ii).
- GERMAN LANGUAGE IN MAN. AND N. W. T., TRANSLATION OF SCHOOL LAWS: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 3099, 4379.
- GIBSON'S CREEK, EXPENDITURE: M. for Stmt.* (Mr. *Colter*) 1509 (i).
- GIROUARD, HON. DESIRE, APPNMT. AS JUDGE OF SUPREME COURT: M. for O.C.* (Mr. *Tarte*) 1509.
- GODERICH HARBOUR, REPS. *re* PIERS AND BREAKWATERS: Ques. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 2340 (i).
- GOODWIN, GEO., SOULANGES CANAL CONTRACTS: ON M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 6514 (ii).
- See “Soulanges Canal.”
- GOOD FRIDAY, SITTING OF HSE.: Remarks (Mr. *Laurier*) 4917 (ii).
- GORDON, WM.: in Com. of Sup., 7123 (ii).
- GOVT. AID TO MAGOG WHARF: Ques. (Mr. *Rider*) 3634 (ii).
- GOVT. BUSINESS: Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 1016; (Mr. *Laurier*) 1087 (i).
- PRECEDENCE ON THURSDAYS: prop. M. (Mr. *Foster*) 1123, 1129 (i).
- MONDAYS: prop. M. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 4254; withdn., 4269 (ii).
- Amt. (Mr. *Choquette*) 4269 (ii).
- Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 4270 (ii).
- MONDAYS AND THURSDAYS: M. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 4463 (ii).
- M. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 5049, 5124 (ii).
- objection (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 5049 (ii).
- GOVT. ENGINEERS' SURVEYS OF PROBABLE CANALS: Remarks (Mr. *Bergeron*) 3471 (ii).
- LIABILITIES. See “Labour.”
- PROPERTY IN MOOSE JAW: prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 1453, 1463 (i).
- Govt. Rys. Act. Amt. B. No. 88** (Mr. *Haggart*). 1°, 4650 (ii).
- RY. CARS FOR OFFICIALS: Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 4379 (ii).
- GOV. GEN., REF. TO IN DEB.: Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 4258, 4293 (ii).
- GOV. GEN.'S CAR “VICTORIA”: in Com. of Sup., 7076 (ii).
- GOV. GEN.'S SEC'S OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 7031 (ii).
- GRAIN IMPORTS FROM BUFFALO, REMISSION OF DUTIES: Ques. (Mr. *Campbell*) 1866 (i).
- IMPORTS BY DISTILLERS: Ques. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 289 (i).
- (SEED) STANDARDS: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 2411 (i).
- STANDARDS IN N.W.T.: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1863 (i).
- STANDARDS, REP. OF MEETING IN WINNIPEG: Remarks (Mr. *Mulock*) 2007 (i).
- GRAND GREVE MAIL SERVICE AND GASPE BASIN: Ques. (Mr. *Joncas*) 639 (i).
- POSTMASTER, RESIGNATION: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 1625 (i).

- Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s and St. Lawrence and Adirondack Ry. B. No. 37** (Mr. *Bergeron*). 1^o*, 958; 2^o*, 1024; in Com. and 3^o*, 1860. (59 *Vic.*, c. 18.)
- GREEN SAND CASTINGS, & C., I. C. R., CONTRACTS: QUES. (Mr. *Fraser*) 3105 (i).
- GREENWAY, MR., TELEGRAM *re* MAN. SCHOOLS: Read (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 3098 (i).
- Remarks (Mr. *Laurier*) 3111 (i).
- Guelph Junction Ry. Co.'s B. No. 30** (Mr. *Masson*). 1^o*, 958; 2^o*, 1024; in Com. and 3^o*, 1860 (i). (59 *Vic.*, c. 19.)
- GUEVREMONT, J. B., SUPERANNUATION: M. for O.C.* (Mr. *Flint*) 711 (i).
- GUY, MAJOR G., SERVICES *re* REBELLION: in Com. of Sup., 7142 (ii).
- HALF-BREED ALLOTMENTS, MAN. AND N. W. T.: QUES. (Mr. *Charlton*) 5037 (ii).
- LANDS GRANTED: QUES. (Mr. *O'Brien*) 3100 (i).
- HALIFAX DRILL SHED, INSPECTOR: QUES. (Mr. *Forbes*) 6817 (ii).
- Hamilton Blast Furnace Co.'s incorp. B. No. 69** (Mr. *McKay*). 1^o*, 2096; 2^o, 2174; in Com. and 3^o*, 3016 (i). (59 *Vic.*, c. 48.)
- HAMILTON, JAS. H., APPOINT. TO CIVIL SERVICE: QUES. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 2409 (i).
- JAMES F., ST. JOHN, EMPLOYT. BY GOVT.: QUES. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 3106 (i).
- LT.-COL.: on M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Mulock*) 6679, 7017, 7123 (ii).
- RESIGNATION: QUES. (Mr. *Edgar*) 5345 (ii).
- HARBOURS AND RIVERS: in Com. of Sup., 7095 (ii).
- Harbour Commissioners of Montreal B. No. 110** (Mr. *Foster*). Res. prop., 4254; in Com., 6827; 1^o* of B., 6901; 2^o* and in Com., 6992; 3^o*, 7113 (ii). (59 *Vic.*, c. 10.)
- THREE RIVERS: QUES. (Mr. *Langelier*) 642 (i).
- HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS, GASPÉ: QUES. (Mr. *Choquette*) 4378 (ii).
- HARBOUR MASTER, ASSISTANT, ST. JOHNS (P.Q.) APPOINT.: QUES. (Mr. *Lavergne*) 2341 (i).
- "HARD-PAN." *See* "Cape Breton Ry."
- HARRIS PROPERTY, ST. JOHN (N.B.) GOVT. PURCHASE FOR I.C.R.: QUES. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 2410 (i).
- QUES. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 5346 (ii).
- HASTEY, ROBT., MAIL CONTRACT: in Com. of Sup., 7135 (ii).
- HAULAGE OF OFFICIAL CARS ON RYS.: QUES. (Mr. *Charlton*) 5050 (ii).
- HAY SALES, CENTRAL EXPERIMENTAL FARM: QUES. (Mr. *McMillan*) 2651 (i).
- HIGH COMMISSIONER, RET. *re*: QUES. (Mr. *Casey*) 1515, 2987, 3047 (i).
- Remarks (Mr. *Casey*) 1255, 1679, 2012 (i).
- DUTIES IN LONDON: M. for O.C. (Mr. *Casey*) 687, 700 (i).
- VISIT TO CAN.: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Casey*) 647 (i).
- *See* "Tupper, Sir Charles."
- HODGINS AND O'KEEFE: in Com. of Sup., 7035 (ii).
- Honey.** *See* "ADULTERATION."
- HORSES (DISEASED) SHIPPED TO GREAT BRITAIN FROM WESTERN STATES *via* CAN.: QUES. (Mr. *Featherston*) 3106 (i).
- HOSPITAL DUES, ABOLITION OF TONNAGE TAX: QUES. (Mr. *McShane*) 1619 (i).
- HOUDE, LÉANDRE, EMPLOYT. BY GOVT.: QUES. (Mr. *Légris*) 1622 (i).
- HOUSE OF COMMONS:
- ADDRESS IN ANS. TO HIS EX.'S SPEECH: Res. (Mr. *Foster*) 5; agreed to, 600 (i).
- REPLY FROM HIS EX.: presented (Mr. *Foster*) 1254 (i).
- AMYOT, MR., LATE M.P., DECEASED: Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 4898 (ii).
- BUSINESS OF THE HSE.: M. (Mr. *Foster*) 144 (i).
- CARDWELL, ELECTORAL DIST.: Member introduced, 6 (i).
- DEBATES, OFFICIAL REP. *See* general heading.
- DENISON, LT.-COL., LATE M.P., DECEASED: Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 6510 (ii).
- GOOD FRIDAY, SITTING OF HSE.: Remarks (Mr. *Laurier*) 4917 (ii).
- GOV. GENERAL, REF. TO IN DEB.: Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 4258, 4293 (ii).
- GOVT. BUSINESS: Remarks (Mr. *Laurier*) 29, 1087 (i).
- PRECEDENCE ON MONDAYS: prop. M. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 4254; withdn., 4269 (ii).
- Amt. (Mr. *Choquette*) 4269 (ii).
- Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 4270 (ii).
- MONDAYS AND THURSDAYS: Ms. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 4463, 5049, 5124 (ii).
- INTERNAL ECONOMY COMMISSION: Remarks (Mr. *Laurier*) 288 (ii).
- JACQUES CARTIER ELECTORAL DIST.: Member introduced, 13 (i).
- LEGISLATION: in Com. of Sup., 7051 (ii).
- MEMBER CALLED TO ORDER: obstructing Business (Mr. *Speaker*) 535 (i).
- MEMBERS, NEW, RET. OF, NOTIFICATION (Mr. *Speaker*) 2, 5, 13, 69, 435, 1625 (i).
- MEMBERS' REMARKS CHECKED: (Mr. *Speaker*) 811, 703, 850, 1147, 1254, 1500, 1544, 1546, 2539 (i), 3646, 3664, 3733, 3796, 3983, 4010, 4216, 4467, 4482, 4510, 4904, 4912, 6879, 7083 (ii).
- MESS. FROM HIS EX.: presented, 346, 687, 892, 1254, 3594 (i), 6110 (ii).
- MONTREAL CENTRE ELECTORAL DIST.: Member introduced, 6 (i).
- ELECTION, RETURNING OFFICERS, & C., ACCOUNTS: QUES. (Mr. *Brodeur*) 3101 (i).
- NORTH ONT. ELECTORAL DIST.: Member introduced, 2 (i).
- PARLIAMENT, 6TH SESSION: Opening, 1 (i).
- CONSTITUTIONAL TERM: QUES. (Mr. *Rider*) 819.
- QUES. (Mr. *O'Brien*) 3104 (i).
- QUES. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 3470 (i), 3598, 3626 (ii).
- PERSONAL EXPLANATION: Unparliamentary Language (Mr. *Kenny*) 279, 288 (i).
- RESTAURANT OF HSE., CLERICAL IMPUTATIONS AGAINST MEMBERS *re* INTOXICANTS: Remarks (Mr. *Speaker*) 6325 (ii).
- SATURDAY SITTINGS; Ms. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 5049, 5124 (ii).
- SENATE AND HOUSE OF COMMONS, DEDUCTIONS FOR NON-ATTENDANCE: prop. Res. (Mr. *Foster*) 6818.

HOUSE OF COMMONS—Continued.

- SESSIONAL EMPLOYEES, NON-PAYMENT: M. to adj. Hse. (Mr. *Sproule*) 4900 (ii).
- SPEECH FROM THE THRONE: Rep. (Mr. *Speaker*) 2 (i).
- UNPARLIAMENTARY LANGUAGE: 223, 246, 255, 472, 476, 1148, 1550, 1629, 2618, 2626 (i), 3734, 4953, 4959, 6852 (ii).
- VACANCIES: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1, 194, 346, 1509 (i).
- VICTORIA (B.C.) ELECTORAL DIST.: Member introduced, 69 (i).
- VOTES AND PROCEEDINGS, OMISSION OF M.: Remarks (Mr. *Edgar*) 5216 (ii).
- WESTMORELAND ELECTORAL DIST.: Member introduced, 6 (i).
- WICKSTEED, RICHARD J., DISMISSAL FROM HOUSE OF COMMONS: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *McCarthy*) 3107 (i).
[See "ORDER," &c., "SPEAKER, MR."]
- House of Commons. See "SENATE."
- House of Commons B. No. 16 (Mr. *McCarthy*). 1°, 61 (i); 2°, 4655; in Com., 5099 (ii).
- Hudson's Bay Canal and Nav. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 52 (Mr. *Boyd*). 1°, 1182; 2°, 1386 (i); M. for Com., 4788; Amt. (Mr. *Flint*) 6 m. h., 4879; neg. on div. and in Com., 4897; again in Com., 5344 (ii).
- Deb. on M. for Com. (Mr. *Devlin*) 4788; (Mr. *Martin*) 4788, 4882 (Mr. *Speaker*) Rulings, 4788, 4798, 4829, 4833; (Mr. *Charlton*) 4790; (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 4790; (Mr. *Laurier*) 4790; Appeal from Chair (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 4791; (Mr. *Daly*) 4824; (Mr. *Welsh*) 4834; (Mr. *Macdowall*) 4836; (Sir *James Grant*) 4839; (Mr. *Lister*) 4841; (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 4848; (Mr. *Davies, P. E. I.*) 4857; (Mr. *Haggart*) 4866; (Mr. *Casey*) 4870; (Mr. *Haslam*) 4872; (Mr. *Fraser*) 4874; (Mr. *Macdonald, Huron*) 4876.
- Hudson's Bay and Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 31 (Mr. *Macdonnell, Algoma*). 1°, 958; 2°, 1024; M. (Mr. *Tisdale*) to place on Order Paper for Com., 6593; in Com., 7042 (ii).
- Huron and Erie Loan and Savings Co.'s B. No. 49 (Sir *John Carling*). 1°, 1088; 2°, 1222; in Com. and 3°, 2572 (i). (59 *Vic.*, c. 49.)
- Huron and Ont. Ry. Co.'s B. No. 28 (Mr. *Sproule*). 1°, 958; 2°, 1023 (i); in Com., 4376; 3°, 4724. (59 *Vic.*, c. 20.)
- HURON (WEST) ELECTORAL DIST., VACANCY: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).
- RET. OF MEMBER: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 435 (i).
- ILLICIT STILL AT OKA: Ques. (Mr. *O'Brien*) 2338 (i).
- PROSECUTIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Bruneau*) 1677 (i).
- IMMIGRATION OF BOYS TO CAN.: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Casey*) 5074 (ii).
- IMPERIAL APPOINTMENTS TO MILITARY SERVICE: Personal Explanation (Mr. *O'Brien*) 6978 (ii).
- ASSISTANCE *re* CAN. DEFENCE: Ques. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 1254 (i).
- DEFENCE AND BRITISH CONNECTION: prop. Res. (Mr. *McNeill*) 1186 (i).
- AND PREFERENTIAL TRADE: prop. Res. (Mr. *McNeill*) 4381, 4461 (ii).
- GOVT. AND ROYAL CAN. INFANTRY: Ques. (Mr. *O'Brien*) 1617 (i).

Imperial Life Assurance Co. of Can. incorp B. No. 64 (Mr. *Coatsworth*). 1°, 1775; 2° m., 2129; 2°, 2173; in Com. and 3°, 3050 (i). (59 *Vic.*, c. 50.)

— PARLT., LIVE STOCK EXCLUSION B.: Remarks (Mr. *Griere*) 2172 (i).

IMPORTS. See "CUSTOMS," "INLAND REV.," "TRADE AND COMMERCE."

IMPROVEMENTS AT ST. ANDREW'S RAPIDS: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Martin*) 3643 (ii).

Independence of Parliament B. No. 9 (Mr. *Mulock*). 1°, 30; 2° m., 2372; Amt. (Mr. *Dickey*) 3 m. h., 2380; agreed to, 2387 (i).

INDIANS:

CAYUGA, SALE OF VILLAGE LOTS: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Charlton*) 3636 (ii).

INDIAN AFFAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 7031 (ii).

MAN. AND N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 7147 (ii).

MCPHERSON, GEORGE, INDIAN AGENT: in Com. of Sup., 7125 (ii).

ONT. AND QUE.: in Com. of Sup., 7124 (ii).

SEED GRAIN, &c., TO HALF-BREEDS, N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 7124 (ii).

WALPOLE ISLAND, LEASE OR SALE OF MARSH: Ques. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 642 (i).

— M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 1889 (i).

[See "INTERIOR," "MAN." AND "N.W.T."]

INFANTRY SCHOOLS, NON-COMS. AND MEN ADMITTED: Ques. (Mr. *McGillivray*) 6510 (ii).

— MILITIA EFFICIENCY: Ques. (Mr. *Bain*) 4556.

INLAND REVENUE:

BEER LICENSES IN NEPEAWA, MAN.: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Martin*) 1078 (i).

BENJAMIN, E. W., PAYMENTS TO INLAND REVENUE *re* WEIGHTS AND MEASURES: Ques. (Mr. *Dawson*) 2339 (i).

CONTROLLER OF INLAND REV., POSITION IN CABINET: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 647 (i).

DEPTL. REP.: presented (Mr. *Costigan*) 31 (i).

ELECTRIC LIGHT INSPECTION: in Com. of Sup., 7132.

ILLICIT STILL AT OKA: Ques. (Mr. *O'Brien*) 2338 (i).

— WHISKEY STILLS, PROSECUTIONS AT SOREL: Ques. (Mr. *Bruneau*) 1677 (i).

GRAIN IMPORTS BY DISTILLERS: Ques. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 289 (i).

TOBACCO, RAW LEAF, IMPORTATIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Jeannotte*) 637 (i).

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES INSPECTOR, THREE RIVERS: Ques. (Mr. *Leduc*) 641, 823 (i).

[See "CUSTOMS," "TRADE AND COMMERCE."]

INTERPROVINCIAL BRIDGE, NEPEAN POINT: Ques. (Mr. *Devlin*) 1625 (i).

— M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Devlin*) 5078 (ii).

INSOLVENCY B. 51 FRENCH COPY: Remarks (Mr. *Martin*) 4653 (ii).

Insolvency B. No. 51 (Mr. *Martin*). 1°, 1088 (i).

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY:

ACCIDENT AT LEVIE: in Com. of Sup., 7087 (ii).

BELIVEAU, JOSEPH, INDEMNITY FOR INJURIES: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Bruneau*) 5077 (ii).

CONTRACTS FOR GREEN SAND CASTINGS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 3105 (i).

EMPLOYERS, ROLLING STOCK, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McMullen*) 707 (i).

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—Continued.

- HARRIS PROPERTY, ST. JOHN, GOVT. PURCHASE :
Ques. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 2410 (i).
OFFICIALS IN MUNICIPAL ELECTIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Mignault*) 2004 (i).
RATES AND REBATES: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 3102 (i).
SHIPMENTS BY SS. "ADMIRAL": Ques. (Mr. *Fauvel*)
3104 (i).
WORKSHOPS AT RIVIERE DU LOUP, APPRENTICES.
Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 1446 (i).

Interest B. No. 8 (Mr. *Mulock*). 1^o*, 13; 2^o m.
and deb. adjd., 631; rsmd., 1233; 2^o 1250 (i).

INTERIOR.

- BOUNDARY, CAN.-ALASKA SURVEYS: Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 4377 (ii).
—— N.B., N.S. and U.S., DELIMITATION: in Com.
of Sup., 7125 (ii).
COLERROOKE, LATE SERGT. N.W.M.P.: in Com. of
Sup., 7052 (ii).
DOM. LANDS: in Com. of Sup., 7139 (ii).
GEOLOGICAL SURVEY: in Com. of Sup., 7125 (ii).
HALF-BREED ALLOTMENTS, MAN. AND N.W.T.: Ques.
(Mr. *Charlton*) 5037 (ii).
—— LANDS GRANTED: Ques. (Mr. *O'Brien*) 3100 (i).
IN COM. OF SUP., 7035 (ii).
IRRIGATION IN N.W.T., LEGISLATION RESPECTING:
Remarks (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 4597 (ii).
MOUNTED POLICE, ENGAGEMENT OF CRIMINALS: Ques.
(Mr. *Davin*) 1346 (i).
—— in Com. of Sup., 7053, 7123 (ii).
REBELLION, SCRIP FOR SCOUTS: prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*)
3337 (ii).
SCHOOLS, &c., N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 7129 (ii).
SEED GRAIN; in Com. of Sup., 7125 (ii).
—— ALBERTA SETTLERS, DISTRIBUTION: Ques. (Mr. *Laverone*)
2341 (i).

[See "MANITOBA," "N.W.T.," &c.]

- INTERIOR DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 7035 (ii).
INTERIOR, DEPTL. REP.: presented (Mr. *Daly*) 1675
INTERIOR (INDIAN AFFAIRS) DEPTL. REP.: presented
(Mr. *Daly*) 1346 (i).
INTERNAL ECONOMY COMMISSION: Remarks (Mr. *Laurier*)
288 (i).
—— MESS. FROM HIS EX.: presented (Mr. *Foster*) 346.
—— PAPERS re DISMISSAL OF R. J. WICKSTEED: M.
for copies* (Mr. *McCarthy*) 3108 (i).
INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION: Remarks (Mr. *Edgar*)
2011 (i).
—— Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 2337 (i).
—— RES., COPY TO H. M.'s GOVT.: M. (Mr. *Edgar*)
4559 (ii).
—— EXHIBITION: Remarks (Mr. *Bergeron*) 6876 (ii).
International Radial Ry. Co.'s Act Amt.
B. No. 63 (Mr. *Masson*). 1^o*, 1775; 2^o, 2173
(i); in Com. and 3^o*, 3848 (ii). (59 *Vic.*, c. 21.)
INTOXICANTS, IMPUTATIONS AGAINST MEMBERS OF
HSE.: Remarks (Mr. *Speaker*) 6322 (ii).
INVITATION TO MR. GREENWAY TO VISIT OTTAWA re
MAN. SCHOOLS: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 3099 (i).
IRRIGATION IN N.W.T., LEGISLATION RESPECTING:
Remarks (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 4597 (ii).
JACQUES CARTIER ELECTORAL DIST., VACANCY: Noti-
fication (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).
—— Member introduced, (13).

JUSTICE:

- ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE: in Com. of Sup., 7046
BARRISTERS (ONT.) EMPLOYED BY GOVT. IN QUE.
CASES: Ques. (Mr. *Deolin*) 5123 (ii).
BINDING TWINE, SALES, MONEYS DUE GOVT.: Ques.
(Mr. *McMullen*) 4652, 5050, 5122 (ii).
CHAMBERLAIN, CHAS., COMMUTATION OF SENTENCE: M.
for O.C. (Mr. *Martin*) 1475, 1487 (i).
—— Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 634 (i).
CONNOLLY, N. K. AND M., CROWN'S CLAIM re JUDG-
MENT: Ques. (Mr. *Laurier*) 1449 (i).
COPYRIGHT, CAN.: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 2337 (i).
DOM. POLICE, MCGAHEY, JOHN, EMPLOYT. ON FORCE:
Ques. (Mr. *Deolin*) 2179 (i).
—— in Com. of Sup., 7051 (ii).
DOM. REFORMATORY, DISBURSEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*)
2652 (i).
—— ESTABLISHMENT AND EXPENDITURE: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*)
2174 (i).
DRAKE, MR. JUSTICE, INVESTIGATION re MANAGEMENT
OF B.C. PENITENTIARY: Ques. (Mr. *Deolin*) 6117
(ii).
GIROUARD, HON. DESIRE, APPOINT. AS JUDGE OF
SUPREME COURT: M. for O.C. (Mr. *Tarte*) 1509 (i).
LARKIN, CONNOLLY & CO., SALE OF PLANT: Ques. (Mr. *Campbell*)
3635 (ii).
LEGAL FEES, &c., PAID IN MONTREAL AND QUEBEC
DISTRICTS: Ques. (Mr. *Monet*) 2651 (i).
MASSON, EX-M.P., APPOINT. AS JUDGE: Remarks
(Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 6959 (ii).
QUEEN vs. ST. LOUIS re CURRAN BRIDGE CONTRACTS:
Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 2006 (i).
ROGERS, ROET., OF MAN., AMOUNT DUE GOVT.: Ques.
(Mr. *Grieve*) 822 (i).
ST. LOUIS vs. QUEEN re CURRAN BRIDGE CONTRACTS:
Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 2177 (i).
—— Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 2177 (i).
—— Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 3631 (ii).
—— SUIT AGAINST CROWN: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*)
5348 (ii).
—— AWARD OF SUPREME COURT: Ques. (Mr. *Lan-
derkin*) 6505 (ii).
SHORTIS, VALENTINE, COMMUTATION OF DEATH SEN-
TENCE: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 818; M. for Ret.,
836 (i); Remarks, 7171 (ii).
—— Ques. (Mr. *Rider*) 1025 (i).
—— PRINTING PAPERS, re CASE: M. (Mr. *Scriven*)
1996 (i).
SOLICITOR GEN. (EX) PRIV. SEC.: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*)
4378 (ii).
SUPREME COURT REPS., DELAY IN PUBLICATION:
Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 637 (i).
KAMLOOP'S AND SPENCE'S BRIDGE (B. C.) MAIL CON-
TRACT: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1186 (i).
KELLY, JAS., APPOINT. TO CIVIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Davis, P.E.I.*)
2409 (i).
KESWICK AND ROACH'S POINT MAIL CONTRACT: Ques.
(Mr. *Charlton*) 5051, 6120, 6505 (ii).
KILDARE STATION, POSTMASTERSHIP: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*)
635 (i).
KOOTENAY (B. C.) RAPIDS NAVIGATION: in Com. of
Sup., 7096 (ii).
—— CUSTOMS DISTRICT COLLECTIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Mara*)
4558 (ii).
Jockey Club. See "CANADIAN."
JUDGES. See "Superior Court."

- Kingston, Napanee, &c., Ry. Co.'s.** See "BAY OF QUINTÉ."
- Kingston, Smith's Falls and Ottawa Ry. Co's. B. No. 82** (Mr. Taylor). 1^o, 3469 (i); 2^o*, 3628; in Com. and 3^o*, 4597 (ii). (59 Vic., c. 22.)
- Labour on Public Works (Govt. Liability) B. No. 4** (Mr. McLennan). 1^o*, 13; 2^o m., 855; 2^o and ref. to Sel. Com., 882; in Com. and 3^o, 4598 (ii). (59 Vic., c. 5.)
- LABOUR PAYMENTS AT MABOU BREAKWATER:** Ques. (Mr. Cameron, Inverness) 2174 (i).
- Labourers on Public Works (Working Day) B. No. 13** (Mr. Lepine). 1^o*, 31 (i).
- LACHINE CANAL BRIDGES, COST OF CONSTRUCTION:** Ques. (Mr. Landerkin) 6118 (ii).
- LACHINE CANAL:** in Com. of Sup., 7143, conc., 7166.
- Lake Erie and Detroit River Ry. Co.'s B. No. 41** (Mr. McGregor). 1^o*, 958; 2^o*, 1024; in Com. and 3^o*, 2128 (i). (59 Vic., c. 23.)
- LAKE ERIE FISHERIES, NETS AND LICENSES:** Ques. (Mr. Casey) 3632 (ii).
- LA MALBAIE, ST. URBAIN AND ST. ALEXIS MAIL CONTRACT:** Ques. (Mr. Angers) 2340 (i).
- LAND DAMAGES:** in Com. of Sup., 7077 (ii).
- Land Grants to Militia (Active Service, N.W.T.) B. No. 93** (Mr. Daly). 1^o, 5343 (ii).
- LAND GRANTS TO HALF-BREEDS IN MAN. AND N.W.T.:** Ques. (Mr. O'Brien) 3100 (i).
— Ques. (Mr. Charlton) 5037 (ii).
- LANGEVIN BLOCK, ESTIMATED COST:** Ques. (Mr. Landerkin) 6119 (ii).
- LARDO AND DUNCAN MINING DISTRICTS, ENGINEER'S REPS.:** M. for Ret. (Mr. Mara) 5064 (ii).
- LARKIN, CONNOLLY & CO., SALE OF PLANT:** Ques. (Mr. Campbell) 3635 (ii). See "Connolly."
- LEGAL FEES, &c., PAID IN MONTREAL AND QUEBEC DISTRICTS:** Ques. (Mr. Monct) 2651 (i).
- LEGISLATION, SENATE:** in Com. of Sup., 7051 (ii).
- LENNOX COUNTY FISHING LICENSES:** Ques. (Mr. Landerkin) 889 (i).
- LETTER FROM CLERGY TO SIR JOHN THOMPSON, re CATHOLIC SCHOOLS, N.W.:** Ques. (Mr. Choquette) 2408 (i).
- LETTER POSTAGE, REDUCTION:** Ques. (Mr. McShane) 4556 (ii).
- LÉVIS GRAVING DOCK AND SS. SERVICE:** Ques. (Mr. McShane) 6817 (ii).
- LIBRARY JOINT COM., MESS. TO SEN.:** M. (Mr. Foster) 888 (i).
— JOINT REP. : presented (Mr. Speaker) 5 (i).
- Lindsay, Bobcaygeon and Pontypool Ry. Co.'s B. No. 27** (Mr. Fairbairn). 1^o*, 958; 2^o*, 1023; in Com. and 3^o*, 1860 (i). (59 Vic., c. 24.)
- LICENSES, FISHING.** See "FISHERIES."
- LIGHTHOUSE-KEEPER, DISMISSAL OF ARTHUR SIMARD:** Ques. (Mr. Angers) 4380 (ii).
- LINKLETTER ROAD P. O., ESTABLISHMENT:** M. for Ret. (Mr. Yeo) 1446, 2366 (i).
- LIQUOR TRAFFIC.** See "Prohibition."
- LITTLE METIS BAY HARBOUR OF REFUGE, ON ORDER FOR RET.:** Remarks (Mr. Sriver) 3657 (ii).
— M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. McShane) 4560 (ii).
- LITTLE RAPIDS LOCK, COST OF CONSTRUCTION:** Ques. (Mr. Landerkin) 6118 (ii).
- LIVERPOOL AND ST. JOHN SS. SERVICE:** in Com. of Sup., 7098 (ii).
- LIVERPOOL HARBOUR, DREDGING:** M. for Ret.* (Mr. Forbes) 3107 (i).
- LIVE-STOCK EXCLUSION B. IMPERIAL PARLT.:** Remarks (Mr. Grieve) 2172 (i).
- Loan Companies Debentures B. No. 66.** (Mr. Tisdale). 1^o*, 1859 (i); 2^o*, in Com. and 3^o*, 7170 (ii). (59 Vic., c. 11.)
— See "BUILDING SOCIETIES."
- LOBSTER AND OYSTER PLANTING IN B. C.:** Ques. (Mr. Corbould) 3099 (i).
— FISHERY REGULATIONS: Ques. (Mr. Bowers) 822 (i).
— CHANGE, re CLOSE SEASON: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 5054 (ii).
- LONDON CUSTOMS DEPT., CHARGES AGAINST EMPLOYEES:** M. for Ret.* (Mr. Forbes) 1889 (i).
— Ques. (Mr. Forbes) 1677 (i).
- Lord's Day Observance B. No. 74** (Mr. Charlton). 1^o, 2333 (i).
- MACPHERSON, LT.-COL., SUPERANNUATION:** Ques. (Mr. Landerkin) 2339 (i).
- MCBEATH, ALLAN, APPRAISER AT ST. JOHN, SUPERANNUATION:** Ques. (Mr. Davies, P.E.I.) 2409 (i).
— M. for Cor.* (Mr. Davies, P.E.I.) 3108 (i).
- "MC CARTHY ACT," CLAIMS UNDER:** M. for Ret. (Mr. LaRivière) 826 (i).
- MCCONNELL'S LETTER re R. C. WELDON, M. P., AND C. H. CAHAN:** Remarks (Sir Charles Tupper) 2335 (i).
- MCGAHEY, JOHN, EMPLOYMT. ON DOM. POLICE FORCE:** Ques. (Mr. Devlin) 2179 (i).
- MCGILLIVRAY, JOHN A., ESQ., MEMBER FOR NORTH ONT.:** Introduced, 2 (i).
- MCKIE'S PIER, EXPENDITURE, &c.:** Ques. (Mr. Yeo) 1253 (i).
- MCPHERSON, GEORGE, INDIAN AGENT:** in Com. of Sup., 7125 (ii).
- MC SHANE, JAMES, ESQ., MEMBER FOR CENTRE MONTREAL:** Introduced, 6 (i).
- MABOU, BREAKWATER AT COAL MINES, PAYMENT FOR LABOUR:** Ques. (Mr. Cameron, Inverness) 2174.
- MADUXNEKEAG FISHWAY, COST OF REPAIRS:** Ques. (Mr. Colter) 1623 (i).
- MAGDALEN ISLANDS MAIL SERVICE:** Ques. (Mr. Langelier) 1865 (i).
- MAGOG PUBLIC WHARF, GOVT. AID:** Ques. (Mr. Rider) 3634 (ii).
— PURCHASE OF PROPERTY: Ques. (Mr. Rider) 633, 820 (i).
- MAIL SERVICE.** See "POST OFFICE."

MANITOBA:

- BERR LICENSES IN NEEPAWA: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Martin*) 1078 (i).
- CHAMBERLAIN, CHAS., COMMUTATION OF SENTENCE: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 634 (i).
- M. for O. C. (Mr. *Martin*) 1475, 1487 (i).
- DISALLOWANCE OF MAN. SCHOOL ACT: Ques. (Mr. *Laurier*) 6115 (ii).
- GERMAN TRANSLATION OF MAN. SCHOOL LAWS: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 3099, 4379 (ii).
- GRAIN STANDARDS: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1863, 2411 (i).
- GREENWAY, MR., TELEGRAM *re* MAN. SCHOOLS: Read (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 3098 (i).
- Remarks (Mr. *Laurier*) 3111, 3273 (i).
- Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 3469, 3471 (i).
- HALF-BREED ALLOTMENTS, MAN. AND N.W.T.: Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 5037 (ii).
- Ques. (Mr. *O'Brien*) 3100 (i).
- PRINENTINARY, LAND PURCHASE: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 3629 (ii).
- MAN. SCHOOLS. *See* general heading.
- RED RIVER RY. BRIDGE AT EMERSON: M. for O.C.* (Mr. *LaRivière*) 3108 (i).
- ROGERS, ROBT., OF MAN. AMOUNT DUE GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Grieve*) 822 (i).
- ST. ANDREW'S RAPIDS, IMPROVEMENTS: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Martin*) 3643 (ii).
- TUPPER, R. L., FISHERY INSPECTOR, COMPLAINTS AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. *McCarthy*) 6507 (ii).
- Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 6509 (ii).
- WHEAT GRADING FRAUDS IN MAN. AND N.W.T.: prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 1031, 1049 (i).
- WINNIPEG COLL. OF CUSTOMS, INSPECTOR YOUNG'S INSTRUCTIONS: M. for copies* (Mr. *Tarte*) 3637 (ii).
- WINNPIEG AND PILOT MOUND MAIL CONTRACT: M. for copy* (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 4596 (ii).
- [*See* DEPARTMENTS, "N.W.T.," &c.]
- MAN. AND DOM. GOVT., PRINTING PAPERS: M. (Mr. *Laurier*) 1891 (i).
- Man. and Nelson Valley Ry. Co.'s incorp.**
B. No. 65 (Mr. *Davis*). 1^o*, 1775; 2^o, 2370 (i); in Com., 5087, 6627, 6770 (ii).
- Man. and North-west Millers Association incorp. B. No. 83** (Mr. *Masson*). 1^o*, 3469 (i); 2^o*, 3628; in Com. and 3^o*, 7042 (ii). (59 *Vic. c.* 46.)
- MANITOBA SCHOOLS QUESTION: MESS. FROM HIS EX.: presented (Mr. *Foster*) 892 (i).
- DISALLOWANCE OF ACT: Ques. (Mr. *Laurier*) 6115 (ii).
- TELEGRAM FROM MR. GREENWAY: Read (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 3098 (i).
- Remarks (Mr. *Laurier*) 3111 (i).
- CONFERENCE WITH MR. GREENWAY: Remarks (Mr. *Laurier*) 3273 (i).
- *re* TELEGRAM: Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 3469, 3471 (i).
- INVITATION TO FIRST MIN. TO VISIT OTTAWA: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 3099 (i).
- PAPERS RESPECTING: Remarks (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 813 (i).
- Ques. (Mr. *Laurier*) 893 (i).

MANITOBA SCHOOLS—Continued.

- M. for Ret.* (Mr. *LaRivière*) 853 (i).
- SMITH, SIR DONALD'S VISIT TO WINNIPEG: Ques. (Mr. *McCarthy*) 2653 (i).
- COMMISSION TO WINNIPEG: Ques. (Mr. *McCarthy*) 5208; (Mr. *Laurier*) 5343 (ii).
- GOVT. COMMISSION TO MAN.: Remarks (Mr. *Laurier*) 4375 (ii).
- PAPERS *re* WINNIPEG COMMISSION: M. to adjn. Hse. (Mr. *McCarthy*) 6121 (ii).
- GERMAN TRANSLATION, SCHOOL LAWS: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 3099, 4379 (ii).
- [*See* "SMITH, SIR DONALD," "REMEDIAL ACT."]
- MAPLE SUGAR, EXPORTS AND IMPORTS: Ques. (Mr. *Rider*) 819 (i).
- MAPS ON RECORD IN LIBRARY *re* VENEZUELAN QUESTION: Remarks (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 2006 (i).
- MARINE:
- ADAMS, E., CHARGES AGAINST T. DONNELLY: M. for copies* (Mr. *Borden*) 4596 (ii).
- "ALERT," STR., SALE AED AMOUNT REALIZED: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 644 (i).
- M. for Cor. (Mr. *Langelier*) 2370 (i).
- BATISCAN POSTMASTER AND LIGHTHOUSE-KEEPER: Ques. (Mr. *Tarte*) 1447 (i).
- BRIDGEWATER HARBOUR MASTER, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 2408 (i).
- FERRY BOATS, ST. JOHN HARBOUR: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 3108 (i).
- FISH ISLAND LIGHTHOUSE-KEEPER, APPNMT.: Ques. (Mr. *Yeo*) 1623 (i).
- MARINE AND FISHERIES, TRAVELLING EXPENSES DEP. MIN.: in Com. of Sup., 7129 (ii).
- APPNMT. OF DEP. MINISTER: Ques. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 6509 (ii).
- "MARY E. HARLOW," SCHOONER, WRECK: Ques. (Mr. *White, Shelburne*) 2177 (i).
- QUEBEC OBSERVATORY, MR. SMITH'S QUARTERS: Ques. (Mr. *Bruneau*) 3101 (i).
- ST. JOHNS (P.Q.) ASSISTANT HARBOUR MASTER, APPNMT: Ques. (Mr. *Lavergne*) 2341 (i).
- "SAN PEDRO," REMOVAL OF WRECK: Remarks (Mr. *Martin*) 821, 2180 (i).
- SIMARD, ARTHUR, LIGHTHOUSE-KEEPER, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Angers*) 4380 (ii).
- "STANLEY," STR., CAPE TORMENTINE AND CAPE TRAVERSE SERVICE: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Yeo*) 4596.
- MAGDALEN ISLANDS MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 1865 (i).
- MAIL SERVICE, P.E.I. AND MAINLAND: Ques. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 2409 (i).
- TONNAGE TAX, ABOLITION ON HOSPITAL DUES: Ques. (Mr. *McShane*) 1619 (i).
- [*See* PROVINCES.]
- MARINE AND FISHERIES, APPNMT. OF DEP. MINISTER: Ques. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 6509 (ii).
- DEPTL. REP.: presented (Mr. *Costigan*) 1509 (i).
- TRAVELLING EXPENSES, DEP. MINISTER: in Com. of Sup., 7129 (ii).
- MARKS, ABRAHAM: in Com. of Sup., 7033 (ii).
- "MARY E. HARLOW," SCHOONER, WRECK: Ques. (Mr. *White, Shelburne*) 2177 (i).
- MASSON, MR., EX-M.P., APPNMT. AS JUDGE: Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 6959 (ii).

MEATS AND PERISHABLE FOODS: in Com. of Sup., 7140 (ii).

MEMBER CALLED TO ORDER: Obstructing Business (Mr. Speaker) 535 (i).

MEMBERS INTRODUCED: 2, 6, 13, 69, 435 (i).

— **NEW:** Notification (Mr. Speaker) 2, 5, 13, 69, 435, 1625 (i).

MEMBERS' REMARKS CHECKED, 611, 703, 850, 1147, 1254, 1500, 1544, 1546, 2539 (i), 3646, 3664, 3733, 3796, 3983, 4010, 4467, 4482, 4510, 4671, 4904, 4912, 6047 (ii).

Mercantile Agencies. See "DETECTIVES."

MESSAGES FROM HIS EX.:

ADDRESS IN ANS. TO HIS EX.'S SPEECH: Reply presented (Mr. Foster) 1254 (i).

BATTENBERG, PRINCE HENRY, DECEASED, REPLY TO ADDRESS TO HER MAJESTY: presented (Sir Charles Tupper) 3597 (ii).

ESTIMATES, THE: presented (Mr. Foster) 687 (i).

— **SUPPL. (1895-6):** presented (Sir Charles Tupper) 6110 (ii).

INTERNAL ECONOMY COMMISSION: presented (Mr. Foster) 346 (i).

MAN. SCHOOLS, FURTHER COR.: presented (Mr. Foster) 892 (i).

— **REP. OF COMMISSIONERS:** presented (Sir Charles Tupper) 6110 (ii).

MILITARY COLLEGE, KINGSTON, BOARD OF VISITORS: Remarks (Mr. Mulock) 853 (i).

— **OMISSION IN RET.:** Remarks (Mr. Mulock) 3648 (i).

— **REP.:** presented (Sir Adolphe Caron) 4558 (ii).

— **RECOMMENDATIONS:** Remarks (Mr. Mulock) 4654, 4787 (ii).

— **M. (Mr. Mulock) to adjn. Hse.,** 6762 (ii).

MILITARY GROUNDS, SUSSEX (N.B.) LEASE, &c.: M. for copies* (Mr. Davies, P.E.I.) 3108 (i).

— **Ques. (Mr. Davies, P.E.I.)** 3628 (ii).

MILITIA:

ADJUTANT GENERAL, SUPERANNUATION: Ques. (Mr. Landerkin) 6505 (ii).

ARMS AND AMMUNITION: in Com. of Sup., 7053; conc., 7147 (ii).

CAN. MILITIA, INCREASED DEFENCES: Remarks (Mr. Mulock) 1254 (i).

DIXON, CAPT., 63RD BATT., COMPLAINT AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. Landerkin) 650 (ii).

GUY, MAJOR G., SERVICES re REBELLION: in Com. of Sup., 7142 (ii).

HALIFAX DRILL SHED, INSPECTOR: Ques. (Mr. Forbes) 6817 (ii).

— **HAMILTON, LT.-COL., RESIGNATION:** Ques. (Mr. Edgar) 5945 (ii).

— **on M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. Mulock)** 6679, 7017, 7123 (ii).

IMPERIAL APPOINTMENTS TO MILITARY SERVICE: Personal Explanation (Mr. O'Brien) 6978 (ii).

INFANTRY SCHOOLS, EFFICIENCY: Ques. (Mr. Bain) 4556 (ii).

— **NON-COMS. AND MEN ADMITTED:** Ques. (Mr. McGillivray) 6510 (ii).

MACPHERSON, LT.-COL., SUPERANNUATION: Ques. (Mr. Landerkin) 2339 (i).

MILITARY COLLEGE. See general heading.

MILITIA—Continued.

MILITARY GROUNDS, SUSSEX (N.B.) LEASE, &c.: M. for copies* (Mr. Davies, P.E.I.) 3103 (i).

— **Ques. (Mr. Davies, P.E.I.)** 3628 (ii).

MILITIA AND DEFENCE, DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 7033, 7053; conc., 7147 (ii).

— **PERMANENT AND ACTIVE, &c., EXPENDITURE:** M. for Ret.* (Mr. Charlton) 3636 (ii).

MURRAY, LT.-COL., CHARGES AGAINST: on M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. Borden) 7007 (ii).

QUEEN'S OWN RIFLES, INVESTIGATION re COMPLAINTS: Remarks (Mr. Mulock) 6818 (ii).

RIFLES FOR VOLUNTEERS, IMPROVED: Ques. (Mr. Casey) 3632 (ii).

RIFLE RANGES, MONTREAL, &c., REPAIRS: Ques. (Mr. McShane) 4556 (ii).

ROYAL CAN. INFANTRY AND IMPERIAL GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. O'Brien) 1617 (i).

VOLUNTEERS, 1837-38, MONEY OR LAND GRANTS: Ques. (Mr. Boston) 1025 (i).

— **SOUDAN EXPEDITION:** Remarks (Mr. Davies, P.E.I.) 4653 (ii).

— **Ques. (Mr. Davies, P.E.I.)** 4786, 5057 (ii).

WILSON, LT.-COL., R.C.A., INSTRUCTIONS re VISIT TO ENGLAND: Ques. (Mr. Godbout) 2003 (i).

WORSLEY, LT.-COL., re CERTAIN CHARGES: on M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. Davies, P.E.I.) 7008 (ii).

[See PROVINCES, &c.]

Militia. See "LAND GRANTS."

MILITIA GRIEVANCES, HAMILTON, LT.-COL.: on M. (Mr. Mulock) to adjn. Hse., 6679 (ii).

Deb. (Mr. Dickey) 6692; (Mr. Edgar) 6700; (Mr. O'Brien) 6708; (Mr. Stairs) 6719; (Sir Richard Cartwright) 6722; (Mr. Tyrwhitt) 6731; (Mr. Lister) 6733; (Mr. Mills, Bothwell) 6743; (Mr. Powell) 6748; (Mr. Macdonald, Huron) 6752; (Mr. Casey) 6763 (ii).

— See "HAMILTON, LT.-COL."

MILL STREET, MONTREAL, OWNERSHIP: Remarks (Mr. McShane) 6978 (ii).

MINING MACHINERY, FREE ENTRY BY PROVINCES, VALUE: Ques. (Mr. Mara) 4558 (ii).

MINISTERIAL RESIGNATIONS SINCE OPENING OF PARLT.: Stmts. (Sir Adolphe Caron) 6, 13, 23, 31, 34, 38, 62, 67, 69 (i).

Remarks (Mr. Laurier) 7, 14, 31, 68, 71; (Mr. Foster) 9, 92; (Sir Richard Cartwright) 10, 75; (Mr. Mills, Bothwell) 14; (Mr. Wallace) anonymous letters, 22, 62; (Mr. Montague) 22, 66; (Mr. Scriver) 24; (Mr. Casey) 25, 136; (Mr. Davies, P.E.I.) 35, 85; (Mr. McCarthy) 38; (Mr. Mills, Bothwell) 39, 99; (Mr. Weldon) 39; (Mr. Edgar) 41; (Mr. Davin) 42; (Mr. McNeill) 44; (Mr. Mulock) 44; (Mr. Cockburn) 47; (Mr. Lister) 48; (Mr. O'Brien) 51; (Mr. Tarts) 53; (Mr. Devlin) 56; (Mr. Edwards) 60; (Mr. Davin) 82; (Mr. Hazen) 105; (Mr. Mulock) 107; (Sir Charles Hubbert Tupper) 122; (Mr. Paterson, Brant) 127 (i).

— **COR., &c., WITH PREMIER:** Ques. (Mr. Grieve) 646 (i).

MINISTERS DURING MR. MACKENZIE'S REGIME: on M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. Borden) 7043 (ii).

MISCELLANEOUS: in Com. of Sup., 7125 (ii).

"**MODUS VINENDI,**" TREATY (1838) WITH DEWL.: M. for Cor. (Mr. Laurier) 1064 (i).

MONEYS, PUBLIC, INVESTED IN CERTAIN SECURITIES: Ques. (Mr. Mulock) 1869 (i).

- MONTMAGNY VOTERS' LISTS, COST OF PREPARATION:**
 Ques. (Mr. Choquette) 1251 (i).
- Montreal and Ottawa Ry. Co.'s B. No. 38** (Mr. Bergeron). 1st, 958; 2nd, 1024; in Com. and 3rd, 2571 (i). (59 Vic., c. 25.)
- Montreal and Province Line Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 85** (Mr. Frechette). 1st, 4254; 2nd, 4597; M. (Mr. Tisdale) to place on Order Paper for Com., 6593; in Com. and 3rd, 7042 (ii). (59 Vic., c. 26.)
- MONTREAL AND QUEBEC DISTRICTS, LEGAL FEES PAID:** Ques. (Mr. McShane) 2651 (i).
- MONTREAL CENTRE ELECTION, RETURNING OFFICERS, &c., ACCOUNTS:** Ques. (Mr. Brodeur) 3101 (i).
 — VACANCY: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 2 (i).
 — Member introduced, 6 (i).
- MONTREAL CUSTOMS OFFICIALS, SALARIES, &c.:** M. for Ret.* (Mr. McMullen) 3637 (ii).
 — DRILL SHED, AMOUNT PAID: M. for Stmt.* (Mr. Tarte) 1509 (i).
 — "GAZETTE," PAYMENTS FOR ADVERTISING, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Rider) 3634 (ii).
 — HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS LOAN: prop. Res. (Mr. Foster) 4254 (ii).
 — GOVT. EXPENDITURE: Ques. (Mr. McShane) 1676 (i).
 — MILL STREET, OWNERSHIP: Remarks (Mr. McShane) 6978 (ii).
 — PORT, PROCEEDINGS AT CONFERENCE re TRAFFIC: M. for copy, &c. (Mr. McShane) 4568 (ii).
 — RIFLE RANGES, REPAIRS: Ques. (Mr. McShane) 3634 (ii).
- Montreal Island Belt Line Ry. Co.'s B. No. 86** (Mr. Lachapelle). 1st, 1510; 2nd, 1659; in Com. and 3rd, 3280 (i). (59 Vic., c. 27.)
- Montreal Park and Island Ry. Co.'s B. No. 72** (Mr. Lachapelle). 1st, 2096; 2nd, 2572 (i); in Com. and 3rd, 4597 (ii). (59 Vic., c. 28.)
- Montreal Turnpike Trusts Debentures B. No. 107** (Mr. Foster). Res. prop., 2229 (i); in Com., 6626, 6639; rep., 6657; 1st of B, 6831; 2nd and in Com., 6992; 3rd, 7112 (ii). (59 Vic., c. 4.)
- MOUNTED POLICE, COMMISSIONER'S REP.:** presented (Mr. Daly) 4463 (ii).
 — ENGAGEMENT OF CRIMINALS: Ques. (Mr. Davin) 1346 (i).
 — in Com. of Sup., 7053, 7123 (ii).
- MOUNT ROYAL MILLING CO., EXPORTS OF RICE MEAL:** Ques. (Mr. McShane) 3634 (ii).
- MOOSE JAW.** See "Govt. Property."
- MUNICIPAL ELECTIONS AND I.C.R. OFFICIALS:** Ques. (Mr. Mignault) 2064 (i).
- MURRAY, LT.-COL., CHARGES AGAINST:** OR M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. Borden) 7007 (ii).
- National Sanitarium Association incorp. B. No. 79** (Mr. Roome). 1st, 2893; 2nd, 3098 (i); in Com. and 3rd, 3848 (ii). (59 Vic., c. 52.)
- Navigable Waters.** See "PROTECTION."
- Nelson and Fort Sheppard Ry. Co.'s B. No. 26** (Mr. Mara). 1st, 957; 2nd, 1023; in Com., 1812; 3rd, 1860 (i). (59 Vic., c. 29.)
 — See "MANITOBA AND NELSON VALLEY."
- NEEPAWA.** See "Beer Licenses."
- NEW BRUNSWICK:**
- ADAMS, E., CHARGES AGAINST T. DONNELLY:** M. for copies* (Mr. Borden) 4596 (ii).
- GIBSON'S CREEK, EXPENDITURE:** M. for Stmt.* (Mr. Colter) 1509 (i).
- HAMILTON, JAS. H., APPNT. TO CIVIL SERVICE:** Ques. (Mr. Davies, P.E.I.) 2409 (i).
 — EMPLOYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. Davies, P.E.I.) 3106 (i).
- HARRIS PROPERTY, ST. JOHN, GOVT. PURCHASE FOR I.C.R.:** Ques. (Mr. Davies, P.E.I.) 2410 (i).
 — Ques. (Mr. Landerkin) 5346 (ii).
- MCBEATH, ALLAN, APPRAISER AT ST. JOHN, SUPERANNUATION:** Ques. (Mr. Davies, P.E.I.) 2409 (i).
 — SUPERANNUATION: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Davies, P.E.I.) 3108 (i).
- MCCONNELL'S LETTER re R. C. WELDON AND C. H. CAHAN:** Remarks (Sir Charles Tupper) 2335 (i).
- MADUXNEKEAG FISHWAY, COST OF REPAIRS:** Ques. (Mr. Colter) 1623 (i).
- MILITARY GROUNDS, SUSSEX, LEASE, &c.:** M. for copies* (Mr. Davies, P.E.I.) 3108 (i).
 — Ques. (Mr. Davies, P.E.I.) 3628 (ii).
- MAINE AND N.B. BONDED WAREHOUSES, ABOLITION:** Ques. (Mr. Colter) 1869 (i).
- NORTHUMBERLAND ELECTORAL DIST., RET. OF MEMBER:** Notification (Mr. Speaker) 1626 (i).
 — VACANCY: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 346 (i).
- ST. JOHN HARBOUR, FERRY BOATS:** M. for Cor.* (Mr. Davies, P.E.I.) 3108 (i).
 — RIVER, IMPROVED NAVIGATION: Ques. (Mr. Colter) 892 (i).
 — EXPENDITURE: M. for Stmt.* (Mr. Colter) 1509 (i).
 — RET.: inquiry (Mr. Colter) 3816, 6115 (ii).
 — WINTER PORT, OCEAN SS. CONTRACT: M. (Mr. Hazen) 2670 (i).
- WESTMORELAND ELECTORAL DIST., VACANCY:** Notification (Mr. Speaker) 1 (i).
 — RETURN OF MEMBER: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 2 (i).
- [See DEPARTMENTS.]
- N. B. AND MAINE BONDED WAREHOUSE, ABOLITION:** Ques. (Mr. Colter) 1869 (i).
- NEEBING HOTEL, PURCHASE BY GOVT.:** Ques. (Mr. Girouard) 5054 (ii).
- NEEPAWA (MAN.) BEER LICENSES:** M. for Cor. (Mr. Martin) 1078 (i).
- NEPEAN POINT, INTERPROVINCIAL BRIDGE:** Ques. (Mr. Devlin) 1625 (i).
 — M. for Cor. (Mr. Devlin) 5078 (ii).
- NETS AND LICENSES FOR LAKE ERIE FISHERIES:** Ques. (Mr. Casey) 3633 (ii).
- NEWFOUNDLAND BAIT ACT, REFUND FOR CAN. LICENSES:** Ques. (Mr. Kaulbach) 1252 (i).
 — FISHING LICENSES, REFUND: Ques. (Mr. Flint) 645 (i), 6114 (ii).
- NEWSPAPERS, FREE TRANSMISSION THROUGH P. O.:** Ques. (Mr. Devlin) 2002, 2012, 2178 (i).
- NEW ZEALAND.** See "Australia."

NIAGARA CENTRAL RY., APPLICATION FOR SUBSIDIES :
Ques. (Mr. McMullen) 6508 (ii).

Nipissing and James Bay Ry. Co.'s consolidated B. No. 34 (Mr. Tisdale). 1st, 958; 2nd, 1024; in Com. and 3rd, 2128 (i). (59 Vic., c. 30.)

NORTH RIVER FISHWAYS, TERREBONNE: Ques. (Mr. Girouard) 4377, 5349 (ii).

NORTHUMBERLAND (N.B.) ELECTORAL DIST., VACANCY: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 346 (i).

— RET. OF MEMBER: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 1626 (i).

NORTHUMBERLAND STRAITS, BORINGS FOR TUNNEL, EXPENDITURE: Ques. (Mr. Perry) 643, 2012 (i).

— MAP *re* BORINGS: Ques. (Mr. Perry) 3099 (i).

— M. for copy* (Mr. Perry) 4596 (ii).

NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES:

ALLOTMENTS TO HALF-BREEDS, MAN. AND N.W.T.:
Ques. (Mr. Chariton) 5057 (ii).

— Ques. (Mr. O'Brien) 3100 (i).

BATTLEFORD AND SASKATCHEWAN MAIL CONTRACT:
Remarks (Mr. Martin) 6992 (ii).

CATHOLIC SCHOOLS, LETTER FROM CLERGY TO SIR JOHN THOMPSON: Ques. (Mr. Choquette) 2408 (i).

CENSUS TAKEN BY MOUNTED POLICE: M. for Ret. (Mr. Martin) 1502 (i).

CREAMERIES, MONEY GRANT: prop. Res. (Mr. Davin) 2654, 2668 (i).

EXHIBITION, REP. OF LIBT.-GOV.: Ques. (Mr. Davin) 1447 (i).

— UNPAID ACCOUNTS: M. for Cor. (Mr. Martin) 648, 657 (i).

— CLAIMS: Remarks (Mr. Davin) 608.

— in Com. of Sup., 7141 (ii).

GOVT. PROPERTY IN MOOSE JAW: prop. Res. (Mr. Davin) 1453, 1463 (i).

GRAIN STANDARDS: Ques. (Mr. Davin) 1863 (i).

IRRIGATION, LEGISLATION RESPECTING: Remarks (Mr. Mills, Bothwell) 4597 (ii).

MAN. SCHOOLS. *See* general heading.

MOUNTED POLICE, COMMISSIONER'S REP.: presented (Mr. Daly) 4463 (ii).

— ENGAGEMENT OF CRIMINALS: Ques. (Mr. Davin) 1346 (i).

REBELLION, SCRIP FOR SCOUTS: prop. Res. (Mr. Davin) 3637 (ii).

SCHOOL ORDINANCES, LT.-GOV.'S REP.: M. for copies* (Mr. McMillan) 3636 (ii).

— PREMIER'S REMARKS: Ques. (Mr. Davin) 818 (i).

SEED GRAIN TO ALBERTA SETTLERS, DISTRIBUTION: Ques. (Mr. Laverne) 2341 (i).

SHEEP SCAB, INTRODUCTION FROM U.S. INTO N. W. T.: Ques. (Mr. Davin) 1029 (i).

TRANSLATION OF SCHOOL LAWS INTO GERMAN FOR MAN. AND N. W. T.: Ques. (Mr. Davin) 3099 (i).

WOLSELEY COURT HOUSE, COMPLETION AND COST: Ques. (Mr. Martin) 3629.

[*See* DEPARTMENTS, "MANITOBA," &c.]

N. W. T. Act Amt. B. No. 15 (Mr. McCarthy). 1st, 61 (i).

N. W. T. Representation Act Amt. B. No. 20 (Mr. Davin). 1st, 216 (i).

N. W. T. Representation Act (*Rev. Stat.*, c. 7) Amt. B. No. 22 (Mr. Martin). 1st, 524 (i); 2nd, 4671 (ii).

N. W. T. Representation Act Amt. B. No. 94 (Mr. Daly). 1st, 6111 (ii).

N. W. T. Representation in Senate Act Amt. B. No. 104 (Mr. Daly). 1st, 6593; 2nd, and in Com., 6819; 3rd, 6822 (ii).

N. W. T., TREATMENT: prop. Res. (Mr. Davin) 1871.

NOVA SCOTIA:

BRIER ISLAND FOG-ALARM BUILDING, REPLACING: Ques. (Mr. Bowers) 6816 (ii).

CAPE BRETON ELECTION, EXPENDITURE OF MONEY: Remarks (Mr. Davies, P. E. I.) 1515, 1626 (i).

CAPE BRETON ELECTORAL DIST., VACANCY: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 144.

— RETURN OF MEMBER: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 1509 (i).

— PAR. IN MONTREAL "HERALD," *re* EXPENDITURE OF \$25,000: Remarks (Mr. Davies, P. E. I.) 1348 (i).

— PERSONAL EXPLANATION (Mr. Dickey) 1859 (i).

CAPE BRETON RY., "HARD-PAN" CLAIMS: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Davies, P. E. I.) 3108 (i).

— CONTRACTS: Ques. (Mr. Cameron, Inverness) 637 (i).

— ROCK, &c., EXCAVATED: Ques. (Mr. Cameron, Inverness) 1862, 3100 (i).

— SIMS & SLATER CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. Cameron, Inverness) 2004 (i).

GUEVREMONT, J. B., SUPERANNUATION: M. for O.C.* (Mr. Flint) 711 (i).

HALIFAX DRILL SHED, INSPECTOR: Ques. (Mr. Forbes) 6817 (ii).

LIVERPOOL HARBOUR, DREDGING: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Forbes) 3107 (i).

MABOU, BREAKWATER AT COAL MINES, PAYMENT FOR LABOUR: Ques. (Mr. Cameron, Inverness) 2174 (i).

"MARY E. HARLOW," SCHOONER, WRECK: Ques. (Mr. White, Shelburne) 2177 (i).

PICTOU AND MAGDALEN ISLANDS, BI-WEEKLY MAIL: Ques. (Mr. Langelier) 1866 (i).

ST. PETER'S CANAL, EXPENDITURE FOR 1895: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 1870 (i).

WEAVER SETTLEMENT, POSTMASTER'S SALARY: Ques. (Mr. Bowers) 2002 (i).

WHITEHEAD CANAL, COMPLETION: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 1677 (i).

[*See* DEPARTMENTS, &c.]

Oaths. *See* "ADMINISTRATION," &c.

OBSERVATORY, QUEBEC, MR. SMITH'S QUARTERS: Ques. (Mr. Bruncau) 3101 (i).

OCEAN MAIL SERVICE, SUBSIDIES: Ques. (Mr. Hazen) 821 (i).

OCEAN SHIPPING INTERESTS. *See* "Montreal Port."

Ocean Steamships Subsidies Act Amt. B. No. 106 (Mr. Foster). Res. prop., 2230 (i); in Com., 6658; rep., 6663; 1st of B., 6831; 2nd and in Com., 6980; again in Com. and 3rd, 7114 (ii). (59 Vic., c. 3.)

OCEAN SS. SUBSIDY, FRANCE AND BELGIUM: prop. Res. (Mr. Ives) 2230 (i).

OFFICIALS AND GOVT. RY. CARS: Ques. (Mr. Charlton) 4379 (ii).

O'DONOGHUE, D. J. *See* "Immigration."

O'HANLY, J. L. P., SERVICES: in Com. Sup., 7128.

OKA, ILLICIT STILL: Ques. (Mr. O'Brien) 2338 (i).

ONTARIO:

ALGOMA ELECTIONS (1891) RETURNING OFFICER'S RET.: Ques. (Mr. Amyot) 2179 (i).
 BARRISTERS EMPLOYED BY GOVT. IN QUE. CASES: Ques. (Mr. Devlin) 5123 (ii).
 BENJAMIN, E. W., PAYMENTS TO INLAND REVENUE *re* WEIGHTS AND MEASURES: Ques. (Mr. Dawson) 2339 (i).
 BERLIN CUSTOMS COLLECTOR: Ques. (Mr. Casey) 4554 (ii).
 BREAKWATERS AND PIERS IN PRINCE COUNTY, TENDERS, &c.: M. for Stmt. (Mr. Perry) 2354, 2363.
 BRAMPTON POSTMASTER, APPOINTMENT: Ques. (Mr. Featherston) 888 (i).
 BRIDGEWATER HARBOUR MASTER, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. Landerkin) 2408 (i).
 CANALS. See general heading.
 CARMUNNOCK POSTMASTER, APPOINTMENT, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Grieve) 5051 (ii).
 CARDWELL ELECTORAL DIST., VACANCY: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 1 (i).
 — RET. OF MEMBER: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 6 (i).
 CAYUGA, SALE OF VILLAGE LOTS: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Charlton) 3636 (ii).
 CLEARVILLE FISHING LICENSES: Ques. (Mr. Casey) 3100 (i).
 — APPLICATIONS: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Casey) 4596.
 CUSTOMS. See general heading.
 DAVISON, SAMUEL, CUSTOMS FRAUDS AT TORONTO: Ques. (Mr. Landerkin) 3103 (i).
 DOM. POLICE FORCE, MCGAHEY, JOHN, EMPLOYMENT ON: Ques. (Mr. Devlin) 2179 (i).
 DOM. REFORMATORY, DISBURSEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. Charlton) 2652 (i).
 — ESTABLISHMENT AND EXPENDITURE: Ques. (Mr. Mulock) 2174 (i).
 DREDGE, GOVT., SALE AT PORT STANLEY: Ques. (Mr. Casey) 3633 (ii).
 DREDGING AT RIVER THAMES, EXPENDITURE: M. for Ret. (Mr. Campbell) 5084 (ii).
 EXPERIMENTAL FARM, OTTAWA, EXPENDITURE: M. for Stmt. (Mr. McMillan) 1085 (i).
 — LIVE-STOCK MANAGER, APPOINTMENT: Ques. (Mr. Featherston) 888 (i).
 — HAY SALES: Ques. (Mr. McMillan) 2651 (i).
 FISHERIES. See general heading.
 FORT FRANCIS LOCKS, EXPENDITURE FROM 1874 TO 1878: Ques. (Mr. Girouard) 5054 (ii).
 GALOPE RAPIDS, CONTRACT, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Landerkin) 6118 (ii).
 GODERICH HARBOUR REPS. *re* PIERS AND BREAKWATER: Ques. (Mr. Cameron, Huron) 2340 (i).
 HURON, WEST, ELECTORAL DIST., RET. OF MEMBER: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 435 (i).
 — VACANCY: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 1 (i).
 INTERPROVINCIAL BRIDGE, NEPEAN POINT: Ques. (Mr. Devlin) 1625 (i).
 — M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. Devlin) 5078 (ii).
 KENT COUNTY FISHERY OVERSEER, LICENSES ISSUED: Ques. (Mr. Campbell) 1615 (i).
 KESWICK AND ROUGH'S POINT MAIL CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. Charlton) 5051, 6120, 6505 (ii).
 LANGEVIN BLOCK, OTTAWA, ESTIMATED COST: Ques. (Mr. Landerkin) 6119 (ii).
 LAKE ERIE FISHERIES, NETS AND LICENSES: Ques. (Mr. Casey) 3632 (ii).

ONTARIO—Continued.

LARKIN, CONNOLLY & Co., SALE OF PLANT: Ques. (Mr. Campbell) 3635 (ii).
 LENNOX COUNTY FISHING LICENSES: Ques. (Mr. Landerkin) 889 (i).
 LITTLE RAPIDS LOCK, COST OF CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. Landerkin) 6118 (ii).
 LONDON CUSTOM HOUSE, CHARGES AGAINST OFFICIALS: Ques. (Mr. Forbes) 1677 (i).
 — M. for Ret.* (Mr. Forbes) 1889 (i).
 MAIL SERVICE. See "POST OFFICE."
 MILITARY COLLEGE. See general heading.
 NEEBING HOTEL, PURCHASE BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. Girouard) 5054 (ii).
 NIAGARA CENTRAL RY., APPLICATION FOR SUBSIDIES: Ques. (Mr. McMullen) 6508 (ii).
 OKA, ILLICIT STILL: Ques. (Mr. O'Brien) 2338 (i).
 ONTARIO, NORTH, ELECTORAL DIST., VACANCY: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 1 (i).
 — RET. OF MEMBER: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 2 (i).
 OTTAWA GAS COMPANY'S UNPAID CLAIMS: M. for Ret.* (Sir James Grant) 3637 (ii).
 PETERBOROUGH COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS: Ques. (Mr. Landerkin) 635 (i).
 — POSTMASTER, REDUCTION OF SALARY: M. for Ret. (Mr. Burnham) 5081 (ii).
 PICTON, GOVT. RENTS, ARREARS: Ques. (Mr. Dawson) 891 (i).
 — P. O., PURCHASE OF SITE: Ques. (Mr. Dawson) 646, 890, 1251, 2339 (i).
 — M. for Ret.* (Mr. Dawson) 3108 (i).
 PORT ARTHUR DISTRICT, FISHING LICENSES: Ques. (Mr. McCarthy) 6116 (ii).
 PORT DOVER DISTRICT, FISHING LICENSES: Ques. (Mr. Charlton) 2654 (i).
 — FISHING LICENSES GRANTED: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Charlton) 3636 (ii).
 PORT STANLEY HARBOUR, EXPENDITURE OF \$5,000: M. for Stmt.* (Mr. Casey) 4596 (ii).
 — SALE OF GOVT. DREDGE: Ques. (Mr. Casey) 3633 (ii).
 PUBLIC WORKS. See general heading.
 QUEEN'S OWN RIFLES, INVESTIGATION *re* COMPLAINTS: Remarks (Mr. Mulock) 6818 (ii).
 RETURNING OFFICER'S RET. *re* ALGOMA ELECTION (1891): Ques. (Mr. Amyot) 2179 (i).
 SHEIK'S ISLAND DAM, LEASE OF WATER POWER: Ques. (Mr. Mulock) 6120 (ii).
 SHIPPING, DAMAGES IN WELAND CANAL: Ques. (Mr. Gibson) 3816 (ii).
 SUBSIDIES FOR NIAGARA CENTRAL RY.: Ques. (Mr. McMullen) 6508 (ii).
 SUDBURY COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS, RESIGNATION: Ques. (Mr. Somerville) 4557 (ii).
 — POSTMASTER, RESIGNATION: Ques. (Mr. Somerville) 4556 (ii).
 TAY CANAL, CLAIMS FOR LAND DAMAGES: Ques. (Mr. Cameron, Huron) 2177 (i).
 — See general heading.
 THAMES RIVER, DREDGING, EXPENDITURE: M. for Ret. (Mr. Campbell) 5084 (ii).
 THOROLD CEMENT USED IN WELAND CANAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Gibson) 3831 (ii).
 TORONTO CUSTOMS EMPLOYEES, NUMBER, &c.: Ques. (Mr. McMullen) 4330 (ii).
 — FRAUDS, SAMUEL DAVISON: Ques. (Mr. Landerkin) 3103 (i).

ONTARIO—Continued.

WALPOLE INDIAN RESERVE, SALE, &c.: M. for Ret.*
(Mr. Mills, Bothwell) 1889 (i).

— LEASE OR SALE OF MARSH: Ques. (Mr. Mills,
Bothwell) 642 (i).

WELLAND CANAL. See general heading.

[See DEPARTMENTS, &c.]

ONT., NORTH, ELECTORAL DIST.: Member introduced, 2 (i).

— VACANCY: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 1 (i).

Ont. Peat Fuel and Ry. Co.'s incorp. B.
No. 62 (Mr. Boyle). 1*, 1775; 2*, 2370; in
Com. and 3*, 3280 (i). (59 Vic., c. 47.)

ORDERS IN COUNCIL *re* DEPTL. EMPLOYEES: Ques.
(Mr. Edgar) 2650 (i).

— NUMBER INCREASING SALARIES: Ques. (Mr.
McMullen) 2650 (i).

ORDER, PRIVILEGE AND PROCEDURE:

ORDER:

ADDRESS IN ANS. TO HIS EX.'S SPEECH: Mr. Davin
takes exception to language used by Mr. McMullen,
he (Mr. Davin) receiving Govt. support for his
Vote; Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 222-3.

— Mr. Laurier's Speech at Boston (Mr. Kenny);
objection (Mr. Landerkin) hon. Member should not
be allowed to read speech he was prevented from
reading a year ago; Ruling (Mr. Speaker) word
"subterfuge" not in order, 246-8 (i).

APPEAL TO THE HOUSE: Mr. McCarthy, on Deputy
Chairman's ruling, called to Order by Mr. Speaker,
no hon. member can discuss appeal from the
Chair, 5746 (ii).

BUDGET, THE: Mr. Kenny states that the hon. member
(Mr. Borden) has misrepresented statement re-
garding Mr. Laurier's speech at Boston, 279;
withdraws the word "rehash", 288 (i).

— Mr. Davin draws attention to unparliamentary
language used by Mr. Casey; Ruling (Mr.
Speaker) the hon. gentleman must withdraw the
statement "hon. members voting money into their
own pockets", 2539-40 (i).

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE: on M. (Mr. Foster) to take
Thursdays; unparliamentary language objected
to by Mr. Mulock, the hon. member (Mr. Davin)
must withdraw "discreditable attitude" and
"cowardly mockery"; Ruling Mr. Speaker,
1147-49 (i).

CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEE: Chairman must speak both
languages (Mr. Choquette); Ruling (Mr. Mills,
Annapolis, Chairman) 5888-89 (ii).

COMMISSIONER OF CUSTOMS' SALARY: in Com. (Mr.
Wallace) on Remedial Act; Ruling (Mr. Speaker)
member cannot discuss the motion, 5190 (ii).

DEBATES, OFFICIAL REP.: Mr. Costigan states that the
hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin) is reading
from unrevised edition of *Hansard* which is not a
correct report of his speech, the word "not"
being inadvertently dropped out; Ruling (Mr.
Speaker) hon. member's statement must be
accepted, 3040-41 (ii).

— Mr. Charlton, in Com. on Remedial Act, draws
attention of House that the *Hansard* staff are phy-
sically and mentally tired out and House should
adjourn; Ruling (Mr. Speaker) that hon. member
having spoken once on question cannot speak
again or move adjmt., 4210 (ii).

ORDER, PRIVILEGE—Continued.

ORDER—Continued.

GOVT. PROPERTY IN MOOSE JAW: on Notice of M. (Mr.
Davin) reference to a past debate objected to by
Mr. Martin; Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 1454 (i).

MR. LAURIER'S SPEECH *re* ORANGEMEN: Newspaper
comments read by Mr. McGillivray; objection
(Mr. Choquette); Ruling (Mr. Deputy Speaker)
5967-74 (ii).

MILITIA GRIEVANCES: Charges by Col. Worsley
against Col. Murray; question cannot be discussed
on M. for Com. of Sup. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper)
as it is a Notice of Motion on the Order Paper,
7007; Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 7008-13 (ii).

PERSONAL INSINUATIONS against the member for
Hamilton: Mr. Mulock called to Order by Mr.
Deputy Speaker; Ruling, must withdraw state-
ments, 5807-11 (ii).

— between members not in order (Mr. Somers-
ville) in Com. on Remedial Act; Ruling (Mr.
Deputy Speaker) 5959; Mr. Choquette objects to
Tory members "washing dirty linen in the Hse.";
Mr. Deputy Speaker asks hon. members to bring
personal remarks to a close, 5960 (ii).

— Mr. Edgar objects to the hon. member (Mr. Mc-
Gillivray) making insinuations of a personal
character against the hon. member for Muskoka
(Mr. O'Brien); counter charge by Mr. O'Brien;
Ruling (Mr. Deputy Speaker) both gentlemen must
withdraw charges, 5960-63 (ii).

— Insinuations against hon. members that they
have changed their principles for mercenary
motives (Mr. Wallace); objected to by Mr. Taylor,
5725 (ii).

REMEDIAL ACT (MAN.) ON M. for *re*: Mr. McCarthy
called to order by Mr. Speaker, hon. member
must not impute motives as to vote of members,
3733; Mr. Edgar asks: Can the leader of the Hse.
use the words "subterfuge" and "libel?" Rul-
ing (Mr. Speaker) 3734 (ii).

— IN COM.: the hon. member (Mr. Davies) cannot
discuss the general policy of Govt. on a clause (Mr.
Ouimet); Ruling (Mr. Deputy Speaker) 4921 (ii).

— IN COM.: Mr. Sproule asks: Is it Parliamentary
for any h. m. to use the word "obstruction?"
Ruling (Mr. Deputy Speaker) 4958-60 (ii).

— IN COM.: Opposition accused of "deliberate
obstruction" by hon. member for Leeds (Mr.
Taylor); called to order (Mr. Edgar, &c.) must
give names of informant to such a reflection, or
must accept Mr. Laurier's denial of statement,
5155-57 (ii).

— IN COM.: Mr. McLeod submits that hon. gentle-
men should confine discussion to question before
the Chair; Ruling (Mr. Deputy Speaker) 5340-41.

— IN COM.: Mr. Paterson (Brant) called to order
by Mr. Deputy Speaker, on discussing the clauses
of B. instead of motion before the Chair, 6399 (ii).

— IN COM.: differences in the Cabinet; ref. to
Senate deb. by Sir Richard Cartwright objected
to by Mr. Ouimet; Ruling (Mr. Mills, Annapolis,
Chairman) 5895 (ii).

— IN COM.: Mr. Mills (Annapolis) submits that the
hon. gentleman (Mr. McNeill) has no right to im-
pute unfairness in Chairman's ruling; Ruling
(Mr. Deputy Speaker) 5947 (ii).

ORDER, PRIVILEGE, &c.—Continued.

ORDER—Continued.

REMEDIAL ACT (MAN.) IN COM.: letter of J. A. Macdonell read by Sir Charles Tupper, re "confidence in the breed"; the question having been discussed before on a M. to adjn. Hse., the hon. gentleman cannot ref. to a past deb., 6272 (ii).

SCRIPTURAL QUOTATIONS: Objection taken by Mr. Bergin to profane and irreverent reading of the Scriptures by Mr. Charlton; in Com. on the Remedial Act, 5661 (ii).

SMITH, SIR DONALD, VISIT TO WINNIPEG: Sir Charles Tupper objects to the hon. member (Mr. Edgar) charging His Excellency with having a policy different from his constitutional advisers, 4278; Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 4293 (ii).

— Mr. Ouimet draws attention to the fact that the hon. member (Mr. Martin) is not speaking to the question by reading telegrams and must not refer to past debate; Ruling (Mr. Speaker) matter not relevant to question before the Chair, 4304 (ii).

PRIVILEGE:

CABINET POSITION: Personal Explanation re Par. in Toronto News (Mr. Weldon) 3043 (ii).

CAPE BRETON ELECTION, INSULTING THE CLERGY AT SYDNEY: Personal Explanation (Mr. McDougall) 1544 (i).

— Personal Explanation (Mr. Dickey) 1659 (i).

CHARGES AGAINST MESSRS. ROSS AND COFFIN: Ministers under Mr. McKenzie's regime: Personal Explanation (Mr. Borden) 7043 (ii).

CLERICAL INTERFERENCE AT ELECTIONS: Personal Explanation re Par. in Toronto Globe (Sir Adolphe Caron) 1347 (i).

DISLOYALTY OF THE OPPOSITION: Charges against Leaders; Personal Explanation (Mr. McNeill) 277 (i).

DISQUALIFICATION OF MEMBER FOR MONTMORENCY (Mr. Turcotte) AND MR. WELDON'S VOTE: Personal Explanation (Mr. Martin) 1186 (i).

GOVT. APPOINTMENTS, RUMOURED: Par. in Montreal Star (Mr. Bergeron) 6114 (ii).

IMPERIAL APPOINTMENTS TO THE MILITIA: Personal Explanation (Mr. O'Brien) 6978 (ii).

MCCONNELL'S LETTER TO R. C. WELDON, M.P., AND C. H. CAHAN in Halifax Chronicle: Personal Explanation (Sir Charles Tupper) 2335 (i).

MEMBERS' INDEMNITY AND ACCOUNTANT: Members right to be paid balance of indemnity without providing a pair (Mr. Martin) 7109 (ii).

MINISTERIAL RESIGNATIONS: Personal Explanation re Anonymous Letters, on M. to adjn. Hse. (Mr. Wallace) 22 (i).

MEMBER FOR MONTREAL CENTRE, CHARGES AGAINST: Personal Explanation (Mr. Foster) 471 (i).

NOVA SCOTIA STATESMEN, CHARGES AGAINST: Personal Explanation, on M. to adjn. Hse. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 240 (i).

REMEDIAL ACT (MAN.) ON M. FOR 2^o: Personal Explanation re compacts with Man. (Mr. Foster) 3726 (ii).

— PAR. IN OTTAWA Citizen re announced support to B.: Personal Explanation (Mr. McGillivray) 3815 (ii).

TUPPER, SIR CHARLES, AND ALLEGED STRAINED RELATIONS WITH MR. WELDON, M.P.: Personal Explanation re Par. in Toronto Mail-Empire (Mr. Weldon) 2411 (i).

ORDER, PRIVILEGE, &c.—Continued.

PROCEDURE:

DEFENCE OF THE DOMINION: M. (Mr. Foster) that Hse. resolve itself into Com. on prop. Res.; objection (Sir Richard Cartwright) that it cannot be done except by unanimous consent of the Hse., as by so doing it is going back on the Order Paper, 6826 (ii).

ORDERS IN COUNCIL: communicating to Newspapers before being laid on the Table; objection (Sir Richard Cartwright) 825 (i).

REMEDIAL ACT (MAN.) IN COM.: Question raised by Mr. McCarthy that Mr. Mara is not authorized to act as Chairman, as under the Orders of the Hse. a Permanent Chairman of Committees has been appointed, 5732; Ruling (Mr. Mara) that when the Hse. is in Committee, it is governed by its own Rules and Orders, quotes "Bourinot," 5734; Mr. McCarthy appeals from ruling and Mr. Speaker takes the Chair and rules that Acting Chairman must be sustained, and on a division the ruling is sustained (Y. 93, N. 25) 5735-37 (ii).

— ON M. FOR COM.: on Amt. (Mr. McCarthy) to ref. B. to Supreme Court: Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper raises the question that this is not the proper stage of the Bill for such an Amt.; Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 4349-52 (ii).

— IN COM.: M. (Sir Charles Tupper) Com. rise and rep.; objection (Mr. McCarthy) that as Hse. has already disposed of a similar order this M. cannot follow in order without an intervening proceeding; Ruling (Mr. Deputy Speaker) 6459 (ii).

SATURDAY SITTINGS: Motion as read by Mr. Speaker not the same as Notice on Order Paper; Ruling (Mr. Speaker) that notice may be amended by consent of Hse.; Mr. Casey contends that Amt. is out of Order; Ruling (Mr. Speaker) Motion as amended in Order, 5125-32 (ii).

SUPPLY: on M. (Mr. Foster) for Com.; objection (Sir Richard Cartwright) that it is contrary to all custom and rules to consider Estimates without having the Auditor Gen.'s Rep. before the Hse., 766 (i).

TARTE, J. I., PAYMENTS TO BY PUBLIC DEPTS.: on Amt. (Mr. Foster) relevancy of Amt. questioned by Mr. Mills, Bothwell; Mr. Speaker ruled the Amt. in Order, 1451-53 (i).

OTTAWA GAS CO.'S UNPAID CLAIMS: M. for Ret.* (Sir James Grant) 3637 (ii).

— Ques. (Mr. Campbell) 3105 (i).

— AND HULL MAIL SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 7135 (ii).

— PUBLIC BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 7094 (ii).

OWEN SOUND HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 7096 (ii).

OYSTER AND LOBSTER PLANTING IN B. C.: Ques. (Mr. Corbould) 3099 (i).

PACIFIC AND ATLANTIC FAST SERVICE, CABLE: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Laurier) 1087 (i).

PADLOCKS FOR MAIL BAGS, PURCHASE: Ques. (Mr. Tarte) 1027 (i).

Parliament. See "INDEPENDENCE."

- PARLIAMENT, 6TH SESSION : Opening, 1.**
 — CONSTITUTIONAL TERM : Ques. (Mr. *Rider* 819 (i).
 — Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 3470, 3598 (i), 3626 (ii).
 — Ques. (Mr. *O'Brien*) 3104 (i).
PASPEBIAC HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS : Ques. (Mr. *Faurel*) 3105 (i).
 — HARBOUR OF REFUGE : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Joncas*) 2342 (i).
 — Ques. (Mr. *Joncas*) 1027 (i).
 — WINTER PORT : Ques. (Mr. *Joncas*) 639 (i).
Peat Fuel. See "ONTARIO."
PENITENTIARIES REP. : presented (Mr. *Dickey*) 1346 (i).
Penitentiary Act Amt. B. No. 103 (Mr. *Dickey*). 1^o, 6502 (ii).
PETERBOROUGH COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS : Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 635 (i).
 — POSTMASTER, REDUCTION OF SALARY : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Burnham*) 5081 (ii).
PERSONAL EXPLANATION re CAPE BRETON ELECTION EXPENDITURE (Mr. *McDougall*) 1544 (i).
 — MCCONNELL'S LETTER TO R. C. WELDON, M.P., AND C. H. CAHAN : Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 2335 (i).
 — MR. MCSHANE'S ALLEGED DISQUALIFICATION (Mr. *Foster*) 471 (i).
 — PAR. IN OTTAWA "CITIZEN" : Remarks (Mr. *McGillivray*) 3814 (ii).
 — PAR. IN TORONTO "GLOBE" re VERCHERES ELECTION (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) 1347 (i).
 — PAR. IN "MAIL-EMPIRE" re STRAINED RELATIONS WITH SIR CHARLES TUPPER (Mr. *Weldon*) 2411 (i).
 — PAR. IN TORONTO "NEWS" re CABINET POSITION (Mr. *Weldon*) 3046 (i).
 — UNPARLIAMENTARY LANGUAGE (Mr. *Kenny*) 279, 288 (i).
 — MR. WELDON'S VOTE re MR. TURCOTTE'S DISQUALIFICATION (Mr. *Martin*) 1186 (i).
 — See "ORDER, PRIVILEGE," &c.
PICTOU AND MAGDALEN ISLANDS, BI-WEEKLY MAIL : Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 1866 (i).
 — See "Magdalen Islands."
PICTON, GOVT. RENTS, ARREARS : Ques. (Mr. *Dawson*) 891 (i).
 — PUBLIC BUILDING, PURCHASE OF SITE : Ques. (Mr. *Dawson*) 646, 890, 1251, 2339 (i).
 — M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Dawson*) 3108 (i).
PILOT MOUND AND WINNIPEG MAIL CONTRACT : M. for copy (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 4596 (ii).
"PIONEER," BOUNTY TO FISHING SCHOONER : Ques. (Mr. *Laverne*) 1184 (i).
POLICE, DOM., MCGAHEY, JOHN : Ques. (Mr. *Devlin*) 2179 (i).
 — See "Dom." "Mounted."
Pontiac Pacific Junction Ry. Co.'s No. 53 (Sir *James Grant*). 1^o*, 1182 ; 2^o*, 1386 (i) ; in Com. and 3^o*, 4376 (ii). (59 Vic., c. 31.)
PORK, SALT, IMPORTS AND DUTY COLLECTED : Ques. (Mr. *Borden*) 2179 (i).
- PORT ARTHUR DISTRICT FISHING LICENSES :** Ques. (Mr. *McCarthy*) 6116 (ii).
PORT DOVER DISTRICT FISHING LICENSES : Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 2654 (i).
 — M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Charlton*) 3636 (ii).
PORT STANLEY HARBOUR, EXPENDITURE OF \$5,000 : M. for Stmt.* (Mr. *Casey*) 4596 (ii).
 — SALE OF GOVT. DREDGE : Ques. (Mr. *Casey*) 3633 (ii).
POSTAGE ON LETTERS, REDUCTION : Ques. (Mr. *McShane*) 4556 (ii).
 — ON NEWSPAPERS, FREE TRANSMISSION : Ques. (Mr. *Devlin*) 2004, 2012, 2178 (i).
POSTAL DELIVERY SYSTEM, NAMES OF CITIES, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Bowers*) 1625 (i).
POSTMASTER AND LIGHTHOUSE-KEEPER AT BATISCAN : Ques. (Mr. *Tarte*) 1447 (i).
POST OFFICE (BRANCH) CROWN ST., QUE. : Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 5347 (ii).
 — in Com. of Sup., 7081, 7133, 7145 (ii).
POST OFFICE :
 ARTHABASKAVILLE AND ST. PAUL DE CHESTER MAIL CONTRACTOR, COMPLAINTS, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Laverne*) 5056 (ii).
 BANDA AND RY. STATION MAIL SERVICE : Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 2178 (i).
 BATISCAN POSTMASTER AND LIGHTHOUSE-KEEPER : Ques. (Mr. *Tarte*) 1447 (i).
 BATTLEFORD AND SASKATCHEWAN MAIL CONTRACT : Remarks (Mr. *Martin*) 6902 (ii).
 BRAMPTON POSTMASTER, APPOINTMENT : Ques. (Mr. *Featherston*) 888 (i).
 B.C. MAIL SERVICE, RET. re : inquiry (Mr. *McMullen*) 3048 (i).
 — EXPRESS CO.'S CONTACTS, &c. : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *McMullen*) 1888 (i).
 C. P. R. MAIL SERVICE : in Com. of Sup., 7133 (ii).
 CARMUNNOCK POSTMASTER, APPOINTMENT, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Grieve*) 5051 (ii).
 CHRISTMAS ISLAND, &c., CONTRACTS FOR MAIL SERVICE : Ques. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 2410 (i).
 FERGUS MAIL SERVICE, CONTRACT : Ques. (Mr. *Stubbs*) 4555 (ii).
 GASPE BASIN AND GRAND GREVE MAIL SERVICE : Ques. (Mr. *Joncas*) 639 (i).
 — POSTMASTER, RESIGNATION : Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 1625 (i).
 GUEVREMONT, J. B., SUPERANNUATION : M. for O. C.* (Mr. *Flint*) 711 (i).
 HASTY, ROBT., MAIL CONTRACT : in Com. of Sup., 7135 (ii).
 INSPECTORS, &c., SALARIES : in Com. of Sup., 7135
 KAMLOOPS AND SPENCE'S BRIDGE (B.C.) MAIL CONTRACT : Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1186 (i).
 KESWICK AND ROACH'S POINT MAIL CONTRACT : Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 5051, 6120, 6505 (ii).
 KILDARE STATION, POSTMASTERSHIP : Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 635 (i).
 LA MALBAIE, ST. URBAIN AND ST. ALEXIS MAIL CONTRACT : Ques. (Mr. *Angere*) 2340 (i).
 LETTER POSTAGE, REDUCTION : Ques. (Mr. *McShane*) 4556 (i).
 LITTLETON ROAD P.O., ESTABLISHMENT : Ques. (Mr. *Yeo*) 1446 (i).
 — M. for Ret. (Mr. *Yeo*) 2366 (i).

POST OFFICE—Continued.

- MAGDALEN ISLANDS MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 1865 (i).
- MAIL SERVICE, P.E.I. AND MAINLAND: Remarks (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 854, 2409 (i).
- Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 891 (i).
- Remarks (Mr. *Yeo*) 2011 (i).
- NEWSPAPERS, FREE TRANSMISSION: Ques. (Mr. *Derlin*) 2004, 2012, 2178 (i).
- OTTAWA AND HULL MAIL SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 7135 (ii).
- PADLOCKS FOR MAIL BAGS, PURCHASE: Ques. (Mr. *Tarte*) 1027 (i).
- PETERBOROUGH POSTMASTER, REDUCTION OF SALARY: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Burnham*) 5081 (ii).
- PICTOU AND MAGDALEN ISLANDS, BI-WEEKLY MAIL: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 1866 (i).
- POSTAL DELIVERY SYSTEM, NAMES OF CITIES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bowers*) 1625 (i).
- POST OFFICE (BRANCH) CROWN ST., QUE.: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 5347 (ii).
- ROCKWAY VALLEY IMPROVED MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Derlin*) 3629 (ii).
- STE. ANNE DES MONTS MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Joucau*) 639 (i).
- ST. ROCHS DE RICHELIEU MAIL CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Bruneau*) 1446 (i).
- SUDBURY POSTMASTER, RESIGNATION: Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*) 4556 (ii).
- TIGNISH POST OFFICE REVENUE: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 1864 (i).
- WEAVER SETTLEMENT (N.S.) POSTMASTER'S SALARY: Ques. (Mr. *Bowers*) 2002 (i).
- WINNIPEG AND PILOT MOUND MAIL CONTRACT: M. for copy* (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 4596 (ii).
- [See PROVINCES, &c.]

POUPORE, W. J., CONTRACTS WITH GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 2175 (i).

— ASSIGNMENT OF CONTRACTS: Ques. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 6505 (ii).

POUND-NETS. See "FISHERIES."

POWELL, HENRY A., ESQ., MEMBER FOR WESTMORELAND: introduced, 6 (i).

PREFERENTIAL TRADE AND IMPERIAL DEFENCE: prop. Res. (Mr. *McNeill*) 4381, 4461 (ii).

Deb. (Mr. *McNeill*) 4461; (Mr. *Davia*) 4397; (Mr. *Weldon*) 4407; (Mr. *Charlton*) 4412; (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 4424; (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 4441; (Mr. *Stairs*) 4454; (Mr. *O'Brien*) 4459; (Mr. *Powell*) 4463 (ii).

— See "Imperial," "Defence."

PRINCE COUNTY BREAKWATERS AND PIERS, TENDERS, &c.: M. for Stmt. (Mr. *Perry*) 2354, 2363 (i).

— PUBLIC WORKS, RET. re: inquiry (Mr. *Perry*) 4467 (ii).

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND:

- BIDEFORD FISHWARDEN, APPNMT.: Ques. (Mr. *Yeo*) 1624 (i).
- CAPE TORMENTINE AND CAPE TRAVERSE SERVICE: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Yeo*) 4596 (ii).
- CASCUMPEC HARBOUR, ROCK BLASTING: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 1253 (i).
- CHRISTMAS ISLAND, &c., CONTRACTS FOR MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 2410 (i).
- CUSTOMS, SUPERANNUATION G. F. ROBINSON: Ques. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 6817 (ii).

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND—Continued.

- DAIRY STATION, SUPERVISION BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald*, 824 (i).
- FISH ISLAND LIGHTHOUSE-KEEPER, APPNMT.: Ques. (Mr. *Yeo*) 1623 (i).
- KILDARE STATION POSTMASTERSHIP: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 635 (i).
- LINKLETTER ROAD P. O., ESTABLISHMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Yeo*) 1446 (i).
- M. for Ret. (Mr. *Yeo*) 2366 (i).
- MCKIE'S PIER, EXPENDITURE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Yeo*) 1253 (i).
- MAIL SERVICE, P.E.I. AND MAINLAND: Remarks (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 854 (i).
- Ques. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 2409 (i).
- Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 891 (i).
- Remarks (Mr. *Yeo*) 2011 (i).
- NORTHUMBERLAND STRAITS, BORINGS FOR TUNNEL, EXPENDITURE: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 643, 2012 (i).
- MAP re BORINGS: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 3099 (i).
- M. for copy* (Mr. *Perry*) 4596 (ii).
- P.E.I. CHEESE, EXPENSE ACCOUNT FOR FREIGHT: Ques. (Mr. *Rider*) 6816 (ii).
- PUBLIC WORKS, PRINCE COUNTY, RET. re: inquiry. (Mr. *Perry*) 4467, 6115 (ii).
- PRINCE COUNTY BREAKWATERS AND PIERS: Tenders, &c.: M. for Stmt. (Mr. *Perry*) 2354, 2363 (i).
- RET. re: inquiry (Mr. *Perry*) 4467 (ii).
- SOURIS BREAKWATER, TENDER AND CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 2650 (i).
- "STANLEY," STR., CAPE TORMENTINE AND CAPE TRAVERSE SERVICE: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Yeo*) 4596 (ii).
- MAIL SERVICE, P.E.I. AND MAINLAND: Ques. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 2409 (i).
- SUMMERSIDE BREAKWATER, CONSTRUCTION: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Yeo*) 4596 (ii).
- TIGNISH BREAKWATER. See general heading.
- WALL, DR., CLAIM FOR DAMAGES AGAINST P.E.I. RY.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 3108 (i).
- [See DEPARTMENTS, &c.]

PRINTING AND STATIONERY DEPTL. REP.: presented (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 3046 (i).

PRINTING, SEL. COM.: List of Members, 885 (i).

— MESS. TO SEN.: M. (Mr. *Foster*) 888 (i).

PRINTING PAPERS BETWEEN DOM. AND MAN. GOVT.: M. (Mr. *Laurier*) 1891 (i).

PRIOR, EDWARD GAWLER, ESQ., MEMBER FOR VICTORIA, B.C.: introduced, 69 (i).

PRIVATE BILLS PETS., EXTENSION OF TIME: M. (Mr. *Foster*) 524 (i).

— SEL. COM.: List of Members, 884 (i).

PRIVATE CARS, OFFICIAL, HAULAGE ON RYS.: Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 5050 (ii).

PRIVATE SEC., EX-SOLICITOR GENERAL: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 4378 (ii).

PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS, SEL. COM.: List of Members, 883 (i).

PRIVILEGE. See "ORDER," &c.

PRIVY COUNCILLORS. See "Controllers."

Protection of Navigable Waters Act Amt. B. No. 98 (Mr. *Costigan*). 1^o*, 6490 (ii).

PROHIBITION, COST OF ROYAL COMMISSION: Ques. (Mr. *Flint*) 632 (i).

— LIQUOR TRAFFIC: prop. Res. (Mr. *Flint*) 1648; Reply (Mr. *Flint*) 2180, 2222, 2228 (i).

Province Line. See "MONTREAL."

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COM., MEETINGS: Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1551, 1578 (i).

— REP.: presented (Mr. *Foster*) 289 (i).

— REF. TO COM.: M. (Mr. *Coatsworth*) 1775 (i).

— SEL. COM.: List of Members, 885 (i).

Public Companies. See "LABOUR."

— **Employees.** See "SALARIES."

— **MONEYS INVESTED IN CERTAIN SECURITIES:** Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1869 (i).

— **OFFICES, APPOINTMENTS SINCE DEC., 1895:** M. for Stmtnt.* (Mr. *Tarte*) 1509 (i).

— **WORKS:** in Com. of Sup., 7037, 7089 (ii).

— **DEPTL. REP.:** presented (Mr. *Ouimet*) 2337 (i).

— (P.E.I.) **RET. re EXPENDITURE:** inquiry (Mr. *Perry*) 4467, 6115 (ii).

Public Works. See "LABOUR," "LABOURERS," &c.

PUBLIC WORKS:

BATISCAN LIGHTHOUSE, PURCHASE OF RIGHT OF WAY: Ques. (Mr. *Tarte*) 1447 (i).

BRIER ISLAND FOG-ALARM BUILDING, REPLACING: Ques. (Mr. *Bowers*) 6816 (ii).

CASCUMPEC HARBOUR, ROCK BLASTING: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 1253 (i).

COLUMBIA RIVER, IMPROVED NAVIGATION, ENGINEER'S REP.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Mura*) 5067 (ii).

DREDGE, GOVT., SALE AT PORT STANLEY: Ques. (Mr. *Casey*) 3633 (ii).

DREDGING AT RIVER THAMES, EXPENDITURE: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Campbell*) 5084 (ii).

DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 7097 (ii).

— **LIVERPOOL HARBOUR:** M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Forbes*) 3107 (i).

GASÉ HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 4378 (ii).

GIBSON'S CREEK, EXPENDITURE: M. for Stmtnt.* (Mr. *Colter*) 1509 (i).

GODERICH HARBOUR, REFS. re PIERS AND BREAKWATERS: Ques. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 2340 (i).

HALIFAX DRILL SHED INSPECTOR: Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 6817 (ii).

HARBOURS AND RIVERS: in Com. of Sup., 7095 (ii).

HOUDE, LEANDRE, EMPLOYT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Legrin*) 1622 (i).

INTERPROVINCIAL BRIDGE, NEPEAN POINT: Ques. (Mr. *Deolin*) 1625 (i).

LANGEVIN BLOCK, ESTIMATED COST: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 6119 (ii).

LÉVIS GRAVING DOCK AND SS. SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *McShane*) 6817 (ii).

LITTLE METIS BAY HARBOUR OF REFUGE: Remarks (Mr. *Scriven*) 3457 (ii).

— M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *McShane*) 4560 (ii).

LIVERPOOL HARBOUR, DREDGING: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Forbes*) 3107 (i).

MCKIE'S PIER, EXPENDITURE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Yeo*) 1253 (i).

MABOU BREAKWATER AT COAL MINES, PAYMENT FOR LABOUR: Ques. (Mr. *Cameron, Inverness*) 2174 (i).

MAGOG, PUBLIC WHARF, GOVT. AID: Ques. (Mr. *Rider*) 3634 (ii).

— **PURCHASE OF PROPERTY:** Ques. (Mr. *Rider*) 633, 820 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS—Continued.

MONTREAL DRILL SHED, AMOUNT PAID: M. for Stmtnt. (Mr. *Tarte*) 1509 (i).

— **HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS LOAN:** prop. Res. (Mr. *Foster*) 4254 (ii).

— **RIFLE RANGES, REPAIRS, &c.:** Ques. (Mr. *McShane*) 4556 (ii).

NEERING HOTEL, PURCHASE BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Girouard*) 5054 (ii).

NORTHUMBERLAND STRAITS, BORINGS FOR TUNNEL, EXPENDITURE: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 643, 2012 (i).

— **MAP re BORINGS:** Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 3090 (i).

— **M. for copies*** (Mr. *Perry*) 4596 (ii).

OTTAWA, GOVT. BUILDINGS, GAS CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Campbell*) 3105 (i).

— in Com. of Sup., 7094 (ii).

OWEN SOUND HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 7096 (ii).

PASPEBIAC HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Fauvel*) 3105 (i).

— **HARBOUR OF REFUGE:** Ques. (Mr. *Joncas*) 107 (i).

— **M. for Ret.** (Mr. *Joncas*) 2342 (i).

— **PIERS AND BREAKWATERS:** Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 636 (i).

— **WINTER PORT:** Ques. (Mr. *Joncas*) 639 (i).

PICTON, GOVT. RENTS, ARREARS: Ques. (Mr. *Dawson*) 891 (i).

— **PUBLIC BUILDING, PURCHASE OF SITE:** Ques. (Mr. *Dawson*) 646, 890, 1251, 2339 (i).

— **M. for Ret.*** (Mr. *Dawson*) 3108 (i).

PORT STANLEY HARBOUR, EXPENDITURE OF \$5,000: M. for Stmtnt.* (Mr. *Casey*) 4596 (ii).

— **SALE OF GOVT. DREDGE:** Ques. (Mr. *Casey*) 3633 (ii).

PRINCE COUNTY (P.E.I.) BREAKWATERS AND PIERS, TENDERS, &c.: M. for Stmtnt. (Mr. *Perry*) 2354, 2363 (i).

— **PUBLIC WORKS RET. re:** inquiry (Mr. *Perry*) 4467, 6115 (ii).

RED RIVER RY. BRIDGE AT EMERSON: M. for O.C.* (Mr. *LaRivière*) 3108 (i).

RIMOUSKI WHARF EXTENSION, TENDERS: Ques. (Mr. *Tarte*) 1028 (i).

ST. JOHN CUSTOM HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 7089, 7145 (ii).

— **RIVER (N.B.), IMPROVED NAVIGATION, EXPENDITURE:** M. for Stmtnt.* (Mr. *Colter*) 1509 (i).

— Ques. (Mr. *Colter*) 892 (i).

— **RET. re:** inquiry (Mr. *Colter*) 2816, 6115 (ii).

ST. LAURENT WHARF, PHILLIPS FILLION: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 1868 (i).

— **REPAIRS:** Ques. (Mr. *Tarte*) 1028 (i).

ST. LAWRENCE RIVER SHIP CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 7084 (ii).

SOCRIS BREAKWATER, TENDER AND CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 2650 (i).

SUMMERSIDE BREAKWATERS, CONSTRUCTION: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Yeo*) 4596 (ii).

TIGNISH BREAKWATER. See general heading.

WINNIPEG MILITARY BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 7094 (ii).

WOLSELEY, (N.W.T.) COURT HOUSE, COMPLETION AND COST: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 3629 (ii).

YAMASKA RIVER BRIDGE: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Bruncau*) 4589, 5059 (ii).

[See PROVINCES, &c.]

PULP WOOD, IMPOSITION OF EXPORT DUTY: Ques. (Mr. *Rider*) 5052 (ii).

"QUADRA," STR., REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 7100 (ii).

QUARANTINE REGULATIONS, CAN. and U. S.: Ques. (Mr. Smith, Ont.) 638 (i).

— in Com. of Sup., 7051 (ii).

QUEBEC:

"ADMIRAL," SS., SHIPMENTS BY I. C. R.: Ques. (Mr. Faurel) 3104 (i).

"ALERT," STR., SALE AND AMOUNT REALIZED: Ques. (Mr. Langelier) 644 (i).

— M. for Cor (Mr. Langelier) 270 (i).

APPRENTICES AT I. C. R. WORKSHOPS, RIVIERE DU LOUP: Ques. (Mr. Choquette) 144 (i).

ARTHABASKAVILLE, & C., MAIL CONTRACTOR, COMPLAINTS, & C.: Ques. (Mr. Lavergne) 5056 (ii).

BAIE DES CHALEURS RY.: Ques. (Mr. Joncas) 636 (i).

— NEGOTIATIONS FOR PURCHASE: Ques. (Mr. Choquette) 1447 (i).

— PURCHASE BY GOVT.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Joncas) 1885 (i).

BATISCAN LIGHTHOUSE, PURCHASE OF RIGHT OF WAY: Ques. (Mr. Tarte) 1447 (i).

— POSTMASTER AND LIGHTHOUSE-KEEPER: Ques. (Mr. Tarte) 1447 (i).

BELIVEAU, JOSEPH, INDEMNITY FOR INJURIES: M. for Ret. (Mr. Bruneau) 5077 (ii).

BOUCHARD, THEODORE, EMPLOYT. BY CUSTOMS DEPT.: Ques. (Mr. Tarte) 1026 (i).

CANAL, MONTREAL TO ST. JOHNS, SURVEY: Ques. (Mr. McShane) 3634 (ii).

CHAMBLY CANAL, VESSELS THROUGH FROM 1892-95: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Langelier) 2370 (i).

CHARLAND, H. C., SOREL, PAYMENT TO: M. for Stimt.* (Mr. Bruneau) 3107 (i).

CHARLEVOIX ELECTORAL DISTRICT, VACANCY: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 2 (i).

CURRAN BRIDGE. See general headings, "St. Louis," "Wellington Bridge," & c.

FILLION, PHILLAS, ALLEGED APPROPRIATION OF GOVT. PROPERTY: Ques. (Mr. Langelier) 1878 (i).

— HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. Choquette) 4378 (ii).

GIROUARD, HON. DESIRE, APPOINT. AS JUDGE OF SUPREME COURT: M. for O.C.* (Mr. Tarte) 1509.

GOODWIN, GEORGE, CONTRACTS. See "Goodwin," "Soulanges Canal."

GRAND GREVE AND GASPE BASIN MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. Joncas) 639 (i).

— POSTMASTER, RESIGNATION: Ques. (Mr. Choquette) 1625 (i).

HOUDE, LEANDRE, EMPLOYT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. Legris) 1622 (i).

I. C. R. See general heading.

ILLICIT WHISKEY STILLS, PROSECUTIONS: Ques. (Mr. Bruneau) 1877 (i).

ILLICIT STILL AT OKA: Ques. (Mr. O'Brien) 2333 (i).

JACQUES CARTIER, ELECTORAL DISTRICT, RET. OF MEMBER: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 13 (i).

— VACANCY; Notification (Mr. Speaker) 1 (i).

LACHINE CANAL BRIDGES, COST OF CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. Landerkin) 6118 (ii).

LEGAL FEES, & C., PAID IN MONTREAL AND QUEBEC DISTRICTS: Ques. (Mr. Monet) 2651 (i).

LÉVIS GRAVING DOCK AND SS. SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. McShane) 6817 (ii).

LITTLE METIS BAY HARBOUR OF REFUGE: Remarks (Mr. Scriver) 3657 (ii).

— M. for Cor., & c. (Mr. McShane) 4560 (ii).

QUEBEC—Continued.

MAGOG WHARF, PURCHASE BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. Rider) 633, 820 (i).

— GOVT. AID: Ques. (Mr. Rider) 3634 (ii).

MILL STREET, MONTREAL, OWNERSHIP: Remarks (Mr. McShane) 6978 (ii).

MONTMAGNY VOTERS' LISTS, COST OF PREPARATION: Ques. (Mr. Choquette) 1251 (i).

MONTREAL CENTRE ELECTION, RETURNING OFFICER'S, ACCOUNTS: Ques. (Mr. Brodeur) 3101 (i).

— ELECTORAL DISTRICT, VACANCY: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 2 (i).

— RETURN OF MEMBER: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 6 (i).

— CUSTOMS OFFICIALS, SALARIES, & C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. McMullen) 3637 (ii).

— DRILL SHED, AMOUNT PAID: M. for Stimt. (Mr. Tarte) 1509 (i).

— "GAZETTE," PAYMENTS FOR ADVERTISING, & C.: Ques. (Mr. Rider) 3634 (ii).

— HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS LOAN: prop. Res. (Mr. Foster) 4254 (ii).

— GOVT. EXPENDITURE: Ques. (Mr. McShane) 1878 (i).

— PORT, PROCEEDINGS AT CONFERENCE re TRAFFIC: M. for copy, & c. (Mr. McShane) 4568 (ii).

— RIFLE RANGES, REPAIRS, & C.: Ques. (Mr. McShane) 4556 (ii).

MOUNT ROYAL MILLING CO., EXPORTS OF RICE MEAL: Ques. (Mr. McShane) 3634 (ii).

NORTH RIVER, TERREBONNE, FISHWAYS: Ques. (Mr. Girouard) 4377, 5349 (ii).

NORTH SHORE RY. SUBSIDY: Ques. (Mr. Rider) 1622.

OBSERVATORY, QUE., MR. SMITH'S QUARTERS: Ques. (Mr. Bruneau) 3101 (i).

PASPEBIAC PIERS AND BREAKWATERS: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 636 (i).

— WINTER PORT: Ques. (Mr. Joncas) 639 (i).

— HARBOUR OF REFUGE: Ques. (Mr. Joncas) 1027.

— M. for Ret. (Mr. Joncas) 2342 (i).

— IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. Faurel) 3105 (i).

POSTMASTER AND LIGHTHOUSE-KEEPER AT BATISCAN: Ques. (Mr. Tarte) 1447 (i).

POST OFFICE (BRANCH) CROWN ST., QUE.: Ques. (Mr. Landerkin) 5347 (ii).

RAPIDE PLAT AND SOULANGES CANAL, ASSIGNMENT OF CONTRACTS: Ques. (Mr. Cameron, Huron) 6505 (ii).

RIMOUSKI WHARF EXTENSION, TENDERS: Ques. (Mr. Tarte) 1028 (i).

ROCKWAY VALLEY, IMPROVED MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. Devlin) 3629 (ii).

STE. ANNE DES MONTS MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. Joncas) 639 (i).

ST. CHARLES BRANCH RY., ESTIMATED COST, & C.: Ques. (Mr. Landerkin) 5348, 6119 (ii).

ST. JOHNS, ASSISTANT HARBOUR MASTER, APPOINT.: Ques. (Mr. Lavergne) 2341 (i).

ST. LAURENT WHARF, REPAIRS: Ques. (Mr. Tarte) 1028 (i).

— PHILLAS FILLION: Ques. (Mr. Langelier) 1868.

SHORTIS, VALENTINE. See general heading.

SIMARD, ARTHUR, LIGHTHOUSE-KEEPER, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. Angers) 4380 (ii).

SOULANGES CANAL. See general headings; "Goodwin," & c.

SOREL ILLICIT WHISKEY STILLS, PROSECUTIONS: Ques. (Mr. Bruneau) 1677 (i).

QUEBEC—Continued.

- STANSTEAD CUSTOMS COLLECTOR: Ques. (Mr. *Rider*) 1026 (i).
- TARTE, J. I., PAYMENTS TO BY PUBLIC DEPTS.: M. for Stmt. (Mr. *Tarte*) 1450 (i).
- THREE RIVERS HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 641 (i).
- HARBOUR DEBENTURES: Ques. (Mr. *Rinfret*) 641 (i).
- WEIGHTS AND MEASURES INSPECTION: Ques. (Mr. *Leduc*) 641, 823 (i).
- VERCHÈRES ELECTION, PAR. IN TORONTO *Globe*: Personal explanation (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) 1347 (i).
- VOTERS' LIST, MONTMAGNY, COST OF PREPARATION: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 1251 (i).
- RICHELIEU COUNTY, TOTAL COST: Ques. (Mr. *Bruneau*) 1821 (i).
- WELLINGTON BRIDGES, LACHINE CANAL, COST OF CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 6118 (ii).
- YAMASKA LOCK, TOLLS COLLECTED, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Mignault*) 6508 (ii).
- RIVER BRIDGE: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Bruneau*) 4589, 5059 (ii).
- QUEBEC, CROWN ST. POST OFFICE: Ques. (Mr. *Landarkin*) 5347 (ii).
- QUEBEC NORTH SHORE RY. SUBSIDY: Ques. (Mr. *Rider*) 1622 (i).
- QUEBEC OBSERVATORY, MR. SMITH'S QUARTERS: Ques. (Mr. *Bruneau*) 3101 (i).
- Queenston Heights Bridge Co.'s incorp. B. No. 43 (Mr. *Coatsworth*). 1^o, 958; 2^o, 1024; in Com. and 3^o, 2572 (i). (59 *Vic.*, c. 43.)
- QUEEN'S OWN RIFLES, INVESTIGATION *re* COMPLAINTS: Remarks (Mr. *Mulock*) 6818 (ii).
- QUEEN. See "BATTENBURG."
- Radial Ry. See "INTERNATIONAL."
- Ry. Act. Amt. B. No. 80 (Mr. *Bechard*). 1^o, 3046 (i).
- B. No. 77 (Mr. *Boyle*). 1^o, 2987 (i).
- B. No. 90 (Mr. *Haggart*). 1^o, 5050; 2^o, in Com. and 3^o, 6943 (ii). (59 *Vic.*, c. 9.)
- B. No. 91 (Mr. *McGillivray*). 1^o, 5050 (ii).
- Ry. Company's. See "DRAINAGE."
- Ry. Employees Safety B. No. 46 (Mr. *Maclean, York*). 1^o, 958 (i).
- See "SAFETY."
- Ry. Return Fare Tickets B. No. 6 (Mr. *McLennan*). 1^o, 13; 2^o and ref. to Com. on Rys., 2371 (i).
- RY. SUBSIDIES (UNPAID): M. for Ret.* (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 3106 (i).
- RAILWAYS AND CANALS, DEPTL. REP.: presented (Mr. *Haggart*) 1254 (i).
- in Com. of Sup., 7076 (ii).
- RAILWAYS, CANALS AND TELEGRAPHS, SEL. COM.: List of Members, 883 (i).
- RY. FREIGHT RATES: Remarks (Mr. *Mulock*) 3109 (i).
- RAILWAYS: See
- BAIE DES CHALEURS RY.
- BAY OF QUINTE RY.
- BRANDON AND SOUTH-WESTERN RY.
- CAPE BRETON RY.
- CANADIAN PACIFIC RY. CO.
- CHIGNECTO MARINE TRANSPORT RY.

RAILWAYS—Continued.

- EDMONTON DISTRICT RY. AND IMPROVEMENT CO.
- GRAND TRUNK RY. CO.
- GUELPH JUNCTION RY.
- HURON AND ONT. RY.
- HUDSON BAY AND PACIFIC RY.
- INTERNATIONAL RADIAL RY.
- KINGSTON, SMITH'S FALLS AND OTTAWA RY.
- LAKE ERIE AND DETROIT RIVER RY.
- LINDSAY, BOBCAYGEON AND PONTYPOOL RY.
- MANITOBA AND NELSON VALLEY RY.
- MONTREAL AND OTTAWA RY.
- MONTREAL AND PROVINCE LINE RY.
- MONTREAL ISLAND BELT LINE RY.
- MONTREAL PARK AND ISLAND RY.
- NELSON AND FORT SHEPPARD RY.
- NIAGARA CENTRAL RY.
- NIPISSING AND JAMES BAY RY.
- PONTIAC PACIFIC JUNCTION RY.
- PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND RY.
- ST. CHARLES BRANCH RY.
- ST. LAWRENCE AND ADIRONDACK RY.
- ST. LAWRENCE AND OTTAWA RY.
- SCHOMBERG AND AURORA RY.
- SOUTH ONTARIO PACIFIC RY.
- SOUTH SHORE SUBURBA " "
- SOUTH WESTERN RY.
- THOUSAND ISLANDS RY.
- TORONTO, HAMILTON AND BUFFALO RY.
- TORONTO, HAMILTON AND NIAGARA FALLS RY.
- WINNIPEG AND GREAT NORTHERN RY.
- RAPIDE PLAT AND SOULANGES CANAL, ASSIGNMENT OF MR. POUPORE'S CONTRACTS: Ques. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 6505 (ii).
- RAPIDE PLAT CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 7144 (ii).
- RATES AND REBATES, I.C.R.: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 3102 (i).
- RECONSTRUCTION OF CABINET, *re* MINISTERIAL RESIGNATIONS: M. (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) 69 (i).
- RED RIVER RY. BRIDGE AT EMERSON: M. for O.C.* (Mr. *LaRivière*) 3108 (i).
- REFORMATORY, DOM., DISBURSEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 2652 (i).
- ESTABLISHMENT AND EXPENDITURE: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 2174 (i).
- REPORTS:
- ADULTERATION OF FOOD: presented (Mr. *Costigan*) 31 (i).
- AGRICULTURE: presented (Mr. *Foster*) 2095 (i).
- AUDITOR GENERAL, PART I: presented (Mr. *Foster*) 926 (i).
- PART II: presented (Mr. *Foster*) 1892 (i).
- CIVIL SERVICE EXAMINERS: presented (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 4253 (ii).
- LIST: presented (Mr. *Ouimet*) 289 (i).
- DOM. POLICE: presented (Mr. *Daly*) 289 (i).
- GEOLOGICAL SURVEY: presented (Mr. *Daly*) 3469 (i).
- INTERIOR: presented (Mr. *Daly*) 1675 (i).
- (INDIAN AFFAIRS): presented (Mr. *Daly*) 1346.
- INLAND REVENUE: presented (Mr. *Costigan*) 31 (i).
- LIBRARY OF PARLT.: presented (Mr. *Speaker*) 5 (i).
- MARINE AND FISHERIES: presented (Mr. *Costigan*) 1509 (i).
- MOUNTED POLICE: presented (Mr. *Daly*) 4463 (ii).
- PENITENTIARIES: presented (Mr. *Dickey*) 1346 (i).

REPORTS—Continued.

PRINTING AND STATIONERY: presented (Sir Charles Tupper) 3046 (i).

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS: presented (Mr. Foster) 289 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS: presented (Mr. Ouimet) 2337 (i).

RAILWAYS AND CANALS: presented (Mr. Haggart) 1254.

SECRETARY OF STATE: presented (Sir Charles Tupper) 4375 (ii).

TRADE AND COMMERCE: presented (Mr. Ives) 1346.

TRADE AND NAVIGATION: presented (Mr. Wood) 603.

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES AND GAS: presented (Mr. Costigan) 31.

Remedial Act (Man.) B. 58 (Mr. Dickey). 1^o, 1511; M. to make B. first Order of the Day, 2095; 2^o in. (Sir Charles Tupper) 2719; Amt. (Mr. Laurier) 6 m. h., 2736, 2759; adjd. deb. rsmld., 2799, 2893, 2988, 3112, 3274, 3338, 3472, 3519 (i), 3671, 3816; Amt. neg. (Y. 91, N. 115) 4250; 2^o agreed to (Y. 112, N. 94) 4251; M. for Com. and Amt. (Mr. McCarthy) 4338, 4370; deb. adjd., 4374; rsmld., 4468; neg. on div., 4553; Amt. (Mr. Wallace) 4781; neg. on div., 4785; in Com., 4786, 4919; M. (Mr. McNeill) Com. rise and rep., 4923; neg., 4944; again in Com., 5208, 5224, 5349-6110 (April 6th-11th, incl.); Order for Hse. again in Com., 6120; Amt. (Mr. McCarthy) to adjn., 6120, 6149; neg., 6172; again in Com., 6173-6498 (April 13th-15th, incl.); Ms. Com. rise and rep. (Mr. McNeill) 4923, 6015; (Mr. Martin) 5450; (Mr. McCarthy) 5880; (Mr. Fraser) 5896; (Mr. O'Brien) 6195; (Mr. Stubbs) 6364; (Sir Charles Tupper) 6457; agreed to, 6498 (ii).

REMEDIAL ACT, DEBATE:—

AMYOT, Mr.: on Mr. Laurier's Amt. 6 m. h. to M. for 2^o, 2854 (i).

ANGERS, Mr.: on Mr. Laurier's Amt. 6 m. h. to M. for 2^o, 4027. Sec. 4 (a) jurisdiction of Parlt., 5314-17. Sec. 10, school districts, 6010 (ii).

BECHARD, Mr.: on Mr. Laurier's Amt. 6 m. h. to M. for 2^o, 4196 (ii).

BAIN, Mr.: in Com., on sec. 4 (a) jurisdiction of Parlt., 5322; (c) on M. (Mr. Martin) Com. rise and rep., 5467. Sec. 6, on M. (Mr. McNeill) Com. rise and rep., 5630 (ii).

BEAUSOLEIL, M.: on Mr. Laurier's Amt. 6 m. h. to M. for 2^o, 2952 (i).

BELLEY, Mr.: on Mr. Laurier's Amt. 6 m. h. to M. for 2^o, 4015; in Com., on sec. 3, 5048. Sec. 10, on M. (Mr. McCarthy) Com. rise and rep., 5882; on M. (Mr. Fraser) Com. rise and rep. (Opposition leading "obstruction") 5908; (Mr. Laurier's speech re "Orangemen") 5967 (ii)

BENNETT, Mr.: in Com., on sec. 6, on M. (Mr. McNeill) Com. rise and rep., 5657. Sec. 10, on M. (Mr. Fraser) Com. rise and rep. (defence of Mr. Masson) 5936-5941 (ii).

BERGIN, Mr.: in Com., on sec. 4 (c) on Amt. (Mr. McCarthy) 5564 (ii).

BORDEN, Mr.: on Amt. (Mr. McCarthy) to ref. B. to Sup. Court (ref. to N.S. entering Confed.) 4480; in Com., on sec. 4 (c) on M. (Mr. Martin) Com. rise and rep., 5537. Sec. 10, on M. (Mr. Fraser) Com. rise and rep. (absence of members of Govt.—ventilation of Chamber) 5913. Sec. 14, on M. (Mr.

REMEDIAL ACT, DEBATE—Continued.

O'Brien) Com. rise and rep., 6219. Sec. 15 (b), on M. (Mr. Stubbs) Com. rise and rep. (charges against Hon. Messrs. Ross and Coffin) 6418-26 (ii).

BOSTON, Mr.: in Com., on sec. 14, on M. (Mr. O'Brien) Com. rise and rep., 6215 (ii).

BOWMAN, Mr.: in Com., on sec. 6, on M. (Mr. McNeill) Com. rise and rep., 5767 (ii).

BRODEUR, Mr.: in Com., on sec. 3 (s.s. 2 should be struck out) 5044. Sec. 4 (a) control of schools, 5232; (c) on Amt. (Mr. LaRiviere) 5554 (ii).

BRUNEAU, Mr.: on Mr. Laurier's Amt. 6 m. h. to M. for 2^o, 3976 (ii).

CAMERON, Mr. (Huron): in Com., on sec. 6, vacancies, on M. (Mr. McNeill) Com. rise and rep., 5668.

CAMERON, Mr. (Inverness): in Com., on sec. 6, vacancies, on M. (Mr. McNeill) Com. rise and rep. (Catholics of N.S. satisfied) 5796. Sec. 10, school districts, 6066 (ii).

CAMPBELL, Mr.: in Com., on sec. 4 (c) books, &c., on M. (Mr. Martin) Com. rise and rep., 5458. Sec. 6, on M. (Mr. McNeill) Com. rise and rep., 5676. Sec. 7, superintendents, on Amt. (Mr. Weldon) 5859. Sec. 12, on M. (Mr. McNeill) Com. rise and rep., 6018; (no quorum) 6020 (ii).

CARGILL, Mr.: in Com., on sec. 6, vacancies, on M. (Mr. McNeill) Com. rise and rep., 5818 (ii).

CARTWRIGHT, Sir Richard: on Mr. Laurier's Amt. 6 m. h. to M. for 2^o, 3274 (i); on Amt. (Mr. McCarthy) to ref. B. to Sup. Court, 4338, 4373; in Com., on sec. 1, on M. (Mr. McNeill) Com. rise and rep. (negotiations at Winnipeg) 4931, 4943. Sec. 4 (a) control of schools, 5208, 5224, 5231, 5276; duties of board, 5390; (c) on M. (Mr. Martin) Com. rise and rep. (reasonable *modus vivendi*) 5481-5526. Sec. 6, vacancies, on M. (Mr. McNeill) Com. rise and rep., 5709; (quotes letter of Sir John Thompson, and articles re "political cracksman"—exaggeration re products in Man. and N.W.T.) 5711-5715; on Ques. of Order (members must not impute motives) 5809. Sec. 10, M. (Mr. Fraser) Com. rise and rep. (delay fault of Govt.) 5891, 5900; on Ques. of Order (personal insinuations, 5963—appmt. of Judge Masson) 5992. Sec. 12, on M. (Mr. McNeill) Com. rise and rep., 6053 (Mr. Masson's appmt.) 6055-6078; on M. (Mr. McNeill) Com. rise and rep. ("confidence in the breed") 6081. Sec. 14 on M. (Mr. O'Brien) Com. rise and rep. (expenditure on historical ball) 6319. Sec. 15 (b) on M. (Mr. Stubbs) Com. rise and rep. (ventilation of chamber—"checker-board system") 6379-6386; (reads Act of Ont. Legislature re County Judges) 6416 (ii).

CARON, Sir Adolphe: on Mr. Laurier's Amt. 6 m. h. to M. for 2^o, 2814 (i).

CARROLL, Mr.: on Mr. Laurier's Amt. 6 m. h. to M. for 2^o, 3195 (i).

CASEY, Mr.: on Mr. Laurier's Amt. 6 m. h. to M. for 2^o, 3413 (i); on Amt. (Mr. McCarthy) to ref. B. to Sup. Court (official reporters) 4340; in Com., on sec. 1 (M) Mr. Chairman leave the Chair, 4951, withdn., 5001. Sec. 4 ("ultra vires of this Parlt.") 5292; (c) books, &c., on M. (Mr. Martin) Com. rise and rep., 5450. Sec. 6, on M. (Mr. McNeill) Com. rise and rep. (conference at Winnipeg) 5684; (B. constructed for "fishing purposes") 5784. Sec. 10, on Ques. of Order (personal insinuations) 5962; on M. (Mr. Fraser) Com. rise and rep., 5976 (ii).

REMEMIAL ACT, DEBATE—*Continued.*

CHARBONNEAU, Mr.: on Mr. Laurier's Amt. 6 m. h. to M. for 2^o, 4217; in Com., on sec. 4 (a) powers conferred on advisory board, 5317 (ii).

CHARLTON, Mr.: on Mr. Laurier's Amt. 6 m. h. to M. for 2^o, 3353 (i); in Com., on sec. 1 (conference at Winnipeg) 4927. Sec. 4 (c) on M. (Mr. *Martin*) Com. rise and rep., 5506; (Visit to Washington) 1890, 5532; (Mr. O'Donohue's rep.) 5509. Sec. 6, on M. (Mr. *McNeill*) Com. rise and rep. (scriptural readings) 5659-5668; (Mr. Masson's appmnt.) 5804, 5806; on M. (Mr. *Fraser*) Com. rise and rep. (reads rep. of conference) 5954. Sec. 12 (restaurant in H. of C.) 6050. Sec. 14, M. (Mr. *O'Brien*) Com. rise and rep. (Govt.'s hostility to Man.) 6306-6317. Sec. 15 (average attendance at schools) 6387; reads Mr. Costigan's motion in ref. to N.B. School Law and other speeches) 6406 (ii).

CHOQUETTE, Mr.: in Com., on sec. 6, vacancies, on M. (Mr. *McNeill*) Com. rise and rep. (obstruction of Conservatives) 5832. Sec. 8 (a) call of meetings, 5863. Sec. 10, on M. (Mr. *McCarthy*) Com. rise and rep., 5882; on Ques. of Order (chairman should speak both languages) 5952; on M. (Mr. *Fraser*) Com. rise and rep. (Mr. Laurier's speech re "Orangemen") 5967. Sec. 14, on M. (Mr. *O'Brien*) Com. rise and rep. (Govt. insincerity) 6300 (ii).

COATSWORTH, Mr.: in Com., on sec. 3 (2) wards in cities and towns, 6192 (ii).

COCKBURN, Mr.: on Mr. Laurier's Amt. 6 m. h. to M. for 2^o, 3970; in Com., on sec. 7, superintendents, on Amt. (Mr. *Somerville*) 5855 (ii).

COSTIGAN, Hon. Mr.: on Mr. Laurier's Amt. 6 m. h. to M. for 2^o, 3930 (ii).

COLTER, Mr.: in Com., on sec. 6, vacancies, on M. (Mr. *McNeill*) Com. rise and rep. (reads proposals of Man. Govt.) 5774 (ii).

CRAIG, Mr.: on Mr. Laurier's Amt., 6 m. h. to M. for 2^o, 2905 (i); in Com., on sec. 4 (personal explanation) 5402; (a) teachers, 5402-5409. Sec. 10, on Ques. of Order ("unfair criticism of chairman") 5949. Sec. 15, on M. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) Com. rise and rep. (remedial legislation question at elections) 6479 (ii).

DALY, Hon. Mr.: on Mr. Laurier's Amt. 6 m. h. to M. for 2^o, 3112 (i); on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to ref. B. to Sup. Court, 4522; in Com., on sec. 1, on M. (Mr. *McNeill*) Com. rise and rep., 4942. Sec. 3 (rights and privileges of minority prior to 1890) 5032. Sec. 4 (Dom. right to legislate) 5241-5272; (a) control of schools, 5211; (judgment of Justice Dubuc) 5212, 5225, 5235; (powers of school board) 5256; (doubt as to legal power of s.s. 2 of s. 3) 5302; (c) books, &c., on M. (Mr. *Martin*) Com. rise and rep., 5454. Sec. 6, vacancies, on Amt. (Mr. *Edgar*) 5535; on Amt. (Mr. *McNeill*) Com. rise and rep., 5593-5622; (Mr. Masson's appmnt.) 5801. Sec. 7, superintendents, on Amt. (Mr. *Weldon*) 5860. Sec. 8 (b) executive officers, on Amt. (Mr. *Dickey*) 5867. Sec. 19, on M. (Mr. *Fraser*) Com. rise and rep. (quotes from *Regina Leader*) 5924; (readjustment of districts) 6013. Sec. 14, meetings, 6355. Sec. 15 (b) on M. (Mr. *Stubbs*) Com. rise and rep. (average attendance at schools, reads tables) 6390 (ii).

DAVIES, Mr. (P.E.I.): on Mr. Laurier's Amt. 6 m. h. to M. for 2^o, 3519 (i); on M. to adjn. deb., 4232; on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to ref. B. to Sup. Court, 4541; in Com., on sec. 1, 4919; on M. (Mr. *McNeill*) Com.

REMEDIAL ACT, DEBATE—*Continued.*

rise and rep. (constitutionality of deb.) 4923-4944. Sec. 4 (a) control of schools (judgment of Justice Dubuc) 5211-5235; ("powers to legislate effectively,") 5250; (Lord Chancellor's views) 5264; (jurisdiction to deal with question) 5358; (b) qualification of teachers, 5413; on Amt. (Mr. *O'Brien*) 5419; permanent Chairman of Com., 5432. Sec. 6, vacancies, on M. (Mr. *McNeill*) Com. rise and rep., 5593-5620. Sec. 8 (a) meetings, 5864. Sec. 10, school districts, 5995. Sec. 12, on Ques. of Order (members not to read newspapers) 6047; on M. (Mr. *McNeill*) Com. rise and rep. (Mr. Masson's appmnt. and chief justiceship, N.B.) 6074; ("confidence in the breed") 6093. Sec. 12 (1) readjustment of schools, 6180; (Amt.) 6190. Sec. 14, on M. (Mr. *O'Brien*) Com. rise and rep. (powers possessed by this Parliament) 6347 (ii).

DAVIN, Mr.: on Mr. Laurier's Amt. 6 m. h. to M. for 2^o, 4159; in Com. on sec. 4 (a) on M. (Mr. *Martin*) Com. rise and rep., 5495. Sec. 6, vacancies, on M. (Mr. *McNeill*) Com. rise and rep. (conference with Mr. Greenway) 5827. Sec. 15 (b) on M. (Mr. *Stubbs*) Com. rise and rep. (reads articles from newspapers re "obstruction" tactics) 6410. Sec. 15 (b) on M. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) Com. rise and rep. (money grant to Manitoba, banner question at coming elections) 6471 (ii).

DAWSON, Mr.: in Com. on sec. 15 (b) on M. (Mr. *Stubbs*) Com. rise and rep. (reads several documents) 6371 (ii).

DEVLIN, Mr.: on Mr. Laurier's Amt. 6 m. h. to M. for 2^o, 3393 (i); in Com., on sec. 1 (ref. to Mr. Coffey) 5004, 5020. Sec. 4 (c) on Amt. (Mr. *Frémont*) 5550. Sec. 5, board meetings, 5579. Sec. 6, vacancies, 5584; on M. (Mr. *McNeill*) Com. rise and rep. (corrects statements re opposition to his party) 4707 (ii).

DICKEY, Hon. Mr.: on Mr. Laurier's Amt. 6 m. h. to M. for 2^o, 2773 (i); on M. to adjn. deb., 4233; in Com. on sec. 4 (a) control of schools, 5351-5372; (b) on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) 5434; (c) on Amt. (Mr. *Larivière*) 5543-5554; on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) 5564; (section allowed to stand) 5565; (d) plans, on Amt. (Mr. *Flint*) 5567; (e) sites, &c., 5570; (f) school grants, &c., 5574. Sec. 5, board meetings, 5577; on Amt. (Mr. *Flint*) 5578. Sec. 7, superintendents, on Amt. (Mr. *Somerville*) 5854; on Amt. (Mr. *Weldon*) 5857. Sec. 8 (a) meetings, 5865; (b) executive officer (Amt.) 5866. Sec. 4 (c) books, &c. (prop. Amt.) 5870-5874. Sec. 10, school districts, 5994. Sec. 12, on M. (Mr. *McNeill*) Com. rise and rep. (Mr. Masson's appmnt., fees, &c.) 6055; (stunt. re "confidence in the breed") 6084. Sec. 15 (b) on M. (Mr. *Stubbs*) Com. rise and rep. (Act appointing county judges for Ont) 6418 (ii).

DUPONT, Mr.: on Mr. Laurier's Amt. 6 m. h. to M. for 2^o, 4171; on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to ref. B. to Sup. Court, 4344; in Com., on sec. 3 (s.s. 2 should be struck out) 5043. Sec. 4 (a) control of schools, 5320; (c) on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) 5873. Sec. 10, formation of school districts, 6005. Sec. 15 (b) on M. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) Com. rise and rep., 6474 (ii).

EDGAR, Mr.: on Mr. Laurier's Amt. 6 m. h. to M. for 2^o, 2797 (i); on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to ref. B. to Sup. Court, 4508; (called to order by Mr. *Speaker*) 4510. Sec. 4 (a) control of schools, 5209; ("opinion of leader of Hse") 5308; (e) sites, &c., 5573. Sec. 5, board meetings (Amt.) 5578, 5580. Sec. 6, vacancies (Amt.) 5585; on M. (Mr. *McNeill*)

REMEDIAL ACT, DEBATE—Continued.

- Com. rise and rep. (length of continuous sitting) 5750. Sec. 10, on M. (Mr. *Fraser*) Com. rise and rep. (brochure) 5934. Sec. 12, on M. (Mr. *McNeill*) Com. rise and rep. (Mr. *Mosson's* appmnt. fees, &c.) 6060. Sec. 14, on M. (Mr. *O'Brien*) Com. rise and rep., 6195; (moribund Parlt.) 6329 (ii).
- EDWARDS, Mr. :** on Mr. *Laurier's* Amt. 6 m. h. to M. for 2^o, 3946 (ii).
- FAIRBAIRN, Mr. :** in Com. on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to ref. B. to Sup. Court, 4365. Sec. 1 (ref. to Orange vote) 5021 (ii).
- FEATHERSTON, Mr. :** in Com., on sec. 14, on M. (Mr. *O'Brien*) Com. rise and rep. (reads resolution of Ministerial Ass. *re* restaurant) 6216 (ii).
- FERGUSON, Mr. (Leeds and Grenville):** in Com. on sec. 10, on M. (Mr. *Fraser*) Com. rise and rep. (relatives in Civil Service) 5891, 5900: (permanent chairman) 5432 (ii).
- FLINT, Mr. :** on Mr. *Laurier's* Amt. 6 m. h. to M. for 2^o, 3949; in Com., on sec. 4 (d) plans, &c. (Amt.) 5565; (e) sites, districts, &c., 5568. Sec. 5, board meetings, 5576; election of chairman at boards, 5578. Sec. 6, vacancies, 5582; on M. (Mr. *McNeill*) Com. rise and rep. (N. S. laws) 5776-5772. Sec. 10 on M. (Mr. *Fraser*) Com. rise and rep., 5977. Sec. 13 (a) wards in cities and towns, 6194. Sec. 14, on M. (Mr. *O'Brien*) Com. rise and rep. (restaurant and intoxicating liquors) 6326. Sec. 15 (b) on M. (Mr. *Stubbs*) Com. rise and rep. (Govt. as "obstructionists," 6454, (ii).
- FORBES, Mr. :** on Mr. *Laurier's* Amt. 6 m. h. to M. for 2^o, 3371 (i).
- FOSTER, Hon. Mr. :** on Mr. *Laurier's* Amt. 6 m. h. to M. for 2^o, 3472. Sec. 1, on M. (Mr. *McNeill*) Com. rise and rep. ("insincerity of Govt.") 4933; (b) on Amt. (Mr. *O'Brien*) Com. rise and rep., 5425. Sec. 5, board meetings, 5575. Sec. 4 (c) books, &c., on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) 5876. Sec. 10 (Mr. *Laurier's* speech *re* "Orangemen") 5969. Sec. 14, on M. (Mr. *O'Brien*) Com. rise and rep. (Mr. *Laurier's* attitude towards B.) 6289; (ii).
- FRASER, Mr. :** on Mr. *Laurier's* Amt. 6 m. h. to M. for 2^o, 3585 (i) in Com., on sec. 1, on M. (Mr. *Casey*) Chairman leave Chair ("obstruction") 4977. Sec. 4 (c) on M. (Mr. *Martin*) Com. rise and rep., 5504; (d) plans, &c., on Amt. (Mr. *Flint*) 5565; (e) sites, districts, &c., 5568. Sec. 5, board meetings, 5575. Sec. 6, vacancies, 5581; on Amt. (Mr. *Edgar*) 5586; on M. (Mr. *McNeill*) Com. rise and rep. (Mr. *Masson's* appmnt.) 5801. Sec. 7, superintendents, on Amt. (Mr. *Weldon*) 5859. Sec. 10 (M) Com. rise and rep., 5886 5891. Sec. 12, on M. (Mr. *McNeill*) Com. rise and rep., 6015; (1) readjustment of school districts, 6173. Sec. 13 (3) no municipal organization, 6194. Sec. 15, Ques. of Order (members sleeping in the House) 6363; (b) on M. (Mr. *Stubbs*) Com. rise and rep. (exam. of Mr. *Masson* by Min. of Jus.) 6417 (ii).
- FRECHETTE, Mr. :** on Mr. *Laurier's* Amt. 6 m. h. to M. for 2^o, 3325 (i).
- FREMONT, Mr. :** in Com., on sec. 4 (a) qualification for advisory board) 5227, 5278; (b) qualification of teachers, on Amt. (Mr. *O'Brien*) 5419; (c) books, &c. 5437. Sec. 7, pay of superintendents, on Amt. (Mr. *McMullen*) 5852. Sec. 10, formation of school districts, 5998 (ii).

REMEDIAL ACT, DEBATE—Continued.

- GEOFFRION, Mr. :** on Mr. *Laurier's* Amt. 6 m. h. to M. for 2^o, 2846 (i).
- GIBSON, Mr. :** in Com., on sec. 5, board meetings, election of chairman, 5578. Sec. 6, vacancies, 5583; on M. (Mr. *McNeill*) Com. rise and rep., 5724. Sec. 10 on M. (Mr. *Fraser*) Com. rise and rep. (absence of members of Govt.) 5912. Sec. 12, on M. (Mr. *McNeill*) Com. rise and rep. (reads newspaper extracts *re* coercion) 6042 6050 (ii).
- GILLIES, Mr. :** on Mr. *Laurier's* Amt. 6 m. h. to M. for 2^o, 3798 (i); on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to ref. B. to Sup. Court, 4520; in Com., sec. 1 (N.S. system) 4996 (ii).
- GRANT, Sir James :** on Mr. *Laurier's* Amt. 6 m. h. to M. for 2^o, 4067; in Com., on sec. 10, on M. (Mr. *Fraser*) Com. rise and rep., 5989 (ii).
- GRANDBOIS, Mr. :** on Mr. *Laurier's* Amt. 6 m. h. to M. for 2^o, 3445 (i); on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to ref. B. to Sup. Court, 4364 (ii).
- GIROUARD, Mr. :** on Mr. *Laurier's* Amt. 6 m. h. to M. for 2^o, 3457 (i).
- HAGGART, Hon. Mr. :** on Mr. *Laurier's* Amt. 6 m. h. to M. for 2^o, 3757; on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to ref. B. to Sup. Court, 4365 (ii).
- HASLAM, Mr. :** on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to ref. B. to Sup. Court, 4552, in Com., on sec. 15 (b) on M. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) Com. rise and rep. (reads explanation sent to Orange lodge *re* vote) 6491 (ii).
- HAZEN, Mr. :** in Com. on sec. 6, vacancies, on Amt. (Mr. *Edgar*) 5587 (ii).
- HENDERSON, Mr. :** in Com., on sec. 4 (a) control and management, 5392. Sec. 6, vacancies, on M. (Mr. *McNeill*) 5655, 5678; on M. (Mr. *McNeill*) Com. rise and rep. (Mr. *Masson's* appmnt.) 5800 (ii).
- HUGHES, Mr. :** on Mr. *Laurier's* Amt. 6 m. h. to M. for 2^o, 4240. Sec. 4 (a) qualification of teachers, 5285. Sec. 6, vacancies, on M. (Mr. *McNeill*) Com. rise and rep. (scrambling for seat in Cabinet) 5762-5766. Sec. 15, on M. (Mr. *Stubbs*) Com. rise and rep. (charges against Mr. *Wallace re* anonymous letters in *Mail-Empire*) 6426-6450 (ii).
- INGRAM, Mr. :** in Com., on sec. 1 (ref. to vote on 2^o of B.) 5023. Sec. 4 (inconsistency of Opposition) 5296 (ii).
- INNES, Mr. :** in Com., on sec. 6, vacancies, on M. (Mr. *McNeill*) Com. rise and rep. (reads proposals of delegates to Winnipeg, 5634-5652 (ii).
- IVES, Hon. Mr. :** on Mr. *Laurier's* Amt. 6 m. h. to M. for 2^o, 2893 (i); in Com., on sec. 1., on M. (Mr. *McNeill*) Com. rise and rep. (Govt. negotiations at Winnipeg) 4941; ("right of minority to appeal") 5037. Sec. 6, vacancies, 5581. Sec. 10, on M. (Mr. *Fraser*) Com. rise and rep. (absence of French Liberals) 5903. Sec. 13 (2) wards in cities and towns, 6192; (3) no municipal organization 6194; (Amt., 6194 (ii).
- JEANNOTTE, Mr. :** on Mr. *Laurier's* Amt. 6 m. h. to M. for 2^o, 3223 (i); in Com., on sec. 6, on M. (Mr. *McNeill*) Com. rise and rep., 5595. Sec. 14, on M. (Mr. *O'Brien*) Com. rise and rep., 6204 (ii).
- JONCAIS, Mr. :** on Mr. *Laurier's* Amt. 6 m. h. to M. for 2^o, 3172 (i); in Com., on sec. 4 (c) books, &c., on Amt. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 5559. Sec. 6, vacancies, on M. (Mr. *McNeill*) Com. rise and rep. (names Opposition "obstructionists") 5834 (ii).
- KENNEY, Mr. :** on Mr. *Laurier's* Amt. 6 m. h. to M. for 2^o, 3394 (i).

REMEDIAL ACT, DEBATE—*Continued.*

- LACHAPELLE, Mr.:** on Mr. Laurier's Amt. 6 m. h. to M. for 2^o, 3211 (i).
- LANDERKIN, Mr.:** in Com., on sec. 6, vacancies, on M. (Mr. McNeill) Com. rise and rep., 5737. Sec. 15 (b) on Amt. (Mr. Stubbs) Com. rise and rep. (policy of Govt. as to minorities) 6403 (ii).
- LANGELIER, Mr.:** on Mr. Laurier's Amt. 6 m. h. to M. for 2^o, 2930 (i); in Com., on sec. 4 (c) on Amt. (Mr. LaRivière) 5547; on Amt. (Mr. Powell) 5553; (e) sites, districts, &c., 5569. Sec. 6, vacancies, 5584; on M. (Mr. McNeill) Com. rise and rep. (charges by *L'Événement*) 5840. Sec. 7, superintendents, 5847; on Amt. (Mr. Weldon) 5859. Sec. 8 (b) executive officer, on Amt. (Mr. Dickey) 5868. Sec. 4 (c) books, on Amt. (Mr. Dickey) 5871. Sec. 10, formation of school districts, 5996. Sec. 12, on M. (Mr. McNeill) Com. rise and rep. (reads letter "confidence in the breed") 6085; (1) readjustment of school districts, 6180. Sec. 15 (a) chairman, on Amt. (Mr. McCarthy's) ballot voting, 6361 (ii).
- LANGEVIN, Sir Hector:** on Mr. Laurier's Amt. 6 m. h. to M. for 2^o, 2918 (i); in Com., on sec. 4 (c) on Amt. (Mr. LaRivière) 5557. Sec. 10, on M. (Mr. McCarthy) Com. rise and rep. (proposes to take out sections that can be passed without discussion) 5884 (ii).
- LaRIVIÈRE, Mr.:** on Mr. Laurier's Amt. 6 m. h. to M. for 2^o, 4084; in Com., on sec. 4 (Opposition to restore rights) 5265. Sec. 4 (b) qualification of teachers, on Amt. (Mr. O'Brien) 5419; (c) books, &c. (Amt.) 5542, neg., 5562; on Amt. (Mr. Powell) 5562; (d) plans, on Amt. (Mr. Flint) 5567; (e) sites, &c., 5571. Sec. 5, board meetings, 5575. Sec. 7, pay of superintendents, on Amt. (Mr. Martin) 5848; appnmt. of superintendents on Amt. (Mr. Somerville) 5855. Sec. 4 (c) books, &c., on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. McCarthy) 5870. Sec. 10, formation of school districts, 5996. Sec. 15 (b) on Amt. (Mr. Stubbs) Com. rise and rep., formation of school districts, 6384; (reads rep. of Mr. Young, *re* average attendance) 6393. Sec. 15 (b) on M. (Sir Charles Tupper) Com. rise and rep. (Opposition to blame for B. not passing) 6462 (ii).
- LAURIER, Hon. Mr.:** on M. (Sir Charles Tupper) for 2^o, 2736; (Amt.) 6 m. h., 2759 (i); on Amt. (Mr. McCarthy) to ref. B. to Sup. Court, 4545-4554; in Com., on sec. 1, on M. (Mr. Casey) chairman leave Chair ("obstruction") 4962. Sec. 4 (b) qualification of teachers, 5408; (b) on M. (Mr. O'Brien) Com. rise and rep., 5425; (c) on M. (Mr. Martin) Com. rise and rep., 5517; (d) plans, on Amt. (Mr. Flint) 5566; (e) sites, districts, &c., 5570. Sec. 5, board meetings, 5576. Sec. 6, on M. (Mr. McNeill) Com. rise and rep., 5697; (reads Sir John Thompson's letters *re* Catholics in N.S.) 5699. Sec. 10 (speech *re* "Orangemen") 5964-5970. Sec. 14, on M. (Mr. O'Brien) Com. rise and rep., 6284. Sec. 14 (restaurant of H. of C.) 6324. Sec. 15 (b) on M. (Sir Charles Tupper) Com. rise and rep., 6459 (ii).
- LAVERGNE, Mr.:** on Mr. Laurier's Amt. 6 m. h. to M. for 2^o, 2865 (i); in Com., on sec. 4 (c) books, &c., on Amt. (Mr. LaRivière) 5561. Sec. 7, superintendents, on Amt. (Mr. Weldon) 5859 (ii).
- LEGRIS, Mr.:** on Mr. Laurier's Amt. 6 m. h. to M. for 2^o, 4050 (ii).
- LISTER, Mr.:** on M. to adjn. debate on Mr. Laurier's, Amt. to M. for 2^o, 4222; on Amt. (Mr. McCarthy) to ref. B. to Sup. Court ("May" quoted) 4355.

REMEDIAL ACT, DEBATE—*Continued.*

- Sec. 12, on M. (Mr. McNeill) that Com. rise and rep. (Judge Masson's appnmt., fees, &c.) 6071. Sec. 15 (b) on M. (Sir Charles Tupper) Com. rise and rep. (last 12 or 14 years a war of religion in Ont.) 6486; (circulars distributed) 6487 (ii).
- MACDONALD, Mr. (Huron):** in Com., on sec. 6, on Amt. (Mr. McNeill) Com. rise and rep., 5607; (called to order—"political blackguard,") 5611-5614. Sec. 10, on M. (Mr. Fraser) Com. rise and rep. (reads Mr. Bennett's speech *re* schools, 1895) 5939-5944. Sec. 10, formation of school districts, 6009. Sec. 12, on M. (Mr. McNeill) Com. rise and rep., 6108. Sec. 14, on M. (Mr. O'Brien) Com. rise and rep. (restaurant of H. of C.) 6327; (demands of commissioners to Mr. Greenway) 6333; (N. B. School Act) 6336. Sec. 14, school meetings, 6356 (ii).
- MACDONELL, Mr. (Algoma):** in Com., on sec. 14, on M. (Mr. O'Brien) Com. rise and rep., 6209; (repeating private conversation) 6210 (ii).
- MACDOWALL, Mr.:** in Com., on sec. 10, on M. (Mr. Fraser) Com. rise and rep. (supports principle of B.) 523. Sec. 15 (b) on Amt. (Sir Charles Tupper) Com. rise and rep. (N. W. T. and B.) 6478 (ii).
- MACLEAN, Mr. (York):** on Mr. Laurier's Amt. 6 m. h. to M. for 2^o, 3202 (i); in Com., on sec. 4 (b) on Amt. (Mr. McCarthy) 5436; (c) books, &c., on M. (Mr. Martin) Com. rise and rep., 5473. Sec. 14, on M. (Mr. O'Brien) Com. rise and rep. (pledged to his constituents to veto remedial legislation) 6342. Sec. 15, on M. (Sir Charles Tupper) Com. rise and rep. (protests against school question as a platform at coming elections) 6486 (ii).
- McDOUGALL, Mr. (Cape Breton):** in Com., on sec. 1 (N. S. school system) 4995.
- McISAAC, Mr.:** on Mr. Laurier's Amt. 6 m. h. to M. for 2^o, 3778 (ii).
- METCALFE, Mr.:** on Mr. Laurier's Amt. 6 m. h. to M. for 2^o, 4135 (ii).
- McCARTHY, Mr.:** on Mr. Laurier's Amt. 6 m. h. to M. for 2^o, 3710; on M. for Com. (Amt.) 4338; ref. B. to Sup. Court, 4340, 4357; (ref. to Catholic daughter) 4366; (Amt. read) 4370, 4522; in Com. on sec. 4 (a) control and duties of board, 5233-5238; (interpretation of judgment of P.C.) 5253; (power of Parl. limited to restore rights) 5266-5307; control of schools, 5350; (b) 5402; Amt. to Amt. (Mr. O'Brien) 5429; (permanent chairman) 5433; (c) on M. (Mr. Martin) Com. rise and rep., 5530; (c) prop. Amt., 5564; (d) plans, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Flint) 5566; (e) sites, districts, &c., 5569. Sec. 6, Order, Ques. of (duties of Dep. Speaker) 5732; (appeal to Hse.) 5734. Sec. 7, pay of superintendents, on Amt. (Mr. Martin) 5848; on Amt. (Mr. Weldon) 5858. Sec. 8 (a) meetings, 5863. Sec. 4 (c) books, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Dickey) 5870; (Amt.) 5872. Sec. 10 (M.) Com. rise and rep., 5880; on M. (Mr. Fraser) Com. rise and rep., 5982-5989. Sec. 12 (1) readjustment of school districts, 6188; (Amt.) 6190. Sec. 14, on M. (Mr. O'Brien) Com. rise and rep. (reviews the history of the Man. Act) 6293; school meetings, 6356; on Amt. (Mr. O'Brien) Com. rise and rep. (reads affidavits *re* Sir Donald Smith's stmt.) 6340. Sec. 15 (a) chairman (Amt.) 6360. Sec. 15, on M. (Sir Charles Tupper) Ques. of Order. (M. irregular) 6459; on M. (Sir Charles Tupper) Com. rise and rep., 6466 (ii).

REMEDIAL ACT, DEBATE—Continued.

- McDONALD**, Mr. (Victoria, N. S.): in Com., on sec. 6, on M. (Mr. McNeill) Com. rise and rep., 5628 (ii).
- McDONALD**, Mr. (Assa.): in Com., on sec. 10, on M. (Mr. Fraser) Com. rise and rep. (Regina Leader) 5925 (ii).
- McGILLIVRAY**, Mr.: on Mr. Laurier's Amt. 6 m. h. to M. for 2^o, 4211; on M. to adjn. deb., 4239; in Com., on sec. 6, vacancies, on M. (Mr. McNeill) Com. rise and rep. ("wobbling" charges) 5841. Sec. 10, on M. (Mr. Fraser) Com. rise and rep. (personal explanation, *re* vote on B.) 5941, 5957; (attacks member for Muskoka *re* connection with Mr. Reid) 5959. Sec. 10 (Mr. Laurier's speech *re* "Orangemen") 5964. Sec. 15, on M. (Sir Charles Tupper) Com. rise and rep. (circulars in Ont. against Roman Catholics) 6494; (Margaret L. Sheppard) 6495-6498 (ii).
- McLEOD**, Mr.: on Mr. Laurier's Amt. 6 m. h. to M. for 2^o, 3296 (i); in Com., on sec. 4, Order, Ques. of (hon. Member discussing whole bill) 5340. Sec. 6, vacancies, on Amt. (Mr. Edgar) 5589. Sec. 4 (a) (should. restore rights) 5602. Sec. 10, formation of school districts, 6191. Sec. 14, on M. (Mr. O'Brien) Com. rise and rep. (powers to legislate) 6349 (ii).
- McMILLAN**, Mr.: in Com., on sec. 4 (c) books, &c., on M. (Mr. Martin) Com. rise and rep., 5461 (ii).
- McMULLEN**, Mr.: on Amt. (Mr. McCarthy) to ref. B. to Sup. Court, 4468. Sec. 4 (c) on M. (Mr. Martin) Com. rise and rep., 5514, 5536. Sec. 6, vacancies, on M. (Mr. McNeill) Com. rise and rep., 5740. Sec. 7, pay of superintendents, 5851-5852. Sec. 10, on M. (Mr. Fraser) Com. rise and rep., 5904. Sec. 12, on M. (Mr. McNeill) Com. rise and rep. (absence of members) 6023. Sec. 14 (c) on M. (Mr. O'Brien) Com. rise and rep. (restaurant, official reporters, &c.) 6327 (ii).
- McNEILL**, Mr.: on Mr. Laurier's Amt. 6 m. h. to M. for 2^o, 4145; on Amt. (Mr. Wallace) not to proceed with B., 4784; in Com., on sec. 1 (M.) Com. rise and rep., 4923; neg., 4944; ("obstruction" unfair to members) 4973. Sec. 4 (a) control of schools, 5214; (reads judgment of P.C.) 5244-5249; Order, Ques. of ("disgraceful noise") 5335; (c) on M. (Mr. Martin) Com. rise and rep., 5484. Sec. 6, vacancies (M.) Com. rise and rep., 5591-5595; (rights extended and perpetuated) 5822. Sec. 7, appnmt. of superintendents, on Amt. (Mr. Somerville) 5853; on Amt. (Mr. Weldon) 5859. Sec. 8 (a) meetings, 5865. Sec. 10, on Ques. of Order, 5947-5949. Sec. 12 (M.) Com. rise and rep., 6015. Sec. 14, on M. (Mr. O'Brien) Com. rise and rep. (Warton meeting) 6265; (Mr. Birmingham's letter to Mr. Belyea) 6328. Sec. 15, on M. (Sir Charles Tupper) Com. rise and rep. (no wish to deprive Man. of rights) 6485 (ii).
- MARTIN**, Mr.: on Mr. Laurier's Amt. 6 m. h. to M. for 2^o, 3013, 3572 (i); on Amt. (Mr. McCarthy) to ref. B. to Sup. Court, 4358; on Amt. (Mr. Wallace) not to proceed with B., 4785; in Com., on sec. 4 (a) duties of boards, 5372; (c) books, &c. (M.) Com. rise and rep., 5450; neg., 5542; on Amt. (Mr. LaRivière) 5543-5558; (d) on Amt. (Mr. Flint) plans, &c., 5565; (c) on M. (Mr. McNeill) Com. rise and rep., 5746. Sec. 6, vacancies, on M. (Mr. McNeill) Com. rise and rep. (bribes to members *re* vote) 5788-5801. Sec. 7, superintendents pay (Amt.)

REMEDIAL ACT, DEBATE—Continued.

5847. Sec. 8 (b) executive officer, on Amt. (Mr. Dickey) 5866. Sec. 7, on Amt. (Mr. Weldon) 5860; (c) on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. McCarthy) 5878. Sec. 10, formation of school districts, 5611. Sec. 11, re-adjustment of schools, 6013. Sec. 12, on M. (Mr. McNeill), Com. rise and rep., 6021; (1) readjustment of school districts, 6173. Sec. 13 (1) school districts in cities and towns (Amt.) 6192; (2) wards in cities and towns (Amt.) 6192; (3) no municipal organization, 6194. Sec. 15 (a) election of chairman, on Amt. (Mr. McCarthy) voting by ballot, 6362; (b) on M. (Sir Charles Tupper.) Com. rise and rep. (votes of N.W.T. and Man. representatives) 6476.
- MASSON**, Mr.: on Mr. Laurier's Amt. 6 m. h. to M. for 2^o, 2879 (i).
- MILLS**, Hon. Mr. (Bothwell): on Mr. Laurier's Amt. 6 m. h. to M. for 2^o, 3616; on Amt. (Mr. McCarthy) to ref. B. to Sup. Court, 4359; (on "May" being quoted) 4350-4355, 4544; in Com., on sec. 1 (commission at Winnipeg) 4922; on Amt. (Mr. McNeill) Com. rise and rep., 4937. Sec. 2 ("may" and "shall") 5030-5043. Sec. 4 (a) control of schools, 5208; duties of board, 5238-5260; (jurisdiction to deal with question) 5352; (b) qualification of teachers, 5409; (c) on M. (Mr. Martin) Com. rise and rep., 5540; on Amt. (Mr. LaRivière) 5542; (f) on Amt. (Mr. Flint) plans, &c., 5565; (e) sites, &c., 5569; (f) school grants, 5575. Sec. 6, vacancies, 5581; on Amt. (Mr. Edgar) 5587. Sec. 7, pay of superintendents, 5847; appnmt. of superintendents, on Amt. (Mr. Somerville) 5853. Sec. 8 (b) executive officers, on Amt. (Mr. Dickey) 5867. Sec. 10, on Ques. of Order ("unfair criticism") 5949; school districts, formation, 5994-6008. Sec. 12, on M. (Mr. McNeill) Com. rise and rep. (Judge Masson's appnmt., fees, &c.) 6064; ("confidence in the breed") 6091; (1) readjustment of school districts, 6178 (ii).
- MONET**, Mr.: on Mr. Laurier's Amt. 6 m. h. to M. for 2^o, 3338 (i).
- MONCREIFF**, Mr.: on Mr. Laurier's Amt. 6 m. h. to M. for 2^o, 2988 (i); in Com., on sec. 10, on M. (Mr. Fraser) Com. rise and rep., 5931; (bribes to members *re* vote on B.) 5991. Sec. 12, readjustment of school districts, 6190 (ii).
- MULOCK**, Mr.: on Mr. Laurier's Amt. 6 m. h. to M. for 2^o, 4187; on M. to adjn. deb., 4221; on Amt. (Mr. McCarthy) to ref. B. to Sup. Court ("May" quoted) 4355. Sec. 4 (a) power of board to control schools (two boards unnecessary) qualification of teachers, 5280; (b) on Amt. (Mr. O'Brien) 5421; on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. McCarthy) 5434; (c) books, &c., on M. (Mr. Martin) Com. rise and rep., 5479. Sec. 6, on M. (Mr. McNeill) Com. rise and rep., 5606-5626; (Mr. Masson's appnmt. and promises to others) 5807. Sec. 10, on Ques. of Order ("unfair criticism") 5950; formation of school districts, 6011. Sec. 11, readjustment of school districts, 6014. Sec. 15, school meetings, 6358; (Amt.) 6359 (ii).
- O'BRIEN**, Mr.: on Mr. Laurier's Amt. 6 m. h. to M. for 2^o, 3317 (i); in Com., on sec. 4 (a) control of schools, 5226; advisory board, 5227; duties of advisory board, 5378; (b) qualification of teachers, 5410; (Amt.) to strike out s.s. (b) 5418; on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. McCarthy) 5433; (Amt.) "shall" to "may", 5437; (c) on M. (Mr. Martin) Com. rise and rep., 5519. Sec. 6, on M. (Mr. McNeill) Com.

REMEDIAL ACT, DEBATE—*Continued.*

rise and rep., 5652; (recites early history of question) 5782. Sec. 10, on M. (Mr. *McCarthy*) Com. rise and rep., 5882; on M. (Mr. *Fraser*) Com. rise and rep. (dealings with Mr. Reid) 5962. Sec. 12, on M. (Mr. *McNeill*) Com. rise and rep., 6025; (Mr. Sellars' opinion read) 6023-6041. Sec. 14 (M.) Com. rise and rep., 6195. Sec. 15, on M. (Mr. *Stubbs*) Com. rise and rep., 6373; (called to order by chairman) 6376 (ii).

OUMET, Hon. Mr.: on Amt. Mr. *McCarthy* to ref. B. to Sup. Court, 4537-4552; in Com., on sec. 1 (Mr. *Davies* called to order) 4921; (power of Lt. Gov. to appnt. board) 5040. Sec. 3 (Amt.) 5043; (a) control of schools, 5209; (b) on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) permanent chairman, 5433; (c) on Amt. (Mr. *Fremont*) 5440; prop. Amt., 5441 (M.) sec. 9 be struck out) 5880. Sec. 12 (l) readjustment of school districts, 6177. Sec. 14 (M. to strike out) 6357. Sec. 15, proceedings at school meetings (Amt.) 6358; on Amt. (Mr. *Mulock*) 6359; (a) voting for chairman by ballot, on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) 6360. Sec. 15 (b) on M. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) Com. rise and rep. (money grant) 6468; (banner in coming elections) 6468 (ii).

PATERSON, Mr. (Brant): on Mr. Laurier's Amt. 6 m. h. to M. for 2^o, 4077; in Com., on sec. 1, on M. (Mr. *Casey*) that chairman leave the Chair ("obstruction") 4970. Sec. 4 (c) on M. (Mr. *Martin*) Com. rise and rep., 5491. Sec. 6, on M. (Mr. *McNeill*) Com. rise and rep., 5718. Sec. 10, on M. (Mr. *Fraser*) Com. rise and rep. (absence of *McCarthyites*) 5916; formation of school districts, 6000. Sec. 14, on M. (Mr. *O'Brien*) Com. rise and rep., 6224; (b) on M. (Mr. *Stubbs*) Com. rise and rep. (reads clauses, &c.) 6396; (called to order by Mr. *Deputy Speaker*) 6399 (ii).

PELLETIER, Mr.: on Mr. Laurier's Amt. 6 m. h. to M. for 2^o, 3809 (ii).

POWELL, Mr.: on Mr. Laurier's Amt. 6 m. h. to M. for 2^o, 3561 (i); on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to ref. B. to Sup. Court, 4564; (article 9) 4368; in Com., on sec. 1 (N. S. system) 4996. Sec. 4 (a) control of schools, 5227; (c) books, &c. (Amt.) 5561; agreed to, 5563; (e) sites, districts, &c., 5569. Sec. 5 board meetings, 5580. Sec. 11, readjustment of school districts, 6013. Sec. 12, readjustment of districts) 6181 (ii).

PRIOR, Hon. Mr.: on Mr. Laurier's Amt. 6 m. h. to M. for 2^o, 4115. Sec. 1 (ref. to telegrams to Orangemen in Victoria) 5009 (ii).

RINFRET, Mr.: on Mr. Laurier's Amt. 6 m. h. to M. for 2^o, 3153 (i).

RIDER, Mr.: in Com., on sec. 7, appmnt. of superintendents (Amt.) 5857 (ii).

ROBILLARD, Mr.: in Com., on sec. 10, formation of school districts, 5999 (ii).

SEMPLE, Mr.: in Com., on sec. 4 (a) control of schools, 5331. Sec. 6, vacancies, on M. (Mr. *McNeill*) Com. rise and rep. ("conciliation") 5747. Sec. 10, on M. (Mr. *Fraser*) Com. rise and rep. (report of Winnipeg conference) 5935; (attack on Mr. *Masson*) 5936-5938. Sec. 15 (b) on M. (Mr. *Stubbs*) Com. rise and rep., 6450 (ii).

SMITH, Mr.: on Mr. Laurier's Amt. 6 m. h. to M. for 2^o, 4122 (ii).

SOMERVILLE, Mr.: in Com., on sec. 5, board meetings, election of Chairman, 5579. Sec. 6 vacancies, 5583; on M. (Mr. *McNeill*) Com. rise

REMEDIAL ACT, DEBATE—*Continued.*

and rep. ("scrambling for seats") 5758-5767. Sec. 7, pay and appmnt. of superintendents (Amt.) 5852. Sec. 8 (a) meetings, 5862. Sec. 10, on Mr. Laurier's speech *re* Orangemen (Ques. of Order) 5973 (ii).

SPROULE, Mr.: on Mr. Laurier's Amt. 6 m. h. to M. for 2^o, 2924 (i); in Com., on sec. 1, Ques. of Order (sessional employees) 4958, 4964. Sec. 4 (b) on Amt. (Mr. *O'Brien*) 5426; on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) 5429; (a) on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) 5335; advisory board, 5396; books, &c., in Ont., 5398; (c) on M. (Mr. *Martin*) Com. rise and rep., 5513; books, &c., on Amt. (Mr. *Fremont*) 5542. Sec. 6, on M. (Mr. *McNeill*) Com. rise and rep., 5628. Sec. 10, on M. (Mr. *Fraser*) Com. rise and rep., formation of school districts, 6009. Sec. 12, on M. (Mr. *McNeill*) Com. rise and rep., 6101. Sec. 14, on M. (Mr. *O'Brien*) Com. rise and rep. (John George) 6226; (reads Archbishop Langevin's reply at Edmonton) 6230; (reads N.S. school law) 6234. Sec. 15 (a) chairman, on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) ballot voting, 6361. Sec. 15 (b) on M. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) Com. rise and rep. (not in accord with party on remedial legislation only) 6486 (ii).

STUBBS, Mr.: on Mr. Laurier's Amt. 6 m. h. to M. for 2^o, 4058; in Com., on sec. 6, on M. (Mr. *McNeill*) Com. rise and rep., 5757. Sec. 14, on M. (Mr. *O'Brien*) Com. rise and rep. (reads inspector's rep. on Ont. Schools) 6214. Sec. 15, proceedings at meetings, on Amt. (Mr. *Mulock*) 6359; (b) secretary (M.) Com. rise and rep., 6364, 6426 (ii).

SUTHERLAND, Mr.: on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to ref. B. to Sup. Court, 4240. Sec. 4 (c) on Amt. (Mr. *Powell*) 5562. Sec. 6, on M. (Mr. *McNeill*) Com. rise and rep., 5600, 5657. Sec. 8 (a) meetings, 5862. Sec. 10, on M. (Mr. *McCarthy*) Com. rise and rep., 5880 (ii).

TAYLOR, Mr.: on Mr. Laurier's Amt. 6 m. h. to M. for 2^o, 3432 (i); in Com., on sec. 6, on M. (Mr. *McNeill*) Com. rise and rep. (time occupied by members' speeches) 5719 (ii).

TISDALE, Mr.: in Com., on sec. 12, on M. (Mr. *McNeill*) Com. rise and rep. (Mr. *Masson's* appmnt., fees, &c.) 6067. Sec. 15 (b) on M. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) Com. rise and rep. (Protestants of Ont. fair to minority) 6482 (ii).

TUPPER, Sir *Charles*, Bart.: on prop. Amt. to M. for 2^o (Mr. *McCarthy*) to ref. B. to Sup. Court, 4338, 4374; (ref. to N.S. entering Confed.) 4496; in Com., on sec. 1, on Ques. of Order, 4920, 4959; on Amt. (Mr. *McNeill*) Com. rise and rep., 4924; commission at Winnipeg "might fail" 4926; ("obstruction") 4957. Sec. 4 (b) qualification of teachers, 5407; on Amt. (Mr. *O'Brien*) 5420; (c) on M. (Mr. *Martin*) Com. rise and rep., 5519. Sec. 5, board meetings, 5577. Sec. 6, on M. (Mr. *McNeill*) Com. rise and rep., 5692; (quotes "Bourinot" and "Todd") 5694; (Sir John Thompson's letter *re* Catholics of N.S.) 5700; on Ques. of Order (appeal to Hse. *re* *Deputy Speaker*) 5732. Sec. 7, pay of superintendents, 5847; appmnt. of superintendents, on Amt. (Mr. *McMullen*) 5852. Sec. 8 (a) meetings, 5862. Sec. 10, on M. (Mr. *McCarthy*) Com. rise and rep., 5880; on M. (Mr. *Fraser*) Com. rise and rep. (appmnt. of Judge *Masson*) 5992. Sec. 12, on M. (Mr. *McNeill*) Com. rise and rep. (refutes statement *re* "confidence in the breed") 6088. Sec. 14, on M. (Mr. *O'Brien*) Com. rise and rep. (reads letters from Sir John Thompson *re* "want of confidence") 6265-6294;

REMEDIAL ACT, DEBATE—*Continued.*

- on M. (Mr. O'Brien) Com. rise and rep. (resolution of Ministerial Ass.) 6317; (Mr. Birmingham's letter re North Bruce) 6328; (power of Parlt. to legislate) 6348. Sec. 15 (M. Com. rise and rep. (expresses regret at "obstruction") 6457 (ii).
- TUPPER**, Sir Charles Hibbert: on Mr. Laurier's Amt. 6 m. h. to M. for 2^o, 3671; on Amt. (Mr. McCarthy) to ref. B. to Sup. Court, (Order, Ques. of) 4349; ("May" quoted) 4354, in Com., on sec. 4 (jurisdiction to deal with question) 5361. Sec. 12, on Ques. of Order (re newspaper pars.) 6047; on M. (Mr. McNeill) Com. rise and rep. (Mr. Masson's appnmt. fees, promises, &c.) 6061. Sec. 15 (Man. does not object to this system) 6381-6383; on M. (Mr. Stubbs) Com. rise and rep. (charges against Messrs. Ross and Coffin) 6421 (ii).
- TYRWHITT**, Mr.: in Com., on sec. 4 (c) books, &c., on M. (Mr. Martin) Com. rise and rep., 5455. Sec. 6, on M. (Mr. McNeill) Com. rise and rep. (*Deputy Speaker's* absence) 5744. Sec. 10, on M. (Mr. Fraser) Com. rise and rep. ("pledged to his constituents to oppose B.") 5928. Sec. 12, on M. (Mr. McNeill) Com. rise and rep. (reads bill) 6016. Sec. 14, on M. (Mr. O'Brien) Com. rise and rep. (reads history) 6214 (ii).
- WALLACE**, Mr.: on Mr. Laurier's Amt. 6 m. h. to M. for 2^o, 2759 (i); on Amt. (Mr. McCarthy) to ref. B. to Sup. Court, 4344; (Amt.) not to proceed with B., 4781; in Com., on sec. 1 ("Mr. Coffey opposed to sep. schools") 5002, 5019. Sec. 4 (a) control of schools, 5213; powers of advisory board, 5276; (two boards unnecessary) 5279; on Amts. (Mr. McCarthy) 5385, 5430; (b) permanent chairman, 5432; (c) books, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Fremont) 5441; on Amt. (Mr. Powell) 5532; on Amt. (Mr. Flint) 5566; (e) sites, districts, &c., 5572. Sec. 6, on Amt. (Mr. Edgar) 5586; on M. (Mr. McNeill) Com. rise and rep., 5601, 5725; (called to order) 5725; (reads Mr. Taylor's letter) 5726; (Mr. Masson's appnmt.) 5815; (called to order on N.P.) 5814. Sec. 7, pay of superintendents, on Amt. (Mr. Martin) 5851. Sec. 10, on M. (Mr. Fraser) Com. rise and rep. ("municipalities") 5926; on M. (Mr. Fraser) Com. rise and rep., 5980; formation of school districts, 6010. Sec. 12, on M. (Mr. McNeill) Com. rise and rep. (godless schools) 6080; on M. (Mr. McNeill) Com. rise and rep. (compares Que. system with Man.) 6102. Sec. 14, on M. (Mr. O'Brien) Com. rise and rep., 6196; (Algoma convention) 6211; meetings, 6315. Sec. 9, chairman elected by ballot, on Amt. (Mr. McCarthy) 6361. Sec. 15 (b) on M. (Mr. Stubbs) Com. rise and rep. (reads bill of rights) 6364; (charges by Mr. Hughes re letters signed "West York Conservative") 6429, 6450 (ii).
- WELDON**, Mr.: on Mr. Laurier's Amt. 6 m. h. to M. for 2^o, 306; on M. to adjn. deb., 423; on Amt. (Mr. McCarthy) to ref. B. to Sup. Court, 4344; on Ques. of Order, 4517, 4537. Sec. 1, in Com., on M. (Mr. Casey) Chairman leave Chair (N. S. system) 4985, 5097. Sec. 4 (c) on M. (Mr. Martin) Com. rise and rep., 5486. Sec. 6, on M. (Mr. McNeill) Com. rise and rep., 5595, 5605; ("conspirators") 5715. Sec. 7, appnmt. of superintendents, 5854; (Amt.) 5856. Sec. 11, readjustment of schools (Amt.) 6014. Sec. 15 (b) on M. (Mr. Stubbs) Com. rise and rep., 6366 (reads list of absent members and "Educational Review") 6367, 6371; on M. (Sir Charles Tupper) Com. rise and rep. (corrects Mr. Macdowall as to religious teaching in board schools) 6480 (ii).

REMEDIAL ACT, DEBATE—*Continued.*

- WELSH**, Mr.: in Com., on sec. 12, on M. (Mr. McNeill) Com. rise and rep., 6041. Sec. 14, on M. (Mr. O'Brien) Com. rise and rep., 6221. Sec. 15 (b) on M. (Mr. Stubbs) Com. rise and rep. (system in P.E.I.) 6414 (ii).
- WHITE**, Mr., (Shelburne): on Amt. (Mr. McCarthy) to ref. B. to Sup. Court (ref. to N. S. entering Confed.) 4504; in Com., on sec. 15 (b) on M. (Mr. Stubbs) Com. rise and rep. (charges against Messrs. Coffin and Ross) 6421 (ii).
- WILSON**, Mr.: in Com., on sec. 6, vacancies, on M. (Mr. McNeill) Com. rise and rep., 5683 (ii).
- WOOD**, Hon. Mr.: in Com., on sec. 4 (b) qualification of teachers, 5413; (c) on Amt. (Mr. La Riviere) 5556. Sec. 5, board meetings, 5576. Sec. 12 (1) re-adjustment of schools, 6178 (ii).
- YEO**, Mr. J.: in Com., on sec. 6, vacancies, on M. (Mr. McNeill) Com. rise and rep., 5770 (ii).
- REMEDIAL ACT (MAN.) ADJOURNMENT OF DEB.: Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 4226 (ii).
- DISTRIBUTION OF COPIES TO PRESS: Remarks (Mr. Mills, Bothwell) 1889 (i).
- Draft copy: Ques. (Mr. Casey) 1625 (i).
- Explanation (Mr. Foster) 3726 (ii).
- GOVT. SUPPORT TO PROP. AMTS.: Ques. (Mr. Bruneau) 3631 (ii).
- LENGTH OF DEB.: Remarks (Mr. Laurier) 3670
- PAPERS re WINNIPEG COMMISSION: M. to adjn. Hse. (Mr. McCarthy) 6121 (ii).
- PRECEDENCE FOR 2^o: M. (Mr. Foster) 2095 (ii).
- VOTE: Remarks (Sir Richard Cartwright) 3668
- RULING: (Mr. Speaker) 3734 (ii).
- [See "ORDER, PRIVILEGE," &c.]
- REPRESENTATION IN SENATE. See "N. W. T."
- RESIGNATIONS. See "Ministerial."
- RESTAURANT OF HOUSE, CLERICAL IMPUTATIONS AGAINST MEMBERS re INTOXICANTS: Remarks (Mr. Speaker) 6325 (ii).
- Restraint of Trade.** See "CONSPIRACIES."
- RETURNING OFFICER'S ACCOUNTS, MONTREAL CENTRE ELECTION: Ques. (Mr. Brodeur) 3101 (i).
- RET. re ALGOMA ELECTION (1891): Ques. (Mr. Amyot) 2179 (i).
- RETURNS re N. W. TER. AND B. C.: inquiry (Mr. Martin) 6513 (ii).
- ORDERED IN 1894, NON-PRODUCTION: Ques. (Mr. Landerkin) 822, 1026 (i).
- RETURNS STATEMENTS, &c.:
- ADAMS, E., CHARGES AGAINST T. DONNELLY* (Mr. Borden) 4506 (ii).
- "ALERT," STR., SALE OF, &c. (Mr. Langelier) 2370.
- AMERICAN CATTLE, TRANSIT THROUGH CAN. (Mr. McMullen) 720 (i).
- APPOINTMENTS TO PUBLIC OFFICES SINCE DEC., 1895* (Mr. Tarte) 1509 (i).
- ATLANTIC FAST SS. SERVICE AND PACIFIC CABLE* (Mr. Laurier) 1087 (i).
- BAIE DES CHALEURS RY., PURCHASE BY GOVT.* (Mr. Joncas) 1888 (i).
- B. C. EXPRESS CO.'S CONTRACTS, &c.* (Mr. McMullen) 1888 (i).
- B. C. MAIL SERVICE, TENDERS, &c. (Mr. McMullen) 1888 (i).

RETURNS, STATEMENTS, &c.—Continued.

- B. C. SOUTHERN RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY (Mr. *Martin*) 3658.
 BEER LICENSES IN NEPEAWA, MAN. (Mr. *Martin*) 1078 (i).
 BEET-ROOT, BOUNTY TO ENCOURAGE PRODUCTION* (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 1509 (i).
 BELIVEAU, JOSEPH, INDEMNITY FOR INJURIES (Mr. *Bruneau*) 5077 (ii).
 BOARD OF CUSTOMS, APPNMT. AND POWERS, &c.* (Mr. *Stairs*) 3197 (i).
 BOUNTY ON BEET-ROOT SUGAR* (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 1509 (i).
 BOUNTY (FISHERY) FRAUDS IN N.S. AND N.B. (Mr. *Bowers*) 1051 (i).
 BREAKWATERS AND PIERS IN PRINCE COUNTY, TENDERS, &c. (Mr. *Perry*) 2354, 2363 (i).
 CAPE BRETON RY., "HARD-PAN" CLAIMS* (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 3108 (i).
 CAPE TORMENTINE AND TRAVERSE SERVICE* (Mr. *Perry*) 4596 (ii).
 CARIBOO AND YALE ELECTORAL LISTS (Mr. *Martin*) 3652 (ii).
 CAYUGA, SALE OF VILLAGE LOTS* (Mr. *Charlton*) 3636 (ii).
 CENSUS OF N.W.T. TAKEN BY MOUNTED POLICE (Mr. *Martin*) 1502 (i).
 CHAMBERLAIN, CHAS., COMMUTATION OF SENTENCE (Mr. *Martin*) 1475, 1487 (i).
 CHAMBLY CANAL, VESSELS THROUGH FROM '92 TO '95* (Mr. *Langelier*) 2370 (i).
 CHARLAND, H. C., SOREL, PAYMENTS TO* (Mr. *Bruneau*) 3107 (i).
 CLEARVILLE FISHING LICENSES, APPLICATIONS* (Mr. *Casey*) 4596 (ii).
 COLUMBIA RIVER, IMPROVED NAVIGATION, ENGINEER'S REP. (Mr. *Mara*) 5067 (ii).
 CONSOLID. FUND, RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURE* (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1087 (i).
 CORN GROUND FOR HUMAN FOOD* (Mr. *McMullen*) 1087 (i).
 CORN, &c., IMPORTED BY DISTILLERS* (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 1509 (i).
 CONTROLLERS AS PRIVY COUNCILLORS (Mr. *Laurier*) 1065 (i).
 C.P.R. CO.'S CLAIMS FOR INCREASED MAIL MATTER* (Mr. *Borden*) 3107 (i).
 CUSTOMS DEPT., LONDON, CHARGES AGAINST EMPLOYEES* (Mr. *Forbes*) 1889 (i).
 CUSTOMS SERVICE, TORONTO, APPNMTS. AND SALARIES* (Mr. *McMullen*) 711 (i).
 DREDGING LIVERPOOL HARBOUR* (Mr. *Forbes*) 3107 (i).
 — RIVER THAMES, EXPENDITURE (Mr. *Campbell*) 5084 (ii).
 DUNCAN AND LARDO MINING DISTRICTS, ENGINEER'S REPS. (Mr. *Mara*) 5061 (ii).
 ELECTORAL LISTS FOR YALE AND CARIBOO (Mr. *Martin*) 3652 (ii).
 EMERSON RY. BRIDGE AT RED RIVER* (Mr. *LaRivière*) 3108 (i).
 EXHIBITION IN N.W.T., UNPAID ACCOUNTS (Mr. *Martin*) 648, 657 (i).
 EXPENDITURE FOR PERMANENT AND ACTIVE MILITIA* (Mr. *Charlton*) 3636 (ii).
 EXPERIMENTAL FARM, OTTAWA, EXPENDITURE (Mr. *McMillan*) 1085 (i).
 EXPORTS AND IMPORTS 1891 TO 1896, REBATES* (Mr. *McMillan*) 3636 (ii).
 EXPRESS CO.'S (B. C.) CONTRACTS, &c.* (Mr. *Martin*) 1888 (i).

RETURNS, STATEMENTS, &c.—Continued.

- FERRY BOATS IN ST. JOHN HARBOUR* (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 3103 (i).
 FISHING LICENSES. See "Fisheries."
 FREIGHT RATES COMMISSION, COST* (Mr. *Martin*) 3108 (i).
 GIBSON'S CREEK, EXPENDITURE* (Mr. *Colter*) 1509 (i).
 GIROUARD, HON. DESIRE, APPNMT. AS JUDGE OF SUPREME COURT* (Mr. *Tarte*) 1509 (i).
 GOODWIN, GEO., SOULANGES CANAL CONTRACTS* (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 3109 (i).
 GUEVREMONT, J. B., SUPERANNUATION* (Mr. *Flint*) 711 (i).
 "HARD-PAN" CLAIMS, CAPE BRETON RY.* (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 3108 (i).
 HIGH COMMISSIONER'S DUTIES IN LONDON (Mr. *Casey*) 687, 700 (i).
 — VISIT TO CAN. (Mr. *Casey*) 647 (i).
 I. C. R. See general heading.
 IMMIGRATION OF BOYS TO CANADA (Mr. *Casey*) 5074.
 IMPORTS AND EXPORTS, 1891 TO 1896, REBATES* (Mr. *McMillan*) 3636 (ii).
 INTERNAL ECONOMY COM., PAPERS re R. J. WICKSTEED'S DISMISSAL* (Mr. *McCarthy*) 3108 (i).
 INTERPROVINCIAL BRIDGE, NEPEAN POINT (Mr. *Devlin*) 5078 (ii).
 LARDO AND DUNCAN MINING DISTRICTS, ENGINEER'S REPS. (Mr. *Mara*) 5061 (ii).
 LINKLETTER ROAD POST OFFICE, ESTABLISHMENT: (Mr. *Yeo*) 2366 (i).
 LITTLE METIS HARBOUR OF REFUGE (Mr. *McShane*) 4560 (ii).
 LIVERPOOL HARBOUR, DREDGING* (Mr. *Forbes*) 3107
 LONDON CUSTOMS DEPT., CHARGES AGAINST EMPLOYEES* (Mr. *Forbes*) 1889 (i).
 MCBEATH, ALLAN, SUPERANNUATION* (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 3108 (i).
 MCCARTHY ACT, CLAIMS UNDER (Mr. *LaRivière*) 926
 MAIL SERVICE IN B.C. TENDERS, &c.* (Mr. *McMullen*) 1888 (i).
 MAN. SCHOOL QUESTION, PAPERS RESPECTING* (Mr. *LaRivière*) 853 (i).
 MILITARY GROUNDS, SUSSEX (N. B.) LEASE, &c.* (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 3108 (i).
 MILITIA, PERMANENT AND ACTIVE, &c., EXPENDITURE* (Mr. *Charlton*) 3636 (ii).
 "MODUS VIVENDI," TREATY (1848) WITHDRAWAL (Mr. *Laurier*) 1064 (i).
 MONTREAL CUSTOMS OFFICIALS, SALARIES, &c.* (Mr. *McMullen*) 3637 (ii).
 — DRILL SHED, AMOUNT PAID (Mr. *Tarte*) 1509 (i).
 — PORT, PROCEEDINGS AT CONFERENCE re TRAFFIC (Mr. *McShane*) 4568 (ii).
 NEPEAWA (MAN.), BEER LICENSES (Mr. *Martin*) 1078
 NEPEAN POINT, INTERPROVINCIAL BRIDGE (Mr. *Devlin*) 5078 (ii).
 NORTHUMBERLAND STRAITS, MAP re BORINGE* (Mr. *Perry*) 4596 (ii).
 N.W.T. CENSUS TAKEN BY MOUNTED POLICE (Mr. *Martin*) 1502 (i).
 — EXHIBITION, UNPAID ACCOUNTS (Mr. *Martin*) 648, 657 (i).
 — SCHOOL ORDINANCES, LT-GOV.'S REP.* (Mr. *McMillan*) 3636 (ii).
 OTTAWA GAS CO.'S UNPAID CLAIMS* (Sir *James Grant*) 3637 (ii).
 PACIFIC AND ATLANTIC FAST SERVICE AND CABLE* (Mr. *Laurier*) 1087 (i).
 PASPEBIAC HARBOUR OF REFUGE (Mr. *Joncas*) 2342.

RETURNS, STATEMENTS, &c.—Continued.

- P.E.I. RY., CLAIM FOR DAMAGES BY DR. WALL* (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 3108 (i).
- PETERBOROUGH POSTMASTER, REDUCTION OF SALARY (Mr. *Burnham*) 5080 (ii).
- PICTON PUBLIC BUILDINGS, PURCHASE OF SITE* (Mr. *Dawson*) 3108 (i).
- PILOT MOUND AND WINNIPEG MAIL CONTRACT* (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 4596 (ii).
- PORT DOVER, FISHING LICENSES GRANTED* (Mr. *Charlton*) 3636 (ii).
- PORT STANLEY HARBOUR, EXPENDITURE OF \$5,000* (Mr. *Casey*) 4596 (ii).
- POST OFFICE, LINKLETTER ROAD, ESTABLISHMENT (Mr. *Yeo*) 2366 (i).
- PRINCE COUNTY (P.E.I.) BREAKWATERS AND PIERS, TENDERS, &c. (Mr. *Perry*) 2354, 2363 (i).
- PUBLIC OFFICES, APPMNTS. TO SINCE DEC., 1895* (Mr. *Tarte*) 1509 (i).
- RED RIVER RY. BRIDGE AT EMERSON* (Mr. *La-Riciere*) 3108 (i).
- ROLLING STOCK, &c., I.C.R., EMPLOYEES (Mr. *McMullen*) 707 (i).
- RY. SUBSIDIES UNPAID, &c.* (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 3108 (i).
- ST. ANDREW'S RAPIDS, IMPROVEMENTS (Mr. *Martin*) 3643 (ii).
- ST. JOHN HARBOUR FERRY BOATS* (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 3108 (i).
- ST. JOHN RIVER (N.B.) IMPROVED NAVIGATION, EXPENDITURE (Mr. *Colter*) 1509 (i).
- SCHOOL ORDINANCES (N.W.T.), LT.-GOV.'S REP.* (Mr. *McMillan*) 3635 (ii).
- SOULANGES CANAL, GEO. GOODWIN'S CONTRACTS* (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 3109 (i).
- SOUTHERN RY. (B.C.) CO.'S SUBSIDY (Mr. *Martin*) 3658 (ii).
- "STANLEY," STR., CAPE TORMENTINE AND CAPE TRAVERSE SERVICE* (Mr. *Perry*) 4596 (ii).
- STRAITS OF NORTHUMBERLAND, MAP RE BORINGS* (Mr. *Perry*) 4596 (ii).
- SUBSIDIES UNPAID GRANTED TO RYS., &c.* (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 3108 (i).
- SUMMERSIDE BREAKWATERS, CONSTRUCTION* (Mr. *Yeo*) 4596 (ii).
- SUPERANNUATION FUND, CONTRIBUTIONS BY DEPTL. EMPLOYEES* (Mr. *Casey*) 711 (i).
- SUPERANNUATION FUND, OFFICERS CONTRIBUTING, NAMES, &c. (Sir *James Grant*) 1508 (i).
- SUSSEX (N.B.) MILITARY GROUNDS, LEASE, &c.* (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 3108 (i).
- TARTE, J. I., PAYMENTS TO BY PUBLIC DEPTS. (Mr. *Tarte*) 1450 (i).
- TAY CANAL, PROPERTIES EXPROPRIATED BY GOVT. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1507 (i).
- THAMES RIVER, DREDGING EXPENDITURE (Mr. *Campbell*) 5084 (ii).
- TIGNISH BREAKWATER, ENGINEER'S REP. (Mr. *Perry*) 1079 (i).
- TREATY (1888) "MODUS VIVENDI," WITHDRWL. (Mr. *Laurier*) 1064 (i).
- VESSELS THROUGH CHAMBLY CANAL FROM 1892-95* (Mr. *Langelier*) 2370 (i).
- WALL, DR., CLAIM FOR DAMAGES AGAINST P.E.I. RY.* (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 3108 (i).
- WALPOLE INDIAN RESERVE, SALE, &c.* (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 1889 (i).
- WELLAND CANAL, CLAIMS FOR ALLEGED DAMAGES* (Mr. *Gibson*) 1889 (i).

RETURNS, STATEMENTS, &c.—Continued.

- WICKSTEED, RICHARD J., DISMISSAL FROM HOUSE OF COMMONS* (Mr. *McCarthy*) 3107 (i).
- WINNIPEG COLL. OF CUSTOMS, INSPECTOR YOUNG'S INSTRUCTIONS* (Mr. *Tarte*) 3637 (ii).
- WINNIPEG AND PILOT MOUND MAIL CONTRACT* (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 4596 (ii).
- YALE AND CARIBOO ELECTORAL LISTS (Mr. *Martin*) 3552 (ii).
- YAMASKA RIVER BRIDGE (Mr. *Bruneau*) 4589, 5059 (ii).
- Revision of the Statutes B. No. 86 (Mr. *Dickey*). 1st, 6499 (ii).
- RICE MEAL, EXPORTS BY MOUNT ROYAL MILLING CO. : Ques. (Mr. *McShane*) 3634 (ii).
- RICHELIEU COUNTY, TOTAL COST OF VOTERS' LISTS : Ques. (Mr. *Bruneau*) 1621 (i).
- RIDEAU CANAL : in Com. of Sup., 7077, 7144 (ii).
- RIFLE RANGES, MONTREAL, &c., REPAIRS : Ques. (Mr. *McShane*) 4556 (ii).
- RIFLES FOR VOLUNTEERS, IMPROVED : Ques. (Mr. *Casey*) 3632 (ii).
- RIMOUSKI WHARF, EXTENSION, TENDERS : Ques. (Mr. *Tarte*) 1028 (i).
- RIVIERE DU LOUP WORKSHOPS (I.C.R.) APPRENTICES : Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 1446 (i).
- ROACH'S POINT AND KESWICK MAIL CONTRACT : Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 5051, 6120, 6505 (ii).
- ROBINSON, GEO. F., SUPERANNUATION : Ques. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 6817 (ii).
- ROBINSON, JAMES, ESQ., MEMBER FOR NORTHUMBERLAND, N.B. : introduced, 1626 (i).
- ROCK. See "Cape Breton Ry."
- ROCKWAY VALLEY P.O., IMPROVED MAIL SERVICE : Ques. (Mr. *Devlin*) 3629 (ii).
- ROGERS, ROBT., OF MAN., AMOUNT DUE GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. *Griere*) 822 (i).
- ROLLING STOCK, I.C.R., EMPLOYEES &c. : M. for Ret. (Mr. *McMullen*) 707 (i).
- ROYAL CAN. INFANTRY AND IMPERIAL GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. *O'Brien*) 1617 (i).
- ROYAL MILITARY COLLEGE. See "Military College."
- STE. ANNE DES MONTS MAIL SERVICE : Ques. (Mr. *Joneas*) 639 (i).
- ST. ALEXIS, LA MALBAIE AND ST. URBAIN MAIL CONTRACT : Ques. (Mr. *Angers*) 2340 (i).
- ST. ANDREW'S RAPIDS, IMPROVEMENTS : M. for Cor. (Mr. *Martin*) 3643 (ii).
- ST. CHARLES BRANCH RY., ESTIMATED COST : Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 5348, 6119 (ii).
- ST. JOHN AND DIGBY SS. SERVICE : in Com. of Sup., 7099 (ii).
- ST. JOHN (N.B.) HARBOUR FERRY BOATS : M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 3108 (i).
- CUSTOMS HOUSE : in Com. of Sup., 7089, 7145.
- IMPROVED NAVIGATION, EXPENDITURE : M. for Stmt.* (Mr. *Colter*) 1509 (i).
- Ques. (Mr. *Colter*) 892 (i).
- RET. re : inquiry (Mr. *Colter*) 3816, 6115 (ii).
- WINTER PORT, OCEAN SS. CONTRACT : M. (Mr. *Hazen*) 2670 (i).
- ST. JOHNS (P.Q.) ASSISTANT HARBOUR MASTER, APPNMT. : Ques. (Mr. *Laverigne*) 2341 (i).

- ST. LAURENT WHARF, PHILIAS FILLION : Ques. (Mr. Langelier) 1868 (i).
 — REPAIRS : Ques. (Mr. Turte) 1028 (i).
- St. Lawrence and Adirondaack. See "GRAND TRUNK," "SOUTH-WESTERN", &c.
- St. Lawrence and Adirondaack Ry. Co.'s B. No. 39 (Mr. Bergeron). 1st, 958; 2nd, 1024; in Com. and 3rd, 1860 (i). (59 Vic., c. 32.)
- St. Lawrence and Ottawa Ry Co.'s B. No. 25 (Mr. McLeod). 1st, 957; 2nd, 1023; in Com. and 3rd, 1812. (59 Vic., c. 33.)
- ST. LAWRENCE RIVER SHIP CHANNEL : in Com. of Sup. 7084 (ii).
- ST. LOUIS, AWARD BY SUPREME COURT : Ques. (Mr. Landerkin) 6505 (ii).
 — QUEEN vs., re CURRAN BRIDGE CONTRACTS : Ques. (Mr. Edgar) 2006 (i).
 — CLAIM re CURRAN BRIDGE : Ques. (Mr. Landerkin) 2177 (i).
 — SUIT AGAINST GOVT. re QUEEN vs. CURRAN BRIDGE : Ques. (Mr. Landerkin) 5348 (ii).
 — CLAIMS AGAINST GOVT. re CURRAN BRIDGE : Ques. (Mr. McMullen) 3631 (ii).
- ST. PAUL DE CHESTER, &c., MAIL CONTRACTOR, COMPLAINTS, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Lavergne) 5056 (ii).
- ST. PETER'S CANAL (C.B.) EXPENDITURE FOR 1895 : Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 1870 (i).
 — in Com. of Sup., 7078; conc., 7164 (ii).
- ST. ROCHS DE RICHELIEU MAIL CONTRACT : Ques. (Mr. Bruneau) 1446 (i).
- ST. URBAIN, LA MALBAIE AND ST. ALEXIS MAIL CONTRACT : Ques. (Mr. Angers) 2340 (i).
- ST. VINCENT DE PAUL PENITENTIARY : in Com. of Sup., 7092 (ii).
- Safety of Labour Employees Passengers B. No. 2** (Mr. Casey). 1st, 6; 2nd m., 900; 2nd neg., 909; 2nd and M. to ref. to Com., 932; ref. to Com., 947 (i).
- SALARIES INCREASED BY ORDERS IN COUNCIL : Ques. (Mr. McMullen) 2650 (i).
 — MONTREAL CUSTOMS OFFICIALS : M. for Ret.* (Mr. McMullen) 3637 (ii).
- Salaries of Public Employees, Assignment, &c., B. No. 57** (Mr. Bechard). 1st, 1511.
- "SAN PEDRO," REMOVAL OF WRECK : Ques. (Mr. Martin) 821 (i).
 — Remarks (Mr. Martin) 2180 (i).
- SATURDAY SITTINGS : Ms. (Sir Charles Tupper) 5124, 5137, 5170, 5207 (ii).
 Deb. (Mr. Laurier) 5124, 5127, 5139; (Mr. Sutherland) 5124, 5144; (Mr. Charlton) 5125, 5131; (Mr. Speaker) 5126, 5128, 5132, 5157; (Mr. Ouimet) Amt., 5127, agreed to (Y. 91, N. 4) 5165; (Mr. Ives) 5127; (Mr. Casey) 5128, 5131, 5139; (Mr. Davies, P. E. I.) 5130, 5134; (Mr. McCarthy) 5131, 5136, 5197; (Sir Richard Cartwright) 5132; (Mr. Mulock) 5132; (Mr. Wallace) 5133, 5189; (Mr. Mills, Bothwell) 5135; (Mr. Fraser) 5136, 5187; (Mr. Macdonald, Huron) 5137, 5156; (Mr. Foster) 5140; (Mr. Sproule) 5146; (Mr. Lavergne) 5148; (Mr. Gibson) 5149; (Mr. Gillies) 5151; (Mr. Turte) 5152; (Mr. Taylor) 5158; (Mr. Edgar) 5157;
- SATURDAY SITTINGS—Continued.
 (Mr. Borden) 5159; (Mr. Dawson) 5162; (Mr. McNeill) 5162, 5173; (Mr. O'Brien) Amt., 5168, neg. (Y. 30, N. 90) 5205; (Mr. Bain) 5131; (Mr. Macdonald) 5183; (Mr. Semple) 5194; (Mr. McMillan) 5195; (Mr. Haggart) 5203 (ii).
- SAULT STE. MARY CANAL : in Com. of Sup., 7145 (ii).
- SAW LOGS, EXPORTS : Remarks (Mr. Macdonnell, Algoma) 1891 (i).
- SCHOOLS, &c., N.W.T. : in Com. of Sup., 7129 (ii).
- SCHOOL ORDINANCE OF THE N.W.T., PREMIER'S REMARKS : Ques. (Mr. Davin) 818 (i).
 — LT.-GOV.'S REP. : M. for copies* (Mr. McMillan) 3635 (ii).
- Schomberg and Aurora Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 45** (Mr. Coatsworth). 1st, 958; 2nd, 1024 (i); in Com. and 3rd, 3848 (ii). (59 Vic., c. 34.)
- SCHOONER "MARY E. HARLOW," WRECK : Ques. (Mr. White, Shelburne) 2177 (i).
- SCRIP FOR SCOUTS DURING N.W. REBELLION : prop. Res. (Mr. Davin) 3637 (ii).
- SEALERS (CAN.) DUTIES EXACTED ON STORES BY NFLD. : Ques. (Mr. McDougall) 5055 (ii).
- SECRETARY OF STATE, DEPTL. REP. : presented (Sir Charles Tupper) 4375 (ii).
- SECRETARY OF STATE :
 ALGOMA ELECTION (1891) RETURNING OFFICER'S RET. : Ques. (Mr. Angot) 2179 (i).
 CATELLIER, L. A., SUPERANNUATION : Ques. (Mr. Bruneau) 4379 (ii).
 CIVIL SERVICE EXAMINERS : in Com. of Sup., 7033 (ii).
 COPYRIGHT, CAN. : Ques. (Mr. Edgar) 2337 (i).
 DISTRIBUTION OF ELECTION LITERATURE BY GOVT. : Remarks (Mr. Edgar) 6768 (ii).
 DOM. ELECTIONS ACT : Remarks (Mr. McCarthy) 6514 (ii).
 MONTMAGNY VOTERS' LIST, COST OF PREPARATION : Ques. (Mr. Choquette) 1351 (i).
 MONTREAL "GAZETTE", PAYMENTS FOR ADVERTISING, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Rider) 3634 (ii).
 PROHIBITION, COST OF ROYAL COMMISSION. Ques. : (Mr. Flint) 632 (i).
 RETURNS ORDERED IN 1894, NON-PRODUCTION : Ques. (Mr. Landerkin) 822, 1026 (i).
 RICHELIEU COUNTY, TOTAL COST OF VOTERS' LISTS : Ques. (Mr. Bruneau) 1621 (i).
 SWEATING SYSTEM, APPNMT. OF COMMISSIONER : Ques. (Mr. Casey) 1620 (i).
 — GOVT. ACTION re A. W. WRIGHT'S RRP. : Ques. (Mr. Ingram) 5052 (ii).
 VOTERS' LISTS, COST OF REVISION SINCE 1885 : Ques. (Mr. Monet) 824 (i).
 — DOM., TOTAL COST : Ques. (Mr. Legris, 1621).
 YALE AND CARIBOO ELECTORAL LISTS : M. for copy (Mr. Martin) 3652 (ii).
- Seduction, &c.** See "CRIMINAL CODE."
- SEED GRAIN TO ALBERTA SETTLERS, DISTRIBUTION : Ques. (Mr. Lavergne) 2341 (i).
 — HALF-BREEDS, N.W.T. : in Com. of Sup., 7124, 7125 (ii).
 — STANDARDS : Ques. (Mr. Davin) 2411 (i).
- SEL. STANDING COMS. : Lists presented (Mr. Foster) 832 (i).

501 A

- Senate and House of Commons Act Amt. B. No. 7** (Mr. *Mulock*). 1^o*, 13; 2^o*, 882; in Com., 893; Com. rose, 909; M. to place on Order paper for Com., 1510; neg. (Y. 49, N. 104) 1510, 1511 (i).
- Senate and House of Commons Act Amt. B. No. 111** (Mr. *Foster*). Res. prop., 6818; in Com., 6979; 1^o* of B., 6980; 2^o*, in Com. and 3^o*, 7108 (ii). (59 *Vic.*, c. 7.)
- SENATE AND HOUSE OF COMMONS, DEDUCTIONS FOR NON-ATTENDANCE: Prop. Res. (Mr. *Foster*) 6818.
- SENATORIAL APPOINTMENTS, JAN., 1896: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1024 (i).
- SESSIONAL EMPLOYEES, NON-PAYMENT: M. to adjn. Hse. (Mr. *Sproule*) 4900 (ii).
- Deb. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 4902; (Mr. *Gibson*) 4902; (Mr. *Laurier*) 4902; (Mr. *McShane*) 4903; (Mr. *Casey*) 4903; (Mr. *Lister*) 4904; (Mr. *Allan*) 4906; (Mr. *Mulock*) 4906; (Mr. *Lépine*) 4909; (Mr. *McKay*) 4910; (Mr. *Fraser*) 4910; (Mr. *Craig*) 4911; (Mr. *McMullen*) 4914; (Mr. *Foster*) 4914; (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 4915 (ii).
- SHEEP SCAB, INTRODUCTION FROM U.S. INTO N.W.T.: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1029 (i).
- SHEEP SCHEDULED BY GREAT BRITAIN: Ques. Mr. *Casey* 633 (i).
- SHEIKS ISLAND DAM, LEASE OF WATER POWER: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 6120 (ii).
- SHIPMENTS OF DISEASED HORSES TO GREAT BRITAIN *via* CAN.: Ques. (Mr. *Featherston*) 3106 (i).
- SHIPPING DAMAGES ON WELLAND CANAL: Ques. (Mr. *Gibson*) 3816 (ii).
- SHORTIS, VALENTINE, COMMUTATION OF DEATH SENTENCE: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 818; M. for Ret. 836 (i); (remarks) 7171 (ii);
 — Ques. (Mr. *Rider*) 1025 (i).
 — PRINTING PAPERS *re* CASE: M. (Mr. *Soriver*) 1996 (i).
- SIMARD, ARTHUR, LIGHTHOUSE-KEEPER, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Angers*) 4380 (ii).
- SIMS & SLATER CONTRACT, CAPE BRETON RY.: Ques. (Mr. *Cameron*, *Inverness*) 2004 (i).
- SKEENA RIVER FISHERMEN, SUNDAY REST: Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 3632 (ii).
- SMALL, H. B., SUPERANNUATION: in Com. of Sup., 7090 (ii).
- SMELT FISHING, EXTENSION OF CLOSE SEASON: Ques. (Mr. *Davies*, *P.E.I.*) 3632 (ii).
- SMITH, MR., QUARTERS IN QUEBEC OBSERVATORY: Ques. (Mr. *Bruneau*) 3101 (i).
- SMITH, SIR DONALD, VISIT TO WINNIPEG: M. to adjn Hse. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 4274 (ii).
- Deb. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 4275, 4278, 4291, 4320; (Mr. *Mills*, *Bothwell*) 4277; (Mr. *Edgar*) 4278; (Mr. *Speaker*) Ques. of Order, 4290, 4293, 4304, 4312; (Mr. *Mara*) 4291; (Mr. *McCarthy*) 4279, 4317; (Mr. *Ouimet*) 4280, 4303; (Mr. *Davies*, *P.E.I.*) 4281, 4330; (Mr. *Cockburn*) 4283; (Mr. *Dickey*) 4284, 4330; (Mr. *Martin*) 4285, 4297; (Mr. *Casey*) 4287, 4328; (Mr. *Mulock*) 4289; (Mr. *Davin*) 4301, 4334; (Sir *Donald Smith*) 4295; (Mr. *Tarte*) 4314; (Mr. *Weldon*) 4332; (Mr. *Flint*) 4336.
- SMITH, SIR DONALD, VISIT TO WINNIPEG: Order, Ques. of (Mr. *Ouimet*) *ref.* to past deb., 4303 (ii).
 — Ques. (Mr. *McCarthy*) 2658 (i).
- SOLICITOR GEN. EX. PRIV. SEC.: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 4378 (ii).
- SOREL ILLICIT WHISKEY STILLS, PROSECUTIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Bruneau*) 1677 (i).
- SOURIS BREAKWATER, TENDER AND CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 2650 (i).
- SOULANGES CANAL, CONTRACTOR'S CLAIMS: Ques. (Mr. *Casey*) 2005 (i).
 — GEO. GOODWIN'S CONTRACTS: M. for copies* (Mr. *Davies*, *P.E.I.*) 3109 (i).
 — RET. *re*: inquiry (Mr. *Davies*) 4375 (ii).
 — on M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Davies*) 6514, 7114 (ii).
- Deb. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 6514, 7115; (Mr. *Edgar*) 6568, 7117 (Mr. *Haggart*) 6578; (Mr. *McCarthy*) 6584, 7118; (Mr. *Dickey*) 6589, 7017; (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 6591, 7016, 7115; (Mr. *Gibson*) 6665; (Mr. *Campbell*) 6681; (Mr. *McMullen*) 6840; (Mr. *Lister*) 6944; (Mr. *Mills*, *Bothwell*) 7117; (Mr. *Mulock*) 7119.
- SOUTHERN RY. (B.C.) CO.'S SUBSIDY: M. for O.C. (Mr. *Martin*) 3658 (ii).
- South Ont. Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. No. 40 (Mr. *Sutherland*). 1^o*, 958; 2^o*, 1024; in Com. and 3^o*, 1860 (i). (59 *Vic.*, c. 35).
- South Shore Suburban Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 36 (Mr. *Lachapelle*). 1^o*, 958; 2^o*, 1024; in Com. and 3^o*, 3280 (i). (59 *Vic.*, c. 36.)
- South-western Ry. Co. and St. Lawrence and Adirondack Ry. Co.'s B. No. 50 (Mr. *Bergeron*). 1^o*, 1088; 2^o*, 1222, in Com. and 3^o*, 3280 (i). (59 *Vic.*, c. 37.)
- SPEECH FROM THE THRONE: Rep. (Mr. *Speaker*) 2 (i).
- SPENCE'S BRIDGE AND KAMLOOPS (B.C.) MAIL CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1186 (i).
- SPIRITS, REFUND OF DUTIES, U.S. OR CAN.: Ques. (Mr. *Rider*) 5123 (ii).
- STANDARDS, GRAIN, REP. OF MEETING IN WINNIPEG: Remarks (Mr. *Mulock*) 2007 (i). *See* "Grain."
- STANDING COMS., SEL., NAMES ADDED: M. (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) 2095, 2172 (i).
- STANDING ORDERS, SEL. COM.: List of Members, 885.
- "STANLEY," STR., CAPE TORMENTINE AND CAPE TRAVERSE SERVICE: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Yeo*) 4596 (ii).
 — MAIL SERVICE, P.E.I. AND MAINLAND: Ques. (Mr. *Davies*, *P.E.I.*) 2409 (i).
 — MAGDALEN ISLANDS' MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 1865 (i).
- STANSTEAD CUSTOMS COLLECTOR: Ques. (Mr. *Rider*) 1026 (i).
- STANTON, E. P.: in Com. of Sup., 7031 (ii).
- STATISTICAL YEAR-BOOK: in Com. of Sup., 7140 (ii).
- Statutes. *See* "REVISION."
- Steamboat Inspection and Engineer's Licenses B. No. 96 (Mr. *Costigan*). 1^o*, 6499 (ii).
- STREAMSHIP SUBSIDIES, OCEAN, AND MAIL SERVICE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Hazen*) 821 (i).
- STRAITS OF NOTHUMBERLAND, MAP *re* BORINGS: M. for copy* (Mr. *Perry*) 4596 (ii).

STRAITS OF NORTHUMBERLAND. See "Northumberland."

STUBBS, WILLIAM, ESQ., MEMBER FOR CARDWELL: introduced, 6 (i).

SUBSIDIES:

OCEAN MAIL SERVICE, SS. SUBSIDIES: Ques. (Mr. Hazen) 821 (i).

— FRANCE AND BELGIUM: prop. Res. (Mr. Ives) 2236 (i).

QUEBEC NORTH SHORE RY.: Ques. (Mr. Rider) 1622 (i).

RY. SUBSIDIES (UNPAID) & C.: M. for Ret.* (Sir Richard Cartwright) 3108 (i).

SOUTHERN RY. (B.C.) CO.: M. for. O. C. (Mr. Martin) 3658 (ii).

NLAGARA CENTRAL RY.: Ques. (McMullen) 6508 (ii).

SUDBURY COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS, RESIGNATION: Ques. (Mr. Somerville) 4557 (ii).

— POSTMASTER, RESIGNATION: Ques. (Mr. Somerville) 4556 (ii).

SUGAR IMPORTS FOR CONSUMPTION: Ques. (Mr. Dawson) 1183 (i).

— IMPORTS, EX SS. "CYNTHANIA": Ques. (Mr. McMullen) 3629, 5345 (ii).

— TEA, AND COFFEE IMPORTATIONS: Ques. (Mr. Girouard) 1864 (i).

SUMMERSIDE BREAKWATERS, CONSTRUCTION: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Yeo) 4596 (ii).

SUPERANNUATIONS AND APPNMTS.: Ques. (Mr. Somerville) 6509 (ii).

Superannuation (Civil Service) Abolition B. No. 19 (Mr. McMullen). 1^o*, 216; objection taken by Mr. Speaker to 2^o, 1661; deb. adjd., 1675 (i); rsmd. and 2^o neg. (Y. 61, N. 72) 4655 (ii)

— FUND, CONTRIBUTIONS BY DEPTL. EMPLOYEES: M. for Ret.* (Mr. McMullen) 711 (ii).

— OFFICERS CONTRIBUTING, NAMES, & C.: M. for Ret. (Sir James Grant) 1508 (i).

— RET. *re* CONTRIBUTORS: inquiry (Mr. McMullen) 3047 (i).

— DEPT. OF AGRICULTURE: Ques. (Mr. Carroll) 1861 (i).

— LT.-COL. MACPHERSON: Ques. (Mr. Landerkin) 2339 (i).

— RETURNS: Ques. (Mr. McMullen) 288 (i).

SUPERIOR COURT (QUE.) ADDITIONAL JUDGE: prop. Res. (Mr. Dickey) 6594 (ii).

SUPPLY:

[Only subjects which caused remark or discussion noted under this head.]

AMTS. AND REMARKS TO MS. FOR COM.: Objection (Sir Richard Cartwright) Auditor General's Rep., 766 (i); Remarks (Mr. Davies, P.E.I., &c.) Soulanges Canal Contract, 6514, 6655, 6831, 6944; Remarks (Mr. Martin) Battleford and Saskatoon Mail Service) 6992; Remarks (Mr. Borden, &c.) Lt.-Col. Worsley's charges against Lt.-Col. Murray, 7007; Remarks (Sir Richard Cartwright) Geo. Goodwin's contract, 7016; Remarks (Mr. Mulock) Lt.-Col. Hamilton's Case, 7017, 7123; Remarks (Sir Richard Cartwright) Canadian Credit, 7042; Personal Explanation (Mr. Borden) Ministers under Mr. McKenzie's Regime, 7043; Remarks

SUPPLY—Continued.

(Mr. Martin) Yale and Cariboo Nominations, 7045; Remarks (Mr. Davies, P.E.I.) Geo. Goodwin's Contract, 7144 (ii).

MESS. FROM HIS EX.; Transmitting Estimates for 1896-97, 687 (i); Suppl., 1895-96, 6110 (ii).

RES. (Mr. Foster) FOR COM., 601; MS., 766, (The Budget) 961; deb. adjd., 1016; rsmd., 1255, 1349, 1551, 1679, 1776, 1892, 2013, 2096, 2230, 2411, 2533 (i); 6514, 6655, 6831, 6944, 6992, 7042, 7114 (ii).

IN COM.: 812, 2639 (i), 6953, 7030, 7046, 7123 (ii).

COMMITTEE:

Administration of Justice, 7045 (ii).

Arts, Agriculture, &c.:

Census of Man., 7140; conc., 7165 (ii).

Exhibition, N.W.T., 7141.

Experimental Farm Bulletins, 7141 (ii).

Meats and Perishable Foods, 7140 (ii).

Statistical Year-Book, 7140 (ii).

Canals—Capital:

Cornwall, 7143 (ii).

Lachine, 7143; conc., 7165 (ii).

Rapide Plat, 7144 (ii).

Rideau, 7144 (ii).

Sault Ste. Marie, 7145 (ii).

Canals—Income:

Beauharnois, 7077; conc., 7149 (ii).

Rideau, 7077 (ii).

St. Peter's, 7078; conc., 7164 (ii).

Civil Government:

Agriculture Dept., 7030 (ii).

Indian Affairs, 7031 (ii).

Contingencies, 7030 (ii).

Gov. Gen.'s Sec.'s Office, 812 (i), 7031 (ii).

Post Office Dept., 7031 (ii).

Privy Council Office, 2639 (i).

Militia and Defence Dept., 7033 (ii).

Civil Service Examiners, 7033 (ii).

Interior Dept., 7035 (ii).

Customs Dept., 7036 (ii).

Public Works Dept., 7037 (ii).

Collection of Revenues: Post Office, 7133, 7146 (ii).

Dominion Lands—Capital, 7139 (ii).

Dominion Police, 7051 (ii).

Dominion Steamers: Quadra, Str., Repairs, 7100 (ii).

Fisheries, 7100; conc., 7164.

Geological Survey: Artesian Borings in N.W.T., 7125.

Govt. of N. W. T.: Schools, clerical assistance, &c. 7129 (ii).

Indians:

Man. and N.W.T., 7147 (ii).

Ont. and Que., 7124 (ii).

Seed grain, &c., Half-breeds, 7124 (ii).

Legislation: Senate, 7051 (ii).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions:

Can., France and Belgium, 7099 (ii).

Liverpool and St. John, 7093 (ii).

St. John and Digby, 7099 (ii).

Militia:

Arms and ammunition, 7053; conc., 7147 (ii).

Guy, Major G., services N.W.T. Rebellion, 7142.

Miscellaneous:

Boundary, Can. and United States, 7125 (ii).

Seed grain, &c., Half-breeds, 7125 (ii).

O'Hanly, J. L. P., services, 7123 (ii).

Travelling expenses, Dep. Min. Marine, 7129 (ii).

Mounted Police, 7053 (ii).

Colebrooks, late Sergt., 7052 (ii).

Suppl. vote to complete service, 7123 (ii).

SUPPLY—Continued.

COMMITTEE—Continued.

Public Works—Capital:

Harbours and Rivers:

St. Lawrence River Ship Channel, 7084 (ii).

Public Works—Income:

Buildings:

British Columbia:

Victoria P.O., 7094 (ii).

Manitoba:

Winnipeg Military Buildings, 7094 (ii).

New Brunswick:

St. John Custom House, 7089, 7145 (ii).

Quebec:

St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, 7092 (ii).

Repairs, Furniture, &c.:

Ottawa Public Buildings, 7094 (ii).

Harbours and Rivers.

British Columbia:

Kootenay Rapids, Navigation, 7096 (ii).

Ontario:

Owen Sound Harbour, 7096 (ii).

Roads and Bridges:

Burlington Canal Swing Bridge, 7097 (ii).

Quarantine, 7051 (ii).

Railways—Capital:

Gov.-Gen.'s car "Victoria," 7076 (ii).

CONCURRENCE:

Arms and Ammunition, 7147 (ii).

Beauharnois Canal, 7149 (ii).

Census of Man., 7165 (ii).

Fishery Inspection, 7164 (ii).

Lachine Canal, 7166 (ii).

St. Peter's Canal, 7164 (ii).

Supply B. No. 112 (Mr. Foster). 1^o*, 2^o*, and 3^o, 7170 (ii). (59 Vic., c. 1).

Supreme and Exchequer Courts Acts

Amt. B. No. 84 (Mr. Dickey). 1^o*, 3596 (i); 2^o*, in Com. and 3^o*, 7170 (ii). (59 Vic., c. 14.)

SUPREME COURT REPS., DELAY IN PUBLICATION: Ques.

(Sir Richard Cartwright) 637 (1).

SUPREME COURT. See "FORESTERS."

SURVEY, MONTREAL TO ST. JOHN'S CANAL: Ques.

(Mr. McShane) 3634 (ii).

SUSSEX (N.B.) MILITARY GROUNDS, LEASE, &c. : M.

for copies* (Mr. Davies, P.E.I.) 3108 (i).

— Ques. (Mr. Davies, P.E.I.) 3628 (i).

SWEATING SYSTEM, APPOINT. OF COMMISSIONER: Ques.

(Mr. Casey) 1620 (i).

— GOVT. ACTION re A. W. WRIGHT'S REP.:

Ques. (Mr. Ingram) 5052 (ii).

TABULATED STATEMENTS INSERTED IN OFFICIAL REP.:

Remarks (Mr. McMullen) 2008 (i).

TARTE, J. I., PAYMENTS TO BY PUBLIC DEPTS. : M. for

Stmnt. (Mr. Tarte) 1450 (i).

TAY CANAL, CLAIMS FOR LAND DAMAGES: Ques. (Mr.

Cameron, Huron) 2177 (i).

— MAINTENANCE, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Perry) 1864, 1865 (i).

— ORIGINAL AND ESTIMATED COST: Ques. (Mr. (Landerkin) 5348 (ii).

— PROPERTIES EXPROPRIATED BY GOVT. : M. for

Stmnt. (Mr. Mulock) 1507 (i).

— REVENUE AND EXPENDITURE: Ques. (Mr.

Mulock) 1867 (i).

TAY CANAL, TOLLS COLLECTED, 1895: Ques. (Mr. Charlton) 5346 (ii).

— COST OF MANAGEMENT: Ques. (Mr. Charlton) 6116 (ii).

TEA, COFFEE AND SUGAR IMPORTATIONS: Ques. (Mr. Girouard) 1864 (i).

TELEGRAM, re MAN. SCHOOLS, MR. GREENWAY'S: read (Sir Charles Tupper) 3098 (i).

— Remarks (Mr. Laurier) 3111 (i).

THAMES RIVER, DREDGING, EXPENDITURE: M. for

Ret. (Mr. Campbell) 5084 (ii).

THEATRICAL SCENERY, &c., DUTIES: Ques. (Mr. McShane) 4378 (ii).

THOROLD CEMENT USED IN WELLAND CANAL, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Gibson) 3631 (ii).

Thousand Islands Ry. Co.'s B. No. 60 (Mr. Taylor). 1^o*, 1775; 2^o*, 2129; in Com. and 3^o*, 3280 (i). (59 Vic., c. 38.)

THREE RIVERS HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS: Ques. (Mr. Langelier) 641 (i).

— HARBOUR DEBENTURES: Ques. (Mr. Rinfret) 641 (i).

— WEIGHTS AND MEASURES INSPECTOR: Ques. (Mr. Leduc) 641, 823 (i).

TIGNISH BREAKWATER, ENGINEER'S REP. : M. for

copy (Mr. Perry) 1079 (i).

— INSPECTION AND REPAIRS: Ques. (Mr. Perry) 1253 (i).

— PETS. re REPAIRS: Ques. (Mr. Perry) 2180 (i).

— POST OFFICE, REVENUE: Ques. (Mr. Perry) 1864 (i).

— BREAKWATER, SURVEYS, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Perry) 634 (i).

— WHARFAGE DUES: Ques. (Mr. Perry) 643 (i).

TOBACCO, RAW LEAF, IMPORTATIONS: Ques. (Mr. Jeannotte) 637 (i).

TONNAGE TAX, ABOLITION ON HOSPITAL DUES: Ques. (Mr. McShane) 1619 (i).

TORONTO CUSTOMS EMPLOYEES, NUMBER, &c. : Ques. (Mr. McMullen) 4380 (ii).

— FRAUDS, SAMUEL DAVISON: Ques. (Mr. Landerkin) 3103 (i).

Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Ry. Co.'s

B. No. 70 (Mr. McKay). 1^o*, 2096; 2^o, 2370; in Com. and 3^o, 3848 (ii). (59 Vic., c. 39.)

Toronto, Hamilton and Niagara Falls

Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 61 (Mr. Bennett). 1^o*, 1775; 2^o*, 2129 (i).

TRADE AND COMMERCE:

ATLANTIC FAST SS. SERVICE AND PACIFIC CABLE: M. for

Cor.* (Mr. Laurier) 1087 (i).

— Remarks (Mr. Borden) 3272 (i).

AUSTRALIA AND NEW ZEALAND, IMPORTS FROM: Ques. (Mr. Mills, Bothwell) 1678 (i).

EXPORTS AND IMPORTS OF BUTTER: Ques. (Mr. Bain) 4380 (ii).

FLOUR AND WHEAT, IMPORTS FOR CONSUMPTION: Ques. (Mr. Campbell) 2651 (i).

GRAIN STANDARDS IN N.W.T.: Ques. (Mr. Davis) 1863, 2411 (i).

— REP. OF MEETING IN WINNIPEG: Remarks (Mr. Mulock) 2007 (i).

TRADE AND COMMERCE—Continued.

- IMPORTS AND DUTY COLLECTED ON SALT PORK: Ques. (Mr. Borden) 2179 (i).
- IMPORTS AND EXPORTS (1891 TO 1896) REBATES: M. for Stmt. * (Mr. McMillan) 3636 (ii).
- MAPLE SUGAR, EXPORTS AND IMPORTS: Ques. (Mr. Rider) 819 (i).
- RICE MEAL, EXPORTS BY MOUNT ROYAL MILLING CO.: Ques. (Mr. McShane) 3634 (ii).
- SAW LOGS, EXPORTS: Remarks (Mr. Macdonnell, Algoma) 1891 (i).
- SUGAR IMPORTED FOR CONSUMPTION: Ques. (Mr. Dawson) 1183 (i).
- TEA AND COFFEE IMPORTATIONS: Ques. (Mr. Girouard) 1864 (i).
- WHEAT GRADING FRAUDS IN MAN. AND N.W.T.: prop. Res. (Mr. Davin) 1031, 1049 (i).
- [See "CUSTOMS," "INLAND REVENUE," &C.]
- TRADE AND COMMERCE, REP.: presented (Mr. Ives) 1346 (i).
- TRADE AND NAVIGATION RETS.: presented (Mr. Wood) 603 (i).
- Trade Marks and Designs Act Amt. B. No. 18 (Mr. Coatsworth). 1^o, 216 (i).
- Trade Restraint. See "CONSPIRACIES."
- TRANSLATION OF LAWS INTO GERMAN FOR MAN. AND N. W. T.: Ques. (Mr. Davin) 3099, 4379 (i).
- TREATY, 1888, "MODUS VIVENDI," WITHDRWL.: M. for Cor. (Mr. Laurier) 1064 (i).
- TUPPER, R. L., FISHERY INSPECTOR, COMPLAINTS AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. McCarthy) 6507 (ii).
- Ques. (Mr. Martin) 6509 (ii).
- TUPPER, SIR CHARLES, ALLOWANCES AS ACTING HIGH COMMISSIONER: Ques. (Mr. Casey) 4376 (ii).
- OFFICES AND SALARIES SINCE 1883: Ques. (Mr. Casey) 888 (i).
- MEMBER FOR CAPE BRETON: Introduced, 1510.
- OFFICIAL STATUS: Ques. (Mr. Casey) 639 (i).
- TRAVELLING AT GOVT. EXPENSE: Ques. (Mr. Perry) 891 (i).
- M. (Mr. Casey) 959 (i).
- Remarks (Mr. Speaker) 959 (i).
- UNLEAVENED BREAD IMPORTATIONS, FREE ENTRY: (Mr. McShane) 6119 (ii).
- UNPARLIAMENTARY LANGUAGE (Mr. Speaker) 223, 246, 255, 472, 476, 1148, 1550, 1629, 2618, 2626 (i).
- U. S. ALIEN LABOUR LAW, RECIPROCAL RELAXATION: Ques. (Mr. Casey) 1623 (i).
- U. S. AND CAN., QUARANTINE REGULATIONS: Ques. (Mr. Smith, Ont.) 638 (i).
- VACANCIES: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 1, 144, 346, 1509 (i).
- VENEZUELAN QUESTION, MAPS ON RECORD IN LIBRARY: Remarks (Mr. Mills, Bothwell) 2006 (i).
- VERCHÈRES ELECTION, PAR. IN TORONTO *Globe*: Personal Explanation (Sir Adolphe Caron) 1347 (i).
- VESSELS THROUGH CHAMBLY CANAL, FROM 1892-95: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Langelier) 2370 (i).
- Victoria (B.C.) Electoral District provision B. 108 (Mr. Prior). 1^o, 6844; 2^o m., 6845; 2^o, 6868 (ii).
- POST OFFICE, CONTRACT AND SURETIES: Ques. (Mr. Edgar) 2652 (i).
- VICTORIA (B.C.) POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 7094 (ii).
- RET. OF MEMBER: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 69 (i).
- ELECTORAL DISTRICT, VACANCY: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 2 (i).
- VILLAGE LOTS AT CAYUGA, SALE: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Charlton) 3636 (ii).
- VOLUNTEERS, 1837-38, MONEY OR LAND GRANTS: Ques. (Mr. Boston) 1025 (i).
- IMPROVED RIFLES: Ques. (Mr. Casey) 3632 (ii).
- SOUDAN EXPEDITION: Remarks (Mr. Davies, P.E.I.) 4653;
- Ques. (Mr. Davies, P.E.I.) 4786 (ii).
- PRINCESS LOUISE DRAGOONS: Remarks (Mr. Davies, P.E.I.) 5057 (ii).
- VOTERS' LIST, COST OF REVISION SINCE 1885: Ques. (Mr. Monet) 824 (i).
- FOR DOM., TOTAL COST: Ques. (Mr. Legris) 1621 (i).
- MONTMAGNY, COST OF PREPARATION: Ques. (Mr. Choquette) 1251 (i).
- RICHELIEU COUNTY, TOTAL COST: Ques. (Mr. Bruneau) 1621 (i).
- Voters' Lists (1896) Revision B. No. 87 (Mr. Dickey). 1^o, 4650; 2^o and in Com., 6594; 3^o, 6625 (ii). (59 *Vic.*, c. 6.)
- VOTES AND PROCEEDINGS, OMISSION OF M.: Remarks (Mr. Edgar) 5216 (ii).
- AMT. (Sir Charles Tupper) agreed to (Y. 99, N. 7) 5223 (ii).
- WALL, DR., CLAIM FOR DAMAGES AGAINST P.E.I. RY.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Davies, P.E.I.) 3108 (i).
- WALPOLE INDIAN RESERVE, SALE, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Mills, Bothwell) 1889 (i).
- LEASE OR SALE OF MARSH: Ques. (Mr. Mills, Bothwell) 642 (i).
- WATSON, MAJOR T. C.: in Com. of Sup., 7033 (ii).
- WATTERS, J. F.: in Com. of Sup., 7033 (ii).
- WAYS AND MEANS: Res. for Com. (Mr. Foster) 601.
- See BUDGET, The.
- WEAVER SETTLEMENT (N.S.) POSTMASTER'S SALARY: Ques. (Mr. Bowers) 2002 (i).
- WEIGHTS AND MEASURES AND GAS REPT.: presented (Mr. Costigan) 31 (i).
- INSPECTOR, THREE RIVERS: Ques. (Mr. Leduc) 823 (i).
- WELLAND CANAL, CLAIMS FOR ALLEGED DAMAGES: M. for Stmt.* (Mr. Gibson) 1889 (i).
- DAMAGES BY SHIPPING: Ques. (Mr. Gibson) 3816 (ii).
- THOROLD CEMENT USED IN BUILDING, &C.: Ques. (Mr. Gibson) 3630 (ii).
- WELLINGTON BRIDGES, LACHINE CANAL, COST OF CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. McMullen) 6118 (ii).
- WESTMORELAND ELECTORAL DISTRICT: Member introduced, 6 (i).
- RETURN OF MEMBER: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 2 (i).
- VACANCY: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 1 (i).

- WHEAT GRADING FRAUDS IN MAN. AND N.W.T.:
prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 1031, 1049 (i).
- WHITEHEAD CANAL, COMPLETION : Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*)
1677 (i).
- WICKSTEED, RICHARD J., DISMISSAL FROM HOUSE OF
COMMONS : M. for Cor.* (Mr. *McCarthy*) 3107 (i).
- WILSON, LT.-COL., R.C.A., INSTRUCTIONS *re* VISIT
TO ENGLAND : Ques. (Mr. *Godbout*) 2003 (i).
- Winding-Up Amt. Act (1889) B. No. 68
(Mr. *Geoffrion*). 1°, 2002 (i).
- Winnipeg and Great Northern Ry. Co's
B. No. 32 (Mr. *Boyd*). 1°, 958 ; 2°, 1024 ;
in Com. and 3°, 3280 (i). (59 *Vic.*, c. 40.)
- WINNIPEG AND PILOT MOUND MAIL CONTRACT : M,
for copy* (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 4596 (ii).
- COLL. OF CUSTOMS, INSPECTOR YOUNG'S IN-
STRUCTIONS : M. for copies* (Mr. *Tarte*) 3637 (ii).
- MILITARY BUILDINGS : in Com. of Sup., 7094.
- WINTER PORT, ST. JOHN (N.B.) OCEAN SS. CON-
TRACT : M. (Mr. *Hazen*) 2670 (i).
- WOLSELEY (N.W.T.) COURT HOUSE, COMPLETION
AND COST : Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 3629 (ii).
- WORSLEY, LT.-COL., CHARGES AGAINST : on M. for
Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 7008 (ii).
- Wrecks, Casualties and Salvage Act
Amt. B. No. 101 (Mr. *Costigan*). 1°, 6499 (ii).
- WRIGHT, A. W., APPNMT. AS COMMISSIONER *re*
SWEATING SYSTEM : Ques. (Mr. *Casey*) 1620.
- GOVT. ACTION *re* SYSTEM : Ques. (Mr. *Ingram*)
5052 (ii).
- Yale and Carriboo Electoral Districts
provision B. No. 109 (Mr. *Dickey*). 1°,
6868 (ii).
- ELECTORAL LISTS : M. for copy (Mr. *Martin*)
3652 (ii).
- NOMINATIONS : on M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr.
Martin) 7045 (ii).
- YAMASKA LOCK TOLLS COLLECTED, &c. : Ques. (Mr.
Mignault) 6508 (ii).
- RIVER BRIDGE : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Bruneau*)
4589, 5059 (ii).
- YOUNG, GEO. H., REP. *re* THOS. SCOTT'S CONDUCT :
M. for copy* (Mr. *Tarte*) 3637 (ii).
- Yukon and B. C. Trading and Develop-
ment Co. of Can. incorp. B. No. 89
(Mr. *Corbould*). 1°, 4788 ; 2°, 6811 ; in Com.
and 3°, 7042, (ii). (59 *Vic.*, c. 41.)